Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday 6 April 2016

9.30 am, Colman & Cavell Rooms
South Norfolk House, Cygnet Court,
Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance

Large print version can be made available

Contact: Sue Elliott on 01508 533943 or democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Members of the Scrutiny Committee:

Cllr L Neal (Chairman)
Cllr T Lewis (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr B Bernard
Cllr B Duffin
Cllr D Fulcher
Cllr C Gould
Cllr K Kiddie
Cllr G Minshull
Cllr J Wilby

This meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed by the public; however anyone who wishes to do so must inform the chairman and ensure it is done in a non-disruptive and public manner. Please review the Council's guidance on filming and recording meetings available in the meeting room.
Agenda

1. To report apologies for absence and identify substitute voting members (if any);

2. To deal with any items of business the Chairman decides should be considered as matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act, 1972. Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances" (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency;

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;  (Please see guidance attached page 6)

4. To confirm the minutes of the Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 2 and 17 February 2016;  (copy attached – page 7)

5. Oral Report from the SNC Representative on Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny regarding South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group;  (NHOSC report attached for your reference – page 18)

   Members are invited to consider whether further input from the Scrutiny Committee is required.

6. Annual Review of the Scrutiny Committee 2015-16;  (attached – page 24)

   Members are invited to consider the Annual Review prior to its consideration at the Council AGM.

7. Scrutiny Work Programme, Tracker and Cabinet Core Agenda;  (attached – page 39)
Working style of the Scrutiny Committee and a protocol for those attending

Independence
Members of the Scrutiny Committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups.

Member leadership
Members of the Committee will take the lead in selecting topics for and in questioning witnesses. The Committee will expect members of Cabinet, rather than officers, to take the main responsibility for answering the Committee’s questions about topics, which relate mainly to the Council’s activities.

A constructive atmosphere
Meetings of the Committee will be constructive, and not judgmental, accepting that effective overview and scrutiny is best achieved through challenging and constructive enquiry. People giving evidence at the Committee should not feel under attack.

Respect and trust
Meetings will be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

Openness and transparency
The Committee’s business will be open and transparent, except where there are sound reasons for protecting confidentiality. In particular, the minutes of the Committee’s meetings will explain the discussion and debate, so that it could be understood by those who were not present.
Consensus
Members of the Committee will work together and, while recognising political allegiances, will attempt to achieve consensus and agreed recommendations.

Impartial and independent officer advice
Officers who advise and support the Committee will give impartial and independent advice, recognising the importance of the Scrutiny Committee in the Council's arrangements for governance, as set out in the Constitution.

Regular review
There will be regular reviews of how the overview and scrutiny process is working, and a willingness to change if it is not working well.

Programming and planning
The Scrutiny Committee will have a programme of work. Members will agree the topics to be included in the work programme, the extent of the investigation to be undertaken in relation to resources, and the witnesses to be invited to give evidence.

Managing time
The Committee will attempt to conclude the business of each meeting in reasonable time. The order of business will be arranged as far as possible to minimise the demands on the time of witnesses.
DEclarations of interest at meetings

Members are asked to declare any interests they have in the meeting. Members are required to identify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates.

- In the case of other interests, the member may speak and vote on the matter.
- If it is a pecuniary interest, the member must withdraw from the meeting when it is discussed.
- If it affects or relates to a pecuniary interest the member has, they have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting.
- Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.
- In any case, members have the right to remove themselves from the meeting or the voting if they consider, in the circumstances, it is appropriate to do so.

Should Members have any concerns relating to interests they have, they are encouraged to contact the Monitoring Officer (or Deputy) or another member of the Democratic Services Team in advance of the meeting.
Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on 2 February 2016 at 9.30am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: L Neal (Chairman), D Fulcher, C Gould, K Kiddie, T Lewis, G Minshull and J Wilby

Apologies: Councillors: B Bernard, B Duffin and K Kiddie

Substitute: Councillor: D Goldson (left after Item 7) for K Kiddie

Cabinet Members in Attendance: Councillors: Y Bendle, J Fuller and M Wilby

Others in Attendance: S Cheshire and M Armitage – Norfolk CAB
J John – North East Suffolk CAB (NESCAB)
M Jones – Diss & Thetford CAB
S Barnes – Commissioning Manager for Children and Young People
Plus one member of the public

Officers in Attendance: The Chief Executive (S Dinneen), the Director of Community Services (P Boyce), the Director of Growth and Localism (T Horspole), the Early Intervention Manager (M Pursehouse), the Housing Access and Standards Manager (T Cooke), the Projects and Process Manager (A Mewes), the Independent Living Team Leader (S Cayford), the Housing and Public Health Partnerships Officer (L Pickering), the Policy Officer (P Chapman), and the Scrutiny and Information Rights Officer (E Goddard)
1156 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared “other” interests in the matters listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>SNC Representative on Norfolk CAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Minshull</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>Benefit claimant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code>                    | 1160   | Provided proxy vote for Diss &amp; Thetford CAB     |
</code></pre>

1157 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 18 November 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

1158 EARLY HELP HUB REVIEW

The Early Intervention Manager provided members with a presentation that detailed the ongoing work and future plans of the Help Hub (HH). He advised the Committee of the importance of collaboration and information sharing between the various agencies within the HH, and provided case studies and examples of how the professionalism and teamwork of its partners had made vast improvements to the lives of many South Norfolk residents. Members were reminded of the cost efficiencies of providing early help so that difficulties could be resolved before they escalated and required more extensive and expensive solutions.

The Commissioning Manager for Children and Young People, Sarah Barnes provided the Committee with a presentation on the Integrated 0-19 Years Healthy Child Programme. Members were advised that the Programme had been commissioned in October 2015 and proposed that professionals would actively seek to help vulnerable people and those in need of care and assistance. It was noted that the Healthy Child Programme also included the work of Health Visitors and School Nurses who would carry out routine visits to tackle weight and developmental problems in children, deal with post-natal depression in mothers, and ensure that children would have a named Health Visitor for the first year of their lives.
The Independent Living Team Leader spoke briefly on the work of the HH regarding independent living in the District, advising members that it was perfectly placed for professionals to quickly deal with issues and therefore reduce the cost and burden on public services. The Committee was reminded of the various grants and assistance available to residents, including the Handy Person Scheme which assisted with adaptations to people’s homes, and Forget Me Not Grants for people with dementia, and it was noted that both schemes were created to help enable residents to remain in their own homes.

Cllr Bendle commended the work of the HH and was pleased at the progress made since its inception one year previously. She stated that the number of people using its services had increased substantially and this figure was continuing to grow, adding that South Norfolk Council itself was also benefitting from the facility. Members were encouraged to continue to spread the word throughout their Wards to further increase public awareness.

In response to a member’s question regarding whether the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) had similar aims and agendas to those of the early help services, the Early Intervention Manager advised that the HH was still developing, growing and continuing with its ‘journey’. He stated that the DWP was undergoing a culture change and that relationships were being encouraged to ensure common goals, adding that a senior manager from the DWP was already a member of the Executive Group.

In reply to a member’s question of whether the Help Hub’s operation was dependent upon the budgets of partners, the Early Intervention Manager confirmed that resources had been pooled and that staff employed in the Hub were existing employees of the agencies who worked in the hub. The Director of Community Services stressed that the work being undertaken to promote and enable independent living and provide preventative care was an investment in the health services, decreasing the need for more expensive hospital and residential care, and improving the lives, skills and health of residents.

The Chief Executive advised members that funding had not been sought from all partners when the HH was created, however the set-up costs and the first three years of operation had been part-funded by Children’s Services, and that most of the Early Help Team had been formed by the relocation of existing staff. Members noted that, as the Help Hub had proven its success and was entering its second phase, research would be made into how processes could be improved and how funds could be directed more efficiently.

Members discussed the complexities of quantifying the costs and savings of the HH, due to the unknown future effects upon residents and services resulting from the impact of its work. Officers added that many of the benefits and outcomes of their work would be realised in the long term and were not quick fixes i.e. early intervention with child obesity having a vast future impact on adult diabetes.
The Committee discussed how the Council intended to raise awareness and promote the HH through schools and toddler groups, and were looking at promoting the brand but also required members to spread the word. Members also discussed the poor public perception of care work, agreeing that the job was not well paid or highly recognised as a worthwhile profession. Cllr Bendle stated that she had been working with job centres to promote care working as a worthwhile career, and would speak to Adult Social Services about the promotion of this.

After discussion, it was

RESOLVED

To

1. note the progress of early help services;

2. recommend that officers investigate new methods and outlets in order to advertise the Help Hub;

and

3. recommend that officers liaise with Adult Social Services to address the promotion of care work with a view to improving its recognition as a worthwhile profession.

1159 PROCESSING BENEFIT CLAIMS

Members considered the report of the Policy Officer, which sought to advise the Committee of the Council’s performance in relation to processing benefit claims, and highlighted the significant improvements in processing times over the last quarter.

The Policy Officer provided members with details of improvements that had been achieved in order to reduce processing times back to acceptable levels and the procedures implemented to ensure that any future issues were effectively managed. The Committee was pleased to note the positive progress made in improving benefits processing times and that the Revenues and Benefits Team would continue to build upon the good working methods to ensure greater efficiencies in the future.
Following a brief discussion, it was

RESOLVED

To note the contents of the report and endorse the good practice employed over the past quarter.

1160 REVIEW OF ADVICE AND SUPPORT SERVICES – CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAUX (CABx)

The Chairman welcomed S Cheshire and M Armitage (Norfolk CAB), J John (North East Suffolk CAB (NESCAB)), M Jones (Diss & Thetford CAB) and member of the public, P Allen, to the meeting.

The Committee was reminded that in 2014, the Service Level Agreements (SLAs) were reviewed and agreed with the three CABx in South Norfolk, for a two-year period. Members considered the report of the Housing and Public Health Partnerships Officer that sought to advise the Committee of the outcomes and changes to the SLAs, the level to which the objectives set had been achieved, and to ask them to consider how the current model could be improved.

Members were advised that many organisations provided advice and assistance to residents but that there were concerns that some advice providers might not be referring and escalating more complex issues, where appropriate. Officers stated that, in some instances, there was duplication of work which resulted in higher costs to advice providers and a less favourable service to customers. The Housing and Public Health Partnerships Officer stressed the importance of a collaborative approach and ‘making every contact count’. He advised that the Council’s focus was on avoiding costly and unnecessary duplication of work and negating the need for residents who required help to have to ‘re-tell their stories’ to several organisations in order to receive comprehensive advice. The Housing Access and Standards Manager reassured the Committee that steps were being taken to align these services to ensure a more simplified, measurable and customer focussed working practice.

Mr Cheshire (Norfolk CAB) provided the Committee with a presentation which detailed the work of the three CABx in South Norfolk. Members were advised of the skills, dedication and professionalism of the staff and volunteers who worked for the CABx, and were provided with examples of the types of services they regularly provided to South Norfolk residents.

There were some concerns raised regarding the lack of measurable outcomes reported by the CABx as members felt it was necessary to be able to assess their outcomes, outputs and achievements when renegotiating the SLA.
In response to a member’s question regarding the level of interaction between the CABx and the Early Help Hub, it was confirmed that, although the referral systems at the CABx did not currently allow them to refer residents to the Hub, this would soon be rectified. The Housing Access and Standards Manager confirmed that the Hub was still developing after one year in operation and that work was being undertaken to align this alongside other organisations to improve the service provision in the District. Members agreed that regular communication between the Council and the CABx would help to streamline the work undertaken and resolve the problems of duplication and confusion.

Miss Allen addressed the Committee and spoke of her concerns, agreeing that the Early Help Hub was of major benefit to residents and value for money, but she felt that it would be unable to take on even a small percentage of the CABx’ work due to the high volumes of people seeking help.

Cllr Bendle spoke of her previous involvement with the CABx and of her participation in the inception of the Early Help Hub and its ongoing journey. She agreed that more communication was required between CABx and the Hub and felt that the CABx should be provided with a thorough understanding of the work being undertaken, and trained in how they could utilise it for their customers, which would result in a more collaborative and streamlined way of working.

After discussion, it was

**RESOLVED**

To

1. note the contribution made to date by the South Norfolk CABx in the provision of advice services for residents;

2. support the need to ensure value for money, and clear outcome-based performance measurement which shows improved outcomes for residents;

3. endorse the re-negotiation of SLAs going forward in line with the content of the report;

and

4. recommend that officers regularly liaise with the CABx to share best practices and current issues to encourage a more collaborative and joined-up way of working.
1161  REVIEW OF 2016-17 BUSINESS PLAN

The Projects and Process Manager presented the Committee with his report which provided details of the draft Business Plan for 2016/17. He explained that the main difference this year was that the Plan had been aligned with the Council’s new Corporate Plan priorities rather than around organisational structures. Cllr Fuller advised the Committee that there had been a significant squeeze of Local Government finances and, as South Norfolk had historically maintained a strong financial record, the Council had been greatly affected. He reassured members of his confidence that the Council was on the right track and that activity would continue to grow in the District.

It was noted that there were two typographical errors in the Draft Business Plan and it was agreed that these would be amended.

In response to a member’s question, the Projects and Process Manager confirmed that some changes had been made to the Draft Business Plans following feedback received during the members’ workshop, in particular regarding the Digital Engagement Strategy and the Market Towns Initiative. The Director of Community Services confirmed that both Councillors and staff had contributed to the Plan and that the Strategic Leadership Forum would review the document to ensure that its themes were embedded within the Council.

Following a brief discussion around the repairs and maintenance facility for Big Sky Property Management Ltd., the Committee agreed that the Draft Business Plan was well compiled and easy to understand and it was

RESOLVED

To note the Draft Business Plan and commend it to Cabinet, subject to two typographical amendments.

1162  SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – WORK PROGRAMME, TRACKER AND CABINET CORE AGENDA

Members noted the Work Programme, Tracker and Cabinet Core Agenda.

Copies of a proposed non-suspensive call-in paper was distributed to the Committee. This paper referred to the proposed Corporate Environment Policy which had been considered by Cabinet on 18 January 2016. Members were advised that, as alternative action had been agreed, the call-in would not be considered at this meeting.

(The meeting concluded at 12:40pm)

Chairman
1163  REVENUE BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2016/17

The Accountancy Manager introduced his report detailing the Revenue Budget from which Council Tax levels would be determined by Full Council. He summarised the salient points and assured the Committee that the revenue budget was balanced and made no calls on general revenue reserves.

He outlined the challenges that the Council was facing in the form of reductions to funding from central government but reassured members that by increasing income and reducing expenditure, a balanced budget would be delivered in 2016/17. A forecast revenue surplus of £2.5million was anticipated in 2015/16 which would increase revenue reserves. Uncertainty remained around the future of the New Homes Bonus beyond 2016/17, which was subject to the results of a current government consultation. There were also anticipated
reductions in funding from the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) which would end in 2018/19 and from 2019/20 the Council would instead make a payment to the Treasury of £50,000 that year. To help the Council make up for these reductions in funding it was proposed that Council Tax should be increased by £4.32 (3.3%) in 2016/17 for a Band D property and further increases of £3.00 were proposed for each year after that.

The Committee considered the risks associated with the full devolution of business rates to local authorities from 2019/20. Officers explained that a number of Local Authorities had received claims for charitable relief from business rates from NHS Foundation Trusts. Members were informed that at present the Council received more than £1 million in business rates from NHS Foundation Trusts and if there was an application for a back-dated claim then this could cost the Council approximately £9 million. The Committee was informed that the Local Government Association was taking legal advice on behalf of its members around the validity of the NHS Foundation Trusts claims for charitable status. Members would be kept informed of this development.

The Director of Business Development responded to members' concerns over the reduction in the RSG by explaining that all forms of funding had been taken into account in the budget before the Committee. It was explained that South Norfolk would not be alone in making a payment to the Treasury in 2019/20 and that if the Council signed up to the government’s proposed funding settlement by mid-October 2016 and produced an efficiency plan, then it would be partially protected from any further cuts to its RSG funding in future. However, this protection would not include any other forms of Government funding. In response to questions over the 2015/16 surplus, the Accountancy Manager explained that this had been created through good management of investments and higher than anticipated fees from planning applications and positive variances in non-pay expenditure. Officers indicated that further savings of £2.8 million would be needed by 2021 in addition to annual income increases of £1.8 million to maintain a balanced budget in the future. Overall, the budget gap would be in excess of £4 million.

Officers advised members that there were no significant new initiatives within the 2016/17 budget but that instead the forthcoming year’s business plan was building on existing strategies of increasing income in areas such as leisure and planning while undertaking LEAN reviews to reduce expenditure. The Council would also look to achieve efficiencies through influencing customer behaviour through the development of its website. Officers would also be reviewing the levels of service provided to residents and business to enable members to make decisions on whether these should be adjusted to release additional resources.

The Committee voted 6-0, with 2 abstentions, to endorse Cabinet’s recommendations.

**RESOLVED**

To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2016/17
The Accountancy Manager outlined his report which proposed a Capital Programme for the period April 2016 to March 2021. He advised the Committee that this would advance the Council’s three priority areas as set out in the Corporate Plan whilst continuing with investment in Council assets and IT systems to improve service delivery. Members were informed that by investing in commercial properties, the Council was able to secure a 7% Gross return on investment compared to a return of only 0.89% for cash in the bank and this therefore represented better value for money for the taxpayer. However, this was at the detriment of liquidity. To assist in the Capital Programme, £3.5million would be used from the Council’s revenue reserves over the 5 year programme.

Responding to a question from Cllr T Lewis, the Director of Business Development confirmed that although £20million was signposted for investment in commercial property over the next three years, £8million of this had been allocated for commercial properties around the A11 and the Norwich Research Park. Members were assured that further details of these investments would be presented to a future Cabinet meeting. In the event that an investment opportunity arose which required immediate action before Cabinet had time to meet, members were reminded that the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the relevant portfolio holder was empowered to act on the Council’s behalf with retrospective approval from Cabinet.

In response to questions concerning potential borrowing options open to the Council, the Director of Business Development explained that if borrowing was done through the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB), then it would be done at a fixed rate, currently below 4%. However, options would be explored regarding the source of borrowing. Members queried if all funding options had been included in the figures quoted in the report, including from European Union (EU) funding. Officers confirmed that they were confident in the accuracy of the figures and that the Council was not currently in receipt of EU funds directly but actively signposted businesses in South Norfolk to apply for relevant EU funds.

Officers advised members that 2015/16 was the final year in which aids and adaptations would be funded from the LSVT receipts. Members queried whether the Right to Buy (RTB) receipts were used for this. The Director of Business Development explained that RTB receipts were accounted for as capital receipts. Following confirmation from Cllr Y Bendle and the Director of Business Development, members were assured that the Disabled Facilities Grant was well placed to meet any rising demand placed upon it as it was increasing to more than £700,000 in 2016/17.

The Committee voted 6-0, with 2 abstentions, to endorse Cabinet’s recommendations.

RESOLVED

To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Capital Programme April 2016 to March 2021
The Accountancy Manager introduced his report which outlined the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy. Members were advised that although interest rates were currently predicted to increase by the end of 2016, there was no certainty about when this would happen and that over the last few years this anticipated increase had been pushed further into the future. The Committee noted that the Strategy in the report showed that the Council was well placed to fund its Capital Programme by borrowing from its own reserves.

Members asked if a change in interest rates would have any effect upon the proposals in the report. The Accountancy Manager assured the Committee that allowances had been made for any change in interest rates in the Council’s Medium Term Plan. In response to further questions about borrowing, the Director of Business Development explained that bonds were being offered by the Municipal Bond Agency which would be considered. Were a loan to be taken from the Public Works Loan Board, it would not be secured against Council property. The Committee was advised that officers would explore all potential sources of borrowing to provide the best outcome for the Council.

The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the Cabinet’s recommendations.

RESOLVED

To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2019

The Scrutiny and Information Rights Officer informed members that a report on the ASC Workforce would be presented in June 2016 and a report on South Norfolk Choice-based Lettings would be presented in December 2016. These had been added to the Work Programme.

Members also noted the Cabinet Core Agenda.

(The meeting concluded at 10:50am)
An opportunity for the Committee to discuss the way in which South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group proposed changes to policies and services for in-year implementation in 2015-16.

1. **Background**

1.1 In January 2016 South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group (SNCCG) reported to its Governing Body that its forecasted deficit for 2015-16 was £6,645k, which was in line with the financial plan it submitted to NHS England in May 2015. In November 2015 it reported there was also a risk of an additional potential overspend of £1.3m if Quality Innovation Productivity and Prevention (QIPP) savings were not delivered and if unplanned activity rose above predicted levels. In January 2016 that potential additional overspend had reduced to £910k.

1.2 In the third quarter of 2015-16 the CCG brought forward a number of proposals for changes to policy and services. Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny (NHOSC) members were notified about these changes via the NHOSC Briefing, where possible, but notice periods were increasingly short towards the end of 2015. It seemed clear that the proposals, or at least the timescales in which they were brought forward, were being driven by the need to make in-year cost savings.

1.3 The former Chief Officer and Chief Finance Officer had both left the CCG in mid 2015 and interims were in place. The interim Chief Officer left just before Christmas and a new permanent Chief Executive Officer took up post on 27th January 2016.

2. **Proposed changes**

2.1 **Decommissioning of intermediate care beds**

2.1.1 Towards the end of November 2015 SNCCG proposed to serve notice on (decommission) 9 intermediate care beds; 6 at All Hallows Hospital, Ditchingham and 3 at Lincoln House Nursing Home, Swanton Morley. These beds were block purchased, which means that they were paid for whether they were in use or not. The CCG wished to cancel this arrangement and move to spot purchase arrangements, whereby it
would ‘buy’ intermediate care beds as and when needed. The block purchase of the 9 beds was to end on 22 December 2015.

2.1.2 Brief details of this proposal were sent to the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager on 11 December. These details and an explanation of subsequent events were included in 14 January NHOSC Briefing.

2.1.3 In mid-December All Hallows was informed that the block purchase arrangement could continue until 7 January 2016 and just before Christmas the CCG and All Hallows announced that the beds would not be decommissioned before April 2016. Agreement was also reached with Lincoln House for its beds to remain open up to April 2016.

2.1.3 The CCG intends to re-procure intermediate care in its area from April 2016. It has explained that over the past three years the length of time that patients stay in the majority of intermediate care beds has reduced from around 30 days to 18 days. This has, in effect, increased bed capacity. The CCG wants the non-NHS providers of intermediate care to adopt the model of shorter lengths of stay and this will be reflected in the re-procurement process. It has also made clear that it does not consider the re-procurement process will result in a substantial change to service that would require consultation with NHOSC.

2.1.4 A Prior Information Notice (PIN) will be published in mid February and a market engagement day for potential providers will be held in the first week of March. After it sees the response from providers and is confident that the re-procurement will proceed, the CCG intends to have a 2 – 3 week window where the public can give feedback on the plans. As part of the public engagement process the CCG will:-

- Explain what it is doing – short term measures with long term aims
- Ask for feedback on current bed capacity
- Ask for feedback on what it is proposing
- Discuss some possible options for a reconfigured intermediate care bed / community care model in South Norfolk.

2.1.5 Possible options for a reconfigured intermediate care bed / community care model in South Norfolk will be set out during the public engagement process so that people understand the context of the re-procurement process and are made aware that further changes may be coming in the future. The CCG is not proposing to implement any of these options in April 2016. It has given assurance that it would consult on any such proposals at a later date.

2.1.6 The proposal to decommission block purchased beds at All Hallows and Lincoln House in advance of the re-procurement process appears to have been driven by the need to make immediate financial savings in 2015-16.
2.2 **Clinical evidence review prior to operations (including for second cataract operations)**

2.2.1 The press reported on 9 December 2015 that SNCCG had written to GPs to inform them that 31 surgeries for patients on the CCG’s Prior Approval List, including second eye cataract operations, would now be automatically rejected unless clinicians could demonstrate that an exception should be made. From 1 December 2015 applications for patients’ second eye cataract operations were only to be decided by the Individual Funding Request (IFR) panel.

2.2.2 There was no advance notification of the policy change so NHOSC members did not get the opportunity to look at the details and consider whether or not the proposal was likely to lead to a substantial variation to service for which consultation with the committee would be appropriate.

2.2.3 After Christmas the CCG confirmed that the policy change had been amended and clarified for GPs. Applications for second eye cataract operations would not go to IFR panel, but a new clinical evidence review stage would be included in the Prior Approval process. The CCG also gave assurance that the process would take no longer than 48 hours from start to finish and there would be no detrimental impact on the 18 week referral to treatment pathway.

2.2.4 In a further development in January, the CCG indicated that the change to process would now be taken forward as a project with North Norfolk CCG and Public Health England. The plan was to look at the hip and knee pathway first and then to expand to other procedures. The CCG was also planning to engage with the acute hospitals on changes to process.

2.2.5 It remains to be seen if fewer patients will receive the treatments and procedures that are on the Prior Approval and Non-Routine treatments and procedures list as a result of this project, or if the threshold of need that triggers a referral to secondary care in these cases will be greater than at present.

When it was looking to introduce a clinical evidence review stage to the process for approval of referrals for second eye cataract operations, the CCG said it did not expect a significant change in the numbers going forward for surgery.

2.2.6 Members received details in the NHOSC Briefing 14 January 2016 about the situation regarding changes in the Prior Approval process.

2.3 **Restriction on hearing aids for adults with mild hearing loss**

2.3.1 On 23 November 2015 the CCG provided information for NHOSC about its proposal to revise criteria regarding eligibility for hearing aids for adults, restricting the issue of hearing aids to patients with a hearing loss measured as mild. The information was included in the NHOSC Briefing, 3 December 2015.
2.3.2 The CCG held a public consultation from 9 November to 15 January 2016, using its website and one public meeting.

2.3.3 The original proposal was to apply the eligibility restrictions only to adults over the age of 50, which the CCG estimated would affect approximately 700 people per annum and save in excess of £177,000. During the consultation period the CCG decided to extend the proposal to all adults with mild hearing loss. This was due to direct feedback which suggested that to limit the restriction to adults over 50 was discriminatory. In taking the decision to extend the threshold, the CCG further extended the consultation period to accommodate for the revision.

2.3.4 On 26 January 2016 the CCG Governing Body decided to not to restrict audiology services for people with mild hearing loss for the time being. This was due partly to the feedback received from local people, clinicians and patient groups during the public consultation. The CCG has decided to await the publication of a national Commissioning Framework for Hearing Services, which is due in April 2016. NHS England is currently working on the Framework with input from several organisations including Action on Hearing Loss and the National Community Hearing Association. It will provide model service specification, contracts etc. and enable CCGs to follow good practice and reduce costs.

2.3.5 Other CCGs in England that have already considered restricting the funding of hearing aids include North Staffordshire, South Staffordshire, Mid Essex, Devon and Cornwall. North Staffordshire brought its policy into force in October 2015.

2.4 Reduction in IVF provision

2.4.1 South Norfolk CCG provided information for the NHOSC Briefing 15 October 2015 on its proposal to restrict IVF (in vitro fertilisation; level 3 Specialist Fertility Services) provision from 1 January 2016 to the following exceptional circumstances:-

- Patients undergoing cancer treatments/chemotherapy
- Patients who have a disease or condition requiring a medical or surgical treatment that has a significant likelihood of making them infertile
- Couples who meet current eligibility criteria in which the male partner has a chronic viral infection where there is high risk of viral transmission to the female partner and potentially any unborn child (such as HIV or Hepatitis C), would also be offered ICSI (intra-cytoplasmic sperm injection).

2.4.2 The CCG ran an on-line public consultation between 16 October and 13 November 2015 and on 24 November 2015 the Governing Body approved the proposed restrictions.

2.4.3 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidance suggests that the NHS should offer patients 3 cycles of IVF. Most CCGs
do not offer 3 cycles but South Norfolk has become one of very few in England to offer none, except for patients in exceptional circumstances. Norwich, North Norfolk and West Norfolk CCGs offer 2 cycles for women under the age of 40 and 1 cycle for those aged between 40 and 42. Great Yarmouth and Waveney CCG offers 3 cycles, with a maximum maternal age of 42.

2.4.4 South Norfolk CCG estimates that in future just 5 couples per annum will receive NHS funded Level 3 Specialist Fertility Services and the saving will be approximately £188,068 per annum.

2.5 Withdrawal of prescriptions for gluten-free products

2.5.1 The CCG provided information for the NHOSC Briefing 15 October 2015 on its proposal to withdraw prescriptions for gluten-free products. North Norfolk CCG became the first CCG in England to take this step in July 2015 and now South Norfolk, Norwich and West Norfolk have followed suit, although West Norfolk continues to allow prescriptions for under 18s, which the others do not. Great Yarmouth and Waveney CCG continues to allow prescription of gluten-free products to children and adults but limits the amount.

2.5.2 South Norfolk CCG estimated that 350 people would be affected by the change and the cost saving would be £150,000 per annum.

3. Purpose of today’s meeting

3.1 Members of NHOSC were aware of South Norfolk CCG’s financial situation and aware of their own responsibility to consider financial sustainability when considering the CCG’s proposals for change. No objections were raised by the committee to the proposals of which members were notified in the October and December NHOSC Briefings.

3.2 However, concerns grew about the way in which the CCG was bringing proposals forward one at a time with no opportunity for NHOSC or members of the public to assess how overall NHS provision in South Norfolk was changing.

3.3 The concerns were compounded during December when news about restrictions on second eye cataract operations appeared in the press before any notification to NHOSC and when All Hallows hospital warned of possible closure as an unintended consequence of South Norfolk CCG’s decision to decommission block purchased beds.

3.4 The Chairman and Vice Chairman of NHOSC agreed that South Norfolk CCG should be invited to today’s meeting to discuss its handling of proposals for in-year changes in the second half of 2015-16. The new Chief Officer, the Clinical Chair and the Chief Operating Officer will attend today’s meeting to answer members’ questions.
4. **Suggested approach**

4.1 Members may wish to focus on the following areas:-

(a) It has appeared as though some of the changes listed in section 2 of this report were brought forward sooner than the CCG may have ideally wished, in order to mitigate immediate financial pressures. How can the CCG avoid a similar situation arising in 2016-17?

(b) What are the CCG’s comments about equality of access to NHS services following the introduction of policies in South Norfolk that are more restrictive than in neighbouring CCG areas?

(c) There is a Joint Committee for commissioning across the North Norfolk, Norwich and South Norfolk CCGs but the CCGs have acted differently in the face of financial pressures. Would merger of the three CCGs be a better option for economic sustainability and equitable delivery of NHS services across central Norfolk?

(d) Before proposing the de-commissioning of block purchased intermediate care beds at short notice, did the CCG fully investigate and understand the potential effect on the providers and the possible knock-on effects on the wider health and social care system (in terms of delayed discharges from the acute hospitals)?

(e) Can the CCG assure NHOSC that it will in future give early notification of proposals for changes that members may consider to be substantial, so that there is time for consultation with the committee if members wish it?

If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (Textphone) and we will do our best to help.
Annual review of the Scrutiny Committee 2015-16

Introduction by Cllr Lisa Neal, Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee

I am pleased to present this Annual Report of South Norfolk Council’s Scrutiny Committee.

All scrutiny has been carried out by the Committee, there have been no Task and Finish Groups this year. The Scrutiny Tracker System is proving very useful.

A wide variety of issues were scrutinised by the committee this year and our recommendations were accepted by Cabinet or Council. Any South Norfolk member or parish council can suggest a topic for investigation or review by the committee and all are welcome to attend our meetings.

We repeated the Directorate Plan workshop in December and believe it is evolving well to suit our needs. It allows all members to take part in informal scrutiny of the Directorate Plans, should they wish to do so, and is an excellent alternative to committee based scrutiny. The officers and members who took part this year felt that it worked very well.

I would like to thank all the officers who contribute the information and research required for our committee work, and our Scrutiny Officer, Emma Goddard, for her support and for co-ordinating everything so effectively.

I commend the report to the Council.

Lisa Neal
Working style of the Scrutiny Committee

Independence
Members of the Scrutiny Committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups.

Member leadership
Members of the Committee will take the lead in selecting topics for and in questioning witnesses. The Committee will expect members of Cabinet, rather than officers, to take the main responsibility for answering the Committee’s questions about topics, which relate mainly to the Council’s activities.

A constructive atmosphere
Meetings of the Committee will be constructive, and not judgmental, accepting that effective overview and scrutiny is best achieved through challenging and constructive enquiry. People giving evidence at the Committee should not feel under attack.

Respect and trust
Meetings will be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

Openness and transparency
The Committee’s business will be open and transparent, except where there are sound reasons for protecting confidentiality. In particular, the minutes of the Committee’s meetings will explain the discussion and debate, so that it could be understood by those who were not present.

Consensus
Members of the Committee will work together and, while recognising political allegiances, will attempt to achieve consensus and agreed recommendations.

Impartial and independent officer advice
Officers who advise and support the Committee will give impartial and independent advice, recognising the importance of the Scrutiny Committee in the Council’s arrangements for governance, as set out in the Constitution.

Regular review
There will be regular reviews of how the overview and scrutiny process is working, and a willingness to change if it is not working well.
**Programming and planning**
The Scrutiny Committee will have a programme of work. Members will agree the topics to be included in the work programme, the extent of the investigation to be undertaken in relation to resources, and the witnesses to be invited to give evidence.

**Managing time**
The Committee will attempt to conclude the business of each meeting in reasonable time. The order of business will be arranged as far as possible to minimise the demands on the time of witnesses.
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The membership of the Scrutiny Committee 2015-16

At South Norfolk Council the scrutiny function is carried out by the Council’s Scrutiny Committee and any Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups that it may appoint to investigate specific issues in greater depth. The Scrutiny Committee is politically balanced and is made up of councillors from the political groups that make up the Council. Only non–cabinet members can be on the committee and this allows those members to have an active role in the Council’s decision-making process.

The Scrutiny Committee is chaired by Cllr Lisa Neal, who is a member of the Conservative party which is the majority party at South Norfolk Council. The Committee’s Vice-Chairman is Cllr Trevor Lewis, who is a member of the Liberal Democrat Party. The Scrutiny Committee is made up of nine Councillors and membership is as follows:

Councillors:

Lisa Neal (Chairman)
Trevor Lewis (Vice-Chairman)

Brendon Bernard
Barry Duffin
Colin Gould
Keith Kiddie
Des Fulcher
Graham Minshull
Jenny wilby

Other non-executive members also took part as substitute members as and when required
The Scrutiny Year and how it operates at South Norfolk

What is scrutiny and how does it select topics for scrutiny?

Scrutiny is an essential part of ensuring that the Council, its partners and other public bodies remain effective and accountable. Scrutiny can examine and monitor all or part of the activity of a public sector body with the aim of improving the quality of public services. Scrutiny ensures that executives are held accountable for their decisions, that their decision-making process is clear and accessible to the public and that there are opportunities for the public and their representatives to influence and improve public policy.

Predominantly, Scrutiny Committee carries out most of its work in relation to the Council's Cabinet. It undertakes this through scheduled reviews of decisions and policies that have been agreed by the Cabinet in order to hold it to account. In addition, Scrutiny considers call-ins. A summary of decisions made by Cabinet is published immediately after each meeting of Cabinet and any three members of the Council may call-in a decision for Scrutiny to consider, which effectively means the decision is delayed until Scrutiny can examine the decision at its next meeting. After examination, Scrutiny can decide to recommend an alternative option or endorse the decision of the Cabinet. There was one call–in for the period that this Annual Report covers.

Support for the Scrutiny function

The Scrutiny function is supported by Democratic Services. The Scrutiny Officer provides advice to both members and officers and supports the Scrutiny Committee and the various Task and Finish groups that may be set up. Democratic Services Officers produce agendas and clerk the meetings. Senior officers and managers of the Council are expected to attend Scrutiny Committee and present reports at the request of the Committee. In addition, Cabinet members are often present to aid the Committee's understanding of a particular item, which makes scrutiny more effective and constructive.

Policy Committees

Policy development is undertaken by the Policy Committees. This enables a clear segregation between scrutiny and policy development. In the past, the Scrutiny Committee supported the development of policy, whilst also evaluating and assessing policies at an early stage. This structure affords the Scrutiny Committee a more independent role when challenging service delivery. In addition, the Scrutiny Committee may still appoint Task and Finish Groups to look at matters in more depth when required.
The Policy Committees feed directly into Cabinet and make recommendations based on their research and findings. Working on a formal and informal basis, these Committees are flexible to programme their work around upcoming policy and are able to focus on specific areas of the Council.

The work programme for Scrutiny Committee

The Scrutiny Committee has a structured work programme that sets out the investigations and reviews that will be carried out and reported to Committee, which is decided by members. There are also opportunities for parish councils to suggest topics for the Committee to look into. This process is known as the Community Reference Scheme and was developed by the Council some years ago and remains unique to South Norfolk. This demonstrates the commitment South Norfolk has to scrutiny and the involvement of others in the process. Members of the Council are also able to raise topics by way of a simple form or discussion with the Chairman or the Scrutiny Officer. Potential reports are assessed by way of the Council TOPIC analysis which evaluates the merits of scrutinising the issue in terms of Timeliness, Objectives, Performance, Interest and Corporate priorities.

T  Is this the right time to review this issue and is there sufficient Officer time and resource to conduct the review? What is the timescale?
O  What is the reason for review; do officers have a clear objective?
P  Can performance in this area be improved by input from Scrutiny?
I  Is there sufficient interest (particularly from the public)? The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny.
C  Will the review assist the Council to achieve its Corporate Priorities?

Scrutiny Business Plan Workshop

In December each year an informal Scrutiny-led member Workshop is organised to review the Council’s Business Plans. This gives all Councillors the opportunity to shape the activities of the Council and how these are measured in order to deliver the priorities and outcomes determined by Cabinet. Directors and key officers are present at the workshop to answer queries and discuss the Plans.

The session allows members to assess:

- The extent to which the proposals deliver the Council's priorities and outcomes
- The impact of the proposals on customers
- The extent to which the proposals are realistic and achievable
Joint scrutiny bodies

Norfolk County Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC); South Norfolk Council has a member representative who sits on the Norfolk County HOSC plus one substitute member. For the period 2015-2016 the member representative has been Councillor Nigel Legg with Councillor Colin Foulger being the substitute member.

The role of the Norfolk County HOSC is to look at the work of the clinical commissioning groups and National Health Service (NHS) trusts and the local area team of NHS England. It acts as a 'critical friend' by suggesting ways that health related services might be improved. It also looks at the way the health service interacts with social care services, the voluntary sector, independent providers and other county council services to jointly provide better health services to meet the diverse needs of Norfolk residents and improve their well-being.

Please follow the link to the Norfolk County Council website for papers and minutes concerning the above: http://norfolkcc.cmis.uk.com/norfolkcc/Committees/tabid/62/ctl/ViewCMIS_CommitteeDetails/mid/381/id/22/Default.aspx

Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub Panel; South Norfolk Council has a member representative who sits on the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub Panel plus one substitute member. For the period 2015 – 2016 the member representative has been Councillor Robert Savage.

The role of the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub Panel is to:

- Scrutinise the actions, decisions and priorities of the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Crime and Disorder Partnership in respect of crime and disorder on behalf of the (County) Community Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel
- Scrutinise the priorities as set out in the annual Countywide Community Safety Partnership Plan
- Make any reports or recommendations to the Countywide Community Safety Partnership and/or where considered appropriate to the communities Committee.

The work of the Scrutiny Committee and outcomes

The scrutiny tracker provides an overview of the work carried out by the Scrutiny Committee over the last 12 month period. It is apparent that scrutiny investigation can not only produce outcomes in terms of feeding into the decisions that are made but that it can also play a valuable role in informing and developing knowledge for members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Resolution and Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 July 2015</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Grants</td>
<td>Leah Mickleborough</td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED:</strong> to note the Neighbourhood Grants Report and its findings.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>Members conducted a thorough review of the first year of the Neighbourhood Grant Scheme. The Committee heard from the Neighbourhood Chairmen, which enabled the Committee to gain an understanding of the Scheme and what it has achieved to-date and gave the Chairmen the opportunity to share good practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sept 2015</td>
<td>Review of The Work of the Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board (IDB)</td>
<td>Bob Wade</td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED:</strong> to note the work of the Norfolk Rivers IDB including its proposals for future working.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>Members learnt of the work of the Norfolk Rivers IDB within the District and of future plans to expand the remit of the IDB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 2015</td>
<td>Market Towns Initiative (MTI)</td>
<td>David Disney</td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED to</strong> 1. note the contents of the report 2. request that officers liaise with Norfolk County Council (NCC) to investigate improving signage in Harleston and to conduct a feasibility study to close exchange street (except for deliveries) to change the route to</td>
<td>The traffic signage study is complete and officers have received prices from NCC to undertake this work. We are also in receipt of a quotation from NCC regarding work specified in the feasibility study. Officers are discussing how this work might be taken forward.</td>
<td>Members of the Committee were pleased to note the achievements of the MTI and hear from the Town Teams regarding events held in the Market Towns and how the Teams had evolved since the last scrutiny review. Members were keen to address issues in the Towns with regard to signage and were particularly concerned by the routing of traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 2015</td>
<td>Corporate Plan 2016-19</td>
<td>Hannah Ralph</td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED</strong> To commend the Corporate Plan to Cabinet and recommend it to Council.</td>
<td>No action</td>
<td>Members were able to conduct pre-scrutiny in relation to the Corporate Plan, ahead of its approval at Council. Members were impressed with the new style Plan and considered that it was much more appealing and user-friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 2015</td>
<td>An update on Council run public conveniences</td>
<td>Paula Boyce</td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED</strong> To note the Council’s approach as highlighted in the report and to encourage local members to work to ensure the viability of each asset on a case by case basis to support local prosperity.</td>
<td>Meetings with local members regarding assets in their Ward are taking place and will continue in order to assist with the Council’s work on this.</td>
<td>Members were satisfied with the Council’s approach to updating Council-run public conveniences. Working with local members will ensure that they are fully aware of plans and work in their Wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb 2016</td>
<td>Early Help Hub Review</td>
<td>Mike Pursehouse</td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED to</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. note the progress of early help services; &lt;br&gt;2. recommend that officers investigate new methods and outlets in order to advertise the Help Hub; and &lt;br&gt;3. recommend that</td>
<td>Early Help now has a presence on social media. There is a Facebook page for Diss, Costessey, Wymondham and Hethersett. The pages focus on information sharing, update of actions plans or events happening in the area, or networking and sharing ideas. Leaflets have also been distributed to communities. Front line staff continue to be</td>
<td>The work undertaken to promote the Help Hub, both internally and externally, will ensure that more people are able to easily access help when they need it. Work undertaken with adult social services should and initial talks with the Princes Trust should address the concerns of the Scrutiny Committee with regard to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>officers liaise with Adult Social Services to address the promotion of care work with a view to improving its recognition as a worthwhile profession.</td>
<td>updated on early help to ensure they are able to promote this to their customers/clients. In terms of adult social services, we are working to promote the care profession and this work, is continuing. Officers are exploring with The Princes Trust about their ‘get into’ care to see if we can practically support young people into this industry.</td>
<td>improving the image and recognition of those working within the care profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Feb 2016</strong></td>
<td>Processing Benefit Claims</td>
<td>Amanda Adams / Paul Chapman</td>
<td>RESOLVED To note the contents of the report and endorse the good practice employed over the past quarter.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>Members received clarity regarding the downturn in performance related to processing benefit claims and noted how officers had improved performance in this area. Members considered that no further input from the committee was required and that officers had put measures in place to ensure that this did not happen again in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb 2016</td>
<td>Review Of Advice And Support Services – Citizens Advice Bureaux (CABx)</td>
<td>Tony Cooke / Liam Pickering</td>
<td>RESOLVED to 1. note the contribution made to date by the South Norfolk CABx in the provision of advice services for residents; 2. support the need to ensure value for money, and clear outcome-based performance measurement which shows improved outcomes for residents; 3. endorse the renegotiation of SLAs going forward in line with the content of the report; and 4. recommend that officers regularly liaise with the CABx to share best practices and current issues to encourage a more collaborative and joined-up way of working.</td>
<td>In order to ensure future provision allows people to access the right support in the right place at the right time, a process of advice service mapping has been undertaken. The mapping work will be completed shortly and this information will then be used in the development of the new CAB SLAs. New SLAs will contain clear detail on the regularity of contact between SNC and our CAB partners as well as the requirements around reporting and collaborative working.</td>
<td>The Council will be able to establish the full scope of advice services that are required and improve the links between the various advice services and SNC to align services more closely with our Early Help approach. The Council will ensure that services operating in South Norfolk feed into the “making every contact count” principle which will underpin the provision of advice services going forward. Establishing a more collaborative approach will improve the quality and consistency of advice residents receive through various channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb 2016</td>
<td>Review of 2016-17 Business Plan</td>
<td>Andrew Mewes</td>
<td>RESOLVED To note the Draft Business Plan and commend it to Cabinet, subject to two typographical amendments.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>Members reviewed the Business Plans and were happy with the planned direction of the Council in 2016/17. The Committee was impressed by the new format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17 Feb 2016 | 2016/17 Budget        | Debbie Lorimer      | **RESOLVED**  
To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2016/17  
To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Capital Programme April 2016 to March 2021  
To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2019 | No action required | Members were satisfied with the budget that was recommended to Council by Cabinet.                                             |
A Quick Guide to Scrutiny

Recommendations and Reporting

Once a piece of scrutiny work has taken place, recommendations are sometimes made and reported to the Cabinet for consideration. This is usually done as part of the relevant report or paying regard to the minutes of the Scrutiny Committee in informing the final decision.

Recommendations should strive to be, as much as possible, specific measurable achievable relevant and timed - SMART.

What happens next?

Once agreement to a scrutiny recommendation has taken place, whether it be something that officers have agreed to, or the cabinet, this should not always be where the scrutiny process ends. It is good practice for the Scrutiny Committee to set a review date to receive an update from the relevant portfolio holder on the cabinet or officers, on the progress that has been made towards implementation of the Scrutiny Committee’s recommendations.

Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups

Task and Finish Groups are time-limited focus groups that report their review findings to the main committee or Cabinet and are supported by relevant officers of the council and or outside contributors.

If a Task and Finish Group is to be set up in place of a full committee review taking place, interested members should volunteer to be involved. It is usual that task & finish groups are not politically balanced unless a strong need exists. This is because the main scrutiny committee which is balanced has to agree the findings, or delegates the task & finish group on behalf of the whole committee to report directly to the cabinet. Actually, it is much more important to appoint those members with an interest or expertise in the issue, irrespective of political groups.

The Centre for Public Scrutiny promotes the value of scrutiny and accountability in modern and effective government and supports non-executives in their scrutiny role. [http://www.cfps.org.uk/](http://www.cfps.org.uk/)
Public involvement and getting in touch with scrutiny

Meetings of the Scrutiny Committee are usually as informal as possible and as well as scrutiny members, are attended by portfolio members, officers, partners and anyone else who can assist with the work and provide evidence for reviews. Members of the public are also welcome to attend the scrutiny committee meetings and can participate at the discretion of the committee’s Chairman.

Getting in touch with scrutiny

If you are a member of the public and wish to find out more about the scrutiny process and the committee, or if you have any queries regarding this Annual Review, please feel free to contact the Council’s Scrutiny Officer; If you have any topic suggestions for scrutiny please use the form attached over this page and send it to the Scrutiny Officer. Alternatively, further information and an online form can be found on the Council’s website, via the following link: http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/democracy/2545.asp

Emma Goddard
Scrutiny Officer

01508 533943
egoddard@s-norfolk.gov.uk
**Scrutiny Committee – Work Programme**

In setting future Scrutiny **TOPICS**, the Committee is asked to consider the following: **T**imely – **O**bjective – **P**erformance – **I**nterest – **C**orporate Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Organisation / Officer / Responsible member</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 May 2016</td>
<td>Health and Wellbeing Strategy review</td>
<td>Director of Community Services and Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For the Committee to review the Council’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy that was adopted in June 2014. Members to assess the impact of the Strategy and outcomes achieved and consider making any recommendations as appropriate as a result of the review.</td>
<td>Officer report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 June 2016 (Tues)</td>
<td>No items scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Aug 2016</td>
<td>To be held in event of call-in only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Sept 2016</td>
<td>No items scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov 2016 (Thurs)</td>
<td>Review of Leisure Centre Refurbishments</td>
<td>Head of Leisure and Cllr M Wilby</td>
<td>For members to receive details of usage, income and membership figures since the Diss and Wymondham Leisure Centres have been refurbished. The Committee to evaluate the impact of the refurbishments and whether the outcomes have met targets set and delivered an increase in membership numbers and usage in comparison to previous figures. Members to make recommendations as appropriate.</td>
<td>Officer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dec 2016</td>
<td>South Norfolk Choice Based Letting / Home Option Review</td>
<td>Housing Access &amp; Standards Manager and Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For members to review the South Norfolk Choice Based Letting Scheme / Home Options ahead of the SLA drawing to a close in 2018. The Committee to consider whether the scheme has met the objectives set and whether new objectives are required when negotiating a new SLA. For members to consider the effectiveness of the scheme and make recommendations regarding moving forward once the SLA has expired.</td>
<td>Officer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
<td>Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July 2015</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Grants</td>
<td>Leah Mickleborough</td>
<td>RESOLVED: to note the Neighbourhood Grants Report and its findings.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sept 2015</td>
<td>Review of The Work of the Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board (IDB)</td>
<td>Bob Wade</td>
<td>RESOLVED: to note the work of the Norfolk Rivers IDB including its proposals for future working.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 2015</td>
<td>Market Towns Initiative (MTI)</td>
<td>David Disney</td>
<td>RESOLVED to 1. note the contents of the report 2. request that officers liaise with Norfolk County Council (NCC) to investigate improving signage in Harleston and to conduct a feasibility study to close exchange street (except for deliveries) to change the route to the main car park.</td>
<td>The traffic signage study is complete and officers have received prices from NCC to undertake this work. We are also in receipt of a quotation from NCC regarding work specified in the feasibility study. Officers are discussing how this work might be taken forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
<td>Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 2015</td>
<td>Corporate Plan 2016-19</td>
<td>Hannah Ralph</td>
<td>RESOLVED To commend the Corporate Plan to Cabinet and recommend it to Council.</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nov 2015</td>
<td>An update on Council run public conveniences</td>
<td>Paula Boyce</td>
<td>RESOLVED To note the Council’s approach as highlighted in the report and to encourage local members to work to ensure the viability of each asset on a case by case basis to support local prosperity.</td>
<td>Meetings with local members regarding assets in their Ward are taking place and will continue in order to assist with the Council’s work on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb 2016</td>
<td>Early Help Hub Review</td>
<td>Mike Pursehouse</td>
<td>RESOLVED to 1. note the progress of early help services; 2. recommend that officers investigate new methods and outlets in order to advertise the</td>
<td>Early Help now has a presence on social media. There is a Facebook page for Diss, Costessey, Wymondham and Hethersett. The pages focus on information sharing, update of actions plans or events happening in the area, or networking and sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
<td>Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb 2016</td>
<td>Processing Benefit Claims</td>
<td>Amanda Adams / Paul Chapman</td>
<td>RESOLVED</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Help Hub; and

3. recommend that officers liaise with Adult Social Services to address the promotion of care work with a view to improving its recognition as a worthwhile profession.

ideas. Leaflets have also been distributed to communities. Front line staff continue to be updated on early help to ensure they are able to promote this to their customers/clients.

In terms of adult social services, we are working to promote the care profession and this work, is continuing. Officers are exploring with The Princes Trust about their 'get into' care to see if we can practically support young people into this industry.

initial talks with the Princes Trust should address the concerns of the Scrutiny Committee with regard to improving the image and recognition of those working within the care profession.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Resolution and Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb 2016</td>
<td>Review Of Advice And Support Services – Citizens Advice Bureaux (CABx)</td>
<td>Tony Cooke / Liam Pickering</td>
<td>RESOLVED to</td>
<td>In order to ensure future provision allows people to access the right support in the right place at the right time, a process of advice service mapping has been undertaken. The mapping work will be completed shortly and this information will then be used in the development of the new CAB SLAs. New SLAs will contain clear detail on the regularity of contact between SNC and our CAB partners as well as the requirements around reporting and collaborative working.</td>
<td>The Council will be able to establish the full scope of advice services that are required and improve the links between the various advice services and SNC to align services more closely with our Early Help approach. The Council will ensure that services operating in South Norfolk feed into the “making every contact count” principle which will underpin the provision of advice services going forward. Establishing a more collaborative approach will improve the quality and consistency of advice residents receive through various channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb 2016</td>
<td>Review of 2016-17 Business Plan</td>
<td>Andrew Mewes</td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED</strong>&lt;br&gt;To note the Draft Business Plan and commend it to Cabinet, subject to two typographical amendments.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>Members reviewed the Business Plans and were happy with the planned direction of the Council in 2016/17. The Committee was impressed by the new format and pleased to commend the Plans to Cabinet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Feb 2016</td>
<td>2016/17 Budget</td>
<td>Debbie Lorimer</td>
<td><strong>RESOLVED</strong>&lt;br&gt;To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2016/17&lt;br&gt;To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Capital Programme April 2016 to March 2021&lt;br&gt;To endorse the recommendations of Cabinet for the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; April 2016 to 31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; March 2019</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>Members were satisfied with the budget that was recommended to Council by Cabinet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CABINET CORE AGENDA 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions: Key, Policy, Operational</th>
<th>Key Decision/Item</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Cabinet Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FULL COUNCIL 23 FEBRUARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May</td>
<td>Community Asset Strategy</td>
<td>B Wade/A Sheppard</td>
<td>K Mason Billig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Home Options Policy Changes</td>
<td>T Cooke</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Request from Gissing Parish Council for South Norfolk Council to Exercise CPO Powers to Purchase Land</td>
<td>T Horspole</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Starter Homes Consultation Response</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>GNGB – Governance Arrangements</td>
<td>T Horspole</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FULL COUNCIL 23 MAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Jun</td>
<td>Performance/Risks/Revenue Budget Q 4</td>
<td>A Mewes/E Goddard / M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>GNGB – Governance Arrangements</td>
<td>T Horspole</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Capital Programme Outturn Report 2015/16</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Treasury Management Annual Report 2015/16</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FULL COUNCIL 11 JULY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jul</td>
<td>Performance/Risks/Revenue Budget Q1</td>
<td>A Mewes/E Goddard / M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Capital and Treasury Management Report Q1</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Sep</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FULL COUNCIL 19 SEP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Oct</td>
<td>Performance/Risks/Revenue Budget Q2</td>
<td>A Mewes/E Goddard / M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Capital and Treasury Management Report Q2</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dec</td>
<td>Review of Conservation Area Appraisals – Loddon, Hingham and Harleston</td>
<td>C Bennett</td>
<td>L Hornby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key decisions are those which result in income, expenditure or savings with a gross full year effect of £100,000 or 10% of the Council’s net portfolio budget whichever is the greater which has not been included in the relevant portfolio budget, or are significant (e.g. in environmental, physical, social or economic) in terms of its effect on the communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral divisions in the area of the local authority.