



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Matthew Dormer (Chair), and Councillors Brandon Clayton (substitute), William Boyd, Andrew Fry, Joanna Kane, Sachin Mathur, David Munro, Rita Rogers and Paul Wren

Also Present:

Councillor Joe Baker – Leader of the Council
Councillor Sharon Harvey – Deputy Leader of the Council

Officers:

Peter Carpenter, Guy Revans, Rachel Egan, Simon Parry, Judith Willis, Rebecca Green, Georgina Harris, Doug Henderson and Della McCarthy

Democratic Services Officers:

Mat Sliwinski

80. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Craig Warhurst. Councillor Brandon Clayton attended the meeting as a substitute for Councillor Warhurst.

81. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

During consideration of item 7 (Minute No. 86), Councillor Rogers declared an other disclosable interest in agenda item 7, Redditch Partnership – Annual Report Update (Minute No. 86.). Councillor Rogers was employed by Worcestershire County Council and as part of work duties was involved with the Bromsgrove Partnership. It was noted that Councillor Rogers had no work or other involvement with the Redditch Partnership or the Redditch District Collaborative which were the subject of this agenda item. Councillor Rogers remained in the room and took part in the debate for the consideration of this item.

There were no other declarations of interest or of party whip.

Chair

82. MINUTES

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 3rd February 2025 were submitted for Members' consideration.

RESOLVED that

the Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 3rd February 2025 be approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chair.

83. PUBLIC SPEAKING

There were no public speakers who had registered to speak at this meeting.

84. FUTURE CEMETERY PROVISION - PRE-SCRUTINY

The Environmental Services Manager presented the Future Cemetery Provision report for the consideration of Overview and Scrutiny.

It was noted that it was previously envisaged that burial provision would be enlarged at the Ipsley Church Lane site. Following elections in May 2024, the new administration had requested putting a hold on any further works on the Ipsley Church Lane site whilst a review of alternative sites was carried out.

Following an independent review of potential alternatives for burial provision within the Borough, looking at 10 locations and 13 sites across the Borough, a potential new site for burial provision was proposed in the report on Land North of Morrisons and West of the B4497, B98 0JD (Proposed Site 2B).

There remained a need for burial provision whilst this site was further investigated. It was added that even with the additional two years of provision found following internal review, there was not enough provision available to last before the proposed site could be operational. It was therefore proposed that a section of land within the Abbey Cemetery that had previously been used for ashes scattering be repurposed to provide ten years of further burial provision.

It was acknowledged that the use of the former ashes scattering area at the Abbey Cemetery and Redditch Crematorium could be upsetting for those who had used this area previously. However, it was confirmed that there would be detailed searches of records and

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

communications provided to those residents who had used this site previously. These communications would be made through social media, websites, and notices posted at the location to inform people of the proposed future use. Residents would be listened to and Members were reassured that this would be an open and transparent process throughout. An appropriate memorial would be considered for installation at the site.

A further proposal contained within the report was that burial provision be included as a specific reference within the Redditch Local Plan, the development of which was currently underway. This recommendation would enable all feasible options and funding for providing new burial space to be considered through the policies and allocations in the new Borough of Redditch Local Plan.

The Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services was invited to speak and in doing so highlighted that the resolutions arrived at within the report were not proposed lightly and full consideration would be given to residents affected by the proposals. The Deputy Leader stated that the first recommendation would ensure the Council had sufficient time to find alternative sites for burial provision and in this regard it was noted that as part of the proposals there would still remain a large area for ashes scattering within the Abbey Cemetery. It was acknowledged that many people may find this place very special to them, and the Council would therefore do its best to alleviate people's concerns.

The Deputy Leader clarified that for the proposed site identified for burial provision, the Land North of Morrisons and West of the B4497, B98 0JD (Proposed Site 2B), the report recommended further investigation to be carried out to determine if the site could be used. Any final decision locating burial provision at this site would be subject of a separate report. The Deputy Leader drew attention to the third report recommendation in that by incorporating new burial provision into the Redditch Local Plan the Council would be better able to monitor the burial provision levels required in the Borough given future housing developments.

Once the report had been presented, Members discussed the following points in detail:

- Arrangements for soil removal at the ashes scattering area at Abbey Cemetery and Redditch Crematorium, B97 6RR – A Member queried the arrangements for removing the top soil of the area that had been used for ashes scattering, in preparation for use as a burial site. The Officers explained that at the site the ashes were scattered on top of the lawn

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

and had already been distributed into the soil. There were no markers present to indicate specific locations of where ashes had been scattered. The proposal in the report was to repurpose part of the ash scattering area within the Abbey Cemetery for burials. This would be through using the soil present at the site for burials. A Member expressed his disapproval and ethical concern with the proposal, noting that the graves would be dug up using the same soil on which ashes had previously been scattered.

- Suitability of the Land North of Morrisons and West of the B4497, B98 0JD (proposed site 2B) for cemetery development – Concerns were raised by some Members regarding the suitability of the proposed site, given that the site was located within the part of Arrow Valley Park used by the Council every summer for sporting events and festivities. A Member raised a further concern regarding the high water table at the site given the proximity of the lake to the site. It was noted that soil samples had not been taken prior to papers being presented to the Committee and there was a risk that the site could be rejected following feasibility studies. A Member expressed hope that the water table would not be an issue given the lake was man-made and therefore lined.
- Records of caskets at the Abbey Cemetery and Redditch Crematorium, B97 6RR – The Officer clarified that based on the records passed to the Environmental Services Manager by his predecessor there were no caskets that had been put in the area under consideration for repurposing. It was explained that if during further investigation of paperwork any evidence of caskets would come to light the Council would need to reconsider its plans as exhumation licence from the Ministry of Justice would then be required. A Member urged the Council to undertake the land survey before any works began, given complications and that could occur if coffins were subsequently found at the site.
- It was reiterated by the Environmental Services Manager that the Council would take special care to investigate every single record to determine if any caskets were left buried at the site and the Council would exercise every caution and promptly contact the Ministry of Justice and the families concerned if there was any casket found during the course of the investigation of the site.

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

- A Member commented that the site earmarked for repurposing within Abbey Cemetery was maintained by Redditch Borough Council and grass was regularly mowed at the site of ashes scattering so there was already disruption to the ashes scattered both from mowers and weather conditions, for example wind.
- The number of families that might be affected by proposals to repurpose the ashes scattering area – The Environmental Services Manager responded that a third of scattering garden L at the Abbey Cemetery and Redditch Crematorium would be affected. The Council would be able to investigate records by garden location to determine the families affected in that garden, subject to any ashes scattering on the grounds that the Council was not aware of.
- Burial provision capacity in Redditch – It was reported that the figure of 71 new burials per year was based on the Office for National Statistics (ONS) data for death-rates in Redditch. Based on this figure, it was calculated that Edgioake Lane Cemetery had approximately five years burial provision available at its current usage, and the Abbey Cemetery had approximately two years left. This was the remaining available space, if the recommended actions were not taken to increase provision.
- Capital expenditure for repurposing the existing ash scattering ground at Abbey Cemetery – It was noted that the estimated figure of £250,000 was a figure quoted within the consultants' report and it was based on the consultant's experience with previous similar projects. The Environmental Services Manager reported that the Council would not be spending this much as some of the infrastructure work at the site, such as paths to the site, would be undertaken by the Council internally.
- The costs of development of the Land North of Morrisons and West of the B4497, B98 0JD (proposed site 2B) – It was noted that the estimated cost of between £1.25 million to £1.75 million for the development of this site was based on recent similar projects. The Officers highlighted that a feasibility study at the site was required, as per resolution two in the report, as many factors remained unknown. It was noted that the feasibility study of the site might uncover a need for significant mitigation works to be undertaken at the site, such as drainage, which could significantly increase the

cost and/or result in less burial space at the site than anticipated.

- Inclusion of costs relating for development of Proposed Site 2B within Council's Budgets – It was clarified by Officers that the budget for undertaking a feasibility study for a new burial site was included in the current 2024/25 financial year (£400,000), which would be carried forward, and there was also an allocation in 2025/26 financial year (£125,000). The budget allocated was deemed sufficient for undertaking feasibility studies.
- With regard to development costs for the Land North of Morrisons and West of the B4497, B98 0JD (proposed site 2B), it was highlighted that this was not included in the 2025/26 budget and would need to be included in a future Medium Term Financial Plan once investigative work had been carried out to understand the topography and geology of the site. It was highlighted that no timescale was yet in place for when detailed plans would be ready. It was predicted that the investigate work and planning would take in excess of one year. Members were reassured that any final cost proposals would be submitted to the Executive Committee and Council as part of the Budget setting report.

On being put to the vote, the recommendations contained in the report were endorsed.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) **the Land located at the current Abbey Cemetery site, used previously as an ashes scattering area be utilised for earth burial provision for an interim period of up to ten years commencing in January 2027.**
- 2) **A review be commissioned of the potential to use the site at Land North of Morrisons and West of the B4497, B98 0JD for burial provision in the long-term.**
- 3) **A process begin of incorporating new burial provision within the new Borough of Redditch Local Plan.**

85. UK SHARED PROSPERITY FUND 2025-26 - PRE-SCRUTINY

The UK Prosperity Fund Manager presented the report. It was explained that there had been a one-year extension of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) for the financial year 2025/2026

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

at a reduced rate of funding. This had resulted in Redditch Borough Council being allocated £818,536.

It was reported that there had been some further changes in the UKSPF for this financial year, in that the list of fifty plus interventions had been replaced with five themes and twelve sub-themes.

The Investment Plan for the funding for 2025/26 had been aligned with the priorities outlined by Members and included support for communities and the Voluntary Sector, improvement of the Town Centre, Parks and Green Spaces and the Cost of Living. Furthermore, there had been consultation with the Redditch Town Deal Board who also supported the priority of investment in upskilling, youth unemployment and support for local businesses as key priorities.

It was noted that one of the proposed recommendations contained within the report would also allow any funds that had not been spent as per the Investment Plan to be reallocated following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration and Governance. This would ensure that all available monies were spent within the deadline.

It was highlighted that the guidance for the UKSPF recommended that a Local Partnership Group, made up of key stakeholders, advised the Council regarding the strategic fit and deliverability of the UKSPF Investment Plan. It was confirmed that the Redditch Town Deal Board, which performed the local partnership group function for Redditch, supported the 2025/26 Investment Plan.

The Leader of the Council was invited to speak and in doing so thanked the Officers for preparing the Investment Plan. The Leader stated that it was felt important to focus on economy within the Plan, supporting local businesses and the voluntary sector. Another key aspect was to support young people, which included the new youth hub in Redditch. It was highlighted that for businesses to grow within the Borough, there was a need for people to be provided with training and upskilled, and having a fund to support with these objectives was welcomed.

During the debate, the following themes were discussed:

- Future of UKSPF – There was a one-year extension to UKSPF for 2025/26. When this extension was announced, the Government stated that a new set of growth funding was

being developed, and it was expected that UKSPF would be replaced by a different fund in the future.

- Reduction in projects funded from UKSPF – It was reported that the 49 per cent reduction in UKSPF funding for 2025/26 would necessitate the discontinuation of some programmes that had been funded from UKSPF in previous years. In assessing which programmes would continue for 2025/26, Officers assessed how the programmes were performing and prioritised those which had been the most successful. In addition, those programmes which had no access to alternative sources of funding and met the ambitions of the Council Plan would also be continued where possible. It was highlighted that within the UKSPF scheme no programmes were subsidised with Council funding.
- Monitoring of UKSPF funds spending – It was confirmed that the Council did monitor how the programmes spent their UKSPF funding allocations, and it was confirmed that all programmes spent money on Redditch activities.

On being put to the vote, the recommendations contained in the report were endorsed.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) The Investment Plan be approved; and**
- 2) Authority to vary the Investment Plan, in order to maximise the use of the grant be delegated to the Assistant Director Regeneration & Property following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration and Governance.**

86. REDDITCH PARTNERSHIP - ANNUAL REPORT UPDATE

The Redditch Partnership Manager introduced the report and in doing so noted that Redditch Partnership was the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) for the Redditch area and aimed to bring together representatives from a wide variety of agencies across the public, private and voluntary and community sectors to enable partnership working for the benefit of local residents.

There were a number of groups that stemmed from the Redditch Partnership. The Redditch Community Wellbeing Group (RCWG) was a longstanding partnership group that met bi-monthly and covered health and wellbeing across all ages. The RCWG had

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

recently developed a monthly in-person multi-agency drop-ins for residents to access advice from multiple agencies.

The Cost of Living Partnership Group was a group operating across Redditch and Bromsgrove that was chaired by the Council's Assistant Director Community and Housing Services. This Group aimed to minimise the impact of the cost-of-living crisis and ensure that people were aware of where they could access support. The messages were distributed in many formats including on the website, via social media messages, and through a printed cost of living leaflet. Most recently, a 'useful contacts' business card had been printed and distributed via the Council teams and partners.

The Redditch Business Leaders (RBL) was a group that originated from the Redditch Partnership but became an independent self-sustained group. The aim of the group had been to focus on skills, in particular employment and career skills of young people. In response to a question, it was stated that RBL was not defunct, and meetings were still being held but the Council had not been directly involved for some time. It was confirmed that the last meeting of RBL took place in December 2024 with the next meeting due to take place in April 2025. In terms of the RBL's Youth Group, it was clarified that the current approach was for RBL representatives to deliver training and undertake mentoring for young people within schools.

Redditch Mental Health and Housing Group was a Redditch specific group focused on bringing together Redditch Council's Housing and NHS Mental Health Teams, along with other relevant agencies.

The Redditch District Collaborative (RDC) was developed following changes nationally with the formation of the Integrated Care Systems (ICS). The RDC was part of the Herefordshire and Worcestershire ICS, with the ICS represented at county level through the County Council's Health and Wellbeing Board and at local Redditch level through the RDC. There were two Primary Care Networks (PCNs) within Redditch and it was the PCNs which had worked closely with the County Council's Public Health and Redditch Borough Council to establish the RDC.

The Redditch Partnership Manager highlighted that due to resource changes, there was no longer a programme lead for the RDC. This triggered a review of how RDC would operate going forward. Following the review there had been a reduction in the number of RDC groups and the focus had shifted towards enhancing connections within established local networks, such as the Redditch Partnership's Community Wellbeing Group.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

It was explained that the Wellbeing in Partnership E-Bulletin had continued to be produced monthly and was received by all Councillors and provided local information on voluntary and community developments that could be passed on to local residents. The Knowledge Bank was a Redditch and Bromsgrove fully searchable directory of community services, publicly available on the Council's website.

Following the presentation, a Member expressed concerns about the lack of performance data available on the Redditch Partnership and the Redditch District Collaborative (RDC). Questions were also raised about how these local groups were accountable to elected members.

A response was provided by the Redditch Partnership Manager in that Redditch Partnership was a completely voluntary, non-statutory partnership. As such, it was difficult to set precise targets as the aim of the Partnership was for voluntary organisations and public sector bodies within Redditch to come together and form connections and partnerships.

It was explained that several years ago the Redditch District Collaborative was in a situation where multitude of groups existed that were not connected to one another with the result that a number of different groups of voluntary sector and public partners worked in isolation. Following a review outlined within the presentation, the number of groups under the umbrella of Redditch Partnership had reduced. Membership of each group was also reviewed and all groups retained had to set out how they linked to the overall Redditch Partnership structure. It was noted that work continued on establishing which organisations were best represented through the RDC.

It was stressed that one of the main aims of the Partnership was to enable community outreach workers from different voluntary and charitable organisations to engage and make connections with an array of other organisations operating across Redditch and Bromsgrove. It was highlighted that Redditch District Collaborative was a completely voluntary partnership of third sector organisations and no public funding was attached. There was therefore no performance data produced in the way that there would be for programmes that were funded from grants such as the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.

It was added that data was shared within the RDC between the different partners, for example on what the individual partners could

do within their organisations to improve performance and what the RDC could do collectively to help improve outcomes for residents.

Following the Officer's response, a Member requested further clarification as there seemed to be a lack of targets and performance data available to elected members on RDC's performance. In response, it was clarified by the Redditch Partnership Manager that collaboration through RDC enabled the different organisations to network and share ideas on how they were delivering their individual programmes and initiatives and how they organisations could collaborate to improve overall outcomes for residents. It was reiterated that as such there could not be set quantitative targets comparable to those for funded programmes as the RDC was a meeting place for partners to share ideas.

An example of added value of organisations forming partnership through the RDC was provided in the starting well service for young people, where the service was able to increase its outreach to residents after linking with the voluntary sector organisations.

A question was asked whether Mental Health and Housing partnership groups were operating in other parts of Worcestershire. It was responded that, within Worcestershire, Redditch and Bromsgrove were the first districts to develop this partnership group. It was noted that the Head of Housing and Health Partnerships for Worcestershire (a post within Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust) was created in 2022 and one of the first tasks for that post holder had been the setting up of Redditch specific group focussing on bringing together Redditch Borough Council Housing and NHS Mental Health Teams.

RESOLVED that

the annual update report be noted.

87. COUNCIL PLAN - PRE-SCRUTINY

The Policy Manager presented the Redditch Borough Council Plan, which had been developed by the Executive Committee alongside Officers and the Local Government Association (LGA). It was stated that in addition to the Council Plan there would be a separate Implementation Plan to link the Council Plan to the Medium Term Financial Plan and Service Areas Business Plans. It was anticipated that the Council Plan would be reviewed annually and key objectives and outcomes measured as part of the Quarterly monitoring reporting regime.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

The Council Plan had three new priorities for the Borough which were Economy and Regeneration, Green, Clean and Safe, and Community and Housing. There was also a section on organisational priorities. Other sections of the draft plan were also outlined during the presentation.

The Leader of the Council addressed the Committee and in doing so thanked the Officers and Members for their work in putting the Council Plan together. The Leader outlined developments that had taken place under the current leadership including finding alternative sites for burial provision, the ability to use Towns Fund for other projects apart from Town Hall redevelopment, continued progress on the digital manufacturing and innovation centre (DMIC) and the opening of the outdoor market. It was highlighted that in addition the Council Plan contained a number of other, simpler initiatives such as area warders. The Leader highlighted the work undertaken by the Portfolio Holder for Performance together with the Policy Manager in developing this Council Plan.

Some Members raised concerns with the impact of local government reorganisation on the delivery of this Council Plan and the potential that some initiatives could be scrapped if they were not delivered before the commencement date for the new unitary structure of April 2028.

Regarding the digital manufacturing and innovation centre (DMIC) it was stated that the same company was brought back in to oversee the innovation centre development as had been in place at the beginning of the project.

On being put to the vote the recommendations contained in the report were endorsed.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) The Council Plan be approved.**
- 2) Authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration and Governance in respect of any changes as a result of the Local Government reorganisation.**

88. TASK GROUPS, SHORT SHARP REVIEWS AND WORKING GROUPS - UPDATE REPORTS

Updates on the Task Groups and Working Groups were provided as follows:

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

a) Budget Scrutiny Working Group – Chair, Councillor Warhurst

There was no detailed update as Councillor Warhurst had submitted his apologies; however, it was noted that meetings of Budget Scrutiny took place on 18th February and 7th March 2025. The meeting on 18th February was to further scrutinise the Medium Term Financial Plan Tranche 2 before the report was submitted for decision-making by the Executive Committee and Full Council. At the meeting on 7th March the Q3 Revenue and Performance Monitoring and the Finance Recovery Programme reports were scrutinised.

b) Performance Scrutiny Working Group – Chair, Councillor Warhurst

There was no update provided as Councillor Warhurst had submitted apologies.

c) Fly Tipping and Bulky Waste Task Group – Chair, Councillor Dormer

It was reported that this Task Group had now been concluded, and the final report of the investigation was being drafted. The Task Group's final report would be presented to a meeting of Overview and Scrutiny in summer 2025.

d) Post-16 Education Task Group – Chair, Councillor Warhurst

There was no update provided as Councillor Warhurst had submitted apologies.

RESOLVED that

the Task Groups, Short Sharp Reviews and Working Groups update reports be noted.

89. EXTERNAL SCRUTINY BODIES - UPDATE REPORTS

Updates on the meetings of External Scrutiny bodies were provided by the representatives as follows:

a) West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Council Representative, Councillor Kane

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

Councillor Kane reported that the last meeting took place on Monday 3rd March where the West Midlands State of the Region 2024/25 report was presented. The report focused on inequalities across the West Midlands Combined Authority region in areas such as the economy, housing, health, and civic participation. It was highlighted among other things that the growth in the average disposable income in the West Midlands was lower than the UK average and that 25 per cent of the population felt they could impact on their local decision-making, slightly higher than the national figure of 23 per cent.

- b) West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) Transport Delivery Overview and Scrutiny – Council Representative, Councillor Munro

Councillor Munro reported that no matters of relevance to Redditch were discussed at the last meeting of Transport Delivery Overview and Scrutiny.

- c) Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) – Council Representative, Councillor Munro

Councillor Munro reported that the last meeting took place on 20th February. There were two main items on the agenda at that meeting, both of considerable relevance to Redditch: mitigation of winter pressures on urgent and emergency care, and the overview of winter pressures from West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS).

Councillor Munro reported that a presentation by Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust was provided into winter pressures. The Trust had a winter plan designed to reduce ambulance handover times, improve emergency department waiting times, improve emergency access standard performance, and reduce number of patients receiving corridor care, however, the representative highlighted that the overall results were disappointing and the improvements expected were not being delivered.

It was cited that the Trust had an overall performance target that by March 2025 78 per cent of patients attending the emergency department should be admitted to hospital, transferred to another provider, or discharged within four hours. The actual figure being achieved as of January 2025 was 57.2 per cent. The target for patients spending over twelve hours in emergency department was 7 per cent. The latest performance data showed this to be at 11 per cent.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

It was reported that the Trust had attempted to reduce ambulance handover delays but there remained significant concern over the number of handover delays and lost paramedic hours. There were some improvements such as discharges from both the Worcestershire Royal Hospital, Worcester, and Alexandra Hospital, Redditch, increasing by circa 10 per cent compared to the previous year. Corridor care had remained a considerable problem at both hospitals, and the January 2025 figures from the ambulance service had indicated that handover delays had reduced, particularly at the Worcestershire Royal Hospital.

Councillor Munro reiterated that the Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust had been subject of a Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspection in 2023 and was found to 'require improvement'. Councillor Munro commented that the need for improvement remained, with the Trust still placed in Tier 1, requiring the highest level of support and improvement, and being required to report to the Department of Health on a weekly basis.

Councillor Munro reported that an overview from West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS) was also provided at the 20th February meeting. It was reported that the position on handover delays between WMAS and the Trust hospitals had deteriorated sharply since August 2024. However, ambulance response times across Worcestershire and Herefordshire had seen a considerable improvement and on average were close to achieving the 18-minute target for category 2 emergency calls and were achieving the national 30-minute response target for less urgent calls; it was reported that these WMAS was achieving these targets despite the issues at the Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust.

Councillor Munro reported that WMAS had made an investment of over £4 million to increase the number of ambulances and staff, with the workforce expanded by 334 staff and the ambulance fleet increasing from 340 to 420. The investment had been fifty per cent funded by the Department of Health, with the remaining half to be funded jointly by the Integrated Care Boards (ICBs) within the WMAS catchment area. Only the Herefordshire and Worcestershire ICB was yet to agree payment terms with WMAS.

Councillor Munro quoted figures on the lost paramedic hours across the areas covered by WMAS. The loss of paramedic hours due to hospital handover delays was expected to be 255,000 hours by April 2025. This figure was already reached by January 2025 for the year 2024/25 and it was expected that the final figure for the year would be circa 375,000 paramedic hours lost across the WMAS catchment.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 10th March, 2025

RESOLVED that

the External Scrutiny Bodies updates be noted.

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

The Executive Committee Work Programme was presented for Members' consideration. It was reconfirmed that the items from this work programme that had been added to the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme in previous meetings would remain for consideration at meetings in the new municipal year.

RESOLVED that

the Executive Committee's Work Programme be noted.

91. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

The Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme was presented for Members' consideration.

RESOLVED that

the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme be noted.

The Meeting commenced at 6.30 pm
and closed at 8.08 pm