

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

20 FEBRUARY 2017 - 2.30PM



PRESENT: Councillor Yeulett (Chairman), Councillor Mrs Hay (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Booth, Councillor Buckton, Councillor Mrs Davis, Councillor Mrs Laws, Councillor Mason and Councillor Mrs Mayor.

APOLOGIES: Councillor Pugh

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jane Bailey (Member Services and Governance), John Carey (Press and Public Relations Officer), Richard Cassidy (Corporate Director), Anna Goodall (Head of Legal and Governance), Dan Horn (Head of Housing and Neighbourhood Services, Phil Hughes (Head of Leisure Services), Aarron Locks (Community Safety Manager) and Trevor Watson (Head of Assets and Projects)

OSC32/16 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 16 January 2017 were confirmed and signed.

Matters Arising and Updates:

- Councillor Yeulett reminded Panel members that Anna Goodall is drafting a letter to Clarion Housing and asked them to let her know if they would like to add anything;
- Councillor Yeulett referred to page 6 and the suggestion to enhance Golden Age Events to support wider Health and Wellbeing issues across the district, he stated that Councillor Sutton was going to discuss this with Councillor Cornwell and raise it at the next partnership meeting. He asked if there is any feedback in respect of this. Councillor Cornwell stated that the idea of Health Fairs is a good model that has been used for some years. They are not the same as our Golden Age Fairs, which are far more successful than they ever were and we are seeing more people attending, but they are not the same people that we would target for a Health Fair, so we would need to look at the model of how this type of fair works. He added that although this is something that we would like to be able to offer we have not got the resources at the moment and we cannot bolt them on to the Golden Age Events. We know how difficult it is to get some of the partners involved and one of the outcomes of the CSR is that we have taken away funding for the voluntary sector and so they have limited resources too;
- Councillor Yeulett stated that later in this meeting this Panel will be looking at the Leisure Strategy and Management Options and this is linked to health and wellbeing, there is a priority to address this in this district. Councillor Cornwell stated that we are only one aspect of the wellbeing provision. It is a challenge with budgets being reduced and does not tend to attract the investment it needs;
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked for clarification that this cannot be bolted onto the current Golden Age Fairs and asked if this has been considered before. Councillor Cornwell stated that they are incompatible, the exhibitors and partners that we need to engage with the Health Fairs are not the same as for the Golden Age. Thinking about health and wellbeing one of the target areas is families and we would need different types of support organisations to engage with this new target audience. So the target group is different, in most cases the partners required to attend are different and although the venues are fine we would need to have them for a much longer day. We would need to re-think this completely, we do well from the partners that currently support Golden Age but we cannot stretch them

- further as some of those attending are volunteers too;
- Councillor Yeulett asked if the panel could be kept updated with any information moving forward. Councillor Cornwell agreed and stated that he will raise this at the next partnership review meeting;
- Councillor Booth stated that with regards to the partners, he noticed that when he has attended Golden Age Fairs there are voluntary groups and health trainers there but not statutory groups like the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's) and that is where these events would be lacking.
- Councillor Yeulett asked if there is an update with regards to the links for the Business Forum. Anna Goodall agreed to investigate;
- Councillor Booth confirmed that he had asked that an additional bullet should be included in the minutes to say that the Committee suggested that the goals in the Business Plan should be more focused and concise;
- Councillor Yeulett asked about the planning information provided to Town and Parish Councils. Councillor Mrs Hay confirmed that she has a meeting with officers later today to discuss further and agreed to provide an update at the next meeting.

OSC33/16 PROGRESS IN DELIVERING THE ENVIRONMENT CORPORATE OBJECTIVES **2016-17**

Councillor Yeulett introduced the item he asked what the key challenges are moving forward.

1. Councillor Murphy stated that the biggest challenge that they have at the moment is the introduction of the brown bin scheme which is probably the biggest challenge since the 3 bin system which was introduced around 12 years ago;
2. Councillor Yeulett asked how the priorities have been agreed. Councillor Murphy stated that the priorities are nearly all as a result of the CSR;
3. Councillor Mrs Hay asked about the number of people signing up for the brown bin scheme, are we at the break even stage yet. Councillor Murphy confirmed that we are approaching the break-even stage. He explained that updates have been circulated to members, these have contained the numbers that have been signing up to the scheme. He stated that there is likely to be a spike in subscribers just before the scheme starts, and then possibly another spike after a couple of months when those that did not subscribe want to start to use the service again as we enter the growing season;
4. Councillor Buckton asked for clarification with regards to the figures stating that 11,000 people have currently signed up but asked how many need to sign up for us to hit the target of 40% which is where the costing's were based at. Councillor Murphy confirmed that the target is 16,000;
5. Councillor Buckton asked if we are doing anything to attract more people to sign up to the scheme to increase that number. Councillor Murphy stated that reminders are being published on social media and letters have been sent to all households, he added that once the scheme starts and the bins go out with the stickers on, that in its self will be another way of advertising the scheme. He added that people are signing up every day so that number is increasing and that he is confident that we will hit the target;
6. Councillor Booth stated that he understands that we can no longer use the green bin for garden waste or use the brown bins for our kitchen waste and asked why this has changed as previously members had been told that this was possible. Councillor Murphy stated that you cannot put garden waste into the green bin or kitchen waste into the brown bin. Richard Cassidy confirmed that currently the brown bins do contain kitchen waste but moving forward, because we are unable to make a charge for that and are only able to charge for garden waste, kitchen waste material will not be able to be disposed of in the brown bin, we are looking at ways around this but currently it is garden waste only;
7. Councillor Mrs Mayor asked for clarification around the brown caddy bags that can be purchased from the one stop shops and hubs. She stated that staff in the shop were confused about if we will be able to use these once the brown bin scheme is rolled out.

Councillor Murphy confirmed that the brown bags can be used in the brown bin up to the 1 April 2017, but not after that date. Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that customer service staff are confused around this. Richard Cassidy confirmed that after this date you will be able to continue to use the brown caddy bags but they will need to be placed in to the green bin for collection, he agreed to clarify this situation with the customer services staff so that they are able to provide the correct information to customers;

8. Councillor Mrs Davis asked for clarification about what can be put into the brown bin for collection. Councillor Murphy confirmed that just garden waste will go into the brown bin. Councillor Mrs Davis read from the website of items that can be disposed of in the brown bin. Councillor Murphy confirmed that is until 1 April 2017. Councillor Booth confirmed that after that we cannot charge for Kitchen waste that as it is classed as domestic waste, but he feels that council were not aware of this when the scheme was formulated as different information was given to members at the member seminar. Councillor Murphy stated that we cannot include the kitchen waste in the brown bin going forward;
9. Councillor Yeulett asked for clarification about this, that the FAQ's previously circulated with regards to the brown bin scheme be recirculated;
10. Councillor King stated that Cabinet members talk all of the time and attend portfolio holder briefings, this is an opportunity to look at each other's portfolios and ensure that nothing is being missed despite crossovers with regards to responsibilities. He stated that his priorities moving forward are to successfully conclude the street lighting contract with Balfour Beatty ensuring that we get a better service that we have had and to improve transport links within Fenland, he confirmed that he has had a meeting with James Palmer to discuss how we can progress and was very reassured by answers that he gave;
11. Councillor Yeulett asked if members feel that markets are successful as the number of stalls have reduced at March, he asked if this is the same across the district and what can we do to encourage more stall holders. Councillor Murphy confirmed that this is the same across the district, he stated that market traders cannot compete with shops selling discounted items. He added that the reason that the March market looks empty is because the fruit and vegetable trader has retired and he had 4 pitches, the trader that replaced him just has 1 pitch and therefore it looks empty. He confirmed that we do try to encourage more traders and have incentives for new traders, but we are unable to fill the markets. He stated that it had been previously suggested that the markets are privatised but unfortunately the smaller markets are just not viable for this type of privatisation. We have had specialised markets which have been popular but unfortunately the traders do not sell enough to encourage them to return. Councillor Yeulett stated that the worry is that the markets will disappear altogether. Councillor Murphy stated that he hopes not and we are trying to encourage interest in all the market towns;
12. Councillor Buckton asked what are next year's plans with regards to markets. Councillor Murphy stated that the plan is the same and that is to try to encourage more traders. He stated that the markets are not the same focus for a town that they used to be, but they serve a purpose and we want them to be successful;
13. Councillor Buckton asked what is the Markets Action Plan and is there a written Action Plan. Richard Cassidy stated that we have been looking to work with market traders and have developed initiatives for new traders. He confirmed that there is a plan in place as a result of meetings and interaction with market traders. He reiterated that with the large fruit and vegetable stall no longer being in the March market, there are certain days that the March market looks quite empty, and that does not give confidence to traders, but we will continue dialogue with them and look at ways to encourage new stall holders, we will continue to market the markets as best we can. He agreed that there is a change away from traditional markets where people came to buy low priced goods, as there are many shops that now sell those discounted products. Some more prosperous market towns markets have reinvented themselves are now selling more upmarket or artisan type products, but we are struggling to get that interest in the Fenland area;
14. Councillor Buckton asked if the Action plan will be updated as it has not achieved what it set out to this year. Richard Cassidy confirmed that the Action Plan will be reviewed, but for all

the reasons discussed it is challenging. Councillor Buckton asked if the Action Plan can be shared with members. Richard Cassidy agreed;

15. Councillor Mrs Laws asked do we look outside of the district when we advertise for market traders, for example Ely market is thriving and she wondered if we approached traders there. Councillor Murphy confirmed we do approach traders from other markets, but we also have to take into account what they are selling too, as we do not want to have stalls selling the same product type. He added that Ely has a large and very wealthy catchment area;
16. Councillor Booth asked if the next year is the year that will decide the future of the markets. Councillor Murphy stated that we will keep pushing forward with the markets while we have traders, we will not give up, but it is getting more difficult. Councillor Yeulett asked for clarification that we will continue with the markets despite the difficulties even though financially it may not be the best decision for the council. Councillor Murphy stated that the markets do not cost a lot to this Council as stall holders pay a fee;
17. Councillor Mason stated that in Whittlesey on Sunday morning there is a market and they sometimes bolt on a car boot sale and in the past they have also combined local events with a market, he asked if any of these have been tried in any of the market towns. Councillor Murphy confirmed that these have been tried, charity stalls have also been offered for free, but they do not want a pitch every week just as one off;
18. Councillor Buckton, referring to page 27 of the report with regards to car parks, asked, that of the work that is listed as carried out, was any of it planned and budgeted for and what is the plan for next year. Councillor King stated that the amount of money that car parks need to be fully up to modern standards is money we do not have. We have for many years been 'firefighting' the maintenance work for the car parks. The work is carried out on the basis of what is deemed to be essential for health and safety. We have planned more extensive work in the past and bids have been made to the capital programme which were unsuccessful. With a much reduced capital programme they are unlikely to be successful moving forward. Our priority is to ensure that they are safe and user friendly. Recently extensive work has been undertaken at St Peters car park in Wisbech to ensure that it is safe and user friendly;
19. Councillor Buckton asked if essentially there is a fund to dip into when repairs are required. Councillor King confirmed that there is a contingency fund for emergency repairs and at the end of the financial year if there is money left it allows some more extensive work to be done;
20. Councillor Mrs Hay stated that she noticed that the Eastwood car park in Chatteris has not been included in the maintenance programme, she added that she understands that when the sports area was constructed the County Council were responsible for bringing the car park area up to an acceptable standard which has not happened. She confirmed that FDC have carried out some repairs but it is in very poor condition now and she is concerned that someone will damage their car there and suggested that an officer goes out to investigate the condition. Trevor Watson confirmed that it is the entrance to the leisure centre and therefore we have carried out some emergency work from time to time to ensure safety but there are on-going discussion with the County Council to establish how we can bring it to a level that we are all happy with. Councillor King confirmed that this should be progressed as quickly as possible and agreed to follow up with Trevor Watson later in the week;
21. Councillor Booth stated that this Panel recently looked at asset plan and policy and asked for clarification about making our assets work for us and that we might in future years release other assets that would help us to undertake essential work elsewhere. Councillor King stated that the only way that the car parks could be made to be self-sustaining is to charge people for parking in them. We have large assets that generate no revenue at all, so even if we dispose of assets and invest that money into car parks, at a future stage we will need to find more money to invest, so it is an on-going battle;
22. Councillor Mrs Laws referred to page 27 of the report with regards to improvements in Grosvenor Road car parks, she stated that she does not consider much attention is required at this car park and asked what type of work is scheduled. Councillor Butcher agreed stating that all of the Whittlesey car parks are fine, he added that the officers are working with a

management plan to get the best use out of our assets and to look at resources for the car parks. Councillor King stated that we will have to do some work to our car parks in the future and it is for this reason that there has been an on-going discussion with regards to car parking charges;

23. Councillor Mrs Davis referred to page 29 of the report with regards to street lighting which states that a number of enquiries were made by some of the Parish Councils to Balfour Beatty in respect of obtaining replacement costs for their category 2 lights, she stated that the reason that those requests were made was to compare them to other suppliers. She asked how much the maintenance part of the contract is going to cost FDC. Councillor King stated that the best way to look at this is to look the maintenance costs per column, he confirmed that we did some market testing to ensure that we were getting a good deal, there is some commercial sensitivity around the cost and therefore we have not been able to share these, other than in percentages, and confirmed that the next cheapest provider was 60% more expensive than Balfour Beatty;
24. Councillor Mrs Davis stated that Parish Councils as a group have been able to obtain quotes that are lower than Balfour Beatty. Councillor King stated that it is difficult to respond without knowing all of the details of the quote and there will also be some commercial sensitivity with regards to that quote too. He stated that one of the difficulties was making sure that we were comparing like for like and Balfour Beatty had a different approach, they looked at an on-going maintenance cost per column whereas the other companies looked at an individual cost for each item. Councillor Mrs Davis confirmed that the second cheapest quote for FDC was the cheapest overall for the Parish Councils. Councillor King suggested that they should get together to discuss the details, he added that we have decided to go with Balfour Beatty based on the information provided at that stage but obviously if something has changed we would be happy to reconsider because we are looking for value for money;
25. Councillor Booth stated that the key issue is that we have quotes on a like for like basis, that is where the issues can occur, Parishes have managed to get quotes for replacements that are a lot cheaper than the quotes from Balfour Beatty, but Balfour Beatty's quote for maintenance is effectively to front end the cost with capital cost by replacing a lot of the lighting stock which other firms would indemnify with insurance. This makes it easier for Balfour Beatty to carry out maintenance. He asked what is the cost per column under the new contract. Councillor King reiterated that this is an issue of commercial sensitivity and explained that he is unable to give that information. Councillor Booth stated that there is a balance between commercial sensitivity and transparency. Councillor King explained that the legal advice that we have had is that we cannot share the cost information from Balfour Beatty. With regards to whether Balfour Beatty front load the contract by replacing columns he explained that there is no evidence of that, all the companies have to operate to a recognised standard and with all these things there is a degree of interpretation;
26. Councillor Booth asked if the cost information can be provided with regards to the maintenance contract and how many street lights it covers. Trevor Watson confirmed that each time this has been on the agenda for Cabinet that information has been included, so they are already in the public domain;
27. Councillor Mrs Davis stated that the report refers to street lights for Benwick Parish Council and asked why the other parishes are not in the report. Councillor King stated that he would assume that they were reflected in a previous report. Trevor Watson confirmed that this report reflects on the past 9 months. Councillor Yeulett asked if the panel can be provided with the figures for the other parishes for information;
28. Councillor Yeulett stated that the Grounds Maintenance contract was renewed with a few issues to start, he asked how is that going. Councillor Murphy confirmed that there were some problems at the start but these were not all down to ISS. When they started they did not have all of the right equipment required to carry out the work but they got the equipment needed. It was the wettest spring time that we have had for many years which caused them problems and also Roddons decided to carry out their own grounds maintenance, but they left some areas because there was some confusion around which parts they owned, which

generated some complaints. We got through that, and have met with them to look at the year ahead, and they are confident that all the issues have all been addressed and future meetings have been planned to keep in contact throughout the year;

29. Councillor Yeulett asked if this cost FDC more. Councillor Murphy confirmed that the money was not all paid to ISS, the money was paid to a contractor who was called in to cover the work so there was no extra cost to the Council;
30. Councillor Mrs Mayor asked for clarification with regards to the community satisfaction with cleansing services survey results. She stated that the numbers that are shown are misleading as the percentage of customers that are satisfied is 77% but the percentage of customers that responded are only 16% of those sent out. She added that she is concerned that it is not a good reflection as good when actually 84% were not returned. Councillor Murphy stated that this is how surveys are reported on, percentages are taken from those that have responded, and this is a fairly good response to a survey for us;
31. Councillor Buckton stated that if we accept that this how we measure satisfaction. 77% of customers are satisfied, our target was 80% which means we failed, but the text says this is a very good achievement. Councillor Murphy stated that he would not say that this area has failed. Councillor Yeulett stated that there has to be measurable targets and we have to make an effort to achieve them. Richard Cassidy stated that traditionally a slightly higher score would be anticipated but that the introduction of the brown bin charges has appeared to have affected the satisfaction feedback in recent months;
32. Councillor Buckton stated that he understands the situation, but that the report does not reflect that and appears complacent. Richard Cassidy stated that 80% is a very high standard of satisfaction for any service, he added that the reason the area is 'green' is that a figure reported within 5% of the target would be considered to be 'green', but there is no indication that the service is complacent. Everybody who makes a comment is individually contacted to discuss their requirements, we do that to learn about how best to improve the service;
33. Councillor Buckton asked what will change next year. Richard Cassidy stated that we feel that because of the introduction of the brown bins charging the satisfaction level was lower than we would expect. We have high standards for cleansing and we maintain inspections and have no cause for concern around the service and are responding to individual problems that a customer has as they arise;
34. Councillor Mrs Hay stated that it has been said that there are no concerns around street cleaning, but that feedback from 'In Bloom' judges for the first time in 7 years was around the roads and open parks not being up to standard;
35. Councillor Booth agreed with Councillor Buckton's comments regarding the satisfaction survey, that the report does not reflect what the actual results are;
36. Councillor Booth referring to measuring satisfaction asked if 'satisfied' is the middle response and suggested that officers consider other types of systems for measuring response, many other places now use a system around net promoter scores as that is a more realistic approach.

Councillor Yeulett thanked Officers and Cabinet Members for their attendance today.

OSC34/16 OVERVIEW - COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (CSP)

Councillor Yeulett introduced the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Overview Item and welcomed Dan Horn who made a presentation to the panel. He asked members for feedback with regards to the following questions:

- Are you clear on processes and how we develop actions;
- Do you feel this addresses the main community safety issues;
- how would you like to see the CSP projects promoted;

He informed members that any feedback will be captured today and taken as a report to the CSP Meeting in April to for consideration from a CSP perspective. He confirmed that following this he would respond back to the Chairman on the outcome of their discussion.

Members asked questions, made comments and received responses as follows:

1. Councillor Yeulett thanked Dan Horn for the very comprehensive presentation, he stated that there are big, broad ranging challenges ahead for the CSP. There is also the challenge to keep up with developing crime and issues that arise. He added that the panel were impressed that feedback from previous Overview and Scrutiny Meetings had been taken into account and all felt that it was a good report;
2. Councillor Buckton thanked Dan Horn, he stated that we were disappointed with the lack of information previously, but this is much better, he added that he hopes that this is more useful for the partnership too;
3. Councillor Booth stated that concerns were raised previously with regards to road safety and this has been picked up in this plan. The language of the actions and the proposed actions within the plan could be a lot clearer. He referred to page 57 of the report and stated that the Action does not mention road safety at all. This is a very credible Action Plan and is very focussed at young people but does not address the wider community issues which is around speeding in Towns and Villages. We know that the biggest issue that people raise is around road safety and speeding and yet there is only 1 action and it is targeting a very specific group and it is not very easily identifiable within the plan. It has been said previously that it is an area of focus but it needs to be a priority. Councillor Oliver stated that the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) has identified that as an issue and that is something that will be taken forward. He added that when surveys are completed speeding is one of the top 3 issues reported, but what we need to find out, is the issue speeding or the perception of speeding, so we need to ask more questions and that is the next stage to get a better idea of what the real issues are;
4. Councillor Booth agreed that he understands the point around perception but stated that speed watch groups can provide the evidence. He added that it was encouraging that the police were sent out last year to carry out speed enforcements, but unfortunately have not been out this year. From a community perception we need to be seen to be taking action;
5. Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that the plan is 'brilliant' especially the traffic light system which is very clear, and very good news that there are no areas that have come out as 'red', however there are some points which have not been completed and one area that has 'no' in the target box and that she feels this should be red. She asked for clarification about what 'Firebreak' is or does. Aaron Locks confirmed that Firebreak is about young people engaging with the Fire Service and was rolled out in Huntingdon as a pilot, there has been a delay moving this project elsewhere in the County;
6. Councillor Mason congratulated the team stating that there has been a lot of work and effort involved in this report. He asked about the support available to licensed premises, particularly through pubwatch schemes, as in Whittlesey there is an issue with pubwatch as they have very little support and asked if this is a district wide issue. Aaron Locks stated that in relation to Wisbech and March pubwatch we provide a lot of support, however we have tried to engage with Whittlesey and went in 2015 to offer training but only 2 members attended. He confirmed that the support is universal but only if that level of support is accepted. Councillor Mason stated that during the past 2 years the group membership has changed, he confirmed that invitations to meetings have been sent to officers in the past, but nobody has attended. He stated that pubwatch works well in Whittlesey and they conform with the regulations, there is a definite interest. Dan Horn stated that he is keen to bridge the gap in particular the misunderstanding in terms of the invitation to the group, and agreed to take that forward outside of this meeting. Councillor Oliver confirmed that that he will also take this matter forward;
7. Councillor Buckton stated that some of the actions need a 'so what' answer. He gave an example about posters being distributed and asked have they been displayed, stating that

something that was a good thing to do might not have been if they are not on display. He gave another example with regards to an awareness and reporting app being developed which is a work in progress, you can spend lots of money on an app but if nobody makes use of it, it was a waste of time. It is about the reflective part on some of the actions and about the outcome and adding value. Councillor Oliver stated that the app is imminent, it is something that is being promoted so that people are aware of it, and because it is not yet up and running we do not know what the impact of that will be. He confirmed that with regards to his earlier comment, officers did check that the posters were put up;

8. Councillor Buckton stated that the presentation mentioned being a pilot group for restorative solutions and asked if there are any financial benefits for this. Dan Horn stated that we put ourselves forward to be involved in the pilot scheme and received an offer of free training for multi agencies working in the Fenland area. We have a menu of how we can sort a particular issue and this is something that we can add. Councillor Buckton stated that all of these officers already have full time jobs and asked where are the resources coming from. Dan Horn stated that there was time involved for officers to receive training but it has added strength to their workforce development as they have another skillset and might get to the cause of the issue quicker and get a better outcome for those affected;
9. Councillor Buckton stated that he understands about the training and skills but they have to go out and do it after they have been trained. Dan Horn agreed and stated that the action plan needs to say how many people have gone through that route and what the impact has been. Councillor Buckton agreed that the training is good to know but we want to know what the impact of that training was;
10. Councillor Booth making reference to cyber crime, stated that there is a fairly low take up in this area and asked about telephone crime, stating that he has seen incidents where people have been duped into giving out money and asked how this is addressed. Councillor Oliver stated that within the partnership there are other organisations that are looking at this type of crime, so this is being addressed but is not specifically in our plan, in the future we may need to include it so that people can see all aspects of that are being tackled;
11. Councillor Yeulett stated that it is important to get the information to the community in every way possible, community groups and schools;
12. Councillor Buckton asked if the work of the CSP is promoted internally within the Council. Dan Horn confirmed that the work is promoted through team meetings to share resources and knowledge. Councillor Buckton asked is the CSP work promoted to different teams across the Council. Councillor Oliver stated that he hopes that the information is going from one team area to another;
13. Councillor Buckton stated that the reason he asks is that the mission statement for the Council is very much about improving people's lives and so it should be in the DNA of everybody that works for FDC and partner organisations so that they can contribute to that. Richard Cassidy stated that working across teams and being one team is core to FDC and how we work as an organisation. He confirmed that all topic highlights are shared at team meetings and that being each others eyes and ears is key with the level of resources we have to make us an efficient Council;
14. Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that she recently has cause to work with the CSP and thanked them for the positive outcome. Councillor Oliver stated that one of his responsibilities is to liaise with the PCC and one of the responsibilities is to show that we are spending the money we are allocated wisely. He confirmed that he attended a meeting last week and were allocated our full grant for the next year and that Fenland's CSP was described as an exemplar CSP within the area.

OSC35/16 LEISURE STRATEGY REVIEW & MANAGEMENT OPTIONS UPDATE

Councillor Yeulett introduced the Leisure Strategy Review and Management Options Update Item.

Members asked questions, made comments and received responses as follows:

1. Councillor Buckton referring to the report, asked what does sustainable mean, does this refer to a leisure service that is able to run without subsidy. Councillor Tanfield stated that the sustainability means that it can run at a zero cost to the Council and that is an aim and we will work as hard as we can to make that a reality, but we must be mindful of things that we have no control over. It is important that we offer the same service that customers expect, so sustainability does not cover the cost but also the value of the customer experience;
2. Councillor Buckton referred to the community cohesion in the title and asked what relevance does this have to the provision of leisure, should the title just focus on improving Community Health and Wellbeing. Councillor Tanfield stated that leisure centres are not just about health and wellbeing, lots of groups, young people, children and schools come together, it is not just about health and wellbeing it can be about mental health and community based groups that come to meet together and that covers much more. Councillor Mrs Davis asked if that is all health and wellbeing. Councillor Tanfield agreed, and stated that community encompasses everyone and anyone. From the outside someone seeing health and wellbeing might not think it was for them but we think that community cohesion brings it in focus for all. Richard Cassidy stated that cohesion is a specific issue in Fenland in respects of the migrant population so we felt it was something that we should specifically mention;
3. Councillor Booth referred to the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) on page 79 of the report which are a 1% rise year on year of people attending the leisure centres and leisure centre income rising by 2% year on year, he asked if these are challenging enough. Councillor Tanfield stated that we have already taken a lot of cost cutting in the leisure centres and that is the reason we are looking at the outsourcing of the management for them. She stated that she feels that 2% is a reasonable target at the moment, but that might change as the project moves forward. Councillor Booth suggested adding the income rising by 2% year on year and costs will rise to the same amount so as not to call on the Council's resources. Richard Cassidy agreed to look at the way the indicators are worded, and clarify the 2% income growth, he stated that the intention is looking at membership growth and income growth and that has been the main focus behind this. Once we have gone through the whole process we need to review the KPI's that we have in place as there will be a change in the way that the service is resourced;
4. Councillor Booth stated that normally KPI's are set as a target. Richard Cassidy stated that there will be very detailed financial estimates and business plans put forward as part of the procurement as part of the tendering process. Once we have that information we can review the target but it is a little early in the process currently. Councillor Booth suggested that we could have a longer term target. Councillor Tanfield stated that we are not saying that we do not want to challenge and do not think we can challenge enough when it comes to making this business work;
5. Councillor Mason asked is the priority to balance the budget or to promote health and wellbeing positively, he explained that the Manor Leisure Centre in Whittlesey do well for booking children's parties but promotion of other community events there that have a sports element to them are not so prevalent. He added that he attended a sports complex, Whittlesey Indoor Sports Community Hub, where they were promoting all sorts of sporting events, all of which could have been promoted from the Manor leisure centre which would have brought in revenue. Councillor Tanfield stated that the difficulty is that we are a business but health and wellbeing is very important to us. The two go hand in hand, the more people that we can encourage to come to the leisure centres the more healthy they will be. The problem is you cannot force people to be healthy, so health and wellbeing also has to work from outside of the leisure centres and that can take a generation of people before it filters through, our priority is to manage the two as best we can;
6. Councillor Mason stated that the sports complex had funding from various places, he suggested that we could have done that from the leisure centre and promoted the events which would have helped the budget and the health and wellbeing aspect and stated that it is disappointing that we did not do that. Richard Cassidy stated that leisure centres are

primarily aimed at the swimming pools and gym activities and our wider role in terms of sports development is to encourage activity in other community facilities. We want to encourage and support all types of sports, but that is different from the leisure centre itself which we want to run on a more commercial footing. There is room for both in Fenland and we want to support the sports events happening in community facilities across the district and do not see it as competition;

7. Councillor Buckton stated that he was looking at the website and could not find a way to attend an exercise class without becoming a member of the leisure centre. The website pushes you towards the membership route and it was not clear if it was possible just to attend and pay on the day for an exercise class. Councillor Tanfield confirmed that you do not have to be a member to take part in an exercise class. Richard Cassidy stated that members would have priority when booking a place in an exercise class because they are paying a regular fee and we actively encourage people that want to attend regular classes to become a member and that is why the marketing takes them down that route on the website;
8. Councillor Buckton stated that if we are trying to persuade people who might not otherwise be active and if they just want to go to one particular class it does not really encourage them to do that. Richard Cassidy stated that if they are going to 1 or 2 classes a week it would be cheaper for them to become a member. Councillor Tanfield stated that non-members are more likely to go into the leisure centre to ask about classes and not necessarily look online. If we have non-members booking alongside members it causes difficulties, but she agreed to look into this as we do not want to put anyone off;
9. Councillor Buckton suggested that potentially we can increase the classes that are offered as in other places where there are exercise classes that you just show up on the day and pay your money. Councillor Tanfield explained that we would have to pay for staff to cover the additional classes and if they are not well attended it is not very cost effective. Richard Cassidy stated that generally, people who become members have a fitness programme set for them and have regular contact with staff tend to continue to come to the leisure centre for longer;
10. Councillor Booth asked why the sports development service is being retained in-house. Councillor Tanfield stated that if we keep it in-house we are able to look at working with different community groups. Leisure is different from sports development, leisure centres are not aimed at working with everyone in the community. So we felt it was very important to retain this officer we are working on projects with Active Fenland and are looking for more funding moving forward;
11. Councillor Booth stated that with regards to funding, there are no target figures set and it would be better to say how many funding applications you want to try to achieve and how much funding you would like to achieve. Councillor Tanfield stated that we do not know which applications are going to be available to us so it would be difficult to specify. Richard Cassidy stated that it is trying to get a balance on a strategic document, we tried to move away from specific numbers. We are considering having an annual refresher for KPI's as an appendix as that would give us the ability to be dynamic with what the indicators are;
12. Councillor Yeulett stated that we have an aging population in Fenland but there are no KPI's focussing on older people. Richard Cassidy agreed that is a helpful point as in our minds we are focussed on older people and some of the projects are referred to but it is not directly reflected in the document;
13. Councillor Yeulett suggested working with schools and Town Councils more effectively to make use of other facilities for health and wellbeing purposes;
14. Councillor Yeulett asked if the leisure service is financially viable. Councillor Tanfield stated that we have had more members now than we have ever had and we are on target to make more money than we have ever made, there is more that we can do to encourage more people to use the leisure centres, but maybe we have gone as far as we can go which is why we have looked to bring in management. There is very much a financial viability to the leisure centres and we hope that the management option will bring the best of both worlds together;

15. Councillor Mason asked is the money being well spent. Councillor Yeulett stated that Fenland is the least active district in the county, and asked are we doing enough;
16. Councillor Yeulett asked if we can organise a Fenland Run, like the Great North Run. Councillor Tanfield stated that partners might want to get involved with something like this, but it is not specifically for us. We would need to ask if that encourages people who are not active to run;
17. Councillor Yeulett asked are health professionals effectively signposting to leisure and are they targeted on the number of exercise referrals that they make. Councillor Booth asked with regards to exercise referrals, what is available for people as part of that scheme. Richard Cassidy confirmed that we work with the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's) and the Public Health Team to promote that scheme through GP's but we do not get as many referrals as we would like. We also work with the Public Health Team around a work place health programme. We last reviewed it in detail 18 months ago and although we get fewer people overall now they stay longer, so the retention rate has improved. There is a constant need to remind the GP's in the area that this pathway is available to them;
18. Councillor Booth asked how many sessions are people offered free of charge. Phil Hughes stated that the scheme is not free, the subsidy is around the increased attention and care that is made available to the customer from the exercise professional. Richard Cassidy stated that what we found was that if you offer the scheme completely free it was not taken up and the investment by the customer gives the scheme some value;
19. Councillor Mrs Laws asked we are doing enough to keep the members when the referral scheme period has finished. Richard Cassidy stated that when a customer scans in to a leisure centre their details come up on the screen and the staff, as part of their responsibilities, will respond to the information that they see, and if they are flagged up as requiring a refresh to a programme they will ask about that. We also measure retention time, completing an annual report looking at the demographics of the users of the leisure centre. He stated fundamentally if you come into a leisure centre for the first time or if you have not been for a while you will be greeted by a friendly face asking how they can help.

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel agreed the following recommendations:

- The KPI's need to be more specific and therefore measurable, and the panel would like to see the separate appendix within the policy so there is the ability to change those in a dynamic way;
- Performance indicators should be around percentage of reduction of local authority subsidy;
- Greater clarity with regards to the leisure centre facilities for use by everyone, not just members, and a greater promotion of that;
- Is there an opportunity for further promotion of the exercise referral scheme and about being clearer about the offering we provide for older people;
- More clarity around the in-house service of the sports development team.

Councillor Yeulett thanked Officers and Cabinet members for their attendance today.

OSC36/16 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY CALL-IN PROCEDURE

Members considered the Overview and Scrutiny Call-In Procedure Report presented by Councillor Yeulett. He informed members that this matter has been put forward for consideration as a result of a question which arose at Full Council.

Councillor Booth stated that he raised the matter at Full Council as he was aware that it does not require as many people in other local authorities to call-in a decision. He stated that he feels this Council should change the number of members required too as the bar is too high, and feels that is evidenced by the fact that we have not had any call-in's for a number of years. He added that one of the reasons that the call-in process was established was around the role of the opposition, and

at the moment there is no way that opposition members are able to undertake that process. He recommended that the arrangements should be changed from 10 members of Full Council to 5 members, that could mean that potentially opposition members could call-in a decision but it would require all to agree and officers would moderate the call-in process to ensure that it was for a good reason.

Councillor Buckton seconded the proposal; he stated that he accepts that there is no real mechanism in place for call in by the opposition members due to the makeup of the Council.

The Overview and Scrutiny Panel AGREED to recommend to Full Council that the Call-In arrangements are changed from 10 members of the Council to 5 members of the Council.

OSC37/16 FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

Members considered the Future Work Programme 2016/17 for the Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Anna Goodall stated that members had asked if we were able to bring forward 2 items from the April Meeting, the Corporate Priorities on Communities and the Local Health Partnership Update. However the local Health Partnership are currently updating their plan and it would be advisable for these items to be postponed until June. Members agreed.

Councillor Yeulett stated that he is concerned about the length of the meetings, large items on the agenda need our attention, and we do our best to do this, but it is difficult maintaining the focus towards the end of a long meeting. Councillor Mrs Laws suggested reviewing the number of meetings, perhaps with a view to having monthly meetings.

Anna Goodall confirmed that the constitution states the number of ordinary meetings of Overview and Scrutiny but that does not prevent additional meetings being added. She stated that because we are overviewing dynamically changing projects that is having an impact on the work programme.

Members discussed the possibility of focussing on areas of an item and to receiving reports that are also focussed in this way, making it easier to follow the programme within the current structure.

The Future Work Programme 2016/17 for the Overview and Scrutiny Panel was AGREED subject to the comments above.

5.15pm

Chairman