

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 25 July 2017

Time: 6.00 pm

Venue: The Writing Room - City Hall, College Green,
Bristol, BS1 5TR

Distribution:

Councillors: Geoff Gollop (Chair), Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Jude English, Gill Kirk, Brenda Massey, Graham Morris, Anthony Negus, Anna Keen, Donald Alexander and Mhairi Threlfall

Copies to: Anna Klonowski (Chief Executive), John Readman (Strategic Director - People), Alison Comley (Strategic Director - Neighbourhoods), Shahzia Daya (Service Director - Legal and Democratic Services), Andrea Dell (Service Manager Democratic Engagement), Lucy Fleming (Democratic and Scrutiny Manager), Nicki Beardmore and Denise Murray (Service Director Finance)

Issued by: Andrea Dell, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 5TR

Tel: 0117 92 22237

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Date: Monday, 17 July 2017

Supplementary Agenda

8. Scrutiny Work Programme 17-18

This supplement contains the draft scopes for the task and finish groups for Scrutiny

(Pages 3 - 50)





Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

(DRAFT) Scoping of Scrutiny Topic

Title

Air Quality and Pollution Working Group (TBC)

1. Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

Air Pollution is a long standing problem in Bristol, and all UK cities. In Bristol an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) was declared in 2001 because of breaches in the legal standards of Nitrogen Dioxide. Nitrogen dioxide is limited under UK and EU law because of the impacts it has on human health. Approximately 100,000 people live within the AQMA and it includes the whole central business and shopping districts, major hospitals and dozens of schools and so many more people are exposed to the air [pollution](#).

The Mayor has established Working Group on Air Pollution, which will work closely with the Congestion Task Force. The Working Group, which includes Cabinet Member Cllr Hance, has received advice from Council Officers and external experts on air pollution, transport and public health matters. This allows for an integrated approach to planning improvements in air quality which will be set out in an Air Quality Action Plan closely linked with emerging transport plans and will also feed into the findings of the congestion task group.

The Council is the lead authority for the feasibility study on a Clean Air Zone and has secured a £498,600 grant funding from DEFRA. The feasibility study is being carried out by external consultants. The study will examine the current situation, future scenarios and model a range of options for a Clean Air Zone(s). The project needs to be completed by March 2018 as a part of the grant conditions, with implementation of a CAZ in 2019.

There is strong cross-party support for improving air quality but members also recognise that difficult decisions may need to be made on a number of related issues.

Scrutiny Members are conscious not to duplicate the existing work but wish to

constructively scrutinise and contribute to the work currently taking place.

Key question that you are seeking to answer

(as above and below).

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

To engage with relevant officers and the Cabinet Member for task-based meetings, centred around the emerging timetable as detailed above and below. The Scrutiny Group will have detailed discussions on evolving plans and be able to challenge and / or to be a sounding-board on emerging reports and policy development.

Draft timetable of the key stages and engagement:
August 2017 – All Member briefing. Followed by scrutiny working group engagement with Officers prior to August Cabinet Report ‘Clean Air Action Plan and Clean Air Zone Feasibility Study’ – scrutiny working group to feed-into and / or challenge report.

Sept / Oct 2017: examine non clean air zone (CAZ) issues, such as trees, wood-burners, planning policy & diesel generators, freight consolidation centre, traffic management and infrastructure, static emissions from factories in Avonmouth

End Jan 2018: Scrutiny Working Group to be taken through the consultant’s report – views sought (prior to Cabinet)

March / April: Consultants Final report on preferred option and policy development

Other areas Lead Members have expressed an interest in:

- better public engagement, awareness raising, and an improved communications strategy for the difficult decisions that may need to be taken, that would affect the public
- assessing the potential economic impacts on different communities

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

TBC by the Group Members

2. Member Involvement

Members involved

CLRs Gill Kirk, Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Jude English

Key Executive Member

Cabinet Member - Cllr Fi Hance

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any

3. Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s)

Alex Minshull - Sustainable City and Climate Change Service Manager
Kathy Derick - Environment Team Manager

Scrutiny Advisor

Johanna Holmes

List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required

Time Frame

	Draft timetable above

Decision-making/path for recommendations:

The group will regularly report back to OSMB

Costs

Specific costs identified

None identified

Date:



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

(DRAFT) Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title Council Assets

1. Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

At a time when the council is facing unprecedented budgets pressures, enquiries are being made and questions asked about council owns assets.

Members are keen to undertake an in-depth look at council owned assets and in particular 'council owned buildings'.

This subject has been discussed previously at the Place Scrutiny Commission in December 2016 and February 2017. Officers attended the Commissions meeting again on 24 July 2017 to discuss how an in-depth piece of scrutiny work could bring about clarity, add-value and positive outcomes for the future.

It was highlighted by officers that each council owned building is different and therefore requires an individual assessment.

It was agreed that the following points are areas of interest of the group and are to be refined when the group members next meet:

- Transparency of asset management
- Best value review
- Policies – what are they / are they fit for purpose and are they being adhered to
- A strategy for council owned buildings
 - Empty buildings
 - Community buildings
 - Possible disposals
 - Community Asset Transfers (CATs)
 - CIL and S106 contributions from any future sales /disposals

Key question that you As above

are seeking to answer

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

TBC – discussions are at the very early stages. It was agreed at the Place Scrutiny Commission that a members briefing should take place first that brings all Members ‘up-to-speed’ and allows them to consider and agree where the focus of the work should be concentrated and where value can be added in the process.

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

TBC by the group members in due course

2. Member Involvement

Members involved

Cllrs Jude English, Anthony Negus, Brenda Massey and Graham Morris
Full Membership of the group to be agreed at OSMB

Key Executive Member

Cllr Asher Craig

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any

3. Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s)

Robert Orrett - Service Director, Property
John Bos - Property Partner, Asset Strategy

Scrutiny Advisor

Johanna Holmes

List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required

Time Frame

Yet to be agreed	

Decision-making/path
for recommendations:

TBC

Costs

Specific costs identified

None identified at present.

Date:



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title

Children's Centres

1.Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

- Fluid situation at present, public consultation to commence in the autumn, scrutiny activity to start late September/early October
- Budget pressures
- Increasing need and increased costs for procurement/provision

Background Information:

- The Mayor's Vision
- Strategic Plan
- Previous Scrutiny

Key question that you are seeking to answer

Tbc

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

Tbc

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

Tbc

2.Member Involvement

Members involved

Cllr Keen, Cllr Massey
Longer term membership to be agreed at OSMB

Key Executive Member

Cllr Godwin, Children and Young People
Cllr Hiscott, Education and Skills

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any

Cllr Craig, Deputy Mayor – Communities (Public Health, Public Transport, Libraries, Parks) (ref: Children Centres as Early Help and Council Assets)
Cllr Cheney Deputy Mayor – Finance, Governance and Performance (ref: Strategic Commissioning children’s services)

3. Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s)

Paul Jacobs, Service Director – Education and Skills
Sally Jaeckle, Service Manager - Early Years

Policy Advisor

Louise deCordova

List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required

Key Partners and Stakeholders:
 Bristol City Council Staff Early Help Teams etc.
 Voluntary Sector Partners
 Health Providers
 Service users
 Equality Groups

Data:
 Statistical Neighbours
 Budget information

Future LGIU Briefings:

- The potential for developing the capacity and diversity of children’s social care services in England
- SEND inspection outcome letters – Part 1
- Children and Social Work Act 2017
- Peer Support and Children and Young People’s Mental Health
- Prospects for Education, Early Years, Children’s Care Services and Further Education and Skills

Time Frame

Suggested	Post September/early October start

Decision-making/path
for recommendations:

Recommendations from investigation to be agreed and adopted by OSM Board
(date tbc)
Recommendations to Executive (Mayor/Cabinet) (date tbc)
Depending on nature of recommendations may need to go to FC (date tbc)

Costs

Specific costs identified

None at present

Date: July 2017



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title

Council Commissioning and contracts (to include Social Value)

1.Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

To ensure processes are in place to avoid contract management failure eg Long Ashton Park & Ride site as set out in the Cabinet report 4th October 2016

In anticipation of a budget gap of around £120 million over the next five years (Corporate Strategy 2017-2022)

To scrutinise and monitor the different approach being taken around commissioning and procurement governance as set out in the Procurement Update report received by Resources Scrutiny in November 2016.

Report Extract:

A Commissioning & Procurement Group (CPG) had been set up and agreed to undertake a number of key reviews:

- a) Review all contracts that are about to end with a view to ensuring that future commissioning has started and includes efficiencies within the contract.*
- b) Review and consider contracts that are in flight and consider whether there is provision for in contract negotiations with providers/suppliers.*
- c) Review all "off contract" spend that currently exists across the Council.*
- d) Review uplift/inflation clauses within contracts to ensure a consistent and affordable approach is taken.*
- e) Review the use, and therefore governance of Waivers.*
- f) Provide a series of "gateways" for future commissioning*

This would ensure improved practice, outcomes and efficiencies were considered. This would also enable the Council to have clearer

Commissioning Intentions, and a procurement strategy that clearly tells our supplier markets of our intentions, whilst ensuring alignment with corporate priorities and corporate objectives. The 4 gateways will be:

- *Gateway 1 - Identification of need*
- *Gateway 2 - Make or Buy decisions - savings /efficiencies, risk /resource*
- *Gateway 3 - Recommendation, Approval & Award*
- *Gateway 4 - Implementation and review.*

Key question that you are seeking to answer

Are the right processes in place to ensure value for money and social value from our contracts?

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

Main objective:

To identify whether the 'different approach' being taken around commissioning and procurement governance, as set out in the Procurement Update report (November 2016), is working to ensure value for money and social value from our contracts.

Main areas of investigation:

1. Review current commissioning, procurement and contract management processes and identify good practice or areas for development
 - Scrutinise or develop the parameters, values, criteria that states how the Council will commission its contracts
 - Scrutinise or develop the processes for a standardised and active (lifetime) contract management process across the council to include scheduled annual reviews to monitor performance and options to use breakclauses and notice to terminate when appropriate
 - Scrutinise or develop a central schedule for monitoring all contracts, to include start dates, contract duration, contract value / performance measures/ scheduled performance monitoring reviews
2. Review the outcomes from commissioning of Adult Social Care, including:
 - Confidence in the market's ability to deliver commissioned needs.
 - Confidence in the market's ability to deliver a resilient workforce
 - Demand management
 - Risk of provider failure
 - Impact of the Three Tier Model on delivery of adult care services
3. Scrutinise or develop the processes to ensure value for money and social value from our contracts.

- Confirm the interpretation of the terms value for money and social value in the current strategic context
- A 12-month review of Social Value delivery data (including local spend data) and develop ongoing Social Value policy and practice, in line with current strategic priorities
- Establish whether there are ways of increasing our spend with local SMEs

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

Terms of Reference

Tbc

Possible outcomes:

- An agreed position statement that sets out how the Council will commission its contracts
- A standardised process to ensure value for money and social value from our contracts.
- An agreed methodology for active(lifetime) contract monitoring including a centrally maintained schedule to monitor performance of key contract milestones and dates
- An interpretation of value for money and social value in the current strategic context
- A refreshed Social Value policy and practice in line with current strategic priorities
- A process for increasing our spend with local SMEs

2.Member Involvement

Members involved

Cllr Alexander, Cllr Morris, Cllr Brook, Cllr Clarke
Longer term membership to be agreed at OSMB

Key Executive Member

Cllr Cheney Deputy Mayor – Finance, Governance and Performance

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any

Cllr Craig, Deputy Mayor – Communities (Public Health, Public Transport, Libraries, Parks) (ref: Social Value)

3.Officer Support

Lead Directorate

Netta Meadows, Service Director - Strategic Commissioning (People)

Officer(s)

Terry Dafter, Service Director - Care and Support - Adults
Rob Logan, Procurement and Commercial Relations Manager

Policy Advisor

Louise deCordova

List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required

Key Partners and Stakeholders:
 Commissioning and Procurement Group
 Voluntary Sector Partners
 Voscur
 Equality Groups

Documents:
[Cabinet Report 4Oct16 - Long Ashton Park & Ride site - Subsidy Payments](#)
[Resources Scrutiny Commission 24Nov16 - Procurement update](#)
[Social Value Policy 2016](#)

Data:
 MTFP
 Budget information
 Statistical Neighbours

Future LGIU Briefings:

Time Frame

Suggested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested methodology is task and finish group (non-public meetings). • 3 phases of investigation tbc • No specific deadline as budget pressure is ongoing and persistent. • Start dates and number of sessions to be negotiated and timetabled.

Decision-making/path for recommendations:

Recommendations from investigation to be agreed and adopted by OSM Board (date tbc)
Recommendations to Executive (Mayor/Cabinet) (date tbc)

Depending on nature of recommendations may need to go to FC (date tbc)

Costs

Specific costs identified

None at present

Date: July 2017



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

(DRAFT) Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title

Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood

1. Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

Context:

Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood (CPNN) will contain around 5,700 new dwellings, local centres, schools, surgeries and employment space (50ha). All sites are located within South Gloucestershire, however there will be significant impact on Bristol's transport network from the increased population, particularly on the A4018 corridor that leads from Cribbs Causeway through Henbury, Westbury and into Bristol's city centre.

South Gloucestershire Council (SGC) have adopted (March 2014) a supplementary planning document (SPD) for the area that sets out the development principals, and required infrastructure, to create the new neighbourhood. In accordance with their Core Strategy policy CS26, SGC require the developments to be comprehensively planned and delivered.

In preparing the landowner's agreement, SGC have calculated the required infrastructure and set a contribution per dwelling that each development will be required to make (£5,800). Included in the calculation was the provision of mitigation measures in Bristol on the A4018 and A38/B4056 corridors. Bristol City Council (BCC) and South Gloucestershire Council (SGC) will need to sign a legal agreement to set out the timings of when these monies will be released to BCC.

Bristol City Council and SGC have agreed that £4.74m of section 106 contribution will be paid to Bristol for the A4018 corridor mitigations. However in order to provide mitigation measures prior to the development being occupied, BCC are applying to the LEP for funding of £1.875m to design the corridor improvements and construct the first phases. It is critical that corridor improvements are delivered in advance of the CPNN development in order to

embed sustainable travel patterns from the outset and contribute to mitigating the increased demand on the transport network that the development will bring.

Given the size of the development and the potential impacts on North Bristol in particular that this development will possibly have, Members are eager to be involved in the work with officers and contribute to the overall process.

Key question that you are seeking to answer

Details TBC but currently as above and below.

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

Member are keen to engage with officers over a relatively long period and as the plans evolve.

An initial discussion between members and officers took place at the Place Scrutiny Commission Meeting on 24/07/17. From this early discussion it was suggested that Members / the Group could input and contribute on the emerging master plan, modelling, proposals and consultation/s.

It was also suggested that a joint meeting between Bristol Councillors and South Glos Councillors (and possible other neighbouring authorities and WECA) would also be a valuable contribution to the process.

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

TBC by the group members

2. Member Involvement

Members involved

Cllrs Tom Brook, Brenda Massey and Geoff Gollop
Cllr Olly Mead has also expressed an interest in joining this group.
Full membership of the group to be agreed and confirmed by OSMB.

Key Executive Member

Cllr Nicola Beech - Cabinet Member, Strategic Planning and City Design
Cllr Mhairi Threlfall - Transport

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any

3. Officer Support

Lead Directorate
Officer(s)

Zoe Wilcox - Service Director, Planning
Peter Mann – Service Director, Transport
Others TBC

Scrutiny Advisor

Johanna Holmes

List of possible internal
and external
witnesses/contributors
and key information
required

TBC

Time Frame

Yet to be confirmed but it was suggested / agreed during initial discussions that to be able to really engage with the process, this would be a long term piece of work.

Decision-making/path
for recommendations:

TBC

Costs

Specific costs identified

None identified at present.

Date:



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title

Fire Safety in Council-owned High Rise Buildings

1.Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

It is generally agreed that the initial response by Cllr Smith, Alison Comley and officers to the Grenfell fire tragedy and its implications for Bristol – has been comprehensive, both in terms of trying to assess and establish the safety of council stock, but also in terms of reassuring tenants.

The investigation following the fire at Grenfell Tower is likely to lead to a number of recommendations being issues from the government to local authority and other social landlords

Although it has been established that the Council's high rise blocks are - to the best of our knowledge - safe, and that where there is cladding, this is of a different type to that used at Grenfell Tower, the forthcoming recommendations will nevertheless need to be addressed.

Given the level of national and local public concern about this topic, in the interests of transparency this work could be overseen by a cross party member group.

Key question that you are seeking to answer

To address the impact of any recommendations that are to be issued by the government after the Grenfell fire investigation, and to have oversight of the implementation of these.

Main objectives/main

As above

areas of investigation

--

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

TBC depending on nature of government recommendations

2.Member Involvement

Members involved

(Initial Scope) Cllr Bolton

Key Executive Member

Cllr Paul Smith

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any

--

3.Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s)

TBC

Policy Advisor

Romayne de Fonseca

List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required

Departmental officers Tenants representatives Technical officers Building control officers

Time Frame

	This would take place after the government recommendations have been issued. The timescale for this is unclear at the present time.
	It is suggested that this work should be carried out by a task and finish group. Members may wish to decide whether some or all meetings should be held in public (resources permitting) due to the possible public and media interest in this issue.

Decision-making/path for recommendations:

TBC

Costs

Specific costs identified

None at present

Date:



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title

Libraries

1.Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

In June 2017 a public consultation commenced on budget saving proposals that put forward three options to reduce the number of council run libraries across the city. The savings target is £1.4m.

The consultation has attracted significant public and media attention. It ends on 5th September. The Cabinet decision will be made on 9th January 2018.

Scrutiny members have expressed concern about the impact of these proposals, and the rationale behind them. Members wish to further explore other models of delivery prior to formulation of the Cabinet proposals, and to influence and have oversight of the implementation of the agreed option post-Cabinet.

Departmental officers are in the process of applying for government funding to explore a range of different models. If the bid is successful the Council will be able to utilise the expertise of consultants in alternative delivery models, such as the Devon “Libraries Unlimited” model.

Key question that you are seeking to answer

Are there alternative delivery models that would enable more Libraries to remain open than those outlined in the consultation document, and how could these models be made feasible in Bristol?

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

Two main phases of potential work:

Phase 1 (*as part of the process to achieve the level of savings required*)

- scrutinise consultation findings,
- scope alternative options for service delivery (this would need to be done over the period September-October 2017 in order to be able to

- accompany proposals to Cabinet)
 - scrutinise Cabinet proposals as they go forward
 - consultants to attend as expert witnesses on alternative delivery models (subject to success of funding bid)
- Phase 2 (*post Cabinet decision on 9/1/2018*)
- scrutiny involvement in shaping the landscape and influencing implementation of the Cabinet decision
 - scrutiny input into decisions re: surplus land, buildings, asset transfer issues, use of capital
 - exploring options for the remaining libraries estate and alternative models of delivery

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

TBC

2.Member Involvement

Members involved (Initial steering group) Cllrs, Negus, Bolton, Gollop, Massey

Key Executive Member Cllr Asher Craig

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any

3.Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s) Kate Murray, Head of Libraries

Policy Advisor Romaine de Fonseca

--

List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required

Departmental officers External consultants

Time Frame

	Suggested methodology for both Phases 1 and 2 is task and finish group (non-public meetings).
Phase 1 1 st meeting (September)	To examine information to be provided by departmental officers which will cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis of all existing service costs• The options appraisal• Assessment of what level of service is required to meet the statutory requirement for a library service• Rationale underpinning the proposed options and weighting criteria• Interactive spreadsheet for modelling costs of different options
2 nd meeting	External consultants to attend as expert witnesses on alternative delivery models
Phase 2	To commence January 2018

Decision-making/path for recommendations:

TBC

Costs

Specific costs identified

None at present

Date:



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

(DRAFT) Scoping of Scrutiny Topic

Title

Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) TBC

1. Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

The Council is currently facing unprecedented financial pressures. In line with good governance measures, this scrutiny (*task and finish group / working group??*) will ensure that Members are fully informed and engaged in the Council's financial management and planning arrangements.

The MTFP is a key part of the Council's Policy and Budget Framework and is intended to set out the Council's strategic approach to the management of its finances and provide a framework within which delivery of the Council's priorities will be progressed.

The MTFP is comprised of two parts:

Part 1 takes into account the impact of the measures implemented in the past year, considers the financial outlook for the Council over the next five years and builds on the five year outlook included in the 17/18 budget report.

In Part 2 the Council sets out its plans and strategies for managing resources and delivering the corporate priorities against this financial outlook.

Members of the Task and Finish - Scoping Group have met three times with finance officers during July for in-depth discussions on the aforementioned MTFP approach and principles, prior to the report going to OSMB (25/7/17) for comment and to Cabinet (27/7/17) for endorsement.

The group will continue with a view to gain clear oversight of the Council's financial governance processes and budgets.

Key question that you are seeking to answer

The Scoping Group Members and Finance Officers agree that further engagement and feedback at key stages of the budget cycle should continue to take place throughout the year.

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

Throughout July officers have taken the scoping group Members through a series of briefings and in-depth discussions to scope the high level proposals during development. This has allowed officers to present the evidence gathered and formulate proposals in an iterative manner.

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

OSMB and group members to discuss and agree if this group should have a broader remit e.g. a watching brief on Council finances in general, that regularly reports to OSMB.

2. Member Involvement

Members involved

Initial Scoping Group: Cllrs G Gollop, G Morris and D Alexander.
Longer-term membership to be agreed at OSMB

Key Executive Member

Cabinet Member - Cllr Craig Cheney

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any

--

3. Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s)

Denise Murray – Service Director – Finance and Business Change
Michael Pilcher – Finance Business Partner
Rory MacDonald - Finance Project Associate
Chris Holme - Interim Service Manager - Corporate Finance

Scrutiny Advisor

TBC

List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required

--

Time Frame

TBC – it has however been agreed that Members and Officers will meet at key stages of the budget cycle throughout the year.	

Decision-making/path for recommendations:

The group will regularly report back to OSMB

Costs

Specific costs identified

None identified

Date:



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title

Parks and Green Spaces

1.Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

Parks and Green Spaces have been set a target of becoming cost -neutral by 2020. Departmental officers are therefore required to explore a number of income-generation and cost-cutting options across the city.

This has generated a significant amount of public concern and media coverage, and this is likely to continue as options are further developed.

The Council's Draft 2017/18 Business Plan for Neighbourhoods states the following:

"We will be exploring options for alternative delivery models for parks, where we can enable maximum local ownership, and potential to fundraise external income eg. Trusts, mutual or other groups to run some parks. The level of saving will depend on the approach taken."

(Over the next year) "We will develop modes of delivery to protect investment in Parks and Green Spaces for the benefit of communities across the city."

(Over the next five years) "Develop a refreshed strategy for Parks and Green Spaces ensuring ownership and influence for local residents."

Key question that you are seeking to answer

There are potentially 2 pieces of work:

Phase 1(Immediate work)

- To scrutinise forthcoming proposals for the Parks Service - this will happen between now and autumn (exact timescale to be clarified)

Phase 2 (Longer term)

- To carry out a review of the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

Phase 1 - Immediate work

- To scrutinise and challenge specific proposals for cost savings and management/development options for Parks, including looking at timescales/achievability of cost neutrality.
- To explore potential options for future development and management of parks
- To ensure all options are considered in the ongoing process to move towards cost neutral in 2020.

Phase 2 - Longer term work

- To review the Parks and Green spaces Strategy to address the question “What is our expectation from parks in the future world?”
- To review the existing quality standard for parks (set in existing Strategy)
- To look at examples of good practice and innovation from elsewhere e.g. Newcastle
- To provide early thinking/ ideas/recommendations on parks at an early stage.
- To tap into expertise available in the city to help us with this
- To consider estates separately from other parks and green spaces due to the differing issues involved with each.

Other issues (timescale to be either between Phases 1 and 2 /run parallel with Phase 2)

- Scrutiny involvement in shaping the landscape and influencing implementation of whatever proposals are finally decided on, including scrutiny input into decisions re: surplus land, buildings, asset transfer issues, use of capital
- To analyse why recent Stoke Park Heritage Lottery Fund bid for Stoke Park was unsuccessful and to learn from this in order that future bids are more “joined-up” and take account what else is happening across the city.

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

TBC

2.Member Involvement

Members involved	(Initial scoping exercise) Cllrs Bolton, Kirk, Negus, Wellington, English
Key Executive Member	Cllr Asher Craig
Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any	

3.Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s)	Gemma Dando/Richard Fletcher
Policy Advisor	Romayne de Fonseca
List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required	Departmental officers Parks Forum Relevant academics Newcastle City Council (?) Any relevant user groups

Time Frame

Phase 1 Sept- November	Immediate work could be carried out by task and finish group. Work would need to commence as soon as possible. Members may wish to decide whether some or all meetings should be held in public (resources permitting) due to the likely public and media interest in this issue.
Phase 2	Longer term work could be carried out by a task and finish group. There is no specific time-critical issue for this piece of work.

Decision-making/path
for recommendations:

TBC

Costs

Specific costs identified

None at present.

Date:



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title

'Tackling Increasing Demand for Social Services – Adults'

1.Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work:

- The 3 tier model has been in operation for 2 years
- Timely to review system to understand if working as intended and understand the experience of and impact on the people who use it
- It is important to have a clear picture of the 1st tier services that underpin the system and which are key to the model's future success, intelligence which can support decision making.
- The model needs to be embraced by all stakeholders including staff and partners to realise the full benefits for the City
- The public communications messaging around the model could be developed to ensure the benefits of the system to users are fully explained

Background Information:

- Budget pressures
- Increasing need and increased costs for procurement/provision
- The Mayor's Vision
- Strategic Plan
- Previous Scrutiny

Key question that you are seeking to answer

Priority Work

1. Is the 3 tier model system working as intended?
2. What does feedback from service users tell us?

3. Do we know what and where the 1st tier services that underpin this model are in Bristol and where the gaps are?
4. Could public communications be improved to explain the benefits of the system to users?

For later in the programme:

- Are discharges and transition from Southmead and BRI hospitals working effectively?
- Can more joint work be done with Public Health to promote an increase in physical activity levels in older people which is evidenced to increase physical confidence and reduce prevalence of falls, in order to reduce hospital admissions due to falls?
- Can we learn from other cities to pilot intergenerational accommodation projects in Bristol?

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

- 1. A Review of the 3 tier model**
 - Is the model doing what we wanted it do? Positive outcomes and development areas?
- 2. Feedback from Service users**
 - Feedback from people in the system and people not in the system, is the system working for people? Understanding the impacts to independence, health and wellbeing.
- 3. Audit/map of 1st tier provision**
 - Mapping events with ward councilors and local communities, supported by intelligence from council staff, voluntary organisations and partners
 - To understand the gaps and improve effectiveness and efficiency for signposting for service users, staff, and partners to support the operation and budget 3 tier model
- 4. Public Communications and culture change**
 - Is there a better way to explain the model to the public
 - Cultural shift required by staff, partners and service users to embrace the model

Draft Terms of

Draft Terms of Reference:

Reference and possible outcomes

tbc
Possible outcomes: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. An understanding of how the 3 tier model is working currently and develop recommendations to a. share learning from the positive outcomes and b. improve development areas.2. Feedback from people in the system is used to a. improve services, b. share learning and c. develop case studies and d. communicate good news3. A map of 1st tier provision in Bristol to share with stakeholders and provide intelligence around any gaps in provision. And use to improve signposting capability of call handlers4. New public communications developed for the public around the benefits of the 3 tier model

2. Member Involvement

Members involved	Cllr Kirk, Cllr Massey Longer Term membership to be confirmed at OSMB
Key Executive Member	Cllr Holland, Adult Social Care
Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any	Cllr Craig Cllr Cheney Deputy Mayor – Finance, Governance and Performance (ref: Strategic Commissioning)

3. Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s)	Terry Dafter, Service Director - Care and Support - Adults Stephen Beet, Head of Service - South/Hospitals, Adults Care and Support Gareth O'Rourke, Head of Service - North, HSC – North
Policy Advisor	Louise deCordova
List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors	Key Partners and Stakeholders: Bristol City Council Staff Social work practitioners

and key information required

<p>Neighbourhood Officers Ward Councillors Voluntary Sector Partners Acute Hospital Trusts Public health CCG Health Providers Service users Equality Groups STP Partners? Age UK Bristol Aging Better</p> <p>Data: Isle of Wight pilot ‘My Life a Full Life’ Adult Care Strategic Plan</p> <p>Evidence from support conversations gaps in service Evidence of what works in the community eg <i>Social Prescribing, CPCE, Go Six?</i> STP partners Statistical Neighbours Budget information LGIU Briefing: SCIE research on integrated health and social care 2020</p> <p>Future LGIU Briefings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ageing policy • CQC annual report

Time Frame

Suggested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested methodology is task and finish group (non-public meetings). • No specific deadline as budget pressure is ongoing and persistent. • Start dates and number of sessions to be negotiated and timetabled.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community mapping events in wards or geographical ‘contract’ areas tbc

Decision-making/path
for recommendations:

Recommendations from investigation to be agreed and adopted by OSM Board
(date tbc)
Recommendations to Executive (Mayor/Cabinet) (date tbc)
Depending on nature of recommendations may need to go to FC (date tbc)

Costs

Specific costs identified

Public Communications for service users – explore whether a contribution from
Better Care Fund is possible to support this work

Date: July 2017



Bristol Scrutiny 2017/18

Scoping of Scrutiny Topics

Title

'Tackling Increasing Demand for Social Services – Children'

1.Reasons for Undertaking this Work

Main reasons for undertaking the piece of work (and any Background information if relevant)

Main reasons for undertaking work:

- Budget pressure - impending cuts £250k to family support budget
- Increasing need and increased costs for procurement/provision
- Poor national market for commissioning services
- Evidence of increasing national trends and significant upturn in children going into care and child protection plans
- Correlation between smaller caseloads and the ability to make a difference to families
- Concern that early help and early intervention pathways may not be delivering targeted early help offer that people understand to prevent recourse to social care services
- Higher than national average re-referral rates 25/26% suggests work not creating sustainable help to families
- New Ofsted framework expected from 2018, thematic inspections could include SEND and joint targeting area of neglect

Background Information:

- The Mayor's Vision
- Strategic Plan
- Previous Scrutiny

Key question that you are seeking to answer

Is our wider children's service early help offer well enough understood and used to meet the need of children and families before it reaches the early help, targeted intervention and children in care thresholds?

Main objectives/main areas of investigation

Main objectives:

To understand whether our wider children's service early help offer is well enough understood and whether it is being used to meet the needs of children and families before it reaches the early help, targeted intervention and children in care thresholds.

Main areas of investigation:

- 1. To understand and define 'increasing demand' in the context of statutory Social Services for Children and children in care thresholds**
 - A review of the data and evidence of children/families affected and resources available to support those services
 - To review and understand children in care thresholds
- 2. To scrutinise the wider children's services early help offer**
 - To define the range of services, including work with partners within the wider children's services early help offer (pathway)
 - How systems (including information technology) work together to support this work
- 3. To scrutinise whether the early help offer is well enough understood?**
 - Do partners and families understand the early help offer (pathway)?
- 4. To scrutinise whether the early help offer is used to meet the need of children and families before it reaches the early help, targeted intervention and children in care thresholds**
 - How is partnership working executed within the early help pathway?
 - What is working well and not so well?
 - Is the quality and quantity of early help services right in the right places?
 - Are our early intervention services working to keep children out of care?

Draft Terms of Reference and possible outcomes

Terms of Reference:

Tbc

Possible Outcomes:

- a. A clear definition of increasing demand in the context of statutory social services for children
- b. A map/audit of children's early help provision in Bristol including partners which affect the pathway to Children's Care services
- c. A coherent early help and targeted prevention offer across our

partnerships that people understand
 d. Recommendations to improve the early help offer and ensure that it is used to meet the need of children and families before it reaches the early help, targeted intervention and children in care thresholds

2.Member Involvement

Members involved Cllr Kirk, Cllr Massey

Key Executive Member Cllr Godwin, Children and Young People

Other Executive Member Portfolios covered, if any Cllr Holland, Adult Social Care (ref: budget pressures and interlocking social care services)
 Cllr Hiscott, Education and Skills (ref: Children Centres as Early Help and Council Assets)
 Cllr Cheney Deputy Mayor – Finance, Governance and Performance (ref: Strategic Commissioning children’s services)
 Cllr Smith, Housing (ref: local accommodation for children in care)

3.Officer Support

Lead Directorate Officer(s) Jacqui Jenson - Service Director Care & Support, Children & Families

Policy Advisor Louise deCordova

List of possible internal and external witnesses/contributors and key information required **Key Partners and Stakeholders:**
 Bristol City Council Staff Early Help Teams etc.
 Troubled Families and Think Family
 Voluntary Sector Partners
 Health Providers
 Service users
 Equality Groups

Data:
 Severity of Increased Need Chart
 Statistical Neighbours
 Budget information

Future LGIU Briefings:

- The potential for developing the capacity and diversity of children’s social care services in England
- SEND inspection outcome letters – Part 1
- Children and Social Work Act 2017
- Peer Support and Children and Young People’s Mental Health
- Prospects for Education, Early Years, Children’s Care Services and Further Education and Skills

Time Frame

Suggested	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Suggested methodology is task and finish group (non-public meetings).• No specific deadline as budget pressure is ongoing and persistent.• Start dates and number of sessions to be negotiated and timetabled.

Decision-making/path for recommendations:

Recommendations from investigation to be agreed and adopted by OSM Board (date tbc)
Recommendations to Executive (Mayor/Cabinet) (date tbc)
Depending on nature of recommendations may need to go to FC (date tbc)

Costs

Specific costs identified

None at present

Date: July 2017