

A meeting of the **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (SOCIAL WELL-BEING)** will be held in the **CIVIC SUITE 0.1A, PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN** on **TUESDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 2011 at 7:00 PM** and you are requested to attend for the transaction of the following business:-

**Contact  
(01480)**

## **APOLOGIES**

### **1. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 6)**

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

**Miss H Ali  
388006**

**2 Minutes.**

### **2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

To receive from Members declarations as to personal and/or prejudicial interests and the nature of those interests in relation to any Agenda Item. Please see Notes 1 and 2 overleaf.

**2 Minutes.**

### **3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000: FORWARD PLAN (Pages 7 - 12)**

A copy of the current Forward Plan, which was published on 14th October 2011, is attached. Members are invited to note the Plan and to comment as appropriate on any items contained therein.

**Mrs H Taylor  
388008**

**10 Minutes.**

### **4. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To resolve:-

that the public be excluded from the meeting because the business to be transacted contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

**2 Minutes.**

### **5. FUNDING FOR CCTV (Pages 13 - 24)**

To receive a report from the Head of Operations on the CCTV service.

**E Kendall  
388635**

**20 Minutes.**

**6. RE-ADMITTANCE OF THE PUBLIC**

To resolve:-

to readmit the public to the meeting.

**2 Minutes.**

**7. THE HEALTH IMPLICATIONS OF THE NIGHT-TIME ECONOMY IN HUNTINGDONSHIRE (Pages 25 - 30)**

To receive a report from the Head of Environmental and Community Health Services on the health implications of the night time economy in Huntingdonshire.

**Dr S Lammin  
388280**

**20 Minutes.**

**8. ANNUAL EQUALITY PROGRESS REPORT (Pages 31 - 48)**

To receive the Annual Equality Progress Report from the Senior Policy Officer.

**Mrs L Sboui  
388032**

**20 Minutes.**

**9. NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS - CONSULTATION RESPONSES (Pages 49 - 56)**

To receive a report from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services on progress with the review of the Neighbourhood Forums in Huntingdonshire.

**Miss H Ali  
388006**

**20 Minutes.**

**10. VOLUNTARY SECTOR (Pages 57 - 64)**

To receive the final report of the Voluntary Sector Working Group.

**Miss H Ali  
388006**

**20 Minutes.**

**11. CAMBRIDGESHIRE ADULTS WELL-BEING AND HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (Pages 65 - 74)**

To receive an update from Councillor R J West on the outcome of recent meetings of the Cambridgeshire Adults Well-Being and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**5 Minutes.**

**12. WORK PLAN STUDIES (Pages 75 - 78)**

To consider, with the aid of a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, the current programme of Overview and Scrutiny studies.

**Miss H Ali  
388006**

**15 Minutes.**

**13. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (SOCIAL WELL-BEING) - PROGRESS** (Pages 79 - 86)

To consider a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services on the Panel's programme of studies.

**Miss H Ali  
388006**

**15 Minutes.**

**14. SCRUTINY**

To scrutinise decisions as set out in the Decision Digest (**TO FOLLOW**) and to raise any other matters for scrutiny that fall within the remit of the Panel.

**5 Minutes.**

Dated this 24 day of October 2011



Head of Paid Service

**Notes**

1. *A personal interest exists where a decision on a matter would affect to a greater extent than other people in the District –*
  - (a) *the well-being, financial position, employment or business of the Councillor, their family or any person with whom they had a close association;*
  - (b) *a body employing those persons, any firm in which they are a partner and any company of which they are directors;*
  - (c) *any corporate body in which those persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000; or*
  - (d) *the Councillor's registerable financial and other interests.*
2. *A personal interest becomes a prejudicial interest where a member of the public (who has knowledge of the circumstances) would reasonably regard the Member's personal interest as being so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Councillor's judgement of the public interest.*

**Please contact Miss H Ali, Democratic Services Officer, Tel No: (01480) 388006 / email: Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk if you have a general query on any Agenda Item, wish to tender your apologies for absence from the meeting, or would like information on any decision taken by the Panel.**

**Specific enquiries with regard to items on the Agenda should be directed towards the Contact Officer.**

**Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting as observers except during consideration of confidential or exempt items of business.**

Agenda and enclosures can be viewed on the District Council's website –  
[www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk](http://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk) (*under Councils and Democracy*).

If you would like a translation of Agenda/Minutes/Reports  
or would like a large text version or an audio version  
please contact the Democratic Services Manager and  
we will try to accommodate your needs.

***Emergency Procedure***

*In the event of the fire alarm being sounded and on the instruction of the Meeting Administrator, all attendees are requested to vacate the building via the closest emergency exit.*

# Agenda Item 1

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (SOCIAL WELL-BEING) held in the Civic Suite 0.1A, Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon, PE29 3TN on Tuesday, 4 October 2011.

PRESENT: Councillor R J West – Vice-Chairman in the Chair.

Councillors S Akthar, K M Baker, I C Bates, Mrs P A Jordan, S M Van De Kerkhove, Mrs D C Reynolds and R J West.

Co-opted Members – Mr R Coxhead and Mrs M Nicholas.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors S J Criswell, Mrs J A Dew and J J Dutton.

### **41. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Vice-Chairman.

### **42. MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor K M Baker declared a personal interest in Minute No. 45 by virtue of being a Trustee of Huntingdon Shopmobility.

### **43. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000: FORWARD PLAN**

The Panel considered and noted the current Forward Plan of Key Decisions (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) which had been prepared by the Executive Leader of the Council for the period 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2012. It was reported that the item entitled "CCTV Future Funding" would be submitted to the Panel at its meeting in November 2011.

### **44. DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS AND CHARGES ON PROPERTIES**

*(Councillor N J Guyatt, Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, was in attendance for this item).*

With the assistance of a report by the Head of Housing Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Panel considered a proposal to impose charges on properties in certain circumstances, which had been adapted wholly or with the assistance of Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs).

The Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing and the Head of Housing Services outlined the background to the proposals. Members noted that changes to legislation gave local authorities the

discretion to impose limited charges on adapted properties that were occupied by their owners if the properties were sold within ten years of the grant being made and if the grant was in excess of £5,000.

The Panel discussed a number of matters, including the resources that the proposal would require for it to be implemented, the anticipated level of charges that would be placed on properties together with the criteria that would be applied to determine whether repayments would be enforced.

Following a question by a Member on when applicants would be notified of charges, the Head of Housing Services assured the Panel that this would be done by Officers during the application process. The Panel then discussed the market value of adapted properties and noted that in Huntingdonshire the charges would only be made in respect of grants in excess of £10,000 for garage/outbuilding conversions and/or an extension to a property. Having expressed their satisfaction with the proposals, the Panel

#### RESOLVED

that the Cabinet be recommended to

- (a) agree that charges be placed on properties where owner occupiers receive a Disabled Facilities Grant in excess of £10,000 (excluding Home Improvement Agency fees) where the grant is for a garage or outbuilding conversion, or extension or any combination of these;
- (b) agree that the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, together with the Head of Housing Services, following consultation with the Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, should determine the most effective and efficient procedure for placing charges on properties; and
- (c) delegate authority to decide whether to seek repayment, as set out in paragraph 2.5 of the report now submitted, to the Head of Housing Services.

#### **45. VOLUNTARY SECTOR REVIEW**

*(Councillor J D Ablewhite, Executive Leader, Councillor T D Sanderson, Executive Councillor for Healthy and Active Communities, and Councillors P J Downes and T W Clough were in attendance for this item).*

The Panel received a report by the Head of Environmental and Community Health Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) detailing the outcome of a review of the Voluntary Sector Organisations that held commissioning agreements with the Council.

In introducing the report, the Healthy Communities Manager reminded

the Panel of the background to the review, which had been prompted by Members at the November 2010 meeting of full Council. It was reported that a series of review meetings had been held with the organisations concerned to assess the potential impact of a reduction in grant funding upon service users, their ability to attract external funding and their willingness to utilise their financial reserves to offset any grant reductions proposed by the Council.

The Panel questioned whether the social impact of grant reductions to voluntary organisations could be assessed given that they had a number of functions beyond those specified within their service level agreements that affected the wider social environment. The review findings indicated that some of the voluntary organisations could be placed in a vulnerable situation if the Council decided to reduce its grants to them by 50%. Members commented that there would be greater pressures placed on the Council and other public service providers and voluntary organisations in the District if grants were reduced. Owing to the fact that the organisations made use of volunteer workers, the cost to the Council of meeting this demand would exceed any grant reductions.

The Panel noted that the level of funding provided to the organisations had changed over time. It was suggested that future funding should be based on the level of need for the services offered by them. It was further suggested that the Council should take into account whether services were offered on a District-wide basis. Members were informed that Huntingdon Shopmobility and St Barnabas Community Learning Centre were the only organisations that provided services to a specific sector of the District's community. Having been acquainted with the outcome of the Equality Impact Assessment undertaken as part of the review, the Panel also expressed concern at the likely effect of any grant changes on those in isolated rural areas.

Members discussed the fact that financial support was provided to the voluntary organisations by other funders such as Cambridgeshire County Council, the Primary Care Trust, the Police and Town and Parish Councils. Although they acknowledged the difficulties faced by some organisations when other funders withdrew their contributions, it was noted that the District Council had, in the past, made up the resulting shortfall in funding.

The Panel has commented that, given the varying levels of funding currently received by the organisations and the contributions that the grants make overall towards their operating costs, a uniform rate of reduction across all the organisations would not be appropriate. Any grant adjustments should be assessed on an individual basis.

The Panel acknowledged the valuable contribution made by the organisations to the Council's aims and the fact that they each had its own links to other voluntary organisations in the District. Members expressed support for the joint working that they undertook and encouraged them to explore further opportunities for closer working in order to generate further efficiency savings.

The Panel suggested that the Executive Councillor for Healthy and Active Communities should investigate alternative accommodation

options for the voluntary organisations with a view to reducing their operating costs. The options identified included approaching Churchmanor Estates and Huntingdon Town Council and utilising accommodation space available at Pathfinder House and at the Bargrove Centre in Eynesbury, St Neots.

A further suggestion was made that the Council should offer support to the organisations that it currently commissions to search for external and/or match funding opportunities. Additionally, it was suggested that a more holistic approach to the review, incorporating other voluntary sector organisations, should be undertaken. Finally, the Panel placed on record the point that future large scale developments, such as the St Neots Eastern expansion, could result in there being greater demand for voluntary services.

RESOLVED

that the Cabinet be invited to consider the Panel's comments as part of its deliberations on the report by the Head of Environmental and Community Health Services.

#### **46. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL REMITS**

Consideration was given to a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) containing a proposal to change the way the Overview and Scrutiny Panels' remits were defined. The remits previously had been linked to Executive Councillors' responsibilities. However, following changes in the Cabinet, it was suggested that specific Council service functions should be allocated to each Panel.

In response to a question by a Member on monitoring of Section 106 Agreements, Members were informed that this remained the responsibility of the Environmental Well-Being Panel but that an exception had previously been made to enable the Social Well-Being Panel to scrutinise schemes for the provision of leisure/play equipment. The Panel decided to reinstate the previous monitoring arrangements.

Whilst acknowledging that all Overview and Scrutiny Panel Members had the opportunity to attend Economic Well-Being Panel meetings when the draft Budget was considered, the Panel accepted a suggestion by Councillor I C Bates that the Social Well-Being Panel should receive a separate report on an annual basis on the budgets associated with those services that fell within its remit. In that light, the Panel

RESOLVED

- (a) that the Overview and Scrutiny Panel remits contained in the report now submitted be endorsed;
- (b) that the Panel reinstate the monitoring of Section 106 Agreements that provide leisure/play equipment; and
- (c) that a report be submitted annually on the budgets associated with the Council functions in the Panel's remit.



**47. CAMBRIDGESHIRE ADULTS WELL-BEING AND HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Councillor R J West delivered an update on matters currently being considered by the Cambridgeshire Adults Well-Being and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, including the NHS consultation on the Redesign of Mental Health Services in Cambridgeshire, acute stroke services for Huntingdonshire residents, a review of home care services, the Adult Social Care Review of Progress Against the Integrated Plan, the review of dementia services and the Health and Wellbeing Board. A discussion then ensued on the management of Home Care Services. Members welcomed the work that was being undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in this respect.

(At this point during the meeting (8.30pm) Councillor I C Bates left the meeting).

**48. WORK PLAN STUDIES**

The Panel received and noted a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) containing details of studies being undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Panels for Economic Well-Being and Environmental Well-Being.

Members placed on record their disappointment that the Cabinet had not accepted their recommendation that the provision of a rifle range should be explored as part of the development proposals for One Leisure, St Ives. The Scrutiny and Review Manager outlined the various ways in which Members were informed of Cabinet decisions and reminded the Panel of the opportunity that existed to call-in any Executive decision.

**49. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (SOCIAL WELL-BEING) - PROGRESS**

The Panel received and noted a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) which contained details of actions taken in response to recent discussions and decisions. The Chairman referred to a question which had been raised at full Council in respect of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital. Officers were requested to seek a response from Circle Healthcare on the financial provision the company had made in respect of the Public Finance Initiative (PFI) for the construction of the treatment centre at the Hospital.

The Panel requested clarification from the Managing Director (Resources) as to when he would be in a position to report back on the action he proposed to take in response to its recommendations arising from the study into the Council's consultation processes. An update was then delivered on the work of the Cambridgeshire Safer and Stronger Overview and Scrutiny Committee study into domestic abuse.

**50. SCRUTINY**

The 117<sup>th</sup> Edition of the Decision Digest was received and noted.

Chairman

### FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

Prepared by  
Date of Publication:  
For Period:

Councillor J D Ablewhite  
14<sup>th</sup> October 2011  
1st November to 29th February 2012

Membership of the Cabinet is as follows:-

Councillor J D Ablewhite	- Leader of the Council, with responsibility for Strategic Economic Development	3 Pettis Road St. Ives Huntingdon PE27 6SR  Tel: 01480 466941 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Jason.Ablewhite@huntingdonshire.gov.uk">Jason.Ablewhite@huntingdonshire.gov.uk</a>
Councillor N J Guyatt	- Deputy Leader of the Council with responsibility for Strategic Planning and Housing	6 Church Lane Stibbington Cambs PE8 6LP  Tel: 01780 782827 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Nick.Guyatt@huntingdonshire.gov.uk">Nick.Guyatt@huntingdonshire.gov.uk</a>
Councillor B S Chapman	- Executive Councillor for Organisational Development	6 Kipling Place St. Neots Huntingdon PE19 7RG  Tel: 01480 212540 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Barry.Chapman@huntingdonshire.gov.uk">Barry.Chapman@huntingdonshire.gov.uk</a>
Councillor J A Gray	- Executive Councillor for Resources	Shufflewick Cottage Station Row Tilbrook PE28 OJY  Tel: 01480 861941 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Jonathan.Gray@huntingdonshire.gov.uk">Jonathan.Gray@huntingdonshire.gov.uk</a>
Councillor D M Tysoe	- Executive Councillor for Environment	Grove Cottage Maltings Lane Ellington Huntingdon PE28 OAA  Tel: 01480 388310 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Darren.Tysoe@huntingdonshire.gov.uk">Darren.Tysoe@huntingdonshire.gov.uk</a>
Councillor T D Sanderson	- Executive Councillor for Healthy and Active Communities	29 Burmoor Close Stukeley Meadows Huntingdon PE29 6GE  Tel: 01480 412135 E-mail: <a href="mailto:Tom.Sanderson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk">Tom.Sanderson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk</a>

Any person who wishes to make representations to the decision maker about a decision which is to be made may do so by contacting Mrs Helen Taylor, Senior Democratic Services Officer on 01480 388008 or E-mail: [Helen.Taylor@huntsdc.gov.uk](mailto:Helen.Taylor@huntsdc.gov.uk) not less than 14 days prior to the date when the decision is to be made.

The documents available may be obtained by contacting the relevant officer shown in this plan who will be responsible for preparing the final report to be submitted to the decision maker on the matter in relation to which the decision is to be made. Similarly any enquiries as to the subject or matter to be tabled for decision or on the availability of supporting information or documentation should be directed to the relevant officer.

Colin Meadowcroft  
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Notes:- (i) Additions/significant changes from the previous Forward are annotated \*\*\*  
(ii) For information about how representations about the above decisions may be made please see the Council's Petitions Procedure at <http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/3F6CFE28-C5F0-4BA0-9BF2-76EBAE06C89D/0/Petitionsleaflet.pdf> or telephone 01480 388006

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Sale of Land at The Whaddons/Thongsley Huntingdon***	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	Alan Worth, Valuation Planning Consent Ref: 1002034FUL	Frank Mastrandrea, Policy and Enabling Officer Tel No 01480 388208 or email Frank.Mastrandrea@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt/J A Gray	Economic Well-Being
Roll Forward of the Council's Core Strategy -Its Local Development Plan***	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	None.	Steve Ingram, Head of Planning Services Tel No 01480 388400 or email Steve.Ingram@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Update.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Annual Equality Progress Report***	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	Covering report, plus two appendices (action plan progress 2010/2011 and outcomes from Equality Impact Assessments 2010/2011	Louise Sboui, Senior Policy Officer Tel No 01480 388032 or email Louise.Sboui@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	COMT, Equality Steering Group, O&S (Social Well-Being), Employment Panel/ELAG, Cabinet	T D Sanderson	Social Well-Being

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
CCTV Future Funding	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	None.	Eric Kendall, Head of Operations Tel No 01480 388635 or email Eric.Kendall@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		T D Sanderson	Environmental Well-Being
Gypsy & Traveller Policy Issues	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	New PPS on G & T Issues Cambs GTANA	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Consider latest policy issues.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
CIL and Developer Contributions SPD	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	Local Infrastructure Framework	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Endorse as Council policy and agree next steps for CIL.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Waste Collection Policies	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	None.	Eric Kendall, Head of Operations Tel No. 01480 388635 or email Eric.Kendall@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		D Tysoe	Environmental Well-Being
Great Fen Supplementary Planning Document	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	Great Fen SPD	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388340 or email Paul.Bland@huntsdc.gov.uk	Endorse as Council policy (further details required)	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Carbon Management Update	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	None.	Chris Jablonski, Environment Team Leader Tel No. 01480 388368 or email Chris.Jablonski@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		D Tysoe	Environmental Well-Being
Planning Proposals Development Plan Document	Cabinet	17 Nov 2011	Updated SHLAA, Employment Land Review, Updated Retail Study	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntsdc.gov.uk	Approve findings for consultations as preferred options.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Cambridgeshire Future Transport - Transport for Cambridgeshire	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	None.	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Update on emerging options and recommendations.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	Cambs County Council-Led Project	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388340 or email Paul.Bland@huntsdc.gov.uk	Endorse as Council Policy (subject to County Council progress).	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
RAF Brampton Urban Design Framework	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	Agreed Urban Design Framework	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No. 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Adopt as Council Policy.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being
Draft MTP	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	None.	Steve Couper, Head of Financial Services Tel No. 01480 388103 or email Steve.Couper@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	Economic Well-Being
Local Government Finance Act 1988 - Publication of Rural Settlement List	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	None.	Julia Barber, Head of Customer Services Tel No. 01480 388015 or email Julia.Barber@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	Economic Well-Being
Huntingdon West Master Plan	Cabinet	8 Dec 2011	Huntingdon West Action Plan	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being

Subject/Matter for Decision	Decision/ recommendation to be made by	Date decision to be taken	Documents Available	How relevant Officer can be contacted	Consultation	Relevant Executive Councillor	Relevant Overview & Scrutiny Panel
Voluntary Sector Support***	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	None.	Dan Smith, Community Health Manager Tel No 01480 388377 or email Dan.Smith@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		T D Sanderson	Social Well-Being
Location of the Call Centre***	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	Previous Cabinet Papers	Julia Barber, Head of Customer Services Tel No 01480 388015 or email Julia.Barber@huntingdonshire.gov.uk		J A Gray	Economic Well-Being
Planning for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs)	Cabinet	19 Jan 2012	CCC SuDs Options Paper	Paul Bland, Planning Service Manager (Policy) Tel No 01480 388430 or email Paul.Bland@huntingdonshire.gov.uk	Consider options.	N J Guyatt	Environmental Well-Being

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Item 5

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

## **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL (SOCIAL WELL-BEING)**

**1 NOVEMBER 2011**

### **THE HEALTH IMPLICATIONS OF THE NIGHT TIME ECONOMY IN HUNTINGDONSHIRE (Report by the Head of Environmental & Community Health Services)**

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 At their meeting, on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2011, the Panel requested background information be submitted to them, at their November meeting, around the health implications of the night time economy in Huntingdonshire.
- 1.2 There is very little information available to assist the Panel with their investigation. There is some information in the Annual Strategic Needs Assessments for the Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership and the Joint Strategic Needs Assessments for Cambridgeshire that identify health-needs but there is very little supporting data. There are well documented difficulties in drawing direct links between police crime statistics and alcohol consumption.

#### **2. THE RELATIONSHIP OF A NIGHT-TIME ECONOMY TO HEALTH**

- 2.1 The night-time economy is associated with sale of alcohol. Alcohol use is a common part of every-day society (NHS, 2011). Hazardous drinking of alcohol is a pattern of drinking which brings about the risk of physical or psychological harm. Alcohol is also connected to a variety of crimes, including antisocial-behaviour, violent crimes, domestic violence, racial crimes, and criminal damage.
- 2.2 The night-time economy can be associated with binge-drinking. This is defined separately for men and women in the 'Health Survey for England' (hse). For men binge drinking is: eight or more units of alcohol on the heaviest drinking day in the last 7 days, and for women it is 6 or more units. The difficulty that arises is that there is no measured data available about binge drinking; the hse data is used to produce synthetic estimates only.
- 2.3 Those night-time economy customers who preload on alcohol before going out in the evening are more likely to be involved in alcohol related violence, disorder and other problems (Hughes, 2007). Data concerning the prevalence of preloading is not consistently collected in the UK and is not available for Huntingdonshire.

#### **3. POSSIBLE HEALTH IMPACTS IDENTIFIED FROM THE NEEDS ASSESSMENTS**

- 3.1 Violent crimes naturally have an impact on the victim's health & well-being. Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership's (HCSP) 2010 Strategic Needs Assessment looked in detail at the places crime happens because the geographical distribution of crime is uneven. The main findings for violence near licensed premises, in 2009-10, were as follows:
  - The pub / club cluster of most concern continued to be Huntingdon
  - Part of the St Neots cluster was also of concern.

- 3.2 That, 2010, assessment didn't just look at geographical spread it also considered offender-types. It recommended that any measures aimed at those committing violent offences associated with the night-time economy should target males aged 18-24.
- 3.3 To look at the nature of violence that takes place near licensed premises a map was created where there were significant clusters of pubs. (three or more premises that were within 150 metres of each other). The following table outlines offences committed within each of these clusters in 6-months in 2009/10:

Pub/Club Cluster	Victims of violent crime	Identified offenders
Eaton Socon/St Neots	53	31
Huntingdon	44	31
St Ives	21	14
Ramsey	16	8

- 3.4 Expressing the number of victims as a ratio of the relative size of the pub cluster shows that Huntingdon produced a relatively high number of victims and offenders compared to its size. The number of victims though are very similar for both St Neots and Huntingdon. It is worth noting that St Ives had previously been identified as a priority area for HCSP linked to the night time economy and associated alcohol related violence and disorder: Operation Nightwatch proved very successful in addressing the issue.
- 3.4 The latest figures show (2010-11) Huntingdon Pub Cluster has the highest rate of violence compared to anywhere else in the County particularly given the relatively small number of licensed premises.

Pub/Club Cluster	All violent offences expressed as a rate per premises
St Neots (west)	1.3
St Neots (east)	6.5
Huntingdon	<b>14.4</b>
St Ives (centre)	5.5
Ramsey	5.6

- 3.5 There was a noted, in 2010, variation in the timing of offences; in Huntingdon it is Friday night and St Neots Saturday night.
- 3.6 The other difference between the two towns was the age of the victims / offenders. There was a significantly higher proportion of under-18s injured / committing violence near pubs in St Neots compared to Huntingdon. Within the Huntingdon pub cluster the 18-24 age group were considerably over represented within the victim profile whilst both the under 18s and over 31s were underrepresented. This is a classic pattern for alcohol related night-time violence.
- 3.7 That assessment also looked at types of crime. It was noted that alcohol-related violence & disorder showed significant reductions year on year, since 2005. However, there was a caveat to the findings: that trends in police recorded violent crime can be very difficult to interpret, as the statistics can be distorted by a number of factors.

3.8 From the police reports to neighbourhood forums we know that in St Neots, between April and July 2011, fifteen key individuals were banned from pub watch premises and an increased visible police presence in the Town Centre was positively received by both late night venues. Statistically only 8% of police-incidents in St Neots, during the period, were categorized as violent crime or night time economy related.

3.9 The public perception of a problem was also tested (Summer 2010)

How much of a problem is alcohol-related violence and disorder?

A very big problem:	47	10.7%
A fairly big problem:	116	26.4%
<b>Not a very big problem:</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>42.6%</b>
Not a problem at all:	81	18.5%
No opinion:	8	1.8%

How much of a problem is people being drunk or rowdy in public places?

A very big problem:	33	7.5%
A fairly big problem:	86	19.6%
<b>Not a very big problem:</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>41.5%</b>
Not a problem at all:	129	29.4%
No opinion:	9	2.1%

3.10 It is drunkenness and rowdiness that is most often associated with binge drinking. The estimates (Draft JSNA: Adults of Working Age (Prevention) 2011) indicate that the prevalence of binge drinking in Huntingdonshire should be around 15.8%; compared to 20.1% nationally.

3.11 Binge drinking in Huntingdonshire is predicted to be less prevalent than generally in England. However, there are areas within the district where predictions are that prevalence could be higher; these areas do not relate to the locations where night-time economy is most active within the district:

Area	Synthetic estimate of prevalence of binge drinking	Range of 95% confidence level of prediction
Yaxley and Farcet	21.4	11.8-36.1
Somersham, Upwood and the Raveleys	22.4	12.4-37.6
Huntingdon West	23.1	12.8-38.3
Buckden and the Offords	23.3	12.8-39.0
Ramsey	23.8	13.1-39.6

Association of Public Health Observatories © 2010 in Draft JSNA: Adults of Working Age (Prevention) 2011

#### 4. HOSPITAL DATA

4.1 Emergency departments within hospitals are often involved in the treatment of alcohol-related injuries. Nationally, the Cardiff Model has been developed to identify how NHS services can make effective contributions to the prevention of alcohol-related harm. The aim is for A&E departments to share information wherever possible about the locations, timings and frequency of events. This data can then be used to target interventions, and thereby reduce violence outside licensed premises and reduce the numbers of A&E admissions. Addenbrookes already made use of this scheme in 2009 but Hinchingbrooke did not.

- 4.2 During early 2011 discussions were held with Hinchingsbrooke about how they could collect this type of data. Earlier this year an agreement was reached with Hinchingsbrooke NHS Hospital and assault victim data relating to attendance at the emergency department (ED) is now provided on a monthly basis, since February 2011.
- 4.3 According to a press release from Hinchingsbrooke Hospital (September 2010), between August 2009 and July 2010, there had been an estimated 2-3 attendances a week. These data should be treated with caution when considering the night-time economy. Some A&E attendances will likely be as a result of alcohol consumption not related to the night-time economy.
- 4.4 The data received so far in 2011 show that in seven months only 53 attendances were recorded for assault. Of these; 55% of attendances were recorded on Friday or Saturday; these are therefore most likely associated with the night-time economy- 29 instances. 34% of [53] patients were female & 66% male. This is slightly higher than expected. Addenbrooke's NHS Trust data had indicated just under a quarter of victims were female; but with such low attendance figures the statistics are not reliable indicators of trends/proportions. The age range of attendees was: between 11 and 52 years; 25% were aged 16 or under, 40% were 17 – 30 years and 35% were over 30 years. 36% of injuries involved weapons (the remainder involved no weapon or just hands and feet) [The use of knives was reported by only 2 patients]

## **5. RECENT INTERVENTIONS**

- 5.1 During the last two years the HCSP has run initiatives tackling alcohol-related violence across the district. These included operations Hartwell – targeting St Ives, and Titan – targeting St Neots & Huntingdon town centres. Evaluations indicated that operation Hartwell in particular was a success in reducing violence.
- 5.2 Huntingdon - PubWatch has been re-introduced into the Huntingdon town area and there are currently 12 members signed up to the scheme. As part of the scheme, each member has been given a radio on a free trial until the 1st December 2011 after which time it is hoped that the members will recognise the benefits and be willing to pay for the radios. To date, four individuals have received bans under the scheme from the 12 premises, all of these individuals have historically been involved in alcohol related violence. As part of the scheme, the members are working towards a zero tolerance to violence and ASB both within their premises and the town.
- 5.3 The St Neots Neighbourhood Policing Team have changed the way in which they 'police' St Neots. Officers are made aware of 'priority premises' and patrol certain routes on key days; those areas have historically been associated with alcohol related violence and disorder. The St Neots area also has a very successful Pub watch Scheme and the 'Traffic Light Scheme' also operates in this area. Ahead of the summer holidays, a letter was sent to every parent of children who attend the secondary schools in St Neots advising them that both the Police and HCSP were aware that underage drinking was occurring in the St Neots area and reminding parents of their responsibility for their children's safety. Although this letter did anger some parents, it seems to have had a positive effect with fewer reports of underage drinking/ alcohol related incidents of disorder.



## 6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Huntingdon will remain the priority area for HCSP because of the relatively high rate of alcohol related violence, within the pub-cluster, and because the interventions need time before full evaluation, if any progress is to be evident. Some interventions are also likely in St Neots and St Ives in relation to the night-time economy, during 2011/12.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Members of Overview & Scrutiny (Social Well-Being) Panel are requested to:

- 7.1 Note the content of this report in relation to both the possible impact of the night-time economy on health, in the broadest sense of the term, and the limitation of the data from which meaningful conclusions may be drawn.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership's 2010 Strategic Needs Assessment  
Department of Health's Health Survey for England

Cambridgeshire PCT's Draft JSNA: Adults of Working Age (Prevention) 2011

Hughes K., Anderson Z., Morleo M., Bellis M. (2007) Alcohol, nightlife and violence: The relative contributions of drinking before and during nights out to negative health and criminal justice outcomes, *Addiction*, 103, pp605.

NHS: Health and Social Care Information Centre (2011) Statistics on Alcohol: England, published May 2011. <http://www.ic.nhs.uk/statistics-and-data-collections/health-and-lifestyles/alcohol/statistics-on-alcohol-england-2011-%5Bns%5D>

Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership's 2011 (draft) Strategic Needs Assessment

### DIFFICULTIES IN DRAWING DIRECT LINKS BETWEEN POLICE CRIME STATISTICS AND ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION:

Tierney, J. and Hobbs, D. (2003) Alcohol related crime and disorder data: guidance for local partnerships, Home Office Online Report 08/03, London, Home Office.

Tierney, J. (2004) Making links: the auditing of alcohol-related crime and disorder, *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal*, 6(3), pp3341.

The Portman Group (2002) Counting the cost: The measurement and recording of alcohol-related violence and disorder, London, The Portman Group.

Institute of Alcohol Studies (2009) IAS Factsheet: Alcohol related crime and disorder, Cambridgeshire, Institute of Alcohol Studies.

Home Office (ND) Crime reduction toolkits: Alcohol related crime, online, available from: <http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/toolkits/ar00.htm> [Accessed 28/06/2010]

**Contact Officer: Dr Sue Lammin**  
**☎ 01480 388280**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 8

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL  
(SOCIAL WELL-BEING)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> NOVEMBER 2011**

**EMPLOYMENT PANEL**

**30<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2011**

**CABINET**

**17<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2011**

## **ANNUAL EQUALITY PROGRESS REPORT (Report by the Senior Policy Officer)**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an annual update on progress with the achievement of the Council's Single Equality Scheme (SES) Action Plan.

### **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The SES and action plan shows how the Council will meet its statutory responsibilities, in particular how we take account of:

- the Public Sector Equality Duties as set out in the Equality Act 2010; and
- achievement against the Equality Framework for Local Government (EFLG).

- 2.2 The SES was originally approved in September 2010 and it was agreed that a full review would take place every three years and an annual review of the action plan. However, some amendments to particular sections of the SES have been made in light of changes to the management structure and corporate plan.

### **3. The Equality Act 2010**

- 3.1 The Equality Act was passed by Parliament in April 2010 and the majority of the new legislation came in to force during 2011. The Act replaced earlier anti-discrimination law and replaced the three separate public sector equality duties (gender, disability & race) into one Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED). The PSED entails having due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance Equality of Opportunity
- Foster good relations

- 3.2 The new duty covers Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage & Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion & Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.

- 3.3 Specific Duties were introduced in June 2011, to assist public authorities in the better performance of the Equality Duty. Specific Duties mean that the Council will need to publish:

- Equality objectives, at least every four years

- Information to demonstrate their compliance with the equality duty, at least annually
- 3.4 The latter will need to include, in particular, information relating to our employees (see HR Employee Equality Monitoring Report to follow) and others affected by Council policies and practices such as service users.
  - 3.5 The publication of this information is meant to ensure that the Council is transparent about performance on equality without any unnecessary bureaucratic processes (previous equality duties all had different features, timescales and reporting requirements). The Council therefore has the flexibility in deciding what information to publish. This information will still need to include details of analysis the Council undertook and information on which the objectives were based, including any details of any engagement or consultation undertaken.
  - 3.6 To enable the Council to demonstrate compliance with the Specific Duties it is proposed that the existing SES will be retained as it is only 12 months old, fairly extensive consultation took place prior to approval and existing monitoring and updates are not overly bureaucratic.
  - 3.7 Information demonstrating compliance with the duty must be published by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2012 (except for schools, who have until April 2012) and the first equality objectives have to be published by 6<sup>th</sup> April 2012, including schools. This report and attached appendices will ensure that we comply with our PSED within these timescales.

#### **4. Equality Impact Assessments (EIA's)**

- 4.1 The Council will continue to use EIA's to help comply with the Equality Duties, that is to consciously think about the three aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of Council decision making, therefore the Council will need to understand the potential effects of Council decisions on different people and keep a record of how decisions were reached. EIA's will enable the Council to do this.
- 4.2 The Council no longer has a three year rolling timetable however it is intended that an EIA will need to be completed whenever a new policy, strategy, service or function is being developed or if any fundamental changes are proposed to an existing policy, strategy, service or function. The Cabinet/COMT report checklist now includes a box to remind authors of the need for EIAs, where appropriate, to be completed before a report is considered. Heads of Service will also receive a reminder email twice a year. Progress will continue to be monitored through the Council's performance management framework.

#### **5. Equality Framework for Local Government (EFLG)**

- 5.1 The Equality Framework for Local Government was introduced in April 2009 to replace the Equality Standard for Local Government. The new Framework has fewer indicators and an emphasis on self assessment and peer challenge. The Framework consists of 3 levels;

'Developing', 'Achieving' and 'Excellent'. The Council underwent a successful external assessment for validation of achievement against Level 3 of the (old) Equality Standard in July 2009; therefore the Council automatically transferred to become 'Achieving' within the new Framework. However an external assessment (Diversity Peer Challenge) is required to validate this. This has been arranged for 28<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> February 2012. Evidence for this peer review is currently being collected.

- 5.2 Some Members will be more closely involved in this assessment than others, the Leader, Deputy Leader and members of Overview & Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-being) will be asked to be part of focus groups/interviews where they will be asked about HDC's equality priorities etc. A briefing session with these Members will be organised closer to the time of the assessment.

## **5. PROGRESS**

- 5.1 The SES action plan is from 2010/13 and currently contains 51 actions. 47 are complete and/or on-going and four have not been achieved. Actions not complete or on-going will be carried forward. Actions arising out of the Diversity Peer Challenge will be added to the action plan.
- 5.2 Nineteen EIA's have been carried out during 2010/11, five of which were as a result of proposed cuts to budgets. A list of outcomes/actions arising out of completed EIA's is in Appendix B; no significant actions were identified.
- 5.3 The Council's corporate plan 'Growing Success', which was a comprehensive plan encompassing all of the Council's aims and objectives, has been replaced with a short term plan focusing on the Council's key external facing objectives. As such, equality and diversity are not explicitly mentioned, although the Council continues to have aims and objectives in this area as evidenced by this report and the SES.

## **6. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 6.1 The Council has a revenue budget of £10,000 to meet the direct cost of achieving objectives, the majority of which is used for employee and Member training. Other costs include the time taken to review and make changes to services/policies in response to assessment of residents needs and completing activities set out in the Action Plan. The Equality Impact Assessments undertaken have not resulted in any significant expenditure and the Council is making a proportionate but effective response to statutory and business requirements. Costs associated with the external Diversity Peer Challenge have already been set aside.

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 Cabinet is asked to:

- Note progress with the Single Equality Scheme action plan and the findings from Equality Impact Assessments conducted during 20010/11 (Appendix A & B) and;
- Note that an external review (Diversity Peer Challenge) will take place on 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> February and be aware of the role of Members during this review.

### **Background Papers**

Single Equality Scheme

**Contact Officers:** Louise Sboui, Senior Policy Officer

☎ 01480 388032

[louise.sboui@huntsdc.gov.uk](mailto:louise.sboui@huntsdc.gov.uk)

## Appendix A - Single Equality Scheme Action Plan 2010/2013 (annual update November 2011)

Action	Responsibility	Target	Progress
<b>Knowing your community and equality mapping</b>			
Continue to research the needs of people with a disability in terms of access to services and information about our services through consultation, engagement with service users (and non users) and analysis of local, regional and national reports*	Policy	On going	Partial achievement
Explore the possibility of creating a profile of LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender) population and  Religion, Belief and non-Belief in Huntingdonshire – this was amended to equality mapping of people with a disability.	Policy	April 2011	Complete  Not yet commenced
Continue to encourage corporate approach to monitoring and analysis of equality monitoring	Policy	2011	Complete and on-going
Analyse results of 2011 Census (available from 2013) and take appropriate action	Policy	2013/14	N/A
Explore the possibility of Cambridgeshire wide interpretation and translation contract	Policy	April 2011	Complete – contract commenced December 2010
Continue to monitor take up of information requested in other languages or formats	Policy	On going	On going
Continue equality impact assessment of new or amended policies/ strategies/ services. Update performance management and service plans accordingly	All Heads of Service, COMT & Policy	April 2011	Complete and on-going
Continue to engage in relevant partnerships to share good practice in addressing equality related issues across Cambridgeshire e.g. Cambridgeshire Equality & Diversity Officer Network, Huntingdonshire Diversity Forum	Policy	Report progress on 2011	Complete and on-going Achieved via continued involvement with Cambridgeshire Equality & Diversity Officer Network, Huntingdonshire

Action	Responsibility	Target	Progress
			Diversity Forum, Cambridgeshire/Bedfordshire Cluster and Cambridgeshire Constabulary Hate Crime Co-ordination Group
Positive activities to raise awareness in the district of equality & diversity issues (events, publicity etc)	Community Initiatives & Policy	April 2011	Complete and on-going until April 2012
<b>Place shaping, leadership and organisational commitment</b>			
Consideration of becoming a Mindful Employer* HR & Policy April 2012	HR & Policy	April 2012	Not achieved
Assessment and publication of results of equality impact assessments	Policy	September 2010, April & October 2011	Complete and on-going
Report on progress with Single Equality Scheme action plan to Chief Officers, Overview & Scrutiny & Cabinet	Policy	September 2010 and November 2011	Complete
Publication of reviewed gender and disability and race equality schemes (as part of the Single Equality Scheme in 2010)	Policy	September 2010	Complete
Produce equality & diversity employee e-newsletters	Policy	4 per year	Complete
Produce a case study/example template that can be completed by employees to help them understand how the service they provide contributes to equality & diversity and to help the Council to highlight its commitment*	Policy	April 2011	Complete
Work towards confirmation of Achieving Council status (Equality Framework for Local Government) via a Peer Assessment in 2012.	Policy	September 2012	Peer assessment brought forward to February 2012
Develop new actions within this Single Equality Scheme to meet	Policy	Sept 2011	Complete



Action	Responsibility	Target	Progress
the requirements of the new Equality Act 2010			
Publish guidelines for employees and partner organisations regarding the impact of the Equality Act 2010. In addition to this, produce summary advice sheet for local employers on equality & diversity/employee related information*	Policy & economic development	April 2011	Complete
<b>Community engagement and satisfaction</b>			
Continue to engage with Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and other hard to engage groups (including older people) *	Community Initiatives & Policy	April 2011	Complete and on-going until April 2012
Support the development of community groups	Community Initiatives	April 2011	Complete
Continue to support the development of Huntingdonshire Faith Forum	Community Initiatives	April 2011	Complete and on going
Research existing disability forums (including learning disability and mental ill health) within the area which can be approached for consultation & engagement on disability issues.	Policy	April 2011	Partial completion, on-going work required
Monitor outcomes from Disability Equality Scheme review and Have Your Say event outcomes	Policy	April 2011	Complete
Ensure evidence of change for the consultation and engagement with children and young people	Policy	April 2011	Complete
Support the development of a children and young people 'friendly service' award	Policy	April 2011	Funding ceased, action not achieved.
New action - Support the development of Young Inspectors at One Leisure	External project officer	Establish three by March 2012	Huntingdon One Leisure already established
Continue with the Gypsy/Traveller consultation and engagement work to identify pitches locally	Planning		Complete and on-going
<b>Responsive services &amp; customer care</b>			
Consider better signage and facilities within Council buildings with	HQ	2012	Complete

Action	Responsibility	Target	Progress
public access*	accommodation group, Customer Services & Leisure		
Establish public access PC's at St Ives and St Neots	Customer Services	2011	Achieved at St Neots but St Ives Customer Service Centre closed.
Produce a simple easy to read guide to Council services	Policy	September 2011	Complete
Publicity to improve access by getting wheelie bins off pavements	Operations Division	April 2011	Complete
HDC will promote good practice in the design and maintenance of the public realm and on public transport, including access for disabled people, through the implementation of its planning policies and, where possible, influencing the County Council and local public transport providers.	Planning	April 2013	On-going
Ensure Huntingdon Shop Mobility is closely linked with Huntingdon town centre redevelopment.*	Planning & Community Initiatives	2012	On-going
Continue to support Papworth Trust work experience and shadowing placements*	Policy & Customer Services	April 2011	Delayed due to Papworth. On-going (Customer Services)  Countryside Services on-going
Continue to support St Neots International Community Group	Community Initiatives	December 2010	Complete
Promote and distribute the Moving Stories DVD Community Initiatives	Community Initiatives	December 2010	Complete

Action	Responsibility	Target	Progress
Support the Junior PCSO scheme with diversity awareness sessions	Community Initiatives	December 2010	Complete and on going until April 2012
Support the development of the ESOL action plan for Huntingdonshire and be part of the delivery group	Community Initiatives	April 2011	Complete
Support anti social behaviour case workers with diversity advice and support	Community Initiatives	December 2010	Complete and on going until April 2012
Analysis of hate crime figures to determine if any actions are required	Community Initiatives & Policy	April 2011	Complete and on going
<b>A modern &amp; diverse workforce</b>			
Explore how the Council can support transsexual and transgender employees	HR & Policy	2011	Not achieved.
Work with the county and other districts to explore feasibility of joint approach to LGBT employee network and LGBT countywide survey.	Policy	April 2011	Complete and on-going. Survey will not go ahead.
Analyse Equal Pay audit for equality issues. Set equality objectives where required	HR	April 2011	Work commenced. Policy has completed the work – waiting for next stage
Explore how best to include sexual orientation, religion and belief in HR employment monitoring	HR	April 2011	Complete and on going
Continue to collect and analyse previous year's employment (equality monitoring) data to produce monitoring and analysis of workforce profiles by equality categories. Set equality objectives where required	HR & Policy	April 2011	Complete and on going
Continue to build capacity amongst Council employees and Members through awareness training, information sharing sessions or newsletters. Identify employees who could receive	HR & Policy	Annual review	Complete and on-going

Action	Responsibility	Target	Progress
specific disability awareness training. Investigate how to ensure Operations Division employees can access Equality & Diversity training			Further work required
Analyse equality training database to identify % of staff received training and create target % for next 3 years	HR & Policy	April 2011	Complete
Promote all of the work life balance options	HR	2011	Complete
Improve disability disclosure amongst employees and Members. Consider 'hidden disabilities' training for managers or basic mental health awareness training for employees*	HR & Policy	2011	Partially complete  Training arranged
Work with the Richmond Fellowship to ensure that support for employees is available Customer Services 2011	Customer Services	2011	Complete - work commenced and on-going
Carry out a Local Labour Market Assessment HR & Policy 2012	HR & Policy	2012	Not complete
Analysis of One Leisure employee survey on awareness of equality & diversity. Use findings to tailor equality & diversity training for One Leisure employees.	One Leisure	2011	Complete

## Appendix B: Single Equality Scheme summary of findings from Equality Impact Assessments 2010-2011 (annual update November 2011)

### Findings from Equality Impact Assessments 2010-2011

Service	Summary and supporting actions
<b>Community Initiatives</b>	<p><b>July 2011</b> Proposed cuts in grant funding could be phased in from 2012/13, this will entail reduced funding for some community-delivered services from six voluntary sector organisations. All six organisations affected by these proposals have been involved in a systematic consultation process (meetings held June –July 2011). Meetings were held to discuss the potential impact of various levels of funding reduction and how negative impacts may best be managed. A refreshed EIA on the potential impact of these proposals was completed in September 2011 and the findings of this assessment have been made available to Members to inform their debates at Scrutiny (4-10-11), Cabinet (20-10-11) and Council (2-11-11); prior to any funding decisions being taken.</p>
<b>Planning Services</b>	<p><b>February 2011</b> This EIA examined the potential impact of proposed efficiency savings in the Capital Programme specifically within the Transportation function of Planning Services. <u>No adverse impact identified.</u> However, in relation to rural isolation, it must be noted that the Council budget relating to rural transport support i.e. Community Transport services, has been protected from budget cuts thereby seeking to mitigate the effects of rural isolation. <u>Action to support the service</u> - The Council will continue to maintain its work on Market Town Transport Strategies, Safe Cycle Routes, Local Transport Plan Bid, Bus Shelter Provision &amp; Railway Station Improvements and to seek scheme delivery via a range of other funding sources such as S.106 and the Sustainable Transport Fund and other options, possibly using external funding.</p>
<b>Customer Services Centres</b>	<p><b>December 2010</b> This EIA examined the potential impact of proposed efficiency savings relating to customer service provision in St Ives, Ramsey and Yaxley.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some impact in terms of gender as affected employees are female (but will be redeployed).</li> <li>• Although no evidence was found, it is likely that reduction in service will impact on disabled</li> </ul>

	<p>people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramsey and Yaxley currently record services offered for younger and older people. These include help with finding work, writing CV's, learning services, bus and rail passes, general issues around services offered by other organisations (e.g. age concern, pensions, other benefits, etc). Younger customers will still be able to access services specific for them via the libraries and with the neighbourhood management services. It was noted that older customers are often less mobile and may not be able to use their free bus pass to travel into Huntingdon. However, they will be able to use the free phone from Ramsey to contact the call centre or will be able to access the CAB for other general queries.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mitigating actions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicating the changes to all customers</li> <li>• Obtain costs for travelling into Huntingdon from other areas</li> <li>• Obtaining telephone line in Ramsey library</li> </ul> <p><b>Update July 2011</b> Overview &amp; Scrutiny panel have asked for an update in June 2012 as there was little to report at the July 2011 meeting as changes not yet into effect due to timescales involved with changing work practices.</p>
<p><b>Environmental Management</b></p>	<p><b>February 2011</b> This EIA examined the potential impact of proposed efficiency savings in the Capital Programme specifically, schemes around Environmental Improvements and Access. These schemes have provided in the past, help to parish and town councils with funding to help pay for and design expertise for public building conversions, renovations, improvements such as ramped entrances and improvements to pavements (improving access, signage and usage). This will impact most on older people, parents with young children, and those with a wide range of disabilities <u>Mitigating action</u> - Continue to provide advice and information to community building committees/parish councils etc concerning possible designs and alternative sources of funding, possibly using external funding.</p>
<p><b>Housing – Housing Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>December 2010</b> The Housing Strategy aims to provide direction for both private and social housing activity within the</p>

	<p>District.</p> <p>The Strategy was reviewed during 2010 and an EIA identified <u>no adverse impact</u>. However, vulnerable people e.g. people who have disabilities, persons fleeing domestic violence or harassment because of their ethnicity, sexuality or religion, could positively benefit from a strategy that provides, through direct service provision including advice, assistance and financial resources the opportunity for vulnerable people to live independently.</p>
<b>Housing – Homelessness Strategy</b>	<p><b>November 2010</b></p> <p>The Homelessness Strategy aims to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• address the causes of homelessness in the area</li> <li>• introduce initiatives to prevent homelessness wherever possible</li> <li>• provide sufficient temporary accommodation for those households that are or may become homeless</li> <li>• ensure that appropriate support is available for people who have previously experienced homelessness in order to prevent it happening again</li> </ul> <p>The Strategy was reviewed during 2010 and an EIA identified <u>no adverse impact</u></p>
<b>Home Improvement Agency</b>	<p><b>May 2011</b></p> <p>An EIA was undertaken to consider the operational and managerial merger of Huntingdonshire District Council's Home Improvement Service with that of South Cambridgeshire District's and Cambridge City Councils. <u>No adverse impact</u> has been identified, however <u>actions to support the merger</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a wider range equality questions in future monitoring forms and customer satisfaction survey</li> <li>• Analyse responses by equality groups to satisfaction surveys and benchmark against previous responses</li> <li>• It is proposed that Parish Councils be asked to promote the service and any detailed changes to it to ensure the service, and information surrounding it, remains accessible to a wide variety of applicants</li> </ul>
<b>Policy, Performance &amp; Partnership - Incremental Progression Framework for</b>	<p><b>July 2010</b></p> <p>The purpose of this policy is to promote a consistency of approach to achieve a measure of uniformity towards incremental progression for staff undertaking recognised qualifications. The policy includes</p>



<p><b>Qualification Success</b></p>	<p>specific guidelines for Apprentices, Technical Trainees, Professional Trainees, Professional/Management Qualifications The policy was reviewed and an EIA found that due to lack of monitoring and analysis, it is not currently known whether adverse impact taking place. <u>Mitigating action:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring Statistics on who receives incremental progression via examination success and numbers of trainees.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Democratic Services – Political Management Structure</b></p>	<p><b>April 2010</b> This function aims to provide an effective political management structure supporting sound, open, transparent and accountable decision-making. An EIA of this function found <u>no adverse impact</u> however there are a number of <u>actions to support the service</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise public awareness of the opportunities local people have to become councillors.</li> <li>• Investigate ways of giving local people more say in local decision making.</li> <li>• Have regard to the multi-faith Calendar when setting the Council’s Schedule of Meetings and Member Development Programme;</li> <li>• Offer equalities training to all Councillors</li> </ul>
<p><b>HR - Adverse Weather Policy</b></p>	<p><b>April 2010</b> The purpose of the policy is to set out the procedure for attending work in adverse weather conditions. The Council has a reasonable expectation that all employees will make every effort to carry on work as usual either by attending their normal place of work or working flexibly. An EIA found that due to lack of monitoring and analysis it is not currently known whether adverse impact taking place. <u>Mitigating action:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statistics to be recorded as and when adverse weather situations arise. HR to mail round to Activity Managers and record data.</li> </ul>
<p><b>HR – Disability at Work</b></p>	<p><b>November 2010</b> This policy aims to provide managers and employees with guidance on a range of support and reasonable adjustments that HDC can provide disabled employees to ensure they are supported at work</p>



	<p>an EIA of this new policy found <u>no adverse impact</u> but there were positive differential impact for disabled employees.</p> <p><u>Action to support this policy include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to collect and analyse previous year's employment (equality monitoring) data to produce monitoring and analysis of workforce profiles by equality categories. Set equality objectives where required.</li> <li>• Continue to build capacity amongst Council employees and Members through awareness training, information sharing sessions or newsletters. Identify employees who could receive specific disability awareness training</li> <li>• Improve disability disclosure amongst employees and Members. Consider 'hidden disabilities' training for managers or basic mental health awareness training for employees.</li> <li>• Work with the Richmond Fellowship to ensure that support for employees is available</li> <li>• Carry out a Local Labour Market Assessment</li> </ul>
<p><b>HR – Stress Management Policy</b></p>	<p><b>September 2010</b></p> <p>The policy aims to reduce the rate and duration of sickness absence from stress-related illness. Not currently known whether adverse impact taking place</p> <p><u>Mitigating actions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stress management policy will form part of the overall health, safety and welfare policy for the Council. Details will be circulated to all managers and employees after the meeting of the Employment Panel on 27 September 2010.</li> <li>• Advice and support will be provided on the new policy and toolkit to managers and employees by HR</li> <li>• Statistical information held by HR should be modified to include additional data to demonstrate compliance with equality legislation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>HR - Redundancy Policy</b></p>	<p><b>September 2010</b></p> <p>The aim of this policy is to provide a fair, consistent, and legal process through which to deal with redundancy whether voluntary or compulsory, responding to appeals against dismissal, dealing with redundancy payments and seeking suitable alternative work.</p> <p><u>No adverse impact identified, however an action to support this policy is proposed:</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider how to monitor the usage of the policy - Stats to be recorded as and when redundancy situations arise.</li> </ul>
<b>Attendance Management Policy</b>	<p><b>December 2010</b> The renewed policy provides guidance to ensure that sickness absence is handled promptly, sensitively and consistently by managers throughout the Council. It also provides guidance to employees on sickness absence and the potential consequences for their employment. <u>No adverse impact</u> identified however, monitoring is not currently carried out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raise awareness of this policy</li> <li>Monitoring of sickness absence – this is linked into encouraging disclosure of personal information, Equalities monitoring needs to be introduced for the policy</li> </ul>
<b>Revenue &amp; Benefits – Service Standards</b>	<p><b>March 2011</b> The aim of this policy is to set out the standards and level of service that we aim to provide to our customers across the whole remit of the service area. <u>No adverse impact</u> however there are a number of <u>actions to support</u> the document include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure that the make-up of the benefit caseload reflects the demographics of the district as a whole.</li> <li>To ensure staff are aware and trained on equality and diversity issues</li> <li>To ensure that the Council meets the service standards and take appropriate action where needed</li> <li>To publicise performance so that customers can see if service standards are being met.</li> </ul>
<b>Revenue &amp; Benefits – Landlords Policy</b>	<p><b>July 2010</b> The main objective of this policy is to set out the roles and responsibilities of the Council and landlords in the administration of Housing Benefit. The EIA found <u>no adverse impact</u> identified, however an <u>action to support this policy</u> is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff are trained on benefit regulations and equality and diversity</li> </ul>
<b>Car Parks Management</b>	<p><b>January 2010</b> An EIA found <u>no adverse impact</u>, however, the service does deliver a positive differential service for people with disabilities. Blue Badge holders are allowed to park for free in HDC car parks and there are</p>

	<p>special spaces for the disabled and some car parks specifically for the disabled. <u>Actions to support this service</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Investigate how to ensure Operations Division employees can access Equality &amp; Diversity training</li><li>• Continue to monitor appeals for any accusations of discrimination</li></ul>
--	---

This page is intentionally left blank

## NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS – CONSULTATION RESPONSES (Report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 At its meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2011, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) commenced a review of the Neighbourhood Forums in Huntingdonshire. At the time, it was agreed that the views of District Councillors, relevant County Councillors and Town and Parish Councils should be sought and reported back to the Panel in November. The purpose of this report therefore is to acquaint the Panel with the responses received.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In order to initiate the Panel's investigations, Councillors S J Criswell, J J Dutton and R J West were asked to draft a letter to all parties seeking their views on the Forums. When discussing the letter, it was agreed that it should also be sent to Partners. The letter was sent out on 21<sup>st</sup> September, requesting responses to be returned by the 28<sup>th</sup> October 2011.
- 2.2 Any subsequent responses, which have been received since the publication of the Panel's Agenda, will be reported at the meeting.

### 3. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 3.1 To date, a total of **30** responses have been received as follows:-

Town and Parish Councils – **15**  
District and County Council Members – **6**  
Partners - **9**

- 3.2 Of the **30** responses received, **25** had attended a Huntingdonshire Neighbourhood Forum meeting, **2** had not attended a Forum meeting, with **1** respondent suggesting the Council should explore the community engagement model adopted by East Cambridgeshire District Council and **2** not indicating their attendance either way.

#### (a) Town and Parish Council Responses

- 3.3 The following Town and Parish Councils have responded:-

Alconbury Weston	Old Hurst	Bury
Great Gransden	Spaldwick	Pidley-cum-Fenton
Great Staughton	St Neots Town	Earith
Huntingdon Town	Stow Longa	Buckden
Waresley-cum-Tetworth	Little Paxton	Chesterton

- 3.4 Of the **15** Town and Parish Council responses, **8** have indicated that they find the Neighbourhood Forums useful, with **3** respondents expressing contrary views. **3** Town and Parish Councils have not indicated a response either way and **1**

respondent stated that they were not aware of the Huntingdonshire Neighbourhood Forums.

3.5 A series of general comments on the Neighbourhood Forums have been received as follows:-

- The Forums are useful to raise local issues such as the presentation of Parish Plans and gaining Partner support on local community initiatives such as local Youth Groups.
- The Forums provide an opportunity to raise matters for discussion at future meetings whilst at the same time enable members of the public to air their views and concerns and meet their local Partner representatives.
- The Police attendance at these meetings are very useful and are the only means of communicating with the Police - in the absence of their presence at Parish Council meetings.
- The Forums have been successful in resolving a number of local issues raised by residents, which are very useful and informative.
- Focus needs to be placed upon smaller, more local areas within the District as it is felt that this would enable Forum meetings to be held more locally, thereby encouraging greater public attendance at the meetings.
- The public are generally not willing to travel great distances to attend a Forum meeting.
- Public attendance would largely depend upon the subject matter in question.
- Too much focus is placed upon issues affecting the Towns and the larger settlements. There is a view that smaller Parish views are often disregarded at the meetings as it is felt that they are not affecting enough people within the community.
- The meetings only attract attendance from local Councillors and Officer representatives from Partner organisations. It has therefore lost its public focus.
- The Neighbourhood Panels do not work effectively.
- Town and Parish Councils need to engage more effectively in the process.
- Some Parishes believe themselves to be different from their neighbouring communities and wish to retain their independence.
- More effective publicity needs to be undertaken in advance of the meeting and communications need to be strengthened.
- The Forum should be brought to the Town and Parish Council meetings.

3.6 In response to a question posed about whether or not local Forums should have decision making powers, **8** Town and Parish Councils agreed with this view and **1** did not comment either way. The **6** that disagreed with this statement commented that the proposals would, in effect, add a fourth tier to Local Government and that elected Members only should be responsible for making decisions on funding. In addition, comments have been received that if there is a large contingent from one area, then their views would carry more weight. This is regarded as being unfair, particularly when attendance at meetings is perceived as being inconsistent and not fully representative of the community. Furthermore, comment has been made that decisions should not be made without consultation with local Town and Parish Councils. Those in support of devolving decision making powers have commented that this would prompt constructive action being taken at Forum meetings and would deter the meetings from being a "talking shop". The view has been expressed that these proposals would add value to the Forums' role by making local issues more important. A comment has been received that this would only be successful if local Members had sufficient knowledge and contact with the local community to reflect

their needs and to vote accordingly. The same respondent also believed that the devolution of these powers would enhance public attendance levels at meetings.

- 3.7 When asking Town and Parish Councils whether or not they would be willing to nominate a representative onto a local Forum that would facilitate closer working between the three tiers of Local Government, **8** respondents indicated they would nominate a representative and **4** indicated that they would not as they were of the view that the issues discussed would not affect their local areas. **3** respondents did not indicate their support either way. Those in support of devolving decision making powers have commented that this would enable individuals at the heart of the community to make local decisions. It was also felt that Town and Parish Councillors are often closer to the public than their District or County Council representatives. It has however been commented that the smaller Parishes may find difficulties in sending a representative to attend these meetings.

**(b) District and County Council Member Responses**

- 3.8 The responses received from District and County Council Members were all received from District Councillors – **6** in total. **4** Members found the Forums useful, indicating that they provide an opportunity for local matters to be discussed by the community whilst at the same time enabling the public to talk to stakeholders directly. Views however were also expressed that policing issues often dominated the meetings and that the meetings are generally not well supported by the public.
- 3.9 **3** of the **6** District Members have expressed the view that local Forums should have decision making powers. It is felt that the Forums would enable local views to be sought and taken into account when making decisions of a local nature. Members who believe that such responsibilities should not be devolved, have made comments that it would raise the public's expectations about what could/could not be determined at Forum meetings, too many decision making bodies would cause confusion, they are not well enough attended to be decision making bodies, they are currently dominated by pressure groups and are therefore not truly reflective of the community. One Member comment has been received that the former Neighbourhood Policing Panels operated more effectively than the present arrangements.
- 3.10 Having been asked whether or not closer working between the three tiers of Local Government was desirable, **4** of the **6** Member respondents expressed support for it, with **1** respondent not commenting either way. The respondent who disagreed with this statement expressed the view that it would make it harder for the public to determine which authority was responsible for particular outcomes. **1** Member respondent who expressed support for this view commented that the existing format of the Forums would not be the best way to achieve this as their primary role is to give residents an opportunity to highlight issues. This Member has also made comment at the possible introduction of "Locality Panels" to comprise the Mayor/Chairman of Town/Parish Councils together with the relevant District and County Councillors, with the "Locality Panel" leading on the Neighbourhood Forums and having decision making responsibilities.
- 3.11 Members were provided with an opportunity to make further comments and/or observations on the Forums as necessary. A comment has been received that the Forums are unnecessary and should be reviewed. On the contrary however, a Member has commented that the Forums should not be abandoned as it would send out negative messages to communities that the Council and Partners does not want to listen to and/or engage with them. It has been suggested that special invitations

should be issued to the Town and Parish Councils with a view to engaging them more effectively in the process. A comment has also been received that decision making at Town and Parish Council level should be introduced on significant planning matters, such as large scale housing developments. Other comments which have been received relate to the inefficient use of Police time, the venues utilised for Forum meetings and the impact in terms of travel, the dates set for the Forum meetings and the low level of public attendees at such meetings.

**(c) Partner Responses**

3.12 **9** responses have been received from Partners as follows:-

Sector Inspector – **2**  
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service – **4**  
Parish Councillor (Panel Member) – **1**  
County Councillor (Chairman/Panel Member) – **1**  
Police Authority - **1**

3.13 **6** Partner respondents have indicated that they do find the Forums useful, with **1** respondent indicating that they are interesting but not very useful and **2** respondents not commenting either way. A series of comments on the Neighbourhood Forums have been received as follows:-

- The meetings provide an indication of local issues and problems that require attention by Partner organisations, thereby promoting local accountability.
- Face to face engagement with Partners is valued by the public. It also enables Partners to pick up on local community issues and respond to them, either on an individual organisation approach or by way of partnership working.
- Some frustration arises due to limited and true community representation at the meetings.
- The issues raised at some of the meetings by the public are generally of a minor nature that could be dealt with by other means.
- The community would not wait three months to raise a significant issue at the Forum meetings and would contact the relevant authority at the time. Whilst the intention to engage with the community is clear, the reality is often different.
- The Forums portray a perception that Partner organisations view this as a “tick box” exercise to demonstrate that they are communicating with the local community rather than being a real Forum where individual issues can be discussed.
- There is a perception that the priorities adopted at Forum meetings all need to be Police related. This is not the case as the priorities should be far ranging and should include other agencies taking the lead.
- The view has been expressed that the meetings are dominated by the Police.
- A comment has been received from one of the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue respondents that they often have very little input at these meetings.

3.14 **5** of the **9** Partner respondents have indicated that they have utilised the Forums for their own organisation’s consultation purposes.

3.15 A number of comments have been made by Partners for developing the Forums further:-



- Clearer roles and expectations for Officers and respondents would be advantageous at the meetings.
  - More effective publicity of the meetings, including the use of social media such as Facebook and Twitter and existing local newsletters/publications, should be undertaken to increase public attendance levels which are perceived to be low.
  - The Town and Parish Councils should make more effort to publicise the meetings.
  - The formal format of the meetings may put people off from attending.
  - Youth Groups and Town and Parish Councils should be more effectively engaged.
  - The Forums should be adapted to enable a greater variety and a number of community members to contribute in the priority setting process. It is suggested that key links between Partner organisations should be established and fed into the Neighbourhood Panels. This would remove the burden of people attending, which there evidently appears a little appetite for across the District.
  - Could the Forums go out to different venues at a different time of the day (eg schools and businesses)?
- 3.16 The Chairman of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Panel is amongst those Partners that have submitted responses. He wishes to draw the Overview and Scrutiny Panel's attention to the work undertaken by the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Panel in improving the effectiveness of Forum meetings. The Huntingdon Panel is currently investigating the idea of a "clearing house" where the Panel would meet separately and look at and respond to issues submitted by the community. It is felt that this would improve the current process as it enables the Neighbourhood Panel to identify issues being raised by groups and for them to either invite the groups to discuss the issues highlighted or to call a public meeting to discuss them openly. Another project being explored is working with and listening to the views of young people.
- 3.17 The idea of all three tiers of local government working together is supported by the Chairman of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Panel so long as they engage and respond to the views of the community and are not led by their own agenda. He went on to comment that it would be detrimental for residents if the Neighbourhood Forums were to come to an end. This view is also supported by 2 of the other Partner respondents.
- 3.18 In addition, the Police Authority response indicates that the future structure of the Neighbourhood Forums should take into account the election of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) in November 2012. The PPC would replace the existing 17 Police Authority representatives and have a wider responsibility for community safety as a whole. The Police Authority have indicated that a Police and Crime Panel will be established to assist with these new changes. Additionally, they have commented that the existing structure and format needs to be simplified to avoid confusing members of the public, rather than adding additional layers which could be portrayed as additional bureaucracy.
- 3.19 In commenting specifically on the Council's proposals for local decision making, the Police Authority wishes for clarification to be received on how and when various Partners would work together and what is required of each to fulfil obligations to local priorities. It has also been commented that the future arrangements for Neighbourhood Forums should also be considered alongside the review of the County Council's area Joint Committees, which are currently not attended by the

Constabulary or the Police Authority, but overlap in terms of considering road safety issues.

#### **4. OTHER MATTERS**

4.1 Town and Parish Councils and District and County Council Members were requested to identify which neighbouring settlements they defined as being part of their local communities. Responses were received as follows:-

- Alconbury, Alconbury Weston, Upton, Huntingdon and The Stukeleys.
- Huntingdon, Hartford, Stukeley Meadows and Hinchingsbrooke.
- Elton, Water Newton, Alwalton, Haddon, Folksworth, Stibbington, Yaxley, Stilton and Farcet.
- Great Gransden and Little Gransden.
- Abbotsley, Gamlingay and Great and Little Gransden.
- Little Gransden and Eltisle.
- St Ives and Old Hurst.
- Spaldwick, Stow Longa, Easton, Ellington, Barham & Wooley, Catworth, Bythorn & Keyston, Brington & Molesworth, Old Weston, Grafham and Buckworth.
- Bluntisham, Earith and Colne.
- St Neots
- St Neots and Little Paxton.
- Godmanchester.
- Warboys and Ramsey.
- Ramsey, Ramsey St Mary's, Ramsey Heights and Ramsey Forty Foot.
- Bury, Ramsey, Ramsey Forty Foot, Ramsey Mereside, Ramsey St Mary, Wistow, Warboys, Upwood, Great Raveley and Somersham.

4.2 At its meeting in September, the Panel requested updates on the discussions on the future of the Huntingdonshire Neighbourhood Forums being held between the District and County Councils and on Cambridgeshire Constabulary's Operation Redesign Community Engagement project. Officers will deliver these updates at the Panel's meeting.

#### **5. CONCLUSIONS**



5.1 Views have been requested from District Councillors, relevant County Councillors, Town and Parish Councils and Partners on the Neighbourhood Forums in Huntingdonshire. This report sets out the responses received to date. Any responses received after the publication of this report will be presented to the Panel at its meeting.

5.2 The Panel is requested to consider the information presented as part of its review of Neighbourhood Forums in Huntingdonshire and to identify how it wishes to pursue the study further.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Report and Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) held on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

Neighbourhood Forums Working File held by Democratic Services Section – includes Consultation Responses.

**Contact Officer:** Miss H Ali, Democratic Services Officer  
 01480 388006  
 [Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

CHIEF OFFICERS MANAGEMENT TEAM

13<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2011

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL  
(SOCIAL WELL-BEING)

1<sup>ST</sup> NOVEMBER 2011

CABINET

17<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2011

## VOLUNTARY SECTOR (Report of the Working Group)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 At its meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) decided to establish a Working Group to investigate the social value of the functions performed by the voluntary organisations that have Service Level Agreements with the Council. The idea for the study emerged from concerns over the impact on third sector organisations of the Council's proposals in the future to reduce the funding it awards to community organisations.
- 1.2 At the time, Councillors S Cawley and R J West and Mrs M Nicholas were appointed onto the Working Group, together with former Councillor Mrs K E Cooper who contributed to the study up until May 2011. Councillor S Cawley assisted up until June 2011 when Councillors K M Baker and Mrs P A Jordan were appointed onto the Working Group. In addition to investigating the social contributions made by the voluntary organisations, the Working Group has been tasked with making recommendations on alternative ways of supporting the voluntary sector. Councillor R J West has been appointed as the Working Group's *rapporteur*. The Working Group has met on six occasions over the ensuing months.
- 1.3 Prior to establishing the Working Group, initial discussions were held at the February 2011 Panel meeting with the Chief Executive of the Hunts Forum of Voluntary Organisations who delivered a presentation to Panel Members on the work of Hunts Forum and the role of the voluntary sector in Huntingdonshire. The former Manager of the Huntingdonshire Volunteer Centre and the Chief Executive of Hunts Forum have attended Working Group meetings, together with the Council's Healthy Communities Manager. Members of the Working Group are grateful for the assistance and support they have provided in the course of their investigations.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 As alluded to earlier, the study emerged from Members' concerns over the impact of the Council's budgetary proposals to reduce the level of grant awarded to the voluntary organisations by £277,000, which represented a 78% budget reduction in 2013/14. The voluntary organisations that the proposals relate to are listed below:-
  - Huntingdonshire Citizens Advice Bureaux
  - Hunts Forum of Voluntary Organisations
  - Huntingdonshire Volunteer Centre
  - Huntingdon Shopmobility
  - St Barnabas Community Learning Centre
  - Disability Information Services Huntingdonshire
- 2.2 During the planning stages of the study, clear and demonstrable links to the Council Plan were identified. The Council Priority to "Work in Partnership to Support Strong

Communities” contains specific activities such as “supporting and encouraging community-led activity” and “encouraging community involvement, volunteering and service”.

- 2.3 In addition to the Working Group’s investigations, the Head of Environmental and Community Health Services was tasked by Chief Officers to undertake a review of organisations within the voluntary sector that are funded by the Council, including those organisations that receive grant aid. This review has been concluded and has been considered by the Panel and the Cabinet at their meetings in October 2011. In that light, Members of the Working Group have been mindful of the need to ensure that investigations are not duplicated.

### **3. FINDINGS**

#### **(a) Supporting Documentation and Existing Information**

- 3.1 At the time the study was initiated, the Coalition Government acknowledged that local spending cuts to the voluntary sector was a potential repercussion of its decision to reduce the level of funding it awarded to local authorities. In that light, the Cabinet Office issued a series of guidance documents on this subject. These documents, which are listed below, have been circulated to Members of the Working Group and have been utilised during the course of the study:-

- Better Together – Preparing for Local Spending Cuts to the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Sector (Cabinet Office)
- Measuring What Matters – A Guide for Overview and Scrutiny Committees About Using “Social Return on Investment” To measure Social Value (Cabinet Office)
- A Guide to Social Return on Investment (Cabinet Office)
- First Steps in Monitoring and Evaluation (Charities Evaluation Services).

- 3.2 Having received these documents, Members have concluded that the methodologies outlined within them are costly, time consuming and require significant levels of resources. They have, therefore, decided to focus on whether and to what extent the voluntary organisations contribute towards the achievement of the key strategic areas outlined within the Council Plan.

- 3.3 In addition to the guidance, the Working Group has also review the existing commissioning agreements for each of the organisations listed in paragraph 2.1, which include details of their respective performance indicators and Members have expressed their satisfaction with the content of them. In reaching this conclusion, the Working Group has taken into account the Annual Report on Organisations Supported by Grants via Service Level Agreements, which had been prepared by the Head of Environmental and Community Health Services and presented to the Panel in July 2011. Members will recall that at the time the report was considered, the Panel expressed their satisfaction with the performance levels that have been achieved.

#### **(b) Hunts Forum of Voluntary Organisations**

- 3.4 The Chief Executive of Hunts Forum of Voluntary Organisations has been party to the Working Group’s investigations and has informed Members that 13 voluntary organisations are currently based at The Maple Centre, alongside Hunts Forum. The primary role of Hunts Forum is to act as a conduit between the District Council and

the numerous voluntary organisations within the District. There are 570 registered community and/or voluntary organisations in Huntingdonshire and of those 250 organisations are members of Hunts Forum. An organisation does not have to become a member of Hunts Forum to access its services.

- 3.5 Cambridgeshire County Council has recently reviewed its commissioning agreement with Hunts Forum. The new agreement came into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 and will cease on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012. Copies of the agreement have been circulated to Members of the Working Group for information.
- 3.6 As the only District-wide voluntary sector representative within the District, there are demands placed on Hunts Forum to attend various meetings, thereby preventing Officers from pursuing core business activities.
- 3.7 Officers of Hunts Forum spend a significant amount of time searching for sources of and applying for external funding. The application process requires numerous sources of evidence to be supplied, which is a further demand on Officers' time. If the District Council was to work in partnership with Hunts Forum in this area, there could be benefits for both organisations in terms of the knowledge and expertise gained and the income that is generated. This concurs with the comments made by Members at last month's Panel meeting, during consideration of the Voluntary Sector Review report, that the Council should offer support to the organisations that it currently commissions in their search for external and/or match funding.

**(c) Site Visits**

- 3.8 The Working Group has decided that the most effective way to conduct their investigations would be by undertaking visits to the voluntary organisations. Visits have been undertaken to three of the six organisations:-
  - Huntingdonshire Citizens Advice Bureaux
  - Disability Information Services Huntingdonshire
  - St Barnabas Community Learning Centre

The following paragraphs contain the Working Group's findings.

***Huntingdonshire Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB)***

- 3.9 The Working Group met with the CAB Manager and the Chairman of the Huntingdonshire CAB on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2011. The Working Group has acknowledged the valuable contributions made by its volunteers and the professional approach that is adopted by the organisation when offering advice and support to service users. These are achieved through a comprehensive training programme for volunteers.
- 3.10 The Huntingdonshire CAB Annual Report indicates that the Huntingdonshire volunteers in total worked 336 hours per week in 2011. The service they provide is free to the community.
- 3.11 The three main areas in which advice is delivered by the CAB relate to debt, benefits and employment. All three have social repercussions not only for the District but for the Country as a whole.

- 3.12 The role of the CAB in offering advice to its communities is acknowledged by the Government. Government forms advise applicants to contact their local CAB for advice on how to complete them.
- 3.13 Some CAB in other areas do not offer services to users who live in neighbouring local authority areas. This is because the local authorities that provide them with funding insist that it should only be utilised to serve those residing within their areas. Whilst this may be the case for some CAB across the Country, the Huntingdonshire Branch offers its services to non-Huntingdonshire residents and this equates to around 10% of queries.
- 3.14 CAB generally try to operate in a flexible way. Resources are deployed according to demand and prioritised in order of need. The organisation has recently re-established its opening hours, made more effective use of its telephony service and held drop in sessions as necessary. The CAB has demonstrated its willingness to embrace new technologies, with consideration shortly due to be given to extending its services to include the option of offering advice by email. The introduction of the "Gateway" interview process has already delivered efficiencies, with around 26% of queries concluded during the initial interview process.
- 3.15 It has been evident to that the CAB are responding to the challenges that its faces both in terms of financial pressures and increasing levels of demand. Historically, demands for the service have increased year on year. Statistics reveal a 9% increase in demand in March 2011, when compared to the same period the previous year. Plans to merge the Huntingdonshire, Ely and Fenland Bureaux with a view to generating efficiencies are in the early stages. The three Bureaux already share training resources.

#### ***Disability Information Services Huntingdonshire (DISH)***

- 3.16 On the 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011, Members met with the Manager of DISH.
- 3.17 DISH serves the whole of Huntingdonshire. It is co-located with Disability Cambridgeshire, which helps it to share expertise with that organisation. Most of its work is carried out through home visits. DISH has 2.5 FTE workers. Two representatives of DISH carry out 3 / 4 home visits per week. Each visit takes between 1 and 3 hours. It receives 12/1300 telephone enquiries per year. Levels of enquires are gradually increasing.
- 3.18 DISH has an additional project funded by RADAR to employ a voluneer co-ordinator to train volunteers and help them obtain qualifications. It will lose this funding shortly. It will also lose funding from Lloyds TSB Bank.
- 3.19 DISH helps adults and families on any issue in their dealings with organisations. It is able to assist with administrative procedures and fill out forms. Workers use the CAB systems to keep up to date with legislative changes. It receives referrals from CAB, NHS organisations and the Job Centre. Workers will attend GP surgeries if requested. One of the benefits of its work is that keeps individuals in their own homes. It also helps to prevent homelessness. A third benefit of its work is that it prevents and detects fraud.
- 3.20 Other benefits of the work of DISH are that it provides a route into work for its volunteers through giving them skills, work experience and confidence and it



provides feedback to public sector organisations on the way they operate, thereby enabling them to improve their procedures.

- 3.21 DISH undertakes its own fundraising activities. At one time, it employed a dedicated income generation officer but this initiative was not successful. The District Council's funding is required because DISH have to find match funding if they are to obtain money from other sources. More importantly, the other organisations that provide funding often stipulate that before it will make a contribution, applicants should be in receipt of funding from its local authority because it demonstrates the legitimacy of the organisation if it has this endorsement.

### ***St Barnabas Community Learning Centre***

- 3.22 The final site visit took place on the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011 when Members met with the Manager of St Barnabas Community Learning Centre. It has a crèche facility located within its premises.
- 3.23 The main function of the centre is that it is building, which is available to the community from 9.00am to 9.00pm Monday to Thursday. It is mostly used by members of the public to access its computers. There are approximately 20 casual drop-ins per week.
- 3.24 The Centre is also used by job seekers. It provides training on interview and recruitment skills. Staffline, a recruitment agency, uses the centre to source temporary workers for local businesses. It helps approximately 25 individuals per year to find employment. This is in addition to the recruitment of temporary workers.
- 3.25 50 / 60% of the Centre's clients are migrant families. It opens in the evening to help those who are in employment. It provides translation services, a qualification conversion service together with a basic English classes and signposts individuals to other service providers.
- 3.26 The Centre provides training courses in catering on behalf of the County Council.
- 3.27 The Centre is prevented from charging customers by the terms of its constitution. It does receive a small income from U3A for hosting classes.

### ***Huntingdon Shopmobility***

- 3.28 The Working Group has been informed of the background to the Shopmobility scheme which was established when Huntingdon Town Centre was pedestrianised. In addition to the site visits, Councillor R J West has undertaken a site visit at Huntingdon Shopmobility on the 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2011. Councillor West has met with the Manager and one staff member and has also been provided with an opportunity to speak to service users. The users have outlined the significant benefits that Shopmobility provides, which impacts greatly on their lives from both a user and a carer perspective. Shopmobility enables users to become independent for a few hours each week to do their shopping and run their errands whilst at the same time providing a number of social benefits. The contributions that these users make to the local economy have also been acknowledged by the Working Group.
- 3.29 The Working Group recommends that options for reducing the current level of expenditure by Shopmobility should be explored. The options might include looking

at cheaper rates for portakabins, enquiring whether retailers could assist with meeting some of the scheme's costs and exploring alternative accommodation sites.

**(d) Voluntary Sector Review Undertaken By The Head of Environmental and Community Health Services**

3.30 Reference has already been made to the review undertaken by the Head of Environmental and Community Health Services which was the subject of a report to the Panel last month. Prior to this, Members of the Working Group had met with the Healthy Communities Manager to discuss progress so that they could incorporate his work into their investigations.

3.31 Based on the information made available at the time, the Working Group has noted that the voluntary organisations have indicated that a 20% reduction in the level of grant funding they receive from the Council could be accepted but that service reductions would arise as a result. However, a 50% reduction in funding would jeopardise the future viability of some of the organisations. The Working Group is mindful that, for a majority of the organisations, the District Council is their core funder and that they are also subject to funding reviews by other organisations such as the County Council and NHS bodies.

3.32 On the basis of their findings reported above and given the differences in the levels of funding currently received by the organisations and the variations in the contribution it makes towards their operating costs, the Working Group recommend that a uniform rate of reduction across the organisations would not be appropriate.

3.33 The Working Group has acknowledged that each organisation contributes in some way towards the Council's priorities. In particular they assist with the priorities to "Help Vulnerable and Disabled People to Live Independently" and "Work in Partnership to Support Strong Communities".

3.34 The Working Group's attention has been drawn to a number of opportunities for reducing the voluntary organisations' costs and for achieving efficiency savings. These are as follows:-

- moving into office accommodation at Pathfinder House;
- the possibility of merging with other voluntary organisations offering similar services with a view to reducing/sharing management costs; and
- reviewing the way in which organisations deliver their services, especially utilising advances in technology wherever possible.

3.35 Having regard to moving into accommodation at Pathfinder House, it has been reported that the Council's Facilities and Administration Manager is currently exploring this through the "Making Assets Count" Countywide initiative. The Working Group supports this action.

3.36 Referring to the other two suggestions, the Working Group has endorsed the recommendation that the voluntary organisations should explore merging with other voluntary organisations and review the way in which they deliver their services.

**4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 The Working Group has investigated the social value of the functions performed by the voluntary organisations that have Service Level Agreements with the Council.

Members of the Working Group have acknowledged the valuable contributions made by the organisations to the Council's aims and, outside the terms of their SLAs, the impact that each has on the wider social environment. The challenges faced by the Council in making future budgetary decisions is one that has been recognised not just by the Working Group but by all Members across the authority. The recommendations proposed by the Working Group have been considered in terms of their ability to inform the Council's future budgetary decisions and offering alternative support to the voluntary organisations.

- 4.2 The Panel is requested to endorse the findings and views of the Working Group for circulation to all Members for consideration during their deliberations on the budget later in the year.



## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Minutes and Reports of the meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) held on 1<sup>st</sup> February and 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011.

Notes of the meetings of the Working Group held on 28<sup>th</sup> March, 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 23<sup>rd</sup> August and 12<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

Voluntary Sector Working File held by Democratic Services Section.

Report by the Head of Environmental and Community Health Services – Voluntary Sector Review – to Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) and Cabinet at their meetings on 4<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> October 2011 respectively.

**Contact Officer:** Miss H Ali, Democratic Services Officer  
 01480 388006  
 [Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Habbiba.Ali@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Scrutiny Committee**

### **ADULTS, WELLBEING AND HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

15<sup>th</sup> September 2011



Cambridgeshire  
County Council

#### **Action**

#### **21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members declared the following personal interests under paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct:

- Councillors Heathcock, Kenney, V McGuire, Read and West as members of Cambridgeshire Older People's Enterprise (COPE);
- Councillor V McGuire by reason of working for caring agencies as a carer;
- Councillor S Brown as a Member of the Mental Health Trust and as an active participant in Cambridgeshire Local Involvement Network (LINK)

#### **22. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING – 7<sup>th</sup> JULY 2011**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2011, were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **23. PROPOSALS FOR ACUTE STROKE SERVICES FOR HUNTINGDONSHIRE RESIDENTS**

The Committee considered a report on proposals for acute stroke services for Huntingdonshire residents.

Attending from NHS Cambridgeshire to present the report and answer members' questions were:

- Dr Gina Radford, Public Health Consultant
- Dr Christine Macleod, Head of the Public Health Network

Introducing the report, Dr Radford advised that stroke was one of the top three causes of death in the UK, and the biggest cause of adult disability. In the last few years, treatment has improved dramatically, and if treated quickly, patients may have a more positive outcome.

In 2007, the Department of Health issued the National Stroke Strategy. The Stroke Strategy identifies the key phase as the first 72 hours, and the importance of transferring suspected stroke patients to specialist units as soon as possible, so they can be given Thrombolysis, treatment with a clot busting drug, if appropriate: it was estimated that this could prevent 500 deaths a year. Since 2009, any patient eligible for Thrombolysis have gone to Peterborough or Addenbrookes Hospitals. Change was proposed to current arrangements to reflect both this change in treatment and the need for care to take place in increasingly specialised stroke units – due to its size, treatment at Hinchingsbrooke was not viable. The three options for future provision were

outlined. The preferred option was to repatriate patients to Hinchingsbrooke as soon as possible, once their hyperacute treatment had been completed at Addenbrookes or Peterborough.

In the course of discussion, members:

- asked what happened when someone had a stroke in the community and was transported to hospital by ambulance. Dr Radford advised that currently ambulance staff do a 'FAST' test if stroke was suspected, and a more detailed test was then undertaken in the A&E unit;
- asked why Option 1, the preferred option, was so much more expensive, as this was likely to be a key question from the public. Dr Radford advised that it was due to the way the tariff was split, so that enough was being paid for both the hyperacute and acute phases. It was noted that the detailed financial information was available publicly, and would be circulated to the Committee;
- asked what the impact would be of ambulances having to travel further in fairly rural areas of the county, and therefore reducing the ability of the ambulance service to provide services to other residents. The problem of frequent congestion on the A14, and the possibility of delays in getting to Addenbrookes and receiving treatment, was also raised. Dr Radford advised that the East of England Ambulance Service had been involved in the consultation from the start, and would ensure that this did not impact on services. It was pointed out that this was already being done for some patients, so it was not an entirely new pathway;
- noted that the repatriation to Hinchingsbrooke after the hyperacute phase only applied if Hinchingsbrooke was the patient's nearest hospital;
- queried the progress of Hinchingsbrooke in developing its rehabilitation, and how this was being assessed. Dr Radford advised that Stroke Metrics were moving from the acute to the rehabilitation phase of assessing stroke care, and work was underway so that services could be monitored and performance compared;
- queried the ability of Peterborough Hospital to cope with additional patients, observing that Peterborough was already experiencing difficulties in terms of capacity. Additionally, there were strong rumours that the City Care Centre in Peterborough was going to close, and this was where the Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy services for residents in north Huntingdonshire were accessed. Dr Radford advised that Peterborough colleagues had been actively involved from the start of the process, and they had given reassurances that they had the resources. She stressed that a relatively small number of patients were involved overall, and that less than 40% of those would be going to Peterborough. Rehabilitation services for the majority of Huntingdonshire patients would be provided by CCS within Huntingdonshire;
- noted how the consultation was being promoted and members of the public were being engaged in the process;
- noted that funding had been identified for Option 1, as this work had been identified as a priority; however, in response to concerns expressed, it was confirmed that Option 1 was not a 'done deal', and that this was a genuine consultation;

J Belman

- whilst acknowledging that Hinchingsbrooke was in a difficult position, queried the rationale behind making Huntingdonshire patients travel further, when the first hour was the most important. Dr Radford advised that the first 72 hours were the most crucial in the treatment of stroke patients. She added that only around three patients would be diverted from Hinchingsbrooke each week. It was very difficult to recruit individuals with the necessary expertise, and ensure that they have exposure to a sufficient number of cases to maintain their skills at a small unit such as Hinchingsbrooke;
- noted that the eligibility for clot-busting drugs depended on other medications a patient may be taking, and being able to administer the drugs with the first three hours following the onset of stroke symptoms;
- commented that the best outcome for the patient was the priority;
- noted that the Huntingdonshire GPs supported the consultation;
- asked why Hinchingsbrooke could not develop the specialised facilities, given that they were available at the James Paget Hospital. Dr Radford advised that James Paget Hospital was considerably larger (47%) than Hinchingsbrooke, and the catchment population of that hospital was much older.

The Chairman thanked Dr Radford and Dr Macleod for their attendance and participation.

The Committee agreed to delegate to the Scrutiny and Improvement Officer to examine and respond to the proposals in the consultation, with the Chairman of the Committee and the members of the Hinchingsbrooke Working Group, taking account of the Committee's comments. It was further agreed that copies of the presentation be circulated to County Councillors with Huntingdonshire Divisions.

#### **24. CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED REDESIGN OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACROSS CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH: PROPOSAL TO SET UP A JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report on the need to set up a joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee (OSC) with Peterborough City Council to consider proposals for the redesign of mental health services in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

It was noted that whilst the County Council's Adults Wellbeing and Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee had delegated powers enabling it to appoint to the joint Committee, those appointments had to be done on the grounds of political proportionality. Any appointments which deviated from political proportionality would need to be agreed at a full Council meeting. As the Committee was keen to appoint Councillor Sales, due to his experience in this area, the appointments would therefore need to go to the full Council meeting in October. It was confirmed that prior to the full Council meeting there would be discussions between the Group Leaders, taking into account the views of this Committee. The Committee proposed that the five County Councillors appointed to the joint Committee should be Councillors Kenney, V McGuire, Sales and two Liberal Democrat appointees.

Members:

- asked why five Peterborough City Council Members should be appointed to the joint Committee, when on a population basis, Peterborough was the much smaller partner. It was clarified that the proposal was to offer Peterborough City Council *up to* five places on the joint Committee;
- agreed unanimously that it was extremely regrettable that the joint Committee could not be appointed until October, given that both the Committee and Group Leaders agreed to waive the political proportionality criterion and appoint Councillor Sales to the joint Committee. Officers agreed that it was regrettable but this was unavoidable constitutionally. It was further clarified that substitutes would have to be of the same political party as the full Member;
- noted that arrangements would be made to have the first meeting of the joint committee as soon as possible after the full Council meeting in October;
- clarified the Cambridgeshire representative had to be County Councillors, as the Committee's District Members were co-optees.

The Committee agreed to the establishment of the joint committee, and to the appointment of members by Council, as detailed in the report.

## **25. REVIEW OF HOME CARE SERVICES: UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report on the work undertaken by the adult social care working group to review home care services.

The Committee noted that members of the working group were:

- meeting with care agencies, groups of care workers and Age UK to identify issues and areas for improvement;
- accompanying monitoring officers on visits;
- interviewing individuals with experience as care workers or service users;
- reviewing complaints and comments data.

Members had grouped issues under the headings of travel, training, culture, support and safety, and suggested that these areas should be the focus of future scrutiny.

The Chairman invited Councillor F Brown to speak. Councillor Brown outlined his strong concerns relating to the current arrangements for home care services, particularly in relation to the terms and conditions of agency care workers, including travel and communication. He also expressed concern on contract arrangements with agencies, e.g. 'no shows' of care workers, but fees still being payable to agencies. He further suggested that the good carers who deliver home care should be rewarded appropriately.

The Chairman thanked Councillor F Brown for his comments, and advised that the working group would be more than happy to meet with him to discuss these issues further. He added that the problem was that there were often numerous anecdotal cases, but hard evidence – e.g. from carers or service users – was required to take issues forward.

Members raised the following issues:

- the need for better organisation within and between agencies was required to make the workload more logistical and sensible;
- the real risk of many smaller care agencies going out of business;



- concerns over what was being missed in terms of abuse, to both service users and carers;
- many carers travel long distances between calls but were not recompensed for their time travelling these distances;
- the most disadvantaged were often unable to give their view on their care;
- home care visits often only last 15 minutes, which was not enough time to either do much practically, or listen to service users;
- home care services had deteriorated since they had been outsourced, and there were huge problems with the current model, especially in rural areas;
- many service users only had praise for the services they received, reflecting that there were many good carers;
- that self-directed care packages should be addressing some of these issues. Officers advised that this had not happened as quickly as expected, due to a number of problems that had not been anticipated e.g. relatives who provided care taken over thresholds for benefits or taxation.

The Committee noted the report.

## **26. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME 2011/12**

The Committee considered and agreed its updated work programme, noting the following issues:

- the implications of the health and social care bill, and commissioning in particular, in the Committee's work;
- that the Children & Young People's Services Overview and Scrutiny may undertake work on Children's Mental Health;
- the new Section 75 agreement for older peoples and adult mental health services was on the Cabinet agenda plan, and would be considered at the December Committee meeting;
- that some aspects of the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Programme were working well, but others were not. It was noted that the Enterprise, Growth & Community Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee were scrutinising the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Programme;
- It was agreed that the Adult Social Care Group would look at issues emerging from the Integrated Plan, and have discussions with senior officers. It was agreed that Councillor Sedgwick-Jell would join that group.

The Committee agreed the priorities and work programme.

*The Committee adjourned for lunch and a presentation on the Health & Wellbeing Board.*

## **27. ADULT SOCIAL CARE – REVIEWING PROGRESS AGAINST THE INTEGRATED PLAN: BUDGETARY POSITION AND MAINTAINING AND MONITORING QUALITY OF SERVICE**

The Committee considered an assessment of progress against the Integrated Plan objectives for 2011-12.

The following officers and Members were present to answer questions on this item:

- Councillor C Hutton, Cabinet Member for Adult Services;
- Claire Bruin, Service Director: Strategy & Commissioning (Adult Social Care);

- Simon Willson, Head of Regulation, Performance and Business Support.

Members noted the report, particularly information on savings made, projects to transform and modernise the service, and actual and predicted performance and risks. A particular feature in the report was the enhanced information on user experiences.

Arising from the report, Members:

- noted how the ASC Performance Review Star diagram attempted to represent visually the complex range of information and interrelationships involved in performance – this model was being further enhanced to show weightings, etc;
- commented that the Committee had previously been reassured that the various projects such as reablement would reduce the overspend, but this did not appear to be happening: was it not the case that not enough was budgeted in the first instance? Councillor Hutton responded that fewer people were going into residential care and there were more having domiciliary care. Reablement was designed to reduce the pressure, although it had not been as fast as originally anticipated, although there was a lot of work going on to remedy that, and she was still confident that reablement would have a significant effect on the budget;
- raised the issue of the gap between the amount the Council pays for domiciliary care (around £16 per hour) and the amount carers receive (around £6 per hour). Officers advised that payments to staff in care agencies varied, due to issues such as anti-social hours, and was not as straightforward as suggested. Detailed information could not be provided, as there were around 40 agencies involved;
- asked how the £7.7M overspend was being reduced. Councillor Hutton advised that there had been a huge amount of work over the summer and the budget was under closer control. She stressed that the £7.7M was the predicted overspend as at year end (31/03/12);
- asked how standards of service delivery were being maintained – what was happening “at the sharp end”? Councillor Hutton advised that there had been a tendency to provide a basket of services regardless of individual need. The approach now was to tailor these services more appropriately to meet individual need, and also keep people out of the system. The problems in earlier months were starting to be addressed. Substantial and critical needs are being met;
- queried how if 116 fewer people were being looked after, the cost and the number of complaints had increased. Councillor Hutton advised that whilst there were indeed fewer people in residential and nursing homes, those that remained there tended to be the more complex cases, which was why the costs had increased. The increase in complaints was mainly attributable to a change in the way complaints were recorded: complaints for older people’s care was formerly monitored and recorded by Cambridgeshire Community Services, but this function had transferred to the Council: there was no evidence to suggest there had been a real increase in the number of complaints received. However complaints remained an issue of concern, particularly those relating to communication;
- commented that reablement was essentially a one-off measure: whilst it would delay service users coming into the system, ultimately there would be diminishing returns, as those individuals came back into the system later with more severe needs, or lived longer. It may even lead to a surge of service

- users further down the line;
- noted that paragraph 3.6 of the report should read “The action plan includes better use of extra care sheltered housing...” A Member commented many sheltered housing schemes across the county had been losing their wardens, so this type of care was not always an option for many service users;
- noted that the reference to a ‘deep dive’ review of the service’s budget meant a very detailed review which considered every aspect;
- asked if any of the Service’s senior managers went out to canvass the views of service users on an independent basis. The Service Director replied that she did this whenever her time permitted, as did other managers within the service;
- discussed the user experience figures, suggesting that it would be helpful to have a wider spread and comparator figures in future reports, so that direction of travel could be assessed;
- expressed concerns about the viability of care agencies over the coming years, and issues around communication and scheduling of appointments for domiciliary care. It was also suggested that the annual hunt for even more efficiencies would lead to degradation of service for service users;
- noted the difficulties experienced by some groups of service users to complain, the plight of which highlighted by groups such as “Speaking Up” – it may be better to ask questions such as “what are the best and worst things about your care” to get a more representative view – Councillor Hutton commented that this may be a constructive approach.

The Chairman summarised the Committee’s comments and recommendations, arising from the report and presentation:

- issues on user experience to be considered;
- the Committee would receive a further progress report at their next meeting;
- the report was not easy to understand, and many Members found the report ambiguous;
- the report should be despatched at the same time as the agenda;
- it was difficult to get a feel for the standards of service delivery from the report;
- there were established errors in last year’s Integrated Planning assumptions;
- future reports should provide a clearer presentation of finances, and also highlight service failings.

## **28. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DEMENTIA SERVICES: RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee considered the responses to the recommendations of the Committee’s member-led review of access to care, support and advice for people with dementia and their carers following diagnosis.

The following were present for this item:

- Councillor C Hutton, Cabinet Member for Adult Services;
- Pat Harding, Acting Executive Director: Community & Adult Services
- Claire Bruin, Service Director; Strategy and Commissioning (Adult Social Care)
- Dr Emma Tiffin, GP Older Peoples Mental Health Lead;
- Cathy Mitchell, Director of Integrated Commissioning, NHS Cambridgeshire

- Annette Newton, Director of Operations; John Hawkins, General Manager, Older People's Mental Health, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust
- Jackie Galwey, Assistant Director of Operations Care at Home Division, Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust
- Clare Warner, Commissioning Service Improvement Manager for Mental health NHS Cambridgeshire & Peterborough;
- Richard O'Driscoll, Head of Older People's Commissioning, NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

Councillor Shepherd had presented the member-led review of dementia services to Cabinet, who had accepted most of the recommendations in full, and partially accepted those recommendations where the County Council did not have unilateral responsibility for specific services. Following the Cabinet meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2011, there had been a number of meetings with partners to take these issues forward.

The Committee:

- noted that value would be added in terms of user experience, partnership working and audit;
- noted that the greatest improvement would be in supporting those older people who were currently unsupported – previously the focus had been on those with advanced dementia, but partners were now looking to support those with early stage dementia (including early onset) and other mental health problems;
- noted that there was a greater focus by the PCT on carers, and this was being addressed in the strategy;
- asked if there was some mechanism whereby the Committee could have feedback and experiences from service users. It was suggested that this would be best achieved through the service user engagement worker, and from information that had already been gathered on service user experiences: this would be circulated to the Committee via the Scrutiny & Improvement officer;
- discussed access to information by users and carers, and how this was monitored. It was noted that (i) service users and their carers would have a named support worker who acted as their contact point, (ii) there were also a range of feedback loops and (iii) signposting would be provided to appropriate agencies;
- noted that a broader range of services would be offered through day therapy services, including music and art therapies, in more central, accessible locations, and funded through core budgets;
- in response to a question on whether there was direct contact or signposting from agencies such as The Samaritans, it was noted that such organisations did not usually work in that way;
- in response to a question on memory clinics, noted that work was ongoing to identify other ways of providing the service that memory clinics provided, as there were no plans to expand these;
- noted that GPs welcomed the higher profile being given to Older People, especially Mental Health, and the focus on increasing capacity and upskilling GPs;
- observed that local support groups usually relied on word of mouth, and signposting to these services were critical. Details of support groups were

- also included on [www.cambridgeshire.net](http://www.cambridgeshire.net) ;
- asked about the roll out of the primary care project, and what it looks like on the ground, in terms of resources and staffing. The Committee was advised that there were twenty posts in Huntingdonshire and Fenland, and some had been recruited to already. There would also be link workers for GP practices;
- asked how many dementia advisers there were in total, and how secure the funding was for those posts. It was noted there were four posts across the county;
- noted it was difficult to ensure that GP training was taken up, but GPs were generally very receptive.

The Chairman invited a member of the public to speak. The speaker suggested that the focus needed to be broadened, and the whole of the national strategy reviewed. Also, the pressure on carers should not be underestimated, as the stress of care was constant.

The Chairman thanked all of those who had participated in the discussion. The Committee agreed to consider the forthcoming older people's mental health strategy and action plan at a future meeting, and to reconvene the original dementia Member Led Review panel.

## **29. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY AND THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

The Committee received a report on the arrangements for developing an effective relationship between Overview & Scrutiny, the shadow Health & Wellbeing Board, and GP commissioning. Councillor M Curtis, the Cabinet Member for Health & Wellbeing, and Pat Harding, Acting Executive Director: Community and Adult Services, answered questions.

The Scrutiny and Improvement Officer reminded Members of the requirement to set up a Health and Wellbeing Board to 'join up' healthcare, social care and public health commissioning. Committee Members were asked their views on how they saw scrutiny fitting in with the process and emerging structure of relationships between the various bodies. Councillor Curtis welcomed a strong scrutiny function to the Board from the outset, and suggested that there may be a role for the Overview function in determining the priorities of the Board.

Members:

- noted Councillor Curtis's comments that he would be talking to GPs on the county's borders, where patients may be served by hospitals outside Cambridgeshire e.g. Peterborough;
- stressed the importance of addressing the democratic deficit, i.e. making healthcare more accountable. Councillor Curtis stressed the importance of a small but efficient Health & Wellbeing Board, and the opportunities for others to feed in to the Board;
- stressed the need for the Board's Constitution and Terms of Reference to be flexible enough to adapt and develop;
- received reassurance from Councillor Curtis that the Board would not procrastinate;
- discussed possible priorities and areas for investigation by the Board;
- suggested that information on the Board be disseminated through appropriate channels to all Members, including District, Town and Parish Councils.

The Committee:

1. agreed that the existing member group (Councillors Kenney, K Reynolds, West, King, Sales, Shepherd, O'Reilly and M Cornwell) plus Cllr Sedgwick-Jell would continue to liaise with the Shadow Board and with the emerging clinical commissioning arrangements, and report and make recommendations to the Committee, as appropriate;
2. agreed that the report from the Centre for Public Scrutiny health reforms scrutiny project would be circulated when it was available.

### **30. CALLED IN DECISIONS**

There were no called in decisions.

### **31. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2011 at 2.30pm.

Members of the Committee in attendance: County Councillors K Reynolds (Chairman), N Guyatt, G Kenney, S King, V McGuire, P Read (substituting for Cllr Yeulett) P Sales, M Smith, G Heathcock (substituting for Cllr Whelan); District Councillors S Brown (Cambridge City), R West (Huntingdonshire) and S Willows (East Cambridgeshire, substituting for T Cornell)

Apologies: County Councillors Austen, Shepherd, Whelan and Yeulett; District Councillors T Cornell (East Cambridgeshire), M Archer and M Cornwell (Fenland)

Time: 10.30am – 4.05pm  
Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANELS**  
**(SOCIAL WELL-BEING)**  
**(ECONOMIC WELL-BEING)**  
**(ENVIRONMENTAL WELL-BEING)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> NOVEMBER 2011**  
**3<sup>RD</sup> NOVEMBER 2011**  
**8<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2011**

**WORK PLAN STUDIES**  
**(Report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services)**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to allow Members of the Panel to review their programme of studies and to be informed of studies being undertaken by the other Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

**2. STUDIES**

- 2.1 The Council has a duty to improve the social, environmental and economic well-being of the District. This gives the Overview and Scrutiny Panels a wide remit to examine any issues that affect the District by conducting in-depth studies.
- 2.2 Studies are allocated according to the Overview and Scrutiny remits. Details of ongoing studies being undertaken by the two other Panels are set out in the attached Appendix.
- 2.3 Members are reminded that if they have a specific interest in any study area which is not being considered by their Panel there are opportunities for involvement in all the studies being undertaken.

**3. RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 The Panel is requested to note the progress of the studies selected.

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Minutes and Reports from previous meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

**Contact Officers: Miss H Ali, Democratic Services Officer**  
**01480 388006**

**Mrs A Jerrom, Member Development Officer**  
**01480 388009**

**Mrs C Bulman, Democratic Services Officer**  
**01480 388234**

**ONGOING STUDIES**

<b>STUDY</b>	<b>OBJECTIVES</b>	<b>PANEL</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>TYPE</b>
<p>Visitor Development &amp; Town Centre Vibrancy</p>	<p>To consider issues relating to Visitor Development &amp; Town Centre Vibrancy.</p>	<p>Economic Well-Being</p>	<p>Further information requested on the cost of the tourism service and the benefits it brings to both the Council and to the District.</p> <p>Noted that Tourism activity is not currently being undertaken. Study is on hold until circumstances change.</p>	<p>Whole Panel Study</p>
<p>Leisure Centre Financial Performance and Employment Structure</p>	<p>To review the overall financial performance and monitoring arrangements. To consider the current / future business structure.</p> <p>To consider whether an increase in income might be made by charging non-residents of the District a higher rate to use the Council's leisure centres.</p>	<p>Economic Well-Being and Social Well-Being</p>	<p>Meetings of the Working Group held on 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 28<sup>th</sup> April, 23<sup>rd</sup> June and 1<sup>st</sup> September 2011.</p> <p>Expected to conclude in the new year. Further meeting to be held on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2011.</p> <p>Interim report submitted to Cabinet on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2011. Cabinet requested the Executive Councillor for Organisational Development to review the Council's IT costs, including the basis upon which the IT network service is re-charged to users.</p>	<p>Working Group</p>



A14 improvements.	To review the implications to the local economy of the decision not to proceed with the A14 improvements.	Economic Well-Being	Agreed to invite a representative of the Highways Agency to a future meeting to discuss their plans in the event of an interruption to traffic flow.	Whole Panel Study.
Tree Strategy	To form a strategy in conjunction with the Tree Officers for the retention and planting of trees.	Environmental Well-Being	Working Group met on 27 July 2011. Draft Tree Strategy circulated to officers for comment. Councillor Davies reported to September meeting and Strategy will be presented to the Panel in due course.	Working Group.
Land Use for Agricultural Purpose in the context of planning policies and its contribution to the local economy.	To review the lack of promotion and protection of land for this purpose.	Environmental Well-Being	Scoping report to be submitted to a future meeting.	To be determined.
Rural Transport	To review the provision of transportation in rural areas.	Environmental Well-Being	Transport for Cambridgeshire report received in July 2011. Comments conveyed to Cabinet. Final report expected shortly.	To be determined.
Maintenance of Water Courses	To receive a presentation on the maintenance arrangements in place for Water Courses within the District.	Environmental Well-Being	Presentation given to October meeting. SUDs report due in January 2012.	To be determined.
Waste Collection and Recycling Policies	To investigate the Council's waste collection and recycling policies.	Environmental Well-Being	Working Group met in October. Policies being prepared by Eric Kendall to	To be determined.

			be presented to the Working Group for comment prior to submission to the Panel.	
District Council Support Services	To review the District Council's support services.	Economic Well-Being	Preliminary information to be submitted to the November Panel meeting.	To be determined.
Development of the Alconbury Airfield site.	To consider the implications for the local economy from the establishment of a local enterprise zone on the former Alconbury Airfield site.	Economic Well-Being	Presentation to be given to November Panel meeting.	To be determined.

#### POSSIBLE FUTURE STUDIES

The Employees Performance Development Review Process	To review the current process.	Economic Well-Being	Amendments to the Performance Related Pay System are being considered as part of the current years pay negotiations and the consultation on pay structure.	To be determined.
Business Rates	To consider the implications to the Authority from changes to Business Rates.	Economic Well-Being	Report to be prepared when further information is available.	To be determined.

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date for Future Action
<p><b>13/05/09</b></p>	<p><b><u>Future Governance of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital: Consultation Arrangements</u></b></p> <p>This item was transferred over from the former Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Service Delivery). Dr Stephen Dunn, Hinchingsbrooke Next Steps Project Co-ordinator and Ms Jessica Bawden, NHS Cambridgeshire attended the Panel's January meeting to provide background to the consultation on the future governance arrangements for Hinchingsbrooke Hospital. Advised the Panel that the consultation was likely to commence at some point in the middle of the current calendar year.</p>	<p>Panel to partake in the consultation when it emerges. Matter to be raised at a future Panel meeting.</p>		
<p><b>01/09/09</b></p>	<p>Panel advised that Councillor S J Criswell had been appointed as the District Council representative on the Stakeholder Panel.</p>			
<p><b>07/12/10</b></p>	<p>Subject to approval from the Department of Health and other regulators, Chairman announced that Circle has been appointed to take over the management contract of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2011.</p>			
<p><b>5/04/11</b></p>	<p>Representatives of Circle presented details of their operating model and vision to be employed once they have assumed responsibility for the governance of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital. Agreed to come back to the Panel to update Members on progress with the mobilisation phase of the project.</p>			<p>TBC</p>

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date for Future Action
<p><b>18/05/11</b></p> <p><b>7/06/11</b></p>	<p><b><u>Corporate Plan – Growing Success</u></b></p> <p>Councillors S J Criswell and R J West appointed to Corporate Plan Working Group.</p> <p>The Panel expressed their wish for continued involvement by overview and scrutiny in monitoring the performance of the new Council Plan.</p>	<p>Process of monitoring yet to be determined.</p>		<p><b>TBC</b></p>
<p><b>6/7/10</b></p> <p><b>7/12/10</b></p>	<p><b><u>Consultation Processes</u></b></p> <p>Panel requested a scoping report on the Council's current consultation processes to be submitted to a future meeting. Members questioned whether the Council's approach to consultation was consistent across the authority and wished to be informed of what the current process was, what methods were used and how materials were prepared for this purpose.</p> <p>Councillor B S Chapman, Mr R Coxhead and Councillors Mrs P A Jordan, P G Mitchell, P D Reeve and R J West have been appointed onto a Working Group to pursue investigations further. The Working Group has been tasked with reviewing the Council's guidance on consultation methodology and to evaluate examples of previous consultations.</p>	<p>Working Group met on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010, 18<sup>th</sup> January, 16<sup>th</sup> February 2011 and 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011. Further meetings held on 21<sup>st</sup> April and 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2011.</p>	<p>Final report submitted to Cabinet in July. Managing Director (Resources) to undertake investigations as to how the current process can be improved and to report to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Social Well-Being) and Executive Councillors on the outcomes.</p>	<p><b>6/03/12</b></p>

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date for Future Action
<b><u>One Leisure Performance</u></b>				
4/01/11	Panel received a presentation on the performance of One Leisure. This presentation was also delivered to the January meeting of the Economic Well-Being Panel.			
1/02/11	Advised that the Economic Well-Being Panel established a joint working group to review the information presented to both Panels in greater depth. Councillors B S Chapman and J J Dutton and Mr R Coxhead were subsequently appointed on to the Working Group.	Meetings held on 3 <sup>rd</sup> March and 28 <sup>th</sup> April 2011.	Interim report submitted to the Panel and Cabinet at their meetings in June 2011.	
07/06/11	Councillor Mrs D C Reynolds appointed to the Working Group.	Meetings held on 23 <sup>rd</sup> June and 1 <sup>st</sup> September 2011. Next meeting to be held on 7 <sup>th</sup> November.		
<b><u>Health Implications of the Night Time Economy</u></b>				
4/01/11	With the agreement of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Economic Well-Being), Members agreed upon the transfer of the study on the health implications of the night time economy to be transferred to the Panel's work programme.	Background information to be submitted to a future meeting.	Request submitted to the Head of Environmental and Community Health Services. This item appears elsewhere on the Agenda.	1/11/11

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date for Future Action
	<p><b><u>Voluntary Sector</u></b></p>			
7/12/10	Noted that an approach had been made by the Voluntary Sector to raise this item at a future Panel meeting. The matter was debated at the Council meeting in December 2010. The Chief Executive of the Hunts Forum of Voluntary Organisation will also be addressing the Panel at its February meeting.			
1/02/11	Presentation received. Panel agreed to investigate the full impact of the Council's budgetary proposals (which would take effect from 2013/14) and alternative ways of supporting the Voluntary Sector, to include Localism and the Big Society, at its March meeting.			
1/03/11	Working Group appointed comprising Councillors S Cawley, Mrs K E Cooper, P G Mitchell and R J West and Mrs M Nicholas who have been tasked with investigating matters raised during the course of the meeting.	First meeting held on 28 <sup>th</sup> March 2011 at the Maple Centre, Huntingdon.		
7/06/11	Councillors Mrs P A Jordan and K M Baker appointed to the Working Group.	Further meetings held 22 <sup>nd</sup> July and 23 <sup>rd</sup> August 2011. Site visits undertaken in September.	Final report of the Working Group appears elsewhere on the Agenda.	1/11/11

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date for Future Action
6/7/10	<p><b><u>Gypsy and Traveller Welfare</u></b></p> <p>Agreed that gypsy and traveller welfare should be included within the Panel's work programme, with a view to informing any future Council policy on the identification of sites.</p>	<p>Report requested for submission to a future meeting. Following consultation with the Chairman, agreed that the study would proceed once Government guidance has been issued on future provision requirements.</p>		TBC
18/05/11	<p><b><u>Grant Aid</u></b></p> <p>This item was transferred over from the Economic Well-Being Panel in light of changes made to the Cabinet Portfolio responsibilities. Annual Report on organisations supported by grants through Service Level Agreements to be received by Panel.</p>		Report anticipated July 2012.	3/07/12
2/11/10	<p><b><u>Cambridgeshire Local Investment Plan</u></b></p> <p>Panel has requested for a separate report on the implications of the Investment Plan upon local housing, to include the potential shortfalls in the delivery of affordable housing within the District,</p>	<p>Request submitted to the Head of Housing Services. Advised that the</p>	Report anticipated in January 2012.	3/01/12

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date for Future Action
	identify what housing is due to come forward and to include reference to the underlying links between housing and planning.	Investment Agreement was due to be signed off in March 2011.		
	<b><u>Review of Neighbourhood Forums In Huntingdonshire</u></b>			
7/06/11	The Cabinet, at its meeting on 19 <sup>th</sup> May 2011, requested the Panel to undertake a review of the Neighbourhood Forums in Huntingdonshire.			
6/09/11	Background report considered. Councillors S J Criswell, J J Dutton and R J West appointed onto a Working Group to initiate the Panel's investigations. County and District Council Members and Town and Parish Councils views on the Neighbourhood Forums will initially be sought and reported back to the Panel in November.	Working Group meeting held on 19 <sup>th</sup> September 2011. Letter sent to all those with an interest in the Forum on 21 <sup>st</sup> September 2011.	Views of County and District Members, Town and Parish Councils and Partners have been sought and will be reported to the Panel at its meeting. This item appears elsewhere on the Agenda.	1/11/11
	<b><u>Homelessness</u></b>			
7/06/11	Requested a background report to be provided on the emerging issue of homelessness arising as a result of changes to the Housing Benefit system.	Request submitted to the Head of Housing Services.	Report anticipated December 2011.	6/12/11



Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date for Future Action
4/10/11	<p><b><u>Monitoring of Section 106 Agreements</u></b></p> <p>Panel agreed to reinstate the Monitoring of Section 106 Agreements that provide leisure/play equipment within its work plan.</p>	Section 106 Agreement Advisory Group due to meet on 9 <sup>th</sup> January 2012.	Report anticipated at either the Panel's January or February 2012 meeting.	3/01/12 or 6/02/12
4/10/11	<p><b><u>Scrutiny of Council Budgets within the Panel's Remit</u></b></p> <p>Panel agreed to scrutinise the budgets associated with the Council functions that fall within the remit of the Panel on an annual basis.</p>	Request to be submitted to the Head of Financial Services.		TBC
7/06/11	<p><b><u>Cambridgeshire Safer and Stronger Overview and Scrutiny Committee Study – Domestic Abuse</u></b></p> <p>Councillor Mrs D C Reynolds appointed as the Panel's representative on the study being undertaken by the County Council.</p>		Councillor Mrs D C Reynolds to report as and when necessary.	
	<p><b><u>Huntingdonshire Strategic Partnership (HSP)</u></b></p> <p>The Panel has a legal duty to scrutinise the work of the HSP, with three thematic groups of the HSP falling within its remit.</p>			

Panel Date	Decision	Action	Response	Date for Future Action
05/04/11	<p><b>Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership</b></p> <p>Annual review of the work of the Partnership undertaken. Members have expressed their satisfaction that appropriate accountability and reporting mechanisms are in place.</p>			
05/10/10	<p><b>Children and Young People</b></p> <p>Details of the thematic group's outcomes and objectives have been received together with the latest report of the group, outlining its terms of reference, membership and current matters being discussed.</p>			
1/01/11	<p><b>Health and Well-Being</b></p> <p>Background information received on the thematic group's outcome and objectives, terms of reference, membership and current matters being discussed.</p>			
	<p><b><u>Forward Plan</u></b></p> <p>None identified at present.</p>			