



Telford & Wrekin
C O U N C I L

Addenbrooke House Ironmasters Way Telford TF3 4NT

CUSTOMER, COMMUNITY & PARTNERSHIP SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date **Monday, 22 October 2018** Time **6.00pm**

Venue **Meeting Room G3-G4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford**

Enquiries Regarding this Agenda:

Democratic & Scrutiny Services Deborah Moseley 01952 383215

Media Enquiries Corporate Communications 01952 382407

Committee Membership: Councillors **G C W Reynolds (Chair)**, J C Ashford, K T Blundell,
C N Mason, L A Murray, S J Reynolds, J M Seymour and
B D Tillotson
Co-optee: Mr D Johnson

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Declarations of Interest**
3. **Minutes** Appendix **A1-2**
To confirm the minutes of the meetings of the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee held on 18 and 23 July 2018.
4. **Grounds & Cleansing Contract Procurement**
To receive a verbal update on the procurement process.
5. **Highways Contract Procurement**
To receive a verbal update on the procurement process.
6. **Work Programme 2018/19** Appendix **B**
To note the work programme.
7. **Chair's Comments and Update**

CUSTOMER, COMMUNITY & PARTNERSHIP SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday, 18 July 2018 at 6.00pm in Meeting Rooms G3/4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford

Present: Councillors G C W Reynolds (Chair), C N Mason, L A Murray, J M Seymour and B D Tillotson

In Attendance: Supt T Harding (Chair of the Community Safety Partnership), A Matthews (Prevention and Protection Officer, Shropshire Fire & Rescue), and D Moseley (Democratic & Scrutiny Services Team Leader)

CCPSC-1 Apologies for Absence

Councillors J C Ashford, K R Guy and Mr D Johnson (Co-Optee)

CCPSC-2 Declarations of Interest

None.

CCPSC-3 Minutes

Members requested that the updates on the Grounds and Cleansing Contract procurement and Highways Contract procurement be recirculated.

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Customer, Community & Partnerships Scrutiny Committee held on 16 October 2017 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

CCPSC-4 Community Safety Partnership

The Chair referred Members to the Safer Telford and Wrekin Strategy 2017-19 which had been circulated with the agenda and noted that the strategy had been approved by Full Council on 11 January 2018. The Chair noted that Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) were introduced by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and were constituted of a number of 'responsible authorities' working together to protect their local communities from crime. Local Authorities had the power to scrutinise the CSP and to this end, Councillor Reynolds welcomed Superintendent Tom Harding as the Chair of the CSP and invited him to provide an overview of the Strategy.

Superintendent Harding explained that previous strategies had been very broad and the framework of the Strategy before Members offered the opportunity to deliver real benefits by bringing forward specific priorities for focus over a two year period. Telford & Wrekin was part of a 'similar group' consisting of 15 areas and, comparatively, had seen a positive trend towards the reduction of crime. It was acknowledged that there would be a significant increase against the 'rape and other sex offences' category but the CSP was keen to articulate to the public that two-thirds of the reports were non-recent offences. Significant work was taking place with

partners to provide increased education relating to CSE vulnerability which encompassed a wide range of individuals including refuse collectors, Royal Mail, hotel workers and the wider public on the signs to look for. This had resulted in reports about young people at risk, some of which had been investigated and others which turned out to be misunderstandings. The level of partnership working had really come on in leaps and bounds and work to reduce environmental crime with the Town and Parish Councils and Environmental Team had broadened the partnership network further.

Members asked a number of questions:-

How often does the CSP meet?

CSP meetings took place once per quarter. Sub groups regularly met across a range of activities and duplication with the Adult Safeguarding Board and Local Safeguarding Children Board was avoided.

The falling rates of crime were welcomed and it was queried whether this was a trend across all areas in the 'similar group'.

Most of the areas in the similar group had reported an increase so Telford & Wrekin was bucking the trend. However, it was noted that the area was very different to Hereford, Worcester and Shropshire and, whilst the area included some of the most deprived areas in the country, that was no reason not to have high aspirations.

Shock was expressed at the high figures for theft and violence against the person

Supt Harding advised that his command priorities were violence and sexual offences and this had resulted in a lot of work taking place with the night time economy. For instance, within the security services, there was now one main door company operating most of the doors and Special Constables were now trained to undertake licence checks. Staff were looking at the issue of domestic abuse nationally and the force was also looking to appoint an Independent Domestic Abuse Adviser to work with the team for 3 days per week. Some positive strides were also taking place to allow greater data sharing on victims of domestic abuse through discussion with the lead consultant for A&E. The close working relationship between the partners and the Council's Housing Enforcement Team had also proved successful.

Statistics showed 224 incidents of child sexual exploitation. How many of these were ongoing concerns?

A key indicator was generally how many individuals the CATE team were working with as being at significant risk. The caseload was generally around 40/50 children but referrals generally came from a variety of sources and not all of them would be classed as significant risk.

Would the Chair of the CSP corroborate with the Independent Local Inquiry on CSE?

The CSP was open to the Inquiry. The Chair personally would be happy to engage with the Inquiry and was proud of the work the Partnership was doing.

Has the CSP noted that it is common for victims to withdraw from Domestic Violence cases?

Domestic Violence was one of the most complex issues to deal with, presenting a real challenge for the Partnership with only 1 in 40 cases being reported (essentially

meaning that abuse occurred 40 times before it was reported). There was under-reporting in more affluent areas and this was in some ways understandable when additional support might be needed if an individual may lose their job and with it the ability to support their family. Domestic Violence Protection Notices and Civil Orders were being utilised more and short term support offered to victims over the period that there was no contact with their abuser as a result. It had to be recognised that criminal justice was not always the best outcome for victims.

How do the views of local residents feed into the priorities set by the CSP?

Each of the Partners collected their own data which was shared and, from this pool of data, a professional judgment was taken on what the priorities should be. For instance, the Council was able to gauge public feeling through social media, surveys and other feedback, eg from Members and Town and Parish Councils. It was not believed that the CSP surveying local residents would deliver any more than was already achieved through existing partnership data.

The use of Body Cameras was welcomed. Were there plans to roll out this technology to Special Constables and PCSOs?

All uniformed Police Officers were using body cams. The next phase of the roll out would include Special Constables and PCSOs. Body cams were proving useful in a number of ways, not just as a method of collecting evidence which would not normally be available (eg proving offender demeanour) but also through a reduction in assaults and complaints against Officers.

It was pointed out that the Council's Public Protection Enforcement Officers were also using body cams.

Members welcomed a valuable report from the Chair of the CSP and, as required by legislation, indicated that they would not be making any recommendations at this time.

CCPSC-5 Tackling Vehicle Damage

Mr Matthews and Supt Harding provided the Committee with some background detail on the partnership working that was taking place, not just between the Police and Fire Service but also including the Council's Night time Economy Officers and Immigration Officers. This demonstrated the impact that partnership working had due to the pooling of different legislative powers and in order to make the most of resources available (for instance, through training PCSOs to undertake Safe and Well visits).

Mr Matthews explained that over a 12-18 month period, there had been a series of vehicle arsons as described in the scrutiny suggestion. Supt Harding advised that an individual had been charged with nine vehicle arsons and the spate of activity had ceased – a result which demonstrated the fantastic joint investigation which had occurred. Whilst it was not possible to discuss the specifics of this case, the Committee were advised that in these instances, Officers would pick up patterns and trends and then work together on an investigation.

Mr Matthews went on to advise that last year there were 39 deliberate fires in Telford and Wrekin, but this year the figure had reduced by 3. Supt Harding noted that West Mercia had the third lowest level of vehicle offences of the 15 similar group areas with Telford & Wrekin being comparatively low.

Mr Matthews advised the Committee that arson had been recorded as follows

January – 1

February 0

March – 5

April to June 2018 - 11

No trends had been identified and, whilst the Service would like the figures to be lower, it was not currently an issue of concern.

The Committee were advised that figures would include cars which had been used by travelling criminals and may not actually belong to local residents.

What are the conviction rates for arson?

Officers did not have conviction figures.

Is there an arson reduction strategy?

There is an overall arson strategy and based on the statistics it was working. Campaigns were run throughout the year and would be proactive during the summer holidays. The Service took part in the schools education programme and would visit over 150 schools in years 3 and 6 as part of the national curriculum. The Crucial Crew event had also raised awareness of the danger of playing with fire among 5.5K children. The Service worked with colleagues, eg Environmental Enforcement, as fly tipping presented a risk of fire. The work undertaken by the Council had a positive impact in this regard.

Small arson prevention signs had been seen in some areas. Would these be rolled out further or available to purchase by Town and Parish Councils?

It was not planned to erect signs across the area as this could result in a dilution of the message, instead signs were sited based on intelligence/incidents. If Town and Parish Councils had particular concerns about their area, they were welcome to raise these with the Service who could consider the evidence for a need in the area.

How could abandoned cars be dealt with to prevent the possibility of arson?

If the vehicle was on private land it was the landowners responsibility; in other cases, the Local Authority had responsibility for recovery of cars with no tax or MOT. Whilst it was noted that seemingly abandoned cars could sometimes be considered a nuisance, it was important to consider whether there was a legal reason they should not be there as recovery was expensive.

If a person was recognised as a potential arsonist during a call-out, how would they be referred to appropriate mental health services?

This was another example of a multi-agency approach and a shift in the ways cases were dealt with in comparison to say 20 years ago. In some cases a school would raise concerns or operational crews would provide feedback. The I Learn Scheme provided trained people to work with individuals and concerted efforts would be

made to protect any home at risk through provision of alarms and an appropriate referral for the individual.

Did the Fire Service still provide smoke alarms in homes?

The blanket approach to the provision of fire alarms had been reduced due to austerity measures and, following a specific criteria, the focus was now on vulnerable groups. However, general fire safety advice was still available for everyone who requested a Safe and Well check.

Were businesses' Fire Risk Assessments checked on entering buildings?

Private companies carried out assessments and these were checked for adequacy during an Inspection but the onus to ensure an adequate assessment was made was on the person responsible for the building. Reasonable adjustments to the standard template could be made eg if the building was single storey with limited occupancy it would not be an onerous assessment.

What was the approach to inspection of business premises?

A risk based approach was taken, with the starting point being the most complex buildings which would be visited every 12 months. A member of the team would also attend a premises following reports from the public.

Members thanked representatives from the Fire Service and the Police for attending to provide a reassuring report and decided that no further scrutiny was required at this time.

CCPSC-6 Work Programme

Members received clarification of the position with regard to Scrutiny's flood risk powers.

The Committee noted the allocation of four formal meetings.

It was suggested that recommendations should be made at formal meetings only and the Chair noted that this was an issue for Scrutiny Management Board to consider.

Members considered the items referred by Scrutiny Management Board and it was:

RESOLVED –

- (a) that the following items would be prioritised for the work programme in 2018/19:-**
 - (i) Third Party Engagement (incorporating the new suggestion 'Town and Parish Council Engagement')**
 - (ii) Anti-Social Behaviour**
 - (iii) Grounds and Cleansing Service Contract Procurement**

- (b) that the topic 'Housing Standards' be re-submitted for consideration for review in 2019/20;**

- (c) that the holding to account of Highways England by the Cabinet Member: Communities, Housing and Enforcement be supported with regard to fly tipping on Highways England land and an update on any outcomes be provided at a future date;
- (d) that 'Flood Management' not be prioritised for the work programme during 2018/19; and
- (e) that the suggestion 'Transfer of Assets' not be prioritised due to officer capacity and the potential for duplication with Audit.

The meeting ended at 7.32pm

Chairman:

Date:

CUSTOMER, COMMUNITY & PARTNERSHIP SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee held on Monday, 23 July 2018 at 6.00pm in Meeting Rooms G3/4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford

Present: Councillors G C W Reynolds (Chair), C N Mason, L A Murray, and B D Tillotson

Also Present: Councillor A R H England (Cabinet Member for Health & Wellbeing)

In Attendance: S Bass (Commissioning, Procurement & Brokerage Service Delivery Manager), R Jones (Service Delivery Manager - Community Participation Team), C Jones (Director of Children's and Adult Services), and D Moseley (Democratic & Scrutiny Services Team Leader)

CCPSC-7 Apologies for Absence

Councillors J C Ashford, K R Guy, J M Seymour and Mr D Johnson (Co-Optee)

CCPSC-8 Declarations of Interest

None.

CCPSC-9 Third Party Engagement

The Chair noted that this was an initial evidence gathering session to answer the question "How effective is the Council in engaging support from third party organisations and the community in light of reducing resources." This item had been added to the work programme in the previous year following a suggestion from one of the Council's partner agencies. The Chair had worked with key officers to produce a draft scope concentrating on adding value to the engagement process. It was a very large topic so some time had been taken to consider how to scope the topic which would enable members to consider how to move the proposed review forward.

The Service Delivery Manager - Community Participation Team gave an overview of existing arrangements which included work with the voluntary and community sector and Town and Parish Councils, formalised partnership arrangements (ie the Local Strategic Partnership, Telford and Wrekin Safeguarding Adults Board, Telford and Wrekin Safeguarding Children's Board, Children and Families Partnership, Safer Telford and Wrekin Partnership (the Community Safety Partnership), Health and Wellbeing Board and the Armed Forces Covenant), and engagement through the budget consultation process (residents and other partners) which had evolved over time from an annual exercise to an ongoing process.

The Commissioning, Procurement & Brokerage Service Delivery Manager gave an overview of the Commissioning Process, which sought the views of the community. Depending on the service being commissioned this might include looked after

children, children in care, adults with learning difficulties, Carers Partnership Board, and Parents Forum (PODs). Providers were also part of the consultation process and the advice of the Community Participation Team was also sought to gauge whether support was already being provided in communities. Reflection also formed part of commissioning activity to consider whether the process worked. Some examples of successful commissioning processes were shared including the Drug and Alcohol Service which involved the CCG, service users and providers in developing the service. Over 80 people came together to discuss service provision as part of a “moving forward board” and, as part of the procurement process, four service users sat on the evaluation panel and subsequent interviews. Re-procurement of the Interpretation Service had also provided opportunities to engage with the deaf community to better understand what the Council needed to do to support their needs for receiving information, advice and guidance.

The Service Delivery Manager - Community Participation Team also provided some examples of successful community engagement including Parish Environmental Teams (PET) funded by Town and Parish Councils, Community Payback Scheme, TACT would soon be working with ‘Hoarders’ to help address the root cause in support of Environmental Health & Adult Social Care objectives, Town and Parish Councils and HLC School had saved 4 libraries from closing and increased the opening hours in another leading to community-led libraries.

The Service Delivery Manager - Community Participation Team also referred to work which took place in support of community cohesion: Street Pastors supporting the Night time economy, Shropshire Islamic Foundation and Quakers supporting the Syrian Refugee Programme (health, wellbeing, translation), Telford Christians Together supporting the Yellow Book (faith based assets), and the work of three Mosques to provide community events and opportunities for police engagement to counteract the impact of EDL activity). She went on to explain the concept of neighbourhood working with health which incorporated all community approaches to improving health and wellbeing from peer-led support to community delivery of services traditionally delivered in acute settings. She also described engagement which had taken place in relation to Children’s Services which had included stakeholder panels, Parent Panels and specific consultation events to gain views of children and young people. Children’s Centre activities were now being delivered with a range partners (Homestart, Parish Councils and Nurseries) and this would be further widened. Examples of Good Practice in Adult Social Care included engagement through the ‘Making it Real Board’, a newly established voice of service users, the Health and Social Care Scrutiny workstream which was considering the customer experience, joint delivery of a Community Hub with the voluntary and community sector and alternative ways delivering services through the Enterprising Communities Project. With regard to Homelessness, the Council had a Strong history of partnership working with the voluntary sector. An increase in partnership working with Maninplace had taken place over the previous 2 years with funding from the Council leading to the delivery of two 24/7 accommodation units, there had also been access to accommodation by Council and levels of visible rough sleeping had reduced. The Crisis Network was a further example of the good working relationships which existed in the sector.

In summary, partnership working was embedded in everything the Council did and a clear process for engagement with partners and the community was part of the budget setting process. Council Services continued to review how they delivered those services, consistently considering volunteering, co-production and alternative delivery methods. Whilst this had provided a broad overview of engagement activity, there was further opportunity for Scrutiny to hear in more detail of any of areas of work that would meet the objectives of the review.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing reiterated that the Council's relationship with Parish and Town Councils was giving them greater purpose by enabling them to provide and deliver services. The Council needed to be very good at change management to thread through the process of partnership working in order to deliver the changes needed.

The Chair invited questions from Members of the Committee.

Further information was sought about Start-up and Development Grants

These were specifically for Voluntary Community & Social Enterprises or Community Interest Groups who were not profit making or whose profits went back into the charity or organisation. Start-up grants up to £2,000 or development grants of up to £10,000 were available. Organisations in receipt of a grant were required to report back to the Council.

Was the level of rough sleeping in the Borough comparable to other areas?

Figures could be obtained if required but Telford had a greater incidence of 'sofa surfing'.

The involvement of service users in the commissioning process for the Drug and Alcohol Service was welcomed; do users generally put themselves forward or is this requested by the Council?

The Council generally makes an offer for service users to be involved in procurement processes but some users more actively come forward to be a part of the process.

What processes are in place to capture the voices of children and young people and how can this be more effective?

Children in care and care leavers are involved in planning for the commissioning of services. There is an 'app' in development which will be used to provide an alternative method of communication for young people.

Can the 'app' be rolled out further?

It could potentially be used for education, for example to seek views on what young people's requirements are for after school clubs and summer clubs. This would support the domiciliary care market through the provision of alternative care arrangements for care workers' children during school holidays. It was also important to try to provide experiences for young people that they might not otherwise have access to, for example, some young people did not go on a family holiday. Members noted that Oakengates Town Council were seeking to put on a programme of events for young people and may be able help meet some of this need. It was also noted that Wellington Methodist Church offered an August holiday club and further details could be provided.

Overall Members welcomed the presentation and recognised that engagement with people who were directly affected by issues was good but that communication with harder to engage groups could be improved. Members did not feel that any further in-depth scrutiny needed to take place but it was **AGREED** to receive an update in approximately four months' to report on new projects and budget consultation (in particular who was being consulted and the reach of the consultation).

A copy of the presentation would be circulated to those Members not present.

CCPSC-10 Chair's Comments and Update

None.

The meeting ended at 7pm

Chairman:

Date:

**Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee
2018/19 Work Programme**

PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Meeting Dates	Meeting Type	Items	Cabinet Member	Assistant Director or Other Participants
18 July 2018	Formal	Community Safety Partnership Tackling Vehicle Damage	N/A	Chair, Community Safety Partnership Fire Authority Prevention & Protection Officer
23 July 2018	Formal	Third Party Engagement	N/A	Procurement & Commissioning; Community Participation Team
22 October 2018	Formal	Grounds and Cleansing Contract Procurement Highways Contract Procurement	Leader & Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services & Pride Programme Transport, Roads and Broadband	Customer & Neighbourhood Services

FORWARD PLAN – 2018/19

Meeting Dates	Meeting Type	Items	Cabinet Member	Assistant Director or Other Participants
28 November 2018	Finance & Enterprise Scrutiny Committee	Customer Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee are invited to take part in the review of Civil Parking Enforcement.	Housing and Enforcement	Customer & Neighbourhood Services

17 December 2018	Formal	Provisional items: Third Party Engagement (Update) Anti Social Behaviour	Housing and Enforcement Customer Services, Visitor Economy & Partnerships	Procurement & Commissioning; Community Participation Team
4 February 2019	Formal	TBC		

TOPICS PRIORITISED FOR THE WORK PROGRAMME IN 2018/19

Topic	Method	Scoped? Y/N	Timescale	Cabinet Member	Assistant Director or Other Participants	Expected Outcome/Impact
Crime & Disorder Reduction:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Safety Partnership Tackling Vehicle Damage 	Spotlight Review	N	2018/19	Communities, Health & Wellbeing	AD: Customer & Neighbourhood Services Organisational Development & Delivery Chair of the Community Safety Partnership, Fire Authority	Exercise of statutory duties:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receipt of the Community Safety Strategy and monitoring of the work of the Partnership. Briefing on current approaches to tackling vehicle damage
Grounds and cleansing procurement	Oversight of procurement process	Y	TBC	Neighbourhood Services & Pride Programme	AD: Customer & Neighbourhood Services Dave Hanley Debbie Germany	Policy Development: Oversight of procurement process and specification for the Grounds and Cleansing service contract. Links to maintenance of open spaces.

Third Party Engagement	Spotlight Review	Drafted	2018/19	Communities, Health & Wellbeing And Customer Services, Tourism & Partnerships	Service Delivery Manager Community Participation Team	To answer the question “How effective the Council is in engaging support from third party organisations and the community in light of reducing resources.”
Anti Social Behaviour	TBC	N	2018/19		Customer & Neighbourhood Services Organisational Development & Delivery	To answer the question “What powers do the Council have to support residents who are experiencing significant anti-social behaviour from other residents and how well is this working. How well is a partnership approach working? Is there more that can be done?”

TOPICS RESUBMITTED FOR THE WORK PROGRAMME IN 2019/20

Housing Standards - There is a lot of new housing in Telford. Is the Council ensuring that they are built to lifetime homes standards and using their planning powers to ensure this happens? Perhaps a look at housing standards generally for older people, many of whom live in private rented accommodation or privately owned homes