

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 26th June, 2017**

**6.00 - 8.25 pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Tim Harman (Chair), Jon Walklett (Vice-Chair), Alex Hegenbarth, Chris Mason, John Payne, Paul Baker, Max Wilkinson and Wendy Flynn (Reserve)
<b>Also in attendance:</b>	Tim Atkins (Managing Director of Place and Economic Development), Kevan Blackadder (BID Director), Richard Gibson (Strategy and Engagement Manager), Councillor Jordan (Leader) and Martin Surl (Police and Crime Commissioner)

### Minutes

**1. APOLOGIES**

Councillors Holliday, McCloskey and Hay had given their apologies. Councillor Flynn would substitute for Councillor Hay.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interests were declared.

**3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the last meeting (12 June) would be tabled for approval at the next meeting of the committee (11 September).

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

None had been received.

**5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE**

The Leader would give feedback on Cabinet's response to the recommendations of this committee in relation to the call-in meeting, under the Cabinet Briefing item.

**6. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED**

Updates on the Police and Crime Panel and Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been circulated with the agenda. An update on the recent meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee had been circulated separately to the agenda (Appendix 1).

Members were asked to contact the briefing authors directly with any comments or questions.

The Chairman had attended the 6 June meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee in his capacity as the newly appointed Cabinet Member for Public Health and advised that Sarah Scott, the Director of

Public Health had given a very interesting presentation and whilst there were areas where the County Council performed very well, some inequalities within districts had been identified. He suggested that this could be something the committee may wish to discuss further with Sarah Scott at a future meeting.

## **7. CABINET BRIEFING**

The Leader confirmed that a group of independent experts, co-ordinated by the LEP and the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee were both discussing major infrastructure. These groups would be looking at what kind of things we needed to be lobbying for (e.g. faster train journey to London). He suggested that this was an important issue and that everyone should be involved in the discussions.

Members would be aware that there were safeguarding issues at the County Council and Police, which was concerning. A special County Council meeting had been arranged, which he would be attending as he was keen to understand the issues and suggested that this was something Cheltenham needed to look at.

Further to the call-in meeting held on the 12 June and the request the Cabinet reconsider the Springbank decision; he advised that Cabinet, having just met, had upheld their original decision to approve the application. He reiterated that the original legislation was aimed at parished areas and with no national guidance as to what constitutes a neighbourhood, local guidance had been developed which aimed to reduce the risk of very large areas. The Leckhampton with Warden Hill application had been straight forward and unlike something such as the JCS, there was no huge consultation before a decision was reached, Cabinet had limited powers in the neighbourhood planning process and could merely receive applications and decide to approve or refuse. His view was that cabinet had no other option other than to approve the application, which was valid and tomorrow (27 June) would have defaulted to approval if no decision had been made. Whilst he appreciated that some would have preferred a different outcome, he explained that this decision did not preclude further discussions on boundaries.

The Leader gave the following responses to member questions:

- It was possible to give feedback at a local and national level about the neighbourhood planning process.
- It was notable that both Springbank and West Cheltenham had refused to defer their applications to allow for further discussion.
- Councillor Jeffries had declared an interest and did not participate in any decisions relating to the Springbank application.

## **8. POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER**

The Chairman welcomed the Police and Crime Commissioner (P&CC) and asked that, before providing verbal responses to the questions which had been submitted by members of the committee, (see table below) the P&CC give a brief overview.

Whilst he had been happy to accept the invitation by the committee, in the spirit of co-operation, he reminded members that it was the role of the Police and

Crime Panel to scrutinise him in his role as P&CC. Despite the shortcomings reported in the press and without trying to make any attempt to belittle the child protection issues that had been raised, he wanted to assure members that there were also many successes. This was not to say that the force were not under monumental pressure, having lost £30m of funding and over 200 officers, reducing numbers from 1300 to 1053. The Chancellors announcement that funding would remain at the same level equated to, for Gloucestershire, a £4.2m shortfall if the force maintained the current level of officers (1058) and a £6.5m shortfall if the P&CC kept to his commitment to increase officer numbers to 1100. This at a time when crime was increasing and growing in complexity.

His Police and Crime Plan, identical to his manifesto, set out what he aimed to achieve, during this current 4 year term, his second after his re-election in 2016 and this plan acknowledged the importance of neighbourhood policing and this included the need for improved Neighbourhood Watch schemes.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Payne</b>
	In light of the recent heightened terrorist threat, could you explain how the £1 million you allocate to community projects contributes to public safety. Have you considered to option of redistributing this money to combating the terrorist threat?
	The £1m allocation equated to only 1% of the P&CCs overall budget and was set up after he was first elected in 2012. He assured members that the counter terrorism network was very well funded by the Government and suggested that what was severely lacking was neighbourhood policing, which resulted in the loss of contact with communities and the intelligence that came with these community links, as well as the reduction in crime. The funding had supported over 300 successful projects across the county, including the Street Pastors project in Cheltenham and he highlighted that these projects had been able to draw in funding from other areas. He felt that these projects represented his most successful achievements.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Payne</b>
	I take the view that a good working relationship between the local police and councillors benefits the whole community. At a recent meeting with your deputy, he stated that Neighbourhood Policing had significantly improved. There appears to be little or no evidence to support that statement. Could you please give your assessment of the current state of Neighbourhood Policing?
	Crime rates in Cheltenham were rising, meaning increasing pressure on ever reducing resources and funding. The Constabulary were committed to neighbourhood policing and were in the process of reintroducing neighbourhood teams but this required the relocation of officers and would take time. He was confident that these changes would have been implemented by the Autumn and felt that the public understood the challenges facing the constabulary.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	How many full time front line police officers are there in Cheltenham, how has this number changed in the last 5 years, is the Cheltenham contingent up to compliment?
	He was not able to give an exact figure as all response vehicles now operated from Bamfurlong, covering Cheltenham and Gloucester and therefore responded to demand and whilst he could ask the Chief

	Constable for a figure, this would not necessarily be representative of the true figure as this would not include firearms officers, etc.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	How do you envisage the number of front line officers in Cheltenham changing in the next 5 years? Do you believe we have enough front line officers?
	Staff costs equated to 80% of his budget, with the rest being spent on buildings, vehicles, insurance, petrol, etc. Crime was on the rise, housing numbers would be increasing and both at a time when police numbers and funding were reducing and he was unsure as to how these issues could be reconciled.
<b>5.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	I believe that police officers who know their areas, engage with local people of all age groups and ethnicity help build up trust and therefore help the police do their job, do you agree and if so what is being done to improve community policing in our town?
	As he had already explained, the reintroduction of neighbourhood teams was a priority but this would take some time to organise.
<b>6.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	What percentage of crimes are solved? Is crime reducing?
	As he had mentioned, crime was increasing and not only in terms of volume but in terms of complexity.
<b>7.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	What are your main concerns which will impact upon your ability to maintain law and order in our town and reduce incidents of crime?
	He had already covered this in previous responses.
<b>8.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	Is the use of police horses relevant in 2017, how much is spent on this resource?
	The 12-18 month trial had cost £194k and was proving very effective, even if it did evoke mixed feelings with the public. The University of Oxford had evaluated the benefits and had shown that levels of public engagement with officers was six times higher when on horseback compared to those in vehicles. He noted that the running costs of this resource would be much lower than the initial set-up costs, which had included a second-hand horse box for £60k, the cost of a fully equipped vehicle. Ultimately the Chief Constable would make the final decision but a deal with South Wales, who had 8 horses, could see Gloucestershire move to 4 and combined would in effect be a unit (of 12).
<b>9.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Harman</b>
	Will the Police and Crime Commissioner seek to use the Powers contained in the Police and Criminal Justice Act 1994 to move on Travelers from locations such as Arle Court Park and Ride?
	Operational decisions were for the Chief Constable and not the P&CC. he would ask that the Chief Constable respond directly to Councillor Harman.
<b>10.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor McCloskey</b>
	A few weeks ago, I was unable to contact the police on the 101 number despite hanging on for more than half an hour. The reason for my call was urgent although not requiring a 999 response. I resorted to calling the OPCC who arranged for the police to call me. Subsequently I made

	<p>an official complaint to the Constabulary. In a telephone conversation with the temporary Chief Inspector in charge of the Control Room, I proposed changes to the automated "system busy" message which were accepted. Last week, I was contacted by a member of the public who held on for one hour before giving up. How difficult is it to change a simple automated message? The 101 number is the main point of contact with the police now that police stations and officers are thin on the ground. How can the police gain local intelligence without an effective 101 service? The public deserve better.</p>
	<p>It was important to note that the 101 service was one of the only 24hr services remaining in Gloucestershire. He reported that last week 1311 '999' calls had been received with an average waiting time of 16 seconds, compared to 10 seconds the week prior. 4361 calls had been received to the 101 service and had an average waiting time of 2 minutes and 20 seconds compared to 1 minute and 24 seconds the week before. The maximum waiting time was 35 minutes and he accepted that the 101 service was not perfect. He explained that there had been a 20% increase in the number of calls to this service since 2014, currently averaging 23,000 calls a month, compared to 6500 '999' calls. In addition to this, calls were taking longer, with call handlers attempting to resolve the issue over the phone, without the need to send an officer. He stressed that the '999' service took precedent and the service, as it stood at the moment, could not be diverted, or a recorded message given. This was currently under review and ten new call handlers were in the process of being recruited.</p>

The P&CC gave the following responses to member questions:

- The issue of gangs coming from major cities and establishing drug networks was a major issue for Gloucestershire, with Cheltenham equally affected than Gloucester. The police relied on intelligence from CBH and cyber intelligence but were successfully tackling the issue and had convicted a number of people. It was noted that some offenders were just children and cases in Rotherham and other areas, had highlighted the need to find a balance between offenders and victims.
- His decision to appoint a temporary Chief Constable was based on the fact that the entire top team at the Constabulary were due to leave and it had been his judgement that a temporary appointment would offer immediate stability. The Government wanted P&CCs to look at the fire service and had given three options; the P&CC take governance of the fire service; appoint a Chief Officer above the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Police Officer or: be given a place on the GCC Cabinet. The P&CC commented that he was open minded about the fire service and that the only reason he had been granted £100k to look at the issue was because GCC had refused to discuss the matter with him.
- Following the HMIC report, the P&CC had asked the Chief Constable to look into why case reviews had been deemed inadequate, but this would take time. He noted that whilst the constabulary had had its funding cut by 25%, the HMIC had had their funding significantly increased which he felt resulted in the HMIC having the resources necessary to look things in more detail.

- The criticism levelled at the constabulary, by HMIC, regarding children in custody related not to the numbers of children in custody, which was low, but instead related to suitable accommodation being sought. The P&C noted that there was no such accommodation available in Cheltenham.
- There was not a week in which rapes or sexual assaults were reported across the County, though not all of these would be reported in the press. Members should not feel alarmed however, as Gloucestershire remained one of the safest places to live in the country.
- The P&CC was willing to attend resident association meetings and invited members to email him with any such requests but reminded them that he was one person, and should therefore not be offended if he isn't able to accept.

The Chairman thanked the P&CC for his time and honesty and hoped that he would accept a further invitation in the future.

## **9. PLACE STRATEGY**

The Managing Director for Place and Economic Development and BID Director had been invited to provide the committee with an update on the Place Strategy, as well as reassuring the committee that BID were engaging with the process of developing the Place Strategy.

The Managing Director for Place and Economic Development reminded the committee that the Place Strategy was approved by Council in March 2017 and a number of consultation exercises had and would be undertaken. This was a long term plan and the overall vision was "A place where everybody thrives" and focussed on four key values: a pioneering spirit, nurturing, connecting and reconnecting and creativity. A clear plan for the public realm in the town centre was required going forward but it was important to note that the transformation of the town would take time.

The BID Director confirmed that the BID were involved in the development of the Place Strategy and were happy to engage because the businesses had identified 5 areas which they wanted BID to focus on and the Place Strategy included 3 of these (public realm improvements, town centre events and parking and accessibility). BID had talked to a number of town centre businesses, as well as Spirax Sparco, Superdry and the Chamber of Commerce and the messages had been consistent:

- There was a skills shortage in Cheltenham, particularly in engineering and law.
- The high cost of living meant that people working in the town often couldn't afford to live here. More starter homes were needed.
- People did not feel incentivised to cycle because of the lack of places to park bicycles.
- A number of businesses had moved their headquarters from Cheltenham and in order to attract and retain businesses there was a need for more commercial space
- The bus service was reliable and affordable but it was felt that some services could run later into the evening.

- Signage in and around the town was poor.
- There was no central area for the public to gather.
- The opening of the John Lewis store was really positive for the town but people felt that the Strand end of the high street was 'a disgrace'. A sentiment shared by two national retailers who had recently visited the town.

The BID Director stressed that these issues must be resolved to ensure that the transformation of the town could move forward successfully.

Despite some of the negative feedback relating to Cheltenham, members felt strongly that it was still a nice place to live and suggested that the town centre was looking less attractive in recent months because of the major works at the Brewery and John Lewis sites. They all hoped that John Lewis would be a catalyst for further improvements.

In response to a member question, the Director of Place and Economic Development explained that the West Cheltenham scheme would have a massive impact on the town but it was important that members be aware that this would take some 15 years to bring to fruition. The town centre could not offer a site anywhere near the 50 hectares that West Cheltenham could, but there were sites, which the council owned that all had existing uses, but which could be considered for an alternative use if there was a strong enough business case. He also confirmed that whilst he was not spending a lot of time visiting other areas, consideration was being given to successes and failures of other towns and cities. With the proposed cyber park being the first in this country, they were also looking to other countries.

In closing the BID Director assured members that BIDs did not see one another as rivals and worked well together, sharing experiences and advice.

No decision was required.

The Chairman thanked both men for their attendance.

## **10. END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE**

The Strategy and Engagement Manager introduced the end of year performance as circulated with the agenda. He reminded members that the 2016-17 action plan was approved by Council back in April 2016 had identified 95 milestones and this report set out progress against those milestones. He advised that 55 were complete, 32 were green, meaning the project was on track to be delivered against a revised timescale and 8 which were amber, meaning that there were concerns about the deliverability of the project against the original timescales. These amber milestones were set out at 3.2 of the paper and he suggested that this was where the committee may wish to focus their discussion.

The Strategy and Engagement Manager gave the following responses to member questions:

- Ubico had done a lot to promote the no side-waste policy, but this remained a borough wide issue and compliance was very much voluntary at the moment. The challenge was around when to enforce

this policy and the kind of reaction this would evoke. The committee could request a briefing if members wanted to understand the issue better.

- Those actions with Wilf Tomaney named as 'Lead' had been passed on to other officers since Wilf's retirement.
- The highways issue was a complex agenda and progress was proving difficult, however, it remained a political ambition for this council. Perhaps this was another area on which the committee could ask for a further briefing.
- Whitehall capacity for progressing new devolution deals was much reduced but discussions were still ongoing and regarding a local arrangement. He accepted, should use a different term to 'devolution'.
- A commitment had been made to make Shopmobility work and it was important that this issue was resolved. This would now be taken forward by Mirjam Wiedemann, the new Economic Development Manager

A member sought clarification about the potential for a garden waste income windfall.

Another member congratulated the Strategy and Engagement Manager for presenting a report which demonstrated the amount that was being done, and suggested that those actions that had not been completed, were out of the control of the council and perhaps these should not be taken forward.

The Chairman felt it important to continue dialogue with GCC about highways matters and looked forward to seeing how the Place Strategy could provide the framework for these discussions. He agreed that it would be beneficial for the committee to receive further briefings on this and the side waste issue. This would be added to the work plan accordingly.

No decision was required.

## **11. STREET PEOPLE SCRUTINY TASK GROUP - FINAL REPORT**

Councillor Payne would present this item on behalf of Councillor Savage who had chaired the task group but was not able to attend the meeting.

Councillor Payne wished to put on record, his thanks to Councillor Savage and Saira Malin, Democracy Officer, for drafting what he considered to be an excellent report and one which he was pleased to be able to present to the committee. It was clear to members, residents and businesses that the number of people begging, sleeping and drinking on the streets in Cheltenham had risen over the last year and this was not to the advantage of anyone, including those exhibiting these behaviours. At the first meeting of the task group, it was evident that street people presented a wide variety and complexity of issues and that there was no single solution. He noted, however, that not all were vulnerable and in fact a large proportion of the 12 or so individuals on the streets of Cheltenham, were not in fact homeless and were instead begging to fund a drug or alcohol addiction. In view of the fact that some individuals travelled between Cheltenham and Gloucester and having discussed some of the successes that Gloucester City had achieved as part of Project Solace, the group decided it needed to meet with representatives of the project. Managed by Gloucester City Council and Gloucestershire Constabulary, and delivered by a team of three, including two seconded Police Officers, the team engaged with



those that took responsibility for their actions and supported individuals to address the root causes of anti-social behaviour, in a co-ordinated way. Where individuals would not engage and anti-social behaviour persisted, enforcement was taken, but it had been reassuring for the group that this was a last resort, with enforcement action only having been taken against 2 individuals since the projects inception. The task group were made aware that the council was already considering a business case for joining the Solace partnership and felt that this would provide an effective solution by increasing resources for Cheltenham and ensuring a co-ordinated approach. On the 11 April 2017, Cabinet agreed that Cheltenham would join the Solace partnership and the task group were in full support of this decision, given the conclusions it had already drawn on the issue. In closing, Councillor Payne commented that with a better understanding of the issue and as part of Solace, the council were well placed to move forward and tackle the issues in a way that Police action could not, as it was self-defeating to fine someone that was begging on the street, although this would continue to be used as a last resort. He was pleased to be able to table this report and hoped that members would support the recommendations.

A number of members commended the report, which demonstrated the sensitive and measured approach that the task group had adopted when undertaking this review and voiced their support for Cheltenham having joined the Solace partnership.

In response to a member question, Councillor Payne confirmed that Solace were sharing the message that members of the public should not give money to people on the street and instead donate to an appropriate charity, but the task group had acknowledged that this would need to be an ongoing campaign rather than a one-off.

The Chairman welcomed the report and recommendations and suggested that tougher laws were required as the Vagrancy Act 1824 was outdated and perhaps this was something that should be raised with the Local Government Association.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that the task group recommendations as set out in the report be endorsed and recommend to Cabinet for approval.**

**Overview and Scrutiny recommends:**

- 1. Reducing the number of street people in Cheltenham should be a priority for this authority, benefiting not on the street people but also residents and local businesses, as well as the town itself**
- 2. An integrated, co-ordinated multi agency approach is required, with close partnership working and appropriate information**
- 3. This authority is well placed to assume a co-ordinating role**
- 4. The adoption of a Project Solace model or similar approach in Cheltenham**

## **12. SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM**

The Democracy Officer introduced the scrutiny topic registration form which had been circulated with the agenda. The form had been submitted by Councillor Parsons and related to the impact of race meetings on local residents. She referred members to the officer implications which had been included overleaf and asked that the committee give consideration to these implications when deciding if and how it wished to scrutinise the issue. Options included:

- Setting up a task group
- An officer report at a scheduled meeting of the committee
- A member seminar
- A one-off meeting
- No action

A member felt that the issues raised by Councillor Parsons were similar to those experienced by residents in other areas during other festivals and events and felt that the review should look at these issues across the town. Other members disagreed, feeling that scope would then be too wide.

In view of the officer implications which indicated that many of these discussions were already ongoing and which highlighted a resource issue, the committee agreed that a one-off, sub-committee meeting with officers from the council and County Council, as well as representatives from the Racecourse, would be the most appropriate course of action. The Democracy Officer would contact members with some provisional dates in due course.

## **13. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN**

The work plan had been circulated with the agenda.

The Democracy Officer advised that she was still waiting for CBH and the Charlton Kings Flood Action Group to confirm whether they could attend the September or October meeting of the committee. She noted that she had started to draft the annual report and that this would be approved by the lead members (Councillors Harman, Payne and Walkett). The committee would be asked to endorse the annual report in September, before it was tabled with Council, to note, in October.

## **14. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXEMPT INFORMATION**

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 100A(4) Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining agenda items as it is likely that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, if members of the public are present there will be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraph 3, Part (1) Schedule (12A) Local Government Act 1972, namely:**

**Paragraph 3; Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)**

**15. APPROVE EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 20 February 2017 had been circulated with the agenda.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that the exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 20 February 2017 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.**

**16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting was scheduled for Monday 11 September.

Tim Harman  
**Chairman**



## Gloucestershire Economic Growth Steering Group (GEGSG) and GEGSG Scrutiny Group – Report to O&S

As of today, GEG Steering Group has a new chair - Cllr Lyndon Stowe, whose cabinet portfolio is ***Economy Skills and Growth***. (I get the impression that this is one of a new set of portfolios, so it would be good have a sheet, if such a thing exists, explaining the new arrangements.)

Steve Jordan has been appointed vice chair of the Steering Group.

A number of topics were discussed at the Steering Group, but all were shrouded in uncertainty. It didn't help that the meeting coincided with the belated Queen's speech. The Scrutiny Group reviewed its Terms of Reference and confirmed that 4 times a year they would meet the same day as the Steering Group to give members the opportunity to listen to the Steering Group in the morning.

They also agreed that twice a year they would meet in a district, on rotation. So, the big question is: **would Cheltenham like to avail itself of this opportunity, and if so, what local topics might be of interest and how should Cheltenham go about organising such a meeting?** I assume that the Scrutiny Group would hold its meeting in a sufficiently large room for as many members and officers to attend as so wished. I further assume there would be an opportunity for questions.

The three dates for these away days in the calendar are:

- 19<sup>th</sup> October (provisionally taken by Cotswolds)
- 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018
- 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018

My recommendation would be to see if either the February or October date would do, and to make a pitch for it as soon as possible. It's beyond my pay grade to determine how an exercise like this should be approached. I'll know more after the 19<sup>th</sup> October meeting in Cirencester. But, I'd be inclined to grab a slot as quick as possible. O&S would seem an appropriate body to organise this, if so minded.

Topics that might be pertinent could include:

- The cyber hub
- Employment & Skills Board (and how local people are to acquire the skills to apply for jobs in the cyber hub)
- Fastershire, plus other local infrastructure issues

There is loads of background information that would give members an appreciation of the scope of work being undertaken across Gloucestershire. The timescale is up to 2050 (though how to engage with these future stakeholders is far from clear!)

The indented text below is quoted in full as it distils the essence of some strategic Government thinking. In particular, '**inclusive growth**' is to be '**place**' based. But '**place**' is as yet undefined. The concern for Gloucestershire is that the Govt may be thinking about a larger area than just Gloucestershire, and we may struggle to make ourselves heard when competing with larger groupings (the Northern Powerhouse,

for instance). We also want to make linkages with other parts of the country and not just the South West. (Oxford, Milton Keynes, Cambridge etc.)

***Inclusive growth*** is a term that has been gaining traction significantly over a number of recent years. In defining inclusive growth, the findings from the recent Inclusive Growth Commission, chaired by Stephanie Flanders has concluded the following requirements to progress:

- ***Place-based industrial strategies:*** Delivering business-led productivity and quality jobs through lifelong learning to develop sectoral coalitions linking industry sectors and places and the creation of new institutions to connect business and industry
- *A fundamental reset of the relationship between Whitehall and the town hall, underwritten in new social contracts: Allowing flexibility of budgets to support co-commissioning for health and social care and other public service areas such as education, skills and employment support to maximise impact and reduce silo spending*
- *Inclusive growth at the heart of public investment: Basing funding models on expected impact on broad based 'quality GVA', the establishment of regional banks and an independent UK Inclusive Growth Investment Fund overseen by a multi-stakeholder board.*
- *Making inclusive growth our working definition of economic success: Understanding social infrastructure gap and defining inclusive growth metrics which would be developed alongside social contracts.*

Members may wish to consider background information provided at the links below:  
Strategic Economic Plan for Gloucestershire

[http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc\\_get.aspx?DocID=168](http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc_get.aspx?DocID=168)

Strategic Economic Plan for Gloucestershire (Business Case)

[http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc\\_get.aspx?DocID=169](http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc_get.aspx?DocID=169)

Building on Success – Gloucestershire Growth Deal 3

[http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc\\_get.aspx?DocID=380](http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc_get.aspx?DocID=380)

All three documents are very readable, containing a number of good info-graphics. If you are interested in the Business case underpinning the A417, Junction 10 of the M5 etc etc, they are all there in the second document.

The third document itemises the strategic projects that have been initiated under phases 1,2 & 3 of the Growth Deal. The emphasis now is on completing these projects. There is no expectation of a further tranche of Growth money.

Cllr Paul McCloskey  
21<sup>st</sup> June 2017