



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 7th July, 2015
7.00 pm

Committee Room Two
Town Hall
Redditch



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

**If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact
Jess Bayley and Amanda Scarce
Democratic Services Officers**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: 01527 64252 (Ext. 3268) / 881443**

**e.mail: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk /
a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk**



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 7th July, 2015

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: Jane Potter (Chair) Gareth Prosser
 Gay Hopkins (Vice-Chair) Paul Swansborough
 Joe Baker Jennifer Wheeler
 David Bush Nina Wood-Ford
 Andrew Fry

<p>1. Apologies and named substitutes</p>	<p>To receive apologies for absence and details of any Councillor (or co-optee substitute) nominated to attend this meeting in place of a member of this Committee.</p>
<p>2. Declarations of interest and of Party Whip</p>	<p>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, and any Party Whip.</p>
<p>3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 8)</p>	<p>To confirm the minutes of the most recent meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a correct record.</p> <p>(Minutes from 9th June meeting attached, minutes from 24th June meeting to follow)</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</p>
<p>4. Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task Group - Final Report (Pages 9 - 48) Councillor Joe Baker</p>	<p>To consider the findings of the Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task Group and to determine whether to support the group's recommendations.</p> <p>(Report attached, presentation to follow)</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</p>

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 7th July, 2015

<p>5. Future Management of Redditch Outdoor Market - Pre-Scrutiny</p> <p>Steve Singleton</p>	<p>To pre-scrutinise the final report concerning the future management of Redditch Outdoor Market.</p> <p>(Report to follow).</p> <p>(Abbey Ward)</p>
<p>6. Review of the Operation of Leisure Services - Pre-Scrutiny</p> <p>Sue Hanley, Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director (Leisure, Environmental & Community Services)</p>	<p>To pre-scrutinise the report concerning the future operation of Leisure Services at Redditch Borough Council.</p> <p>(Report to follow)</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</p>
<p>7. Scrutiny Proposals - Suggested reviews</p>	<p>To consider any completed scrutiny proposal forms and to determine whether to launch any Task Groups or Short, Sharp Reviews to investigate the proposed subject(s) further.</p> <p>(No reports attached).</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</p>
<p>8. Proposed Joint Scrutiny Task Group - Increasing Physical Activity in Worcestershire</p> <p>(Pages 49 - 56)</p>	<p>To consider a Scrutiny Proposal received from Worcestershire County Council to participate in a joint scrutiny Task Group review of Increasing Physical Activity in Worcestershire and to determine whether to participate in this review.</p> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p>All Wards</p>
<p>9. Executive Committee Minutes and Scrutiny of the Executive Committee's Work Programme</p> <p>(Pages 57 - 68)</p>	<p>To consider the minutes of the latest meeting(s) of the Executive Committee and also to consider whether any items on the Executive Committee's Work Programme are suitable for scrutiny.</p> <p>(Minutes and Executive Work Programme attached).</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</p>

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 7th July, 2015

10. Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

(Pages 69 - 72)

To consider the Committee's current Work Programme, and potential items for addition to the list arising from:

- The Forward Plan / Committee agendas
- External publications
- Other sources.

(Report attached)

(No Specific Ward Relevance)

11. Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Nina Wood-Ford

To receive a verbal update on the recent work of the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

(Verbal report)

All Wards

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 7th July, 2015

12. Exclusion of the Press and Public

Should it be necessary, in the opinion of the Borough Director, during the course of the meeting to consider excluding the public from the meeting on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged, it may be necessary to move the following resolution:

“That, under S.100 (A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matter(s) on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs (to be specified) of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act”.

These paragraphs are as follows:

Subject to the “public interest” test, information relating to:

- Para 1 – any individual;
- Para 2 – the identity of any individual;
- Para 3 – financial or business affairs;
- Para 4 – labour relations matters;
- Para 5 – legal professional privilege;
- Para 6 – a notice, order or direction;
- Para 7 – the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime;

and may need to be considered as ‘exempt’.



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9th June 2015

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Jane Potter (Chair), and Councillors Joe Baker, Tom Baker-Price, David Bush, Pattie Hill, Gareth Prosser, Paul Swansborough, Jennifer Wheeler and Nina Wood-Ford

Also Present:

Councillor Pat Witherspoon, (Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Tourism)

Officers:

Sue Hanley and John Godwin

Democratic Services Officers:

Jess Bayley and Amanda Scarce

1. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andrew Fry and Gay Hopkins with Councillors Pattie Hill and Tom Baker-Price attending as substitutes respectively.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

There were no declarations of interest nor of any party whip.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting held on 7th April 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The Chair took the opportunity to inform Members that following the feedback from the Executive Committee in respect of the Tackling Obesity Task Group and the items which this Committee had resolved, arrangements had been made for her to attend meetings of both the Redditch Community Wellbeing Trust and the Health and Wellbeing Board on 23rd June and 15th July respectively.

.....
Chair

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9th June 2015

4. LEISURE SERVICES PRE-SCRUTINY BRIEFING REPORT - STAGE 1

The Chair, for the benefit of those Members new to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, provided background information on this item and explained that the recommendations from a Task Group report on the Abbey Stadium had been approved by the Executive Committee in June 2014. Members were provided with a copy of the recommendations relevant to this meeting. It was further explained that at the previous meeting of the Committee it had been agreed that the Committee should adopt a three stage process of scrutinising this topic, with this meeting being the first stage of that process. The second stage would involve looking at the consultants' report which had been commissioned the previous year and the third stage would be to pre-scrutinise the final report prior to it being considered by the Executive Committee in July.

Officers explained to Members that the report before them, as requested, covered the commissioning of the consultants' report, the process and the information around the specification that officers had provided to the external consultants. This had included looking at corporate options, the potential for different models together with details of the services that could be included within those models.

In providing background information Officers informed Members that a number of consultants, who were experts in this field, had been approached with a view to providing an options appraisal, which would form part of the Review of Operation of Leisure Services report. However, Members were advised that only two or three consultants had responded, though Officers asked to clarify the exact number after the meeting. The table provided at Appendix 1 had been formulated in consultation with various officers in the Leisure Services Team. The email also at Appendix 1 was a summary of various discussions Officers had had with the consultants around the specification and the needs of the Council.

Following presentation of the report, Members raised a number of points and discussed the following areas in detail:

- The procurement process which was followed and whether it was appropriate for the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services to be involved in that process.
- How the final consultant was chosen and whether this had been based on price alone. Officers informed Members that whilst

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9th June 2015

cost had been one consideration, timescales and the closest match to the Council's requirements had also been taken into consideration.

- Whether the option of a leisure trust had been considered prior to the Abbey Stadium Task Group investigating such an option or whether this had arisen out of the recommendation from the Task Group.
- The methodology in producing the service mix options as detailed in the report and any possible conflict of interest in respect of the Head of Service. Officers explained that from a corporate perspective the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services had been tasked with putting together the scope from his wide knowledge of the industry and the internal workings of the Leisure Team. The consultants role was to provide a report on the options for future delivery of services.
- Other relevant correspondence referred to within the report and between Officers and the consultants was also discussed.
- It was highlighted in the consultant's offer that a significant amount of information would be needed in order to produce the options appraisal.
- The reasons for the delay in the consultants providing the options appraisal. Officers explained that this was largely due to the Council's internal systems being incompatible with those of the consultants and their being unable to analyse some of the data provided because of this. This necessitated more work than had originally been anticipated having to be carried out.

Officers explained that the first drafts of the options appraisal had been received in July and October 2014 and, following amendment, the final document had been provided in late January/early February 2015. In order for Members to best understand the resultant report, which they would consider at the following meeting, it was agreed that the information referred to in this report and highlighted by Officers should be provided at that meeting. It was acknowledged and accepted by the Committee that the majority of that information would need to be considered within confidential session.

Members discussed whether it would be useful to invite a representative of the consultants to present the options appraisal at the following meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Officers informed Members that the consultants had been approached and were in principle willing to attend, although it should be noted that the consultants were likely to charge a fee for attendance at that meeting. The Chair also highlighted that an additional meeting of the Committee would need to be held in order

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9th June 2015

to ensure that all stages of this scrutiny exercise were completed prior to the Executive Committee meeting to be held on 14th July 2015.

The Chair reiterated her concern that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was not being used to its full potential and that its role was to help and support the Executive Committee in the decision making process. This could only be achieved if the reports were readily available for the Committee to consider in a timely manner.

RESOLVED that

- 1) the Consultants' Options Appraisal be made available to Members of the Committee, together with the following additional information:**
- 2) the information requested by The Sports Consultancy in their Leisure Management Options Appraisal letter, as detailed below:**
 - **A full schedule of all services and facilities to be considered.**
 - **Historic financial performance for the past 3 years as well as 2014/15 budget.**
 - **Condition surveys of the main facilities (if available).**
 - **Future asset plan (including any planned or necessary facility works to be undertaken).**
 - **Staffing list.**
 - **Support services and central costs (legal, financial, marketing, property etc.)**
- 3) the correspondence between officers and the consultants on the subject of the consultant's report;**
- 4) copies of previous drafts of the consultant's report prior to the final version presented in January 2015;**
- 5) the briefing note sent by the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services to the Consultants;**
- 6) that an additional meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be arranged for Wednesday 24th June 2015; and**
- 7) the Chair use her discretion when the documents referred to above were available as to whether the consultants be invited to attend that meeting.**

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9th June 2015

(During consideration of this item Members discussed matters that necessitated the disclosure of exempt information. It was therefore agreed to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on the grounds that information would be revealed relating to financial and business affairs. However, there is nothing exempt in this record of the proceedings.)

5. FEEDBACK FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY TRAINING

The Chair thanked all those who had attended the training session and reiterated that the Committee was in a unique position in that it was able to help the Council. She suggested that the Committee should focus this year's work on more strategic areas and assist with how the Council makes savings through budget scrutiny. This would not necessarily be through Task Groups as Short, Sharp Reviews were an effective process which the Committee needed to make better use of in the future.

There had been a number of areas which had been discussed at the training session; however Members were mindful of the work already included within their work programme and it was suggested that those items be included for consideration later on in the year.

RESOLVED that

Officers arrange presentations to be included within the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme in respect of Council Tax/Bedroom Tax/Housing Benefit and Housing/house building/development.

6. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION TRACKER

For the benefit of those Members new to the Committee it was explained that the Recommendation Tracker was used to monitor the implementation of recommendations which had been made by the Committee to the Executive Committee.

The following recommendations were discussed in detail:

- Landscaping Recommendation 4 – the provision of data for landscaping reported by ward area for Members on an annual basis. Members discussed the data and questioned whether it was useful and really helped Members to fulfil their roles. The Committee also noted the officer time spent preparing and disseminating the information. As the Executive Committee had previously agreed in April 2014 to

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9th June 2015

review the efficacy of this process and whether there was a continuing need for the data Members agreed it should be recommended that this process be discontinued.

- Voluntary and Community Sector Recommendation 8 – introduction of a Staff Award in recognition of voluntary work carried out by staff. Members were informed that there had been no response to an item recently placed in the Staff Newsletter requesting staff to report back on voluntary work they carried out. Members also discussed the Pride of Redditch Awards and whether this could be linked celebrating staff volunteering.
- Voluntary and Community Sector Recommendation 2 – consideration was given to employing an apprentice to assist the Grants Officer. Officers advised that due to staff sickness this had been delayed.
- Committee recommendation – officers had been asked earlier in the year to approach the Kingfisher Shopping Centre in respect of further funding for the Shopmobility scheme. Members were informed that this had been done and the Kingfisher Shopping Centre had declined.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) Officers no longer be required to provide landscaping data for each ward on annual basis to elected Members, as proposed in the fourth recommendation from the Landscaping Task Group in April 2014;**

RESOLVED that

- 2) the Voluntary and Community Sector Recommendation 8 remain in place for a further 12 months; and**
- 3) the report be noted.**

7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES AND SCRUTINY OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE'S WORK PROGRAMME

During the consideration of the Executive Committee minutes from the meeting held on 14th April 2015 Officers highlighted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recommendations in respect of the Redditch Market had been received and noted. It had also been highlighted it was felt premature for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to receive the consultants' report for the market.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9th June 2015

Members questioned whether the Committee was able to view the report as an exempt agenda item and it was confirmed by officers that the Committee was able to request sight of this document if it so wished. This was due for consideration at the Executive Committee's July meeting and therefore could potentially be made available to Members to carry out pre-scrutiny at the extra meeting, planned for 24th June 2015.

RESOLVED that

- 1) **Officers to request, on behalf of the Committee, sight of the Redditch Market consultant's report for consideration at the meeting to be held on 24th June 2015; and**
- 2) **the Executive Committee Minutes of the 14th April and the latest edition of the Executive Work Programme be noted.**

8. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

Officers confirmed that the work programme would be updated to include all the items discussed at this evening's meeting.

RESOLVED that

the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme be noted and updated as detailed within the minutes.

9. TASK GROUPS - PROGRESS REPORTS

Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task Group – Chair, Councillor Joe Baker

Councillor Baker confirmed that the investigation was coming to a close, with six recommendations being formulated and the final report drafted. A number of interviews had recently taken place, which had produced some useful information and raised Members' awareness about the support currently available to the LGBT community, particularly in respect of health related issues and preventative actions. Members had identified a training need for frontline staff in particular areas and had reviewed the Council's Equal Opportunity Policy. Positive feedback had been received from an Officer working within schools and overall the work of the task group had been very positive.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9th June 2015

RESOLVED that

the update report on the Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task Group be noted.

10. HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chair welcomed Councillor Wood-Ford to the Committee and as the Council's representative on the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC).

Councillor Wood-Ford informed Members that she had attended a visit to the Patient Flow Centre, which was based at the Wildwood site and staffed by the Health Care Trust. It co-ordinated Acute Hospital patient discharges according to which Pathway was most appropriate (for example, home with support/community hospital/residential care) and was a multi-partner facility. The aim of the centre was to enable patients to be discharged from acute hospitals as soon as they were ready by overcoming the problems which can prevent this, such as transport care or facilities needed at home. This has been particularly important with growing numbers of people being admitted to hospital, especially older people with more complex needs.

Councillor Wood-Ford had been impressed with the work of the Centre and had found the visit most informative.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.22 pm



Overview & Scrutiny

Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task Group

July 2015

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

making
a
difference

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

CONTENTS

	Page Number
Chair's Foreword	2
Summary of Recommendations	3
Introduction/Background Information	7
Chapter 1: Demonstrating Commitment	10
Chapter 2: Community Support	16
Chapter 3: Health and Wellbeing	21
Chapter 4: Items to note	27
Conclusion	29
Appendix 1 - Terms of Reference	30
Appendix 2 - Witnesses	33
Appendix 3 - Timeline of Activities	34
Appendix 4 – Glossary	36
Appendix 5 – Declarations of Interest	38

Membership of the Task Group

Councillors Joe Baker (Chair), Natalie Brookes, Gay Hopkins and David Thain.

Support Officer

Jess Bayley, Democratic Services Officer, Tel: (01527) 64252 Extn: 3268

Email: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Completed

July 2015

Contact

Further copies of this report are available on request from:

Address: Overview and Scrutiny Team, Democratic Services, Redditch Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH

Email: scrutiny@redditchbc.gov.uk

FOREWORD

Following the local elections in May 2014 an incident occurred where a former elected Councillor used inappropriate and offensive language about high profile members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) community. These comments caused a public outcry and calls for action to be taken locally. I was asked by members of the LGBT community to act as a spokesperson for the community. A show of solidarity with the LGBT community in Redditch was organised and attended by a range of community representatives and this showed that the LGBT community had local support and was a positive force to be reckoned with.

It came to light after this gathering that there was little to no support available to the LGBT community living in the Borough. Members of the LGBT community requested that the Council look into what services were available and what could be done to enhance local support. I therefore suggested that this subject should be investigated by Overview and Scrutiny.

I would like to thank all of the expert witnesses who took part in this review process. I was especially delighted to welcome Superintendent Jim Baker to a meeting. This was the first time that a police Superintendent had attended a scrutiny meeting in Redditch and I think this shows how seriously the police take tackling homophobic behaviour.

I would also like to point out that I was pleased that we had a diverse array of Councillors appointed to this Task Group with differing experiences and background knowledge of the subject. I would like to thank Councillors Brookes, Hopkins and Thain for their professionalism, understanding and the open manner in which they contributed to the review.



**Councillor Joe Baker,
Chair of the Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task
Group**

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**CHAPTER 1: DEMONSTRATING COMMITMENT****Recommendation 1**

Redditch Borough Council should participate in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index every year.

Financial Implications: Participation in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index is free for all organisations. Council staff would need to spend time submitting detailed forms in order to take part in the index and to provide evidence to support claims made in completed submissions. However, the group is contending that the costs in terms of officer time would be offset by the benefits to be accrued from participation in the scheme and demonstrate to both existing LGBT staff, and talented LGBT people who could become future employees, that the Council is committed to supporting the LGBT community.

Legal implications: There are no legal implications.

Recommendation 2

Worcestershire County Council should take part in the Stonewall Education Equality Index.

Worcestershire County Council should also encourage schools to take part in the Stonewall School Champions Programme and / or to use the Birmingham LGBT Schools Toolkit.

Financial Implications: Participation in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index is free for all organisations. Council staff would need to spend time submitting detailed forms in order to take part in the index and to provide evidence to support claims made in completed submissions. However, the group is contending that the costs in terms of officer time would be offset by the benefits to be accrued from participation in the scheme.

Membership of the Stonewall School Champions Programme can cost a school as little as £150 plus VAT if the school signs up to one of Stonewall's Train the Trainer sessions. The Birmingham LGBT Toolkit can be downloaded from the organisation's website for free.

Legal implications: There are no legal implications.

CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY SUPPORT**Recommendation 3**

There should be a greater celebration of the positive history of the LGBT community during the annual LGBT History Month celebrations with a focus on the specific theme in each given year. This should include holding events at the Palace Theatre.

- a) In the long-term Redditch Borough Council should commit to introducing a budget to support LGBT History Month.

Financial implications: There would be financial implications to the introduction of a bespoke budget to support the LGBT History Month. The group is not specifying the appropriate size of the budget as they feel this should be determined by the Executive Committee.

There are financial costs associated with booking the Palace Theatre, though these costs can be minimised if bookings are for use of facilities in non-peak hours. The group are envisaging that the Room Upstairs could be booked. This currently costs £13.00 per hour to hire (though Members recognise that this fee may change in subsequent years in line with any changes to the Council's fees and charges). The group are suggesting that the LGBT Support Services Redditch group should be approached to find out whether they would be willing to contribute to fundraising in order to pay for the room hire.

Legal implications: There are no legal implications.

Recommendation 4

A leaflet advertising the support networks available for the LGBT community in Redditch, should be produced.

- a) Redditch Borough Council should support any groups that produce this literature by allowing such leaflets to be made available for residents to collect in public venues, such as Redditch Town Hall, and making this information available to view on relevant web pages of the Council's website.

Financial Implications: There would be a cost associated with producing a leaflet. Members are proposing that, subject to the LGBT Support Services Redditch group agreeing to take a lead on delivery of this proposal, the group should apply for grant funding to help produce a leaflet.

There would potentially be the cost of officer time in terms of adding information to the Council's website, though the group is not anticipating that this would be extensive.

Legal implications: The Council and LGBT Support Services Redditch group would need to discuss the content to ensure that when information is placed on the Council's website there is no breach of copyright.

CHAPTER 3: HEATH AND WELLBEING**Recommendation 5**

The specific mental health needs of the LGBT community should be addressed in equalities training provided to frontline Council staff. This should be covered in one of the equalities briefing sessions that the policy team is due to deliver in forthcoming months.

Financial Implications: Equalities training is already provided to staff. The group is anticipating that provision of this information as part of these established training sessions would not entail a requirement for additional financial expenditure.

Legal implications: There are no legal implications.

Recommendation 6

Local partners should help to promote the following to members of the LGBT community, including on the Redditch and Bromsgrove Wellbeing website:

- a) Gay and bisexual men are eligible for free Hepatitis B vaccinations available at the Arrowside Sexual Health clinic.
- b) Lesbian and bisexual women are entitled and should be encouraged to attend cervical screening tests.

Financial Implications: There would be the cost of officer time in adding content to the wellbeing website, though this is unlikely to be significant. The costs of further attempts by partners to promote these services would vary according to the methods of communication that are adopted.

Legal implications: There are no legal implications.

CHAPTER 4: ITEMS TO NOTE

Hate Crimes and Incidents: The group was impressed by the commitment demonstrated by representatives of West Mercia Police Force to tackling homophobic, biphobic and transphobic hate crimes and incidents. Residents who have been the victims of these offences are urged to report incidents to the police.

Morton Stanley Festival: Morton Stanley Festival provides an opportunity to celebrate positive aspects of life in the Borough. As part of these celebrations the group urges the LGBT Support Services Redditch group to consider arranging to have a stand at the festival in 2015.

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In June 2014 derogatory comments about high profile members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) community were made by an elected Councillor (who subsequently resigned). In a demonstration of solidarity with the LGBT community living in the Borough a cross party gathering took place outside Redditch Town Hall that month. Following this gathering a number of members of the LGBT community approached Councillor Baker to express concerns about the limited support available to the community in Redditch. In this context the Overview and Scrutiny Committee concluded in autumn 2014 that it would be an opportune time to launch a review of the support networks available to the LGBT community in the Borough. As the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had previously agreed that only two Task Group exercises could take place at any one time it was not possible to launch the review until December 2014.

The four Members appointed to the review were tasked with addressing a number of key objectives:

- To investigate the support provided by Redditch Borough Council and relevant local partnerships to the LGBT community.
- To assess the support available from the NHS and mental health services to the LGBT community.
- To review support available to people who are the victims of homophobic hate crimes and incidents.
- To scrutinise the support available to young LGBT people living in the Borough.
- To identify the general support networks available to the LGBT community in Redditch.

The Task Group gathered evidence from a variety of sources. This included interviews with relevant Council Officers working in the Policy, Community Safety, Housing and Leisure Services teams. Interviews were also held with representatives from external organisations including Stonewall, Birmingham LGBT, Arrowside Sexual Health Clinic, Redditch and Bromsgrove Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and the Redditch Mental Health Action Group (MHAG).

Wherever possible the group attempted to consult with representatives of the LGBT community. Members recognised the need to be sensitive to the needs and potential vulnerability of the LGBT community. A decision was therefore taken early in the course of the review to treat the identities of any members of the community who provided evidence, either directly at meetings or indirectly to members of the group, as confidential. This was to protect them against any possible negative responses from members of the community who may hold prejudicial views.

A number of relevant scrutiny reports produced by other local authorities were considered during the review. This included; the *Trans Equality Scrutiny Panel* review, completed by Brighton and Hove City Council in 2013, *Services Available to LGBT Communities in Manchester*, published by Manchester City Council in 2013, *Update on Stonewall Challenge*, published by City of York Council in 2014, and *A Review Of Services And Support For Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual And Transsexual/Transgender Young People* published by Sandwell Metropolitan Council in 2006.

Members also reviewed the content of bespoke publications produced by groups that specifically support the LGBT community. These included; the *Homophobic Hate Crime: the Gay British Crime Survey* report, published in 2013, written information about the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index and Education Equality Index, the *Birmingham LGBT Annual Report 2013/14* and the Birmingham LGBT Schools Toolkit. In addition, Members considered written documentation that had been produced by other key agencies that work with and support the LGBT community. This included; the *Reducing Crime Against People at Risk Scrutiny Report*, produced by Worcestershire County Council in 2014, the *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Public Health Outcomes Framework Companion Document*, the *PHE Action Plan 2015-16: Promoting the Health and Wellbeing of Gay, Bisexual and other Men who have Sex with Men* report and *Gender Dysphoria Services: A Guide for General Practitioners and other Healthcare Staff* produced by NHS England.

Local context

The national census conducted in 2011 did not canvass residents for information about their sexual orientation or transgender status. Only one relevant question appeared in the census which invited people to declare if they were living in a civil partnership; in 2011 36 household had been identified as living in a civil partnerships in Redditch. However, these figures do not account for members of the LGBT community living in loving relationships who had not entered into a civil partnership, those who were not living with their partners or single members of the community. This question could also not help to identify the number of residents who may not yet have come out about their sexual orientation or gender identity.

In this context only estimates can be provided about the size of the LGBT community living in the Borough. The group has been advised that HM Treasury tends to estimate that the number of LGBT people resident in any given area usually represents six per cent of the local population. The population of Redditch Borough was calculated as being 84,300 when the last census was conducted in 2011; if the Treasury's estimate is applied this would equate to an LGBT population in Redditch of 5,058.

The launch of the Task Group review coincided with the introduction of a bespoke LGBT community group, LGBT Support Services Redditch. Two members of the group, Councillors Baker and Brookes, were founding members of this community group. The Task Group welcomes the launch of LGBT

Support Services Redditch which has attracted a number of members and secured premises during the time in which this review has been taking place.
Legislation and Public Service Duties

The Equalities Act 2010 replaced the previous public sector equalities duties for disability, race and gender. Under the terms of this legislation public bodies must take due regard of a number of protected characteristics. These protected characteristics are:

- Age.
- Disability.
- Gender reassignment.
- Pregnancy and maternity.
- Race, including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality.
- Religion or belief (including lack of belief).
- Sex
- Sexual orientation.

Redditch Borough Council's Executive Committee recently endorsed an Equal Opportunity Policy. This policy is designed to ensure that the Council considers the impact of equalities issues on employees and the Council's wider role in supporting local authority employees. The group pre-scrutinised the content of the policy and welcomed the content of the document as a demonstration of the Council's commitment to being an equal opportunities employer and to supporting a diverse mixture of staff.

CHAPTER 1: DEMONSTRATING COMMITMENT

Recommendation 1	Redditch Borough Council should participate in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index every year.
Financial Implications	Participation in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index is free for all organisations. Council staff would need to spend time submitting detailed forms in order to take part in the index and to provide evidence to support claims made in completed submissions. However, the group is contending that the costs in terms of officer time would be offset by the benefits to be accrued from participation in the scheme and demonstrate to both existing LGBT staff, and talented LGBT people who could become future employees, that the Council is committed to supporting the LGBT community.
Legal Implications	There are no legal implications.

The Stonewall Workplace Equality Index is the definitive benchmark for employers that want to demonstrate that they are providing the best possible working environment for LGBT employees. The index is free to enter and provides organisations from the public, private and voluntary sector with an opportunity to compare their organisation's performance to other bodies. Over 800 organisations have participated in the Workplace Equality Index over the past decade including local authorities. Stonewall links the index criteria to eight key areas of best practice. These criteria are updated every three years in order to continue to drive up standards amongst participating bodies.

Each Year Stonewall's Top 100 Employers is published. The ratings in this list are based on the submissions from Councils in the Stonewall Workplace Equality index. In 2015 15 local authorities featured in the top 100 list including Leicestershire County Council, Brighton and Hove City Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council. However, Redditch Borough Council did not feature on this list and does not currently participate in the index.

In order to take part in the Index relevant staff would need to complete various submission forms and to provide supporting evidence to back up any claims. Stonewall selects a range of participating organisations at random each year as part of an assessment of participants in the Workplace Equality Index. Therefore Council staff would need to be available to meet with representatives of Stonewall if the Council was selected for this sample.

Members of the Stonewall Diversity Champions' Programme receive close support from Stonewall when participating in the Workplace Equality Index. As part of this process they receive an in depth analysis of their submission and Stonewall representatives provide annual benchmarking meetings. Advice is also provided about both progress to date and areas for improvement as an employer.

There would be a number of benefits to participating in the index:

- Enhancing the competitiveness of the Council in terms of recruiting talented LGBT staff.
- An understanding of how the Council is performing as an employer of LGBT staff compared to other organisations.
- Greater understanding of action that could be taken to improve the support available to LGBT staff.
- Helping LGBT staff to feel supported and empowered to be themselves in the workplace. Nationally it has been found that LGBT staff often feel anxious about coming out about their sexual orientation or gender identity to colleagues due to concerns about how other staff may respond.
- Enabling the Council to challenge inappropriate behavior or ignorance of issues amongst other staff.
- Demonstrating to LGBT customers of Council services the organisation's commitment to supporting LGBT staff and customers.

According to the *Workplace Equality Index: Five Year Review* many organisations that participate in the Index are surprised in the first year about the findings identified by Stonewall. In some cases it is suggested that assumptions are made by an employer about the extent to which their organisation is inclusive and therefore reviewing performance through the index process can be challenging. *"It can be difficult for employers to start scrutinising their performance in relation to sexual orientation, particularly if they believe that they are already performing to a high standard. It is easy to be complacent and presume that, as things stand, an organisation is welcoming of all; including lesbian, gay and bisexual staff."* Redditch Borough Council cannot therefore assume that just because a new Equal Opportunity Policy was recently approved the Council is performing well as an employer of LGBT staff. Furthermore, the Task Group are aware that in a working environment where many services are shared with Bromsgrove District Council and other local authorities there may be additional challenges in terms of compliance with best practice across different working environments and at a range of offices.

The group is proposing that ideally the Council should participate in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index. This would ensure that the Council would receive useful feedback and could really commit to identifying and resolving any difficulties with current working structures.

Recommendation 2	<p>Worcestershire County Council should take part in the Stonewall Education Equality Index.</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council should also encourage schools to take part in the Stonewall School Champions Programme and / or to use the Birmingham LGBT Schools Toolkit.</p>
Financial Implications	<p>Local authorities can take part in the Stonewall Equality Index for free. Participation in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index is free for all organisations. Council staff would need to spend time submitting detailed forms in order to take part in the index and to provide evidence to support claims made in completed submissions. However, the group is contending that the costs in terms of officer time would be offset by the benefits to be accrued from participation in the scheme.</p> <p>Membership of the Stonewall School Champions Programme can cost a school as little as £150 plus VAT if the school signs up to one of Stonewall's Train the Trainer sessions. The Birmingham LGBT Toolkit can be downloaded from the organisation's website for free.</p>
Legal Implications	There are no legal implications.

National Picture:

The group interviewed representatives of Stonewall as part of the review in April 2015. At the time of this interview Members were advised that one of the three key challenges facing the LGBT community was homophobic bullying in both primary and secondary schools. *The Teachers' Report 2014: Homophobic Bullying in Britain's Schools*, published by Stonewall, found that 86 per cent of secondary school teachers and 45 per cent of primary school teachers had reported that pupils had experienced homophobic bullying at their school. Unfortunately many young people at school were found to be using terminology such as "gay" as a pejorative term whilst other pupils would utilise offensive language to describe the perceived sexual orientation of other students or teachers, such as "poof" or "faggot".

At the national level there has been some progress since 2009. Stonewall found that there had been a significant increase in the number of schools that had policies designed to address homophobic bullying; from 19 per cent to 31 per cent of primary schools and from 30 per cent to 55 per cent of secondary

schools. Also the number of teachers reporting that pupils were regularly subject to homophobic bullying had decreased in this period from 25 per cent to 13 per cent. However, many teachers were still reporting that there had been no real improvement in terms of the extent to which they felt that Head Teachers and school governors were demonstrating leadership in tackling this problem.

Victims of homophobic bullying may feel reluctant to report the incident to teachers for a variety of reasons such as concerns about repercussions, a fear that their sexual orientation may become public knowledge, embarrassment and the assumption that teachers cannot or will not do anything to resolve the problem. The consequences of homophobic bullying, if it continues unchallenged, can be devastating for young LGBT students. *According to The School Report: The Experiences of Gay Young People in Britain's Schools in 2012* these consequences can include the following:

- Young LGBT not feeling part of their school community and potentially becoming socially isolated as a consequence.
- A negative impact on education attainment and aspirations for the future amongst young LGBT people.
- An increase in the number of young LGBT people absconding from school which can have a negative impact on their education.
- An increased risk of self-harm, suicide and depression.

Local Context:

The Council's Community Safety Team in recent years has delivered a significant amount of work in an attempt to challenge homophobic bullying and language in schools. This has involved staff engaging with local Middle and High Schools to deliver age appropriate lessons to pupils in Years 8 and 9 (ages 12 – 14). Staff have also visited schools to provide bespoke mentoring support and to tackle specific cases of homophobic behavior as and when they have occurred alongside representatives of West Mercia Police Force when appropriate.

In recent months officers from the Community Safety Team have been involved in helping to support the introduction of an LGBT youth group for young people studying in Redditch. In addition, the group has been informed that at least one of the high schools in Redditch already has an LGBT youth group and that this has been regularly attended by local pupils.

The group is keen to praise schools that have already taken action to support LGBT pupils as well as the Community Safety Team for their hard work in relation to this issue.

Stonewall Programmes:

In addition to the Workplace Equality Index Stonewall also provides an Education Equality Index which is free to enter for any local authority in England and Wales. The index provides local education authorities with an opportunity to assess how they are performing in relation to other local education authorities through a

benchmarking process. Participating authorities have traditionally made significant progress in tackling homophobic bullying within schools. Every participating local authority receives tailored feedback from Stonewall. In 2014 27 local authorities took part in the index including Hertfordshire county Council, Sheffield City Council and Leicestershire County Council. The group would urge Worcestershire County Council to join those local authorities in future years.

Alongside the Education Equality Index schools can participate in the Stonewall School's Champion Programme. The programme provides schools with an opportunity to learn how to better support LGBT pupils within education and to effectively tackle homophobic bullying. According to Stonewall's website membership of the Education Schools Champions' Programme has been free since September 2013 for schools which register to take part in a Stonewall Train the Trainer session. At the time of writing these Train the Trainer sessions currently cost £150 plus VAT. During the review Members were advised that a couple of local schools are already participating in the Stonewall School's Champions Programme and have found that this has enhanced the school's ability to support LGBT pupils and teachers.

Birmingham LGBT Schools Toolkit:

Birmingham LGBT is a community group which supports the LGBT community living in the city. The Task Group visited the Birmingham LGBT offices in April 2015. They were impressed by the plethora of support services provided by Birmingham LGBT to the community and the extent to which Birmingham LGBT was active within the city.

One of the key support services provided by Birmingham LGBT is *The National LGBT Toolkit for Schools* (there is also a Birmingham version of this toolkit for use in the local area). The toolkit, which can be downloaded for free from the Birmingham LGBT group's website, is intended to provide schools with guidance in relation to supporting LGBT students. The toolkit is also accompanied by a number of case studies on the group's website. When the Task Group visited Birmingham LGBT they were advised that staff from the group do, on request, sometimes visit schools within the local area and engage with pupils. This approach is useful because young people have a chance to engage with representatives of the LGBT community who can speak authoritatively about how particular behaviour and experiences have impacted on them.

Conclusion

Schools can obtain a number of key benefits from participating in either of these two schemes which includes help:

- Preparing for Ofsted inspections in relation to homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying.
- Enabling pupils to reach their potential and to achieve future aspirations.
- Empowering staff to feel confident enough to challenge homophobic language and bullying.

The group is proposing that Worcestershire County Council, as the local education authority, should encourage schools to participate at least one of these two programmes. Members recognise that there are financial costs involved in terms of participating in the Stonewall School Champion's Programme but these costs are relatively minimal. For both programmes the main impact on resources may be in terms of staff time, though the group feels that investment in either programme would be justified due to the positive impact on LGBT students..

The group understand that Worcestershire County Council does not have the power to oblige schools, particularly academy schools, to participate in either of these schemes. However, Members agree that as Worcestershire County Council is the local education authority in the county it would have more influence and a better chance of encouraging schools to participate in one of these programmes than Redditch Borough Council.

CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Recommendation 3	<p>There should be a greater celebration of the positive history of the LGBT community during the annual LGBT History Month celebrations with a focus on the specific theme in each given year. This should include holding events at the Palace Theatre.</p> <p>a) In the long-term Redditch Borough Council should commit to introducing a budget to support LGBT History Month.</p>
Financial Implications	<p>There would be financial implications to the introduction of a bespoke budget to support the LGBT History Month. The group is not specifying the appropriate size of the budget as they feel this should be determined by the Executive Committee.</p> <p>There are financial costs associated with booking the Palace Theatre, though these costs can be minimised if bookings are for use of facilities in non-peak hours. The group are envisaging that the Room Upstairs could be booked. This currently costs £13.00 per hour to hire (though Members recognise that this fee may change in subsequent years in line with any changes to the Council's fees and charges). The group are suggesting that the LGBT Support Services Redditch group should be approached to find out whether they would be willing to contribute to fundraising in order to pay for the room hire.</p>
Legal Implications	<p>There are no legal implications.</p>

LGBT History Month takes place in February every year in the UK. The aim of the LGBT History Month is to celebrate equality and diversity and to raise awareness of the needs and experiences of the LGBT community. The LGBT History Month helps to increase the visibility of the LGBT community within wider society, educate people about issues that impact on the LGBT community, and promote the welfare of LGBT people. Each year there is a different theme for LGBT History Month and local organisers have flexibility with regard to how they choose to organise events, though some resources can be obtained from the LGBT History Month website.

In recent years LGBT History Month events have taken place in Redditch. Redditch Library has kindly offered to host to the LGBT History Month events in the Borough. Local partners, including Redditch Borough Council, have tended to contribute to the arrangements for the event.

In 2015 there were a few difficulties encountered by the organisers of the event including staff turnover at a number of key partner organisations. Members of the group understand that many of the partners from the Worcestershire LGBT Hate Crime Forum who made a significant contribution to the event had been asked to help at short notice. There were a number of stalls providing important information to visitors, including advice about sexually transmitted diseases and action to address homophobic hate crimes and incidents. The group recognise that contributors to the event should be praised for their hard work and dedication in delivering an event at short notice and in difficult circumstances.

However, the Task Group had some concerns about the event in 2015. In particular, the Councillors who attended the event were concerned to find that there were limited displays and information about the positive contributions that have been made by the LGBT community to the wider society. The theme for 2015 was Hidden Histories and Coded Lives; the group was disappointed to find that limited use had been made of this theme to promote key figures from the LGBT community who had made historic contributions to the world. In addition, representatives of the LGBT community consulted by the Councillors expressed reservations about the event. There were concerns that by failing to use the opportunity to promote positive role models the event did not help to support young LGBT residents struggling to come to terms with their sexual orientation or gender identity and the potential response from the wider community that they would encounter.

By contrast the Task Group is aware that events in Bromsgrove generally involve a balanced mixture of information about key support services as well as activities celebrating the LGBT community. In 2015 in Bromsgrove activities ranged from a family friendly celebration of the LGBT community at the Artrix featuring fun activities such as balloon modelling as well as a dramatisation of Oscar Wilde's letter to Lord Alfred Douglas from Reading gaol; Wilde Without the Boy. Members are keen for a similar mixture of events and activities to be delivered in Redditch as part of any future LGBT History Months.

The Task Group has concluded that a key issue is that specific funding provided by Bromsgrove District Council is used to help finance the delivery of LGBT History Month events in the district. By contrast at present no funding is allocated to the LGBT History Month in Redditch. The group is suggesting that in order to improve the LGBT History Month in the Borough in future years the Council should introduce a bespoke budget for this purpose. The Council has a proud history of supporting and funding community action to demonstrate that the people of Redditch will not tolerate discrimination, such as the Holocaust Memorial Event. By committing to introduce a budget for LGBT History Month, to be funded at a level which the Task Group agrees should be determined by the

Executive Committee, the Council would be demonstrating its commitment to supporting the LGBT community.

Members recognise that it may not be possible in the current difficult financial climate for the Council to introduce a budget for this purpose straight away. In this context the group would request that the Executive Committee consider committing to an aspiration for the Council to introduce a budget for the LGBT History Month at a later date once the Council's finances are in a better position to support this function.

The Task Group is also in agreement that greater involvement of the LGBT community in the preparation and delivery of LGBT History Month in Redditch would help to improve the event in future years. Members recognise that many members of the LGBT Hate Crime Forum are likely to be members of the community. However, by working with the LGBT Support Services Redditch community group the two bodies could combine their expertise together with local knowledge in order both to meet the needs and celebrate the achievements of the LGBT community.

In addition, the Task Group is proposing that the arrangements for future LGBT History Months should be organised at a much earlier date. The themes for future LGBT history months are announced a significant amount of time in advance; the theme for 2016 will be Religion, Belief and Philosophy and in 2017 will be Citizenship, PSHE (personal, social and health education) and law. By starting to make arrangements for the next LGBT History Month as soon as possible partners will have more time to discuss arrangements and to finalise their contributions. It could also make it easier for partners to book venues such as the Room Upstairs at the Palace Theatre in Redditch for some of the activities celebrating LGBT History Month (bookings at the Palace Theatre are finalised approximately 18 months in advance of performances).

Members recognise that the concerns that they have raised in this report appear to be fairly critical of the LGBT History Month arrangements for 2015. The group is keen not to cause any offence to partners and individuals who have worked hard on these arrangements. However, it should be noted that this scrutiny Task Group is undertaking its proper role; to act as a critical friend by both highlighting any problems where these have been identified and suggesting constructive actions that could be taken to resolve these problems in future. Members hope that their comments will be embraced by partners and that an LGBT History Month will continue to be provided in future years in the Borough.

<p>Recommendation 4</p>	<p>A leaflet advertising the support networks available for the LGBT community in Redditch, should be produced.</p> <p>a) Redditch Borough Council should support any groups that produce this literature by allowing such leaflets to be made available for residents to collect in public venues, such as Redditch Town Hall, and making this information available to view on relevant web pages of the Council's website.</p>
<p>Financial Implications</p>	<p>There would be a cost associated with producing a leaflet. Members are proposing that, subject to the LGBT Support Services Redditch group agreeing to take a lead on delivery of this proposal, the group should apply for grant funding to help produce a leaflet.</p> <p>There would potentially be the cost of officer time in terms of adding information to the Council's website, though the group is not anticipating that this would be extensive.</p>
<p>Legal Implications</p>	<p>The Council and LGBT Support Services Redditch group would need to discuss the content to ensure that when information is placed on the Council's website there is no breach of copyright.</p>

One of the overriding objectives of the review was for the group to assess the provision of support networks to the LGBT community within Redditch. Whilst Members identified some support services there was very little information available to the LGBT community about the services that were available. Members were concerned that this could leave members of the LGBT community vulnerable to becoming isolated and might create a false impression of the demand in the Borough for support from the LGBT community.

To address this problem the group is proposing that a leaflet advertising the support networks available to the LGBT community should be produced. The group is envisaging that the content and presentation would be similar in style to a brochure produced on behalf of the Redditch Older People's forum to advertise social groups and socialising opportunities to senior citizens.

Members do not feel that it would be appropriate for Redditch Borough Council to produce this leaflet. Instead, the group believes that the LGBT community is in a

better position to identify the support networks that are available and the potential needs and interests of the community. Members believe that LGBT Support Services Redditch would be in an ideal position to take a lead on producing this leaflet and would urge members of the group to consider doing so.

The Task Group recognises that financial resources might be required by the LGBT Support Services Redditch group to produce a leaflet. The financial costs required to print this leaflet would be dependent on the length of the document, the type of graphics used, the number of documents produced and the fees charged by the printers. However, as a rough comparison the group has been advised that it costs approximately £100 to print 400 copies of short (four page) leaflets in the Council's Print Unit. Based on these costs the group is not anticipating that the LGBT Support Services Redditch group would need to make a significant financial investment. However, it is possible that the group will need to secure grant funding and may want to consider applying for funding through the Council's grants programme or from local County Councillors' divisional funds.

Whilst Members are not asking Redditch Borough Council to take responsibility for producing this type of leaflet they are urging the Executive Committee to consider this recommendation carefully. In particular, the Council could assist the LGBT community by agreeing to display any leaflets that are produced in public buildings such as Redditch Town Hall and the Abbey Stadium. The Council could also assist by agreeing to include information obtained from the leaflets on relevant pages of the Council's website.

CHAPTER 3: HEALTH AND WELLBEING

One of the objectives of the review was for the group to assess the support available from the NHS and mental health services to the LGBT community. The written evidence that the group gathered regarding the medical and mental health needs of the LGBT community helped to clarify national policies and practices. This indicated that the NHS does recognise that the LGBT community have particular health needs and service requirements. Key findings from the group's research regarding the national context include the following (all of the data below is derived from the written documentation listed in the introduction to this report):

- There are higher rates of substance abuse, including alcohol consumption, smoking and drug use, within the LGBT community compared to the general population.
- Studies have consistently found that there are high levels of mental health problems within the LGBT community.
- Members of the LGBT community are more likely to experience social isolation and may be the victims of homophobic, biphobic or transphobic bullying at some point in their lives which can impact on their mental health.
- Eating disorders are more prevalent within the LGBT community than the general population.
- Services for transgender patients seeking to transition are specialist and are not commissioned at the local level. However, GPs have a key role to play in providing initial support to transgender patients and in monitoring follow up care post-surgery where this has been undertaken.
- Evidence suggests that LGB people are less likely to eat the recommended levels of fruit and vegetables per day than the general population. This can have an overall impact on an individual's health particularly in the long-term.
- *The Guidelines for the Care of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Patients in Primary Care* estimate that 44 per cent of gay and bisexual men have never discussed sexually transmitted infections (STIs) with a health professional whilst less than half of lesbian and bisexual women have ever been tested for an STI.
- *The Guidelines for the Care of Trans Patients in Primary Care* record that 74 per cent of transgender people have reported having at least one negative experience with the health service and 20 per cent do not use general health services at all.
- LGBT patients may be reluctant to discuss their sexual orientation or gender identity with their GPs due to concerns about the possible reaction they may encounter. According to the *Gay and Bisexual Men's Health Survey* conducted by Stonewall gay and bisexual men are more likely to come out to their family, friends and work colleagues regarding their sexual orientation than to their GP.
- National studies have found significant issues with health inequalities amongst LGBT minority groups. For example *The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Public Health Outcomes Framework Companion Document* reports that substance abuse amongst gay and bisexual men with physical disabilities is higher than amongst gay and bisexual men without disabilities. Black and

minority ethnic lesbian and bisexual women are also at a higher risk of cardiac disease, diabetes and cancer than white lesbian and bisexual women.

Following interviews with representatives of the Redditch and Bromsgrove CCG and Redditch MHAG, it quickly became apparent that the Task Group would not be in a position to clarify the precise health needs and experiences of the local LGBT community during the review. This is because at a local level the health environment is complex. Different branches of the NHS commission and deliver different services; for example NHS England commissions transgender services whilst Worcestershire County Council's Public Health team leads on local public health campaigns. In order to assess all relevant services the group estimated that they would need to undertake a separate, lengthy review focusing solely on the health needs of the LGBT community which would encompass consultation with service commissioners as well as service providers. In addition consultation with representatives of the local LGBT community would be necessary in order to understand current experiences and to identify any gaps in provision and this would take time as any such consultation would need to be conducted in a sensitive and informed manner.

Despite this Members did identify two key issues from national trends which they agreed could legitimately be addressed at the local level. These are the focus of the group's fifth and sixth recommendations.

Recommendation 5	The specific mental health needs of the LGBT community should be addressed in equalities training provided to frontline Council staff. This should be covered in one of the equalities briefing sessions that the policy team is due to deliver in forthcoming months.
Financial Implications	Equalities training is already provided to staff. The group is anticipating that provision of this information as part of these established training sessions would not entail a requirement for additional financial expenditure.
Legal Implications	There are no legal implications.

The group discovered through their research that at the national level there are high rates of mental health problems within the LGBT community. In particular many LGBT people report experiencing depression and anxiety at some point in their lives with suicide attempts amongst transgender people especially high. Some key data was gathered in relation to this during the course of the review (all of the data below is derived from the written documentation listed in the introduction to this report):

- LGB people are twice as likely as the general population to have had suicidal thoughts or to have attempted suicide.
- 84 per cent of transgender people have considered suicide and half of transgender people have attempted suicide.
- The Department of Health's Suicide Prevention Strategy 2012 identified LGBT people as a high risk group in terms of suicide attempts.
- 56 per cent of young LGB people have reported self-harming.
- One in five lesbian and bisexual women have reported self-harming.
- One in 14 gay and bisexual men have reported self-harming.
- Three quarters of young transgender people have self-harmed.
- 53 per cent of adult transgender people have self-harmed at some point in their lives.
- One in five lesbian and bisexual women have reported having an eating disorder compared to one in 20 women in the general population.
- Gay and bisexual men are more likely to have an eating disorder or a problem with eating, at one in seven or 13 per cent, compared to four per cent of men in general.
- 19 per cent of transgender people report having an undiagnosed eating disorder and five per cent report having a diagnosed eating disorder.

It should be noted that there can be multiple triggers for mental ill health experienced by members of the LGBT community as with the general population. However, the situation can be exacerbated by negative experiences such as homophobic, biphobic or transphobic hate crimes or incidents, including bullying. Young LGBT people may be particularly vulnerable when exploring their own sexuality and gender identity. They can also be very vulnerable when they are coming out to family and friends, especially if the response they receive is negative and potentially leads to homelessness.

During the course of the review Members consulted with frontline staff involved in providing housing services to the local community. Officers acknowledged that they were not aware of the prevalence of mental health problems within the LGBT community or particularly familiar with the needs of the community. However, they suggested that it would be useful for frontline services to have access to this information. The Council's service transformation programme focuses at the service level on meeting the holistic needs of the customer. Information about the particularly high rates of mental ill health within the LGBT community could help frontline service officers to better understand the vulnerability of LGBT customers presenting for housing or other Council services and to adapt the services that they receive to meet their needs accordingly.

The Council's Policy Team already provides equalities training to staff. In recent years this has primarily been delivered in the form of a workshop which has taken a couple of hours to deliver and focused on all of the protected characteristics. However, Members have been advised that the team is scheduled to deliver shorter, bespoke training sessions focusing on particular equalities issues in forthcoming months. In order to minimise the financial costs involved the group

is proposing that the specific mental health needs of the LGBT community should be addressed as part of these scheduled training briefings.

<p>Recommendation 6</p>	<p>Local partners should help to promote the following to members of the LGBT community, including on the Redditch and Bromsgrove Wellbeing website:</p> <p>a) Gay and bisexual men are eligible for free Hepatitis B vaccinations available at the Arrowside Sexual Health clinic.</p> <p>b) Lesbian and bisexual women are entitled and should be encouraged to attend cervical screening tests.</p>
<p>Financial Implications</p>	<p>There would be the cost of officer time in adding content to the wellbeing website, though this is unlikely to be significant. The costs of further attempts by partners to promote these services would vary according to the methods of communication that are adopted.</p>
<p>Legal Implications</p>	<p>There are no legal implications.</p>

During the review Members identified actions that could be taken by partners immediately which would have a beneficial impact on the health of the LGBT community.

Hepatitis B Vaccinations

Hepatitis B is a virus that can affect the liver. It is spread through unprotected sex and /or by sharing needles for intravenous drug use. According to the NHS Choices website in most cases Hepatitis B will stay in the body for one to three months; this is called acute Hepatitis B. In one in 20 cases the virus remains in a person's system and this is known as chronic Hepatitis B. In 20 per cent of chronic Hepatitis B cases people can develop scarring of the liver, also known as cirrhosis. One in 10 people with cirrhosis go on to develop liver cancer. There is a Hepatitis B vaccination which is considered to be effective in 95 per cent of cases. In England vaccination is recommended for high risk groups. Gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men are considered to be one of the high risk groups for Hepatitis B.

In Redditch gay and bisexual men are offered the Hepatitis B vaccination for free at the Arrowside Sexual Health Centre. When members of the group visited the

centre they learned that NHS staff are keen to promote participation in this vaccination programme to gay and bisexual men as much as possible.

It is difficult to determine to what extent gay and bisexual men living in Redditch are currently aware of the availability of this vaccination for free without extensive consultation with the community. However, anecdotal reports received by members of the Task Group from representatives of the LGBT community indicate that awareness is currently mixed. In this context the group believes that additional action by partner organisations to promote the availability of this vaccination to gay and bisexual men would represent a worthwhile investment, particularly in relation to the potential benefits to public health that might arise as a consequence.

Cervical Screening

Cervical screening, also known as a smear test, is a method used to detect abnormal cells in a woman's cervix. By detecting and removing abnormal cells at an early stage they can be prevented from becoming cancerous, though not all abnormal cells will become cancerous. Changes to cells in the cervix are often caused by the Human Papilloma Virus (HPV), which is tested for as part of the cervical screening process. There are over 100 varieties of HPV, which is highly contagious. According to the NHS Choices website over three quarters of sexually active women will acquire at least one form of the HPV virus in their lives.

In the UK all women aged between 25 and 64 are invited for cervical screening as part of the national cervical screening programme; women aged between 25 and 49 are invited to attend screening every three years and women aged between 50 and 64 are invited to attend every five years. According to the NHS website since the cervical screening programme was introduced in the 1980s the number of cervical cancer cases has decreased by 7 per cent per year.

Lesbian and bisexual women, like all women, are at risk of developing cervical cancer. Bisexual women may have partners of both sexes whilst they are sexually active whilst some lesbian women may have their first sexual experiences with men when they may be infected with the HPV virus. In addition, the *Guidelines for the Care of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Patients in Primary Care* explicitly states that women who exclusively have relationships with other women can still transmit HPV to their female partners through oral sex and from sharing sex toys without using a condom.

Given these risks for lesbian and bisexual women the group was concerned to find that many lesbian and bisexual women do not regularly attend cervical screening. According to *The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Public Health Outcomes Framework Companion Document* 50 per cent of lesbian and bisexual women have failed to attend a cervical screening and 37 per cent of lesbian and bisexual women had been advised at some point that they did not require screening due to their sexual orientation. Similarly Stonewall reported in a 2008

study of lesbian and bisexual women's health that 20 per cent had been informed by a health professional that they did not require cervical screening.

It is difficult to determine to what extent lesbian and bisexual women living in the Borough are attending cervical screening tests or to clarify what advice health professional are providing to lesbian and bisexual women locally without undertaking extensive consultation with the community. However, anecdotal reports received by members of the group from local representatives of the LGBT community suggest that some lesbian and bisexual women are ignoring invitations to attend screening based on the assumption that they are not at risk of developing cervical cancer. Members concluded that the anecdotal evidence, when combined with national research findings, was concerning and justifies the need for partner organisations to be tasked with more actively promoting participation in cervical screening to lesbian and bisexual women living in Redditch.

CHAPTER 4 – ITEMS TO NOTE

Hate Crimes and Incidents:

According to *Homophobic Hate Crime: the Gay British Crime Survey* (Stonewall, 2013) one in three lesbian, gay and bisexual people had experienced a homophobic hate crime in the preceding three years. Similarly *The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Public Health Outcomes Framework Companion Document*, published by Public Health England, reports that at the national level one in five LGB people have experienced an homophobic hate crime or incident (including biphobic crimes and incidents) in the last three years whilst 19 per cent of transgender people have been physically attacked and 38 per cent experienced intimidation and threats due to their gender identity. However three quarters of victims of homophobic hate crimes and incidents interviewed for the *Homophobic Hate Crime: the Gay British Crime Survey* did not report it to the police or to any other official organisation that might be in a position to provide support and it is estimated that 97 per cent of transphobic crime goes unreported.

There may be multiple reasons why victims of homophobic, biphobic and transphobic hate crimes and incidents do not submit a report to the police. However, according to the *Homophobic Hate Crime: the Gay British Crime Survey* 28 per cent of victims did not think that their report would be taken seriously and in just over 40 per cent of cases the victim did not think that the incident was serious enough to justify being reported. A further 31 per cent of victims did not think that the Police would or could do anything in response.

In February 2015 the group interviewed the then Inspector Rebecca Love (who has subsequently been promoted) and Superintendent Jim Baker of the West Mercia Police Force in order to ascertain the extent to which homophobic, biphobic and transphobic hate crimes and incidents were a problem at the local level. Members also wanted to find out how local public services regarded reports of homophobic, biphobic and transphobic hate crimes and incidents. This was the first time a senior officer at the level of Superintendent had attended an Overview and Scrutiny meeting at Redditch Borough Council and Members agreed that this demonstrated that the police were committed to tackling homophobic hate crimes and incidents. Members also wanted to commend the officers for the passion with which they spoke about tackling all forms of hate crime and incidents and the extent to which they took this problem seriously.

Unfortunately, Members were advised that locally there appears to be under reporting of homophobic hate crimes and incidents. The Task Group are therefore strongly urging members of the LGBT community to have the confidence to approach the police to report any homophobic, biphobic or transphobic hate crimes or incidents they have been the victims of or may experience in the future. Reporting is key to tackling such crime and should also help public sector organisations to appreciate the scale of the problem and the resources required to tackle it.

Morton Stanley Festival:

Morton Stanley Festival is held on an annual basis. The festival provides an opportunity to celebrate positive aspects of life in the Borough. As part of these celebrations the group believes that the positive contribution of the LGBT community in the Borough should be celebrated.

In recent years there has been a community area at the festival. Various community groups as well as relevant Council departments have had stalls in this community area where useful information and advice has been provided to people attending the event. Minority ethnic groups have managed stalls at the festival in previous years and this provided an opportunity to promote positive aspects of their communities to the wider population living in Redditch. The group has been advised that stalls can be established in the community area for a fee of approximately £10 – 30.

Members believe that a stall dedicated to the LGBT community would make a positive contribution to the festival in 2015. A stall could be used to provide advice and support to members of the LGBT community as well as to their families. A stall could also promote the positive contributions of the LGBT community to the Borough. Members feel that ideally arrangements to introduce an LGBT presence at the festival should be community led so that members of the LGBT community can feel that the stall and information provided is representative of the community. Members would therefore urge LGBT Support Services Redditch to consider approaching the Council about arranging for an LGBT stall to feature in the festival in 2015.

CONCLUSION

The Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task Group has completed an intensive review of the support available to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people living in the Borough.

There was additional action and support networks that the group felt were needed to support the LGBT community in Redditch. However, Members were heartened by the passion with which many partners are attempting to act in support of the LGBT community. Members were also encouraged by the launch of the LGBT Support Services Redditch group during the course of this review and Members hope that this community group will continue to grow and to meet the needs of the LGBT community living in the Borough in future years.

The six recommendations proposed by the Task Group are all based on the evidence they have gathered and, if implemented, would have a positive impact on the LGBT community in Redditch. Members therefore urge the Council's Executive Committee and partner organisations to approve their proposals and to act on their suggestions as soon as possible.

APPENDIX 1
Scrutiny Proposal Form

(This form should be completed by sponsoring Member(s), Officers and / or members of the public when proposing an item for Scrutiny).

Note: The matters detailed below have not yet received any detailed consideration. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee reserves the right to reject suggestions for scrutiny that fall outside the Borough Council's remit.

Proposer's name and designation	Councillor Joe Baker	Date of referral	22nd July 2014
Proposed topic title	Provision of Support Networks for LGBT Task Group		
Link to national, regional and local priorities and targets	<p>This review proposal links to the following Council Strategic Purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help me live my life independently (including health and activity) • Keep my place safe and looking good. • Provide good things for me to do, see and visit. 		
Background to the issue	<p>The rights and needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered (LGBT) people living within Redditch Borough has recently been the focus of some discussion. To demonstrate solidarity with the LGBT community a gathering took place outside the Town Hall prior to full Council on 9th June, which I organised and attended. Following this gathering I was approached by a number of local residents from within the LGBT community who expressed some concerns about the support available to them and who sought reassurance about the action being taken locally to address homophobia.</p> <p>There are a small number of groups and initiatives, at the local and regional level, which work to address the needs of the local LGBT community. This includes the Bromsgrove and Redditch LGBT History Month. However, I am concerned that these groups are not necessarily engaging effectively with the local LGBT community and in some instances there may be limited awareness that these groups exist. I am also</p>		

	<p>concerned that there are limited social groups locally that specifically address the needs of people from the LGBT community.</p> <p>In 2012 Stonewall published the <i>School Report</i>, research focusing on the experiences of young gay peoples in British schools. This research found that 55% of young lesbian, gay and bisexual people experienced homophobic bullying in school and one in four (23%) of lesbian, gay and bisexual young people had tried to take their lives at some point. I am concerned about how these experiences are manifested at the local level and the extent to which local public agencies are currently providing sufficient support to young lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people living in Redditch Borough.</p> <p>I think a review of this subject matter would be useful as it would demonstrate the Council's commitment to supporting the LGBT community and would respond to concerns raised directly with me by some local residents. I would hope that at the end of a review of this subject Redditch Borough Councillors would have an understanding of the needs of the local LGBT community and what action the Council and other public sector agencies can do to support the community more effectively.</p>
<p>Key Objectives Please keep to SMART objectives (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To explore the work currently undertaken by Redditch Borough Council and Redditch Local Strategic Partnership to support lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people. 2) To investigate the support available from the NHS and Mental Health Services for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people. 3) To review the support available from public agencies to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people who have or are continuing to experience homophobic bullying and harassment (including hate crime). <p>(This should involve considering the findings of the recent <i>Reducing Crime Against People at Risk</i> scrutiny report undertaken by Worcestershire County Council).</p>

	<p>4) To assess the support available to young lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people locally.</p> <p>5) To investigate existing social opportunities available to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people locally and the potential to make additional social opportunities available.</p> <p>6) To determine the financial implications of any actions proposed by a Task Group to meet the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people locally.</p>
<p>How long do you think is needed to complete this exercise? (Where possible please estimate the number of weeks, months and meetings required)</p>	<p>This review should be completed by July 2015.</p>

Please return this form to: Jess Bayley or Amanda Scarce, Democratic Services Officers, Redditch Borough Council, Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH

Email: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk / a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

APPENDIX 2
Acknowledgements

Members would like to thank the following for providing evidence or other forms of support during the course of the review:

Fay Beverton, Stonewall
Superintendent Jim Baker, West Mercia Police Force
Jayne Bough, Housing Services Manager
Jonathan Cochrane, Arts and Events Manager
Rebecca Dunne, Policy Manager
John Godwin, Head of Leisure and Cultural Services
Brenda Holden, Housing Options Team Leader
Karen Hunter, Director of Corporate Affairs, Redditch and Bromsgrove Clinical Commissioning Group
Sarah Kelsey, Community Safety Project Officer
Rebecca Love, (previously Inspector for the West Mercia Police Force and subsequently promoted).
Tim Mackrill, Palace Theatre Manager
Neil Ordish, Redditch Mental Health Action Group (MHAG) and Headgym.
Jan Smyth, Democratic Services Officer
Frankie Stevens, Stonewall
Liz Tompkin, Head of Housing
Dave Viney, Birmingham LGBT

There were a few additional representatives of key organisations that the group consulted. Clarification was not available at the time of writing as to whether these representatives were happy to be listed in this report. Therefore, whilst the group would like to thank these individuals they are not named here out of respect for their privacy.

The group would also like to thank representatives of the LGBT community who were consulted during the course of the review. To protect their anonymity they have not been named in this report.

APPENDIX 3
Timeline of Activities

Date	Task Group Activity
1st December 2014	Scoping discussion and brainstorm of approach to the review.
5th January 2015	Consideration of the <i>Reducing Crime Against People at Risk scrutiny report</i> , produced by Worcestershire County Council in 2014, and consideration of the <i>Homophobic Hate Crime: the Gay British Crime Survey</i> report, published by Stonewall in 2013.
19th January	Interview with Rebecca Dunne, Policy Manager.
29th January	Consideration of relevant scrutiny reports produced by Brighton and Hove City Council, Manchester City Council, Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council and York City Council.
10th February	Interviews with Sarah Kelsey, Community Safety Project Officer and with a representative of the LGBT community in Redditch.
24th February	Interview with Superintendent Jim Baker and former Inspector Rebecca Love and consideration of information about Worcestershire county Council LGBT Employees' Network.
17th March	Consideration of feedback from the LGBT History Month events in Redditch in 2015 and discussion of the next steps in the review.
23rd March	Interview with John Godwin, Head of Leisure and Cultural Services, Jonathan Cochrane, Arts and Events Manager, and Tim Mackrill, Palace Theatre Manager. Consideration of the <i>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Public Health Outcomes Framework Companion Document</i> , the <i>PHE Action Plan 2015-16: Promoting the Health and Wellbeing of Gay, Bisexual and other Men who have Sex with Men</i> report and the <i>Gender Dysphoria Services: A Guide for General Practitioners and other Healthcare Staff</i> produced by NHS England.

10th April	Interview with Fay Beverton and Frankie Stevens from Stonewall.
14th April	Visit to Birmingham LGBT to interview David Viney.
22nd April	Consideration of progress with the review and final actions to resolve before completing the review.
27th April	Visit to Arrowside Sexual Health Centre
11th May	Consideration of the Birmingham LGBT Schools Toolkit.
18th May	Interview with Liz Tompkin, Head of Housing, Jayne Bough, Housing Services Manager and Brenda Holden, Housing Services Team Leader followed by an interview with Karen Hunter, Director of Corporate Affairs for the Redditch and Bromsgrove Clinical Commissioning Group.
27th May	Interview with Neil Ordish, Redditch Mental Health Action Group (MHAG) and Headgym.
4th June	Interview with Rebecca Dunne, Policy Manager, and consideration of the Council's draft Equal Opportunity Policy. Consideration of a draft list of recommendations proposed during the course of the review.
8th June	Agreeing a draft set of recommendations and the structure for the group's final report.
23rd June	Finalising the content of the group's report and agreeing the content of a presentation to the Overview and Scrutiny and Executive Committees.

APPENDIX 4**Glossary**

Biphobia - prejudicial views and discriminatory behaviour in relation to people who are or are perceived to be bisexual.

Bisexual – A person who is sexually attracted to other people who may identify as male or female.

Cisgender – A term used for people who are not transgender.

Cross Dressing – In the transgender community this is often regarded as a pejorative term.

Gay – A person who identifies as a male and is sexually attracted to other people who identify as male.

Gender dysphoria – This is a term often used by the medical profession to refer to the discomfort that an individual may experience when their identity as a man or a woman does not correspond with the sex characteristics of the body they were assigned at birth. (The term Gender Identity Disorder – GID – is also sometimes used in this context).

Gender identity – Refers to a person's internal perception and experience of their gender.

Gender queer – Someone whose gender may be fluid or who does not identify with a set form of sexuality.

Homophobia – Prejudicial views and discriminatory behaviour in relation to people who are or are perceived to be gay or lesbians.

Lesbian – A person who identifies as a female and is sexually attracted to others who identify as female.

Sex Change Operation – An alternative term for Sex Reassignment Surgery which is considered to be offensive by some transgender people.

Sex Reassignment Surgery – The surgical procedures undertaken so that a person can transition from the sex they were assigned at birth to the sex which reflects their gender identity. It should be noted that not all transgender people choose to have surgery.

Sexual Orientation – A person's sexual orientation is separate from their gender identity. A transgender person could be straight, gay or bisexual.

Trans – The umbrella term used to refer to transgender people.

Transgender – Someone who feels that the gender they were assigned at birth does not relate to their gender identity. A transgender person may be planning, in the process or have completed transitioning from the sex they were assigned at birth to the sex that reflects their gender identity.

Transitioning – The term used to refer to the process by which an individual moves from the sex assigned to them at birth to the sex that reflects their gender identity.

Transman – Someone who was female at birth but has a male gender identity. Trans men may be planning, be in the process, or have completed transitioning.

Transphobia - Prejudicial views and discriminatory behaviour in relation to people who are or are perceived to be transgender.

Transsexual – A desire to live and be accepted as a member of the opposite sex to that which one was assigned at birth and to have sex reassignment surgery.

Transwomen – Someone who was male at birth but has a female gender identity. Trans women may be planning, be in the process or have completed transitioning.

APPENDIX 5

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Joe Baker has declared an other discloseable interest in this review as a founder member of the LGBT Support Services Redditch group.

Councillor Natalie Brookes has declared an other discloseable interest in this review as a founder member of the LGBT Support Services Redditch group.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

7th July 2015

**JOINT SCRUTINY PROPOSAL – INCREASING PHYSICAL ACTIVITY IN
WORCESTERSHIRE**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Pat Witherspoon, Portfolio Holder for Leisure and tourism
Portfolio Holder Consulted	No
Relevant Head of Service	John Godwin, Head of Leisure and Cultural Services
Ward(s) Affected	No specific ward relevance.
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

This report provides an overview of a proposal that has been received from Worcestershire County Council to undertake a joint scrutiny review of action that could be taken to increase physical activity rates in Worcestershire. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to determine whether a representative of Redditch Borough Council's Overview and Scrutiny process should participate in this review.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to **RESOLVE**

- 1) **whether to participate in the Joint Scrutiny of Increasing Physical Activity in Worcestershire;**
- 2) **that subject to agreeing to participate in the review, to nominate a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to serve on the joint review; and**
- 3) **that the report be noted.**

3. KEY ISSUES**Background**

- 3.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board, (OSPB), the lead scrutiny Committee at Worcestershire County Council, recently considered the content of the Worcestershire Public Health Annual Report 2014. A key outcome of this process was that the OSPB agreed to establish a scrutiny Task Group to review the County Council's role in increasing physical activity within Worcestershire.
- 3.2 The proposed review would cover issues within the remit of district Councils. In Redditch this review would be relevant in particular to the Council's Leisure and Cultural Services team and the relevant Head of Service has been informed about the proposed scrutiny accordingly. The Chair of the OSPB, Councillor Richard Udall, has therefore written to the Chairs of Overview and Scrutiny Committees at

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**7th July 2015

every district local authority in the county to find out whether representatives of each authority would be interested in participating in a joint review of this subject.

- 3.3 The proposed terms of reference for the review together with a suggested list of potential expert witnesses is detailed in the draft scrutiny proposal form for the review, attached at Appendix 1.

Financial Implications

- 3.4 There are no direct financial implications directly relating to this report.

Legal Implications

- 3.5 There are no legal implications directly relating to this report.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.6 Redditch Members have reviewed relevant subjects in recent years. This includes the Promoting Sporting Participation review in 2011/2012 and a review of the Abbey Stadium in 2013/14. If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee chooses to participate in this joint scrutiny review Members may want to bring any relevant findings arising from these exercises to the attention of the joint scrutiny Task Group.
- 3.7 The majority of Committee meetings at Worcestershire County Council are held during the day. Therefore if the Committee resolves to participate in this exercise consideration may need to be given to appointing a Councillor who is available during the day to represent the Council.
- 3.8 Members are asked to note that the joint scrutiny activity will be hosted by Worcestershire County Council. For this reason if the Council chooses to participate in this exercise it would not count towards the maximum of two Task Groups at any one time that scrutiny Members have committed to undertaking in Redditch this year.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.9 No direct customer or equality and diversity implications have been identified for this report.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

No risks have been identified.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Draft Scrutiny Proposal: Increasing Physical Activity in Worcestershire.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

7th July 2015

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Jess Bayley, Democratic Services Officer
Email: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel.: (01527) 64252

Topic: Increasing Physical Activity in Worcestershire			
Background to the issue (what is it and why is it being considered for scrutiny)	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board (OSPB) at its meeting on 26 February 2015 discussed the Worcestershire Public Health Annual Report 2014, a theme of which was to increase opportunities for participation in physical activity. This 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."</p> <p>The County Council is keen to ensure opportunities to access sport and physical activity is available to all, and members are interested to find out what impact the 2012 Olympics has had on participation rates. On 23 April 2015, therefore, the OSPB added physical activity to the 2015 scrutiny work programme, and this was subsequently approved by the Council on 14 May 2015.</p>		
Terms of reference	<p>To examine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current physical activity rates in Worcestershire • What is the County Council's role in promoting physical activity? • How is the County Council working with partners to enable more people to take part in physical activity and sport? • What can the County Council do to help increase physical activity rates in to meet the Chief Medical Officer recommendations of 30 minutes a day 5 days a week? 		
Scrutiny Officer & Scrutiny Liaison Officer	<p>Suzanne O'Leary, Overview and Scrutiny Manager Alyson Grice/Samantha Morris, Overview and Scrutiny Officers Tony Leak, Scrutiny Liaison Officer</p>		
Suitability for scrutiny. Which of the following criteria does it meet?			
<i>Is the issue a priority area for the Council?</i>	Yes	<i>Does it examine a poorly performing service?</i>	No
<i>Is it a key issue for local people?</i>	Yes	<i>Has it been prompted by new Government guidance or legislation?</i>	No
<i>Will the scrutiny have a clear impact on services?</i>	Potentially	<i>Will it result in improvements to the way the Council operates?</i>	Potentially
<i>Are improvements for local people likely as a result?</i>	Possibly		

<p>Scope of scrutiny (what issues will it cover and what won't it cover)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What opportunities for physical and sporting activity exist in Worcestershire (including schools)? • What are the barriers of taking part in physical and sporting activity in Worcestershire? How can these be removed? • What Olympic Legacy programmes are running? • Who are the key partners cross county and organisations working to increase physical activity and what influence does each have? • How are the County Council working with these partners (including the district council) to enable more people to take part in physical activity and sport, particularly for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Those currently inactive ○ Those in areas of deprivation ○ Hard to reach groups of people • Is there sufficient provision to meet the demand? • What is the availability of sporting opportunities in Worcestershire on a geographical, gender, age and cost basis – what are the gaps in provision? • How do schools (public and independent) work with the community to share sporting facilities? • How is the Public Health Ring-fenced grant being used to support physical activity? <p><i>N.B. O&S has committed to ensure that the following are considered in all scrutiny reviews as appropriate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • equality and diversity issues • commissioning • localism
<p>Advantages to conducting scrutiny & Indicators of success (ie how will you know a good scrutiny has been done?)</p>	<p>To have a better understanding of the situation in Worcestershire which will in turn could help to prioritise the areas of most need for the provision.</p>
<p>Has anyone else examined the issue?</p>	<p>TBC</p>
<p>Any disadvantages or pitfalls to conducting this scrutiny?</p>	<p>Concern that sport and leisure is a district council function and it may duplicate work already being undertaken.</p>
<p>INFORMATION NEEDS</p>	
<p>Key Documents, Reports & Data required</p>	<p>Inequalities in Health in Worcestershire – Worcestershire Public Health Annual Report 2014 (p56 & p61)</p>
<p>Is an expert adviser needed?</p>	<p>Suggestion: Frances Howie, Head of Public Health as expert adviser</p>
<p>Possible interviewees</p>	<p>Cabinet Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Localism and Communities ➤ Health and Well Being ➤ Children and Families <p>Frances Howie, Head of Public Health</p>

	<p>Richard Harling, Director of Adult Services and Health Gail Quinton, Director of Children's Services (and appropriate Children's Services officers) Sports Partnership Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sport England District Councils (Sports Development and Planning) CCGs Youth Cabinet Children and Young People and Adults who do not participate in organised sports and physical activities Warriors Community Trust Kidderminster Harriers</p>
Is this an issue that young people would be interested in? If so, ask Youth Cabinet for evidence.	Yes
Site Visits	TBC
Types of meeting/consultation needed? (eg workshops/focus groups/public meetings/questionnaires etc)	Task Group Meetings
Any meetings to be held outside of County Hall?	Potentially
Media & publicity needs?	May request media release to gather views of the public
OUTLINE TIMETABLE	
Proposal to OSPB	8 June 2015
Evidence Gathering	June – October 2015
Scrutiny Report to OSPB	November 2015
Scrutiny Report to Cabinet	January 2016



Executive Committee

Tuesday, 9 June 2015

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Bill Hartnett (Chair), Councillor Greg Chance (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juliet Brunner, Brandon Clayton, John Fisher, Mark Shurmer, Yvonne Smith and Debbie Taylor

Officers:

Rebecca Dunne, Clare Flanagan, Deb Poole and Amanda de Warr

Committee Services Officer:

Debbie Parker-Jones

136. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Pat Witherspoon.

137. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

138. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Work Programme

It was noted that the following reports which had been scheduled for consideration at the meeting had been deferred to a later date:

- Reorganisation and Change Policy – rescheduled to July;
- Disposal of Matchborough West Community Centre – July;
- Leisure Services Review – potential item for June meeting but to be considered in July;
- Modifications to the Borough of Redditch Plan No.4 – September; and
- Applying Article 4 Directions to the Council's Schedule of Locally Listed Buildings – December.

.....
Chair

Executive Committee

Tuesday, 9 June 2015

139. MINUTES**RESOLVED that**

the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 14th April 2015 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

140. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Committee received the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 7th April 2015.

It was noted that there were no recommendations to consider as the recommendation at Minute No. 97 relating to the Future Management of Redditch Market – Pre-Scrutiny had been dealt with by the Executive at its last meeting.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 7th April 2015 be received and noted.

141. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY POLICY

Members were asked to agree for recommendation to full Council an updated Equal Opportunity Policy.

The Policy incorporated a specific Disability Policy and consolidated ongoing work around the Equality Act 2010, which had included a series of workshops during 2013 and 2014 developed after different elements of the Equality Act had come into force.

All of the Council's trade unions had been consulted on the Policy and were in agreement with this. The Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task Group had also seen and supported the Policy.

Officers confirmed that the Policy applied to Council employees aged 18 years or over, and that younger employees, including for example apprentices, were subject to separate legislation. Members proposed that the Policy be amended to reflect that separate legislation applied to any employees under the age of 18.

RECOMMENDED that

subject to an amendment to the Policy to reflect that employees under the age of 18 were subject to separate

legislation, the Equal Opportunity Policy appended to the report be approved and adopted.

142. COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

The Committee received a report which proposed no change to the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2016/17, which Members were required to review annually. The report also set out data in relation to the take up of the Hardship Fund and other measures which showed the impact of the Scheme on collection rates and recovery action.

Members were advised that there had been only a small increase in the number of rent accounts in arrears, with Housing Officers having reported that it was not possible to make a clear link between the changes to Council Tax Support and rent arrears. Recovery action was said to be in line with what was to be expected when compared with other authorities.

Less than half of the 2014/15 Hardship Fund budget had been spent, which again was in keeping with other authorities who had introduced a similar scheme. The surplus of the budget would carry over to 2015/16 and Officers had worked proactively with a total of 211 customers through the Hardship Scheme. In doing so they had provided budget advice and support to identify where other financial support could be offered. Where possible, the Council avoided taking bailiff action against those affected by the change to support and instead attempted to establish alternative means of collecting Council Tax. Members expressed their gratitude to all Officers involved with the Scheme, which provided transitional support and assistance to the most vulnerable.

In response to a Member question, Officers stated that Universal Credit had not impacted or been particularly problematic at this stage, with the only notable issue relating to the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) computer systems. Officers were working closely with the DWP on people data to provide relevant information.

RESOLVED that

- 1) no changes be made to the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2016/17; and**
- 2) the contents of the report in relation to take up of the Hardship Fund and other measures data be noted.**

143. WRITE OFF OF DEBTS 2014-15

Members were presented with a report detailing the level of write offs of debts due to the Council for the 2014/15 financial year.

The current bad debts provisions were noted, which Officers advised were adequate in relation to the levels of write offs and outstanding debt.

Timing issues, for example when invoices were sent out, together with differing debt types were factors which did not make it easy to compare debt levels on a year-on-year basis. The introduction of the Council's new finance system in March 2015 had also impacted on available data. Officers stated however that the authority's level of write offs were relatively low and represented a similar picture to other authorities.

Non Domestic Rates and the liquidation/winding of businesses represented the highest level of write offs. Whilst Officers made every effort to pursue debts before writing them off collection rates had fallen in this area as recovery action might not be pursued so rigorously where to do so might create a business more problems. Officers worked with the North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration team where necessary to determine the best course of action in such cases.

Officers adjudged when it was either not reasonable or uneconomic to recover debts. Work on housing benefits overpayments in particular was extremely labour intensive and there was a requirement for the Council to act on data received from HM Revenue and Customs within a set timeframe, with failure to do so resulting in an error being logged against the Council.

RESOLVED that

the contents of the report be noted.

144. MINUTES / REFERRALS - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, EXECUTIVE PANELS ETC.

There were no outstanding referrals for the Committee to consider.

145. ADVISORY PANELS - UPDATE REPORT

RESOLVED that

the report and update be noted.

Executive
Committee

Tuesday, 9 June 2015

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 7.36 pm

.....
Chair

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE LEADER'S WORK PROGRAMME

6 July 2015 to 31 October 2015

(published as at 8th June 2015)

This Plan gives details of items on which key decisions are likely to be taken in the coming four months by the Borough Council's Executive Committee.

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

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

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

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL


*making
a
difference*

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

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

“Key Decisions” are ones which are likely to:

- (i) result in the Council incurring expenditure, foregoing income or the making of savings in excess of £50,000 or which are otherwise significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or**
- (ii) be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in the area comprising two or more wards in the Borough;**
- (iii) involve any proposal to cease to provide a Council service (other than a temporary cessation of service of not more than 6 months).**

The Work Programme is available for inspection free of charge at the Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH from 9am to 5pm Mondays to Fridays; or on the Council's website (www.redditchbc.gov.uk).

If you wish to make representations on the proposed decision you are encouraged to get in touch with the relevant report author as soon as possible before the proposed date of the decision. Contact details are provided. Alternatively you may write to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, The Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH or e-mail: democratic@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

The Executive Committee's meetings are held regularly at 7pm on Tuesday evenings at the Town Hall. They are open to the public, except when confidential information is being discussed. If you wish to attend for a particular matter, it is advisable to check with the Democratic Services Team on (01527) 64252, ext: 3257 to make sure it is going ahead as planned. If you have any other queries, Democratic Services Officers will be happy to advise you.

The full Council meets in accordance the Council's Calendar of Meetings. Meetings commence at 7.00pm.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Councillor Bill Hartnett	Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership & Partnership
Councillor Greg Chance	Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration, Economic Development, Public Transport
Councillor John Fisher	Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management
Councillor Yvonne Smith	Portfolio Holder for Community Safety & Regulatory Services
Councillor Mark Shurmer	Portfolio Holder for Housing
Councillor Debbie Taylor	Portfolio Holder for Local Environment & Health
Councillor Pat Witherspoon	Portfolio Holder for Leisure & Tourism
Councillor Juliet Brunner	
Councillor Brandon Clayton	

Decision including Whether it is a key Decision	Decision Taker Date of Decision	Details of Exempt information (if any)	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Equal Opportunity Policy Key: No	Executive 9 Jun 2015 Council 15 Jun 2015		Report of the Head of Transformation and Organisational Development.	Rebecca Dunne, Policy Manager Tel: 01527 881616
Council Tax Support Scheme Key: Yes	Executive 9 Jun 2015		Report of the Head of Customer Access and Financial Support	Amanda de Warr, Head of Customer Access and Financial Support Tel: 01527 64252
Write off of Debts Key: No	Executive 9 Jun 2015		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Amanda de Warr, Head of Customer Access and Financial Support Tel: 01527 64252
Reorganisation and Change Policy Key: No	Executive 14 Jul 2015 Council 27 Jul 2015		Report of the Head of Transformation and Organisational Development	Deb Poole, Head of Business Transformation and Organisational Development Tel: 01527 881256
Future Management of Redditch Outdoor Market Key: No	Executive 14 Apr 2015 Executive 14 Jul 2015		Report of the Chief Executive Background paper - Consultant's report on options for the future operation of the market	Steve Singleton Tel: 01562 732168

Decision including Whether it is a key Decision	Decision Taker Date of Decision	Details of Exempt information (if any)	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Economic Priorities for Redditch Key: No	Executive 14 Jul 2015		Report of the head of Economic Development and Regeneration	Dean Piper Tel: 01562 732192
Disposal of Matchborough West Community Centre Key: No	Executive 14 Jul 2015		Report of the Head of Customer Access and Financial Support	Amanda de Warr, Head of Customer Access and Financial Support Tel: 01527 64252
Review of Operation of Leisure Services Key: No	Executive 14 Jul 2015 Council 27 Jul 2015	May be exempt information relating to finance and staffing	Report of the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services Back ground paper - Independent Consultant's report on options for the future management arrangements	Sue Hanley, Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director (Leisure, Environmental & Community Services) Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3601
Risk based verification Key: No	Executive 14 Jul 2015		Report of the Head of Customer Access and Financial Support	Amanda de Warr, Head of Customer Access and Financial Support Tel: 01527 64252
Consolidated Revenue and Capital Outturn and Financial Reserves Statement Key: No	Executive 14 Jul 2015 Council 27 Jul 2015		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Sam Morgan, Financial Services Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3790

Decision including Whether it is a key Decision	Decision Taker Date of Decision	Details of Exempt information (if any)	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Tower at site of former Methodist Church, Headless Cross Key: Yes	Executive Not before 14th Jul 2015		Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Emma Newfield, Planning Assistant Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3214
Landscape Improvements to the Town Centre Phase II Key: No	Executive, Council Not before 14th Jul 2015		Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Lyndsey Berry, Town Centre Co-Ordinator/Planning Officer Tel: 01527 587002
Job Evaluation Key: Yes	Executive 14 Jul 2015		Report of the Executive Director, Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Worcestershire Regulatory Services - review Key: No	Executive 14 Jul 2015 Council 27 Jul 2015		Report of the acting head of Regulatory Services	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Borough of Redditch Plan no.4 - Modifications Key: No	Executive 8 Sep 2015 Council 21 Sep 2015		Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Emma Baker, Development Plans Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3034

Decision including Whether it is a key Decision	Decision Taker Date of Decision	Details of Exempt information (if any)	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Finance Monitoring - Quarter 1, April - June 2015 Key: No	Executive 8 Sep 2015		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Sam Morgan, Financial Services Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3790
Update on the Medium Term Financial Plan Key: No	Executive 8 Sep 2015		Report of the Executive Director, Finance and Resources	
Applying Article 4 directions to The Council's schedule of locally listed buildings Key: Yes	Executive Not before 12th Jan 2016		Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Emma Newfield, Planning Assistant Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3214
Tenancy Policy Key: No	Executive date tbc		Report of the Head of Housing	

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

7th July 2015

WORK PROGRAMME

(Report of the Chief Executive)

Date of Meeting	Subject Matter	Officer(s) Responsible for report
ALL MEETINGS	REGULAR ITEMS	(CHIEF EXECUTIVE)
	Minutes of previous meeting Consideration of the Executive Committee Work Programme Consideration of Executive Committee key decisions Call-ins (if any) Pre-scrutiny (if any) Referrals from Council or Executive Committee, etc. (if any) Task Groups / Short, Sharp Review Groups - feedback Committee Work Programme	Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive
	REGULAR ITEMS Update on the work of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel. Quarterly Tracker Report	Chair of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

7th July 2015

	<p>REGULAR ITEMS</p> <p>Updates on the work of the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Bi-Annual Monitoring Report – Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy</p>	<p>Redditch Borough Council representative on the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p>
OTHER ITEMS - DATE FIXED		
7th July 2015	Increasing Physical Activity in Worcestershire – scrutiny proposal from Worcestershire County Council	
7th July 2015	Leisure Services Pre-scrutiny – Stage 3: consideration of the <i>Review of Operation of Leisure Services</i> report	Relevant lead Director
7th July 2015	Provision of Support Networks for the LGBT Community Task Group – final report	Councillor Baker
7th July 2015	Redditch Outdoor Market – Pre-scrutiny	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
September / October 2015	Committee Discussion – agreeing preferred approach to budget scrutiny for the 2016/17 budget setting process.	Relevant lead Director
1st September 2015 (provisional date)	Tackling Obesity Task Group - Feedback	Councillor Potter

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

7th July 2015

OTHER ITEMS - DATE NOT FIXED		
	Housing Benefits - Presentation	Relevant lead Head of Service
	Housing Provision - Presentation	Relevant lead Head of Service

