

## Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 28th February, 2011  
6.00 - 8.30 pm

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Duncan Smith (Chairman), Chris Coleman, Barbara Driver, Wendy Flynn, Rowena Hay (Vice-Chair), Diggory Seacome, Jo Teakle and Jon Walklett
<b>Co-optees:</b>	James Harrison and Karl Hemming
<b>Also in attendance:</b>	Andy Champness (Glos. Police Authority), Helen Down (Partnerships Officer) and Dr. Melanie Gibbs (Glos. Police Authority), Richard Gibson (Policy & Partnerships Manager), Trevor Gladding (Public Protection Manager), Councillor Colin Hay (Cabinet Member Corporate Services), Councillor Helena McCloskey, Councillor Andrew McKinlay (Cabinet Member Sport & Culture), Rosi Shepherd (CCSP), Paul Stephenson (CBH) Councillor Klara Sudbury (Cabinet Member Housing & Safety) and Caroline Walker (CBH)

### Minutes

#### 1. APOLOGIES

Grahame Lewis, Strategic Director and Lead Officer had given his apologies and Jane Griffiths, Assistant Chief Executive was attending in his place.

The Chairman advised Members that the Art Gallery and Museum Development Scheme Update (formerly agenda item 10) had been deferred as the relevant Officer had been taken ill. Revised agendas had been circulated and this item would be rescheduled on the work plan.

#### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Walklett and Driver declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 9 (St. Pauls Regeneration Update) as CBH Board Members.

#### 3. AGREEMENT OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 10 JANUARY 2011

The minutes of the last meeting had been circulated with the agenda.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 10 January 2011 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.**

#### 4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

None received.

#### 5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Chairman highlighted the decision by Council for the continuation of the Budget Working Group with existing membership, which included committee members Councillors Smith and Walklett. The committee were happy with this proposal.

## **6. COMMISSIONING UPDATE**

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services hoped all members had taken the opportunity to read his email dated the 22 February 2011, in which he had outlined the current position of the Council in its move to become a strategic commissioning authority.

A members working group had been established some time ago and was originally tasked with assessing the rationale behind the move to strategic commissioning.

In December 2010 Council agreed the move to strategic commissioning and associated changes to the Council structures.

The working group were now focussing on member roles and he was attending the meeting in this instance to seek the views and comments of the committee on who should be involved, when and how.

He was confident that this was an opportunity to enhance the role of all members. Commissioning required knowledge of needs of the community and members had a role in feeding back from their wards, constituents and the town in general.

The relevant Cabinet Member(s) would sit on the Programme Board for each commissioning exercise and maintain a dialogue with all Councillors to ensure that they were all fully engaged. He was also keen to see Cabinet Working Groups established to support these reviews.

Whilst Cabinet Members were accountable, Overview & Scrutiny (O&S) had a role in monitoring services and ensuring the outcomes were being delivered.

Establishing member roles and a way of approaching commissioning exercises with which all members were comfortable was crucial. No decisions had yet been made, it was an evolving process and as such he urged members to respond to his email.

The working group had discussed the current three committee O&S structure and whether this was the right way forward and whether there was an opportunity to change the structure, though it was not for Cabinet to decide how scrutiny was organised. The County had a different model for O&S, elements of which could be used.

Working groups were focussed, interesting and could prove more effective, enabling more open dialogue on options. The Budget Working Group could prove a useful example.

The Chairman felt that it was important to maintain an open dialogue and challenged all members to respond to the email from the Cabinet Member

Corporate Services. He suggested that co-optees would offer valuable insight and asked that they be sent a copy of the email.

He assured members that this was merely an introduction to strategic commissioning and more detail would be provided next time. The next few months would be important in establishing a successful process of member involvement.

A member raised the importance of transparency in the decision making process when the Council commissioned services.

With reference to the future O&S structure he considered that working groups of interested and knowledgeable members for specific topics would be a sensible approach.

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services suggested that Cabinet Members would approach all members to express an interest and tease out a manageable sized group. Given that members would be expected to be totally open and discuss private thoughts and opinions, trust would be a critical component of any such discussions.

Another important consideration should be officer support which the Council may not have available to provide.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for having provided an introduction and confirmed that a further update would be scheduled for the next meeting (9 May).

## **7. CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING**

The Cabinet Member Housing and Safety had attended a meeting of the Supporting People Board at which the strategy had been approved. This was a very high level strategy and she had been pleased to see that some of the comments made by the committee had been taken on board. The budget had been affected and whilst it had proved manageable, there would be changes to the service as a result. She was able to provide a budget summary on request which was difficult to understand in isolation but it did detail funding to specific client groups.

A small group from the Children and Young Peoples Partnership had been looking at the Councils allocation of £50k for youth work in the borough and it was now appropriate to include those members of the committee who had expressed an interest in further involvement, Councillors Coleman, Teakle, Driver and co-optee Karl Hemming. The difficulty that needed to be overcome was that the County Council had stipulated that their £50k was for activities alone, not youth workers, but CBC were not in a position to fund this with their £50k as this would not be sustainable. Members were referred to the 'Ageing Well Strategy Consultation' briefing note which had been circulated prior to the meeting and invited nominations for membership on the task and finish group that would inform the Council's response. Those that were interested would need to be available to meet in the coming weeks. She invited other members to highlight specific issues or priorities. The Chairman confirmed that the Mayor, Councillor Regan and Councillors Flynn, R. Hay and Seacome had

indicated that they were interested in being involved in further discussion of this matter. The committee were happy with the proposed membership.

Anti-social behaviour would be discussed in more detail later on the agenda. However, Best Bar None, a national scheme of incentives and awards for licensed premises having met best practice would be launched by the Mayor on Friday (5 March). The Government were consulting on Anti-Social Behaviour and the consultation would close on Thursday (4 March) and she would circulate a link outside of the meeting.

The Cabinet Member Housing and Safety gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- The £50k County and CBC funding for youth work would not fund youth workers.
- The County Council were being prescriptive about how the £50k should be spent in that they had stipulated it should fund activities only, no staff costs, along similar lines as the 'Places to go, things to do' funding which provided funding to existing groups. This funding would not be available until July 2011.

The Cabinet Member Sport and Culture explained that the review of Leisure Services was a three stage process;

1. Assessing what services were provided at the moment.
2. Establishing what services the council wanted to deliver.
3. Deciding the best way of delivering the services of choice.

Currently on stage one, the systems thinking approach had been taken to identify potential improvements and efficiency savings within the current delivery arrangements. The aim was to provide more for less, rather than less for less.

Once this stage was complete, member input would be required to establish what the council wanted to deliver and the mechanism for delivery. Whilst not titled 'commissioning', this had been done before and examples included the Lido and Playhouse Theatre. All had pros and cons and these, along with other examples, would need to be considered as part of the process.

Refurbishment works to the Drawing Room and Conference Suites at the Town Hall were now complete, as was the work to the flooring at the Pittville Pump Rooms.

The Folk Festival had achieved a profit this year, the first time in three years. Events were held at various venues in the town and had attracted people from outside of Cheltenham, which had increased revenue for local hotels, etc.

In reference to the Art Gallery and Museum Development Scheme, the final visit by the Heritage Lottery Fund had taken place on the 14 February and had been undertaken by the Chairman himself, which signified the importance it had been awarded.

A number of items of clarification had been addressed and the final decision was expected on the 18 March 2011. There were no significant changes to the information contained within the 11 February 2011 Council report, though, were the HLF bid fail to be wholly successful, the proposals would be reconsidered by Council.

Leisure@ performance at the end of January was good. GP referrals, which were being pushed in light of the changes to the NHS, had been 30% higher than the target for the year, with physio 13% higher. Footfall had reached 235,000 and modelling indicated that this would rise to a quarter of a million within the next twelve months.

Active Leisure for the Elderly was over 20% above the target, but swimming, including free swimming was down, not significantly, but it was below target.

The Cabinet Member Sport and Culture gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- The Leisure and Culture review did cover a large number of services. The review of the Art Gallery and Museum would not start until the result of the HLF bid had been announced, but some other areas were far more advanced. Stage one of the process would be far enough advanced by the date of the next meeting (9 May) in order to be in a position to answer more questions and he confirmed he would be setting up a Cabinet Working Group to support the review.
- School attendance was not included in the swimming target, these were measured separately.
- Were the HLF bid to be successful the AG&M would close on the 31 March 2011 and would open some time mid March 2012 once work was completed, though this was not set in stone.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Members for their attendance.

## **8. CORPORATE STRATEGY 2011/12**

The Policy and Partnerships Manager introduced the report as circulated with the agenda.

The objective and outcomes framework had been retained, though as the council's budget had reduced by nearly £3m from last year and the scale of activity had reduced with 14 less improvement actions.

Members would not be surprised by the improvement actions as 11 had been retained from the previous year. Item 3.1 of the report set out the outcomes that were directly applicable to the work of the committee.

Government had lifted the national indicator set which had been welcomed as it presented an opportunity to reflect on indicators used to measure corporate performance and choose new indicators which could be more meaningful.

To ensure that the formal views of the members were captured the draft strategy would be considered by all three overview and scrutiny committees, before going to Cabinet on the 15 March and then to Council on the 28 March for final approval.

Feedback from the O&S committees would be included in the final report or in a verbal update from the Leader.

The following responses were given by the Policy and Partnerships Manager to questions from members of the committee;

- The performance indicator for the number of new dwellings started could be a useful monitoring indicator rather than a direct service indicator.
- All six districts were working to review the Service Level Agreement with Gloucestershire First and they in turn were reviewing their action plan and scaling back given the reduction in members of staff. Districts were assessing what needed to be done at a local and county level and Cheltenham still had 2.5 members of staff, though 1 would soon be on maternity leave. Were there to be any changes to the current arrangements, the outcome would be amended accordingly.
- Executive Board were reviewing all frozen posts and considering whether recruitment was necessary. Assistant Directors were looking at this within each of their divisions. Work was ongoing with Human Resources with reference to workforce development going forward.
- When a vacancy arose the relevant service manager would complete a form detailing why the post needed to be filled, how it contributed to the corporate strategies, etc and would identify alternative options. Executive Board would consider the request and may challenge the service manager to provide more information.
- The proposed indicator for measuring 'residents sense of community and their involvement in resolving local issues' by the number of VCS organisations supported by the Council that have gone onto deliver former public services was limited. Previously there had been 5 indicators from the Place Survey and officers had struggled to establish alternative indicators but were happy to take alternative suggestions from the members of the committee.

The Chairman thanked the Policy and Partnerships Manager for his attendance and suggested that members raise further concerns and comments between now and the Cabinet meeting on the 15 March.

## **9. ST. PAULS REGENERATION - UPDATE**

The Assistant Chief Executive and Head of Housing Support Services, Cheltenham Borough Homes, introduced a PowerPoint presentation (*available on request from Democratic Services*).

The Assistant Chief Executive had come before the committee in the past and considered this to be a good news story.

The process had been challenging for CBH as an Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO) of the Council, Housing Associations had done development but for an ALMO this was new ground. The development was very much a partnership undertaking with the Council having provided Officer, financial and legal support.

The urban design by Nash Partnership was developed into a large scale planning submission which was approved in December 2009 with no objections, which had been a pleasant surprise to all.

CBH undertook a tender exercise for the construction contract, in which residents were involved and subsequently, Wates Construction had been successful. Wates had agreed to appoint a Tenant Liaison Officer and had a proven track record of developing communities.

The final plans had required a vast range of design and planning and large amount of community consultation, which had proved invaluable in ensuring that CBH took the community with them. This in turn had resulted in there having been no protests or complaints to date.

A technicality in the process was the grant agreement with the HCA, for which complex legal arrangements had been necessary. Collectively it equated to a large financial package which had been eased by the free transfer of land to CBH by CBC.

Organising the necessary road closures was always going to be an issue and whilst these were still being negotiated, it was hoped that they would be finalised soon. It was highlighted that no objections had been received.

The Assistant Chief Executive outlined the 2011 programme of works. He also detailed some of the outcomes that would be achieved, which included transformational improvements to the retained stock, which would be run as a separate contract by the same contractor.

The committee were shown a computer image of what would be achieved and were reminded that the build would be at level 4 of sustainable homes standards, making them energy efficient and therefore more cost efficient for future residents.

The community regeneration aspect had been helped by the formation of the 'Heart of St. Pauls Association' and the ongoing success of the Community House on Folly Lane which was fully utilised by residents. This would remain open until the purpose built facility was complete.

Child poverty was an issue in the St. Pauls with levels of deprivation some of the highest in the Country. To get some of these families actively involved in the project had required family liaison.

Employment Initiatives had been especially successful in combating anti-social behaviour in the area, one man in particular had secured work with a contractor following a period working for CBH.

A testament to the success in St. Pauls was that at one point there were large scale voids in the area, which was no longer the case. In fact properties in St. Pauls were so in demand, there was a waiting list and this, before the development work had been done. This would be the legacy of CBH.

CBH had been encouraged to enter the Inside Housing Awards, Regenerating Communities category and made it through to the last 6 finalists. Unfortunately they didn't win, but were highly commended for the community involvement elements and were very proud of the result.

The Chairman thanked the Officers for their attendance and for what was a very encouraging update. He reminded members that a debate about the future strategic direction of CBH was scheduled for the next meeting (9 May).

Councillors Driver and Walkett, as members of the CBH Board commended the organisation for their incredible work and personally thanked the two Officers.

The Assistant Chief Executive, CBH, thanked members for their kind words and reiterated that it was a partnership endeavour which had required immense input from Councillors and Officers of CBC and would continue to do so in the future.

## **10. CRIME AND SAFETY OVERVIEW**

Rosi Shepherd, the Chair of the Cheltenham Community Safety Partnership (CCSP), along with Helen Down the Partnerships Officer and Trevor Gladding the Community Protection Manager introduced themselves to the committee.

The Partnerships Officer explained that CCSP was statutory, each of the six districts had one and all fed into the county partnership. The CCSP sat under the Cheltenham Strategic Partnership and consisted of 7 statutory partners.

The aim of the CCSP was to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour (ASB) and fear of crime.

The priorities of the CCSP were set annually in an action plan and worked was delivered through action groups on ongoing issues (substance misuse, domestic abuse, hate crime, ASB) and a range of partners were involved in each.

The CCSP also had to be responsive to crime trends. Crime in Cheltenham was down by 8% on last year, the partnership had set a target reduction of 17.5% by April 2008, which was achieved eventually and had continued to fall since then.

For some time the partnership had focussed activities on reducing crimes linked to the night time economy, mainly assaults. This included initiatives such as the taxi marshals, Best Bar None and street pastors which was launched at the end of 2009. The result was a 31% reduction in assaults by the end of 2009-2010 and alcohol related crime was down by 16% this Christmas compared to last and was lower in Cheltenham than Stroud.

Last year domestic and shed/garage burglaries linked to cycle thefts was the main problem in Cheltenham and the partnership supported various strands of work to stop domestic burglary. This remained a priority for the partnership and the Police had asked for help in organising a conference.

In terms of challenges ahead, the uncertainty about future funding was the main issue. Since the paper had been circulated it had been announced that the



County Council would receive £580k of un-ring fenced money for community safety from the Home Office. It was hoped that some of this would be passed on to the district councils but emphasis was given to the fact that this was not ring fenced to community safety.

Despite this, the partners had agreed a series of actions for 2011-12, which included the implementation of the Cardiff A&E model for violence prevention in Cheltenham.

The Chair of the CCSP highlighted that the key to addressing domestic burglaries was ensuring good communication with residents on how to manage risk to their homes.

The Community Protection Manager offered the perspective of his area of work. CBC had benefited from a good relationship with the Police since the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act.

Cheltenham was the first district to have a full time Police Officer sited in the CBC Anti-Social Behaviour Team, he was confident that this would expand in the future given that the Superintendent of Cheltenham accepted the need to work in Partnership.

The days of working in silos were long gone, but this had not happened overnight and measures put in place almost five years ago were just starting to show results. He didn't wish to list all of the projects but was confident that the work undertaken had made Cheltenham safer for residents and visitors, in which businesses had played their part too.

The Chairman thanked all three representatives for their attendance and update which had been most useful.

The following responses were given by the three representatives to questions from members of the committee;

- The partnership would balance communication of the domestic burglary issues in Cheltenham with positive stories, a good example of which was the advent calendar at Christmas, which coupled advice with various vouchers. This would prevent the fear of crime amongst residents rising. In this instance the Police had asked the partnership to take a lead given the successes of the past.
- The Council had given consent for the Town Centre dispersal order despite concerns about the size of the area and a blanket approach. Thankfully the Police approached it in a way that meant that it was never used whilst addressing the issues that had necessitated the application.
- The partnership priorities would take account of the youth provision gap and the issues arising from it.
- The Licensing Act of 2003 was being revised and Officers were actively investigating the opportunity of charging a levy. The levy would apply to premises wishing to stay open after 12 midnight and could range from £400 to £6k per annum dependent on capacity of the premises. The levy would be split 30/70, 30% going to the Council for administration of the charge and the remaining 70% to the Police.

- Since the paper was circulated £500k had been allocated to the newly formed Safer Stronger Justice Committee and as such the recommendation would need to be amended to reflect the request that funding is provided to each of the districts.
- The partnership received strong support from CBC and the role of chair of the CCSP was maintaining engagement of all partners and retaining voluntary and community sector involvement given their vast knowledge of service delivery with minimal resources.
- The investigations into the levy were at initial stages but the hope was that some agreement could be reached with the Police about the split (30/70) in order that the monies addressed all results of the night time economy, including cleansing issues. It would be surprising if other local authorities didn't pursue the night time levy. A briefing note would be produced to keep members informed.

The Chairman thanked the three representatives for their attendance and update and proposed that he write to the Gloucestershire Safer, Stronger Justice Commission to advocate the use of the un-ring fenced funds from the Home Office to support local community safety projects, including anti-social behaviour. Members of the committee were happy with this proposal and as such a letter would be drafted and sent in due course.

The Chairman introduced the two representatives of the Police Authority, Andy Champness the Chief Executive and Dr. Melanie Gibbs the Deputy Chair.

The Deputy Chair of authority passed on the apologies of the Chairman, Councillor Rob Garnham who sadly was unable to attend the meeting.

She explained that she hadn't prepared a paper or presentation, which was probably for the best as it may have repeated most of what had been presented by the CCSP representatives.

There were 17 members on the Police Authority, most of whom, of which she was one, were independent members.

In April 2011 the authority would move from the current 17 Inspector Neighbourhood Areas within 3 Divisions (Cheltenham/Tewkesbury, Gloucester/Forest of Dead and Stroud/Cotswolds) and move to a new model.

There would be 6 Local Policing Areas (formerly Divisions) one for each district and Cheltenham LPA would have 2 Inspector Neighbourhood Areas, North and South, where it used to have 4.

Ahead of detailed cuts but in anticipation of them the Authority had looked to do things more effectively and efficiently, working to identify where savings could be derived whilst maintaining frontline policing and increasing a visible policing presence wherever possible.

The new model offered a more flexible structure which would allow visible policing to be maintained whilst achieving savings of 20% over the next 4 years. The restructure necessitated changes to the management of estates which would in turn allow for investment in people rather than buildings, therefore, the

estates strategy had been revisited with a view to disposing of some police stations.

The Chairman thanked the Deputy Chair of Gloucestershire Police Authority and invited questions and comments from members.

The following responses were given by the Deputy Chair and Chief Executive of the GPA to questions from members of the committee;

- The Police Authority were holding public meetings to allow the public the opportunity to give their views and opinions. No decisions about the closures of police stations were final.
- Inspectors were confident that the restructure would not affect how an area was policed and nor would the closure of some police accommodation given that some of it was rarely open e.g. St. Marks had not been used for local policing for some time. Residents in Whaddon had expressed their desire to retain a building presence and alternative options were currently being explored.
- Members were invited to attend the public meeting at Pittville School on the 22 March between 7pm and 9pm. Alternatively, Councillors and the public could submit ideas and views via the website ([www.gloucestershirepoliceauthority.co.uk](http://www.gloucestershirepoliceauthority.co.uk)).
- The main priority of the current consultation, which would close at the end of March, was to meet the 2011-2012 budget, but this would be an ongoing process and the Police Authority were open to talking to all organisations, including Children Centres, etc. Long term the Police Authority were hoping to achieve a Cheltenham presence in shared accommodation with CBC and/or other organisations.
- The funding for Police Community Support Workers had been ring fenced for the next 2 years, however no promises could be made beyond that.
- CBC were in initial discussions with Tony Godwin (Superintendent, Cheltenham Local Policing Area) about housing Police Officers within the Municipal Offices.
- The Police Authority always aimed to maintain a good relationship with the Press.

Finally, the Chairman introduced Councillor McCloskey, the CBC representative on the County Community Safety O&S Committee.

Councillor McCloskey explained that the committee was formed in November 2009 as a result of the revisions to the County Council scrutiny structure. This was a statutory committee.

The committee comprised of 9 members of the county council, 1 councillor from each of the six district councils and a representative of the police authority. The remit of the committee included crime & disorder, fire & rescue, trading standards, emergency management, coroners and registration of births & deaths.

Work and recommendations of the tasks groups were monitored by the committee every 6, 12 and 18 months.

To date, work of the committee included;

**Fire & Rescue** – The committee had written to the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee outlining its concerns over the proposals to create a South West Regional Fire & Control Centre in Taunton. This project had since been cancelled.

The committee had considered and supported the project to build and maintain 4 new fire stations.

A comprehensive report was produced on the levels of sick absence in the Fire & Rescue Service and contained 18 recommendations which included;

1. The need for better communication between the Occupational Health Service and Human Resources.
2. Improvements to the recording of sick absence.
3. Debriefing of control room staff after distressing telephone calls.

**Emergency Planning** – The committee reviewed the approach and impact of severe weather, this included the consideration of how the county council communicated with the public during emergencies.

Members received a presentation of the current business continuity arrangements which detailed the requirement of Service Managers to sustain critical elements of their service without reliance on ICT, Property Services or Human Resources for up to 5 days.

The floods in 2007 were a severe test of the arrangements as Shire Hall was closed for a week. ICT was recovered within 2 days, the call centre relocated to Wiltshire and the County Emergency Centre relocated to Waterwells. In the main, services worked well, though not all plans proved viable and some staff from non-critical areas were not used as effectively as they could have been.

**Crime & Disorder** – A task group was established in March 2010 to better understand the Community Safety Partnerships and in September 2010 it compiled a report. The main recommendation was that the joint working arrangements of the Gloucestershire Safer and Stronger Communities Partnership and the Gloucestershire Criminal Justice Board be formalised. As a direct result of the recommendation, the Gloucestershire Safer, Stronger and Justice Commission was set up and held its first meeting in January 2011.

The committee recently responded to the Government consultation relating to the proposal to replace police authorities with elected Police and Crime Commissioners. A particular concern was where scrutiny of the commissioner would reside given that the white paper was lacking on this point.

The committee had considered where it could add value in light of the current financial situation and had already identified;

**Fire & Rescue** – following the cancellation of the regional control centres the committee would respond to the Governments consultation 'the future of the Fire & Rescue control services in England'.

In anticipation of the move to Taunton, repairs and maintenance to the local control centre had been minimal over recent years and in light of the cancellation of that project, urgent investment was required.

**Emergency Planning** – The committee was concerned that a 25% reduction to Business Continuity resources would compromise emergency plans. An exercise was undertaken on the 1 February to test the effectiveness of the arrangements, which was currently being evaluated. A report would be taken to the committee in March where it would decide upon any further action.

**Crime & Disorder** – The committee were concerned about the proposals for an elected Police and Crime Commissioner, particularly, who would be responsible for scrutinising the commissioner. The committee had expressed an interest in taking role if this was appropriate.

**Registration** – In view of the need to make financial savings, major changes to the registration service were planned. Financial planning proved difficult as budgets were set annually and carry forward of under or over spend was disallowed and by its very nature, the work and income fluctuated from year to year. The service was currently 75% self financing and the aim was that it would become fully self financing over the next 3 years, plans for which included centralising administrative functions into the Cheltenham office, moving local registry services into shared buildings as at Cirencester Library and all historic registers to be held in the Archives building in Gloucester. The committee would receive a progress update at their October 2011 meeting.

Trading Standards – the committee was concerned about the proposed cut to funding of 50% over the next 2 years, by creating a multi-disciplinary team focussing on response rather than prevention. A request had been submitted to the O&S Management Committee to set up a task group to evaluate outcomes.

The Chairman thanked Councillor McCloskey for the update she had provided and commended the good work of the committee.

In response to a question from a member of the committee, Councillor McCloskey confirmed that the demolition of the fire station on Keysham Road was due to start soon if it hadn't already and the service would temporarily occupy an empty warehouse on Kingsditch Industrial Estate until the new station had been completed.

The Chairman thanked all attendees for the staying and providing such comprehensive updates to the committee, it was appreciated.

## **11. COMMITTEE WORK PLAN**

The Chairman referred members to the work plan as circulated with the agenda.

Given that the Art Gallery & Museum Development Scheme and Leisure & Culture Commissioning Review updates had been scheduled for the next meeting (9 May), some of the items currently scheduled on the work plan would need to be rescheduled.

The Chair and Vice-Chair would agree the agenda for the next meeting on the 31 March, at which point work would start on the draft 2011-2012 work plan.

This would be presented to members at the next meeting of the committee for approval.

In the meantime, members were invited to contact the Democracy Officer with details of any items of interest to be added to the work plan.

Councillor Driver suggested that she would be in a position to provide a Youth Café update earlier than was proposed on the work plan given that it would be opening sooner than originally thought. This would be considered at the Chairs Briefing.

**12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION**

There were no urgent items for discussion.

**13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting was scheduled for the 9 May 2011.

Duncan Smith  
**Chairman**