



## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

MONDAY 8TH APRIL 2019  
AT 6.00 P.M.

PARKSIDE SUITE - PARKSIDE

MEMBERS: Councillors L. C. R. Mallett (Chairman), S. A. Webb (Vice-Chairman), C. Allen-Jones, S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, M. Glass, C.A. Hotham, R. J. Laight, P. M. McDonald, 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 4th March 2019 (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Former Market Hall site Redevelopment - Phase 2 - Pre-scrutiny - To follow
5. Transport Planning Review Draft Report (Pages 7 - 32)
6. WCC LTP4 on the district of Bromsgrove (Pages 33 - 34)
7. Finance and Budget Working Group - update

*As this is the last meeting of the municipal year, Members may wish to take time to review the work of this Group and consider whether there are any particular areas which they would like to be included in the future plans section of the Board's annual report.*

8. Corporate Performance Working Group - update

*As this is the last meeting of the municipal year, Members may wish to take time to review the work of this Group and consider whether there are any particular areas which they would like to be included in the future plans section of the Board's annual report.*

9. Draft Overview and Scrutiny Board Annual Report 2018/19 (Pages 35 - 54)

10. Task Group Updates

- Bromsgrove Sporting Football Club Task Group
- Business Rates Relief – Short Sharp Review

11. Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee - update (Pages 55 - 60)

12. Cabinet Work Programme - To follow

13. Overview and Scrutiny Board Work Programme (Pages 61 - 64)

K. DICKS  
Chief Executive

Parkside  
Market Street  
BROMSGROVE  
Worcestershire  
B61 8DA

29th March 2019



## **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)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

**4TH MARCH 2019, 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, P.L. Thomas and M. Thompson

Observers: Councillor C. B. Taylor

Officers: Mrs. R. Bamford, Mr. D. M. Birch, Ms F. Mughal, Ms. J. Pickering and Ms. A. Scarce

112/18 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor R.J. Deeming and P.M. McDonald.

113/18 **TRANSPORT PLANNING REPORT - TO FOLLOW**

Members were informed that the consideration of the Transport Planning Review draft report had been deferred to the next meeting in April, 2019. The Chairman explained that the small sub group of Members (Councillors Mallett, Webb, Colella and Thomas) who had met with the officers from Worcestershire County Council would be meeting to discuss the draft final report, before it was brought before the Board.

114/18 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING ARRANGEMENTS**

There were no declarations of interest or whipping arrangements.

115/18 **TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD HELD ON 11TH FEBRUARY 2019**

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February, 2019 were submitted for Members' consideration.

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on 11<sup>th</sup> February, 2019 be approved as an accurate record.

116/18

## **PLANNING ENFORCEMENT PROCESS**

Members were reminded that at the Overview and Scrutiny meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> January, 2019 a topic proposal form was submitted to review the Council's Planning Enforcement Department, in particular, to look at processes and breaches of Planning Policy and Regulations.

Members were advised that should the Board agree to establish a Task Group for an investigation of the work and processes of the Council Planning Department that the initial meeting would need to be arranged in the new municipal year.

The Development Management Manager and the Head of Planning and Regeneration gave a presentation in respect of the planning enforcement process and the breach of planning control. The key areas were highlighted as follows:

- What was a breach of planning control? A breach of planning control was defined in section 171A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. If there was a breach of planning control, the Council would initially try to resolve the matter locally, before resorting to any formal enforcement action.
- When should enforcement action be taken? Whilst the Council had powers to take enforcement action if there was a breach, enforcement was there to prevent inappropriate development that would not get planning permission. It was explained that a large number of breaches had no action taken against them because they caused no planning harm.
- What are the time limits for taking enforcement action? It was explained that there were set time limits as to when enforcement action could be taken.
- What happens with enforcement enquiries? The process of how an enquiry would be dealt with from the initial report was explained, including the allocation of an officer to each case.

Arising from the presentation Members made the following comments and raised a number of concerns. Officers provided responses as follows:

- With regards to enforcement cases, Members felt that the current mechanism in place, to inform Members of any cases in relation to enforcement, was not working. Members were advised that if an enforcement enquiry was made, they would be advised at the initial stage and would also be made available to the public. However, once enforcement action had started this would not be available as it became a criminal case and the sharing of information may impact on the Council's case. However, The Head of Planning and Regeneration confirmed that she would be happy to share some of this information, in confidence, with Members, upon request.
- Officers clarified that any orders made would be available to the public; however, the full details of the case would remain confidential.

# Agenda Item 3

Overview and Scrutiny Board  
4th March 2019

- It was explained that the information would not be made available for public interest until a notice was served.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration emphasised that if Members had any concerns in relation to a particular site then they should contact her and she would be happy to discuss this with them.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration offered to meet with Members individually to go through any particular enforcement concerns they may have in relation to their Wards. Members also requested that the Council Enforcement Policy be made available to them.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Strategic Housing encouraged Members to talk to the Planners if they had any concerns regarding particular sites in their Wards. He accepted that it was difficult when legal enforcement action was being considered and that there was a need for confidentiality at some stages of that process.

Members asked for it to be noted, that whenever they had raised issues with the Planning Team, that they had been pleased with the support received, particularly in respect of any enforcement issues.

The Chairman asked Members to put forward any suggestions regarding any further steps to be taken in respect of the topic proposal and Members responded that it was felt that it was too broad. It was also recognised that a particular enforcement case could not be included within any review that was carried out.

Councillor S. Webb proposed that the presentation and the discussions simply be noted and that no further action be taken.

Councillor M. Thompson proposed that the topic proposal be added to the work programme of the Board for future consideration.

Members were reminded that the Board had previously carried out a detailed review with regard to the planning process and in particular enforcement processes and procedures was undertaken in 2011.

Members requested that the presentation be disseminated to them for their perusal.

**RESOLVED** that the presentation be noted and that no further action be taken.

117/18

## **WCC LTP4 ON THE DISTRICT OF BROMSGROVE**

Members were reminded that at the last meeting, the Board considered a proposal that had been received from Councillor S. Colella, for a scrutiny review in respect of an investigation into the effect of WCC LTP4 on the District of Bromsgrove. Members had concluded that the Head of

Planning and Regeneration be invited to attend this meeting to discuss the subject matter further in order to determine whether this would be a suitable topic for further scrutiny.

Councillor S. Colella requested that, as the Transport Planning Report had been deferred, that the consideration of the review also be deferred pending the outcome of the report to be considered at the next meeting.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration provided a brief update to Members in respect of the transport infrastructure in Bromsgrove. She informed the Board that whilst the accuracy of the data used for the Local Transport Plan 4(LTP4) was a key issue, the transport review would underpin the Strategic Transport Assessment which Worcestershire County Council (WCC) would carry out, supported by this Council's officers and Mott MacDonald. Members were informed that WCC had commissioned Jacobs to carry out the work and confirmed that they were the current consultant at WCC.

Councillor S. Colella commented that following the meeting, which had been held with a number of officers from WCC he had felt that they had not fully appreciated or considered the traffic infrastructure in the District and he was concerned that there was no vision for the future of the District. Councillor Colella further reiterated that the issues raised had not been considered in the LTP4. He felt that the LTP4 did not support the population, development and economic growth for Bromsgrove.

In reviewing the plan it was felt that the 'Predict and Provide' methodology used was not fit for purpose for Bromsgrove District and this had been replaced with 'Vision and Validates'. It was felt that the new approach was more appropriate for Bromsgrove.

Following the discussions it was agreed that the item would be deferred until the next meeting of the Board in order for it to be discussed in conjunction with the draft Transport Planning Review Report.

118/18

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

Members were informed that the next meeting of this Group would take place on 4<sup>th</sup> March, 2019 when the working group would consider a number of reports including the Investment and Acquisition Strategy and that an update would be provided at the next meeting of the Board in April 2019.

119/18

## **CORPORATE PERFORMANCE WORKING GROUP - VERBAL UPDATE**

Members were informed that the March 2019 scheduled meeting of the Group had been cancelled. The next performance report would be considered in June 2019, In light of this, the next meeting would be arranged to take place in the new municipal year.



120/18

## **TASK GROUP UPDATES**

Councillor M. Thompson provided the following updates:

- Bromsgrove Sporting Football Club Task Group – The Group was yet to meet and an update would be provided once the first meeting had taken place;
- Business Rates Relief Short Sharp Review – as previously advised, the Group had held two meetings and the next meeting was due to be arranged. The Senior Democratic Services Officer (Bromsgrove) advised that she would contact the Chartered Accountant in order to invite him to the next meeting once this had been arranged and an update would be provided in due course.

121/18

## **CABINET WORK PROGRAMME - TABLED AT THE MEETING**

Members considered the Cabinet Leader's Work Programme from the 1<sup>st</sup> April to 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2019 which was tabled at the meeting. The Senior Democratic Services Officer (Bromsgrove) provided the following update:

- Corporate Performance Reports would be considered by the Corporate Performance Working Group;
- Bromsgrove Enterprise Park – Build out was already on the Board's work programme and had been put back, so would now be considered at the Overview and Scrutiny Board in April, 2019.

Members agreed to pre-scrutinise the following items:

- Market Hall Site Redevelopment – Phase 2 – April, 2019
- North Worcestershire Economic Growth Strategy July, 2019

## **RESOLVED**

- a) that the Cabinet Leader's Work Programme be noted; and
- b) that the following items be included in the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for pre-scrutiny as agreed:
  - Market Hall Site Redevelopment – Phase 2 – April, 2019;
  - North Worcestershire Economic Growth Strategy July, 2019.

122/18

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

Members considered the Overview and Scrutiny Board Work Programme. As a number of items had been added and deferred to the next meeting, it was agreed that the following reports would be considered and/or moved to future meetings:

# Agenda Item 3

Overview and Scrutiny Board  
4th March 2019

- Bromsgrove Market update to be considered in April, 2019;
- Customer Services update to be considered in June, 2019;
- Staff Survey to be consider in June, 2019;

## **RESOLVED**

- a) that the Overview and Scrutiny Board Work Programme be noted;  
and
- b) that the Overview and Scrutiny Board Work Programme be amended subject to the pre-amble, as detailed above.

The meeting closed at 7.00 p.m.

Chairman

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY  
BOARD INVESTIGATION**

**TRANSPORT PLANNING  
REVIEW  
FINAL REPORT**

**February 2019**



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

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Contents

	<b>Page No</b>
1. Foreword from the Chairman	1
2. Summary of Recommendations	2
3. Background Information	3
4. Chapter 1 – Investigation	4
5. Chapter 2 – Lessons Learnt	
6. Chapter 3 – Going Forward, Future Priorities and the Plan Making Process	
7. Areas to Note	
8. Conclusion	
9. Appendix 1 – Timeline	
10. Appendix 2 – Acknowledgements, Witnesses and Background Papers	

**Foreword from the Chairman**

**Councillor Luke Mallett**

DRAFT

## **Summary of Recommendations**

After consideration of the evidence available and interviewing witnesses the Overview and Scrutiny Board has proposed the following recommendations, supporting evidence can be found within the main body of this report.

### **Recommendation 1**

- a) That Worcestershire County Council's Highways Team consult with the relevant County Councillor, when consulted in respect of any planning applications. This should be done as a matter of course, as they may have more detailed local knowledge of a particular area.
- b) BDC Members will continue to receive the weekly list of all planning applications.

### **Recommendation 2**

That as part of the response to a planning application the Worcestershire County Council's Highways Team should include a full breakdown of the costs of any infrastructure work which needs to be carried out and provide details of how this work would be funded.

### **Recommendation 3**

That it is recognised that the relationships between Worcestershire County Council and this Council and its parish councils and residents has not been positive and that although the journey to improvement has begun, the improvements to the culture and ways of working need to be ongoing to ensure that the improvements continue.

### **Recommendation 4**

That Worcestershire County Highways Team recognises that there is no "one size fits all" approach. They should remain open minded and flexible in considering the approach to the analysis of planning applications before reaching any conclusions.

### **Recommendation 5**

At the earliest possible stage of the Strategic Transport Assessment the Project Officers from Worcestershire County Council and this Council arrange a briefing for Members in order to provide details of the scope of the Strategic Transport Assessment, the process and relevant timelines.

## **Recommendation 6**

That this Council is fully represented on the Project Team of the Strategic Transport Assessment to be undertaken, by both officer and Member representation.

## **Recommendation 7**

That, throughout the process of the Strategic Transport Assessment, the Strategic Planning Steering Group holds regular meetings dedicated to this with representatives of Worcestershire County Council in attendance, in order to provide updates and listen and taken on board the views of this Council's Members.

## **Recommendation 8**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Board recognises the current need for the additional transport support from Mott MacDonald. However it requests that the Leader and Cabinet make every effort to seek re-imburement of those costs from Worcestershire County Council.

DRAFT



## **Background Information**

The need for a review of the infrastructure in the Bromsgrove District has been something which has been discussed at length over a number of years at various levels. The frustrations of both Members and residents, in a number of areas in particular, have also been well documented.

The most recent discussions, which have culminated in this report being commissioned, arose from a number of Council meetings, the first on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2017 when the Council debated the Council's response to the Worcestershire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) consultation. Further issues were raised and discussed in detail when the minutes of this meeting were received at the Council meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2017. At this meeting, it was agreed that Mott MacDonald or a similar organisation would be appointed to undertake independent traffic data monitoring. A notice of motion was then submitted at the Council meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> September, which was withdrawn at the meeting, following agreement that a full report would be brought forward to the Council meeting in November 2017 for discussion.

A full timeline summarising when relevant matters have been discussed at various meetings is attached at appendix 1.

It had initially been agreed at the Council meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2017 that a report would be presented to full Council in respect of a number of the issues raised in relation to infrastructure within the District and the work of Worcestershire County Council Highways (WCC). However, it was subsequently agreed by the Group Leaders that it would be more appropriate for the Overview and Scrutiny Board to consider the matter. At the Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017 a briefing paper was tabled, which contained details of the areas to be covered by that report. On consideration of that paper, the Board did not believe it went far enough in addressing all the issues which had been raised over recent months. Particular reference was made to the work which had been carried out by Mott MacDonald and the analysis of traffic counts and the Barham model, together with a response from WCC on the points which had been tabled at a previous Council meeting. Following lengthy discussion the Board agreed that what was proposed to be in the report was not sufficient and did not respond to all the questions raised by Members. It was therefore agreed that the matter be included on the Overview and Scrutiny Board's work programme with all relevant stakeholders invited to attend a future meeting in order to give them the opportunity to respond to the questions raised.

The following chapters of this report will provide information on the investigation which was carried out by the Overview and Scrutiny Board, together with a chapter in respect of Lessons Learnt and finally a Chapter on Going Forward and doing things differently, together with how this could be achieved.

## **Chapter 1**

### **The Investigation**

As highlighted in the background information provided it is clear that this subject has been both well documented and discussed at length on many occasions. This Chapter will therefore concentrate on discussions held at four key meetings, three public meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017, 15<sup>th</sup> January 2018 and 24<sup>th</sup> May 2018 and a fourth meeting held in private on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2018. The purpose of the private meeting was to enable a more open and honest discussion between a small group of Members from the Overview and Scrutiny Board supported by the Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager and officers from WCC, with the hope that the matter could be brought to a satisfactory conclusion for all concerned.

#### 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017

At this meeting, under the Work Programme item, Members considered a briefing note from the Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager which summarised the general position in relation to the work of the consultants providing transport planning advice to the Council, following the resolutions made at the Council meetings in April and June 2017. It responded to concerns raised by Members at the September 2017 Council meeting and highlighted the way forward to ensure current planning applications could be considered by the Planning Committee and the ongoing strategic work which would require further resourcing. It was agreed that any report would, in the first instance be considered by the Board prior to its consideration at Council.

Whilst it was anticipated that the initial report would come forward to the December meeting, the Chairman and Members were concerned that it would not address all the issues which had been raised over a number of months. The aim of the meeting therefore had been to ensure that all areas discussed would be included and if it was felt necessary, the timescale would be extended to ensure that happened.

The minutes from the Council meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2017 provided a detailed record of those areas discussed. This included the data which had been gathered in previous months, the importance of the relevant officers from WCC being present at any future meeting where these matters were discussed in order to give them an opportunity to put forward any response. The release of the data sets was also discussed and it was questioned why WCC were unwilling to share this information even through a Freedom of Information application had been made.

Members highlighted that it was important that consideration be given to the future needs of Bromsgrove in the form of forward planning and ensuring that not only the current data was accurate but ensuring that modelling was

carried out in order to see what the position would look like as far ahead as 2030 due to the impact of future developments and projections.

The main areas of concern were the need for an explanation and acknowledgement from WCC and its officers as to why the previous model assumptions appeared to be inaccurate and the impact that this had had on the Council and its residents. It was also felt important that any report produced should enable both Members and residents to understand the position and have confidence that the information being provided within it was correct.

In total there was over twenty bullet points highlighting areas of concern from Members, which it was felt needed to be addressed and included within any report. It was therefore concluded that before this process could move forward a meeting needed to be held with all relevant parties present in order to respond to those points and any further questions which arose from that meeting. However, whilst in agreement with this, Members were keen to ensure that the investigation was treated separately from the planning application process and that it did not prevent work being carried out on any planning applications coming forward or the Planning Committee decision making process. It was understood that the work commissioned by Mott MacDonald would mitigate this to an extent, however it was noted that there were financial implications for the Council by commissioning this work and at this early stage Members were already questioning whether it was appropriate to seek compensation of some sort from WCC in respect of those costs.

15<sup>th</sup> January 2018

Officers from this Council arranged for key officers from WCC to attend this meeting. They had been provided with a copy of the relevant minutes from previous meetings in order to give them an overview of the areas which would be covered and the questions they would be asked at this meeting.

Following introductions and WCC officers giving a steer as to what they saw as their role within the process (it was stated that they had already provided the Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager with information for his report and if further information was requested then discussions would take place to assist with the report). It was agreed that the best way forward was to take each bullet point from the previous meeting and allow WCC officers an opportunity to respond.

The first initial part of the meeting concentrated on the data sets, their release and explanations as to why these had been withheld. It was explained that as there were a number of applications still in progress they had not, on legal advice at WCC, been able to release that data. However, following further discussions they had been informed that this was now possible and were happy to share this information outside of the meeting. The traffic count data, which had been gathered in previous months, was also highlighted, as Members had raised concerns, as this had been different to that expected, in fact some had been expected to show a reduction in traffic numbers when in

fact they had shown an increase. With this much variance Members again raised concerns around how this would impact on data for future years when the revised assumptions fed into the planning process. WCC officers explained that the data was merely a snapshot and not used to forecast future needs. This was done by using national data and recognised modelling in respect of traffic growth, together with a significant amount of detailed analysis. It was further explained that there was a high cost to such modelling and currently there was a limited number of areas which were undergoing such work.

Members continued to questions WCC officers in respect of the data and modelling used and it was noted that in some cases this had been out by as much as 8%. The continued concern was what the impact of such varying data would be on future modelling. WCC officers responded that they were aware of the lack of confidence from the Bromsgrove Members and that they hoped this and future meetings could address some of the concerns and help to restore that confidence.

Members went on to question WCC officers in respect of both the use of BaRHAM and its cost to WCC. WCC officers advised that this model had been built for one particular case, but had begun to be used for areas outside of its original purpose and was subsequently withdrawn, the consultants who had built it had accepted that the cost to WCC was zero.

Following discussions around the general data and modelling, Members went on to discuss the impact on a number of recent developments in Hagley and whether the data used had been accurate and whether the appropriate infrastructure had been put in place to mitigate the growth. Members were led to believe that funds available to WCC had been spent elsewhere within the County but that Bromsgrove had not benefitted from these. WCC officers confirmed that a number of the points raised would be addressed again and that it was important that everyone looked very hard at future growth and forthcoming big issues around existing growth to ensure that the right plans were put in place to address these and to ensure that the Council got as much benefit as possible from the highways and other infrastructure strategy.

This led on to discussions around clarification of the budget that WCC held and the practicalities around its distribution. It was questioned how the existing budget was allocated across the County and that some areas appeared to receive a disproportionate amount of funding compared to others.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration also commented on the discussions and made particular reference to confirmation by WCC that the BaRHAM model was not fit for purpose. She also commented that she took comfort from the data provided by Mott MacDonald for a number of planning applications moving forward. Once again, the cost of this was raised by Members and the possibility of recouping some, if not all of this, from WCC. She also made a number of interesting points, which resonated with Members, in particular she reiterated the lack of confidence in WCC Highways and the importance of the developers being aware of the new dimension to

working together to ensure that lack of confidence was repaired and she stressed the need for WCC to work collaboratively with this Council to ensure that transport issues were identified and considered fully so that going forward the appropriate sites for development were identified.

Members also discussed Air Quality in a number of areas, together with the Air Quality Management Areas which were already in place within the District. Worcestershire Regulatory Services officers were in attendance and discussed how unacceptable levels of pollutants could be addressed and the impact on the health of residents. The types of monitoring were also discussed and the levels set nationally, together with long term health implications and the Council's legal duty to reduce emissions. This is an area which the Board has taken an interest in previously, with a Task Group being established in 2012 and a detailed report going to Cabinet in September 2013. The Board has always shown a keen interest in ensuring that the appropriate monitoring is carried out and have pre-scrutinised a number of reports on the subject over recent years.

At the end of the meeting a summary of the main areas covered and actions arising were given to ensure it was clear as to what was expected from WCC officers at the next stage of the investigation.

24<sup>th</sup> May 2018

Members had continued to receive verbal updates at previous meetings and had been advised that the delay in receiving the final report had been due to the lack of appropriate responses to the points raised by Members, being provided to the Council's officers by WCC officers.

The Chairman advised Members that the matter had been discussed at WCC and as a result it had been agreed that WCC officers and Councillor K. Pollock, the Cabinet Member for Economy and Infrastructure should attend the meeting. There was also a report presented to the Board which had been produced by the Council's retained highways consultants, Mott MacDonald. This report had been produced in response to a request from the Board to examine the study undertaken by JMP who were commissioned by WCC to examine the need for a Western Distributor/Bypass. It was noted that Councillor Pollock had not agreed with the conclusions in the Mott MacDonald report. It was confirmed that the JMP report had been funded by WCC and was not connected to any developers.

Concerns which had been raised as far back as 2016 were referred to and showed that there had been a consistent view that the review had been flawed as it had not taken the right approach or used the correct methodology and this document had been relied on to make decisions. In particular reference was made to the Council District Plan and it was clarified that this had been adopted and the key therefore was to ensure that the appropriate highways mitigation was in place and it was therefore important to thoroughly understand the infrastructure as part of that work.

Reference was made to a scenario where a new development had been agreed despite public concerns about the impact of it on local roads and infrastructure. In that case the WCC Highways had accepted, without question, the views of the consultants who, it was understood, had been paid for by the developer, to consider the mitigation required. It was confirmed that the Mott MacDonald report had not been shared with JMP although it was suggested that it would be useful if it was and they be asked for their views on it.

Councillor Pollock had expressed sympathy for the local District Councillors and residents who experienced traffic issues on a daily basis. He referred to a number of projects, including the Highways England M5 Motorway project at junctions 1 and 2 and that there had been little regard for the impact on the local areas when traffic had been diverted off the motorway.

It was suggested by the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services and Strategic Housing that the Mott MacDonald report be sent back to JMP and that they be asked to rectify the report that they had produced and consider if the information within it was correct or not or alternatively it was suggested that JMP be asked to put together a new report responding to the questions raised.

Concerns were raised by the Head of Planning and Regeneration that the report requested by the Board was more of a highways engineer role and therefore suggested that it may be more appropriate for that report to take a more holistic approach as opposed to getting entrenched in the detail of particular areas and problems.

23<sup>rd</sup> October 2018

Following the various discussions and the delays in getting information from WCC it was decided that a small group of Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Board (Councillors S. Colella, P. Thomas and S. Webb) and chaired by the Overview and Scrutiny Board Chairman (Councillor L. Mallett), together with the Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager would arrange to meet with WCC officers to try to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion for all concerned.

This meeting was planned for 23<sup>rd</sup> October and at the beginning of it the Chairman highlighted three key areas which he felt should be covered by the report, which are the areas detailed in chapters 2 and 3 of this report.

Frank and open discussions were held at this meeting and the Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager questioned whether there was any value in looking back over the previous minutes and concerns raised by Members as these had been so well documented and he felt it may now be more useful to look forward and find ways in which to address the issues raised and ensure that they were not repeated. However, Members were of the view that in order to move forward it was important to understand the historic part of the process and why issues that had built up over time had resulted in the

Council's current position. This would then allow the Council, its officers and Members to move forward and ensure that similar mistakes were not made in the future. Members were of the view that it was important to recognise the danger of history repeating itself. It was however acknowledged that there may be some questions that were not able to be answered.

Members went on to discuss case studies which validated the use of Mott MacDonald "checking" the work of the Highways team and it was agreed that that fed into some of the questions which had previously been put forward and was there as a supporting challenge. It also provided Members with the confidence to make the right decisions with future planning applications, knowing that this work had been carried out. This again brought Members back to the discussion around the ongoing cost of Mott MacDonald's work and the long term financial impact to the Council and whether this cost should be reimbursed by WCC.

Members also discussed with the WCC officers both the data and modelling used, in particular the traffic surveys undertaken in May/June 2018 and how the information was gathered. The methodology used by WCC was also discussed in detail and again the accuracy of the data which was produced from it. Particular sites in some Wards were discussed and it was questioned as to why data collected by a developer was not checked and verified before being used in the decision making process.

Problems arising from developments which were in addition to those initially identified were also discussed and it was highlighted that these would not be included in the original plans. This showed that developers did not look at the wider picture, but just at the initial impact from their development. Whilst it was suggested that it would not be in the developers interested to do this, it was something which needed to be looked at more closely to get a true picture of the impact of any development.

WCC Officers confirmed to Members that the developers put forward their proposals and the WCC responded to what had been provided. It was not for WCC to question what had been put before then. However, if there was any particular concern arising from the proposals then they would pass the information to an independent consultant and challenge its content. Members suggested that WCC officers needed to be flexible in their approach and ways of working to ensure the right decisions were being made.

One of the most important areas discussed was the use of local knowledge. It was noted that WCC officer on occasion contacted the County Councillor for a particular area and it was suggested that whilst this was useful, that the Ward Councillor would have much more detailed knowledge of an area which could prove invaluable to officers. This would also allow for concerns to be raised formally at an early stage and would show Members that their view was being taken seriously.

Members continued to reiterate that their concern was the understanding (or lack) of the base situation in Bromsgrove and lack of confidence in the various

models used, which had been confirmed by these being found to be not fit for purpose. There were very specific underlying problems in Bromsgrove, not just the number of vehicles or growth, but roads and junctions which were already at capacity and this was “growth” above and beyond that expected and led by the motorway network and commuter traffic. The set of circumstances were so unusual that they made the current infrastructure unbearable. It was further questioned as to whether WCC corporately were taking responsibility for mistakes which had been made both in the recent past and historically, which had had a detrimental impact on Bromsgrove District.

Further discussions took place around the delivery of the infrastructure in certain areas and the ways in which it could be funded. Members discussed SIL and IDP payments and the consequences should contributions not be in place. It was suggested that developments should not be moved forward if they did not have details of how the infrastructure would be funded included within them. Whilst it was understood that WCC would try to get as much of the funding as possible from the developer the concern was that if WCC did not have the funds to complete the work needed then it would not be carried out. Members further questioned how WCC could agree to a development when they were aware that the developer contribution would not be sufficient to fully fund the infrastructure needed and they themselves did not have the funds available to cover the balance.

Members went on to suggest that as part of the planning applications, where the Highways Team was consulted, a breakdown should be included of where the money for covering the work needed would come from and should clearly state how the gap would be met. Members believed that it was important for this to be included as it would give them the confidence that not only was it recognised that the work needed to be carried out but that there was a commitment to make it happen. This could also be used as the beginning of a tracking process that once the development was completed, that the necessary work had been carried out, as Members believed that there should be a clear audit trail which showed that this had been followed through.

WCC officers stressed their concern that the Council’s confidence remained very low and they hoped to be able to work with officers and Members to repair the damage which had been done.



## Chapter 2

### **Lessons Learnt**

Chapters 2 and 3 of this report can be broken down into four specific areas for discussion:

- Questions and answers to those questions
- Lessons learnt
- Confidence going forwards including doing things differently to achieve that.
- Future priorities and the plan making process.

Whilst future priorities and the plan making process have been dealt with separately and in more detail, under Chapter 3, confidence going forwards is also touched upon within this Chapter and is an area which Members have come back to on numerous occasions. The ongoing lack of confidence felt towards WCC has been highlighted by the continued use of Mott MacDonald and the need of the Council to seek that support to enable them to continue carrying out its every day duties as the planning authority.

It is acknowledged that there have been issues to tackle over recent years; it is considered that ensuring a new way of working going forward is the key element to focus on and not forensic investigations into the past.

As highlighted in the previous chapter at a number of Overview and Scrutiny Board meetings specific questions have been posed by Members, the questions and where possible the answers were eventually responded to formally by WCC in a document, Formal Response to BDC – Overview and Scrutiny Committee dated July 2018. It should be noted that's some of the questions posed are not questions that can be answered. Notwithstanding this Members were in many cases disappointed with the responses received and have continued to press for more detailed and appropriate answers to the questions they have raised, together with an acknowledgment from WCC that they were to blame for some of the mistakes that had clearly been made.

From the Council's perspective a key lesson to be learnt is the level of evidence and analysis that can be generated when considering the provision of transport infrastructure.

WCC have accepted that there were issues with some of the work that has been undertaken by them in recent years, particularly around the input into the previous Whitford Road application and subsequent appeal inquiry, and the commissioning and production of the BaRHAM model. This acceptance was welcomed and it is hoped that WCCs commitment to the processes outlined below will ensure that Member confidence can be restored in the work undertaken by WCC Highways.

Although engagement does take place at the moment, WCC officers have committed to higher levels of engagement with both BDC Members and officers to ensure that confidence can be restored.

A number of previous reports have been produced and circulated which review work undertaken by WCC or their consultants, such as BaRHAM and the Western Distributer feasibility assessment; these have been listed in the background papers section of this report.

DRAFT

## **Chapter 3**

### **Going Forward, Future Priorities and the Plan Making Process (doing things differently)**

The Board acknowledges that there is a need to move forward and for the confidence in Worcestershire County Council (WCC) to be rebuilt and restored. The previous chapter it was discussed how lessons can and must be learnt from the mistakes made and the need for this to be acknowledged by WCC. It is also important for them to assist in the process of rebuilding that confidence in order for both Councils to be able to work together in the future.

From the information that the Board has received it believes that the future priorities can be broken down into two specific areas

- Progressing planning applications
- Strategic Transport Assessment

The progression of the current large scale planning applications needs to remain a focus. These allocations are contained within the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) which remains sound only relatively recently being adopted in January 2017. The detailed work which is currently being progressed to provide the technical solutions to allow for these schemes to come forward needs to continue. This work is being done to satisfy the policies contained within the BDP. It is envisaged that Mott MacDonald will continue their role in advising the Council on this over the coming months.

#### **Strategic Transport Assessment**

Members will be aware of the recent consultation on the Issues and Options for the Bromsgrove District Plan review. Within that documentation sections were included on:

- Growing the economy and the provision of strategic infrastructure
- Transport

These sections begin to set the scene for what challenges need to be overcome as the plan review progresses. The responses to the issues and options consultation are still being assessed and will be reported back to Members in due course through the Strategic Planning Steering Group. These sections of the issues and options contain questions which will provide the Council with some evidence on what and where there are issues with transport across the District. The key here is evidence, and this is what the Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) will provide.

Discussions have and continue to take place between this Council and WCC about the scope and content of an STA. Officers and Members at both

organisations have committed to producing an STA which will directly inform the content of the Bromsgrove District Plan review as the plan progresses.

## What is an STA?

An STA is recommended by the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) as a tool to inform the plan making process. The PPG provides some detail on what a STA should contain but, it is not prescriptive on the exact details and approach, therefore it is important that the approach taken is robust and comprehensive.

The Board are advised that the discussions to date have been positive and agreement has been reached on exploring a three stage approach to the STA which is outlined below. It must be stressed though that this approach could change in response to the evidence available and the requirements of the plan making process. Those three stages are detailed below.

Historically planning authorities have provided WCC with development sites; they have then been assessed and information provided on what infrastructure is required to enable the site, this is the “predict and provide” approach. This approach, although not necessarily the wrong approach, has not worked particularly successfully in Bromsgrove due to the complexity of the transport network.

The iterative evidence based approach which is now being progressed will allow for a much more robust analysis of site options which can be tested against current and future transport conditions.

### **1: Establish baseline position**

The first step is establishing a baseline i.e. a factual position of how the transport network operates, it is then possible to quantify the current issues, and then in turn quantify impacts of development more thoroughly. The types of data needed to build the evidence could include:

- Up-to-date traffic counts for peak periods including turning movements at junctions
- 12 / 24-hour automatic traffic counts
- Queue length surveys at junctions in that area considered to be critical
- Journey time surveys of key parts of the network
- Freight counts (if applicable and seen as a problem)
- Pedestrian and cyclists counts
- Capacity data for public transport services (rail and bus)
- Car park data
- Accident data on key parts of the network where development impacts are greatest
- Emissions/ Air Quality data

This data will allow this Council/WCC to properly see the constraints and opportunities on the network, which will help inform the spatial distribution of development. As this data collection/analysis work progresses decisions can be made on the correct assessment tools for stages 2 and 3. This is the iterative element, it is critical to make sure that the correct tools are procured to do the job, rushing to procure tools without a better understanding of the challenge could lead to the wrong tools being procured.

## **2: High level scenario testing**

Once the baseline has been established testing of options at a high level can commence. The first level of testing is envisaged to be at a strategic level, testing zones, corridors or other large areas rather than individual sites. This will allow this Council to filter out areas which are likely to have a severe impact on the network which is unlikely to be mitigated. This will also allow the Council to begin testing large scale interventions such a new roads etc. The advantage of this approach is that these interventions are tested in a wider context in conjunction with other options and not in isolation as was done with the western distributor proposal.

## **3: Transport modelling**

This is the more detailed modelling which will look more closely at sites; through this work the Council will clearly be able to quantify the specific impacts of larger development sites. Through this process the Council would also run development scenarios with the mitigation in place, to test that it actually does mitigate the impact of development. This various outcomes from this work will directly inform the preferred option plan.

The timescales for this work are being considered at the moment but it is likely to take up to 18 months to complete this work. This is normal and other evidenced base work which will inform the revised Plan will be developed alongside this evidence. In addition to this work, other transport related work is also taking place which has been summarised in below.

A key part of the STA's future success will be ensuring that BDC are fully represented at all stages and levels of the project. To that end terms of reference have been agreed whereby which the Council's officers are both project managing the STA alongside officers from WCC and other district planning authorities and the Council will also have membership of the board which is overseeing the project. Part of the terms of reference also requires regular update reports being produced to ensure the project stays on track.

## **Areas to Note**

### **Financial and Legal Implications**

For the immediate future the Council will still require the support of Mott MacDonald to ensure that the large planning applications are able to progress to Planning Committee and that the Strategic Transport Assessment will be fit for its intended purpose.

The Council as the local planning authority is under a statutory duty to determine planning applications within certain timescales unless varied by agreement with the developer. Failure to do so could lead to appeals for non-determination. Therefore the Council should do all it can to place itself in a position to determine planning permissions.

### **Service/Operational Implications**

Over a considerable period of time there has and continues to be an enhanced level of scrutiny over how transport planning is carried out across Bromsgrove. Much of that scrutiny has been on the role of Worcestershire County Council. The triggers for this scrutiny have included the planning applications for both Whitford Road and Perryfields Road, as these are live applications this report can not address specific detailed issues in relation to them.

### **Risk Management**

The main risk associated with this report is the ability of the Council to carry out its statutory planning function effectively. This function is both in relation to determining planning applications and producing a development plan. Effective transport planning is key to both functions if this does not take place then the risks of planning appeals and unsound plan become more heightened.

## **Conclusion**

As can be seen from this report it is acknowledged by the Board that there has been issues previously with the way that Transport planning has been carried out in Bromsgrove. Whilst that is unfortunate, a new approach has been identified and detailed within the report and which, assuming all parties engage in it fully, will ensure that going forward transport planning will play a much more effective role in the wider strategic planning function of the Council.

DRAFT

## Appendix 1

### Timeline of Events

- 26<sup>th</sup> April 2017 Council  
Minute No 109/16 – Council response to Local Transport Plan No 4 Consultation. Detailed discussions took place and Members aired their concerns around the impact of the proposed plan and the need for action to be taken in the Bromsgrove District.
- 21<sup>st</sup> June 2017 Council  
Minute No 13/17 – discussion under the minutes from the meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2017. Members again discussed their concerns as length, reiterating those which had been raised at the previous meeting. It was agreed that Mott MacDonald or a similar organisation would be appointed to undertake independent traffic data monitoring.
- 20<sup>th</sup> September 2017 Council  
Minute No 55/17 – Notice of Motion from Councillor L. Mallett in respect of the WCC's highways data from 2017. Following a lengthy debate the motion was withdrawn with the agreement that a report on the matters raised would be brought back to Council in November.
- 30<sup>th</sup> October 2017 Overview and Scrutiny Board  
Minute No 51/17 – Pre-scrutiny of Centres Strategy led to request for briefing paper in respect of proposed footbridge over A38.
- 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017 Council  
Minute No 70/17 – Notice of Motion from Councillor P. MacDonald in respect of LTP4.
- 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017 Overview and Scrutiny Board  
Minute No 66/17 – Verbal updated in respect of the Footbridge over the A38.  
Minute No 74/17 – briefing and discussion around the content of the report requested by Council at the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2017 and explanation that the Overview and Scrutiny Board would now co-ordinate this.



# Agenda Item 5

- 15<sup>th</sup> January 2018      Overview and Scrutiny Board  
Minute No 79/17 – interview with officers from WCC who took away a number of questions from Members and agreed to provide responses.
- 26<sup>th</sup> March 2018      Overview and Scrutiny Board  
Minute No 99/17 – a draft outline report of the areas to be covered was presented to the Board.
- 24<sup>th</sup> May 2018      Overview and Scrutiny Board  
Minute No 7/18 – additional information. The matter had been discussed at WCC and Councillor K. Pollock the relevant Portfolio Holder, WCC Officers and a representative from Whitford Vale Voice (a local community group) attended. The report from Mott MacDonald in response to the JMP report was also considered in detail.
- 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018      Overview and Scrutiny Board  
Minute No 46/18 – verbal update, reporting that the Chairman had met with the Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager to discuss the issues highlighted by the Board. It was agreed that a small Group of Members of the Board would meet with key officers from WCC to discuss these in more details and to move the matter forward.
- 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2018      Private Meeting  
The Chairman, together with Councillors S. Colella, P. Thomas and S. Webb met with officers from WCC. The aim of the meeting was to talk through the current position in respect of having the appropriate information to allow the Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager to write the report which had been requested.
- 8<sup>th</sup> April 2019      Overview and Scrutiny Board  
Consideration of this final report and if agreed it will go forward to Cabinet/full Council.

## **Appendix 2**

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

#### **WITNESSES**

The Board considered evidence from the following sources before making its recommendations:

##### **Internal Witnesses:**

Ruth Bamford – Head of Planning and Strategic Housing

Mike Dunphy – Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager

##### **Councillors:**

Kit Taylor – Portfolio Holder for Planning and Strategic Housing

##### **External Witnesses:**

Nigel Hudson – Worcestershire County Council

Karen Hanchett – Worcestershire County Council

Steve Hawley – Worcestershire County Council

Martin Rowe – Worcestershire County Council

Councillor Ken Pollock – Worcestershire County Council, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economy and Infrastructure

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Worcestershire County Council LTP4 consultation documentation.

Worcestershire County Council Formal response to Bromsgrove District Council – Overview and Scrutiny Committee July 2018.

Reports and Minutes of meetings of Council and the Overview and Scrutiny Board as detailed in the timeline at appendix 1.

MM BaRHAM technical note

MM review of western distributor appraisal

**This page has intentionally been left blank**

DRAFT

DRAFT

**Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services**

Bromsgrove District Council, The Council House, Burcot Lane,  
Bromsgrove, Worcestershire B60 1AA

Telephone: (01527) 881288

Email: [scrutiny@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@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: <a href="mailto:s.colella@bromsgrove.gov.uk">s.colella@bromsgrove.gov.uk</a>
Date: 26 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2019	

<p><b>Title of Proposed Topic</b> (including specific subject areas to be investigate)</p>	<p>Investigation into the effect of WCC LTP4 on the district of Bromsgrove.</p> <p>To consider its effect upon the Bromsgrove District Plan, the main A roads through the district, impact on Economic and Housing Growth and the fulfilment of NEST1-9, NEAT1-8 and BR1-7 and RB1.</p>
<p><b>Background to the Proposal</b> (Including reasons why this topic should be investigated and evidence to support the need for the investigation.)</p>	<p>BDC Development Plan relies on the support of the LTP4 to invest in the infrastructure to support growth not only in the district of Bromsgrove but in neighbouring District and County divisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The perception is that there is no investment of note beyond Kidderminster Town.</li> <li>• Thus such a lack of investment is unsustainable, expected increase in traffic congestion, poor integrated travel systems and</li> <li>• no resolution to the current congestion and poor air quality across the district.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Links to national, regional and local priorities</b> (including the Council's strategic purposes)</p>	<p>Bromsgrove Development Plan, Wyre Forest Development Plan, NPPF, Air Quality, economic and housing growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help me find somewhere to live in my locality</li> <li>• Keep my place safe and looking good</li> </ul>

# Agenda Item 6

<p><b>Possible Key Objectives</b></p> <p>(these should be SMART – specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely)</p>	<p>Complete an assessment of the impact of LTP4 on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the districts strategic purposes,</li> <li>• impact on economic growth strategy,</li> <li>• housing growth, health and wellbeing.</li> </ul>			
<p>Anticipated Timescale for completion of the work.</p>	<p>December 2019</p>			
<p>Would it be appropriate to hold a Short Sharp Inquiry or a Task Group? (please tick relevant box)</p>	<p>Task Group</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Short Sharp Inquiry</p>	

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

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

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

**ANNUAL REPORT**

**2018 – 2019**



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

# Contents

	<b>Page Number</b>
<b>Chairman's Foreword</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Membership</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Activities and Outcomes during 2018/19</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Scrutiny of the Crime and Disorder Partnership</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Task Groups and Short Sharp Reviews</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Working Groups</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>External Scrutiny Body</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Future plans 2019/20</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix A - Topic proposal form</b>	<b>18</b>



**Foreword**

DRAFT

## Introduction

This report outlines the work undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Board of Bromsgrove District Council during 2018 – 2019.

It should be noted that in June 2015 Members of the Board agreed that, as Overview and Scrutiny should be seen as not being party political, they would use white name plates, which did not reference a political group and sit in alphabetical order. This has continued to be the case in this municipal year and at the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2019 Members debated this matter again and considered a number of options going forward. The outcome of that debate was to continue with the white name plates and the seating arrangements, as Members were in agreement that this approach had worked well at previous meetings and there was no reason why it should not continue.

## The Role of Overview and Scrutiny

The role of overview and scrutiny is an important one in the Council's governance structure; it provides a vital role in challenging and driving improvement. It is a key part of the democratic decision making process in local Councils, where elected Councillors outside of the Cabinet can contribute to shaping Council policy, community well-being and accountability. It is often referred to as the "critical friend" of the Council and can hold a magnifying glass over any area which is causing concern or issues for local residents.

The Overview and Scrutiny Board has a number of roles within the Council. These include:

- Holding the Cabinet to account by thoroughly scrutinising their decisions to ensure that the Council continues to provide the best services possible for Bromsgrove District residents.
- Acting as a 'critical friend' to the Cabinet by reviewing Council policies and strategy, making recommendations where appropriate.
- Performance and financial monitoring, to ensure the Council services provide value for money, are sustainable and to the highest possible standard.
- Pre-scrutiny of items prior to the consideration by the Cabinet.

All of these can be achieved in a number of ways, either through presentation of a report at the Overview and Scrutiny Board or if a more in depth investigation is needed then the Board can set up a Task Group to focus on specific areas and recommend ways to improve existing practices within the Council. A template of the topic proposal can be found in Appendix A.

The detailed terms of reference and procedure rules for the Overview and Scrutiny Board can be found at Part 5 and Part 12 of the Council's Constitution. The Council's Constitution can be accessed by using the following link.

<http://svmoderngov:9072/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=329&Year=0> (Please click on the latest date to access the most recent version of the Council's constitution).

## **Who attended the Overview and Scrutiny Board Meetings?**

The Overview and Scrutiny Board met ten times in 2018/19, the meetings were attended by Elected Members, a range of representatives from partner organisations, the Chief Executive, Directors, Heads of Service and Officers.

There has been continued support from the relevant Portfolio Holders this year, with regularly attendance from a number of them when a report which relates to their portfolio has been presented to the Board. This has given them an opportunity to hear first-hand the debate and ideas that the Board have put forward. On a number of occasions, whilst the Board has not made any recommendations in respect of an item it has endorsed and supported recommendations which would be considered by Cabinet at its meeting.

If you would like further information on the role of Overview and Scrutiny at the Council you can find full details of all meetings and copies of Task Group reports on the Council's website.

DRAFT

## Membership

Membership of the Board for 2018/2019 is as follows:



Cllr Luke Mallett (Chairman)



Cllr Shirley Webb (Vice Chairman)



Cllr Chris Allen-Jones



Cllr Chris Bloore  
(May to Nov 2018)



Cllr Steve Colella



Cllr Richard Deeming



Cllr Malcolm Glass



Cllr Charlie Hotham



Cllr Rod Laight



Cllr Peter McDonald  
(Appointed Nov 2018)



Cllr Philip Thomas



Cllr Michael Thompson

## **Activities and Outcomes during 2018/19**

The Board continues to receive regular updates in order to monitor the progress of recommendations it has made, through the Recommendation Tracker. This contains both recommendations put forward by Task Groups and accepted by the Cabinet, together with recommendations put forward by the Board itself. In respect of Task Groups the Board does, where necessary, receive an update report 12 months following acceptance of its recommendations.

Detailed below are some of the key areas and reports that the Board has considered in this municipal year.

### **SPORTS HALL OPTIONS APPRAISAL - PRE SCRUTINY**

The Sport Hall and former Dolphin Centre are areas which the Board has considered on a number of occasions over recent years. This year the Board considered a report in respect of an Options Appraisal for a Sports Hall, as it had been agreed at Full Council to further consider the provision of a sports hall. Members had requested a report which included number of options. The report detailed the journey that the Council had been on to date, potential timescales for the various options put forward, and the financial, service/operational and legal implications. Members appreciated that this was a matter of great interest to residents and on this occasion the Chairman invited residents in the public gallery to participate in the meeting.

Following lengthy discussions the Board agreed to note the content of the report as it was felt that the decision should be made at full Council.

### **TRANSPORT PLANNING REVIEW**

This was an area which had been well documented and discussed at various meetings over a number of years. It had first been brought to the Board in September 2017, following discussion at a number of Council meetings.

A number of updates were given to the Board throughout the year, in respect of the Transport Planning Review., which looked at the infrastructure issues within the district and the impact of large developments on it. Officers and the relevant portfolio holder from Worcestershire County Council (WCC) attended a number of meetings to respond to questions which had raised and to address Members concerns in respect of the lack of confidence in the work of the Highways Team. A Sub Group was set up to meet key officers from WCC in order to discuss those issues in more detail.

At one of those meetings, Board recommended that the Issues and Options consultation process be suspended pending receipt of further information from WCC in respect of the future plans of the infrastructure for Bromsgrove District. The recommendation was unfortunately, rejected by Cabinet.

The Board finally, considered its draft report on this subject at its April meeting with a number of recommendations being put forward.

## **AQMA REVOCATION AT HAGLEY (INCLUDING COSTS FOR ADDITIONAL MONITORING AND DATA)**

Air Quality Management Areas and Air Quality in general are something which the Board has shown a keen interest over the years. They had carried out task groups in 2007 and again in 2013, so when this report appeared on the Cabinet Work Programme the Board was keen to pre-scrutinise it. This work was carried out in April 2018, and additional information in respect of the types of monitoring and data for the Hagley area was presented to the Board later in the municipal year, with a number of recommendations being put forward at the initial meeting.

## **ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, CRIME AND POLICING ACT 2014 (IMPLEMENTATION OF PROVISIONS)**

The Board pre-scrutinised a report in relation to the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, which outlined the implementation of provisions. The report also proposed a series of amendments to the Council's Scheme of Delegations to enable the Council to best utilise and implement the ASB tools and powers under the Act.

It was reported that the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 provided the tools and powers, outlined in the report, which were relevant to the Council and supported the Strategic Purpose 'Keep My Place Safe and Looking Good'.

The Board that the Council's Scheme of Delegations be amended to include "in consultation with the Ward Councillor". This recommendation was accepted by Cabinet.

## **COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME REVIEW – PRE SCRUTINY**

The Board pre-scrutinised a report in respect of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme (CTS). The report recommended that approval be sought for the Council to undertake a formal consultation with the major preceptors and the proposed revised scheme. Following discussion Members recommended that consideration of the scheme be deferred pending further information. This was largely due to it not being clear in the report who would or would not benefit from the scheme.

The recommendation was agreed by Cabinet and further work on the report was carried out. Members received a further update later in the year in respect of the consultation but unfortunately due to timescale it was difficult for the Board to consider the report in full. It was therefore agreed that on this occasion the Finance and Budget Working Group would carry out the final pre-scrutiny work.

The Finance and Budget Working Group reported back to the main Board that the revised scheme had taken into account all the areas that that Board had discussed and therefore they had been happy to note the report.

## **WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE**

Following a number of issues with waste collection the Board had requested an update on what had led to the problems which had occurred. The Board was informed of the current measures and actions that had been put in place to alleviate any issues in the future. Members were also advised that a number of business cases would be brought forward which would address the areas of concern and the pressure on the service, in the long term.

The Board subsequently pre-scrutinise the business cases in respect of Domestic Waste Collection, Commercial Services and Place Team Resources. These had been produced to show the current pressure on the Environmental Services Team and to consider a number of options to secure the service areas for the future. The Board were encouraged to see that the concerns which had been raised earlier in the year had been addressed through these business cases.

The Board noted the report in respect of these business cases.

## **CORPORATE PEER CHALLENGE ACTION PLAN**

The Board was keen to pre-scrutinise a report which outlined the outcomes and next steps resulting from the Corporate Peer Challenge (CPC) visits which had taken place in January and February 2018. This had been followed up with a written report summarising a number of recommendations to meet the Council needs. These recommendations were designed to complement and add value to the Council's performance and improvement plans.

The Action Plan set out responses to those recommendations together with relevant timescales for completion. The Board recommended that the Constitution Review Working Group carry out a wider review of Council procedures to aid the debating process.

Members received an update at a later meeting and considered the progress made in delivering the recommendations within the Peer Challenge Action Plan. The peer challenge had been an excellent learning opportunity for the Council, providing an external health check of the Council's position.

## **IN HOUSE MANAGEMENT OF BROMSGROVE MARKET**

Following the return of Bromsgrove Market to being managed in house, the Board received a number of updates throughout the year to ensure that this was carried out successfully.

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, the Town Centre and Strategic Partnerships provided an update in respect of the Bromsgrove market and were advised of the special events which had taken place in recent weeks and future plans.

The Head of Leisure and Cultural Services advised Members that positive feedback had been received from market traders. It was further advised that a business plan

would be devised to review the current market provision as the Council was committed to investing in the Town Centre market. A further update would be provided in the next municipal year.

## **DEVELOPMENT OF THE BURCOT LANE SITE**

The Chief Executive presented the report which provided Members with an update of the current position regarding the site redevelopment and the funding application submitted to Homes England.

The report proposed three options with the preferred option being to establish a housing company to manage the retained housing stock. The proposed plans were discussed at length and the Board recommended that further work be carried out to explore the options available to the housing company to allow it to act as a letting agent; and that the housing company's overarching principle be to provide "affordable" rental accommodation for local people.

DRAFT



## **SCRUTINY OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER PARTNERSHIP**

The Board has a statutory duty to hold at least one meeting a year which covers the scrutiny of the work of the local Crime and Disorder Reduction (CDRP) partnership. In the case of Bromsgrove District Council this is the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership.

At its June 2018 meeting the Board was provided with an update on the progress of the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership (NWCSP) during 2017/18. A number of key points were highlighted including that:

- Local authorities had a statutory duty to scrutinise the work of the local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) under Section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006.
- The NWCSP had a statutory duty to produce a Partnership Plan outlining how it would address key crime and community safety priorities.
- The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) had a duty to co-operate with the CSP to reduce crime and disorder and there was a reciprocal duty on the CSP to collaborate with the PCC.
- A new Community Guardians project had been proposed which would create a team of officers to patrol areas of concern in terms of anti-social behaviour.
- The Respect Programme continued to be delivered in schools.

A Youth and Community Hub was being set up in the basement of the Baptist Church in New Road and a project manager appointed. The Hub was official launched in July 2018.

## **TASK GROUPS AND SHORT SHARP REVIEW**

Task Groups are established by the Board to conduct an in-depth review of any service, policy or issues that affects the District. The Chairman of a Task Group must be a Member of the Board, with the wider membership being any Members who were not Members of the Cabinet. Some of this year's Task Groups have concluded and some remain ongoing. The work carried out by the Task Groups are summarised below. The full outcome of the reviews would be detailed in its final reports.

For those Task Groups which had been completed the final reports are available on the Council's website.

## **ROAD SAFETY AROUND SCHOOLS**

Following a Notice of Motion at Full Council proposed by Councillor P. M. McDonald, this subject was referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board. Members received an update from the Environmental Services Manager and after a lengthy discussion it was agreed that it was a subject of such important that a Task Group should be established.

The Task Group met on six occasions from February to September 2018, to discuss the matter in more detail. During the course of the investigation, interviews were undertaken with representatives from Parking Services, County Highways, West Mercia Police, the Environmental Services Manager, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, the Town Centre and Strategic Partnerships and Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Cultural Services, Community Safety and Regulatory Services.

The Group reported its conclusions and recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Board in September 2018 and resolved to submit the Group's findings to the Cabinet in September, 2018. Cabinet agreed that all of the Group's findings should be considered as part of the Road Safety Review to ensure that the Council provided an efficient and effective Service which was submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Board and was sent to external agencies, including those who had helped with the report.

The Board received its formal response to the recommendation at its January, 2019 meeting.

## **CCTV SHORT, SHARP REVIEW**

Following an update to the Board in December, 2016 in respect of the CCTV, a number of concerns were raised by Members in respect of the allocation of CCTV cameras and the allocation of them. The Board suggested that further investigation on this matter was needed to ensure that the service met the needs of residents, that it was fit for purpose and provided value for money. Subsequently, a Short Sharp Review Group was set up to consider the issue in more detail. This Group met on seven occasions from March 2017 to September 2018 to examine CCTV provision in Bromsgrove District in more detail.

The Board was presented with the findings and recommendations from the Scrutiny Investigation undertaken by the CCTV Short Sharp Review which made a number of recommendations and received its formal response to the recommendation at its January, 2019 meeting.

## **HOSPITAL CAR PARKING BOARD INVESTIGATION**

Following a Notice of Motion at Full Council proposed by Councillor P. M. McDonald, this subject was referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board. The Board set up a small group of Members to look at this matter, this group held two meetings and a number of issues were discussed with a representative from Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust.

The findings and recommendations of the investigation was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Board and it was proposed that Full Council write to the Secretary of State to suggest that NHS Trust owned hospital car parks should be made free of charge. This was agreed at Full Council and the dialogue with the Secretary of State is currently ongoing.

## **BUSINESS RATES RELIEF SHORT SHARP REVIEW**

The Business Rates Relief Short Sharp Review has met twice and Members have agreed a work programme going forward, having identified a number of key witnesses to interview.

## **BROMSGROVE SPORTING TASK GROUP**

Members agreed to launch a Task Group to review the work of Bromsgrove Sporting Football Club and Membership of that Task Group has been confirmed. To date however, an initial meeting has not been arranged.

## **WORKING GROUPS**

### **FINANCE AND BUDGET WORKING GROUP**

This Group has met on nine occasions this year and were particularly active in the weeks leading up to the budget setting. The Portfolio Holder for Finance has attended the majority of meetings, together with the Executive director, Finance and Resources. On occasions Heads of Service have been invited in to provide information on a variety of reports covering their areas. For the first time this year a meeting was set aside in respect of Fees and Charges to which all Heads of Service and relevant Portfolio Holders were invited.

For the first time this year the Working Group have been able to pre-scrutinise many reports at a very early stage, so rather than put forward recommendations, in some cases the Portfolio Holder took on board the views of the Working Group and these were fed directly into the final reports which were published.

To give an idea of the work that has been carried out, the list below contains some of the reports which the Working Group has considered:

- Medium Term Financial Plan and Quarterly Monitoring Reports
- Year End Financial Outturn – Capital and Revenue, and Reserves
- Overarching Budget Framework (this included Cost Recovery and Outturn –v- Budget)
- Capital and Revenue Programmes
- Treasury Management and Capital Strategy
- Investment and Acquisition Strategy
- Finance System

Once again by being able to consider a number of reports in more detail and prior to their consideration at Cabinet has allowed Members of the Board via the Working Group to play an integral part in the budget setting process.

### **CORPORATE PERFORMANCE WORKING GROUP (formerly Measures Dashboard Working Group)**

This Group has met on six occasions this year, with a major changing taking place at the beginning of the new municipal year, when it was decided that the name of the Working Group would change and the terms of reference would be updated to reflect the work which was being carried out. This showed that the Working Group had made good progress from its initial slow start and had progressed from simply checking the data on the Corporate Dashboard to taking a more strategic approach and questioning the relevant Heads of Services and looking at particular areas in more detail. This was highlighted from the work carried out in respect of the Domestic Waste Service when the Working Group met with the Head of Environmental Services and the Environmental Service Manager following issues with waste collection during September 2018.

The Group have dedicated each meeting to looking at the relevant measures for each of the Council's strategic purposes and where necessary have suggested changes or amendments to the ways in which delivery of that service is being measured. As with the Finance and Budget Working Group, this shows a direct link with Officers and Portfolio Holders has been established in supporting the work carried out and helping to ensure that the performance of services is measured in a useful and constructive manner.

DRAFT

## **EXTERNAL SCRUTINY BODY**

### **Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC)**

The Board receives regular updates from Councillor Bloore, the Council's representative on Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The updates provide the Committee with information on any strategic health issues and the Board are able to feedback to HOSC through Councillor Bloore any concerns they have about particular areas.

Some of the issues highlighted during the year included:

- Winter pressures on hospitals and patient flow in and out of hospital.
- Ambulance divert pilot.
- The role of HOSC, its effectiveness and its terms of reference

Further details are available at the Worcestershire County Council website.

DRAFT

**Future Plans 2019/20**

DRAFT

## APPENDIX A

### 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:</b>	
Tel No:	Email
Date:	

<b>Title of Proposed Topic</b> (including specific subject areas to be investigate)			
<b>Background to the Proposal</b> (Including reasons why this topic should be investigated and evidence to support the need for the investigation.)			
<b>Links to national, regional and local priorities</b> (including the Council's strategic purposes)			
<b>Possible Key Objectives</b> (these should be SMART – specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely)			
Anticipated Timescale for completion of the work			
Would it be appropriate to hold a Short Sharp Inquiry or a Task Group? (please tick relevant box)	Task Group		Short Sharp Inquiry



**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	

DRAFT

DRAFT

**The Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Board express his thanks to all Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Board, recognising in particular the valuable contribution made by Members through Task Group investigations and Short Sharp Reviews.**

For any background information on the work of Overview and Scrutiny Committee in Bromsgrove, please visit <https://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/council/the-council.aspx>

Democratic Services, Bromsgrove District Council, Market Street, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire, B61 8DA  
Tel: 01527 881443 email: [scrutiny@bromsgrovedc.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@bromsgrovedc.gov.uk)

## Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 5 March 2019, County Hall, Worcester - 1.30 pm

### Minutes

#### Present:

Mr P A Tuthill (Chairman), Ms P Agar, Mr G R Brookes, Mr P Grove, Prof J W Raine, Mrs M A Rayner, Mr C Rogers, Mr A Stafford, Mr T Baker, Mr C Bloore, Mrs F Oborski and Mrs F Smith

#### Also attended:

Charles Waddicor, Herefordshire and Worcestershire STP  
Simon Trickett, Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Groups  
Sue Harris, Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust  
Peter Pinfield and Simon Adams, Healthwatch Worcestershire

Sheena Jones (Democratic Governance and Scrutiny Manager), Jo Weston (Overview and Scrutiny Officer) and Dr Frances Howie (Director of Public Health)

#### Available Papers

The members had before them:

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. Presentation handouts (circulated at the Meeting)
- C. The Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 November 2018 (previously circulated).

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

#### 907 Apologies and Welcome

Apologies had been received from Mr M Chalk, Mr M Johnson and Mr R P Tomlinson.

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

None.

#### 909 Public Participation

None.

#### 910 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Previous

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 November 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## Meeting

### 911 NHS Long Term Plan

Attending for this Item were:

Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG)  
Simon Trickett, Accountable Officer

Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sustainability and Transformation Partnership (STP)  
Charles Waddicor, Independent Chair

Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust (WHCT)  
Sue Harris, Director of Strategy and Partnerships of and STP Communications and Engagement Lead

Worcestershire County Council  
Frances Howie, Director of Public Health

Healthwatch Worcestershire  
Peter Pinfield, Chairman  
Simon Adams, Chief Operating Officer

Representatives from across the health economy had been invited to the meeting and by way of presentation (available on the website), outlined the background to the national NHS Long Term Plan, what engagement events were planned locally and what the Plan would mean for the residents of Worcestershire.

The Committee was reminded that the national NHS Long Term Plan was launched on 7 January 2019 with five main themes:

- a new service model for the 21<sup>st</sup> century
- reducing pressure pressure on emergency hospital services
- people would get more control over their own health and personalised care when they needed it
- digitally-enabled primary and outpatient care would go mainstream across the NHS
- local NHS organisations would increasingly focus on population health, moving to Integrated Care Systems everywhere.

The Plan suggested that there would be changes to primary care contracts and a shift of clinical leadership focus with additional funding for non GP Practice staff, such as social prescribers and physios. In addition, there would be greater emphasis on same day emergency care with a greater proportion of patients not becoming an inpatient by having diagnostics and treatment more

readily available. Integrated Care Systems (ICSs) would also cover the whole country by April 2021 with more streamlined commissioning arrangements, typically involving a single CCG for each ICS/STP area.

Action on prevention had already been implemented, but the Plan would aim for more targeted support for weight management, type 2 diabetes, hypertension, a BMI of 30+ and smoking cessation. In addition, alcohol care teams would be established.

Elective, or planned, surgery numbers would grow implying that waiting lists would be reduced. Missed targets would potentially incur fines, where both hospitals and CCGs would be fined if any patient had to wait more than 52 weeks.

The Plan also sets out its plan for workforce by increasing nurse undergraduate places by 25% from 2019/20, increasing nursing associates by 50% in 2019/20 and increasing medical school places from 6,000 to 7,500 a year. Further retention incentives were suggested including a new GP Indemnity Scheme. In addition, the new GP contract would increase core funding by £978m every year by 2023/24.

It was reported that 2019/20 would be a transitional year for finance, with all NHS organisations expected to get back to balance by 2023/24. There would be reforms to the current payment system, moving from an activity based payment to a population based payment system. Further financial controls were also cited and the implementation of the Long Term Plan would provide a duty on CCGs and providers to collaborate.

In relation to the current Worcestershire position, it was reported that many of the NHS Plan's key areas were already either developed or being developed by the local Herefordshire and Worcestershire STP. In addition, the STP priorities were consistent with the themes outlined in the Long Term Plan such as improving outcomes in cancer and stroke, providing more care and treatment at home to reduce unnecessary admissions and putting a real emphasis on prevention.

Good progress had been made locally in areas such as developing neighbourhood teams, where nurses, therapists, social workers and GPs were working as teams responsible for supporting the most vulnerable patients in the local community. Furthermore, there were already closer working arrangements across the four

CCGS across Herefordshire and Worcestershire.

Nationally, Healthwatch had been commissioned to support the engagement process and locally Healthwatch Worcestershire was working closely with health partners to enhance the process, particularly by targeting hard to reach groups. Activity would build on the previous engagement in 2016 which informed the development of the Herefordshire and Worcestershire STP and the NHS Long Term Plan presented an opportunity for staff, groups and residents to influence local priorities.

In the ensuing discussion, the following main points were raised:

- The additional funding for GP Practices was welcomed, alongside the commitment for increased medical and nursing places, although Members learned that over half of all GPs in Worcestershire were aged over 50. Although training places would be increased, it would take some time – potentially 10 years - to filter through
- There was a definite shift across the health and social care economy from competition to collaboration and joint working for the needs of the population.
- Stakeholder engagement would commence shortly and continue through the summer, with a view to publishing a refresh of the STP in Autumn 2019 in line with the Long Term Plan objectives
- The Committee understood the model of decreasing acute inpatient stays, with same day emergency care
- When asked how the health system could assist the Acute Hospitals Trust, it was suggested that there was an opportunity to do so through collaboration, but it was also recognised that their financial position would not ease until the workforce was more stable and the need for agency staff decreased. Following recent Board appointments, everyone present hoped there would be improvement over the next 12 months.
- In response to a query about a future tariff being based on population and whether new housing developments would be factored in, it was reported that the funding formula would be reviewed periodically, although there would be a delay in housing developments being accounted for
- The Committee agreed that developments and pathways to ease A&E attendance, such as the Frailty Unit, had worked well and learned that

inappropriate attendance at A&E was at its lowest level

- When asked what the Long Term Plan challenges were for Worcestershire, it was reported that changes in behaviour were needed to achieve effective collaborative and preventative working. However, Neighbourhood Teams and recent developments in more increased collaborative working meant that the system locally was already ahead and the work on prevention was key
- A Member not on the Committee asked about the objective of having a more digitally enabled primary care and outpatient system to be advised that this would develop in time. Members could visualise the potential, especially in relation to outpatient appointments. It was noted that Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust was currently a digital exemplar
- The Committee and those present welcomed the Long Term Plan and investment in certain areas, however, acknowledged that neither was a quick fix and continued to be concerned about workforce. It was hoped that the partnership with Worcester University and their future vision to develop a medical school would help. It was suggested that the Committee might examine the workforce challenges and potential action that could be taken to encourage young people in particular to view health and social care as a rewarding career
- The Committee agreed that the delay in the publication of the Adult Social Care Green Paper had an impact on the health economy and it was disappointing that this was still not available.

The Chairman of Healthwatch Worcestershire added that engagement was vital to assist the health and social care system to understand the needs of local residents and achieve the Long Term Plan's objectives. Whilst it was unusual for Healthwatch to be engaged to deliver a Health Service function it was working with NHS colleagues to help engage with hard to reach groups.

## 912 Health Overview and Scrutiny Round-up

The Chairman and Mrs Rayner had attended the latest West Midlands Ambulance Trust meeting and reported that there was now a paramedic on every ambulance. 30% of patients who called an ambulance were not being taken to hospital. Ambulances had still been queueing at acute hospital emergency departments and Worcestershire had been a particular issue for this.

**913 Work Programme 2018/19**

The Committee agreed that there was nothing to add to the Work Programme at this time.

In relation to the item for the Committee's April meeting about Quality and Performance of the Acute Hospitals, it was noted that the CQC had carried out an unannounced inspection in January 2019 responding to information received about care of patients. Its report on this had been published on 1 March and referred to significant overcrowding of the accident and emergency department.

The meeting ended at 3.10 pm

Chairman .....



## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

### WORK PROGRAMME

2018/19

#### 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>
<b>08/04/19</b>	Former Market Hall site Redevelopment – Phase 2 – Pre-scrutiny	Picked up from the Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme 1 <sup>st</sup> April – 31 <sup>st</sup> July 2019
	Transport Planning Review Draft Report	
	WCC LTP4 on the district of Bromsgrove (deferred from previous meeting pending the Board’s consideration of the Transport Planning Review Draft Report)	Arising following submission of topic proposal by Cllr S. Colella at meeting on 11 <sup>th</sup> February 2019
	Working Group Updates and Review of work carried out in the 2017/18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance and Budget</li> <li>• Corporate Performance</li> </ul>	
	Task Group Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bromsgrove Sporting Football Club Task Group</li> <li>• Business Rates Relief – Short Sharp Review</li> </ul>	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Overview and Scrutiny Board Annual Report	Members to review the work of the Board.
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	

## WORK PROGRAMME

2019/20

Date of Meeting	Subject	Additional Information
<b>10<sup>th</sup> June 2019</b>	Bromsgrove Market – 6 month update following bringing the running of the market back in house.	Presentation
	Bromsgrove Enterprise Park – Build Out Pre-scrutiny (Chief Executive/Head of Economic Development & Regeneration, NWEDR)	Picked up from the Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme 1 <sup>st</sup> Feb – 31 <sup>st</sup> May 2019
	Customer Services Protocol – Invite Customer Support Manager to provide an update	Arising following submission of topic proposal by Cllr S. Colella at meeting on 11 <sup>th</sup> February 2019.
	Joint Staff Survey Task Group - Update on actions arising from the Survey and recommendations from the Task Group.	Arising from discussions at the meeting held on 11 <sup>th</sup> February 2019.
	Recommendation Tracker – Update on actions taken following recommendations made by the Board.	
<b>8<sup>th</sup> July 2019</b>	North Worcestershire Economic Growth Strategy – Pre-scrutiny	Picked up from the Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme 1 <sup>st</sup> April – 31 <sup>st</sup> July 2019
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> September 2019</b>	Scrutiny of the Crime and Disorder Partnership	There is a statutory requirement for the Board to carry out this piece of work at least once a year.
<b>21<sup>st</sup> October 2019</b>		
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> December 2019</b>		
<b>13<sup>th</sup> January 2020</b>		
<b>10<sup>th</sup> February 2020</b>		

<b>30<sup>th</sup> March 2020</b>		
<b>27<sup>th</sup> April 2020</b>		

## **Outstanding Items and Potential Items for pre-scrutiny**

- Bromsgrove Sports and Physical Activity Strategy - Picked up from the Cabinet Leader's Work Programme (item currently outstanding).
- Demonstration of modern.gov on an iPad together with data regarding paperless agendas.
- Worcestershire Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) – To investigate whether HOSC is fit for purpose (possibly invite the Chairman of HOSC to a future meeting.)

## **Updates Received – Monthly**

The Council's representative on the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee provides a verbal update to the Board each month.

The Council's representative on any Joint Scrutiny Task Groups 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.

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>