

SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
15 OCTOBER 2007

MINUTES
(18.00 – 20.50)

PRESENT Councillor John Webster (in the Chair following item 1), Councillors Peter Allen, Chris Coleman, Barbara Driver, Tina Franklin, Penny Hall, Paul McLain, John Morris (substitute for Sandra Holliday) Alan Nicholson

Hazel Kitchin, Jackie Sallis and Lorna Steers

APOLOGIES Councillor Holliday, Cabinet Member Finance (David Hall)

RELEVANT DEPUTIES IN ATTENDANCE:

Leader (Duncan Smith), Cabinet Members Quality of Life (Chris Ryder), Safer and Stronger Communities (Anne Regan), Corporate Services (Stuart Hutton), Arts and Culture (Diggory Seacome).

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

As Vice Chairman, Councillor Allen introduced this item explaining that it was not on the agenda which had been circulated because it had arisen out of an amendment to the Constitution agreed by Council on 9th October. Council had effectively disqualified any members of the political group forming the Council's Cabinet from taking the Chair of any Overview and Scrutiny Committee and had deferred the decision of electing a new chair to the Social and Community Committee at its next meeting.

Councillor Allen invited nominations from the Liberal Democrat group explaining that he was unable to put himself forward as the Constitution allowed no more than two Chairs of Overview and Scrutiny Committees from the same Political Group.

Councillor Franklin proposed Councillor Webster and this was seconded by Councillor Morris.

VOTING

For 4

Against 4

Following advice from the Deputy Monitoring Officer, Councillor Allen used his ordinary vote and in order to progress the meeting voted in favour of Councillor Webster.

RESOLVED that Councillor Webster be appointed Chairman of Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor McLain expressed the view that following the appointment of Councillor Webster the Conservative Members would withdraw from attending any future Committee meeting.

Councillor Nicholson left the meeting having previously indicated he would only attend for this vote because he was feeling unwell.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mrs Steers declared a personal interest in agenda item 7: Final review of the council's conditional offers of grant as a Director and Chair of Cheltenham Federation of Tenants and Leaseholders.

Mrs Kitchin declared a personal interest in agenda item 7: Final review of the council's conditional offers of grant and agenda item 8a, 8b, 8c and 8d because she was an executive member of Cheltenham Arts Council.

Councillor Morris declared a personal interest in agenda item 9: Regeneration in Cheltenham as he was a member of the Board of Management of Hesters Way Neighbourhood Project in his own right. He left the meeting before the start of the discussion in respect of this item and did not take part in the voting.

Councillor P Hall declared a personal interest in agenda item 7: Final review of the council's conditional offers of grant as the Council's appointed representative on Cheltenham VCA.

Councillor Driver also declared a personal interest in agenda item 7: Final review of the council's conditional offers of grant as the Council's appointed representative on Hesters Way Neighbourhood Project.

3. MINUTES (Agenda item 3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 10th September 2007 be approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A number of public questions had been received in respect of item 7: Final review of the council's conditional offers of grant and are attached at Appendix A together with the responses.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE

(a) By Council – None

(b) By Cabinet – None

(c) Other Committees – None

Following a suggestion made by the Chairman, the Committee agreed that items 7 and 9 be brought forward on the agenda so that they be considered consecutively before the presentation by Cheltenham Everyman Theatre, followed by the Cultural Review items and then the rest of the agenda.

6. FINAL REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S 2005-08 CONDITIONAL OFFERS OF GRANT
(Agenda item 6)

As a representative of the Committee's Grant Review Working Group, Councillor Morris presented this report which had been circulated with the agenda. He explained that the review had been based on a performance monitoring proforma submitted by each organisation under the terms of their grant together with one and a half to two hour interviews with each group.

Councillor Morris referred to the findings and recommendations of the review group outlined in Section 4 of the report which, with the approval of the Committee, would be referred on to Cabinet for a final decision regarding future funding. He explained the review group's reasoning behind its recommendation not to fund the former Cheltenham Regeneration Partnership and Cheltenham Federation of Tenants and Leaseholders in future. Following the review process the review group also made a number of recommendations in respect of undertaking any future review including the provision of a brief as to the purpose and structure for both the working group and the organisations involved so everyone is clear as to what is expected. Councillor Morris, thanked his fellow members of the working group who had worked very hard to complete the reviews within a very short time constraint.

Councillor Allen indicated that as a member of the cross party working group set up to explore the context for the proposed single regeneration company, he recognised the value of the Stronger Communities Partnership (formerly Cheltenham Regeneration Partnership) and therefore in line with recommendations contained in agenda item 9 to be discussed next on the agenda, he felt the council should continue to put financial resources into this Partnership.

The Chairman referred to the recommendation not to continue to fund Cheltenham Federation and emphasised that in order for Cheltenham Borough Homes to continue to achieve 3 star status it was imperative that an independent organisation is used to promote tenants' rights to consultation and involvement in the decision making processes surrounding the management of their homes.

RESOLVED that the Committee endorses the findings of the review group as detailed in Section 4 of the report and agrees to submit these findings to the Cabinet for their due consideration.

7. REGENERATION IN CHELTENHAM (agenda item 9)

As the Chair of the Single Regeneration Company Feasibility working group Councillor Allen presented this report which had been circulated with the agenda. He reminded the Committee that at the last meeting the item had been partially debated and then deferred because of the late circulation at the meeting of appendix A 'the final report of the single company feasibility working group'. Further time had been requested by the Committee in order to make an informed decision based on all the available evidence.

In response to a concern raised by Councillor McLain regarding the impact of the proposed funding model on the two neighbourhood projects, Councillor Allen indicated that whilst there had been some initial concerns made by the smaller companies about the possibility of losing their individual identities, these had been outweighed by the benefits of collaborative working to improve service delivery in their neighbourhoods.

The conclusions of the working group had been a compromise which all parties concerned had come to accept.

The Committee considered the proposed funding model set out in section 6 of the report and upon a vote being taken:-

RESOLVED that the Committee:-

- i) Endorses the findings of the Single Regeneration Company Feasibility Working Group set out in Section 6 of the report and agrees to submit these findings to the Cabinet for their due consideration.
- ii) Thanks representatives of the five regeneration companies and Bernice Thomson from the Regeneration Partnership (Cheltenham) for their hard work and persistence in pulling their report together.

(Voting For: 2, Against:0, Abstained: 4)

8. PRESENTATION BY CHELTENHAM EVERYMAN THEATRE (agenda item 6)

Mr Geoffrey Rowe, Chief Executive of Cheltenham Everyman Theatre provided a presentation covering the following:-

- Statistical information about the number of customers including outreach work undertaken
- Overview of financial position
- How the Theatre helps to deliver the aspirations of the Council set out in its Business Plan

Members raised a number of questions about the number of Cheltenham residents who used the theatre in relation to the value of the Council's grant, which Mr Rowe answered. In response to other comments from members, Geoffrey Rowe explained that the theatre was working hard in each of the 5 regeneration areas within Cheltenham to make the programme accessible to disadvantaged groups including young people.

The Chairman thanked Mr Rowe for his presentation.

9. CULTURAL REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

The Cabinet Member Arts and Culture introduced this section of the agenda which had been dedicated to provide members of the Committee with an update on the progress of the implementation of the Cultural Review. He explained that the individual lead officers would briefly present their reports which had been circulated with the agenda and the Committee would then be given the opportunity to raise any specific questions relating to each report.

9A Cheltenham Festivals

Donna Renney, Chief Executive of Cheltenham Festivals presented her report, explaining that everything recommended in the Pratley report concerning Cheltenham Festivals had been delivered and drew particular attention to the following issues:-

- the externalisation of the Festivals has been achieved.
- over the next 2 years the Festivals intend to generate 88% of their funding from sponsorship, fundraising, box-office and other business initiatives.
- Pittville Pump Room – making it commercially viable continues to be a challenge given its limited seating capacity and complete absence of modern catering facilities for concerts.
- Town Hall – the facilities are no longer good enough to support festivals of international reputation in the 21st Century. The initiatives to develop the Town Hall are welcomed but investment also needs to be made in staging and acoustic improvements. The Festivals are willing to help achieve improvements in whatever way they can by working cohesively with Cheltenham Borough Council.

The Festivals were congratulated by the Committee for the hard work undertaken since the review which had culminated in the success of the Festivals year on year bringing significant economic benefits to the town.

In response to a question from Councillor McLain, Donna Renney indicated that it was too early to say whether there had been any positive outcomes from the setting up of the Cultural Partnership, she had had little input to date as her time had been significantly taken up by the management of the separation from Cheltenham Festivals from the Council, as well as providing a full festivals programme.

The Chairman commented that it was an excellent report. He referred to Section 5 Governance and Championship and stressed that the council should take recommendations about successful championship of the arts at local authority officer level very seriously as the Festivals was a business as well as a service. He highlighted the importance of getting the balance of programming right in order to be able to reach out and engage with a wide variety of people.

9B Future Development of Cheltenham Town Hall and 9C Pittville Pump Room

The Assistant Director Entertainment and Tourism introduced his information/discussion papers consecutively which had been circulated with the agenda.

Town Hall - He briefly explained that arising from the recommendations contained in the final report of the Cultural Review, architects were appointed to prepare a scoping report outlining a phased development programme to be implemented as funds became available. The architects had produced plans and a schematic model to show how the three phased development might be achieved and this was displayed at the meeting for public inspection. He drew particular attention to the following main issues:-

- The first phase has been estimated to cost approx £4 million at current prices. The Cultural Review had envisaged a situation whereby the sale or lease of the Pump Room would provide resources to invest in the development but with the decision now taken to retain the Pump Room under direct Council control, this source of funding is no longer open

- With the Town Hall being a listed building set within a conservation area it has been necessary to consult English Heritage on the development proposals and at their request a heritage impact assessment has been commissioned.

Pittville Pump Room - The Assistant Director Entertainment and Tourism provided an update on the management arrangements at Pittville Pump Room following the Cabinet decision in July 2007 that it would remain under management and operation of the council's Entertainment and Tourism Division for the foreseeable future. Levels of commercial business were picking up following a period of uncertainty about its future. Responsibility for the programming of the Pump Room has already been transferred to the Town Hall team and all sales and bookings for both venues are now handled centrally, which will allow Pump Room staff to concentrate on operational matters. A full review of existing Pump Room business, hire charges and the management structure will be undertaken.

The Committee made the following comments:-

Town Hall

- Some basic requirements also needed to be addressed as a matter of priority within Phase One eg repairs to toilet facilities that were out of action during the Literature Festival
- Any future developments should take into account the needs of disabled users.

In response to comments made during the Cheltenham Festivals discussion the Assistant Director Entertainment and Tourism reassured Members that the existing power supply was adequate for running the Town Hall but it was the supply to the tented village during the Festivals that caused difficulties.

In response to a public question raised by Mr Stennett on behalf of the residents in the vicinity of the Town Hall, the Assistant Director Entertainment and Tourism indicated that the residents would be consulted in respect of any proposed 'cultural hub' including bar/café area. The council is running a business and catering is a key part of the cultural experience. He agreed to email the Heritage Impact assessment to Mr Stennett and indicated that consultation on the development project will take place with all interested parties and stakeholders.

Pittville Pump Room

- The loop did not work and the private donors who had funded the rebuilding of the PPR after the war still had not been recognised in any way.
- How much had the marketing exercise cost? The Assistant Director Entertainment and Tourism did not know the answer and agreed to provide a response following the meeting. (The cost has subsequently been confirmed to be £10,145)

9D Art Gallery and Museum – oral update

The Museum and Arts Manager provided an update following the launch of the RIBA open competition in June to find the right architect and design scheme for the AG & M project as follows:-

- Huge interest has been received on the competition both nationally and internationally with 77 final submissions.

- Public consultation has been taking place from 19th September to 17th October both via the website and on display within the AG & M.
- The judging panel is meeting on 19th October to shortlist down to four Stage 2 finalists and they will have until 30th November to submit their final schemes.
- Funding of £30k was secured through the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme.
- The council can only apply to Heritage Lottery Fund and other funding organisations once a design scheme has been confirmed. Stage 1 submission to HLF will be March 2008.

The Museum and Arts Manager provided the following responses to Members' questions:-

- The four finalists will be interviewed by RIBA architects and will be asked to provide detailed costings.
- Other sources for funding the £4 million scheme include £1.25 million bid from the Heritage Lottery Fund, £500k from the sale of the Axiom, involving Friends organisations, the appointment of a fundraising officer to secure match funding and the establishment of a Development Trust.

Members congratulated the Museum and Arts Manager on her drive and expressed concern about the scheme's long term achievability. The Committee was concerned that the consultation had predominantly been web-based and not all target audience have access to the website. Mrs Kitchin, representing the Arts Council indicated that as far as she was aware the visual arts groups had not been consulted to date and hoped that they would be involved during the lead up to the final decision. It was also important to get the views of the residents of the town so publicity of the scheme should be as wide as possible.

RESOLVED that the Committee notes the Cultural Review Implementation update

10. BRIEFING FROM CABINET MEMBERS

The Cabinet Member Safer and Stronger Communities updated Members on Children and Young People issues including:-

- the success of play schemes and activities over the summer.
- Five roadshows were successfully held by the South Cheltenham youth project, a partnership of agencies including the council. Questionnaires completed during the events are currently being analysed to try to improve the quality of life for young people in Cheltenham.
- The allocation of just over £10k through the Community Pride Scheme to support the implementation / improvement of youth facilities throughout the Borough.

Councillor Webster asked "What communication of information from the Neighbourhood Policing Panels is in place to feed through to the CCSP?" In response the Cabinet Member Safer and Stronger Communities agreed to find out and get back to all members (see response attached at Appendix B)

11. POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEM (Agenda item 12)

Jackie Sallis introduced her proposed scrutiny topic on hospital parking which had been circulated with the agenda. She briefly explained that as a volunteer at Cheltenham General Hospital she had become aware of increasing user dissatisfaction with the car parking facilities both in terms of the charges which she had tabled for information and the number of spaces available. She was particularly concerned because oncology was losing a further number of parking spaces which would affect the most vulnerable users of the hospital. She asked the Committee to consider looking into the concerns raised and make representation to Cheltenham General Hospital on behalf of the users of the hospital car park.

The Committee agreed that the item should be included in the future work programme for a future item and suggested that the Car Parking Manager be called as a witness together with the Director of Finance as the issue was more than likely related to budget pressures.

12. COMMITTEE FEEDBACK SESSION

The Chairman felt that once again there had been too much on the agenda to be dealt with effectively within the timeframe. Councillor Driver commented that the acoustics in the drawing room were not good, the public in attendance had also indicated that they were unable to hear the Committee during some of the debate.

13. 2008/09 BUDGET PRIORITISATION

The Leader briefly introduced this report on behalf of the Cabinet Member Finance who was unable to attend the meeting and had sent his apologies. He explained that the Council is facing a budget gap of between £0.8m and £1m for 2008/09 and between £2.7m and £5m over the next 5 years. As part of the strategy for bridging the gap, the Cabinet are keen to seek views from all overview and scrutiny committees on where it should look to find savings in services within their respective remits.

The Chairman indicated that to give this important exercise due consideration the Committee would require at least one hour, which was not possible in view of the time (8.50pm). It was agreed that the item be deferred to the next scheduled meeting on 29th November, if this met with the budget timetable.

Councillor J Webster
Chair

APPENDIX A

Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee 15.10.07
Public Questions re: Item 7 Report of COG Review Group

Q1. Andy Hayes (Hesters Way Partnership) 221 Gloucester Road, Cheltenham, GL51 8NJ

In reference to the COG review report, item 7 on the agenda; There seems to be some inconsistency about which organisations have been asked to an interview. Could you explain how you arrived at your decision as to which groups were reviewed?

The Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meeting of 9 July 2007 agreed which organisations they would review as part of their final review of the council's conditional offers of grant.

This report stated:

Section 1.1.3 "In light of the proposed introduction of the new single advice contract covering housing and advice services, it was recommended that the O+S Committee consider reviewing only those organisations which are not subject to this process, as these organisations have already undergone a separate review, as part of the development of this new contract. This would exclude the following organisations from this year's review (1) Cheltenham, Cirencester and Tewkesbury Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB),(2) Cheltenham Community Support Centre (CCSC), (3) Cheltenham Community Projects (CCP) and (4) Cheltenham Housing Aid Centre (CHAC)"

And the reports recommendation 1.2.3 stated that they had "agree not to review the four advice agencies listed in 1.1.3"

Q2. Nigel Meyrick (The Cheltenham Federation of Tenants and Leaseholders) 27 James Donovan Court, Hewlett Road, Cheltenham, GL52 6UF

In reference to the COG review report, item 7 on the agenda; Could you explain why the voluntary and community organisations involved were not circulated with an agenda of the structure of the interview, including the requirement for a 15 minute presentation, at least one week before the interviews were to take place?

In addressing this question, firstly, it should be noted that in the case of the Federation who have submitted this question, that a mid term review meeting was held with the Federation on 16 May, when officers informed the Federation's Chair and Development worker that they would be required, at their final review which was to be held in September, to provide a presentation to the O+S Committee review detailing clearly their achievements and performance over the three year funding period.

Secondly, Kevin Daws (Federation development officer) requested by email on 5 September that a computer projector be made available to support their electronic presentation to the O+S Committee review group on the 11 September. This indicates that both Kevin and the Federation were fully aware that a presentation was required to be made to the review group, and in light of Kevin's email, the Federation knew at least one week prior to their review that they were required to provide a presentation to the O+S Committee

And finally, the review process which was adopted by the O+S Committee final review group followed the previous review process that had been utilised by the officer led interim reviews. This required each organisation to provide a short presentation to the review group to inform them about their progress and achievements over the 12 month period, which was then followed by the review group asking questions in relation to the review pro-forma which had been submitted by the organisation, in addition to making references and enquiries relating to the additional supporting information supplied by each of the organisations.

It was therefore deemed that each of the organisations being reviewed were aware of the format that the review would take, since this would be based on the previous review format, and as such it was not felt to be necessary to notify the organisations of this.

Q3. Bernice Thomson (Stronger Communities Partnership) 3 Britten Place, Cheltenham, GL51 7NS

In reference to the COG review report, item 7 on the agenda;

Can you tell me whether there are procedures in place to;

- a) raise any inaccuracies
- b) to appeal against recommendations

To be able to answer the question of whether there are any possible inaccuracies in either the review or the recommendations which have been made, the review group will firstly need to be advised as to what inaccuracies Bernice Thomson may be alluding to. Any such inaccuracies would then be considered by the review group, and a subsequent answer will be given.

With regards any appeal process, the review group wished to inform Bernice that in response to its report, the Social and Community O+S Committee will pass its recommendations on to the Cabinet, and it is they who will make the final recommendation regarding any future funding commitments for the Cheltenham Regeneration Partnership (Stronger Communities Partnership), since the review group was tasked only with reviewing each organisation's performance and achievements during the relevant funding period. Any potential appeals relating to possible future funding would therefore need to be addressed at the Cabinet, and/or to the Cabinet deputy responsible for this area of work (Cabinet deputy for Quality of Life)

Q4. Kevin Devaney (Hesters Way Neighbourhood Project) 62 Ashlands Road, Hester's Way, Cheltenham, GL51 0DE

In reference to the COG review report, item 7 on the agenda; Although voluntary and community organisations were aware we would undergo an autumn review, the timescale in which to complete the pro forma was felt to be short, especially as it was during the summer holiday period. Do you think that this timescale is within the spirit of the Compact?

It was felt that a 12 working day period to complete and return the review pro-forma was more than sufficient, and additionally since each of the organisations being reviewed were aware that their conditional offers were due to be undertaken in September and were aware of the performance and monitoring information which is required to be presented to the council to support the review process; as detailed in Schedule B of their conditional offer of grant agreement; this supporting information should already have been in the process of being collated ready for submission to the council.

Each of the organisations required to be reviewed was contacted by email by the Community development manager on 30 July 2007 to inform them that the final review process had been agreed, this email also detailed when the reviews were planned to be conducted and detailed

the date when the review group's report would be submitted formally to the O+S Committee (15 October). The email informed the organisations that they would soon be receiving a pro-forma document which their organisations would be required to complete and return by 24 August.

The review pro-forma was formally issued as an electronic document on 7 August, again by email, and organisations were again reminded that they had until 24 August to complete the pro-forma. This email provided each organisation with 12 working days to complete the said form ~ which was felt to be more than sufficient time for the pro-forma to be completed.

With reference to the issue regarding whether this is in the spirit of the Compact. The Compact's Funding and procurement code of practice, does not set out timeframes for submitting performance and monitoring information, it only states that monitoring procedures should be: (i) proportionate to the size of funding, size of provider and perceived risk in monitoring requirements and to focus on outcomes; and (ii) should ensure that monitoring arrangements are agreed by all parties and that the information is used to assess the performance and delivery of services, review value for money, and consider potential opportunities for possible improvements to the way services are delivered.

Whilst there is a 12 week consultation period detailed as a 'joint undertaking' in the Compact's Consultation code, the conditional offer of grant reviews are reviews and not a consultation matter, and as such this undertaking was not deemed to be appropriate, nor in fact would a longer period have fitted in with the O+S Committee's reviews timetable, which required the reviews be undertaken in time to meet the commitments of the council's annual budget round consultation period.

Q5. Angela Gilbert (Cheltenham VCA) 2 Coombe Glen Lane, Up Hatherley, Cheltenham, GL51 3LE

In reference to the COG review report, item 7 on the agenda; Can you tell me why organisations under review were asked in their meetings not to discuss future plans, especially when they were asked to include information about their strategies and plans for the future in their submissions?

The O+S Committee's final review group's role; in light of these reviews being a final review of the current term of conditional offers of grant; was to review the organisation's performance over the grant funding period. These reviews were backward looking reviews exploring the performance and achievements of each of the organisations, in addition to identifying how these organisations sought to address or overcome any problems and/or issues which may have impacted upon either the organisation as a whole or its service delivery/ performance during this period.

As backward looking reviews, future development were not deemed to be a major element of the reviews, which might have been in the case during the previous two interim year reviews, when the officer led review group was clearly trying to consider both the performance and achievements of the organisation during the 12 month period, in addition to the organisation's future plans and viability, since these reviews were being conducted in order that these reviews could make recommendations back to the O+S Committee and to the Cabinet regarding the release of any on-going funding, or alternatively to possibly recommend whether future funding commitments should possibly be withdrawn.

Future development plans and proposals for these organisations were used purely by the O+S review group to help them gauge the future viability of these organisations and any strategic

relevance, or in order to highlight any potential problems or issues which the review group felt might ultimately impact upon these organisations and their service delivery, but ultimately this would not have any major impact upon the backward looking nature of the final review process.

The only possible exception to this could be the review of the Cheltenham Regeneration Partnership. Whilst the review group accepted that the partnership had met the terms of their conditional offer of grant, the review group had a number of reservations as to how the partnership functioned and also questioned the long term relevance of the partnership, and for this reason the review group took the decision that they would not consider recommending that the partnership should receive any on-going funding commitments from the council, and agreed that they would leave this decision ultimately up to the Cabinet.

Appendix B

Response from Cabinet Member Safer and Stronger Communities to Councillor Webster's question relating to Neighbourhood Panels (Item 10)

The new Neighbourhood Management Policing approach augments the Inspector Neighbourhood Areas (INAs) that currently exist within Cheltenham Borough. There are four INAs in Cheltenham and each have been sub divided into communities as shown below :

- **Whaddon INA (Whaddon and Lynworth, Prestbury, St.Pauls and Pittville)**
- **Hesters way INA (Hesters Way, St.Marks, Springbank and Fiddlers Green, Wymans Brook and Swindon Village)**
- **Leckhampton INA (Leckhampton, Charlton Kings, Tivoli, Benhall and Hatherley)**
- **Town Centre INA (Town Centre, Fairview, Lansdown)**

As part of this new approach to policing and neighbourhood management each community has been subject to a process of community engagement whereby members of the respective Safer Community Policing Teams, one per INA , has conducted questionnaires, interviews, street surgeries and meetings to identify their priorities. The priorities are not always police based, many are community issues that can be resolved through this new process by other partner agencies such as CBC

All INAs have now concluded their community engagement process and during the months of August and September 2007 Priority setting days were held by each of the four INAs where the top three priorities were agreed. The priority setting days were attended by key members of the local community including Councillors, residents associations, neighbourhood watch, other key individuals and the Police. These individuals then debated each identified priority in turn and then voted for the top three, the police are not allowed to vote.

Some of the communities identified in excess of ten priorities and whilst the top three will be specifically focused on by the Safer Community Teams and partner agencies others identified will not be ignored

Within my role as Partnership officer I was present at the priority setting days in order to provide support from either a Partnership or CBC perspective. I am also a member of the Neighbourhood management Policing steering group for the Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Policing Division, thus ensuring that representation and contributions are made on behalf of the partnership and / or CBC

The new Neighbourhood policing model is now part of the wider remit of the Cheltenham Community Safety Partnership and as such each of the Inspectors in charge of the INAs will report on the progress of their agreed priorities on a quarterly basis to the partnership

All current priorities can be found on the www.gloucestershire.Police.uk website under **Safer Communities**. Within this section is clear and concise information about many of the features and activities of the safer Community policing teams” .