

Minutes of the meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held in Committee Room One East Pallant House Chichester West Sussex on Thursday 26 July 2012 at 09:33

## **Members (15)**

Mrs C M M Apel (Chairman)  
Mr R J Hayes (Vice-Chairman)

Mr A D Chaplin	Mr D J Myers
Mrs P Dignum	Mr H C Potter
Mrs N Graves	Mr F Robertson
Mrs E Hamilton	Mrs J A E Tassell
Mr G H Hicks	Mrs B A Tinson
Mr S Lloyd-Williams	Mr N R D Thomas
Mr G V McAra	

were present (15)

## **Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members Absent**

None

## **Chichester District Council Members Present as Observers or Speakers**

Mrs H P Caird  
Mr J C P Connor  
Mrs E P Lintill (agenda item 8)  
Mr J A P Montyn (agenda item 9)  
Mrs C Purnell (agenda item 12 (4) (b))

## **Officers Present for All Agenda Items**

Mr S R Carvell – Executive Director of Environment  
Mrs B Jones – Principal Scrutiny Officer  
Mr G Thrussell - Senior Member Services Officer

## **Outside Representatives Present for Specific Agenda Items**

Ms K Scales – Development Manager Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (agenda item 7)

## **68 Chairman's Announcements**

Mrs Apel welcomed everyone to this meeting. There were no specific announcements.

## **69 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence. All of the committee members were present.

## **70 Approval of Minutes**

### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee approves without amendment the minutes of its ordinary meeting on Thursday 3 May 2012 and of its special meeting on Tuesday 15 May 2012.

Accordingly, Mrs Apel signed and dated each set of minutes.

## **71 Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

## **72 Declarations of Interests**

Mr McAra declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 7 (Chichester in Partnership Project – Fundraiser Hub) as a member of Midhurst Community Partnership, which is an organisation in receipt of funds from the Fundraiser Hub.

Mrs Tinson declared a personal interest in respect of agenda item 7 (Chichester in Partnership Project – Fundraiser Hub) as an employee of *4Sight*, a charity which has a contract with Chichester in Partnership regarding the Fundraiser Hub project and which benefits from the Fundraiser Hub by purchasing senior fundraiser time.

## **73 Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted for this meeting.

## **74 Chichester in Partnership Project – Fundraiser Hub**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the agenda report (copy attached to the official minutes).

Miss A Loaring (Partnership Manager) and Ms K Scales (Development Manager Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC)) presented this item.

Miss Loaring explained Chichester in Partnership Core Group's decision to prioritise support to the voluntary/community sector and its approval of VAAC's proposal to develop a Fundraiser Hub. The Hub's long term objective was to increase the capability and capacity of the voluntary and community sector to be more successful in raising funds. She outlined the two main aspects of the Hub's work, namely the provision of (a) a full-time fundraiser, whose services could be purchased by larger organisations without having to incur the cost of employing their own fundraiser or engaging consultants and (b) trained volunteers who can be matched with local organisations to make bids, where those organisations cannot afford to pay for the senior fundraiser's time. Volunteers were trained at the University of Chichester in fundraising skills and further courses would be held. The target to raise £140,000 in the first full financial year had been exceeded by raising £252,939 in nine months. There had been positive local press coverage. The latest funding surgery had been held earlier in July 2012 with over 70 organisations attending from the Chichester and Arun area.

Ms Scales commented on the impact of the adverse economic climate and public sector cuts on many community and voluntary organisations, which highlighted the need to make such groups aware of the many, varied funding opportunities that existed and how

to access them. She emphasised the need to have professionally trained but affordable or free fundraising advisers instead of adopting an amateur approach where the role is an adjunct to someone's main job or role.

During the debate Mrs Apel and the committee commended this project as a tremendous and successful initiative. Members acknowledged the excellent work that was being done by VAAC and the impressive results that had already been achieved. The clarity of the report was also appreciated.

Ms Scales responded to members' questions and comments as follows:

- Notwithstanding that many organisations, because of their small size, sought only modest grants, it was important not to neglect the larger fund-giving organisations eg the Comic Relief and National Lottery funding schemes.
- If an organisation left the Fundraising Hub, it was important to retain if possible the information or knowledge that it possessed.
- Fundraising was available for community and voluntary organisations as a whole, which could include churches (as had recently happened), historic buildings and village halls. Applications would be considered on their own merits.
- The frequency of fundraising training courses was subject to demand; the next one (a four-day module) was set for October 2012 and was now being prepared. The course was supplemented by mentor training sessions at VAAC both before and after the module. The course was going to be marketed to a wider audience. The University of Chichester aimed to create a fundraising degree.
- Following the merger between Voluntary Community Action Chichester District and Voluntary Action Arun to form VAAC, the decision to move to Bognor Regis was made on cost-effective grounds, but VAAC's services would be provided across the two local authority district areas to meet demand wherever it existed. A VAAC representative was in fact on duty this morning at East Pallant House.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes the progress of the Fundraiser Hub and its future plans.

#### **75 Educational Attainment in the District**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the agenda report and a colour version of the secondary schools results graph (page 25) that had been circulated separately with the agenda (copies attached to the official minutes).

Mrs T Murphy (Corporate Information Manager) and Mr M Gover (Corporate Information Officer) presented this item.

Mrs Murphy explained that although the education remit lay with West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) as the local education authority (LEA), good educational attainment was a significant influence on quality of life and long-term outcomes (including employment) for successive generations of Chichester District's young people and its residents generally. This Council had an important role to play in enabling economic development and creating the conditions for private sector job growth, and in order for this to benefit the District's residents a high level of proficiency in education and skills was required. It

was for this reason that the Scrutiny Planning Group (SPG) had requested a study of educational attainment in Chichester District to be undertaken by the Council's corporate information officers, who had liaised with WSCC colleagues to prepare the findings in this report. Although this was a new task for this Council, it was not wholly innovative in that Forest Heath District Council in Mildenhall in Suffolk had recently undertaken a scrutiny review of educational attainment in its own local authority area (para 3.7 of the report). The options available to this committee were set out in para 4.2.

Mr Gover referred to the first appendix (a report to the SPG in June 2012) and drew attention to (a) the second bullet point on page 11, which gave the headline results for A\* to C GCSEs (or equivalent) and the county and national averages and (b) the secondary schools summary details on page 14 regarding those GCSE results and absences. All of the data in the report was derived from the Department of Education.

Mrs Murphy, Mr Gover and Mrs Jones answered members' questions on the following:

- The justification for a scrutiny review of this kind given the roles of and work already being done by, for example, Ofsted and WSCC.
- The issue of educational attainment within the county as a whole was potentially a future project (in 2013) for the West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Steering Group once it had completed its first review (started in March 2012) of the Community Legal Advice Service provision across the county.
- The WSCC Cabinet Member for Education and Schools, Peter Griffiths, stated in his 23 May 2012 letter to the chairman of WSCC's Children and Young People's Services Select Committee (appendix nine on page 26) that all elected members should be encouraged to visit and ask relevant questions about attainment at Key Stage 2. Whilst it could be useful for this Council's members to liaise with schools in their wards, they should be wary of simply focussing on the statistics; it was more important to understand what lay behind those figures.

At this point, Mrs E P Lintill, whose portfolio as the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Wellbeing and Community Services includes children and adult services, and who was present as an observer shared her experience as a primary school governor. She cautioned against (a) looking at the statistics superficially, pointing out that the small size of a primary school could skew the results and that it was the factors behind those results that needed to be understood and (b) visits to schools ending up being an unhelpful distraction for very busy staff and pupils. She added that Ofsted no longer had regard to the value added scores for primary schools (appendix four on pages 18 to 19) and secondary schools (appendix eight on page 23).

- The data disclosed by this study inevitably revealed issues which individual ward members might wish to explore further. This might include the effects of a fluctuating school roll because of short-term attendance of the children of migrant workers or the reasons for some schools achieving high or improved results. This had been a desktop study and officers had only just begun to look at the findings. Particular statistics could be raised with WSCC for clarification and cases of poor teaching were for the LEA and Ofsted to investigate. There were also issues to address such as the quality of leadership in schools and the extent to which judging GCSE results at 16 should take into account that the same school starting age did not equally suit all children, some of whom would take longer to reach their full potential.

- The secondary results graph (appendix ten on page 25) had given the committee cause for concern in that in 2011 only two of the six schools had exceeded the national and county average in the percentage of their pupils attaining five or more A\* to C GCSE passes (including English and mathematics). There was a need to understand what target in their action plans these schools had to attain, the reasons for this unsatisfactory performance and what intervention measures were available to and were being taken by the LEA to address the situation.
- The pupil/teacher ratio for primary and secondary schools was calculated by the Department of Education and was linked to class sizes.
- The collection of data should not be an end in itself but a means for ensuring that pupils on leaving school had the best possible employment prospects, particularly within Chichester District.

At the conclusion of the debate the committee considered the three options in para 4.2 of the report. In view of areas of concern and questions members had about the results of this study, the committee decided that:

- WSCC's Cabinet Member for Education and Schools, Peter Griffiths, and its Director of Learning, David Sword, should be invited to a future meeting of this committee to answer questions on educational attainment in Chichester District

[**Note** This will probably be the meeting on Thursday 22 November 2012]

- Decisions on whether to carry out a full scrutiny review via a task and finish group and/or invite selected head teachers of primary and secondary schools to appear before this committee and/or arrange school visits by members should be deferred until after the committee had heard from Mr Griffiths and Mr Sword.

#### **RESOLVED**

That having considered the report the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agrees that West Sussex County Council's Cabinet Member for Education and Schools and Director of Learning should be invited to appear before it at a meeting later in 2012 in order to answer questions on educational attainment in Chichester District.

## **76 Safeguarding Task and Finish Group – Final Report**

The committee considered the agenda report (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Dignum, who was the chairman of the Safeguarding Task and Finish Group (STFG), and Mr S Hansford (Assistant Director Communities) presented this item.

Mrs Dignum referred to the outcomes set by the STFG to be achieved in carrying out its review (para 1.4 of the report). She highlighted the third arrow point in outcome one and commented that several officers had explained to the STFG how children's issues could arise in their work and service areas such as on a visit by an environmental health officer to a resident's home. Regarding para 4.2 of the report, she said that the STFG had been very impressed by the actions and approach taken by the Council's staff both before and after an incident was referred to the appropriate agency for investigation. It was clear that the Council could and did become involved in a range of safeguarding situations. She drew attention to the requirement for safeguarding principles also to apply to partnership organisations (para 5.1). As to West Sussex County Council (WSCC), in para 6.1 the final sentence required correction because the awaited further and unannounced

inspection by Ofsted had *not* yet taken place. It was regrettable that the presentations to the STFG by two WSCC officers had not in fact related to children (para 6.2). She commended the skilful way in which a composite safeguarding policy document had been drafted from the two existing policies (Children and Vulnerable Persons and Adults at Risk).

Mr Hayes, Mr Myers and Mrs Tinson, who had served on the STFG, expressed their full support for the work done and the conclusions reached. Mrs Tinson said that it would be helpful for all Council members to be given a flow chart showing the reporting lines when an incident arose.

Mr Hansford answered members' questions on points of detail about risk assessments for officers and the frequency with which the basic e-training would be provided via the Council's new *Celia* internet training site (the next session would be in autumn 2012).

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes the report of the Safeguarding Task and Finish Group and all its recommendations are endorsed for approval by the Cabinet.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CABINET**

That the Cabinet approves the following recommendations made by the Safeguarding Task and Finish Group to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- (1) A central point in the Council is identified to maintain a list of all safeguarding referrals made by the Council's staff to personnel and to partner organisations in order that numbers and issues may be regularly monitored.
- (2) An information box is added to all Cabinet reports for the author to consider the safeguarding implications issues when preparing the report and recommendations with policy implications.
- (3) Training plans are put in place as soon as possible in order to raise awareness of safeguarding issues to all the Council's staff and members.
- (4) A safeguarding training session is held for members prior to a meeting of Full Council in autumn 2012.
- (5) The adoption of the Safeguarding Policy.

## **77 Bus Services Review**

The committee considered the agenda report (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr S Hansford (Assistant Director Communities) and Mr J A P Montyn, one of the Council's two ward members for West Wittering and the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, attended for this item.

Mr Hansford presented the report. He explained that the third and final stage of WSCC's review of the level of subsidy to public bus routes in the county had now been completed and the changes to affected routes would be implemented in September 2012. The details appeared in the appendix. It had not yet been possible to assess the impact on the communities concerned, but as part of this Council's Community Facilities Audit parishes would be asked to comment on how their areas and residents were being

affected by the reductions in the levels of subsidy and service. This audit would probably take place in late 2012/early 2013 rather than November 2012.

Mr Montyn emphasised that the remit and outcome of the whole review concerned the cutting of bus subsidies and not services. The annual subsidy had fallen by £2 m. WSCC had negotiated with bus operators to see how their services could operate with reduced subsidies, which WSCC could no longer continue to afford at their former levels. The review had been very extensive, working with the bus operators, carefully examining services on a route by route basis and aiming to minimise the harm and discomfort caused. It had been conducted on a cross-party basis with wide officer involvement. The outcome of the review needed to be put into perspective: there were 350 bus routes, some 80 of which had been subsidised. Nearly 30 of those 80 routes were unaffected by the subsidy reductions, with the remainder of the subsidised routes being affected to a greater or lesser degree. WSCC would do as much as it could to work with operators and community transport providers, but the harsh reality to be faced was that the previous funding resources had gone. He was not in a position to answer questions about specific routes.

Mr Montyn responded to members' questions and comments regarding (a) the impact of the cuts in rural communities, which to an extent were dependent on public transport, (b) what might be done to review certain decisions in the light of feedback from the parishes (it was always open to operators to revise schedules in response to customer demand), (c) the size and scale of the bus subsidies reduction in the context of total budget savings of £79 m (8%), which affected other parts of Highways and Transport as well as other services, and without there being an increase in the WSCC part of the 2012-2013 council tax, (d) the reason for using larger vehicles instead of mini-buses despite there being fewer passengers was an operating decision for the service provider, (e) the need to make the public more aware of volunteer bus services in some rural areas and, indeed, WSCC's own Social Services transport facility and (f) the introduction of new bus routes could always be considered in response to new residential developments.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes the impact of the withdrawal of bus subsidies following the announcement of the third round of the review and that a decision on the need for a more in-depth scrutiny review of the impact shall be deferred until the Community and Facilities Audit has been undertaken.

#### **78 Members Task and Finish Groups Protocol**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee received the Members Task and Finish Groups Protocol circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes the Members Task and Finish Groups Protocol.

## 79 Feedback from the Scrutiny Planning Group, Standing Panels, Task and Finish Groups and West Sussex County Council Select Committees

### (1) Scrutiny Planning Group

The committee received the minutes of the Scrutiny Planning Group's (SPG) last two meetings on Tuesday 19 June 2012 and Tuesday 10 July 2012 that had been circulated with the agenda (copies attached to the official minutes).

#### Minute 9 – West Sussex County Council Waste Plan Consultation – 19 June 2012

#### Minute 7 – Draft West Sussex County Council Waste Plan Consultation – 10 July 2012

Mr Chaplin and Mr Robertson both referred to the Development Plan Panel (DPP) meeting held on Thursday 19 July 2012, of which they were both members. The DPP had considered a report on a response drafted by officers to the West Sussex Waste Local Plan consultation. The DPP felt that it was not in a position to express an informed view about the draft response, which, therefore, it could only note rather than endorse. In recognition of a number of concerns about the identification of the Fuel Depot in Bognor Road Chichester as a potential site, including the A27 transport impact, the DPP asked for the comments made by the SPG at its July 2012 meeting and the views of this committee on the West Sussex Waste Local Plan to be incorporated by officers in the Council's response to be submitted by the extended deadline of Monday 13 August 2012. Since the subject was not a specific agenda item for this meeting, it was agreed that the report considered by the DPP and the minutes of that meeting would be e-mailed to committee members in order that they could send any comments to the relevant planning policy officer ahead of the deadline. The response would have to be submitted subject to the Cabinet's retrospective approval in September 2012.

[**Note** The DPP papers were e-mailed to the committee members on Tuesday 31 July 2012 requesting them to respond by no later than the end of Wednesday 8 August 2012]

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee receives the minutes of the meetings of the Scrutiny Planning Group on Tuesday 19 June 2012 and Tuesday 10 July 2012.

### (2) Standing Panels

#### (a) Housing Standing Panel – Tuesday 22 May 2012

Mrs Graves, the chairman of the Housing Standing Panel, gave an oral report on the matters covered by the Panel at its meeting on Tuesday 22 May 2012:

- Generic Housing Issues The new equity loan scheme, the cut to the housing allowance rate and its effect on tenants, and the levels of affordable housing required on large-scale developments.
- Right to Buy Scheme Increase in maximum discount available since 1 April 2012.
- Local Authority Mortgage Scheme Presentation received; more details required.
- Neighbourhood Planning Views on the level of support by the Council where a community submits a neighbourhood plan and the need to ensure that resources required to prepare the Local Plan are not diverted to neighbourhood plans.



- Review of Member Seminar on Changing Housing Environment One point was the definition of a rural parish for the purposes of the rural allocations policy.

The committee had no questions for Mrs Graves.

### **(b) Health Standing Panel – Wednesday 30 May 2012 and Wednesday 25 July 2012**

At the start of this item a written version of the oral report provided was circulated to the committee members (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Tinson, the chairman of the Health Standing Panel, gave an oral report on the items covered by the Panel on Wednesday 30 May 2012 and Wednesday 25 July 2012:

- Health Standing Panel Work Plan 2012-2013 Reduce health inequalities, improve wellbeing for all sectors of the community, encourage sustainable and accessible health provision and intervention, assess efficiency and effectiveness of service processes, joint working arrangements, local health strategies and generally raise awareness levels of local health issues.
- Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy Considered West Sussex statistical evidence and national policy highlighting problems caused by alcohol misuse, received presentations and endorsed both the Council's work to reduce alcohol misuse and the Council's draft *Alcohol Harm Action Plan*.
- Chichester Wellbeing Updates on the progress and performance of the Chichester Wellbeing advice service based at the Westgate Leisure Centre.
- Health Inequalities and Child Poverty Presentation A West Sussex Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Research Unit presentation (a) gave data (from the *Public Health Plan – Healthy and Well in West Sussex*) for Chichester District on fulfilling health potential, living life to the full and influences on health, (b) disclosed adverse statistics about (i) inequalities in ward level life expectancy for both the county as a whole within the South East and Chichester East ward in particular and (ii) the District's ageing population and the dependency issues to which this gave rise and (c) highlighted how partnership working could improve the local population's health and wellbeing. It was very desirable that this presentation should be given to all Council members.
- Promoting Health Inequalities Action Plan Reviewed the *Chichester District Action Plan 2011-2012* and commented on proposed action plan for 2012-2013.

Mrs Tinson responded to members' questions and comments regarding (a) access to the Chichester Wellbeing service, (b) how extended licensing hours for convenience stores made it easier to buy and consume alcohol at anti-social hours and (c) the importance of starting well in life raised issues such as breastfeeding, availability of school meals and standards of education.

Mrs E P Lintill, Cabinet Member for Leisure, Wellbeing and Community and present as an observer, commented on the successful work being done by the Health and Wellbeing Board, which had been commissioned and was funded by West Sussex County Council.

### **RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes the outcomes of recent meetings of the Housing Standing Panel and the Health Standing Panel.

### **(3) Task and Finish Groups**

As stated on the face of the agenda, this subject was covered under items 9 and 11.

### **(4) West Sussex County Council Select Committees**

The following oral reports were received from the named members regarding the West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) select committee meetings they had attended:

#### (a) Children and Young People's Services Select Committee

Mrs Apel had attended this committee's recent meeting on Wednesday 13 June 2012. Matters discussed included (i) Improvement Board Update (a meeting on that very day with the Children's Minister had been postponed), (ii) staff appointments (25 of 45 vacancies had been allocated and authority staff were being trained to become social workers) and (iii) improvements being made in the quality and timeliness of adoptions.

#### (b) Environmental and Community Services Select Committee

Mrs C Purnell (Selsey North) attended this committee's meeting on Wednesday 20 June 2012. Agenda items included (i) responses from the Cabinet Members for Communities, Environment and Enterprise and Highways and Transport following up matters raised at the committee's previous meeting, (ii) the viable options for long-term mortuary provision and body removals in West Sussex, (iii) West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service's proposed efficiency savings and its consultation on proposed financial risk arrangements, (iv) budget monitoring and performance outturn report 2011-2012, (v) scrutiny of WSSCC's response to the Thameslink Rail Franchise consultation and (vi) the work programme for the committee's Business Planning Group. During the meeting references were made to (a) a trial scheme of a smart phone app (*LoveWestSussex*) to enable the public to report (and then monitor) highway issues such as potholes directly to the contractor and (b) the case for WSSCC and district/borough councils synchronizing litter picking/grass-cutting.

#### (c) Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee

Mrs Dignum attended this committee's meeting on Wednesday 4 July 2012. It was responsible for adults' social services, community health and health liaison, and the review and scrutiny of the planning, provision and operation of health services in West Sussex. It was formed in April 2012 by the merger of the former Adults' Services Select Committee and the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Agenda items included:

- Western Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust Update on Service Redesign for Quality The number of community beds, availability of emergency orthopaedic care at St Richards and Worthing Hospitals, elective orthopaedic knee/hip surgery at St Richards Hospital (which would become the centre for major orthopaedic surgery), pre- and post-operative care near where the patient lives, developments with ophthalmic clinics (a new clinic at St Richards Hospital was due to open imminently) were some of the issues covered.
- Proactive Care: The Future Model of Services for the Frail Elderly In view of the growing numbers of elderly people, who were living longer and who had complex needs, there was a need to co-ordinate and simplify the existing agencies and approaches, while recognising that local priorities would vary across the county. The objective was to have a 'one call one team' plan with a single access point, that was community-based and that reduced hospital admissions by 15%.

Mrs Dignum noted one member's comment that there were no emergency admissions for ophthalmology at St Richards Hospital and said that she would raise that issue.

**80 Late Items**

There were no late items considered at this meeting.

[**Note** The meeting ended at 12:21]

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRMAN

Date \_\_\_\_\_