

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE
BOURGES & VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

19 JANUARY 2011

Present: Councillors Todd (Chairman), C Burton, Simons, Peach, JR Fox and Goldspink

Co-Opted Member: Ansar Ali – Cambridgeshire Police Authority

Also Present: Councillor Sandford Representing the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group
Sam McLean Head of Public Participation and Citizen Power Peterborough, RSA
Benedict Dellot Researcher, RSA
Louise Thomas Senior Researcher, RSA

Officers in Attendance: Paul Phillipson Executive Director - Operations
Adrian Chapman Head of Neighbourhood Services
Julie Rivett Neighbourhoods and Community Engagement Strategic Manager
Karen Kibblewhite Safer Peterborough Manager – Cutting Crime
Graeme Clark Project Lead for Citizens Power: Peterborough
Paulina Ford Performance Scrutiny and Research Officer
David O'Connor Long Solicitor

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies had been received from Councillor Day and Councillor Peach was in attendance as substitute.

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

The following declarations of interest were made:

Item 8 – Citizen Power Peterborough - Project Initiation Document

As the report had made reference to the Peterborough Environment City Trust Councillor Sandford declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Board of the Peterborough Environment City Trust.

3. Minutes of meeting held on 10 November 2010

The minutes of the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 10 November 2010 were approved as a correct record subject to the correction of the spelling of Paul Phillipson's last name on page 2.

4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

There were no requests for Call-in to consider.

5. Portfolio Progress Report from Cabinet Member

Councillor Walsh Cabinet member for Community Cohesion and Community Safety was unable to attend the meeting and had sent her apologies. In the absence of Councillor Walsh Adrian Chapman, Head of Neighbourhood Services presented the Portfolio Progress Report on her behalf. The portfolio given to Councillor Walsh was newly created at the beginning of the municipal year and covered Community Cohesion and Community Safety.

Community Safety crime rates had continued to reduce in the city year on year with an overall reduction of 9%. The areas that were still of concern was violent crime and domestic violence. The work of the Cohesion team was overseen by the Cohesion Board and a Cohesion Plan for 2010/11 had been agreed along with a set of priorities. The planning and preparation for the demonstrations that took place in the City in December 2010 had been a particular success for the Cohesion team. The future in relation to cohesion was about how the agenda could be taken forward within the context of a reducing budget and the team would be looking creatively at how this work would continue.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Violent Crime – the report had stated that there had been a slight increase in violent crime and suggested that it might have been as a direct result of police activity where they were targeting those getting drunk earlier in the evening. Members wanted to know why this was happening. *Officers advised that the words in the report had not given an accurate explanation. The reality was that increased police activity had been aimed at tackling crime relating to the night time economy and as a result of that there had been increased reports of violent crime so it had not been a direct result of police intervention but a result of increased police activity which detects violent crime.*
- Financial resources to the Police and Council were being cut so how would this affect dealing with low level Anti social behaviour (ASB). *The cuts on the budget across the public sector had forced officers to look creatively at how they dealt with ASB across the City. A new approach to ASB was to combine pieces of legislation and resources in terms of the people delivering that legislation e.g. Police, Local Authority, Cross Keys. The economies of scale that came out of that would help to maintain a focus on ASB at low level and above. The Head of Neighbourhood Services advised that he would provide the Committee with a table showing the amount of ASB related interventions that had been taken through the court system which was the highest it had been for some time. There was an intention to maintain this level of performance by better engagement with Members to understand where the problems were in their wards.*
- Members wanted to know if the Cohesion Board could include an additional priority which looked at the exploitation of tenants in rented accommodation. *Officers advised that the current plan was drawing to a close. The restructure of the neighbourhood service would bring the Cohesion Manager into the Neighbourhood Service team which would provide a better working relationship between teams that covered housing and housing related issues. This work was already being picked up through the relevant housing teams.*
- Was there legislation to protect tenants? *Yes there was. The report that would come to the Committee at a future meeting on the Cohesion Strategy and Action Plan would include the work being done around tenants and landlords.*
- Members suggested holding a celebration cohesion event for those people in the community who were not normally recognised and who had helped to achieve the successful outcome at the recent demonstration march. *Adrian Chapman welcomed and thanked the Committee for the suggestion and would speak to the Cohesion Manager about organising such an event and report back to the Committee through the Scrutiny Officer.*

The Chair acknowledged the good work that had been achieved under the portfolio of Councillor Walsh.

ACTIONS AGREED

- (i) To note the current progress on the portfolio for Community Cohesion and Community Safety.

That the Head of Neighbourhood Services:

- (ii) Contacts the Community Cohesion Manager to discuss the organisation of a celebratory event for people from the local communities who had helped to ensure community cohesion during the demonstrations in the City in December.
- (iii) Circulate to the Committee via the Scrutiny Officer a table showing the amount of ASB related interventions that had been taken through the court system.
- (iv) Includes in the report on the Cohesion Strategy and Action Plan work being done around tenants and landlords.

6. Safer Peterborough Partnership Adult Drug Treatment Plan 2011-2014

Karen Kibblewhite, the Safer Peterborough Manager for Cutting Crime introduced the report. The report included the draft Adult Drug Treatment Plan 2011-14 and the draft Adult Drug Needs Assessment 2010/2011. The plan was based on the Adult Drug Needs Assessment which showed what was happening with drug use in the city and where there was a need to focus treatment services. A detailed plan would then be submitted to the National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse (NTA) where the majority of funding came from and would be for a period of three years. There was no draft budget allocation as this had not yet been received from the Department of Health. The plan had been sent for consultation through local stakeholders, specialist service providers, the service user group -SUGA and the Adult Joint Commissioning Group for Drugs and would also go to the Safer Peterborough Board. The plan only covered adults over 18 and drug use.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Is there a link to the Citizens Power programme? *There was a link and the two would support each other and be aligned.*
- Can some of the work for drugs treatment be funded partly by this new Social Impact Bond initiative? *The prison received a separate pot of money and they had to do a similar piece of work with a needs assessment and treatment plan. The Social Impact Bond was a national pilot working with adult male offenders released from prison after less than 12 months in custody. The work would address a range of issues around their offending behaviour and around the resettlement path ways but would not pick up things that would ordinarily be picked up through the drug treatment. Officers were working very closely with the Social Impact Bond by sharing information and making sure there was no duplicate work. Officers made sure that people accessing services through the community were able to pick up and continue there treatment in the prison and visa versa when they come out.*
- How would recent announcements about closures of some of the GP surgeries affect the action plan regarding shared care arrangements with GPs? *The piece of work around shared care arrangements was being led by the Primary Care Trust (PCT). The Council would work very closely with the PCT over the next 12 to 18 months as they also had to consider the move towards GP commissioning as well as the GP closures, The money which currently comes down for drug treatment would be ring fenced.*
- Members requested that in future reports there should be a glossary for all the abbreviations?

The Chair thanked Karen Kibblewhite for the excellent piece of work completed by officers on producing the draft Adult Drug Treatment Plan 2011-14 and the draft Adult Drug Needs Assessment 2010/2011.

ACTION AGREED

To note the progress and work completed on the Adult Drug Treatment Plan and Adult Drug Needs Assessment 2010/2011.

The Chair requested on behalf of the Committee that item 8 was presented before item 7 on the agenda.

7. Citizens Power Programme - Civic Health and Peterborough Curriculum Strands

The Head of Neighbourhood Services introduced the officers from the Royal Society of Arts who were in attendance to help present the report. Graeme Clark introduced the report and gave a brief overview of the Citizens Power Programme. The report informed the Committee of two strands which were Civic Health and Peterborough Curriculum. The Civic Health Strand was about a new way of building community spirit and the Peterborough Curriculum Strand was about connecting what we learn with where we live.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Members wanted to know if the Peterborough Curriculum strand was duplicating what was already being done across the City. *Officers advised that this strand provided added value to what was already being done and was the key to improving educational standards in Peterborough. The first added value was that the project focused on the curriculum; the guided learning that took place in schools on a day to day basis. The government was freeing up to 60% of the curriculum in schools to enable more flexibility on how it could be delivered. The project was focusing on five pilot schools by going really deep and finding out what children in these schools really needed. The second added value was a mapping exercise to identify all the excellent work that was going on in all of the schools across Peterborough. The map of all of the activities would then highlight any gaps or overlaps in areas of work that would need to be focused on. The third added value was providing the capacity to ensure schools lined with other schools, local businesses, heritage centres and other places to enrich the lives of the children.*
- How would the work carry on when the project finished given that we did not have the resources? *Louise Thomas from the RSA advised Members that the difference with an Area based Curriculum approach was that it was about local people from the local community sitting down with schools to design the local curriculum and it was about working with local businesses to help deliver the curriculum. Sustainability was about the way of doing things not about funding. One example that is being worked on at the moment was with the Cathedral on a project where the Cathedral facades could be used to teach maths and geometry. The Peterborough Football Club had worked with students on literacy.*
- Members felt that the curriculum outcomes were vague and had no supporting data. *Officers advised that they were currently gathering information which would form the baseline data and once this was gathered they would be able to put figures to the outcomes. Mel Collins advised that the examination data would be used as baseline data and that she would be looking at the end of years one and two at the impact of this project on children's literacy and numeracy outcomes.*
- Members felt that the funding for the project would be better spent on improving standards.
- Can we have a breakdown of funding for this programme? *Sam McLean advised Members that the money generated was £250K from Peterborough City Council, £250K from the Arts Council, £250k from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, £35K from the Tudor Trust and a further additional funding of between £250K to £750K was expected to be generated for the programme.*
- Where does the Arts Council generating its funding from? *Generally from the subscription of the RSA Fellows. A proportion of the money would come from tax payers' money.*

- Your report stated that in finding out where these projects had been tried in other areas of the country one of the outcomes from the health strand was a survey done by IPSOS Mori. The Primary Care Trust already does these kind of surveys so why did we have to come to the RSA to do a survey or we could go directly to IPSOS Mori? *One of the major consequences of the cuts to local government was the abolition of the place survey which was used to get a sense of what Civic health was like in Peterborough however the City needs a tool to collect similar information that was collected by the Place Survey. This tool will be better as it would be focused on capabilities which make it different to other surveys. It looks at what capacity or capability an individual or community have to get involved in their communities and that is where the Civic pulse will add massive value. Not everyone has the capability to take part in the Big Society and this needs to be acknowledged. The survey is a diagnostic tool to help the Authority identify areas which are in most need. The RSA has expertise in research in public participation and IPSOS Mori have expertise in designing surveys and undertaking them that is why the RSA working with them.*
- The Council is developing the Neighbourhood Council initiative and the Neighbourhood Managers are working out in the community so why do we need a separate process? *The reality is that they are not separate and the development of the whole ethos of Neighbourhood Councils was to really push the agenda of Neighbourhood Councils around the Big Society and Localism. However they would need hard evidence to take it forward and this programme would help Neighbourhood Councils to achieve this.*
- When reading about projects that are proposed by the Citizens Power programme they are ideas that do not seem to have been suggested by local people. Reading the programme it would appear to be written by people who are not listening to what the people of Peterborough want. The language of the programme is a problem for people to understand. *Sam McLean advised that a lot of the RSA communications could be problematic for some people and that needed to be looked at and changed to meet the needs of local people. These projects were the culmination of four months intensive research which included 25 interviews with people working in public services in the City, five workshops with local people to get a sense of what their issues were and data already available. The work being done would have a positive impact on local people. The Civic Commons project has massive potential and was based on types of participation practice that had been very successful in America, Sweden and Finland and comprised of three parts. The first part was a public deliberation forum bringing 30 people together with experts that the RSA could leverage in to see how they could learn from the experts. The second part was capacity building and the group would work with the Parliamentary outreach team who would give them campaigning skills. The third was about building a network that grew.*
- The system of local government in America and Sweden would be different to here and therefore the Civic Commons would have more interest there. *The direction of local government here was moving in a similar way. Civic Commons was about how we build together with the voluntary sector and the public on the work that we currently want to deliver.*
- Are you committed to involving Members of this Committee in the different strands? Some Members advised that they had only had one initial meeting with the Project Manager and no contact since. *Adrian Chapman advised Members that officers were absolutely committed to engaging with Members and that the Project Manager had tried to engage individually with each member of the Committee. The Project Manager responded by saying that he accepted Members comments and that more work needed to be done on engaging with them.*
- Mel Collins commented that the Governance for the Curriculum Project was the Enjoy and Achieve Partnership and they met monthly and had a newsletter which included information on the Curriculum Project. Mel Collins invited a Councillor from the Committee to be on the Enjoy and Achieve Partnership and would circulate through the Scrutiny Officer the news letter which gave a regular up date on the Curriculum Project. Councillor Collins advised that he was the Councillor for the Curriculum Strand.

- Why was the project seen as a priority when there were public expenditure cuts? *The Curriculum Project was about getting more funding and resources and linking things up that already exist.*

ACTION AGREED

That officers of the Royal Society of Arts and Peterborough City Council should proactively engage and communicate with all Councillors and in particular Members of the Committee assigned to each strand. The purpose of this would be to ensure Members had a clear understanding of the aims, objectives and outcomes of the Citizens Power Programme.

8. Citizens Power Programme - Project Initiation Document (PID)

Graeme Clark introduced the report and reminded the Committee that the Project Initiation Document (PID) had been requested by the Committee at its last meeting and that Councillor Goldspink had agreed to work with him on the production of the PID as a critical friend.

Councillor Goldspink had submitted a list of questions prior to the meeting to obtain further information and a written response to these had been provided prior to the meeting.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- What is the history of ownership and sponsorship of this project? Councillor Goldspink had checked the Council's project management record system and it had listed Paul Phillipson as the Project Sponsor and Adrian Chapman as the Project Owner however the draft PID had not listed a project sponsor and Adrian Chapman was listed as the Project Owner with Graeme Clark as the Project Manager. The latest version of the PID stated Adrian Chapman as Project Sponsor and Julie Rivet as Project Owner. *Adrian Chapman advised Members that Kevin Tighe was the original Project Sponsor but there had been several reorganisations since then and that he was now confirmed as Project Sponsor.*
- Why had you not followed the Council's project methodology and produced a PID? *Adrian Chapman informed Members that Officers had worked very closely with the Corporate Project Management team and had been advised that the PID was an optional document.*
- Members requested that the Council Project Team be challenged as to why the PID which was a crucial document was optional as no project should ever be started without a PID. *Adrian Chapman advised that he would go back to the project team and report back to the Committee in between meetings.*
- Members were concerned that the programme had not been treated as a key decision and published in the Forward Plan and wanted to know if it had been the subject of a Cabinet decision. *Paul Phillipson informed Members that the figure of £125K a year for two years, which was the Council's contribution, was set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy which is what is being currently worked to this year. It was therefore part of the budget setting process and ratified at Council. There were several Cabinet members that this comes under and they are kept informed.*
- Members asked the Legal Officer present to confirm that if a project had a value of over £500,000 or affected a significant area of the city it would become a key decision and therefore had to be published in the Forward Plan. If this was the case then the procedure had not been followed. *The Legal Officer informed Members that this was correct but there were several items which went through the Medium Term Financial Strategy and were consulted on and then ratified at Council.*
- Sam McLean advised Members that the programme was not a PCC project but it was a partnership project with the RSA and the Arts Council and therefore needed to be equally accountable to them as well as PCC.
- How many reports on the progress of the programme have been presented for scrutiny to the other two funders? *Members were informed that part of the governance structure of*

the project was to report on a monthly basis on the progress of each of the projects to the Operations and Communications Board. The board consisted of each of the partners. An additional layer of governance was a report on progress to a Senior Management meeting held every quarter which consisted of Matthew Taylor, Chief Executive of RSA, Marco Cereste, Leader of the Council, Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive of PCC and Andrea Stark, Executive Director of the Arts Council, England.

- Have they raised any questions regarding the quality or content of documentation of this project? *Sam McLean informed Members that they had not raised any questions but he sensed that the Committee may not have seen all of the documents for the project including the scoping report. Adrian Chapman advised that all documents for the project were produced in partnership with the RSA and the Arts Council and were signed off before publication.*
- Councillor Goldspink expressed concern about the project and the assumption that Councillors had not read all the documents. *Adrian Chapman advised the Committee that he would carry out a full audit of all documents that had been produced and confirm what had been provided to the Committee.*
- Members wanted to know the outcomes of each project and the cost to ensure it was value for money. Members wanted to ensure that the public agreed that the project was value for money.
- Councillor Goldspink commented that the Citizens Power Programme had already had three opportunities to convince the Committee that the project was worth while and yet the Committee still had to ask the same questions about aims, objectives, outcomes and measures which was not acceptable. He felt that the project should be stopped immediately before the Authority spent any more money as he believed that it did not offer value for money. He proposed that the Committee recommend to the project sponsor that the project be stopped.
- Councillor Burton advised that he supported Councillor Goldspink's proposal.
- Councillor Sandford commented on the fact that Councillor Goldspink had given a press release with regard to his views on stopping the project prior to the Committee meeting and wanted to know if this procedure was correct.
- Councillor Goldspink understood his concerns but commented that everything he had commented on was in the public domain and it was only his desire to raise interest.
- Paul Phillipson thanked the Committee for its effective scrutiny.

Councillor Goldspink requested that his proposal be put to a vote as it had been seconded by Councillor Burton. The proposal was to recommend to the Project Sponsor that the joint venture between the RSA, City Council and Arts Council be disbanded. The reason for the recommendation was that there had been no clear evidence received by the Committee on the aims, objectives, outcomes and measures and therefore the Committee were unable to establish whether the project provided value for money. Councillor Collins, Councillor Todd and Councillor Fox advised that they would prefer to pause the project to allow it to be reviewed. Councillor Burton advised that as Councillor Goldspink had put a proposal forward and it was seconded that it would need to be voted on.

The proposal was put to the vote and four Members (Councillors Peach, Simons, Burton and Goldspink) voted for the proposal and three Members (Councillors Todd, Collins, Fox) voted against, therefore the proposal was carried.

Paul Phillipson expressed his disappointment at the recommendation being put forward and he advised Members that the recommendation would be put to the project sponsors for a decision on whether they wished to continue or not. The Committee would be informed of the outcome when the decision had been made.

RECOMMENDATION

That following consideration by the Committee of the Citizen's Power Programme it is recommended to the Project Sponsor, Adrian Chapman that the Citizens Power Programme,

which is a joint venture between the Royal Society of Arts, Peterborough City Council and the Arts Council, be immediately disbanded.

ACTIONS AGREED

That the Head of Neighbourhood Services and Project Sponsor for the Citizens Power Project:

1. Challenge the Council's Project Team as to why a Project Initiation Document is classed as an optional document under Peterborough City Council project methodology guidelines.
2. Undergo a review of all documentation produced for the Citizen's Power Programme and identify which documents had been presented to Members of the Committee.

9. Establishment of the Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review

The Scrutiny Officer presented the report which informed the Committee of the establishment of a Scrutiny Task and Finish Group to conduct an in-depth review of Neighbourhood Councils. The Task and Finish Group had been formed at the request of the Committee at its meeting on the 10 November 2010. The report listed the members of the Task and Finish Group and the Terms of Reference of the Review for approval.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee agreed:

1. The establishment of a Task and Finish Group to conduct an in-depth review of Neighbourhood Councils
2. The Terms of Reference of the Task and Finish Group
3. The Membership of the Task and Finish Group

10. Neighbourhood Council Review - Initial Report and Recommendations

Councillor Burton lead member of the Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Task and Finish Group presented the report and thanked officers, Members and key witnesses who had taken part in the first part of the review.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Councillor Goldspink requested that the text in the report which referred to survey results from the Neighbourhood Council meetings be amended. It had not been made clear that the responses were made up of a mix of people and not just members of the public. It needed to be made clear that the 36% who had responded were a mix of residents and representatives of other bodies. *Adrian Chapman advised that most of the surveys were completed anonymously but Neighbourhood Managers had informed him that the surveys had been completed predominantly by members of the public. He would recheck the results and change the wording accordingly in the report before being presented to Cabinet.*
- Councillor Sandford commented that he approved of all the recommendations within the report and that he particularly approved of recommendation 5:

That mainstream revenue budgets are disaggregated, wherever possible, feasible and legal, and delegated to Neighbourhood Councils to prioritise and control in order to best meet local needs. To facilitate this as early as possible, a pilot programme should be implemented focussing on a specific part of Council activity before a more expansive roll-out programme.

He had been impressed when the group had interviewed Councillor Cereste and Councillor Seaton and felt that they had expressed a genuine commitment to make Neighbourhood Councils work. *Adrian Chapman advised that he had already had a conversation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and the Head of Corporate Finances about the concept of disaggregating budgets. The Cabinet member for Resources was very keen to see this recommendation taken forward. The recommendation would need to go through Cabinet first but if approved Adrian Chapman would like to start the Pilot at the beginning of the next financial year.*

- Councillor Peach commented that the report had highlighted areas of duplication and in particular with regard to Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Councils. He asked if the group had considered removing Neighbourhood Councils in areas where there were Parish Councils. He also referred to recommendation 7 (That the Community Leadership Fund is maintained at £10,000 per ward, but that 25% of that budget is allocated by Councillors to meet needs identified through the Neighbourhood Council Neighbourhood Planning process). He suggested that the Community Leadership Fund should remain the same in that it be left up to the Ward Councils to decide how this fund should be spent and not have 25% given over to the Neighbourhood Councils. *Councillor Burton responded by clarifying that recommendation 7 did not say that 25% of the Community Leadership Fund would be spent by the Neighbourhood Councils. It meant that Ward Councillors be guided by what they learn at the Neighbourhood Councils and consider using up to 25% of their budget on projects suggested by Neighbourhood Councils. Councillor Burton confirmed that Stage two of the review would be looking at the relationship of Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Councils and would be engaging with Rural Councillors for their feedback. Adrian Chapman advised Members that recommendation 10*

ACTION AGREED

To endorse the recommendations made in the Review of Neighbourhood Councils – Part One report from the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Task and Finish Group and refer them to the Cabinet.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet consider the recommendations at their meeting on 7 February 2011.

11. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the following four months. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Committee's work programme.

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the Forward Plan and agreed that there were no items for further consideration.

12. Work Programme 2010/11

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2010/11 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

ACTION AGREED

To confirm the work programme for 2010/11 and the Scrutiny Officer to make any amendments as discussed during the meeting.

- Citizens Power Programme – response to recommendation made by Committee at tonight's meeting
- Neighbourhood Council Review – Stage 2 Report

13. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 9 March 2011

CHAIRMAN
7.00 - 9.20 pm