



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thu 26 Oct
2017
7.00 pm

Committee Room Two
Town Hall
Redditch

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

*making
a
difference*

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

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

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: (01527) 64252 (Ext. 3268) or 881443
e.mail: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk /
a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk**



Overview and Scrutiny

Thursday, 26th October, 2017

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

Committee

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs:	Jane Potter (Chair)	Gareth Prosser
	Gay Hopkins (Vice-Chair)	Paul Swansborough
	Matthew Dormer	Jennifer Wheeler
	Andrew Fry	Nina Wood-Ford
	Pattie Hill	

1. Apologies and named substitutes

2. Declarations of interest and of Party Whip

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

3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 10)

4. Local Discretionary Relief Scheme - Pre-Scrutiny (to follow - Revenue Services Manager)

5. Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group - Final Report (Councillor Jane Potter) (Pages 11 - 30)

6. Executive Committee Minutes and Scrutiny of the Executive Committee's Work Programme - Selecting Items for Scrutiny (Pages 31 - 50)

7. Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme (Pages 51 - 54)

8. Scrutiny Task Groups, Short Sharp Reviews and Working Groups - Update Reports

- Budget Scrutiny Working Group – Chair Councillor Jane Potter
- Civil Contingencies Review – Chair, Councillor Gareth Prosser
- Mental Health Services for young People – Chair, Councillor Nina Wood-Ford
- Performance Scrutiny Working Group – Chair, Councillor Matthew Dormer

9. External Scrutiny Bodies (Councillor Wood-Ford)

- West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) Overview and Scrutiny Committee; and
- Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC)

Overview and Scrutiny

Thursday, 26th October, 2017

10. Exclusion of the press and public

Should it be necessary, in the opinion of the Chief Executive, 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 3 - financial or business affairs
- Para 4 - labour relations matters;
- Para 7 - the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime;

and may need to be considered as ‘exempt’.

11. Future Leisure Service Provision (Councillor Potter and the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Resources) (Pages 55 - 86)

During consideration of this item Members will consider the following two reports regarding future operating arrangements for Leisure and Cultural Services:

- a) Leisure Service Provision Short Sharp Review – final report and presentation (attached)
- b) Leisure and Cultural Services Options Review – report and presentation (to follow – may be partially exempt)

Based on consideration of both reports Members will be asked to consider whether to make any recommendations regarding the future delivery of Leisure and Cultural Services to the Executive Committee.

12. Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel - Chair's Update (Councillor Matthew Dormer) (Pages 87 - 96)



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Gay Hopkins (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Anita Clayton (substituting for councillor Jane Potter), Natalie Brookes (substituting for Councillor Andrew Fry), Matthew Dormer, Pattie Hill, Gareth Prosser, Paul Swansborough, Jennifer Wheeler and Nina Wood-Ford

Also Present:

Councillor Debbie Chance (attending in her capacity as Portfolio Holder for the Local Environment)
Councillors Michael Chalk and Greg Chance

Officers:

Sue Hanley, Guy Revans and Andy Morris

Democratic Services Officers:

Jess Bayley and Amanda Scarce

27. ELECTION OF CHAIR

A nomination for the position of Chair was received for Councillor Jane Potter and Members agreed that she should be appointed the Chair of the Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.

Following Councillor Potter's appointment as Chair of the Committee a vacancy arose in the position of Vice Chair of the Committee. A nomination for the position of Vice Chair was received for Councillor Gay Hopkins and Members agreed that she should be appointed the Vice Chair of the Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.

RESOLVED that

- 1) **Councillor Jane Potter be appointed Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year; and**

.....
Chair

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

- 2) **Councillor Gay Hopkins be appointed Vice Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year.**

28. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Andrew Fry and Jane Potter with it being confirmed that Councillors Natalie Brookes and Anita Clayton were attending as their respective substitutes.

29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

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

30. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 4TH JULY 2017

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 4th July 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

31. SEASONAL GARDEN WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE - PRE-SCRUTINY (HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES - TO FOLLOW)

A detailed report and presentation was presented by the Head of Environmental Services and the Environmental Operations Supervisor, which explained the business case for the introduction of a Garden Waste Scheme in Redditch with effect from February 2018.

The presentation covered in detail a number of areas, including:

- Why the Council wanted to introduce a Garden Waste system in Redditch, including expanding the services available to residents and increasing revenue and recycling rates.
- The results of the survey which had been carried out both online via social media and postal responses, which showed the demand was there for such a scheme.
- The recycling rates for the Borough which for composting was the lowest in the County at 2.18%.
- The cost of the service and the projected revenue which could be achieved from this.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

- How the introduction of the service would reduce the volume in the domestic waste stream.
- How the system would work in Redditch – it would be operated by Bromsgrove District Council’s experienced Garden Waste Crews.
- The service would commence on 27th February 2018 and run until the end of November 2018, with 20 collections on alternate weeks throughout this period.
- Information was provided on what could be included within the garden waste brown bin.
- How the scheme would be promoted and the leaflets that would be provided to residents, together with details of information available on the website.
- How residents could sign up to the scheme and the social media campaign that would run from October 2017. Sign up could be through the website, by phone or at the One Stop Shops.
- The first 2,000 people would receive a reduced set up fee of £10 before 31st January 2018. Payment was by direct debit only.

Following presentation of the report Members raised a number of questions, which were responded to by the Officers. In particular Members raised concerns that a similar scheme had been piloted before and questioned whether in areas where only one or two residents signed up this was value for money. It was also noted that some people might not be able to fill a whole bin or might need more than one. Officers confirmed that it was possible for residents to “club” together and share a bin or for a household to have more than one bin.

As the recycling figures for composting were low, Members asked whether the Council should be doing more to promote composting and the availability of composters. Officers confirmed that this was an ongoing campaign which was promoted throughout the Borough in conjunction with the County Council. This provided an additional service for those already composting.

Whilst appreciating the data in respect of the levels of recycling, Members were mindful that the demographics of Redditch were very different to other areas, which were much more rural. Members also asked whether there was a limit to the number of bins that could be issued and the system could cope with. The Head of Environmental Services explained that initially there was capacity for 4,000 with the option to add another 800 if necessary. The initial set up cost was discussed together with details of the discount scheme and the option for this to be reduced further or the

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

period extended, Members also queried when the Council could see the benefit of the revenue that could potentially be raised and it was confirmed that this should be quite quickly following the first year of the scheme. It was confirmed that the set-up fee was only payable for the first year and the subscription would roll over to the next year, with a letter being sent confirming this each year.

Members raised concerns around whether some residents would want to have a third bin to have to store and/or put out and officers advised that this was simply offering residents another form of recycling and it was their choice as to whether they wished to take up the offer. It was commented that given the amount of time spent taking rubbish to the recycling centre the new scheme provided good value for money.

The Head of Environmental Services responded to the concern raised by Members in respect of the scheme which had been exploited previously and it was explained that there had been greater financial risk due to it being set up by the Council. However as this scheme would be delivered by Bromsgrove District Council's existing team that risk was greatly reduced. The vehicles used also had a much lower environmental impact and this was a much more positive scheme going forward.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) from March 2018 Redditch Borough Council will introduce, and Bromsgrove District Council will run as part of the shared services agreement for Environmental Services, a seasonal (March to November inclusive) garden waste service on behalf of Redditch Borough Council;**
- 2) the charge will be £45 for the initial season to be increased in line with fees and charges as appropriate;**
- 3) a set-up fee of £20 per customer is charged in the first year of service and for new customers in each following year;**
- 4) an introductory offer of a £10 set-up fee will be used to encourage early sign up before 31st January 2018;**
- 5) the Head of Environmental Services, in consultation with the designated Portfolio Holder, has authority to temporarily reduce or remove the set-up fee as**

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

promotional tool to increase and encourage subscriptions;

- 6) should the Recommended Option be pursued, a capital commitment for the next four years of £31,000 in year 1 and £15,000 in years 2 to 4 is to be included in the capital programme;
- 7) once the maximum number of customers has been approached a customer waiting list will be employed. Officers will bring a further report and business case with options for extending the service should it be required;
- 8) the chargeable Orange Sack Service is formally retired as part of the new service charges; and
- 9) a communication plan is devised and implemented to advise residents of the changes to RBC waste collection service and the requirement to use brown bins only for garden waste.

32. HOMELESSNESS SHORT, SHARP REVIEW - REPORT (COUNCILLOR WOOD-FORD)

Councillor Wood-Ford gave a short presentation which summarised the Homelessness Short, Sharp Review's final report and recommendations. Members were advised that Recommendation 1 had already been agreed, recommendation 3 was for the Committee to agree and Recommendations 2, 4 and 5 were to report to the Executive Committee for its consideration.

Following receipt of the presentation Members discussed a number of areas in detail, including:

- The Housing First Schemes – concerns were raised as to where the funding would come from for such a scheme and how it would help. It was explained that it would be particularly helpful for single males over the age of 40, as it had been highlighted that support was lacking for this group of people, with currently the main offer being within hostels and outside of the Borough. The Deputy Chief Executive suggested that funding would be sought at a national level through the West Midlands Combined Authority and it would be through this process that a scheme would be developed.
- Members of the review commented that they had been pleasantly surprised at the amount of support which was available within the Borough. However there was also a

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

group of people for whom help was available but who chose not to accept it.

- Swanswell – details around this organisation were provided in respect of their substance abuse programmes and the group had been disappointed that they had been unable to arrange an interview with them. Their work was of such importance that the group felt it would be most useful for the Committee to invite them to attend a future meeting.

In summing up, Councillor Wood-Ford highlighted how impressed the group had been with the work of the Food Bank and the support it provided, which covered a number of other areas. Thanks were given to the group for their detailed short sharp review and it was noted, for future reference, that holding such a review over the summer period had not been ideal due to holiday commitments. Councillor Wood-Ford also took the opportunity to thank the Democratic Services Officer for her hard work over a very short period of time.

Following discussions it was also requested that the MP be asked to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, the Rt. Hon. David Gauke, MP.

RESOLVED that

Swanswell be invited to attend a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to deliver a presentation outlining the services they provide to residents in Redditch.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) **Redditch Borough Council should take part in any opportunity to deliver Housing First in properties in the Borough. This should include applying to participate in any Housing first pilot schemes operated by the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA);**
- 2) **the Leader of the Council should write to the Secretary of State for Work and pensions, the Rt. Hon. David Gauke MP, urging him to end the freeze on Local housing Allowance (LHA) rates; and**
- 3) **the Council's Communications and Arts and Events teams should notify the CAB of any forthcoming events in Redditch which they could attend to promote their services and heighten awareness of their services in the Borough.**

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

The Committee NOTED that

the draft Redditch Borough Council Housing Allocations Policy has been adopted by the Council.

33. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES AND SCRUTINY OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE'S WORK PROGRAMME - SELECTING ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY

The Committee considered the minutes from the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 11th September 2017. Members noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recommendation in respect of the Housing Allocations Policy had been approved by the Executive Committee.

Members also considered the content of the Executive Committee Work Programme for the period 1st October 2017 to 31st January 2018. Officers explained that the Committee and Budget Scrutiny Working Group were already scheduled to pre-scrutinise a number of items on the work programme. Upon questioning Officers confirmed that the Matchborough and Winyates District Centre Redevelopment Consultation was already scheduled for pre-scrutiny at a meeting in December 2017.

34. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee noted that an extra meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would take place on 10th October 2017. This meeting would provide Members with an opportunity to reconsider the Leisure Services Provision Short Sharp Review Group's findings together with a chance to pre-scrutinise Officers' suggestions in respect of the future delivery of leisure services.

35. TASK GROUPS, SHORT SHARP REVIEWS AND WORKING GROUPS - PROGRESS REPORTS

The following progress reports were provided for Members' consideration:

a) Budget Scrutiny Working Group

In the absence of the Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Working Group, Councillor Jane Potter, Officers advised that at the latest meeting of the group Members had received an update on the contracts that had been issued in the first quarter of the financial year. Members had also discussed in detail the

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

financial information required to enable the group to make a constructive contribution to the Council's budget setting process during the year.

b) Civil Contingencies Short Sharp Review

Officers confirmed that Councillors Matthew Dormer, Gareth Prosser and Yvonne Smith had been appointed by their group leaders to sit on the review. A nomination was received for the position of Chair of the review in respect of Councillor Gareth Prosser.

c) Mental Health Services for Young People Task Group

The Committee was advised that the Task Group had convened in July to discuss questions to include in a questionnaire for local schools about Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHE) lessons. The group had agreed to postpone distribution of the questionnaires until September when the school holidays would finish. The group would reconvene in due course and report back their findings to the Committee.

d) Performance Scrutiny Working Group

Following the resignation of the previous Chair of the group from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members were advised that there was a vacancy which needed to be filled by a member of the Committee. A nomination was received for the position of Chair of the Working Group in respect of Councillor Matthew Dormer.

Councillor Dormer proceeded to present a report on behalf of the group in respect of the need for an After Care Social Worker to be based at Redditch Town Hall. This had arisen following a meeting with Officers at which Members had discussed the Council's arrangements for housing care leavers in the Borough. It was confirmed that currently this service was only available in Worcester and that there were no financial implications to the Council arising from this recommendation.

RESOLVED that

- 1) Councillors Matthew Dormer, Gareth Prosser and Yvonne Smith be confirmed as Members of the Civil Contingencies Short Sharp Review group;**

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

- 2) Councillor Gareth Prosser be appointed Chair of the Civil Contingencies Short Sharp Review Group; and
- 3) Councillor Matthew Dormer be appointed Chair of the Performance Scrutiny Working Group for the remainder of the municipal year.

RECOMMENDED that

an after Care Social Worker should be provided with a base to work in the Housing Options team's office at Redditch Town Hall in order to work with care leavers in Redditch.

36. EXTERNAL SCRUTINY BODIES - UPDATE REPORTS (COUNCILLOR NINA WOOD-FORD)

The Committee received updates in respect of the following external scrutiny bodies from Councillor Nina Wood-Ford

- a) West Midlands Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Wood-Ford confirmed that there had not been a meeting of the Committee since 4th July 2017. The next meeting of the Committee was due to take place on 12th September 2017.

- b) Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC)

Councillor Wood-Ford explained that there had been two meetings of HOSC since the last Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting. The first had been held on 19th July and had followed the most recent CQC rating of the Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust being inadequate. There had appeared to be some positives and a number of areas had been rated as very good, there were improvements to the work force culture, greater accountability and improvement to the training, recruitment and retention of staff. It was believed that 34 new consultants had been employed over the three hospital sites.

Transport issues had been discussed following the removal of the free bus service and it was anticipated that voluntary drivers would be used with the cost being less than that of a taxi. The service would include home pick-ups and Malvern

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 7th September, 2017

CAB was already providing some services to Worcester Royal Hospital.

An additional £29m funding had been confirmed and would be spent on a number of projects including a bridge between the main hospital and the Aconbury West wing and take the beds from the Mental Health Unit at Aconbury East at a cost of £16m. This project would take between 18 and 24 months to complete. A similar project had previously been carried out in Kidderminster. It was understood that there had also been a survey carried out of those who were awaiting treatment in corridors, following the high demand on accident and emergency services.

The second meeting had involved meeting with the new Chairman and Chief Executive, who appeared to be knowledgeable about what was needed to address many of the problems faced by the Trust. Members discussed a number of areas which had been reported in the local press, including the need for more theatres, elective surgery taking place at the Alexandra Hospital and the fact that the Trust remained in special measures.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.22 pm

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

26th October 2017

STAFF SURVEY JOINT SCRUTINY TASK GROUP

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

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

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

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to **RESOLVE** that

- 1) a member of the Overview and Scrutiny function be appointed to the role of Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff;
(Recommendation a in the report)
- 2) a quarterly update on the Programme Board's Action Plan be received by the Overview and Scrutiny Board/Committee;
(Recommendation c in the report)
- 3) the Performance Scrutiny (RBC) and Measures Dashboard (BDC) Working Groups' terms of reference are updated to include an area covering performance management processes, performance target and objective setting across both authorities. (It is envisaged that this would be achieved through joint meetings being held on a regular basis; and
(Recommendation d in the report)

To **RECOMMEND** that

- 4) The Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff and the relevant Portfolio Holder from each Council assist in the formulation of all future staff surveys and attend staff briefings.
(Recommendation b in the report)

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

26th October 2017

3. KEY ISSUES

- 3.1 For the first time, Redditch Borough and Bromsgrove District Councils have worked together to carry out a joint scrutiny task group. The Staff Survey was an area which Bromsgrove Members had considered on a number of occasions in previous years, having first considered the subject back in 2013. Following receipt of the results of the second survey at a meeting on 19th September 2016 Members agreed, that as little progress appeared to have been made on a number of areas of concern, it was something which needed further investigation. The Board agreed this would be suitable for joint scrutiny as the majority of staff are part of a shared service.
- 3.2 A topic proposal and a brief joint scrutiny protocol were considered by the Bromsgrove Overview and Scrutiny Board at a meeting on 31st October 2016. Following the agreement of the Board the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board, Councillors Luke Mallett and Shirley Webb, together with the nominated Chairman of the Task Group, Councillor Steve Colella, attended the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 25th October 2016 to present a proposal to undertake joint scrutiny. The Redditch Committee supported the proposal and the joint Scrutiny Task Group was formed.
- 3.3 As it was the first time joint working had been carried out both Overview and Scrutiny functions agreed that the membership would be taken from the main Committees on this occasion, with three Members being appointed from each Council. Meetings were held at alternate locations to ensure balance in the conduct of the review,
- 3.4 The Bromsgrove Overview and Scrutiny Board considered the Task Group's recommendations at a meeting on 22nd August 2017. During this meeting the Board endorsed all of the Task Group's proposals.
- 3.5 Bromsgrove District Council's Cabinet subsequently considered the group's recommendations at a meeting on 6th September 2017. The Cabinet, like the Executive Committee in Redditch, was asked to make a decision on one recommendation (recommendation b in the main report). The Cabinet endorsed this recommendation though in an amended form which did not make reference to the Portfolio Holder. This was because the relevant Portfolio Holder, the Leader of the Council, suggested that this role was more appropriate for a scrutiny Member to undertake.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**26th October 2017

Financial Implications

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

Legal Implications

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

Service/Operation Implications

- 3.8 As the review was proposed by Bromsgrove's Overview and Scrutiny Board the decision was taken for Bromsgrove to take a lead on facilitating the review. A Bromsgrove Member was also appointed Chair of the Task Group, with a Redditch Member, Councillor Jane Potter, being appointed Vice Chair.
- 3.9 As this was the first joint Task Group to only involve Members from Redditch Borough and Bromsgrove District Councils Members may feel that there are lessons that can be learned from this exercise which could be applied to future reviews.
- 3.10 Overview and scrutiny is a key part of the Council's democratic decision making process and enables non-executive Members of the Council to put forward recommendations for policy development, policy review and service improvement.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.11 No customer or equalities and diversity implications have been identified.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

No risks have been identified.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group Report

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

See attached report for details.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**26th October 2017

AUTHORS OF REPORT

Name: Amanda Scarce & Jess Bayley – Democratic Services
Officers

E Mail: a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk /
jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Tel: 01527 881443

STAFF SURVEY JOINT SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REPORT**JUNE/JULY 2017**

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

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

1. Executive Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cllr Steve Colella
Chairman

2. Recommendations

The group recommends:

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

3. Introduction, and Background Information

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

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

4. Observations

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

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

5. Terms of Reference

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

Scrutiny of the Survey Results

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Consider how to increase the response rates in future

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bench mark survey with other similar organisations and marque organisation

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

Establish reasons for the low response rates

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

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

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

6. Lead Member for Staff

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

7. Conclusions and Future Plans

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

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

Staff

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

Council

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

8. Supporting Documentation

Appendix 1 – Topic Proposals

Appendix 2 – Summary of Meetings

APPENDIX 1



Bromsgrove
District Council
www.bromsgrove.gov.uk

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY TOPIC PROPOSAL

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

Completed forms should be returned to scrutiny@bromsgrove.gov.uk – Democratic Services, Bromsgrove District Council.

Name of Proposer: Cllr Steve Colella	
Tel No: 07758 739901	Email: s.colella@bromsgrove.gov.uk
Date: 21 st September 2016	

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

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

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

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

Potential Joint Working Arrangements

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

Appoint a Vice Chairman (from the other Council).

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

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

Venue: alternate between each Council.

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

APPENDIX 2

Summary of Meetings**Meeting 1 (22/11/16)**

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

Meeting 2 (07/12/16)

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

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

Meeting 3 (06/02/17)

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

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

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

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

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

Meeting 4 (22/02/17)

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

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

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

Meeting 5 (22/03/17)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Meeting 6 (26/06/17)

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank



Executive Committee

Tuesday, 12 September 2017

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Bill Hartnett (Chair), Councillor Greg Chance (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Joe Baker, Juliet Brunner, Debbie Chance, Brandon Clayton, John Fisher, Mark Shurmer and Pat Witherspoon

Also Present:

Councillor Michael Chalk (observing)

Officers:

Mike Dunphy, Clare Flanagan, John Godwin, Sue Hanley, Julie Heyes, Andy Morris, Jayne Pickering, Deb Poole, Guy Revans, Samantha Skilbeck, Becky Talbot, Anna Wardell-Hill and Judith Willis

Democratic Services Officer:

Debbie Parker-Jones

35. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All of the Councillor membership of the Executive Committee declared an Other Disclosable Interest in Agenda Item 6 – Leisure and Cultural Services Concessions Policy – as detailed at Minute No. 40 below.

37. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Work Programme

The following reports which were due to be considered, or possibly considered, at the meeting had been deferred to a later date:

- Commercialisation and Financial Strategy;
- One Public Estate Exercise; and
- Whistleblowing Policy.

.....
Chair

The Applying Article 4 Directions to Non-designated Heritage Assets report, which had previously appeared on the Work Programme for consideration by the Executive in December 2017, had been removed from the Work Programme at the request of Officers.

Overview and Scrutiny matters

It was noted that the Garden Waste Service report at Agenda Item 7 had been pre-scrutinised by the Overview and Scrutiny ('O&S') Committee on 7th September. As the O&S Committee had unanimously endorsed all of the report recommendations there was no O&S minute extract for consideration by the Executive Committee.

It was also noted that there were no outstanding recommendations for the Executive Committee to consider from the 4th July 2017 O&S Minutes at Agenda Item 13, as the recommendation at Minute No. 25 – Council Housing Allocations Policy – had been dealt with at the 11th July 2017 Executive.

38. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HELD ON 11TH JULY 2017

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 11th July 2017 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

39. REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO CONSULTATIONS ON WYRE FOREST LOCAL PLAN REVIEW PREFERRED OPTION AND DRAFT WORCESTERSHIRE RAIL INVESTMENT STRATEGY

Members considered the informal Officer responses submitted to Wyre Forest District Council ('WFDC') on the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review Preferred Option consultation, and to Worcestershire County Council ('WCC') on the Worcestershire Draft Rail Investment Strategy.

Due to the scheduling of the Executive Committee meetings it had not been possible for the responses to be considered by Members in advance of the deadlines for comments. It was noted that both consultations were non-statutory and that should further responses need to be submitted it should be possible to do this through the ongoing engagement the Council had with both WFDC and WCC.

Officers explained the background to the informal responses and the issues with these in relation to the town. In both cases, whilst Officers were not directly objecting to the documents it was felt that wider strategies needed to be developed as some elements had not been included in these. Redditch Borough Council needed to work with WFDC and WCC to develop the strategies in order for all parties to have a full understanding of all of the issues. The omission in the Draft Rail Strategy of any reference to an 'express' train from Redditch to Birmingham was noted, which it was stated had previously been discussed at various forums.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) **the draft Officer response to the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review Preferred Option, as attached at Appendix A to the report, and as submitted to Wyre Forest District Council as the formal consultation response, be approved; and**
- 2) **the draft Officer response to the Worcestershire Draft Rail Investment Strategy, as attached at Appendix B to the report, and as submitted to Worcestershire County Council as the formal consultation response, be approved; and**

RESOLVED that

- 3) **the report be noted.**

40. LEISURE AND CULTURAL SERVICES CONCESSIONS POLICY

The Committee considered a detailed report on the introduction of a new concessionary policy for Leisure and Cultural Services. An updated list of recommendations and Section 6.2 of the report were tabled at the meeting.

Officers explained the background to the review, which had initially begun as a review of the current Reddicard scheme as part of the latest budget round. Officers highlighted the main elements of the report, including the key considerations and proposals detailed therein, and responded to Members' questions.

It was noted that the Council would still be the most generous authority in the area in terms of leisure concessions. The changes were not aimed at raising money as the majority of the headline prices would reduce under the proposals. The focus was on affordability and the greatest areas of need, with charges applying to those people who had the ability to pay for services; an approach which was supported by the majority of 1,650 survey respondents. This was important to ensure that the health and wellbeing benefits

that could be achieved by being physically active could continue to be offered to all residents, and to ensure that price was not a barrier to participation at Council-run services.

Officers advised that the somewhat complex Reddicard pricing structure had made the Council slightly uncompetitive, with the result being that pricing in some areas was above market rate. Services had to be sustainable in the long term and the Council needed to remain competitive in what was an extremely competitive and ever changing leisure market.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) the new Leisure and Cultural Services Concessions Policy be approved and Officers make the required changes to increase the disability related concessions from 25% and 50% for In Work and Out of Work benefits to 50% and 100% respectively, as shown in the updated table at Section 6.2 of the report – as tabled at the Executive Committee and appended to these minutes. This change will also be made at Section 6.3 of the report where golf fees for disabled users will be based upon a 50% and 100% concession approach where applicable;**
- 2) Option 2, which maintains free of charge swimming for under 16's and introduces charges for over 60's swimming, be implemented as part of the review. This option will also include an affordability test to support those who need financial assistance to access services;**
- 3) the revised Fees and Charges supporting the new Concessions Policy, which will run from 1st January 2018 to 31st December 2018, be approved based on Appendix 2 to the report and in conjunction with list of variable prices shown as Option 2 in Section 6.1 of the report;**
- 4) the Head of Service variance be adjusted to 30% and responsibility for Officer authorisation of variances be delegated to service managers in agreement with the Leisure and Cultural Services Head of Service; and**
- 5) authority be delegated to the Leisure and Cultural Services Head of Service to vary the Concessions Policy in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder within the first 12 months of operation, to address any unforeseen issues that emerge.**

Executive Committee

Tuesday, 12 September 2017

(Prior to consideration of this item, all of the Councillor membership of the Executive Committee declared Other Disclosable Interests in this matter by virtue of their memberships of / links to the organisations detailed below, which currently held meetings at the Town Hall and who were not charged for room hire. All of the Councillors remained in the room and participated in the consideration of, and voting on, this matter.

Councillor	Organisation
Joe Baker	Labour Party Friends of Gruchet-le-Valasse Friends of Auxerre
Juliet Brunner	Conservative Party
Debbie Chance	Labour Party Friends of Gruchet-le-Valasse
Greg Chance	Labour Party Friends of Gruchet-le-Valasse
Brandon Clayton	Conservative Party
John Fisher	Labour Party Redditch One World Link
Bill Hartnett	Labour Party Board of Redditch Co-operative Homes Friends of Gruchet-le-Valasse Friends of Auxerre
Mark Shurmer	Labour Party
Pat Witherspoon	Labour Party Redditch Older People's Forum Board of Redditch Co-operative Homes Friends of Gruchet-le-Valasse Friends of Auxerre

41. REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL GARDEN WASTE SERVICE

Members considered a report on the proposed introduction of a seasonal (March to November inclusive) garden waste service for the town. Officers presented the report and gave a presentation to Members on the key elements of the service, in particular on the financial elements of this, and responded to Members' questions in this regard. As detailed under Leader's Announcements it was noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had pre-scrutinised this report on 7th September 2017 and had unanimously endorsed all of the report recommendations.

It was noted that the results of two surveys undertaken by Officers showed that there was demand for the service, with 72% of 1000 social media and postal respondents being in favour of this. In relation to the Map of consultation responses included in the agenda papers, Officers clarified that whilst Feckenham was covered by the proposed service, and had been included in the

consultation process, no responses had been received from any Feckenham residents.

In view of the survey responses, together with the fact that there was no longer any financial risk to the Council, and given that the environmental impact was now reported to be significantly different (reduced) to when a garden waste service had previously been considered by the Council in 2010, Members felt that the time was now right for the service to be introduced. Members also noted that notwithstanding the introduction of a garden waste service, both they and Officers fully advocated the composting of garden waste at home where possible, and would endeavour to encourage residents to do this.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) from March 2018 Redditch Borough Council introduce, and Bromsgrove District Council run as part of the shared services agreement for Environmental services, a seasonal (March to November inclusive) garden waste service on behalf of Redditch Borough Council;**
- 2) the charge for the service be £45 for the initial season, to be increased in line with fees and charges as appropriate;**
- 3) a set-up fee of £20 per customer be charged in the first year of service and for new customers in each following year;**
- 4) an introductory offer of a £10 set-up fee be used to encourage early sign-up before the 31st January 2018;**
- 5) the Head of Environmental Services, in consultation with the designated Portfolio Holder, be granted authority to temporarily reduce or remove the set-up fee as a promotional tool to increase and encourage subscriptions;**
- 6) should the Recommended Option be pursued, a capital commitment for the next 4 years of £31k in year 1 and £15k in years 2 to 4 be included in the Capital Programme;**
- 7) once the maximum number of customers has been approached a customer waiting list be employed and Officers bring a further report and business case with options for extending the service should it be required;**
- 8) the chargeable Orange Sack Service be formally retired as part of the new service changes; and**

- 9) a communication plan be devised and implemented to advise residents of the changes to Redditch Borough Council's waste collection service and the requirement to use brown bins only for garden waste.

42. VOLUNTARY & COMMUNITY SECTOR GRANTS PROGRAMME 2018/19

The Committee considered a report on the funding split and themes for the Voluntary and Community Sector grants process for 2018/19. The report also sought a change to the Help Me to Live My Life Independently £35k pot for discounted childcare, to widen out the scope of this theme to enable organisations to bid for funding for general projects focussed on children and young people.

All Members noted the importance of the grants process and of the work carried out by recipient organisations who delivered vital services to residents. Whilst the Council had limited resources it always aimed to allocate grants in the best way possible, based on the Council's Strategic Purposes. Members reiterated the need to ensure that details of the grants programme reached as many organisations as possible, both large and small, to ensure that all were aware of this. The use of social media was also encouraged in spreading details of the grants programme. Members highlighted the importance of organisations not relying solely on Council funding, and encouraged all organisations to seek additional funding in order to avoid financial difficulties should a grant not be awarded to them.

Some Members raised concerns on the back of complaints received from Redditch residents regarding a reported lack of obvious presence of the Redditch arm of Citizens Advice Bromsgrove and Redditch, being advised to visit the Bromsgrove office and facing difficulties getting through on the telephone lines. Officers agreed to take Members' comments back to Citizens Advice.

RECOMMENDED that

the themes and percentages funding be allocated for the 2018/19 voluntary and community sector grants process as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

43. DIGNITY AT WORK POLICY

Members were asked to consider an updated version of the Dignity at Work Policy ('the Policy').

Officers advised that the Council and the Trade Unions were committed to working towards creating a working environment in which all employees were treated fairly, with dignity and respect, and where a zero tolerance approach to harassment, discrimination, bullying or victimisation was taken. The Policy had been seen and commented upon by the Corporate Management Team, Trade Unions and Staff Survey Programme Board, all of whom were supportive of this.

Members supported the Policy and felt that staff welfare was of paramount importance to the Council, with staff being deemed to be the Council's most valuable asset.

RECOMMENDED that

the Dignity at Work Policy, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved and adopted.

44. HUMAN RESOURCES AND ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Members were asked to consider a new Human Resources and Organisational Development Strategy ('the Strategy').

The Strategy, which was closely linked and should be read in conjunction with the Council Plan, detailed the approach the Council planned to take to ensure it had employees with the right skills, in the right place, at the right time, to enable the organisation to deliver its Strategic Purposes in the most effective way.

Members supported the Strategy and noted that this had been seen and commented upon by the Trade Unions, who were supportive of its contents.

A Member requested that, in future, any proposed new or revised policy/strategy reports clearly highlight any changes which were being proposed to existing policies/strategies, in order to avoid Members having to compare these with previous documents, which Officers undertook to do.

RECOMMENDED that

the Human Resources and Organisation Development Strategy, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved and adopted.

45. JOB EVALUATION POLICY

Members were asked to consider a new Job Evaluation ('JE') Policy ('the Policy'), which set out the formal process for re-evaluating posts within the Council.

It was noted that the Policy had been agreed by the Job Evaluation Steering Group, which included Trade Union representatives from UNISON, GMB and Unite.

Officers explained the JE process and responded to Members' questions, with it being noted that it was the post, and not the person, who was subject to evaluation.

RECOMMENDED that

the Job Evaluation Policy, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved and adopted.

46. FINANCE MONITORING QUARTER 1 2017/18

Members received a report which detailed the Council's final financial position for the General Fund Revenue, Capital and Housing Revenue Account ('HRA') for the period April to June 2017 (Quarter 1 2017/18).

Officers explained that on the back of discussions with the Executive and the Budget Scrutiny Working Group, a summary position only, with general supporting financial commentary, was being given on the Revenue Budget, with Officers due to discuss the more detailed elements with their respective Portfolio Holders. It was noted that there was an £87k underspend at the end of the first quarter, which Officers detailed the key aspects of.

Officers went on to highlight the main elements of the Capital Budget Summary, notably the 'Help me find somewhere to live in my locality' underspend, together with the HRA underspends for Repairs and Maintenance and Supervision and Management. Officers were working on producing better profiles of spend based on realistic spend throughout the year, and stated that they would also provide a breakdown of spend against the £19m Financial Reserves in the Quarter 2 report.

In relation to the Efficiency Plan, Officers advised that a number of savings had been delivered, further details of which would be included in the Quarter 2 report. Members queried why only £85k of the proposed £1.572m savings set out in the Efficiency Plan for 2017/18 had been identified. Officers advised that it had not been possible to analyse all of the information in Quarter 1 and that full

details would therefore be set out in the Quarter 2 report. The issue of vacancies was raised and Officers undertook to include a schedule of vacant posts which had been deleted in the Quarter 2 report.

Issues highlighted by Grant Thornton, the Council's external auditors, as part of their Audit Findings Report for 2016/17, were raised. Officers stated that they accepted that there were issues in relation to the identification and monitoring of savings, and advised that they would be meeting with Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council in October to look at their processes. Equally, it was noted from the Statement of Accounts briefing which had taken place the previous evening that progress had been made by the Council in both this and other areas, and that the Council was moving in the right direction.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) **the 2017/18 Capital Programme be increased by £209k to include the Section 106 projects detailed in Appendix 3 to the report; and**

RESOLVED that

- 2) **the current financial position for the quarter April to June 2017, as detailed in the report, be noted.**

47. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 4TH JULY 2017

The Committee received the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 4th July 2017.

It was noted that there were no recommendations to consider, with the recommendation at Minute No. 25 – Council Housing Allocations Policy – having been dealt with at the 11th July Executive.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 4th July 2017 be received and noted.

48. MINUTES / REFERRALS - TO RECEIVE AND CONSIDER AND OUTSTANDING MINUTES OR REFERRALS FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, EXECUTIVE PANELS ETC.

There were no outstanding referrals to consider.

**Executive
Committee**Tuesday, 12 September 2017

49. CORPORATE PARENTING BOARD - VERBAL UPDATE FROM PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY AND REGULATORY SERVICES (IF APPLICABLE)

The Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Regulatory Services confirmed that there was no update to be given in relation to the Corporate Parenting Board.

50. ADVISORY PANELS - UPDATE REPORT

Members received the regular update report on the work of the Executive Committee's Advisory Panels and similar bodies which reported via the Executive Committee.

Members referred to the Planning Advisory Panel ('PAP') meeting which had taken place earlier that evening, and advised that a further PAP meeting was due to take place shortly to discuss the broad outline plans for the District Centres. It was also reported that a meeting of the Redditch Partnership Economic Theme Group was due to take place shortly.

RESOLVED that

the report and updates provided be noted.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 9.15 pm

.....
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

- 6.2 At present, those Redditch residents receiving PIP funding (previously disability living allowance, incapacity benefit, etc.) can access the Abbey Stadium fitness suite and swimming pool on a free of charge basis while their disability concession Reddicard is valid.

Under the new scheme this will be replaced with a maximum concession of 100% for gym memberships and therefore correlate with disabled user's ability to pay based on the level of support or income they receive. This is in line with other local authorities that offer a concession based on affordability; not protected characteristics.

At present there are 234 disabled Reddicards in use. It is estimated that 150 of these are regular gym members who, under the new scheme will be liable to a monthly charge of between £0.00 and £17.50 for a gym membership, or a session charge of £0.00 or £2.20 per swim.

	Standard Price	2017/18 & 2018/19 charge	2018 – 19 50% Concession	2018-19 100% Concession
Gym Peak member rolling monthly membership	£35.00	£0	£17.50 per month	FOC
Gym Peak member – 12 month	£32.00	n/a	£16.00 per month	FOC
Gym off Peak member rolling monthly membership	£28.00	£0	£14.00 per month	FOC
Gym Off Peak member – 12 month contract	£25.00	n/a	£12.50 per month	FOC
Adult swimming Opt 1	£4.40	£0	£2.20	FOC
Adult swimming Opt 2	£4.20	£0	£2.10	FOC
Adult swimming Opt 3	£4.20	£0	£2.10	FOC
Adult swimming Opt 4	£4.00	£0	£2.00	FOC

This page is intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE LEADER'S WORK PROGRAMME

1 November 2017 to 28 February 2018

(published as at 2nd October 2017)



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).

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 normally held 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: 3268 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, Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership and Partnership
Councillor Joe Baker, Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Regulatory Services
Councillor Debbie Chance, Portfolio Holder for the Local Environment
Councillor Greg Chance, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration, Economic Development and Transport
Councillor John Fisher, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management
Councillor Mark Shurmer, Portfolio Holder for Housing
Councillor Pat Witherspoon, Portfolio Holder for Leisure and 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
Anti Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 - Implementation of Provisions Key: Yes	Executive 12 Dec 2017 Council 29 Jan 2018		Report of the Head of Community Services	Bev Houghton, Community Safety Manager (Redditch and Bromsgrove) Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3656
Fees and Charges 2018/19 Key: No	Executive 12 Dec 2017 Council 29 Jan 2018		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Finance Monitoring and Efficiency Plan Update - Quarter 2 2017/18 Key: No	Executive 12 Dec 2017		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Financial Regulations and Contract Procedure Rules Key: No	Executive 12 Dec 2017 Council 29 Jan 2018		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Matchborough and Winyates District Centre Redevelopment Consultation Key: Yes	Executive 12 Dec 2017		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
Medium Term Financial Plan - Update Report Key: No	Executive 12 Dec 2017 Executive 16 Jan 2018 Executive 6 Feb 2018		Report of the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
One Public Estate Exercise Key: Yes	Executive 12 Dec 2017		Report of the Chief Executive	Dean Piper, Head of Economic Development and Regeneration Tel: 01562 732192
Provision of Off Street Pay and Display Car Parking in Borough Parks Key: No	Executive 12 Dec 2017 Council 29 Jan 2018		Report of the Head of Environmental Services	Guy Revans, Head of Environmental Services, Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3292, Claire Felton, Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, Tel: 01527 881429, John Godwin, Head of Leisure and Cultural Services Tel: 01527 881762

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
Service Delivery Options - HRA Gas Maintenance Key: Yes	Executive Not before 12th Dec 2017	Likely to be considered in exempt session.	Report of the Deputy Chief Executive	Sue Hanley, Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director (Leisure, Environmental & Community Services) Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3601
Supplementary Planning Document Consultation (Good Design) Key: No	Executive 12 Dec 2017		Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Emma Baker, Development Plans Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3034
Whistleblowing Policy Key: No	Executive 12 Dec 2017 Council 29 Jan 2018		Report of the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Civil Contingencies Short Sharp Review - Final Report Key: No	Executive 16 Jan 2018		Report of the Chair of the Civil Contingencies Short Sharp Review	Jess Bayley, Democratic Services Officer Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3268
Council Tax Base 2018/19 Key: No	Executive 16 Jan 2018		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207

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 Annual Report Key: No	Executive 16 Jan 2018		Report of the Head of North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration	Dean Piper, Head of Economic Development and Regeneration Tel: 01562 732192
HRA Initial Budget 2018/19 - 2020/21 Key: No	Executive 16 Jan 2018 Council 29 Jan 2018		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources and Head of Housing Services	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Pay Policy 2018-19 Key: No	Executive 16 Jan 2018 Council 29 Jan 2018		Report of the Head of Transformation and Organisational Development	Becky Talbot, Human Resources and Development Manager Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3385
Medium Term Financial Plan 2018/19 - 2021/22 and Council Tax Setting Key: No	Executive 19 Feb 2018 Executive 19 Feb 2018		Report of the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207
Finance Monitoring and Efficiency Plan Update - Quarter 3 2017/18 Key: No	Executive 27 Mar 2018		Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director, Finance and Resources Tel: 01527 881207

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
Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2017/18 Key: No	Council 9 Apr 2018		Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Jess Bayley, Democratic Services Officer Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3268

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

26th October 2017

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 Call-ins (if any) Pre-scrutiny (if any) Task Groups / Short, Sharp Review Groups – feedback Working Groups - feedback Committee Work Programme	Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chair of Task Group / Short, Sharp Review Chair of Working Group Chief Executive
	REGULAR ITEMS Update on the work of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel. Tracker Report Updates on the work of the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Monitoring Report – Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy	Chair of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service Redditch Borough Council representative on the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

26th October 2017

OTHER ITEMS - DATE FIXED		
26 th October 2017	Leisure Services Provision Short Sharp Review group – Final Report	Councillor Potter
26 th October 2017	Leisure and Cultural Services Options Review – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Director
26 th October 2017	Local Discretionary Relief Scheme	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
26 th October 2017	Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group – Final Report	Councillor Potter
7 th December 2017	Economic Development Strategy - Presentation	Relevant Lead Director
7 th December 2017	Fees and Charges 2018/19 – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Director
7 th December 2017	Matchborough and Winyates District Centre Redevelopment Consultation – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
7 th December 2017	Medium Term Financial Plan – Update Report	Relevant Lead Director
7 th December 2017	One Public Estate Exercise – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Director

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

26th October 2017

7th December 2017	Service Delivery Options – HRA Gas Maintenance – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
11th January 2018	Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sustainability and Transformation Plan – Update Report	
11th January 2018	HRA Initial Budget 2018/19 – 2020/21 – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Director
11th January 2018	Medium Term Financial Plan – Update Report	Relevant Lead Director
11th January 2018	Place Partnership Presentation	Relevant Lead Director
13th February 2018	Civil Contingencies Short Sharp Review	Councillor Prosser
13th February 2018	Medium Term Financial Plan 2018/19 – 2021/22 – Scrutiny of budget proposals	Relevant Lead Director
22nd March 2018	Housing Benefits Presentation	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
22nd March 2018	Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2017/18	Councillor Potter
OTHER ITEMS – DATE NOT FIXED		

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

26th October 2017

	Tackling Obesity Task Group - Feedback	Councillor Potter
--	--	-------------------



Overview & Scrutiny

Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review

December 2015



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

	Page Number
Chair's Foreword	2
Summary of Recommendations	3
Introduction/Background Information	5
Chapter 1: External Service Provision	9
Chapter 2: Working in Partnership	17
Chapter 3: Council Services	20
Conclusion	22
Appendix 1 - Terms of Reference	23
Appendix 2 - Witnesses	26
Appendix 3 - Timeline of Activities	27
Appendix 4 – Blank Template Questionnaire	28
Appendix 5 – Declarations of Interest	30
Appendix 6 – Table: Service Delivery Models	31

Membership of the Task Group

Councillors Jayne Potter (Chair), Tom Baker-Price, Gay Hopkins and Paul Swansborough.

Completed

December 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

Our leisure and cultural services, including the Palace Theatre and Forge Mill Needle Museum, are a great credit to Redditch and provide very useful and interesting amenities for our residents.

However a large subsidy is currently required from the taxpayer to maintain these services which may lead to cuts being necessary in the near future as a result of the national economic situation. It was with this in mind that we wanted to investigate what other Councils have done in order to maintain services, and in many cases improve them.

We sent a simple questionnaire to a number of Councils and were very pleased with the quantity and quality of responses that we received. This led to us visiting Chase Leisure Centre where we met representatives of Cannock Chase District Council and also meeting with the Leader of Tamworth Borough Council. At Cannock, where an external trust delivers leisure services, we were overwhelmed by the quality and variety of services they now offer. Chase Leisure Centre now works closely with MacMillan Nurses, Clinical Commissioning Groups and many other public agencies to help their residents lead more healthy and fulfilling lives.

All the Councils we contacted had made considerable savings in the region of a minimum of £200,000-£300,000 per year and were able to maintain or improve rather than cut services. We therefore came to the conclusion that the status quo in Redditch is not an option but that we must seek to secure services for our residents and hopefully improve them by working with an outside organisation.

I would like to thank the members of the group namely, Gay Hopkins, Tom Baker-Price and Paul Swansborough for their help, support and enthusiasm, as well as Jess Bayley, Democratic services Officer, who has worked hard to help us establish the facts and liaise with members of other Councils. I would also like to acknowledge the generosity of those Councils which responded and in particular Cannock Chase and Tamworth Councils who went above and beyond by giving us their time and detailed advice.



**Councillor Jayne Potter,
Chair of the Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review**

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**CHAPTER 1: EXTERNAL SERVICE PROVISION****Recommendation 1**

The Council should enter into a procurement process for an external provider to run the following services:

- **The Abbey Stadium**
- **Forge Mill Needle Museum**
- **The Palace Theatre (including the Palace Youth Theatre)**
- **Pitcheroak Golf Course**

Financial Implications: The group have been advised that it could cost the Council £75,000 to undertake a competitive tendering process to procure an external provider to manage Council leisure services. This figure was also detailed in the Options Appraisal report considered by Members in July 2015. There may also be additional costs, in terms of officer time in relation to the procurement process which are difficult to calculate as it would be dependent on the time involved (Members have been advised it could take between 12 months to two years to complete this process).

The group is contending that significant financial savings could be secured in the long-term if this recommendation is implemented, though it is not possible to provide any figures as this would be dependent on the content of the final contract. This could include efficiency savings and capital investment from an external service provider in leisure facilities within the Borough. If a charitable trust secures a contract with the Council additional savings may be achieved in relation to VAT, though there could potentially be costs arising from business rates which at the time of writing remain to be clarified in the Comprehensive Spending Review.

(Further detailed information relating to the financial implications of this recommendation is provided in the report).

Legal Implications: The Council would need to conduct this procurement process in accordance with European procurement rules. The Legal Services team would need to be involved in helping to negotiate a contract on behalf of the Council. This approach to service delivery also has clear governance implications for the Council. These are addressed in the report. Depending on the outcomes of this process staff would need to be transferred to an external service provider via TUPE transfer and this would have financial implications, particularly with regard to pension arrangements.

CHAPTER 2: WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP**Recommendation 2**

Redditch Borough Council should consult with Bromsgrove District Council about whether Arts Development (including Events) and Sports Development can be included in the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1. Both Councils would need to make a decision about whether this would be appropriate.

Financial Implications: There are no direct financial implications to consulting with Bromsgrove District Council regarding this proposal except in terms of officer time. However, Members are contending that if Arts Development and Sports Development could be included within the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above further efficiency savings could be achieved by both Councils in the long-term.

Legal implications: The Arts and Events team and Sports Development are both shared services. Consequently both Councils would need to make a decision in support of outsourcing these services if they were to be included within the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above. Members are asked to note that if one Council supported inclusion of these shared services in the procurement process and the other Council did not approve this proposal there would be very complex legal issues, relating to shared services, TUPE transfer of staff and maintaining services for the Council that did not support the proposal, which would take time and resources to resolve.

Recommendation 3

The Council should enter into discussions with RSA Academy Arrow Vale and Tudor Grange Academy Redditch concerning future operating arrangements for Arrow Vale Sport Centre and Kingsley Sport Centre.

Financial Implications: There are no direct financial implications in relation to entering into discussions with RSA Academy Arrow Vale and Tudor Grange Academy Redditch except in terms of Officer time.

Legal implications: There are no direct legal implications to this recommendation. Members of the group believe that no changes to Council services that might impact on the future operating arrangements at Arrow Vale Sports Centre and Kingsley Sports Centre should be considered without the Council first entering into discussions with the respective schools.

CHAPTER 3: COUNCIL SERVICES

The group recognises that there are a small number of the Council's leisure and cultural services that are not directly affected by these recommendations. The group believes that these services should continue to be delivered by the Council at this time. The reasons why Members reached this conclusion are detailed in Chapter Three of the report.

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Background

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee launched a Task Group review of the Abbey Stadium in 2013. Following consideration of the findings from this review it was agreed by the Executive Committee in June 2014 that:

- a) the Council should explore the options for a leisure trust to manage some or all of its facilities, including the Abbey Stadium; and
- b) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be given the opportunity to pre-scrutinise any final business case relating to the future operation of some or all of the Council's leisure facilities, including the Abbey Stadium, prior to its submission to the Executive Committee.

In April 2015, following discussions of progress in relation to this matter, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that an item on the Executive Committee's Work Programme, the *Review of Operation of Leisure Services*, should be subject to detailed pre-decision scrutiny. (This report outlined initial findings from an options appraisal of leisure service delivery at the Council). Discussions about this report took place at three consecutive Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings in June and July 2015.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee on 14th July 2015 Members considered the options appraisal. During this meeting Members agreed that further work by Officers was required prior to a decision on the future delivery of leisure and cultural services being taken. The findings from this further work are currently scheduled to be considered by the Executive Committee in January 2016.

In this context the Overview and Scrutiny Committee concluded that a more detailed scrutiny review, focusing on the future delivery of leisure services by the Council, would be helpful. A decision was taken to launch this exercise as a Short, Sharp Review to ensure that Members could complete their investigations by the end of the calendar year in time for any approved recommendations to be built into the Council's budget.

There were a number of key objectives to this review (to view further detail about the group's terms of reference please refer to Appendix 1):

- To consider the general requirements of a number of different models of service delivery which could be used to provide the Council's leisure and cultural services (the list of service delivery models considered by the group corresponded with the different models listed in the *Review of Operation of Leisure Services* report published in July 2015). The full list of models considered by the group can be viewed in Appendix 1.
- To review the financial implications for the Council of all of the service delivery models.
- To assess the implications of each model for the quality of services.
- To consider the governance arrangements that would apply in relation to each model.
- To consult with other local authorities about the operational models that they have adopted for the delivery of leisure and cultural services.

- To identify suitable delivery models for the Council's leisure and cultural services (including considering whether different delivery models might be suitable for different elements of leisure and cultural services).

Evidence Gathering

The group gathered evidence from a variety of sources during the course of the review. Information about the various different service delivery models was obtained from a number of written reports. In particular Members found the following reports useful:

- *Alternative Service Delivery Models: Discussion Document* (Grant Thornton, May 2015).
- *Responding to the Challenge: Alternative Delivery Models in Local Government* (Grant Thornton, January 2014).
- *Local Authority Sport and Recreation Services in England: Where Next?* (The Association of Public Service Excellence – APSE, October 2012).
- *Spreading Their Wings: Building a Successful Local Authority Trading Company* (Grant Thornton, 2015).

The group's conclusions regarding each of the service delivery models that they rejected and the reasons why they concluded that those models would not be suitable in Redditch are outlined at Appendix 6.

Information was also requested from Council Officers about the current financial costs involved in managing the Council's leisure and cultural services and the governance arrangements that would need to be put in place if the Council was to adopt alternative models of service delivery. This information was provided in both a written form and verbally during a number of interviews. The evidence included a detailed breakdown of the financial costs involved in maintaining the Council's leisure and cultural services together with the income that had been accrued from these services over the past three years.

At the start of the review Members agreed that it would be essential for the group to consult with other local authorities. The group was keen to learn about the service delivery models that had been adopted by other Councils, the rationale for adopting those models and the impact that this had had both in terms of service quality and on local authority finances. A decision was taken to dispatch questionnaires to the lead Officer and relevant Portfolio Holder at 19 local authorities. This comprised 15 authorities which were selected on the basis of the comparability of services and demographics to Redditch Borough Council at the time the questionnaires were sent and four Councils selected on the basis of close geographical proximity to the Borough. A total of 12 Councils returned completed questionnaires of which 11 are listed in the acknowledgements in Appendix 2 (one Council requested that their identity remain anonymous which has been respected in this report).

The information provided in the completed questionnaires was very useful and helped to inform the group's final recommendations. On the basis of these responses additional information was requested from three Councils.

- A visit was undertaken to Chase Leisure Centre in Cannock Chase, Staffordshire, where representatives of Cannock Chase District Council and Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust (WLCT) kindly provided the group with a tour of the building and advice about working with an external service provider.

- An interview was held with Councillor Danny Cook, Leader of Tamworth Borough Council, concerning the approach the authority has adopted to delivering leisure and cultural services within their Borough.
- Written information was provided about the unique operational arrangements in place at Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council to manage their community centres.

Members would particularly like to thank these three Councils for their advice and support during the course of this review. The evidence they provided helped the group to clarify a number of points and to identify actions that they felt should be taken to enhance the delivery of leisure and cultural services within Redditch Borough.

Local Considerations

Currently a large range of leisure and cultural services, which are discretionary services, are directly managed by the Council (some of which are shared with Bromsgrove District Council). These include:

- Leisure centres, including the Abbey Stadium, Arrow Vale Sports Centre and Kingsley Sports Centre
- Sports development
- Arts development
- Events, such as the bonfire night and Morton Stanley Festival
- Community centres
- Allotments
- The Palace Theatre
- Forge Mill Needle Museum and Bordesley Abbey
- Pitcheroak golf course
- Parks and open spaces, including Arrow Valley Park and Morton Stanley Park
- Play areas
- Business development services, including the room bookings system, marketing and sponsorship and facilities management

The estimated net direct costs to the Council of delivering leisure and cultural services in 2015/16 are £1.5 million. This excludes the costs of support services (also known as enabling services), indirect costs and borrowing costs. The group also did not ask Officers to provide financial details for the costs of delivering Business Development services, such as the room booking service, because they determined at an early stage that these services were integral to the operation of the Council and should therefore continue to be delivered in house.

When considering alternative models of service delivery Members have been advised that only direct costs should be taken into account. The estimated gross expenditure for 2015/16 on leisure and cultural services is approximately £4 million, with £2.5 million generated in income across the leisure services that the Council delivers.

Throughout the review Members were mindful of the significance of leisure and cultural services to a number of the Council's priorities. In particular, these services are relevant to two of the Council's strategic purposes; "provide good things for me to do, see and visit" and "help me to live my life independently (including health and activity)". The group was keen to ensure that any actions proposed in their recommendations enhanced the Council's ability to meet these objectives.

In addition, the Council, as a member of the Redditch Partnership, remains committed to tackling health inequalities. Members of the group are aware that through participation in leisure and cultural services residents can be assisted with addressing health problems related to obesity as well as provided with helpful support in relation to any mental health difficulties they may experience. The group was keen to ensure that any actions they proposed enabled the Council to continue to meet the needs of the local community in this respect.

When discussing potential recommendations the group considered key objectives that Members felt the Council should attempt to achieve in future in respect of leisure and cultural services. This took into account both local priorities as well as the increasingly challenging economic environment in which local government operates.

- A need to ensure that good quality leisure and cultural services are provided to residents living in the Borough
- A desire to make sure that leisure and cultural services remain sustainable
- The benefits for the Council of achieving efficiency savings

The group's final recommendations were informed by these considerations as their vision for the future of leisure and cultural services in the Borough.

the *Local Authority Sport and Recreation Services in England: Where Next?* report (APSE, 2012) it was noted that “...two thirds of local authorities (have) observed a shift from the role of ‘provider’ to ‘facilitator’ since 1997 and within the next five years, two-thirds perceive the core remit of sports services being one of ‘facilitator’ or ‘enabler’”. In the majority of these reports the report authors had noted that local authorities often have arranged for a leisure trust, either an existing leisure trust operating across multiple authorities or a new local leisure trust, or, less frequently, for a private company to deliver leisure services on the Council’s behalf.

This pattern of external service provision was mirrored in the arrangements in place at the Councils which completed questionnaires for the consideration of the group. In total 11 of the 12 Councils consulted by the group confirmed that at least some of their leisure and cultural services were delivered by another organisation, sometimes alongside other leisure services which the Council continued to deliver directly. A variety of service delivery models had been adopted by these Councils including working with an external leisure trust, having a contract with a private sector company, services delivered by a bespoke local leisure trust and delivery of specific services by a local voluntary sector group. Furthermore, the choice of which services to outsource to an external service provider varied; at some local authorities all leisure and cultural services were managed by an external provider whilst at other Councils only specific services were delivered by another body, most commonly leisure centres.

A number of key benefits arising from service provision by another (non-Council) service provider were highlighted by these Councils:

- Increases in participation in physical activities. In some cases this had been achieved because the Council had set specific targets within their contracts which the external service provider had to meet.
- The ability to retain services. A number of Councils commented that leisure and cultural services would not have been sustainable if the Council had continued to deliver them directly due to budget pressures.
- External providers specialising in leisure and cultural services could focus on direct delivery of those services without having to address the additional distractions that impact on Council staff, such as attending Committee meetings. Typical of this view was the Council that commented “...in terms of services the Trust is a single focus organisation and is therefore at liberty to market the services and facilities much more effectively than...another Council department.”
- Councils which had opted to work with an existing leisure trust or private company specialising in delivering leisure services frequently noted that the quality of local services benefitted from the expertise of these organisations.
- In many cases services and equipment had been updated, partly due to requirements in leisure contracts, though also in cases where the service provider specialised in delivering additional activities that had not previously been explored by the Council.
- In every case Councils reported that they had been able to achieve significant efficiency savings as a result of working with an external service provider.
- The range of benefits arising from working with an external service provider were best summarised by one local authority respondent: “A well-established external operator is best placed to ensure the leisure offer is keeping up with the changing landscape to ensure that it remains relevant and meeting the aspirations of the community. There are economies of scale with large operators providing significant levels of strategic management support which a Council is unable to as well as being able to share best practice across contracts as opposed to working in isolation.”

In the majority of cases the Councils that completed the group's questionnaire commented that they would adopt the same approach again if the choice arose. Indeed, in a number of cases the Councils had recently reached new agreements with external organisations and trusts regarding the future delivery of services based on their previous positive experience. However, some respondents did suggest that the Council should be cautious when considering whether to establish a new leisure trust to deliver leisure and cultural services. It was suggested that a new trust could be expensive to establish and might represent a financial risk in an already competitive leisure services market.

Finances

One of the main benefits of working with an external service provider that was highlighted by the other Councils in their responses were the financial savings that had been achieved. The level of savings varied according to the terms of the contracts that had been negotiated by the Council. In some cases Councils had set targets for efficiency savings in their contracts. In other cases lower efficiency savings were anticipated though significant capital investment from the external provider had been agreed in contract negotiations. Specific figures in terms of efficiency savings are not quoted here out of respect for commercial sensitivities. However, it can be confirmed that efficiency savings reported to the group varied from £350,000 per year to £2.2 million over a period of three years.

The local authorities also highlighted a number of additional financial advantages from working with an external service provider:

- By working with an external service provider the financial risks to the Council involved in delivering leisure services, particularly in leisure centres, could be reduced: *“By outsourcing the operational management to an external operator, the Council has transferred significant financial risk for the day to day running of the centres to the operator.”*
- Councils working with an external leisure trust or with a private company benefited from sharing overheads with other customers in relation to covering the costs of back office functions such as Human Resources.
- The transfer of relevant employees under TUPE arrangements had led to a reduction in expenditure at those Councils on the staff payroll. As staff wages and associated costs represent a relatively large part of local authority expenditure this had led to savings for the Council over time.
- The transfer of staff had also led to a reduction in demand for back office functions at the local authorities. Councils had responded to this in various ways, including by negotiating target budget reductions with the managers of effected back office functions in order to avoid the need for redundancies.
- Some Councils reported that there would always be certain leisure services that would need a local authority subsidy to continue to be provided due to a variety of reasons, including limited market appeal or local competition. However, where Councils were working with an external service provider the level of subsidy that was required from the local authority had fallen significantly.
- Councils working with either a bespoke local leisure trust or an external leisure trust, particularly those Councils which had been working with a trust for some time, reported advantages in terms of reduced VAT and business rate payments.

Members investigated VAT exemptions for trusts in some detail as they recognised that this could have implications for the Council's choice of appropriate service delivery

model. The group has been advised by Officers that leisure trusts are eligible for exemptions on some payments which were not applicable to local authorities. For example, whilst the Council charges VAT for certain leisure service activities, which is included within the fees and charges for those activities, a trust is exempt from paying VAT on these activities. Trusts do have to pay VAT on certain supplies and services which, unlike the Council, they cannot reclaim from HMRC. However, Officers have advised that the income from sport activities for which trusts do not have to pay VAT is higher than expenditure on supplies and services and therefore on balance a trust could secure savings from VAT exemptions when running Council leisure services. Officers have advised that, depending on the level of services that might be included within a contract, this could equate to savings of £45,000 – £50,000.

Business rates were also investigated by the group in detail as again Members understood that significant savings in this respect could influence the Council's choice of service delivery model. Currently business rates for Council buildings, including leisure facilities, constitute a relatively high financial cost for the Council. For example the group has been advised that the Abbey Stadium alone is subject to business rates of £130,000. At present there is a mandatory 80 per cent reduction in business rates for charitable organisations (including trusts), with the remaining 20 per cent of business rates subject to discretionary policies at the local authority level. The 80 per cent of reduced business rates have tended to be covered by the Government resulting in significant savings from business rates for local authorities that have adopted a trust model of service delivery to date. However, Members have been advised that the Government is in the process of changing the national Business Rate Scheme. Clarification about the implications of these changes is anticipated in the Comprehensive Spending Review on 25th November 2015. However, Officers have advised that there is the possibility that in future local authorities will be expected to cover 100 per cent of any reduced business rates available to charitable organisations.

At the time of writing this was all subject to speculation. The group would therefore urge the Executive Committee to obtain further clarification from Officers on this point as soon as it can be made available and feel that this potential development should be taken into account as part of any discussions about changes to the Council's approach to service delivery. However, based on this information and on the significant level of efficiency savings achieved by Councils working with both leisure trusts and private sector companies Members agree that the Council should be open to entering into a contract with either a trust or a private company to deliver leisure and cultural services in the Borough.

The group is aware that the estimated cost of £75,000 for the proposed procurement process would represent an additional budget pressure which would need to be incorporated into the Medium Term Financial Plan. However, Members are contending that these costs would be offset in the long-term by the efficiency savings and potentially capital investment that could be secured from working with an external service provider.

Contract Terms

There are legal considerations to address when negotiating a contract. The contract negotiations would need to be conducted in accordance with part 15 of the Constitution: Contract Procedure Rules (which are currently in the process of being updated). According to the latest version of the rules available, published in November 2011, any procurement for goods and services which exceed the EU Procurement Thresholds, (£173,934 or works exceeding £4,348,350) the Council has to follow full EU Public

Procurement Directives. This essentially means that more complex procedures need to be followed than for standard procurement processes, potentially adding to the timeframes required to complete the process.

Many of the Councils that completed the group's questionnaire provided some useful, practical advice with regard to contracting out services. The key issues highlighted by these Councils for the group's consideration were:

- Service delivery arrangements need to meet the needs of people living in Redditch, particularly the most vulnerable.
- The benefits of reflecting on the unique selling points of leisure and cultural services in Redditch and of making sure that service delivery arrangements are suitable for these services. In particular Members were advised that assumptions should not be made that arrangements successfully in place in another district would necessarily suit Redditch.
- The Council should be flexible over options for service delivery and assess both the strengths and weaknesses of each service independently as well as collectively when making decisions: *"...be careful looking at one delivery model for all Leisure / Heritage / Culture Services. You may miss opportunities by a blinkered approach. Take each service as standalone, and then look for natural synergies before deciding one model is best."*
- Members were advised that there was a need for the Council to be realistic about the length of time and resources required to arrange for alternative models of service delivery to be introduced at the Council. Estimates on the length of time required varied between 12 months and two years. Any savings arising from new approaches to delivering services would also, consequently, be delayed until the whole contract negotiation process has been completed.
- The need to engage with affected staff and Trades Unions throughout the process and to be open and honest with employees about potential outcomes.
- Any changes to service delivery need to be based on detailed planning and have an evidence basis. In some cases Councils had based their decisions about service delivery on the findings contained in an options appraisal report or a bespoke local review of leisure services.

The group was also advised that the Council could detail particular objectives within any contract. This would help to ensure that any existing features of leisure and cultural services considered to be non-negotiable could be retained in the event of a new service provider assuming responsibility for the delivery of services. The group notes that this could include the following features (this is intended to provide a hypothetical list of examples rather than a definitive list of requirements which the group believes would need to be identified by senior Officers in consultation with the Executive Committee):

- A requirement for the Redditch to be recognised at facilities operated by an external service provider on behalf of the Council in order for eligible residents to continue to be able to pay fees and charges at a concessionary level
- Free swimming provision for customers aged under 16 or over 60 years old
- Performance targets in respect of participation in physical activities
- Requirements to work in partnership with particular local partner organisations on specific projects

However, the group has been advised that the Council needs to be cautious about attempting to exert too much control over any external provider awarded a contract as this could be counterproductive. *"It is essential that the operator has the autonomy over*

significant elements of the services and that the Council does not seek to unduly control this flexibility.” For example, a controlling approach could prevent an external service provider from introducing projects and activities that had successfully attracted customers at leisure centres they manage in other parts of the country. In a worst case scenario organisations might be deterred from bidding in the procurement process or from offering favourable terms, both financially and in terms of the services that could be provided to customers.

Governance

The group recognises, however, that the Council will want to retain some influence over service delivery in the Borough. For this reason Members considered potential governance arrangements as part of the review.

Members were advised that Council representatives, which could include elected Councillors, could be appointed to the board of a trust (if a trust secures a contract to deliver the Council’s leisure services). However, there are strict rules regarding the composition of a trust board; representation is usually calculated on a ratio basis of 2:11 in favour of more external representatives than Council representatives. The more Council representatives that are appointed to a board the more external representatives have to be appointed to achieve this balance, which can make it difficult for a board to operate effectively.

The group has been advised that it is more likely that the Council will retain influence over service delivery, regardless of what type of service provider is successful in the procurement process, through contract management arrangements. Frequently a requirement of contracts negotiated with an external service provider is that representatives of the organisations will meet with relevant officers from the Council to discuss performance. The frequency of these meetings can be negotiated but provide opportunities for both parties to raise any concerns about service risks or to discuss new developments. The Council can use these meetings as an opportunity to scrutinise services. Direct Member involvement with an external provider could be limited. At some Councils the relevant Portfolio Holder was invited to attend meetings between officers and representatives of the service provider to discuss service targets and any challenges. However, Members were advised that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which holds local decision makers to account, would have limited opportunities to require representatives of an external service provider to attend Committee meetings. Instead, the Committee would need to focus on holding the service to account through Council Officers responsible for managing and monitoring the contract with the external service provider.

Staffing implications

The group understands that the actions they are proposing in this recommendation will have clear implications for staff employed by the Council to deliver leisure and cultural services. Staff would need to be transferred in accordance with the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (also known as TUPE). This transfer would be subject to negotiations with the external service provider but Members would expect staff to be entitled to maintain current terms and conditions when transferred. The group would also urge senior Officers to engage with staff and Trades Unions throughout this process, through regular briefings, to ensure that staff understand and are engaged with the process.

Members have been advised that pensions can be one of the most complex areas for Councils and external providers to resolve during contract negotiations. Staff who are part of the local government pension scheme would retain the right to remain in that scheme. The Council would need to cover any deficit in terms of employer pension contributions up to the point at which the staff transferred and the service provider could expect to cover pension contributions from the date of transfer. However, Members have also been advised that every three years actuaries review pensions and this can lead to a change in the pension contribution required from the employer. The Council might then have to increase contributions to cover the deficit for the years preceding the staff transfer. There may also be a requirement for an increase on the contributions for staff for their years of service after they have transferred to the new service provider. Cover for this additional contribution would need to be discussed with the external service provider during contract negotiations; in some instances the local authority has covered these increases whilst in other cases alternative arrangements have been agreed. The group has been advised that in order to negotiate pensions effectively the Council should also consult with Worcestershire County Council, as the lead for local government pensions in the county, at an early stage in the process.

The group are keen to clarify that their proposals are in no way intended as a criticism of existing staff and they recognise that staff work incredibly hard. In many cases without this hard work the Council would be subsidising leisure and cultural services at a much higher level. However, in the current economic circumstances the group is contending that the Council cannot continue to deliver these services directly. Furthermore, Members believe that staff will have greater opportunities for career development working for an external service provider and will have more flexibility to work on new ideas and initiatives that the Council lacks the resources to support.

Local Considerations

The Council currently has contracts with two external service providers for Pitcheroak Golf Course; one for the café on the site and the other for provision of golf services. In both cases these contracts are due to expire in October 2016. Members have been advised that the golf course can be included in the services listed in this recommendation as management of this contract could be novated to an external service provider.

During the review Members discussed the possibility of managing Forge Mill Needle Museum and the Palace Theatre in a separate manner due to the bespoke status of these facilities and their importance to the cultural heritage of the Borough. However, Members found that a number of Councils had similar services which had been successfully incorporated into external trust arrangements with other leisure facilities. The group feels that this approach, of combining more facilities into a package of services managed by an external service provider, would help the Council to achieve greater efficiency savings overall as overheads and expertise will be shared across all the services. For this reason the group is proposing that Forge Mill Needle Museum and the Palace Theatre should be included in the procurement exercise.

Conclusion

Members feel that it would be best for the Council to enter into a competitive tendering process to procure an external provider to deliver the Council's services. A variety of bodies could apply to take part in this procurement process including existing leisure trusts, private sector companies and voluntary sector groups. The group has not

specified a target service provider as Members feel that there should be flexibility available for organisations to bid to take part in the procurement process if they are interested in doing so.

CHAPTER 2: WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP

There are a number of leisure and cultural services and facilities that the Council currently delivers in partnership with other organisations. The group believes that there are opportunities available to enhance these services, potentially through their inclusion in the procurement process referred to in recommendation 1 above. However, Members recognise that the Council should not act unilaterally without first consulting with relevant partner organisations. They are therefore proposing that the Council should enter into dialogue with partner organisations regarding two separate matters, as detailed in Recommendations 2 and 3 below.

Recommendation 2	Redditch Borough Council should consult with Bromsgrove District Council about whether Arts Development (including Events) and Sports Development can be included in the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1. Both Councils need to make a decision about whether this would be appropriate.
Financial Implications Legal Implications	<p>There are no direct financial implications to consulting with Bromsgrove District Council regarding this proposal except in terms of officer time. However, Members are contending that if Arts Development and Sports Development could be included within the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above further efficiency savings could be achieved by both Councils in the long-term.</p> <p>The Arts and Events team and Sports Development are both shared services. Consequently both Councils would need to make a decision in support of outsourcing these services if they were to be included within the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above. Members are asked to note that if one Council supported inclusion of these shared services in the procurement process and the other Council did not approve this proposal there would be very complex legal issues, relating to shared services, TUPE transfer of staff and maintaining services for the Council that did not support the proposal, which would take time and resources to resolve.</p>

In recent years Redditch Borough Council has entered into a number of shared services with other local authorities. This includes the Arts and Events and Sports Development teams which are shared with Bromsgrove District Council. Under shared service arrangements one Council acts as the host authority, though costs are shared and services are delivered across the two authority areas.

During the course of the review Members discovered that Arts Development and Sports Development services were delivered in a variety of ways by different Councils. Some local authorities had outsourced these services to an external service provider whilst other Councils continued to deliver these services directly. There is therefore no single best practice approach to delivering these services.

However, the group believes that locally it would be appropriate to include both of these shared services in the procurement process referred to in Recommendation 1 above for the following reasons:

- The services would benefit from the expertise of external service providers and this could lead to improvements in terms of the quality of the services that are delivered.
- It would provide members of both teams with greater flexibility than in a local authority environment to innovate and to participate in new initiatives.
- Staff will also be provided with more opportunities for career development if they are working for an external service provider.
- Members are contending that greater efficiency savings could be achieved, by both Redditch Borough Council and Bromsgrove District Council, if these services were to be included in a procurement process with a larger number of other leisure and cultural services.

The group has not consulted with Bromsgrove District Council as part of this review. Therefore discussions need to be held with Bromsgrove Members before any action can be taken to change the current approach to delivering the Arts, Events and Sports Development services. Subject to the Executive Committee approving this recommendation Officers will need to initiate discussions with Bromsgrove District Council with a view to determining whether Bromsgrove would agree to outsource both shared services to an external provider. Reports would also need to be presented for the consideration of the Executive Committee in Redditch and Cabinet in Bromsgrove in due course to obtain formal approval to outsource these services to an external service provider.

There is the possibility that, whilst Redditch Members might agree to include these services in a procurement process, elected Members at Bromsgrove District Council may reject this proposal in favour of the Council continuing to deliver these services directly. Officers have advised that this would have very complex legal implications because Arts and Events and Sports Development are shared services. In particular, consideration would need to be given to how to continue to deliver services in both locations, which staff to TUPE transfer to an external service provider and which to retain in Bromsgrove. This would take considerable time and resources to resolve, particularly as the Council has not withdrawn from a service shared directly with Bromsgrove before and there is no precedent which can therefore be followed.

Ideally, the group would have preferred to include Arts Development, Events and Sports Development in the list of services detailed under Recommendation 1. If both Councils do endorse this proposal Members agree that Arts Development, Events and Sports Development should be included in the list of services offered in the procurement process. To provide an opportunity for this to occur Members are urging Officers to progress discussions with Bromsgrove District Council and to bring forward reports on this subject to both the Executive Committee in Redditch and the Cabinet in Bromsgrove for consideration as soon as possible.

Recommendation 3	The Council should enter into discussions with RSA Academy Arrow Vale and Tudor Grange Academy Redditch concerning future operating arrangements for Arrow Vale Sport Centre and Kingsley Sport Centre.
Financial Implications Legal Implications	There are no direct financial implications in relation to entering into discussions with RSA Academy Arrow Vale and Tudor Grange Academy Redditch except in terms of Officer time. There are no direct legal implications to this recommendation. Members of the group believe that no changes to Council services that might impact on the future operating arrangements at Arrow Vale Sports Centre and Kingsley Sports Centre should be considered without the Council first entering into discussions with the respective schools.

Redditch Borough Council currently manages two sports centres located at local high schools; Arrow Vale Sports Centre, located at RSA Academy Arrow Vale, and Kingsley Sports Centre, located at Tudor Grange Academy Redditch. The Council contributes to the costs of managing the facilities, including a proportion of the business rates. During the day the facilities available at these centres can be used by school pupils. Outside school hours the facilities can be accessed by external customers.

Members agree that in the current economic climate, and at a time when other leisure services are in the process of being examined, it would be timely to review the future operating arrangements for these two sports centres. It is possible that by introducing alternative service delivery models at these centres improvements to the quality and range of services might occur as well as financial savings for both the Council and schools. However, Members recognise that the Council cannot proceed unilaterally in determining what changes, if any, could be made to operational arrangements at the sports centres. The schools will clearly have an interest in this subject.

The group is therefore proposing that the Council should enter into discussions with the two schools to consider appropriate future operational arrangements at Arrow Vale and Kingsley Sports Centre. They are not specifying any alternative arrangements that they feel should be considered to allow for flexibility in the discussions between the Council and the schools.

CHAPTER 3: COUNCIL SERVICES

The group recognises that there are a small number of leisure and cultural services currently provided by the Council that are not directly affected by their recommendations. This includes:

- Allotments.
- Business support services, such as civic suite room bookings and sponsorship of the roundabouts in Redditch.
- Community Centres and Meeting Rooms.
- Parks and open spaces (including the Arrow Valley Countryside Centre).
- Playgrounds.

Members of the group agree that these services should continue to be delivered directly by the Council at this time.

There are a number of reasons why Members concluded that these services should not be outsourced to an external service provider:

- A number of these services manage and maintain assets that are important to the wider community. In some cases the Council has developed long-standing and multi-layered working relationships with different local groups in relation to these services and the group did not want to undermine this positive work.
- Some of these services, particularly the business support services, are integral to the operation of core internal services at the Council. For example the room booking system provides essential support to the local Democratic process by ensuring that appropriate room facilities are available for Committee meetings.
- Members were concerned that there was a limited commercial market in respect of many of these services and that this would make it difficult for a trust or private company to enhance these services.
- Few of the Councils consulted by the group appear to have included these services within their contracts with external service providers.
- During the course of the review the group obtained limited evidence with regard to parks, open spaces, playgrounds and allotments. Members wanted to ensure that any recommended changes to service provision had an evidence basis, in line with good practice in scrutiny. For this reason they did not feel that any recommendations could be proposed about these facilities at this stage.
- The group was impressed by the approach that Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council had adopted to working with local community groups to maintain community centres, following a thorough review. This has been achieved as a result of the Council working directly with Local Management Committees, comprising a range of volunteers from local groups. Members are keen for a similarly innovative, community focused approach to be implemented in Redditch Borough by the Council.
- The Arrow Valley Countryside Centre is subject to an existing contract with an external service provider. This contract is not due to expire until November 2021 and Members do not feel that it would be appropriate to novate management of this contract to an external service provider during this period.

Whilst the group feels that no changes should be made to the delivery model for these services at this time Members would suggest that this should not preclude the Council considering changes in the future. The group is aware that new opportunities to deliver services differently may emerge over time and Members are suggesting that Officers

and the Executive Committee should investigate all such options as and when they arise in case this could lead to benefits for local residents. Members also suggest that if the economic challenges facing local government further intensify the Council may need to review all services to ensure that in future they are delivered as efficiently as possible. It is therefore possible that the ways in which these services are delivered in future may have to change.

CONCLUSION

The Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review group have completed a detailed review of a complex subject in a relatively short space of time. This was necessary to ensure that their findings could be taken into account as part of the Council's budget setting process in 2016/17 and that any approved proposals could start to be implemented in a timely manner.

In the current economic climate the group does not feel that the status quo, in terms of direct delivery of leisure and cultural services by the Council, is sustainable. Members want to ensure that good quality services continue to be delivered in the Borough at the same time as making financial savings. The group has concluded that this can only be achieved if the Council enters into a contract with an external provider to deliver those services.

The future delivery of leisure and cultural services in the Borough of Redditch has been the subject of debate for the past 18 months and Officers and members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee have separately reviewed this subject in some detail. Members believe that it has reached a point where a decision needs to be made about the future approach that the Council should adopt to delivering these services. The group therefore commends their report to the Executive Committee and urges them to endorse these recommendations.

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 Potter	Date of referral	01/09/15
Proposed topic title	Leisure Services Options Short, Sharp Review		
Link to national, regional and local priorities and targets	<p>Redditch Borough Council Strategic Purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide good things for me to do, see and visit. • Help me live my life independently (including health and activity). <p>Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health inequalities - with particular focus on smoking, obesity alcohol/drugs, and mental health. 		
Background to the issue	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee launched the Abbey Stadium Task Group in 2013/14, which focused on improvements that could be made to the venue. In response to the findings in this review the Executive Committee agreed that the Council should explore options for all or some of the Council's leisure and cultural services to be managed by a trust. External consultants were subsequently tasked with undertaking an options appraisal in relation to the future operation of the Council's leisure services. The findings of this options appraisal together with a report from officers have been the subject of detailed pre-scrutiny in recent months. Overview and Scrutiny Members therefore have significant background knowledge in respect of this subject.</p> <p>On 14th July 2015 the Executive Committee considered the options appraisal, an officer overview of the findings in this appraisal and points raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Based on all of the information that had been provided the Executive Committee concluded that further work was required prior to a decision on the future delivery of leisure and cultural services.</p> <p>I feel that an Overview and Scrutiny Short, Sharp Review</p>		

	<p>could make a valuable contribution in relation to this additional work. Scrutiny Members can gather extra evidence which Officers may not have the time or resources to obtain. We can also provide a fresh and objective perspective and I believe we could really help the Council to identify a suitable way forward in relation to this matter. Good scrutiny can help the Council and this is what I aim to do through this exercise.</p> <p>The future operation of the Council's leisure and cultural services is an important matter for the Council to address. The final decision on this matter could have significant financial implications for the Council as well as improving the offer for residents. There could also potentially be implications for staff, depending on the decision that is made. It would therefore be best to ensure that a well informed decision is made on this subject as soon as possible so that staff can appreciate the position moving forward.</p> <p>As part of the review I am suggesting that Members should consider different operating models for the delivery of leisure and cultural services. However, I am not proposing that the group consider the option of delivering services in house as I believe that Officers are in a better position to consider this option due to their expertise. I am also not proposing that the Council consider retaining a streamlined service as I think that this could be achieved through service transformation which the Council is already working on and therefore I do not think further investigation of this would add any value.</p>
<p>Key Objectives Please keep to SMART objectives (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To consider the general requirements of the following different options in terms of future operational arrangements for leisure and cultural services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External delivery by an external leisure operator or existing trust; • Creation of a new leisure trust. • Commissioning/outsourcing parts of leisure and cultural services. • A local authority trading company (Teckal). • A joint delivery vehicle (public). • A joint delivery vehicle (private). • A mutual delivery model. 2) To review the financial implications for the Council of all of the delivery models. 3) To assess the implications of each delivery model for the quality of services delivered to the customer. 4) To consider the governance arrangements that would apply in relation to each model.

	<p>5) To consult with other local authorities about the operational models that they have adopted for the delivery of leisure and cultural services.</p> <p>6) To identify suitable delivery models for leisure and cultural services. This should include considering whether different delivery models may be suitable for different elements of leisure and cultural services.</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>The aim is to complete this review by December 2015. This should ensure that the findings of the group and any recommendations, if approved, can be taken into account in advance of the Council's budget being set for the following year in February 2016.</p> <p>Any findings would need to be available in a timely manner order to be taken into account by Officers undertaking additional work as requested by the Executive Committee in July 2015. It is for this reason that I am proposing that a Short, Sharp Review of this subject should be undertaken rather than a full Task Group investigation.</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

The group would like to thank the following Councils for returning completed copies of their questionnaire:

- Cannock Chase District Council
- Gloucester City Council
- Malvern Hills District Council
- Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council
- Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Stevenage Borough Council
- Stratford-on-Avon District Council
- Tamworth Borough Council
- Wychavon District Council
- Wyre Forest District Council

Thanks are also extended to the following individuals who provided evidence and invaluable support during the course of the review:

- Councillor Danny Cook, Leader of Tamworth Borough Council
- Ray Cooke, Leisure Services Manager.
- Mike Edmonds, Head of Commissioning, Cannock Chase District Council
- Clare Flanagan, Legal Services Manager
- Robert Foster, Head of Leisure and Cultural Services, Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council
- John Godwin, Head of Leisure and Cultural Services
- Sue Hanley, Deputy Chief Executive
- Julie Heyes, Business Development Manager
- Tony McGovern, Managing Director, Cannock Chase District Council
- Paul McLaughlin, Estates Team Leader – North, Place Partnership Limited.
- Councillor Christine Mitchell, Portfolio Holder for Culture and Sport, Cannock Chase District Council.
- Jayne Pickering, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Resources
- Councillor Amelia Rout, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture and Localism, Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council.
- Terry Simms, General Manager, Chase Leisure Centre (and Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust - WLCT).
- Dave Wheeler, Leisure Services Manager

APPENDIX 3
Timeline of Activities

Date	Task Group Activity
22 September 2015	Consideration of the group's terms of reference and agreeing key evidence to consider during the review.
7 October	Scrutinised the content of <i>Alternative Service Delivery Models</i> , a report by Grant Thornton.
13 October	<p>Considered questionnaire feedback from other local authorities and scrutinised the content of the following reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Responding to the Challenge: Alternative Delivery Models in Local Government</i>, (Grant Thornton, 2014). • <i>Spreading their Wings: Building a Successful Local Authority Trading Company</i> (Grant Thornton, 2015). • <i>Local Authority Sport and Recreation Services in England: Where Next?</i> (The Association for Public Service Excellence – APSE – 2012).
19 October	Consideration of the current financial costs involved in delivering the Council's leisure and cultural services and interview with the Leisure Services Managers.
3 November	Interview with the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Resources to discuss the financial implications of using different models of service delivery as well as current income from the Council's Leisure and Cultural Services. A further interview was also held with the Legal Services Manager to discuss governance arrangements for particular service delivery models.
10 November morning	Visit to Chase Leisure Centre, Cannock Chase, Staffordshire and interview with representatives of Cannock Chase District Council.
10 November evening	Interview with Councillor Danny Cook, Leader of Tamworth Borough Council.
18 November	Finalising the group's recommendations.

APPENDIX 4
Template Questionnaire (Blank Copy)
Redditch Leisure Services
Councillors' Scrutiny Review

A group of Councillors in Redditch are currently reviewing the model of service delivery used by Redditch Borough Council to provide leisure and cultural services to local residents. As part of the review the Councillors are keen to hear from representatives of other local authorities about how leisure services are delivered in other parts of the country.

The Councillors involved in this review do not have any decision making powers. However, based on the evidence they gather they can make recommendations to local decision makers.

Name and

Council: _____

1) Does your Council use any of the following models to deliver leisure and cultural services?
(Please delete any options that do not apply to your Council.)

- a) An external leisure trust
- b) A bespoke local leisure trust
- c) Private company (commissioning arrangement)
- d) Voluntary sector body (commissioning arrangement)
- e) A local authority trading company (Teckal)
- f) A joint delivery vehicle
- g) A mutual delivery model
- h) Delivered directly by Council staff
- i) Other (Please specify) _____

2) Why did your Council choose this model of service delivery?

3) When did your Council introduce this model of service delivery?

4) What services are provided using this model of service delivery?

- 5) Has your Council made financial savings by adopting this approach to service delivery? If so please could you provide a rough estimate of the savings achieved?

- 6) What have been the benefits for residents of delivering services in this manner?

- 7) Would you adopt this service model again if you were making a choice about the future of leisure and cultural services at your Council? (Please briefly outline the reasons for your answer). If your answer to this question is no please explain which alternative delivery model you would now choose and why.

- 8) Is there anything else you would like to add for our consideration?

The Councillors may, based on your answers, contact you to discuss your responses further. Please indicate below whether you would be happy to be contacted by deleting the answer that does not apply to you in the box below.

Yes I'd be happy to be contacted / No – please do not contact me further

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Return Address: Please return completed copies of this survey by Friday 9th October 2015 to:

Jess Bayley, Democratic Services Officer, Democratic Services,
Redditch Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch B98 8AH

Email: scrutiny@redditchbc.gov.uk

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL



making
a
difference



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

APPENDIX 5
Declarations of Interest

Councillor Jane Potter declared an other disclosable interest during the review as a member of the board of governors at Tudor Grange Academy Redditch. This declaration relates specifically to the group's third recommendation.



Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel

Wednesday, 27 September 2017

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Matthew Dormer (Chair), and Councillors Pattie Hill, Paul Swansborough and Nina Wood-Ford

Officers:

Sue Hanley, Bev Houghton and Judith Willis

Democratic Services Officer:

Jess Bayley

1. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor Gareth Prosser.

An apology submitted by the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Regulatory Services, Councillor Joe Baker, was also noted by Members.

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 of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel held on 22nd March 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. NORTH WORCESTERSHIRE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP - UPDATE REPORT

The Community Safety Manager presented a briefing note outlining the work of the North Worcestershire Community Safety

.....
Chair

Crime and Disorder

Scrutiny

Panel

Wednesday, 27 September 2017

Partnership in 2017/18. During the presentation of this paper the following matters were highlighted for Members' consideration:

- A number of projects, designed to facilitate crime prevention, had received grant funding from the West Mercia Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC).
- There was also a Community Safety Project Officer who had been recruited relatively recently to deliver projects in the Borough. These projects were designed to address key areas of local concern based on available data.
- There had been an increase of 21 per cent in total recorded crime during the year.
- The increase appeared in large part to be due to changes in reporting practices. In previous years only reports supported by viable evidence identified by the police would be included in the data; by 2017 all reported incidents, regardless of the evidence basis, were recorded.
- There had been a significant increase in bicycle theft, with this peaking in the months of April, May and June.
- Bicycle theft had been particularly notable in Church Hill and Matchborough and had included thefts from rear gardens.
- The available data revealed that 14 per cent of crime had been committed in the town centre. A lot of this was linked to the night time economy.
- There had been 11 hate crimes reported, leading to an increase of 19 per cent in such offences. It was noted that 10 of these offences related to a single, ongoing complaint which had since been resolved.
- The Partnership had been reviewing action that could be taken to address crimes committed by repeat offenders.

Following the presentation a number of issues were raised by Members:

- The work of YSS. Members were advised that this was a charity that carried out work with offenders and those at risk of offending as well as on other projects involving young people in Worcestershire.
- The work of Swanswell to support people struggling with substance abuse problems. Officers explained that Worcestershire County Council commissioned Swanswell to deliver drug and alcohol services across the county and representatives of the organisation were involved in the work of the Redditch Tasking Group.
- The work of the Partnership to raise the profile of the partnership in terms of helping retailers to tackle theft from

Crime and Disorder

Scrutiny

Panel

Wednesday, 27 September 2017

shops. Members were informed that the partnership worked closely with the Kingfisher Shopping Centre.

- The approach adopted by partners to address cases of child and sexual exploitation (CSE).
- The role of schools in terms of referring young people at risk of CSE. Members were advised that training was being delivered to school staff to help assist with this.
- The extent to which the increase in reported bicycle thefts was linked to changes in the reporting of crime statistics. Members were advised that there had been an increase in bicycle thefts and the partnership was examining these to identify any patterns.
- The work of partners to ensure that stolen bicycles were not subsequently sold on. Members were advised that the Police had worked with second hand stores and scrap metal dealers to try and address this. Owners were also encouraged to use property marking merchandise like SmartWater which could help to demonstrate ownership and facilitate the return of stolen property.
- The data indicated there had been an increase in vehicle crimes, which covered offences such as theft of a vehicle and theft from a vehicle. Officers were asked to clarify how drink driving was categorised in the data.

RESOLVED that

the update report be noted.

5. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED that

under S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matters on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act, as amended:

Minute 6 – Report Concerning Anti-Social Behaviour in Redditch Borough; and

Minute 7 – Report on Preventing Violent Extremism

Crime and Disorder

Scrutiny

Panel

Wednesday, 27 September 2017

6. REPORT CONCERNING ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN REDDITCH BOROUGH

The Community Safety Manager presented a report on the subject of anti-social behaviour (ASB) in Redditch Borough and in so doing highlighted the following information for Members' consideration:

- There were various definitions of ASB, which took into account the likely impact including on the quality of people's lives.
- The Council was in the process of updating its definition of ASB as identified in the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014. A report on this subject would be presented for the consideration of the Executive Committee in due course.
- ASB included a number of incidents considered to be beyond the bounds of acceptable behaviour.

[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 which relates to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime].

7. REPORT ON PREVENTING VIOLENT EXTREMISM

The Community Safety Manager presented a report on the subject of preventing violent extremism.

[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 which relates to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime].

The Meeting commenced at 6.30 pm
and closed at 7.55 pm

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank