

# Cheltenham Borough Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Meeting date:** 27 February 2023

**Meeting time:** 6.00 pm

**Meeting venue:** Council Chamber - Municipal Offices

---

## **Membership:**

Councillor John Payne (Chair), Councillor Steve Harvey (Vice-Chair), Councillor Graham Beale, Councillor Nigel Britter, Councillor Jackie Chelin, Councillor Stephan Fifield, Councillor Tabi Joy, Councillor Julian Tooke and Councillor Suzanne Williams

---

## **Important notice – filming, recording and broadcasting of Council meetings**

This meeting will be recorded by the council for live broadcast online at [www.cheltenham.gov.uk](http://www.cheltenham.gov.uk) and [www.youtube.com/user/cheltenhamborough](https://www.youtube.com/user/cheltenhamborough). The Chair will confirm this at the start of the meeting.

If you participate in the meeting, you consent to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for broadcasting and/or training purposes.

If you have any questions on the issue of filming/recording of meetings, please contact Democratic Services.

---

**Contact:** [democraticservices@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@cheltenham.gov.uk)

**Phone:** 01242 264 246

## **1 Apologies**

## **2 Declarations of interest**

## **3 Minutes of the last meeting (Pages 5 - 12)**

Minutes of meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January.

## **4 Public and Member questions, calls for actions and petitions**

## **5 Cabinet Briefing**

Briefing from Councillor Jeffries, Deputy Leader (if he has an update, or if O&S Members have questions for him).

**Objective:** An update from the Cabinet on key issues for Cabinet Members which may be of interest to Overview and Scrutiny and may inform the work plan.

## **6 Matters referred to committee**

### **7 Race week (Pages 13 - 18)**

**18:10 - 18:40**

**Objective:** Action plan following on from January item, looking to understand the steps the council are undertaking, in partnership with others, to improve residents' experience of race week.

Louis Krog (Head of Public Protection)

### **8 Scrutiny topic request - outside bodies (Pages 19 - 22)**

**18:40 - 19:10**

**Objective:** To consider how to respond to the scrutiny topic request submitted by Cllr. Flynn (Review of Nominations to Outside Bodies).

Councillor Wendy Flynn

Claire Hughes (Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer)

Darren Knight (Executive Director Place and Communities)

### **9 Information Governance (Pages 23 - 28)**

**19:10 - 19:40**

**Objective:** To understand the council's information governance arrangements, how it is performing and the key risks.

Claire Hughes (Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer)

### **10 Feedback from other scrutiny meetings attended**

Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel (3<sup>rd</sup> February) – update from Councillor Willingham to follow.

The Gloucestershire Economic Growth O&S Committee has not met since the last O&S meeting.

Cllr. Bamford was unable to attend the Gloucestershire Health O&S Committee on 31<sup>st</sup> January – the minutes are available [here](#).

**11 Updates from scrutiny task groups (Pages 29 - 30)**

Update from Scrutiny Task Group on Tackling Multiple Deprivation

**12 Review of scrutiny workplan (Pages 31 - 34)**

**13 Date of next meeting**

17<sup>th</sup> April.

**Informal de-brief**

What went well? Can we identify opportunities for improvement or training needs?

Gareth Edmundson  
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

### Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Tuesday, 31st January, 2023**

**6.00 - 7.55 pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	John Payne (Chair), Steve Harvey (Vice-Chair), Nigel Britter, Jackie Chelin, Tabi Joy, Julian Tooke, Suzanne Williams and David Willingham (Reserve)
<b>Also in attendance:</b>	Claire Morris, Harry Mayo, Darren Knight, Councillor Matt Babbage, Councillor Peter Jeffries, Louis Krog and Andre Klein

### Minutes

**1. APOLOGIES**

Cllrs. Beale and Fifield sent apologies, while Cllr. Willingham was in attendance as a substitute.

The Chair welcomed back Cllr. Harvey as Vice-Chair after his leave of absence, and thanked Cllr. Tooke for taking on the role during that time.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllrs. Joy and Payne noted that they both sat on the Budget Scrutiny Working Group, and had taken part of the discussion on the budget proposals under consideration in item 8.

Cllr. Willingham added in relation to item 7 that he was Chair of the Licensing Committee and the council's night-time economy champion.

**3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

Prior to the meeting, Cllr. Chelin had highlighted two typos in the previous minutes. With those changes in mind, the minutes of the 28<sup>th</sup> November 2022 meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

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

There were none.

**5. CABINET BRIEFING**

The Deputy Leader reported that CBC had been unsuccessful in its Levelling Up bid for funding to contribute to the National Cyber Innovation Centre, which was disappointing but would not prevent progress on the Golden Valley development. He was keen to get feedback from the decision makers on why this project had not been supported, given its potentially transformational impact on communities in Cheltenham and across Gloucestershire. The GV

development had launched its first public consultation events across Cheltenham, including on the High Street and at Gloucestershire College, and the team would be at the High Street Pod on 4<sup>th</sup> February.

He added that the Leader of the Council had signed up to a shared commitment to decarbonise transport alongside all other councils in Gloucestershire. Transport made up a significant part of the county's carbon emissions, and as a council they were committed to solutions like integrated mass transit and improving the reliability and cost of public transport.

Looking forward, they continued to face a challenging financial situation, with inflationary pressures and energy prices being the two biggest issues to grapple with. He recalled that in December 2021, inflation had reached a 40 year high of 4.2%. This had peaked at 11.1% last year, though it had reduced slightly since. Interest rates had also increased eight times. Over the same period, energy costs had risen from about 15p for a unit of electricity and 3p for a unit of gas to 40p and 10p respectively, even with the government's caps on pricing.

The latest budget monitoring report for 2022/23 reported a £2.39m overspend against what was a reasonable and prudent budget when it was set. The Local Government Provisional Finance Settlement setting out the level of government funding saw a 3% increase in core funding against inflation at the time of 11.1%, and only guaranteed one year of funding. It placed greater reliance on local tax generation and this council's commerciality to enable a balanced budget for 2023/24.

One Member asked when they were likely to hear back from central government about why the Levelling Up bid failed, and suggested that residents deserved to know why they hadn't supported a project with real benefits for deprived parts of the town. The Deputy Leader was not sure of the timescale of this.

One Member praised the work of finance team in challenging times, and wondered whether Cheltenham's reputation as a wealthy town might have contributed to its lack of support from central government, when in reality it contained areas of acute deprivation.

### **6. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE**

There were none.

### **7. RACE WEEK**

Louis Krog (Head of Public Protection) (LK) and Andre Klein (Cheltenham Racecourse) (AK) outlined the key points from their briefing note, which outlined the direction of travel ahead of the festival in March.

AK explained that they anticipated more than 250,000 racegoers over the four days of the festival, with the largest day being Gold Cup day on the Friday. The racecourse had made some changes to capacities across all four days, limiting numbers to 68,500 (a reduction of more than 5,000 on Gold Cup day) to alleviate some of the pressures experienced last year and improve the

experience for customers and residents. Gold Cup day was already sold out, and they were looking forward to providing a good experience for racegoers.

He added that he had been leading on the work to make changes in order to mitigate the issues seen last year, in particular minor social misdemeanours like those seen on Richmond Road. Last year's festival had received about 200 complaints in total, though this included things like beer prices and cold chips. They had trialled the Love Our Turf campaign in November, seeking to promote positive behaviour, improve racegoers' journeys and above all reduce negative experiences for residents. They were developing a better rapport between the racecourse and residents, and the campaign sought to demonstrate an enhanced level of care and respect by providing more street cleaning, bins and toilets, and by placing stewards and wayfinders on the street to facilitate safe and orderly travel.

He added that they were keen to ensure this wasn't just a racecourse initiative, and were working closely with CBC officers, the Business Improvement District (BID) and Chamber of Commerce to ensure a joined up approach to the strategy. The November trial had received no negative feedback, and the principal difference now would be the larger footprint of the festival, covering additional areas. A significant marketing and advertising campaign would support its operational delivery.

LK added that the council's focus was primarily on the enforcement side of things, and they were looking to learn lessons from last year. The Police and Crime Commissioner had arranged a debrief with ward councillors after the 2022 festival, while internal debriefs and reflections had taken place too. The presence of envirocrime officers would be upscaled, particularly at key sites and peak times, as well as police officers and PCSOs with additional powers to act as a deterrent. They would focus on active reporting of offences, and would close a key road southbound on all four evenings to get people away from the racecourse more quickly.

He noted that the council's approach was not just aimed at preventing anti-social behaviour (ASB), but also at supporting wider public safety in areas like taxis and sexual entertainment venues (SEVs). In effect, officers would be on duty from 8am on Tuesday until 2am on Saturday. It was an incredibly resource-intensive program, putting a strain on capacity, but they recognised the need to build on the successful approach trialled in November. The 'war on wee' campaign, led by Cllr. Wilkinson, would also form part of this, and was looking into using things like hydrophobic paint to discourage public urination.

The Chair moved into Member questions and debate:

- One Member asked what it was that made the festival uniquely difficult to manage. AK responded that it was sheer numbers more than anything else, in addition to the four day duration. Racegoers often came from a long way away, for example from Ireland, and tended to stay for the full four days. No other event saw quite so many people moving in and out of town at this rate. Putting wayfinders and stewards along Evesham Road would make a real difference for racegoers and local residents.

- One Member asked whether the officers had had a definite commitment about increased policing to match the council's efforts. LK responded that while they had not had a particular number yet, they might have more information to report back at the February meeting, and would take the query to the Chief Inspector in the meantime. He was confident that the police recognised the scale of the event and the need to take a more robust approach to challenging people. The local policing team had already committed to support CBC's envirocrime officers and were supportive of the work they were doing for racegoers and residents. AK agreed that the police were integral to every element of the plan.
- One Member asked how success would be measured, and how this would affect the level of resource allocated next year. LK suggested that complaints were generally a good barometer, as well as where exactly they came from. The November trial had seen a significant reduction, and hopefully this would continue.
- One Member whose ward included the railway station suggested funnelling racegoers down the Honeybourne Line towards the town centre rather than along Gloucester Road. Another Member noted that this backed onto residential properties as well, so it would just move the disturbance to a different neighbourhood.
- One Member was disappointed that the British Transport Place were not implementing dry trains (for example before 10am) like they did for football fans. There was no obvious downside to this, and it would prevent people getting drunk far too early in the day. Another Member added that large numbers of racegoers also arrived on coaches.
- One Member noted the issue of unlicensed taxis, and the work being done by local authorities in London like the 'know what you're getting into' campaign. They hoped that there would be a joined up approach with ongoing work on the night-time economy.
- One Member noted the issues of ticket touts and illegal drugs. Cocaine seemed to be the drug of choice, bringing with it behavioural changes. AK emphasised that they were sending a clear message that lawbreaking and disorder wouldn't be tolerated. They couldn't stop everybody, but could significantly mitigate harm and disturbance.
- One Member highlighted the work of Ubico in keeping the town clean during race week.
- One Member highlighted CCTV and street lighting as key to public safety, and advocated having more safe crossing places on busy highways like Evesham Road. This was a county council issue but one GCC would likely support as it would have an obvious positive impact.
- One Member noted that a lot of the staff working at or around the racecourse would be young people on temporary contracts, and hoped there were strong safeguarding processes in place. LK agreed that a many festival workers, as well as those working in hospitality in the town centre, were reliant on temporary and less experienced staff, and their safety was key. The council was there to support businesses wherever it could, for example through the BID and through doorstep briefings and checks.



The Chair noted that planning for an event as large as the festival was a year round exercise of which they only saw a snapshot, and thanked the officers for their work.

### **8. BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR COMING YEAR**

Cllr. Babbage (Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Working Group) introduced the group's response to the 2023 budget proposals, noting that several BSWG members were in attendance at this meeting as well as the Cabinet Member for finance. As a scrutiny working group, they sought to scrutinise and challenge the budget setting process and highlight issues of particular importance, and had had a wide-ranging discussion about the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account budget proposals.

One Member asked whether the group had a particular view on how the council could react to significant external challenges like inflation and interest rates. Cllr. Babbage acknowledged that these macroeconomic challenges had a direct impact on CBC's operation, for example in the increased cost of the Ubico contract. The question was how to determine the best approach, and the council had a diverse set of investments that helped to mitigate the impact of economic uncertainty.

The Cabinet Member Finance and Assets placed on the record his thanks to the BSWG, noting that challenge and oversight were an important part of the budget process. Cllr. Babbage added his thanks to the finance team for their work in putting the proposals together.

### **9. RESIDENTS' SURVEY**

Darren Knight (Executive Director Place and Communities) (DK) introduced the report and gave a presentation on the background, results and implications of the residents' survey. He was broadly pleased with the results, noting that although overall satisfaction was relatively low, the most common reason for this was highways, which were not a CBC responsibility. The survey gave a good overall sense of where things were at, and would tie in with the Corporate Plan going to Council on 20<sup>th</sup> February.

The Chair moved into Member questions and debate:

- One Member asked whether respondents were able to provide suggestions or just a rating. DK confirmed it was the latter, but they did also ask people what they would change. The next survey would use more open-ended questions.
- One Member asked how residents felt about the town at night, and how this compared to other places across the country. DK responded that there was not yet comprehensive national data on this.
- One Member praised the use of objective, empirical data to take residents' concerns into account, and asked whether the results could be shared with the county council. DK confirmed that they already had been, and officers like the Director of Community & Economic Development were in regular dialogue with GCC about issues like the High Street paving and highway maintenance.

- One Member echoed the need for close county involvement, noting that heavily parked roads limited the effectiveness of cleaning equipment, while temporary parking restrictions would allow proper street and drain cleaning to take place.
- One Member noted the contradiction between residents wanting more services and a below inflation council tax increase at the same time. Expanded services had to be funded somehow, and the government had cut the revenue support grant.
- One Member highlighted the importance of residents feeling safe in the town. DK agreed, and explained that licensing and environmental health officers were working on a review looking closely at how best to deliver this. There were always ways to improve the services the council provided residents.
- One Member noted that throughout the survey, disabled residents generally reported lower satisfaction levels. It was worth looking more closely at this, although there were obviously GDPR concerns. Roughly a quarter of the population had some form of disability, often linked to long-term health conditions, so it was important to consider how to be as inclusive as possible going forward. DK thanked them for raising an important point, and there was clearly more work needed to understand the scale and implications of this. Another Member added that the council did some good work in reaching out to disability groups, for example as part of its consultations on private hire vehicles.
- One Member noted that the Local Government Association (LGA) were doing their own satisfaction survey, and alignment with this could be valuable. DK agreed that the council could collaborate with the LGA in order to compare their own results with the detailed national picture.
- One Member advocated dialogue and cooperation in order to ensure a good working relationship between the county and borough councils.
- One Member highlighted the need to consider the methodology used when sampling residents, in order to ensure robust and reliable data.
- One Member suggested that the survey lacked some granularity, and noted a high number of reporting errors on the online survey, which made it hard to make a real comparison with the telephone survey. DK agreed that the online portal's respondents were self-selecting, but it did give residents who weren't part of the representative sample to contribute.
- One Member highlighted prospects for young people as an essential area in which Cheltenham was currently struggling. Another Member agreed, and suggested that encouraging young people, especially girls, to think about careers in cyber and technology could help to keep them in the town.

The Chair thanked the Executive Director Place and Communities for the detailed survey and presentation.

### **10. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED**

Cllr. Bamford's update from the Gloucestershire Health O&S Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2022 and Cllr. McCloskey's updates from the Gloucestershire Economic Growth O&S Committee meetings on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2022 and 18<sup>th</sup>

January 2023 were taken as read. The Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel had not met since the last O&S meeting.

One Member highlighted the discussion of NHS dentistry in the Health O&S Committee update, especially the third paragraph on the lack of school dental services. There was a clear gap in provision for pupils whose parents couldn't afford to go private, with 1 in 5 children suffering from serious tooth decay. This was an appalling failure to look after the most vulnerable in society, and it was a travesty that it had been allowed to get to this state. Intervention was needed and as a first step they hoped to see the restoration of school dental services. The Chair agreed that it was scandalous to see this happening in Cheltenham, and noted that tooth decay often led to serious health conditions. Another Member noted that dentistry could not be disconnected from overall health, considering the consequences of a lack of dental maintenance. They hoped this would be communicated to the responsible parties, and taken forward to advocate for those who weren't receiving the right level of care.

## **11. UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS**

The update from the Scrutiny Task Group was taken as read.

The Democracy Officer added that the group's final scheduled meeting had since taken place on 26<sup>th</sup> January, where members discussed how best to classify and refine the large number of recommendations produced throughout the process. They sought to draw out the key issues to highlight in the final report, and were keen to focus on areas directly within the council's gift or overseen by closely related partners like Cheltenham Borough Homes, to maximise the positive impact.

Cllr. Willingham added as the Chair of the task group that there was a tight deadline for producing the report in time for the next O&S meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> February, and it might have to be deferred to the April meeting as a result in order to ensure a high quality report with deliverable recommendations. It would be better to take a little longer and deliver a better report, given that they were looking at issues that were decades in the making.

## **12. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN**

The workplan was taken as read. The Chair added that Members had suggested several topics for scrutiny, which they would review at the next Chair's briefing.

One Member asked whether the wheelchair access item under 'items for future meetings' would cover a wide range of policy areas or one particular aspect. The Chair suggested that a wide-ranging discussion would be most appropriate.

## **13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

27<sup>th</sup> February.

John Payne  
**Chairman**

# Briefing Note

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

27<sup>th</sup> February 2023

Race Week

This note contains information to keep Members informed of matters relating to the work of the Cabinet or a committee but where no decisions from Members are needed.

If Members have questions relating to matters shown, they are asked to contact the Officer indicated.

## March Racing Festival

This briefing note supplements the briefing note presented at the January 31<sup>st</sup> 2023 committee meeting and provides further updates to assist the committee with its work overseeing and scrutinising the planning arrangements.

### War on Wee Update

Work to implement the “War on Wee” initiative is progressing. A press release was issued w/c 6 February to launch the initiative and to seek expressions of interest to assist the authority with understanding the likely demand and stock required.

[https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/news/article/2781/council\\_launches\\_war\\_on\\_wee\\_campaign\\_for\\_march\\_races](https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/news/article/2781/council_launches_war_on_wee_campaign_for_march_races)

### Policing

Members requested information about the police deployment along the Evesham Road and surrounding areas. Information supplied by police colleagues are outlined below:

- Neighbourhood staff will be on duty from 10:00 hours until 0200 hours the following morning on the local races operation.
- Early turn staff commencing duty at 1000 will be deployed in the local area of Pittville, Prestbury and Cheltenham Town Centre (see appendix).
- Staff will be deployed in pairs and will be placed at points along Evesham Road to monitor racegoers leaving the racecourse. Deployment will commence by 17:00 until about 1915.
- After this time, officers, in pairs, will follow the racegoers into town will be redeployed into the Town Centre to commence early Streetsafe engagement and be based at the police HUB based on Cheltenham High Street.

### Toilets

The council and racecourse have increased the number or locations of temporary toilets around the town. The locations and units are listed in Appendix 2.

### Communications

There will be a strong focus on proactive comms this year to support the various work streams and initiatives including the racecourse’s “Love your Turf” campaign, the council’s “War on Wee” and various safety messages from the police and the council.

In practice, this work is managed internally and at a multi-agency level.

## **Other matters**

- Emergency planning table top exercise was completed on Wednesday 15 February 2023
- Safety Advisory Group (SAG) meetings are ongoing to review plans and give assurance regarding event safety
- A strategic coordinating group (SCG) has been stood up to provide an overarching view and oversight of the planning, in its totality, to ensure all the necessary steps have been taken to deliver a safe and successful event. The importance of this has been highlighted in light of the ongoing Manchester Area enquiry and forthcoming Protect Duty.

Appendix 1









## Appendix 2

### Cheltenham – Pittville & Surrounding Area

- Walnut Close – 1 x Urinal Trailer and 4 x Standards
- Pittville Park Gates – 2 x Standards + 1 x Standard Urinal
- Evesham Rd after Central Cross Drive – 8 x Standards + 2 x Standard Urinals
- North and South Central Cross Drive – 4 x Standards + 2 x Standard Urinals
- East Approach Drive – 2 x Standards
- Albemarle Gate/Tommy Taylors Lane Junction – 2 x Standards
- UCAS – 6 x Standards
- Park Stores – 2 x Standards
- Prince Regent/ Tommy Taylors Lane – 2 x Standards

### Cheltenham Town

- High street outside Sports Direct – 3 x Standards
- Top of Prom Imperial Circus – 3 x Standards
- Bottom of Prom St Georges Rd – 3 x Standards
- Royal Well Rd Coach Station – 1 x Standard + 1 x Standard Urinal

### Contact officer:

Louis Krog, Head of Public Protection, [Louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:Louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk)

**SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION**

<b>Date:</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> January 2023
<b>Name of person proposing topic:</b>	Cllr. Wendy Flynn
<b>Contact details:</b>	<a href="mailto:cllr.wendy.flynn@cheltenham.gov.uk">cllr.wendy.flynn@cheltenham.gov.uk</a> , 07870670578
<b>Suggested title of topic:</b>	Review of Nominations to Outside Bodies

**What is the issue that scrutiny needs to address?**

The Leader/Cabinet/Council appoint representatives to Outside Bodies (OB). This is usually every 2 years, following local elections. The CBC website says that these appointments are to maintain effective partnerships with organisations that are independent of CBC but have an impact on its service areas. I am not aware of the subject of appointments to OBs ever being scrutinised. However, I am aware of some issues with the way this process has been carried out in recent years which I would like the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to look into, please.

**1. Annual Reports to Council**

The Council's Constitution states:

*Part 5G – Guidance for Councillors Appointed To Represent the Council on Outside Bodies  
13.1 Members who represent the Council on outside bodies are required to submit a written report to either full council, Cabinet or the Economy and Business Improvement, at least annually, on the activities of the organisation.*

I'm not aware of this being done, despite it being a constitutional requirement. I believe this should be the starting point for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's investigation. Should reports be submitted and if so when and what should be included?

I believe it is important that reports are submitted annually and that they should contain, as a minimum:

- A summary of what the OB does, including how it supports CBCs aims;
- The number of meetings that have taken place along with the number of meetings the nominee has attended;
- Highlights of the OB's work over the past year and their aims for the coming year/s.
- How the nominee has contributed to developing/maintaining the effective partnership between CBC and the OB?

**2. Repeat nomination of a member/s with low/zero input to Outside Body**

The reports are really crucial when looking at the wider subject of nominations to OBs. I am aware of situations where a member has been nominated to an OB but not acted in a way that is conducive to an effective partnership with the OB. For example, one member was nominated to an OB on 3 occasions but never completed the paperwork that would enable them to sit on that OB, depriving the OB of a CBC representative for a total of 6 years and harming the Council's relationship with that OB. Without members submitting annual reports, CBC could be repeatedly nominating to organisations where the nominees are not attending meetings and negatively affecting the Council's relationship with that OB.

**3. Process of nomination**

Another area the O&S Committee might want to look into is how CBC nominates to OBs. When more nominations are put forward than there are places available, should the OB be given the opportunity to hear from each potential nominee and to select the one that's the best fit for them? I've heard from a number of people involved in OBs who feel the CBC nomination is something done to them. Over the years, I've come across resentment, and even anger, with committees or boards putting up with the CBC representative rather than embracing their involvement and contribution. Offering an OB a choice of representative would be one way to improve the relationship.

Also, should CBC look to rotating representatives rather than keep appointing the same member to the same OB? Obviously, there are arguments for and against this but adopting this approach would give more members the opportunity to learn first-hand about the work some of the OBs do and their contribution to Cheltenham. It could play an important part in member development.

The current process means that the ruling political group are able to take any of the positions they want, with other political groups being thrown the unwanted crumbs. If an OB does not want to accept the nomination, then they forfeit the opportunity to have CBC representation. Some OBs I've been involved with over the years have expressed the belief that rejecting the nomination could affect their access to funds and other support. The O&S Committee might want to consider whether the strong political aspect of nominations is conducive to good relationships; the relationship between the OBs and CBC should transcend politics and be independent of a change in political make-up of the Council.

#### **4. Appropriateness of nomination**

Are the OBs that CBC currently nominate to and the number of nominees appropriate? Are there organisations that it would be advantageous for CBC, and advantageous for the organisation, to have a representative on that it doesn't currently? The climate emergency, cost of living crisis, and the Golden Valley development have seen changes in CBC's priorities. The new Corporate Plan depends on partnership working for its success. How might the nominations to Outside Bodies process, if done right, support the Plan? Should CBC continue to allow nominations to OBs of non-councillors?

#### **What do you feel could be achieved by a scrutiny review (outcomes)**

Stronger partnerships with Outside Bodies.  
 A more effective and fairer system of nomination.  
 Improved accountability and transparency.  
 Support for Corporate Priorities.  
 Better/broader member engagement with OBs and member development.

**If there a strict time constraint?**

No

**Is the topic important to the people of Cheltenham?**

Yes

**Does the topic involve a poorly performing service or high public dissatisfaction with a service?**

Not a service CBC delivers to the public, no.

**Is it related to the Council's corporate objectives?**

Yes

**OFFICER IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Date:</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> January 2023
<b>Officer name:</b>	Claire Hughes
<b>Officer title:</b>	Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer
<b>Contact:</b>	<a href="mailto:claire.hughes@cheltenham.gov.uk">claire.hughes@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>
<b>Please give your comments on this proposed topic, for example: is there any other similar review planned or in progress, are there any potential resource constraints?</b>	
<p>The process of appointing members to outside bodies is set out in the Constitution. Any changes to this process are a matter for the Constitution Working Group to consider and then to make recommendations to Council as appropriate. Therefore this is a subject that would be more appropriately addressed via the Constitution Working Group.</p> <p>The issue regarding a lack of annual reports has already been identified and officers are in the process of making contact with all representatives to remind them of their obligations and request that their reports be prepared for presentation at the March Council meeting. In view of this, the committee may wish to consider what value they are able to add at this stage.</p> <p>Additionally, a number of outside bodies, such as Ubico, the Cheltenham Trust and Publica, are regularly called to O&amp;S for performance reviews where Members of the committee can put questions directly to the Chair/CEO.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank

# Information/Discussion Paper

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 27<sup>th</sup> February 2023

### Information Governance

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 item has come to scrutiny at the request of the committee following its inclusion on the Executive Forward Plan.
- 1.2 The purpose of this discussion paper is to enable the committee to understand the council’s information governance arrangements, how the council is performing in the area of information governance and to identify any key risks.
- 1.3 Information governance is the framework for handling information legally, securely, efficiently and effectively in order to deliver the best possible services.

#### 2. Summary of the Issue

- 2.1 The council generates and receives a huge amount of data. It therefore acknowledges that information is one of its key assets and as such requires the same discipline to its management that it would to other important assets such as people, buildings and finances. Information assets can be either electronic or paper and include records and data sets held in back-office systems, network/shared drives, and within email systems.
- 2.2 It is vital that the council applies a robust management system in relation to information governance and that it has an effective framework in place which details how it collects, processes, accesses, stores, shares and deletes information.
- 2.3 A recent review of the council’s information governance framework identified that some policies were in need of a review and that further work could be done to bolster assurance. Failure to update policies and/or have robust procedures in place can place the council at risk to complaints, intervention and fines from the Information Commissioners Office and ultimately of legal challenge.

#### 3. Summary of evidence/information

- 3.1 The Information Commissioners Office provides a number of self-assessment tools which enables organisations to self-assess themselves in terms of their maturity in various areas of information governance. The Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer has recently conducted three of these self-assessments in order to assist in identifying areas for improvement. The results of those assessments were:

Area of Assessment	Overall Rating
Data Protection	GREEN
Data Sharing	GREEN
Records Management	AMBER

## 3.2 Data Protection

Whilst the overall assurance level for the council in this area was GREEN, a number of areas were identified for further review:

- The council should complete a data audit across each business area to identify the data it processes and how it flows into, through and out of the council
- The council should maintain records of processing activities i.e what data it collects and uses, detailing what personal data it holds, where it came from, who its shared with and what we do with it
- The council should make it clear to individuals how they can challenge the data we hold, how they can request rectification of errors, and their rights to erasure and restriction of processing
- The council should have processes in place for the deletion of information, including having a written retention policy
- The council should establish a policy which sets out when it is necessary to conduct a Data Protection Impact Assessment (an assessment of the impacts on individuals associated with processing their personal data)

## 3.3 Data Sharing

Whilst the overall assurance level for the council in this area was GREEN, a number of areas were identified for further review:

- The council should have a policy in place setting out when it is appropriate for the staff to share and/or disclose data
- Services should have allocated record 'owners' who take the lead on data within their service area
- A log of all decisions to share information should be retained within service areas

## 3.4 Records Management

The overall rating for the council in this area was AMBER. The following areas were identified for further review:

- Services should have allocated record 'owners' who take the lead on data within their service area
- The council should have processes in place for the deletion of information, including having a written retention policy
- Periodic checks on compliance should be carried out
- Central log or information asset register for each area should be produced

## 3.5 Data Quality

Data quality is a measure of the condition of data based on factors such as accuracy, completeness, consistency, reliability and whether it's up to date. It is a core component of the overall information governance framework. Poor data quality can lead to significant consequences such as fines and findings of non-compliance with regulatory regimes.



Page 25  
Whilst the council has a data quality policy which seeks to set out a number of key considerations it is out of date, having last been updated in 2008. Work has now commenced on updating that policy to bring it in line with the most recent data quality standards and to reflect the corporate branding utilised by CBC.

#### 4. Next Steps

- 4.1 An action plan has been produced (attached) which will be presented to Cabinet in May 2023, together with a number of updated policies for approval. Completion of this action plan will minimise the risks to the council of non-compliance with statutory provisions in the areas of data protection and information security.

---

<b>Background Papers</b>	None
<b>Contact Officer</b>	Claire Hughes, Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer <a href="mailto:claire.hughes@cheltenham.gov.uk">claire.hughes@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>
<b>Accountability</b>	Councillor Rowena Hay, Leader of the Council

This page is intentionally left blank

## Information Governance Action Plan

February 2023

Not Started	In Progress	Off Track but in progress	Off Track – not in progress
-------------	-------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

Action	Lead Officer	Target Date	Progress
<b>Information Governance Framework</b>			
Create a documented information governance framework setting out the councils overarching approach to information governance	Claire Hughes	May 2023	Document in draft and out to consultation with relevant officers
<b>Data Protection</b>			
Create an information asset register by completing a data audit across each business area to identify the data it processes and how it flows into, through and out of the business. (Also a records management action)	Alex Lawson	May 2023	
Maintain records of processing activities detailing what personal data it holds, where it came from, who its shared with and what we do with it	Alex Lawson	April 2023	A record of processing activities is in the process of being created
Make it clear to individuals how they can challenge the data we hold, how they can request rectification of errors, and their rights to erasure and restriction of processing	Claire Hughes	May 2023	Included in revised Data Protection Policy – Policy is in draft and out to consultation with relevant officers
Have processes in place for the deletion of information, including having a written retention policy (Also a records management action)	Claire Hughes	May 2023	Document retention policy to be drafted
Establish a policy which sets out when it is necessary to conduct a Data Protection Impact Assessment	Claire Hughes	May 2023	DPIA Policy to be drafted

Data Sharing			
Have a policy in place setting out when it is appropriate for the staff to share and/or disclose data	Claire Hughes	May 2023	Data Sharing Policy to be drafted
Allocate record 'owners' who take the lead on data within their service area (Also a records management action)	Service Managers	May 2023	Individual discussions with services will be conducted throughout April and May
A log of all decisions to share information should be retained within service areas	Service Managers	May 2023	Individual discussions with services will be conducted throughout April and May
Records Management			
Periodic checks on compliance should be carried out	TBC	Ongoing	
Data Quality			
Update Data Quality Policy	Claire Hughes	May 2023	In progress

## **Overview and Scrutiny, 27<sup>th</sup> February 2023**

### **Update from Scrutiny Task Group on Tackling Multiple Deprivation**

Following the conclusion of the task group process in January, the final report is being drafted in consultation with officers, the Chair of the task group and the Chair of O&S.

The report seeks to refine the large number of possible issues and suggestions raised throughout the process and come forward with a set of recommendations that highlight the most effective areas for support, as well as referencing areas of work that are already underway.

The final report was initially due to go to O&S in February, but has been deferred to the April meeting in consultation with the Chair, in order to ensure alignment with the objectives of the new Corporate Plan and enable officers to produce a report that is both actionable in the short term and sustainable in the long term.

**Harry Mayo (Democracy Officer)**

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee work plan – 2022/23

Item	Objective	What is required?	Author/presenter
<b>27<sup>th</sup> February 2023 (deadline 15<sup>th</sup> February)</b>			
Race week	Action plan following on from January item, looking to understand the steps the council are undertaking, in partnership with others, to improve residents' experience of race week.	Discussion paper, action plan	Louis Krog (Head of Public Protection)
Scrutiny topic request	To consider how to respond to the scrutiny topic request submitted by Cllr. Flynn (Review of Nominations to Outside Bodies)	Scrutiny topic registration form	Cllr. Wendy Flynn, Claire Hughes (Monitoring Officer), Darren Knight (Executive Director Place and Communities)
Information Governance	To understand the council's information governance arrangements, how it is performing and the key risks.	Discussion paper, organisational chart/action plan	Claire Hughes (Monitoring Officer)
<b>Monday 17<sup>th</sup> April 2023 (deadline 5<sup>th</sup> April)</b>			
Minster Exchange	Project learning, benefits realisation. Is it generating the occupancy/income we expected, and if not what are we doing about it?	Discussion paper	Bruce Gregory (Workshop Group), Paul Jones (Executive Director Finance and Assets)
Tackling Multiple Deprivation STG report	To consider the final report of the Scrutiny Task Group on Tackling Multiple Deprivation, including the proposed workplan and any recommendations to Council	Discussion paper, STG report	Harry Mayo (Democracy Officer), Richard Gibson (Head of Communities, Wellbeing and Partnerships), Cllr. Willingham (Chair of the Task Group)
Culture Strategy	To understand the final version of the strategy, how it will be implemented and how success will be measured.	Discussion paper	Richard Gibson (Head of Communities, Wellbeing and Partnerships)
Gloucestershire Airport	Following on from <a href="#">28th March Gloucester City Council meeting</a> : looking at GAL's financial sustainability, both in relation to recent improvements and in the long term <b>(EXEMPT)</b>	Discussion paper	Karen Taylor (Managing Director), Mike Morton (Chair), <b>+ Chair of Gloucester City Council O&amp;S?</b>
Cheltenham Trust	How is the Trust performing relative to its business plan? Risks, opportunities and challenges. <b>(EXEMPT)</b>	Discussion paper	Laurie Bell (Trust CEO), Richard Gibson (Head of Communities, Wellbeing and

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee work plan – 2022/23

			Partnerships), Louis Eperjesi (Chair of the Board)
Municipal Offices	Update on progress with the Municipal Offices <b>(EXEMPT)</b>	Discussion paper	Paul Jones (Executive Director Finance and Assets)
<b>Monday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2023 (deadline 24<sup>th</sup> May)</b>			
End of year performance review	Consider the end of year performance: have we achieved what we set out to, and if not, why?	Discussion paper	Richard Gibson (Head of Communities, Wellbeing and Partnerships), Darren Knight (Executive Director of Place and Communities) Ann Wolstencroft (Head of Performance, Projects & Risk)
<b>Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2023 (deadline 21<sup>st</sup> June)</b>			
UBICO Annual Report	To consider the annual report, where Ubico are performing well, what risks are they facing and how they are mitigating them	Discussion paper	UBICO, Client Officer and Cabinet Member



# Overview and Scrutiny Committee work plan – 2022/23

Items for future meetings			
Title	Objective	Format and expected date	Author
Public Art Panel	Consider its effectiveness, successes and difficulties faced	To be scheduled once SWOT has been concluded	Tracey Birkinshaw (Director of Planning) and Chair of Public Art Panel
North Place and Portland Street	Update on these sites	TBD	Paul Jones (ED Finance & Assets)
Business continuity	To consider the robustness of CBC business continuity arrangements in the event of a cyber incident, and update the cyber business continuity plan	TBD Discussion paper, FAQ responses	Darren Knight (Executive Director People and Change), Ann Wolstencroft (Program Manager, HR), John Chorlton (Chief Technology Officer, Publica)
Wheelchair access	How does the council ensure that disabled access is always carefully considered in CBC's decision-making, and implemented wherever possible?	TBD Discussion paper	TBD
Building Control	General overview and performance review	TBD	Ian Smith (Building Control Manager)
Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Panels	Cabinet Member Customer and Regulatory Services answers questions on the decisions over allocations, and presents a report evidencing the impact of allocations made with the investment.	Annual item (towards the end of the year)	Cllr. Martin Horwood, (Cabinet Member Customer and Regulatory Services)  + officers? e.g. Tracey Birkinshaw (Director of Community & Economic Development), Liam Jones (Head of Planning)

Annual Items		
Budget proposals for coming year	January	Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Working Group
End of year performance review	June	Richard Gibson (Head of Communities, Wellbeing and Partnerships)
UBICO annual report	July	Ubico, Client Officer and Cabinet Member
Overview & Scrutiny annual report	September	Democracy Officer
Annual report of the Police and Crime Commissioner	September	PCC (Chris Nelson)
Publica annual report	October (after Publica AGM)	Jan Britton (Managing Director), Bill Oddy
Quarter 2 performance review?	November	Richard Gibson (Head of Communities, Wellbeing and Partnerships)