



CHELTENHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee
24 June 2002

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Councillor Smith (in the chair)
Councillors Morris, Bishop, Coleman, Holliday, Jones, Wheeler, Driver, Moreton, Regan, Seacome and Mrs Hale.

Also attended Julie Feltham - Community Health Council - item 7
Caroline Fowles - Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Primary Care Trust- item 7
Chris Huckle, Richard Gibson, Richard Levett, Sonia Phillips, Paul Davies and Tim Evans, Rita Baker.
Peter Williams John Hymus and Chris Brooks Leisure Connection - item 10

6.00-9.15 p.m.

Subject	Description	Action
1.	Apologies Councillors Stennett, Ledoux and Barnes	
2.	Declarations of interest Agenda item 7 - Councillor D Hale declared a personal interest	
3.	Co-option 1.The Constitution allows for a representative from the Housing Forum to be co-opted to the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The nomination of Claude Bullingham was confirmed. 2.To consider the continued co-option of a representative from MAD The nomination of Vicky Paton was confirmed.	RB RB
4.	Minutes As this was the first meeting of the Committee there were no minutes to approve.	
5.	Public questions and petitions None received.	
6.	Matters referred to committee None had been received from council, cabinet or area committee.	
7.	Presentation by Caroline Fowles, Chief Executive, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Primary Care Trust and Julie Feltham, Chief Executive, Community Health Council - 'The role of local authorities in the scrutiny of the health service and local health agenda' The Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Primary Care Trust was one of 3 PCT's in Gloucestershire and was a free standing NHS Trust bringing together 19 GP practices, serving 162,000 residents with an annual spend of £121M. Caroline Fowles outlined what the Trust was responsible for - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the health of local people living in the area • Developing primary care services • Providing some community services and employing health care staff working in the community • Purchasing services for local residents The priority was to provide preventative care and work closely with their partners, including local authorities.	

	<p>Members were keen to explore the possibility of using empty council properties to assist with the provision of intermediate care, and asked that this topic be referred to cabinet with an offer to investigate.</p> <p>There would be a stakeholders meeting on intermediate care the 11 July 2002 and all were welcome.</p> <p>The Group Director requested that details and venue should be sent to him for circulation.</p> <p>Julie Feltham explained that the Health and Social Care Act 2001 placed a duty on health authorities, NHS Trusts and Primary Care Trusts to consult patients and the public and to involve them in decision making about the planning and delivery of services they commissioned or provided.</p> <p>This would allow patients, carers and citizens to be properly involved and to influence their healthcare and health services, and ensuring that quality, performance and configuration of local health services met the needs of the area and its inhabitants.</p> <p>The proposed mechanisms to deliver this were -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patient Forums representing the views of patients, Act of Parliament awaited. • Commission for Patient and Public Involvement in Health which would be a national body backed by a local network to coordinate and oversee arrangements. • Patient Advice and Liaison Service (PALS) set up in NHS trusts from April 2002 to provide information to patients, their carers and families, and resolve problems and complaints. • Independent Complaints Advocacy Service (ICAS) a nationwide service to provide help to patients to pursue formal complaints through the NHS procedure. • Patients' Prospectus published by every trust and care home outlining patients views and the action taken as a result. • Overview and Scrutiny Committees based on the local authorities to represent democratically local views on the quality, performance and development of health services. <p>The Group Director - Social and Community stated that Councillor Rowena Hay had been invited to attend a Gloucestershire County Council working group to develop this committee.</p> <p>Unfortunately, due to other commitments this was not possible and she had nominated Councillor Forbes to attend in her place.</p> <p>The consensus of the committee was that in due course a member of the Social and Community O and S committee should attend the proposed county based O and S committee, but in the meantime the committee was happy for Councillor Rowena Hay to nominate her deputy as long as the committee was briefed and consulted as necessary.</p> <p>The chair thanked the Caroline Fowles and Julie Feltham representatives of The Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Primary Care Trust for attending.</p>	<p>CH</p> <p>CH</p> <p>RH</p>
8.	<p>Funding for external organisations</p> <p>The Chair of the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee had asked for this committee to assist the council in taking forward the recommendations of the best value review of the funding of external bodies, which was approved by cabinet on 28 May 2002.</p> <p>The Economic Development and Regeneration Officer stated that the Committee would take on the responsibility for carrying out a review of all council funded voluntary sector organisations that had a social and community focus.</p> <p>To start the process the committee was asked to approve the following recommendations -</p> <p>To approve the terms of reference as a basis for carrying out the review and, to consider whether -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to invite the organisations to make individual presentations to the full committee, and determine the timescale for doing so. • to establish a working group, to include appropriate officers, to take forward the review. <p>The Chair suggested that a small review group of three to four members should be set up and asked for volunteers.</p> <p>The volunteers were Councillors Morris, Mrs Hale, Regan and Driver, and the committee agreed their nomination.</p>	

	The Committee asked for the review group to meet before the next committee meeting and report back on a proposed workplan and methodology .	RG
9.	<p>Presentation - Arms Length Management Organisation</p> <p>Paul Davies, Housing Manager, gave an update on progress with the ALMO. He re-capped Government policy, the 2010 decent homes target, the introduction of business planning and rent restructuring, separating landlord and strategy functions and reviewing options for housing.</p> <p>The result locally had been to set up the Housing options (member and tenant) working group in parallel with a Best Value review of the housing management service. The working group reported in Autumn 2001, to Cabinet, and recommended the establishment of an ALMO as the preferred means of meeting the government's "decent homes standard".</p> <p>The Housing Manager then explained that the ALMO was a way of attracting funding to repair and modernise council homes, through borrowing permission and direct exchequer subsidy.</p> <p>Under an ALMO model, the Council homes would remain owned by the Council, and tenants would remain council tenants, but with management delegated to the ALMO, which would employ the staff.</p> <p>The ALMO was a company limited by guarantee, non-profit making, council owned, with a board of 1/3 Members, 1/3 tenant representatives, 1/3 independents. This gave more tenant participation than the existing structure.</p> <p>The ALMO would provide and manage services to tenants and residents, whilst the council would retain its strategic and enabling role.</p> <p>The Housing Manager went through the main parts of the decent homes standard, which required homes to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fit for habitation, in reasonable repair have modern facilities and services and provide reasonable thermal comfort <p>Compared to the standard, Cheltenham's 5,200 homes, which were mainly old, were all fit to live in, most in reasonable condition, but most needed internal modernisation. 1320 (26%) homes already met this standard, but 3915 (74%) failed to reach it. To bring all homes up to the standard by 2010 would require investment of £70m which gave a £26m shortfall without additional resources, which could potentially be made available to the ALMO.</p> <p>The Government had announced on the 29 May that Cheltenham's bid to establish an ALMO had been approved, including a conditional allocation of £13.5m for 2003/05 and an indicative allocation of £12.7m for 2005/07</p> <p>A shadow board (members and tenants) had been set up, with a Corporate project team and a Housing core group.</p> <p>Consultants (Ernst & Young and JR Knowles) had also been appointed.</p> <p>Tenant consultation continued, with the aid of an independent advisor, and stock information was being updated.</p> <p>The Housing Manager highlighted the links between best value and the ALMO, including the internal, full service review which would report to cabinet this July and the Housing Inspectorate's full service and ALMO set up inspection in Nov 2002.</p> <p>The final ALMO inspection in Autumn 2003, looking at Government guidance and the Improvement plan would be the one that allowed draw-down of funds if a three-star inspection rating could be achieved.</p> <p>There would be a 15-18 month lead in, and the current position was that Cheltenham had a Band A housing management service, with top 25% performance for rent collection and repairs.</p> <p>The Housing Manager explained the management agreement, Section 27 delegation, and Annual delivery plan which formalised the links between the ALMO and the</p>	

	<p>council.</p> <p>The structure of the ALMO would follow the delegated functions and delivery plan. Most ALMO staff would transfer from the Council in accordance with TUPE regulations.</p> <p>The delivery plan target was for all homes to be decent by April 2010, with 90% by April 2007.</p> <p>The Housing Manager highlighted some possible principles for the investment plan including Government guidance on procurement (Egan), setting priorities (areas, elements), and reviewing option appraisals, and he stressed that as the stock would still be owned by the council, decisions on option appraisals would rest with the council.</p> <p>The Council's ALMO funds could be used for repair, maintenance and improvement of council homes to decency standards but not for environmental works .</p> <p>A draft year by year plan to allow stakeholder consultation could also be a way forward after priorities were set by the Council.</p> <p>The chairman expressed his concerns that there had been only limited member involvement in the review so far and requested that this committee be involved in the improvement plan implementation.</p> <p>The Housing Manager explained that the Best Value review of housing management would be going to cabinet on the 24 July and that it was likely that this overview and scrutiny committee would be asked to oversee the implementation plan.</p> <p>The chairman thanked the Housing Manager for his presentation.</p>	
10.	<p>Update on the Recreation Centre redevelopment proposals and on the best value review of sports facilities and development.</p> <p>The best value review position statement was presented by the Head of Sport and Play - Sonia Phillips. This document acted as a precursor to the final report of the review which would determine what the service needed to achieve over the next five years, as defined by the improvement plan. The chair suggested that members should take a greater part in the best value review process and suggested that 3 members of the committee should join the best value project team. Councillors Smith, Seacome and Mrs Holliday volunteered and were agreed by the committee.</p> <p>Redevelopment of Cheltenham Recreation Centre</p> <p>The Head of Sport and Play outlined the sequence of events -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 1998 - Sport England's rejection of Cheltenham's original Lottery Sports Fund Application January 1999 - Revised SELF application by Stephen Limbrick Associates submitted November 1999 - Sport England's formal notification of 'In-Principle' support with conditions June 2000- Stephen Limbrick Associates formally appointed to take project forward. December 2000 - Major review with Sport England to agree updated scheme and procurement proposals. November 2001 - June 2002 Balfour Beatty appointed as Stage 1 Contractor and 2nd stage tender process completed. March -May 2002 - Application for final lottery fund award to Sport England and confirmation received with conditions. <p>The total estimated project cost was £5.7M of which CBC's contribution was £2.8M.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 July 2002 - anticipated start on site September 2003 - anticipated contract practical completion November 2003 - anticipated centre re-opening to the public depending upon staff training and CBC operational readiness. <p>Members queried the timing of the end June 2002 closure at the start of the school holidays, but this was required by Sport England. Sandford Lido would be available</p>	

	<p>and 51 schools had been provided with information on other facilities available within Gloucestershire.</p> <p>All agreed that it was an exciting project but some concern was expressed on the type of marketing campaign to be employed to encourage customers to reuse the new facilities and attract further new business.</p> <p>Members suggested that the feasibility of providing a minibus shuttle service from areas of deprivation could be explored to encourage those prospective customers who did not have their own transport to use the facilities.</p> <p>Leisure Connection contract with CBC</p> <p>The Chair expressed concern on the findings of the satisfaction surveys detailed in the position statement which showed a steady decline over the three years 1999, 2000, 2001, especially the standards of cleanliness.</p> <p>Peter Williams - Contract Manager stated that he had been in Cheltenham for the last six months and worked closely with Lucy Cape and standards had improved.</p> <p>Several default notices had been issued; however Peter Williams stated these were not all cleanliness related, but were due to staffing problems.</p> <p>The Chair recognised this but stated that the public expected a good standard of service to be provided.</p> <p>The chair thanked the Sport and Play Manager and the representatives of Leisure Connection for attending.</p>	
11.	<p>A. Work Programme</p> <p>The Group Director handed out a list of suggestions for the 2002/03 workplan arising from the committee's recent training evening.</p> <p>This had been expanded at the away day on 19 June attended by the board, group leaders, cabinet and the chairs of overview and scrutiny who discussed the forward plan and work programme. A recommended workplan would be taken to the full council meeting on 22 July 2002.</p> <p>The chair suggested that the committee meet for a maximum of one hour in the last week of July 2002 to agree how the workplan would be tackled .</p>	
	<p>B. Items for next meeting</p> <p>The Chair suggested that all future Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings should have a timed agenda -</p> <p>18:00 - 19:00 Any presentations, including questions</p> <p>19:00 - 20:00 members to split into 2-3 groups so that that they can cover more items.</p> <p>20:00 - 20:15 Discussion time</p> <p>20:30 Finish</p> <p>The other members of the committee agreed that this suggestion would provide a manageable framework in which to operate.</p>	
	<p>Date of next meetings</p> <p>late July meeting to be arranged.</p> <p>9th September 2002</p>	