

Public Document Pack

Your ref
Our ref
Ask for Christine Lewis
Email



**District Council House, Frog Lane
Lichfield, Staffordshire WS13 6YU**

Customer Services 01543 308000
Direct Line

Wednesday, 10 November 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee has been arranged to take place
THURSDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 2021 at 6.00 PM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER District
Council House, Lichfield to consider the following business.

Access to the is via the Members' Entrance.

In light of the current Covid-19 pandemic and government advice on social distancing, whilst this meeting will be held at the District Council Offices, a limited number of people can attend the meeting therefore it will be live streamed on the Council's [YouTube channel](#) for all members of the public to view.

.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Christie Tims', written over a light grey circular stamp.

Christie Tims
Head of Governance and Performance

To: Members of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Councillors Leytham (Chair), Norman (Vice-Chair), Eagland, Evans, Grange, A Little, Parton-Hughes, Powell, Robertson, Silvester-Hall, Mrs Tranter, Warburton and M Wilcox



www.lichfielddc.gov.uk



[/lichfielddc](https://www.facebook.com/lichfielddc)



[lichfield_dc](https://twitter.com/lichfield_dc)



MyStaffs App

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declarations of Interests
3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting 3 - 6
4. Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) To Follow
5. **A Better Council** 7 - 12

This will be a verbal presentation however the Cabinet report is attached as a background paper.
6. Health Matters 13 - 18
7. Updates from Task Groups 19 - 26
8. Work Programme 27 - 28



OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16 SEPTEMBER 2021

PRESENT:

Councillors Leytham (Chair), Norman (Vice-Chair), Eagland, Evans, Grange, A Little, Powell, Robertson, Silvester-Hall, Mrs Tranter, Warburton and M Wilcox

8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Parton-Hughes.

9 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interests.

10 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting were received.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting be approved.

11 WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee considered their work programme. Along with points raised on health matters and the Car Parking Strategy, the Councillor Community Fund was discussed and it was noted that some Members had received applications. It was felt that Councillors could aid the advertisement of the fund through their local Parish Councils or social media and it was agreed to send Members wording to use when doing this. Councillors Grange, Tranter, M. Wilcox, Warburton and Eagland volunteered to be on a Member Task Group, if required, to evaluate the pilot of the scheme when data was available. The Cabinet Member reported that a press release would be communicated shortly to remind residents of the funding scheme and would bring back a report on the performance of the scheme before finalising the need for the task group to meet.

Dry Recycling was discussed and the Cabinet Member reported that the decision had been made to move to a dual scheme to begin in April. It was felt that communications on the scheme had not been sufficient and it was questioned what use a task group could be at this late stage. It was reported that the group could work through the communications plan going forward into the implementation of the new recycling scheme as well as evaluating its success. Councillors Norman, Grange, M. Wilcox, and Powell volunteered to be part of this task group. There were some questions around the use of a bag and bin and it was asked if the choice of material into each receptacle and it was reported that there had been various conversations with other authorities who are running similar schemes and their advice had been taken into account. Volume of materials was also discussed and it was noted that more bags could be requested if required.

Climate Change was discussed and there was some disappointment that information on what had been undertaken so far had not been forthcoming. It was felt that as the Council had declared a Climate Change Emergency, it was getting time critical to have an action plan in place and meet the targets set by the Council. It was reported that the previous Chief Executive had taken the lead however due to the pressures faced during the pandemic, much had stopped. However there had been some improvements made including to Burntwood

Leisure Centre. It was then reported that a new lead officer was appointed, following the departure of the chief executive, and a company called APSE to help gather baseline figures and work on an action plan. It was also reported that an Officer would be appointed on a two year contract to lead on the matter as well as comprehensive training for other officers. The figures of emissions needed to be reduced was reported and noted by the Committee. It was envisioned that the action plan would be considered by the Committee when ready. It was noted that the LGA could help access best practice from other authorities that may prevent the need to employ external companies however it was reported that it was difficult to have a one size fits all solution as all councils were different.

It was questioned why there was not already an action plan even if in draft form and a briefing paper again requested with the information given at the meeting especially the base data which could be considered by a Member Task Group if created. It was agreed that Member involvement was critical.

RESOLVED: That the work programme be noted and amended where required.

12 HEALTH MATTERS

Whilst discussing the work programme, the Committee noted that there had been a High Court Judgement that the Environment Agency would be held liable for the pollution coming from Walleys Landfill Quarry in Newcastle under Lyme.

It was then reported that Staffordshire County Council's Health and Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committee would be considering access to GP practices.

RESOLVED: That the information received be noted.

13 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS)

The Committee received a report on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2020-2025 which took into account the all reports that had been approved at Cabinet and Council but refreshed to remove the previous financial year and add the new financial year of 2025/26 as well as refresh and update assumptions to reflect the latest information available. It was reported that news had been received that a multi year settlement from central government would be forthcoming and although the contents of that settlement was unknown, it would finally provide some certainty for budget setting and confidence in spending. It was reported that due to this, the principles and assumptions as stated in the report would be reviewed and revised before coming back to the Committee again in November.

The Head of Finance & Procurement then gave an update on the current situation regarding financial matters and reported that the Spending Review 2021 as mentioned, did confirm a three year settlement but there was a short timescale for government departments to submit their responses to the review. It was also reported that some analysis undertaken from external organisations predict that there will not be any significant increase in spending power. It was noted that another key announcement was regarding Social Care reform and although Lichfield District Council did not provide this service, it would have an impact for example the increase in National Insurance contribution as an employer and it was estimated the cost of this would be around £100k per annum although it is hoped that the government will offset this as a public authority. It was noted that this offset would not apply to partners who provide services on behalf of the Council so there would be an impact to the Council that way. It was reported that the funding announced could not be used to offset and current or future funding gap and that would have to be done through Council Tax increases. Future local government funding was reported and that it was coming forward including Covid Recovery, Planning reform, Devolution as well as potentially the requirement for long term spending plans which was already included in the Council's MTFS and it was felt that it does add some value. It was

reported that the government had announced that the opportunity to remain in the Business Rate Pool for 2022/23 has been offered and this would be considered. It was reported that it was envisioned that it would be a roll over settlement which could mean keeping more Business rates but Ministers were recasting what would be happening over the next three years making forecasting difficult.

It was requested that views be given on a proposed savings strategy with key outcomes of sustainable, balanced budget over the medium term using general reserves to achieve outcomes. Targets set would have to be flexible and adaptable to change and General Reserves could not fall below a certain level.

It was reported that following an unexpected surplus, a Risk and Recovery reserve was created and around half of that had been allocated and there was a desire to continue the strategy of supporting initiatives that made the district a good place to live and visit as well as spend to save projects and the Committee was requested to ratify this continuation.

The unrestricted earmarked reserves was discussed and it was asked if they were not envisioned and it was reported that restricted reserves were created for items like partnership agreements. Unrestricted reserves could be released for other priorities if required.

The funding gap was confirmed and it was reported that it was based on a number of prudent pressures including the pay award and items subject to Council approval.

It was noted that an impact on Capital Receipts from the non sale of Netherstowe & Leyfields was shown in the MTFS although it was reported that there was not one. It was reported that the Capital Receipt was envisioned to be used for the pay off the loan for Burntwood Leisure Centre and funding for this would have to be found elsewhere. It was noted that it was an invest to save initiative to pay off that loan.

The budget consultation was discussed and it was felt exploring more ways of engaging and identifying best practice elsewhere could help increase engagement. It was reported that this was already being undertaken including the use of third party platform.

Council Tax setting was discussed by the Committee and it was felt that the rise in National Insurance would also have a big impact on residents, as well as Universal Credit reduction and very high inflation rises, and it would be wrong to just carry on with a maximum rise year on year. It was reported that the Cabinet was in agreement that any rise should be balanced and be a compromise between allowing the continuation of service delivery without being too high a pressure on residents. It was also reported that the Council Tax Support Scheme would be reviewed to ensure help is available for those who require it. There were also views however that additional cost pressures should also be taken into account and not forgotten. It was also expressed that it was predicted that any inflation rise would be for the short term. It was also considered that if Council Tax were to rise, then spending should too to ensure residents can see something for it.

The visitor economy was discussed and it was agreed that it had been good to see events return however it was requested that there were also attractions outside the city centre and these should be advertised equally.

The investment in the Planning Service was discussed and it was hoped that it would pay dividends for the authority.

RESOLVED: (1) That the allocations from the risk and recovery budget totalling £571,000 be noted;

(2) That the views expressed in relation to the approach to setting targets be considered by Cabinet and a theme based approach to delivering sustainable MTFS savings is implemented with a savings target of £500,000 for 2022/23;

(3) That the views expressed in relation to the potential level of the District's Council Tax increase for 2022/23 be considered by Cabinet; and

(4) That the approach to Budget Consultation 2022/23 be noted.

14 MEMBER TASK GROUP UPDATES

The Committee received notes from Member Task Group meetings held since the last full Overview & Scrutiny Committee. For this round, it included notes from the Lichfield City Masterplan Member Task Group where they considered the Car Parking Strategy. During discussions for the work programme, it was felt that more was needed to understand the actual strategy rather than a list of ideas. It was also felt that privately run car parks should be included in the overall strategy especially in light of issues experienced with the transfer of car parks in the city centre. It was agreed that it would be of remiss to not consider the strategy from a residents point of view. It was asked if future capacity could be considered and it was hoped that the consultants commissioned to work on the strategy had taken this into account. It was agreed to give these points to the Chairman of the Task Group.

RESOLVED: That the notes from Member Task Group meetings be received and noted.

(The Meeting closed at 7.46 pm)

CHAIRMAN

A Better Council

Cabinet Member for Innovation & Corporate Services



Date: 09/11/2021
Agenda Item: 5
Contact Officer: Simon Fletcher / Tracey Tudor / Christie Tims
Tel Number: 07961 202055 (SF)
Email: simon.fletcher@lichfielddc.gov.uk
tracey.tudor@lichfielddc.gov.uk
christie.tims@lichfielddc.gov.uk
Key Decision? YES
Local Ward Members All

CABINET

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report introduces a proposal for an organisational change programme called 'Being A Better Council'. The programme (strategy) is designed to help us become the council we recognise we need, and want to be, to respond to the changing needs and expectations of our residents. It recognises the need to do so based on our 'invisible competition', the organisations against whom our residents compare and benchmark the way our services are organised and provided.
- 1.2 This organisational change programme will be implemented between December 2021 and March 2023, with improvements to services and measures of success realised between April 2022 and March 2025. It is an ambitious programme; it seeks to plan and implement substantial and sustainable change to our organisational structures, performance and culture to better deliver our Strategic Plan and meet our aspirations to be a modern, well-run council.
- 1.3 Successful implementation of the programme will result in new operating models for our services, delivered by more of our employees who are skilled and confident; able to provide services that are resident centric, commercially minded and data and performance driven. This in turn will drive increased satisfaction with our performance and increased trust in us.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Cabinet approves the organisational change programme, Being a Better Council 2021 – 2024.
- 2.2 That Cabinet approves a capital budget of £750,000 over the period of the programme (2021/22 – 2023/24) with funding provided by reallocating existing capital projects already identified within the MTFS, to implement the programme.

3. Background

- 3.1 The need for this organisational change programme has arisen from a recognition that, while there are examples of well performing services and pockets of strong management practice, overall satisfaction with our services and trust in us as a local council is not where we wish it to be.

- 3.2 We also recognise that increasing demand for our services alongside some cultural, management and quality challenges, at a time when our finances remain uncertain, creates an environment in which we are not set up to deliver the place making ambitions of our residents.
- 3.3 In February 2021, both Cabinet and Council reviewed our medium-term financial strategy (MTFS) which identified £5.2m - £6.7m of savings requirements for the period 2021/22 – 2024/25, with further savings of £2.2m - £2.7m required by March 2026. In September 2021, the government announced there will be a three-year financial settlement provided as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review in October this year. At the time of drafting this report, while we do welcome the certainty a multi-year funding guarantee will provide, we still do not know how ‘good’ or otherwise our future funding will be.
- 3.4 These financial pressures added to the challenges articulated in paragraph 3.2 show the council is operating in challenging times where ‘doing nothing’ is not a realistic option. The organisational change programme proposed through this report sets out how we intend to change as a council. We will rethink our traditional structures, increase the use of digital technologies, create a stronger resident centric approach to service provision and engender a commercial mind set in the use of data, performance management and through our organisational culture.
- 3.3 The ‘Being a Better Council’ programme deliver this change. It will focus on three key areas, enabling us to be:
- **Better equipped** – realigning service structures and rethinking how our services are delivered, and by whom. We will bring all residents’ facing services together and support them with better use of digital technologies that are second nature to our invisible competition. Where sensible, we will merge the functional elements of services (e.g. assessment and processing) and underpin their management and delivery with stronger performance management and greater clarity over what is expected of them.
 - **Better led** – creating a strong ‘can do’ culture across the organisation and equipping all our managers with the right skills to do their jobs.
 - **Better performing** – investing in the core capacity and capabilities of our workforce, to create an officer cohort capable of increased growth and performance.
- 3.4 It is envisaged these key areas (work streams) will be delivered through 15 complimentary projects over the length of the programme. Some are existing and known projects (e.g. Transformation Programme, Digital Strategy and Community Engagement Strategy). Others are new (e.g. Organisation Design / Target Operating Model, Customer Centricity Training). All are identified as key to shifting the way the organisation works and thinks. A full list of work streams is set out in section 6 of the programme documentation.

Alternative Options	<p>Do nothing – This would not enable us to systematically challenge what we do and how we do it. It would not tackle known concerns over the performance and culture of some of our services. It would not enable us to respond to financial pressures we are facing.</p> <p>Other structural models have been considered but would not yield the necessary efficiencies required.</p>
Consultation	<p>Consultation has been carried out with the relevant officers and members. Consultation on the further stages of the programme will be undertaken as per the requirements of our constitution and our employment policies with input from customers and residents at relevant stages of the programme.</p>
Financial Implications	<p>It is assumed that any revenue implications from this programme will be managed through existing budgets.</p>

The Approved Capital Programme includes the following related capital budgets:

	Approved Capital Programme				
	2021/22 Budget £000	2022/23 Budget £000	2023/24 Budget £000	2024/25 Budget £000	Total £000
Property Planned Maintenance	390	180	215	0	785
IT Hardware	165	160	174	0	499
IT Infrastructure	123	15	0	0	138
IT Innovation	143	50	0	0	193
Approved Budgets	821	405	389	0	1,615

It is recommended that these Approved Budgets are repurposed to fund the Better Council Budget:

	Recommended Capital Programme				
	2021/22 Budget £000	2022/23 Budget £000	2023/24 Budget £000	2024/25 Budget £000	Total £000
Property Planned Maintenance	362	180	215	0	757
IT Hardware	0	0	0	0	0
IT Infrastructure	108	0	0	0	108
IT Innovation	0	0	0	0	0
A Better Council	150	600	0	0	750
Recommended Budgets	620	780	215	0	1,615

Approved by Section
151 Officer

Yes

Legal
Implications

The change programme will need to manage key risks around potential changes to roles and contracts of employment for staff, the statutory framework in which we operate and ensuring that all obligations can still be met using new mechanisms and processes.

A standard project and programme management approach will need to be developed to ensure these are captured and resolved as the project develops.

Governance obligations will form part of our core capacity.

Approved by
Monitoring Officer

Yes

Contribution to
the Delivery of
the Strategic Plan

1. Enables achievement of our objective to be A Good Council that is – financially sound, transparent, and accountable and responsive and customer focussed
2. Becoming A Good Council will in turn enable us to deliver the other strands of our Strategic Plan 2020 – 2024:
 - a. Enable people to
 - i. Help themselves and others
 - ii. Collaborate and engage with us
 - iii. Live healthy and active lives
 - b. Shape place to
 - i. Keep it clean, green, and safe
 - ii. Preserve the characteristics
 - iii. Make sure sustainability and infrastructure needs are balanced
 - c. Develop prosperity to
 - i. Encourage economic growth

	ii. Enhance the district for all iii. Invest in the future
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	An Equality impact assessment has been completed which shows that there may be support needs for some residents to access services. This can be mitigated by extensive user testing and additional support from our own staff and 3 rd sector providers.
Crime & Safety Issues	None identified.
Environmental Impact	One of the key aims of this Council is to maintain a clear focus on the clearly stated carbon reduction ambitions. This proposed approach will allow clarity of focus. Increase in digital capacity will enable a reduction in more carbon intensive mechanisms – such as reducing visits to the Council, use of paper and energy etc. Improvements in efficiency will help provide organisational capacity to tackle sustainability.
GDPR / Privacy Impact Assessment	None, though DPIA's will be undertaken for all new processes and services as they are introduced to ensure customer and resident data is secure at all times.

	Risk Description & Risk Owner	Original Score (RYG)	How We Manage It	Current Score (RYG)
A	Financial – that the costs of delivering the programme exceed the capital funding available - AT	Likelihood: Y Impact: Y Severity: Y	Ensure a robust project methodology is employed to manage costs.	Likelihood: G Impact: Y Severity: G
B	Legal – those changes proposed do not jeopardise delivery of our statutory obligations - CT	Likelihood: Y Impact: Y Severity: Y	Ensure a robust project methodology is employed to manage risk and legal obligations.	Likelihood: G Impact: Y Severity: G
C	People – that employment implications are managed effectively to ensure staff are developed and have capacity to deliver - CT	Likelihood: Y Impact: Y Severity: Y	Ensure a robust project methodology is employed to manage programme and identify culture, behaviours and skills requires. Ensure all current applicable policies are followed and new policies to support transition are developed and consulted effectively.	Likelihood: G Impact: Y Severity: G
D	Customers – that key processes and services remain available and operational throughout the programme - TT	Likelihood: Y Impact: Y Severity: Y	Ensure a robust project methodology is employed to capture data, demand, and expectations. Clear engagement in place along with robust user testing and suitable mechanisms to deal with additional needs.	Likelihood: G Impact: Y Severity: G
E	Outcomes – that the programme supports the delivery of our Strategic Plan - SF	Likelihood: Y Impact: R Severity: R	Map roll out of programme to tackle largest strategic issues. Ensure baseline and robust tracking mechanisms exist to monitor progress and evidence deliver – deal with what matters most.	Likelihood: G Impact: R Severity: Y
F	Programme and project delivery resilience – reputation risk if we did not deliver. Leadership Team	Likelihood: Y Impact: R Severity: R	Ensure the correct skills and resources are identified to deliver the programme and projects.	Likelihood: G Impact: R Severity: Y
G	Change management not managed – the ability and capacity to make the change internally. Leadership Team	Likelihood: Y Impact: R Severity: Y	Programme delivery approach designed to change the culture as well as the individual projects.	Likelihood: Y Impact: Y Severity: Y

H	Potential of service failure in relation to BAU. Leadership Team	Likelihood: Y Impact: R Severity: Y	Capacity built within the programme and projects to ensure that colleagues are allowed to carry out BAU	Likelihood: G Impact: Y Severity: G
I	IT infrastructure and IT systems to deliver the changes required TT	Likelihood: Y Impact: R Severity: Y	IT infrastructure and IT systems designed around the transformed organisation.	Likelihood: G Impact: Y Severity: G

None	Background documents Any previous reports or decisions linked to this item
------	--

None	Relevant web links Any links for background information which may be useful to understand the context of the report
------	---

This page is intentionally left blank

WORK PROGRAMME – 25 October 2021

Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2021/22

This document sets out the work programme for the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2021/22.

The Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for:

- Scrutiny of matters relating to the planning, provision and operation of health services in the Authority's area, including public health, in accordance with regulations made under the Health and Social Care Act 2001 and subsequent guidance.
- Scrutiny of the Council's work to achieve its priorities that Staffordshire is a place where people live longer, healthier and fulfilling lives and In Staffordshire's communities people are able to live independent and safe lives, supported where this is required (adults).

Link to Council's Strategic Plan Outcomes and Priorities

- Inspire healthy, independent living
- Support more families and children to look after themselves, stay safe and well

We review our work programme from time to time. Sometimes we change it - if something comes up during the year that we think we should investigate as a priority. Our work results in recommendations for NHS organisations in the county, the County Council and sometimes other organisations about how what they do can be improved, for the benefit of the people and communities of Staffordshire.

Councillor Jeremy Pert

Chairman of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee

If you would like to know more about our work programme, please get in touch with Deborah Breedon, Scrutiny and Support Officer on Deborah.breedon@staffordshire.gov.uk

In Staffordshire, the arrangements for health scrutiny have been set up to include the county's eight District and Borough Councils. The Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee is made up of elected County Councillors and one Councillor from each District or Borough Council. In turn, one County Councillor from the Committee sits on each District or Borough Council overview and scrutiny committee dealing with health scrutiny. The Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee concentrates on scrutinising health matters that concern the whole or large parts of the county. The District and Borough Council committees focus on scrutinising health matters of local concern within their area.

Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2021-22

Page 14

Date	Topic	Background/Outcomes	
Committee Meetings, Reviews and Consultations			
		Background	Outcomes from Meeting
Monday 7 June 2021 at 10.00 am Scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Scrutiny Arrangements Work Programme Planning Covid-19 Update 		Awareness of the background, scope and role of health scrutiny in Staffordshire. Work programme items to be prioritised and work programme to be submitted to the meeting on 5 July 2021
Monday 5 July 2021 at 10.00 am Scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restoration and Recovery Access to GP surgeries Future Delivery of Residential Replacement Care Services in Staffordshire (learning disabilities) (21/07/2021) Covid-19 Update 		<p>R&R: highlighted the work carried out through pandemic, noted the progress and risks around R&R and work planned to address current issues and move forward. Requested additional data and actions plans.</p> <p>Access to GP : noted the actions planned and requested detail of process to engage re s106 agreement relating to healthcare and feedback from consultation work with residents and practices on patient preference - perceptions, challenges and barriers.</p> <p>RRCS: Endorsed the commencement of the option appraisal. Pre-decision report requested. Covid update was noted members to share the update and representation of the vaccine programme widely.</p>
Monday 26 th July at 2.00 pm Additional meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walleys Quarry Landfill site - Health Implications 		<p>Health and wellbeing implications : Questioning of strategic partners relating to the health and wellbeing implications of odour emissions from Walley's Quarry Landfill Site resulted in a recommendation to write to Government relating to the length of time the issues had been going and the adverse impact on the health and wellbeing of residents in Staffordshire and to request intervention in this matter. Other recommendations related to requests for further information about health and safety of employees, air quality monitoring reports, data relating to mental health impact. Also recommendations to EA to maintain monitoring, share data with PHE and to suggest investigate technical monitoring of emissions at landfill sites and recommendations to CCGs relating to referral pathways for those requiring support for mental health and wellbeing issues associated with Walleys Quarry Landfill Site. EA was requested to provide monthly written briefings of emission levels and a report to this committee in October 2021 to detail the range of works completed.</p>
Monday 9 August 2021 at 10.00 am Scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> George Bryant Centre Maternity Services Covid-19 Update 	<p>Work planning (7.6.2021)</p> <p>SCC PH</p>	<p>GBC- Endorsed the process., requested additional information re clinical data to include in the business case. Highlighted the importance of the community impact assessment. Healthwatch Staffordshire to support face to face engagement with service users, families and carers. Further report requested following consultation.</p> <p>Maternity Services – endorsed the process and requested further trend data for home births. Healthwatch Staffordshire support to contact user groups. Further report following consultation.</p>

Monday 20 September 2021 at 10.00 am Scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urgent and Emergency Care Programme Difficult Decisions Phase 3 vaccination programmes COVID-19 Update 	Work programme (14.09.2020) Triangulation (2020) & Work planning	Process agreed - Comments re consultation process U&E care programme and Difficult decisions will feed into the consultation process and reports re feedback to future meeting. Phase 3 Vaccination programme – Progress noted, suggestion to include more detail of Flu vaccination programme in Webinar on 29 Sept. Thanked officers for speed of mobilisation. Covid Update- noted increase in case rates, steady take up rate and early winter pressures. To circulate Covid study report. DC/BC requested additional urgent items re GP Access and West Midlands Ambulance Service to be added to work programme.
Thursday 21 October 2021 at 2.00 pm Members Workshop	Introduction to Mental Health workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mental Health and Wellbeing – overview of services from mild to acute provision 	Work Planning (7.6.2021) CS/ASC/CCG	
Monday 25 October 2021 at 10.00 am Scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transformation Programme Update Mental health hospitals in Staffordshire Performance Overview and Dashboard ICS Walleys Quarry Update (26/7/21) COVID-19 update (Verbal) 		
Monday 29 November 2021 at 10.00 am Scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health & Care pathway Performance Overview and Dashboard PH COVID update 		Residents can access the services they need and can move seamlessly through health and care services without deconditioning
Monday 13 December 2021 at 10.00 am Additional meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> West Midlands Ambulance Service GP Access 		Requested 20 September meeting
January 2022 TBC VC Scrutiny Lead Inquiry day	Inquiry Day - wider determinants of Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AM – Healthy you - Diet/ obesity/ activity healthy life expectancy. PM – Healthy Environment impact – housing, planning, food outlets 	Full day 2 sessions	Role of partners including community support and Parish Councils Involving DC/BC, Parish Councils, healthwatch and voluntary sector.
Monday 31 January 2022 at 10.00 am Scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Care Home services – review of market and health and care plan for sector medium term Impact of Long COVID Health and Care post COVID lessons learned Integrated Care System 		
Tuesday 15 March 2022 at 10.00 am Scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of advances in technology in Health & Social Care (Inquiry) Draft Mental Health Strategy 		

Tuesday 19 April 2022 at 10.00 am Scheduled	Environment Day <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate change – what are Staffordshire's health and care partners doing Impact of air pollution on health 		Corporate and Prosperous – considering Climate Change
Working Party VC Overview lead Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role and impact from school's mental wellbeing counsellors, including the Healthy Schools Programme 	Awaiting timeline	
To be scheduled Chair Lead holding to Account	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrutiny of Corporate Plan (Single item) Focus on Health and Care 	Work planning (7.6.2021)	Corporate O&S - 29 July 2021 officers to prepare performance data: Draft Corporate Plan to be considered (date to be agreed)

Working list of items		
Suggested Items	Background	Possible Option
The Role of Community Hospitals within the Wider Health Economy (CCGs, MPFT, D&BUHFT)		
'Long' Covid-19 - Reponse by Health (CCGs and Accute Hospital Trusts)	Agreed at Committee meeting on 14 September 2020	January 2022
Workforce Planning (Accute Hospital Trusts)	Requested by Chairman at Committee meeting on 26 October 2020	
SCC Mental Health Strategy (SCC)	Requested by Richard Deacon 21 October 2020	Draft February 2022
ICS and Urgent Care configuration engagement (CCGs/ICS)	Requested by Chairman in correspondence with CCGs Accountable Officer 5 March 2021	20 September 2021
Staffordshire Healthwatch Annual Report and Contract (Healthwatch and SCC)	Requested at meeting on 16 March 2021	Briefing circulated August 2021 – schedule early 2022
Going Digital in Health (CCGs)	Requested at meeting on 16 March 2021	15 March 2022
Care Homes – Future Strategy and Key Issues including Future Demand (SCC)	Requested at meeting on 16 March 2021	January 2022
Social Care IT system procurement		March 2022
Mental Health: Community	To be scheduled (work planning - 07.06.2021)	
Mental Wellbeing Children: engage with education providers	To be scheduled (work planning - 07.06.2021)	
Mental Health : Acute – shortage of childrens beds	To be scheduled (work planning - 07.06.2021)	
Childrens Dentstry – Flouridisation/ orthodontic access	To be scheduled (work planning - 07.06.2021)	
STP	Scheduled October 2021	
Womens Health Strategy	To be scheduled (work planning - 07.06.2021)	
Application funding for Adult Social Care	To be scheduled (work planning - 07.06.2021)	

Membership

Jeremy Pert Chairman)
 Paul Northcott (Vice-Chairman - Overview)
 Ann Edgeller (Vice-Chairman – Scrutiny)

Jak Abrahams
 Charlotte Atkins
 Philip Atkins
 Richard Cox
 Keith Flunder
 Thomas Jay
 Phil Hewitt
 Jill Hood
 Janice Silvester-Hall
 Ian Wilkes

Borough/District Councillors

Jill Hood (Stafford)
 Martyn Buttery (Cannock)
 Rosemary Claymore (Tamworth)
 Barbara Hughes (Staffordshire Moorlands)
 Colin Wileman (East Staffordshire)
 Joyce Bolton (South Staffordshire)
 David Leytham (Lichfield)
 Ian Wilkes (Newcastle-under-Lyme)

Calendar of Committee Meetings

at County Buildings, Martin Street, Stafford. ST16 2LH
 (at 10.00 am unless otherwise stated)

Monday 7 June 2021 at 10.00 am;
 Monday 5 July 2021 at 10.00 am;
 Monday 26 July 2021 – Special meeting - Castle House NuLBC
 Monday 9 August 2021 at 10.00 am;
 Monday 20 September 2021 at 10.00 am;
 Monday 21 October at 2pm - Mental Health Workshop;
 Monday 25 October 2021 at 10.00 am;
 Monday 29 November 2021 at 10.00 am;
 Monday 13 December 2021 at 10.00 am special meeting WMAS/ GP Access
 Monday 10 or 17 January 2021 (TBC) at 10.00 am – Wider Determinants
 Monday 31 January 2022 at 10.00 am;
 Tuesday 15 March 2022 at 10.00 am;
 Tuesday 19 April 2022 at 10.00 am.

Working Party meetings to be scheduled September 2021 - February 2022
 Paused awaiting timelines

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview & Scrutiny Task Group

Meeting Notes



Review topic	Date of Meeting
Lichfield City Centre Masterplan – Car Parking	21 Oct 2021

Attendance	Venue
Members: Ball (Chair) Checkland Cross Warburton Pullen (Cabinet Member) Apologies: Baker (Vice Chair) Officers: Helen Bielby Simon Humble David Moore Christine Lewis Witnesses: Stephen Crichton from Gleeds (Project Manager) Neil Chapman from Austin-Smith:Lord (Architects).	Virtual

Areas Discussed
<p>The Cabinet Member introduced both the Car Parking Strategy and Public Realm Strategy and reported that with the latter, it was a thematic approach and not for action straight away but a clear direction where the council wants to end up at. It was reported that the more immediate hope was how public would move around the city. Regarding the car parking strategy, it was hoped that views could be given on the mix and the parking behaviour that would come out of the strategy was correct and a customer experience was as useful and easy as possible. It was noted that the Council was writing to schools with a competition to get pupils suggestions for the BRS site and what priorities they had to help futureproof and aid conversations within families around the district. The Task Group was pleased that there would be a youth voice feeding into the project. There was some concern that a path had already started to be followed however it would help the Council to understand their needs and wants to feed in. There was a thought that it should go wider and include college and university students within the area. It was agreed that other areas outside the BRS site were not at a point to include in this competition.</p>

Public Realm Strategy

The Chair wished to focus on whether the strategy was deliverable, suitable, fit for purpose and value for money (however it was noted that this would be difficult to consider at this point).

The Task Group felt that the document was well put together and representative for what was needed for the city. It gave a full picture and the order of proposals were sensible however could contradict some of the actions in the car parking strategy. There were some comments on the details however it was agreed that those discussions should be for a later meeting and this meeting was to discuss the principles of the strategy.

Pedestrianisation was discussed and it was felt that it could be widened to include Upper St John's Street and Tamworth Street. There was support for limiting the number into the city to encourage the use of public transport or to be more active.

Seating was also considered and it was felt that there could be more in the city centre.

Comments from Cllr Baker were submitted in her absence including trees and substrate, geology and water table, waterways and subsiding pavements and roads.

The deletion of a circular walk around Minster Pool was supported by Members but there were some concerns on the idea of a floating stage on the pool as the practicalities may not be there.

All were in agreement that the strategy should be for the resident as well as the visitor to the city.

Officers and the consultants were grateful for the comments received. It was agreed that the strategy could proceed to the project board and then Cabinet.

Car Parking Strategy

The Task Group were pleased to receive this version of the Car Park Strategy and felt it was more comprehensive and clearer. Again the focus of discussion was agreed to be around whether the strategy would be deliverable, identify efficiencies, produces the right level and type of projects, service improvements and value for money.

There were some thought that some operational details were needed to ensure that the strategy was deliverable etc. It was noted that the action plan would lay out those operational matters. It was also reported that there was still areas that the car parking staff needed to feed into as it would impact on them.

Capacity in the car parks were discussed and it was noted that figures pre covid showed that there was significant capacity in some car parks especially the multi-storey car parks. It was then reported that post lockdown, there had not been the predicted rush back in cars as expected.

Priorities of actions were considered and it was noted that the Cabinet Member had requested that more work be undertaken to make it as realistic as possible.

Charging was discussed and there were concerns that neighbouring areas should be monitored closely. It was also felt that one payment app across Staffordshire would be helpful and the most useful for visitors/residents. The task group were happy to see the introduction of ANPR for charging. It was asked if regular users and residents could have an account to further ease of use.

It was felt that zoning should be considered and many people would park dependent on where they enter the city from. This along with how to divert people away from the city centre and any impact on blue badge parkers. It was noted that this linked to the Public Realm Strategy. It was reported that there would be a feasibility of full pedestrianisation of the city centre which was being developed with Staffordshire County Council and would be considered by the task group however that was on street parking where this strategy was off street.

It was asked if Lower Sandford Street car park had been considered and whether it could be pedestrianised with another access point. It was noted it was mentioned in the Public Realm Strategy. It was agreed that this could be looked into further.

Overall, the task group were happy for the strategy to proceed to the project board and then Cabinet.

Outcomes

That the Strategy be referred to the project board however be considered as more a review and evaluation document.

Further Work Required/Next Steps:

To proceed to the project board and Cabinet.

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview & Scrutiny Task Group

Meeting Notes



Review topic	Date of Meeting
New Leisure Centre	3 November 2021

Attendance	Venue
Members: Baker (Chair) Grange Ray Robertson M. Wilcox Apologies Silvester-Hall Eadie (Cabinet Member) Officers: Ben Percival John Smith Sarah Sleigh Christine Lewis Philip Gillingham Witnesses: None	Virtual

Areas Discussed
<p>Declarations of Interests</p> <p>Cllr Grange declared a personal interest as a member of Freedom Leisure and has association with the Friends of Friary Grange.</p> <p>Cllr Ray declared a personal interest as he has association with the Friends of Friary Grange. He also declared that his son is a Tennis coach in Lichfield.</p> <p>Cllr Baker declared a personal interest as her husband uses the facility</p> <p>S122 Consultation</p> <p>The Task Group began the meeting discussing this item and it was noted that there had been 123 responses with 118 logged comments. It was also noted that the majority of detailed comments received did not relate to the loss of open space at Stychbrook Park as required by the S122 Notice. Taking that into account, it was reported that 84 responses were in objection and 17 in support. The Task Group did note that the question posed to residents was specifically requesting</p>

objections to the appropriation of land and it was felt that with this in mind and noting that 19,000 people were contacted via Lichfield e-news and 186 residential properties in close proximity to the park were written to, that this was not a representative return.

Task group were also made aware of the online petition to save Stychbrook Park which at the time of the meeting had 395 signatures.

Members also discussed comments made regarding the location of a new leisure centre suggesting that the BRS site should be considered. They felt that there should be more communications as to why that site is unsuitable and has been discounted to ensure residents had all the information that has been investigated.

It was asked for the full responses to be sent to the task group so that all qualitative information could be considered.

There was the question posed by the Cabinet Member as to whether appropriation should continue as the Levelling Up Fund (LUF) application had not been successful however the task group agreed to that project plan as presented should continue and funding was discussed in more detail later in the meeting.

Further discussion around the Stychbrook Park and site investigations took place and it was noted that extensive de-risking of the site had taken place including ecology assessments where no material concerns had been discovered. It was noted that there would be arboricultural matters to be dealt with at the pre-planning stage but it was noted some hedgerow would be lost for access to the site.

Transport assessments around the site area was discussed by the Task group and it was felt that the current study might not be extensive enough or representative of the true picture. Members felt it needed to take a more holistic approach and consider any impact of access down the whole of Eastern Avenue including tailbacks and problems with coaches trying to turn into the site without signals or similar. It was noted that funding for a new independent study could be requested from SCC Cllr community grants. It was asked if, as a developer, the council would be liable for S106 funding for highway matters and it was reported that it was predicted that major highway improvement works were unlikely to be needed as a result of this development.

Funding

The unsuccessful LUF application was discussed further and it was reported by the Cabinet Member that as a tier 3 authority, it was always unlikely that the council would have been awarded or awarded in future rounds. The Cabinet Member asked the task group for views as to whether to continue with the project as currently planned but wait until funding was secured or build what could be afforded now and try and build other facilities in the future when possible. It was also proposed that this modular approach may not have to be at the same site.

There was much discussion around these options, the task group were in agreement that a modular approach should not be pursued as the evidence and ANOG report showed the need for the agreed facility mix especially in the area approved due to deprivation. The Cabinet Member accepted these views however did not wish to have residents have to wait an indefinite amount of time for facilities whilst trying to get funding. The task group did express that the current plan was in place before there the LUF had been announced and therefore did not feel that a new leisure centre should be hinged on it.

The task group presented a third option of exploring more options for funding. It was felt that there could be other avenues to consider including lobbying MPs and talking to other authorities within the LGA family group to gain their lessons learned when obtaining funding. It was discussed whether development of the BRS site could help fund the leisure centre through capital receipts. It was noted however that, without effective communications, it would be difficult for residents to accept why BRS has been used to fund a facility instead of housing the leisure centre.

It was discussed whether a DBOM type build could be possible but it was noted that there wasn't much appetite for this from the leisure sector market post covid.

Another approach suggested was to investigate actually growing the facility mix and make the centre bigger than currently envisioned to see if that would attract investment.

General Project Update

The need for pitches was discussed and it was noted that other than a pool, this was what was deemed required and although not part of the original study, was part of the playing pitch strategy. It was also discussed whether these could be delivered elsewhere or at a different time however noted that planning in with the centre was the easiest way for mitigating the loss of a pitch at the site and ensuring that Sports England's requirements would be met when submitting a planning application.

It was felt that there needed to be coordination with the Lichfield City Masterplan to ensure there weren't conflicting priorities for the Council.

FGLC was discussed including the user figures however the task group felt it did not give a true picture as did not take into account the need for social distancing, reduced programmes and lack of active marketing. Gym use was considered and although noted that private facilities could provide the service for a lower price, it was only FGLC that provided a fully accessible service eg hand bikes. It was also noted that leisure centres like FGLC were just as much a means of much needed social interaction for some especially older residents than fitness.

It was reported that funding may not be secured without achieving outline planning permission but in contrast it was asked if there was point in proceeding with planning if there was no hope in building what was proposed due to affordability.

Date of Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting would be scheduled in due course but will include input to the pre app and outline planning stages ensuring concerns covered and key consultees/others involved.

Outcomes

That the group be sent all comments received from the S122 consultation and themes of comments made.

That appropriation of the Stychbrook Park site continue as agreed with task group supporting a recommendation to Cabinet for this. That pre-app appropriation be added to the schedule.

That authorities in the LGA family group who have built similar centres be contacted to discuss funding advice.

That extensive research be undertaken regarding funding options.

That there be coordination with the Lichfield City Masterplan to ensure all opportunities and priorities are realised.

The outcomes as shown in the briefing paper are still considered active by the task group but dates may be subject to review.

Further Work Required/Next Steps:

Approval of appropriation of site.

Funding opportunities.

Site visit to another Local Authority built leisure centre

Item	Report or Briefing paper	Date
Money Matters and Review of MTFS	Report to Committee	Quarterly
Reports from SCC Health and Care O&S	Report to Committee	Quarterly
Updates from Task Groups	Notes of Task Group Meetings to Committee	Quarterly
DFG Update	Briefing Paper	For 18 November 2021
Local Plan Update	Briefing Paper	For 18 November 2021
Future of Lichfield Housing Ltd	Report to Committee	18 November 2021
CIL Review	Report to Committee	January 2022
LEPs Review	Report to Committee	TBC
Together We're Better	Member Briefing	TBC

Task Group	Extant or Proposed	Matrix Score
Lichfield City Masterplan	Extant	8
New Leisure Centre	Extant	7
Local Plan	Extant	8
Dual Stream Recycling	Extant	8
New Ways of Working/Being a Better Council	Proposed	7
Climate Change Emergency	Proposed	7
Review of Councillor Community Fund	Proposed	5

This page is intentionally left blank