

NOTES OF A MEETING OF THE JOINT CHAIRS AND VICE-CHAIRS STEERING GROUP – SCRUTINY, AUDIT AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES COMMITTEES

14 FEBRUARY 2014 – COMMITTEE ROOM A, COUNTY HALL, LLANDRINDOD WELLS

PRESENT: County Councillors R.G. Thomas (Chair).
County Councillors W.T. Jones, Mrs M Mackenzie, T. Turner and Mrs S.C. Davies.

Officers:

Peter Jones (Programme Office Manager), Wyn Richards (Scrutiny Manager), Liz Patterson and Lisa Richards (Scrutiny Officers), Susan Simpson (Partnership and Policy Manager), Dominique Jones (Senior Manager, Organisational Development and Partnership Support), Sue Glenn (Corporate Consultation Officer), Rhian Jones (Corporate Planning Officer).

1. Apologies

County Councillors - County Councillors E.M. Jones, A.W. Davies and J.G. Morris.
Officers – Nick Philpott (Director – Change and Governance), Clive Pinney (Solicitor to the Council).

2. Notes of Last Meeting

Documents Considered:

- 24th January, 2014

Issues Discussed:

- What difference had the feedback provided by the Steering Group made. It was suggested that arising from the budget seminar for Members that the comments had made little difference.
- The Scrutiny Manager confirmed that there had been no formal response to scrutiny's comments.

Outcomes:

- **Received**
- **Scrutiny Manager to follow up on provision of guidance to Members on "Have Your Say" process.**
- **Scrutiny Manager to email the Leader (copy to Chief Executive) asking for a response to scrutiny's comments on the Draft Council Budget.**

3. Scrutiny of the Draft One Powys Plan.

Documents Considered:

- Briefing Note from the Scrutiny Manager.
- Draft One Powys Plan 2014-17 (v8)
- Welsh Government Outcome Agreements 2013 – 2016.
- Presentation Slides – One Powys Plan – Key Findings from the Engagement and Consultation Process.

Issues Discussed:

Presentation by Dominique Jones regarding the stages in the development of the Draft Plan.

- Editing process is the next stage which will remove the technical jargon and make the document more readable.
- Draft Plan is based on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Citizen Needs which underlined the high level Forward Needs Analysis.
- Interventions were then scoped and prioritised together with an alignment of delivery structures.
- The Plan will not include details of the projects which sit beneath the plan and will deliver the actions identified.
- Under the Local Government Measure 2009, previously there were 2 plans (The Powys Change Plan and the One Powys Plan). The Council has now committed to a single plan. The focus previously had been solely on what the Council would deliver. The current plan is about working with partners in achieving a more valuable intervention i.e. engagement on a multi agency basis.
- At a recent meeting of the LSB there were obvious tensions between the different governance arrangements for the various partnerships e.g. the Powys teaching Local Health Board (PtLHB) plan only had a cursory reference to the One Powys Plan. The Chief Executive of the PtLHB was to discuss this with Welsh Government as there would need to be a change in governance arrangements to ensure that the drive towards single plans could be taken forward. Currently there was inconsistent guidance coming from Welsh Government to partnership bodies such as the PtLHB.
- The Steering Group commented that the current Draft Plan looked like the Council's plan only. It was explained that as the various partnerships were at different places in relation to joint planning, the current version was not a fully integrated plan as yet. The synergy between the various agencies' plans was also missing.
- The Steering Group was reminded that the Council was pioneering in relation to the creation of a single plan, being the first Council in Wales to do this.
- There is a need for an accountability framework to underpin the plan to explain which of the agencies is responsible for which elements of the actions. This would also be important for scrutiny as the scrutiny of the draft plan was the first element of the scrutiny of the Local Service Board in Powys.
- The Cabinet will approve the plan on 1st April, with the Council approving the plan on 30th April.

Presentation by Sue Glenn on the Key findings from the engagement and consultation process.

- Following a consultation exercise during the summer of 2013 the consultation cards were revised and a further consultation exercise undertaken which coincided with the budget consultation exercise.
- In response to a question from the Steering Group, members were advised that vulnerable families and people suffering from mental health problems were not consulted. However these items identified by the public generally as low priority would be retained in the plan as these groups could not be disadvantaged.

- Training for Members on the consultation cards would have been an advantage to assist Members when discussing the cards and issues with Town and Community Councils. Liaison with Members and Town and Community Councils in future on such issues in future should be undertaken through the Neighbourhood Management process.
- It would be of assistance if in future there were briefings for Members prior to major consultation exercises being undertaken. It would also be of assistance to the Council if consultation exercises in future could be aligned e.g. budget and One Powys Plan.
- There is a need for greater understanding by Members of the synergy between issues e.g. in relation to transport issues – the consultation exercise says that this is important. However a Cabinet report recommended removing rural transport.
- The current year’s consultation process will be reviewed in preparation for next year.
- There should be links between the Plan and the Budget by means of the Statement of Intent. However even with the recent changes to the budget, there has been an attempt to account for these changes in the development of the plan.
- **Detailed Comments on the Draft One Powys Plan:**
- **Section 6 – Listening to You.**
 - Road Traffic Accidents – the numbers of accidents split between Trunk Roads and other roads are a 50% / 50% split. However Trunk Roads are only 7% of the total network. Therefore 50% of accidents occur on 7% of the network (Trunk Road) by comparison to 50% of accidents occurring on 93% of the network (other roads). This issue is therefore not a transformational change but day to day business, hence the lower priority and removal from the plan. It is also not a multi agency issue.
 - Children and Vulnerable Families – What weighting was given to the consultation responses?. Vulnerable families are still seen as being an important issue despite the general consultation response indicating that this is a low priority. The general consultation response has been balanced by the customer focus responses in establishing the priority level.
 - The Steering Group suggested that the document needed to make it clearer as to why vulnerable families are included in the plan.
 - Town and Community Councils – responses from Town and Community Councils were limited. There is a need to engage with Town and Community Councils and communities through the Neighbourhood Management process.
- **Section 7 – Listening to our Regulators.**
 - The Steering Group suggested that the comments made by Estyn following the recent re-inspection should be more clearly attributable to the regulator following the recent inspection visit.
- **Section 4 – Our Priorities.**
 - **General.**
 - The document did not include any baselines, targets and dates. What was included to date were the measures but none of the outcomes. It was difficult therefore to comment on these elements of the document as the information was missing. The Steering Group commented that the timetable for considering the document be revisited so that the Joint Chairs be provided with the finalised document for consideration in future.

- Rurality (e.g. page 15) – the document needs to specify what are the challenges caused by rurality?
- The document is too Council focussed rather than a multi agency focus – there needs to be a clearer indication of how these sections are multi agency focussed.
- Page 36 needs to be populated.
- Need to revise the layout of sub-divisions under each section with the “Difference” and “Actions” sub-sections following each other and the “Measures” should come at the end.
- The colours used in the document need to be revisited as they need to be dyslexic friendly. Some of the potential readers are also colour blind who would find these coloured items difficult to read.
- Need to define in the document what is meant by “Vulnerable Families”.
- “Why is this important” sections are at times too complex and need to be simplified to make them more readable.
- The plan will therefore reduce from 15 to about 10 issues.
- Health and Adult Social Care.
 - 1. Housing.
 - Welfare Reform appears under “challenges” but not under “differences”, but then reappears under “actions”.
 - Should the Local Development Plan be included under “actions”?
 - 2. Long Term Conditions.
 - This will be removed as a section as some of the actions will be included in service plans or as elements in some of the other issues. Therefore it is not a transformational / multi-agency issue.
 - 3. Older People.
 - In “challenges” – “Outward migration” and “limited labour market” – these are 2 separate elements. There is nothing in the actions to address this challenge.
 - In “challenges” – “Rapidly growing numbers” – should be the inclusion of the words “require a flexible menu of support and care”.
 - 4. Carers.
 - Under “Why is this important” – the paragraph needs editing as it is too complex and dense with information – needs to be broken down to more readable elements.
 - The connection with other agencies needs to be emphasised here.
 - 5. Mental Health and Well-Being.
 - In “Why is this important” – only anxiety and depression is mentioned as common mental health concerns. There is no mention of stress, as stress is linked to unemployment rates etc.
 - In “Difference” and “Actions” elements there is no mention here about reducing the level of suicides as an outcome.
- Children and Young People.
 - 6. Vulnerable Families.
 - There is no mention of teenage pregnancies in this section. This needs to be checked against the Strategic Joint Needs Assessment and included if appropriate.
 - In “Measure” – “reduce cost of providing care” – this is poorly worded and needs to be revised.
 - 7. Healthy Lifestyles.
 - In “Why is this important” – the paragraph relating to alcohol effects and the one relating to vaccinations needs to be split as they are 2 separate points.

- In “measures” there is no split between age groups. The Steering Group was advised that this would be picked up within the project detail.
- Transforming Learning.
 - 8. Education.
 - In “challenges” – “organise schools” – after the word “schools” should be included “(primary, secondary and post 16)”.
 - In “Why is this Important” – comment about Powys grades being 5% above the rest of Wales – this comment needs to be reflect that Powys is underperforming by comparison to the results it should be achieving.
 - In “Actions” – “Assisted Learning Needs” – improved support should be for “all” schools.
 - In “Actions” – “Ensure that a high quality of education” – “organisation of schools” needs to be added to this statement.
 - Adult Education is not included in this section. Schools are included because of the Council’s position following the Estyn inspection. Comments on adult education and jobs had been raised during the public consultation but not included in the plan.
 - 9. Training and Jobs for Young People.
 - The Steering Group queried whether this was a Council programme only. There had been a discussion within the Council regarding skills gaps within the organisation. However there could be a wider skills gap within communities which would be an issue when services were being transferred. Therefore this section needed to be amended to reflect this.
 - There should be links here to Part 4 – Carers, relating to young people leaving Powys.
 - In “Differences” the statement regarding “more young people... in full time education” should be amended to read “more young people achieving their potential” It was also queried whether this statement was meant to include young people in education elsewhere or just within Powys, or did it mean keeping young people up to 25 in Powys?
 - In “Differences” – “young people in jobs” and “young people in apprenticeships” should be swapped around.
- Stronger, Safer and Economically Viable Communities.
 - The Steering Group noted the suggestion at the Local Service Board meeting that the title should be amended to read “vibrant” rather than “economically viable” communities which was supported.
 - 10. Stronger Communities.
 - In “Actions” – Page 30, bullet point 6 – the elements of this bullet point need to be split as the paragraph is too confusing. It was also queried whether the comment regarding grants needed to be expanded.
 - 11. Transport.
 - In “Challenge” – a comment should be included regarding a lack of infrastructure.
 - 12. Community Safety.
 - In “Differences” – the comment “people will feel more confident” needs to be amended to read “people will see the benefits of agencies...”
 - 13. Road Traffic Collisions.
 - In “Challenges” – motorcyclists from out of the county having accidents in Powys - had a significant impact on other services in Powys e.g. health, ambulance etc.
 - 14. Internet Access.

- There should be an additional comment here regarding mobile access rather than just internet access.
- The Steering Group questioned whether mobile access was identified in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment?
- The Steering Group also questioned whether internet access should be made available in the vicinity of all public buildings?
- Access to services should be available by means of mobile phones.

Outcomes:

- **That the comments of the Joint Chairs be forwarded to the Cabinet for consideration in amending the draft plan.**
- **That feedback be provided to the Joint Chairs as to whether the comments made have been accepted or not for inclusion in the draft plan.**
- **That the revised plan including the baselines, outcome targets and timescales be circulated to the Joint Chairs for comment (Programme Office Manager and Scrutiny Manager to co-ordinate the circulation of the document)**

4. Dates of future meetings

- 21st March, 2014
- 16th May, 2014
- 18th July, 2014
- 19th September, 2014
- 14th November, 2014

5. LSB Meeting Dates

- 13th March, 2014
- 12th June, 2014
- 25th September, 2014
- 11th December, 2014

**County Councillor R.G. Thomas
Chair**