

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 7PM ON WEDNESDAY 16 JANUARY 2018
BOURGES VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Councillors H Fuller (Chairman), J Bull (Vice-Chairman), A Ali, R Brown, N Simons, J R Fox, D King, L Serluca, A Ellis, E Murphy, Parish Councillor N Boyce, Parish Council Co-opted Member

Also Present: Councillor I Walsh Cabinet Member for Communities

Officers in Attendance: Wendi Ogle-Welbourn Corporate Director: People & Communities
Will Patten Service Director: Commissioning
Oliver Hayward Assistant Director: Commissioning
Rob Hill Assistant Director: Communities & Safety
Matt Oliver Team Manager: Youth in Localities
Jane McDaid Head of Peterborough Property Services
Caroline Rowan Communities Estates Manager
Joanna Morley Democratic Services Officer

36. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from. Councillor Martin, Councillor Shaheed and Councillor Hussain. Councillor Ellis attended as substitute for Councillor Martin and Councillor Murphy attended as substitute for Councillor Hussain.

37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS

Councillor Bull, as a member of the judiciary, declared an in interest in item 5 on the agenda, the portfolio progress report of the Cabinet Member for Communities, where it referenced the Peterborough Enforcement Service (PES), Reducing Offending and the Safer Peterborough Partnership (SPP). Councillor Bull also declared an interest in item 6 on the agenda, the Community Asset Transfer Report, as she was a trustee of St. John's Hall. Councillor Fuller declared an interest in item 6 as he was a trustee of Thorney Society which subleased the Bedford Hall.

Councillor Simons declared an interest in item 6 as he was a member of Thorney Parish Council and a member of the Bedford Hall Management Committee.

The Chairman advised that as the Community Asset Transfer report affected all wards, many of the committee members would have some interest in their community buildings and that therefore the discussion should be kept at a strategic level rather than referencing individual buildings and ongoing cases.

38. MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14 NOVEMBER 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2017 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

39. CALL IN OF ANY CABINET, CABINET MEMBER OR KEY OFFICER DECISIONS

There were no requests for call-in to consider.

40. PORTFOLIO PROGRESS REPORT: CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report which provided an overview of the work being undertaken under the Communities portfolio.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and asked questions of the Cabinet Member for Communities, the Assistant Director: Communities and Safety and the Team Manager: Youth in Localities. In summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- The report emphasised the need to meet local needs through stronger community engagement. By using volunteers and developing local groups to bring people together, communities could be empowered to take an active role in local problem solving.
- The Cabinet Member previously had the remit for all homelessness but homelessness and housing need had been transferred to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development whilst the Communities portfolio had kept the rough sleepers remit.
- At the last physical count rough sleepers had reduced to 17, however it was estimated that there were actually up to 30 people who slept rough each night in the City, which was an increase on last year's estimate of 23.
- A strategic and tactical focus group had been created to provide active support to individuals as well as looking at longer term approaches to address the issue of rough sleeping.
- Two additional outreach workers had been engaged to offer accommodation and provide support for rough sleepers.
- The Council had been working with voluntary and faith organisations to provide night shelter, severe weather emergency provision (SWEP) and befriending.
- The voluntary sector had been commissioned to provide The Peterborough Community Assistance Scheme (PCAS)
- A number of community hubs had been developed where the Council had worked with the public and partners so that people could come together. The future vision for the hubs was that they would be occupied by multi-agency groups that would help build resilient communities that could deal with local issues and needs.
- The cohesion team had continued to build excellent community links which had enabled Peterborough to avoid some of the issues faced by other cities.
- The Syrian resettlement programme had been supported incredibly well by residents of Peterborough and this partnership work had been recognised as one of the finalists for the Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) Annual Service Awards 2017.
- Peterborough had been selected as one of five cities to participate in the Inclusive Cities project which was an externally funded project which aimed to tackle social inclusion.
- The PES (Peterborough Enforcement Service) had been developing its staff to be multi-skilled so that they were better equipped to deal with people's needs.

- Many measures had been taken to ensure that the Council maintained a close working relationship with their enforcement partner, Kingdom. If a complaint was about how an enforcement notice was issued then it was directed to Kingdom but if the complaint was about why an enforcement notice had been issued then the complaint was directed to the Council for review. Any escalation of a complaint was also sent to the Council.
- The Inclusive Cities project was funded by the Paul Hamlin Society and so Peterborough's participation in the project did not require any additional funding from the Council. The project was an opportunity to share best practice and to develop future projects.
- All buildings would be considered as possible locations for future community hubs as the geographical location of these hubs would be vital to ensure that both the community and the multi-disciplinary services could easily access them.
- Councillors cautioned against hubs being led by the police service as there were people who would use hubs but not if they developed into replacements for police stations.
- Hubs were not intended as a replacement for police stations and were not designed for the police to be there full time. Instead hubs were a place where the police could drop in and where residents could access police services as a part of multi-agency provision.
- A mobile hub which visited rural parishes of the City was also suggested.
- The large spike in the November figures for the amount of Fixed Penalty Notices issued reflected the Christmas shopping period and the larger footfall that was in the City Centre at that time.
- Councillors commended the work being done by youth services and felt that the excellent achievements of Peterborough's young people should be much more widely publicised.
- The Youth Service was operating in a rapidly changing landscape with very little direction nationally around youth policy and was having to adjust, as was the trend nationally in many areas, to more community led provision. The Youth service was having to put in place officers that could co-ordinate, support and enable rather than actively deliver services.
- The development of the community hubs could provide the Council with an opportunity and a vehicle with which to promote youth services and the schemes that were available.
- It had been a cross party decision to replace the rural commission with parish council co-opted members that sat on each of the scrutiny committees. This had been an attempt for parish councils to contribute to live policy rather than being a re-active body. Parish councils had a further degree of input through the Parish Council Liaison meeting.
- The Community Safety Strategy had had scrutiny support and had been amended to better highlight and prioritise local issues such as anti-social behaviour and environmental issues, before going to full Council in March.
- Members requested more information on the volunteering schemes that had been put in place to support victims of domestic abuse.
- The government had directed that the Prevent programme, which was concerned with radicalisation, was better suited to being led by local councils as there may have been some blockers to its success with the Police leading it. The target for this handover was between September and December 2018 and PCC had already started on the process of restructuring and owning this scheme. Officers would look to update the Committee on its progress later in the year.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee considered and scrutinised the report and **RESOLVED** to endorse the approach being taken under the portfolio of the Cabinet Member for Communities and requested that:

1. The Team Manager: Youth In Localities provides a briefing note for the Committee outlining in greater detail the work being done by youth services and how they were adapting to the changing landscape and the move to the co-ordination of more community led youth provision, rather than Council delivery of services.
2. The Cabinet Member for Communities provides a briefing note detailing the volunteering work done to support victims of domestic abuse.
3. The Assistant Director: Communities and Safety, at an appropriate time later in the year, provides a briefing note for the Committee giving an update on the progress made with the transfer of responsibility to the Council of the Prevent agenda and the resource allocated to it.

41. COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFER REPORT

The Cabinet Member for Communities introduced the report which was presented to the Committee in order for them to review the progress made to date regarding community asset transfers and to agree the direction of travel for the future management of community buildings.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and asked questions of the Cabinet Member, the Head of Peterborough Property Services and the Communities Estate Manager. In summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- The Cabinet Member felt that it was important for this report to come before the Committee.
- The Community Asset Transfer (CAT) scheme had been running since 2013 and there had been difficult and complex issues in implementing the scheme. Progress had been slow but it was hoped that it would move more rapidly from this point onwards.
- Members of the CAT working group realised that they needed to narrow the options available for taking on a community asset. The option to develop a Trust model to hold community assets not transferring was no longer a viable option to take forward as only a small number of buildings fell under this model. Instead, where an existing community organisation did not wish to pursue a formal asset transfer, any sites that become vacant would be offered to other community groups within the City who had expressed an interest in owning and occupying a community venue.
- It was hoped that the simplification of the programme would help move things forward at a quicker pace.
- As community centres were a fundamental resource for neighbourhoods, Councillors stressed that they did not want a quicker pace for the CAT scheme to in any way jeopardise these buildings and residents' access to them.
- In response to claims that some buildings that had already transferred had been saddled with unforeseen bills and repairs officers stressed that the Council did not want to see any of the community groups fail to successfully manage the buildings and would do its utmost to make sure that they succeeded.
- Councillors questioned whether community volunteers had the necessary skills and capacity to manage a community building and asked what safeguards and reassurances were in place for those who took on the management role.
- Some community buildings were very well run and making a profit whilst others were run on a shoestring and had become very isolated and intractable and officers had not been able to get in contact with them to offer help. The Council offered free and impartial legal

advice to community organisations and also kept a watchful eye on how they were progressing. Additionally the Charities Commission was available to help with accounts.

- Officers were very keen to pursue Councillor involvement and ideally would like to see all Councillors within a ward appointed to the board of a community centre. This would strengthen the group's skills hopefully allowing them to better represent their communities and additionally give them a route to feed into the Council if any intervention was required.
- The decision to withdraw the trust model option was taken as there was only a very small number interested in it and there was concern that a centralised trust would take away from the whole idea of local community use and empowerment. For those groups who did not want to take on that additional financial responsibility, other voluntary and charitable organisations that were interested in taking over the management of a centre would be approached and it was hoped they would work with the current community group to strengthen that association. Partnership with other charities therefore might be a more viable and successful option for some groups.
- The alternative option to the trust option was being offered as a way of keeping the buildings open and the community groups active; it would just be the management of the buildings that would change. In this way buildings could be safeguarded for community use and officers reiterated that there was no intention to close any of them.
- It was proposed that all existing community management organisations of buildings should confirm their intentions around community asset transfer by 31st March 2018. Officers stressed that this deadline was for groups to decide a direction of travel and give an indication of their aspirations rather than getting them to sign a binding contract.
- Members expressed concern that when existing management committees decided not to take on the building, that the community centres should not be sold to other community organisations without a proper asset valuation being conducted in case they were then sold on for profit.
- When buildings were transferred under the CAT scheme there was no intention that they would be closed and the land sold off as there was a use lease clause in the contract saying that the building must be used for community use. If there was a transfer of leasehold then there was a covenant which outlined the same restriction.
- Officers felt that a number of associations had not arranged meetings to discuss the CAT scheme and that there needed to be some rigour to the process. If groups had not indicated a direction by the March deadline then it was a clear indication that they were not interested in or not acting as an association.
- The Chair of Community Action Peterborough (CAP) who was present at the meeting, was invited to speak and told the Committee that they had been waiting for more information on the Trust model before they made a decision and had only been informed in the last week that this option was not now going forward. A request for flexibility on the March deadline was made as it was felt that not everyone was aware that it was just an indication that was required by this time and because most committees only met monthly.
- After the last CAT meeting, it was agreed that the best way forward would be to write letters to every centre to make clear the changes to the CAT scheme and the options available, and to copy in all ward councillors so that they too were aware of these changes and were fully informed.
- The Chair of CAP wanted to highlight that officers from PCC and members of CAP were working together and that although the information that was presented at the forum was received negatively by some, most members respected the honesty with which questions were answered and felt that it was the biggest step forward that they had made.

ACTIONS AGREED:

The Committee scrutinised the report and requested that:

1. Officers provide a briefing note to members outlining what roles Councillors can take to support community assets and what their responsibilities would be.
2. A further report outlining the progress made regarding community asset transfers be presented at the July meeting of the Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Committee scrutinised and noted the report and **RESOLVED** to recommend that;

1. That the Community Asset Transfer programme and its current approach be continued but that the March deadline be extended in order that Community organisations had longer to consider and confirm their intentions around community asset transfer.

42. ADULT SOCIAL CARE COMMISSIONING ARRANGEMENTS

The Service Director and Assistant Director of Commissioning introduced the report which provided the Committee with further information on the commissioning arrangements within Adult Social Care and which followed on from two reports received at the previous meeting which had outlined the impact of the Transformation and Savings programme and the current performance of Adult Social Care.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- There were three main areas covered in the report; strategic commissioning, the operational elements and their governance arrangements.
- Strategically the whole approach around commissioning was prevention and intervention specifically to help people remain independent and in their own homes for longer.
- The methodology was to manage the market and take a collaborative approach not just with the provider organisations but also with the Health sector to provide a joined up approach and to make sure the right services were commissioned.
- Operationally, strategic decisions were enacted through re-tender service improvement plans with providers and ultimately through the re-contracting arrangements.
- There had been some real rigour put around the governance arrangements in the last twelve months and these took a number of forms:
 1. The arrangement with Health to manage the better Care Fund (BCF) was done through the integrated commissioning board which linked to the Strategic Transformation Programme (STP).
 2. There was a joint commission board with partners in Cambridgeshire County Council which managed the decisions made around strategic and operational commissioning and provided very effective scrutiny from business partners in Finance, Legal and HR.
 3. Peterborough also had seven partnership boards: Careers Partnership Board, Older Peoples Partnership Board, Learning Disabilities Partnership Board, Mental Health Stakeholder Group, Autism Board, Physical Disability Board and Sensory Impairment Board. These boards were made up of service users and advocates of the users to make sure their voices were heard in the decision making process.

4. There were independent arrangements with Healthwatch Peterborough and Cambridgeshire that provided effective scrutiny for decisions made on health services.
 5. A Quality and Improvement Safeguarding Team had been developed recently. This team worked primarily with domiciliary care agencies and care home providers, in partnership with the QCC, to look at, on a case by case basis, those areas that needed improvement. This scrutiny prepared providers for their next inspection but also ensured that the level of care in Peterborough was of a good quality. There has been a marked improvement in care levels, with 80% of people who were in a care home now being in one that was of good or better quality. This was notable when compared with other eastern county counterparts who did not perform as well.
- The Community Resilience Strategy outlined how community partners worked together to combat isolation and loneliness and to make sure that what was commissioned was needed and addressed specific needs rather than just buying units of care off the shelf.
 - The Winter Plan had been developed with partners in Health and was largely financed by the Better Care Fund. The Plan made sure that there was investment in front line services such as the discharge and reablement teams and also ensured that there was additional capacity in the market so that when people were discharged from hospital and needed extra longer term care that it was available.
 - The success of the Winter Plan so far could be measured by the DTOC (Delayed transfers of care) target which was 3.5%, measured by NHS and Adult Social Care contributable delays. Peterborough was well within this target coming within the top quartile nationally, and were under a fair amount of positive scrutiny from other local Authorities who wanted to see how Peterborough had approached its Winter Plan. The Director of Commissioning wanted to highlight that operational teams were doing a fantastic job in contributing to this achievement.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee RESOLVED to note the contents of the report.

43. FORWARD PLAN OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan of Executive Decisions, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the forthcoming month. 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 of Executive Decisions.

44. WORK PROGRAMME 2017 – 2018

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2016/17 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the work programme for 2017/18

45. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

- 20 February Joint Scrutiny Of The Budget
- 13 March Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee

CHAIRMAN
7.00pm - 8.53pm