

# Public Document Pack



**BARRY KEEL**  
Chief Executive  
Floor 1 - Civic Centre  
Plymouth  
PL1 2AA

[www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy)

Date 27/11/09 Telephone Enquiries 01752 304486 Fax 01752 304819  
Please ask for Mrs Rachel Watson e-mail [rachel.watson@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.watson@plymouth.gov.uk)

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

**DATE: WEDNESDAY 2 DECEMBER 2009**  
**TIME: 2.00 PM**  
**PLACE: COUNCIL HOUSE (NEXT TO THE CIVIC CENTRE)**

### **AGENDA SUPPLEMENT 1**

#### **Committee Members –**

Councillor James, Chair  
Councillor Mrs Watkins, Vice Chair  
Councillors Coker, Fox, Purnell, Roberts, Thompson, Viney and Wildy

#### **Co-opted Representative –**

Mr D Fletcher

#### **Substitutes–:**

Names substitutes from the Panels may act as a substitute member provided that they do not have a personal and prejudicial interest in the matter under review.

***Members are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business overleaf.***

***Members and Officers are requested to sign the attendance list at the meeting.***

BARRY KEEL  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**

7e To receive updates on Task and Finish Groups **(Pages 1 - 22)**

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board will receive the Joint Task and Finish Group's scrutiny report in respect of Localities Working.

10a To receive quarterly reports from each Panel **(Pages 23 - 42)**

11a To receive and consider recommendations from Panels to the O & S Management Board, Cabinet or Council **(Pages 43 - 44)**



**Customers and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel  
Joint Task and Finish Group  
Scrutiny Review – Report  
November 2009**

**Localities Working**

**Plymouth City Council**

**Content**

- 1 Introduction**
- 2 Executive Summary**
- 3 Vision for Localities Working**
- 4 Panel**
- 5 Scrutiny Approach**
- 6 Witnesses**
- 7 Key Issues Arising from the Evidence**
- 8 Findings**
- 9 Recommendations**
- 10 Acknowledgements**

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board approved in principle, on 5 August 2009 the establishment of a joint task and finish group to review Localities Working, with membership to be drawn from Customers and Communities, Children and Young People and Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panels. The Task and Finish Group will submit its findings for approval to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 2 December 2009, prior to consideration of Localities working at Cabinet on 19 January 2010 and Council on 1 February 2010.

## 2 Executive Summary

- 2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board established a Joint Task and Finish Group to review Localities Working. The Council wants Locality Working to help it create a city with successful, strong, cohesive and sustainable communities.

- 2.2 The Group was asked to make recommendations on –

- the best way of joining up services in Localities and the proposal to have Locality Service Co-ordination Teams in each locality;
- ways we can improve links between organisations providing services and the community in each Locality and whether Area Committees should be replaced with Partnerships (one for each locality) with a new focus on joint problem solving between services and communities; and
- what sorts of information Locality Teams will need to help with their work.

- 2.3 The Group heard representations from a variety of witnesses and received written information from the Youth Parliament.

- 2.4 Key issues and findings included that -

- There is broad support for better service co-ordination based on the establishment of multi-agency teams at Locality level.
- There is a strong view that Neighbourhoods, not Localities, are the appropriate unit for community engagement. Most Localities are too large and diverse to be natural boundaries for community engagement.
- It is widely acknowledged that the Area Committees were not working effectively.
- Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings and initiatives could, with some improvements, provide a good vehicle for community engagement but this needs to be supplemented with a variety of methods, beyond meetings, to maximise community engagement.
- Ward Councillors, engaged in improved PACT processes and equipped with feedback via these different methods, could advocate key priorities on behalf of their communities.
- Localities Working needs to be delivered within existing budgets, but has potential to respond to different needs and to priority Neighbourhoods, in relation to relevant data.

2.5 The Group believes that Localities Working can successfully deliver improvements if it is based on: good community engagement at Neighbourhood level; improved joining up of key services at Locality level; a strengthened role for Ward Councillors as advocates on behalf of communities; availability and consistency of relevant data at neighbourhood and Locality levels.

2.6 Recommendations are made covering -

- Service Co-ordination Teams for each Locality (reflecting proposals put out for consultation) within minimum representation of: street scene and environment; community safety; health; and children and young people, across partner agencies. Each team should be pulled together by a Locality Lead.
- Community engagement, to support Localities Working, focused at Neighbourhood level incorporating existing Partners and Communities Together (PACT) initiatives and strengthened arrangements to involve Ward Councillors and facilitate community involvement. (This is an alternative to proposals put out for consultation).
- Availability of information, to support Localities working, covering: local issues; feedback from consultation and community engagement; and data on city-wide priorities, disaggregated at Neighbourhood and Locality levels.
- Directing resources in response to need, using appropriate data sets.
- A post-implementation review.

### **3 Vision for Locality Working**

3.1 The Council wants Locality Working to help it create a city with successful, strong, cohesive and sustainable communities. Residents in these communities should be actively involved in shaping the places in which they live and improving services, leading to increased satisfaction and better quality of life.

### **4 The Panel**

4.1 The Joint Task and Finish group had a cross-party membership comprising the following Councillors –

- Councillor Fox (Chair)
- Councillor Wildy (Vice Chair)
- Councillor Purnell
- Councillor Roberts
- Councillor Mrs Stephens
- Councillor Mrs Watkins

For the purpose of the review, the joint task and finish group was supported by –

- Pete Aley, Assistant Director for Safer Communities
- Helen Wright, Democratic Support Officer

## 5 Scrutiny Approach

5.1 The task and finish group convened on two occasions to consider evidence and hear from witnesses -

- 2 November 2009
- 5 November 2009

5.2 Members of the Joint Task and Finish group aimed to examine and make recommendations on –

- the best way of joining up services in Localities and the proposal to have Locality Service Co-ordination Teams in each locality;
- ways we can improve links between organisations providing services and the community in each Locality and whether Area Committees should be replaced with Partnerships (one for each locality) with a new focus on joint problem solving between services and communities; and
- what sorts of information Locality Teams will need to help with their work.

The Work Programme Request (PID) is attached as Appendix 1.

5.3 At its meetings on 2 November and 5 November, the task and finish group considered evidence from witnesses, raised questions and considered answers and recommendations relating to Localities Working.

## 6 Witnesses

6.1 The task and finish group heard representations from –

- Pete Aley – Assistant Director for Safer Communities
- Superintendent Andy Bickley – Devon and Cornwall Constabulary
- Peter Flukes – Wolseley Trust
- Jane Donovan – Assistant Director for Environmental Services
- Pam Marsden – Assistant Director for Community Care
- Pat Patel – Tamarview Community Complex
- Carole Burgoyne – Director for Community Services
- Phil Mitchell – Housing and Regeneration Manager
- Mr Emery – Resident
- Sam Swaby – Granby Island Community Centre
- Peter McNamara and colleagues– Devonport Regeneration Community Partnership
- Annie McGee – Consultant to Plymouth Family Support Service
- Councillor Wheeler - Chair of Ham and St Budeaux Area Committee
- Martin Clay and colleague– North Prospect Partnership
- Councillor Dr Mahony – Chair of Compton and Peverell Area Committee

Responses from witnesses and written evidence received from the Youth Parliament are detailed in Appendix 2. Responses to the Localities Working Joint Task and Finish Group Questionnaire is attached at Appendix 3.

## 7 Key Issues Arising from the Evidence

- 7.1 From the evidence received the Panel considered the following to be the key themes.
- 7.1.1 There is broad support for better service co-ordination based on the establishment of multi-agency teams at Locality level. Although there could be some flexibility in how these teams are established, minimum service standards should apply across Plymouth. The establishment of such teams should not imply that all services would be located or delivered at Locality level.
- 7.1.2 Despite Localities being an appropriate unit for service co-ordination and some delivery, there is a strong view that Neighbourhoods, not Localities, are the appropriate unit for community engagement. It was widely acknowledged that the Area Committees were not working effectively, with low attendance from residents, limited involvement from service providers and few outcomes. The committees were also seen as too formal which inhibited some residents from engaging in the process.
- 7.1.3 Different models had been considered such as the 'Northern Network'. Meetings were held within the Southway Ward and involved Ward Councillors and representatives from the police, head teachers, doctor's surgeries, the church, allotment association and the scouts. Any issues raised were dealt with by the Ward Councillors. The meetings were held on an informal basis at which the Ward Councillors took the notes which avoided formal support service requirements. However, the Panel recognised that this model would not necessarily work in other Neighbourhoods, such as Devonport which is establishing a Board as part of New Deal for Communities succession arrangements.
- 7.1.4. It was acknowledged that Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings and initiatives were operating with differing degrees of success at Neighbourhood level and, with some improvements, could provide a good vehicle for community engagement within small areas (residents knew what was needed within their own communities). However community engagement should not be a 'one size fits all' approach. Different Neighbourhoods have different needs and a variety of methods beyond meetings need to be employed to maximise engagement.
- 7.1.5 Although the scope of the Work Programme Request (PID) excluded the task and finish group from examining the boundaries of the six Localities (which had been agreed by the Local Strategic Partnership), it was acknowledged that most Localities (nb the Central and North East Locality) were too large and diverse to be seen as natural boundaries for community engagement. The 43 Neighbourhoods could be used as building blocks in this process as they were seen as key in enabling community engagement.
- 7.1.6 Although there should be minimum service standards across Plymouth, resources need to be directed in response to need rather than divided equally between the six Localities. It is evident that Localities Working needs to be delivered within existing budgets, as there was no additional funding available. However, a focus at Neighbourhood and Locality level would provide real potential to respond to different needs and to priority Neighbourhoods in relation to the Index of Multiple Deprivation and other data sets.



In particular, there is an opportunity to better co-ordinate resources in South West Locality which contains particular targeted interventions in Stonehouse, North Prospect and Devonport Neighbourhoods. However pockets of deprivation in more affluent areas should not be overlooked.

- 7.1.7 Data research should be used to inform future funding and where resources needed to be focused. It was acknowledged that scientific data should be used and not solely public perception, e.g. as in some areas residents would not be persuaded that crime had reduced. It was further acknowledged that the use of surveys could produce differing results and perceptions, i.e. the Place Survey and MORI Survey which had been undertaken in Devonport.
- 7.1.8 Specific resourcing issues had been identified at the Service Co-ordination Team level within Street Services (resources should not be taken away from the front line). It was recognised that this service could move more gradually to Localities Working.
- 7.1.9 Potential savings had been identified as a result of the recommendation to disband Area Committees (this saving could be allocated across the six Localities). Although it should be emphasised that 'cost cutting' was not a driver to move to Localities Working.
- 7.1.10 It was acknowledged that Localities Working should put the role of the Ward Councillor at the heart of this process and provide an opportunity to enhance the role.
- 7.1.11 The core expertise of each partner would need to be clearly identified and used effectively. Partners had a substantial role to play in this process and had a great capacity for communication which currently was not being exploited to its full extent.

## 8 Findings

- 8.1 Based on the evidence the Panel has collected, it believes that Localities Working can successfully deliver improvements if it is based on –
  - good community engagement at Neighbourhood level;
  - improved joining up of key services at Locality level;
  - a strengthened role for Ward Councillors as advocates on behalf of communities;
  - availability and consistency of relevant data at neighbourhood and Locality levels.
- 8.2 Service Co-ordination Teams in each Locality, pulled together by a Locality Lead, should include representatives of key services such as street scene, community safety, health, and children and young people, across partner agencies. Working together, within clear terms of reference, they would problem-solve and tackle relevant issues prioritised by the Councillors.
- 8.3 Each of Plymouth's 43 Neighbourhoods would have a recognised process for engaging its communities and gathering feedback. This needs to be relatively informal and can be based on existing PACT (Partners and Communities Together) initiatives eg street surveys and community meetings, improved where necessary to encourage wider participation.
- 8.4 This would be supplemented by information gathered by other methods, web-based, feedback from other fora and consultations etc, analysed at neighbourhood level.

- 8.5 Ward Councillors, engaged in the improved PACT process and equipped with feedback via these different methods, would advocate key priorities on behalf of their communities. Straightforward service requests and complaints (e.g. an individual householder's refuse collection) would continue to be directed to relevant services but issues reflecting a breakdown of services across different agencies or more complex cross-cutting matters (e.g. a run-down area attracting anti-social behaviour) would be referred to Service Co-ordination Teams; one for each Locality.
- 8.6 One Councillor from each neighbourhood would expect to be able to meet with their Locality's Service Co-ordination Team a few times during a year; but over time, working relationships based on problem resolution outside meetings should become more common place. Councillors would have a role in feeding back on progress to communities. This would put Ward Councillors at the heart of a process which engages communities in their Neighbourhoods. It would enhance Councillors' roles as advocates amongst different agencies, and encourage improved joint working at Locality level across the city.
- 8.7 To support Localities Working, information should be available covering local issues. This should include feedback from community engagement and consultation, as well as data on city-wide priorities, all disaggregated at neighbourhood level in a way that would inform decision-making and service responses.

## 9 Recommendations

- 9.1 In order to achieve the required outcomes, listed as 'benefits' in the Work Programme Request, i.e. –

"The scrutiny is an opportunity to examine ideas, good practice and a range of views before development of proposals on Localities Working. This will enhance the consultation process underway and will afford a particular opportunity for Members and others to contribute prior to recommendations being made to Cabinet and Council.",

the following recommendations are proposed –

### 9.1.1 **The Best Way of Joining up Services in Localities and the Proposals to have Locality Service Co-Ordination Teams in each Locality**

Service Co-ordination Teams are formed for each Locality reflecting proposals put out for consultation, i.e. as a minimum, with representatives from four key services, street scene and environment; community safety; health; and children and young people, across partner agencies. This would not preclude a limited number of additional services being represented permanently or on an ad hoc basis, in line with individual Locality requirements. Each team should be pulled together by a senior person (Locality Lead) and this role could be shared across different partners by mutual agreement.

City-wide minimum service standards should be developed to assist Locality Service Co-ordination Teams and standard Terms of Reference should apply to all Teams. Terms of Reference should cover any powers, decision-making, accountability, complaints, and any budget responsibility.

*The majority of witnesses agreed that the formation of Service Co-ordination Teams within each Locality was a good idea and the Panel supported this proposal (see 6.1.1).*

### **9.1.2 Ways to Improve Links Between Organisations Providing Services and the Community in each Locality and whether Area Committees should be replaced with Partnerships (one for each Locality) with a New Focus on Joint Problem Solving between Services and Communities**

Community engagement to support Localities Working, should be focused at neighbourhood level (i.e. in each of Plymouth's 43 Neighbourhoods) incorporating existing Partners and Communities Together (PACT) initiatives and with strengthened arrangements to involve Ward Councillors and facilitate community involvement. Arrangements should be as informal as possible (in terms of minute-taking etc) avoiding formal support service requirements.

Opportunities should be explored to involve Third Sector organisations in facilitation and to feed in community views from different sources e.g. web-based feedback, 'trade fair' events (i.e. not just meetings).

This proposal is an alternative to the suggestion made during consultation, of developing new community engagement structures at Locality level. However, the strengthened Neighbourhood arrangements should replace Area Committees which should be disbanded.

Ward Councillors should act as advocates on behalf of their Neighbourhoods and one Councillor from each Neighbourhood within a Locality should meet regularly with the relevant Service Co-ordination Team to raise issues, receive feedback and monitor progress. These Councillors should feedback to communities at Neighbourhood level.

*The majority of witnesses considered the proposal for Area Committees to be replaced with Partnerships (as detailed in the consultation questionnaire), as an inappropriate vehicle to deliver effective community consultation/engagement. To be effective, this needed to be delivered at Neighbourhood level. The Panel recognised that the proposed model to replace Area Committees with Partnerships would not work and therefore put forward the alternative proposal as outlined above (see 7.1.2, 7.1.4, 7.1.5 and 7.1.10).*

### **9.1.3 What Sorts of Information Locality Teams will need to Help with their Work**

To support Localities working, information should be available covering local issues, feedback from consultation and community engagement, and data on city-wide priorities, all disaggregated at Neighbourhood and Locality levels in a way that can inform decision-making and service responses.

*The Panel agreed that it was important to base decision making on good information and data to compliment community feedback and identify need and inequalities; and that this needs to be available at Neighbourhood level to help address this need (see 7.1.7).*

#### 9.1.4 **Addressing need**

The Panel also identified the issue of addressing resources in response to need (see 7.1.6). Although minimum service standards should apply across Localities and pockets of deprivation in more affluent Neighbourhoods should not be overlooked, Locality working should be used to direct resources to priority Neighbourhoods using appropriate data sets to identify need.

#### 9.1.5 **Review**

The panel acknowledged that a review of the progress of Localities Working would be required. It was proposed to set up a task and finish group 12 months after the implementation of this model in order to undertake the review.

### **10 Acknowledgements**

- 10.1 The Joint Task and Finish Group wished to thank staff and Service Users at Hamoaze House, and acknowledge the contribution from the witnesses, council officers, Pete Aley the Assistant Director for Safer Communities and Helen Wright the Democratic Support Officer.



## Request for Scrutiny Work Programme Item

1	<b>Title of Work Programme Item</b>	<b>Localities Working</b>
2	<b>Responsible Director (s)</b>	Carole Burgoyne
3	<b>Responsible Officer</b>  <b>Tel No.</b>	Peter Aley, Assistant Director for Safer Communities  304388
4	<b>Aim</b>	Contribute to, and encourage participation in, consultation to develop a model for Locality Working in Plymouth's 6 Localities identified by the LSP.
5	<b>Objectives</b>	<p><b>Objectives of Locality working are to:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable residents to influence and challenge service delivery</li> <li>• Make services more 'joined up'</li> <li>• Improve councillor involvement</li> <li>• Reducing inequalities between communities</li> <li>• Focus money and staff more effectively</li> <li>• Improve the sharing and use of information</li> <li>• Monitor service provision more effectively</li> <li>• Meet local and national targets.</li> </ul>
	<b>Benefits</b>	The scrutiny is an opportunity to examine ideas, good practice and a range of views before development of proposals on Localities working. This will enhance the consultation process underway and will afford a particular opportunity for members and others to contribute prior to recommendations being made to cabinet / council.
	<b>Beneficiaries</b>	The LSP Service providers The Third sector Communities Cabinet Full council
6	<b>Criteria for Choosing Topics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporate priority area</li> <li>• Public interest issue covered in local media</li> </ul>

7	<b>Scope</b>	<p>To examine and make recommendations on:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The best way of joining up services in Localities and the proposal to have Locality Service Co-ordination Teams in each locality</li> <li>• Ways we can improve links between organisations providing services and the community in each Locality and whether Area Committees should be replaced with Partnerships (one for each locality) with a new focus on joint problem solving between services and communities.</li> <li>• What sorts of information Locality Teams will need to help with their work.</li> </ul>		
	<b>Exclusions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The boundaries for our 6 Localities (which the Local Strategic Partnership has already agreed).</li> <li>• Any new arrangements for service delivery or new approaches to neighbourhood working, i.e. at the level of our 43 neighbourhoods. (However this would not preclude looking at how neighbourhood issues and concerns can best be considered at Locality level).</li> </ul>		
8	<b>Programme Dates</b>	<b><i>Needs to be complete by mid November</i></b>		
	<b>Timescales and Interdependences</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Target Date for Achievement</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>
		<p style="color: red; text-align: center;"><b>Known milestones for achieving the final report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27.7.09 Customers &amp; Communities OSP – this PID needs to be approved by them, will have to be tabled;</li> <li>• 5.8.09 O &amp; S Management Board – this PID should be published on 27.7.09 with the agenda, Management Board will need to appoint Members;</li> <li>• Task &amp; Finish Group needs to meet in August if going to 02.11.09 and 05.11.09 O &amp; S Management Board.</li> </ul>	<p style="color: red; text-align: center;"><b>Dates of known milestones</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 19.01.10– Cabinet</li> <li>• 01.02.10 – Council</li> </ul>	Peter Aley
9	<b>Links to other projects or initiatives / plans</b>	Part of CIP4		

10	Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel	Customers and Communities OSP
11	Lead Officer for Panel	<i>Peter Aley</i>
12	Reporting arrangements	<p><b>Dates of Panels, Commission and Cabinet /Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 28.9.09 – Customers &amp; Communities OSP – too late, won't be able to approve task &amp; finish group report, need mechanism to approve task &amp; finish group report before O &amp; S Management Board</li> <li>• 01.12.09 – O &amp; S Management Board to approve scrutiny report.</li> <li>• 19.01.10 – Cabinet</li> <li>• 01.02.10 – Council</li> </ul>
13	Resources	<p><b>Staff and other resources</b></p> <p>Strategic Housing and LSP staff</p>
14	Budget implications	<p><b>Resources within existing budgets and any additional resources required</b></p> <p>Staff time</p>
15	Risk analysis e.g. if no scrutiny	A potential major change in the way the council and partners co-ordinate services and engage the public would be developed without the opportunity for proactive scrutiny to influence it.
16	Project Plan / Actions	<b>Project Plan to be prepared by Select Committee appointed by Panel</b>

**Customers and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel  
Localities Working Task and Finish Group  
Key Points from the Meeting held on Monday 2 November 2009**

**1. Witness            Andy Bickley  
                             Superintendent Devon and Cornwall Police**

**Key Points:**

- Neighbourhood working is far more responsive;
- Policing areas are not aligned with other agency boundaries;
- Co-ordinating budgets and an opportunity for public engagement;
- Some areas would need more intensive intervention;
- Not precious about budgets;
- Data informs where the resources need to go but would need constant review;
- Not policy making evidence but evidence based policy;
- Use of actual scientific data and not public perception (in some areas people wont be persuaded that crime has reduced);
- Place survey and MORI survey in Devonport produced different results and perceptions;
- Too many meetings are not productive;
- Area Committees are not productive, poorly advertised, and attendance is largely due to the issues on the agenda (if it does not affect people they will not attend).

**2. Witness            Peter Flukes  
                             Wolseley Trust**

**Key Points:**

- Functions of partners should be carefully defined;
- Core expertise of each of the partners should be used effectively, core expertise has to be identified;
- Opportunities to improve the role of Councillors;



- Opportunities to utilise partners more fully (partners have a great capacity for communication which at present is not harnessed – partners do have a substantial role to play);
- Enabling role not one grouping of representatives;
- No interference with the co-ordination teams (communication and accountability);
- Councillor role right at the heart of this process.

**3. Witness      Jane Donovan**  
**Assistant Director Environmental Services**

### **Key Points**

- Actions not meetings have a lean structure (issue with being able to provide staff to attend meetings);
- Place resources where they are needed and not divide the budget by the six localities;
- Flexibility and the need for innovation (disappointed that minimum standards may not be achieved in all areas in order to place resources in the more challenging areas);
- Localities working is not addressing the 'business as usual issues' need highlight matters that are not working;
- Need to have the right system in place to enable ownership for those things to be done properly and encourage a sense of pride and ownership in an area;
- No extra funds, very clear deliver within existing resources;
- Use of resources from partners;
- The local authority is the budget holder for street scene and environmental issues and not other partners;
- There were benefits for a community if residents live in a clean environment (the police were willing to share resources);
- Use the probation service;
- Who would be the representatives (Services for Children and Young People had appointed people across the localities – do not have anyone within the structure to act as representatives, do not want to take resources away from the front line, the challenge would be the right people doing the right job);

- Key element regarding where people live (people respond to whether they live in a mess or clean area, accountability and continuity were important to achieving this).

**4. Witness Pam Marsden  
Assistant Director for Community Services**

**Key Points:**

- Flexibility, although 25 staff had moved into Plympton/Plymstock this would be under review and they were confident in working with health partners;
- Co-location and shared resources would only be placed in three of the localities and not all six;
- Better service for the service user that was our aim (integration that was what you would achieve);
- Working well with health partners;
- Flexibility about management;
- Other partners;
- The work on localities seems to be further advanced;
- No thought about accountability/governance arrangements.

**5. Witness Pat Patel  
Tamarview Community Complex**

**Key Points:**

- Acknowledge PACT meetings are working well and were a good vehicle for community engagement for a small area;
- Residents know what is needed in their area;
- Community groups were able to pull people together;
- The ability to have some influence over budgets would be a good thing;
- Area Committees are just for Councillors and Co-opted representatives;
- Little involvement by service providers at Area Committee meetings;
- Lack of youth service provision in the area;
- Small neighbourhood working would be best.

**6. Witness Phil Mitchell  
Housing and Regeneration Manager**

**Key Points:**

- Use of the super output areas focus on where there was the most deprivation, this might be a way of prioritising some of the neighbourhood working;
- There was a difference in what was being said he seemed to be suggesting that the locality level should be used for strategic issues that were not resolved at neighbourhood level, other witnesses seem to imply locality level is more taskforce working;
- Not possible to have an infrastructure in all 43 neighbourhoods to deal with issues (focus on deprivation).

**7. Witness Mr Emery  
Resident of Plymstock**

**Key Points:**

- Lack of consultation with localities working (only a small sample of people involved in the process);
- Area Committees were not local enough;
- Service providers did not attend Area Committee meetings;
- General PACT meetings liked the neighbourhoods;
- The consultation response on locality working from the Plymstock Area Committee did not accurately reflect the minute;
- Area Committees were too formal (council meetings form a barrier for residents, it is a council meeting for councillors as oppose to a meeting with residents);
- Consultation was insufficient (no information or background was provided for people to enable them to make a recommendation);
- Recommendations community engagement on consultation;
- The system is not working for individuals and individuals make up communities.

**8. Witness Peter McNamara  
David Brown  
Will Blagdon  
Anne Freeman  
Devonport Regeneration Community Partnership**

**Key Points:**

- Evidence based resources based on evidence and priorities;
- Money resources to be dropped down to the neighbourhood could hit targets but have no great benefit;
- Not one size that fits all;
- Use existing access points;
- Clear purpose;
- Partnership working is efficient, saves time and opens doors;
- Funding is not everything;
- Need to take with a pinch of salt level of community consultation, lack of involvement in DCLT and Land Trust.

**9. Witness      Annie McGee  
                         Consultant to PFSS**

**Key Points:**

- Workforce development new ways of training staff;
- Develop trust of people prior to embarking on the formal part;
- One service long time proven record of success might consider expertise apply work throughout the local authority;
- Three key issues not an issue Area Committees relationship with neighbours and boundaries;
- Lack of parity across the city (Barn Barton hard to reach groups have not got a youth worker);
- Not aware of work going on in half term.

**10. Witness      Sam Swaby  
                         Granby Island Community Centre**

**Key Points:**

- Commonality of purpose;
- Danger of solely looking at deprived localities as there were pockets of deprivation in affluent areas;
- Only way Index Multi Deprivation – evidence based;

- Data collection inform funding in the future (be clear in the recommendations).

**11. Witness Councillor Wheeler**

**Key Points:**

- Neighbourhoods were key to enabling the community, happy to use the neighbourhoods as building blocks;
- People were only interested in what goes on in their area;
- Problem resourcing 43 neighbourhoods.

**12. Witness Martin Clay  
Roger Mitchell  
North Prospect Partnership**

**Key Points:**

- Loss of an area's identity;
- Concerns relating to losing the improvements that have already been made;
- Funding needed to be driven rather than just divided into the localities;
- There was an assumption that funding would be divided equally into the six localities;
- Attention to make representatives views at the localities level, loudest voice not have the most say danger historically that has happened;
- Mature neighbourhoods invest and grow.

**13. Witness Councillor Dr Mahony  
Chair of Compton and Peverell Area Committee**

**Key Points:**

- Central and North East locality is too big and diverse;
- Not challenging neighbourhoods and building blocks more flexible with ward boundaries.

**14. Witness Carole Burgoyne  
Director for Community Services**

**Key Points:**

- 'One size did not fit all' localities would be operated in slightly different ways;

- Minimum service standards should be developed;
- Not all services will be located at Locality level i.e. Mental Health or Adoption;
- Learn lessons from previous consultation exercise, i.e. the recent waste rezoning initiative could have engaged the PCSOs to make residents aware of what would be happening to their street's waste collection arrangements;
- Important to manage expectations do not want to move to a more complicated way of working.

### **15 Written Youth Parliament Evidence**

#### **Key Points:**

- young people were unaware that Area Committees existed and therefore did not attend the meetings;
- a proposal to hold a Localities Working open day to launch the initiative;
- a suggestion to send questionnaires to school to establish the issues affecting young people (young people found Area Committee meetings boring);
- in order to encourage people to become engaged, examples could be provided of successful outcomes;
- a proposal to form Localities Working committees aimed at young people; membership could be drawn from the youth forums within the Localities which could then feedback the local issues to the committees;
- there were potential issues relating to transport and whether young people would be able to attend the meetings due to size of the Localities.

**Written Evidence Gathered from Questions set out by the Panel**

**Locality Working: Task & Finish Group Questionnaire Responses**

**Feedback to date**

(9 RESPONSES RECEIVED TO 28/10/09).

Q1 – Set up 6 Locality Teams/4 key services?

**77% recorded yes, 0% no.** Need regular newsletters, feedback from the community, involve university in SE locality. Other services suggested to be covered: security, housing maintenance, social divide, planning and transport.

Q2 – Led by Champion, assisted by coordinator?

**44% recorded yes, 10% no.** Champion needs to have commitment and ability, recognise needs of low income families, work alongside Area Committees (ACs), councillors could be Champions, should be a Community champion and not recompensed. Coordinator could volunteer for free.

Q3 – Replace 8 Area Committees with 6 Locality Partnerships?

**44% recorded yes, 22% no.** A view that Neighbourhood level is preferred and most effective level of community engagement (PACTS work well at this level), so need two tier system. Localities are based on school catchments, these are irrelevant: suggestion of four way split to create 4 strategic areas. Another disagreed with boundaries.

PACTS should continue. Localities too big for community to be heard. Develop ACs to take on new role. Regular newsletters needed, need regular meetings with police.

Q4 – Involving local people.

Emphasis on well publicised meetings, accessible, central venues, use questionnaires, door to door inquiries, work together, have flexible agendas, draw up a plan, support active tenants organisations, link with community anchors.

Q5 – What information is needed?

Statistical information, information from areas, record of what work is being done, local knowledge, disability issues, listen to TRAs (?), need full range of information from all services.

Q6 – Governance arrangements?

Decisions should be based on necessity and consensus. All services to be covered. Listen to community views. Need delegated budget, decide where finances spent.

Q7 – Any other comments?

AC experience is of very low attendance from residents. Rethink the whole boundary issue. Areas too big. Keep it simple and it will work. Councillors need budget to improve area. Keep residents informed.

A view that after Scrutiny need to feedback to ACs.

Ensure consultation is not about what's already decided.

NJM 28/10/09

This page is intentionally left blank



**CITY OF PLYMOUTH**

**Subject:** Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel Quarterly Report

**Committee:** Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel

**Date:** 9 November 2009

**CMT Member:** Bronwen Lacey, Director for Children and Young People

**Author:** Richenda Broad (Acting Assistant Director for Commissioning, Policy and Performance - Lead Officer)

**Contact:** [richenda.broad@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:richenda.broad@plymouth.gov.uk)

**Ref:**

**Part:** Part I

---

**Executive Summary:**

This report sets out a review of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel for the second quarter of 2009/10.

---

**Corporate Plan 2009-2012:**

The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel provides strategic scrutiny of the following Corporate Improvement Priorities and key areas:

- CIP7 - Keeping children safe
  - CIP8 - Improving skills and educational achievement
  - CIP9 - Developing high quality places to learn in
  - CIP 13 - Supporting staff to perform better
  - CIP 14 - Proving better value for money
- 

**Implications for Medium Term Financial Plan and Resource Implications:  
Including finance, human, IT and land**

None

---

**Other Implications: e.g. Section 17 Community Safety, Health and Safety, Risk Management, Equalities Impact Assessment, etc.**

None

---

**Recommendations & Reasons for recommended action:**

That the report is noted

---

**Alternative options considered and reasons for recommended action:**

N/A

---

**Background papers:**

Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny minutes and forward plan

---

**Sign off:** N/A

## CITY OF PLYMOUTH

## Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel Quarterly Report

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This report sets out a review of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel for the second quarter of 2009/10, incorporating the meetings of 24 September and 22 October 2009 respectively.

**2. Scope of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

- 2.1 The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel is primarily concerned with the strategic scrutiny of the following Corporate Improvement Priorities and key areas:

- o CIP7 - Keeping children safe
- o CIP 8 - Improving skills and educational achievement
- o CIP 9 - Developing high quality places to learn in

- 2.2 The detailed terms of reference for the panel are contained in Appendix 1.

- 2.3 The panel consists of the following members and officers

Title	Name	Attendances (4 meetings)
Councillor (Chair)	Purnell	4
Councillor (Vice Chair)	Stephens	3
Councillor	Mrs Beer	2
Councillor	Bowie	2
Councillor	Mrs Bragg	4
Councillor	Delbridge	3
Councillor	Reynolds	1
Councillor	Roberts	4
Councillor	Vincent	2
Statutory Co-opted rep	C Bruce-Spencer	-
Statutory Co-opted rep	T Lyddon	1
Statutory Co-opted rep	K Willis	2
Statutory Co-opted rep	M Gee (resigned 19.11.09)	-
Co-opted rep	A Kearnes	2
Co-opted rep	J Paget	3
Co-opted rep	K Taylor	2
Co-opted rep	Prof M Totterdell	-
Lead Officer	Richenda Broad/Claire Cordory-Oatway	4
Democratic Support	Cathy McCabe/Amelia Boulter/Rachel Watson	4

- 2.4 The Panel, through effective strategic and operational scrutiny, supports the following cabinet member and CMT officer

Title	Name
Cabinet Member (Children and Young People)	Grant Monahan

Director of Services for Children and Young People	Bronwen Lacey
--	---------------

2.5 The panel has a budget of £2,000 to support the scrutiny work.

2.8 The panel has requested practical training in respect of finance.

### 3. Key achievements to date

The panel has now met on two occasions. Meetings have been well structured, managed efficiently and well attended by panel members. A positive contribution has been made to support an effective strategic and operational overview; in particular, the following achievements have already been made:

#### 3.1 Co-opted representatives

The panel has sustained a diverse group of co-opted representatives, including young people, and celebrates the wider perspective these representatives bring.

#### 3.2 Integrated Services – Localities

In order to inform an effective overview of locality service provision, the panel has visited a number of venues/service providers within the South West and Plympton localities to hear about their work and role in the locality agenda, including:

- Green Ark Children's Centre, Devonport
- Hamoaze House (Voluntary & Community Sector)
- Stoke Damerel Community College (& chair of SW locality Commissioning Group)
- Excellence Cluster Coordinators & Locality Manager
- Plum Tree Children's Centre, Plympton (& member of Plympton Locality Commissioning Group)
- Plympton St Maurice School
- Yealmpstone Farm Primary School

The Panel has successfully joined with other panels to achieve effective scrutiny of the 'localities working'. This group has had a targeted approach and the panel would like to emphasise that it values site visits.

#### 3.3 Safeguarding – Child Protection Plans

The panel received an update on performance indicators related to children with a child protection plan. The panel heard that for some professions (e.g. GPs, Health Visitors), attendance at initial case conferences, reviews and core group meetings was slightly below target, reflecting a national picture. However, in many cases the relevant professionals had submitted written reports for consideration at those meetings. The panel resolved that future performance updates would reflect whether the necessary information had been received from the relevant professionals, not just whether they had attended the meetings.

#### 3.4 Corporate Parenting

The panel received a report on the role of the Corporate Parenting Group, which provides a leadership role by championing the specific needs of children and young

people in care, and ensuring a corporate approach is taken by a range of council departments and agencies. The group was formed in recognition of the particular disadvantages that children and young people in care can face; they can do less well socially, economically and emotionally compared to other children. The Plymouth Pledge has been developed which outlines Plymouth's commitment to all children and young people in care, aiming to 'narrow the gap' between them and their peers. The panel made the following resolutions:

- the panel regularly review the work of the Corporate Parenting Group and identify issues that require further work and arrange for Corporate Parenting to become incorporated into the work programme on an annual basis;
- Cabinet consider the commitments outlined in the Pledge for children and young people in care and that Corporate Parenting and the involvement of children and young people in care is incorporated into the committee's work programme on an annual basis;
- the Corporate Management Team identify departmental 'champions' in each council area so that the needs of children and young people in care can be incorporated into strategy and policy formation with accountability to the Corporate Parenting Group;
- all appraisals and staff supervision to specifically address progress against the Pledge;
- all Elected Members attend induction training on Corporate Parenting;
- all departments consider providing work placements for young people in care.

### **3.5 Teenage conception rates**

A joint task and finish group has commenced and work is progressing effectively.

## **4. On the Horizon**

The panel has set out the following topic areas on the work programme for the remainder of 2009/10:

Overview:

- Placement Services (Adoption; Fostering)
- Integrated services for children with disabilities
- Provision and support for young carers
- Employment for young people (not in education, employment or training)
- Common Assessment Framework

In addition, a task and finish group has been set up with a focus on reducing teenage conception rates in the city. The group will review the Improving Young People's Sexual Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2009 – 2012 and accompanying Implementation Plan, and will produce a report with recommendations for improvement to support the implementation plan.

Policy Development/Review:

- Recruitment and retention for Foster Carers
- Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services
- Preventing and managing obesity in the young people of Plymouth

Performance:

- Performance review, including budget
- Complaints and compliments (annual report)
- Quality Assurance Framework
- School attainment results, including those for Looked After Children

Strategic Policy Documents:

- Strategy for Change – Building schools for the future
- Youth Justice Plan

## **5. Recommendation**

- 5.1 That the progress of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny panel is noted by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

Richenda Broad

Lead Officer Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel

9 November 2009

## **Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel Terms of Reference**

### Responsibilities

- On-going monitoring of post-inspection action plans (relating to its policy areas);
- To review new and existing policies and consider how they may be improved and developed;
- To monitor the budget and performance of the Cabinet Member, Department and partners to ensure that the priorities for the area are being delivered upon;
- To monitor performance against the relevant Corporate Improvement Priorities;
- To review Policies within the Budget and Policy Framework;
- To consider Equality Impact Assessments against new and existing policies;
- To investigate local issues to find out how the council and its partners can improve to meet the needs of local people;
- To make recommendations about service delivery to the Cabinet (via the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board);
- To review and scrutinise the performance of partner organisations;
- To set up ad hoc Working Groups as and when required;
- To produce quarterly progress reports to go to the management board;
- Any work delegated to the panel by the Board.

### Policy Areas include:

- Children's Services
- Lifelong Learning
- Learning and Family Support
- Education
- Social Care relating to Children and Young People
- Children and Young People's Trust
- Children and Young People's Partnership
- Teenage Pregnancy
- Child Healthcare

### Policy Framework Plans and Strategies relating to Policy Areas

- Children and Young People's Plan
- Ideas for Change
- Youth Justice Plan

### Membership

The Chair of the Panel shall serve on the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. The Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel will be chaired by a Member of the opposition political group with the vice-chair from the majority political group. All Members of the panel will adhere to the general rules of Overview and Scrutiny. There are 9 members of the panel including the Chair and the vice-chair. The vice-chair is from the opposite political group to the Chair.

The Panel also includes 4 statutory members for education matters –

- 2 Parent Governors
- 1 Catholic Church representative
- 1 Church of England representative

All Members of the panel will adhere to the general rules of Overview and Scrutiny.

Cabinet Member

Children and Young People

Directorate

Services for Children and Young People

Lead Officer

Assistant Director, Children's Services

Corporate Improvement Priorities (CIPs)

- Safe Children (CIP 7)
- Skills and Education (CIP 8)
- High quality places to learn (CIP 9)
- Supporting council staff to perform better (CIP 13)
- Providing better value for money (CIP 14)

LSP Link

- Wise

This page is intentionally left blank



**CITY OF PLYMOUTH**

**Subject:** Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel Quarterly Report

**Committee:** Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel

**Date:** 25 November 2009

**CMT Member:** Carole Burgoyne (Director for Community Services)

**Author:** Christina Smale (Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel Lead Officer)

**Contact:** christina.smale@plymouth.gov.uk

**Ref:**

**Part:** Part I

---

**Executive Summary:**

This report sets out a review of the Health & Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel for the second quarter of 2009/10.

---

**Corporate Plan 2009-2012:**

The Health & Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel provides strategic scrutiny of the following Corporate Improvement Priorities and key areas:

- CIP3 - Independent Living
  - CIP4 - Reducing inequalities
  - Health performance
  - Adult Social Care performance
  - Commissioning
- 

**Implications for Medium Term Financial Plan and Resource Implications:**

**Including finance, human, IT and land**

None

---

**Other Implications: e.g. Section 17 Community Safety, Health and Safety, Risk Management, Equalities Impact Assessment, etc.**

None

---

**Recommendations & Reasons for recommended action:**

That the report is noted

---

**Alternative options considered and reasons for recommended action:**

N/A

---

**Background papers:**

Health & Social Care Overview and Scrutiny minutes and forward plan

---

**Sign off:** N/A

## CITY OF PLYMOUTH

## Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel Quarterly Report

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This report sets out a review of the Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel for the second quarter of 2009/10, incorporating the meetings of 29 July and 23 September 2009 respectively.

**2. Scope of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

- 2.1 The Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel is primarily concerned with the strategic scrutiny of the following Corporate Improvement Priorities and key areas:
- CIP3 - Independent Living
  - CIP4 - Reducing inequalities
  - Health performance
  - Adult Social Care performance
  - Commissioning
  - Health & Adult Social Care Integration
- 2.2 The detailed terms of reference for the panel are contained in Appendix 1.
- 2.3 The panel consists of the following members and officers

Title	Name	Attendances (2 meetings)
Councillor (Chair)	Mrs Watkins	2
Councillor (Vice Chair)	Mrs Aspinall	2
Councillor	Berrow	2
Councillor	Browne	1
Councillor	Delbridge	2
Councillor	Gordon	1
Councillor	Stark	2
Councillor	Kerswell	0
Councillor	Mrs Nicholson	1
Lead Officer	Christina Smale	1
Democratic Support	Katey Johns	2
Co-opted Representative – Local Involvement Network (LINK)	Barry Lucas (resigned 09/09)	1

- 2.4 The Panel, through effective strategic and operational scrutiny, supports the following cabinet members and CMT officers

Title	Name
Cabinet Member (Adult Health & Social Care)	David Salter
Director for Community Services	Carole Burgoyne

2.5 The panel has a budget of £2,000 to support the scrutiny work.

### 3. Key achievements to date

3.1 The panel has now met on two occasions. Meetings have been well structured, managed efficiently and well attended by panel members. A positive contribution has been made to support an effective strategic and operational overview, in particular the following achievements have already been made:

- The Chair has extended an open invitation for any panel member to attend pre-meeting planning sessions in order to improve transparency and include all panel members in proactive scrutiny.
- The panel has approved a comprehensive work programme which, in addition to focusing on Council services, looks at Partnership initiatives and performance.
- The Chair and Vice-Chair continue to meet regularly with the Chief Executives of NHS Plymouth and Plymouth Hospitals Trust in order to develop partnership working.
- The panel heard of the work being undertaken to promote and increase welfare benefits and tax credits take-up in the City and resolved to raise the issue of debt alerting opportunities with the Chief Executive of Plymouth Hospitals Trust. As a result, the Trust agreed to liaise with the City's Community Inclusion Unit to look at possible alerting/signposting opportunities at Derriford Hospital.
- The panel has been quick to understand the scope, remit and key performance measures of the three CIP's that it is responsible for scrutinising. Lead Officers and Cabinet Members from each of the three CIP's have already met the panel, presented the CIP's and been subject to scrutiny, thus laying the foundation for ongoing review and scrutiny of progress against milestones and key performance measures.
- The panel wishes to increase its co-opted representation and has written to the Board of Directors for NHS Plymouth and Plymouth Hospitals Trust inviting a non-executive director of each to join the panel.
- The panel was pleased to receive proposals from the South West Specialised Commissioning Group regarding service development proposals for delivering surgical procedures and associated treatment to patients with soft tissue sarcoma. The proposed approach and intention to designate two soft tissue sarcoma centres in the south west region was both welcomed and supported by the panel.
- The panel has engaged with the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Trust over its Foundation Trust consultation and has provided a formal written response in full support of the Trust's proposals.
- The panel has continued to monitor Plymouth Hospitals Trust performance with regard to provision of maternity services and hygiene standards following poor inspection results. This has involved a visit to the maternity services unit by the Chair and Vice Chair and the Chair's involvement with the tendering process for the Hospital's Hotel Services Contract.

- The panel has met with the Director for Community Services and discussed the vision for the Council and how the Department's function will help to deliver the strategic priorities.

#### **4. On the Horizon**

4.1 The Panel has received an update from the Director of Community Services, Chief Executive of the Plymouth Primary Care Trust and the Chief Executive of the Plymouth Hospitals Trust on the current financial and performance of all three organisations with a view to setting the following objectives in the workplan:

- To review the findings of the Care Quality Commission Annual Performance Assessment of Adult Social Care
- To review the findings of Care Quality Commission – Annual Healthcheck
- To receive an update on All Our Futures strategy
- To review the safeguarding/adult protection multi agency arrangements for adults

4.2 The panel will receive –

- The Director for Public Health's Annual Report 2009
- NHS Plymouth – Mental Health Commission Annual Report 2009
- Proposals for delivering Specialised Burn Care Services

#### **5. Recommendation**

5.1 That the progress of the Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny panel is noted by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

5.2 The panel is working towards managing and resolving it's tracking resolutions promptly but acknowledges blocks in the system that have meant slippage in starting reviews i.e. safeguarding.

Christina Smale  
Lead Officer Health & Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel  
17 November 2009

## Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel

### Terms of Reference

- To review new and existing policies and consider how they may be improved and developed;
- To monitor the budget and performance of the Cabinet Member, Department and partners to ensure that the priorities for the area are being delivered upon;
- To monitor performance against the relevant Corporate Improvement Priorities;
- To review Policies within the Budget and Policy Framework;
- To consider Equality Impact Assessments against new and existing policies;
- To investigate local issues to find out how the council and its partners can improve to meet the needs of local people;
- To make recommendations about service delivery to the Cabinet (via the Board)
- To review and scrutinise the performance of partner organisations
- To set up Ad-Hoc Working Groups as and when required;
- To produce quarterly progress reports to go to the management board

### Policy Areas

- Adult Social Care
- Partner Organisations – PCT etc

### Cabinet Members

- Adult Health and Social Care

### Directorate

- Public Health
- Community Services

### Corporate Improvement Priorities (CIPs)

- Independent Living (CIP 3)
- Reducing Inequalities (CIP 4)

### LSP Link

- Healthy

### Membership

The Chair of the Panel shall serve on the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. The Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panel will be chaired by a Member of the majority political group with the vice-chair from the opposition political group. All Members of the panel will adhere to the general rules of overview and scrutiny.

This page is intentionally left blank

**CITY OF PLYMOUTH**

**Subject:** Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel Quarterly Report  
**Committee:** Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel  
**Date:** 27 October 2009  
**CMT Member:** Adam Broome (Director for Corporate Support)  
Ian Gallin (Assistant Chief Executive)  
**Author:** Simon Arthurs (Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel  
Lead Officer)  
**Contact:** simon.arthurs@plymouth.gov.uk  
**Ref:** SS-OSPQtr2-SRA  
**Part:** Part I

---

**Executive Summary:**

This report sets out a review of the Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel for the second quarter of 2009/10.

---

**Corporate Plan 2009-2012:**

The Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel provides strategic scrutiny of the following Corporate Improvement Priorities and key areas:

- CIP2 - Informing and involving residents
  - CIP13 - Supporting Council staff to perform better
  - CIP14 - Providing better value for money
  - The strategic and operational activities of the Chief Executives and Corporate Support Departments
- 

**Implications for Medium Term Financial Plan and Resource Implications:  
Including finance, human, IT and land**

None

---

**Other Implications: e.g. Section 17 Community Safety, Health and Safety, Risk  
Management, Equalities Impact Assessment, etc.**

None

---

**Recommendations & Reasons for recommended action:**

That the report is noted

---

**Alternative options considered and reasons for recommended action:**

N/A

---

**Background papers:**

Support Services Overview and Scrutiny minutes and forward plan

---

**Sign off:** N/A

## CITY OF PLYMOUTH

## Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel Quarterly Report

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This report sets out a review of the Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel for the second quarter of 2009/10, incorporating the meetings of 6 August and 1 October 2009 respectively.

**2. Scope of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

- 2.1 The Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel is primarily concerned with the strategic scrutiny of the following Corporate Improvement Priorities and key areas:
- o CIP2 - Informing and involving residents
  - o CIP13 - Supporting Council staff to perform better
  - o CIP14 - Providing better value for money
  - o The strategic and operational activities of the Chief Executives and Corporate Support Departments
- 2.2 The detailed terms of reference for the panel are contained in Appendix 1.
- 2.3 The panel consists of the following members and officers

Title	Name	Attendances (2 meetings)
Councillor (Chair)	D.James	2
Councillor (Vice Chair)	M.Lowry	2
Councillor	P.Berrow	1
Councillor	S.Dann	1
Councillor	S.Leaves	1
Councillor	J.Lock	1
Councillor	D.Stark	2
Councillor	B.Stevens	2
Councillor	J.Thompson	2
Lead Officer	Simon Arthurs	2
Democratic Support	Gemma Pearce	2

- 2.4 The Panel, through effective strategic and operational scrutiny, supports the following cabinet members and CMT officers

Title	Name
Cabinet Member (Finance, Property, People and Governance)	Ian Bowyer
Cabinet Member (Customer Services, Performance and Partnerships)	Steven Ricketts
Director for Corporate Support	Adam Broome
Assistant Chief Executive	Ian Gallin

- 2.5 The panel has a budget of £2,000 to support the scrutiny work.



### **3. Key achievements to date**

3.1 The panel has now met on two occasions. Meetings have been well structured, managed efficiently and well attended by panel members. A positive contribution has been made to support an effective strategic and operational overview, in particular the following achievements have already been made:

- The panel received the terms of reference for the Audit Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in order to have a clear and focused understanding of its own remit.
- The Chair has extended an open invitation for any panel member to attend pre-meeting planning sessions in order to improve transparency and include all panel members in proactive scrutiny.
- The panel has approved a work programme focusing on the CIP's and progress of key strategies, including the people, accommodation and IT strategies.
- The panel is also managing and resolving it's tracking resolutions promptly.
- The panel has recommended that feedback from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board is a standing item on its own agenda, enabling the panel to ensure it operates effectively and maintains a good working relationship with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and other Overview and Scrutiny panels.
- The panel has been quick to understand the scope, remit and key performance measures of the three CIP's that it is responsible for scrutinising. Lead Officers and Cabinet Members from each of the three CIP's have already met the panel, presented the CIP's and been subject to scrutiny, thus laying the foundation for ongoing review and scrutiny of progress against milestones and key performance measures.
- The panel has met with the Director for Corporate Support and discussed the vision for the Council and how the Corporate Support function will help to deliver this.
- The panel has scrutinised and recommended the People Strategy to the Cabinet for approval.

### **4. On the Horizon**

4.1 Having received an overview of the CIP's and scrutinised the People Strategy the panel has set out the following objectives in the workplan:

- To review the findings of the Place survey, as part of the ongoing scrutiny of CIP2 (informing and involving residents)
- To receive an update on the respective Accommodation and ICT strategies
- To review resources to support scrutiny (as referred by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board)

- Monitoring of the CityBus Ltd Shareholding project (jointly with the Growth and Prosperity Overview and Scrutiny Panel)

**5. Recommendation**

5.1 That the progress of the Support Services Overview and Scrutiny panel is noted by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

Simon Arthurs  
Lead Officer Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel  
27 October 2009

## **Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

### **Terms of Reference**

- To review new and existing policies and consider how they may be improved and developed;
- To monitor the budget and performance of the Cabinet Member, Department and partners to ensure that the priorities for the area are being delivered upon;
- To monitor performance against the relevant Corporate Improvement Priorities;
- To review Policies within the Budget and Policy Framework;
- To consider Equality Impact Assessments against new and existing policies;
- To investigate local issues to find out how the council and its partners can improve to meet the needs of local people;
- To make recommendations about service delivery to the Cabinet (via the Board)
- To review and scrutinise the performance of partner organisations
- To set up Ad-Hoc Working Groups as and when required;
- To produce quarterly progress reports to go to the management board

### Policy Areas

- Business Transformation
- Finance
- ICT
- Human Resources and Organisational Development
- Democracy and Governance
- Assistant Chief Executive
- Policy and Performance
- Communications

### Cabinet Members

- Finance, Property, People and Governance
- Customer Services, Performance and Partnerships

### Directorate

- Chief Executive's
- Corporate Support

### Corporate Improvement Priorities (CIPs)

- Involving residents (CIP 2)
- Staff performance (CIP 13)
- Value for money (CIP 14)

### LSP Link

- LSP Support

### Membership

The Chair of the Panel shall serve on the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. The Support Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel will be chaired by a Member of the majority political group with the vice-chair from the opposition political group. All Members of the panel will adhere to the general rules of Overview and Scrutiny.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Draft**  
**Recommendations from Panel to the Overview and Scrutiny**  
**Management Board**

**Customers and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel**  
**Meeting – 23 November 2009**

**Minute 37. Life Centre and Related Leisure Projects – Update and to Agree Future Scrutiny Arrangements**

Recommended that –

- (1) the report is noted;
- (2) an additional meeting of the Panel is held in January 2010 to review the following –
  - a the Life Centre and Related Projects Programme
  - b the award of the construction contract
  - c funding/finance of the project
- (3) the Panel seek delegated authority from the Management Board to consider the Panel's recommendations to Cabinet on 19 January 2009. (Due to the tight timescales, it will not be possible to submit the Panel's recommendations to the Overview and Management Board as the scheduled meeting on 2 December 2009 is too early and the meeting on 20 January is too late).

**Minute 39. Corporate Improvement Priorities**

Recommended that the current anomaly is further investigated to enable the bi monthly joint finance and performance report to be submitted to the Panel to enable it to effectively monitor budget/performance issues.

This page is intentionally left blank