



Report to: Cabinet

Subject: Overarching Scrutiny end of year report 2010/11

1 Date: 7th April 2011

2 Author: Councillor J. Collin

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To provide members with the end of year Scrutiny improvement plan and work programme position.

1.2 To refer the **conclusions and recommendations** of all outstanding 2010/11 Scrutiny reports for consideration.

2. BACKGROUND

A Scrutiny Function Review undertaken in November 2009 highlighted a number of areas for improvement. The Overarching Scrutiny Committee was subsequently established, and a Scrutiny Improvement Plan implemented in March 2010 with the aim of substantially increasing the effectiveness of Scrutiny. This report sets out what has been achieved over the last year, outlines what is proposed for next year and summarises final reports and recommendations for Cabinet approval.

3. SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENT PLAN OUTCOMES

- A 2010/11 Scrutiny Annual Report has been produced, aligned to the Council's Annual report on the Council's website and circulated to Council members and Heads of Service.
- In response to our improved systems and processes, Portfolio Holders are responding in writing to Scrutiny recommendations and attending 6 month follow - up meetings to review progress.
- A balance has been achieved between longer term, in depth reviews and short, sharp reviews. There is also an even spread of activity between the two Committees and in terms of joint reviews.

- The quarterly Scrutiny Update is now available to all Council members, to staff via the e-gen alert and to the general public via the Council's website.
- A library of 2010/11 Scrutiny reports will be available on the website at the end of the 2010/ 2011 financial year
- Scrutiny review subjects are increasingly addressing real time Policy issues and developments that are in synch with the Council's current priorities.
- Themed presentations to Scrutiny Committees on emerging policies and services help members to identify key priorities for the work plan.
- Following the presentation and approval of Scrutiny reports at Cabinet, we actively seek out opportunities to communicate our recommendations to a wider relevant audience in order to ensure progress.

4. COMMITTEE ENGAGEMENT

In addition to the formal work programme, there have been a number of other developments this year which have helped to build understanding and capacity of Scrutiny members to undertake reviews, encouraged officers to respond early to upcoming policy and to improve the Council's performance management.

4.1 Presentations received 2010/11

Performance Scrutiny Committee

- Neighbourhoods and Crime work programme and outcomes
- Domestic Abuse awareness and preventative activity
- Homelessness policy and processes

Policy Review Committee

- Gedling Partnership Implementation Plan
- Fast Forward programme
- Leisure Arts and Changing Lifestyles Strategies
- The Sub National Growth white paper
- Economic Development programme

4.2 Visits, conferences and training

During the course of the work programme members have benefitted from a range of familiarisation activity, including visits to domestic violence projects and conferences, consultation with community groups engaged in health promotion, tours of the Gedling One stop shop and CCTV facilities and attendance at the Environmental Sustainability event hosted at Gedling Borough Council.

Scrutiny members have undertaken Member Development training provided by East Midlands Councils and training provided in house on the use of the Covalent Performance monitoring system and LEAN efficiency processes. Presentations and reports provided by officers and partners at working group meetings have greatly improved members understanding of specialist areas of work.

4.3 Consultation with members

The Tea and Scrutiny event on the 1st December gave Scrutiny members, Cabinet members and Officers the opportunity to take stock of the last year, take account of upcoming priorities and build on plans and working relationships for the future. This will now be an annual event to inform the future work plan. Both Performance and Policy Scrutiny members have taken an active part in consultation on the setting of new targets for the Council, and Performance Scrutiny Committee has become highly proactive in its analysis of Covalent.

5. TEA AND SCRUTINY EVENT – 1st DECEMBER

The Scrutiny Function follow up working group arranged a review and evaluation event to maintain the forward impetus of Scrutiny at Gedling. This event was highly successful in identifying how well the improvement plan has addressed the issues raised in the 2009 review, and identified a number of priorities going forward.

- That the Scrutiny function be renamed as ‘Overview and Scrutiny’, and otherwise retain the same Committee structure
- The Overarching (or Overview) Scrutiny Committee should now enhance its lead and set the strategic parameters for the work of Scrutiny in 2012
- Scrutiny should increasingly operate as a ‘think tank’ for the Council and its partners, and engage proactively with similar functions of other organisations.
- Scrutiny must take account of forthcoming Central government legislation, organisational restructuring and Governance review to support the Council in the delivery of the 2011 12 service plan
- An annual review and work planning event should be held in the Autumn of each year

6. SCRUTINY WORKPLAN ANALYSIS

A total of 14 reviews have been undertaken as follows, and the final year end position is detailed overleaf.

- 7 - Policy Scrutiny reviews
- 4 - Performance Scrutiny reviews
- 3 – Joint Committee reviews
- 3 – six month follow up meetings and reports

6.1 END OF YEAR SCHEDULE OF REVIEWS 2010/11

Review	Report	Response	6 Month review
Gedling Transformation Programme follow up review	√	√	√
Housing and Council Tax benefit Policy Review	√	√	√
Compliments and Complaints policy review	√	√	√
Health promotion for the over 60s review	√	√	June 2011
Local Democracy and Construction bill – development of Policies	Petitions and ‘Councillor Call for Action’ Policies and protocols in place	N/A To be circulated in a Democracy pack as part of new member induction	2 Year review
Gedling Carbon Footprint review	√	√	June 2011
Covalent review	√	√	June 2011
Gedling Partnership Review	√	After 7 th April cabinet	Sept 2011
Scrutiny Function review	√	N/A	tba
Domestic Violence review	Pending – final meeting 23 rd Feb	As above	tba
External Funding review	√	As above	tba
NHS Restructure review	√	As above	tba
Surveillance review	√	As above	tba
Planning Performance Review	√	As above	tba

7. CONCLUSIONS

Scrutiny has had a busy and productive year. Early indications from the follow up work undertaken with portfolio holders so far is that the majority of recommendations are aligning in a productive way with service developments, and having a galvanising effect on the work and policies of the council as a whole.

7.1 Overview and Scrutiny key priorities 2011/12

The following priorities have been gathered from members and officers for consideration as a result of the Scrutiny function follow up review:

Identify a draft strategic plan for 2011/12:

- Links to the Council service plan
- Input and links to Member development
- New Guide to Scrutiny at Gedling
- Develop a protocol for working with the with Cabinet
- Refine the process for follow up of recommendations
- Engaging the public – a facilitation process
- Links to similar functions in partner organisations
- Links to Partnership work at the Council
- Links to Crime and Health Panels
- Examine the impact of new legislation: Localism, Health, Policing, Education
- Use the Satisfaction survey and data published by the Council

Map areas of work for the 2011/12 work plan:

- Policing restructure
- Our role in working with the Voluntary Sector
- Links with Parish Councils
- Developments in Education policy
- Covert Surveillance legislation and powers revisit
- Housing and Council Tax policy changes
- Joint procurement
- Economic development strategy

8. FINAL REPORTS YEAR END MARCH 2011

In signing off the 2010/11 work programme, the Overarching Scrutiny Committee has referred the **conclusions and recommendations** of the following working group reports to Cabinet for consideration:

Appendix 1: Gedling Partnership Policy Scrutiny Review*

Appendix 2: Covert Surveillance Policy Scrutiny Review

Appendix 3: Scrutiny Function Joint Scrutiny Committee Review

Appendix 4: Domestic Violence Performance Scrutiny Review

Appendix 5: Planning Performance Scrutiny Review

Appendix 6: External Funding Joint Scrutiny Committee Review

Appendix 7: NHS Restructure Joint Scrutiny Committee Review

* The full reports can be viewed on the Council website, either under 'Committee Agendas' or on the 'Scrutiny Committees' page.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Members are asked to consider and approve the recommendations of the Scrutiny working groups listed above and provide an individual portfolio holder response on each to the Overarching (Overview) Scrutiny Committee.

10. APPENDICES

Summary of Scrutiny Conclusions and Recommendations

Appendix 1 - Gedling Partnership Policy Scrutiny Review

1. Conclusions

- 1.1** In reviewing all evidence, working group members were convinced of the value of the Gedling Partnership as a way of joining up resources and expertise to improve the scope and quality of strategies, plans and projects impacting upon Gedling.
- 1.2** Members were made aware that as a result of a thorough restructuring and refocusing exercise in 2009, the Partnership has now moved towards a more systematic and evidence based operation that targets its combined resources more effectively according to our strategic priorities, in line identified local needs.
- 1.3** There is a strong level of engagement of partners at formal Partnership meetings and events, and by some key partners within local delivery action groups. It is evident from our observations that there is still room to develop into a fully synergised partnership in which all members contribute fully and are able to commit to and sustain an integrated and varied programme of work, regardless of the availability of bespoke funding.
- 1.4** Performance management of the work of the partnership is still developing, with processes recently implemented to capture and evaluate programme activity on a project specific basis.
- 1.5** The LAA Reward Grant and strategic grant resources of individual partners have been well utilised in extending the reach and raising awareness of some services to hard to reach groups and in priority neighbourhoods. The challenge for the partnership will be to take the next step in joining up budgets around key priorities and engaging further with

the Neighbourhood plans of communities on specific projects, i.e. Housing and the physical environment.

1.6 The Partnership and its component organisations are under more pressure than ever to make efficient use of resources and time. Board and Implementation Team meetings are highly resourced in terms of officer attendance, therefore the meetings must be seen as an opportunity to galvanise and effect action.

1.7 The proposed withdrawal of County Council representation has been followed up by the Board, and links with the County will be an important consideration going forward.

1.8 Responses to our consultation with partners indicate the following:

- That all consulted value their involvement in the partnership
- All bring expertise, valuable perspectives and in most cases resources to the table
- All are generally happy with the structure and administration of the partnership, although one would like to see more robust management structures and one a possible Social Enterprise status and commissioning role.
- The Parish Council representative highlighted the need for support in bringing the wider parish council / rural agenda and perspective to the table, and in providing a route back and forth for information to parishes and communities.

In looking forward, they see the priorities as:

- Maintaining and progressing good prioritisation and communication
- Having a mechanism for re evaluating priorities in the light of public views as well as against strategic objectives
- Maintaining the strategic level commitment of partners and support networks through the various transitions now underway with individual organisation's funding, staffing and priorities.

- Recognising the individual contributions of partners as well as that of the Gedling Partnership as a whole, and encouraging equal commitment from all members
- Raising awareness amongst elected members and the public of the vision, role and added value achieved by the Partnership
- Keeping the community engaged, informed and resourced, and create opportunities for mutual appraisal of neighbourhoods and community plans
- Continuing the improvements to management processes and becoming SMARTER in action planning, agenda management and representation.
- Ensuring effective use of joint resources and identifying new opportunities to attract funding to implement the vision.

1.9 What future for Local Strategic Partnerships?

No specific policy statements have been made to date by the new Government on the future role and responsibilities of Local Strategic Partnerships.

Their role in co-coordinating and bringing together local public services has been acknowledged, and supported, in publications such as the Health White Paper. The Spending Review says more about place-based budgets, and potential governance arrangements for these.

Meanwhile many LSPs have found themselves in a rapidly changing environment, in which major parts of their former workloads have disappeared (such as upward performance reporting on LAAs, or preparations for further rounds of CAA).

New issues have appeared on the agenda, such as the need to form relationships with GP consortia in the area and the proposed role of Health and Wellbeing Boards.

Many LSPs are also heavily involved in identifying efficiencies and savings that can be made through shared services, and asset management, across public sector bodies in an area.

In this new context, the Gedling Partnership will need to review how it works, including

- Streamlining and re-focusing of sub-groups and thematic partnerships

- Re- assessing staffing structures in the light of reduced reporting demands from Government.
- Designing and taking on new working relationships with different partnership member organisations to achieve more with less.
- Rethinking work programmes and moving more to a ‘task and finish’ approach

2. Recommendations

The working group makes the following recommendations to the Board of the Gedling Partnership and the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning:

- 2.1** Continuation of the Gedling Partnership should be endorsed by the Council as necessary and integral to the delivery of the Council’s vision and plan.
- 2.2** As more decision making and resources are devolved under new Government initiatives, the potential for the partnership to take on a more defined role in facilitating the allocation of joint projects and resources to communities in Gedling should be actively pursued.
- 2.3** To achieve this, especially in the light of recent changes, the Partnership needs to become even more synergised. Informal opportunities should be explored to develop innovative joint working arrangements, review and refresh the shared vision, engender team spirit and to engage the specific commitment of partners in key pieces of work.
- 2.4** The leadership roles of board members and theme leaders should be further explored and developed to enable them to provide an impetus to all strands of the Vision 2026 Strategy and Implementation Plan.
- 2.5** The partnership should consider quantifying and capturing the various outputs, outcomes and financial added value it achieves in a clearer, more systematic format that can be identified and evaluated by Councillors and members of the public.
- 2.6** Initiate a communications and public relations plan for the Partnership that incorporates a regular, branded Gedling Partnership update in Contacts, and more importantly sets out methods of engagement with

elected members and mechanisms for benchmarking the vision and plan against the needs and aspirations of communities.

2.7 The Gedling Partnership should now take the opportunity to reassess and re - embed the vision and plan, role and working methods of the partnership in the light of place based budgeting proposals, devolution and localism, organisational restructuring, changes in regional funding and performance assessment.

2.8 The Partnership could consider making use of Gedling Borough Council Scrutiny as an ongoing resource, and encourage similar functions within partner authorities to link up with Scrutiny at Gedling, to help inform the quality and direction of Partnership plans.

Appendix 2: Covert Surveillance Policy Scrutiny Review

1. Conclusions

1.1 Having undertaken a brief scan of Gedling's current use of RIPA surveillance powers, members were satisfied that the powers are being exercised under appropriate controls.

1.2 Evidence of the numbers and nature of cases to date suggests that Gedling's use of RIPA powers to engage in covert surveillance has been proportionate.

1.3 Use of RIPA to address fly tipping has not been fully maximised due to constraints identified by the Public Protection Manager at 4.9 in this report.

1.4 Effective partnership approaches are in place with the Police, DWP, Trading Standards and the Environment Agency in applying RIPA procedures. These partnership arrangements support and enhance Gedling's statutory role to help ensure the safety of Gedling residents.

1.5 Outcomes of the recent Government review indicate that covert surveillance procedures will become more complex in their application under forthcoming new legislation.

1.6 The balance between the demands on officer time and council resources against the results achieved will need to be assessed once legislation and full guidance are in place.

2. Recommendations

The working group makes the following recommendations to Cabinet, the Portfolio Holder for Safe and Sustainable Communities and the Overarching Scrutiny Committee:

- I. That completion of this review is kept in abeyance until the new legislation and operating instructions are produced, at which point their impact can be fully evaluated.
- II. In the meantime, Andy Callingham, Public Protection Manager, to liaise with the Scrutiny Officer with any updates.

Appendix 3: Scrutiny Function Review

1. Conclusions

- 1.1 Scrutiny is now far more dynamic and outward looking, and both Scrutiny and Executive members are more positively engaged. This has increased its influence and added value to Council services and plans
- 1.2 The new structure, processes and working remits of committees are effective in providing both a review of Council performance, and a forward looking appraisal of the potential impact of new policies.
- 1.3 Having settled into its role, the Overarching Scrutiny Committee is now well placed to provide even more Strategic guidance to the Scrutiny process, and to set the agenda for Scrutiny going forward.
- 1.4 The Overarching Scrutiny Committee must continue to monitor the interface between conducting a review and subsequent outcomes. Scrutiny members can play their part in underpinning key

recommendations by establishing SMART action points and review at the outset and highlighting key recommendations as part of their committee work and within their groups.

1.5 The Tea and Scrutiny event outcomes and comments of Cabinet members and senior managers indicate that the problems that existed in Scrutiny a year ago have been fully addressed, and that as long as the function continues to respond to the changing operating environment and strategic priorities of the Council it will add value.

1.6 With so much new legislation, restructuring and reduction in funding for the Council and its partners to deal with, now is the time for Scrutiny to act as a think tank for the Authority and to help to mitigate the effect of these developments upon Gedling residents. There is scope for the role carried out by Scrutiny to build on the very positive outcomes of this year, and to become an essential consultancy resource to the Council as it addresses the challenges and opportunities of the forthcoming 18 months

2. Recommendations

The working group makes the following recommendations, with those at 2.1 and 2.2 to be referred to Personnel and Resources Committee for referral to Council:

2.1 That the Scrutiny Function is renamed 'Overview and Scrutiny', and the Overarching Scrutiny Committee becomes the 'Overview Scrutiny' Committee

2.2 That the current Scrutiny structure is retained, with Performance Scrutiny engaging in look back and review and Policy Scrutiny looking forward at the potential impact of new policies and initiatives.

2.3 That the Overview Scrutiny Committee takes a more proactive role in proposing Scrutiny reviews linked to our strategic priorities.

2.4 That the current procedure for Call in of a decision includes the requirement for a formal response to the Overarching Scrutiny Committee.

2.5 That the following three protocols are packaged and circulated to Members as part of the Member Induction programme 2011:

- Councillor Call in procedure
- Councillor Call for Action protocol

- Petitions policy and procedure
 - 2.6 That a set of protocols are drawn up between the Overarching Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet to reflect and further enhance the working relationship.
 - 2.7 That a new 'Guide to Scrutiny at Gedling' is produced and included in the Member Development Programme.
 - 2.8 That the Overarching Scrutiny Committee considers the Councils arrangements for financial performance and risk management and considers where this might link to Performance Scrutiny.
 - 2.9 OA Scrutiny to set some key strategic priorities for 2011:

- To explore the implications of the Localism bill, place shaping and place based budgeting, as well as NHS, Education and Policing restructuring.

- To investigate and engage with emerging new democratic accountability structures, i.e. Health Panels, Crime Panels

- To offer a consultancy service to the Council and its partners on new policies and plans.

- To use the resources of the CfPS in developing the input of the Public to Scrutiny.

- To support and enhance leadership amongst Members by contributing to the Member development program.

- 2.10 Scrutiny work plan priorities should take account of the detailed outcomes of the Tea and Scrutiny Event, and an annual work review and planning event held in September each year, aligned to the Scrutiny Annual report.

Appendix 4: Domestic Violence Performance Scrutiny Review

1. Conclusions

- 1.1 It is clear from the evidence that Domestic Violence must remain a priority issue both nationally and in Gedling, particularly as 6 of our wards are in the top 8 areas of highest incidence in South Nottinghamshire. The exact

scale of the problem is difficult to establish, and strategic agencies have a role to play in providing a meaningful statistical picture to inform and monitor D.V work in the County.

- 1.2 There are also some compromises to be made which are compounded by changes to the Health sector and the proposals for G.P. Clusters. A lot of ambiguity and uncertainty exists as to where responsibilities for Domestic Violence will lie. It will be important to have discussions about how we organise things between County and District in the light of this – what precisely is the best division of responsibility between the two?
- 1.3 MARAC processes are effective in identifying those people who need the resources most. Everything has become stretched, however this is a high risk area in policing terms – public protection, child protection and dangerous person management all impact upon it. The MARAC is not in itself a solution - it collectively identifies the most effective potential remedy and engages with associated packages of interventions.
- 1.4 There is however an issue of a lack of awareness of the purpose of the MARAC. Those who are working in the field of D.V. know what it is and how it works, but if you are not close to it, it can be unclear. Agencies working on the frontline are not aware of the MARAC – there is not a good understanding, and this may be contributing to low referrals. There was some evidence that G.P practices and other agencies in the partnership are not presently as proactive as some in raising awareness, picking up and referring people for DV support.
- 1.5 Outcomes of the consultation on Supporting People will be of key importance as the most significant interventions are funded by this stream - if those interventions are no longer available, the pressure on Gedling's housing advice service is likely to increase, with more people presenting as homeless and requiring emergency accommodation.
- 1.6 Domestic Violence has been a high profile issue in recent years and received a great deal of funding, matched by high levels of commitment and dedication by staff and volunteers. In times of increased resources we experience “mission creep”, whereby new elements extend from the original aims and priorities. This is a time when providers need to revisit their original aims and consolidate roles and responsibilities.

- 1.7 There appears to be a lack of consistency across the 7 districts around levels of funding and how it is coordinated, which needs to be addressed. The only Strategic element is the Policing aspect – everything else has grown up from the grass roots, and this has resulted in overlaps, as well as gaps. As funding gets tighter, all D.V organisations are competing for the same funding pot, which is shrinking. It seems that D.V. providers will have to become more outward looking and engage in more networked and partnership approaches in order to maintain a service.
- 1.8 It is difficult to say which service has less impact, as all services are benefitting victims in some way, and the type of response needed depends on the situation. The reality is that D.V is usually a time limited experience for most victims – it is a crisis situation from which the majority move on, therefore the response or intervention required is usually a short term one.
- 1.9 Members endorse the continued value of preventative work in schools as well as the need to protect children caught up in domestic violence, both of which are key factors in reducing the prevalence of domestic abuse in society.
- 1.10 The DV Champion has a key role in leading the partnership towards a more defined and effective strategic and delivery approach across the County, and to ensure that the right resources are appropriately directed towards those areas of highest incidence, and those individuals at greatest risk.
- 1.11 At Gedling Borough Council, our capacity to act as a D.V service provider is limited, however we have a key role to play in the areas highlighted in the recommendations below.

2. Recommendations

The working group makes the following recommendations to the Portfolio Holder for Safe and Sustainable Communities and the Safer Nottinghamshire Board:

- 2.1 Maintain our representation on the partnership, as it is likely that organisations will be expected to take a consortium approach for funding in future.

- 2.2 As part of its new Strategy the partnership should identify and facilitate a more streamlined and effectively targeted response to DV across the County, with WAIS encouraged to act as a facilitator or umbrella organisation for a coordinated voluntary sector approach.
- 2.3 Ongoing resources should be made available through the Safer Nottinghamshire Board to sustain the MARAC, Refuges and the WAIS Helpline, which have been identified as core gateway services enabling victims to emerge safely from Domestic abuse.
- 2.4 Training in D.V awareness and safeguarding children should be provided for all frontline staff in public service agencies, particularly those agencies that currently under refer.
- 2.5 The role of schools and colleges in D.V strategy must be strengthened to ensure continued preventative education and promotion of the 'respect' agenda under the new extra – curricular funding arrangements.
- 2.6 Elected Members should take up the importance of preventative work with their local schools in their role as Community Champions.
- 2.7 Links should be explored with 'Child Line', both by the Safer Nottinghamshire Board and WAIS domestic violence helpline.
- 2.8 The capacity and role of frontline health services should be developed to enable greater support and intervention with victims and vulnerable children.
- 2.9 Consider the outcomes of the review and evaluation of the effectiveness of the South Nottinghamshire Sanctuary Scheme recently undertaken by Rushcliffe Sanctuary Co-ordinator & Broxtowe DV Prevention Officer. If the scheme is withdrawn due to funding constraints, monitor the impact upon our emergency housing budget and levels of homelessness in the Borough and feedback to the Safer Nottinghamshire Board.
- 2.10 Maintain funding of the Gedling WAIS outreach worker post and ensure that an appropriate proportion of her time is targeted at the identified priority neighbourhoods.

- 2.11 Embrace National DV campaigns and D.V training and maintain links with local self supporting groups to help them to provide signposting and referral in local communities.
- 2.12 Encourage a better understanding amongst agencies of the role and purpose of the MARAC in order to increase engagement, progress common risk assessment and improve referrals
- 2.13 DV awareness to be included in the Member Training programme

Appendix 5: Planning Performance Review

1. Conclusions

- 1.1 The working group was encouraged by the developments in Planning since the 2007 review. Members had been concerned about staffing and the impact of frozen posts, and are pleased that staffing has been consolidated, roles are more defined and the department is preparing for the significant developments associated with upcoming new legislation.
- 1.2 Improvements have been demonstrated in terms of more realistic individual officer workloads and enhanced opportunities for secondment and training, income generation arising from the role of the Enforcement and Compliance Officer and increased public access to planning information. Steps had also been taken to improve officer responses to member and customer enquiries, and leadership has been demonstrated in driving the Sustainability agenda with partners.
- 1.3 Members were satisfied that the balance and number of referrals of applications to Planning Committees is about right, and is not creating any bottlenecks or delays in meeting processing targets.
- 1.4 Planning represents a significant proportion of the Legal department's workload, and the impact of current and ongoing budget savings requirements upon such inter - department work will need to be monitored.
- 1.5 It is important that the work processes involved in Planning are better represented in Covalent, to give more meaningful information and avoid the 'red alert' symbol on targets over which planning has limited or no control. Members were pleased to learn that from 2011/12 there will be a new local indicator which records numbers of applications and monitors where value has been added. (Some National indicators about speed of processing will still have to be retained).
- 1.6 The advent of the Localism Bill represents a significant change in remit for Planning Policy, a potential increase in large scale applications and changes also in the freedoms of Members engaged in Planning Committee meetings.

2. Recommendations

The working group makes the following recommendations to the Portfolio Holder for Development and Enterprise:

- 2.1 That a high level review of the enforcement policy in line with the Localism bill / Neighbourhood planning is undertaken by the end of the year, to be carried out in more detail at an appropriate point thereafter.
- 2.2 That a demonstration of the new online planning information facility is provided at Planning Committee.
- 2.3 That a progress report on the Improvement plan is presented to Planning Committee
- 2.4 That the new 'added value' planning processing target referred to in the conclusions at 5.5 is included in Covalent performance reporting in 2011/12.
- 2.5 That a facility is put in place for an automatic email response / acknowledgement to emailed applications and customer queries, that also sets out the various stages and timescales of planning applications.

Appendix 6: External Funding Joint Scrutiny Review

1. Conclusions

- 1.1 Major grant schemes are being withdrawn as East Midlands Development Agency winds down and the Greater Nottinghamshire Partnership has changed its remit to administration of European funds within Nottingham City Council boundaries. It is a fact that there are increasingly less grants available, and most are prioritised for the most deprived areas.
- 1.2 It is difficult to compare our success levels in achieving external funding with that of other districts as the determining factors for receipt of regeneration funds are different in each case, and out of our individual control.

1.3 Nevertheless, it is possible to say that Gedling has been more “risk aware” than some of our neighbours and has not pursued long term ambitious regeneration strategies that are not sustainable without continued grant funding. This has enabled Gedling to respond to the changing environment without losing large rafts of our current services.

1.4 From the evidence gathered, those schemes that we have pursued have either been time bound physical improvement or efficiency programmes, or extensions to mainstream work linked to our strategic priorities. This has enabled good practice to be developed through external funding and absorbed into the core business.

1.5 Our Neighbourhood Coordination approach to enabling Communities will stand us in good stead with the ‘total place’ agenda, and we have the Partnership mechanisms to enable innovative joint resourcing, or place based budgeting, in the future.

1.6 The areas of greatest risk are:

- To our ‘added value’ Leisure activity. This may be mitigated to some extent through ongoing negotiation with the emerging G.P Consortium. Plans to rationalise Leisure facilities and bring services closer to town centres and communities will also open up new potential.
- To vulnerable residents, who are on the receiving end of reductions in Supporting People and other funding linked to adult social care.

1.7 The opportunities are clearly to be found in stimulating economic growth and business rates, environmental sustainability, empowering communities and the voluntary sector and enhancing our leadership role under the General Power of Competence.

2. Recommendations

The working group makes the following recommendations to the Portfolio Holders for Finance and Strategic Planning:

- 2.1 Refine what our role needs to be in respect of enabling local communities to access grants and resources to deliver their own services and engage with local plans
- 2.2 Take the lead with improving how Partnerships operate, and push as hard as we can for resources for Gedling. Although grants are declining, this increases the need to be on the ball and to pick up on as many opportunities as we can.
- 2.3 Continue to build our Economic Development Strategy and maximise opportunities for growth
- 2.4 Better integrate our risk management and performance monitoring to increase our response to challenges and opportunities
- 2.5 Consider developing a coordinated strategy and mechanism for monitoring and increasing external grant income
- 2.6 Seek to measure and respond to the impact of legislation upon our most vulnerable residents over the next 2 years and beyond.

Appendix 7: NHS Restructure Joint Scrutiny Review

1. Conclusions

- 1.1 The current restructure is the most significant change in the NHS in the last 60 years. The fundamental shift in ethos, organisational development and decision making to be undertaken, coupled with the local requirement to make savings of 5%, represents a major transition for the NHS and for the County Council. As a local partner it is therefore important that Gedling Borough Council responds and engages productively with the process.
- 1.2 There are at this stage a number of unknowns; firstly around the makeup of the new GP Consortia and HWB Boards, and secondly how funding will be structured, where it will be held (whether by the County Council, or by the G.P Consortium) and what impact or relationship this will have upon other streams, such as Supporting People funding.

- 1.3 Thirdly, there is the national issue of alignment of District and Consortia boundaries, the risk of increasing the postcode lottery for patients and how any future commissioning of District based health and wellbeing schemes might be affected.
- 1.4 In terms of Gedling and its relationship to the County Council's strategic role, it will be crucial that all parties are clear where the responsibility for the delivery of some Public Health functions lie, i.e. in the case of Disabled Facilities grants.
- 1.5 In responding to the NHS restructure the Council must take account of the wider legislative context and seek in its leadership role to integrate the various strands at a local level. The role of Elected Members in achieving this is crucial, and it will be a priority to ensure that District Councillors are appropriately represented.
- 1.6 It is important that our current and future schemes are able to demonstrate clear outcomes in relation to the new Public Health model, therefore in the interests of continuous improvement our current activity should be re evaluated in relation to current developments.
- 1.7 It is of paramount importance that communities and individuals are not disadvantaged by the changes and are able to take advantage of patient choice, and to take up opportunities to influence and lead in improving health outcomes in their own local area.

2. Recommendations

The working group makes the following recommendations to the Portfolio Holder for Leisure, NHS Nottinghamshire County and Nottinghamshire County Council:

- 2.1 Taking account of the findings of this review, Gedling BC should submit a response to the consultation on funding and commissioning routes of the "Healthy Lives, Healthy People", due by 31st March. The key delivery role that Gedling has in Public Health should be highlighted.
- 2.2 Senior Officers and Portfolio holders at Gedling should pursue an ongoing dialogue with the new GP Consortium and the County Council to help ensure effective District engagement with the new Public Health structure

in Gedling, and offer District Portfolio holder representation on the HWB Board and at Consortium level.

- 2.3 Discussions should aim to achieve consolidation and further development of the productive health and wellbeing work that has taken place so far in the Borough, look for innovation and aim to establish some gateway activity between GBC and the Consortium as the new structure emerges.
- 2.4 In preparation for G.P Commissioning, a mapping exercise of relevant Council services, resources and partnership activity around the 6 key phases of the NHS 'Life course' approach could be undertaken and shared with the Consortium.
- 2.5 Examine and build resilience around the possible impact on our core functions and responsibilities, i.e. Public protection, Housing needs and Leisure.
- 2.6 Concomitant with the above is the need to make representation to the County Council and G.P Consortium about the benefits of the continued funding of both preventative and restorative local health schemes, and the ongoing need for health professionals to be involved in Priority Neighbourhood health promotion projects.
- 2.7 Maximise the role of the Gedling Partnership and Health and Social Wellbeing partnership in creating the building blocks for future representation and engagement with the HWB and GP Consortium, particularly in respect of Priority Neighbourhoods and the enablement of the voluntary sector.
- 2.8 Promote The Big Society bank opportunity to communities as a resource for delivering their own health and community resilience initiatives
- 2.9 Take into account the recommendations of the Over 60s Health Promotion Scrutiny review, which are presently being developed by a sub group of the Health and Social Wellbeing Board.
- 2.10 Explore the emerging opportunities of the Localism Agenda for added value to be achieved in communities through the advent of Neighbourhood plans.
- 2.11 Establish at Gedling a mechanism to replicate the Scrutiny of the HWB Board that exists at County level, and hold a review meeting with NHS Partners at an appropriate point following the restructure.