

17 April 2014

Dear Councillor

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Scrutiny Committee will be held at the Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden on Tuesday 29 April 2014 at 7.45pm or at the conclusion of the question and answer session whichever is the earlier.

Yours faithfully

JOHN MITCHELL

Chief Executive

Commencing at 7.30 pm, there will be an opportunity of up to 15 minutes for members of the public to ask questions and make statements, subject to having given two working days prior notice

A G E N D A P A R T I

1	Apologies for absence and declarations of interest.	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2014 (attached).	4
3	Business arising.	
4	Consideration of any matter referred to the Committee in relation to call in of a decision (standing item).	
5	Responses of the Executive to reports of the Committee (standing item).	
6	Cabinet Forward Plan.	14
7	Scrutiny forward plan.	16

8	Health and Wellbeing update.	18
9	NHS England and West Essex CCG (verbal item).	
10	Day centre review.	27
11	Trade waste contracts and pricing (to follow).	
12	Scrutiny Committee 2013/14 Review and 2014/15 Plan	30
13	Any other items that the Chairman considers to be urgent.	

To: Councillors G Barker, P Davies, I Evans, **E Godwin**, S Harris, S Howell,
D Morson, E Oliver, J Rich and D Watson.

Lead Officer: Adrian Webb (01799 510421)

Democratic Services Officer: Adam Rees (01799) 510548

MEETINGS AND THE PUBLIC

Members of the public are welcome to attend any of the Council's Cabinet or Committee meetings and listen to the debate. All agendas, reports and minutes can be viewed on the Council's website www.uttlesford.gov.uk.

Members of the public and representatives of parish and town councils are now permitted to speak or ask questions at any of these meetings. You will need to register with the Democratic Services Officer by midday two working days before the meeting. An explanatory leaflet has been prepared which details the procedure and is available from the Council offices at Saffron Walden.

A different scheme is applicable to meetings of the Planning Committee and you should refer to the relevant information for further details.

Please note that meetings of working groups and task groups are not held in public and the access to information rules do not apply to these meetings.

The agenda is split into two parts. Most of the business is dealt with in Part 1 which is open to the public. Part II includes items which may be discussed in the absence of the press or public, as they deal with information which is personal or sensitive for some other reason. You will be asked to leave the meeting before Part II items are discussed.

You are entitled to see any of the background papers that are listed at the end of each report.

If you want to inspect background papers or speak before a meeting please contact either Peter Snow on 01799 510430, Maggie Cox on 01799 510369, or Rebecca Dobson 01799 510433 or by fax on 01799 510550.

Agenda and Minutes are available in alternative formats and/or languages. For more information please call 01799 510510.

FACILITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Council Offices has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets. The Council Chamber has an induction loop so that those who have hearing difficulties can hear the debate.

If you are deaf or have impaired hearing and would like a signer available at a meeting, please contact Peter Snow on 01799 510430 or email psnow@uttlesford.gov.uk as soon as possible prior to the meeting.

FIRE/EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest designated fire exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by a designated officer. It is vital you follow their instructions.

- You should proceed calmly, do not run and do not use the lifts.
- Do not stop to collect personal belongings.
- Once you are outside, please make your way to the flagpole near the visitor car park. Do not wait immediately next to the building. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD
SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.30 pm on 6 FEBRUARY 2014**

Present: Councillor E Godwin – Chairman.
Councillors, P Davies, S Harris, S Howell, D Morson, E
Oliver, J Rich and D Watson.

Also present: Councillors J Ketteridge (Leader), R Chambers (Portfolio
Holder – Finance), J Cheetham (Deputy Leader), J Redfern
(Portfolio Holder – Housing), H Rolfe (Portfolio holder
Community Partnerships) A Walters (Portfolio Holder –
Community Safety) and Councillor A Dean.

Officers in attendance: R Auty (Assistant Director Corporate Services), M
Cox (Democratic Services Officer), A Knight (Accountancy
Manager), R Harborough (Director of Public Services), S
Joyce (Assistant Chief Executive-Finance), C Canbolat
(Specialist Accountant) and A Webb (Director of Corporate
Services).

SC46 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillors G Barker and I Evans.

SC47 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman asked that the Committee's condolences be sent Councillor
Janice Loughlin following her recent tragic loss.

SC48 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2013 were signed as a
correct record subject to recording Councillor Watson in the list of
apologies for the meeting.

SC49 BUSINESS ARISING

i) Minute S40 – Extraordinary meeting 11 November 2013

The minutes of the meeting on 11 November 2013 had been approved as
a correct record at the Scrutiny meeting on 26 November. On the
following day an email had been received from Matt North (one of the
speakers at the meeting) questioning the accuracy of the minutes
regarding the following statement made by Councillor Barker

'she said it was true that for 18 months the policy had been worked on; yes the housing numbers were mandated; yes members had made a mistake in thinking they could set a lower annual building rate.'

Councillor Barker had confirmed that, as the housing numbers were not mandated it was unlikely that she would have said they were, and she had no objection to the minute being corrected.

RESOLVED that the Committee agree that an appropriate amendment be made to minute S40 of the meeting on 11 November 2013.

ii) **Minute S45 - Planning**

Councillor Watson clarified his reasons for requesting the scrutiny report on Planning. He said that the measurement of Planning performance was based on numbers and timescales rather than the quality of the information provided. He was concerned that the documentation for the Planning Committee didn't always include all the relevant representations, consultation responses or supporting evidence. This information was also not always available on the planning portal.

Officers said they would take this message back to the Planning Department.

SC50 **STANDING ITEMS**

The Chairman said she was aware of no matters referred to the Committee in relation to call in of a decision, nor of any responses of the Executive to reports of the Committee.

SC51 **SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee noted the work programme and agreed with the proposed agenda items for the final meeting of the year on 29 April 2014.

SC52 **FORWARD PLAN**

The Forward Plan was noted.

SC53 **DOG FOULING**

The committee received a comprehensive report, which addressed the questions about the council's service in relation to dog fouling which had been requested in the scoping report.

The report concluded that the provision and servicing of dog bins should be considered in the broader context of initiatives to address fouling of public spaces by dogs. In the past dog bins had been provided to parishes and recharged at about £110. There were around 250 bins in the district that were emptied by Street Services, however it was costly to service bins, and really unnecessary as dog waste could be placed in public bins or black bins.

The Director of Public Services said that the provision and emptying of waste bins was a discretionary service and the council was seeking to avoid funding this type of activity.

Members discussed this issue. They were aware that this was often a very emotive issue within communities, but the best way forward was through publicity and education to raise public awareness about the disposal of waste. It was understood that dog bins didn't necessarily solve the problem but were useful in prominent and busy areas, especially for use by visitors.

The committee agreed the following as a way forward.

- An education and publicity campaign regarding the proper disposal of dog waste.
- Parish councils to liaise with the District Council regarding the purchase and servicing of dog bins for their areas.

SC54

2014/15 BUDGET

The Assistant Chief Executive – Finance introduced the reports for the budget 2014/15. He said this was an opportunity for members to make comments and suggestions for Cabinet to take into account when determining its budget recommendations for Full Council. The financial reports would be annotated with any comments the Committee wished to make before being submitted to the Cabinet at its meeting on 18 February, and then to Full Council on 27 February.

SC55

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT 2013/14 BUDGET AND FIVE YEAR BUDGET STRATEGY

The Accountancy Manager presented the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) 2014/15 Budget and Five Year Budget Strategy. The HRA budget reflected the service arrangements and investment in relation to the council's housing services for the third year under self-financing, and these arrangements had enabled the service to stand alone financially and for local decisions to be taken for housing services. She informed the committee that the dwelling rental income was proposed to increase by an average of 5.05% in line with the formula rent calculation, and income and expenditure had been budgeted on an incremental and inflationary basis.

The Tenants' Forum and the Housing Board had reviewed the documents and recommended them for approval.

She invited questions and asked the Committee to endorse the recommendations.

In answer to a question from Councillor Watson, the Accountancy Manager said she would provide an explanation for the rise in sheltered support service income.

Members asked questions relating to the HRA Business Plan. Councillor Morson referred to the £3.4m operating surplus that had been allocated to agreed projects in the business plan and asked whether the council was confident this would be spent within the period.

Councillor Redfern replied that the authority had already delivered a significant programme of investment in the first five years of the HRA business plan and would continue to do so. A major project was the redevelopment of the council's sheltered housing sites and a significant amount of the surplus had been earmarked for the Mead Court development, which would provide 30 new properties.

Councillor Dean said that at the recent meeting of the Housing Board there had been a discussion about being ambitious with building regeneration. Councillor Redfern said that the council had an ambitious programme and there was already a tremendous amount of work being undertaken.

Members asked about the implications for the programme of investment when the council started to repay the HRA loan, as it was currently paying interest only. The Assistant Chief Executive- Finance said he expected that there would continue to be annual headroom to invest in council stock. Councillor Chambers said that the Council would consider debt repayment options year by year.

RESOLVED to endorse the following recommendation to Cabinet that it should recommend to Full Council the HRA Revenue Budget and 5 year financial strategy.

SC56

TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2014/15

The Committee received the report on the Treasury Management Strategy. This governed the Council's cash-flow management, use of banks, investment and borrowing and set out how to keep council funds safe and minimise risks. The Prudential Indicators and the Minimum Reserve Provision Statement were included within the report.

The Assistant Chief Executive – Finance highlighted the following areas. There had been no new external borrowing, investments continued to be prudent and there was a longer list of counterparties, to include building societies in order to diversify risk. He reported that the Landsbanki issue

had been resolved, an investor had purchased the debt and the Council had received the funds.

Councillor Watson commented that unemployment had recently fallen to 7.2%, which was less than had been assumed in the report and he asked whether this might have an effect on interest rates. He was advised that the report had been written before the recent announcement, but unemployment was still above the 7% threshold and it was not expected that interest rates would change in the next financial year.

Councillor Chambers was pleased that the Saffron Building Society, as a local business, had had been included on the counterparty list.

RESOLVED to endorse the recommendations to Cabinet that it should recommend to Full Council:

- The Treasury Management Strategy 2014/15 as set out as Appendix A
- The prudential indicators set out at Appendix A1
- Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement Appendix A2
- The Council's counterparty list at Appendix A3

SC57

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2014/15 – 2018/19

The Accountancy Manager presented the report on the Capital Programme 2014/15 to 2018/19. She explained that the programme covered both General Fund and HRA assets and schemes that have a long-term value and exceeded costs of £10,000. The report included a summary of the 5 year programme by portfolio.

Members asked a series of questions.

It was explained that the Stansted Housing Partnership, although not within the council's capital programme had been included for information and it was noted that this money would be fully spent in 2014/15.

Questions were asked in relation to the Museum projects. It was confirmed that the Museum Society did have the necessary funds to cover the 75% funding for the Museum storage facility. Members were pleased at the proposed renovations of the castle and the matched funding that had been secured.

Councillor Howell noted from the report that the forecast ICT spend was around £220k for 2013/14, but was lower in the subsequent years. He asked for an assurance that the council was investing appropriately in this area. The Director of Corporate Services said there had been considerable investment over the last few years, which had resulted in efficiency savings. The service was now in a period of consolidation and planning for change. The council was facing some challenges in respect of the

Government PSN CoCo requirements but he confirmed that the council was investing where it was necessary to do so.

Councillor Watson asked about the process for monitoring schemes that were funded under the Community Projects Grants. Councillor Rolfe replied that there was an agreed criteria for all applications and schemes had to be completed within a certain period. The proposals were considered by members and officers, with a subsequent audit of invoices and receipts.

It was confirmed that details of the projects supported by the council would be available on the transparency section of the website.

RESOLVED to endorse the recommendation that Cabinet recommend to Full Council the Capital Programme and associated financing of the programme as set out in the report.

SC58

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

Members considered the report on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

The Assistant Chief Executive-Finance went through the report in detail. He said the Council was currently in a strong financial position, protected from the problems in local government through a combination of prudent financial management and funding from the New Homes Bonus (NHB). He explained changes to the funding from the Local Government settlement. The historic core funding was reducing each year and had been replaced with the NHB (a reward for enabling housing growth) and Localised Business Rates (the council's share of the business rates paid by Uttlesford businesses).

He said it was not possible to predict what might happen to Government funding, particularly in relation to the NHB, but there was reasonable confidence that for the next 3 financial year's total income would exceed forecast budget. This would give the opportunity to make meaningful investments in projects, although in a sustainable way to avoid future revenue commitments. During this period the council should invest in cost reduction and/or income generation in case of problems from 2017/18 onwards.

Looking beyond that period a range of different forecasting models had been prepared. The report set out four possible funding scenarios, the difference between the best and worst case was significant and because of this uncertainty the MTFS had adopted the following principles:

- The council planned to reduce the amount by which the revenue budget is funded by NHB
- Avoid making ongoing revenue commitment from the NHB funding
- Use NHB for capital projects and one off items.

The report also set out the forecast income from council tax, the proposed management of the council's reserves and concluded with the guiding principles of the strategy.

He invited questions from the committee.

Members commented on the assumptions in relation to business rate income, which appeared conservative in the light of the ongoing trend of economic improvement and the likelihood that more premises would be occupied. The Assistant Chief Executive – Finance agreed that there was an improving situation both nationally and locally. However there was a huge backlog of business rate appeals that had not yet been determined. Some were from large organisations, which if successful would have a significant impact on the council's income. Growth in this area had not been assumed because of these risks.

Councillor Howell said that the council's strong financial position was a tribute to the Council, both its staff and members.

He referred to the assumptions made about the NHB in para 38 and 39 of the report, that stated that because this funding was now embedded a cancellation of the scheme after 6 years was unlikely. He pointed out that the Labour shadow minister had indicated the NHB was unfair and a Labour Government would reform the system. He therefore felt that assumption A (NHB carries on without amendment) used as the basis for the MTFS was quite precarious. He suggested that Scenario B (new homes bonus is frozen at year 6 levels) appeared to be more realistic. He thought that the real task for the next 3 years was a rapid reduction of the council's overheads.

Councillor Ketteridge replied that the Government's statements on local government funding were clear, that core funding would disappear and be replaced by the HNB and business rates income. He thought it was unlikely that the NHB would be taken away without it being replaced with something else.

The Assistant Chief Executive – Finance said it was the intention within the strategy that the council would be looking to reduce its reliance on the NHB for on-going revenue expenditure. Increasing income was unlikely to be a solution so ways of reducing expenditure would need to be considered.

Councillor Watson suggested that the council should look at its core functions and which services it had to, or wished to provide. It was confirmed that the Council's management team had already started on this piece of work.

Councillor Davies asked if it was true that the coalition was proposing that NHB funding would not be forthcoming for new housing developments that

were granted on appeal. It was confirmed that this was one of the suggested reforms.

Councillor Rolfe agreed with the approach of the MTFs, it was not a doomsday scenario but still a prudent approach. He considered that the drive for economic development and an increase in business rate income should be a key factor in balancing the accounts, as was the provision of houses in the district.

RESOLVED to endorse the Medium Term Financial Strategy as set out in the report for recommendation by Cabinet to Full Council.

SC59

ROBUSTNESS OF ESTIMATES AND ADEQUACY OF RESERVES

The Assistant Chief Executive-Finance, as Section 151 Officer presented a report on the robustness of estimates and the adequacy of reserves. He said that by law when the council set its budget it had to take the advice of the Section 151 Officer. He then highlighted a number of areas in the report, and invited questions.

Councillor Howell asked whether the future of the New Homes Bonus should be included as a risk item. He pointed out that there was a general election within the next 18 months and the Labour Party had already stated its opposition to this form of funding. There was a debate as to how quickly any changes would be implemented but it could be within the 3 year period. The Assistant Chief Executive –Finance said that this report was concerned only with the financial year 2014/15 and as the amount of the New Homes Bonus had been confirmed for this period it could not be included as a risk. However, officers continued to be mindful of the longer term issue.

Members asked questions on section 106 agreements. It was explained that this related to when the Council's obligations under an agreement might exceed the value of the available funds. The Director of Public Services said that S106 agreements should ensure that the development remained viable and so there was a constraint on the amount of money that could be requested. Funds for future maintenance may only be secured for 10 years rather than the 20 years sought in the developer's guidance. It could be necessary to scale down aspirations or to fund some facilities in a different way. However, on the whole the council had done well out of section 106 funding.

RESOLVED to endorse the following recommendations to Cabinet:

- a) that the Cabinet recommends to Full Council that it takes account of the advice in the report when determining the 2014/15 General Fund budget and Council Tax

- b) that the Cabinet recommends to Full Council that it approves the risk assessment relating to the robustness of estimates as detailed in the report
- c) that the Cabinet recommends to Full Council that it sets the minimum safe contingency level for 2013/14 at £1.2 million.
- d) that the Cabinet recommends to Full Council that no transfers to or from the Working Balance should be built into the 2014/15 budget.

SC60

GENERAL FUND AND COUNCIL TAX 2014/15

The Assistant Chief Executive-Finance presented the report that provided the detailed revenue estimates for the General Fund Budget and Council Tax 2014/15. This showed a council tax requirement, which balanced to a level of council tax income assuming a 2% cut in council tax. He explained that the budget was in line with the Cabinet budget strategy and with the priorities derived from the residents' consultation. He highlighted the key budget items and invited comments from Members.

In relation to the recent Council Tax reforms, Councillor Morson asked the portfolio holder if he was satisfied that all was being done to help those least able to pay.

Councillor Chambers said he believed that a reform of the benefit system had been necessary but this council was phasing in the effects of the changes. There had been a change to the liability cap this year such that non- vulnerable working age people previously on full Council Tax Benefit would pay 12.5%, an increase on the 8.5 % on the previous year. This was still the lowest level in Essex. The Council had established a hardship fund but only £2k of this fund had been used this year. The Council aimed to be proactive with advice and support and this approach had generally been effective. In answer to a question he confirmed there had been a small number of court summons but the aim was to work with household at an earlier stage find a solution.

Councillor Rich said that the 12.5% was a generous level, the next lowest in Essex was over 20%. The council could afford to be more generous because of its good financial position.

Councillor Dean said that since the Local Council Tax scheme (LCTS) had been considered at Full Council in December an additional £300k of NHB funding had been received. He claimed that reducing council tax by 2% had the effect of giving back £96k to better off residents, whilst increasing the liability cap from 8.5% to 12.5% took away £62k from those residents that were the worst off. He suggested that given the Council's favourable financial position, the liability cap should revert to 8.5%.

The Assistant Chief Executive – Finance replied that the decision on the LCTS was a binding decision and could not be revoked. Other members

said that there had been a full discussion on this matter at the Council meeting.

Councillor Howell endorsed the recommendation and said he was pleased with the allocation of funds for the Audley End Cycleway project. He hoped that the Portfolio Holders would report back on the detailed proposals for the various projects that had been allocated funds.

Councillor Ketteridge commended the budget. He said it was in line with the corporate plan, shared the benefits of growth, and provided for council tax settlement that gave a 2% saving to all residents. He thanked the Assistant Chief Executive – Finance and his team for all the work on the preparation of the budget reports.

RESOLVED

To endorse the following recommendations to Cabinet:

- a) that the Cabinet recommend that the Full Council approve the General Fund Council Tax Requirement of £4,646,960 as summarised in paragraph 24 and detailed in appendices A to C
- b) the Cabinet be recommended to approve the schedule of fees and charges at Appendix E.

The meeting ended at 10.20 pm.

**UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
FORWARD PLAN**

KEY DECISIONS

Decision	Decision maker	Date of decision	Documents submitted to the decision maker for consideration	Portfolio Holder	Contact officer from where the documents can be obtained
Discretionary rate relief policy	Cabinet	19 June 2014	Reports not yet available	Cllr Robert Chambers	Stephen Joyce, Assistant Chief Executive-Finance sjoyce@uttlesford.gov.uk
Localism Act 2011 Community Empowerment	Cabinet	Ongoing		Cllr H Rolfe	John Mitchell, Chief Executive jmitchell@uttlesford.gov.uk

DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE

Decision	Decision maker	Date of decision	Reason for decision to be taken in private	Portfolio Holder	Contact officer from where the documents can be obtained

OTHER DECISIONS

Non-Key Decision	Decision to be taken in private? (reason)	Decision maker	Date of decision	Documents submitted to the decision maker for consideration	Portfolio Holder	Contact officer from where the documents can be obtained
Hadstock and Great Easton conservation appraisals	N	Cabinet	8 May 2014		Cllr Barker	Assistant Director Planning and Building Control ataylor@uttlesford.gov.uk
Bridge End Garden Culvert	N	Cabinet	on-going		Cllr Chambers	Director of Corporate Services awebb@uttlesford.gov.uk
LBLC and adjoining land to rear of the Skate Park	N	Cabinet	on-going		Cllr Chambers	Director of Corporate Services awebb@uttlesford.gov.uk
Essex Energy Consortium	N	Cabinet	On going		Cllr Redfern	Director of Public Services rharborough@uttlesford.gov.uk

Work Programme 2013/14

Date	11 June 2013	3 September 2013	15 October 2013	11 November 2013 (call in)	26 November 2013	6 February 2014	29 April 2014
Standard agenda items	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in
	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee
	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan
	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan
Agenda items	NHS England	CCG progress – update – Toni Coles Health and Social Care planning – Colette Ovens	Police Crime Commissioner Update from the public meeting	Call in – LDF	Tenant Scrutiny Panel update	Dog Fouling	Health and Wellbeing Update – Peter Fentem
	East of England Ambulance Service Update Report & Presentation	Highways Strategic Partnership – written update from Peter Massie	Car Parking Task Group Final Report – Cllr Evans	Dog fouling – scoping report	Budget Process – Preparatory report and briefing (Stephen Joyce)	Budget (Stephen Joyce)	NHS England and West Essex CCG
	Tenant Scrutiny Panel Introduction	Highways Consultation Responses – written update from Planning	Airport related parking - scoping report (verbal)	Swimming pool provision – scoping report	Rural Broadband		Statutory Services Review – Day Centres Roz Millership
	Annual Report from the Leader	Planning Performance Review – written PI update	Septic Tanks – Roz Millership		Airport related parking.		Trade waste contracts and pricing – Adrian Webb
	Update from Car Park Task Group Chair	Sewage Works - Scoping Report	Trade waste contracts and pricing – scoping report		Planning process – scoping report		2013/14 Scrutiny review and forward plan
	Highways Strategic Partnership - Scoping report	Rural Broadband - Scoping Report			Statutory Services List		
		Police Crime		Page 16			

		Commissioner - Invite questions for public meeting on 19 September					
		Car Parking Update – written Cllr Evans					

- Planning provision for schools and school places
- NEPP – sustainability and audit review outcomes
- PCC - email questions to PCC and invite a senior police officer to a future meeting

Item 8 – Health and Wellbeing Update

As part of re-structuring the LSP the Uttlesford Health and Well Being Group replaced the Healthy Communities and Older People's Group in April 2012. The change was triggered by the creation of new statutory bodies and the reform of Public Health as part of the Health and Social Care Bill and in particular the formation of the Essex Health and Well Being Board.

The LSP reviewed what a local Health and Well Being Group could do?

- Know the local story (the JSNA)
- Generate options and priorities
- Build shared priorities
- Focus on outcomes
- Integrate commissioning
- Identify decommissioning
- Hold relevant bodies to account!

The role of the group is to achieve some of the objectives declared below:

- Improve Health and Wellbeing
- Facilitate democratic and community leadership
- Provide the local adhesive (inside and outside the council)
- Liaise with Public health, social care, health services, education, sport and leisure, housing, regeneration and spatial planning, crime and disorder.
- Develop a common script
- Get things done - be an action group, not solely a talking group and participate in projects
- Make partnerships work!

What work the group has done,

What the group has achieved (see Appendix A for list of current members)

1. The group's interim list of achievements is quite impressive when you consider the turmoil of the NHS/WECCG changes and the review being undertaken by ECC which includes attention to the future role of Adult Social Care. It tries to ensure that the public, statutory authorities and voluntary sector groups are kept informed about, share knowledge of and gain an understanding about the impact of the changes in health, social care, housing and wellbeing. This has to be achieved whilst changes in the manner of the delivery of these services are taking place and the Local Plan is undergoing review.

Item 8 – Health and Wellbeing Update

It endeavours to maintain a constructive partnership with the other groups within the LSP.

2. Information from the last Census has been reviewed (Steve Rhenius) and circulated to every member and parish council on the composition of their community. **Particular reference has been made to the role and prevalence of 'unpaid carers'** The group has made good use of the statistical and technical evidence available to the group regarding housing development. It has played a part in developing a strategy, with the district council, to support residents with suitable accommodation and extra care as their needs develop, particularly with older persons and those with a disability.
3. It has scrutinised the ever changing remit faced by the Voluntary Sector in delivering services. It has identified where there are gaps remaining even when some have been commissioned. It helps focus on the needs of Uttlesford and attempts to disentangle them from the services for West Essex since the needs of Epping and Harlow are not identical with those of Uttlesford. Note that the King's Fund's ideas about community services propose the development of a simple pattern of services based around primary care and natural geographies and provided by a multi-disciplinary team.
4. It has promoted the first serious discussions by members of the group about OT support in the community and the delays incurred. It has opened a dialogue and further discussion with the CCG (Dr Alice Hodgkinson) on housing and support. Now Adult Social Care, Housing and Public Health are in discussion.
5. It has examined where services are not being provided and determined whether the group can apply leverage to achieve changes. The new Stroke programme provided by the Council and Leisure Services is very much the result of such leverage. The public is better protected as a result of such initiatives, but questions remain about why SEPT is not providing this service or at least contributing financially to it. It will also look to support other long term conditions with similar supportive projects.
6. It has examined the manner of the delivery of the new Mental Health Strategy in detail. This is of special interest to Uttlesford. There has only been an opportunity to examine the new strategy in outline where providers came along to the group to discuss their new strategy. More detail has been provided

Item 8 – Health and Wellbeing Update

to the group regarding the commissioning of dementia services and the delivery, in Uttlesford, of services by the Alzheimer's Society. It has been opportune for the group to learn about these services at first hand because the DH has launched another initiative to address the problems posed by this condition. The importance of the budget for funding Transformation has been mentioned and the question how this will change in the future. The 'lead' officer has not been identified.

7. Support for the aims of the group developing the Frontline and the Timebank projects. These are projects to support community need and assist the more vulnerable members. Although the H & WB Group will not seek a role in delivering these services, some involvement will help the group to map what is happening on the ground, supplemented by feedback from the Voluntary Sector Board.
8. Ensure that the voice of Uttlesford is heard despite the low priority often afforded to Uttlesford because of our 'documented affluence'. It is especially important when highlighting our needs and priorities to ECC, the CCG and the Voluntary Sector. The group recognises this and is well placed to identify the issues. The 'Who Will Care' document is not being looked at elsewhere with such an independent input. Only close liaison with Healthwatch and the Essex Health and Wellbeing Board can ensure that Uttlesford's voice is heard. This is where good links must be established. It is likely that Uttlesford will be part of a pilot project to support the aims of the 'Who will care' action plan.
9. Continue to examine the priorities of the WECCG in detail.
10. In general identify with whom responsibility lies and when appropriate identify whom we can/should challenge. Establish constructive partnerships.
11. It will monitor and try to identify opportunities for work with various Council Departments and officers eg the Planning Department. Information gained from the Essex Planning Officers' Association (EPOA) linked to the UDC website will prove relevant. Issues have already been identified about 'joining up' of applications where fewer than 50 houses are not considered by the Estates Department, but may form an additional amount to those already approved.
12. There is no single point in the district council where these pieces of work are currently being examined; there is no

Item 8 – Health and Wellbeing Update

repetition apparent. The relationship with the Scrutiny Committee merits review.

13. The group whilst independent complies with UDC's Corporate plan 'Effectively consulting with partners' and 'promoting equitable, diverse, and a healthy community'

What has changed or failed to develop as intended,

- a) A stronger need to raise the profile of the group.
- b) The loss of a real Public Health presence in Uttlesford
- c) Repeated re-structuring of the CCG
- d) A disappointing start for the Uttlesford Residents' Health Forum

What the group has planned for the year ahead.

Current Action List see Appendix B

Questions for the committee: - If there is anything you would like the scrutiny committee to scrutinise.

What are the Scrutiny Committees' expectations of this group? Given that new legislation requires Local Authorities to take a closed interest in Health and Well Being should the relationship between the committee and the group change? If so how should it change?

Appendix A

List of Members of the Health and Wellbeing Group

Professor Peter Fentem MBE Independent Chair

Alexandra Green	SEPT
Alison Wilson;	West Essex MIND
Andrew Gardner;	Age UK and Healthwatch
Annelise Barns, Head of Adult Operations;	ECC Adult Social Care
Claire Cowdrey;	West Essex CCG
Clr Cant;	
Clr Godwin;	
Clr Howard Rolfe;	
Doug Mason;	Chair of West Essex MIND
Dr Alice Hodgkinson;	Former Member who may return
Gaynor Bradley;	UDC – Partnerships Manager
Geoff Smith;	UDC – Environmental Health
John Starr;	UDC – Drugs and Alcohol Lead Officer
Judith Snares;	UDC - Housing
Kate Pedler;	Patient Participation Group - Thaxted
Kate Robson;	Uttlesford CAB
Kirsty Monk;	Council for Voluntary Services Uttlesford
Mari Hinton;	Uttlesford Carers
Marion Howell;	Alzheimer’s Society
Neil Blackshaw	Chair of the Uttlesford Residents Health Forum
Stephanie Baxter;	UDC – Housing Enabling Officer
Stephen Rhenius;	UDC – Research and Intelligence
Sue Locke;	UDC – Lead Officer, Access and Equalities

**Priority and Action Planning Form –
The Role of Group is to:**

- Provide a local arm to the Essex wide Health and Wellbeing Board and report to the Uttlesford Local Strategic Partnership.
- Play a part in enabling the community of Uttlesford to aspire to the best health possible.
- Shape and influence the development of integrated, efficient and cost effective services for the local population of Uttlesford.
- Share resources where possible and provide integrated ways of addressing health inequalities.
- The Group will meet regularly. Priority areas will be identified and an action plan developed.
- Provide a local forum for public engagement.

Activities:

- Support the development and delivery of an Essex wide Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy by the local health and care system and voluntary sector, having due regard to the measures taken by Uttlesford itself and to its own health profile.
- Contribute to the development of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment
- Consider the totality of available resource in Uttlesford for Health and Wellbeing and consider how through the prioritization of health improvement and prevention, the management of long term conditions and the provision of rehabilitation and admission to hospital can be prevented
- Enable effective partnership working between Health, Essex County Council and Uttlesford District Council and the Voluntary Sector; integrating services where possible, both formally established under the NHS Act and more informally through teams working together locally.
- Ensure Health Services and the Local Authorities work together to deliver Health and Social Care Services that benefit local people through effective use of the Governments investment in prevention and early intervention
- Enable joint working in Uttlesford on the wider determinates of health and wellbeing, such as housing, leisure facilities and accessibility in order to enhance service integration
- Receive and send reports to and from the Essex Health and Wellbeing Board as well as the Uttlesford Local Strategic Partnership.
- Ensure a joint approach to health and wellbeing workforce development and training as in the Health and Wellbeing Declaration

Priority or Action (plus label as quick win, 1 or 2 years, 5 years or future wish list)	Named organisation / or person with responsibility to develop and report	Who will undertake the activities to ensure delivery?	How will/can it be done?	Measurable targets, performance measures, outputs and outcome (if possible)	Other notes – e.g. budget, resources etc
<p>1. Request a diagram of the CCG staffing structure intended to be in place from 1-4-14</p> <p>Examine the WECCG Business Plan for 2014/15 in detail and test the emerging proposals with a swot analysis to determine the most favourable option(s) .</p>	Chair	Chair and Group	<p>Project 1.</p> <p>Steve Rhenius to identify better focus for Uttlesford. New Health profile data from www.localhealth.org.uk might assist along with other research material.</p>	Better focus on health issues in Uttlesford. Support delivery in Uttlesford.	PH input required
2.JSNA – Add areas of concern that might not be suggested by the current report.	Chair	Steve Rhenius as above			PH input required
3.Assist in the development of the district’s public health strategy		Geoff Smith/Gaynor Bradley/Sue Locke	West Essex Health Strategy being developed. Gaynor has prioritised a chapter on Uttlesford, awaiting feedback.		
4.HealthWatch Observe the development of their Strategic Plan		Tom Nutt although Andrew Gardner is a Health Watch rep			Consultation events may be of use to the group

(incomplete) and note their priorities and current agenda		and sits on the group			
5.Work with partners in the group to deliver joined up working and projects to support the aims of the group. Use the Planning meetings with the Parishes to inform on what is happening in the community.		Develop with partners in the meetings. .	Developing a meeting with the voluntary sector and the CCG/SEPT/Adult Social Care/ECC Pilot project with Thaxted being considered around the Village Agent scheme		Update parish clerks on some of the outcomes.
6.Liaise with the EESET Group re provision of employment and various projects.		Lead Officers: Kerry Vinton/Simon Jackson and Sue Locke	Chair to liaise with Janet Drysdale		
7.Work with the Children's and Young Peoples Group to identify health need.		To be identified	John Starr has been invited to attend and update. Child poverty project being undertaken in this group, lead officer to feed into HWB		
8.Appoint the Public Health representative from ECC as a priority.	Chair	John Mitchell/Cllr Rolfe	post has been lost without meaningful consultation		
9.Ensure access is made available to all the ERPHO and QIE to the community and provide feedback to the		Steve R has established access and is engaged			

community.					
10. Develop a project to work across all groups around the impact of rural isolation on health.		Andrew Gardner Lead Age UK plus partners	Project 3 Chair to contact Andrew Gardner to discuss progress and outcomes,		Update from Andrew Gardner – is this the role of Uttlesford Voices? ‘Stay Well’ events will inform
11. Build on the information derived from the latest RCCE review of Uttlesford and develop a project on Access to Services to complement the above.		Kerry Vinton/Sue Locke	Gaynor is looking for funding to support a ‘Village Agents scheme and to work with parishes.		E-mail sent to Nick Shuttleworth 21/8/14 to determine what is happening. The Rural Services Survey for Uttlesford still pending
12. Review Direct Payment and PIP take up across Uttlesford and the implications on local services, care providers etc (links to Economic Group)		Health, Social Services and the Voluntary Sector	Chair and SL to issue invite with clear requirements of update required.		
13. Review the provision of Occupational Therapists and physiotherapists in the community in an aim to ensure health management at home.		Housing/Adult Social Care/Chair	Review of OT services in the community – discuss with Maggie Pacini		
14. Examine, in detail, the manner of the delivery of the new Mental Health Strategy.		WE Mind			

Committee: Scrutiny Committee

Agenda Item

Date: 29 April 2014

10

Title: Day Centre Review

Author: Roz Millership, Assistant Director Housing
and Environmental Services Ext 516

Item for decision

Summary

1. This report responds to the Committee's request to examine discretionary services, beginning with an update on the current position of the Uttlesford Day Centres and outlining what has changed since the last review was carried out in 2009.

Recommendation

2. That the Scrutiny Committee members note the report.

Financial Implications

3. Day centre buildings (with the exception of Stansted) are owned and maintained by this council. Provision is made in general fund revenue budgets for upkeep of the buildings and utilities costs. There is provision for a rolling programme of major works in the capital programme with an annual budget of £10,000.

Background Papers

4. None

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	A further review would involve consultation with users and centre management committees
Community Safety	N/A
Equalities	Day centres users are a group with protected characteristics: older persons some of whom will have disabilities. Any further review would need to include an EqIA.

Health and Safety	Essential health and safety work to premises continues to be carried out
Human Rights/Legal Implications	N/A
Sustainability	N/A
Ward-specific impacts	Day centres are located in Dunmow, Takeley, Thaxted and Walden
Workforce/Workplace	Arrangements for the employment of staff vary between centres

Situation

6. The last review of the Uttlesford Day Centres was carried out in 2009.
7. One of the recommendations following this review was that the Day Centres were to keep the proceeds raised from their activities and use this money to employ their own Managers. Three of the five centres, Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow and Stansted now employ their own Managers. The other two centres continue to be run by their volunteer management committees.
8. Issues facing the centres, such as maintaining the required levels of volunteer support, still remain a problem for the smaller day centres.
9. Whilst some centres have been successful in re-branding their image, including not using the outdated term of “Day Centres”, others have done little to move this forward.
10. The council continues to maintain the council owned buildings from which the Day Centres operate.
11. The level of activity varies across the five day centres with some having greater usage than others. There appear to be various reasons for this, including location, days opened and lack of variety of activities offered to the users.
12. The initial day centre review in 2009 reported that Takeley is located in a building with a limited life. This is confirmed in a recent stock condition survey.
13. The condition survey shows that all the day centre buildings are of a varying standard, with some now requiring major refurbishment to make them fully fit for purpose going forward.
14. With decisions needed to be made on the amount of investment required to keep the day centres operational, officers feel that now would be an appropriate time to re-evaluate the Day Centres as a whole and fully review

how best the service can be delivered to meet the changing needs of the community.

15. Risk Analysis

16.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Day centre buildings not fit for purpose	3. Significant risk - some of the buildings will shortly need major refurbishment if they are to continue to be fit for purpose	3. Significant risk of Day Centre service being unable to continue from current locations	Review of buildings to be carried out to ascertain viability of continued use of these buildings as Day Centres
Day centre service financially unviable	2. Some risk – some of the Day Centres have low usage and therefore without increase in numbers will remain financially unviable	2. Some risk – reduced number of Day Centres across the district	Review of Day Centre Service to address the continuing need for current number of Day Centres or whether a more effective service may be provided on a different basis.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

Committee: Scrutiny

Agenda Item

Date: 29 April 2014

12

Title: Scrutiny Committee 2013/14 Review and 2014/15 Plan

Author: Richard Auty, Assistant Director Corporate Services Item for decision

Summary

1. This report provides an overview of what the scrutiny committee has looked at during 2013/14 and the proposed work programme for 2014/15.

Recommendations

2. The Scrutiny Committee considers potential areas for review in 2014/15.

Financial Implications

3. None.

Background Papers

4. None

Impact

Communication/Consultation	None
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

Situation

5. During 2013/14, the Scrutiny Committee has received reports and presentations from a number of outside bodies including the East of England Ambulance Service, Essex Police, West Essex Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and NHS England. The subject areas covered were:
 - a. GP accessibility in growth areas.
 - b. Current GP provision and patient ratio.
 - c. Changes to NHS England and the CCG.
 - d. Ambulance cover, emergency response times in rural areas and ambulance station closures.
 - e. Police and Crime Commissioner (update from Scrutiny Committee Chairman)

6. The committee has also scrutinised a number of internal services and service change proposals. These include:
 - a. Council owned car parks.
 - b. Planning performance.
 - c. Housing Tenant Scrutiny Panel.
 - d. Septic tanks.
 - e. Rural Broadband.
 - f. Dog Fouling.
 - g. Local Plan.
 - h. Highways Strategic Partnership.
 - i. Airport related parking.
 - j. 2014/15 Budget proposals including HRA, Treasury Management Strategy, Capital Programme 2014/15 - 2018/19, Medium Term Financial Strategy, Reserves, and the General Fund.
 - k. Statutory Services (on-going).
 - l. Trade waste contracts and pricing.

7. The committee created a Task Group to investigate the provision of council owned car parking within the district. The review included usage, capacity, ticket options and impact on businesses. Evidence was gathered through consultation with the public and analysis of usage and income data supplied by the North Essex Parking Partnership.

The Task Group made recommendations including:

- Further investigation into a 30 minute free parking at all car parks except Swan Meadow, instead of free parking after 3pm.
- Facilitate the establishment of a parking rebate scheme for Stansted Mountfitchet by local businesses and retailers.
- Discontinue the 4 hour tariff at The Common car park.
- Improve signage.
- Review with NEPP the reliability of data.
- Investigate patterns of usage further, specifically in areas of development.

- Ensure that car park capacity is accessed and fully understood at planning stage with proposed mitigation clearly set out.

The report was recently considered by Cabinet and it was agreed that the scrutiny report should be further considered alongside a cabinet review of car parking capacity within district centres, which will be presented at Cabinet in due course.

8. The Scrutiny Committee has previously indicated it may wish to consider the following topics in 2014/15:
 - Day centres
 - Tenants scrutiny panel –on-going
 - Swimming pool provision
 - East of England Ambulance Service
 - Rural broadband implementation update
9. A scoping document for each review will be produced and presented at the scrutiny meeting in advance of the full report. The document outlines the areas to be covered and will enable Members to confirm it meets their expectations.
10. The scoping document will be supplied to outside bodies for external reviews. The organisations will be asked to supply a written report for Members to review prior to the meeting. If the report does not satisfy the terms of reference in the scoping document, then the outside body will be invited to the following scrutiny meeting.
11. In addition to the scrutiny reviews there will also be other areas of planned work coming to the Committee, including a preparatory report on the budget process in November, followed by all budget reports in February.