

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title:	Agenda												
Date:	Wednesday 18 April 2018												
Time:	4.00 pm												
Venue:	Conference Chamber West West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds												
Full Members:	<p style="text-align: center;">Chairman Diane Hind</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vice Chairman Susan Glossop</p> <p><u>Conservative Members (12)</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Simon Brown</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Richard Rout</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mike Chester</td> <td>Andrew Speed</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Patrick Chung</td> <td>Clive Springett</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Paula Fox</td> <td>Sarah Stamp</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Susan Glossop</td> <td>Jim Thorndyke</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Margaret Marks</td> <td>Frank Warby</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Charter Member (1)</u> Diane Hind</p> <p><u>Haverhill Indys (1)</u> John Burns</p> <p><u>Independent Member (1)</u> Paul Hopfensperger</p> <p><u>Independent Member (1)</u> Anthony Williams</p>	Simon Brown	Richard Rout	Mike Chester	Andrew Speed	Patrick Chung	Clive Springett	Paula Fox	Sarah Stamp	Susan Glossop	Jim Thorndyke	Margaret Marks	Frank Warby
Simon Brown	Richard Rout												
Mike Chester	Andrew Speed												
Patrick Chung	Clive Springett												
Paula Fox	Sarah Stamp												
Susan Glossop	Jim Thorndyke												
Margaret Marks	Frank Warby												
Substitutes:	<p><u>Conservative Members (6)</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Wayne Hailstone</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Peter Thompson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jane Midwood</td> <td>Patricia Warby</td> </tr> <tr> <td>David Roach</td> <td>Vacancy</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Charter Member (1)</u> Julia Wakelam</p> <p><u>Haverhill Indys (1)</u> Tony Brown</p>	Wayne Hailstone	Peter Thompson	Jane Midwood	Patricia Warby	David Roach	Vacancy						
Wayne Hailstone	Peter Thompson												
Jane Midwood	Patricia Warby												
David Roach	Vacancy												
Interests – Declaration and Restriction on Participation:	Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest not entered in the Authority's register or local non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda (subject to the exception for sensitive information) and to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on an item in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.												
Quorum:	Six Members												
Committee administrator:	Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Tel: 01638 719729 Email: christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk												

Public Information



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Venue:	West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 3YU	Tel: 01284 757120 Email: democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk Web: www.stedmundsbury.gov.uk
Access to agenda and reports before the meeting:	Copies of the agenda and reports are open for public inspection at the above address at least five clear days before the meeting. They are also available to view on our website.	
Attendance at meetings:	The Borough Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public.	
Public participation:	<p>Members of the public who live or work in the Borough are invited to put one question or statement of not more than three minutes duration relating to items to be discussed in Part 1 of the agenda only. If a question is asked and answered within three minutes, the person who asked the question may ask a supplementary question that arises from the reply.</p> <p>A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time the meeting is scheduled to start.</p> <p>There is an overall time limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.</p>	
Disabled access:	<p>West Suffolk House has facilities for people with mobility impairments including a lift and wheelchair accessible WCs. However in the event of an emergency use of the lift is restricted for health and safety reasons.</p> <p>Visitor parking is at the car park at the front of the building and there are a number of accessible spaces.</p>	
Induction loop:	An Induction loop is available for meetings held in the Conference Chamber.	
Recording of meetings:	<p>The Council may record this meeting and permits members of the public and media to record or broadcast it as well (when the media and public are not lawfully excluded).</p> <p>Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Committee Administrator who will instruct that they are not included in the filming.</p>	

Agenda

Procedural Matters

Part 1 - Public

- 1. Substitutes**
Any Member who is substituting for another Member should so indicate, together with the name of the relevant absent Member.
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Minutes** **1 - 10**
To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2018 (copy attached).
- 4. Public Participation**
Members of the public who live or work in the Borough are invited to put one question/statement of not more than 3 minutes duration relating to items to be discussed in Part 1 of the agenda only. If a question is asked and answered within 3 minutes, the person who asked the question may ask a supplementary question that arises from the reply.

A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time the meeting is scheduled to start. There is an overall limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.
- 5. Announcements from the Chairman regarding responses of the Cabinet to reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee**
- 6. Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Families and Communities** **11 - 18**
Report No: **OAS/SE/18/011**
- 7. Monitoring Community Safety Activities Including Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership** **19 - 28**
Report No: **OAS/SE/18/012**
- 8. Review of Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre - Scoping Report** **29 - 34**
Report No: **OAS/SE/18/013**

9. Update and Approval of 2018-2019 Work Programme

35 - 54

Report No: **OAS/SE/18/014**

Part 2 – Exempt

NONE

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held on **Wednesday 7 March 2018** at **4.00 pm** in **Conference Chamber West, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU**

Present: **Councillors**

Chairman Diane Hind

Vice Chairman Susan Glossop

John Burns
Mike Chester
Patrick Chung
Margaret Marks

Andrew Speed
Clive Springett
Jim Thorndyke

Substitutes attending:

David Roach

Patricia Warby

By Invitation:

Ian Houlder, Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance
Sara Mildmay-White, Cabinet Member for Housing
Peter Stevens, Cabinet Member for Operations

Also in attendance:

Aidan Dunn, Assistant Director Strategic Finance and Head of Procurement (Suffolk County Council)
Davina Howes, Barley Homes Director (St Edmundsbury B.C.)
Duncan Johnson, Barley Homes Director (Suffolk County Council)
Simon Phelan, Barley Homes Director (Forest Heath District Council)

203. **Substitutes**

The following substitutions were declared:

Councillor David Roach for Councillor Simon Brown.
Councillor Patricia Warby for Councillor Frank Warby.

204. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Simon Brown, Paula Fox, Paul Hopfensperger, Richard Rout, Sarah Stamp, Frank Warby and Anthony Williams.

205. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2018, were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

206. Public Participation

There were no questions/statements from members of the public.

207. Announcements from the Chairman regarding responses of the Cabinet to reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The Chairman advised that she attended Cabinet on 6 February 2018 and presented the Committee's report on items it considered on 10 January 2018, which was noted.

208. Barley Homes Group Limited Annual Report 2018

Prior to the report being presented to the Committee, the Chairman, Councillor Diane Hind, welcomed Councillor Sara Mildmay-White, Cabinet Member for Housing, who was also a representative for St Edmundsbury Borough Council on the Barley Homes Shareholder Advisory Group (SAG) and three of the Directors from Barley Homes, Davina Howes and Simon Phelan for the West Suffolk Councils and Duncan Johnson, Chairman of the Board of Directors for Suffolk County Council, who was accompanied by Aidan Dunn, Assistant Director (Strategic Finance) and Head of Procurement at Suffolk County Council (SCC) who supported SCC in operating Barley Homes.

Councillor Sara Mildmay-White then presented Report No: OAS/SE/18/004 to the Committee, which provided the opportunity for Members to note the Barley Homes' Annual Report 2018 and the SAG's view and recommendations, and to provide any additional comments to inform the preparation of Barley Homes next Business Plan, which would be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in the summer.

Attached at Appendix A to the report was the Annual Report of Barley Homes (Group) Limited, the company established jointly with Forest Heath District Council (FHDC), St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC) to build open market housing for sale, housing for private rent and affordable housing. The Annual Report (Appendix A) presented the position from a Barley Homes perspective, and the covering report provided the perspective from both FHDC and SEBC's viewpoint, as joint owners (shareholders) of Barley Homes.

The covering report also included information on the current progress made against the agreed Barley Homes Business Plan; key challenges and achievements; and a number of recommendations on the way forward, which the Overview and Scrutiny were asked to consider, such as:

- SAG welcomed any feedback from the Scrutiny Committee on how to improve communications so as to keep all members better informed moving forward.

The Committee strongly expressed their concerns regarding the deliverability of the Barley Homes five-year business plan, given one of the four initial development sites had been removed from the business plan, (Wamil Court, Mildenhall), because Suffolk County Council (SCC), a shareholder in Barley Homes took the decision to sell the site on the open market, securing a higher price. Although the property had been offered to Barley Homes, the offer they were able to make based on the assessed future development was not acceptable to SCC. It was concerned that if SCC had done this once, what was stopping them from doing it again?

Some members also felt that the cost of the preparatory work carried out by Barley Homes (approximately £6,500) in assessing and progressing Wamil Court, Mildenhall should be paid back by SCC from the sale proceeds it achieved on the sale of the land.

Aidan Dunn, Assistant Director (Strategic Finance) and Head of Procurement, explained in detail the history behind Wamil Court, Mildenhall, which went back to the original business plan and the Care UK's contract for the renewal of the care home, and the need for SCC to maximise the cash receipt for the site when Care UK returned it back to SCC in 2014. Barley Homes was asked to provide their best market value price for the site, however SCC found a buyer who were prepared to pay three times more than what Barley Homes could offer. Following concerns being raised about this sale by the West Suffolk partners, SCC had taken stock of the situation and was now looking at what it wanted as a partner of Barley Homes and stated that SCC was now much more open minded to the bigger picture and not just focused on maximising profits and land receipt sales. All partners were now looking at the original assumption in the original business plan when Barley Homes was established, as these were considered to be too restrictive, and it had become apparent that further work was required with Barley Homes to establish new assumptions and greater flexibilities.

In response, the Assistant Director (Resources and Performance) noted that there was a lot of emotion around the sale of the Mildenhall site, which was understandable, and officers would progress the principle question of the £6,500 being recouped. She explained that market valuation was a subjective issue, depending on the intentions of the purchaser. Members raised concern that the price paid for Wamil Court could ultimately result in a housing application coming forward that could not achieve development management policy compliance.

The Committee questioned whether St Edmundsbury Borough Council would have gone ahead with the Joint Venture in the first place with just three sites, instead of the four; and whether Barley Homes would still be able to deliver the homes it had originally set out to achieve in the first business plan, and sought reassurances from SCC that they would not sell their other two sites on the open market, without first giving Barley Homes the opportunity to buy the sites first.

In response, Aidan Dunn informed members that SCC wanted houses to be built on the two sites it owned as set out in the Business Plan and it would offer the sites to Barley Homes in the first instance. However, if the sites

were not viable for Barley Homes, then SCC would consider selling those sites to another buyer.

Some members accepted that there would be teething problems, but questioned whether this was a joint venture that the council should realistically be pursuing. If the councils involved had differing perspectives, then there should be a point set when Barley Homes was fully reviewed and a decision made as to whether it was still viable to continue or to dissolve Barley Homes and simply sell potential development sites on the open market, as members did not want to have the same problem in 12 months.

The Committee was informed that Barley Homes was currently working hard to progress the three remaining sites set out in the current business plan to ensure that they worked and delivered against the timeline set out in Appendix A. Officers reiterated that all council leaders were fully committed and wanted Barley Homes to be a success. Conditions in the housing market had changed since the original business plan was prepared, and given the desires to maintain schemes that were policy compliant, a revised business plan would need to be brought forward that still achieved a profitable outcome for the business.

In response to a question raised regarding how members were kept informed about Barley Homes, Councillor Mildmay-White identified that this had been raised within the Leaders Statement to Council, and it was always intended that Barley Homes annual reports would be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

In response to a question raised, the Committee was informed that the figures set out in Appendix 2 of the Annual Report were a snapshot in time up to the end of January 2018, and the full set of accounts would be available at the end of the financial year.

Discussions were also held on the appointment of non-executive directors; the Westfield site in Haverhill and parking issues at Castle Hill, Haverhill, to which responses were provided.

Aidan Dunn reiterated that SCC wanted the joint venture to work and the SCC Leader was committed to Barley Homes.

The Chairman of the Committee summed up by stating that the message coming out of the meeting was that members were concerned about Barley Homes and about the delivery of housing going forward and suggested that the revised Business Plan be brought back to the Committee in July/September 2018 to enable members to further assess progress.

Councillor Diane Hind moved the recommendations, these were duly seconded by Councillor Andrew Speed and with the vote being unanimous, it was:

RESOLVED: That

- 1) The Annual Report 2018 for Barley Homes (Group) Limited, attached as Appendix A to Report No: OAS/SE/18/04, and the progress made to date be noted.
- 2) The Barley Homes Shareholder Advisory Group's views and recommendations set out in Report No: OAS/SE/18/004, to address the current challenges, be noted.
- 3) The Barley Homes Revised Business Plan be referred back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in July/September 2018, along with the full year-end set of accounts to enable the Committee to assess further progress being made.

209. Lettings Policy

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Sara Mildmay-White presented Report No: OAS/SE/18/005, which advised the Scrutiny Committee on proposed revisions to the Lettings Policy. Revisions were required as a result of recent case law and to ensure that the Lettings Policy was compliant with the requirements of the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 which comes into force on 3 April 2018.

This was a revised interim policy to ensure the Council was legally compliant and that a full review of the Lettings Policy would be carried out later in the year and brought back to the Committee for further scrutiny. Attached at Appendix 1 to the report was the revised Lettings Policy, which included the proposed changes, and was also summarised in paragraph 1.1.8 of the covering report.

The Committee scrutinised the report in detail and asked questions to which responses were provided.

In response to a question raised regarding Housing Associations and whether they had their own policies or similar template to the attached draft lettings policy, members were informed that Housing Associations across the sub-region worked with the same lettings policy document.

In response to a question raised regarding "refusing an offer of accommodation", members were informed that officers did everything they could by working with applicants sensitively, and housing providers, to offer support/assistance and to verify their circumstances as to why an offer of accommodation is not deemed suitable.

The Committee also discussed Armed Forces Personnel and questioned whether the emergency services could also be included. Officers advised that the additional priority for UK Armed Forces Personnel was more of a reflection that they moved around frequently in their line of work, which was not the case with emergency services personnel. However, a full review of the lettings policy would be carried out later in the year.

The Vice-Chairman of the Committee wished to thank the Assistant Director (Families and Communities) and her housing team for all the work they do, which was appreciated.

Councillor John Burns moved the recommendation, this was duly seconded by Councillor Patricia Warby and with the vote being unanimous, it was:

RECOMMENDED

That the Revised Lettings Policy, attached as Appendix 1 to Report No: OAS/SE/18/005, be approved.

210. Car Parking Update

[Councillor Andrew Speed left the meeting at 5.32pm prior to the consideration of this item]

Prior to the report being presented to the Committee Councillor Peter Stevens, Cabinet Member for Operations wished to thank officers for the car parking figures and asked the Committee to note that infrastructure development would be coming forward to support car parking provision.

The Committee received Report No: OAS/SE/18/006, which provided members with an update of the car parking service across 2017, off-street parking outcomes and work priorities. The report included information on transactions and usage, issue of fines, car park improvements (credit card enabled pay machines and RingGo cashless payments, electric charging points, Park Mark, Disabled Parking Accreditation and Vinery Road car park); planning for future car parking provision, Civic Parking Enforcement, and future work streams.

The Committee considered the report in detail and asked a number of questions to which comprehensive responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on the drop in transactions made in 2017 compared to 2016 and the reasons behind the drop; what the cost was to the council in using RingGo compared to other parking providers, to which comprehensive responses were provided.

In response to a question raised regarding electric charging points and whether the council received a grant for installing them, members were informed that the council funded the replacement of the two existing charging points and made a contribution to the new charging points at a cost of £20,000 with Suffolk County Council funding the remainder.

In response to a question raised, officers agreed to provide members with data on the usage of electric charging points.

The Committee discussed the number of discounted weekly tickets sold in Bury St Edmunds and noted there was no mention of discounted weekly tickets for Haverhill in the report. Officers agreed to provide members with the data for Haverhill.

Discussions were also held on the Car Parking Account actual budget spend for 2016-2017 and the various areas where surplus funds were spent, which included Street Cleansing, District Highways, Street Furniture and CCTV.

There being no decision required, the Committee noted the contents of the report.

211. **Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance**

The Committee was reminded that on 15 March 2017, it had received a presentation from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, setting out responsibilities covered under his portfolio.

At this meeting, the Cabinet Member had been invited back to provide his annual update, and Report No: OAS/SE/18/007 set out the focus of the update.

The Cabinet Member was also provided in advance of the meeting with some key questions identified by Scrutiny members on areas they wished to be appraised on during the annual update, which were included in the report along with responses, specifically:

- 1) Procurement of contracts:** After a contract had been awarded to a company/business, how does the Council then ensure fair treatment and good practice was being adhered too in treating the public and employees ethically?
- 2) Procurement of contracts:** What penalties were there when contracts were not delivered on time? (Example: play equipment contracts).
- 3) Procurement of contracts:** Who reviews the performance of contracts awarded by the Council?
- 4) Equal gender pay:** As a Council do we operate an equal gender pay scheme, for example, if two people are doing the same job, with the same experience, same qualifications are they receiving the same pay irrelevant of gender or disability?
- 5) Harassment:** Given all the publicity in recent months, does the Council have anyone making any sexual harassment claims, male or female?

Councillor Ian Houlder opened his presentation by thanking the Committee for the invitation to address them on progress made within his Portfolio since March 2017.

The Committee asked a number of follow-up questions relating to procurement, which included the preferred list of suppliers and how local/small businesses could get onto the councils list of suppliers; what percentage of suppliers were renewed; and whether procurement rules applied when employing consultants, to which comprehensive responses were provided.

A member queried the purpose of the Workforce Strategy 2018-2020. It was confirmed that the Council was increasing its workforce, and continuing to develop its staff through the comprehensive training programme, that would be reflected in the strategy.

The Chairman on behalf of Members wished to thank the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance and officers for their attendance and **noted** the update.

212. **West Suffolk Information Framework - Report from the Joint Task and Finish Group**

[Councillors Jim Thorndyke and Patricia Warby left the meeting at 6.18pm prior to the discussion of this item and subsequent voting]

Councillor John Burns presented Report No: OAS/SE/18/008, which updated members on the work carried out by the Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group with Forest Heath District Council in developing a proposed West Suffolk Information Framework.

On 19 April 2017, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that a West Suffolk Information Framework Joint Task and Finish Group (the Group) be set up to scrutinise and shape the development of an Information Strategy for West Suffolk Councils'. The Group included two members from both Forest Heath District Council (Councillors Simon Cole and Brian Harvey) and two from St Edmundsbury Borough Council (Councillors John Burns and Clive Springett).

In the early stages of the process the Group agreed that the document should become a Framework, rather than a Strategy, reflecting the focus on Data and Information and the councils Vision and Objectives regarding its usage, and that a subsequent ICT Strategy would focus on the delivery of the Technology Architecture to support the Framework.

Attached at Appendix A to the report was the Draft Information Framework, which sought the Committee's input following the work of the Group. The framework was a first for West Suffolk Council's and represented a revised approach to data and the way we use it. The framework provided a high level summary of the council's current position and proposed an approach that sought to maximise data assets through aligning data across West Suffolk Councils' and its partners to improve the services provided across the Councils'.

The Committee was advised that draft document would be proof-read, formatted and designed, including the addition of photographs (where applicable) in advance of final publication.

The Committee considered the report and questioned whether we would be data compliant with regards to the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR), to which officers advised that there was a wider project across the Council on GDPR which would feed into the West Suffolk Information Framework.

Councillor Diane Hind then moved the recommendation, this was duly seconded by Councillor Patrick Chung and with the vote being unanimous, it was:

RECOMMENDED:

That the Draft West Suffolk Information Framework, attached as Appendix A to Report No: OAS/SE/18/008, be approved.

213. Decisions Plan: March to May 2018

The Committee received Report No: OAS/SE/18/009, which requested that members peruse the Cabinet Decisions Plan for the period March 2018 to May 2018, for which it would like further information on or might benefit from the Committee's involvement.

The Committee considered the latest version of the Decisions Plan and asked questions on the "*Leisure Investment Fund: Consideration of Business Case for Investment in Haverhill Leisure Centre*", to which a response was provided.

The Committee requested further information on progress with the Western Way Development Programme, including how the expansion of West Suffolk College might impact on education in other parts of St Edmundsbury. It was agreed a written response would be provided.

The Committee also requested whether it would be possible for it to consider the Haverhill Research Park report and the proposed vision, prior to it being considered by Cabinet, as it was reported that local members had not yet been consulted on the proposed vision. Officers agreed to look into the timetabling of this item through the democratic process.

There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the contents of the March to May 2018 Decisions Plan, subject to a written response being provided on the Western Way Development Programme and the timetabling of the Haverhill Research Park report to Cabinet.

214. Work Programme Update

The Committee received Report No: OAS/SE/18/010, which updated Members on the current status of its rolling work programme of items for scrutiny during 2018-2019 (Appendix 1).

The report also requested the Members identify questions they would like the Cabinet Member for Families and Communities to cover in his annual update to the Committee on 18 April 2018.

The Committee considered the report and came up with the following questions to be put to the Cabinet Member for Families and Communities at its April 2018 meeting:

- **Health:** How are Families and Communities working with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other interested parties, to ensure the needs of residents are being met in terms of health facilities (in all areas of the Borough) including ensuring that relevant S106 contributions from developers are not wasted because of a potential failure (or its partners/replacement) to follow-up on the need identified at the time of the agreement or lack of desire to provide such facilities.
- **Health:** Are S106 agreements, in the view of Families and Communities, sufficiently tight and legal enough to not allow any wriggle out room later including identifying alternative uses rather than returning funds/land back to the developer?
- **Customer services, access and engagement:** What is being proposed for communications when we move to one Council. As we move to a single council it will be inevitable that some people may have to travel further to engage with services, and if they do not have internet, or are not familiar with technology, or are without transport, what will they do?
- **Families and communities:** What sanctions and action can the Council take when a rough sleeper refuses all proper and appropriate help and support?
- **Customer services, access and engagement:** What are the reasons behind the delay in the Bury Bus Station building being occupied, and what is the current status regarding future occupancy?

Finally, the Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) informed the Committee the additional item on the Barley Homes Group Business Plan would be included in its work programme for July/September 2018.

There being no decisions required, the Committee **noted** the current status of its work programme, including the additional item on the Barley Homes Business Plan and had identified questions to be put to the Cabinet Member for Families and Communities.

The Meeting concluded at 6.40 pm

Signed by:

Chairman

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Families and Communities	
Report No:	OAS/SE/18/011	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	18 April 2018
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Robert Everitt Cabinet Member for Families and Communities Tel: 01284 769000 Email: robert.everitt@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officers:	Davina Howes Assistant Director (Families and Communities) Tel: 01284 757070 Email: davina.howes@westsuffolk.gov.uk Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Tel: 01638 719729 Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	As part of the "Challenge" role, Overview and Scrutiny are asked to consider the roles and responsibilities of Cabinet Members. It is part of the Scrutiny role to "challenge" in the form of questions. Therefore, to carry out this constitutional requirement, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member shall attend to give an account of his or her portfolio and answer questions from the Committee.	

Recommendation:	<p>Members of the Committee are asked to question the Cabinet Member for Families and Communities on his portfolio responsibilities, and having considered the information, the Committee may wish to:</p> <p>1) Make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for Families and Communities for his consideration;</p> <p>2) Request further information and / or receive a future update.</p> <p>3) Take any other appropriate action as necessary.</p>		
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
Consultation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 		
Alternative option(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 		
Implications:			
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
None			
Wards affected:	All		
Background papers:	None		
Documents attached:	None		

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Background

1.1.1 As part of its "Challenge" role, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the roles and responsibilities of Cabinet Members. To carry out this constitutional requirement, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member shall be invited to give an account of his or her portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.

1.1.2 Last year, on 19 April 2017, Councillor Robert Everitt, Cabinet Member for Families and Communities attended this committee and presented a report which summarised the areas of responsibility covered under his portfolio.

1.2 Scrutiny Focus

1.2.1 The scope of this report differs from that of last year as the Cabinet Member has been asked to prepare a report which answers the following specific questions identified by the committee members as being relevant to the families and communities portfolio:

- 1) Health:** How are Families and Communities working with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other interested parties, to ensure the needs of residents are being met in terms of health facilities (in all areas of the Borough) including ensuring that relevant S106 contributions from developers are not wasted because of a potential failure (or its partners/replacement) to follow up on the need identified at the time of the agreement or lack of desire to provide such facilities.
- 2) Health:** Are S106 agreements, in the view of Families and Communities, sufficiently tight and legal enough to not allow any wriggle out room later including identifying alternative uses rather than returning funds/land back to the developer?
- 3) Customer services, access and engagement:** What is being proposed for communications when we move to one Council? As we move to a single council it will be inevitable that some people may have to travel further to engage with services, and if they do not have internet, or are not familiar with technology, or are without transport, what will they do?
- 4) Families and communities:** What sanctions and action can the Council take when a rough sleeper refuses all proper and appropriate help and support?
- 5) Customer services, access and engagement:** What are the reasons behind the delay in the Bury Bus Station building being occupied, and what is the current status regarding future occupancy?

1.3 **Response to Key Questions Set out in the Scrutiny Focus**

1.3.1 **Health: How are Families and Communities working with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other interested parties, to ensure the needs of residents are being met in terms of health facilities (in all areas of the Borough) including ensuring that relevant S106 contributions from developers are not wasted because of a potential failure (or its partners/replacement) to follow up on the need identified at the time of the agreement or lack of desire to provide such facilities.**

- The Families and Communities team comprises of nine officers who cover a broad spectrum of specialisms.
- Within the team, we have three officers who we share with partner organisations; two officers we share with West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (since September 2017) and one officer we share with Public Health at Suffolk County Council (since February 2017). This has furthered collaborative working to meet joint objectives around health for our communities across west Suffolk.
- The S106 needs to identify a harm to infrastructure (usually built facilities). It then needs to secure fair payments to mitigate that need and lastly (usually) a payback if monies have not been spent. If the need exists and a project is clearly identified, there is no scope within the planning system for a failure of those parties asking for the money, not spending the money. We cannot secure money for a project, then change the project if the CCG are, for whatever reasons, unable to deliver it. S106 is not a tax, it is only required if there is a defined infrastructure project to spend the money.
- When securing S106 contributions, it is a legal requirement that they are necessary and directly related to the harm being caused by the proposed development. Any proposed projects must be clearly defined, so where harm is anticipated from a development, the negative impact can be offset by monies secured from the developer.
- The project then, must be defined enough to offset the harm and be limited to the impact, i.e. the physical demand placed on a facility, by increasing patient demand. Having more than one option for off-setting the harm is possible, but care needs to be taken when firstly stating a certain surgery needs expanding, for instance, and then also saying that an alternative (leaving the surgery the same) is also acceptable.

1.3.2 Health: Are S106 agreements, in the view of Families and Communities, sufficiently tight and legal enough to not allow any wriggle out room later including identifying alternative uses rather than returning funds/land back to the developer?

- Essentially yes, because the concept of “wriggle room” is not lawful; the identified harm and how it is to be mitigated needs to be justified for any s106 sum to be lawfully secured and, at the time the S106 is signed, all parties must know where the monies will be spent.
- The concept that harm exists is not enough, the mitigation of that harm must clearly be identified and the “harm” must be to infrastructure, so built facilities not (for example) lack of GP’s.
- We are always dependant on NHS England in these matters, as statutory consultees they will provide the evidence and justification for any requirements; how they work with the CCG does not fetter the S106 consultation process, but sometimes projects identified by the CCG have not been taken up by NHS England. The S106 agreement will have to define where the money will be spent and if the money cannot be spent on the defined project, it should not be requested.
- Our Development Implementation and Monitoring Officer monitors what sums we hold, their payback dates and where the S106 states the monies need to be spent. In addition, we email both NHS England and the CCG with regular updates of all these monies, to ensure we do not get to a position where any such monies need to be paid back to developers.

1.3.3 Customer services, access and engagement: What is being proposed for communications when we move to one Council? As we move to a single council it will be inevitable that some people may have to travel further to engage with services, and if they do not have internet, or are not familiar with technology, or are without transport, what will they do?

- Firstly, it is important to note that single council does not mean that customers have to travel further to engage with services. The councils retain customer access points in each of the main market towns: Haverhill, Newmarket, Mildenhall and Bury St Edmunds. We also have arrangements in place with the library in Brandon. These locations are available to people who require some face to face support. In addition, a number of our services offer home or on-site visits and we have staff working across the West Suffolk area. Importantly, ward councillors continue to be visible and accessible to their constituents.
- Our Customer Access Strategy has a focus on encouraging customers to engage with the Council online; we have in recent years invested in the online content available to customers, so whether they want general information about Council services or want to report a problem, make an application or pay for a service, this can all be achieved at a time and place which is convenient for them.
- The broadband initiative in Suffolk means that more households than

ever are gaining access to more reliable and faster broadband infrastructure so it is becoming increasingly commonplace for homes to rely on the internet for everyday activities, such as grocery shopping, insurance renewals and for streaming entertainment. However, we recognise that not all households have internet access for a number of reasons so we remain committed to providing public access PCs across a number of our sites.

- The introduction of Universal Credit prompted a review of public access PC sites, and a map was created for colleagues to advise customers as required, detailing our own and partner sites where this provision is available.
- For those customers who are truly experiencing rural isolation (no reliable transport links, medical conditions restricting access and movement and/or no online capability), then we have our team of customer services advisors who can provide support on the phone and, in these very vulnerable cases, make safeguarding or agency referrals for further community/outreach services.
- In addition, we continue to provide support to partners, such as the help we've given to Suffolk West Citizens Advice in adapting their customer service model to provide more telephone advice for those who can't visit the office.
- Working with partners to improve customer access is a continuing agenda and we promote this approach whenever the opportunity arises. Wherever possible, we share locations with other partners so that customers can access a wide range of support; Haverhill House and the Mildenhall offices are a good example as these are shared with the Jobcentre and Citizens Advice.
- Communications is also part of the implementation work for the new West Suffolk Council. This is working alongside services to identify where and what extra communications may be needed either to residents, partners or service users.

1.3.4 **Families and communities: What sanctions and action can the Council take when a rough sleeper refuses all proper and appropriate help and support?**

- Unless the person is committing anti-social behaviour, there are no sanctions that the council can take. We will continue to offer help and support by working with various support agencies, such as the police, health, probation, Adult and Community Services and Voluntary and Community sector such as the Bury Drop in, as appropriate.
- With regards to rough sleepers' belongings, we deal with each case individually at present. If they are simply rough sleeping we try to welfare check and continue to offer support. If there is any suggestion that they are begging, then the Housing Options team liaises with the police to consider appropriate enforcement powers.

- We are aware of the impact rough sleeping has on the individual concerned and the wider community. The council has recently recruited two further outreach workers (one post funded by Suffolk County Council Public Health) to encourage people away from a life sleeping on the street and to support people to access drug and alcohol treatment services. Our current outreach worker has been successful in building relationships and gaining the trust of those sleeping on the streets, which in turn has led to more individuals engaging with support.
- We are also committed to working with landlords to try to prevent people rough sleeping. We will continue to work with partners to ensure that relevant support is provided to the most vulnerable.
- Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO) are intended to deal with a particular nuisance in a specific area. Bury St Edmunds town centre has an order in place which commenced in October 2017. The conditions are around alcohol related anti-social behaviour and begging. Haverhill also has a PSPO in place with a condition around alcohol related anti-social behaviour. In Bury St Edmunds one warning has been issued under the PSPO to a person who was persistently begging in the town centre. This has resulted in the person desisting from this behaviour. It should be noted that some people who appear to be sleeping rough and are begging are, in fact, accommodated.

1.3.5 Customer services, access and engagement: What are the reasons behind the delay in the Bury Bus Station building being occupied, and what is the current status regarding future occupancy?

- As part of its savings programme, the council removed staff from the bus station building and divided the building so that space could be made commercially available. The decision to do this was based on the staff savings made with any commercial income being seen as an additional benefit. As such, the council saved £100,000 per year in staff costs.
- Suffolk County Council is responsible for passenger transport and any timetabling information. Therefore customer information relating to timetabling remains the County, not the Borough Council's responsibility. The County Council provides bus timetabling information online and via its real time technology.
- Shopmobility services are provided by the library and the public toilets remain open for use and increased CCTV and security checks are in operation in the building and surrounding area.
- It has taken longer than we would have liked to rent the vacant unit on site. For some time, the council's property team has been working alongside a local businessman who wishes to begin operating from the vacant part of the bus station building.
- The lease on the vacant part of the building has now been signed. Details of the building layout, signage and fit out arrangements have all been agreed. Finalising details of the arrangement have taken some

time and the council has been keen to support the local businessman to expand his business. We are expecting a few weeks lead in before the tenant's fit-out contractors start on site.

1.4 **Proposals**

- 1.4.1 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee ask follow-up questions of the Cabinet Member following his update.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Monitoring Community Safety Activities including Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership	
Report No:	OAS/SE/18/012	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	18 April 2018
Portfolio holder:	Councillor Robert Everitt Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities Tel: 01284 769000 Email: Robert.everitt@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Davina Howes Assistant Director (Families and Communities) Tel: 01284 757070 Email: Davina.howes@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	To update the Committee on community safety activity in West Suffolk including the Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP) from April 2017 to March 2018	
Recommendation:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee: It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that members consider and discuss the information outlined in this report.	
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Consultation:	The annual monitoring report draws on information from partner agencies relation to community safety issues. Due to the sensitivity some information remains restricted.	
Alternative option(s):	Not required	
Implications:		

<p>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs): A decision was agreed through the Strong and Safe Communities Group (SSCG), the DHRs will be funded equally by the statutory partners of the CSP in the area where the review is being conducted. Funding for ECINS (case conferencing management system): A decision was agreed through the SSCG that Suffolk local authorities will contribute £2000 per year; 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 to enable ECINS to continue to be use. This has been included in existing budgets. The Police Athena IT platform was planned to be operational from April 2018, however this timeline has slipped and the use of ECINS has been extended to cover the time delay, resulting in further financial support required from each authority which will be found from existing budgets 	
<p>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Safety Partnerships are statutory bodies and are required to carry out a number of statutory duties. Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires local authorities to consider crime and disorder in all their functions. 	
<p>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Risk/opportunity assessment:</p>		<p><i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i></p>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
Strength of partnership working is lost due to changes and reorganisation of key statutory partners	High d	Review role of partnership working and ensure all key partners have a key responsibility	Medium

Return to silo working within partners and withdraw from engagement	Medium	Members and leadership team to encourage and embed partnership working in all areas of business for the council(s)	Low
Ward(s) affected:		All wards across St Edmundsbury	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		The Police and Crime Commissioner Plan (2017-2021) www.suffolk-pcc.gov.uk	
Documents attached:		Appendix A – Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership Project Plan 2017-2018	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership

1.1.1 Over the past year, the Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP) continued to meet and discharge its statutory duties by:

- Carrying out an assessment of crime and disorder in the area
- Continuing to deliver the three plan and action plan to reflect the priorities of the partnership
- Carrying out Domestic Homicide Reviews as and when required

1.1.2 In May 2016, the WSCSP considered its priorities for 2017 -2018.

Based on the outcomes from a partnership workshop the following priorities were identified as the focus for the WSCSP;

- Supporting vulnerable people from becoming targeted by criminals from out of the county. This includes victims of substance misuse, drug dealing and supply, vulnerable adults at risk of 'cuckooing', young people being used to 'run' drugs and sexual exploitation.
- Violence against women and girls. This includes domestic abuse, sexual violence, modern day slavery, sexual exploitation.
- Emerging issues, including rural crime, homelessness and street begging, E safety, hate crime and Prevent.
- Domestic Homicide reviews, including ensuring that the WSCSP continues to carry out effective reviews, refines processes and shares learning.

1.1.3 The council continues to support the police in relation to the targeting of vulnerable people targeted by criminals. In particular, cases are discussed at both the Anti-Social Behaviour meeting and the Housing Forum. It is recognised that the criminals adapt their behaviour and that the issues involved are complex.

1.1.4 The Police, Suffolk County Council and district councils across Suffolk are developing both an overarching plan, and local responses to the issue of drugs and criminal gangs, known as 'County Lines'. Local priorities will be developed which in turn will be adopted by CSPs and a local action plan implemented (see section 1.2.3 – 1.2.6 below for further information).

1.1.5 Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs): WSCSP has completed a DHR for the Babergh area in respect of an incident which occurred in November 2014. The report was commissioned by the WSCSP and compiled by an independent chair. The report was published in October 2016, following approval by the Home Office.

1.1.6 An action plan relating to the recommendations in the report has been monitored throughout 2017-2018 by the WSCSP. All actions were completed to the satisfaction of the partnership in January 2018. The Home Office has been notified.

1.1.7 Over the past 12 months the WSCSP have been informed of three further potential DHRs in the Mid Suffolk/Babergh area:

- Mid Suffolk: Incident occurred in February 2017 with a formal request to conduct a DHR received in March 2017. The DHR report and action plan was completed and sent to the Home Office in December 2017. The WSCSP are awaiting Home Office decision and the outcomes of the review was discussed by the WSCSP in March 2018. The action plan will be instigated and monitored by the WSCSP until complete.
- Mid Suffolk: Incident occurred December 2017. The DHR is progressing.
- Mid Suffolk: Incident occurred in November 2017 and following a police investigation was not deemed a DHR. However the WSCSP is considering the benefits of a "light touch" review to be conducted by Suffolk County Council and this was discussed at the WSCSP meeting in March 2018.

1.2 Strong and Safe Communities Group

1.2.1 The Strong and Safe Communities Group continues to meet and is chaired by Ian Gallin. Representatives from a number of organisations attend the meeting including: seven borough and district councils, Suffolk County Council, Suffolk Police, Suffolk Police and Crime Commissioner, Suffolk NHS, Clinical Commissioning Groups, Probation and Suffolk Fire and Rescue.

1.2.2 The Group focusses on a number of key areas: The current work streams are: (i) violence against women and girls (VAWG), also encompassing domestic abuse, (ii) sexual violence and sexual exploitation, (iii) County Lines and (iv) youth gangs and violence.

1.2.3 VAWG: A countywide VAWG strategy is currently being drafted and will form the basis of a countywide action plan. To date a number of projects have been commissioned and partnership work is continuing to tackle violence against women and girls, including:

- Domestic Abuse Link Worker: Will work within the West Suffolk Housing Team and offer support and advice to victims of domestic abuse when present as homeless. The post is hosted by Anglia Care Trust and funded by the government.
- Specialist Domestic Abuse Refuge: Through a successful funding bid to government, Suffolk County Council and the seven district and borough councils are piloting a project to make 23 bed spaces available across Suffolk for victims of Domestic Abuse available for women who are not eligible for support through the existing refuges. Five beds are located in West Suffolk. There is also a bed space available for a female victims who have no recourse to public funds
- West Suffolk Domestic Abuse Forum: Meet on a bi monthly basis and cover the whole of West Suffolk. Supported by partners across a range of services.

- Target Hardening: A pooled pot of funding from a range of statutory partners has been established. This will be managed through the Safe Partnership who will conduct security and fire risk assessments and undertake any necessary security measures. This service will commence in April 2018. Referrals will be through the commissioned Independent Domestic Violence Advisors service.
- Additional support for specialist services: Through the West Suffolk Community Chest grant scheme we have supported the following services within West Suffolk:
 - Survivors in Transition – to provide sexual abuse support services within St Edmundsbury.
 - Suffolk Rape Crisis – to provide a counselling service within St Edmundsbury.
 - Women’s Aid – to provide training to staff in order to establish a family support project within St Edmundsbury.
 - Fresh Start New Beginning – to provide sexual abuse support services (for young people) within Forest Heath.

1.2.3 Youth Gangs and Violence including county lines: This work is being led by the Youth Offending service in conjunction with partners across Suffolk. Initially the focus has been on Ipswich which has an urban street gang culture with associated County Lines. County lines refers to the number of identified mobile ‘phone lines’ which are managed by those involved in organised crime groups from out of the area for the purposes of establishing and running drugs markets in market towns. Of those targeted, in terms of running/dealing drugs, many are vulnerable or are young people. It is closely associated with gang, formation turf wars and escalating violence.

1.2.4 A partnership strategy is in place and underway for Ipswich and this has been used as the template for a county wide strategy. Local partners including youth offending service, Police, and West Suffolk councils are already meeting to refine the strategy to reflect the nature of the issues in this area.

1.2.5 Whilst the west of Suffolk is seeing the rise in prevalence of county lines, (Bury St Edmunds, Haverhill, Newmarket and Stowmarket in particular), the issue around gang violence, involving young people, is at a much lower level than that in Ipswich. Those young people already involved are being managed through children and young people’s service youth offending services.

1.2.6 It is in the preventative space that the new work will be initiated. This will feature in the WSCSP action plan as this will provide the local response approach with and through our communities and will be the most effective. This was formalised at the WSCSP meeting in March 2018.

1.3 Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)

1.3.1 The multi-agency ASB group continues to meet fortnightly in the St Edmundsbury area.

1.3.2 The group considers only high risk (as identified by a risk assessment matrix), repeat and/or vulnerable victims and each case is managed through the shared case management system. All West Suffolk council services refer cases to this meeting where use of ASB legislation is considered. In 2017 -2018 two community protection notices have been issued by West Suffolk councils in the Bury St Edmunds area.

1.3.3 ASB which is not assessed as high risk, can be referred by members of the community, Police or councillors. This information is passed to the relevant Families and Communities Officer who works with the community and partners to resolve issues in the first instance or move to refer to the ASB group to consider the use of enforcement legislation.

1.4 Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs)

1.4.1 On 1 October 2017, PSPOs were introduced in Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill town centre to combat alcohol related anti-social behaviour. In Bury St Edmunds a further condition was added in relation to persistent begging. These orders will remain in place for a period of up to three years after which time they will be reviewed.

1.4.2 In Bury St Edmunds one warning has been issued under the PSPO to a person who was persistently begging in the town centre. This has resulted in the person desisting from this behaviour, so no further action has needed to be taken. No actions have been taken with the PSPO area in Haverhill.

1.4.3 Work is continuing, in partnership to look at best practice from around the country, to initiate alternative giving mechanisms for the public who want to support those who are rough sleeping.

1.4.4 Whilst some members of the public will always wish to give money or provide food or drinks directly to those who are begging, we are aiming to give a positive message around re-directing that giving, to support the charities and organisations who can provide more sustainable solutions. It is important to be aware that many people who are begging in the town are not actually homeless.

1.4.5 It should be noted that West Suffolk homeless prevention team are well sighted on those who are on our street and the Rough Sleeper liaison officer maintains regular contact with them and works with them to find more permanent solutions to their rough sleeping. Two further outreach posts have recently been recruited.

This page is intentionally left blank



Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership Plan 2016-2019

The Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP) is a statutory body with a responsibility to:

- Make an assessment of community safety issues
- Produce a plan which responds to those issues
- Review and report on progress against that plan
- Carry out Domestic Homicide Reviews

The partnership is made up of statutory representatives from local councils in St Edmundsbury, Forest Heath, Mid Suffolk and Babergh, Suffolk Police, Registered Social Landlords, Suffolk County Council, Probation, Rehabilitation company and the Clinical Commissioning Group. The Youth Offending Service and Havebury Housing Partnership are long-serving co-opted members.

The WSCSP works to support community/voluntary groups to secure funding to deliver projects/initiatives which meet an identified community safety issue, which are a threat or risk or will cause the greatest harm to the community.

How does this work?

WSCSP has a duty to consider the more strategic overarching issues which are affecting community safety in Western Suffolk. These are issues which may not affect our communities on a day to day basis, but are a threat to overall safety in Suffolk and undermine families and communities. These will be identified by making an assessment of crime and community safety in partnership with Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Police.

Who we will work with?

In addition to the statutory agencies of the partnership working together, we also have strong links with the following groups;

Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) : The PCC is fully supportive of CSPs and their work and in turn, CSPs have a duty to take due regard of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan. The WSCSP plan reflects those issues in the PCP which result in producing the greatest threat, risk and harm to our communities.

Strong and Safe Communities Group (SSCG): This group was commissioned by the Health and Wellbeing Board and works with the Community Safety Partnerships; it does not replicate or duplicate what is already happening. Community safety is a key determinant for health and wellbeing and this tactical county wide group has been developed with an aim to give a light touch coordinated response, with a view of getting a better understanding of the whole picture in community safety, drawing agendas together, identifying gaps and responding.

Priorities for WSCSP

A strategic assessment has been undertaken. This is an assessment of all crime and disorder and substance misuse problems that Western Suffolk faces. This assessment assists with the most effective use of available resources in a way which will have the greatest impact on the most relevant problems. It is not intended that the issues identified are the ONLY issues which are addressed throughout the year, but that the issues highlighted are prioritised when resources are available for allocation.

The following data sources have been used to determine this assessment:

- Crime and Disorder data and reports from Suffolk Police
- Ambulance call out data
- Substance misuse data from Public Health England
- Iquanta performance data

Open source research has also been undertaken where relevant to identify emerging national policy developments.

The following priority areas of work have been identified as the focus for the WSCSP:

- 1) Supporting vulnerable people from becoming targeted by criminals from out of out of the county. This will include victims of substance misuse, Drug dealing and supply, vulnerable adults at risk of 'cuckooing', young people being used to 'run' drugs and sexual exploitation.
- 2) Violence against women and girls. This will include domestic abuse, sexual violence, modern day slavery, sexual exploitation.
- 3) Emerging issues. This could include rural crime, homelessness and street begging, E safety, Hate Crime and Prevent.
- 4) Domestic Homicide reviews. This will include ensuring that the WSCSP continues to carry out reviews, refines processes and shares learning.

The intention is not to duplicate any work that individual agencies may be doing but to understand the relevance to Community Safety for residents in Western Suffolk and maximise the opportunities for coordinating a response and intelligence between agencies in the West.

For further information please contact:

Cllr Robert Everitt, Chair, Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership

Robert.everitt@stedsbc.gov.uk

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Review of Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre – Scoping Report	
Report No:	OAS/SE/18/013	
Report to and dates:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	18 April 2018
Portfolio holders: (St Edmundsbury)	Councillor Alaric Pugh Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth Tel: 07930 460899 Email: alaric.pugh@stedsbc.gov.uk	
(Forest Heath)	Councillor Lance Stanbury Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth Tel: 07970 947704 Email: lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Julie Baird Assistant Director (Growth) Tel: 01284 757613 Email: julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	To establish a Joint West Suffolk Task and Finish Group to Review the Christmas Fayre.	
Recommendation:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee: It is RECOMMENDED that a Joint West Suffolk Task and Finish Group be established, <u>with four members from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee being appointed</u>, to carry out a review of the Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre and to make recommendations for 2019.	
Key Decision: (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)	Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition? Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Consultation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 2.1.4 covers the proposed engagement arrangements for the review 		
Alternative option(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option of not reviewing the Christmas Fayre has been considered. However, this would mean that Forest Heath members would not have the opportunity to input to the review which will make recommendations for 2019, at which point the Fayre would be the responsibility of the new Single Council. 		
Implications:			
Are there any financial implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any staffing implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any ICT implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any equality implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
The Task and Finish Group are not able to reach conclusions on the future of the Fayre in the timeframe and with the available resources before a West Suffolk decision is needed on what should happen in 2019	Medium	The review is properly resourced, with good quality information provided and appropriate support for engagement and deliberation.	Low
Ward(s) affected:	All West Suffolk wards		
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>	2015 review of the Christmas Fayre: Cabinet report OAS/SE/15/016 Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee CAB/SE/15/077		
Documents attached:	None		

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre has been running since 2004. St Edmundsbury Borough Council organises the event and commits staff and resources to running it. It is currently run as a not-for-profit community event and attracts over 120,000 visitors to Bury St Edmunds over a four day period. As such, it was reported by the National Association of British Markets Authorities in 2015 to be in the top dozen Christmas Markets in the UK in terms of its size and economic contribution.

1.1.2 A formal review of the Fayre was last carried out in 2015 by a Task and Finish Group consisting of 6 members of St Edmundsbury Overview and Scrutiny Committee, who met in August and October 2015 and then reported to Cabinet in December 2015. The review concluded that "St Edmundsbury Council should commit to the Christmas Fayre for the remainder of the current administration" (i.e. May 2019) and made a number of recommendations that have been, or are being implemented.

1.1.3 A further review of the Christmas Fayre is now proposed for the following reasons:

- i) The current commitment to continue with the Fayre only runs until April 2019, so decisions are needed as to what should take place in winter 2019;
- ii) Planning for the Christmas Fayre starts in the preceding year. As such, a decision will need to be made in 2018 for the 2019 Fayre;
- iii) If the event goes ahead as planned, the 2019 Christmas Fayre will be the first to be run by the new West Suffolk Council as opposed to St Edmundsbury Borough Council. For this reason, current members from across West Suffolk need to be involved in the decisions about the future of the Fayre; and
- iv) The new anti-terrorist requirements for large scale events were not in place in 2015 when the previous review was carried out. These requirements have financial and other implications and it would be helpful to consider these alongside a wider review of the Fayre.

2. 2019 Christmas Fayre Review

2.1 It is proposed that a Joint West Suffolk Task and Finish Group be established to carry out a review of the Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre to make recommendations to the West Suffolk Shadow Executive in Autumn 2018. This is subject to agreement from Forest Heath's Overview and Scrutiny Committee who are considering an identical paper at their meeting on 19 April 2018.

2.1.1

Membership

It is recommended that the Joint Task and Finish Group comprises of **eight**

Members; four from the Forest Heath Overview and Scrutiny Committee and **four from the St Edmundsbury Committee**. The Group would be supported by officers, including the Service Manager for Economic Development, Markets Development Officer, Service Manager (Health and Safety) and a Policy Business Partner, and the Portfolio Holders could be part of the Group if invited.

2.1.2

Review period

The review work will be carried out between May and August 2018, in order to feed into final reports for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings in September, and a report to the Shadow Executive in October 2018. This will allow time for the recommendations to be taken account of before the arrangements for 2019 would need to be set (as things currently stand, dates for Christmas Fayres are set around one year in advance).

2.1.3

Scope

It is proposed that the Review covers a range of issues, as follows:

Principle and ownership	Consider whether West Suffolk Council should continue to support a 4 day Christmas Fayre in Bury St Edmunds from 2019 that is run on a not-for-profit basis and organised directly by the Council.
Vision	Review current vision ("The Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre is a fun, festive and inclusive event for all ages. The event is designed to attract visitors and have a positive effect on local people and businesses. The Fayre is provided by St Edmundsbury Borough Council".)
Timing and length	Review dates (currently last weekend in November) and timings and length of event and consider alternative options.
Format and venues	Review current elements of the Fayre (stalls and entertainment and funfair) and the 10 venues used.
Type of stalls	Review current split of stalls (i.e. approx. one third of each of household goods; foods; and personal goods)
Links to wider economy (retail and tourism)	Review the impact on local businesses, both positive and negative.
Transport and accessibility	Review the current transport and accessibility arrangements, including parking; coaches; park and ride; disabled access.
Finance	Review the current financial position of the Fayre (including security costs) and other potential options. Consider the overall cost of the Fayre, including opportunity costs and the indirect benefits.
Staffing and volunteers	Review current casual staffing arrangements (employed by SEBC) and volunteers.

Safety and security	Review the anti-terror measures put in place for the 2017 Fayre and note the separate review of health and safety of the 2017 Fayre.
Examples from other places	Consider examples of best practice from other places around the UK and overseas.
Communications and marketing	Review the current arrangements for communication and marketing about the Fayre, and consider alternatives.
Management and Resources	Review the management arrangements in previous years and outline the benefits and costs of alternatives.

2.1.4 It is also proposed that the Joint Task and Finish Group consider progress in implementing the actions agreed in 2015 in the form of a 5-year operational plan for the Christmas Fayre.

2.1.5 **Engagement**

The Joint Task and Finish Group should engage with the following groups and organisations in order to inform their decisions about the future of the Christmas Fayre:

- OurBuryStEdmunds
- Town centre businesses
- Businesses that provide services to the Fayre
- Bury and Beyond Development Management Organisation
- Arc management
- Emergency services

2.1.6 The Group should also take account of the feedback from residents and visitors given through the Christmas Fayre Survey in 2017.

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny of Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Update and Approval of 2018-2019 Work Programme	
Report No:	OAS/SE/18/014	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	18 April 2018
Chairman of the Committee:	Councillor Diane Hind Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Tel: 01284 706542 Email: diane.hind@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Tel: 01638 719729 Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	To update the Committee on the current status of its rolling work programme of annual items, and to adopt additional items identified by the Committee at its workshop held on 7 February 2018.	
Recommendations:	<p>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>Reviews</u> the current status of annual items in its Work Programme for 2018-2019, <u>Appendix 1</u>; and 2) <u>Adopts</u> the additional items as set out in <u>Appendix 2</u> and <u>Appendix 3</u> for inclusion in its forward work programme for 2018-2019. 3) <u>Identifies questions</u> for the Leader of the Council to cover as part of his overall presentation of the Draft West Suffolk Annual Report (2017-2018) on 6 June 2018. 	
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Documents attached:	Appendix 1 – Current work programme 2018-19 Appendix 1A – List of 20 topics identified & scores Appendix 2 – Additional items to be adopted Appendix 2A – Topics progressed via other means Appendix 3 – Work programme suggestion – Vehicle Non-Idling Policy for West Suffolk
----------------------------	---

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendations

1.1 Rolling Work Programme

- 1.1.1 The Committee has a rolling work programme, whereby suggestions for scrutiny reviews are brought to each meeting, following the completion of the work programme suggestion form, and if accepted, are timetabled to report to a future meeting.
- 1.1.2 The work programme also leaves space for Call-ins and Councillor Calls for Action.
- 1.1.3 The current position of the work programme, including Task and Finish Group(s) for 2018-2019 is attached at **Appendix 1** for information.

1.2 Outcome of Scrutiny Workshop (Work Programme Setting)

- 1.2.1 At an informal scrutiny workshop held on 7 February 2018, members identified a list of potential new items of work from both members and officers for inclusion on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's rolling work programme for 2018-2019.
- 1.2.2 The workshop resulted in a ranked list of these potential new work topics based on "public interest"; "impact"; "relevance" and "partnership working/external scrutiny" (**PIRP**).
- 1.2.3 Members found the use of the "PIRP" analysis had been very successful in identifying those areas of work which had the potential to make recommendations, which could lead to real improvements, did not duplicate existing work across the council, and would be of value to both St Edmundsbury, West Suffolk and a Single Council in the future.
- 1.2.4 Members were asked to pick a manageable number of new areas of work out of a total of 20 identified, alongside the previously agreed and ongoing work of the Committee, for inclusion in its 2018-2019 work programme, which is attached at **Appendix 1** and **Appendix 1A**.
- 1.2.5 Members chose to take forward the 5 highest scoring issues from the analysis exercise, which are attached for the Committee's approval at **Appendix 2**.
- 1.2.6 **Appendix 2A**, sets out how the remaining 15 items might be progressed by other means.
- 1.2.7 Attached at **Appendix 3** to the report is a completed work programme suggestion form proposing vehicle non-idling zones in Bury St Edmunds, which was referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee from Council in December 2017, following a motion submitted by Councillor Diane Hind, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

1.3 **Portfolio Holder Annual Presentations**

- 1.3.1 At every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member attends to give an account of his or her portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
- 1.3.2 At the Committees meeting on 6 June 2018, the Leader of the Council will be attending to present the Draft West Suffolk Annual Report (2017-2018).
- 1.2.3 The Committee is therefore asked to identify questions for the Leader of the Council to over in his annual report to the Committee.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Rolling Work Programme (St Edmundsbury Borough Council)

The Committee has a rolling work programme, whereby suggestions for scrutiny reviews are brought to each meeting, and if accepted, are timetabled to report to a future meeting. The work programme also leaves space for Call-ins and Councillor Calls for Action.

Description	Lead Member	Details
06 June 2018		
Draft West Suffolk Annual Report (2017-2018) and Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	Leader of the Council	To provide an input to this important document. To also include the annual update from the Portfolio Holder.
West Suffolk Homelessness Reduction Strategy	Portfolio Holder for Housing	To provide input into the West Suffolk Homelessness Reduction Strategy.
Haverhill Research Park	Portfolio Holder of Planning and Growth	To provide input into this item, prior to being presented to Cabinet.
Decisions Plan: June 2018 to May 2019	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update and Reappointments to Task Groups / SCC Health Scrutiny	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales. (To re-appoint the Suffolk County Council Health Scrutiny Committee for 2018-2019.
11 July 2018		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	Cabinet Member for Housing	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Barley Homes Group Limited	Cabinet Member for Housing	To consider a revised business plan for Barley Homes and full year-end set of accounts.
West Suffolk Supplementary Planning Doc. On Affordable Housing	Portfolio Holder for Housing	To provide input into the West Suffolk Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable Housing.
Decisions Plan:	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.

Description	Lead Member	Details
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.
12 September 2018		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
West Suffolk Housing Strategy	Cabinet Member for Housing	To provide input into the West Suffolk Housing Strategy.
West Suffolk Tenancy Strategy	Portfolio Holder for Housing	To provide input into the West Suffolk Tenancy Strategy.
Christmas Fayre Review – Final Report	Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth	To receive the final report on the review the Christmas Fayre carried out by the Joint Task and Finish Group.
The Apex	Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture	To receive the Annual Report from The Apex.
Decisions Plan:	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.
07 November 2018		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Annual Car Parking Update	Portfolio Holder for Operations	To receive an annual report on Car Parking in St Edmundsbury.
Decisions Plan:	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.
09 January 2019		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.

Description	Lead Member	Details
Decisions Plan:	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.
13 March 2019		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Barley Homes Group Limited Annual Report 2019	Lead Portfolio Holder - Housing	To scrutinise the Annual Report of Barley Homes Group Limited
Decisions Plan:	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

Futures items identified to be programmed:

1. Future Developments for Regional Transport in West Suffolk (A1307) – Progress Report.
2. SCC Highways Progress Update (Following Extraordinary meeting held on 25 October 2017)

This page is intentionally left blank

ST EDMUNDSBURY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
List of Potential Topics Identified and Scores

ISSUE/TOPIC	PUBLIC INTEREST	IMPACT (VALUE)	RELEVANCE	PARTNERSHIP WORKING OR EXTERNAL SCRUTINY	TOTAL SCORE
SCORING	0=None 1=Low 2=Medium 3=High	0=None 1=Low 2=Medium 3=High	0=None 1=Low 2=Medium 3=High	0=None 1=Low 2=Medium 3=High	Max 12
Bus Transport, including Rural	3	3	3	3	12
Support for Small Businesses	3	3	3	3	12
Vehicle Non-Idling Policy (West Suffolk) <i>(Motion submitted to Council in December 2017)</i>	2	3	3	2	10
Garden Waste Collection Scheme (Brown Bins)	3	3	3	0	9
Bus Station (BSE) – commercial aspect	3	3	3	0	9
Integration of road infrastructure for new developments	3	2	2	1	8
Town Centre Masterplan <i>(Developing Place Growth Plans)</i>	1	3	3	1	8
The Apex – 10 Year Plan	2	2	3	0	7
School Visits to Museums	1	2	2	2	7
Representation on Outside Bodies	0	3	3	1	7
Asset Management Plan	0	3	3	0	6
Digital and Customer “Journey” (including ARP) <i>(Including Consultations by SEBC – Member Suggestion)</i>	2	2	2	0	6
St Andrew’s Street Car Park	0	0	0	0	0

Members discounted the following from the original list of 20 items identified, prior to scoring					
Environmental Polices – Bring into action - <i>(How they feed into taxi licensing; parking and public transport).</i>	--	--	--	--	Build into every / future report
Aging Population (Resilient Communities)	--	--	--	--	Build into every / future report
Use of New Homes Bonus	--	--	--	--	Defer to 2019-20
Civil Parking Enforcement (Transfer of powers from the police to the local authority)	--	--	--	--	Defer to 2019-20
Developer Contributions (Community Infrastructure Levey)	--	--	--	--	Defer to 2019-20
Review of Scrutiny's Role in the New Constitution, e.g. Call-in	--	--	--	--	Defer to 2019-20
Enforcement	--	--	--	--	Defer to 2019-20

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Additional Items for inclusion in the Work Programme for 2018-2019

	Description	Scope of Review / Terms of Reference / Objectives	Lead Officer(s)
1	Support for Small Businesses	Work to progress through the Growth and Innovation Group with various options developed. These will then be scrutinised by Overview and Scrutiny with input from Cabinet throughout the democratic process.	Assistant Director (Growth)
2	Bus Transport, including Rural	Scrutiny review to be supported by graduate trainee in the Policy Team. Suggest Task and Finish Group, including external witnesses and consultation on new models.	Assistant Director (Families and Communities) Assistant Director (Growth)
3	Vehicle Non-idling Policy for Wests Suffolk	<u>See Appendix 3</u> (Work Programme Suggestion Form) One off meeting involving external witnesses and officer report.	Assistant Director (Planning and Regulatory) Service Manager (Environmental Health)
4	Garden Waste Collection Scheme (Brown Bins)	Joint Task and Finish Group made up of 4 councillors from each council (8, no substitutes) with at least one from each council being a member of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee (ideally two). Work to commence around May/June 2018, in order to have a report to support decisions for the start of year 4, in April 2019.	Assistant Director (Operations)
5	Bury St Edmunds Bus Station (commercial aspect)	Question plan developed with the Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities for 18 April 2018 as part of his annual update.	Assistant Director (Families and Communities)

This page is intentionally left blank

Items held for possible future scrutiny at a later date, or being progressed by other means

	Description	Scope
Page 47	1 Integration of road infrastructure for new developments	<p>The Council's Planning and Regulatory and Growth teams are working together to align our processes and our important work with Suffolk County Council as Highways Authority to ensure we provide accurate and consistent advice at the beginning of the development process and ensure a joined up, development team approach to dealing with planning applications and how we engage meaningfully with our various consultees, including Highways. Internal actions plans within DM include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director level discussions with SCC to improve working practices • Formal involvement of Highways in pre-application discussions – through Planning Performance Agreements • Development Team approach to Major applications with all relevant consultees involved from inception • Review of standard planning conditions and the requirements through Section 106 • Review of condition monitoring
2	Town Centre Masterplan (Developing Place Growth Plans)	Work to progress through the Growth and Innovation Group with various options developed. These will then be scrutinised by OAS with input from Cabinet throughout the democratic process.
3	The Apex – 10 Year Plan	Already being looked at by Member Panel and Cabinet. Report to Cabinet with briefing note to all councillors. Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture to highlight at next visit to committee.
4	School Visits to Museums	Suggest Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture provides update at next visit to committee.
5	Representation on Outside Bodies	Suggest referring to the Shadow Council and/or Future Governance Steering Group to consider as part of Single Council.
6	Asset Management Plan	Overview and Scrutiny will have the chance to consider the Plan as part of its development through the democratic process.

	Description	Scope
7	Digital and Customer "Journey"	Suggest topic for future Single Council.
8	St Andrew's Street Car Park	Scored zero to avoid duplication of effort as this was already being addressed by the Town Centre Masterplan.
9	Environmental Policies – Bring into action	All future reports to include information on environmental policies, if applicable.
10	Aging Population – resilient communities	All future reports, in particular housing to include information on aging population, if applicable.
11	Use of New Homes Bonus	Possible item for consideration by OAS under Single Council in 2019-2020.
12	Civil Parking Enforcement	Possible item for consideration by OAS under Single Council in 2019-2020.
14	Developer Contributions (CIL)	Possible item for consideration by OAS under Single Council in 2019-2020.
14	Review of Scrutiny's Role in the new Constitution	Possible item for consideration by OAS under Single Council in 2019-2020.
15	Enforcement	Possible item for consideration by OAS under Single Council in 2019-2020.

**Suggestion for Scrutiny Work Programme Form
 (To be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee)**

Suggestion from:
Cllr Diane Hind: Referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee from Full Council in December 2017.
What would you like to suggest for investigation / review?
Proposal to enforce Vehicle Non-idling Zones (develop a policy) at Schools, Homes for the Elderly, Hospitals, Day Care Centres, GP Surgeries, and similar.
What are the main issues / concerns to be considered?
<p>Air Quality is associated with a number of health issues and particularly affects the most vulnerable in society such as children and older people. Children (14 and under) and older people (65 and older) are particularly susceptible to the effects of air pollution, as are people with respiratory conditions, like asthma, or heart problems.</p> <p>The 2017 Air Quality Annual Status Report produced by West Suffolk councils said that Bury St Edmunds was the only town in West Suffolk to show exceedance of air Quality objectives for Nitrogen dioxide, areas included Sicklesmere Road, Roundabouts on Kings Road and Parkway. Also, at various times at Tollgate Green air quality levels are above the desired level which is of concern to my residents who wish to see improvements before the area officially fails air quality objectives.</p> <p>Of course it isn't just a poisonous gas like Nitrogen Dioxide that is harmful, it is also particulates (microscopic particles) that unfiltered vehicles emit.</p> <p>Obvious solutions are to use the car less, buy vehicles with low emissions etc. These though are solutions in our residents control so what can we do? We can set a good example and use electric vehicles where possible but currently that has operational challenges as well as a high cost, although costs will hopefully reduce in the coming years.</p> <p>There is however something positive the council could do immediately and that is to have no idling zones around our schools, homes for the elderly, hospitals, day care centres, and GP surgeries.</p> <p>The Highway Code (Rule 123) already advises that drivers must not leave a stationary vehicle's engine running unnecessarily on a public road. If a vehicle is likely to remain stationary for more than a couple of minutes, drivers should apply the parking brake and switch off the engine to reduce vehicle emissions and noise pollution.</p> <p>A couple of minutes though can cause a lot of pollution and we've all seen people running their engines to defrost windscreens whilst they have breakfast or pop in to the local shop or the parents keeping their cars warm for their children. I'm sure most are unaware of the impact this has on the health of others, and indeed their own health.</p>

I believe we could and should have an anti-idling policy in Bury St Edmunds and urge members to support my request that our Environment team action this policy as a matter of urgency. I have spoken with the Environment Officer and Service Manager (Environment) who are supportive of the idea.

Simple facts

A car idling for one minute can produce enough exhaust fumes to fill up to 150 balloons.

Public Health England estimates long-term exposure to particulate air pollution has 'an effect equivalent to' around 25,000 deaths a year in England. Road traffic is estimated to contribute more than 64% of air pollution in towns and cities.

A diesel car used for short journeys in urban environment will pollute more, this is because the Diesel particulate filter (DPF) won't reach sufficient temperature to regenerate. Regeneration, basically burning off soot etc. to ash occurs when travelling for 10minutes plus at over 40mph. Failure to regenerate can cause vehicle problems and the AA report that they are continually called to assist vehicles with a blocked DPF.

An idling engine can produce up to twice as many emissions as an engine in motion, impacting the surrounding the area and the air that we breathe.

The Royal College of Physicians estimate [40,000 deaths a year in the UK](#) are linked to air pollution, with engine idling contributing to this.

The residents of Northgate Ward are very concerned about this and I've received correspondence from other residents (outside my ward) who heard about my proposal and took the trouble to write to me in support of it. I've included some examples of residents support further on.

I appreciate that enforcement is an issue both financially and practically which is why I am suggesting that our Environment Team be asked to evaluate and report on two options for consideration:

1. System based on recommendation, notices being advisory, a means of educating people to better practice. A bit like the health warning that was placed on cigarettes. A polite notice can also be used by establishments as a way of drawing attention to the request without the need to be confrontational. One member of the public who contacted me on this thought collaboration with schools was the answer. Children are very good at getting adults to think about their actions and are usually enthusiastic and very earnest about citizenship and personal behavior.
2. A system with financial penalties.

In conclusion, can I just reiterate that we will need a combination of different actions to rid our towns and cities of dirty air but introducing no-idling zones is one simple step that we can take now that can lead to cleaner air for all of us.

Also one of our priorities as a Borough Council is Healthy Communities and this should be a part of that aim. I accept that there are financial implications but improved health is priceless.

Would this review benefit from a “West Suffolk” approach (i.e. joint scrutiny by both Councils), or is it relevant only to your council?
I think it could be a joint presentation or St Edmundsbury could trial first.
Who is responsible for providing this service, or tackling the issue in question?
West Suffolk councils are responsible for providing this service, as detailed in the Air Quality Annual Status Report and as required by the Environment Act 1995. I see this as a trial in St Edmundsbury to be rolled out across the County if other councils so desire.
Have you spoken to them, and if so, what was the response?
The Councils Environment Officer and Service Manager (Environment) are supportive of reducing idling within both Bury St Edmunds and the remainder of West Suffolk, and are already working on an anti-idling campaign that will be initially targeted at schools and expanded as deemed necessary.
What is the Portfolio Holders view on this issue?
The Portfolio Holder was at Full Council in December 2017, and accepted the referral to Overview and Scrutiny.
What would be the likely benefits and outcomes of carrying out this investigation / review?
Healthier Communities, plus we would be making a real difference to Air Quality. We would also generate a lot of positive publicity for the Council.
Estimated Committee and officer resource implications (eg research group, one-off report, dedicated meeting etc)
Possible One-off report.
Suggested witnesses, documentation and consultation
There is much support from the general public for example I cite the following unsolicited quotes: Email from resident and Council worker My wife and I live on Springfield Avenue about 50 metres away from the school. I asked Environment Officer about whether the volumes of cars arriving, idling and leaving could be affecting the local air quality. He informed me of the relevant idling regulation, of the work being done by other councils and that Cllr Hind may be taking on this issue. Our concerns began not long after moving here. As environmentalists we are concerned with the volume of vehicles each morning and afternoon, the parking arrangements and the lack of awareness shown for others during the drop off / pick up period. Email from a resident Knowing that the Tollgate junction is one of the most polluted in Bury St Edmunds has made me more aware and worry for those and myself who regularly walk through it. More importantly, It’s made me concerned for my children’s health who walk to tollgate school

very regularly.

Letter to Bury Free Press

As attached

Comments on social media From Bury St Edmunds Town Talk page on Facebook

Comment 1

I'm concerned about pollution levels in and around Bury streets, particularly where cars are idling in traffic jams.

Comment 2

Idling when waiting such as just to keep the heater on, can be legislated against. It has been illegal in the whole of Braintree District for many years.

Will this investigation / review contribute to one or more of the Council's Strategic Priorities? If so, which (please tick)	
Growth in West Suffolk's economy for the benefit of all our residents and UK plc	
Resilient families and communities that are healthy and active.	X
Increased and improved provision of appropriate housing in West Suffolk in both our towns and rural areas.	

Will this investigation / review contribute to the achievement of one or more of the commitments within the Council's West Suffolk Strategic Framework 2018-2020 Priorities? If so, which (please tick)	
Growth in West Suffolk's economy for the benefit of all our residents and UK plc.	
1. Lobby for a better connected West Suffolk, in terms of transport and digital connectivity.	
2. Promote West Suffolk as a place to do business, so as to attract investment and innovation that increases salary levels and encourages the right mix of jobs to grow our economy.	
3. Invest in and promote our local places by building on their unique qualities through specific local strategies, projects and environmental services	
4. Develop our current and future local workforce through education; training and opportunities for all.	
Resilient families and communities that are healthy and active:	
1. Foster supportive networks to improve and sustain the lives of individuals; families and communities.	X
2. Use our community, leisure, open space and heritage assets to support wellbeing and education.	
3. Work with and influence partners including the voluntary sector in our shared endeavour of improving the health, wellbeing and safety of families and communities.	X
Increased and improved provision of appropriate housing in West Suffolk in both our towns and rural areas:	
1. Plan for housing to meet the needs of current and future generations throughout their lifetime that is properly supported by infrastructure, facilities and community networks.	
2. Improve the quality of housing and the local environment for residents.	

3. Enable people to access suitable and sustainable housing.	
--	--

Will this investigation hit one of the essential elements of a scrutiny review when analysing potential scrutiny reviews? If so, which (please tick)	
Public Interest: The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen by overview and scrutiny.	X
Impact (Value): Priority should be given to issues that make the biggest difference to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the area, and which have the potential to make recommendations which could lead to real improvements. The outcome must also be proportionate to the cost of carrying out the review in terms of staff and councillor time.	X
Relevance: Overview and scrutiny must be satisfied that an issue identified for review is relevant and does not duplicate existing work being undertaken elsewhere by various Working Groups, Cabinet, partners etc.	
Partnership working or external scrutiny: The focus of scrutiny is moving towards joint action and community leadership, so anything which offers this opportunity should be given serious consideration.	

Would you like to be involved in the investigation / review?	
Yes	
Date of request: 6 February 2018	Signed Councillor Diane Hind

Please return this form to the:

Scrutiny Officer, Forest Heath District Council, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Suffolk, IP28 7EY

Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk

[Updated: July 2013](#)
[Updated: June 2014 \(Revised West Suffolk Strategic Priorities\)](#)
[Updated: March 2015 \(Amended as a Joint Form\)](#)
[Updated: February 2018 \(Revised West Suffolk Strategic Framework 2018-2020\)](#)

MASTER PLAN

Time to tackle pollution danger

Cllr Alaric Pugh (Readers' Views, January 12) makes several points about the Town Centre Master Plan (TCMP), and asserts that the borough council is looking "at ways to improve the pedestrian experience in our town centre".

BBC 2 undertook an experiment, broadcast on January 10, that was shown in a programme called Fighting for Air.

What it made very clear is the damage done to the lungs of young children due to emissions from vehicles passing through town.

They undertook a one-day experiment and were able to reduce traffic flow and vehicle emissions around a local school by 30 per cent. It is vital viewing for those who come into our town – particularly parents on the school run.

One might expect that the council and the town centre schools would work together to tackle the risks to health for children as well as visitors, residents and others in the town centre.

A viewing of this programme shows just how much damage is done to children's health by the intense pollution around schools at dropping off and collection times. Yet the TCMP and the schools seem to ignore the health risks presented by

traffic in the town centre. The programme also measured significantly reduced pollution levels in a street used by pedestrians for shopping, so if the council ignores the health issue of traffic pollution in Bury, it is certainly not improving "the pedestrian experience".

Those responsible for the present and future health of those they represent, and for whom they have a duty of care, cannot continue to ignore the growing problem of traffic pollution in Bury St Edmunds. They cannot carry on regardless of the health risks to those who live, visit, and work in town, and ignore the health risks to future generations.

Antony Hurden
Bury St Edmunds