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Agenda prepared by Julian Joinson, Principal Democratic Services Officer – Telephone: (01925) 442112 Fax: (01925) 656278
E-mail: jjoinson@warrington.gov.uk

A G E N D A

Part 1
Items during the consideration of which the meeting is expected to be open to members of the public (including the press) subject to any statutory right of exclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apologies for Absence

To record any apologies received.
2. **Code of Conduct - Declarations of Interest**
   **Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012**

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda no later than when the item is reached.

3. **Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the meetings held on 6 December 2017 and 7 February 2018 as correct records.

4. **Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership - Presentation**

To consider a presentation by Philip Cox, Chief Executive, Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership on the work of the LEP.

5. **Adult Social Care and Children’s Care Services Complaints – Annual Report**

To consider a report of Rick Howell, Head of Service - Operational Contracts and Commissioning, Families and Wellbeing Directorate, comprising the annual report on Adult Social Care and Children’s Care Services Complaints. (to follow)

6. **Work Programme 2017/18 and 2018/19**

To consider the updated Work Programme 2017/18. Members may also wish to suggest topics for initial consideration for inclusion in the Work Programme 2018/19.

7. **Schedule of Meetings for 2018/19**

To note the proposed schedule of meetings for 2018/19, as follows:-

- 13 June 2018
- 17 October 2018
- 5 December 2018
- 6 February 2019
- 10 April 2019
Part 2

Items of a "confidential or other special nature" during which it is likely that the meeting will not be open to the public and press as there would be a disclosure of exempt information as defined in Section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972.

Nil
THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
Present: Councillor P Carey (Chairman)

Councillors: M Creaghan, L Dirir, C Froggatt, A Hill (substituting for M Tarr), T Jennings, W Johnson, I Marks and C Mitchell,

Co-optees: Mr D Littlewood

Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Tarr and from co-optee Ms P Johnson

SC22 Code of Conduct – Declarations of Interest

Declarations of Interests were made by the following Members:-

Councillor Mitchell declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 5- Network Warrington, on the basis of her appointment to the Board of that organisation and as Chairman of that Board.

Councillor Jennings declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 5- Network Warrington, on the basis of his appointment to the Board of that organisation.

SC23 Minutes

The Chairman reminded Members that, at the last meeting, he had been requested to undertake some discussions with the Council’s executive leadership about the future work of the Committee. To date, the Chairman had sought to focus the Committee’s attention on the work on external partners, but other Members had expressed the view that there needed to be a balance of topics, which included some internal Council services. Accordingly, the Chairman had spoken to members of the Executive Board, all Directors and the Chief Executive.

Steven Broomhead, Chief Executive, was in attendance to answer any questions from the Committee. He indicated that a list of possible work programme topics had been compiled, some of which were internal and some of which were external services. The proposed topics had been derived from the Corporate Plan and were based on the principle that the Council was the main policy lead for the area. The Council did not wish to be solely financial driven and Scrutiny was a vital part of the process of accountability and involvement.

The Chairman indicated that proposed topics had included the following:-

- Cheshire Pension Scheme (representation on its governance bodies, ethical investment policies, and management of the fund);
- Flood Risk Management (although the topic might have been covered sufficiently under the recent scrutiny of Emergency Planning issues);
- Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise partnership (due to be covered in April 2017);
- Trends in Looked After Children;
- Special Educational Needs (SEN) children (overall spending and constraints); and
- Home care market sustainability.
It was noted that there were only two further meetings planned in the Municipal Year 2017/18. The Committee was invited to consider if it wished to include those topics in its work programme. Members suggested the following additional topics:-

- Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE); and
- Monitoring delivery of the Council’s key Strategies.

Councillor Froggatt commented that scrutiny under the latter bullet could only occur if the Council had a comprehensive list of Strategic Plans. However, he considered that there were some gaps in the plans available, including:-

- Commercialism and Treasury Management Strategy;
- Town Centre Strategy;
- Cultural Strategy;
- Youth Strategy; and
- Parks and Open Spaces Strategy.

The Chairman responded that the Parks and Open Spaces Strategy was currently being reviewed in conjunction with the Sports Pitches Strategy, but should be available by Easter 2018. In addition, several Member briefings had been delivered by the Executive Director Economic Regeneration, Growth and Environment on the Town Centre. The Chief Executive confirmed that there was a Town Centre Strategy, which was contained within the Town Centre Masterplan. A copy could be provided to members if they so wished. The Youth Strategy had recently been submitted to the Senior Management Team and would be considered shortly by the relevant Policy Committee. The Cultural Strategy would be progressed soon, but had been delayed by staffing difficulties. That Strategy would also be submitted to the relevant Policy Committee.

Councillor Froggatt commented that Policy Committees had been created to support the policy development role, but their principal success so far had been in relation to the establishment of a Living Wage policy. There was a feeling that the Committees had not maximised their potential. The Chief Executive confirmed that there was a review being undertaken in connection with the Policy Committees and a report about their future would follow to the Council. It would be possible to bring that report to the Scrutiny Committee first. Council Marks commented that he had been unsure about the need for Policy Committees from the outset and believed that the route for items to Policy, Scrutiny Committees or Executive Board, needed more clarity. The Chairman noted that the Committee’s decision to refer the Children’s and Adults Safeguarding Reports to the Protecting the Most Vulnerable Policy Committee had been an acknowledgement of the need to spread the scrutiny workload more evenly.

Councillor Dirir expressed satisfaction that the work of the Policy Committees was being reviewed. She gave an example of a motion that had been put to Council some time ago about air quality outside schools, which had been referred to the relevant Policy Committee, but which had not subsequently progressed. The issue was potentially putting children’s health at risk. Other authorities, such as Sheffield, were leading the way on that issue. Mr Joinson, Principal Democratic Services Officer, confirmed that the matter was due to be discussed at the Protecting the Most Vulnerable Policy Committee on Tuesday 12 December 2017.

Decision,

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2017 be agreed as a correct record.
The Committee considered a presentation by Chief Inspector Sarah Pengelly, Cheshire Constabulary (Warrington), on crime statistics for Warrington, national and local trends, hot topics and resource issues. CI Pengelly gave a brief history of her 26 year career, which included early work as a covert officer, followed by a move to local policing in Ellesmere Port and her appointment as CI in Warrington from January 2017.

A comprehensive presentation was provided which included information on the following:-

- Policing in Cheshire (4 priorities from the Police and Crime Commissioner’s Police and Crime Plan:-
  - A service connected to communities
  - Support victims and protect the vulnerable
  - Prevent crime and anti-social behaviour
  - A Police service fit for the future);
- Preventing crime and anti-social behaviour;
- ‘We’re Here’ Commitments (4 public policing commitments. Associated posters were circulated to Members on:-
  - We’re Here for Victims
  - We’re Here for Communities
  - We’re Here for Justice and
  - We’re Here Where and When You Need Us);
- Delivering Local Policing (8 local policing units in Cheshire with geographic responsibility and support from local, regional and national teams);
- Warrington Local Policing Unit (comprising 6 community teams, including 6 sergeants; 21 Officers; and 45 PCSOs, 5 response teams providing 24/7 policing, 28 detectives and other support);
- The VOL Triangle (victim/offender/location – noting that in the digital age victims and offenders could be in different continents);
- Operational Needs (a pie chart snapshot of calls received over the last 70 days, eg. 24% crime, 10% concerns for safety; and 15% anti-social behaviour, 5% hoax calls, etc);
- Crime benchmarking (showing that Warrington was generally busier than the rest of Cheshire);
- Key performance measures – from the Police and Crime Commissioner and Community Safety Partnership Plan (number of recorded crimes all increasing);
- Performance measures on alcohol related crime and antisocial behaviour and related disorders (some increasing and some decreasing);
- Key crime operational threats (modern day slavery and human trafficking, organised crime, cross border ‘County Lines’ crime, domestic abuse, internet based crime and traditional acquisitive crime);
- Recent success stories (jailing of a drugs ring for 19 years);
- Future ambitions (problem solving, engagement/visibility/reassurance, engagement with hard to reach communities, connecting to and understanding other communities and a creating a representative police force);
- Challenges (austerity, vulnerable groups, counter terrorism and cyber-crime).

Members made comments and asked questions in relation to the following issues:-
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- Did the Police work with the Probation Service, given that the service was now more fragmented? - *Response:* Yes, both services were committed to working together and that included integrated Offender Management Teams based in Warrington. For example, if a person had been jailed for shoplifting and was being released from prison, the Team helped that individual back into society by providing advice on benefits, bank accounts, etc.

- How were garage and shed burglaries classified? - *Response:* Those offences were classed the same as a residential burglary. Offences such as taking car keys from a domestic property then stealing the car, were also classed as burglary. Any uninvited person in your home was a violation.

- In relation to crime statistics shoplifting appeared to be lower in Warrington. -- *Response:* The figures showed that shoplifting rates for Warrington were lower than the rest of the Police Force area, but overall the figures were rising.

- Did the Police respond to cases of coercive domestic abuse? - *Response:* Yes, the Police had an understanding of and a response to coercive abuse. There was some new legislation which had helped with that type of case and there was some funding available for a Warrington based Team. Domestic Violence Protection Notices could be issued to keep perpetrators and victims apart. The Police encouraged victims to make a report. Operation Enhance had involved a plain clothed Police Officer and domestic violence worker visiting all domestic violence victims. However, the criminal justice system was very slow and could take up to six months to resolve any issues.

- If Police helpdesks were being rationalised, could consideration be given to the use of existing local authority neighbourhood hubs - *Response:* That possibility was currently being looked at.

- Many parish councils were supportive of the concept of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), but there had been some criticism of the administration of their role. Certain parishes part funded PCSO posts, but sometimes the PCSOs were deployed elsewhere, which led to complaints. Better information was required by parishes about how PCSOs worked and were managed. - *Response:* That feedback would be taken on board.

- How would PCSOs be deployed in the inner wards where there was no parish council? - *Response:* The intention was for each ward to have access to one PCSO. It might also be possible to have a small pool of PCSOs who could be directed to individual wards on the basis of need. Warrington currently had 22 part funded PCSOs. A dialogue was currently taking place with Dr Muna Abdel Aziz, Director of Public Health, on the future situation.

Cl Pengelly reminded councillors about what they could do to assist the Police. Council decisions could have a direct impact on policing, which included:-

- funding for PCSOs;
- encouraging communities to report matters to the Police;
- providing ideas on how to engage better with the public;
- reporting incidents directly; and
- identifying vulnerable people.

She also asked Members whether councillors would find a broader monthly or bi-monthly communication from her useful. Members indicated that they usually received feedback from their local PCSOs. The Chairman stated that he used to receive local reports from the Area-based sergeant, but that in future a general newsletter sent to all councillors and the Senior Management Team might be useful.

The Chairman thanked Cl Pengelly for her comprehensive presentation.
To note the presentation on local policing from Cheshire Constabulary.

**SC25 Network Warrington**

The Committee considered a presentation by Ben Wakerley, Managing Director and Councillor C Mitchell, Chairman of the Board, Network Warrington. David Boyer, Assistant Director Transportation and Environment, Warrington Borough Council, was also in attendance for this item.

Mr Wakerley set the scene for the presentation by outlining the rich history of the bus company, which had been established in 1902. The company was one of only 11 municipal bus companies remaining in the UK, but which were often considered to be the best companies. Network Warrington had a large share of the deregulated market locally and had routes leading as far away as Leigh, Northwich and Altrincham. The operator had 91 buses and covered some 3 million miles per year. It had a turnover of around £10.5M, although revenues were declining. Its biggest competitor was the private car.

The presentation highlighted the following matters:-

- Profit and loss account (the company had moved from a position of a £1M loss in 2012 to making a small annual profit, but passenger numbers were still in decline, costs were rising and there were barriers to further fare increases)
- Challenges (reputational issues, poor PR about fare rises, complex interpersonal relations, an ageing fleet and depot, managing the expectations of partners and local resistance about specific routes);
- Recent improvements (establishment of numerous engagement meetings including a Facebook Group, Employee Council and Meet the Manager events, some lower fares, innovative branding, eg. the ‘Pops’ 20/21 route, group tickets, Westy and Dallam discounts, improved routes/services);
- On-going developments (introduction of a new business plan, appointment of a Public Relations officer, proposals for new buses);
- Vision – ‘An outstanding bus company’ (bus use in the UK had fallen by 1.5% last year, but better operators bucked the trend. Network Warrington wanted to engage with customers);
- Introduction of 5 branded networks (Pops, Warrington West Link, Cheshire Cat, Connect 17 and Warrington’s Own Buses. The brands were intended to be fun and designed to appeal to customer groups. Some artist’s depictions of the new liveries were also displayed);
- Improved buses (including wi-fi, quality fabric interiors, top specification, alloy wheels and social seating arrangements);
- Bus Stops (lobbying for improved bus stops to tempt people away from private car use on congested roads. The information on display at bus stops was generally poor and often not cleaned);
- Potential areas for further improvements (branded bus stops, eg on the Cheshire Cat route, improved journey times and routes, including use of systems like the Leigh guided busway, enhanced bus lanes and better enforcement, going green, including supporting planning decisions which promoted multi-modal transport and resisted the building of new multi storey car parks);
- Risks (declining passenger numbers, congestion, competition and ‘cherry picking’ of parts of routes, industrial relations, regulators, staffing issues and franchising);
- Proposal for a new depot;
Overall the company was making good progress, but both it and its partners would need to address falling passenger numbers. The Council should make that a priority in the new Local Transport Plan (LTP4). The company was owned by the Council and required its continuing support. In return, it was the intention to pay a modest dividend to the Council in 2017/18.

The presentation included reference to a decision to reroute the No.6 service down All Saints Drive, which had been taken before the current management team at the company had been in place. It was acknowledged that the issue had attracted some heated coverage in the press, including some highly personal comments. This was not considered to be helpful as the company had been careful to meet with and listen to the concerns of residents, although both parties had disagreed on the way forward. The fundamental issue was that the company considered that the route was safe, but that badly parked cars sometimes made bus operation more challenging. A risk assessment had been carried out of the route and no specific barriers to operation had been identified. Furthermore, there had been no reported collisions on All Saints Drive.

A Frequently Asked Questions sheet had been compiled to answer residents’ concerns. The company’s management team also offered to meet with local councillors privately to discuss the matter. It was not possible to keep revising routes as that could jeopardise services. The No.6 service currently operated at a loss and a change to the route was likely to make the service less viable in the longer term. The company would, however, look at options as it developed its Cheshire Cat brand.

Councillors representing local residents on the No.6 issue commented that, notwithstanding the disagreement over the final decision, the meeting between residents and the bus company had not been well handled. Communications from the company had seemed unresponsive and inevitably that had led to residents becoming upset. A subsequent statement from the bus company indicating that it was not prepared to enter into any further correspondence on the matter had also provoked a negative response and there would be further criticism on behalf of residents published in the press tomorrow. Mr Wakerley reiterated that he had listened carefully to the arguments put, but that the route down All Saints drive did not give rise to a safety issue. Repetition of the same arguments was not productive. The Chairman reminded all present that the Committee was not in a position to resolve a specific local dispute, but that a reasonable offer had been made by the bus company to meet with individual councillors to discuss the matter further.

Members raised a number of issues and asked questions as follows:-

- Services in Grappenhall and Thelwall had been reducing gradually over time and there was no service in Latchford. This had led to the overall network not being connective.  
  **Response:** The reduction in service was as a result of people migrating to private cars.

- It was acknowledged that the company had been through some difficult times in recent years. However, the company was considered to be a valuable asset and would continue to be supported by Members, given that it operated socially necessary services.

- Better enforcement in relation to bus lanes was considered to be important, the issue of more bus lanes and the location of existing bus lanes should also be considered.  
  **Response:** Mr Boyer responded that the Council was undertaking a review of all bus lanes, which was now almost complete.

- The use of real-time bus information was considered to be a step forward.  
  **Response:** The real-time system was a good system. It was also hoped to be able to generate more back office/management information from use of the system.

- Would the Council be permitted to erect branded bus stop signs, such as for the Cheshire Cat route, and would that upset other bus operators?  
  **Response:** The solution might be to
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offer the opportunity for branded signs to all operators. Network Warrington would be prepared to pay for the cost of any branded signage for its routes.

- Could the company consider a “£1 to Town” fare? - Response: Innovative promotions could be considered, but the company had good terms and conditions for its staff and if fares were reduced that could that might put wages at risk.

- The Council was developing activities for young people in the town centre. To some extent that was a captive audience. How could the company encourage young people to use buses? - Response: The company was talking to the Youth Zone and had met their management and Helen Jones MP last week. The company was hoping to develop an offer which would attract those new customers. Councillor Jennings also suggested liaising with IMPACT (the Youth Council) to engage with young people.

- Could marketing be used to improve the quality of bus stops, while at the same time promoting important local issues such as corporate parenting? - Response: A number of bus shelters were provided by Clear Channel (formerly Adshel) who provided for the upkeep of the shelters by the sale of advertising space. The existing contract was coming to an end and would be reviewed. It might be possible to bring this function back in house and to use bus shelters to generate income from advertising or to promote local messages.

- When would the new branded bus routes be introduced? - Response: The registration date for the services was April 2018, with a likely implementation date of May 2018.

On the question of the quality of information in bus stops, Mr Boyer acknowledged that in many instances it was poor, although there were some good examples too. Overall the Council found it difficult to invest in bus stops, as unlike Greater Manchester or Liverpool, the Council could not raise a precept for transport. That also made it difficult for the Council to support non-commercial bus services. However, the Council was improving bus lane enforcement and would continue to work in partnership with Network Warrington.

The Chairman, thanked Mr Wakerley and Councillor Mitchell for their presentation and indicated that he was pleased to see the developments proposed by Network Warrington.

Decision,

To note the presentation on behalf of Network Warrington.

SC26 Work Programme 2017/18

The Committee considered the updated Work Programme 2017/18. Mr Joinson, Principal Democratic Services Officer, was in attendance to provide support.

The Chairman reported that the following items had been proposed for the next meeting on 7 February 2018:-

- Home improvement Loans (for older terraced properties to bring them up to decent homes standards); and
- Budget Process (the annual consultation).

The Chairman enquired if Members wished to receive information from Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service around their recently published Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) 2018/19. Members confirmed that they did not wish to comment on the Plans for the forthcoming year.

The Chairman highlighted items proposed for the Committee’s meeting on 11 April 2018, as follows:-
• Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP);
• Town Centre Strategy (from the Town Centre Masterplan).

Members were also reminded of the suggested topics proposed during the discussions recorded at minute SC23 – Minutes, above. The topics would need to be scoped further and incorporated into next update of the Work Programme.

Decision,

To note the updated Work Programme 2017/18 and the additional topics identified at Minute SC23 – Minutes.

SC27 Schedule of Meetings for 2017/18

Decision,

To note the schedule of meeting for the remainder of 2017/18, as follows:-

• 7 February 2017
• 11 April 2017
**SCUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**7 February 2018**

**Present:** 
Councillor P Carey (Chairman)

**Councillors:**  
M Creaghan, L Dirir, C Froggatt, T Jennings, W Johnson, I Marks, C Mitchell and M Tarr

**Co-optees:**  
Mr D Littlewood

**Also in Attendance:**  
Councillors B Barr, D Bennett, J Grime, D Keane, A King, M McLaughlin and P Warburton

**Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from co-optee Ms P Johnson

The Committee was reminded that, in the case of quasi-judicial matters, if a Member was not present from the start of the meeting to hear all of the evidence, they should not then vote on the matter.

**SC28 Code of Conduct – Declarations of Interest**

Declarations of Interests were made by the following Members:-

Councillors Carey, Jennings and Mitchell declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Items 6 to 8 - in respect of the Call-In, on the basis of their appointment to the Development Management Committee, which had recently considered a planning application on behalf of the organisation which was the subject of the contract decision that was being called-in. The planning application had been deferred on two occasions. Members were satisfied that consideration of the planning application had no bearing on the Call-In proceedings being discussed today.

Councillor Creaghan declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Items 6 to 8 - in respect of the Call-In, on the basis that her name had been mentioned as supporting the organisation which was the subject of the contract decision that was being called-in.

**SC29 The Call-In Process**

The Committee was informed that on 15 January 2018 the Executive Board had agreed the direct award of a contract to the Salvation Army for the provision of Supported Housing for men and women at risk of homelessness. However, that decision had been called in under the Council’s overview and scrutiny procedure rules.

Members considered a report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer, which explained the background to the Call-In and an outline of the arrangements and procedures for determining the matter. The report included the following documents:-

- Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules (extract;)
- Part 1 details of the called-in decision;
- The Call-In request;
- Principles of Decision Making;
• Response of the Executive Board Member to the Call-In; and
• Call-In Protocol.

Mr Cumberbatch, Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer, was in attendance to speak to the report. In summary, the following procedure would be followed:-

- Introductory report from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer;
- Consideration of moving to Part 2 of the meeting (a confidential discussion);
- Evidence by the Caller-In;
- Questions by the Committee;
- Evidence from the Executive Board Member for Public Health;
- Questions by the Committee;
- Debate and decision by the Committee who might:-
  - Offer no advice;
  - Offer advice to the Executive Board;
  - Refer the matter to full Council (in exceptional circumstances).

If the matter was referred back to the Executive Board, it would be submitted to the meeting due to be held on 12 March 2018. Mr Cumberbatch then described the Call-In procedure in more detail. He also confirmed that the Call-In submission was valid and that it was now a matter for the Committee to determine the appropriate course of action.

Decision,

That the report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer on the Call-In process be noted.

SC30 Exclusion of the Public (including the Press)

Members were invited to consider whether the meeting move into Part 2. Councillor Froggatt queried the reason for the matter being kept confidential. The Chairman responded that there were issues of confidentiality in relation to the contract prices within the Executive Board report and that those issues could inhibit a full discussion if the debate were to be held in public. Councillor Froggatt enquired if confidentiality related only to the table on page 52 of the Agenda which listed the tender prices. However, the Chairman commented that legal advice had been obtained and it was noted that there were other references to sensitive contractual issues through the Executive Board report for which confidentiality should be maintained.

Decision,

That members of the public (including the press) be excluded from the meeting by reasons of the confidential nature of the following items of business to be transacted being within Category 3 of Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 (Rule 10 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules) and the public interest in disclosing the information is outweighed by the need to keep the information confidential.

SC31 The Call-In Process (continued)

The Committee considered a confidential report from Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer, which included the Part 2 private report to the Executive Board.
Decision,

That the confidential report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer on the Call-In process be noted.

SC32 Evidence from the Proposer of the Call-In

Councillor Steve Parish, the proposer of the Call-In indicated that he would speak to the item and that Councillor David Keane would also provide evidence.

The Committee considered the completed Call-In form and a supplementary document that explained the rationale for the Call-In, which was on the following grounds:-

- Lack of, or inappropriate consultation - Other providers had not been consulted, nor service users past and present.

- The decision had not been taken with a sufficient degree of openness - There was no mention of the intention that opening additional direct beds would allow withdrawal of funding from another provider.

- The decision lacked clarity of aims and desired outcomes - The short-term nature of the contract was inherently problematic – a procurement exercise had been done but the decision would allow a procurement exercise to be done.

- The financial implications and/or risks had not been given due consideration - Changes to legislation, payment of Universal Credit, and the new capping arrangements might make the business model of large hostels unsustainable.

- Alternative options and their likely effects on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the Borough had not been considered - The contract perpetuated a one-provider situation with no alternative options considered (either for the main contract or for additional emergency beds).

Councillor Parish gave the background to provision for rough sleepers since the old night shelter closed in May 2010, and also to the Council’s tendering of the James Lee House hostel services in 2012, which had been curtailed because of the incumbent provider’s ownership of the building. He called as a witness Councillor David Keane, who had been the Executive Member at the time, to explain more about that process, which concluded with accepting the incumbent provider’s exclusive use of the building.

Councillor Keane reported that he acknowledged that there might be no perfect procurement process and that the Council was striving to achieve the best solution possible. He indicated that, in 2012, he had been the relevant Executive Board Member for housing matters and that he had been responsible for the decision to award the contract for the operation of James Lee House. A tendering process had taken place and in fact the tender had been won by a contractor other than the Salvation Army. However, following a legal challenge by the Salvation Army, the preferred provider was not able to operate from the James Lee House premises. Councillor Keane had discussed the situation with officers at that time and had been assured that when the contract was next due for renewal, it could be tender for in a transparent and fair way.
Councillor Keane commented that the exemptions from competition requirements, as set out in the Council’s contract procedure rules, were not normally based around considerations such as building ownership. It was also noted that under the ‘light touch’ regime, as provided by the Public Contract Regulations 2015, contracts below a certain amount might not be subject to a full tender exercise. However, the current situation had been on-going for some time and it was disappointing that no alternative long term solution had yet been found. There was a concern that the Council would never obtain good price for the contract if it continued to make short term arrangements.

Overall councillor Keane was of the view that the contract decision failed to comply with the rules around transparency and openness. When the revised contract decision was taken in 2012, a promise had been made to refer the matter to Warrington’s Homelessness Commission for further consideration. He believed that the current Executive Board report was misleading, since there was not only one provider available, and the matter had been successfully advertised via the Chest.

Councillor Parish reiterated that subsequent contracts for the services had been on a short-term basis, which meant that any renewal was under the threshold for a full tender, possibly against the regulations against artificially narrowing competition, and that any market test inevitably favoured the incumbent provider.

Although this meant the Council was stuck in a one-provider situation, the Council, rather than seeking to place additional services with other providers, had incorporated them in the James Lee House contract, thus reinforcing the Council’s dependence on one provider. That included four beds for women, which were originally in a self-contained outbuilding, but had been changed (it was unclear on whose authority) so that women were sharing facilities with men. The issue had come to a head because of a proposal to create eight emergency beds, adding further to the concentration of facilities with one provider.

Councillor Parish indicated the Committee was not being asked to give advice that would put renewal of the main James Lee House contract at risk, but to give advice to the Executive Board about how the one-provider situation had actually been compounded, rather than seeking greater diversity of provision and, given the uncertainties of government policy and the forthcoming tender process, about whether the direct bed provision, adding to the complexity of the tender and potentially putting an alternative provider at risk of closure, was either wise, or in line with the principles of the procurement regulations.

Members were invited to ask questions of the proposer of the Call-In, but no questions were put.

**SC33 Response from Councillor McLaughlin - Executive Board Member for Public Health and Wellbeing.**

A written response had been circulated with the Agenda. Councillor McLaughlin was in attendance to speak to that report. Dr Muna Abdel Aziz, Director of Public Health and Rick Howell, Head of Service Operational Contracts and Commissioning, were also present to provide support.

Councillor McLaughlin welcomed the challenge about the contractual issues. Her view was that the decision had been made in line with the principles of good decision making. Councillor McLaughlin responded to the main reasons for the Call-In as follows:-

The decision had been to approve the direct award of a contract to The Salvation Army for the provision of Supported Housing for men and women at risk of homelessness. The contract award
was for a period of one year until 31 March 2019, with the option to extend for a further six months to 30 September 2019.

The current contract for the service had been in place since 1 April 2016 with an expiry date of 31 March 2018. The annual contract value was £297,000, with an average cost of £105.77 per unit per week. Prior to that, the contract value had been reduced over time by approximately 30% from its highest point of £427,000 (per year) to its current annual level of £297,000. The service had maintained its capacity of 54 units and would pick up the additional planned Direct Access beds whilst operating at the same cost. That had been achieved by re-configuring service delivery and re-modelling provision.

The services delivered fell into what was known as the ‘light touch’ regime under Section 7 and Schedule 3 of the Public Contract Regulations 2015 ("PCR 2015"), and therefore the Council did not have to formally tender the services and had discretion in the process of procurement.

Lack of, or inappropriate consultation

- This contract had been advertised on The Chest (the North West's Local Authority Procurement Portal) in October 2017 to establish the level of interest in providing a Supported Housing Service for single male and females at risk of homelessness. That market testing exercise had been a means of consulting a wider provider base in terms of the delivery of 54 units of supported accommodation for males and females and to put forward possible alternative service models or accommodation options. There had been a limited response to the Market Test and none of the providers had offered alternative premises for the delivery of the support service.

- Service User consultation was undertaken by the provider and was addressed as part of ongoing quarterly contract management. Feedback from people accessing the service had been positive regarding the support on offer. The suggestions clients had made during consultation regarding their contributions, catering arrangements and day time activities had been considered in the service specification.

- Feedback from stakeholders received through WBC Housing Plus, who facilitated all referrals into James Lee House and move-on, had been positive in terms of access and service delivery.

- The commitment set out in the paper to undertake a procurement process within a stated timeline highlighted to all providers the intended process which would include consultation with potential alternative suppliers and also service users.

- As part of the preparation for the planned tender process, consultation with service users would be undertaken by Warrington Advocacy to develop the contract specification and outcomes framework (similar to a recent Learning Disability exercise).

The decision had not been taken with a sufficient degree of openess

- This direct award was to maintain the existing Supported Housing service. It did not affect funding of other services as it proposed to maintain the current provision for a period of time to allow for a full procurement process.
- Direct Access would focus on providing emergency accommodation for people at risk of rough sleeping, with an identified pathway into the main Supported Housing service.

- At the time of writing and the Executive Board decision, planning consent remained outstanding in relation to Direct Access beds. The inclusion of direct access beds within the specification was to allow for those beds (subject to planning) to be supported within the current contract value at no extra cost to the Council. Direct access to the service was expected to reduce the use of emergency bed and breakfast.

- The proposed implementation of Direct Access into the service would not draw funding away from other providers as they would be delivered with no increase to the current contract value.

The decision lacked clarity of aims and desired outcomes

- The direct contract award was to maintain the existing provision for men and women at risk of homelessness and would enable the Council to continue to meet its statutory homelessness duties and contribute to the prevention of homelessness as part of the Council’s implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act from April 2018.

- The Part 1 report considered by the Executive Board had recommended direct award for the contract from 1 April 2018 on the basis of limited interest in a market test. The market testing exercise had been undertaken through the Council Procurement portal, the Chest. A full procurement process had not been undertaken. The direct contract award would enable the full procurement exercise (tender) to be undertaken providing an opportunity for service providers to submit service delivery proposals and associated costs for formal evaluation.

- A Market test was a tool frequently used to assess interest from providers in delivering a particular type of service. The response of the market test had indicated limited interest for the required 54 units of Supported Housing for men and women at risk of homelessness. The details from the market test had been considered by the Executive Board in the Part 2 report.

- The contract award of 12 months (+ up to an additional 6 months) would provide sufficient opportunity to run a tender for the provision of Supported Accommodation. The Council would be inviting future bidders to explore alternative service models through the intended procurement process and the process would ensure no ‘monopoly position’ for any existing provider.

- The 18 month maximum contract duration would also provide an opportunity to fully consider the implications of the Government’s consultation around future funding for short term supported accommodation. It would enable the Council to fully understand its responsibilities in relation to the allocation and administration of the future funding model. The consultation had closed on 23 January 2018 with the planned implementation date of a new funding framework in April 2020.

The financial implications and/or risks had not been given due consideration

- The Government consultation around future funding of Short Term Supported Housing was currently ongoing; and the uncertainty regarding implications on future funding models had
resulted in limited provider interest at this point to engage with a procurement process through the Market Test.

- The proposal of a maximum 18 month contract to October 2019 would give both the local authority and providers of supported accommodation sufficient time to fully understand the impact of the Government’s plans for the future funding of Short Term Supported accommodation and for that to inform any future procurement exercise.

- In addition, it would allow the Council to fully understand and prepare for any new responsibilities under the Government’s proposals.

- The consultation process would enable providers to investigate different ways to meet the needs and specification in the tender to follow on from the contract; with knowledge of the Government’s intentions and any financial or service delivery risks that might present.

- The impact of Universal Credit on the existing service was monitored as part of the contract management process; and that would continue to be monitored as part of any future contract award.

**Alternative options and their likely effects on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the Borough had not been considered**

- The Market Test had been intended to understand the potential market for the service and to benchmark potential cost across potential providers. The responses to the market test had not identified alternative premises or alternative service models to meet the current volume and need for men and women at risk of homelessness.

- The proposed contract award of a maximum of 18 months would allow for a full procurement exercise to be undertaken for the provision of the Supported Housing service. The proposed contract award would enable other service providers to research and identify alternative service models and accommodation as appropriate.

- The Council owned the land on which James Lee House was located. The owner of the building was Your Housing who had a long lease to the Salvation Army. Your Housing would have to agree to a lease to a new provider. That would be a lengthy negotiation which was unlikely to have been completed within the timescale of the end of the contract.

- Further discussion could take place between providers and with the Council to explore best use of the premises in relation to the homelessness needs of the borough. However, there was no duty or requirement on the owner of the building (Your Housing) to transfer or gift use of the setting to any new provider that might emerge during a procurement process.

- The extent of the procurement was to be determined. This would be an open tender process; where providers or collaborations of providers could offer different service models and solutions. For example, the tender might have different requirements and or opportunities for providers to respond with different approaches or perhaps working together.

- Services would need to demonstrate that the accommodation and support service provided value for money and would meet the needs of the current and future numbers of individuals at risk of homelessness; with no detriment either financially or reduction in the numbers of
individuals currently being supported. Development of the service specification would be informed by a stocktake for homelessness provision in Warrington in light of the Homelessness Commission and Priority Action Group (PAG) recommendations.

- Consideration would be given as part of the tender preparation to an approach using ‘lots’ where the Council asked the market to respond to some or all of the requirements. That approach could enable different sized organisations to participate and collaborate to deliver services.

Members asked a number of questions and received responses, as follows:-

- Was it considered appropriate that the service provider undertake consultation with users? - There were different forms of consultation undertaken. Consultation was undertaken as part of the contract with the Salvation Army. If a full procurement exercise was undertaken the Council would use the Warrington Advocacy Service ‘Speak Up’.

- It was alleged that the Salvation Army had refused to cooperate with the winner of the contract in 2012. Was there now a responsibility for the Council to commission the service with another provider? - The Government’s funding arrangements were changing and at this point the Council did not know what the new arrangements would be. As a consequence it was difficult to secure a new provider. There was a need to continue the existing provision until there was further clarity. Other providers could put forward alternative models of provision.

- Would the officers look into the history of the contract to ascertain why there was a monopoly situation? - In 2012, the Homelessness Commission had been established. That had been followed by a Needs Assessment. All partners had been engaged in the process. There was also a Priority Action Group (PAG) dealing with homelessness. All partners were looking at potential solutions against a backdrop of national policy changes and welfare reform. The PAG had considered the Homelessness Commission’s recommendations. The PAG has recognised the scale of the issues identified and the Council was attempting to address these through the use of its extensive commissioning powers.

- Was the perception of a monopoly putting off potential alternative providers? - It was not possible to comment on other people’s perceptions of the current situation. However, it was envisaged that the biggest barrier to wider interest in the contract was the lack of general funding available and uncertainty following the Government’s consultations.

- What was the reason for the large drop in the contract value from £427,000 (per year) to its current annual level of £297,000? Why was so much being paid initially and were the current providers complacent due to lack of effective competition? - The contract was now delivering more for the money spent. Much of the savings were from working closely with the Salvation Army to obtain the maximum use of the building. They had built in some efficiencies and reduced some areas of provision. However, the Council was satisfied that they were delivering a safe service. In addition, the Council had been able to negotiate some additional services for the same price.

- The future position looked more reassuring, given the information provided as part of the Call-In process. If that information had been in the original reports the decision might not have been called-in. In essence there was no other viable provider at the moment and the service and other financial implications would remain unchanged. The original report had
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not allowed Members to fully understand the position. - Although there was a reference to the procurement process in the original report there had been little detail. The report was essentially to deal with the narrow issue of an imminent extension required to the existing contract. On the question of an alleged monopoly, the key question was, were the service providers able to deliver the Council's outcomes. If the current provider had been unable to reassure the Council about delivery, concerns would have been acted upon. The Homelessness Commission, PAG and Health and Wellbeing Board had received more background and elected Members had been involved in those discussions. The Call-In had been logged after those meetings. In the future, if James Lee House continued to offer the best service, they would continue to win the contract. However, there would be an opportunity for different models of service delivery to come on stream.

• A comment was made that a target occupancy of 90% seemed odd, as this might provide a disincentive to move people on.

• A comment was made that the Government’s position might not be any clearer in 18 months time?

• Concern was expressed about the process of market testing and it was suggested that a full procurement exercise might have produced a contract value above the threshold for which competition was required.

• One bullet point above stated that the contract would not affect funding for other services. Did that mean that funding for Room at the Inn in the sum of £36k would continue? - It would not be appropriate to talk about the specifics of funding for other providers under this Item. However, the contract extension for James Lee House would not withdraw funding from elsewhere. There were issues generally about funding for providers and no homelessness provider could rely on guaranteed funding for the future. If the Committee wished to know more about the funding arrangements with Room at the Inn, it should consider including an item in its work programme. Councillor McLaughlin indicated that she would be happy to provide a report to a future meeting. The Chairman reminded Members that the Committee should confine its deliberations to the Call-In matter on the Agenda.

• Was any consultation undertaken other than by the service provider? - The Service provider was closest to be in a position to talk to users. Housing Plus, as the service that people approached when presenting as homeless and when moving on, could also provide feedback. Stakeholders and other bodies were also consulted, including the Rough Sleeper/Homeless Forum and the Hard to House Panel. The market testing had also resulted in a different type of consultation. A full procurement exercise would include the use of the Advocacy Service. However, the Council was currently happy with the current provider. Generally, the Council would not consult very widely for a short term award. In a recent decision about the award of intermediate care, that decision had been taken on the basis of known information about the current contractor. Wider consultation would take place under a full procurement exercise.

• Was the original consultation independent? - It was reported that the original consultations had been independent.

• Was 12 - 18 months sufficient time to undertake a full procurement exercise? - 18 months was thought to be the maximum time needed and the timescale could, in fact, be shorter. The current service was somewhat unique with core elements included within specification.
Officers would consider if the contract could be divided into lots. Providers could then approach the Council to say what they might be in a position to deliver, which could then be built into the local specification. Procurement might take one year, but some leeway had been built into the current renewal arrangement.

- There was still a concern that the direct award might affect funding for other services and external factors could also affect those services. - Other services and external factors were outside of the scope of the current Agenda Item. However, the Council was committed to homelessness provision in the town and would seek to commission all homeless services. The Chairman commented that wider issues and external factors should be reserved for debate at full Council.

SC34 Consideration of the Call-In Decision

The Chairman asked if Members wished to question or debate the matter further, or if they were now ready to make a decision. Mr Cumberbatch reminded the Committee of the options available to it. There were no issues for full Council, so the Committee should either:-

- Offer no advice and the decision would be implemented; or
- Refer the matter to the Executive Board with advice. In that instance the Committee should set out clearly what the advice should be in each case.

The Chairman commented that the Committee was not in a position to comment on the historical aspects of the contract or wider issues in relation to other providers’ services. The current contract was due to expire in two months and arrangements needed to be put in place quickly for continuity of the service. The extension to the contract would give time to assess any legislative changes emerging and for different models of provision to be evaluated and consulted upon. Members were invited to agree to the Executive Board decision being implemented.

It was MOVED and SECONDED:-

To offer no advice to the Executive Board

On being put to the VOTE, the motion was LOST, whereupon it was MOVED and SECONDED:-

That the Executive Board be requested to consider the following:-

(1) Whether the short term contract deters other potential providers bidding;

(2) Whether other providers are put off bidding by the monopoly situation which the Salvation Army has on the contract;

(3) Whether the Council should be more proactive in encouraging and commissioning other providers to show interest in bidding for this contract.

An amendment to the above Motion was approved to add the following wording:-

(4) That officers should look at the lease arrangements on James Lee House, to avoid a monopoly situation arising in the future.

On being put to the VOTE, the motion was CARRIED.
Decision,

That the Executive Board be requested to consider the following:-

(1) Whether the short term contract deters other potential providers bidding;

(2) Whether other providers are put off bidding by the monopoly situation which the Salvation Army has on the contract;

(3) Whether the Council should be more proactive in encouraging and commissioning other providers to show interest in bidding for this contract;

(4) That officers should look at the lease arrangements on James Lee House, to avoid a monopoly situation arising in the future.

**SC35 Date of Next Meeting**

Decision,

To note the date of the next meeting on 11 April 2018
Agenda Item 3b

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Programme Topic</th>
<th>Purpose of the item</th>
<th>Link to National Policy &amp; Local Context</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) | An introduction to the work of the LEP, including:  
  - what the LEP does  
  - governance/accountability;  
  - achievements to date; and  
  - plans for the future. | The C&W LEP is a key partner to enable economic growth in Warrington and Warrington has been a leader in the establishment and support of the LEP. LEPs are supported by Government and are a key conduit for Government growth and infrastructure funding – this role is increasing. The future of the LEP is bound up with the current debate about devolution and Combined Authorities. | Philip Cox CEO or Chair (LEP)  
(supported by Andy Farrall) | 11 April 2018 |
| Cheshire Fire and Rescue | Engagement with the Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service around their financing decisions for 2018/19 and Possible site visits to Safety Central/Lymm Fire Station and the Fire Control building at Lingley Mere Business Park | The service continues to focus on preventative measures and is currently branching out working to improve the health and wellbeing of residents. In addition, ‘blue light’ services are increasingly sharing resources to increase their cost effectiveness. | Alex Waller (Cheshire Fire and Rescue) | (site visits early 2018)  
On 06/12/17 the Committee decided it did not wish to consider the IRMP |
<p>| Network Warrington | An introduction to the aims, business model and operation of the bus company, in the light of its status as a local authority owned company providing services to the public in a highly competitive market. | Network Warrington remains one of a very small number of local authority controlled bus companies following deregulation. Nationally bus companies are struggling to maintain services in the face of reduced local authority subsidies for non-profitable routes, yet have a key role in providing access to employment, reducing social isolation and in reducing harm to the environment by reducing journeys undertaken in private cars. | Ben Wakerley, Managing Director and Cllr C Mitchell, Chairman of the Board | 6 December 2017 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Performance</strong></td>
<td>A look at overall educational attainment in the Borough, including performance at Academies and Free Schools</td>
<td>GCSE and equivalent results in England: 2016 to 2017 (provisional), GCSEs (key stage 4) collection data is due to be published in October 2017.</td>
<td>Hilary Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGA/CfPS have recently published a document ‘Your school, your community - Elected councillors’ role in school improvement’ which provides some guidance on how councillors can engage with local schools, including those not under local authority control.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Safeguarding Adults Board</strong></td>
<td>Consideration of the Annual Report 2016/17, including achievements and future priorities of the Board</td>
<td>At the end of the financial year the Board must publish an annual report on its achievements, members’ activity and findings from any Safeguarding Reviews during that period. Guidance recommends that the Board should be linked to Scrutiny arrangements</td>
<td>Shirley Williams (Chair), (supported by Margaret Macklin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Safeguarding Children’s Board</strong></td>
<td>Consideration of the Annual Report 2016/17, including achievements and future priorities of the Board</td>
<td>The Chair of the LSCB has a statutory duty to publish an annual report. The Scrutiny Committee should consider the analysis of the effectiveness of local services in keeping local children safe.</td>
<td>Richard Strachan (Chair), (supported by Margaret Macklin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warrington and Vale Royal College</strong></td>
<td>An update on the changing landscape of further education, the opportunities for Warrington and Vale Royal College and its performance</td>
<td>Following a review of post 16 education provision, the Cheshire and Warrington Area Review Recommendations were published in November 2016. Further education plays a crucial role in preparing young people for employment and in meeting the needs of local businesses. Warrington and Vale Royal College is a key local provider</td>
<td>Nichola Newton (Principal and Chief Executive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheshire Constabulary</strong></td>
<td>An update on crime statistics for Warrington, including national and local trends, hot topics in Warrington and resource issues</td>
<td>Cheshire Constabulary is a key partner in promoting and ensuring community safety in Warrington. Like all public bodies, the Police are facing challenges in relation to budgets</td>
<td>CI Sarah Pengelly (Cheshire Police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 6</td>
<td>Theme – Council Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Planning</td>
<td><strong>An introduction to the Council’s Emergency Planning process, its existing Plans and multi-agency working across Warrington and Cheshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and other legislative requirements place a duty on Warrington Borough Council to ensure that plans and procedures are in place to effectively respond to a major emergency. Plans should be capable of responding to a variety of emergencies from flooding to large scale incidents such as the recent high profile terror incidents in Manchester and London and the Grenfell Tower fire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Muna D Abdel Aziz</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Rate Relief</td>
<td><strong>To receive an update on what the Council pays out, and how the system is funded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charities and amateur community sports clubs can apply for relief of up to 80% if a property is used for charitable purposes. ‘Discretionary relief’ (up to 100%) may be provided by local councils to ‘top up’ certain reliefs to give charities extra help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adrian Webster</td>
<td>18 October 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Transport in Warrington - Update</td>
<td><strong>To receive a report on the following matters:-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | • Implications of the Bus Services Act 2017;  
| | • The extent of route subsidisation in Warrington; and  
| | • Concessionary Fare scheme - update |
| | In February 2017, the Committee received a report outlining the national context regarding public transport and setting the scene for consideration of the Council’s approach to bus transport as a shareholder of a local bus company. A report on related issues was request in six months time. |
| | David Boyer | 18 October 2017 |
| Home Improvement Loans | **To consider whether the Council with its partners might establish a system for Home Improvement Loans for vulnerable older people who are unable to maintain their properties to an acceptable standard. The loan could be secured as charge against the property.** |
| | The English House Survey 2014/15 identified 20% of homes nationally which failed to meet the Decent Homes Standard. In Warrington work was also carried out to identify homes with solid walls which were harder to heat, many of which were located in the inner wards. Substantial investment would be needed to bring these homes up to standard. |
| | Dr Muna Abdel Aziz | 6 December 2017  
7 February 2018 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Process</strong></td>
<td>The annual look at the steps taken to develop the Council’s budget for 2018/19</td>
<td>By 2020, the Council’s budget will have been cut by more than a third. The Council has further savings still to find in the next three years. Alongside this, demand for services is increasing due to a mixture of factors, including the population getting older and people living longer.</td>
<td>Lynton Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health Annual Report 2017</strong></td>
<td>To receive a more in-depth report on the work of the Public Health Service, in the light of the information provided in the Public Health Annual Report 2017: Prevention: People, Place and Prosperity</td>
<td>The Committee is aware that the Public Health Service has recently published its Annual Report for 2017. The service collects public health intelligence and provides public health improvement and protection and is central to the Government’s aim of reducing the burden on the NHS by preventing or minimising ill-health.</td>
<td>Dr Muna Abdel Aziz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation and Engagement</strong></td>
<td>To receive a report on the Council’s approach to consultation and engagement</td>
<td>The Council consults on significant changes to its policies and services and other matters, such as the annual Budget. The level of engagement can range from simple information sharing to full devolution, where participants are involved in shaping the final decision. A Manager’s Toolkit on Consultation and Engagement is currently accessible via the Council’s Intranet. A review of the consultation and engagement activity and approach is currently taking place</td>
<td>Amanda Juggins (supported by Helen Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Social Care and Children’s Care Services Complaints – Annual Report</strong></td>
<td>To receive the annual report on adult social care and children’s cares services complaints, to obtain a view on the overall performance of Council care services and to identify any potential trends or problem areas</td>
<td>Local authorities are required to establish a statutory complaints procedure for both adults and children’s social care and to provide an annual report. Guidance requires the report to be provided to an overview and scrutiny committee</td>
<td>Rick Howell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Funding Formula for Schools and High Needs Funding</th>
<th>To maintain a watching brief on the implications of the recent Government consultations on the National Funding Formula for Schools and High Needs Funding</th>
<th>The Government’s stage 2 consultations on National Funding Formula for Schools and High Needs Funding closed on 22 March 2017. The outcome is not yet known, but any proposals are likely to have significant implications for local authority maintained schools in Warrington and local academies. In the Queen’s Speech on 21 June 2017 the Government has stated that it remains committed to Fairer Funding, but did not identify any immediate legislative proposals.</th>
<th>Hilary Smith</th>
<th>TBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE);</td>
<td>Scoping required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialism and Treasury Management Strategy</td>
<td>Scoping required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Strategy</td>
<td>Scoping required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Strategy</td>
<td>Scoping required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Strategy</td>
<td>To monitor the implementation of the Youth Service Strategy – 2017 - 2020</td>
<td>The Youth Service underwent a restructure in April 2016, which resulted in a focus on targeted support. The new three year Youth Service Strategy was informed by a survey of young people undertaken in 2016 and information from Public Health about trends and issues.</td>
<td>Debbie Leadbetter</td>
<td>Considered by PMV Policy Committee on 20/02/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Spaces Strategy</td>
<td>Scoping required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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