



Email: committeeservices@horsham.gov.uk
Direct line: 01403 215465

Scrutiny and Overview Committee

Monday, 14th March, 2016 at 6.00 pm

Conference Room, Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham

Councillors:

Leonard Crosbie (Chairman)	
David Coldwell (Vice-Chairman)	
Alan Britten	Nigel Jupp
John Chidlow	Tim Lloyd
Paul Clarke	Brian O'Connell
Roger Clarke	David Skipp
Jonathan Dancer	Ben Staines
Matthew French	Michael Willett
Tony Hogben	

You are summoned to the meeting to transact the following business

Agenda

	Page No.
1. Apologies for absence	
2. Minutes	1 - 6
To approve as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 11 th January 2016	
3. Declarations of Members' Interests	
To receive any declarations of interest from Members of the Committee	
4. Announcements	
To receive any announcements from the Chairman of the Committee or the Chief Executive	
5. Replies from Cabinet/Council regarding Scrutiny & Overview recommendations	
6. Business Improvement Working Group	7 - 14
Minutes of the meetings held 12 th January, 10 th February (attached) and 8 th March 2016 (to follow)	
7. Crime and Disorder Working Group	
To receive an update from the Chairman	

8. **Finance and Performance Working Group** 15 - 18
Minutes of the meeting held 17th February 2016
9. **Social Inclusion Working Group**
Minutes of the meeting held 7th March 2016 to follow
10. **Health Provision Working Group** 19 - 24
Minutes of the meeting held 25th January 2016

Letter from the Working Group to the West Sussex Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee
11. **Feedback from West Sussex Joint Scrutiny**
Feedback from the Joint Scrutiny Steering Group meeting on 27th January 2016 and from the Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group on Housing Provision for Care Leavers on 2nd March
12. **Planning Appeals: Budget 2015/16 Costs to Date and Current Status of Major Appeals**
13. **Work Programme** 25 - 28
To receive any suggestions for the Scrutiny and Overview Work Programme 2015-16

Chairman's suggestions:
- Request for a report from the Cabinet Member for the Local Economy for review of Costs and Revenues of Parking Services
14. **CIL Report Consultees: Role of Scrutiny & Overview Committee**
15. **Urgent Business**
Items not on the agenda which the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as urgent because of the special circumstances

SCRUTINY & OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
11TH JANUARY 2016

Present: Councillors: Leonard Crosbie (Chairman), Alan Britten, Roger Clarke, Matthew French, Tony Hogben, Nigel Jupp, Brian O'Connell, David Skipp, Ben Staines, Michael Willett

Apologies: Councillors: David Coldwell (Vice-Chairman) John Chidlow, Paul Clarke, Jonathan Dancer, Tim Lloyd

Officers: Katharine Eberhart, Director of Corporate Resources

Also present: Councillors: Christian Mitchell, Godfrey Newman, Tricia Youtan

SO/45 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9th November 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

SO/46 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

SO/47 **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

There were no announcements.

SO/48 **REPLIES FROM CABINET/COUNCIL REGARDING SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee received the reply from Council to the recommendation made by the Scrutiny and Overview Committee to amend the Council's Constitution to include a revision of the planning determination process.

This revision arose following concerns and discussions raised by Members of both the Finance and Performance Working Group and the Business Improvement Working Group, so that in the event of a Development Control Committee proposing a decision that would be likely to have significant cost implications for the Council, the decision could be referred for determination by full Council.

The Committee was pleased to see that the recommendation had been accepted by Council and suggested that if a planning application did follow this process, then the Councillors from the other Development Control Committee should familiarise themselves with the site and application, in order to make their decision at the Council meeting.

SO/48 Replies from Cabinet/Council regarding Scrutiny and Overview recommendations (cont.)

If a case did arise in this situation, the planning application would be heard in its entirety at the Council meeting, exactly as it had happened at the Development Control meeting.

This process would be more democratic and the Council as a whole would be responsible for the decision.

There were some concerns raised by Members about how the process would work in practice, so it was suggested that six months after the new structure had been in place, the Committee would review the process and how it operated.

A procedure note was being drafted by the Director of Planning, Economic Development and Property and the Head of Legal Services, this document would then be presented to the Chairman of the two Development Control Committees for consideration, the Scrutiny and Overview Committee requested that this document be presented to the this Committee before it was approved, as it had originated from Scrutiny and Overview.

RESOLVED

That the reply from Council to the Committee's recommendation be received.

REASON

All replies from Council and Cabinet to recommendations of the Committee are to be received.

SO/49 **BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT WORKING GROUP – NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10TH NOVEMBER 2015**

The Chairman of the Business Improvement Working Group presented the notes of the meeting held 10th November 2015.

The main focus of the Working Group was the review of the S106 process. The Working Group established how the S106 process worked and made three recommendations which would form part of the final report of the review. At the next meeting the Working Group would look at the West of Horsham as a sample case.

In addition, the Group was also looking at Business Transformation and the new programme.

The Committee referred to the agenda and questioned the second bullet point on page 12 of the agenda which set out a term of reference for the S106 review: "Commission an immediate comparison analysis of S106 agreements supported by...a specialist firm of suitably qualified external legal advisers",

SO/49 Business Improvement Working Group – Notes of the meeting held 10th November 2015 (cont.)

and how this would be taken forward, the Working Group would report back its next meeting.

The Working Group was anticipating completing this review and presenting its final report and recommendations in May 2016.

The Committee also asked the Chairman of the Working Group to establish the latest position on the recruitment of the new Planning Obligations Officer.

RESOLVED

That the notes of the Business Improvement Working Group meeting held 10th November 2015, be received

REASON

All notes of Working Group meetings are to be received by the Committee

SO/50 **CRIME AND DISORDER WORKING GROUP – NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD 14TH DECEMBER 2015**

The Chairman of the Crime and Disorder Working Group presented the notes of the meeting held on 14th December 2015.

The Group had reviewed the Community Safety Partnership Plan and its three priorities: Alcohol and Drugs, Vulnerable Victims and Casualty Reduction. The Partnership was three quarters of the way through its delivery year and the updates were presented by the Community Safety Manager, Chief Inspector at Sussex Police and the Community Safety Officer, on behalf of Fire and Rescue.

The Committee noted that good progress had been made to this point and Members of the Working Group had been very impressed with the comprehensive presentation, the quality of work that all three groups had undertaken and the attention to detail.

The Working Group was due to meet again in April 2016 to receive an update at the end of the delivery year and looking forward to the forthcoming year.

The Committee noted the update and welcomed the suggestion that a similar presentation made by the officers and Police be given at a future meeting of the Council so that all Members could recognise the work of this Partnership. The Chairman of the Group would endeavour to organise this presentation.

SO/50 Crime and Disorder Working Group – Notes of the meeting held 14th December 2015 (cont.)

RESOLVED

That the notes of the Crime and Disorder Working Group meeting held 14th December 2015, be received

REASON

All notes of Working Group meetings are to be received by the Committee

SO/51 **FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE WORKING GROUP – NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD 18TH NOVEMBER 2015**

The Chairman of the Working Group presented the notes of the meeting held 18th November 2015. Since this meeting the Group had met twice informally to review the Council's Budget 2015/16 and the financial forecast.

In December the Members met informally with the finance officers and discussed the revenue and the capital budget. Overall the Council was forecasting a balanced budget for costs and Members noted that there were a number of capital projects in the pipeline.

Business cases for the medium term capital budget projects would be reviewed by the Working Group.

In January the Members met informally with the Cabinet and discussed the financial settlement from central Government, the potential deficit and it also gave Members the opportunity to ask questions of the Cabinet in terms of the Budget.

The Committee discussed briefly the option to increase Council Tax in the District and the New Homes Bonus.

At the informal meeting Members had also discussed in depth the emerging expense in relation to housing benefits as a result of errors in the department, which had led to the department exceeding its regulatory acceptable errors limit. The Committee noted that the Government could claim the money back which had been paid in error to residents and this amounted £180,000.

CenSus was a shared service and Horsham was partners with Mid-Sussex and Adur and Worthing Councils; however Mid-Sussex Council was the lead authority in housing benefits, but Members noted that the loss was across all three partners. This error rate had been ongoing since 2013/14 and the Working Group would continue to monitor this area. The Committee also noted that two Cabinet Members from Horsham sat on the CenSus Joint Committee.

SO/51 Finance and Performance Working Group – Notes of the meeting held 18th November 2015 (cont.)

RESOLVED

That the notes of the Finance and Performance Working Group meeting held 18th November 2015, be received

REASON

All notes of Working Group meetings are to be received by the Committee

SO/52 **SOCIAL INCLUSION WORKING GROUP – NOTES OF THE MEETING HELD 30TH NOVEMBER 2015**

The Chairman of the Social Inclusion Working Group presented the notes of the meeting held 30th November 2015.

The Working Group had received a report on Digital Inclusion which highlighted a problem on the Council's website in terms of accessibility. Members noted that had since been addressed and now there was a clear link from the Home page on the website to the accessibility pages.

The Working Group had identified and supported the importance of maintaining face to face contact for residents who required this when accessing services as the Council became more digitally advanced. The Committee strongly supported this and emphasised its importance.

The Working Group was concerned about the CenSus Revenues and Benefits performance data and the problems suffered by those who received benefits, there was concern over slow and overpayments and the Group would continue to monitor this, this was also supported by the Committee.

RESOLVED

That the notes of the Social Inclusion Working Group meeting held on 30th November 2015, be received

REASON

All notes of Working Group meetings are to be received by the Committee

SO/53 **HEALTH PROVISION WORKING GROUP –CHAIRMAN’S UPDATE**

The Committee noted that the Health Provision Working Group on 17th December 2015 had been cancelled and the next meeting would be held on Monday 25th January 2016.

RESOLVED

That an update from the Health Provision Working Group be received

REASON

All Working Group updates are to be received and approved by the Committee.

SO/54 **TO RECEIVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR THE SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW WORK PROGRAMME**

There were no suggestions for the Scrutiny and Overview work programme.

SO/55 **ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA BUT CONSIDERED URGENT**

None.

The meeting finished at 7.15 pm having commenced at 6.00 pm.

CHAIRMAN

Notes of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee **Business Improvement Working Group** **12th January 2015**

Present: Councillors: Brian O’Connell (Chairman), John Chidlow (Vice-Chairman), Paul Clarke, Jonathan Dancer, Matthew French, Nigel Jupp, Godfrey Newman

Apologies: Councillors: David Coldwell, Tony Hogben, David Jenkins, Michael Willett

Also present: Councillors: Leonard Crosbie (Chairman of Scrutiny & Overview Committee)

Officers: Aidan Thatcher, Development Manager
Raymond Warren, Business Transformation Officer

1. **TO APPROVE AS CORRECT THE RECORD OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10th November 2015**

The notes of the meeting held on 10th November were approved as a correct record.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OR CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

There were no announcements.

4. **BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME – UPDATE FROM THE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION MANAGER**

The Chairman advised that the Business Transformation Advisory Group would be meeting on 14th January to scope the next stage of the programme. The Business Transformation Manager therefore concentrated on what had been achieved so far, in particular the office move, and how it compared to the business case which had been presented to Members in October 2014.

The office move had been scheduled for completion by the end of June 2015 and this had been achieved. The budget of £1,193,000 had been set and the project was currently just under budget.

4. Business Transformation Programme – Update from the Business Transformation Manager (Cont.)

The scope of the office move had been broadly achieved: wifi access throughout the building and standardised working spaces to allow for flexible working; the provision of 290 desks (some 25 more than originally anticipated); a mixture of formal and informal meeting spaces; dedicated Member meeting rooms, that could also be used by officers; and private customer space near the ground floor reception. There had also been a significant reduction in storage space, which had partly been achieved through off-site storage.

Members asked if the public reception area on the ground floor would be reviewed, and were advised that WSCC were looking at their customer face to face services, although there was no formal review of the reception area at present.

The Chairman thanked the Business Transformation Manager and his team for all their work in successfully delivering the office move, and other aspects of the Business Transformation Programme, including the new website.

- The Working Group would be updated with details of the next stage of the Business Transformation Programme in March, after it had been scoped.

5. PROPERTY & ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW – ASSET LIST UPDATE

The Chairman advised that this item was deferred.

6. REVIEW OF THE S106 PROCESS

The Working Group set out to review the West of Horsham Countryside Homes application as a case study to establish the process and see if it was fit for purpose. This had been a complex application involving a number of amendments, and it had been subject to a viability study.

The Development Manager advised that the outline application had been made in 2009, when the initial S106 agreement was entered into. The number of affordable housing units (20%) had been established at this stage. The developer had not been required to confirm the sizes of the units at the outline stage; this was established with each subsequent reserved matters application.

6. Review of the S106 Process (Cont.)

Members were concerned that local housing need had not been directly addressed at the outline application stage. The Development Manager confirmed that this was in line with government legislation.

Members were advised that a viability study was required if the developer sought an amendment to the permission, eg a reduction in infrastructure contributions or number of affordable housing units to be provided. The Development Manager confirmed that the viability study was scrutinised to ensure the developer was not profiting unduly from it.

Members discussed the review mechanism within S106 agreements designed to ensure that developers' profits were reasonable. The Development Manager reported that a Planning Obligations Officer post had been established during the recent restructure. A significant part of this role was to monitor the progress of S106 agreements.

With regards to the spending of S106 monies, the Council was establishing a new database that would record and monitor all contributions. This information would be readily available to parish councils and help to identify unspent monies.

It was suggested that a small task group of Members be set up to follow the S106 progress on major applications. The Chairman considered that such a group would not be necessary, particularly in the light of the recommendations of the Working Group that local Members, (i) be alerted when an application is likely to warrant an S106 agreement; and (ii) be advised of the draft Heads of Terms by the Legal team.

Members requested a comparison analysis of S106 agreements, looking at three major applications; Countryside, Barclay and Kilwood Vale.

- The Chairman therefore requested a comparison of the Heads of Terms of these three S106 agreements. It was noted that this information would not include details of negotiations leading to the Heads of Terms and would therefore be of limited value.

The overriding concern of the Working Group was that the initial S106 agreement secured at the outline stage did not have a monetary value attached because a breakdown of the sizes of housing to be provided was not required until the reserved matters stage.

- The Chairman therefore asked for clarification on the extent of the Council's power to negotiate with the developer at outline stage.

Agenda Item 6a

Business Improvement Working Group
12th January 2016

7. MEMBER OVERVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S USE OF THE REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT 2000

The Working Group noted that the Council had not used the powers under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 in the past quarter.

The meeting finished at 7.45pm having commenced at 6.00pm

CHAIRMAN

Notes of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee
Business Improvement Working Group
10th February 2016

- Present:** Councillors: Brian O’Connell (Chairman), John Chidlow (Vice-Chairman), David Coldwell, Matthew French, Nigel Jupp, Godfrey Newman, Michael Willett
- Apologies:** Councillors: Paul Clarke, Jonathan Dancer, Tony Hogben, David Jenkins
- Also present:** Councillors: Leonard Crosbie (Chairman of Scrutiny & Overview Committee), Brian Donnelly (Cabinet Member for Finance & Asset)
- Officers:** Aidan Thatcher, Development Manager

1. MINUTES

The notes of the meeting held on 12th January were approved as a correct record.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Godfrey Newman declared a personal interest because he lives on Highwood Estate, the Berkeley development.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OR CHIEF EXECUTIVE

There were no announcements.

4. REVIEW OF THE S106 PROCESS

The Working Group compared the Heads of Terms of the three S106 agreements which had been requested at the previous meeting: the Berkeley development (Highwood, land West of Horsham); the Countryside development (Wickhurst Green, land South of Broadbridge Heath); and the Crest development (Kilwood Vale, land West of Bewbush).

The extent to which they varied from each other, in particular Kilwood Vale which included provision for Crawley, was noted.

Members discussed the value of using a template S106 agreement and the Development Manager confirmed that templates were often used, although these were not always appropriate because of the unique nature of many

4. Review of the S106 Process (Cont.)

developments. The Chairman agreed that the use of a standard template for all S106 agreements would not benefit the process, given the number of variables between each case.

The Working Group was mindful of the Housing and Planning Bill, which would lead to some changes in the way S106 agreements are negotiated.

Members discussed the North of Horsham development, which would be the largest scheme ever seen in the District, requiring significant new infrastructure. The Chairman confirmed that there would be full Member briefings during every stage of the North of Horsham process.

Members requested a breakdown on what was established at outline stage and then at reserved matters stage. The Development Manager confirmed that a seminar regarding parameter plans, which would include information on the outline and reserved matters stages, had already been timetabled for a future Member Seminar.

At outline stage, affordable housing provision was negotiated as a percentage of total units, not as a monetary value. This was government policy and reflected that of the local policy framework within the HDPF. Any monetary value could only be indicated through a voluntary agreement with the developer and there are issues using this approach as development costs change over time (up and down) and thus could result in less provision being provided.

With regards to monetary value at reserved matters stage, the Chairman suggested that this could be established using a calculation based on square footage (although noting the above caution), with a clawback clause to ensure that the developer would compensate the local authority should the selling price of houses increase.

- The S106 review would recommend a clawback clause in future S106 moving forward where the proportion of affordable housing does not meet the required level.

In response to comments from a member of the public to the S106 agreements connected to recent major developments, the Chairman concluded that no fault had been identified in the system. The Council was in a stronger position than when these S106 agreements had been negotiated now that the new Development Team was well established and the HDPF adopted.

4. Review of the S106 Process (Cont.)

The Working Group discussed the need to protect the amount of affordable housing in the district, and the Chairman made a recommendation to the Scrutiny & Overview Committee that:

- A Working Group be established to look into the potential for the Council to invest in building and managing its own affordable housing stock.

The Working Group acknowledged that Members could not expect to be involved in negotiations, which were carried out by suitably qualified officers, but there was a need for transparency and Members needed to be kept aware during the process and assured that the best deals were achieved.

In order to ensure transparency and Member engagement the Chairman suggested that a panel of three Members with relevant experience should be appointed, two of whom would meet on a quarterly basis with the Development Manager or other relevant staff, so they can be briefed on current S106 negotiations. Those Members could then report back to relevant Ward Councillors and other Members.

- The Chairman would arrange to meet with the Chief Executive, Director of Planning, Economic Development & Property and the Development Manager before the next BIWG meeting to discuss this idea with a view to establishing appropriate terms of reference for a S106 Panel.
- The formation of this Panel would then be discussed at the next BIWG meeting to establish details of its role and function, with a view to recommending it to Council, via the Scrutiny & Overview Committee.

The meeting finished at 7.20pm having commenced at 6.00pm

CHAIRMAN

Notes of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee **Finance and Performance Working Group** **17th February 2016**

Present: Councillors: Stuart Ritchie (Chairman), John Chidlow, Leonard Crosbie, Nigel Jupp, Michael Willett

Apologies: Councillors: John Bailey, Jonathan Dancer, Brian O'Connell, Ben Staines

Also present: Councillor: Peter Clarke, Brian Donnelly, Christian Mitchell, Godfrey Newman

Officers: Ben Bix, Governance Project Manager
Dominic Bradley, Head of Finance
Mark Pritchard, Commissioning and Performance Manager

1. **TO APPROVE AS CORRECT THE RECORD OF THE FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE WORKING GROUP MEETING ON 26TH AUGUST 2015**

The notes of the Finance and Performance Working Group meeting held on 18th November 2015 were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

2. **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM CHAIRMAN OR CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

There were no announcements.

4. **REPORT ON THE COUNCIL'S FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE, DISTRICT PLAN PRIORITIES AND KEY PROJECTS FOR QUARTER 3, 2015/16**

The Commissioning and Performance Manager presented the report on the Council's Finance and Performance, District Plan Priorities and Key Projects for Quarter 3, 2015/16.

This report detailed the finance and performance figures for Quarter 3 2015/16.

It was noted that the format of the report had been rearranged to provide a summary of the District Plan Priorities at the beginning.

Members noted the development of 'Horsham Town Vision'.

Agenda Item 8

Finance and Performance Working Group
17th February 2016

Members discussed the status of the new Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre.

Action: Commissioning and Performance Manager to provide members with an illustration on 'Leisure Requirements' and 'Operations' Governance Model in regard to the new Broadbridge Heath Leisure centre.

The Head of Finance presented a summary on income and expenditure for Quarter 3 2015/16 and reported that an underspend of £73k was forecast at year-end.

Members noted that the revenue summary appendix had been re-ordered by significance rather than Directorate to aid their review of the papers.

Members suggested that an updated balance sheet be produced each quarter and be included within the report. The Head of Finance explained that this was not possible at present without significant time and resource being spent on it. It was noted that the Finance Department are planning a new Financial Management System in April 2017 which should more easily produce these reports and summaries.

Action: Head of Finance to find out how other authorities handle balance sheets.

The Head of Finance provided members with an update on the New Homes Bonus.

Action: Head of Finance to discuss Development Management costs with Chair of Scrutiny.

5. **COMPLAINTS, COMPLIMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS – MONITORING AND LEARNING REPORT FOR QUARTER 3**

The Working Group noted the figures for the quarter which were detailed in the Complaints, Compliments and Suggestions report.

The Members noted that there was a significant decrease in the number of complaints during quarter 3.

The report detailed a breakdown of the figures for the Working Group.

Members noted the introduction of the new complaints, compliments and suggestions methodology.

6. ANALYSIS OF REQUESTS MADE UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AND ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION REGULATIONS 2015

The Governance Project Manager read a statement from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services Finance to Members in regards to an email received from a member of public, whom had been in correspondence with the Information Commissioners Office (ICO). Members attention was drawn to the performance indicators monitored by the Working Group which were the measures used by the external Regulator (the Information Commissioner).

With regard to response rates, the Working Group was informed that the ICO may formally monitor response rates below 85% - in the last year, monitoring was undertaken by the ICO on Salford, Greenwich, Cumbria and Nottingham councils. Horsham was not vulnerable to a monitoring notice, as noted in the report before members, because response performance was 98%. Turning to requests for reviews, contextually, there had been 32 requests for review out of 789 requests for information since 1 April 2014 (4%). Of those 32 reviews, 24 requestors did not choose to appeal to the ICO. Five did appeal to the ICO and the ICO upheld the Council's decision on all 5 occasions.

The member of the public had incorrectly described the action of the Information Commissioner with regard to the 2 cases that were the subject of his email as decisive, and that the Council had a finding against it. By dealing with his request outside the 20 day timescale, the Council had breached regulation 5(2) and in 1 to 2 % of cases the Council continues to breach regulation 5(2) as did every other public body that does not comply with 100% of requests within 20 days. However this was recognised by the ICO and should be seen in the context that the Information Commissioner had a tolerance level of 85% responses within 20 working days, that is, the Information commissioner has tolerated breaches of regulation 5(2) in respect of 15% of requests. Horsham District Council was 98% compliant (well above the tolerance level).

The member of the public had failed to state that the Information Commissioner had found the Council in compliance with the main duty (regulation 5(1)) to provide the information and therefore closed the case with no further action. Members were informed that the ICO published its decision notices online and that the ICO had not deemed it necessary to publish such a notice on the occasion mentioned by the member of the public.

The Working Group noted the contents of the Freedom of Information Act and Environmental Information Regulations report and were reminded that the council published its disclosure log online. .

Members requested to keep the report quarterly rather than annual.

Agenda Item 8

Finance and Performance Working Group
17th February 2016

7. CENSUS JOINT COMMITTEE MINUTES HELD ON 11TH December 2015

The Members discussed the Revenues and Benefits Performance Update section of the minutes.

Members agreed on a date (22 March 2016) to convene with the lead members from Mid-Sussex of the CenSus joint Committee (revenues and benefits) for an informal briefing on the subject of the Revenues and Benefits Performance.

The meeting ended at 7.41 p.m. having commenced at 6.00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

Notes of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee **Health Provision Working Group** **25th January 2016**

Present: Councillors: David Skipp (Chairman), Liz Kitchen, Tim Lloyd

Apologies: Councillor Tricia Youtan

Also present: Councillors: Leonard Crosbie

1. TO APPROVE AS CORRECT THE RECORD OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28TH OCTOBER 2015

The notes of the meeting held 28th October 2015 were approved as a correct record.

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OR CHIEF EXECUTIVE

There were no announcements.

4. FOLLOW UP ON THE OUTCOME OF THE LOCAL PRIMARY CARE PROVISION SEMINAR

The Chairman of the Working Group gave a brief overview on the discussions which took place at the Local Primary Care Provision Seminar in December 2015.

There had been representation from Park, Riverside, Orchard, Courtyard and Holbrook surgeries in Horsham.

The future of the healthcare provision in Horsham was uncertain. Orchard and Riverside surgeries had explained how they wanted to merge together and expand on the premises of Orchard surgery; however the plans for expansion were partly reliant on approval from West Sussex County Council as the building was shared by Horsham Library and the Citizens Advice Bureau and owned by the County Council.

Members suggested relocating the Citizens Advice Bureau to the current Council Parkside building; therefore providing space for the GP's to expand in the current Orchard surgery building.

Agenda Item 10a

Health Provision Working Group
25th January 2016

Courtyard surgery spoke about the potential idea of moving to a large surgery with community facilities on the north side of Horsham, but this would require funding.

Park surgery had explained that they did not have the capacity to take on many extra patients.

There were no firm proposals from NHS England and the CCG at this stage to accommodate the growing population in Horsham in terms of the healthcare provision. Members reiterated their concern that there was a vast amount of development underway across the District, particularly in Broadbridge Heath and Southwater, yet no proposals for additional medical services to accommodate the extra homes.

The Group recognised that the rural parts of the District such as Steyning, Pulborough and Billingshurst were fairly well catered for in terms of GP services.

Members noted that there were financial implications linked to GPs being part of a partnership at a surgery, this often deterred GPs as they did not want the financial responsibility and therefore were not always keen to invest in a new surgery.

The Working Group had previously explored developing in Hurst Road with some of the local GPs.

Members wished to explore this further by arranging a meeting with West Sussex County Councillors representing the Horsham area to gain views and support the option of developing the site. The Chairman would draft a letter, to present to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee on 14th March 2016, for approval, to send to the West Sussex County Councillors.

5. SOUTH EAST AMBULANCE RESPONSE TIMES

This had been raised by a Member of the Working Group, there was concern about long ambulance response times in rural parts of the District such as Steyning. Data had been collected from South East Coast Ambulance Service and NHS England which indicated that the majority of emergency calls in the District were responded to within eight minutes. However, Members were concerned that these statistics were not was not realistic for some of the more rural areas.

The Working Group agreed that it would like to invite a representative from the South East Coast Ambulance Service to discuss the response times and provide Members with a realistic picture for the District.

Agenda Item 10a

Health Provision Working Group
25th January 2016

Members also wanted information on the plans for the ambulance station in Horsham and the allocation of ambulances across the District.

Councillor Tim Lloyd updated the Working Group on how a group in Steyning had received funding for a nursing facility in the village to provide post operative care for those leaving hospital. The proposed site was the community centre in which the Police Station was planning to vacate.

The community group were in the process of drawing up a business plan. The community was looking for support from NHS England and the CCG were currently being consulted. There were a number of GPs in the area already on board. Councillor Lloyd would keep the Working Group informed as plans progressed.

Members also expressed their concern in relation to the congestion arising from the lack of parking spaces at Horsham Hospital, which was leading to long tailbacks on the roads caused by people queuing for the car park. The Chairman would raise this again with the CCG.

The meeting finished at 4.11 p.m. having commenced at 3.00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN



March 2016

Proposed letter to Mrs Margaret Evans, Chairman of WSCC's Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee (HASC).

Councillor David Skipp, Chairman of the Health Provision Working Group has advised that the Group has questions for County Councillors and they would like to undertake this through the Scrutiny process, particularly through the Health Provision Working Group, and are requesting approval and support from the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.

Dear Mrs Evans,

Further to your committee's recent review of the need to strengthen Primary Care services across the County, and our Chief Executive's response dated 29 February, I am writing at the request of our Scrutiny and Overview Committee to draw attention to, and seek your support for, action to address a very real and pressing set of issues with Primary Care Services in and around the town of Horsham.

Our Health Provision Working Group recently reviewed the conclusions of a seminar held between representatives of Horsham General practices and councillors at which two particular issues were identified,

1. There has been a lack of provision of health services for the new residents moving into recently built houses in the west of Horsham catchment area. The scheme which had been proposed at the Broadbridge Heath leisure centre, which included facilities for General Practitioners, had fallen through and no further premises were available. This has led to demand on existing surgeries which is placing immense strain on health care professionals and the provision of services.
2. There does not appear to be any strategy in place to cater for those families moving into West of Horsham, potential residents in the numerous flat conversions under construction in Horsham and those moving to North Horsham. Neither the CCG nor NHS England have presented a coherent strategy as to how this deteriorating situation can be managed.

The Working Group are of the opinion that there may be options to resolve the provision of services based around the Hurst Road area, with its proximity to Horsham Hospital and road links to and from the town centre. We would like to meet with you and West Sussex County Councillors representing Horsham divisions to obtain their views on the present impasse.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor David Skipp
Chairman of the Health Provision Working Group.

**Scrutiny and Overview Work Programme
November 2015-December 2016**

	Scrutiny & Overview	Social Inclusion	Finance & Performance	Business Improvement	Crime & Disorder	Health Provision	West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Group
November 2015	Meeting	Digital Inclusion Review	Q KPI Report Q Complaints Report Q FOI Report CenSus Mins	Extra Meeting – S106 Review			
December					Meeting Update on action plans and presentation (see minutes from 22/6/15)	Local Health Provision in the Town Centre	
January 2016	Meeting			Additional Meeting -S106 Review -Normal business -Q RIPA Update		Local Health Provision in the Town Centre	Joint Scrutiny Steering Group – To agree work programme
February			Meeting Q KPI Report Q Complaints Report Q FOI Report CenSus Mins	Additional Meeting -S106 Review		Further meetings TBC	Meeting (TBC) Housing Provision for Care Leavers Review Group
March	Meeting -Work Programming -Procedure note on planning appeals (TBC)	Digital Inclusion	Meeting	Additional Meeting -S106 Review			

Scrutiny and Overview Work Programme
November 2015-December 2016

April				Meeting -S106 Review -Normal Business -Q RIPA Update	Meeting Update on action plans at year end		
May	Meeting S106 Report from BIWG (TBC)						
June	Meeting Report back on recommendation re planning appeals (see minutes from 11/1/16) 6 months on -Review of Constitution	Meeting	Meeting Q KPI Report Q Complaints Report Q FOI Report CenSus Mins ** Council Property update Brian Elliott				
July	Meeting			Meeting -Q RIPA Update			
August			Meeting Q KPI Report Q Complaints Report Q FOI Report CenSus Mins				

Scrutiny and Overview Work Programme
November 2015-December 2016

September	Meeting -Boundary Commission Review (timescales TBC)	Meeting					
October		Meeting		Meeting -Annual RIPA Report			
November	Meeting Trade Waste WG update on report recs see mins of S&O 9/11/15						
December							

This page is intentionally left blank