

CABINET – 23 November 2022
PUBLIC QUESTIONS

<p>1. Questioner's name: Chris Chiswell</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p>The proposed strategy sets priorities for education of vulnerable users, those walking, and those cycling. Why has the council not included a strategic priority on driver education, given this group has potential to cause greatest harm?</p>	<p>Education is a key aspect of our road safety strategy, and one where success requires effective multi-agency collaboration. Within Strategic themes 3 and 4, to improve safety for people walking and cycling, we have identified several education actions. These are not limited to the education of vulnerable road users but extend to driver education, reaching out to young drivers at schools and colleges, to older drivers and includes roads policing interventions such as Operation Close Pass (giving cyclists more space when overtaking).</p> <p>I am pleased to report that Gloucestershire Fire & Rescue Service have recently appointed to a new Road Safety Education Officer post established in the 2022/23 budget. We are also fortunate to have in our police force officers who are at the forefront of national work to improve road safety in conjunction with insurers and other agencies. We have to work together to make our local roads safer.</p>
<p>2. Questioner's name: Chris Chiswell</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p>The proposed strategy lists School Streets as a key intervention. However, at the recent School Street's scrutiny committee review, both the lead member and lead officer said they did not support their wider roll out. What is the council's actual position on school streets, and what is its level of ambition?</p>	<p>There are currently two school streets schemes in Gloucestershire, one in Tewkesbury and one in Cheltenham.</p> <p>The process of implementing, running and monitoring these schemes required considerable resources and was significantly affected by the disruption to travel and normal attendance patterns during the Covid lockdowns. Whilst both schemes have since been made permanent, we remain to be convinced that this is the most effective or practical approach to solving the challenges. That is why</p>

	<p>we have agreed to continue monitoring these sites to understand how sustainable and lasting the changes are, before we consider any further extension to the school streets approach in Gloucestershire.</p> <p>In the meantime, the council remains committed to tackling school gate congestion and supporting parents with measures to increase walking, cycling and scooting to school. This will improve the local environment for residents and help reduce carbon emissions under our Greener Gloucestershire programme.</p> <p>Resources permitting, we will also support other schools who have committed to School Travel Plans, as we believe that the school community are best placed to lead on changing behaviour through an active travel plan, and working with local champions and influencers.</p>
<p>3. Questioner's name: Chris Chiswell</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p>The council received over 500 responses to its consultation, including many free text comments that are not presented anywhere in an entirely numeric consultation report (appendix B). However, despite this, the only change in the strategic priorities that the council has implemented is a minor wording amendment to ST1 to read review speed limits on 'A roads in Gloucester and Cheltenham', rather than 'those on hotspot list'. Given these minimal changes, how would the council evidence to citizens and community groups that the council is committed to coproduction, and that it is worth investing time in responding to consultations beyond popularity votes?</p>	<p>You are correct in that the consultation asked for free text comments to add to or supplement the responses from the member of the public. This was included specifically to help the team understand more detail and / or the context of the individual's replies and it also allowed an opportunity to learn from any areas of public feedback that might not as easily fit into the identified priorities that were consulted upon. This was done specifically to enhance the consultation and allow for additional changes or inclusions (into the final draft policy) that the consultation version might not have picked up; rather than anything to the contrary.</p> <p>The report is clear on those elements of public feedback that have specifically led to inclusions and improvements in the policy, predominantly in sections 80 and 81 of the report. However free text comments also provide insight into all of the more data focused</p>

	<p>responses; an obvious example being whether someone doesn't support an element of the policy because it is 'too ambitious' or 'not ambitious enough'.</p> <p>Appendix B (as you acknowledge) is a numerical representation of those responses rather than relisting the free text comments.</p>
4. Questioner's name: Kevin Markey	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
<p>Agenda Item 8: Support to Refugees on the Homes for Ukraine (HFU) Scheme</p> <p>Equality Assessment</p> <p>Protected Characteristics Marriage and Civil Partnership</p> <p>Why is no data collected on this protected characteristic? Surely it would be good to do so to compare how effective Marriage & Civil Partnership protection is against and if protection is needed.</p> <p>Is there any significant disadvantage faced by married &/or civil couples compared to Solo people, Divorced & widows or those couples who cohabit or are just "in a relationship"?</p>	<p>The Homes for Ukraine scheme is operated by central Government through the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC). Gloucestershire County Council's role is simply to administer the scheme locally on their behalf. As such, we rely on the data provided to us by DLUHC through the referral process. Until recently, data has not been collected on the marital status of the individual or family, and so we have not been able to analyse by this characteristic. However, this information has recently been added into the data being provided and we will therefore monitor this data going forward. Support is provided by a number of different organisations to both sponsors and guests on the scheme. This support is flexible and is tailored towards individual needs, regardless of how and why those needs arise.</p>
5. Questioner's name: Kevin Markey	Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman
<p>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p>Is any consideration being given to parking on pavements and the dangers it causes by forcing wheelchair users Mothers with prams and child cyclists onto the road!?</p> <p>Also the effects of heavy vehicles parked on pavements causing structure damage to an area designed for pedestrians!?</p>	<p>Parking on pavements is something that currently falls to the Police to enforce and is one of the elements that we actively pick up with them through the Road Safety Partnership and through our own communications strategy.</p> <p>As you indicate, this has a benefit both from a road safety perspective (preventing people being forced into the road); from an</p>

<p>I give an example of a hearse fire only last year that caused much damage needing to be repaired to a pedestrian area on Cam high street!</p> <p>In addition a blind or visible impaired person coming against a land rover or vehicle parked on a pavement would be distressed and it leads to others following this bad example.</p> <p>Should a park and walk initiative be encouraged?</p>	<p>accessibility perspective (encouraging more cycling and walking and therefore decarbonisation) and also from a maintenance perspective (not only the surface damage but also the prevention of damage to the services under the Pavements).</p> <p>Whilst this doesn't form a specific element of this road safety policy, it is a issue that aligns with this policy; with our Local Transport Plan and our Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure plans and our wider approach to transport decarbonisation.</p>
<p>6. Questioner's name: Alick Miskin</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr David Gray</p>
<p>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p>Given you're providing no budget or even plans to make walking and cycling safer in the Stroud District by improved LTN 1/20 compliant infrastructure, why are you insisting on ignoring pleas for a lower 20mph default speed limit wherever motorists and vulnerable road users mix and insisting on continuing the current long-winded and inefficient assessment process of each suggested local scheme using the outdated 2013 Dft Guidelines? Wales has done it, Oxfordshire is doing it, why is Gloucestershire so against any meaningful measures to support Active Travel?</p>	<p>Any of the infrastructure that is installed or proposed to support cycling and walking will consider the requirements of LTN1/20 and improvements within Stroud district are no different here. You may be aware of the Stroud Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan that the County Council has published as well as out proposals for the longer-term development for the cycle spine which proposes key connections within the Stroud area – both of which are published on our website.</p> <p>The policy sets out our approach to assessing and considering 20mph limits and this is consistent with the current national best practice. This doesn't advocate a 'blanket approach' to 20mph limits and does consider these requests where the approach and environment are appropriate – and of a base assessment here is to understand where vulnerable users mix. We will continue to work with DfT on their developing approaches and learn from others such as Wales and Oxfordshire, however I don't believe that their approaches necessarily represent a blanket approach either.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

Question 1: Cllr John Bloxsom	Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman
<p>Agenda Item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p>Will the forthcoming Road Safety Policy result in proposals for speed limit reductions, which meet the stated criteria and are supported by local communities, being approved?</p>	<p>We have updated our policy to help clarify the council's requirements to communities and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Where a request for a reduction in speed limit meets these criteria, it will be considered for resourcing together with other scheme proposals as part of the council's normal budget and highways scheme approval processes.</p> <p>It is not unusual for councils to receive more demand for such schemes than they have the capacity and resources to deliver. In such cases prioritisation is used to deliver those which best support the council's strategic objectives and operational factors such as deliverability.</p> <p>The Road Safety Policy will also help us to consider the need for (and specific requests for) speed limit reductions across the wider highway network. Similarly these would need to be appropriate for the location and its environment, supported by casualty data and considered alongside feedback from the Police.</p>
Question 2: Cllr John Bloxsom	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>What is the forecast AMPS expenditure on the repair and security on the former Stonehouse Library building and can it be confirmed that, now Stonehouse Market CIC has withdrawn from the proposed lease of the</p>	<p>AMPS have carried out no repair and security works on this building.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

<p>building, the £14,000 in Build Back Better funding reportedly allocated to it for pre-occupation works, has either been withheld or, if paid, returned to GCC?</p>	<p>A £10,000 Build Back Better Councillor grant was made to the group to help with refurbishment costs. As they have informed us they no longer wish to occupy the building, we have requested the return of the grant.</p>
<p>Question 3: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>Why has the overspend and use of agency staff in children services been increasing and will this not impede the continuing steps needed in the service which Ofsted reported needed “improvement to be good” in April 2022?</p>	<p>The increase in agency costs reflects the challenges in recruiting social work practitioners which is a national issue and not confined to Gloucestershire. We are taking proactive steps to grow our own workforce using a wide range of supply lines. By the end of September 35 newly qualified social workers had started in Assessed and Supported Year of Employment (AYSE) posts and we have agreed to increase the number of student placements to around 90 per year acknowledging our good rate of recruitment from student placements previously. We will also be expanding our apprenticeship programme and are tendering for a further cohort of overseas social workers. These will attenuate our agency rate over time which is showing a marginal reduction in Quarter 2 along with vacancies and turnover.</p>
<p>Question 4: Cllr John Bloxsom</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>Is Cabinet satisfied that the £747k in overspend in Corporate Resources which “relates to additional external cost for Children’s cases within the Legal Services budgets” has been incurred purely in the best of interests</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>These costs relate solely to supporting children’s care proceedings through the courts.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

<p>of the children concerned rather than the Council's reputation management?</p>	
<p>Question 5: Cllr David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>Agenda item 8: Support to Refugees on the Homes for Ukraine (HFU) Scheme</p> <p>Are children here under the HFU scheme and attending UK schools, generally entitled to free school meals and to access the HAF, and if so what is being done to encourage uptake?</p>	<p>Children who are living in Gloucestershire under the HFU scheme are eligible to apply for free school meals when attending school. All infant children across the country attending reception class, year 1 and year 2 (up to age 7) are given free school meals as standard, and children under the HFU scheme are included in this. From Year 3 onwards, children from families who are claiming universal credit will be entitled to free school meals. All Ukrainians on the HFU scheme are able to apply for universal credit and therefore claim free school meals.</p> <p>Similarly, the Holiday Activities and Food programme (HAF) is also available to these families. The programme provides free, fun activities for all families in Gloucestershire who are eligible for benefits related free school meals. Ukrainian children from families claiming free school meals will therefore also be able to access the HAF as well as holiday school meal vouchers.</p> <p>Full details about applying for universal credit, claiming free school meals and accessing the HAF are included in the welcome pack that is shared with all Ukrainians and their sponsors following their arrival in the country. These are all discussed as part of the welcome visit that is carried out by the Homes for Ukraine team within the first few days after</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

	arriving in Gloucestershire. In addition, the series of welfare revisits that are being carried out at the four to six month point in the sponsorship arrangement provide an opportunity for the HFU team to check that the Ukrainian families have applied for all benefits that they are entitled to as well as accessing any relevant support and activities.
Question 6: Cllr Roger Whyborn	Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman
Agenda item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy The new Road Safety policy will doubtless require significant TROs to deliver it, if it is to be effective, and currently there are major delays in processing TROs, and reports of serious staff shortages. What is the present staff level in the TRO section, and what establishment is required for effective operation including that of the new policy, and what steps are being taken and when to reach the staffing level needed?	Our TRO team is currently staffed by both internal employees and external agency staff. There are currently 5 vacancies for internal posts that are being recruited.-Positive resourcing improvements continue and we have recently appointed three experienced agency engineers to a new Traffic Team and are developing a team structure which brings TRO and Road Safety work together within the role of this team to help provide wider capacity.
Question 7: Cllr Roger Whyborn	Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman
Agenda item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy Looking at table 2 it shows shows some reduction in fatalities over the previous 10 years on average, but clearly there is an increasing trend on serious injuries. What are the latest KSI figures available for the current year 2022?	Our road safety data is reported quarterly and by calendar year. In the first 6 months of 2022 there were 158 serious injuries and 16 fatalities. This included some multi-vehicle and multi-casualty collisions.

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

Question 8: Cllr Roger Whyborn	Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman
<p data-bbox="114 284 1182 327">Agenda item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p data-bbox="114 359 1182 582">The report rightly points out that there is a very clear problem of high KSIs for pedestrians and cyclists in urban areas, as in para 13, table 4. In themes 4 & 5, the road safety policy talks about delivering widespread 20mph restrictions in both Gloucester and Cheltenham, also centres of market towns and villages, and more besides. When will we know the proposed locations/scope of these schemes?</p>	<p data-bbox="1189 319 2092 430">As explained in the report, much of the background work required to reduce KSI's involves analysing the hot spot list, which identifies clusters of collisions at roads and junctions.</p> <p data-bbox="1189 470 2092 758">In 2019, 2020 and 2021 most (53%) of all KSI casualties were at locations on this list. This key piece of work is currently underway to identify any low cost measures as well as more significant interventions that would require larger capital sums. However we are aware that some interventions may require significant investment or a new approach, so we have raised this in the cabinet report and are working closely with the police to explore any scope for doing things differently.</p> <p data-bbox="1189 798 2092 949">Our aim is to develop a rolling multi-year programme that identifies both engineering measures and supporting interventions such as road user education and publicity, reaching out to higher risk groups.</p> <p data-bbox="1189 989 2092 1204">Schemes are normally identified in the draft Highways Capital Programme as part of the budget process so further information will become available in the draft budget papers taken to Cabinet in December. As development of a rolling programme is a significant resource investment it will be an ongoing piece of work.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

<p>Question 9: Cllr David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p>Given the powers to implement both derive from the same legislation, could the Cabinet Member explain why the road safety policy includes pilot studies and a guidance note for “Quiet Lanes” but does not also include similar pilots and guidance for “Home Zones”?</p>	<p>As you will already be aware, the council has secured DfT funding this year to explore the feasibility of a mini-Holland scheme in, along and near the Honeybourne Line in Cheltenham.</p> <p>This work supports delivery of our Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), helping to create better conditions for walking and cycling.</p> <p>Whilst Home Zones are not explicitly mentioned in the draft Road Safety Policy the delivery of LCWIPs, most of the components of Home Zones are captured by the actions in Strategic Themes 4 and 5 of the draft Policy, to increase levels of walking and cycling. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support delivery of LCWIPs - Deliver lower speed limits (20mph) <p>application of the road user hierarchy to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<p>Question 10: Cllr David Willingham</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 9: Gloucestershire Road Safety Policy</p> <p>There has been considerable increase in urban e-scooter use (both legally via the GCC-approved Z-wings scheme, and outside of this), and this micro-mobility trend seems set to grow. Given that this policy is supposed to be future looking for vision zero by 2050, why is road safety for e-scooters / micro-mobility not a more explicitly mentioned strategic goal of the road safety policy, backed by specific policy actions?</p>	<p>Whilst there has been much media coverage about road safety of e-scooters the casualty data shows that drivers, passengers, motorcyclists, cyclists and pedestrians are at greater risk of death and serious injury in our county. We need to focus on these first in order to reduce KSI’s on Gloucestershire’s roads.</p> <p>In addition the longer-term legal status and use of e-scooters on the highway remains to be determined by DfT as all of the</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

	legalised use nationally remains under trial status. The outcome of the trials will inform any future reviews of the Road Safety Policy, which we have committed will be a 'live' document.
Question 11: Cllr Lisa Spivey	Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman
Agenda item 10: Library Strategy 2023-2028 Does the Cabinet Member agree that 273 people represents a disappointing response rate for a County-wide consultation about an important Service? What proactive steps were taken to seek the views of Gloucestershire's communities?	<p>Whilst the response to the consultation survey in respect of the new Library Strategy was lower than anticipated, the formulation of the draft strategy was prepared through prior engagement internally and externally having listened to what customers had to say prior to going out to consultation. Experts within our communications team were also involved in designing the engagement and consultation process.</p> <p>The survey was promoted in all libraries through hard copy survey and online and highlighted to groups using the library particularly younger and older people. The survey was promoted through our community run libraries and partners. Additionally, it was publicised through both GCC and libraries social media and also via the library website. The survey was also sent directly to the database of library members as part of the service's regular email newsletter.</p>
Question 12: Cllr Lisa Spivey	Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman
Agenda item 10: Library Strategy 2023-2028	The library service has been successful in attracting funding through Arts Council England as one of their National Portfolio Organisations. This will bring 3 years of ringfenced revenue

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

<p>The strategy does not appear to come with any new funding streams. How will the elements of the strategy which increase the scope of library activity be deliverable within the current budget envelope?</p>	<p>funding to deliver the ambitions in respect of the creative and cultural elements of the strategy. In addition to this the service will be exploring other sources of grant funding for specific elements of the strategy and partnering with other areas of the County Council and external organisations.</p> <p>The adoption of the strategy and the ambitions within it, in itself will also help to strengthen the Council’s position when it comes to securing future funding or any associated bids through Central Government.</p>
<p>Question 13: Cllr Lisa Spivey</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 10: Library Strategy 2023-2028</p> <p>The library usage and engagement figures quoted in the report aren’t listed against any specific targets. What are the current figures for library visits, virtual visits, school visits and adult learning events per year, and what targets are set for these indicators during the life of the strategy?</p>	<p>The figures for both the full year of 2021/22 and year to date are shown in the table below.</p> <p>In using these figures, the following should be noted: School visits - in 2021-2022 visits restarted in September and the figures include both mainstream and special schools. Adult activities – in 2021-22, events restarted in July 2021.</p> <p>Physical Library visits – County libraries only: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st April 2021-31st March 2022 = 794,217 • 1st April 2022-31st October 2022 = 727,163 <p>Virtual visits – Virtual Reference Library: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st April 2021-31st March 2022 = 86,385 • 1st April 2022-31st October 2022 = 48,318 <p>Virtual visits – GCC Library website: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st April 2021-31st March 2022 = 215,340 sessions, 850,576 page views

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

- 1st April 2022-31st October 2022 = 88,877 sessions, 339,567 page views

E-stock downloads: -

- 1st April 2021-31st March 2022 = 295,390
- 1st April 2022-31st October 2022 = 187,551

School visits: -

- 1st April 2021-31st March 2022 = 3,208 pupils visited on 200 different occasions
- 1st April 2022-31st October 2022 = 3,343 pupils visited on 195 different occasions

Preschool visits: -

- 1st April 2021-31st March 2022 = 348 children visited on 53 different occasions
- 1st April 2022-31st October 2022 = 668 children visited on 52 different occasions

Adult learning: -

- 1st April 2021-31st March 2022 = 383 events with attendance of 2,384
- 1st April 2022-31st October 2022 = 552 events with attendance of 3,832

Since the pandemic there has been a change in the way libraries are used, although school and physical visits are set to exceed those in 2021-22. The way cultural and creative activities and events are delivered will also change from April 2023, since the announcement that libraries will be a National Portfolio Organisation, with targets and reporting to Arts Council England. It was felt therefore that to include clear indicators within the Strategy would not be helpful at this point, however, an annual report will be produced so that the

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

	public are able to see how the service is performing against their ambitions.
Question 14: Cllr Ben Evans	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>On page 223 we are informed that the Children and Families budget is showing an overspend of over £11m. At budget setting we were assured by the cabinet member for C&F that this year we would finally have a C&F budget that balanced. He was wrong by £11m. Can he assure us that this annual overspend will finally be taken into account and a realistic children’s service budget set for the coming financial year?</p>	<p>Each year the budget is produced using the most up to date estimates of the numbers of children in care and unit costs. These numbers are volatile and difficult to predict so the base budget is set at a realistic but stretching level. In order to fund any in year overspend the risk is assessed at the time the budget is approved. A General Reserve was created to cover these risks should they materialise. This ensures that the Council has funding to cover higher than anticipated costs whilst at the same time avoiding service reductions in other areas that may not be needed.</p>
Question 15: Cllr Ben Evans	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>On page 225 we read: “The over-spend continues to be primarily against the external placements budget” – What practical steps is the Cabinet taking to get the external placements budget under control?</p>	<p>The provider market for accommodation continues to be challenging driving costs and availability. We have a range of workstreams underway to address this.</p> <p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhancing our edge of care offer to enable children to remain at home and/or stabilise their current placement - Progressing reunification, return home, special guardianship and adoption to ensure children achieve permanence and remain in our care only as long as necessary.

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reviewing all placements commencing with the highest cost packages to ensure these provide value for money while continuing to meet the needs of the child. - Increasing our recruitment of in-house foster care capacity as our first and best option for most children entering our care.
<p>Question 16: Cllr Ben Evans</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>Is commissioning more and more external services, as recommended in Agenda item 5, not just creating an upward spiral of costs, rather than tackling the systemic problems of supply and demand of providers in the County?</p>	<p>The services proposed under item 5 meet very particular statutory requirements placed on the local authority. It may be necessary on occasion to admit a child into the care system at short notice with relatively little information about their broader circumstances and needs.</p> <p>Emergency foster care providers certainty about costs and the care offer avoiding providers taking a precautionary and often costly approach to meeting the needs of children in these circumstances. It also allows a period of assessment to inform the next stages in meeting the child’s needs on a planned and assessed basis.</p> <p>The remand and PACE elements are necessary to meet the duties placed on the local authority to accept a child charged by police but denied bail - thereby avoiding their unnecessary detention in police cells and meeting the needs of a child remanded by the courts into the care of the local authority. Both provisions are low volume but potentially challenging and costly if provision is not put in place appropriately. Recent</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

	changes to statutory guidance has increased the likelihood of demand for such placements.
Question 17: Cllr Ben Evans	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>On page 226 we read: “Against safeguarding staffing budgets, there is a forecast over-spend of £2.6 million (12.3% above budget). Turnover of staff continues to rise and has been between 24% and 28.7% over the last six months. At the end of August there were 126 agency workers in post, and this compares to 85 agency workers in August 2021.” – Approximately 25% of people leaving Children’s Services quoted poor IT as at least part of the reason for their departure. Will the cabinet consider investing to save to help stop this turnover, which merely creates a false economy by adding further ongoing costs?</p>	<p>The recruitment and retention of permanent social workers is a critical part of our continuous improvement journey in children’s social care. Social workers tell us that they want to work in stable teams where they are well supported by their manager and have proactive, positive supervision and clear development and career progression. We are significantly investing in a wholistic programme of work to develop this culture including our workforce academy, our grow our programme and development for managers to ensure they are able to manage well. This is supported by a proactive recruitment campaign to promote these benefits of working direct with GCC. It is the case that a significant proportion of social workers mention ICT as a frustration in exit interviews. There is already a programme of significant investment in our ICT infrastructure built into exist budgets including replacing our networks, refreshing laptops and upgrading software and that programme continues into the next financial year.</p>
Question 18: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>There are £2.470 million of unrealised savings in adult social care being brought forward from 2021/22. Can the Cabinet Member break down why each of the proposed savings haven’t been achievable, whether they are</p>	<p>The total brought forward unrealised savings from 2021/22 is £2.896 million (£2.470 million relates to 2022/23 savings).</p> <p>The two main areas of savings are £1.822 million from the Enhanced Independence Offer (EIO)/Reablement and £0.688</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

<p>still planned for the future and what impact this will have on setting the 2023/4 budget in this area?</p>	<p>million from strength/outcome-based focus in commissioned services. The other saving programmes are £0.100 million out of county electronic call monitoring, £0.199 million through the implementation of the Adults Technology Strategy and £ 0.087 million through Shared Lives. All of these savings programmes have been impacted by the pandemic. The new EIO service had delays caused by the pandemic and issues with recruiting sufficient numbers of staff to deliver the service. It is now anticipated to be up to capacity by the end of this year and is already beginning to achieve savings. Outcome-based focus is expected to achieve the savings but has been impacted by COVID19 and the cost-of-living crisis. Out of county electronic call monitoring is now being reviewed to consider whether the savings target remains correctly stated and achievable. The others are now expected to achieve savings though are still being delayed due to the cost-of-living crisis. These savings schemes are not expected to adversely impact the 2023/24 budget directly though full achievement of the savings, especially with the EIO, is not expected this year.</p>
<p>Question 19: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 11: Financial Monitoring Report 2022/23</p> <p>It is concerning to see that we have an underspend of £695,000 in our work on prevention within public health at the same time as other budgets in adult social care are overspent. What plans will be put in place to ensure we are maximising our impact on prevention to avoid the need for more major and costly interventions later?</p>	<p>The main reason for the public health underspend is lower activity among our demand led services (including Sexual Health, NHS Health Checks and face to face healthy lifestyle services) as they recover from Covid19 pandemic, and some existing contract costs being lower than anticipated in year. As the public health grant is ring-fenced, the underspend is held in a reserve and is being used to support ongoing in-year recovery from in prevention and community-based services.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING –23 November 2022

	<p>Any remaining funding will be carried forward to offset inflationary pressures in the forthcoming financial year in the public health budget.</p>
--	--