



Leadership Gloucestershire – 16 February 2017

1 Welcome, introduction and apologies

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
Cllr Mark Hawthorne (Chair) Pete Bungard	Gloucestershire County Council	
Cllr Steve Lydon David Hagg	Stroud District Council	
Cllr Dave Norman Jon McGinty	Gloucester City Council	Cllr Paul James
Cllr Brian Robinson	Forest of Dean District Council	Cllr Patrick Molyneux
Cllr Steve Jordan Pat Pratley	Cheltenham Borough Council	
Cllr Christopher Hancock Christine Gore	Cotswold District Council	
Cllr Robert Vines Mike Dawson	Tewkesbury Borough Council	
Martin Surl Richard Bradley Ruth Greenwood	Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC) Office	Paul Trott
Suzette Davenport	Gloucestershire Constabulary	
Mary Hutton	NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	Dr Andy Seymour
Diane Savory David Owen	GFirst Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)	
Jane Burns Simon Harper	Gloucestershire County Council	
Katie Jenkins	Government representative – Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)	
Deborah Potts	Active Gloucestershire	

2 LAST MEETING

2.1 Action notes

The notes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016 were agreed.

2.2 Actions arising

a) Budget 2017-18 positions

Information had been circulated summarising the budget positions for Leadership Gloucestershire partners.

Cllr Dave Norman reported that Gloucester City Council were lobbying for extra funding through Richard Graham MP. A meeting was due to be held with Minister the following Monday (20 February 2017).

Martin Surl reported that the Police and Crime Panel had endorsed a 1.99% increase in the Police precept.

It was understood that the Government would be making a final announcement on local government funding on 22 February 2017.

b) Business Rates Retention Scheme

David Hagg provided an update on the latest position. The Government had indicated that pilot schemes would be run in a number of areas. Gloucestershire was well placed to be involved with a single business rates' pool already in place and co-terminous public sector boundaries. The Gloucestershire MPs were likely to be supportive.

Action – David Hagg

c) Employment Skills Award

An update on funding available through the Employment and Skills Board would be provided following the meeting.

Action – Simon Harper (to advise Pete Carr GCC)

3 GLOUCESTERSHIRE MOVES

Cllr Mark Hawthorne welcomed Deborah Potts, Chief Executive of Active Gloucestershire.

Mary Hutton introduced the item, noting that being active had significant benefits for people's wellbeing. This not only related to good health but also to reduced demand for social care, independent living and better employment opportunities. Sport England would be supporting 10 pilot programmes across the country with funding available over four years. There was potential for Gloucestershire to attract as much as £13m in public funding.

Deborah Potts made a PowerPoint presentation providing background to Gloucestershire Moves and setting out the ambitions for the county. She

believed that it could be a flagship programme for Vision 2050. There was an opportunity for the county to become a national role model through a new approach to physical activity. The modelling showed potential savings to the county of £1.285bn over 10 years (health £9m, social care £12m, transport £103m, productivity £1.162m).

The aim was that by 2050 Gloucestershire would be the most active county in the country, physical activity would be the norm and the county would be known as a tourist destination for sport and physical activity.

Leadership Gloucestershire partners recognised the links between Gloucestershire Moves and Vision 2050. Vision 2050 would be looking at the future design and location of housing in the county and would include a vision for the use of the landscape and leisure. Without change, the county would 'drift' with an increasingly aging population, fewer economically active people and poor business productivity.

Answering questions, Deborah confirmed that an audit had taken place of activities across the county. She believed that the county's position was strong but she recognised that there were areas where funds were not necessarily being used in the right way with the duplication of activities and wasted resources. She said that discussions had been held with the district councils and an agreement had been reached on the support for year one. Funding was also being sought from other public sector partners, although the sums involved were not large. Private sector organisations were being approached and Deborah was confident that they would provide financial sponsorship.

Partners asked Deborah to look again at the financial model for the programme as the benefits for health and social care looked low in comparison with the other areas identified. More detailed information was required on how the programme related to the public sector (for example the healthy living agenda). It was important for partners to understand the impact of the programme on their own priorities.

It was hoped that the programme would learn from best practice elsewhere. Suffolk, for example, had been particularly successful in engaging with local communities through parish and town councils. Deborah explained that one of the key strands of activity for Gloucestershire Moves was capacity building for smaller organisations, such as parish councils, to allow them to participate in the programme.

In terms of the ambitions for the programme, partners suggested that specific targets should be identified rather than stating that Gloucestershire would become the most physically active in the country.

There was support for the programme amongst Leadership Gloucestershire partners and it was agreed that the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) should have a primary role in governance. It was noted that the programme fitted well under the HWB's Prevention and Self-care Group.

It was agreed that Jon McGinty would work with Mary Hutton and Deborah Potts to clarify the governance of the programme, including how the interests of the district councils would be addressed.

Action – Jon McGinty and Mary Hutton

4 POLICING AND CRIME ACT 2017

A paper had been circulated from the Police and Crime Commissioner setting out the current position.

Martin Surl invited Ruth Greenwood, one of the policy officers at the Commissioner's Office, to provide a briefing on the provisions included in the Policing and Crime Act 2017 which had received Royal Assent on 31 January 2017.

Ruth made a PowerPoint presentation covering the background to the Act including the Conservative manifesto pledge and the consultation undertaken by the Government. She explained that the purpose of the Act was to further reform policing and enable important changes to the governance of fire and rescue services.

The Act included a duty for emergency services to collaborate but did not prescribe how this should happen locally. It provided an opportunity for Police and Crime Commissioners to submit a business case for the fire and rescue service in their area to come under the remit of the Commissioner's Office. A number of Commissioners had already announced their intention to explore local business cases. A range of models were available for the governance of the police and the fire and rescue service under the Commissioner's Office.

Martin stated that he did not have a strong view on whether the fire and rescue service would be better placed under the remit of the Commissioner's Office. He said that he was not prepared to spend council taxpayers' money on exploring a local business case. However, funding was available from the Home Office through the Police and Transformation Fund for this purpose. He had been informed that around £100,000 would be available for exploring a local business case. This would allow the public to be consulted on what was best for Gloucestershire. The consultation would be undertaken later in the year (after the Purdah period for the County Council election in May).

Martin did not expect a business case to be submitted until the Autumn at the earliest. His understanding was that only the Commissioner could submit a business case but Ruth undertook to check the position with the Home Office.
Action – Ruth Greenwood

Cllr Mark Hawthorne noted that fire and rescue services that were integrated within local authorities, such as Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service, were in a very different position to standalone fire and rescue authorities. He said that Gloucestershire County Council had been working with local authorities in a similar position to make a strong case for fire and rescue services to be retained. He explained that a piece of work had been commissioned highlighting the benefits in Gloucestershire of the fire and rescue service remaining within the Council. Council officers would be sharing information on the fire and rescue service, including the outcome of the work that been undertaken, with the Commissioner's Office. He said that the Council strongly supported the retention of Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service.

Other partners were concerned that different views would emerge on the future governance of Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service. They noted the importance of involving South Western Ambulance Service in any collaborative arrangements. They were anxious that the Commissioner's consultation involved partners from across the public sector and hoped that a consensus could be reached on the best approach for Gloucestershire.

Martin was requested to keep Leadership Gloucestershire updated on developments and provide an opportunity for the Police and Crime Panel, which included members from the seven councils, to scrutinise the local business case.

Action – Martin Surl and Simon Harper

Martin also made a statement about the reason why he had withdrawn from membership of the Gloucestershire Road Safety Partnership. He explained that legal advice had been given to Commissioners across the country regarding concerns about the way road safety partnerships had been established. Cllr Hawthorne noted that Martin was the only Commissioner to date who had withdrawn from a local road safety partnership.

5 GROWING GLOUCESTERSHIRE

Mike Dawson presented a report on options for Strategic Planning collaboration. He recognised the benefits of appointing a Planning Commissioner and adopting a more flexible approach to providing resources for strategic planning. This did not necessarily mean a shared service but would allow a more joined-up approach and provide greater capacity across the county. Any new arrangements would not impact in any way on the sovereignty of individual planning authorities.

Appropriate governance arrangements would be needed and the Economic Growth Joint Committee was well placed for this role as its membership included the Council Leaders.

It was recognised that more detailed work was required to reach a consensus on the shape of the new arrangements. With most district councils recently adopting local plans, there was an opportunity to put joint arrangements in place before work started on reviewing plans.

It was evident that there remained a great deal of frustration amongst house builders and businesses about the lack of strategic planning coordination across the county. Planning was often seen by businesses as a barrier to expanding their activities in the county. Significantly more houses and job opportunities were required otherwise young people would leave Gloucestershire and go to neighbouring areas that were more economically active.

In light of the strategic importance of the Planning Commissioner role, Cllr Mark Hawthorne offered to match the funding provided by the district councils, even though the County Council was not responsible for developing local plans. He took the opportunity to congratulate Cheltenham BC, Gloucester City and Tewkesbury BC on adopting the Joint Core Strategy. He recognised how challenging the process had been but showed the benefits of local authorities working together on development plans.

Leadership Gloucestershire partners recognised the weaknesses around strategic planning across the county. The officer working group, including a representative from GFirst LEP, would consider the best approach and report to the next meeting.

Action – Mike Dawson

6 NEXT STEPS

Leadership Gloucestershire partners recorded their thanks to Suzette Davenport, the Chief Constable, for all her work in the county and sent her their best wishes for the future.

Action – Cllr Mark Hawthorne and Simon Harper (letter to Suzette Davenport)

7 2017 MEETING DATES

1 June – 11am

27 July – 10am

26 October – 10am

14 December – 10am