



RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

*at the Council Offices, Farnborough on
Thursday, 7th April, 2022 at 7.00 pm*

To:

Cllr M.D. Smith (Chairman)
Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr S.J. Masterson (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Gaynor Austin
Cllr Jib Belbase
Cllr M.S. Choudhary
Cllr R.M. Cooper
Cllr K. Dibble
Cllr L. Jeffers
Cllr Mara Makunura
Cllr Nem Thapa

Standing Deputies

Cllr Sue Carter
Cllr Sophie Porter

Enquiries regarding this agenda should be referred to the Administrator, Adele Taylor, Democracy and Community, Tel. (01252) 398831, Email. adele.taylor@rushmoor.gov.uk.

A G E N D A

1. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – (Pages 1 - 6)**

To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting held on 17th February, 2022 (copy attached).

2. **REGISTERED PROVIDERS TASK AND FINISH GROUP - ANNUAL REPORT 2021/22 – (Pages 7 - 12)**

Report No. EPSH2211 is attached on the work of the Task and Finish Group during the 2021/22 Municipal Year. The Committee is asked to consider the recommendations.

3. **CABINET CHAMPIONS –**

To receive reports from the three Cabinet Champions on their work during the 2021/22 Municipal Year. The Champions are as follows:

- Equalities - Cllr Abul Chowdhury
- Health and Wellbeing – Cllr Mara Makunura
- Armed Forces – Cllr Jacqui Vosper

4. **CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN –**

To receive a presentation from the Head of Democracy and Community on progress with the Climate Change Action Plan and proposals for the future.

5. **WORK PLAN – (Pages 13 - 22)**

To consider the Work Plan for the 2021/22 Municipal Year (copy attached).

MEETING REPRESENTATION

Members of the public may ask to speak at the meeting on any of the items on the agenda by writing to the Committee Administrator at the Council Offices, Farnborough by 5.00 pm two working days prior to the meeting.

Applications for items to be considered for the next meeting must be received in writing to the Committee Administrator fifteen working days prior to the meeting.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Thursday, 17th February, 2022 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr M.D. Smith (Chairman)
Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr S.J. Masterson (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Gaynor Austin
Cllr Jib Belbase
Cllr M.S. Choudhary
Cllr R.M. Cooper
Cllr K. Dibble
Cllr L. Jeffers
Cllr Mara Makunura

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr Nem Thapa

22. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 9th December, 2021 were **AGREED** as a correct record.

23. PRIMARY CARE NETWORKS

The Committee welcomed Dr Alice Earl and Dr Louise Payne, Clinical Directors for Farnborough and Aldershot respectively, who were in attendance to report on local primary care services, impacts of the pandemic, future working arrangements and how the Primary Care Networks (PCN) and the Council were working together.

Dr Payne, provided an overview on Primary Care Networks and it was noted that a PCN was a group of doctors' practices working together with other healthcare providers and appropriate organisations to deliver integrated services to residents. It was noted that the Aldershot PCN covered 48,000 patients and Farnborough PCN covered 60,000 patients.

In Aldershot, there were four practices involved in the PCN, Princes Gardens Surgery, The Border Practice, The Cambridge Practice and The Wellington Practice. The executive, and leadership and strategic management structure included, the four Practice Managers alongside the Clinical Director (Dr Payne) and a PCN Manager. Below that, additional roles within the structure included medicine management, mental health and wellbeing, care co-ordination, first contact physio and paramedic practitioners. These roles were provided through the Additional Roles Reimbursement Scheme (ARRS) a fund established to support GP practices to address the needs of their patients.

In response to the pandemic, it was noted that the PCNs had had to suspend contracts on some services to ensure patients were supported throughout. However, some services continued to be provided such as general medical services to patients and screening/immunisation services. Collaborative working had played a part in many responses to the pandemic, including the setting up of the vaccination sites in both towns (99,323 vaccines administered to date), working together across Aldershot and Farnborough PCN's on addressing mental health matters resulting in the recruitment of a care co-ordinator funded through pooled resources, working with the Council and other partners with the aim to reduce health inequalities across the Borough and forging and building on relations within the community, in particular with the Nepali community.

Dr Earl reported on the situation in Farnborough and it was noted that, by offering more digital services throughout the pandemic, patient appointments had risen by 20%. In addition, patients had got used to seeing appropriate specialists under the additional roles scheme to address their needs. With the return to business as usual, it was noted that the PCNs would continue to develop on the experiences learnt during the height of the pandemic. However, it was advised that "return to normal" would require an element of catch up, through the management of patients whose care had been affected by the pandemic. Priority cohorts would also be targeted, with a particular drive around those with mental health issues and learning difficulties, hypertension and diabetes, amongst others. The Committee also noted that each of the six practices within the Farnborough PCN had a Mental Health Support Practitioner working within the practice to help support and improve people's mental health. The care co-ordinator helped to guide people to who was best placed to support their needs, freeing up the doctors to treat those with more complex issues.

The Committee discussed the presentation and raised a number of issues. These included:

- Face to face appointments – it was noted that face to face appointments had not stopped during the pandemic. However, they were not freely available to be booked by patients and were issued via a triage system based on need/demand. Currently 60% of appointments were carried out face to face compared to around 80% before the pandemic. Many patients had embraced the virtual/telephone consultations on offer. Moving forward it was noted that the PCN were using and would continue to use internet/phone-based appointment systems to address capacity issues. Nevertheless, it was considered important to offer choice to patients but not allow them to dictate/demand how they would be seen.
- Patient lists/demand – it was noted that demand outweighed the provision across the Borough, but the PCNs were working with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) on the building and projected population plans to address the issue and expand as required moving forward.
- Care Homes – it was noted that care homes had suffered during the height of the pandemic and during May 2020 a local GP had stayed over, at a

particular site, on a number of occasions, to address the needs of extremely unwell patients. Once the vaccination programme had commenced in January 2021, admissions to hospital had reduced and outbreaks had become more contained.

- Cancer patients – it was noted that there had been no backlog in cancer care; throughout the pandemic cancer care had always been a priority, with referral through to diagnosis/commencement of treatment generally being achieved within a four week period.
- Young peoples' mental health – It was noted that schools were starting to work jointly with Mental Health Integrated Care Services to address mental health issues within the education setting. In addition, through the additional roles opportunity, the local PCNs were looking to employ mental health practitioners, but it was noted that there was currently a national shortage of qualified practitioners to fill these roles.

From the Council's perspective, Mr Colver advised that health was now a very important part of the Council's work and suggested that, where the Council was adding value, was working with the PCNs and the CCG on the wider determinants impacting on health.

The Chairman thanked Drs Earl and Payne for their presentation.

24. EDUCATION SERVICES IN RUSHMOOR

The Committee welcomed County Councillor (CC) Roz Chadd, Executive Lead Member for Education and Skills, who was in attendance to provide an update on attainment levels in 2021, prospects for 2022, skills issues/gaps and collaboration with district authorities.

CC Chadd, gave an overview of the primary schools in the Borough, of which there were 30, four of which were academies. In relation to the OFSTED ratings, 83% rated as "good" locally compared to 85% nationally and 43% were rated "outstanding" compared to 21% nationally. Four schools "required improvements", one of which was an academy, the three maintained schools were being supported by Hampshire County Council (HCC) and it was hoped that each would achieve a "good" OFSTED rating when next reviewed. It was noted that no schools were rated "inadequate" in the Borough.

With regard to the attainment levels in the primary schools, it was noted that no formal examinations had taken place during the pandemic, however key stages (KS) 1&2 levels were strong in comparison to national data. Across Hampshire, Rushmoor had outperformed all districts with the exception of Hart and Winchester at KS1&2 in 2019.

With regard to the secondary schools, it was noted that there were three secondaries and one all through school. Fernhill was currently receiving support as the last OFSTED rating had been "requires improvement". A lot of work had been put in by the school and HCC officers and the school were currently awaiting another

inspection where they hoped to gain a “good” rating. In 2020, Alderwood, the local all through school, had achieved a “good” OFSTED rating alongside Cove and Wavell schools.

The attainment levels in the secondary schools was noted and it was advised that an improvement had been realised between the 2018 and 2019 results. The pass rate of grade 4 or above for English and Maths had been 58% compared to the national average of 63%. Attainment 8, which is used to measure how well children were doing at KS4, was currently at 4.2 compared to a 4.6 national average.

The Committee reviewed the specialist school provision in the Borough, which included Samuel Cody, Henry Tyndale and Rowhill Schools. It was noted that Samuel Cody, which achieved a “good” rating from OFSTED in 2017, was due to expand in September 2022, offering an additional 90 places over a phased three year period. The school supported children with moderate learning disabilities. Henry Tyndale, the specialist school for children aged 2-19 with more complex learning disabilities had 155 pupils and had achieved an “outstanding” OFSTED rating in 2016. The Henry Tyndale early years setting operated out of Cherrywood School under a joint headship with shared knowledge and expertise. Rowhill School was the setting for the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU). PRU catered for secondary aged children who had been permanently excluded, were at risk of exclusion, were medically unwell or suffered from high levels of emotional needs. It was advised that referrals could be made from Rushmoor, Hart and East Hampshire. The unit offered intensive short term interventions to help pupils return to mainstream schooling. The most recent OFSTED report in 2018 had considered the school “good”.

The Committee was advised of the mental health support provision in schools. It was noted that mental health issues in young people had increased during the pandemic and, to help address the rising issues, an initiative had been implemented to provide mental health support teams within schools. HCC had been successful in the bidding process for Rushmoor and secured funds to recruit mental health professionals to work within the Borough’s schools although recruitment had been a challenge. It was noted that currently there was a team based in one school in the Borough which supported other schools through engagement with pupils and headteachers. It was also advised that schools could use their funding to engage outside organisations to address mental health issues within their settings through various methods such as plays and workshops.

The Committee discussed the wider impacts of the pandemic and noted that the focus for curriculum catch up within schools was primarily on the transition years (Years 2-3 and 6-7). It was also noted that HCC continued to advise schools to follow Department of Education guidelines on COVID measures, where appropriate.

It was explained that HCC continued to look for additional provision for Special Educational Needs (SEN) settings and it was noted that a consultation was underway for a satellite provision at Park Primary for Henry Tyndale. An autism unit at Pinewood Infants which would follow through to Guillemont Junior School.

The Committee noted what Rushmoor could do to support schools and skills within the Borough. CC Chadd recommended that Rushmoor could join the newly

established Hampshire Regeneration and Growth Partnership, encourage staff and councillors to take up roles as school governors and ensure local businesses engage with the community by offering apprenticeships which could now be supported by the HCC apprenticeship levy.

CC Chadd also gave an overview of Children's Services. It was noted that Children's Services had seen a 15-20% increase in initial contact since the start of the pandemic, this however had not been reflected in the numbers of children moving into care, which had remained static. In response to a query, it was advised that a social worker's workload depended on experience. With regard to Children's Homes it was noted that only one had been closed during the pandemic with a small number of children being moved around to ensure safety. In addition, there was a national push on the recruitment of foster carers which were in short supply across the country.

The Committee discussed the presentation and in response to a query regarding home learning during the pandemic it was indicated that as children from deprived areas had generally been in school during the pandemic it was felt that it had been children from middle income families, who may be time poor, that had suffered more. As teachers understood best what pupils needed most. intervention would be led by them. Further queries regarded children crossing borders to attend school in some areas, it was advised that this was balanced with similar numbers coming into Rushmoor to attend school from adjoining counties. It was explained that SEN schools had no catchment areas and could be attended by pupils from outside the Borough.

The Chairman thanked CC Chadd for her presentation and stated that the Committee would welcome an update following the 2022 examinations on attainment levels in Rushmoor's schools.

25. **WORK PLAN**

The Committee **NOTED** the current Work Plan.

A request was made for a report on performance data for the Property Services team within the Council at a future meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm.

CLLR M.D. SMITH (CHAIRMAN)

This page is intentionally left blank

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE****Registered Providers Review Group Report**7th April 2022**REPORT NO. EPSH2211****REVIEW OF REGISTERED PROVIDERS 2021/22****1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report is to inform Members of the Overview and Scrutiny committee on the outcome of the 2021/22 Registered Providers (RPs) Review. The purpose of the review meetings is to continue to build good working relationships with our RP partners, to monitor the performance and activities of the RPs and work together to resolve any problems. It also provides an opportunity to explore how RPs can support the council in the delivery of its corporate themes set out in the business plan. The report gives an overview of the scrutiny process and for each of the RP's reviewed and identifies; what is working well, causes for concern and any issues to follow up which may need to be raised with the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Economy or Operational Services.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny RP Review sub-group for 2020/21

Members	Officers
Councillor Diane Bedford Councillor Mike Smith Councillor Nem Thapa Councillor Rod Cooper Councillor Keith Dibble Councillor Terry Bridgeman	Zoë Paine Sue Thornett

- 2.2 Registered Providers: Meetings held

Registered Provider	Meeting date
Stonewater	18 th October 2021
Metropolitan Thames Valley	15 th November 2021
Vivid	17 th January 2022

3 The Scrutiny Process:

- 3.1 Each RP provides financial and performance information, it's policies and strategies in advance of the meeting giving the group the opportunity to consider the information in advance.
- 3.2 Accompanied site visits prior to the meeting; these were unable to take place in this programme due to Covid-19 restrictions.

Key Discussions in the review process

- 4.
- Housing management for all tenures
 - Maintenance of property and neighbourhoods
 - Customer service and compliance with the Housing Regulators Customer Standards
 - Risk management: fire, gas, and electrical safety
 - Financial and performance information
 - Assisting residents with welfare issues
 - Development opportunities
 - Working together on Climate Change
 - Tackling deprivation and equality opportunity
 - Ward Members experience of working with RPs
 - Impacts of Covid-19

5. Summary of Review Group findings

- 5.1 **Vivid** – Total properties in Rushmoor: 5,678. General needs 4,375, leasehold 648, shared ownership 305, housing for older persons 290, supported 7 and 53 other tenure. Vivid are Hampshire's largest provider of social housing and Rushmoor's stock transfer organisation.
- Members were pleased that the repairs service is recovering from the impact of the pandemic with routine repairs service back to normal. Vivid has employed over 30 additional trades to assist and address repairs.
 - Some examples were cited of residents waiting time to report repairs; Vivid recognised that it had not been as good as needed. Vivid emphasised that response to enquiries was very important to them, their current focus is to improve the speed of access via their contact centre and to improve communication flow.
 - Feedback received from local ward councillors was positive with compliments on the work Vivid are doing in tenancy support and supporting vulnerable tenants. Staff were swift in responding to enquiries, polite and helpful.
 - Residents are encouraged to get involved in developing and monitoring services, there is a resident panel which includes shared owners and leaseholders known as 'VIVID Impact'
 - Members were impressed with the amount of community development work Vivid are involved with in Rushmoor their partnership working to support local project for schools, employment skills and the elderly. They

have digital mentors going into their older person schemes to deliver one-to-one IT skills learning, and operate a IT recycle scheme for schools.

- Vivid offer a high-level tenancy support to tenants with welfare needs, including a specialist money advice, employment and training teams, all referrals are triaged to see what level and type of support is required. Low level generic support is provided by their homeless prevention officers. Last year they brought in an additional £5.9m of additional income and backdated benefits to their residents.
- Vivid have a specialist Tenancy Enforcement Team which deals with all their serious cases of anti-social behaviour and works closely to jointly tackle ASB with the community safety team, and the Police.
- Vivid has an ambitious development programme and are committed to building social rent properties. Rushmoor remains a priority development area.
- Members were impressed with Vivid's plans on reducing the carbon emissions in their housing stock and their commitment to partnership working to achieve this. They have developed a carbon neutral strategy and have made a provision within their business plan to invest in their stock to meet government targets. Their target for SAP rating is B for all homes by 2030 they are also introducing provision of electric charging points for cars and looking to replace gas central heating boilers with more efficient boilers for example replacing with air source heat pump.

5.2 Stonewater: Total properties in Rushmoor: 103. 100 general needs rent, 3 shared ownership, Stonewater properties in Rushmoor consist of 77x1, 2 and 3-bed flats, 22x2 and 3 bed houses and four maisonettes.

- Members were pleased with Stonewater's approach with their 'Customer Promise', Improving Customer Service and prioritising what matters to their customers and customer engagement in shaping services.
- Members were impressed with Stonewater's approach to social isolation, wellbeing, and the community. They have specialist officers to work with families as well as with older/retired customers utilising technology and getting devices to customers. Wellbeing calls with the retirement living team made contact daily during the pandemic where customers were shielding or nervous to go out.
- Stonewater have an Environmental Sustainability Team within their Homes Team and aim to achieve EPC rating C on all their properties by 2030. They have a schedule of works planned from 2022 – 2030 and are no longer installing gas central heating boilers on new build properties; they are mostly installing ground source heating.
- Where they are able, they are working with other RPs across an area to reduce service charge implications.
- Councillors were pleased that Stonewater are also installing electric charging points for vehicles with all new schemes having electrical charge points.
- Tenants Satisfaction with repairs has been slightly lower because of pandemic but is now improving. There are still customers reluctant to allow people into their homes. Stonewater can arrange to meet a customer virtually which enables them to send photographs of any repair issues so they can be resolved quickly. Contractor and recruitment

problems together with difficulty in obtaining materials has been an issue, these are currently sector wide issues.

- 5.3 Metropolitan Thames Valley:** Total properties in Rushmoor: 805 affordable housing properties, 468 general needs rent, 329 lease hold, and 8 market rent, consisting of houses and flats houses
- Since the merge of Thames Valley Housing and Metropolitan they have restructured and implemented their 'Right Side Up Initiative', with emphasis on putting their residents at the centre of their service. Local housing managers are covering smaller geographical areas and managing all tenures, to get know residents and have a positive impact on the communities. Their call centre has been upgraded to a housing hub introducing an upskilled assessment and support team to triage cases.
 - Members were pleased with MTV's excel at customer service, listening and engaging with their residents which has increased customer satisfaction. They are encouraging digital services but are mindful of face-to-face need for vulnerable customers. Focus has been on making sure residents are able to sustain their tenancies. MTV work in partnership with a variety of agencies to support people.
 - They have a Revenues Team who will provide support to residents, and an Empowering Futures and Assessment & Support Team. The focus is to ensure their residents sustain their tenancies and maximising their income.
 - Members complimented MTV on their climate change policy. They are no longer installing gas central heating boilers, these have been replaced with heat source pumps to meet zero emissions, also introducing installing electric car charging points in newbuild properties Their target is to make sure all their existing homes have an EPC rating of C by 2030 and all new homes will be built to an EPC rating of B or if not better.
 - MTV has launched a Sustainable Procurement Policy; this allows them to capture and report on the carbon footprint of supply chains. All suppliers will be required to report on their emissions, waste, and water use.
 - Members were reassured to hear of MTVs positive approach to anti-social behaviour, fly tipping and issues raised concerning communal areas, MTV were aware of the local issues Members raised and are acting to resolve these.
 - MTV's shared ownership team has introduced a shared ownership swap scheme for those needing to move on welfare grounds.
 - Members have on occasion found it difficult to communicate with MTV when representing residents. MTV has introduced a direct contact for councillors and MPs to report issues which will be dealt with by a dedicated councillor complaints team.

6 Conclusion

The RP Review process continues to play an important role in developing good working relationships with housing providers operating in the borough. The meetings enable the council's members and officers to improve their understanding of the condition and management of the affordable housing stock in the borough. The process also provides a

platform to hold open and candid conversations about concerns so that they can be addressed and resolved, as well as the opportunity to see how the council and its RP partners can support one another in the delivery of their objectives.

Following consultation with the Chairman of the Review Group, it is proposed that a further programme of review is carried out in 2022/2023. The Review Group will agree the process and select the registered providers for review at its next meeting.

7 Recommendation

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is requested to:

1. Endorse the programme of work carried out in 2021/22.
2. Authorise the Review Group to prepare a programme of reviews for 2022/23

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

- Minutes of the review meetings
- Supporting documents supplied by RPs.

CONTACT DETAILS:

Councillor Diane Bedford

Chair of the Registered Providers Review Group

Report Author – Sue Thornett: Housing Enabling and S106 Officer
sue.thornett@rushmoor.gov.uk

Head of Service – Tim Mills: Head of Economy, Planning and Strategic Housing
tim.mills@rushmoor.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PLAN

The purpose of the work plan is to plan, manage and co-ordinate the ongoing activity and progress of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It will be updated regularly and presented to each meeting of the Committee. It will include issues that are currently being actioned as well as those that will be subject to future work.

The Committees Terms of Reference are as follows:

- to perform all overview and scrutiny functions on behalf of the Council;
- to appoint such formal sub-committees and informal task and finish groups as it considers necessary to assist it in discharging its functions;
- to prepare and approve the overview and scrutiny work programme so as to ensure that the Committee's time is effectively and efficiently utilised;
- to undertake investigations into such matters relating to the Council's functions and powers as:
 - (1) may be referred by the Council, Committees, the Cabinet, or the Leader; or
 - (2) the Committee may consider appropriate; or
 - (3) have been referred to the Committee pursuant to the "call-in" procedure set out in the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules in Part 4 of this Constitution. (These can be decisions taken by the Cabinet, a Cabinet Member, key decisions taken by an officer or under joint arrangements).
- to monitor and review the performance of the Council and services against relevant performance indicators and adopted plans;

- to review and/or scrutinise decisions proposed to be made (pre-decision scrutiny) or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any of the Council's functions;
- to review existing policy and strategy with a view to securing continuous improvement in the way in which the Council's functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness;
- to make reports and/or recommendations to the full Council and/or the Cabinet in connection with the discharge of any functions;
- to review and/or scrutinise any matter affecting the area or its inhabitants;
- to discuss initiatives put forward for consideration by individual members of the Committee and any relevant 'call-for-action' in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of this Constitution; and
- to consider petitions referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in accordance with provisions set out in the Petition Scheme set out in Part 4 of this Constitution.

(A) ISSUES CURRENTLY BEING PROGRESSED BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE TASK AND FINISH GROUPS

ISSUE (PURPOSE OF REVIEW)	TASK AND FINISH GROUP (MEMBERSHIP 2021/22)	TIMETABLE	CURRENT WORK	STATUS
<p>To monitor the performance and activities of Registered Providers working in the Borough.</p>	<p>Task and Finish Group established consisting of:</p> <p>Cllrs. D. B. Bedford, T.D. Bridgeman, R.M. Cooper, K. Dibble, Nem Thapa and M.D. Smith.</p>	<p>2021/22</p>	<p>The following RP's would be reviewed during the 2021/22 Municipal Year:</p> <p>Stonewater – 18th October, 2021 – the Group received a presentation on changes to the way Stonewater work and their policy on Climate Change.</p> <p>MTVHA – 15th November, 2021 – The Group held a meeting at which concerns were raised regarding a MTV Scheme in Aldershot, a date will be arranged for the Group to visit the scheme in due course.</p> <p>VIVID – 17th January, 2022 – The Group held a productive meeting at which it was advised that communication with residents remained a priority and the backlog of repairs as a result of the pandemic were being addressed through additional trade deployment.</p>	<p>Green</p>

ISSUE (PURPOSE OF REVIEW)	TASK AND FINISH GROUP (MEMBERSHIP 2021/22)	TIMETABLE	CURRENT WORK	STATUS
			<p>A review will also take place of the questions included in the Schedule of Questions used as part of the review process.</p> <p>The Annual Report would be presented to the Committee at its meeting in April, 2022.</p>	
To review the Council Tax Support Scheme	<p>Council Tax Support Task and Finish Group established, consisting of:</p> <p>Cllrs. D.B. Bedford, J.B. Canty, Christine Guinness, Lee Jeffers, M.J. Roberts and M.D Smith.</p>	2021/22	<p>The Group met on 17th August when a discussion was held on the purpose of the group and some CT data was analysed.</p> <p>Additional data was reviewed at the meeting on 6th October, 2021, and at the meeting held on 25th November it was recommended that the scheme would remain the same for 2022/23 but would undergo a fundamental review in early 2022.</p> <p>Cabinet reviewed the recommendations at its meeting on 18th January, 2022. A recommendation to Council was made to retain the current scheme for 2022/23 and the Group were recommended to undertake a detailed review of the scheme early in 2022/23.</p>	Green

ISSUE (PURPOSE OF REVIEW)	TASK AND FINISH GROUP (MEMBERSHIP 2021/22)	TIMETABLE	CURRENT WORK	STATUS
Educational Improvement	<p>A Task and Finish Group has been set up consisting of:</p> <p>Cllrs. Gaynor Austin, D.B. Bedford, M.S. Choudhary, Nadia Martin, S.J. Masterson and M.D. Smith.</p>	2021/22	<p>Arrangements will be made for a meeting to be held in the Spring of 2022. Hampshire County Council representatives will be invited.</p> <p>At the Committee meeting in February 2022, CC Roz Chadd, Executive Lead Member for Children's Services provided an update on attainment levels for 2021, prospects for 2022, skills issues/gaps and collaboration with district authorities.</p>	

(B) OTHER ISSUES CURRENTLY BEING PROGRESSED BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

ISSUE	TIMETABLE	CURRENT WORK	STATUS
Safer North Hampshire and Policing Matters	2021/22	At its meeting in July, 2021 representatives from Hampshire Police and the Community Safety teams gave an update on current issues and addressed a number of specific queries raised by Members. A further review will be undertaken in 2022/23	Green
Food Waste Service – Communications and Education Plan	2021/22	At the meeting in August, 2021 the Committee received a presentation on the communications and education plans for the launch of the Food Waste Service. The Committee endorsed the plans and agreed to monitor the development on the service and its performance. An update briefing note will be circulated in Spring 2022.	Green
Rushmoor Voluntary Services and Citizens' Advice	2021/22	At its meeting in October, 2021 the Committee received presentations from Citizens' Advice and Rushmoor Voluntary Services on their services and current performance. It was noted that new service level agreements are being developed over the next 6-9 months and it was agreed that the Committee should consider the provisions set out in these at a future meeting.	Green
Rushmoor Housing Limited (RHL)	2021/22	At its meeting in December, 2021 the Committee reviewed the RHL Shareholder Report as requested by the Chief Executive.	Green
Supporting Communities Strategy and Action Plan	2021/22	The Committee were updated on the Supporting Communities Strategy and Action Plan at its meeting in December, 2021. The current work and past achievements were outlined and noted. It was suggested that this item could be brought back to the Committee later in the year following the refresh.	

Last Updated 30/03/2022

Primary Care Networks	2021/22	<p>The Committee received a report from the Clinical Directors responsible for Aldershot and Farnborough at its meeting in February 2022. The report covered primary care services, the impacts of the pandemic, future working arrangements and collaborative working with the Council.</p> <p>The PCNs would be invited back to a future meeting.</p>	
-----------------------	---------	---	--

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

WORKFLOW – OCTOBER 2021- APRIL 2022

DATE	ITEMS
7th April 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Registered Providers Task and Fish Group – Annual Report• Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan - update• Champions Annual Reports• Food Waste Service – Written Update to be provided
Potential Future Items for Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Supporting Communities Strategy and Action Plan – update – December 2022</i>• <i>Property Services – Autumn 2022</i>

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Progress Meetings 2021/22

(Circulate the Cabinet Forward Plan, the Committee Work Plan and notes of the previous Committee meeting to each meeting of the Progress Group)

DATE	ITEM	NOTES
1 February 2022	<p>Education Establishments Representatives</p> <p>Statement of Accounts 2019/20</p> <p>Disability Issues</p>	<p>Meeting in the Spring to which some local head teachers will be invited.</p> <p>It was noted that follow a discussion with Cllr Dibble this item would now be raised at a future meeting of CGAS</p> <p>It was suggested that this would be picked up as part of the annual report from the Champion for Wellbeing</p>
14 March 2022	<p>Climate Change Action Plan</p> <p>Food Waste</p> <p>Farnborough Airport</p> <p>Annual Report</p>	<p>Presentation on achievements, perspective for the future, Strategy and Action Plan refresh</p> <p>A written update would be provided to the Committee at this time</p> <p>A meeting with the airport would be arranged for the new Municipal Year</p> <p>The annual report would be drafted after the meeting on 7th April and shared with the Chairman for comment.</p>
Items for Future Progress Meetings		

This page is intentionally left blank