

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee



<b>Title</b>	<b>Agenda</b>									
<b>Date</b>	<b>Thursday 18 March 2021</b>									
<b>Time</b>	<b>5.00 pm</b>									
<b>Venue</b>	<p><b>Facilitated by Microsoft TeamsLive virtual meetings platform only.</b></p> <p><b>The meeting will be accessible by the press and public via a live stream, the link to which will be published on the Council's website alongside the agenda papers.</b></p>									
<b>Full Members</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chair</b> Ian Shipp</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Vice Chair</b> Simon Cole</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>Conservative Group (9)</b></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Simon Brown Mike Chester Patrick Chung Terry Clements Simon Cole</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Stephen Frost Margaret Marks Joe Mason Marion Rushbrook</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>The Independent Group (6)</b></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Michael Anderson Trevor Beckwith Tony Brown</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Paul Hopfensperger Lisa Ingwall King Ian Shipp</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>Labour Group (1)</b></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Diane Hind</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Conservative Group (9)</b>	Simon Brown Mike Chester Patrick Chung Terry Clements Simon Cole	Stephen Frost Margaret Marks Joe Mason Marion Rushbrook	<b>The Independent Group (6)</b>	Michael Anderson Trevor Beckwith Tony Brown	Paul Hopfensperger Lisa Ingwall King Ian Shipp	<b>Labour Group (1)</b>	Diane Hind	
<b>Conservative Group (9)</b>	Simon Brown Mike Chester Patrick Chung Terry Clements Simon Cole	Stephen Frost Margaret Marks Joe Mason Marion Rushbrook								
<b>The Independent Group (6)</b>	Michael Anderson Trevor Beckwith Tony Brown	Paul Hopfensperger Lisa Ingwall King Ian Shipp								
<b>Labour Group (1)</b>	Diane Hind									
<b>Substitutes</b>	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>Conservative Group (5)</b></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">John Augustine Mary Evans Clive Springett</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Jim Thorndyke Vacancy</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>The Independent Group (2)</b></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Dawn Dicker</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Vacancy</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>Labour Group (1)</b></td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Cliff Waterman</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Conservative Group (5)</b>	John Augustine Mary Evans Clive Springett	Jim Thorndyke Vacancy	<b>The Independent Group (2)</b>	Dawn Dicker	Vacancy	<b>Labour Group (1)</b>	Cliff Waterman	
<b>Conservative Group (5)</b>	John Augustine Mary Evans Clive Springett	Jim Thorndyke Vacancy								
<b>The Independent Group (2)</b>	Dawn Dicker	Vacancy								
<b>Labour Group (1)</b>	Cliff Waterman									
<b>Interests – declaration and restriction on participation</b>	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.									
<b>Quorum</b>	Six Members									
<b>Committee administrator</b>	<p><b>Christine Brain</b> Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) <b>Telephone</b> 01638 719729 <b>Email</b> <a href="mailto:christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk">christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a></p>									

## Public information

<b>Venue</b>	Virtual meeting only to be facilitated by Microsoft Teamslive
<b>Contact information</b>	Telephone: 01638 719729 Email: <a href="mailto:democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk">democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a> Website: <a href="http://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk">www.westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>
<b>Access to agenda and reports before the meeting</b>	<p>The agenda and reports will be available to view at least five clear days before the meeting on our website.</p> <p>On this occasion, a link to the meeting livestream broadcast, and guidance on how members of the public can access the meeting broadcast will be made available on the Council's website when the agenda is published.</p>
<b>Attendance at meetings</b>	<p>The 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.</p> <p>The meeting will be held virtually. You can view the livestream of the meeting via the link provided on the webpage where the agenda and papers are published. Please note that a virtual meeting is not invalid by virtue of members of the public being unable to attend or participate in meetings that are held virtually.</p>
<b>Public participation</b>	<p>Members of the public who live or work in the district are welcome to speak and may ask one question or make a statement of not more than three minutes duration relating to items to be discussed in Part 1 of the agenda only.</p> <p>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. As the meeting is taking place virtually, a person who wishes to speak must register by <b>9am</b> the last working day before the day of the meeting. This can be done by sending the request to <a href="mailto:democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk">democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a> or telephoning 07776 254986, 07595 428481 or 01638 719237. See Agenda Item 6 for further details on how to participate.</p> <p>If a member of the public cannot attend the meeting remotely, they may submit a written question or statement to Democratic Services by midday at the very latest on the day of the meeting and this will be read out on their behalf during the meeting. There is an overall time limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chair's discretion.</p>
<b>Accessibility</b>	<p>If you have any difficulties in accessing the meeting, the agenda and accompanying reports, including for reasons of a disability or a protected characteristic, please contact Democratic Services at the earliest opportunity using the contact details provided above in order that we may assist you.</p>

<b>Recording of meetings</b>	<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>
<b>Personal information</b>	<p>Any personal information processed by West Suffolk Council arising from a request to speak at a public meeting under the Localism Act 2011, will be protected in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. For more information on how we do this and your rights in regards to your personal information and how to access it, visit our website: <a href="https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/Council/Data_and_information/howweuseinformation.cfm">https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/Council/Data_and_information/howweuseinformation.cfm</a> or call Customer Services: 01284 763233 and ask to speak to the Information Governance Officer.</p>

---

## Agenda

### Procedural matters

**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**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2021 (copy attached).

**1 - 6**

**4. Declarations of interest**

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any pecuniary or local non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda, **no later than when that item is reached** and, when appropriate, to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on the item.

**5. Announcements from the Chair regarding responses from the Cabinet to reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

### Part 1 – public

**6. Public participation**

Members of the public who live or work in the district are welcome to speak and may ask one question or make a 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.

As this meeting is being held virtually and to allow persons sufficient time to be briefed on procedures accordingly, **a person who wishes to speak must register by 9am on the last working day before the meeting (Wednesday 17 March 2021).**

There is an overall limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chair's discretion.

- |            |  |                |
|------------|--|----------------|
| <b>7.</b>  | <b>Exiting the European Union: West Suffolk Council's preparations and current status</b>  | <b>7 - 14</b>  |
|            | Report number: <b>OAS/WS/21/003</b>  |                |
| <b>8.</b>  | <b>Update on the Mildenhall Hub</b>  |                |
|            | Following on from the update on 12 November 2020, officers will be giving a short presentation to provide the latest information on the planned opening of the Mildenhall Hub and the specific impact of Covid-19. |                |
| <b>9.</b>  | <b>Suffolk County Council: Health Scrutiny Committee - 13 January 2021</b>   | <b>15 - 32</b> |
|            | Report number: <b>OAS/WS/21/004</b>  |                |
| <b>10.</b> | <b>Work programme update</b>   | <b>33 - 36</b> |
|            | Report number: <b>OAS/WS/21/005</b>  |                |

## **Part 2 – exempt**

**None**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held on **Thursday 14 January 2021** at **5.00 pm** facilitated by MS TeamsLive virtual meetings platform.

Present            **Councillors**

**Chair** Ian Shipp

Simon Brown  
Tony Brown  
Mike Chester  
Patrick Chung  
Terry Clements  
Stephen Frost

Diane Hind  
Paul Hopfensperger  
Margaret Marks  
Joe Mason  
Marion Rushbrook

**In attendance**

Trevor Beckwith, Ward Member for Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds  
Robert Everitt, Cabinet Member for Families and Communities  
Susan Glossop, Cabinet Member for Growth  
Brian Harvey (Observer)

87.    **Substitutes**

No substitutions were declared.

88.    **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Simon Cole, Lisa Ingwall King and Jim Meikle.

Councillor Michael Anderson was also unable to attend the meeting.

89.    **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2020 were confirmed as correct record by the Chair.

90.    **Declarations of interest**

Members' declarations of interest are recorded under the item to which the declaration relates.

91. **Announcements from the Chair regarding responses from the Cabinet to reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

The Chair informed members he attended Cabinet on 8 December 2020 and presented the Committee's report from its meeting held on 12 November 2020. As per the minutes above, the Chair updated Cabinet on the presentation given by the Director and Service Manager (Corporate Policy) on "Major Council Capital Projects and the Impact of Covid-19", which was noted by Cabinet.

92. **Public participation**

No members of the public had registered to speak on this occasion.

93. **Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO): West Suffolk**

[Councillor Diane Hind declared a local non-pecuniary interest, as a resident of Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds.

Councillors Tony Brown, Margaret Marks and Joe Mason all declared local non-pecuniary interests as being Town Councillors for Haverhill].

The Committee received report number OAS/WS/21/001, presented by Councillor Robert Everitt, Cabinet Member for Families and Communities, which outlined the process due to be undertaken on Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) following recommendations made by Cabinet on 22 September 2020.

In September 2020, Cabinet recommended that further consideration be given to the proposals submitted during engagement with stakeholders, namely the extension of PSPO areas in Brandon, Haverhill, and Bury St Edmunds.

The report set out the work undertaken since Cabinet met in September 2020, including undertaking additional evidence gathering with Suffolk Police and those submitting the proposals. In accordance with guidance, any changes to existing PSPOs or a request for a new PSPO should undertake consultation with those affected by the changes.

The recommendation to Overview and Scrutiny was that public consultation should take place in Haverhill to remove an area that was now a residential area, and in Bury St Edmunds to introduce a PSPO in the Moreton Hall area relating to anti-social driving. Evidence and further consultation with Brandon Town Council had concluded that no further consultation within this area was required.

The police, Brandon Town Council, Haverhill Town Council and Moreton Hall Residents Association were supportive of the recommendations.

Attached at Appendix A to the report was a map which identified the area for removal in Haverhill. Attached at Appendix B to the report was a map which identified areas within the Moreton Hall ward; these were subject to change depending on consultation results received.

Consultation would take place between 18 January and 21 February 2021. Due to the Covid restrictions consultation with the general public within the proposed areas, would be focused through online, social media and press releases to raise awareness of the consultation. Public consultation would run alongside the stakeholder consultation. Once the consultation was completed, the data would be analysed, with a final decision being considered by Cabinet in March 2021.

The Chair then invited Councillor Trevor Beckwith, Ward Member for Moreton Hall to address the Committee in respect of this item. He thanked the Committee for allowing him to speak. He informed the Committee that anti-social driving on the Moreton Hall estate had been a big issue since 2016. He set out the history to the anti-social driving which had moved from the centre of Bury St Edmunds to Moreton Hall. He explained that although Covid-19 had an impact and reduced the number of vehicles in the area, residents continued to report incidents to the Police who were supportive of a PSPO being introduced in Moreton Hall.

The Committee then considered the report and asked questions. In particular detailed discussions were held on the need for more enforcement, how practical it was in issuing Fixed Penalty Notices for anti-social driving, and who was responsible for carrying out enforcement of the various PSPOs to which comprehensive responses were provided.

In response to a question raised about street drinking in Haverhill, particularly in Railway Walk and the Town Centre, officers explained that this had not been raised with the Families and Communities Team as an issue. However, officers agreed to raise this with the Haverhill Police inspector. Officers also confirmed that the Railway Walk was still included in the PSPO and this would be made clear in the public consultation. The only area which was proposed for removal was the small residential area.

In response to a question asked about how many Fixed Penalty Notices had been issued, officers agreed to provide members with a written response.

In response to a question raised about anti-social street driving in Moreton Hall, officers advised members that action had been taken in tackling the issue. The council was working closely with the various agencies such as the police, who were doing their best in resolving the issue.

In response to a question raised regarding how the council benchmarked PSPOs and whether this could be a future scrutiny topic, officers explained that the Committee would need to have a clear rationale before adding to its future work programme. An alternative option could be to include an update on PSPOs in the Annual Community Safety Partnership report.

The Chair informed members it was crucial for residents and members to report any anti-social behaviour in their wards to the Police. This will enable the Police to compile evidence and deploy resources to those areas affected with anti-social behaviour and issue Fixed Penalty Notices.

There being no decision required, the Committee noted that:

- 1) No further extension of the PSPO was necessary in Brandon.
- 2) Public consultation would be carried out in Haverhill for the removal of a residential area from the existing PSPO.
- 3) Public consultation would be undertaken on the proposal to introduce a new PSPO for antisocial driving in the Moreton Hall area of Bury St Edmunds.
- 4) Cabinet will consider the results of the consultation and make a decision in March 2021.

94. **Work programme update and suggestion for scrutiny**

The Committee received report number: OAS/WS/21/002, which updated members on the current status of its rolling work programme of items, and items currently agreed but had yet to be programmed for scrutiny during 2021 as attached at Appendix 1.

Attached to the report at Appendix 2 was a completed work programme suggestion for a review of the Councils website by Councillor Terry Clements. He explained that he felt that there were some anomalies on the website and the language used, such as key phrases and key words could be confusing. The aim of the propose review was to make communication easier for our residents when using the website.

The Committee discussed the suggestion form and in particular whether public feedback could be incorporated as part of the process.

The Assistant Director (Families and Communities) confirmed no specific complaints had been received about public access but if members did receive concerns from members of the public, they were welcome to pass them to her.

At its conclusion, the Committee noted the current status of topics currently scheduled in its rolling work programme for 2021 (Appendix 1).

Councillor Mike Chester then moved the recommendation, this was duly seconded by Councillor Paul Hopfensperger, and with the vote being unanimous, the Committee:

**RESOLVED:**

**To include in its forward work programme for 2021 a review of the Council's website and identified the following members willing to be part of a small working party to support the review, being Councillors Terry Clements, Paul Hopfensperger, Mike Chester, Stephen Frost and Patrick Chung.**

**Note:** Following the conclusion of the meeting, Councillor Paul Hopfensperger subsequently withdrew from the working party.

The meeting concluded at 6.06 pm

**Signed by:**

**Chair**

---

This page is intentionally left blank



# Exiting the European Union: West Suffolk Council’s preparations and current status

<b>Report number:</b>	<b>OAS/WS/21/003</b>	
<b>Report to and date(s):</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	18 March 2021
<b>Cabinet member:</b>	Councillor John Griffiths Leader of the Council Tel: 01284 757001 Email: <a href="mailto:john.griffiths@westsuffolk.gov.uk">john.griffiths@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Jill Korwin Director Tel: 01284 757252 Email: <a href="mailto:jill.korwin@westsuffolk.gov.uk">jill.korwin@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	

**Decisions Plan:** Not applicable.

**Wards impacted:** All

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that:

- 1. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes the update presented in the report.**

## **1. Context to this report**

- 1.1 In June 2016, UK voters voted to leave the European Union (EU) and work started to plan for a new relationship with the European Union (BREXIT). The UK eventually withdrew from Europe on 31 January 2020 and until 31 December 2020 the UK remained in the EU's customs union and single market. The UK continued to follow EU rules but was no longer a part of any European political institutions.
- 1.2 A trade deal was agreed between the UK and EU on 24 December, which was ratified by Parliamentary vote on 30 December 2020. As a result, from 1 January 2021, the UK formally left the EU customs union and single market. As such, while there are not any tariffs levied or restrictive quotas imposed, trade in goods has become a lot more burdensome. There are a whole series of new customs and regulatory checks, including rules of origin and stringent local content requirements.
- 1.3 From April 2021, all products of animal origin (POAO) will require pre-notification and health documentation and physical checks will be conducted at the point of destination, any grace periods where EU Member States may have taken pragmatic approaches to customs compliance will fall away. For firms trading between Great Britain and Northern Ireland, they will begin to fully access all aspects of the Trader Support Service (TSS), with goods entering Northern Ireland from Great Britain subject to certain checks and/or controls, on a phased basis.
- 1.4 From July, the UK Border Operating Model will end, the full burden of customs declarations will become permanent, meaning the full declarations at the point of importation and tariffs with additional paperwork and checks taking place.
- 1.5 This scrutiny will enable Members to gain an understanding of the implications of exiting the EU for the council, partner organisations, residents and businesses in Suffolk and to understand how organisations are working together to ensure that information and advice is disseminated appropriately.

## **2. Summary of preparations and impacts**

- 2.1 **Collaborative work across Suffolk**
- 2.2 Suffolk public sector partners have taken a collaborative approach to preparing for exiting the European Union and formed the Brexit Task Force in 2018, an officer group tasked to scenario plan, educate and support public and business to plan for leaving the EU. As part of this, the Council worked proactively with partners including other local

authority teams, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) and its Growth Hub and the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce. For much of this time, the Brexit Task Force was actively considering the implications of a no deal scenario.

- 2.3 Work was also undertaken through the Suffolk Resilience Forum (SRF), with the intention of reassuring the public and businesses that the public sector was prepared for the Brexit transition. This was done through aligned messaging between all partners to create a single, unified, and authoritative voice on Brexit support.
- 2.4 In November 2017, NALEP commissioned an analysis of the potential impacts and implications that Brexit might have for key economic sectors in Norfolk and Suffolk. Sectors it focussed on were agriculture, manufacturing, construction, offshore wind energy, digital and life sciences.
- 2.5 The report concluded that workforce, regulations, trade and funding and investment would be areas most impacted by exiting the EU. Its recommendations for future planning included:
  - a. Developing a local industrial strategy to highlight sector specialisms and highlight what the local place has to offer (“a strong place-based story”) and
  - b. Being proactive in reaching out to businesses (particularly with opportunities for growth).
- 2.6 In 2019, all Local Authorities were awarded funding from the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) to support Brexit preparations and partners in Suffolk agreed that having met initial costs directly incurred, the most value could be achieved from pooling this fund. Following work between the Brexit Task Force and the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce, Suffolk Public Sector Leaders (SPSL) agreed to invest some of the shared funding in two, two-year advisor posts dedicated to proactively working with local businesses on Brexit related issues and opportunities. These advisor posts have since been extended thanks to further funding from Suffolk Public Sector Leaders. The advisors continue to work with businesses and have been key to supporting the transition and raising issues with central government.
- 2.7 The NALEP implications analysis was updated at the end of 2019 and The Norfolk and Suffolk draft [Local Industrial Strategy - New Anglia](#) was published in January 2020 and submitted to Government with a focus on the four areas assessed as of greatest impact - manufacturing, agricultural, energy and health and care. Conclusions of the report included:

- a. For Norfolk and Suffolk, 7 out of the top 10 countries by export value are EU Member States
- b. Sectors and businesses which are reliant on low-skill, low-wage labour are more likely to be adversely affected by Brexit
- c. Brexit will create opportunities for companies to develop stronger domestic supply chains. Good business networks and communications will help businesses in Norfolk and Suffolk reroute their supply chains and capitalise on opportunities which come up.
- d. The central point of the negotiations will be the trade-off between regulatory freedom and low barriers to access EU markets.

- 2.8 The report also stated that under the Withdrawal Agreement and trade deal scenario, Norfolk and Suffolk's GDP in 2030 was predicted to be 4% smaller than it otherwise would have been and 5.7% smaller than it otherwise would have been if no trade deal is secured. However, it should be noted that these are figures for Norfolk and Suffolk (the NALEP geography) and prior to the impact of Covid-19 on the global economy.
- 2.9 This early analysis has been augmented by intelligence gathered by NALEP, its local Growth Hub (housed by the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce and funded by NALEP) and local partners, which is synthesised and reported to Government on a weekly basis.
- 2.10 Feedback from businesses has included concerns about workforce in the agriculture, hospitality and tourism sectors and uncertainty on future trading arrangements where businesses rely heavily on exports. However, the most common feedback from businesses across sectors has been frustration at the prolonged uncertainty and lack of clarity.
- 2.11 Until the implications of the terms of the trade deal are fully realised, it is impossible to accurately forecast what the impacts on the economy or more widely will be. This is compounded by the future uncertainty and significant global economic impacts resulting from the worldwide responses to COVID-19.
- 2.12 A significant amount of EU funding has been secured for Norfolk and Suffolk. Currently £86 million has been secured by NALEP for investment in projects across Norfolk and Suffolk between 2015 and 2022. That funding is secure and there are still some funds that UK organisations can bid to, however further information on the UK Shared Prosperity Fund is essential to understand the longer position.

## 2.13 **West Suffolk Council's Preparations**

2.14 As stated, West Suffolk Council has worked collaboratively with partners to be proactive and pragmatic in maximising possible opportunities and minimising potential risks following the UK's exit from the EU. Consideration of Brexit implications were included in the council's business planning and interactions with partners and providers and continue to be monitored as the full impacts emerge.

2.15 The ongoing council preparations have included:

### a. Businesses

- Engaging with businesses. ensuring they are signposted to any necessary Brexit preparation, and generic support via information on the council's website, contact with the Chamber Trade Advisors as well as dealing with specific requests.
- Promoting events such as NALEP – "Applying to the Brexit Readiness Fund" events and working with the Chamber, regulators, and Growth Hub
- Undertaking specific sector engagement with the Horse Racing Industry given the unique challenges they face.

### b. Personal data

- Questions were raised by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government regarding the personal data flows of the council. Following investigation, it is confirmed that the Council's hosted data service providers are predominately UK based and there has been reassurance from Microsoft that there will be no issues arisen from data held in EU servers. The council also has no internal system that transfers data outside of the UK.

### c. Projects

- Risk and mitigation assessments have been undertaken for all Council led development work.
- Risks for development projects have been identified regarding the supply chain – both in terms of the cost and availability of supplies. The mitigation of the issues identified is ongoing and to date no issues have materialised.

### d. Supply chain

- Work has been undertaken to identify and mitigate for any potential supply chain issues for the council. This is particularly pertinent for Operations. For West Suffolk Council, issues such as the fuel supply, vehicle parts and long-term recruitment have been explored.

- Post-Brexit procurement has incurred two changes.
  - New public procurement opportunities (above threshold) will need to be published on the UK e-notification service called [Find a Tender service \(FTS\)](#). The FTS means new opportunities will no longer be sent to the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) or Tenders Electronic Daily (TED).
  - The UK can now exercise additional freedoms in relation to contract spend on goods, services and works contracts with a value below the applicable thresholds. As such, we can now reserve the procurement by supplier location - this means being able to run a competition and specify that only suppliers located in a geographical area can bid – and for Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs) and Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprises (VCSEs) – meaning the council is now able to run a competition and specify that only SMEs and VCSEs can bid.
  
- e. EU residency and housing
  - The issue of EU Settled Status was considered the most pressing for West Suffolk residents in 2019. The council is actively ensuring that all residents that need to apply for Settled Status can do so via resources available on the council website. This will remain open until June 2021.
  - The Housing Options and Homelessness team have also been investigating housing obligations and anything additional that can be done for EU citizens who have not got settled status, both immediately following exit day and after the application deadline. The team have also undertaken training to adjust to any new changes to housing.
  
- f. Support to staff
  - As an employer, West Suffolk Council took steps to ensure staff from the EU were supported. To this end, the council had agreed to meet the costs of the Settled Status fee for staff members (before the fee was removed) and communicated these provisions to the workforce.
  
- g. Communications
  - The council has undertaken external communications to help ensure that support to residence and businesses is easily available. This has mostly been signposted via a designated webpage: [Exit from the European Union \(Brexit\) \(westsuffolk.gov.uk\)](https://westsuffolk.gov.uk)

2.16 There are, however, several issues that are ongoing and are being investigated by officers as our understanding of the full implications of the Brexit deal develops. These include:

- a. Environmental Health implications
  - The potential impact of UK Immigration rules from 2021 on licensing is yet unknown. EU citizens moving to the UK to work will need to get a visa in advance and will need to show they have a job offer from an approved employer sponsor. While it is likely to be low risk, it is not yet known how this will affect industries, like Taxis, where the council acts as licensing authority.
  - The council currently offers Export Health Certificates to businesses. It is anticipated that there will be an increased demand once the distribution of imports and exports settles. The licensing team are actively monitoring resource pressure.
- b. Contracts
  - Council officers are to undertake checks to ensure contracts remain valid following EU Exit and that external suppliers have contingency plans in place, where necessary.

2.17 Officers continue to track actual and potential impacts, keep abreast of government guidance (and funding) and provide advice to businesses and communities. The Brexit Task Force continues to meet and the SRF is monitoring potential impacts.

### **3. Implications arising from the report**

- 3.1 Financial: Currently none, although there could be contract price increases. Monitoring impact on housing budget for individuals with no recourse to public funds.
- 3.2 Legal Compliance: None, the Council has met its legal obligations regarding Brexit.
- 3.3 Personal Data Processing: Confirmation received that personal data not impacted
- 3.4 Equalities: Support for settled status scheme provided.
- 3.5 Crime and Disorder: Risk noted at Suffolk Resilience Forum level (low)
- 3.6 Environment or Sustainability: None
- 3.7 HR or Staffing: All staff affected by settled status have been advised
- 3.8 Changes to existing policies: None

- 3.9 External organisations (such as businesses, community groups):  
advice provided.

#### **4. Appendices referenced in this report**

- 4.1 None

#### **5. Background documents associated with this report**

- 5.1 None



# Suffolk County Council: Health Scrutiny Committee (13 January 2021)

<b>Report number:</b>	<b>OAS/WS/21/004</b>	
<b>Report to and date(s):</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	18 March 2021
<b>West Suffolk Council Member on the Health Scrutiny Committee:</b>	Councillor Margaret Marks Telephone: 01440 713443 Email: <a href="mailto:margaret.marks@westsuffolk.gov.uk">margaret.marks@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	

**Decisions Plan:** This item is not included in the decisions plan.

**Wards impacted:** Not applicable.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- 1. Notes the report attached as Appendix 1 to this report.**

## **1. Context to this report**

### **1.1 Suffolk County Council: Health Scrutiny**

- 1.1.1 Councillor Margaret Marks, the Council's appointed representative on the Suffolk County Council Health Scrutiny Committee has prepared a report from the meeting held on 13 January 2021.

## **2. Proposals within this report**

- 2.1 The Committee is asked to note the report prepared by Councillor Margaret Marks.

## **3. Alternative options that have been considered**

- 3.1 None.

## **4. Consultation and engagement undertaken**

- 4.1 None.

## **5. Risks associated with the proposals**

- 5.1 None.

## **6. Appendices referenced in this report**

- 6.1 Appendix 1 – Report from Councillor Margaret Marks from the meeting of the Suffolk County Council Health Scrutiny Committee held on 13 January 2021

Appendix 2 – PowerPoint Presentation – Difficult to Engage

## **7. Background documents associated with this report**

- 7.1 None

**REPORT FOR WEST SUFFOLK OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
THE HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING  
13 JANUARY 2021**

**Children and Young People's Emotional Health and Wellbeing**

To consider the current issues faced by children and young people in Suffolk in respect of their emotional health and wellbeing and how they are being supported.

The Committee's focus for this item:

- a) What are children and young people in Suffolk struggling with in terms of their emotional health and wellbeing?
- b) In terms of accessing the support needed, what has been working well and what could be improved

**Preface**

The subject of this HS Meeting and the challenges it presents are so incredibly complex that I am going to ask you to read through the Committee papers from P19 to P58. My greatest concern in all of this is that in an attempt to put support in place, it generates a system so complex that I struggle to understand where I would go to seek support, so are we confident that young people will be able to do this.

I am therefore encouraged by the Transformation Programme plan on Page 19, item 2 under the Transformation Programme, as it states

"The objective of the Children, Young People and Families (CYPF) Mental Health and Wellbeing project is to implement an integrated, system wide approach that enables all CYPE (0-25 years) in East and West Suffolk to have positive mental wellbeing, to enable them to flourish and lead rich and fulfilling lives. It will deliver a "*right person, right help, right time*" approach and there will be no wrong door. The model will have a stronger focus on early intervention, prevention and recovery.

Following the meeting the Committee made the following recommendations:

- commended the co-production work taking place, for which there was clear evidence presented of how this approach was helping to improve services;
- expressed concern about the impact of the third COVID-19 lockdown on young people's emotional health and wellbeing in general terms, due to restrictions placed on everyday activities and uncertainties about the future;
- recommended that the good work taking place in schools in the West of the County should be replicated in schools across Suffolk;

- recommended that support and advice should be available for young people in Years 11 and 13 who may be experiencing specific anxieties regarding the impact of COVID-19 on their education and future life chances;
- noted the importance of early intervention and prevention and also ensuring young people received the right sort of help, at the right time, in the right place, first time;
- recommended that training on mental health for front-line services, including for primary care, should seek to address the need for culture change – more listening, empathy, understanding, kindness;
- noted that waiting times for assessment and treatment were increasing, due to increasing demand and a lack of staffing capacity, and agreed to seek an update on this in 6-9 months' time;
- noted that work was taking place to review available staffing skill mix, but services faced a continuing staffing challenge due to COVID-19 related redeployment and absence;
- commended the work taking place in the CYP Engagement Hub to look at initiatives to offer young people peer support whilst they were awaiting assessment and treatment and recommended this be made a high priority;
- noted that significant improvements had already been made in delivering Education Health and Care Plans within the 20 week timescale, and wished to see this improvement continue

The meeting commenced with a presentation from a Mental Health Champion and I will forward the power point separately to accompany this report.

### **West Suffolk Hospital Future Systems Programme Scrutiny Task and Finish Group**

In November it was determined that a Task and Finish Group be established to monitor the activity of the Future System Programme work and allow us to raise questions as the project develops, highlighting areas where a deeper scrutiny may be required by the full Committee before a final decision is made.

The first meeting of this committee was on 1 December 2020 and Pages 59 and 60 provide further details. The Terms of Reference are detailed on Page 61.

At the January Meeting, and as Chair of this Task and Finish Group I made the following comments:

"You have before you the Terms of Reference for the newly formed Task and Finish Group for the West Suffolk Hospital Future Systems Programme, which I hope you will consider to be beneficial to this Committee. I add weight especially to Items 2 and 3 where, with the fast-moving pace of this Project and the importance to West Suffolk, aging demographics, rurality and poor transport infrastructure inform much of the needs for our community and its delivery. These I feel will be some of the challenges that we may need to Scrutinise as the Project considers Co-location of services away from the current Hospital site.

This Group has been welcomed by the Project Manager, Gary Norgate, who has demonstrated his transparent willingness to share plans with us and with the wider community as the Project develops. However, at a recent public meeting, where the initial plans for site location and the general oversight of plans was being shared, only 38 members of the public attended. This was an immediate cause for concern and it may be that with the enormous amount of information relating to Covid that is landing on social media and in emails, the event was simply missed. So, taking the comment from Paragraph 2 of the T and Cs, *"It should add value to the NHS and its partners and should reflect the views and concerns of patients and the public"*. It is essential that the public have the opportunity to be fully informed and engaged with the developing project. In order to help facilitate this, the three members of the Task and Finish Group have set up group emails with their local community Groups, Councillors etc and will use this to inform of proposed developments in the programme shared by WSH Communications.

In order to ensure we maintain the integrity of Scrutiny this will be an information vehicle.

### **Health Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme**

A number of changes were made to the provisional Work Programme and these will be detailed with the papers submitted for the next Health Scrutiny Meeting on 17 March 2021.

Councillor Margaret Marks  
30 January 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

# ‘DIFFICULT TO ENGAGE’

Suffolk Barriers to Support – Is it the Service User or the  
Service?

# Live Case Study

- 13 years in the Mental Health System
- An experience of all pathways & apparent available options
- Access to the larger mental health community
- I am not a rarity regarding this – but an alarmingly typical representation – the things YP have told me are things I have said myself
- Co-Morbid Diagnosis
- Young Persons Mental Health Champion
- **‘Difficult To Engage’**



# 'The Facts' at surface level - Mental Health Concerns (In Suffolk)

- LGBTQ+
  - Bereavement from suicide
- Neurodevelopmental Conditions
  - Housing difficulties
  - Family mental illness
  - High self harm rates
- COVID-19
- Children in Care & Care Leavers

# The Underlying issues – 3 E's of Engagement (in MH services)

- Empathy / Humility – Kindness in a crisis, patience, the ability to listen, a willingness admit to being wrong., **respect for their feelings**
- Education / Complex Understanding – Flexible thought, scientific capacity, ability to problem solve, **respect for the subject.**
- Each Other / Communication – Understanding of language, ability to relay messages with clarity, comprehension of conversation & **respect for the other person's viewpoint**

“If way to the better there be, it exacts a  
full look at the worst”

-Thomas Hardy

# Empathy & Humility

“Wisdom & Purpose can be too easily twisted to Pride & Desire” - DAI

- Quotes from young people;

“It just makes you feel like not a person.” “It’s like they want us to try and kill ourselves for them to take us seriously” “They don’t care if I die, they don’t care about me do they?”

- Every single YP that I’ve spoken to has ‘those stories’
- Hostility in a crisis – I’s situation
- ‘Attention Seeker’ and other negative labels
- Stigma/Judgement around MH in an apparent ‘safe place’
- Taught that vulnerability is weakness – or reaffirmed

# Education & Broader Understanding

- Closed-mindedness – unwillingness to seek diagnosis – 3+ years waitlist
- Undiagnosed Impact – Education, Relationships, Work Life
- Offer of only limited CBT without understanding pitfalls e.g Dr Mike Lloyd on Dissociation – “don’t tell them to ‘relax’, have a bath’ mindfulness/meditation can be incredibly dangerous and do much more harm than good.”
- Trauma awareness – Retraumatizing practices – one size fits all approach
- No understanding of comorbidity – “You shouldn’t be thinking about your past, you have OCD, it’s bad for people like you.” “Your illness developed before your personality.” “That’s just how autistic people are.”
- Up to date understanding - e.g. DSM 4/5
- LGBTQ+ awareness or training = ‘you can choose to be whatever you want to be?’ ‘I’m a bit too tired for pronouns’
- “I’m still not backed up by a diagnosis – so I can’t really tell work, they don’t believe me. They understand a diagnosis.” “No-one will believe me. They just think I’m lazy, maybe they’re right.”

# Each Other / Communication

- **Pillar to Post** – not talking to each other internally or externally – YP has to do the run around work if family won't or **aren't able** – then labelled 'difficult' if they get lost or overwhelmed.
- When you're out you're out – back to your GP **'if anything changes'** – More Wait Lists
- You wait month or years for an assessment and then they discharge you
- Language examples – **'Superficial Lacerations' 'Low Mood'**
- Misinformation – Not listening or hearing your side
- Jargon with **no explanation – even after complex diagnosis**
- Quotes – here are some things YP have heard from service providers in **CRISIS** situations;  
**"What do you expect us to do?"** "That was silly wasn't it?" **"Are you feeling a bit blue?"**  
"You're just too difficult." **"Have you split up with your boyfriend?"**  
"I deal with really bad people, that can't control themselves. **You seem like you can handle it."**

# Examples of Good Practice

- Care-Co Apologising – Humility
- First Response Line Suffolk – Empathy
- Home Treatment/Crisis Team in Bury St Edmunds – Respect
- Paramedics – Understanding
- Outliers – Teachers, Librarians, Nurses
- The MH Transformation in Suffolk
- Youth Panels
- Specialists – Autism Diagnostic Team

**This should be the rule not the exception**

# Proposals/Recs for Change

- **More Specialist and Targeted Training** – FPP etc
- **More Therapeutic Pathways** – The offer informs the service, creates oversimplifying
- **Communication and Language Overhaul** – no more ‘difficult to engage’ or ‘what do you expect us to do?’
- **Culture shift** – rewarding and sharing good practise
- **More Peer Support** – lived experience
- **Service Users Of All Ages Involved in Recruitment & Training**
- **Ideal Worker focus**
- **Support Groups** -more targeted-
- **Definitions of Jargon** - openly available
- **Mental Health Awareness for GPs** – vital as they keep getting sent back there
- **Intro Packs** – Who is who? What does it mean to be in ‘Secondary Care’?

# Conclusion

“These mixed messages breed mistrust”

Not engaging is not an ‘unwillingness’ to get better

People don’t reach out for a variety of reasons

Not usually is it the desire to stay sick

But because they’ve been taught not to trust

You are necessary – it should never be completely down to the sick person to have to be the expert, that should be a choice, not a necessity for survival.

This all seems complicated but on the ground people just want to be believed, listened to, and treated with respect.

‘Break The Vicious Cycle’

This page is intentionally left blank

# Scrutiny Work Programme 2021 Update

<b>Report number:</b>	<b>OAS/WS/21/005</b>	
<b>Report to and date(s):</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	18 March 2021
<b>Chair of the Committee:</b>	Councillor Ian Shipp Telephone: 07368 134769 Email: <a href="mailto:ian.shipp@westsuffolk.gov.uk">ian.shipp@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officers:</b>	Leah Mickleborough Service Manager (Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer) Telephone: 07595 428481 Email: <a href="mailto:leah.mickleborough@westsuffolk.gov.uk">leah.mickleborough@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>  Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Telephone: 01638 719729 Email: <a href="mailto:christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk">christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	

**Decisions Plan:** This item is not included in the decisions plan.

**Wards impacted:** Not applicable.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- 1. Reviews and notes the current status of topics currently scheduled in its rolling work programme for 2021, attached at Appendix 1.**

## **1. Context to this report**

### **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 any Task and Finish Group(s) or Review Groups, and items currently agreed, but yet to be programmed for 2021 is attached at **Appendix 1**.

## **2. Proposals within this report**

2.1 The Committee is asked to note the current status of its rolling work programme attached at **Appendix 1**.

## **3. Appendices referenced in this report**

3.1 Appendix 1 – Scrutiny Work Programme 2021

## **4. Background documents associated with this report**

4.1 None

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Rolling Work Programme (2021)**

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.

<b>Description</b>	<b>Lead Member - Officer</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>June 2021 (Time: 5.00pm)</b> <b>Venue:</b> <b>(Thursday)</b>		
Draft West Suffolk Annual Report (2020-2021)	Leader of the Council	To provide an input to this important document.
Terms of Reference for Review of West Suffolk Markets		As agreed at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in November 2020
Anglia Revenues Partnership (ARP)	Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance	ARP to be invited to talk to the Committee about debt recovery for Council Tax and Business Rates collections and the processes used and how they have been impacted by Covid-19 in terms of recovery.
Community Safety Monitoring Report	Cabinet Member for Families and Communities	To review the work of the Partnership on an annual basis.
Suffolk County Council: Health Scrutiny Committee – 17 March 2021	Councillor Margaret Marks	To receive an update from the Council’s appointed representative on discussions held by the Suffolk County Health Scrutiny Committee on 17 March 2021.
Cabinet Decisions Plan	Leader of the Council	To receive information on forthcoming decisions to be considered by the Cabinet.

Description	Lead Member - Officer	Details
Work Programme Update	Chair of Overview and Scrutiny	<p>To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.</p> <p>Update from the modern-day slavery and website working groups as agreed at the Overview and Scrutiny meetings in November 2020 and January 2021</p>
<p><b>Items Carried Forward from the 2019-2020 Work Programme – Yet to be scheduled in the 2021-2022 Work Programme</b></p>		
<p>1) <b>Anti-Idling Campaign Update:</b> Councillor Lisa Ingwall-King agreed to complete a work programme suggestion form to help inform officers on the scope of the update – Agreed at meeting held on 9 January 2020.</p>		
<p>2) Invite back <b>Havebury Housing Partnership</b> once they have progressed their three strategies – Agreed at meeting held on 12 March 2020.</p>		
<p>3) Invite <b>Flagship Housing</b> (same as Havebury Housing) – Agreed at meeting held on 12 March 2020.</p>		
<p>4) A report on <b>Homes for Life</b> setting out what is being built for older people – Agreed at meeting held on 12 March 2020.</p>		