



Executive Committee

Tuesday, 10 March 2015

MINUTES

Present:

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

Also Present:

Councillors Andrew Brazier, Natalie Brookes and Jane Potter

Officers:

C Flanagan, J Pickering, L Wood and R Wooldridge

Democratic Services Officer:

Jess Bayley

110. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

111. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

112. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Alexandra Hospital

The Chair advised that alongside the Leaders of Bromsgrove District Council and Stratford-On-Avon District Council he had signed a letter which had been sent to the West Midlands Clinical Senate. This letter had questioned when a report about the Alexandra Hospital would be released.

Additional Papers

Members were advised that two sets of Additional Papers had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

.....
Chair

Additional Meeting

An additional meeting of the Executive Committee had been arranged for 6.30pm on Monday 30th March 2015. This would consider recommendations from the Grants Panel on allocation of funds available as a result of the demise of the Redditch Citizens Advice Bureau. The meeting would be held in the Council Chamber, immediately prior to the Council meeting the same evening.

113. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 23rd February 2015 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

114. OBESITY TASK GROUP REPORT

The Chair of the Tackling Obesity Task Group, Councillor Jane Potter, presented the group's final report. During delivery of this presentation the following points were highlighted for Members' consideration:

- A significant number of people living in Redditch, 65.9 per cent of the local population, were either overweight or obese.
- The Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) and Redditch Borough Council had both identified health as a local priority.
- Obesity was associated with a number of medical conditions including Type 2 Diabetes and coronary heart disease.
- The group had found that there were a lot of projects and activities in the Borough that could help people to lose weight; however, there was limited awareness amongst people of these opportunities.
- The key challenge identified by the group had been how to motivate people to lose weight.
- The group had considered suggesting that a website be established to promote local initiatives; however, this idea had been rejected due to the resource implications.
- Officers had suggested that social media could be used to promote local opportunities and that, if combined with the Time2Change campaign, this could be undertaken at limited cost to the Council.
- Officers had also suggested this campaign should be underpinned by a Communications Plan.
- The feedback received by the group from the Redditch and Bromsgrove Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) indicated that

there was limited awareness amongst medical practitioners of local opportunities for people to lose weight.

- The group was envisaging that the monthly updates to GP Practices they were proposing would be sent to a designated contact and would not be lengthy.
- Members of the group recognised that there were arguments both for and against the introduction of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for hot food takeaways. However, the group believed that the Council had a moral obligation to investigate this matter further.
- The number of Councils with an SPD for hot food takeaways had increased in the past 10 years from none to over 20.
- Participation in health chat training would provide Councillors with useful information about a range of health issues.
- The group was not intending to propose that Councillors who had participated in the training should subsequently advise residents that they were overweight or obese. Instead participants could use the information provided to signpost residents to useful sources of support.
- The group had been impressed by the work that Redditch Borough Council was delivering to improve the health of staff.

Following presentation of the report the following matters were discussed by the Committee:

- The potential for all partners to promote local opportunities to lose weight to the public.
- The need for a multi-agency approach to be applied in order to tackle obesity levels effectively.
- The resource implications involved in investigating the potential to introduce an SPD for hot food takeaways and whether such an investigation would represent value for money.
- The difficulty of restricting the opening of hot food takeaways within a particular area around local schools and the challenge involved in imposing this restriction retrospectively.
- The lack of a relevant policy in the Local Plan No. 4 to which an SPD for hot food takeaways could be linked.
- The inclusion of a Health Impact Assessment in the preparatory work for the Local Plan No. 4.
- The contribution of free swimming and local Sure Start Centres to improvements in the health of local residents.
- The complex causes of obesity and the need for a variety of options to be available to people who were willing to lose weight.
- The potential impact that obesity could have on a person's self-confidence and mental health and the need for agencies to adopt a sensitive approach to supporting people in this position.
- The potential workload involved in gathering information to provide monthly updates to GP Practices and the need for partners to actively contribute to this data gathering process.

- The need for participation in health chat training by staff and Members to be undertaken on a voluntary basis.
- The improvements in the health of local residents that had been achieved since the Comprehensive Area Assessment was published in 2010.
- The impact that the behaviour of parents had on the health and life choices of their children.
- The extent to which the group had been able to consult with local residents as part of the review.

RESOLVED that

- 1) **the Tackling Obesity Task Group's report and recommendations be noted; and**
- 2) **the Tackling Obesity Task Group be asked to consider presenting their findings for the consideration of relevant local partner organisations.**

115. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Committee received the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 17th February 2015.

It was noted that there were no recommendations to consider as the recommendation at Minute No. 76 relating to the Medium Term Financial Plan had been dealt with by the Executive Committee at its previous meeting.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 17th February 2015 be noted.

116. HEALTH AND SAFETY POLICIES

The Committee received a report containing updated versions of the Council's Health and Safety, Risk Assessment and Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Policies, for recommendation to the Council. During consideration of the policies the following matters were discussed:

- The documents followed the Health and Safety Audit undertaken in April 2014 and incorporated recent changes in legislation and best practice.
- All three policies had been considered by the Joint Corporate Health, Safety and Welfare Committee and the policies incorporated some changes requested by the Committee.

- There were a number of Council services where staff were exposed to significant risks and Officers were keen to apply a standard approach to assessing those risks.
- Similarly a number of services regularly worked with hazardous substances and the Council had to ensure the safety of staff working in these environments.
- Ideally Members wanted the Council to have both effective health and safety policies and for staff to apply good working practices.
- Staff and Trade Union representatives had been consulted about the content of the policies.
- There were approximately 34 health and safety policies which would be considered over the following months. These policies would be reviewed on a regular basis.

Membership of the Joint Employee Liaison Meeting (ELM) was also briefly debated by the Committee. In terms of the formal membership of ELM it was noted that the majority groups at both Redditch Borough Council and Bromsgrove District Council had each appointed a Member to serve on ELM. However, the Committee was advised that meetings of ELM were open to all elected Members to attend.

RECOMMENDED that

the Health and Safety Policy, Risk Assessment Policy and Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Policy be approved for publication to all Members and Council employees in order to meet their legal duties.

117. LAND AT KINGHAM CLOSE/FAR MOOR LANE

During the presentation of this report the following points were highlighted:

- The majority of the site had significant tree coverage. A number of these trees were subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).
- However, many of the trees were part of an ash and maple plantation and a row of hybrid poplars which were not covered by TPOs.
- These trees formed a useful screen for nearby housing and acted as a buffer between any development and the adjacent Worcestershire Wildlife Trust nature reserve.
- If the site was to be developed trees that were not subject to a TPO could be removed. However, the removal of these trees would need to take into account the impact on the surrounding area.

- The existing trees also acted as a buffer between a watercourse and the road.
- The Root Protection Area of two larger trees that were subject to TPOs extended onto the site.
- A full tree survey would be required to assess the impact of any future development on trees that were subject to TPOs.
- Whilst the restrictions in relation to the site were not significant appropriate advice would need to be obtained regarding the ecological implications of any future development.

Following presentation of the report a number of points were discussed in further detail:

- The location of the site and potential risks associated with accessing the development on a bend in a road.
- The appropriate use of the land following a sale.
- The role of the Planning Committee in determining any future applications to develop the site.
- The potential impact of an industrial development on a site adjacent to a Worcestershire Wildlife Trust nature reserve.
- Future plans to sell land of a similar size in the Borough.

RESOLVED that

the land adjacent to Kingham Close/Far Moor Lane, Redditch be declared surplus to Council requirements and disposed of at market value.

118. PAY POLICY STATEMENT

The Committee received a report which sought recommendation to Council of the Pay Policy for 2015/16. The following matters were discussed during consideration of this item:

- There was a statutory requirement for the Council to produce a Pay Policy on an annual basis for the consideration of Council.
- A number of key points needed to be addressed in the policy including remuneration of the Council's Chief Officers, remuneration of the lowest paid employees and the relationship of the remuneration between the Chief Officers and employees who were not Chief Officers.
- The Job Evaluation Scheme would be implemented in 2015-16 rather than in 2014-15 as had been mistakenly recorded in the policy.
- In the new financial year the living wage would be paid to staff on the lowest scales.

RECOMMENDED that

the Pay Policy as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

119. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Members were asked to approve the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2015/16. A number of points were considered in relation to this item:

- There was a requirement for local authorities to set the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Prudential Indicators each year.
- The £109.9 million of borrowing listed for the authority included the costs of purchasing the authority's Council housing stock.
- The Council kept borrowing costs to a minimum where possible.
- Council Tax payments could be invested in the short-term.
- The Council could make unlimited investments in HM Treasury and in other local authorities. All other investments had to be made in AAA rated money market funds.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2015/16 and Prudential Indicators be approved;**
- 2) the Authorised Borrowing Limit for borrowing at £116 million if required be approved;**
- 3) the maximum level of investment to be held within each organisation (i.e. bank or building society) be £2.5 million, subject to market conditions; and**
- 4) the updated Treasury Management Policy Statement be approved.**

120. BUDGET MONITORING REPORT OCTOBER - DECEMBER 2014 (QUARTER 3)

Members considered the consolidated revenue and capital outturn report and the Council's financial position for the period April to December 2014. A number of points were discussed in detail during consideration of this item:

- Significant progress had been made during the year in achieving budget savings.

- The Council had exceeded the unidentified savings anticipated at the start of the year; budget savings of £697,000 had been achieved.
- Significant savings had been achieved by Environmental Services, arising from the findings of a business case, and by the Customer Access and Financial Support team.
- There was a projected underspend in capital expenditure. This was mainly due to a delay in the procurement of vehicles and plant for Environmental Services.
- A loss of income was being forecast for the CCTV and Lifeline services due to Worcestershire County Council withdrawing Supporting People funding.
- There had been a significant overspend on Leisure Services. This was mainly due to a reduction in income arising from local competition and from the closure of some services for essential maintenance, such as the pool and squash courts at Kingsley Sports Centre.
- There were risks associated with plans to achieve £150,000 savings in 2015/16 through a review of leisure services' management arrangements. However, the review also had the potential to result in new and innovative ways of working.
- The Council had attracted less income through sponsorship than had been anticipated at the beginning of the year.
- Revised fees and charges had been attached for Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS). This had been required because WRS had received a statutory notice about the appropriate level after the fees and charges for the Council had been set in 2014.

RESOLVED that

- 1) the current financial position on Revenue and Capital as detailed in the report be noted; and**
- 2) the amended Regulatory Services fees and charges be approved.**

121. ADVISORY PANELS - UPDATE REPORT

The Committee received the following updates:

- a) Planning Advisory Panel – lead Portfolio Holder, Councillor Greg Chance

The most recent meeting of the panel, which had been due to take place on 10th March, had been cancelled. An additional meeting of the panel would be required in due course though a date remained to be confirmed.

- b) Housing Advisory Panel – lead Portfolio Holder, Councillor Mark Shurmer

A meeting of the panel would take place on 18th March 2015.

- c) Economic Advisory Panel – lead Portfolio Holder, Councillor Greg Chance

Members noted that the Economic Advisory Panel no longer existed, having been superseded by the Economic Development Theme Group, a sub-Committee of the Redditch Local Strategic Partnership. For this reason references to the Advisory Panel could be removed from the report.

RESOLVED that

the update reports be noted.

The Meeting commenced at 7.02 pm
and closed at 9.00 pm

