



MINUTES OF COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

DATE: Wednesday 17 February 2021 TIME: 10.00 am

VENUE: Virtual Meeting - Web ex meeting

Present

Membership:

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr Mark Hawthorne MBE	Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE
Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Brian Robinson
Cllr Robert Bird	Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Cllr Steve Robinson
Cllr Richard Boyles	Cllr Stephen Hirst	Cllr Vernon Smith
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Cllr Lynden Stowe
Cllr Chris Coleman	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin	Cllr Klara Sudbury
Cllr Dr John Cordwell	Cllr Dr Andrew Miller	Cllr Ray Theodoulou (Chairman)
Cllr Kevin Cromwell	Cllr Patrick Molyneux	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr Nigel Moor	Cllr Pam Tracey MBE
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Graham Morgan	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Ben Evans	Cllr David Norman MBE	Cllr Simon Wheeler
Cllr Bernard Fisher	Cllr Brian Oosthuysen	Cllr Kathy Williams
Cllr Andrew Gravells MBE	Cllr Shaun Parsons	Cllr Lesley Williams MBE
Cllr Kate Haigh	Cllr Sajid Patel	Cllr Suzanne Williams
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Loraine Patrick	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive
Cllr Tim Harman	Cllr John Payne	
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Alan Preest (Vice- Chair)	

Apologies: Cllr Keith Rippington, Cllr Rachel Smith and Cllr Eva Ward
Honorary Aldermen Terence Parker, Gordon Shurmer and John Sewell

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 November 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a) Queen's New Year Honours

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

The Chairman congratulated the people living in Gloucestershire who had received awards as part of the Queen's New Year Honours. The names of those who had received awards were listed in the papers for the meeting.

b) Constructing Excellence awards

Gloucestershire County Council had won the regional Constructing Excellence awards in December 2020 in the categories for integration and collaborative working, and value and building project of the year for the redevelopment of Shire Hall. At the national awards, the Council was announced as winner in the integration and collaborative working category.

The Chairman and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Change congratulated and thanked all those involved, in recognition of this achievement.

c) Steve McHale

Group Leaders and other members paid personal tributes to Steve McHale, former County Councillor for Coney Hill and Matson, who had sadly passed away.

They commented on how friendly and genuine Steve was, and about his dedication to his role as a councillor. Steve McHale had been a member of the Council for Labour from 1993 to 2013, had served on a range of committees, was a member of the Gloucestershire Police Authority, and had been Leader of the Labour Group between 2009 and 2013.

They noted his personal love of running and of world travel, and his commitment to his work in care. They expressed condolences to Steve's family. The Chairman confirmed that he would write to Steve's partner on behalf of the Council.

The Chairman invited members to participate in a minute's silence as a mark of respect for Steve McHale.

d) Vaccination programme

The Chairman and Group Leaders paid tribute to all those who had been involved in the vaccination rollout in Gloucestershire, noting that it had been one of the most successful in the country. The historic contributions of Gloucestershire people including Edward Jenner, who discovered vaccination in 1796 which led to the extinction of smallpox, and Frederick

Sanger, who won his second of two Nobel prizes for Chemistry in 1980 for his work in sequencing the genome, was noted.

The efficient organisation and dedication of the primary care networks and vaccination centres in the county was praised. Frontline workers who continued to provide essential services despite the pandemic were paid tribute to and thanked. In particular, the toll the pandemic has taken on hospital staff saving the lives of those who were unwell was recognised.

e) Virtual meeting protocol

Simon Harper, Head of Democratic Services, explained the virtual meeting protocol for the meeting, and provided guidance on how to use the WebEx remote meeting software.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Twenty five public questions had been submitted prior to the meeting. The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1 – David Willingham asked on behalf of Flo Clucas, whether the cabinet member would meet with the families concerned regarding late application process for school places which was far from ideal and could restrict access to grammar schools.

Cllr Patrick Molyneux replied that he would be happy to set up a virtual meeting with the individual and families concerned. He referred to the answer to the original question noting the policies in place.

Question 3 – Helen Munro referring to the meeting with Bovis homes, asked if the member could confirm that the intention was to leave the meeting with an agreed way forward and timetable. She asked what the plan would be if they did not hold to that timetable?

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that he understood the frustration and urged the individual to contact Tewkesbury Borough Council as they would be able to take action if Bovis Homes exceeded the threshold.

Question 9 – Chloe Turner asked in what sense did the miscommunication happen and when could it be addressed?

Cllr Dave Norman replied that he had a discussion with officers on this and has asked officers to re-engage. He asked that he be copied in to any correspondence that the parish council had on this matter.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Question 10 – Dilys Neill stated that along the edges of highways lots of trees that weren't ash had been cut down. She asked could the member guarantee that no tree of whatever species had been felled that had been healthy or could have been saved by a tree surgeon.

Cllr Nigel Moor replied that advice had been taken from experts and that he trusted in that advice. Already a great deal of regeneration was taking place in those hedgerows.

Question 11 – Dilys Neill asked for a written response on the detail within her question and asked specifically how many trees would be planted for the period of November 2020 to March 2021. She also asked whether the Council was committed to replace those that did not survive?

Cllr Nigel Moor replied that there were details of the replanting programme on the County Council website. Between 15,000 and 20,000 trees could have been planted over that period. Across the whole of Gloucestershire when also taking into account the work with partners, around 80,000 trees would be planted this year.

Question 12 – Dilys Neill asked whether the County Council was committed to preserving mature trees wherever possible.

Cllr Nigel Moor replied that this was the case. He explained that £1.2million had been put into the ash dieback programme as the safety of public was paramount.

Question 13 – Chris Chiswell asked whether the Council was now adopting a targeted yearly decrease in vehicle emissions contrary to a 15% increase detailed in the January cabinet paper.

Cllr Nigel Moor replied that he would provide a written answer but explained that this was one aspect of transport plan. There was now an overarching strategy to reduce emissions.

Question 14 – Chris Chiswell asked how many more years it would be before the County Council set a measurable ambition to save the lives of children on the roads in Gloucestershire

Cllr Nigel Moor replied that a range of options on these indicators and targets would be considered by Cabinet.

Question 15 – Alan Mossman asked why the Council had chosen to spend £27million pushing ahead with schemes that increased road capacity, so that there

were more cars on the road travelling faster. This was less than one tenth as much as was spent on projects that would encourage walking and cycling.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne explained that the County Council had a commitment to do both: to improve road infrastructure and bring forward a comprehensive cycling strategy that respected all users of the road network.

Question 16 – David Willingham asked if the Cabinet Member for Highways could provide a guaranteed timeframe for this issue to be resolved?

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that the Council was keen to move this forward. The trial had been discussed but due to the pandemic traffic volumes had been affected and it would need to be considered once it was clear what 'normal' traffic volumes were.

Question 17 – David Willingham stated that this road safety scheme had been funded in 2017-18 and that now members were blaming the pandemic for the slow progress. Something had gone wrong and he asked audit to look at this.

Cllr Nigel Robbins replied that he would ask the cabinet member for a timescale and a more satisfactory response to what the issues were.

Question 19 – David Willingham asked whether the council could review the standard reply to make it clear that they would react to residents' concerns and requested that the Council provide gully clearing data on the website.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that this was being considered once the technology was available.

5. CORPORATE PARENTING

Cllr Richard Boyles, Cabinet Member for Children's Safeguarding and Early Years, presented the Corporate Parenting Report.

Cllr Boyles provided members with an update on Gloucestershire County Council's Virtual School Annual Report (2019/20), outlining the educational achievements of Children in Care (CiC), and the work being done by the Virtual School to support CiC to develop and learn.

It was noted that attendance had increased to 92.6 percent for all school age children and exclusions were down to 12.1%, as a result of training and the launch of the persistent absence strategy and CiC protocols. However, there was still work to do in this area, which had been identified in the improvement plan.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Pupil Premium Plus and Personal Education Plans (PEPs), alongside joint working had been making a difference to learning, however more needed to be done to improve educational outcomes. It was intended that PEPs would become smarter, and that this would be monitored by the new Virtual School Management Committee and the Corporate Parenting Board.

It was noted that 17 care leavers were at university, and 6 care leavers had graduated in summer 2020.

Cllr Boyles thanked all Virtual School staff for their work, particularly during these challenging times.

Members were reminded to complete their one page profiles to help identify areas where CiC can be specifically supported.

One member expressed concern regarding a recent report which raised concerns that young people in Gloucestershire had been at risk, and requested a report to understand what had been going on. Cllr Boyles responded that a meeting was due to be held to discuss the case, and he would ensure that reassurances were given.

Another member requested an update as to how the Trevone House facility was progressing.

6. PETITIONS

Cllr Stephen Davies presented Cllr Vernon Smith, Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, with a petition relating to the roundabout road improvements at the A38 Perry Way junction, near Frampton-on-Severn.

7. POLICY AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK - MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY AND THE COUNCIL STRATEGY

The report before members included the budget recommendations, Medium Term Financial Strategy, budget consultation report, scrutiny budget report, Council Strategy and due regard statement.

The Chief Executive explained the procedure that would be followed at the meeting. First, Cllr Mark Hawthorne, Leader of the Council, and Cllr Lynden Stowe, Cabinet Member for Finance and Change, would be asked to present the recommendations from the Cabinet.

Second, in order to reach a position where a substantive motion could be debated, the other political groups would be invited to propose amendments to the budget but there would be no debate at that stage. This would be a departure from the normal procedure where only one amendment could be moved and discussed at any one time.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Once the amendments had been presented, the Chairman would call for an adjournment to provide an opportunity for the Group Leaders to reach a common position.

After the adjournment, the Leader of the Council would advise members of those areas where it had been possible to reach agreement. Any amendments which had not been accepted or withdrawn would then be presented by the groups, debated and voted upon.

Thereafter all members would have an opportunity to debate the budget in line with the normal rules of debate. At the end of the debate, the Leader of the Council would have the right of reply.

Finally, a recorded vote would be proposed by the Chairman, and seconded by the Vice Chairman, at each stage of the debate.

The Chairman therefore proposed that under procedure rule 23.1 the following part of procedure rule 12.5 be suspended for the duration of the budget debate:

‘Only one amendment may be moved and discussed at any one time. No further amendment may be moved until the amendment under discussion has been dealt with.’

The Vice-chairman seconded the motion and, on being put to the vote, the motion was supported.

Conservative Group

Cllr Mark Hawthorne, the Leader of the Council, and Cllr Lynden Stowe, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Change, presented the recommendations from the Cabinet meeting held on 27 January 2021.

The Leader of the Council informed the meeting that in addition to the proposals agreed on 27 January 2021 the Conservative Group were also submitting three amendments: -

		Proposal	Repeating or one-off?	2021/22 Cost £000s	Funded from
1	Highways	Highways Local - £10k per Councillor	one off	£530	Rates Retention Reserve / additional Council Tax(CT) / National Non-Domestic Rates (NDR)
2	Economy	£60k to support Nuclear	one off	£60	Rates Retention Reserve / additional CT / NDR

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

		South West Fusion bid at Berkeley/Old bury			
3	Economy	£100k to develop Apprenticeship clearing house with GFirstLEP	one off	£100	Rates Retention Reserve / additional CT / NNDR

The Leader of the Council discussed the impact of Covid-19, and stated that the time to remember those lost to Covid-19 was not yet, but that they would be remembered. What was needed now was to focus on the recovery. He paid tribute to all those who had contributed to the work to protect people and communities during the pandemic, and highlighted the robust partnership working between the council's social care teams and the NHS. He thanked all members of council staff, in particular the Public Health Team and Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service, for stepping up to every challenge presented to them. He went on to pay tribute to teachers and the wider school staff; and stated that we owed them all a huge debt of gratitude.

The Leader outlined the investment already made since the start of the pandemic. This included the provision of PPE (Personal Protective Equipment), 1500 laptops to vulnerable children and young people, and support to local communities to the tune of £2.5m.

He stated the importance of everyone following the (lockdown) rules. Many people have lost their jobs, businesses were struggling with many ceasing to trade, and children and young people have had their education interrupted. He informed the meeting that it would be important for the council to lead the fight to build back better. He stated that the budget and amendments proposed today supported the front line and would help get Gloucestershire back open for business.

The Cabinet Member Finance and Change seconded the budget proposal and amendments. He drew members' attention to the due regard statements; it was important to be aware of any impact on equalities. The Cabinet Member stated that he thought that this was a good settlement but acknowledged that he would have preferred a three year settlement as this would have enabled more certainty. With regard to council reserves, he informed the meeting that costs relating to the impact of the pandemic had so far been met by government and had not affected the council budget. The Chief Finance Officer has confirmed that the current reserve position was adequate.

The proposals would deliver an increase in revenue spending of just under £15m; this included significant increases in social care. The capital budget proposals included investment in improved ICT provision, and support to the climate change agenda. The proposed increase in council tax was 4.75% (1.99% on general tax,

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

2.76% specifically for social care). This would deliver the third lowest council tax of any local authority in the country.

Liberal Democrat Group

Cllr Paul Hodgkinson and Cllr Nigel Robbins proposed the amendments from the Liberal Democrat Group: -

		Proposal	Repeating or one-off?	2021/22 Cost £000s	Funded from
1	Highways	20 mph speed zones	One-off	£100	Savings Contingency Fund (Technical & Countywide (T&C))
2	Community	Barriers to mobility report actions reserve	One-off	£67	Savings Contingency Fund (T&C)
3	Highways	School Street pilot extension for remaining districts	One-off	£100	Savings Contingency Fund (T&C)
4	Parking	Cancelling planned increase to parking permits, with enforcement funding maintained.	One-off	£33	Savings Contingency Fund (T&C)
5	Education	Children at risk of Exclusion pilot fund	One-off	£100	Uplift to external placements budget (Childrens)
6	Education	Preparation for school / early years fund (building on previous DfE funding)	One-off	£100	Uplift to external placements budget (Childrens)
7	Community	Covid Community Recovery - £10k per councillor pa for 3 years	3 years	£530	Rates Retention Reserve

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

8	Highways	Highways Local - additional £20k per councillor	One-off	£1,060	£127k revenue from drainage schemes carried to 2022/23 £933k capital from - £112.46k from Capital and Minor Work, £207.2k from reactive works, £27.95k from Unclassified Roads Structural maintenance 21/22, £159.01k from Class C structural maintenance 21/22, £95.64k from B roads structural maintenance and £330.74k from A roads structural maintenance 21/22
---	----------	---	---------	--------	---

Cllr Hodgkinson stated that these amendments were about keeping people safe and that communities knew what was best for their areas. The Highways Local scheme had been transformative, hence the proposal for the additional investment in this area. He stated that it was not appropriate for the Conservative group to slash this amount. He informed the meeting that all the proposed amendments had been costed and were watertight. The Liberal Democrat Group could not support the overall budget because of the lack of ambition, particularly around the climate change emergency. He stated that Gloucestershire deserved better.

Cllr Robbins stated that delaying the increase in parking permits as proposed in the amendments was eminently sensible. He reminded the meeting that Gloucestershire has a high rate of school exclusions; schools did their best but often failed. The proposal was to employ youth workers to work with these children and young people. He explained that the school readiness proposal related to early years provision.

Labour Group

Cllr Lesley Williams and Cllr Kate Haigh proposed the amendments from the Labour Group: -

	Sector	Proposal	Repeating or one-off?	2021/22 Cost £000s	Funded from
1	Public Health	£50k for Food	one off	£50	Funded from £1.253m CT and NNDR uplift

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

		Projects - a fund to support initiatives for supplying food. -			
2	Youth Services	£1k per councillor to support youth work / support	one off	£53	Funded from £1.253m CT and NNDR uplift
3	Environment	£1k per Councillor to support climate change initiatives	one off	£53	Funded from £1.253m CT and NNDR uplift
4	Children & Families	£50k Fund for essential ICT equipment for secondary school students	permanent	£50	Funded from £1.253m CT and NNDR uplift
5	Community	£150k Fund to support voluntary groups to cover core running costs	permanent	£150	Funded from £1.253m CT and NNDR uplift
6	Public Health	£50k to fund research into the impacts of long COVID	one off	£50	Funded from £1.253m CT and NNDR uplift

Cllr L Williams thanked officers for their dedication to the response to the Covid-19 pandemic. She also thanked the residents of Gloucestershire for following the guidance. She informed the committee that the Labour Group thought that this was a disappointing budget. She was concerned about young people; isolation was affecting them. The pandemic had also highlighted the inequalities in society. She questioned where the investment in supporting young people and communities was

in the proposed budget. Local councillors knew their communities and should be provided with the financial support to help their local areas.

Cllr Haigh stated that now more than ever our communities needed our support. She stated that services were not always commissioned well and that this had been discussed during the scrutiny of the budget process. There was unmet need because of years of cuts. She stated that the proposed budget seemed to be a penny pinching approach.

Green Group

The Chairman of council clarified that the members of the Green Group had given their apologies to this meeting, and had not submitted any amendments for consideration.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting from 11.53 to 12.15 for Group Leaders to discuss amendments and identify areas of agreement.

Debate on decisions on the budget amendments

Following the adjournment, Cllr Hawthorne set out the position of the Conservative Group in relation to the budget amendments put forward by the Liberal Democrat and Labour Groups.

The following amendments were accepted:

Party	Item	One-off	Amount	Funded by
Lib Dem	20 mph speed zones	One-off	100,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Lib Dem	Barriers to mobility report actions reserve	One-off	67,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Lib Dem	School Street pilot extension for remaining districts	One-off	100,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Lib Dem	Cancelling planned increase to parking permits, with enforcement funding maintained.	One-off	33,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Lib Dem	Children at risk of Exclusion pilot fund	One-off	100,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Lib Dem	Preparation for school / early years fund (building on previous DfE funding)	One-off	100,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Labour / Lib Dem	Covid Community Recovery - £5k per	One off	265,000	Covid Funding

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

	councillor			
Labour	Food projects	One off	50,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Conservative	Highways Local	One-off	530,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Conservative	Apprenticeships	One off	100,000	CT/NNDR Growth
Conservative	Nuclear South West	One-off	60,000	CT/NNDR Growth

The following amendments were not accepted:

Party	Item	One-off	Amount	Comment
Lib Dem	Covid Community Recovery - £10k per councillor pa for 3 years	3 years	530,000	Amended
Lib Dem	Highways Local - additional £20k per councillor	One-off	1,060,000	Amended
Labour	Laptops	One off	50,000	Refused
Labour	Covid Community Grants	One-off	150,000	Amended
Labour	Youth Grants	One-off	53,000	Amended
Labour	Climate change grants	One-off	53,000	Refused
Labour	Long Covid study	One-off	50,000	Refused

Debate then followed on the amendments that had not been accepted.

Liberal Democrat Group amendments

Some members expressed disappointment that the Highways Local proposal had not been fully supported; it was suggested that many divisions would miss out on highway schemes this year. Some members were also concerned that without these proposed amendments communities would lose out, and some local initiatives might have to close their doors.

It was stated that it could not be argued that lack of money was the reason why these amendments had not been accepted; in the case of the Covid-19 proposal it was questioned why this could not be afforded even for one year.

In response to concerns/questions raised the Leader of the Council informed the meeting that he would be happy to explain the budget proposals on the doorstep to any concerned residents. The proposed budget did not take away any funding from existing budget areas. He stated that this was a budget that allowed councillors to support their local areas.

Some members expressed concern that these amendments diverted funding away from flooding support funding streams, in particular the drainage budget. This did not take into account the impact of the recent weather. Other members commented that the proposed amendment was not proposing to withdraw funding from the drainage budget.

Some members stated that the substantive proposals were taking more money from communities when the community could probably do a better job of identifying where to spend funding. It was also stated that although roads were important communities were more so.

There was a clear difference of opinion across the meeting with regard to whether the proposed amendments withdrew funding from the drainage budget, or not; and whether the partial support to the highways local scheme would be sufficient to support the community.

On being put to a recorded vote those Liberal Democrat Group's amendments which had not been accepted by the Conservative Administration were not supported.

For (20): Cllrs David Brown, Chris Coleman, Dr John Cordwell, Iain Dobie, Ben Evans, Bernie Fisher, Kate Haigh, Joe Harris, Colin Hay, Jeremy Hilton, Paul Hodgkinson, Graham Morgan, Brian Oosthuysen, Nigel Robbins, Brian Robinson, Steve Robinson, Klara Sudbury, Simon Wheeler, Lesley Williams and Suzanne Williams

Against (29): Cllrs Carole Allaway-Martin, Phil Awford, Matt Babbage, Rob Bird, Richard Boyles, Kevin Cromwell, Stephen Davies, Andrew Gravells, Terry Hale, Tim Harman, Mark Hawthorne, Stephen Hirst, Andrew Miller, Patrick Molyneux, Nigel Moor, Dave Norman, Shaun Parsons, Sajid Patel, Loraine Patrick, John Payne, Alan Preest, Vernon Smith, Lynden Stowe, Ray Theodoulou, Brian Tipper, Pam Tracey, Robert Vines, Kathy Williams and Will Windsor-Clive

Labour Group amendments

Some members expressed disappointment that not all the amendments, other than food banks, had been supported. The amendments had been about supporting local communities, looking to the future, and building back fairer. Some members questioned why money was being taken away from communities. It was argued that small amounts of money could return huge results; why take power away from the community.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

With regard to laptops the Leader of the Council stated that this was also about 4G dongles. Additional funding was already available for this equipment, although there was currently a national shortage of these items. These issues were already being progressed.

As to Long Covid-19 the Leader of the Council informed the meeting that the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group would be opening its Long Covid-19 clinic shortly. He also stated that an additional £2.5m had been invested in communities during the previous year.

Some members reiterated their disappointment that not all of these amendments had been supported.

On being put to a recorded vote those Labour Group's amendments which had not been accepted by the Conservative Administration were not supported.

For (20): Cllrs David Brown, Chris Coleman, Dr John Cordwell, Iain Dobie, Ben Evans, Bernie Fisher, Kate Haigh, Joe Harris, Colin Hay, Jeremy Hilton, Paul Hodgkinson, Graham Morgan, Brian Oosthuysen, Nigel Robbins, Brian Robinson, Steve Robinson, Klara Sudbury, Simon Wheeler, Lesley Williams and Suzanne Williams

Against (29): Cllrs Carole Allaway-Martin, Phil Awford, Matt Babbage, Rob Bird, Richard Boyles, Kevin Cromwell, Stephen Davies, Andrew Gravells, Terry Hale, Tim Harman, Mark Hawthorne, Stephen Hirst, Andrew Miller, Patrick Molyneux, Nigel Moor, Dave Norman, Shaun Parsons, Sajid Patel, Loraine Patrick, John Payne, Alan Preest, Vernon Smith, Lynden Stowe, Ray Theodoulou, Brian Tipper, Pam Tracey, Robert Vines, Kathy Williams and Will Windsor-Clive

Adjournment for lunch 13.30 to 14.00

General debate on the budget

Members acknowledged the work of officers in preparing the budget and they thanked them for their efforts.

The main points raised in the budget debate were: -

- That it did not sufficiently reflect and address climate change,
- That the impact of the increase in home working was not recognised; the implications of this were profound,
- That it did not sufficiently enable councillors to support their local community,
- That the impact on residents should be recognised,
- That work to support climate change was funded within this budget,
- That there was concern that the budget for children and families would again prove to be insufficient,
- That it was disappointing that the government was not doing more with regard to funding the recovery from Covid-19,

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

- That the budget did invest in both adults and children (£6m and £5m respectively),
- That the overall capital budget had been increased to £100m.

On being put to a recorded vote the substantive motion was carried:-

For (29): Cllrs Carole Allaway-Martin, Phil Awford, Matt Babbage, Rob Bird, Richard Boyles, Kevin Cromwell, Stephen Davies, Andrew Gravells, Terry Hale, Tim Harman, Mark Hawthorne, Stephen Hirst, Andrew Miller, Patrick Molyneux, Nigel Moor, Dave Norman, Shaun Parsons, Sajid Patel, Loraine Patrick, John Payne, Alan Preest, Vernon Smith, Lynden Stowe, Ray Theodoulou, Brian Tipper, Pam Tracey, Robert Vines, Kathy Williams and Will Windsor-Clive

Against (5): Cllrs Kate Haigh, Brian Oosthuysen, Brian Robinson, Klara Sudbury and Lesley Williams

Abstentions (14): Cllrs David Brown, Chris Coleman, Dr John Cordwell, Iain Dobie, Ben Evans, Bernie Fisher, Joe Harris, Colin Hay, Jeremy Hilton, Paul Hodgkinson, Graham Morgan, Nigel Robbins, Steve Robinson and Suzanne Williams

RESOLVED

1. That, the Council Strategy for 2021/22 is approved.
2. That, having considered the additional consultation responses and the Public Sector Equality Duty Due Regard Statement , approval is given to the MTFs and the revenue and capital budgets for 2021/22, council tax for each valuation band, and to issue precepts on each district collection fund as set out below:
 - a) Gloucestershire County Council 2021/22 Budget:

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

	£000
Original 2020/21 Budget	468,183
Removal of 2020/21 One Off Investments	-7,938
Revised 2019/20 Budget	460,245
Inflation	4,079
Cost and spending increases	25,445
Cost reductions	-6,761
Total 2021/22 Budget	483,008
Less:	
Top Up Grant	54,236
Business Rates Income	23,254
Revenue Support Grant	8,220
Public Health Grant	24,767
Improved Better Care Fund	19,436
New Homes Bonus	1,912
Social Care Grant	15,788
Other Non Ring Fenced Grants	6,119
Collection Fund Deficit	-815
Reserves	822
Budget to be met by Council Tax Payers	329,269

Total to be precepted:

	Taxbase Total	Total Precept £
Cheltenham	42,970.60	60,555,083
Cotswold	41,848.15	58,973,303
Forest of Dean	29,737.73	41,907,041
Gloucester City	38,119.80	53,719,233
Stroud	45,573.57	64,223,244
Tewkesbury	35,403.02	49,890,689
Total	233,652.87	329,268,593

- b) That approval is given to the Capital programme set out in Annex 8a of the detailed MTFs, and delegated authority is given to the Section 151 Officer to vary allocations between individual schemes in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Change.

3. That the following amendments to the draft budget be approved:

Party	Item	One-off	Amount
Lib Dem	20 mph speed zones	One-off	100,000

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Lib Dem	Barriers to mobility report actions reserve	One-off	67,000
Lib Dem	School Street pilot extension for remaining districts	One-off	100,000
Lib Dem	Cancelling planned increase to parking permits, with enforcement funding maintained.	One-off	33,000
Lib Dem	Children at risk of Exclusion pilot fund	One-off	100,000
Lib Dem	Preparation for school / early years fund (building on previous DfE funding)	One-off	100,000
Labour / Lib Dem	Covid Community Recovery - £5k per councillor	One off	265,000
Labour	Food projects	One off	50,000
Conservative	Highways Local	One-off	530,000
Conservative	Apprenticeships	One off	100,000
Conservative	Nuclear South West	One-off	60,000
			1,505,000

4. That the Council approves the Capital Strategy, set out in Annex 7 of the detailed MTFS, the Treasury Management Strategy and the non treasury Investment Strategy for 2021/22, set out in Annex 10 of the detailed MTFS.
5. That approval is given to the Operational Boundary and Authorised Limits of borrowing, as set out in the Capital Strategy, at Annex 7 in the detailed MTFS as follows:

Table 8: Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary for External Debt

Authorised limit and operational boundary	2019/20 Limit £m	2020/21 Limit £m	2021/22 Limit £m	2022/23 Limit £m	2023/24 Limit £m
Total Authorised Limit for External Debt and Other Liabilities	440.000	455.000	500.000	500.000	495.000
Split: External Debt	341.592	357.930	404.107	405.575	401.843
Other Liabilities	98.408	97.070	95.893	94.425	93.157
Total Operational Boundary for External Debt	420.000	435.000	480.000	480.000	475.000
Split: External Debt	321.592	337.930	384.107	385.575	381.843
Other Liabilities	98.408	97.070	95.893	94.425	93.157

- a) Noting that the authorised limit for 2021/22 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003
- b) That the approval is given to the Prudential Indicators for Treasury Management set out in Annex 10 of the detailed MTFS for :

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

- (i) the maturity structure of borrowings, and
- (ii) the upper limit for principal sums invested for more than 364 days of £200 million.

6. That the Council approves the Schools Funding set out in section G and Annex 9 in the detailed MTFS.

8. MEMBER QUESTIONS

Twenty Three member questions had been received. The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 3 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked how many trees had been planted since the cabinet meeting on 27 January 2021.

Cllr Nigel Moor replied that the answer had been given and urged the member to encourage communities to bid for schemes.

Question 4 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson clarified that he had asked how many trees had been planted, not how many would be planted.

Cllr Nigel Moor explained the difficulties due to the pandemic and that there was an opportunity to make a difference this year.

Question 5 - Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked why the decision not to form a youth council had not been reported back to members of the council and what the reasons were for ignoring the will of Council.

Cllr Richard Boyles explained that a countywide approach was being taken to hear the voices of children. It was not called a youth council but was shared across partners and would be a more effective way of engaging with all the young people in the County.

Question 6 – Cllr Kate Haigh explained it was LGBT history month and asked what the County Council were doing to promote the availability of PrEP and what work had been done to ensure people were comfortable with the way they were asked questions and the language used by the public health team.

Cllr Tim Harman replied that he was keen to get feedback on these services.

Question 7 – Cllr Rob Bird thanked members and officers on finding an appropriate site and asked the member to maintain that commitment. He asked if there was any further information to share?

Cllr Patrick Moluyneux replied that he was happy that a suitable site had been found. More information would come through in due course but 420 places would

be available for the 2023/24 academic year and the aim was for 630 places to be available when fully opened.

Question 9 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked the Council to be more proactive in reaching out to supermarkets and food shops in the County to tell workers and bosses what was available to them in terms of support.

Cllr Tim Harman acknowledged the work that they did. He informed the member that the Council had an engagement board and a lot was being done on a national level.

Question 10 – Cllr Colin Hay asked what proportion of children who needed a computer had received one as well as a 4G router. He asked how many children still needed that equipment.

Cllr Patrick Molyneux explained that most of the equipment was delivered directly by schools and that many of the children receiving free school meals would be classed as vulnerable and would be still attending schools. The Council was working closely with schools to identify those that needed the help. It was estimated that over 300 4G routers had been delivered.

Question 11 – Cllr Colin Hay asked if the member was confident that children in need of computers would have one before they returned to school.

Cllr Patrick Molyneux said that the Council was doing everything to provide equipment to children who needed it. He referred to those children who were home educated and explained that he had asked officers to identify all those children that needed that support. He would see what figures were available to identify any gap between those who had received equipment and those who did not yet have it.

Question 16 - Cllr Brian Robinson explained that a commercial solution for remote communities was not practical. He asked why the council persisted with this when it was unlikely a commercial solution would be put in place and why a practical solution had not been explored.

Cllr Patrick Molyneux replied that if a commercial company said they could roll out broadband the Council were then unable to provide public money to support it according to an EU directive. The Council was looking at alternative ways to deliver this.

Question 18 – Cllr Brian Robinson asked for a commitment that a solution would be delivered in his area as had been detailed in the answer.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that he would be keen for the local councillor to talk to the flood alleviation team and local highways manager to understand what was required.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Question 19 – Cllr Colin Hay asked what additional effort was being made by alternative provision sites and schools to support excluded children during the pandemic.

Cllr Patrick Molyneux replied that all excluded children had access to education through alternative provision and that the Council would ensure that there was provision for every child.

Question 20 – Cllr Colin Hay asked for some of the detail in how alternative provision had been stepped up and managed during the pandemic.

Cllr Patrick Molyneux stated that the pandemic had fast tracked remote schooling and there were a lot of lessons to be learned in how to use technology to take advantage of more flexible schooling.

Question 21 – Cllr Lesley Williams asked when the analysis of attainment and achievement of students in the county would be seen?

Cllr Richard Boyles explained that work would start when schools reopened.

Question 22 – Cllr Lesley Williams asked that the display of notable women in the county be made easily available and promoted.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne replied that if there were alternative ways to communicate what was in place he was open to suggestions.

Question 23 – Cllr Lesley Williams asked what was being done on the ethical charters and modern slavery charters.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne replied that a written response would be provided.

9. SCRUTINY

9.1 Scrutiny report

Cllr Shaun Parsons, Chair of the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee, provided an update on scrutiny activities.

It was noted that members of the scrutiny committees continued to be active looking at a wide range of issues including the Director of Public Health Annual Report, the response to Covid-19, the NHS Integrated Care Strategy, the Gloucestershire Youth Offending Service, the River Severn Partnership, electric vehicle infrastructure and governance of the GFirst Local Enterprise Partnership.

A successful budget scrutiny day was held on 7 January 2021 with involvement of members from different scrutiny committees, Cabinet members and Directors. The task group relating to public participation had reported to Cabinet, and attention was

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

drawn to a comprehensive report on flooding which would be presented at Environment Scrutiny Committee soon.

Members were encouraged to provide their views on the scrutiny structure by responding to the email that had been circulated by Democratic Services.

There was a request for a summary report on member feedback to the scrutiny structure review at the next Council.

A member commented that the task group relating to taxi licensing had also completed its work.

9.2 Health Scrutiny Committee

Following the removal of Cllr Brian Robinson from Health Scrutiny Committee, which resulted in the position of chair becoming vacant, members were asked for nominations for this position.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne nominated and Cllr Shaun Parsons seconded Cllr Stephen Hirst for this position.

RESOLVED to appoint Cllr Stephen Hirst as the Chair of Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

10. CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE REPORT

Cllr Mark Hawthorne, Chair of the Constitution Committee, presented the recommendations from the meeting held on 18 January 2021.

It was explained that a number of technical amendments had been made to the Constitution reflecting changes to job roles and responsibilities.

It was also understood that the Committee had discussed the introduction of a time frame for the provision of written responses to supplementary questions, where answers could not be given verbally at a Council meeting, and for these responses to be made available to the public. After some debate by the Committee a way forward had been proposed.

One member welcomed the change as a step in the right direction, whilst another member commented that they believed the timescale for a response should be shorter. It was acknowledged that the Constitution could be amended in the future if members felt that the proposed change wasn't working.

RESOLVED that the amendment outlined in the Constitution Committee report be made to the Constitution at standing orders 9.5.3, 9.8.3, and 8.8.3.

11. INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION STATEMENTS

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

RESOLVED to note the Individual Cabinet Member Decision Statements for the period 1 November 2020 to 31 January 2021.

12. CABINET DECISION STATEMENTS

RESOLVED to note the Cabinet Decision Statements for the meetings held on 16 December 2020 and 27 January 2021.

13. GLOUCESTERSHIRE LGPS 2019-20 ANNUAL REPORT

Cllr Ray Theodoulou, Chair of the Pensions Committee, presented the Gloucestershire Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) 2019-20 Annual Report.

CHAIRPERSON

Meeting concluded at 3.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Full Council actions – 17 February 2021

	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Progress</i>
1	Chairman's Announcements	Chairman to write to the wife of Steve McHale to express his condolences.	Michelle Pidgeon	Letter sent 22 February 2021.
2	Public Questions	Question 1 – Cllr Patrick Molyneux to attend a virtual meeting with families concerned regarding late application process for school places.	Chris Spencer	<p>Response: A meeting can of course be set up with Cllr Patrick Molyneux, to discuss the concerns of parents, however it should be noted that as National Allocations Day is on Monday 1st March 2021, and this date cannot be changed as it is a nationally set date, any discussion is likely to happen after parents have been notified of their school place. The coordination of all secondary school place allocations has now been completed in order that all parents can be notified on that date.</p> <p>As the government did not change National Closing Date for admissions applications, Gloucestershire has</p>

			<p>continued to apply its policy under the Co-ordinated Scheme. Gloucestershire allows parents to change their preferences at any time but if changes are made after 31st October 2020 – then these will be considered late i.e. after all the on-time applications. We have to be fair and consistent to all families across Gloucestershire – and our message to families has been very clear regarding choosing preferences wisely and the importance of applications being made by the closing date. There were many other authorities that applied the same policy as Gloucestershire this year i.e. not changing their late preference policy. There is a tremendous amount of work that the Admissions Team has to complete in order to meet its statutory duty to allocate school places on 1st March and therefore to change our policy on late changes of preferences</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>would impact on the delivery of allocating school places.</p> <p>Gloucestershire has always allowed parents to express more preferences than the minimum of three stated in the School Admissions Code. It is therefore felt that to offer five school preferences was sufficient for the 2021 transfer process.</p> <p>As previously stated the Department of Education issued guidance to all local authorities/schools and academies regarding the grammar testing arrangements this year. The guidance recommended delaying the test due to the Pandemic –to enable students to have a little more time to prepare – and as all the grammar schools are academies they collectively made the decision to delay the testing following this advice. The government did</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>not however change the legislation to amend the National Closing Date.</p> <p>It is not a guarantee that even if a child has reached the benchmark for a grammar school place that they will be offered a place – as places are allocated by those scoring the highest in the test for each school. If more children reach the benchmark than the number of places available then priority is given to children with an educational health care plan and children in care first. Reaching the benchmark merely means that you will be considered for a place – grammar schools are usually oversubscribed i.e. more children have passed the test than places available and this remains the case in 2021.</p> <p>The advice for the parents is to wait for Allocation Day on the 1st March 2021 – they will</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>then have the opportunity to accept or refuse the school place that they have been offered and request to go on the waiting list for any schools. The Admissions Team will conduct a second round of offers at the beginning of April – and if they are able to offer a higher preference to the family then they will do so and then withdraw the offer of the original school place. If they are unable to offer a grammar preference they will then advise the parents of their right of appeal and direct them to the school to request the necessary paperwork. All of the grammar schools are academies and are therefore their own Admissions Authority and are responsible for administering their own appeals process</p>
3	Public Questions	<p>Question 13 – Cllr Nigel Moor to provide a written response to Chris Chiswell as to whether the Council was now adopting a targeted yearly decrease in vehicle emissions contrary to a 15% increase detailed in the January cabinet paper.</p>	Colin Chick	<p>Response: GCC officers would require further explanation about the figures quoted in this question as it is not clear how they reflect the targets published in</p>

				<p>Gloucestershire’s emerging Local Transport Plan (LTP).</p> <p>Nationally, road passenger cars account for 55% of all transport related greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), HGVs 16.6%, LGVs 15.6% and buses 2.5%, as opposed to railways 1.4% (by source 2018) in Figure PD0(A) of the emerging LTP. It is clear that if GCC wants to deliver a carbon neutral county and work with partners to deliver a stepped target in carbon reduction by 2030^[1], there needs to be a step change in the way we travel, including significant mode shift in combination with a dramatic rise in the use of clean emission vehicles.</p> <p>Gloucestershire’s LTP supports the Gloucestershire Climate Change Strategy, Gloucestershire Sustainable Energy Strategy and reflects Gloucestershire’s ambition to be carbon neutral. The LTP target to reduce per capita transport carbon emissions (LTP PI-14), has been strengthened to reflect national commitment and</p>
--	--	--	--	---

^[1] Response to Climate Emergency (Item 8) at Cabinet (20 Dec 2019) <https://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cid=117&Mid=9232>
80% reduction by 2030 and carbon neutral by 2050

				<p>GCC's declaration of a climate change emergency in 2019.^[2] Furthermore, in 2020, GCC made a further consideration to sign up to the UK100 Pledge and follow the pledge guidance to be net zero by 2045. ^[3]</p> <p>The LTP refers to further supporting work in understanding the carbon reduction pathway in order to help deliver our revised LTP target for zero tonnes transport carbon emissions per capita by 2045. The LTP target is reported in the annual performance report LTP Implementation Plan. The GCC Climate Strategy will be monitored through an initial annual action plan and then subsequently a rolling 5 year action plan to 2035.</p>
4	Public Questions	Question 17 – Cllr Vernon Smith to provide David Willingham with a timescale and a more satisfactory response to what the issues were regarding the delivery of a road scheme at Alstone Croft through Highways Local funds.	Colin Chick	<p>Response:</p> <p>Local Highway Manager will provide following additional information. We are aware of the ongoing concerns to residents in this area,</p>

^[2]Carbon action plan motion (836) at County Council (15 May 2019) <https://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=333&MId=9141>

^[3] UK100 Pledge ambition making all cities/towns/villages in the UK 100% clean before 2050- <https://www.uk100.org/pledge-faqs>

			<p>however we found that previous proposals to address the situation were not practical because of the physical layout of the roads. It was then agreed to carry out trials of some different arrangements, however since that agreement was made, the impact of the COVID pandemic is such that we have not been experiencing anywhere near normal traffic flows. It is not clear whether the problem still exists to the same degree as it did in 2017, and equally, it would be wrong to trial new arrangements and judge their success or failure against the current traffic levels and conditions. We have now been given the indication of the return to "normal" post COVID, over the next few months, and that also gives us a potential timetable for consideration of both the scale of the problem and the effectiveness of potential solutions. I would suggest that early summer would be</p>
--	--	--	---

				the most appropriate time to revisit the issue, and the Local Highways Manager will be happy to engage with the relevant Councillors and residents at that time, to enable us to carry this scheme forward.
5	Corporate Parenting	Cllr Richard Boyles to provide members with an update following the recent report on serious case reviews in Gloucestershire.	Chris Spencer	<p>Response: Following the publication of the Working Together 2018 the system of Serious Case Reviews(SCR) was replaced by a new system involving Rapid Reviews(RR) and Local Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews (LSCPR). SCRs therefore ceased to be with the exception that any commissioned before the start of the new WT18 arrangements were to be completed within 12 months of the date of the new arrangements being put in place. In respect of Gloucestershire the former GSCB had commissioned 9 SCRs including the joint Domestic Homicide Review /SCR.</p> <p>Of these SCRs 5 were</p>

			<p>published between April 2019 and December 2020 and they are all available on the Gloucestershire Children's Safeguarding Partnership (GSCP) website. The titles are James; Megan; Family Y; Liam and Lauren.</p> <p>The joint SCR/ DHR has been submitted to the Home Office for quality assurance as is required under DHR procedure. The Home Office has informed us that the earliest they expect to complete this is August 2021 as they have a 'back log' of reports to QA.</p> <p>The three remaining SCRs are all subject to court proceedings and the individual SCRs cannot be published. The GSCP however made the decision to publish the recommendations of these SCRs in a single document including an update on how partners are progressing those recommendations.</p> <p>I am pleased to say therefore</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>that all Gloucestershire SCRs are now completed and publication of their findings has also been achieved.</p> <p>The new partnership arrangements give much more flexibility in determining how to respond to children's cases that previously would have met / or come close to meeting the threshold for a SCR. That flexibility also allows partners to review cases which would not previously have met that threshold but offer an opportunity for partners to reflect and learn from the experience of such children / young people. The GSCP agreed a very clear referral process including clear criteria for RRs and LSCPRS.</p> <p>GSCP has now held 11 Rapid Reviews on individual children three of which became the subject of the first GSCP LSCPR which was on the theme of child sexual exploitation. This LSCPR was published on February</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>10th and is again available on the GSCP website. Individual RRs are not published but the learning from RRs is also widely disseminated through the partnership. Both RRs and LSCPRs are submitted to the National Panel and it is worth mentioning that the feedback from that Panel is that GSCP is a leading authority in terms of the approach and the quality of reviews. The recent LSCPR attracted a great deal of attention from the panel who were impressed with the difference between it and the former SCR process. The LSCPR was undertaken in a shorter space of time; had greater staff involvement; considered the experiences and views of the children involved; and, the final report was short, focused and contained good recommendations.</p> <p>Whilst the learning from individual reviews always contains some case specific detail the GSCP has taken</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>some of the recurring themes as priorities for the partnership this coming year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Working together to understand complex children’s cases and to develop safeguarding practice which helps to identify such children earlier and keep them safe.• A revised approach to all forms of child exploitation including better offender management.• Maintaining a focus on non-mobile babies and non-accidental injuries including rigorous use of the GSCP pre-birth protocol.• Maintaining and improving the focus on recognising and dealing with neglect at an early stage
6	Corporate Parenting	To share Wendy Williams’ progress report on Trevone House with Cllr Jeremy Hilton.	Chris Spencer	Report shared with Cllr Jeremy Hilton by email on 17 February 2021.

7	Member Questions	Question 11 – Cllr Patrick Molyneux to look into what figures were available to identify any gap between pupils who had received ICT equipment at home and those who did not yet have it.	Chris Spencer	Response: The majority of children affected have been provided with the equipment needed as priorities in the earlier stages of the pandemic and of remote learning. Headteachers and LA staff continue to be vigilant to identify those children and young people who are in need of support in order to gain access to remote learning online. The Headteachers associations for primary, secondary and special schools have conducted surveys of school in the county to identify where there are / have been particular gaps in provision. Schools are responsible for ordering equipment directly from the DfE so figures are not reported to the LA. The numbers have changed daily and have reduced as schools receive equipment
---	-------------------------	---	----------------------	--

				for those who need it.
8	Member Questions	Question 18 – the Flood Alleviation Team and Local Highways Manager to talk to Cllr Brian Robinson regarding solutions to flash flooding in his area.	Colin Chick	The Flood Risk Management (FRM) Team has been in touch with Cllr Robinson in order to set up an initial meeting to discuss flooding issues in his area. A first step will ideally be a meeting between Cllr Robinson, the FRM team and Gloucestershire Highways. Some of the parishes he covers were among some of the worst hit during the December 23 rd / 24 th flooding event, so a follow up step could be a coordinated multi-agency approach and a more detailed investigation.
9	Member Questions	Question 23 – Cllr Mark Hawthorne to provide Cllr Lesley Williams with a written response on what work was being done on the ethical charters and modern slavery charters.	Steve Mawson	Response emailed to Cllr Lesley Williams on 1 March 2021.
10	Scrutiny	To provide members with a summary report on member responses to the scrutiny structure review at the next Council meeting.	Simon Harper	Summary to be prepared for the next Council meeting on 17 March 2021.
11	Scrutiny	RESOLVED To appoint Cllr Stephen Hirst as the Chair of Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Simon Harper	Completed.
12	Constitution Committee Report	RESOLVED	Sophie Benfield	Completed.

		That the amendment outlined in the Constitution Committee Report to Council be made to the Constitution at standing orders 9.5.3, 9.8.3, and 8.8.3.		
--	--	---	--	--

Gloucestershire Safeguarding Children Partnership



Executive/Management Group/Subgroup	
TITLE OF REPORT:	Thematic Review of Child Exploitation Safeguarding Practice February 2021 – Update
Presented at GSCP Executive	
Presented at GSCP Management Group	24th March 2021
Presented at Other Meeting (Including Date)	GSCP Quality and Improvement in Practice Subgroup (QiiP) 4 th March 2021 GSCP Child Exploitation and Missing Subgroup 9 th March 2021
LEAD	Sue Fereday T/DCI Public Protection Unit. Chair: Child Exploitation and Missing Subgroup

1. Background

During June and July 2020, the Gloucestershire Safeguarding Children Partnership (GSCP) scrutinised three separate cases where a young person had suffered significant harm and which had involved Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE). They recognised the potential to improve the way agencies worked together to safeguard young people and commissioned this Local Child Safeguarding Practice Review (LCSPR).

An independent author was appointed to work with the safeguarding partners in a thematic review of safeguarding practice and structures. The intention being to use the experiences of the three young people to guide a wider review, focusing on strategic development rather than an individual case. Its purpose to:

- Support the development of safeguarding practice and services.
- Identify potential improvements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people.

A wide number of agencies participated and key thematic areas offering the potential to improve outcomes for young people were identified.

2. Report

The Gloucestershire Safeguarding Children Partnership are already progressing with the recommendations from the review asking the Child Exploitation and Missing Subgroup to lead on the implementation and how the partnership intends to deliver improvements to safeguarding practice.

Partnership activity against the recommendations started prior to publication on receipt of the final draft from the independent author in November 2020. The below sets out the activity undertaken, in progress and planned for 2021.

Recommendation 1:

The GSCP should develop a new Child Exploitation Strategy, based upon the principles of contextual safeguarding. This should include the identification of relevant pathways and the commissioning of services.

Update:

The partnership has committed to rewriting its strategy looking at options of working with the National Working Group (NWG) and other experts in this area to advise and support the creation of a Young person's 'Outside the Home' Strategy". The intended aim to ensure the partnership has a collective confidence and knowledge about how to take effective action –options available and how to collectively and consistently implement them.

The GSCP Child Exploitation and Missing Subgroup are leading on the development of the multi-agency strategy with a working group created towards the end of 2020. The group have met a number of times before and since publication on the 10th February 2021 to start scoping the revised strategy including setting out a proposed timeline that should see a draft available for the GSCP Executive to sign off in the summer of 2021. A project Management resource has been allocated to assist in the project and to add capacity to the working group.

Firmer understanding of deadlines and milestones will be set out at the Child Exploitation & Missing subgroup on the 9th March 2021.

Recommendation 2:

All agencies should introduce a trauma informed referral assessment process which is child and young person focused.

Update:

In direct response to this recommendation, partnership referral and assessment processes are being reviewed to ensure they are trauma informed and the child's voice is clearly represented. This has already commenced with the new child exploitation screening tool with further reviews planned or underway. For example work on the MARF and VIST is underway as well as an NHS England pilot project to review entry and access to emotional wellbeing and mental health services in the county, this links to recommendation two of the report.

These reviews are taking place with the support of partners such as the 'Nelson Trust' who are accredited trainers for a trauma informed approach. To further ensure a trauma informed approach is taken when completing and assessing referrals, training will be sought for staff and woven into existing processes. An example of this is demonstrated in the Trauma Informed Model of Care (TIMOC) pilot being conducted with Trevone House staff group.

The Child Exploitation and Missing Subgroup will be monitoring and overseeing the progress against this action through 2021 with an expectation it should be completed and reported back to the GSCP Executive later in the year.

Recommendation 3:

CAMHS should review the current referral process to ensure that it is child and young person focussed, and that the new referral process is widely understood & promoted across partner agencies.

Update:

Gloucestershire is one of 12 national NHS England pilot sites to look at transforming CAMHS and wider mental health services. This review of the counties emotional wellbeing and mental health services is currently underway and will be completed later in 2021.

As part of the mental health transformation programme the review has already undertaken

- a review of need in partnership with Public Health
- consultation with children, families, clinicians and stakeholders locally to gain insight into what works well, and what needs to improve. We continue to co-design our new offer going forward.
- NHS England Improvement as part of the system wide review of mental health support for children and young people in Gloucestershire.

This has resulted in a number of recommendations to take forward which includes:

- Better quality of referral information which will enable the principle “no referral is rejected” but forwarded to most appropriate option for support, by developing robust referral criteria/referral form and communicating this to all stakeholders.
- Telephone triage with all families as a first contact to ensure that all of the information is captured at referral point and options can be discussed directly with children and young people and their families.
- When referrals are received and other children’s services are involved there will be a multiagency meeting arranged to ensure that the partnership is working together collectively to best support children and family’s needs in the round.
- Create a central resource where the partnership can describe a system wide offer of support to children, young people and families and provide information about support available, clearly articulating an offer. This includes implementing the principles of THRIVE.
<http://implementingthrive.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/THRIVE-Framework-for-system-change-2019.pdf>
- In addition the partnership is evaluating the pilot of providing therapeutic input to foster carers and social workers to best support children in care.
- Longer term we aim to work with partners to develop a single point of access by operationalising a system-wide ‘front door’ calling upon the expertise and skills from across the system adopting the philosophy that no request for support is rejected.

It is anticipated that this review and pilot will be concluded in 2021 allowing the partnership to ensure that emotional wellbeing and mental health specialist service provision is widely understood, accessible and child focused.

Firmer understanding of deadlines and milestones will be set out at the Quality and Improvement in Practice subgroup on the 4th March 2021.

Recommendation 4: Gloucestershire Constabulary should review compliance with their VIST safeguarding policy in relation to adolescents and ensure measures are in place to improve the identification and reporting of adolescent risk.

Update:

- Significant work has already been undertaken to review and refresh the Constabulary’s VIST guidance. The VIST itself will now be reviewed to ensure it accurately reflects appropriate and proportionate aspects of the Neglect Toolkit and a trauma informed approach and importantly reviewing whether child exploitation is accurately reflected in the question sets. This work will continue in the first quarter of 2021 with future plans for education and awareness raising of some of the complexities identified through this LSCPR. The Child Exploitation and Missing Subgroup will receive an update on this work at their next meeting in March 2021.
- An audit has been conducted into the quality of VIST submissions which has identified common themes and misconceptions; this information is being used to ensure training is focused on the core issues. Training, started in August 2020, will continue targeted at a range of front line staff and then across other areas of the partnership.
- Changes to the MASH and Public Protection intranet pages are planned to ensure information is constantly available for reference.
- Regular check and test processes are in place at various levels to correct compliance issues and ongoing compliance and quality assurance will be tested with monthly quantitative and qualitative evaluation. The outcome of this piece of work in response to this recommendation will be reported to the CE and Missing Subgroup in May 2021.
- While this recommendation specifies the Constabulary it has been recognised that all partners should review their compliance and quality in respect of the identification and reporting of risk. Indeed similar reviews in the auditing of MARF submissions has already started in GHC along with work in CSC to add the new Criminal Exploitation screening tool to their online workspace to highlight identification of risk. This wider partnership work will be monitored by the Child Exploitation and Missing subgroup and the GSCP Management Group through 2021.

REPORT AUTHOR:	Susan Fereday T/DCVI Public Protection Unit. Chair: Child Exploitation and Missing Subgroup
Sponsoring Manager	Annette Blackstock Designated Nurse Safeguarding Children and Safeguarding Adult Manager Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group. Chair: Quality and Improvement in Practice Subgroup