



Council

Mon 24 Apr
2017
7.00 pm

Council Chamber
Town Hall
Redditch

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

*making
difference*

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

**If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact
Democratic Services
Democratic Services**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: (01527) 64252 (Extns. 3266/3268) or 881443
e.mail: democratic@bromgroveandredditch.gov.uk**



Council

Monday, 24th April, 2017

7.00 pm

Council Chamber Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs:	Joe Baker (Mayor)	Bill Hartnett
	Jennifer Wheeler (Deputy Mayor)	Pattie Hill
	Tom Baker-Price	Gay Hopkins
	Roger Bennett	Wanda King
	Natalie Brookes	Jane Potter
	Juliet Brunner	Gareth Prosser
	David Bush	Antonia Pulsford
	Michael Chalk	Mark Shurmer
	Debbie Chance	Rachael Smith
	Greg Chance	Yvonne Smith
	Anita Clayton	Paul Swansborough
	Brandon Clayton	David Thain
	Matthew Dormer	Pat Witherspoon
	John Fisher	Nina Wood-Ford
	Andrew Fry	

1. Welcome	The Mayor will open the meeting and welcome all present.
2. Apologies	To receive any apologies for absence on behalf of Council members.
3. Declarations of Interest	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.
4. Minutes (Pages 1 - 30)	To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 20 th February and 2 nd March 2017.
5. Announcements	To consider Announcements under Procedure Rule 10: a) Mayor's Announcements b) The Leader's Announcements c) Chief Executive's Announcements. (Oral report)

6. Executive Committee (Pages 31 - 110)

To receive the minutes and consider the recommendations and / or referrals from the following meetings of the Executive Committee:

Meeting of the 20th February 2017

To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 20th February 2017. The recommendations from this meeting were resolved by Council at its meeting on the 20th February 2017.

Meeting of the 4th April 2017

The Executive Committee made recommendations to the Council on the following matters:

- Minute 102 – Redditch Borough Council Response to Local Transport Plan 2017-2030
- Minute 103 – Redditch Borough Council response to Solihull Draft Local Plan
- Minute 112 – Shared Service Business Case for Customer Access and Financial Support Services.

(The recommendation and minute for this matter is open and in the public domain.)

NOTE: the confidential report and appendices attached to this recommendation have only been made available to Members and relevant Officers. Should Members wish to discuss the report and / or attachments in any detail, a decision will be required to exclude the public and press from the meeting on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged, as defined in paragraph 4 of Schedule 12 (a) of Section 100 1 of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.)

The recommendations made by the Committee are set out at the front of each report and included within the agenda pack.

The minutes of each meeting are included in Minute Book 5.

<p>7. Regulatory Committees</p>	<p>To formally receive the minutes of the following meetings of the Council's Regulatory Committees:</p> <p>Audit, Governance and Standards Committee – 2nd February 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- (The recommendation at Minute 32 – Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2017/18 to 2019/20, was considered by Council at its meeting on the 20th February 2017). <p>Planning Committee – 18th January 2017, 15th February 2017 and 15th March 2017</p> <p>The minutes are included in Minute Book 5. There are no recommendations from these meetings for the Council to consider.</p>
<p>8. Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2016/2017 (Pages 111 - 130)</p>	<p>To consider the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Annual Report for the year 2016/2017.</p> <p>(Report attached)</p>
<p>9. Urgent Business - Record of Decisions</p>	<p>To note any decisions taken in accordance with the Council's Urgency Procedure Rules (Part 6, Paragraph 5 and/or Part 7, Paragraph 15 of the Constitution), as specified.</p> <p>(None to date).</p>
<p>10. Urgent Business - general (if any)</p>	<p>To consider any additional items exceptionally agreed by the Mayor as Urgent Business in accordance with the powers vested in him by virtue of Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.</p> <p>(This power should be exercised only in cases where there are genuinely special circumstances which require consideration of an item which has not previously been published on the Order of Business for the meeting.)</p>



Council

Monday, 20 February 2017

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Joe Baker (Mayor), Councillor Jennifer Wheeler (Deputy Mayor) and Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Natalie Brookes, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Debbie Chance, Greg Chance, Anita Clayton, Brandon Clayton, Matthew Dormer, John Fisher, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Pattie Hill, Gay Hopkins, Wanda King, Jane Potter, Gareth Prosser, Antonia Pulsford, Mark Shurmer, Yvonne Smith, Paul Swansborough, David Thain, Pat Witherspoon and Nina Wood-Ford

Officers:

Kevin Dicks, Claire Felton, Sue Hanley, Tracey Hurst, Sheena Jones, Jayne Pickering and Darren Whitney

Democratic Services Officer:

Debbie Parker-Jones

63. WELCOME

The Mayor opened the meeting and welcomed all present.

64. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Roger Bennett.

65. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Juliet Brunner, Michael Chalk and Jane Potter declared Other Disclosable Interests in Agenda Item 6 – Executive Committee, Medium Term Financial Plan – as detailed at Minute No. 68 below.

66. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 30th January 2017 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

.....
Chair

Council

Monday, 20 February 2017

67. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor

The Mayor advised of the following events which he had attended since the last meeting of the Council:

- Inspire Winyates Community Awards;
- Polish School Awards;
- Astwood Bank First School – presentation of certificates to pupils in School choir who had taken part in the Holocaust Memorial Day Service; and
- Kidderminster Musical Evening for which he thanked Councillor Wanda King for accompanying him.

The Mayor also thanked Councillor Wheeler for attending events which he had been unable to.

The Leader

The Leader, along with the Mayor, had attended a fund-raising event at the Palace Theatre involving local choirs, and the event at the Polish School to present certificates to pupils who had taken part in the Holocaust Memorial Day Service.

The final Health Commission meeting had taken place and the recommendations from this were due to be considered at a special meeting of the Council on 2nd March 2017.

Final confirmation of the bike race in May was still awaited and the Leader expressed his thanks to all who had pledged funds in an attempt to secure the race for the town.

Along with other Members the Leader had attended a “Time to Talk” session at the Town Hall, run by the local UNISON branch. Communications staff from UNISON’s national headquarters had also attended to report on the event and to interview various parties. The Leader praised the Time to Talk programme and was pleased that this was receiving the recognition it deserved.

It was noted that this would be Sheena Jones’s, Democratic Services Manager, last meeting of the Council before leaving the authority in March to start a new job with Worcestershire County Council. Members thanked Sheena for her service and good work at the Council and wished her well in her new role.

Council

Monday, 20 February 2017

68. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN AND COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTIONS

The Council received the minutes and considered the recommendations from the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 7th February 2017 in relation to the Shopmobility Service and the Medium Term Financial Plan, together with the recommendations of the Executive Committee meeting of 20th February which had taken place immediately preceding the meeting of the Council in relation to the Pay Policy Statement and Council Tax Resolutions. The Council Tax Resolutions appeared in Additional Papers 1 to the 20th February Executive Committee.

7th February 2017

Shopmobility Service

Councillor Greg Chance proposed, Councillor Bill Hartnett seconded, the recommendations relating to charging for the Shopmobility Service.

It was noted that a charging structure for the Shopmobility Service had been proposed in order to ensure that the Service was sustainable for the future. The annual cost to the Council of the Service after voluntary contributions and funding from the Kingfisher Shopping Centre was £69k, which in light of further funding cuts from central government was deemed unsustainable. It was noted that in addition to the proposed charges recommendation, the Executive Committee had resolved that Officers explore opportunities for additional financial contributions to the delivery of the Service with the Kingfisher Shopping Centre and Town Centre Partnership, and that, subject to the approval by Council of the proposed charging structure, a further report on the operation of the Service be taken to the Executive within 12 months and to report on the options for its future delivery.

Councillor Anita Clayton proposed, Councillor Tom Baker-Price seconded, the following amendment:

“That the proposed £5 and £10 registration fees be removed from the proposed charges.”

Councillor Clayton stated that she did not support either the £10 Annual Membership Fee or the £5 ‘Pay as you Go’ charge as these directly affected people with disabilities. She was concerned that the charges would make one-off trips expensive for the service users.

During the debate on the amendment, the view expressed that Disability Action Redditch should have been formally consulted on the proposals. The view was also expressed that the proposed

Council

Monday, 20 February 2017

charges were comparable to other providers and a potential initial dip in take up of the service had been accounted for in the proposals.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.5, the amendment was the subject of the following named vote:

Members voting FOR the amendment:

Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Anita Clayton, Brandon Clayton, Matthew Dormer, Gay Hopkins, Jane Potter, Gareth Prosser, Antonia Pulsford and David Thain (12).

Members voting AGAINST the amendment:

Councillors Joe Baker, Natalie Brookes, Debbie Chance, Greg Chance, John Fisher, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Pattie Hill, Wanda King, Mark Shurmer, Yvonne Smith, Jennifer Wheeler, Pat Witherspoon and Nina Wood-Ford (14).

Members ABSTAINING from voting:

Councillor Paul Swansborough (1).

The amendment was declared lost.

Following further debate and a vote on the substantive recommendation it was

RESOLVED that

the following charges for the Shopmobility Service be approved and implemented with effect from 1st April 2017:

- 1) an annual registration fee of £10 to cover administrative costs, specialised insurance and Officer time training customers on equipment;**
- 2) a hire charge for registered users of £2 for Redditch residents;**
- 3) a hire charge for registered users of £3 for Non-Redditch residents; and**
- 4) a £5 charge for customers who do not wish to register as a member or if they only need to use the service once or for a short period.**

Medium Term Financial Plan

Councillor Bill Hartnett proposed, Councillor John Fisher seconded, the recommendations from the Executive Committee relating to the Medium Term Financial Plan.

In proposing the item, Councillor Chance referred to further unexpected Government cuts in support grants which had seen the Council's funding position change from £4m in recent years to the Council having to pay the Government over £300k by 2021. The controlling group felt that they had no option but to recommend the budget before Members. Changes to funding under the New Homes Bonus Scheme would see a loss of expected/predicted income of £1.2m. The Leader had written to the Redditch MP and Local Government Minister in January seeking a meeting with the Minister in an attempt to gain a more reasonable settlement. The budget was also being set with draft settlement figures only from Government, with the final settlement details due to be confirmed that week.

The Medium Term Financial Plan, which aimed to save £2.8m over the following 4 years, proposed the use of £400k of balances to retain free swimming for the over 60's and under 16's, community events such as the Morton Stanley Festival, Street Theatre and Firework Display and Elections by thirds. In order to reduce Council expenditure it was proposed to stop providing some services including surrendering the Council's interests in the Kingsley and Arrow Vale Sports Centres and cessation of pre-9.30am concessionary bus passes for pensioners, with charges to be introduced for the Shopmobility Service. The Council would also be investigating changing the model of delivery of Leisure Services for provision of the Abbey Stadium, Palace Theatre, Forge Mill, Community Centres and Pitcheroak Golf Course, which would form part of a procurement exercise. It was noted that the town's parks would not be included in the review.

A lengthy debate on the budget proposals ensued, during which opposing views were expressed by Members. Some supported the review of the Leisure Service whilst suggesting this could have been carried out earlier. The view was expressed that the level of savings currently projected from this initiative may not be achievable.

Members thanked finance Officers for their hard work on the budget in what were unprecedented times given the financial challenges faced by the Council and the delay in receiving the final finance settlement figures from Government. Thanks were also expressed to staff generally for the money-saving suggestions that had been submitted.

During the discussion of this item a short comfort break was taken at 8.20pm, following which the meeting resumed at 8.25pm.

Council

Monday, 20 February 2017

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the recommendations on the budget calculation were the subject of the following named vote:

Members voting FOR the resolutions below:

Councillors Joe Baker, Natalie Brookes, Debbie Chance, Greg Chance, John Fisher, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Pattie Hill, Wanda King, Mark Shurmer, Yvonne Smith, Jennifer Wheeler, Pat Witherspoon and Nina Wood-Ford (14).

Members voting AGAINST the resolutions below:

Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Anita Clayton, Brandon Clayton, Matthew Dormer, Gay Hopkins, Jane Potter, Gareth Prosser, Antonia Pulsford, Paul Swansborough and David Thain (13).

Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED that

the following be approved:

- 1) **the savings and additional income that do not impact on service delivery for:**
 - 2017/18 £1.032m
 - 2018/19 £56k;
- 2) **the revenue bids for:**
 - 2017/18 £80k
 - 2018/19 £5k;
- 3) **the Capital bids of:**
 - 2017/18 £136k
 - 2018/19 £70k
 - 2019/20 £1.508m
 - 2020/21 £1.490m;
- 4) **the unavoidable pressures for:**

2017/18	£112k
2018/19	£27k
2019/20	£83k
2020/21	£25k;

CouncilMonday, 20 February 2017

5) the release from balances of:

2017/18	£103k
2018/19	£87k
2019/20	£105k
2020/21	£136k;

6) the increase in Council Tax for 2017/18 of £5 per Band D equivalent; and**7) the budget savings and pressures for 2018/19 – 2020/21 be subject to change due to the potential impact of changes to service delivery and the localisation of Business Rates together with any changes to New Homes Bonus.**

(Prior to consideration of this matter, Councillors Juliet Brunner, Michael Chalk and Jane Potter declared Other Disclosable Interests in Agenda Item 6 – Medium Term Financial Plan, in the following capacities:

- Councillor Brunner – as a Governor of RSA Academy Arrow Vale;
- Councillor Chalk – as an employee of RSA Academy Arrow Vale; and
- Councillor Potter – as a Governor of Tudor Grange Academy Redditch.

Councillors Brunner, Chalk and Potter remained in the room during the consideration of this matter.)

20th February 2017

Pay Policy Statement

RESOLVED that

the Pay Policy Statement 2017/18, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.

Council Tax Resolutions

Further to consideration of the Medium Term Financial Plan Members considered the Council Tax Resolutions 2017/18.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the Council Tax recommendations were the subject of the following named vote:

Council

Monday, 20 February 2017

Members voting FOR the resolutions below:

Councillors Joe Baker, Natalie Brookes, Debbie Chance, Greg Chance, John Fisher, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Pattie Hill, Wanda King, Mark Shurmer, Yvonne Smith, Jennifer Wheeler, Pat Witherspoon and Nina Wood-Ford (14).

Members voting AGAINST the resolutions below:

Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Anita Clayton, Brandon Clayton, Matthew Dormer, Gay Hopkins, Jane Potter, Gareth Prosser, Antonia Pulsford, Paul Swansborough and David Thain (13).

RESOLVED that

the recommendations, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report and as appended to these minutes, setting a Council Tax for 2017/18 of £227.21 for a band D unparished property, be approved.

69. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2017/18 - 2019/20

The Council received the recommendations of the Audit, Governance and Standards Committee meeting of 2nd February 2017 in relation to the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2017/18 to 2019/20.

RESOLVED that

- 1) the Strategy and Prudential Indicators at Appendix 1 to the report be approved; and**
- 2) the updated Treasury Management Policy at Appendix 2 to the report be approved.**

70. REDDITCH POLLING PLACES AMENDMENT

Members considered a report which proposed a change of Polling Place in advance of the May County Council Elections. This was an additional change to the agreed Polling Districts and Polling Places review in 2014.

The benefits of the proposed change in venue were noted, together with the anticipated savings from current portable building costs.

Council

Monday, 20 February 2017

RESOLVED that

- 1) the Polling Place for the electors in Polling District CEB be changed from a portable building in the car park of the REDI Centre to the REDI Centre itself; and
- 2) the change of Polling Place take effect for the May 2017 elections.

71. URGENT BUSINESS - RECORD OF DECISIONS

There were no urgent decisions to note.

72. URGENT BUSINESS - GENERAL (IF ANY)

There were no separate items of urgent business to consider at this meeting.

The Meeting commenced at 7.07 pm
and closed at 9.02 pm

.....
Chair

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FINANCE & RESOURCES

1.0 PURPOSE

To seek approval of the appropriate formal resolutions to determine the levels of Council Tax for Redditch Borough Council for 2017/18. The levels of tax take account of the requirements of Redditch Borough Council, Worcestershire County Council, the Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia, Hereford and Worcester Fire & Rescue Authority and Feckenham Parish Council.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Localism Act 2011 made significant changes to the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and requires the billing authority to calculate a Council Tax requirement for the year, not its budget requirement as previously.

3.0 PRECEPTS AND LEVIES

Details have been received from the various precepting bodies to enable the Council to set the Council Tax for 2017/18. The amounts of the precepts are set out below:

	£
Worcestershire County Council	28,470,930
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	4,836,628
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue Authority	2,028,740
Redditch Borough Council	5,804,343
Parish precept	8,300
Total	41,148,941

4.0 INFORMATION

It is necessary to formally set Council Tax levels throughout the area for the spending requirements of Redditch Borough Council, Worcestershire County Council, the Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia, Hereford and Worcester Fire & Rescue Authority and Feckenham Parish Council. If the Council approves the recommendations set out below the average band D Council Tax in 2017/18 will be £1,674.50, made up as follows:

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

Authority	2016/17 £	2017/18 £	Increase %
Redditch Borough Council	222.21	227.21	2.25
Worcestershire County Council	1,122.31	1,155.31	2.94
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	189.60	189.60	0.00
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue	78.00	79.53	1.96
Feckenham Parish Council	22.69	22.85	0.70
Total Council Tax	1,634.81	1,674.50	2.43

The % increases all relate to the change from current year levels.

The necessary formal resolutions are set out below.

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. that it be noted at its meeting on 17th January 2017, the Executive Committee calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
 - (a) for the whole Council area as 25,509.11 [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates; this being Feckenham Parish as 363.26.
2. Calculate the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2017/18 (excluding Parish precepts) is **£5,804,343**.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) £60,246,887 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act (taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils) (*i.e. Gross expenditure*)
 - (b) £54,339,544 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act. (*i.e. Gross income*)

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

- (c) £5,812,643 being the amount by which the aggregate of 3 (a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3 (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A (4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
- (d) £227.86 being the amount at 3 (c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
- (e) £8,300 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Feckenham Parish precept) referred to in Section 34 (1) of the Act.
- (f) £227.54 being the amount at 3 (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3 (e) above by Item T (1 (a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34 (2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.
- (g) £250.06 being the amount given by adding to the amount at 3(f), the amount of the special item relating to the Parish of Feckenham 3(e), divided by the amount in 1(b) above.
- (h) The amounts below given by multiplying the amounts at 3(f) and 3(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band, divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwelling listed in different valuation bands.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

Valuation Band	Proportion of Band D tax paid	Parish of Feckenham £	All other parts of the Council's area £
A	6/9	166.71	151.47
B	7/9	194.49	176.72
C	8/9	222.28	201.96
D	1	250.06	227.21
E	11/9	305.63	277.70
F	13/9	361.20	328.19
G	15/9	416.77	378.68
H	18/9	500.12	454.42

4. It be noted that for the year 2017/18, Worcestershire County Council, Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia and Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwelling in the Council's area as indicated below:

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Worcestershire County Council	770.21	898.57	1,026.94	1,155.31	1,412.05	1,668.78	1,925.52	2,310.62
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	126.40	147.47	168.54	189.60	231.74	273.87	316.01	379.21
Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority	53.02	61.86	70.69	79.53	97.20	114.88	132.55	159.06

5. Having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 4(h) and 5 above, that Redditch Borough Council in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 hereby sets the amounts shown below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings:

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

Valuation Band	Proportion of Band D tax paid	Parish of Feckenham £	All other parts of the Council's area £
A	6/9	1,116.34	1,101.10
B	7/9	1,302.65	1,284.61
C	8/9	1,488.45	1,468.14
D	1	1,674.50	1,651.65
E	11/9	2,046.02	2,018.69
F	13/9	2,418.72	2,385.72
G	15/9	2,790.85	2,752.76
H	18/9	3,349.01	3,303.31

6. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make payments under Section 90(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 from the Collection Fund by ten equal instalments between April 2017 to March 2018 as detailed below:

	Precept £	Surplus on Collection Fund £	Total to pay £
Worcestershire County Council	29,470,930	37,644	29,508,574
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	4,767,493	6,360	4,856,402
Hereford & Worcester Fire	2,028,740	2,616	2,031,356

7. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make transfers under Section 97 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 from the Collection Fund to the General Fund the sum of £5,811,808 being the Council's own demand on the Collection Fund (£5,804,343) and Parish Precept (£8,300) and the distribution of the Surplus on the Collection Fund (£7,465).
8. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make payments from the General Fund to Feckenham Parish Council the sums listed above (£8,300) by instalment on 1 April 2017 in respect of the precept levied on the Council.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Council Tax Setting 2017/18

9. That the above resolutions 3 to 5 be signed by the Chief Executive for use in legal proceedings in the Magistrates Court for the recovery of unpaid Council Taxes.

10. Notices of the making of the said Council Taxes signed by the Chief Executive are given by advertisement in the local press under Section 38(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.



Council

Thursday, 2 March 2017

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Joe Baker (Mayor), Councillor Jennifer Wheeler (Deputy Mayor) and Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Roger Bennett, Natalie Brookes, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Debbie Chance, Greg Chance, Anita Clayton, Brandon Clayton, Matthew Dormer, John Fisher, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Pattie Hill, Gay Hopkins, Wanda King, Jane Potter, Gareth Prosser, Antonia Pulsford, Mark Shurmer, Rachael Smith, Yvonne Smith, Paul Swansborough, David Thain, Pat Witherspoon and Nina Wood-Ford

Officers:

Kevin Dicks, Claire Felton and Jayne Pickering

Committee Services Officers:

Jess Bayley and Amanda Scarce

73. WELCOME

The Mayor welcomed all those present and formally opened the meeting. In so doing he advised all those present that due to public interest the meeting was being recorded. Those live streaming the meeting were reminded of the Council's protocol around the recording of meetings.

74. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

75. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Debbie Chance declared an other disclosable interest in Minute Item 77; Health Commission Final Report, in her capacity as an employee of University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust.

Whilst it was acknowledged that all present would have had some form of contact with the Alexandra Hospital, there were no formal declarations of interest made.

76. HEALTH COMMISSION - MINUTES

.....
Chair

The minutes of the meetings of the Health Commission held on 12th, 14th and 19th January 2017 were submitted for Members' consideration.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meetings of the Health Commission held on 12th, 14th and 19th January 2017 be approved as correct records and signed by the Chair.

77. HEALTH COMMISSION - FINAL REPORT

The Council considered the final report of the Health Commission, a group set up by the Council comprising members of the Executive Committee. This had met in public on three occasions to gather evidence from health service commissioners, providers and residents about the potential impact of the options from the Joint Services Review of Health on the Alexandra Hospital. The meetings had co-incided with the three Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Groups' consultation about the future of Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust's services.

In presenting the report, the Leader of the Council thanked all Councillors who had been involved in the work of the Commission and also the officers who had worked very hard within tight timescales to support it. The report included recommendations to the Council to inform its response to the consultation. The Leader commented that residents wanted safe services which were local and accessible, with a plan and a trust which was viable and sustainable. He provided a detailed summary of the supporting evidence behind each of the recommendations whilst making reference to the report. The Leader concluded his presentation by outlining the Council's wholehearted support of the staff employed by the NHS at both the Alexandra Hospital and throughout the country and he thanked them for their dedication and commitment.

Councillor Juliet Brunner also took the opportunity to thank Members and officers for their hard work and those residents who had given up their time to either attend the meetings or to complete a questionnaire. She also reiterated her thanks and support to the staff at the Alexandra Hospital. However, she shared her disappointment about the number of people who had responded to the Health Commission's survey in comparison with those who had previously signed the petition to retain services at the Alexandra Hospital.

A number of Members took the opportunity to comment on the work of the Health Commission and the need to support residents and ensure that appropriate services were available to all. Comments were also made in respect of the consultation process and the

Council

Thursday, 2 March 2017

length of time which had elapsed since the first notice of motion had been proposed by the Council in July 2012.

RESOLVED that

- 1) **Redditch Borough Council re-affirms its position as detailed in the Notice of Motion from the Council meeting on 23rd July 2012 which was carried unanimously (as detailed in Appendix B to the report);**
- 2) **In light of Section 29A and continuous changes of senior personnel managing Worcestershire Acute Hospitals Trust, that all previous options be reconsidered and a new plan developed;**
- 3) **The Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) take into account the following concerns raised by Members:**
 - a) **Redditch and Bromsgrove CCG and WAHT have not submitted evidence when requested by the Commission in a timely manner. The Commission therefore feels that its concerns have not been given due regard as befits their role as the democratic representatives of the Borough;**
 - b) **Members should have received separate submissions from Redditch and Bromsgrove CCG and WAHT at its meeting on 12th January. The purchaser/provider relationship was not therefore clear to either elected Members or members of the public present at (or viewing the live streaming of) the meeting of the Health Commission;**
 - c) **the Worcestershire CCGs' proposals are totally undermined by the decision not to explore Option 2 in 2015. The Health Commission has evidence that another trust was interested in providing services at the Alexandra Hospital;**
 - d) **significant concerns over the patient care capacity problems currently being experienced at Worcestershire Royal Hospital and its ability to cope moving forward; and**
 - e) **car parking capacity problems being experienced by patients and visitors at Worcestershire Royal Hospital;**
- 4) **WAHT's approach to communication with the public be improved to include greater promotion of the Trust's concessionary travel and car parking policy;**
- 5) **The Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Groups and Worcestershire Acute Hospitals Trust take into account**

CouncilThursday, 2 March 2017

projected housing growth in Redditch, Bromsgrove and Stratford Districts, as detailed in the relevant Local Plans and as detailed in the 3 Councils' submission to the Joint Services Review in 2013, and reviews the proposals in light of these (see Appendix O);

- 6)
 - a) the Worcestershire CCGs, WAHT and the Worcestershire Health and Care Trust note Members' concerns in respect of the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sustainability and Transformation Plan and the implications for Redditch residents; and
 - b) the Redditch and Bromsgrove CCG, WAHT and the Worcestershire Health and Care Trust work more proactively with the Council to develop and implement this plan in order to meet the needs of Redditch residents recognising the role of the Council in the preventative agenda.
- 7) The Redditch and Bromsgrove CCG and WAHT work with the Council to identify actions that can be taken by all service providers to address the high rate of respiratory illness experienced in the Redditch area;
- 8) The Council write to NHS England and NHS Improvement urging that the proposed changes to WAHT services are not implemented until:
 - a) the concerns raised by patients as detailed in the completed surveys and minutes of the Health Commission meetings, have been addressed; and
 - b) the £29m capital investment detailed in the Worcestershire CCGs' consultation report has been secured.
- 9) The Council writes to NHS England and NHS Improvement expressing Members' concerns about the Trust and the Worcestershire CCGs' consultation process, the viability of the Trust, and its ability to provide quality and safe services (as evidenced by Section 29A), the time it has taken to review hospital services, which Members feel has been too long, and the overall inadequacy of the plan for future services;
- 10) The Council writes to Central Government urging them to review funding arrangements for the NHS and Social Care; and
- 11) The Council writes to Central Government/NHS England requesting that there be a substantial recruitment and

training initiative for new doctors and nurses to work within the NHS.

A named vote was requested in respect of Recommendation 12
Members voting FOR the resolution: Councillors Joe Baker, Natalie Brookes, Debbie Chance, Greg Chance, John Fisher, Andy Fry, Bill Hartnett, Pattie Hill, Wanda King, Mark Shurmer, Rachael Smith, Yvonne Smith, Paul Swansborough, Jennifer Wheeler, Pat Witherspoon and Nina Wood-Ford (16)

Members voting AGAINST the resolution: 0

Members ABSTAINING from voting on the resolution: Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Roger Bennett, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Anita Clayton, Brandon Clayton, Matthew Dormer, Gay Hopkins, Jane Potter, Gareth Prosser, Antonia Pulsford, David Thain (13)

RESOLVED that

- 12) the following answers be provided to the first eight questions in the CCGs' Consultation Survey:**

Question	Response
1. a To provide high quality health services which deliver the highest standards of care to patients.	Strongly agree
1. b To work within the budget available to deliver services which are as near people's homes as possible.	Strongly disagree
1. c To ensure that all services are staffed appropriately to provide safe care at all times.	Strongly agree
2.a To develop countywide centres of excellence for various planned care services. Some services will be at the Alexandra Hospital and some at Worcestershire Royal Hospital.	Strongly disagree
2.b To centralise all inpatient children's facilities	Strongly disagree

Council

Thursday, 2 March 2017

at the Worcestershire Royal Hospital.	
2.c To provide better access to home nursing and consultant-led clinics to prevent as many children as possible from being admitted to hospital.	Tend to agree
2.d To centralise all hospital births in the county at the Worcestershire Royal Hospital. Where women would have the choice of midwife or consultant-led care.	Strongly disagree
2.e To centralise all emergency surgery at the Worcestershire Royal Hospital.	Strongly disagree
2.f To retain Accident and Emergency Departments at both the Alexandra Hospital (adults over 16 years old only) and Worcestershire Royal Hospital.	Strongly disagree
2.g To introduce urgent care centres at both hospitals which will treat adults and children 24 hours a day.	Not sure See point 8.
3. Please tell us why you agree with the proposals.	1.a With high quality services delivered locally. 1.c To enable adequate staffing a review needs to include staffing from other trusts including Birmingham. 2.c Providing consultant services are delivered locally (see the Council's own survey at question 5 and verbal feedback).
4. Please tell us why you disagree with the proposals.	1.b The budget proposed is inadequate. We do not believe the

Council

Thursday, 2 March 2017

	<p>services should be delivered by WAHT alone.</p> <p>2.a Based on the public response to the Council's own survey, see question 5.</p> <p>2.b Based on the public response to the Council's own survey, see question 5.</p> <p>2.d Based on the public response to the Council's own survey, see question 5.</p> <p>2.e Based on the public response to the Council's own survey, see question 5 and from verbal feedback.</p> <p>2.f But would have strongly agreed had all ages (i.e. under 16s) been treated at the Alexandra Hospital.</p>
5.a Do you think the NHS should provide transport services to enable patients, visitors and staff to travel between the three hospital sites?	Yes See point 8.
5.b Do you think the NHS should subsidise the costs of transport to hospital even though this means there would be less money for treatments?	No See point 8.
5.c Would you be likely to use a hospital transport service if you or a friend or member of your family were being treated at one of the three Worcestershire hospitals?	Not applicable
Questions 6 and 7	Not applicable
8. Now thinking about all the proposals in this document, is there anything further that we should consider to improve or enhance the healthcare provided by	<p>The questions are confusing and would appear to capture the CCGs' proposals.</p> <p>Reference 2.g It is confusing to the public what an Urgent Care Centre is.</p>

Council

Thursday, 2 March 2017

Worcestershire hospitals.	Reference 5.a & b, transport services should be provided but not at the expense of patient care. To avoid the need for additional transport, services should be provided locally.
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

78. URGENT BUSINESS - COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTIONS

The Council Tax Resolutions was accepted as an item of urgent business – not having met the publication deadline – and was considered at the meeting as such, with the approval of the Mayor, in accordance with the Council’s constitutional rules and the powers vested in the Chair by virtue of Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 to agree matters of urgency being discussed by reason of special circumstances. In this case the special circumstances were that an error had been made in the calculations for the Council Tax Resolutions agreed at Council on 20th February 2017. The item needed to be considered to enable Members to approve the revised and correct calculations before publication of the Council Tax bills for the new financial year.

The Council considered the report of the Director of Finance and Resources which set out calculation errors in the Council tax resolutions agreed at the Council meeting on 20th February 2017. The errors did not affect the budget agreed by the Council but needed to be corrected in order for the Council Tax bills to be issued on time.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, a named vote was taken and voting was recorded as follows:

Members voting FOR the resolution: Councillors Joe Baker, Natalie Brookes, Debbie Chance, Greg Chance, John Fisher, Andy Fry, Bill Hartnett, Pattie Hill, Wanda King, Mark Shurmer, Rachael Smith, Yvonne Smith, Jennifer Wheeler, Pat Witherspoon and Nina Wood-Ford (15)

Members voting AGAINST the resolution: Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Anita Clayton, Brandon Clayton, Matthew Dormer, Gay Hopkins, Jane Potter, Gareth Prosser, Antonia Pulsford, Paul Swansborough, David Thain (13)

Members ABSTAINING from voting on the resolution: 0

RESOLVED that

Council

Thursday, 2 March 2017

the amendments to the Council Tax Resolutions as set out at Appendix 1 attached to these minutes be approved.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.02 pm

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

RESOLVED that

1. that it be noted at its meeting on 17th January 2017, the Executive Committee calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
 - (a) for the whole Council area as 25,509.11 [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates; this being Feckenham Parish as 363.26.
2. Calculate the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2017/18 (excluding Parish precepts) is **£5,795,925**.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) £60,246,887 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act (taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils) (*i.e. Gross expenditure*)
 - (b) £54,339,544 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act. (*i.e. Gross income*)
 - (c) **£5,804,225** being the amount by which the aggregate of 3 (a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3 (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A (4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
 - (d) **£227.54** being the amount at 3 (c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
 - (e) £8,300 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Feckenham Parish precept) referred to in Section 34 (1) of the Act.
 - (f) **£227.21** being the amount at 3 (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3 (e) above by Item T (1 (a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34 (2) of the Act, as the

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

- (g) £250.06 being the amount given by adding to the amount at 3(f), the amount of the special item relating to the Parish of Feckenham 3(e), divided by the amount in 1(b) above.
- (h) The amounts below given by multiplying the amounts at 3(f) and 3(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band, divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwelling listed in different valuation bands.

Valuation Band	Proportion of Band D tax paid	Parish of Feckenham £	All other parts of the Council's area £
A	6/9	166.71	151.47
B	7/9	194.49	176.72
C	8/9	222.28	201.96
D	1	250.06	227.21
E	11/9	305.63	277.70
F	13/9	361.20	328.19
G	15/9	416.77	378.68
H	18/9	500.12	454.42

4. It be noted that for the year 2017/18, Worcestershire County Council, Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia and Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwelling in the Council's area as indicated below:

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Worcestershire County Council	770.21	898.57	1,026.94	1,155.31	1,412.05	1,668.78	1,925.52	2,310.62
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	126.40	147.47	168.54	189.60	231.74	273.87	316.01	379.20
Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority	53.02	61.86	70.69	79.53	97.20	114.88	132.55	159.06

5. Having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 4(h) and 5 above, that Redditch Borough Council in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 hereby sets the amounts shown below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings:

Valuation Band	Proportion of Band D tax paid	Parish of Feckenham £	All other parts of the Council's area £
A	6/9	1,116.34	1,101.10
B	7/9	1,302.39	1,284.62
C	8/9	1,488.45	1,468.13
D	1	1,674.50	1,651.65
E	11/9	2,046.62	2,018.69
F	13/9	2,418.73	2,385.72
G	15/9	2,790.85	2,752.76
H	18/9	3,349.00	3,303.30

6. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make payments under Section 90(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 from the Collection Fund by ten equal instalments between April 2017 to March 2018 as detailed below:

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Council Tax Setting 2017/18

	Precept £	Surplus on Collection Fund £	Total to pay £
Worcestershire County Council	29,470,930	37,644	29,508,574
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	4,767,493	6,360	4,856,402
Hereford & Worcester Fire	2,028,740	2,616	2,031,356

7. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make transfers under Section 97 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 from the Collection Fund to the General Fund the sum of £5,811,690 being the Council's own demand on the Collection Fund (£5,795,925) and Parish Precept (£8,300) and the distribution of the Surplus on the Collection Fund (£7,465).
8. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make payments from the General Fund to Feckenham Parish Council the sums listed above (£8,300) by instalment on 1 April 2017 in respect of the precept levied on the Council.
9. That the above resolutions 3 to 5 be signed by the Chief Executive for use in legal proceedings in the Magistrates Court for the recovery of unpaid Council Taxes.
10. Notices of the making of the said Council Taxes signed by the Chief Executive are given by advertisement in the local press under Section 38(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

COUNCIL

24th April 2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – 4TH APRIL 2017

102. REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 2017 - 2030

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) the informal response to the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan 2017 – 2030, attached at Appendix A to the report, for submission as the formal Council response be approved; and**

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**Date 4th April 2017**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN
2017- 2030**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Chance
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Ward(s) Affected	All wards
Ward Councillor(s) Consulted	N/A
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 The purpose of this Report is to seek Council approval for the informal response that was submitted to the consultation on Worcestershire County Councils Local Transport Plan 2017 - 2030.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Members note the contents of the report.
- 2.2 That Executive Committee RECOMMEND to Council that the informal response to the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan 2017 - 2030 (as attached at Appendix A) be approved by Council and submitted as a formal Council response.

3. KEY ISSUES**Financial Implications**

- 3.1 No financial implications.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 Worcestershire County Council, as the Local Transport Authority, is legally required to produce, deliver and maintain a Local Transport Plan under the Transport Act (2000) and the Local Transport Act (2008).

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.3 Worcestershire County Council consulted on the Local Transport Plan (LTP) between 22nd December 2016 and 17th March 2017. An informal response (attached at Appendix A) was submitted on the 17th March 2017 in order to meet

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**Date 4th April 2017

the consultation end date. The purpose of the Consultation on the LTP sets out the County Council's aspirations and priorities for investing in the transport networks, including infrastructure, technology and services to support all relevant modes of transport including walking, cycling, rail, bus and community transport as well as highways.

3.4 The County Council is required by Central Government to produce Local Transport Plans (LTP) to set out objectives for developing transport plans. The draft plan currently being consulted will cover the period from April 2017 until 2030. Although it's expected the document will be reviewed regularly, as the county is expected to see unprecedented population growth, housing development, economic diversification and technological advances.

3.5 A copy of the informal response can be seen at Appendix A however for convenience the main points have been repeated here.

Main document

3.6 Further information regarding the purpose and contents of the Redditch Transport Strategy are required before any further comments can be submitted.

3.7 The following specific junction schemes are suggested within the Redditch Package:

R3 - Ran Tan Major Junction Capacity Enhancement

R4 - Battens Drive/ Warwick Highway Junction

R5 - Plymouth Road/ Bromsgrove Road Junction

R6 - B4184 Windsor Road/ Birmingham Road Junction

R7 - A441 Birmingham Road/ B4101 Dagnell End Road junction

3.8 The Council request to be involved in any suggested improvement schemes. Officers have questioned whether potential funding sources being referred to identify the necessary scheme or whether they are to also implement the scheme. If the funding identified is not to pay for implementation Officers have questioned where the funding would come from to implement solutions.

Strategic Environmental Assessment

3.9 Page 22 says Redditch has an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). It also states this AQMA is part of the Stoke Heath AQMA. This is not the case. Redditch has never has a designated AQMA within its boundaries and the Stoke Heath AQMA is a significant distance from the Redditch boundary.

3.10 Page 23 and 26 states "*The Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 seeks to allocate 46,400 dwellings between 2011 and 2030....*". This is incorrect; the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 allocates 6,400 dwellings between 2011 to 2030.

Other comments

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**Date 4th April 2017

- 3.11 There is a fundamental lack of regard for strategic growth issues related to future housing needs of the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area. It is widely accepted that there is a need to find land to accommodate at least 37,900 dwellings. It is acknowledged that this growth will need to be accommodated within the Housing Market Area and further work is needed to identify suitable locations for this growth through the Strategic Growth Study. Redditch, as a Local Authority within the Housing Market Area, has agreed to participate within the Strategic Growth Study, therefore the Green Belt to the south west of the urban area may need to be considered for future development. A long standing issue with this area is the unknown infrastructure that would be needed to support any potential future development. Therefore it is essential for the various Transport Teams at WCC to be involved as early as possible with this work in order to provide advice and guidance on the various forms of transport and transport infrastructure that may or may not support development. Therefore it is felt there needs to be a much stronger link between LTP4 and strategic planning as the implications from new housing are an intrinsic highway matter which should help to inform the location of new development.
- 3.12 LTP4 acknowledges the need to improve Redditch Train Station however it is felt that further work may need to be done to enhance the rail service offer, in particular enhanced links from Redditch to Birmingham such as an express train at peak times. Currently there is no mention of rail service within LTP4.

LTP4 and Redditch Town Centre Strategy

- 3.13 There is a lack of detail regarding what is envisaged for the Town Centre. WCC Officers have previously stated that the Town Centre Strategy is included in LTP4 which it is not. Town Centre Schemes were listed within LTP3 however they have not been carried forward to LTP4. Information on why these schemes are not within the document is requested as there is still an aspiration for them to be implemented.
- 3.14 LTP4 does not mention the strategy for downgrading the Ring Road around the Town Centre. This is the primary road for access to and from the Town Centre and it is felt this important scheme should be detailed within the Document. This scheme was contained within Local Transport Plan 3 as 'Scheme R1' within the Redditch Urban Package. It is felt that this scheme should be carried forward to LTP4.
- 3.15 A Car Parking Study is detailed as an Action in Town Centre Strategy as it is within the Redditch Package of the LTP. However it is not clear from the detail in the LTP whether this is the same parking study or an additional one as the remit of the car parking study in the LTP has not been detailed.
- 3.16 The Redevelopment of Train station area is an action in the Town Centre Strategy as it is within the LTP (detailed as the 'Redditch Station Enhancement Scheme'), is essential these strategies align to ensure what was envisaged through the Town Centre Strategy is mirrored in the LTP.

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**Date 4th April 2017

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.17 The contents of the LTP have the potential to affect every resident in the Borough. The schemes detailed within the LTP need to be the right schemes to ensure that the transport in the Borough is sustainable up to 2030.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 As above (3.11) there may be a risk to the Borough if the LTP does not address some of the bigger issues facing the borough over the next few years. It is essential that the LTP addresses the current issues facing the Borough and looks ahead to the issues likely to be facing the Borough up to 2030.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Redditch Borough Council Response to Worcestershire County Council Local Transport Plan 2017 - 2030

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Worcestershire County Council Local Transport Plan 2017 – 2030 (December 2016)

1. The main LTP4 document
2. Habitats Regulation Assessment
3. Network Management Plan
4. Policies Document
5. Strategic Environmental Assessment

7. KEY

AQMA - Air Quality Management Area
LTP – Local Transport Plan

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Louise Jones
Email: louise.jones@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel.: (01527) 64252 ext: 3221

**Redditch Borough Council Response to Worcestershire County Council
Local Transport Plan 2017 – 2030**

1 Redditch Borough Council has a number of comments and concerns in relation to the Local Transport Plan (LTP), which are detailed below. Comments are made under the sub-heading of the relevant LTP document and refer back to the consultation questions where appropriate. The end of the document details general comments and concerns the Borough Council has with the LTP.

Main Document

2 Page 9 of the Main Document includes a map of major housing development; it is felt that the locations of the numbers on the map do not accurately reflect the actual location they are intended to represent. It is appreciated that this is difficult to achieve with a map of this scale, however in order for the document to be correct numbers 3 and 5 need relocating.

3 Page 16 states that Redditch are still preparing the Development Plan, the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (BORLP4) was adopted on the 31st January 2017.

Specific Comments on the Transport Packages

North East Strategic Transport Schemes (NEST) NEST 3 – Redditch Transport Strategy

4 No detail is provided within the document as to what the Redditch Transport Strategy will be or the timescales it will be working towards. It is felt that further information about the purpose and contents of this document are needed before any further comments can be submitted. Information within the table refers to 'Local Development Plan' not BORLP4.

Redditch package

5 All of the actions listed within the table refer to 'Developers' as a source of potential funding, however Redditch do not have an Infrastructure Delivery Plan with all of these schemes listed, the IDP should be updated to reflect this. In addition, the majority of all the large development sites in Redditch are already under construction or have been granted planning permission. Therefore it is unlikely there will be much scope for collecting significant funds from Developers for these schemes.

6 R3 – R4 lists Maintenance as a potential source of funding. It is not clear what this is referring to.

7 R1 – Parking Strategy. It is not clear what the remit of this Strategy will be. It is assumed that this strategy will focus on the Town Centre, however this will need confirmation. Please see comments below in relation to 'Town Centre Strategy'.

8 R2 – Active Travel Network Investment Programme – Refers to 'town centres'. Redditch only has one town centre, clarification should be provided on which centres this specifically refers to.

9 R3 – R7 The Borough Council would wish to be involved in any suggested improvement schemes although further information on what the exact issues to be addressed are at these locations would be useful, or some rationale for why these areas have been picked over others. Are potential funding sources referring to funding to identify the necessary scheme or is this to also

implement the scheme? Where would funding come from to implement solutions? It is considered all junction names should also refer to road names for people who don't know what Ran Tan junction is for example.

10 R9 – Alexandra Hospital Bus Interchange Scheme – A potential funding source listed is 'Major Scheme (DfT)' however this scheme isn't listed as the beginning of the document under the list of major schemes. More information would be welcomed on when this scheme would go to the DfT for consideration and the likelihood of this scheme being implemented through DfT funding.

11 The Alexandra Hospital Bus Interchange Scheme is detailed within the Main Document, Officers feel that 'bus' should be removed from its title as the scheme description goes on to describe the scheme as a '*multi-modal interchange ... for taxi/ community transport/ bus users and operators and car pick-up and drip-off facilities*'. The Council also feel that more should be done through this scheme to increase links between the Alexandra Hospital and Worcester Hospital.

12 With regard to all of the schemes listed in the Packages it is not clear whether the purpose of the scheme is to provide the analysis and a solution, or whether implementation will also be part of the scheme.

Strategic Environmental Assessment

13 Page 22 says Redditch has an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). It also states this AQMA is part of the Stoke Heath AQMA. This is not the case. Redditch has never has a designated AQMA within its boundaries and the Stoke Heath AQMA is a significant distance from the Redditch boundary.

14 Page 23 and 26 states "*The Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 seeks to allocate 46,400 dwellings between 2011 and 2030...*". This is incorrect; the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 allocates 6,400 dwellings between 2011 to 2030. This incorrect figure has been added to the 7,000 dwellings Bromsgrove will deliver to state, "*In this context in addition to a potential increase in road-based travel through induced demand, the addition of 53,400 homes and over 83ha of employment in the North East Worcestershire Delivery Area in the period to 2031 will generate demand for new trips.*" This is incorrect; this figure should be 13,400.

Other comments

15 There is a fundamental lack of regard for strategic growth issues related to future housing needs of the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area. It is widely accepted that there is a need to find land to accommodate at least 37,900 dwellings. It is acknowledged that this growth will need to be accommodated within the Housing Market Area and further work is needed to identify suitable locations for this growth through the Strategic Growth Study. Redditch, as a Local Authority within the Housing Market Area, has agreed to participate within the Strategic Growth Study, therefore the Green Belt to the south west of the urban area may need to be considered for future development. A long standing issue with this area is the unknown infrastructure that would be needed to support any potential future development. Therefore it is essential for the various Transport Teams at WCC to be involved as early as possible with this work in order to provide advice and guidance on the various forms of transport and transport infrastructure that may or may not support development. Therefore it is felt there needs to be a much stronger link between LTP4 and strategic planning as the implications from new housing are an intrinsic highway matter which should help to inform the location of new development.

16 LTP4 acknowledges the need to improve Redditch Train Station however it is felt that further work may need to be done to enhance the rail service offer, in particular enhanced links from Redditch to Birmingham such as an express train at peak times. Currently there is no mention of rail service within LTP4. Whilst it is acknowledged that the scope for WCC to influence service provision is limited there is potential through the existing lines of communication that exist with the rail providers to ensure service is as effective and efficient as it can be.

17 The Eastern Gateway is mentioned as a game changer (on page 10 of the Main Document) however there is no detail or information related to the transport implications of this site. Other than being listed as a Game Changer there is no other reference to the site than this in any of the LTP documentation provided. The works needed to access the eastern gateway are in Redditch and many of the implications of the Eastern Gateway will fall within the Redditch boundary it is felt it should be included in LTP4.

18 Officers note that LTP4 identifies the Battens Drive/ Warwick Highway Junction for review and potential improvement scheme. It is felt that the junction at the other end of the Warwick Highway i.e. the Alders Drive Junction should also be considered for review as Officers have identified traffic build up at both ends of the Warwick Highway. This is important as both Winyates and Matchborough are planned to be regenerated over the lifetime of the BORLP4 and therefore traffic may increase as a result of this.

LTP4 and Redditch Town Centre Strategy

19 LTP4 lacks recognition of the importance of the actions set out in the Town Centre Strategy which will have fundamental implications on the local transport system. Overall there is a lack of detail regarding what is envisaged for the Town Centre. WCC Officers have previously stated that the Town Centre Strategy is included in LTP4 which it is not. Town Centre Schemes were listed within LTP3 however they have not been carried forward to LTP4. Information on why these schemes are not within the document is requested as there is still an aspiration for them to be implemented.

20 LTP4 does not mention the strategy for downgrading the Ring Road around the Town Centre. This is the primary road for access to and from the Town Centre and it is felt this important scheme should be detailed within the Document. This scheme was contained within Local Transport Plan 3 as 'Scheme R1' within the Redditch Urban Package. It is felt that this scheme should be carried forward to LTP4.

21 A Car Parking Study is detailed as an Action in Town Centre Strategy as it is within the Redditch Package of the LTP. However it is not clear from the detail in the LTP whether this is the same parking study or an additional one as the remit of the car parking study in the LTP has not been detailed. It is essential if this is a Town Centre only Car Parking Study then its aim and objectives link to what was envisaged for the car parking study detailed within the Town Centre Strategy.

22 As above regarding the Car Parking Study the Redevelopment of Train station area is an action in the Town Centre Strategy as it is within the LTP (detailed as the 'Redditch Station Enhancement Scheme'). Again the strategies must align to ensure what was envisaged through the Town Centre Strategy is mirrored in the LTP.

23 The Borough Council will continue to meet with WCC colleagues to try and ensure that the issues outlined above are addressed in later iterations of the Draft Local Transport Plan.

COUNCIL

24th April 2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – 4TH APRIL 2017

103. **REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO SOLIHULL
DRAFT LOCAL PLAN**

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) **the Officer response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan, attached at Appendix A to the report, for submission as the formal Council response be approved.**

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**Date 4th April 2017**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO SOLIHULL DRAFT LOCAL PLAN**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Chance
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Ward(s) Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor(s) Consulted	N/A
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

The purpose of this Report is to seek Council approval for the Officer response that was submitted to the consultation on the Solihull Draft Local Plan.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That members note the contents of the report
- 2.2 That Executive Committee is asked to RECOMMEND to the Council that the Officer response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan (attached at Appendix A) be approved by Council as the formal consultation response.

3. KEY ISSUES**Financial Implications**

- 3.1 No financial implications.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 The attached response discusses the Duty to Co-operate which is a legal requirement under Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 112 (2) of the Localism Act 2011.

Service / Operational Implications**3.3 Summary of Response**

Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) consulted on their Draft Local Plan between 5th December 2016 and 17th February 2017. An Officer response (attached at Appendix A) was submitted on the 17th February 2017 in order to meet the consultation end date. The purpose of the Consultation on the Draft Local Plan was to seek views on the revised policies and proposed site allocations for housing and employment land, in addition to those in the existing Plan. The Council also published an updated evidence base.

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**Date 4th April 2017

- 3.4 The Officer response to the consultation raised a number of concerns which Officers felt still needed to be addressed through the Plan. A full copy of the Officer response can be seen at Appendix A, however for convenience the main points will be detailed here.
- 3.5 It is not clear from the Draft Local Plan exactly what the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for Solihull is. The Solihull Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SSHMA) (November 2016) states at paragraph 7.21 that the OAHN for Solihull is either 13,094 or 14,278 dwellings. Neither the text nor the table in Policy P5 'Provision of Land for Housing' specifies which figure has been used. Furthermore, the Policy is confusing and misleading with regard to the overall housing requirement figure of 6,522 it is unclear how this number has been arrived at.
- 3.6 It is considered that the Draft Plan does not adequately respond to the shortfall of 37,900 dwellings arising from Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GBHMA) as indicated in the Birmingham City Development Plan. The Main Modifications to the Birmingham Plan (MM2 and MM3) indicate that the focus of the search for capacity to address this shortfall will be within the authority areas of The Black Country, Bromsgrove, Redditch, Solihull, North Warwickshire, Tamworth, Lichfield, Cannock Chase, South Staffordshire and parts of Stratford-on-Avon. The Draft Local Plan states that SMBC will test whether it could potentially accommodate 2000 dwellings (paragraph 211) that arise from the GBHMA need, but this is not a firm commitment to actually accommodate 2000 dwellings. There is no clear rationale or evidence to help determine or indicate what the relevant level of additional housing Solihull should be accommodating to address this shortfall. Furthermore, statistics released by the ONS in 2011 confirm that there are significant links between Solihull and Birmingham, including travel to work patterns. This factor amongst many others has not been used to support the 2000 dwelling figure as the correct allocation to address the shortfall of housing in the GBHMA within Solihull Borough.
- 3.7 It is encouraging that SMBC's reference the Duty to Co-operate with its neighbours to address the GBHMA housing shortfall in paragraph 211 of the Draft Local Plan. However due to the views expressed above Officers do have concerns at this stage as to whether Solihull will be able to satisfy the tests of the Duty to Cooperate as the plan progresses if these issues are not addressed. Officers from the RBC are more than willing to meet with SMBC representatives to try and ensure that the issues outlined above are addressed in later iterations of the Draft Local Plan review.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.8 It is in the wider interest of the Borough that Solihull contributes as effectively as possible to ensuring the housing need from Birmingham is met in the most suitable locations. If this is not achieved then it is possible that other less suitable

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**Date 4th April 2017

areas such as Redditch are required to accommodate growth which is not in the most sustainable location.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 As stated above it is in the Boroughs best interest to ensure that Solihull work effectively with Birmingham and the other Authorities within the Housing Market Area to ensure that the needs from Birmingham are addressed in the most sustainable and suitable places. It will be a risk to Redditch Borough if Solihull does not do this. Work has not been completed to consider if or how Redditch could contribute towards meeting any need arising from Birmingham.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Redditch Borough Council response to Solihull Draft Local Plan (February 2017)

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Solihull Draft Local Plan (November 2016)

7. KEY

GBHMA - Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area
OAHN - Objectively Assessed Housing Need
SMBC - Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
SSHMA - Solihull Strategic Housing Market Assessment

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Mike Dunphy
Email: m.dunphy@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel.: 1325

Redditch Borough Council

Town Hall,
Walter Stranz Square,
Redditch,
Worcestershire B98 8AH

tel: (01527) 64252
fax: (01527) 65216
minicom: 595528
DX: 19106 Redditch



Policy and Spatial Planning
Solihull MBC
Council House
Manor Square
Solihull
B91 3QB

devplans@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

17th February 2017

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Redditch Borough Councils Response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan

Redditch Borough Council (RBC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Solihull Draft Local Plan (November 2016). This response is an informal response at this stage, once formal endorsement is received from the Council we will confirm the wording of the final response via email.

The comments we wish to make on the Solihull Draft Local Plan, are structured under a number of sub-headings and predominantly relate to the proposed housing provision in Solihull Borough and Consultation Q14: *“Do you agree that we are planning to build the right number of new homes? If not why not, and how many do you think we should be planning to build?”*.

Objectively Assessed Housing Need

1 RBC considers that building on the data in the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP and Black Country Local Authorities Strategic Housing Needs Study, August 2015 (SHNS) offers a starting point for the Solihull Strategic Housing Market Assessment, November 2016 (SSHMA). However it must be remembered the figure contained within the August 2015 study does not represent the objectively assessed need for the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area.

2 It is not clear from the Draft Local Plan exactly what the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for Solihull is. The SSHMA states at paragraph 7.21 that the OAN for Solihull is either 13,094 or 14,278 dwellings. Neither the text nor the table in Policy P5 ‘Provision of Land for Housing’ specifies which figure has been used. Furthermore, the Policy is confusing and misleading with regard to the overall housing requirement figure of 6,522 it is unclear how this number has been arrived at.

Greater Birmingham Housing Growth

3 The SSHMA underpinning the housing requirement in the Draft Local Plan appears to only deal with meeting the local housing need of the Borough and does not adequately address the wider Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area (GBHMA) needs and shortfall. In

particular, paragraph 7.32 of the SSHMA states, *“The OAN above does not consider any additional homes SMBC might provide to address unmet need from elsewhere in the HMA”*.

4 The Draft Local Plan states that SMBC will test whether it could potentially accommodate 2000 dwellings (paragraph 211) that arise from the GBHMA need, but this is not a firm commitment to actually accommodate 2000 dwellings. There is no clear rationale or evidence to help determine or indicate what the relevant level of additional housing Solihull should be accommodating to address this shortfall. Furthermore, statistics released by the ONS in 2011 confirm that there are significant links between Solihull and Birmingham, including travel to work patterns. This factor amongst many others has not been used to support the 2000 dwelling figure as the correct allocation to address the shortfall of housing in the GBHMA within Solihull Borough. RBC considers that for the above reasons the plan does not adequately respond to the shortfall of 37,900 dwellings arising from GBHMA as indicated in the Birmingham City Development Plan. The Main Modifications to the Birmingham Plan (MM2 and MM3) indicate that the focus of the search for capacity to address this shortfall will be within the authority areas of The Black Country, Bromsgrove, Redditch, Solihull, North Warwickshire, Tamworth, Lichfield, Cannock Chase, South Staffordshire and parts of Stratford-on-Avon.

5 Birmingham and Solihull are inextricably linked. This is fundamentally expressed by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP). Birmingham and Solihull form the *‘Metropolitan Core’* of the LEP area and is seen as the focus for many of the economic drivers of the conurbation. The GBSLEP is summarised in the GBSLEP Strategic Economic Plan 2016-2030 (SEP) as *“a partnership of business, public sector and further and higher education leaders with a mission to grow the economy of Greater Birmingham and Solihull.”* The SEP also presents key statistics for Greater Birmingham and Solihull inclusively, for example, *“Greater Birmingham and Solihull has an economy worth £40bn”* and *“Greater Birmingham and Solihull has a population of 2m”*.

6 The SEP identifies Solihull as a key location for economic growth including UK Central (HS2, NEC and Birmingham Airport) and promotes HS2 (Solihull) as a *“once-in-a-generation opportunity to drive productivity, economic growth and prosperity across the Midlands”*. The Birmingham Curzon Investment Plan and the growth plans for UK Central in Solihull have set out the opportunity to create more than 52,000 jobs and £1.25bn in GVA per annum. The opportunities to deliver economic growth make Solihull an ideal location to achieve balanced and sustainable development, by accommodating an appropriate level of housing in close proximity to such major economic growth. It would be remiss of SMBC to assume that the significant benefits afforded to the Council by increased economic activity, should not be balanced with a significant contribution to meeting the GBHMA shortfall. RBC considers that the SSHMA is particularly dismissive of jobs-led scenarios given the important role that Solihull plays in the context of Midlands growth and a *‘once-in-a-generation opportunity’*.

7 A Strategic Growth Study for the GBHMA is being commissioned by the local authorities in the GBHMA to provide a clear recommendation on, the broad locations for growth, a range of potential housing capacities from each growth location, and an indicative delivery timetable. This work includes a full strategic review of the Green Belt within the GBHMA. Whilst it is a significant positive that Solihull have agreed to take part in this study, it is essential that the land within the Borough is considered on an equal basis to land within other local planning authority areas. It is essential that this happens for robust conclusions to be reached and a solution found to meeting the needs of the GBHMA. It is acknowledged that work has been undertaken on assessing the green belt within Solihull, it is important that the conclusions of this work are reassessed in the light of the more

strategic work now being progressed. The need for a strategic green belt review is also highlighted in the recently published West Midlands Land Commission report which stresses;

The (Green Belt) review should pick up from and, where appropriate, supersede the reviews which a significant number of local authorities have underway, where the Commission has heard from a number of respondents that individual local reviews risk a piecemeal and unsustainable 'chipping away' of the Green Belt.

8 RBC was encouraged by SMBC's reference to the Duty to Cooperate with its neighbours to address the GBHMA housing shortfall in paragraph 211 of the Draft Local Plan. However due to the views expressed above RBC do have concerns at this stage as to whether Solihull will be able to satisfy the tests of the Duty to Cooperate as the plan progresses if these issues are not addressed.

Officers from the Council will be more than willing to meet with SMBC representatives to try and ensure that the issues outlined above are addressed in later iterations of the Draft Local Plan review.

Yours faithfully,



Ruth Bamford

Head of Planning and Regeneration
Bromsgrove and Redditch Councils

COUNCIL

24th April 2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – 4TH APRIL 2017

112. **SHARED SERVICE BUSINESS CASE FOR CUSTOMER ACCESS AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

RECOMMENDED that

the Business Case for the Customer Access and Financial Support Services Shared Service be approved.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted



Overview & Scrutiny

Annual Report 2016/17



CONTENTS

	Page Number
Foreword by the Chair	2
Introduction and Key Principles of Scrutiny	3
Membership	4
A Snapshot of Reports Received Throughout the Year	5
LGB&T Community Awards	8
Crime and Disorder Scrutiny	9
Health Overview and Scrutiny Working Groups	9
West Midlands Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee	10
Working Groups	11
Task Group Investigations	14
Joint Overview and Scrutiny Investigations	15
Overview and Scrutiny Contact Details	17

FOREWORD BY THE CHAIR

I am very pleased to present the annual report for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This report provides an account of the work that the Committee has undertaken during the last twelve months, highlights progress that has been made, and identifies potential areas for further development.

As Chair, the last year has been a busy yet rewarding period. The Committee has continued to scrutinise the Council's budget by setting up a Budget Scrutiny Working Group to examine and understand better the finances of the Council. A Performance Scrutiny Working Group was also established to look at our performance. Both of these working groups have proved particularly useful in helping members to understand the council and its workings better and in so doing to make recommendations to Council which have proved helpful.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has worked to ensure that Council services are fit for purpose and enhance the wellbeing of our residents. It has also embarked on a number of Task Group and Short Sharp reviews. It was particularly pleasing that the work of our LGB&T Task & Finish group and the Officer concerned was acknowledged by the local community and awards were given to recognise this important piece of work.

We have seen a number of new developments, including the setting up of a West Midlands Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on which we have a representative, and the first joint scrutiny group with Bromsgrove. The latter shows signs of profitable working together in future by the two sets of councillors.

A further group which has the potential to help many residents is the Mental Health Services for Young People Task Group which has provided members with much interesting and helpful information which we hope will lead to improved outcomes for our residents, in particular our young people.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to all my fellow Committee Members for the hard work, support and enthusiasm that they have shown. I am also very appreciative of the hard work of Officers who support the work of the Committee, and would like to thank our lead support officers, Jess Bayley and Amanda Scarce, for the excellent work they have produced.



Councillor Jane Potter
Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Redditch Borough Council

INTRODUCTION

There is an annual requirement for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to produce a report outlining its work and achievements during the previous year. The report contains information about the reviews that have been undertaken by Task Groups, Short Sharp Review Groups, and the work of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel. The report also provides an opportunity to reflect on the achievements of joint scrutiny Committees to which Redditch Members have been appointed.

This year scrutiny Members have placed an emphasis on undertaking more detailed scrutiny of the Council's budget and service performance through the work of the Budget Scrutiny and Performance Scrutiny Working Groups. The outcomes of these groups' work are detailed in the report below.

This report has been produced by the Democratic Services Officers with lead responsibility for Overview and Scrutiny in consultation with the Chair of the Committee and the remaining eight Members.

KEY PRINCIPLES OF SCRUTINY

Members at Redditch Borough Council aim to ensure that the Overview and Scrutiny process complies with the four key principles of scrutiny identified by the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS), the organisation set up to promote effective scrutiny in local government. The four key principles of effective scrutiny are:

- to provide a critical friend challenge to executive policy-makers and decision-makers;
- to enable the voice and concerns of the public and its communities to be heard;
- for scrutiny to be carried out by independent minded governors who lead and own the scrutiny process; and
- to drive improvement in public services.

MEMBERSHIP GALLERY

The following Councillors have served as members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee this year.



Councillor Jane Potter
Chair of the Committee



Councillor Gay Hopkins
Vice Chair



Councillor
Joe Baker



Councillor
Tom Baker-Price



Councillor
Matthew Dormer



Councillor
Andrew Fry



Councillor
Paul Swansborough



Councillor
Jenny Wheeler



Councillor
Nina Wood-Ford

A SNAPSHOT OF REPORTS / PRESENTATIONS RECEIVED THROUGHOUT THE YEAR

During the course of the year the Committee received a number of reports and presentations on a variety of subjects. Further details about the reasons why issues were selected for scrutiny and the outcomes of the scrutiny process are detailed below.

Scrutiny Work Programme Planning

In May 2016 all Members were invited to participate in a scrutiny work programme planning event and training session. The main aim of this event was to identify issues that would be suitable for further scrutiny during the year. Members worked in groups to identify issues and were keen to ensure that the subjects which were added to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's work programme were selected in accordance with the four key principles of good scrutiny (as detailed on page 3 above). A range of issues were added to the work programme as a result of these discussions, both for the attention of the Committee and for consideration as potential Task Group activities.

Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sustainability and Transformation Plan

One of the principle issues identified during this session as suitable for the consideration of the Committee was the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP). At the time of the session the introduction of these plans, designed to act as five year forward plans for local health services, had already been announced. However, the plans were at an early stage of development.

In July 2016 representatives of the Worcestershire Health and Care Trust and Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust (WAHT) attended a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to provide Members with an update on the requirements for the plans and areas of local interest. They were invited to provide a further update to the Committee in December 2016 once the plan for Herefordshire and Worcestershire had been drafted and was the subject of public consultation. Members appreciated having an opportunity to question the content of the plan and to provide feedback for the consideration of the two trusts.

Due to the significance of health services to all residents the Committee extended an invitation to every Member to attend meetings when these presentations were delivered. A further update on the Herefordshire and Worcestershire STP is scheduled for the consideration of the Committee in July 2017.

Employment Opportunities for People with Disabilities

Another subject that was identified as suitable for further scrutiny during the work programme planning event was employment opportunities in Redditch for people with disabilities. This subject was suggested following anecdotal reports about difficulties experienced by some people with disabilities when attempting to secure employment. Members were keen to find out more about the experiences of people with a range of both physical and learning disabilities.

In October 2016 representatives of the North Worcestershire Economic Development Unit and Job Centre Plus attended a meeting of the Committee to address this subject. The item consisted of two distinct sections; an update on employment opportunities and

support for people with disabilities at the local level and information about economic development strategies for the Borough. The latter part of the presentation helped to place the discussions in context. Due to the significance of this subject to residents living across the Borough the decision was taken to invite every Member to attend the Committee meeting when this item was discussed.

Committee level Budget Scrutiny

Despite the establishment of the Budget Scrutiny Working Group during the year Members agreed that, to ensure transparency, a number of key budget items should continue to be considered at meetings of the parent Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Primarily this was conducted via the pre-scrutiny process, whereby Members considered reports on various aspects of the Council's budget prior to a decision being taken by the Executive Committee. The following items were considered in this manner:

- The Council's Efficiency Statement
- Fees and Charges 2017/18
- Housing Revenue Account 2017/18
- Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 – 2020/21

A number of recommendations were proposed through the pre-scrutiny process and the majority of these were approved.

Council Plan and Leisure Intervention – Pre-Scrutiny

In line with requirements in the Council's constitution the Overview and Scrutiny Committee also pre-scrutinised the proposed content of the Council Plan 2017 – 2020 in January 2017. Members were interested to view the target actions recorded in the plan, which linked to the Council's strategic purposes. Given the significance of the plan to the local area Members agreed that the Committee should in future receive biannual monitoring updates on the progress that has been achieved implementing the actions detailed in the report.

During consideration of this item the Committee also received a verbal update on the leisure intervention work that was launched in 2015/16. Members were interested to receive this update, following a significant amount of scrutiny of leisure services in the previous municipal year. The Committee was advised that the intervention work, driving waste out of existing services, had been progressing well. However, Members did make it clear that further information would be helpful in writing and it was agreed that this should follow later in 2017.

Housing Growth Report

This year the Committee continued to consider the Executive Committee's Work Programme at meetings in order to identify potential items for scrutiny. One such item selected for scrutiny was the Housing Growth Strategy, due to the potential level of public interest and the significance of housing growth to the Council's finances. The committee was particularly keen to ensure that the Council was meeting its purchasing targets so that funding would not need to be returned to the Government. Members were reassured to learn that the Council had constructive plans in place in respect of future housing growth and welcomed the chance to comment on these.

Recommendation Tracking

During the year Members continued to track the implementation of scrutiny recommendations that have been approved by the Executive Committee and other decision making bodies. Members were particularly interested to learn about the progress that was made during 2016/17 with the delivery of the recommendations proposed by the Improving Access for People with Disabilities to Redditch Taxi Fleets Short, Sharp Review, especially in light of the re-introduction of an active Redditch Taxi Forum.

Homelessness

At a meeting of the Committee on 28th March 2017 Members considered a proposal to review homelessness in the Borough. The subject of homelessness was suggested as being suitable for further scrutiny following coverage in the local press and as a result of Members receiving queries on the subject from residents. The Committee concluded that this would be a suitable topic for a Short, Sharp Review, with the potential to extend into a Task Group depending on the findings of the group in its first three months. At the agreement of Members this review will not be launched until the start of the 2017/18 municipal year.

LGB&T COMMUNITY AWARDS

During the year Members who had served on the Provision of Support Networks for the LGB&T Community Task Group, and the Democratic Services Officer who supported this review, were honoured with awards from the LGB&T Support Services Redditch community group. These awards, which recognised the work of the Councillors and the Officer on this review, were presented at a meeting of full Council by a range of dignitaries, including the Chair and Vice Chair of the community group, the Mayor of the Borough and a representative of Stonewall. A further award, recognising the Council's support for the LGB&T Community, was accepted by the Leader on behalf of the Council. It was particularly rewarding to receive the awards from the local LGB&T community as the scrutiny review was launched to address concerns within the community about the level of support available locally for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people and all Members appointed to the group had aimed to make a positive difference to the lives of people within that community.

The awards were followed by an update at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the action that has been taken by the Council to implement some of the recommendations arising from the work of the Task Group. In particular Members were pleased to learn that the Council is aiming to participate in the Stonewall Equality Index. Whilst the Committee feels it would be unrealistic to expect the Council to achieve a high rating in the index in its first year participation should have a positive impact on the organisation as relevant policies and procedures should be reviewed and updated as part of the process leading potentially to positive outcomes for LGB&T staff. The group also hopes that participation in the Stonewall Equality Index will help to empower LGB&T staff working for the Council and provide further reassurance of the local authority's support.

Members welcomed the hard work of officers from the Council's Policy Team, and partner organisations, to arrange the latest LGB&T history month celebrations in February 2017. This encompassed a range of activities at a number of venues, including at the Palace Theatre. Members hope to continue to support this event in the future.

CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY

Membership: Councillors Matthew Dormer (Chair), King, Potter, Swansborough and Wood-Ford.

The Police and Justice Act 2006 required every local authority in England and Wales from April 2009 to have a designated Committee with responsibility for scrutinising the work of the local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CRDP), often referred to as a Community Safety Partnership. Under this legislation Scrutiny Committees are only permitted to hold the partnership as a whole to account not individual partner organisations. The Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel, established in 2010 as a Sub-Committee of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, has been allocated responsibility for scrutinising the work of the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership, which covers the Redditch area.

In February 2017 Members received an invitation to participate in joint scrutiny of the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership with Bromsgrove and Wyre Forest District Councils' Overview and Scrutiny Committees. This proposal to undertake joint scrutiny had been suggested by Bromsgrove Members to enhance the scrutiny process and increase the potential for there to be constructive outcomes from scrutiny of the local community safety partnership. A joint scrutiny arrangement has been successfully trialed in the south of the county for this purpose and it was suggested that similar arrangements could be replicated in the north. However, the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee concluded that the subject merited scrutiny at a local level only and Members agreed to increase the number of meetings of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel from one to two per year from 2017/18 onwards.

The meeting of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel in 2016/17 took place on 22nd March 2017. During this meeting Members received an update on the work of the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership in the preceding 12 months. Particular attention was given to the investment of £10,000 to tackle anti-social behavior (ASB) where needed in the Borough. Further information about ASB in Redditch, and the work of the partnership to address this, will be discussed at the next meeting of the panel in September 2017.

HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Councillor Nina Wood-Ford was the Council's representative on the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) in 2016/17. District and Borough Councils are invited to appoint representatives to the HOSC to ensure that the interests of the district in relation to health are taken into account. Councillor Wood-Ford provides regular updates on the work of HOSC for the consideration of the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee. She can also report any items suggested for the consideration of HOSC on behalf of Redditch Members.

During the year Councillor Wood-Ford has advised the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee about the outcomes of discussions of the following topics at meetings of HOSC:

- Ongoing developments with the review of WAHT and the outcomes of an unannounced Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspection.

- The issuing of a Section 29a notice following further CQC inspections of WAHT's services.
- The consultation process in respect of the future of WHAT services.
- Changes to public health budgets and the implications for local services.
- The redesign of Adult Mental Health Services (AMHS) and the reduction in services at Orchard Place.
- The use of E-cigarettes.
- The views of HOSC Members in relation to the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP).
- The performance of the West Midlands Ambulance Trust, which was found to be good.

WEST MIDLANDS COMBINED AUTHORITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Councillor Jenny Wheeler was appointed to serve on the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) Overview and Scrutiny Committee which was newly established in 2016/17. In order for Members to develop their knowledge of the role of the Committee and to avoid duplication a decision was taken for Councillor Wheeler to provide regular updates to the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the work of this body.

To ensure that the WMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee could make a constructive contribution in terms of holding the West Midlands Combined Authority's Partnership Board to account a scrutiny workshop session took place in November 2016. Councillor Wheeler attended this session alongside other Councillors and Officers representing both constituent and non-constituent members of the WMCA. The findings of this session helped to inform the work programme of the WMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which subsequently launched four Task and Finish Groups to investigate particular subjects in detail. These are focusing on:

- Mental Health
- Land
- Productivity and skills
- The budget

Due to her experience and knowledge developed as a member of the Mental Health Services for Young People Task Group Councillor Wheeler volunteered to participate in the Mental Health Task and Finish Group. Councillor Wheeler has since been appointed the Vice Chair of this group.

There will be further developments with the WMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee in 2017/18. In particular in May 2017 a Mayor will be elected for the West Midlands area and the WMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee will have responsibility for holding him/her to account. The Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee looks forward to receiving further updates on the work of the WMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee and to supporting partners on this Committee where required.

WORKING GROUPS

This year scrutiny working groups were established by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. These groups were tasked with considering the Council's budget and service performance (as detailed on the Council's measures dashboard) respectively.

BUDGET SCRUTINY WORKING GROUP

Membership: Councillors Jane Potter (Chair), Matthew Dormer, David Thain and Jenny Wheeler.

The Budget Scrutiny Working Group was established in June 2016 to provide scrutiny Members with an opportunity to investigate budgetary matters in greater detail. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had taken a decision to introduce the working group in light of the challenging financial circumstances facing local government.

Meetings of the group were held every month. During these meetings Members considered a range of subjects including the following:

- Management of the Council's property assets by the Place Partnership and the Council's contribution to funding this partnership.
- The Council's Efficiency Statement and progress with the implementation of the aspirations detailed within this.
- Budget pressures for the Council and the action planned to achieve savings and / or generate further income for the Council.
- The Council's capital programme. Based on the evidence they gathered Members recommended that senior officers should improve forward planning and add any one off funding requirements for later years in the programme as this was not happening regularly. The group also proposed that the length of the programme should be extended from three to four years in line with the length of the Council's Efficiency Statement.
- Housing Services and the Right to Buy process. Members were keen to learn more about the amount of funding available to the local authority from sales of Council houses which could be reinvested in new properties and the length of time in which this funding was available to spend. The group was also keen to ensure that this process was managed efficiently so that the council did not need to pay any funding back to Government.
- The Shopmobility service and the potential to reduce the costs associated with delivering that service through alternative models of service delivery. Members received information about a survey that had been conducted with customers and recommended a review of the different options available to manage the service. The Executive Committee has since considered and approved changes to the operation of the service, including the introduction of a new charging system.
- Recharging arrangements between Council departments as well as between local authorities in shared services. In particular the group welcomed the work of the Officer Recharges Working Group and recommended a wholesale review of recharging arrangements, though Members are eager to ensure that Officers' time is accurately recorded in terms of where they are delivering services and the tasks involved.
- Section 106 funding agreements. The group has monitored expenditure of Section 106 funds in line with proposals from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in 2016 that use of this funding should be scrutinised by Members.

PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY WORKING GROUP

Membership: Councillors Tom Baker-Price (Chair), Natalie Brookes, Matthew Dormer and David Thain.

Performance Scrutiny was identified by Members as an area in need of improvement in 2015/16. Performance monitoring is a key aspect of good practice in the scrutiny process nationally. It was not considered to be appropriate to replicate the performance scrutiny arrangements in place at other local authorities as Redditch Borough Council, in partnership with Bromsgrove District Council, has developed a separate approach to managing the performance of services. This involves focusing on performance measures for services, rather than targets or performance indicators, and progress in respect of these measures is logged on a corporate dashboard. The working group was established to monitor performance in relation to these measures on the dashboard as well as to identify any areas missing from the dashboard.

Following a demonstration of the dashboard by representatives of the Council's Policy Team Members were tasked with identifying items from the dashboard which they considered suitable for further scrutiny. During the course of the year Members considered a number of issues including the following:

- The potential for the dashboard to be made available as a tool which other local authorities could use to manage performance.
- The Council's performance management system, the focus on measures over targets and the extent to which this was the best system available to enable Council services to meet the needs of residents.
- Performance in respect of Lifeline services, following concerns amongst Members that the data on the dashboard appeared to indicate a decline in the number of customers. The group noted that changes in customer numbers had been influenced by factors outside the Council's control and were encouraged by the dedication of staff. Members agreed that more could be done to market the service to other potential customers and a recommendation on this subject was approved by the Executive Committee in December 2016.
- The potential to add measures to the dashboard specifically relating to the activities of elected Members. As part of this process the group recommended the introduction of a measure monitoring Members' participation in training. This recommendation is due to be considered at the next meeting of the Council's Member Support Steering Group.
- In connection to this the group also suggested that broadcasting arrangements for Committee meetings should be explored in order to enhance the transparency of the decision making process. However, this proposal was rejected by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- Sickness absence levels within Housing Services and the potential causes of this was debated. Members learned that due to the nature of their work staff in the team were more likely to be exposed to colds and other viral illnesses whilst staff with physical duties might be unable to fulfil their roles if they sustained injuries which prevented heavy lifting.
- The fluctuation in the number of customers visiting Forge Mill Needle Museum was discussed. Members were advised that the museum had been selected as a potential site for the use of the crematorium during renovation works and for this reason had been unable to book a programme of events during an otherwise typically busy period.

- The possibility of adding a measure in respect of the participation of people with disabilities in physical activities was discussed with officers from the Sports Development Team. Members were pleased to learn about the inclusive approach adopted by the Council and the significant amount of work undertaken by officers to promote sporting opportunities to the public. Based on their discussions the group concluded that no additional measures for this subject were necessary.
- The potential for Leisure and Cultural activities to have separate branding from the Council in order to encourage participation was discussed with a range of officers. On the one hand the group felt that there would be greater participation, potentially to the benefit of people's health, if separate branding could be used in these circumstances. However, Members also noted the need for consistency in use of branding and to ensure that this complied with an overarching corporate approach.
- The use of the civic suite and income generated from external bookings was considered during a meeting of the group. Members interviewed Officers about measures for this purpose as there was general consensus that an increase in the hiring out of the civic suite could have a beneficial impact on the Council's finances. Members were impressed with the work that Officers had been undertaking to market the civic suite and noted the limitations mid-week, particularly in respect of use of these rooms for Committee meetings as part of the local democratic process.
- Performance in respect of gas safety inspections was discussed during an interview with Officers. Members agreed that it was important to receive an update in respect of this matter following a breach of the regulations in 2015. The group interviewed Officers about the work that has been undertaken by the Council since this breach occurred as well as the current position and Members welcomed the hard work of Officers to address this.
- Members have concluded that in future it would be helpful for the Performance Scrutiny Working Group to scrutinise the development of measures for the Council Plan which was approved in January 2017.

Future of the Working Groups

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that at the end of the municipal year the outcomes from the work of these groups would be assessed. During the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 28th March Members agreed that both of the working groups should continue to exist in 2017/18. Members also noted during this meeting that the work of the Performance Scrutiny Working Group was similar to that of Bromsgrove District Council's Measures Dashboard (scrutiny) Working Group. Where similar items are identified by both groups for scrutiny in 2017/18 the Committee is proposing that the options to investigate this matter through the process of joint scrutiny should be considered, thereby reducing the amount of time and resources required from Officers. This proposal will be referred to Bromsgrove District Council's Overview and Scrutiny Board for further consideration.

TASK GROUPS AND SHORT, SHARP REVIEWS

The final reports of all completed investigations can be found on the Council's website within the Overview and Scrutiny section.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE TASK GROUP

Membership: Councillors Nina Wood-Ford (Chair), Andrew Fry, Gay Hopkins, David Thain and Jenny Wheeler

Completed: March 2017.

During the scrutiny work programme planning event in May 2016 mental health was identified as a subject that was suitable for further scrutiny. This subject had also recently been identified by the Council's Corporate Management Team (CMT) as an area where a scrutiny investigation could make a positive difference to the lives of Redditch residents. At a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June 2016 Members agreed that it would be useful to investigate the subject of mental health further. In particular, it was proposed that a review of support services for children and young people with mental health and wellbeing difficulties would be particularly helpful.

In July 2016 the review was launched with the following terms of reference:

- To clarify the roles of different agencies in supporting (and referring) young people with 'milder' mental health problems.
- To consider current arrangements in the provision of child and adolescent mental health services, including any local strategies which shape services.
- To investigate current preventative action undertaken to support young people vulnerable to developing mental health problems and to identify ways in which this could be improved.
- To consider the impact on Council services of demand from young people with 'milder' mental health problems.
- To clarify at what point a young person's mental health is considered serious enough to merit direct intervention from mental health services.
- To explore best practice in other parts of the country in terms of supporting young people with 'milder' mental health problems and the potential to replicate this in the Borough of Redditch.

The review has taken place in a context in which at the national level mental health has increasingly been the subject of public scrutiny and there have been a number of Government announcements on the subject. At the local level Members have found that partners have recently been working to improve CAMHS services through service transformation work. Significant progress has been made with the delivery of actions detailed in a transformation plan for the county, though more changes are scheduled to take place. The Council has also signed up to the WMCA's Mental Health Concordat during the period in which the review has been taking place. All of these developments have been taken into account by the group and have informed the seven recommendations which are due to be reported for the consideration of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 28th March.

JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY INVESTIGATIONS**INCREASING PHYSICAL ACTIVITY JOINT SCRUTINY TASK GROUP****Review Host: Worcestershire County Council****Redditch Borough Council representative: Councillor Gareth Prosser****Completed: June 2016.**

The Worcestershire County Council (WCC) Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board (OSPB) at a meeting on 26th February 2015 discussed the Worcestershire Public Health Annual Report 2014. A key theme in this report is a local aim to increase opportunities for participation in physical activities. The report highlighted that "...*physical activity rates decrease quite steeply after the age of 45...*" (although) "...*when comparing with the region and England, Worcestershire participation rates are relatively high...*" It also noted that "...*there is fragmentation of responsibility between County, District and national (Sport England) levels...*" The County Council was keen to ensure opportunities to access sport and physical activity were available to all, and were interested to find out what impact the 2012 Olympics had had on participation rates. For these reasons the Board concluded that a review of this subject would be worthwhile.

The Board recognised that, due to the involvement of district Councils with the delivery of leisure and cultural services at the local level, it would be appropriate for this review to be conducted as a joint exercise. The Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the terms of reference for this review on 7th July 2015. The Committee agreed that this was an important subject and noted that participation would correspond with addressing two of the Council's strategic purposes including: provide good things for me to do, see and visit and help me to live my life independently (including health and activity). The review could also help to address significant issues relating to health inequalities which the local authority is committed to addressing as a member of the Redditch Partnership. Furthermore, Members noted the links to a previous review completed by the Committee, a review of action that could be taken to tackle obesity levels in the Borough, which was completed in March 2015.

The Task Group completed their investigations in June 2016 and the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted the outcomes of the investigation in July 2016. The recommendations were largely endorsed by Worcestershire County Council's Cabinet subject to a few amendments to the wording of some recommendations. As Worcestershire County Council was the host authority for the review it is envisaged that County Members will take a lead on monitoring implementation of the group's recommendations.

STAFF SURVEY JOINT SCRUTINY TASK GROUP

Review Host: Bromsgrove District Council

Redditch Borough Council representatives: Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Jane Potter (Vice Chair) and Jenny Wheeler.

Bromsgrove District Council representatives: Councillors Steve Colella (Chair), Caroline Spencer and Shirley Webb.

Deadline: September 2017

Bromsgrove District Council's Overview and Scrutiny Board has considered the outcomes of the Councils' staff surveys conducted in 2013 and 2016 at a number of meetings over the past three years. In September 2016 Members expressed concerns about the outcomes from the first staff survey and the decline in the number of employees who had completed the second survey in 2016. Based on these concerns Members agreed that it would be helpful to launch a Task Group to investigate the matter further.

As many of Bromsgrove District Council's staff work in services shared with Redditch Borough Council a decision was taken to approach the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee about the potential to hold this as a joint review. Members in Redditch welcomed Bromsgrove Members to a meeting of the Committee in October 2016 and, based on the information provided, agreed that Redditch should take part in this exercise.

The Task Group has been allocated the following terms of reference:

- To consider how to increase the response rates in future.
- To consider the merits of the questions both in terms of desired outputs and number of questions.
- To establish reasons for the low response rates.
- To benchmark the survey with other similar organisations
- To make recommendations to the Bromsgrove Overview and Scrutiny Board and Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The review is the first joint scrutiny exercise to involve Redditch and Bromsgrove Members only. To ensure that the review operates effectively and in a balanced manner a decision was taken at the start of the investigation to hold meetings at alternate locations and to appoint an equal number of Members from each authority's scrutiny Committee to the review. At least one Member of each authority needs to be present for the meetings to be quorate to ensure that both Councils can contribute to the evidence gathering and recommendation setting stages of the process. The group's final report is due to be reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in September 2017.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY CONTACT DETAILS

For additional copies of this report, or to find out more about Overview and Scrutiny at Redditch Borough Council, please contact:

Jess Bayley, Democratic Services Officer
Jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel: (01527) 64252 Extn: 3268

Amanda Scarce, Democratic Services Officer
a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel: (01527) 881443

Address:

Overview and Scrutiny,
Democratic Services,
Redditch Borough Council,
Redditch Town Hall,
Walter Stranz Square,
Redditch
Worcestershire
B98 8AH

Further Information

Further information about the Overview and Scrutiny process at Redditch Borough Council can also be found on the Council's dedicated web pages. To access these web pages please use the web address attached here:

<http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk/council/the-council/overview-and-scrutiny.aspx>

