

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD AT 4:30PM ON
2 JULY 2020**

VIRTUAL MEETING: PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL'S YOUTUBE PAGE

- Committee Members Present:** Councillors C. Harper (Chairman), K. Aitken, R. Bisby, S. Bond, R. Brown, C. Burbage, G. Casey, A Coles, N. Day, A. Dowson, A. Ellis, John Fox, Judy Fox, S Hemraj, T. J. Howard, J. Howell, M Jamil, D. Jones, A Joseph, S. Lane, D. Over, S. Qayyum, L. Robinson, B. Rush, N Sandford, N. Simons, H. Skibsted, S. Warren, C Wiggin and I. Yasin.
- Co-opted Members:** Co-opted Member Rizwan Rahemtulla
Parish Councillor Junaid Bhatti
Parish Councillor June Bull
Parish Councillor Keith Lievesley
Parish Councillor Neil Boyce
Parish Councillor Susie Lucas
- Also Present:** Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority
Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health
Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Education, Skills and University
Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments
Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance
Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities
Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation
Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation
Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment
Councillor Bashir Cabinet Advisor for Children's Services
- Officers Present:** Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive of Peterborough City Council
Charlotte Black, Service Director: Adults and Safeguarding
Will Patten, Service Director Commissioning
Lou Williams, Service Director, Children and Safeguarding
Jonathan Lewis, Service Director, Education
Adrian Chapman, Service Director for Communities and Partnerships
Dr Liz Robin, Director for Public Health
Steve Cox, Executive Director Place & Economy
Mohamed Hussein, Director, Housing Needs and Supply
Graham Hughes, Service Director, Highways and Transport
Sue Grace, Director, Customer and Digital Services
Amanda Askham, Director of Business Improvement and Development

Peter Carpenter, Acting Corporate Director Resources
 Fiona McMillan, Director of Law and Governance
 Rachel Edwards, Head of Constitutional Services
 Pippa Turvey, Democratic and Constitutional Services Manager
 Paulina Ford, Senior Democratic Services Officer
 Jane Webb, Senior Democratic Services Officer
 Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer
 David Beauchamp, Democratic Services Officer
 Karen S Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer

The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming those members of the public and press who were watching the livestream of the meeting through the Council's YouTube page. Due to government guidance on social distancing, the meeting took place remotely in accordance with current legislation as laid out in the [Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels \(Coronavirus\) \(Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2020](#) which made provision for remote attendance at, and remote access to Council meetings. The meeting was held in accordance with Peterborough City Council's Virtual Meeting Protocol.

The Democratic Services Officer conducted a roll call of Members and Officers in attendance.

6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors S Barkham, J Goodwin and A Ali. Councillor A Joseph was in attendance for Councillor Ali. Apologies were also received from Co-opted Members A Kingsley, P Cantley, F Vettese and C Watchorn.

Councillor Dowson was not confirmed in attendance at the start of the meeting due to IT issues. Councillor Sandford announced he would leave the meeting at 5:30pm.

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS

Councillor J Bull announced she was a Vivacity Trustee. There were no whipping declarations.

8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question From Iftikhar Ahmed	Answered by Mohamed Hussein Director: Housing Needs and Supply
<p>This is regarding North Ward, Peterborough. Would the Council allow for overcrowding in homes during COVID? Specific properties with rogue landlords and overcrowding have been reported to the Council. No social distancing measures are taking place in the local park (Gladstone Park, off Bourges Boulevard) and the bushes and hedges have not been trimmed. A lot of anti-social behaviour is taking place but when issues are reported, the Council uses COVID as a reason for not being able to take any action. As the health and safety of many residents is at risk, I believe the Council should look</p>	<p>In regard to overcrowding, the government guidance when it came out around matters that the local authority should take action on In terms of housing people were related to people who were rough sleeping. There was no guidance issued in respect of moving or transferring people that were in overcrowding or otherwise unsatisfactory conditions. Had that been the guidance, it would have been difficult for us to work on that basis because the numbers that would have been involved would have been simply been too many and it would have overwhelmed the service completely. So we have acted in accordance</p>

<p>properly into any reported issues.</p>	<p>with the guidance in that respect and will continue to do so.</p> <p>In respect of the other matters, I have a prepared response.</p> <p>All PCC shrubs are cut back once a year, once per year. They will have their annual cut following bird nesting season however we will still slide back anything that could be obstructing a public highway. So at the moment it's nesting season so they wouldn't be cut at the moment in any case.</p> <p>We will ask a member of Aragon Direct Services to check the location for any obstructions and have these cut back if required.</p> <p>And further, since the start of COVID, police officers are undertaking regular patrols in the area which includes Gladstone Parks. Any calls received by Peterborough City Council raising concerns around lack of social distancing are passed on to police colleagues. Residents are also encouraged to report incidents at the time they are taking place, direct to the police.</p> <p>Officers from the Prevention and Enforcement Service will liaise with police around the issues you have raised around tackling anti-social behaviour and look at options to promote social distancing messages in the park and in the wider community.</p>
---	--

Members asked why the minutes of the previous Joint Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 20 May had not been included with the agenda for this meeting. Members were advised that it was not normal practice to include minutes at an extraordinary committee meeting and as Joint Scrutiny meetings were extraordinary meetings the minutes would be presented at the next ordinary Scrutiny Committee meeting. The minutes of the last Joint Scrutiny Meeting would be presented to the next Health Scrutiny Committee meeting on 7 July.

9. PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCILS REPOSE TO COVID-19

The Chief Executive of Peterborough City Council introduced the report which provided details of the Council's response to the current Coronavirus pandemic; the progress made on assessing financial, service and community impact. The Council's initial approach to recovery would be covered in more detail at the next meeting.

An overview was given on the report content. The highlight reports were published fortnightly.

The Director for Public Health advised the committee that the government had announced on 24 May that all upper tier councils in England needed to prepare a Local Outbreak Control Plan. This would work with the National Test and Trace system and multi-agency partner organisations to contain COVID - 19 and prevent a second wave of infection. There was a strong focus on social distancing, regular handwashing, self-isolating and testing. Surveillance and monitoring of the situation had improved with daily review data meetings, with information passed to the Outbreak Management Team to interpret and direct relevant local actions.

The plan included governance structures and workforce requirements to monitor and control local outbreaks including care homes, schools, workplaces and other vulnerable population groups. Testing was readily available using the £1m Test and Trace Grant provided to deliver the Local Outbreak Plan which had been published on the Council's website. There was now a Multi-Agency Health Protection Board of Senior Officers and a Member led Outbreak Engagement Board to protect and care for the local communities.

Peterborough had seen a downward trend in cases, hospital admissions and deaths. The current results issued and published by Public Health England (PHE) currently included tests run in local laboratories, mainly hospitals and care homes and focused on people who were ill. Tests booked by individuals themselves - Pillar 2 Tests for residents with symptoms - were carried out in national laboratories which although were previously included in national figures they did not filter into local statistics.

The overall trend was decreasing, and the community was managing the situation well. Pillar 1 cases in Peterborough, those most seriously ill, were below the national average, whereas Pillar 2 cases were above the national average. Peterborough was therefore ascending the table of cases because of the change in the way the Pillar 1 and Pillar 2 results were being published. Parts of Peterborough had higher risk factors such as overcrowding, diversity of languages, higher levels of deprivation and housing containing more residents. Data had been received which confirmed these were the sectors of greatest risk and the Council therefore had to try and protect these groups via campaigns and social media. More community support would be introduced to help with the forthcoming easing of lockdown arrangements due the following weekend.

The Health Scrutiny Committee considered the report section by section and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions were as follows.

Background and Public Health Context

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Members asked what rapid response mechanisms were in place to prevent a second Coronavirus spike, given that Public Health England (PHE) data published 1 July 2020 stated that 148 patients had died in Peterborough City Hospital since the start of the pandemic and that there were nearly 28 cases per 100,000 which placed Peterborough in 11th position nationwide. The Director for Public Health advised that there was some confusion over data published by PHE and further data releases due 2 July 2020 would better confirm Peterborough's position. It was emphasised that Peterborough deaths from Covid-19 had not been high and deaths and hospital admissions were falling. Public behaviour was responsible for the containment of the first wave and all communities needed to continue to play their part by following government advice on social distancing, handwashing and hygiene measures. Testing and self-isolation remained important and

there was guidance available for places of worship, business and parks to keep the community safe.

- The Service Director for Communities and Partnerships reassured Members of arrangements in place for the weekend of the 4 July 2020 which came about following the formation of Rapid Response approach. This was a small team comprising of enforcement officers, environmental health colleagues, the police, communications team and community staff, youth and education officers and representatives from the community who meet daily. They analysed the incoming data and formulated the appropriate response in the relevant locality. As a result, activities were planned from 2 July 2020 in the Millfield area with strong messaging using the LED van and youth workers. Environmental officers were visiting local businesses in both an advisory and enforcement capacity. There were about 30 established group leaders who had been working closely with the council and community messages were delivered via local radio stations. The Rapid Response Team had access to various resources and could react quickly, the same day if necessary.
- Members felt that the power to impose a local lockdown should be given to the Director for Public Health and asked if that case could be made to Central Government to allow more local control. Whilst Directors understood the concerns, they had not been included in discussions surrounding this as local lockdown was not being considered for Peterborough at this time. It anticipated that there would be consultation before a local lockdown was enforced.
- Most outbreaks were confined to settings such as care homes, workplaces or specific premises and in those situations the Council could use local powers under the Health & Safety Act, the Coronavirus Act or routine public health legislation to close premises or enforce isolation and it was hoped using these local powers would prevent national intervention.
- For the Secretary of State to impose a lockdown there would have had to have been a rising trend for some time and remedial action locally would have already commenced.
- The Chief Executive advised that there was a continuing national live debate on the assignment of powers in the event of local lockdown.
- The council would be submitting a request for £3.2m funding from Central Government for sheltering homeless people on 3 July 2020. The final figures for the claim had not been calculated but were based on the costs incurred through the rest centre process. A significant number of people had been resettled into settings appropriate to their needs and there were currently around 48 rough sleepers in The Park Inn. Of these, 20 were eligible for resettlement and it was anticipated that they would be resettled by the end of July. Ongoing assistance for the remaining 28 included repatriation, help to obtain the legal documentation to work and assistance in finding work. The government had recently issued a directive regarding certain ineligible people which created flexibility within the regulations and provided for accommodation and support for a further three months. The government had also indicated that eligible rough sleepers should be housed until the end of March 2021 and follow on short to medium term accommodation was being sought.
- There were 17 rough sleepers remaining on the street, some of whom had never engaged with support services. Some had been accommodated in rest centres and their behaviour had resulted in some of them being asked to leave, however a tolerant approach was adopted and most were given a further opportunity should they re-engage. The remainder had become rough sleepers recently and were not covered by the government directive although it was hoped to extend to them the same opportunities to be accommodated in the rest centres and re-settled.
- Members considered three months a short period of time to find work when over 2m people were unemployed and partner agencies were making a case to have the terms amended. The Light Project (*local faith charity offering support with night shelter and day centre*) had been invited to participate in the Ministry meetings.
- The Director of Public Health confirmed it was very important to have up to date data and communication of data had been improved recently. Several data feeds were received and discussed daily by the Surveillance Group, including regular information from the

Office of National Statistics and COVID-19 information from hospitals and the 111 Service. More detailed anonymised post coded data was also being received.

- Data was based on the date of testing and there could therefore be some delay whilst waiting for test results to come through.
- The Local Outbreak Control Plan included smaller testing arrangements within the results. There were further Pillars of testing, including the anti-body testing, and a research Pillar.

Test and Trace

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Mass testing of those without symptoms had proved helpful in healthcare settings with a high density of cases, however consideration would need to be given to resources required to test within settings with a lower density of cases. Mass testing of the population would in theory identify those infected who could then isolate to contain the virus however practicality remained the issue, given the relatively low numbers of infections.
- Within the Local Outbreak Plan the Incident Management Team, led by PHE Communicable Disease Specialists, would consider the appropriate response required if a cluster or a high number of cases was identified within a workplace. Testing of all workers would be an option and testing facilities could be deployed very quickly.
- Information was received from Contact Tracing which indicated that self-isolation negatively influenced the spread of the virus, it was important that those contacted by Test and Trace agents complied with the need to self-isolate as required although only a proportion of those people would develop symptoms.
- Negotiations were not currently in progress with Leicester Council on their lockdown and travel arrangements however the Director for Public Health agreed to investigate issues relating to the local lockdown in Leicester and the impact of travel between Peterborough and Leicester.
- Members were concerned that a number of large families had visited Leicester in the last two weeks which had the potential of increasing the cases in Peterborough, particularly if visits were repeated.
- Trained staff already existed within the health care system who had experience of Track and Trace functions within their existing roles.
- Front line intervention required additional support for Environmental Health Officers and staff would be trained to fulfil this role and work on prevention and control in high risk areas.
- The overall outbreak management capability needed strengthening in the public health team and it was hoped to conduct further training within community groups.

ACTION AGREED

The Director of Public Health to investigate issues relating to the local lockdown in Leicester and the impact of travel between Peterborough and Leicester.

Peterborough Hub

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- The Council were aware that there may be people who needed support during the pandemic who had not needed support before the crisis. The Council had worked hard to identify those people through the media, leaflet drops, newspapers and radio broadcasts. Contact had been made with known carers and those who had been discharged from Adult Social Care in the previous six months to ensure they had the

support they required. There were over 60 voluntary and specialist organisations spread across the city who had worked with the hub and every request for help received via the Hub had been fulfilled. This included food and medication deliveries, gardening and supporting mental health through friendship calls and craft packs for adults and children. Parish councils had also engaged through the clerks to consider closer working with the Council.

Care Homes

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Secured additional residential, nursing and extra care capacity had been increased by 106 additional beds across existing providers, some of which were already contracted to the Council.
- Members commented that there had been 140 deaths in care homes due to, or suspected, from COVID-19 as per an FOI (*Freedom of Information request*). The Service Director, Adults and Safeguarding reassured Members that an agreement was in place with all acute trusts that a patient's test result must be known prior to discharge in accordance with national guidance.
- Comparative figures on care home deaths was requested and the Director for Public Health agreed to request this information from the data analysts.

ACTION AGREED

The Director of Public Health agreed to ask the Analytical Team to produce comparative data between Peterborough, the national average and neighbouring areas for deaths in care homes.

Personal Protection Equipment (PPE)

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Reports had been received by members that the Alconbury hub who supplied PPE to primary care units in Peterborough had very low stock levels. The local authority had made a commitment to care homes to provide PPE from their own social care supplies should they experience problems sourcing from usual suppliers and most care homes had reported an improvement in supplies. The supplies of PPE to primary care facilities was the responsibility of the CCG (*Clinical Commissioning Group*) and enquiries would be made to confirm their availability of supplies.
- The price of PPE had become inflated due to the increase in demand however the council worked closely with suppliers and had negotiated the best possible supply arrangements. Details of credible suppliers were passed to care homes.
- Care homes appeared to be managing PPE supplies well however Members requested that a bulk purchase scheme to include care homes could be considered to reduce costs.

ACTIONS AGREED

1. The Executive Director, People and Communities, agreed to contact the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and ask them to investigate possible issues regarding Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) shortages in Primary Care Facilities.

2. The Executive Director, People and Communities agreed to investigate the possibility of creating a bulk buying scheme with care homes to purchase Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) at reduced rates.

Schools Re-opening

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Free school meals over the summer break would be offered through Edenred UK via a £90 voucher for each child who qualified for free school meals.
- Assessments and tests for 2021 were still being considered. SATS would take place as usual however the Early Years Baseline Assessment would be postponed for a year.
- Ofqual, (*The Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation*) were currently considering alternative arrangements for next year's GCSEs, including the delaying of exams until July to compensate for the education lost this year.
- The number of children returning to school in the last few weeks of term was not expected to increase, however the current expectation was that every child would return in September which would be challenging. Although Peterborough schools were generally well funded the government had announced an additional £1bn funding and whilst the exact details were yet unknown, it was expected the focus would be on deprivation.
- Head teachers were reporting that children had not regressed although there was a need to catch up on missed education. The Council's approach to distance learning was considered effective. Teachers would need to reconsider their curriculum.
- Ofsted assessments would be postponed until the spring term and recovery actions in place would continue to be monitored.
- The Council's Education Team met fortnightly with secondary school headteachers to share information and best practice for the benefit of pupils and school resources.
- Guidance had been received from the government allowing for summer provision to continue through the school holidays with the correct protective measures in place to provide support for key workers. Government guidance also advised that schools would not remain open for the holidays and the usual summer care programmes could return to provide care. Vivacity would remain responsible for the services they provided for the 90-day transition period and a meeting was imminent to discuss the summer programme further.
- Period poverty was being addressed through schools and Members asked if this provision had continued. The Government had released information on best practice in this area and the Service Director, Education agreed to obtain further information.
- Members expressed concern over the quality of the hour and a half education and career support currently given to year 12 students who would be preparing for university. The Service Director, Education explained that only 25% pupils were allowed to attend school at any one time, but the guidance was limited, and the emphasis remained on distance and independent learning. He agreed to follow up on specific concerns if they were made known to him.
- Students who returned to school to re-sit their A levels would provide additional demand on schools, however it was anticipated that the quality of assessments would be such that there would only be a small number of students in this category. Further information was expected and would be relayed when received.
- The Schools Transport Plan had responded to the current social distancing guidance with regard to school taxis and bus services. Future provision would be challenging as there was a limited amount of suitable transport available and more information would be required on how schools would re-open before final arrangements could be made. Additional funding would also be required to facilitate the anticipated increase in costs.
- Schools would not remain open in the summer holidays for compulsory education although summer clubs could continue.

- Government guidance had now been released on re-opening of schools safely. Schools needed to undertake risk assessments and have protective measures in place. The Council would support schools who found this challenging and were unable to fully function and would consider each situation individually. However the guidance was clear on the need to continue to provide remote learning. Conversations were planned with secondary headteachers to discuss the matter further the following week.
- Members were concerned there would be an increase in traffic due to children being taken to school and staggered start times may be considered to avoid too many people congregating in one place at one time. However, working parents may not find this fits in with work start times. It was hoped that out of school clubs would provide some flexibility when they re-opened in September. The School Street programme considered managing drop off arrangements in a different way and further risk assessments were required. It was hoped more children would walk or cycle to school.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Director of Education was asked to liaise with Head Teachers regarding challenges faced by Year 12 students in light of disruption caused to their education by Coronavirus.

City Centre Re-opening

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Members asked if the current messaging on shopping locally referred to smaller shops and centres or the city centre and the Executive Director Place & Economy assured the Committee that the city centre would be safe for visitors to return.
- Concerns were expressed that littering and other anti-social behaviour would increase with the re-opening of pubs and restaurants due 4 July and Members were advised that an appropriate operational plan was in place with the Police and the Prevention and Enforcement Service (PES).
- Blue Badge holders were experiencing difficulties finding car parking spaces. Some disabled parking bays had been removed following discussion with Disability Peterborough however if the provision was now considered insufficient a further investigation would follow.
- For now, car parking would remain free in Council owned car parks although this would be reviewed periodically.
- Work continued with local businesses to maintain the current social distancing measures.
- The Build Back Better scheme would follow the current reopening plan for the City Centre to address needs across the city to make it a better place to visit. Planned developments at the Station Quarter, the University and North Westgate / Queensgate Centre would help revitalise the city. The Business Improvement District work was also ongoing.
- Current plans to enhance the City Centre and provide long term improvements also included relocating the market stalls into Bridge Street, replanting the planters and hanging baskets and encouraging cafes and restaurants to use outdoor space. Plans were in place to replace and upgrade the street lighting.
- The Service Director for Communities and Partnerships advised that the spirit of the recent legislation supported a cafe culture in the high streets to aid recovery and the legislation supported the easing of bureaucracy to move this forward. The Council had been working with around 70 premises in the city centre to see how they would like to continue operating and if this would require amendments to their licences. For most, no changes would be made as most licences had provision for using outside space however others might require an outside licence.

The Recovery Framework

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Members would have liked more information on the Tranche One cycling spend however there had been very little time between the guidance being issued and the submission for funding deadline, being only five days. The strength of the proposed schemes had resulted in a funding increase of 12%. The position going into Tranche Two would be strengthened if these schemes were delivered within an eight-week period,
- Further funding of £7-800,000 was expected in the next few weeks for the Tranche Two funding and once guidance was received, Members and interested organisations would be included in the consultation.
- Suggestions to memorialise those who had lost their lives to Covid-19 and their families had been received and had cross-party approval. It had not been decided what form this would take however but this was being considered.
- The volunteer response had been overwhelming during the pandemic with around 2,500 volunteers across the county and their work was praised by the Service Director for Communities and Partnerships. When surveyed recently, 60% had agreed to continue after the pandemic ended, half of which had a professional background and held a DBS (*Disclosure and Barring Service*) check. Discussions were currently underway with the PCVS (*Peterborough Council for Voluntary Services*) and other partners to establish a volunteer scheme.
- The pandemic had changed the way people were working. A recent survey carried out amongst PCC staff had provided good feedback and agile and home working would be a feature of the future working arrangements at the Council.

Vivacity

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Vivacity had now provided their HR data to enable the Council to review staffing arrangements which had been delayed due to their staff being furloughed. This would be completed as quickly as possible to avoid undue stress on the workforce.
- Meetings were planned with Vivacity on 3 July to consider any plans in place to re-open the libraries safely and other services which would remain under Vivacity control for the 90 day transition period.
- Members asked if there was any additional funding available to help Vivacity reopen its services, however the Council could only apply for funding if they ran leisure services themselves and once services had been transferred back to the Council, the relevant applications could be made.
- The council did not intend to cut services unless the demand for services had shifted however the way forward must be affordable. Outdoor gyms and cricket pitches could be provided as additional services.
- The Council would consider every aspect of current Vivacity provision and alternative ways of delivery including working with local groups, local communities and parish councils as well as moving some services in-house and this was an opportunity to review and regroup services and re-set the local vision for these services to meet the modern needs of the city.
- Members sought assurance that there were ambitious plans for Culture to be part of the Recovery. Officers responded that this assurance could be given and a meeting had taken place between the Service Director for Communities and Partnerships, the Chief Executive and the Arts Council's Chief Executive to discuss the arts, culture and heritage aspirations within the city and how they could be used to encourage a strong recovery.

The work already started on developing a new Cultural Strategy for Peterborough was now on hold pending the ease of lockdown and was likely to recommence in autumn.

- Members felt that it was of paramount importance to restart the entertainment and cultural sectors to prevent undue hardship to performers.

Implications

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Most local authorities were in the same position and were waiting for additional government funding.
- The forecast for the deficit was getting larger and didn't account for COVID-19 funding due from central government. Members expressed concern over the Council's financial position, given that most reserves had now been used. The Acting Corporate Director Resources advised that most local authorities were in the same position. As the data quality improved, the expenditure appeared to increase. As the pandemic progressed, the Council were being asked to increase their workload and there may be income not yet received. The LGA (*Local Government Association*) and professional organisations were lobbying central government for increased funding.
- The largest impact was from lost tax income, again a countywide issue, and government would be looking at the collection fund deficit over a three-year period at the end of 2020 when setting the Local Government Settlement for 2021.
- The funding available from the Homelessness Grant was not large when considered against the overall expenditure. The Council had applied for a grant but would not receive anywhere near the expenditure incurred in tackling homelessness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Joint Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to note and comment on the progress made to date in responding to the impact of the Coronavirus.
2. The Joint Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend that the Service Director – Education, investigated and reported back to the relevant Scrutiny Committee on the issues surrounding Period Poverty, especially over the summer holidays, noting that schools' involvement in tackling this issue had been reduced by Coronavirus.
3. The Joint Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend that the Executive Director, Place and Economy and the Service Director – Education explored the feasibility of establishing a Cycle to School grant scheme and report back to the relevant Scrutiny Committee and decision maker.
4. The Chairman closed the meeting and thanked the Chief Executive and her team for all their hard work to provide support, care, information and advice to residents, councillors and staff during the COVID-19 pandemic period which was much appreciated.

CHAIRMAN

2 July 2020

The meeting began at 4:30PM and ended at 7:10 PM