



CHELTENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 28 November 2016
6.00 pm
Pittville Room - Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Tim Harman (Chair), Jon Walklett (Vice-Chair), Colin Hay, Sandra Holliday, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Dan Murch, John Payne, Paul Baker and Max Wilkinson

The Council has a substitution process and any substitutions will be announced at the meeting

Agenda

1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING 31 October 2016	(Pages 3 - 16)
4.	PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS	
5.	MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE	
6.	FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED Gloucestershire Health and Care O&S Committee (15 November) – update from Councillor Harvey Police and Crime Panel (7 November) - verbal update from Councillor Helena McCloskey The Gloucestershire Economic Growth O&S Committee has not met since the last meeting of this committee.	(Pages 17 - 18)
7.	CABINET BRIEFING A verbal update from the Cabinet on key issues for Cabinet Members which may be of interest to Overview and Scrutiny and may inform the O&S work plan	

8.	6.15pm	STAGECOACH PowerPoint presentation by Rupert Cox, Managing Director (Stagecoach West)	
9.	7.00pm	UPDATE FROM THE URBAN GULLS FOCUS GROUP Discussion paper of the Urban Gulls Group (to be presented by Helen Down, Team Leader, Participation and Engagement)	(Pages 19 - 22)
10.	7.20pm	UPDATE ON PRIVATE RENTED HOUSES OF MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) SURVEY Discussion paper by Mark Nelson, Built Environment Enforcement Officer	(Pages 23 - 24)
11.	7.35pm	QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE REVIEW Report by Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager (to follow)	
12.		UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS	(Pages 25 - 26)
13.		REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN	(Pages 27 - 30)
14.		DATE OF NEXT MEETING 16 January 2017	
		BRIEFING NOTES (not for discussion) Place Strategy – engagement plans and links to the devolution agenda	

Contact Officer: Saira Malin, Democracy Officer, 01242 775153
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 31st October, 2016

6.00 - 7.40 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Tim Harman (Chair), Jon Walklett (Vice-Chair), Sandra Holliday, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Dan Murch, John Payne, Max Wilkinson and Simon Wheeler (Reserve)
Also in attendance:	Councillor Steve Jordan, Councillor Chris Coleman, Louise Emmerson (Cheltenham Festivals) and Tim Atkins (MD of Place and Economic Development)

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Colin Hay and Councillor Simon Wheeler was attending as a substitute.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

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

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 12 September 2016 be approved and signed as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS

None had been received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No matters had been referred to the committee.

6. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED

The representatives on the Police and Crime Panel and Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillors H McCloskey and Harvey respectively, had provided written updates on recent meetings.

Regarding health matters, the chair advised that he had proposed a motion at the County Council meeting regarding Cheltenham's Accident and Emergency services. This had received unanimous support and the issue was due to be scrutinised at the county council O&S committee on 15 December.

Councillor McCloskey advised the committee that the Police and Crime Panel were due to approve the police and crime plan for 2017-2021 at their next meeting on 7 November. This now encompassed a range of different priorities including cost-cutting themes covering rural and neighbourhood policing, mental

health, victim support and restorative justice. The panel were also due to receive an update on the complaint against the commissioner referred to in the update.

Councillor Walklett advised that Bernise Thompson of the neighbourhood partnership had written to the county council regarding her concerns about neighbourhood policing in the lower High Street area and he would forward the letter to Councillor McCloskey so that she could raise it at the next meeting of the Police and Crime panel.

There had been no meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee since the last meeting of this committee.

7. CABINET BRIEFING

The Leader reminded Members that the public survey on recycling was now in progress and they should encourage local residents to participate.

Members would be aware that the results of the first domestic homicide review had now been published and the results of a second review would be published in six months time. Both were tragic cases and there were lessons to be learnt and he planned to arrange a Member Seminar in six months time so these learning points could be identified.

Cheltenham and Gloucester City Councils had both agreed the JCS recommendations but Tewkesbury Borough Council had asked for a strategic site at Twigworth to be removed and so the JCS could not be taken forward as it stands. The Local Plan had been removed from the Cabinet agenda for 8 November as a joint consultation had been planned. This may come back to the December Cabinet if the JCS issues could be resolved.

A Special Cabinet held last Friday had agreed to the early surrender of the lease of the Oakley Resource Centre which was now closing today. As the owners of the building, the council was stepping in from 1 November to keep the building going and will be working closely with CBH and other partners using the building. He thanked everyone who had helped to run the organisation for the last 20 years and the trustees for agreeing to the early surrender of the lease. The council's aim was to protect the services provided from the centre for the local community and a meeting had been arranged with partners for mid-November to discuss the long-term future of the centre. A person had been appointed to manage the building until March in the interim.

He confirmed that CBH would continue to occupy the majority of the building and all potential options for keeping the centre running would be explored with a target date of March 2017 for having a long-term solution in place.

8. CHELTENHAM FESTIVALS

Louise Emerson, the Chief Executive of Cheltenham Festivals, gave a presentation (Appendix 1) which outlined current performance and future aspirations.

During the presentation she emphasised that that the Festivals' aim was to create a cultural experience and for the Festivals to stand out from other similar events. She highlighted the financial challenges that the Festivals faced given

that the funding they received from the Arts Council was reducing in real terms. 50% of their funding was currently received from sponsors which could never be guaranteed and therefore was a continual challenge. The Festivals were looking to change their funding model next year to reduce this risk. The Festivals continue to rely upon key sponsors and partners.

She described the cultural, economic and educational contributions that the Festivals made to Cheltenham. In addition to the the events the Festivals involved putting on many free activities and outreach projects across the town. These events gave children who would not normally be involved in the Festivals the opportunity to engage and to help them appreciate music and reading.

In conclusion she summarised their outcomes which were to:

- be distinctive and best
- extend their audiences
- be locally embedded with partners and people in the town
- improve their marketing
- strengthen their financial stability

The chair invited questions from the Committee and the Chief Executive gave the following responses:

- The Chief Executive confirmed that she had been invited to participate in the Tourism Strategy group and she would see the Festivals as an important tourist attraction in the town.
- The estimate of 30% of Festival visitors coming from outside the area was a conservative estimate and the Festivals would continue to have a joint aim to attract more visitors from both outside and within Cheltenham.
- It was important that they continued to inspire the next generation so education was an integral part. It was much easier to raise money for the educational side of their work so she was confident that this important work would continue to be funded.
- A Member asked some questions on behalf of local residents about the noise levels at the Jazz Festival which had been reported to be in the order of 62/63 decibels which was above the agreed 60 decibel limit.
- The Chief Executive was not a specialist on noise levels and would provide a written response on what steps the Festivals were taking to reduce the noise levels at the Jazz Festival to 60 dB or below.
- Other Members advised that although local residents were generally supportive of the Festivals they had suggested that more use could be made of other venues in the town such as Pittville Park and could there be a fallow year when the Gardens would not be used and therefore had time to recover. Another suggestion was that the free events at the Jazz Festival could be moved to an alternative part of Montpellier Gardens alongside the main road rather than close to residential properties. If the Literature Festival could be held in August/September it could potentially use the Cheltenham Ladies College as a large venue.
- She confirmed that she had given an enormous amount of thought to potential venues. There was a lack of suitable large venues in the town and therefore they were reliant on the 1400/1500 seat venues which the large tented venues provided and indeed these large events helped to

subsidise the smaller ones. Transferring the Festivals to a venue such as Pittville Park would create a very different type of festival and would not work in her view. Many people were attracted to the Festivals because they did take place in a hub in the centre of town and this works well for retailers and businesses as well as festival visitors. She also felt the Festivals would lose momentum if they stopped for year. They already had events in many other venues across town including the Everyman, the Daffodil and the Hotel du Vin. The timing of the Literature Festival in October was key to the Christmas book selling market and therefore an August/September date would not be acceptable and would also clash with the Edinburgh Festival. The Cheltenham Ladies College were also keen that their pupils could attend the Festival so they would not support it being held out of term time. It was her understanding that the Festivals were restricted as to which parts of the Gardens they could use but she was willing to explore other options. (A Member from the Gardens Forum indicated that this had been discussed at one of their meetings and it was his understanding that as long as the Festivals did not take more space they could use alternative part of the Gardens).

- She noted the suggestion that a Buskers Festival had been very successful in another country but highlighted that there would be no income from ticket sales and there were a lot of hidden costs in staging free events across the town and they were quite resource intensive.
- She noted the suggestion of an urban street art festival.
- She acknowledged that funding from the council had reduced from 8% to 1% and Arts Council funding was also reducing. The Festivals had responded to this by selling more tickets and bringing in more sponsorship and partners.

The Chair thanked the Chief Executive for a very informative presentation and commended the Festivals for the publicity they brought to the town. He would ask officers to follow up the point about the viability of any relocation within the Gardens.

9. PLACE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Managing Director of Place and Economic Development referred members to the paper which had been circulated with the agenda.

He has been asked to report on Economic development, tourism and car parking. These were areas that have been neglected over many years. Consequently there were gaps in skills and resources and a need for investment. He considered that his appointment was a confirmation by the council that they now wanted to take some action in these important areas. He contrasted Gloucester where strategies were already in place and were well funded and well-resourced and the town was now seeing real results in relation to tourism, marketing and regeneration. There was no magic solution for Cheltenham and it would take time to make up for this lack of investment in the past.

The following responses were given to member questions;

- A Member asked what responses had been received from the county council on the proposals from the car parking members working group.

The MD advised there had been no actions as yet they would continue to work closely with the county council particularly as this council had no strategic car parking resource and therefore were reliant on the county council expertise. The county council too had resource challenges but they had agreed that a senior member of the GCC team would attend future meetings of the car parking members working group.

- A Member challenged what timescales and targets for delivery had been set.
- The MD advised that that he was keen to undertake the whole exercise in a professional way and ensure the car parking strategy was properly scoped and funded from the start. A target had been set to report to Cabinet in May 2017 and this project provided a great opportunity to improve and rationalise car parking facilities and introduce new technology.
- For the Tourism Strategy there was a limited budget with a one-off payment of £50k but a consultant had been appointed with a view to developing a three-year strategy. This would then need buy in from stakeholders and local businesses and this would take time. The council had limited resources to support the strategy and therefore local investment was critical and without this it would fail.
- Regarding Economic Development, his plan was to free up some resource internally to develop the Place strategy which Cabinet had approved in October. Once in place this would be a very important marketing tool for the town to attract both tourists and businesses.
- Asked to comment on the recent survey which indicated that 80% of new business start-ups in Cheltenham fail, the MD said he had been concerned at these statistics. He did point out that high failure levels are common for all new business start-ups and the statistics did not include businesses who had been taken over. However, it was important to try and understand the reasons for those failures and he was working with the LEP to investigate further.
- Regarding the GCHQ innovation launch of the proposed new cyber accelerator hub in West Cheltenham, he acknowledged that the cyber businesses themselves could be quite small but GCHQ, with its international brand of quality, would attract a supply chain. Indeed they had already been inundated with expressions of interest from consultancies and other specialists who wanted to be involved.
- Asked whether council officers had the skills to operate commercially, the MD acknowledged that a change of culture was needed. His service managers had already embraced the idea of measuring services on the basis of cost effectiveness rather than time to deliver. Some staff would need skills training to enable them to be more innovative and staff would need to be encouraged and given freedom to innovate. He believed they had a duty to the council tax payers and businesses to deliver services in the most cost-effective way and that would include examining fees and charges.
- The working vision set out in 3.26 was a starting point. Cheltenham was in a great position and it needed to develop its brand.
- Asked for an update on the Cabinet Member's announcement at the Budget Council that there would be no car parking charges after 6 p.m., the MD advised that this implementation had been deferred due to the

current financial pressures and the potential implications needed to be fully reviewed.

- The MD confirmed that the consultant appointed to develop the tourism strategy was already meeting with existing stakeholders and a market research company was being used to carry out consultation with local shoppers and businesses. The challenge would be working within the limited budget of £50k.
- He confirmed that there was a great potential for collaborative working with the BID. He noted that himself and the Leader were directors of the BID so he should declare an interest.

The Chairman thanked the Managing Director of Place and Economic Development for his attendance and added that the Committee should have an ongoing role in scrutinising progress in these key areas and he asked for future update reports to be brought back to the committee.

10. UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS

The task group summary had been circulated with the agenda and the Democratic Services Manager talked through the summary.

Members noted that had been an increase in rough sleeping in various areas of the town and therefore this was an important issue for scrutiny to look at.

11. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN

The work plan had been circulated with the agenda.

The Managing Director of Economic Development and Place was requested to give an update on disabled toilet provision in the town. He advised that his officers had been looking at the potential for upgrading these facilities in line with the Changing Places initiative. The capital cost for such a facility was in the order of £20 to 30k and they were looking at the options for bringing in external funding. The issue was really the ongoing revenue costs estimated to be £10K per toilet as the council had currently no provision in the budget for this. They were also exploring the option of potential retailers coming into the town helping to provide these facilities.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled for Monday 28 November 2016.

Tim Harman
Chairman

Cheltenham Festivals

- Inspiration
- Innovation
- Quality
- Collaboration

How we are financed

	2007	2015
Sponsorship/Fundraising	39%	48%
Box Office	35%	43%
CBC	18%	1%
ACE	6%	4%
Misc.	2%	4%
Patrons	48	168

Cultural contribution

- Over 900 events
- Engaging with over 300 schools
- Over 20,000 students take part
- Ongoing community involvement in West Cheltenham
- Library prize initiated with the Booker Foundation

Economic contribution

- 30,000 paying customers
- 10,000 engaged with ...around town
- 27,000 free activities at Science
- 32 days of Festivals bringing in 10,000 people ex-Glos
- 'Retail, Hotel, Food and Drink, Parking, ... Return visits'

Educational contribution

- First Story & Hospitals project
- Musicate
- Lab Live
- Fame Lab & Fame Lab Academy

The numbers

	2007	2015
Turnover	£2.9m	£5.6m
Tickets	133,741	218,932
Web visitors	(149k visitors)	440k (790k visitors)
Database	53k	166k
Events for Schools	45	322
Students	c.7,000	19,953

Outcomes

- More distinctive content, originating in Cheltenham - engaging nationally
- International / national and local collaborations and commissions
- Locally embedded with partners & people
- Marketing sophistication
- Financially stable - range & level of funds income increased

HOSC summary of Highlights.

The Glos CC HOSC met on 15 November. The two items under the Scrutiny section of the Agenda both related to Health.

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust -Financial position.

The Chief Executive summarised her written report and answered questions ((Saira you know where that report is online)). She also introduced Mr Keith Norton who was a one of the Boards Non Executive Directors (NED)

The CEO accepted that the financial situation that the Trust found itself in was a failure of financial governance and that she, and the Board, would be making strenuous efforts to rectify the situation. Comment from Cllr Harvey, Deborah had only joined the Trust as CEO in June this year so the failings did not happen on her watch but it has been clear from the two meetings she has given evidence at the HOSC that she is committed and determined to resolve the issues.

Investigations had been set in motion to determine how the deficit had occurred, they will be in two phases and have already started. Big internal and External Auditors will be involved and oversight will be by an independent Auditor. It is too early at this stage to say exactly how the funding was mismanaged and it would not be appropriate to speculate but the deficit did not happen overnight and appears to have been masked in reports to the Board, who would have acted sooner had they known. Numerous HOSC Members expressed their disappointment at the situation, I won't repeat some of the intemperate rhetoric which the CEO refuted, and hoped to hear from the CEO again in January 2017.

Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP)

We received verbal reports from most of the CEOs and Senior County Officers involved in this huge piece of National work. Unusually, the geographical area of responsibility under the STP for our County was uniquely the County boundary. Many other STP geographical area crossed county lines and this was causing mixed reactions across the country because of the different funding lines and services that needed to be joined up. The Gloucestershire STP teams worked very well together as they were all within our County delivering services already and their teams were well known to each other. Members asked about when the first phase of the STP would start and were told it was already underway because of this unique position that Gloucestershire finds itself in.

Cllr Steve Harvey
CBC rep on Glos CC HOSC

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

28 November 2016

Update from the Urban Gulls Focus Group

This note contains the information to keep Members informed of matters relating to the work of the Committee, but where no decisions from Members are needed.

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 This report from the Urban Gulls Focus Group has come to Scrutiny on request.

2. Summary of the Issue

- 2.1 Urban gull complaints are nuisance related – people being woken by noise in the early hours, being swooped on, attacks on pets, faeces on property (eg balconies and cars) and the fear of infectious disease. Businesses such as car show rooms and cafes with outside seating face clearing faeces daily and nesting materials can block guttering or air conditioning units.
- 2.2 Gulls are wild birds and the council does not have any statutory responsibility to deal with them. However, it is recognised that they do cause considerable disturbance to residents and the public and environmental health team receives a significant number of urban gull complaints each year from residents and businesses.
- 2.3 The budget for gull control work was initially £3500, which was increased to £5000 in 2011. The majority of the budget is spent on hiring two different sized lorry mounted platforms with baskets, to enable access to affected rooftops to treat the eggs. The budget also covers backfilling the days spent on the programme by the council's pest control officer, to ensure cover for other pest control work.
- 2.4 The budget was increased again in 2015 to £9,100, to enable the switch from oiling gulls eggs to replacing them with dummy eggs when the oil was withdrawn from sale. Replacing the eggs with dummy eggs has the same benefits as egg oiling, in that gulls are noisiest when there are hatchlings in the nest, so the noise is reduced over the summer if they don't hatch; it stops the gull population from growing and adults that fail to produce offspring at a site tend to move on in future years. Dummy egg replacement is also more effective than oil as the gulls continue to sit on them for longer, without re-laying. It is more expensive due to the cherry picker hire costs to collect the eggs back at the end of the season, hence the budget increase.
- 2.5 The Urban Gulls Focus Group was set up in 2012 and is attended by residents and councillors from the affected areas. It is used to explain what CBC does and does not do and why in relation to the problem and also what residents can do to help.
- 2.6 CBC currently carries out the annual egg replacement programme (led by the Community Protection Team); issues media releases requesting residents to report

nests and explaining measures residents can take; co-ordinates the focus group and is a member of the Severn Estuary Gulls Group, which is made up of local authorities all around the Severn and is used to compare different methods used and to learn about new methods.

- 2.7 Residents can help by reporting nests to be included in the egg replacement programme (if they can't reach them themselves); removing the nests themselves if they can reach them safely; bird proofing their properties to prevent nesting and being careful not to allow gulls access to food waste. Residents have also helped to deliver leaflets to affected areas.

3. Summary of evidence/information

3.1 Number of eggs treated:

2007: 141

2008: 155

2009: 82

2010: 157

2011: 400 (base budget increased from £3500 to £5000).

2012 and 2013: no details

2014: 451

2015: 339 (plus 29 chicks found). Base budget increased to £9100 and switched to egg replacement.

2016: 471

4. How the situation could be improved further

- 4.1 The Urban Gulls Focus Group considers that a strategy is needed to deal with the problem more comprehensively, considering all of the following approaches:

- Restricting food sources
- Restricting breeding success
- Restricting nesting places
- Scaring techniques
- Culling – although it is recognised that this is challenging and controversial and not a viable option.

- 4.2 A strategy would need to be developed within the context of budget constraints, operational capacity and the need to generate income.

- 4.3 In terms of **restricting breeding success** and **restricting nesting places**, the Community Protection Team would like to consult about starting to charge for the egg replacement service and offering low cost bird proofing while the officers and cherry pickers are on the roof tops. Bird proofing offers a longer term solution. The Urban Gulls Focus Group was supportive of this approach, dependent on costs.

- 4.4 In terms of **restricting food sources** for the gulls, the Environment Agency at the most recent meeting dispelled the notion that the main food source for gulls is the landfill sites at Bishops Cleeve and Hempsted, as they had done extensive work on it

and the gulls are no longer feeding there at all. This has been monitored and has been the case since 2011 and nor have they been displaced to other sites within a 40 mile radius. There may be opportunities through the Waste and Recycling Service Redesign to help tackle the issue of food waste as a food source for gulls.

4.5 Other suggestions include:

- Setting up a Scrutiny Task Group to develop a strategy. This would be for the Scrutiny Committee to decide, taking into account other priorities and resources to support it and the focus group already in existence.
- Seeking to increase the budget in line with other authorities such as Bath to allow for more to be done.
- Trialling the use of red and white squares as a deterrent. Anecdotal evidence shows that gulls won't land or nest on red surfaces if the shade is the same as the dot on the beak of a gull.
- Using the media and social media more to raise awareness and gather more community intelligence about the problem.

Background Papers	n/a
Contact Officer	Helen Down, Participation & Engagement Team Leader, 01242 774960, helen.down@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Councillor Andrew McKinlay, Cabinet Member Development and Safety

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

28 November 2016

Update on Private Rented HMO Survey

This note contains the information to keep Members informed of matters relating to the work of the Committee, but where no decisions from Members are needed

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 This has come to scrutiny to update members on the progress of the private rented sector HMO survey which was subject of a report taken to Cabinet on 14th June 2016.

2. Summary of the Issue

- 2.1 In June 2014 Cabinet approved the recruitment of a new permanent post to be responsible for the ongoing identification and survey of HMO's, initially within the St Pauls and All Saints wards. The post is to be funded from the Housing Survey Reserve and then by HMO licensing fees and supported by existing enforcement staff.
- 2.2 Following detailed desk top analysis to identify possible HMO's and the development of a survey form, the survey work commenced in early September 2016. It was estimated that the survey of St Pauls would take approximately 9 months to complete depending on the extent of substandard accommodation discovered during the survey work.

3. Summary of evidence/information

- 3.1 The desk top analysis involved the scrutiny of council tax records, the electoral register and enforcement records including officer knowledge of the area. This analysis identified approximately 450 possible HMO's within the St Pauls Ward.
- 3.2 As of the 15th November, 225 HMO's have been fully inspected and additionally 72 properties have been visited and found not to be HMO's following interview with the occupants.
- 3.3 During the survey 10 HMO's have been referred through to the enforcement team for further investigation resulting from identification of poor management, poor standards of accommodation or where a licensable HMO was not licensed.
- 3.4 Of the HMO's inspected so far, less than 5% have been found to have unsatisfactory management standards that would result in formal enforcement action and although further analysis of the results is required, the level of category 1 hazards found is extremely low for this type of accommodation. A full report will be produced at the end of the survey, but evidence to date may reflect the proactive work undertaken by

enforcement officers in St Pauls over the last five years, including the licensing of 130 HMOs under the Governments Mandatory HMO Licensing Scheme.

4. Next Steps

- 4.1 The survey of St Pauls should be completed by February 2017 and at this stage a full report will be drawn up showing survey results.
- 4.2 The permanent survey post has been advertised and we are looking to recruit into the position in the near future. This post will continue the HMO survey work in the All Saints ward and other wards in due course.

Background Papers	Cabinet report – 14 June 2016
Contact Officer	Mark Nelson, Enforcement Manager, 01242 264165, mark.nelson@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Councillor Peter Jeffries, Cabinet Member Housing

O&S Task group	Purpose	Status summary	Nominations/Membership (chairman in bold)	Facilitating Officer	Sponsoring Officer	Cabinet Member	Proposed by	Terms of Ref agreed by O&S	Recs to O&S	Report to Council	Report to Cabinet	Cabinet follow up	O&S Follow up scheduled
KEY TO COLOURS	Active STGs												
	On hold												
	Standing group												
	Not prioritised by O&S												
Devolution	The Leader asked if O&S would set up a task group to maintain an overview of the ongoing discussions in relation to devolution and explore the opportunities and benefits for Cheltenham.	It became clear in February that the Chancellor would not be making any announcements in his budget statement regarding the Gloucestershire bid so the meeting of the task group planned for the 1 March was cancelled. On the 25 February Leadership Gloucestershire were advised of the Cotswold Unitary bid and the implications of this proposal and the timescales for progressing it are currently being reviewed. Scrutiny will continue to keep a watching brief and the task group will be reconvened when there is a revised way forward to discuss. There have been no further developments on this since the last O&S meeting.	Cllrs Williams, Harman, Paul McCloskey, Payne, Mason and C. Hay (Cllrs Jordan and Reid will observe)	Rosalind Reeves	Pat Pratley	Leader (Cllr Jordan)	Leader, Cllr Jordan	Oct-15					
Street People	Get a better understanding of the extent and nature of the issue(s) and identify any areas which could be more effective	The task group held a workshop with various agencies and organisations on the 14 November. The task group were able to confirm that there has been an increase in the number of rough sleepers and that they are not all homeless. The group also identified some areas which require further discussion. The group would now like to meet representatives of Project SOLACE, a multi-agency team which works to bring agencies together to deal with ASB and has success in reducing the number of persistent beggars on the street in Gloucester.	Cllrs Payne, Savage, C. Hay, Parsons, Wheeler and Nelson	Saira Malin	Exec Board	Housing (Cllr Jeffries)	Leader, Cllr Jordan	Jul-16					
Budget scrutiny working group	The working group's role is to develop the budget process, support the development of Members' scrutiny role and to consider ideas from Members for reducing the budget gap.	The working group have a schedule of meetings arranged throughout the year and consider the budget as well as financial implications for projects such as the 2020 partnership.	Cllrs Babbage, Nelson, Payne, Sudbury and Walklett * there is still a Lib Dem vacancy Cabinet Member Finance to attend by invitation.	Rosalind Reeves	Mark Sheldon	Finance (Cllr R. Hay)	Council	May-12	Jan-15	Feb-15	Jan-15		

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
------	---------	-------------------	--------------

Meeting date: 28 November (report deadline: 16 November)			
Stagecoach	Discussion about the bus service in Cheltenham and how it could be better delivered	Presentation / Q&A	Rupert Cox, Stagecoach (West)
Urban Gulls Focus Group	Update from the Group	Discussion paper	Helen Down, Team Leader – Participation and Engagement
Private Rented Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO) Survey	A progress update on the survey and results so far/next actions and timescales	Discussion paper	Mark Nelson, Built Environment Enforcement Manager
Quarter 2 performance review	Consider performance for the year so far and comment as necessary (will cover progress in relation to collaborative working to tackle drug dealing)	Report	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
Place Strategy	Consider summary of progress in the scoping / production of the Place Strategy and timescales for its completion	Briefing note (not for discussion)	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
Meeting date: 16 January 2017 (report deadline: 4 January)			
DRAFT budget	Consider the recommendations of the budget scrutiny working group	Discussion	Chair of BSWG
Cycling & Walking STG	Review progress against recommendations 12 months on	Discussion	Wilf Tomaney
Everyman Theatre	Presentation (is this something members want on the agenda)	Presentation (tbc)	Geoffrey Rowe
Place Strategy	Further conversations to help define the vision (is this something members want on the agenda)	Discussion (tbc)	Richard Gibson
Meeting date: 20 February 2017 (report deadline: 8 February)			
DRAFT Corporate Strategy	Consider draft Corporate Strategy before it goes to council and comment as necessary	Discussion	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager

O&S Committee 2016/17 work plan

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
------	---------	-------------------	--------------

Meeting date: 24 April (2017) (report deadline: 12 April)			
--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

Meeting date: 26 June 2017 (report deadline: 14 June)			
--	--	--	--

End of year performance	Consider end of year performance and comment as necessary	Discussion	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
-------------------------	---	------------	---

Items for future meetings (a date to be established)			
---	--	--	--

North Place	Watching brief and further in-depth scrutiny as necessary	Presentation	Jeremy Williamson
Cheltenham integrated transport issues	Look at issues (if any) that are identified by various scrutiny task groups once they have completed their work and consider how to take them forward??	Tbc	Tbc
Cheltenham Spa Railway Station STG	Review progress against recommendations 12 months on	12 months on from Cabinet response (not yet scheduled on forward plan)	Jeremy Williamson
BID update	Progress update from BID	When there is more to update the committee on	Kevan Blackadder

O&S Committee 2016/17 work plan

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
------	---------	-------------------	--------------

Annual Items			
Budget recommendations	January	Chair, Budget Scrutiny Working Group	
Draft Corporate Strategy	February	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager	
End of year performance review	June	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager	
Scrutiny annual report	Sept	Saira Malin, Democracy Officer	
Quarter 2 performance review	November	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager	

Briefing Note

(For information only)

Overview and Scrutiny Meeting 28 November 2016

Place Strategy – engagement plans and links to the devolution agenda

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1** At last month's O+S meeting, the Managing Director for Place and Economic Development provided an introduction to the draft Place Strategy that was agreed by cabinet on 11th October. This note updates the committee on the proposed plans to engage with a wide range of stakeholders, plus updates the committee on the devolution agenda.

2. Place Strategy background

- 2.1** As highlighted at the last meeting, the place strategy will pull together our strategic thinking on a range of issues that help define Cheltenham as a place. In doing so, it will co-ordinate the activities of a range of partners and agencies to focus on the outcomes that will support economic growth, cultural vitality and the wider well-being of our communities.

- 2.2** The draft place strategy that was endorsed by cabinet set out a working vision to start the conversations around what type of place we want Cheltenham to be:

We want to unlock the ambition of our communities to achieve their promising future – recognising Cheltenham's history whilst refocussing on innovation, vibrant cultural experiences, economic growth and growing our talent pool.

We will be a regional leader, well connected and have delivered a sustainable legacy.

- 2.3** The scope of the Place Strategy was proposed as follows;

- A collective assessment of the challenges that the town faces, and the strengths we can build on. What are the key risks for the town in the future and what are the key opportunities?
- A shared vision for Cheltenham – setting out our ambitions for the kind of town we want Cheltenham to be in the future. What will make Cheltenham stand out in the future, why is it special, and how does a vision for Cheltenham link to
- The development of a framework for action to deliver these ambitions – using commissioning principles to identify the key supporting outcomes and then working with partners in an entrepreneurial way to facilitate delivery of the vision, and with a clear sense of the priority projects that will make the biggest impact.

- 2.4** The key supporting outcomes were proposed as being;

- **A place where businesses choose to invest, where skills, innovation and talent are sought and fostered**
- **A place where tourists choose to visit and return – recognising the vibrancy of the town, its offer and relevance to different age groups**
- **A place where young people study and prosper; and linked to the vibrancy of**

the town and its job opportunities, wish to stay after their studying is completed

- **A place where people live in thriving communities**

2.5 Whilst Cheltenham Borough Council will take the lead in the development of the place strategy, we want the strategy to be owned by a wide range of stakeholders so that we can:

- Harness the ambitions for success shared by local businesses, agencies and organisations;
- Reflect the pride that people living in Cheltenham feel for their town, and
- Tell a story of ambition to the outside world, both nationally and internationally, to those people wishing to visit, study in or invest in Cheltenham.

3. Place Strategy engagement plans

3.1 To support the wider ownership of the strategy, an engagement plan has been developed to run to the end of January 2017. This will then enable officers and members to review the information ahead of the strategy coming back to Council at the end of March for approval.

3.2 The consultation programme is still in development but the following events have been planned :

When	Who	Purpose
21 November	Key place-shaping stakeholders	<p>To bring key stakeholders up to speed with the place strategy, other key strategic plans and the engagement plan</p> <p>To discuss the initial vision and outcomes</p> <p>For key stakeholders to bring their own key data / evidence and ambitions for Cheltenham for a round table discussion</p> <p>To share and discuss initial thoughts / concerns / opportunities</p> <p>Agree stakeholders' role moving forward</p>
23 November	Cheltenham Tourism Partnership meeting that will include representatives from the hospitality trade, Cheltenham BID, Cheltenham Trust, Cheltenham Festivals	<p>How do we use the place strategy to develop the branding and marketing of Cheltenham so that we deliver the outcome: A place where tourists choose to visit and return</p>
29 November	Youth workers' event facilitated by GRCC	<p>Engage with young people and youth work providers so that we make sure the place strategy responds to current and future needs of young people and delivers the outcome: A place where young people study and prosper</p>
14 December	Wilson Arts Collective facilitated by the Cheltenham Trust	
Early Jan	Pittville School workshop	

Mid-Dec	Business workshop. Invitees to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheltenham Development Taskforce • University of Gloucester • Gloucestershire airport • Cheltenham BID • GCC • LEP • Chamber • GWR • Stagecoach 	Engage with a range of organisations that can help us define how the place strategy will make Cheltenham a place that embraces growth and investment to deliver the outcome A place where businesses choose to invest, where skills, innovation and talent are sought and fostered
Mid-Dec	Cultural and creative providers workshop to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University • Cheltenham Trust • Cheltenham Festivals • Cheltenham Racecourse • Everyman Theatre • Playhouse • Holst Museum • Meantime Arts 	Engage with cultural and creative providers to define how the place strategy can help create a buzz in Cheltenham
12.1.17	Positive Participation Partnership meeting that includes a range of community providers, housing providers and VCS organisations	Engage with a range of public and VCS partners about how we can use the place strategy to harness skills and resources within our communities to deliver the outcome A place where everyone has the opportunity to live in thriving communities

3.3 We are also planning to support organisations hold their own consultation events. These will include:

Organisation	Type of meeting	Target date
Cheltenham Civic Society	One-off workshop	Jan 2017
VCS forum	Scheduled Meeting	13.12.16
CBC - O+S	Committee meeting	28.11.16 and 16.1.17
CBC – staff	Staff drop-in	Jan 2017
University – students	One-off workshop	TBA

3.4 In terms of consultation activities, we are planning a story-board to showcase Cheltenham to stimulate discussion and a website to act as repository for place-making activities.

3.5 One of other considerations that we will be testing with stakeholders and members is how we build an effective partnership that can provide a forum for strategic discussions as we move into the implementation phase of the strategy.

4. How the devolution agenda can inform our place strategy

4.1 Alongside our own work to develop a vision for Cheltenham, there is work being undertaken at a county level, on the back of the devolution agenda, to develop a vision for Gloucestershire. This section of the paper brings members of the Committee up to date with various strands of work associated with the devolution

agenda:

4.2 **KPMG review**

4.3 Leadership Gloucestershire (LG) commissioned KPMG to undertake a review of Gloucestershire's Devolution bid submitted in 2015. KPMG have now produced a final discussion report which was considered by LG on 27 October.

4.4 There is a sense that the original bid was too detailed. Instead KPMG have suggested that the devolution work develops more ambitious asks from government in four key areas:

- **Housing** – if planning is carried out strategically and sites are developed in a timely manner with the right tenure mix and flexibilities around the availability of capital and planning regulations challenging targets can be progressed
- **Employment land** – if the right employment land is available, businesses will be attracted to the county, devolution can provide greater access and powers to unlock the right employment land
- **Skills** – Strategically planning HE/FE provision and targeting education towards growth sectors will increase growth and productivity. In addition, focusing on career advice/pathways, innovation and increasing skill levels through a focused offering will increase productivity
- **Infrastructure** – Greater access to infrastructure funds combined with a strategic planning offering (covering physical and social infrastructure) will allow the level of growth and housing ambition in Gloucestershire required to attract businesses and residents

4.5 These four areas will all support our place strategy outcomes, particularly how we make Cheltenham a place where businesses choose to invest and where young people can study and prosper.

4.6 KPMG also felt that Leadership Gloucestershire should be making a clear statement of intent around Public Service Reform to join up partnership working, commissioning and integration between public and other bodies. It is recognised that this work does not need any formal agreement with government; instead it places the onus on local partners to deliver this. KPMG proposed five areas where Leadership Gloucestershire could make progress:

- Whole system reform
- Data sharing
- Work and health programme
- Community safety
- Health and social care

4.7 The final strand of KPMG's review looked at governance structures and it concluded that there needs to be strong accountability and governance to achieve radical transformation and devolution.

4.8 Having reviewed the report, Leadership Gloucestershire concluded that additional capacity is needed to support the work around devolution, public service reform and governance structures, with the expectation that the 10 partners would each contribute £10k to enable this capacity to be sourced.

4.9 In the meantime Leadership Gloucestershire have requested that the important work around community safety, the sustainability and transformation plan and public estates (all started in response to the original devolution bid) would continue.

4.10 **County Community Safety Review**

- 4.11** A review of community safety partnership working was commissioned by the Police and Crime Commissioner as an area of the original devolution bid that could be progressed without the need for government approval. A consultant was appointed and his final report and recommendations have been endorsed by LG. This will see the formation of a Gloucestershire Community Safety Partnership
- 4.12** The review established strong support for the development of an overarching body for Gloucestershire that would provide the strategic co-ordination of the agreed countywide Community Safety themes (such as Domestic Abuse, Cyber-Crime, Anti-Social Behaviour) on behalf of the six Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in Gloucestershire. The Partnership, which could be established in shadow form initially, would need to link to a number of other strategic boards that lead on cross-cutting agendas including the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, Health and Wellbeing Board, the Safeguarding Children Board, the Domestic and Sexual Violence Board and the Enabling Active Communities Partnership.
- 4.13** At a district level, a place-based multi-agency forum will be developed that will take a tactical lead on community safety, health and wellbeing and social isolation issues. For Cheltenham, we will use our existing partnership structures to meet this requirement.
- 4.14 Sustainability and Transformation Plan**
- 4.15** In December 2015, the NHS shared planning guidance 16/17 – 20/21 outlined a new approach to help ensure that health and care services are built around the needs of local populations. To do this, every health and care system in England has to produce a multi-year Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP), showing how local services will evolve and become sustainable over the next five years.
- 4.16** Gloucestershire's health and care community have now published their Sustainability and Transformation Plan.
- 4.17** The STP sets out the significant challenges we face and the opportunities to ensure local people can access high quality, sustainable and safe physical and mental health care into the future. The challenges include a growing population with more complex needs, increasing demand for services, escalating drug costs, recruiting enough staff with the right skills and expertise and considerable pressure on NHS and social care finances. The Gloucestershire STP sets out priorities to:
- Place greater emphasis on prevention of illness and self-care with investment to support it
 - Provide more joined up care and support in people's homes and in the community
 - Explore options to bring together some hospital services into 'centres of excellence' to ensure safety and quality
 - Develop a 'best use of medicines' programme and priority fund the drugs and treatments that have the greatest health benefit for the population
 - Develop a sustainable workforce
 - Make the most of new technologies.
- 4.18** To address the significant challenges the Sustainability and Transformation Plan is very much a partnership document and recognises the important roles that district councils play in supporting the health and wellbeing of our communities,
- 4.19 One Government Estates**
- 4.20** Leadership Gloucestershire has been successful in securing £50,000 that will help prepare a business case for a further £500,000 of additional funds to deliver a range of shared asset management projects.

5. Gloucestershire 2050

5.1 2050 Vision is a project jointly commissioned by Leadership Gloucestershire and GFirst LEP. The project has arisen from a number of recent developments and discussions that have identified the need for an ambitious, innovative, coherent and cohesive long term development plan for Gloucestershire. This is in recognition that whilst excellent progress is already being made in addressing short to medium term economic and social issues, without a longer term view of what Gloucestershire could – and should – become, the existing nature of interventions is largely reactive to current drivers and too fragmented and small scale to engender real change.

5.2 The purpose of the 2050 Vision project is therefore to consider where Gloucestershire wants to be in 30 years' time and to take an unfettered, high level view of the opportunities for transformational change projects that will help get the County to that place. There is a formal governance structure in place together with a project manager seconded from GFirst.

5.3 Alongside the formal 2050 Vision project, David Marlow of 3rd Life Economics (3LE) was commissioned by the county council to do a piece of challenge work with the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee (GEGJC) to stimulate debate amongst the committee on economic growth ambitious with a particular emphasis on productivity, connectivity and a “city-region” approach. Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee (GEGJC) recently convened a Round Table/Workshop with a small number of partners and officers where David Marlow's laid down six big ticket items for GEGJC to consider:

- Growing a 'top 25' global research university over the next twenty years.
- Focusing enterprise, innovation and skills support single-mindedly on "frontier firms" from whom most business and economic growth is likely to be delivered.
- Positioning Cheltenham-Gloucester as a leading UK 'metro' anchoring the Gloucestershire 'city-region', and putting in place policies to make this a reality.
- Promoting radical improvements in connectivity to London and Thames Valley.
- Adopting a more striking goal for public services reform and fiscal devolution.
- Developing one or two flagship signature investments of undisputed international significance with which to enthuse and engage proactive government support.

6. Next Steps

6.1 With much work ongoing both at the Gloucestershire level and at the Cheltenham level on defining and articulating our common vision for our respective places, and then for how we organise ourselves to deliver these visions, there are some significant opportunities to define a future model of local governance that most efficiently responds to local needs and opportunities. Our place strategy is only the start of a journey, but one that we will be sharing with our partners at neighbourhood level as much as those at a county level.

6.2 The role of elected members in defining this vision is absolutely paramount. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to return to O+S in the new-year to continue the conversation.

Page 37

Contact Officer

Richard Gibson
Strategy and Engagement Manager
01242 235 354
Richard.gibson@cheltenham.gov.uk

Accountability

Cllr. Steve Jordan, Leader of the Council

Scrutiny Function

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

