



Please ask for: Matt Berry
Extension No: 4589
E-Mail: mattberry@cannockchasedc.gov.uk

15 March 2021

Dear Councillor,

Community Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 23 March 2021, 4:00pm

Meeting to be held via Remote Access

You are invited to attend this meeting for consideration of the matters itemised in the following Agenda.

Yours sincerely,

I. Curran
Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer

To: Councillors:

Bennett, C. (Chairman)	
Jones, B. (Vice-Chairman)	
Allen, F.W.C.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.
Davis, Mrs. M.A.	Thompson, Mrs. S.L.
Dunnett, Ms. A.J.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Witton, P.T.
Hewitt, P.M.	Woodhead, P.E.
Smith, C.D.	

Agenda

Part 1

1. Apologies

2. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members

To declare any personal, pecuniary or disclosable pecuniary interests in accordance with the Code of Conduct and any possible contraventions under Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

3. Minutes

To approve the Minutes of the meetings held on 10 November 2020 and 8 March 2021 (enclosed).

4. Improving Community Wellbeing (Environment, Partnerships & Community Safety) Priority Delivery Plan Performance Update – Q3 2020/21

To receive the latest performance information (Item 4.1 – 4.7).

5. Recovery Action Plans Progress Update

To receive the progress updates for the sections of the Community Recovery and Organisational Recovery Action Plans relevant to the work of this Committee (Item 5.1 – 5.4).

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE

COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD ON TUESDAY 10 NOVEMBER 2020 AT 4:00 P.M.

VIA REMOTE ACCESS

PART 1

PRESENT:

Councillors

Jones, B. (Vice-Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.

Davis, Mrs. M.A.

Freeman, Miss M.A.

Hewitt, P.M.

Smith, C.D.

Sutton, Mrs. H.M.

Thompson, Mrs. S.L.

Todd, Mrs. D.M.

Witton, P.T.

Woodhead, P.E.

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillors C. Bennett (Chairman) and Ms. A.J. Dunnett.

In the Chairman's absence the meeting was chaired by Councillor B. Jones (Vice-Chairman).

2. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restrictions on Voting by Members and Party Whip Declarations

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

3. Minutes

The Minutes of the previous meetings held on 26 November 2019 and 13 January 2020 were approved.

4. Covid-19 Update

The Managing Director provided the Committee with the following updates on Covid-19 related matters:

- On 29 October the Staffordshire Local Resilience Forum (LRF) declared a major incident on the basis of the County being moved into 'tier-2' restrictions, and the NHS starting to experience significant pressures, especially from individuals with Covid-19 related issues.

- The implement of tier-2 on 31 October coincided with the Prime Minister's announcement that day of a new national lockdown for England from 5 November to 2 December.
- The new lockdown was however quite different from the one in March, as most business sectors now remained open and trading, along with the education sector. Hospitality, leisure services, and non-essential retail had however been required to close again. Furthermore, there was no national shielding programme in place this time.
- With regards to the Council specifically, most staff had continued to work from home so there was not the same level of transition needed this time, and all services, bar a few exceptions, were generally operating at normal level. The main exceptions being the closedown of leisure and culture facilities managed by Inspiring Healthy Lifestyles (IHL), along with non-essential retail at the indoor and outdoor markets operating in the District.
- Key priorities for Officers were similar to those in wave 1, with support being provided to the local test and trace programme, advice to businesses on compliance with the current regulations and restrictions, payments to businesses via two new funding schemes, and taking enforcement action where necessary.
- In respect of those persons classified as being Clinically Extremely Vulnerably (CEV), of which there were 4,267 in the District, they would be receiving a letter this week from the NHS signposting them to local authorities for support, which would include connecting them to priority supermarket delivery slots for food shopping, and ensuring that community pharmacies undertook delivery of prescriptions, for which they were paid to do.
- The Council was also working with the Cannock and Hednesford branches of the Salvation Army, the Cannock and Rugeley Foodbanks and other voluntary organisations in the District to provide support if needed
- For the seven-day period up to 6 November, the number of positive cases of Covid-19 in the District was 322.5 per 100,000 people. Although a high rate, it was currently the lowest in Staffordshire relative to other local authority areas in the County, following a period of the District having the highest case numbers. For those individuals aged 60+, the rate was 261.2 cases per 100,000, which was below the District average.
- There were approximately 103 open incidents in the District, two of which were regarded as high risk because of what was involved. One was in a working men's club and the other a nursing home.
- Testing rates for the District were currently 435.8 per 100,000 people: the fifth highest rate in Staffordshire and above the regional average. Of those tested, the positivity rate was 11.6%, slightly below the regional average. The testing centre located at the Civic Centre site, was well utilised, and the Council had been working hard with partners to establish an equivalent centre in Rugeley,

an application for which had been submitted to the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) this week. Additionally, ad-hoc testing sessions were also taking place, with one arranged at the Norton Canes Community Centre on 13 November.

- Staffordshire had been selected as one of 67 pilot areas for lateral flow testing to be conducted. Such tests gave results in only 20 to 30 mins, thus provided a fast way to test the local population. Work was underway with colleagues at Staffordshire County Council (SCC) on the necessary arrangements for the pilot.
- At the end of the current lockdown Staffordshire would be put back into one of the restriction tiers, but the level chosen would depend on case rates and other factors. An assessment on this was expected to be made at the end of November or right at the beginning of December.
- Issues related to the pandemic were expected to continue for some months, and the usual winter pressures experienced by the NHS had yet been seen. The next few months would be especially challenging for all of the public sector, and the Council was working with all relevant organisations in Staffordshire to ensure the right actions were being taken to mitigate the impact and spread of Coronavirus.

The Vice-Chairman thanked all Council staff for their fantastic efforts to support residents, businesses and the wider community, and noted that although current figures were a cause for concern, the data was moving in the right direction, but the community must need to keep working hard to try and achieve some semblance of normality before Christmas time.

In response to a query from a Member concerning the number of open incidents across the District, the Managing Director advised that a comparison couldn't be made to the first lockdown as an operational system for testing was not in place until the end of that period.

Another Member also thanked the Council staff for their work during the pandemic, even when issues were not as critical, noting that it was appreciated by all Members.

In response to a query from the same Member concerning the operation of the national and local test and trace systems and whether there was any pressure on Council staff to support the national scheme, the Managing Director advised that it was a complex and complicated system, with multiple different elements each operating specific aspects of it. The local level system was however working well in terms of successful contacts made. In terms of staffing pressures, much of the workload was between the Public Health function at SCC and this Council's Environmental Health team. Both parts of these teams were under a fair bit of pressure at present, and if several staff were tested positive and/or had to self-isolate then this would really impact what work could be done.

Another Member too thanked the Council staff for their work, along with Dr Richard Harling, Staffordshire Director of Public Health, and the SCC Cabinet member for Health, Care and Wellbeing, Johnny McMahon.

In response to a query from the same Member concern clusters and locations of positive cases in the District, the Managing Director advised that there were some restrictions on what could be disclosed in terms of specific facilities and streets, but the highest case rates a few weeks ago were in Cannock town centre wards, whereas as at 6 November, the Hednesford North area was now top of the list. Household transmission was a significant feature across the District, and most schools had been impacted, both at primary and secondary level. This was not just about pupils and staff with positive cases, but also affected those who were required to self-isolate.

5. Improving Community Wellbeing (Environment, Partnerships & Community Safety) Priority Delivery Plan Performance Update – Q1 and Q2 2020/21

The Committee received the latest performance information for the Priority Delivery Plan (Item 5.1 – 5.6).

The Managing Director advised that the performance information was as presented, and the Partnerships, Community Safety & CCTV Manager and Waste & Engineering Services Manager were both in attendance should any specific queried be raised.

The Partnerships, Community Safety & CCTV Manager reported that the work of the team had increased during the pandemic, but support from external and internal partners had improved drastically, which was a positive outcome from this situation.

In response to a query from a Member concerning the performance indicator for 'Number of Tenancies Sustained', the Committee was advised that a response would be sought from colleagues in Housing and circulated to Members via email once known.

In response to a query from the same Member concerning an update on the Council's climate change work, the Waste & Engineering Services Manager advised that carbon literacy training had been arranged for relevant Officers and Members to book onto, and progress made on producing a costed action plan. The last piece of work to complete would be the citizens assembly.

In response to a query from the same Member concerning the reporting of vulnerabilities and how had this related to Covid-19, the Partnership, Community Safety & CCTV Manager advised that the department was working closely with the Environmental Health team on relevant issues, but referrals were coming through the normal mechanisms via the Community Safety Hub. Awareness raising was also happening from a Safeguarding perspective. There had been a number of cases during the first lockdown where the issues involved were more complex for a number of reasons.

In response to a query from another Member regarding the increase in good news stories, the Partnerships, Community Safety & CCTV Manager advised that work had been undertaken with the Council's Communications team to put out positive information and increase the use of social media platforms to get messages out. The ASB Worker had been helping out young people in the District back into education and employment opportunities. The aim was to ensure greater contact with residents through all available media channels and trying to celebrate success where possible and signpost services.

In response to a query from the same Member as to whether the issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) included breaches of Covid-19 regulations, the Partnerships, Community Safety & CCTV Manager advised that the team did not issue FPNs for such matters. The Managing Director further advised that Officers would look at how this data could be collated and inserted into the report as it was useful for Members to be aware of.

6. Covid-19 Recovery Strategy

The Committee considered the Council's Covid-19 Recovery Strategy and associated action plans (Item 6.1 – 6.15).

The Managing Director advised that the strategy and its associated plans were relevant as the Council would move out of response phase again, and there would be a longer-term legacy impact from the pandemic on the Council and the District.

Key issues for the Committee's awareness under each of the four work streams were:

- **Financial recovery:** The Council was facing a deficit funding position. Although central government grant support of circa £2m had been provided, this was in comparison to a deficit in the region of £3m. It was expected that the Council would end this financial year £700,000 in the red, with the funding gap being covered by earmarked reserves. The pandemic had destroyed income levels, so the speed of financial recovery would be dependent on wider economic recovery.
- **Economic recovery:** Unemployment would be a semi-permanent feature for the District. Pre-Covid levels were the lowest ever seen and consistently below the regional average, so it had not been a massive issue over recent years. Now however the District had moved back to facing issues of unemployment, and the Council was working with businesses to support employment opportunities.

The District had a very high number of small businesses in operation, many of which suffered major cashflow problems during the first wave of the pandemic, so whilst there was a need to see what the impact from the second wave would be, the full impact wouldn't become clear until during 2021, particular after the end of the extended furlough scheme.

- Community recovery: The position on this was more positive, with a renewed focus on supporting vulnerable people and strengthened relations with the voluntary sector in the District, which would need to be maintained going moving forward.
- Organisational recovery: The pandemic had changed working practices for the Council (such as holding committees via 'Zoom'), and 80% of staff had been consistently working from home and doing well at it. As such, this raised questions about the need for physical office space. Staff had made use of new technologies and adapted to new ways of working, so it was important to keep this going. Crucially, the public had been able to keep in contact with the Council despite the continued closure of the reception services, and no complaints had been received so far about this. Finally, a cross-party Recovery Overview Board had been established that would receive regular, detailed updates on the delivery of the four action plans.

In response to a query from a Member concerning the use of reserves to support the finances and whether the Council would look to extend shared services or cut frontline services in the near future, the Managing Director advised that the use of reserves was not a sustainable solution, but would help the Council for the next 18 months. In terms of savings, no options were off the table for Members to consider and make decisions about. The situation was not helped by continued uncertainty about the future of local government funding, and so the Council had to be responsible and prudent by looking at all options to avoid deficits in the long-term.

In response to a query from a Member regarding engagement with the voluntary sector and how this would be continued going forward (including with parish and town councils), the Managing Director advised that pre-pandemic, the Council and the voluntary sector operated very differently from one another, but the events of this year had brought the two sides together, with strong relationships being built and expected to continue. It had been recognised that the Council should not rush into doing things that other organisations were better positioned to do, but conversely, there were certain things the Council could do and influence that voluntary groups could not.

A Member reported on a 'Pavement Parade' that took place on 8 November for Remembrance Sunday, the aim of which was to support those who could not attend a service this year due to social distancing restrictions in force. The parade had been extremely well supported and was covered by BBC Midlands Today, who as part of their broadcast interviewed a 100-year-old nurse who had served in Africa during World War 2.

The meeting closed at 5:13 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

Cannock Chase Council

Minutes of the Call-In Meeting of the

Community Scrutiny Committee

Held on Monday 8 March 2021 at 4:00pm

Via Remote Access

PART 1

Present:

Councillors

Jones, B. (Vice-Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.	Hewitt, P.M.
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (substitute)	Smith, C.D.
Davis, Mrs. M.A.	Thompson, Mrs. S.L.
Dunnett, Ms. A.J.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Witton, P.T.
Fitzgerald, Mrs. A.A. (substitute)	Woodhead, P.E.

Councillors Supporting the Call-in Request:

- Hughes, R.J.*
- Johnson, J.P.
- Lyons, Miss O.*

Invitees (from Cannock Chase District Council):

- Mr. R. Kean, Deputy Managing Director and Head of Finance
- Mr. M. Edmonds, Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles
- Mr. D. Piper, Head of Economic Prosperity
- Councillor J.A.A. Newbury, Environment and Climate Change Portfolio Leader
- Councillor A.S. Boucker
- Councillor P.D. Startin
- Councillor M. Sutherland
- Councillor Mrs. C.E. Martin*

Invitees (from Rugeley Town Council):

- Councillor B. Dipple

*District Councillors Hughes, Lyons and Martin are also members of Rugeley Town Council.

7. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillors C. Bennett (Chairman) and Mrs. H.M. Sutton.

Councillors Mrs. S.M. Cartwright and Mrs. A.A. Fitzgerald were in attendance as substitutes for Councillor Bennett and Council Sutton, respectively.

In the Chairman's absence the meeting was chaired by Councillor B. Jones (Vice-Chairman).

8. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restrictions on Voting by Members and Party Whip Declarations

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

Councillor P.E. Woodhead reported that as Hednesford Town Council was directly referenced in the paperwork for agenda item 3, he, and Councillor Ms. A.J. Dunnett, were both current members of Hednesford Town Council.

9. Call-In Request: Car Parking Charges in Rugeley

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles (Item 3.1 – 3.20 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Councillor C.D. Smith read out and proposed the Motion as set out in paragraph 3.7 of the report, which was duly seconded by Councillor Mrs. S.M. Thompson.

The supporters of the call-in then spoke in turn, outlining their reasons as to why the motion should be supported, which covered the following matters:

- Traders and shoppers needed to be supported, especially with non-essential retail premises due to reopen from 12 April, but it was considered that the current timescales for the Cabinet's proposals did not support this work.
- This matter was about fairness as there were inconsistencies in the application of parking policy across the District, with Council Taxpayers in areas that didn't have free parking having to subsidise it for areas that did.
- Hednesford Town Council had been allowed to have an arrangement in place for free car parking, but a similar request from Rugeley Town Council was rejected. This was not intended as a criticism of Hednesford Town Council as they had clearly sought to have the best policy in place to support their local residents and traders, the criticism was aimed at the wider parking policy for the District.
- There were no details provided about the Cabinet's proposed trial scheme.
- Post-Covid recovery was key, and time was of the essence in terms of addressing the economic damage caused by the pandemic. There wasn't

the flexibility to undertaken feasibility studies and take reports through various meetings – this issue needed to be dealt with straight away to support struggling businesses.

The Vice-Chairman then opened the matter up for debate by the Committee, with the following points being raised by Members:

- The Cabinet report referenced the financial impact and potential income losses of the request from Rugeley Town Council, but it was considered the financial gap may not be as wide as the report suggested.
- The Conservative Group could have included the proposal as part its Alternative Budget recently presented to Council, but did not, so it was hard to see where the funding would come from to support it.
- Everywhere would like free car parking, but the reality was most town centres now had paid for parking. The comparisons between the Rugeley Town Council offer and the situation in Hednesford were unfair as Hednesford Town Council had funded free parking in the town for many years now via a legal agreement with the District Council. As such, if it was considered that free car parking couldn't be supported across the District then shoppers and businesses in Hednesford would be penalised, and the Council's income affected as visitors would likely use the free car parks at Tesco and Aldi instead.
- To ensure fairness, this matter should be considered as part of the annual budget cycle so the financial implications and wider impact could be properly assessed and considered.
- If free parking was to be offered in Rugeley, then Cannock also needed to be looked at.
- It wasn't the case that the Conservative Group didn't support free parking in Hednesford, and nor would they want to penalise those who already had access to that provision. Clarity was needed as to whether car parking income was ring fenced and whether any studies had been done to look at the impact of free parking options in Rugeley. A fresh look was needed at the car parking provision in the District as the town centres needed to be unique and support the businesses and residents using them.

The Head of Finance confirmed that car parking income was not ring fenced and formed part of the General Fund budget. Any specific proposals for improvement works would be put through the capital programme.

The Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles confirmed that studies had not been undertaken due to the Council dealing with the pandemic, but this matter would have been picked up as part of the car parking strategy review included in the new Corporate Plan.

- Several other councils had worked with businesses in their areas to devise an incentive scheme to provide all or some of a shopper's car parking for free if they shopped in that area. This was something this Council could conceivably look at and would take much time to do so.

The following questions were then raised with the Environment and Climate Change Portfolio Leader, to which he replied in turn (responses shown in *italics*):

- Did Councillor Dudson speak to you about his attendance at the Rugeley Town Council meeting last year and what was subsequently proposed?

Aware that he was attending the meeting, but car parking matters were not discussed as this only came up whilst the meeting was taken place.

- What was the view on the concerns raised about the timescales for completing the work agreed by the Cabinet?

The Hednesford Town Council arrangement was agreed in a different time, but the focus now had to be about what the Council could do going forward to support businesses, hence why the review would have proper processes and options for consideration.

- What was the rationale for the wording in the final sentence of the reasons for the Cabinet's decision of 28 January?

The Cabinet's view was that free car parking could be used by commuters travelling to other areas, thereby taking up spaces that could be used by local shoppers. Also did not want to encourage behaviours that would not support the recovery of businesses in the town centres, hence the need for the review to look at wider impacts on hospitality and leisure too, and the best way forward.

- As referenced in paragraph 6.4 of the Cabinet report, what package of support measures were being considered?

This was outside the scope of the portfolio area, but more use of the 'ShopAppy' scheme could be encouraged to help more local businesses advertise online and the Council could promote the town centres and businesses in the area. The Economic Development team did this on an ongoing basis throughout the year, and the new Corporate Plan included a number of objectives linked toward economic recovery etc.

The Head of Economic Prosperity further advised that the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic needed to be properly assessed, but Officers were looking at the marketing of the town centres, including the holding of markets and other events, and other options for regeneration. Much of the focus over the past year had been supporting businesses through the payments of different grant funding schemes, with a further scheme announced in the Government's budget last week.

- Issues had been raised about the timing of the Cabinet's proposal and the need to support businesses as soon as possible post pandemic.

The Council should be doing everything it could to help businesses bounce back, but it was still unclear at this stage how businesses would be affected going forward. It was therefore prudent to look at the impact and assess how best to help rather than putting in knee jerk reactions on specific aspects without looking at the wider picture. Officers were trusted to look at what could be done to provide support.

- Had there been any review of the arrangements agreed with Hednesford Town Council since they were first put in place?

Having spoken to Officers it was understood that a review took place in 2008 that encompassed a wider review of car parking in the District. The review recommended that no action be taken.

The debate then continued, with the following further points being raised:

- Relationships with parish and town councils needed to be fostered, regardless of the outcome of this meeting, and embraced by both Members and Officers. It was understood that Rugeley Town Council had been given an offer on the same basis as the Hednesford Town Council agreement some years ago, but this was declined.
- It was vital for areas to work together hence why other Members were supportive of Rugeley. Cannock did not have similar support due to not having its own town council, so a much wider review was needed than proposed by Cabinet.
- Further to an earlier comment about an incentive scheme, the Cabinet decision of 28 January set out that a trial scheme be looked at to refund parking for shoppers using the town centres.
- Agree with previous comments raised about lack of representation for Cannock, with its local voice being taken away when the Community Forums were abolished. It was noted that a request had been made recently for Beecroft Road car park to be resurfaced, but this was unlikely to be done as the site featured in the wider redevelopment proposals for the town centre.
- There was an urgency to addressing this matter, particularly as it was now over 10 years since the last review occurred. Businesses did not have the time wait for the outcome of a feasibility study as they needed help now. The District Council had representation across all the town centres, so if a fair policy had been applied then this matter would not be an issue.

The Environment and Climate Change Portfolio Leader, Councillor J.A.A. Newbury, gave his right of reply to the debate, raising the following points:

- The Cabinet report set out the key income issues that had to be accounted

for when considered the request from Rugeley Town Council, which if accepted, would result in lost income of circa £37,000 and also prevent the Council being able to claim against the Government's Income Guarantee Scheme. Furthermore, the purchase of new pay & display machines for the Rugeley based car parks, at a cost of £98,000, also had to be taken into consideration as these were purchased before the Town Council made its request.

- In respect of the Hednesford Town Council arrangement, this was as part of a legal agreement put in place a number of years ago and there was no desire to remove this arrangement from them. It was understood that a similar offer was to Rugeley Town Council at the same time but was declined.
- The long-term impact of the pandemic also needed to be factored in, as well as the expectation that the move to online shopping would be accelerated.
- Any decisions regarding parking provision across the District should not be rushed into and be evidence led based on the views of shoppers and traders.
- There was a need to undertake a thorough and holistic review of car parking, hence why a full review was planned for 2021 which would inform a revised car parking strategy for the Council.
- The Council wanted to work with parish and town councils to support economic recovery and didn't want to dismiss Rugeley Town Council's offer out of hand, hence why Cabinet made the decision it did.
- There was also a need to be mindful of the commitment to carbon neutrality, hence the provision of free car parking could be seen as an incentive to drive into town centres rather than using other means of transport.
- The Conservative Group's Alternative Budget as presented to Council 10 February made no mention of including the proposal being considered by the Committee in the budget for 2021/22.
- Members had raised concern about the work capacity of Officers, but it had to be noted that dealing with the request from Rugeley Town Council and the arrangements for this meeting had taken up a lot of Officers time when they were having to deal with many other issues at present.
- Cabinet knew this was a difficult time for the Council's finances, so it was expected a package of support measures would be needed for the District rather than one-off policies.
- The Committee was therefore asked to reject the proposal before it today and support the work already planned and ongoing.

Councillor C.D. Smith gave his right of reply to debate, raising the following points:

- He was not claiming the incentive scheme for refunds of car parking as an original idea but was fully supportive of it being taken forward.
- The current Administration of the Council had had twelve years pre-pandemic to look at this issue and had not done so.
- A motion presented to Council last year from the Conservative Group about reviewing car parking charges had been voted down at the time.
- By the time the work was done as proposed by the Cabinet, businesses closures and loss of business rates to the Council would far outweigh any losses in car parking income.

The original motion as moved by Councillor Smith and seconded by Councillor Thompson was then put to a vote.

Resolved:

That the Cabinet decision of 28 January 2021 (minute no. 67) in respect of Car Parking Charges in Rugeley **not** be referred to full Council.

A further vote was then taken to instead refer the matter back to Cabinet for reconsideration:

Resolved:

That the Cabinet decision of 28 January 2021 (minute no. 67) in respect of Car Parking Charges in Rugeley **not** be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration.

Accordingly, the decision of the Cabinet meeting held on 28 January 2021 (minute no. 67 of the minutes of that meeting), stood as agreed by Cabinet and could now be implemented.

The meeting closed at 5:43 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

**Community Wellbeing Priority Delivery Plan 2020/21 - Environment, Partnerships and Community Safety –
As at 31 December 2020**

Delivery of actions for Q3				
				Total Number of Actions
Action completed	Work in progress but slightly behind schedule. Action will be completed in next Quarter.	Action > 3 months / 1 Quarter behind schedule and action is required to address slippage	Action / project cannot be completed / delivered. Option to close to be agreed by Leadership Team / Cabinet.	
19	3	4	0	26

Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Frequency of reporting (Q or A)	Last year's outturn	Target	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Sustaining safe and secure communities							
Number of good news stories / case studies (including social media platforms)	A	65	4	33	24	31	
Number of Community Protection Notice Warnings (CPNWs) issued	Q	58	New Indicator Last Year	4	1	9	
Number of Community Protection Notices (CPNs) issued	Q	11	New Indicator Last Year	1	0	0	
Number of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) issued	Q	4	New Indicator Last Year	0	0	0	
Number of ASB complaints dealt with via the Community Safety Hub	Q	90	Measure (not target)	46	42	27	
Number of CCTV case reviews provided to Staffordshire Police	Q	505	Measure (not target)	73	101	61	
Support vulnerable people							
Increased number of referrals to the Community Safety Hub	Q	262	Measure (not target)	87	77	76	
Increased number of safeguarding concerns cards referred to the Community Safety Hub – hard copy	Q	2	New Indicator Last Year	0	0	0	
Number of Community Safety Hub referrals escalated to the First Response Team (children safeguarding) including emails received via safeguarding email	Q	51	New Indicator Last Year	13	17	18	

Performance Indicator	Frequency of reporting (Q or A)	Last year's outturn	Target	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Number of Community Safety Hub referrals escalated to the Vulnerable Adults Team (adult safeguarding) including emails received via safeguarding email	Q	107	New Indicator Last Year	31	36	47	
Number of tenancies sustained	Q	77	Measure (not target)	2	12	13	
% of Assessments completed for households presenting where the household is homeless or threatened with homelessness within 56 days	Q	93.3%	95%	94.7%	96%	99%	
Number of Discretionary Housing Payments awards	Q	£96,264 184 cases	£141,262	£ 18,286 79 cases	£ 31,518 84 cases		
Promoting attractive and healthy environments							
Retain 6 Green Flags	A	6	6	6			
Number of fly tipping incidents	Q	406	131 (average for a quarter)	186	166	87	

Projects

Approach	Key Project	Milestone(s)	Comments	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
<i>Sustaining safe and secure communities</i>							
We will work with partners to ensure our licensing compliance and enforcement strategies for persons, premises and vehicles are risk based and make best use of local intelligence	Review of compliance and enforcement policies in key areas of taxi and private hire licensing and sale of alcohol	Review responses to consultation on taxi policy	Policy is now aligned with key requirements of national guidance and consultation commenced 22.01.21				
		With Stafford BC, update, and consult on, Statement of Licensing Policy under Licensing Act 2003	Revised Policy prepared and consultation exercise complete				
		Produce revised Policy for adoption by Council	See above. It is now expected that a revised policy will be presented for adoption in Q4.				X
<i>Support vulnerable people</i>							
We will work with colleagues, partners and residents to raise awareness of safeguarding vulnerable adults and children (See Something Say Something)	Prevent project	Funding for delivery of phase 2 (Primary Schools)	Funding has been secured and project rolled out virtually to schools.				
		Identify schools to deliver phase 2	Secondary school Prevent initiative is due to be rolled out across the County				
		Deliver Phase 2	Continued delays awaiting update and steer from SCC				
	County Lines Initiative	Research good practice across Staffordshire and West Midlands					
		Secure funding to raise awareness regarding early intervention and prevention	1 st project meeting has taken place with really good attendance from key stakeholders				

Approach	Key Project	Milestone(s)	Comments	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
		Develop initiative plan	A multi-agency project group has been set up to lead this initiative.			✓	
		Deliver County Lines initiative	Despite the implications of the pandemic this initiative is now to be delivered in a different (virtual) way launching Feb 2021.			●	
	SPACE 2020	Secure funding for targeted and universal offer	Space 2020 has predominantly been organised via the Commissioner's Office and was essentially agreed to go ahead.	✓			
		Commission providers for diversionary activities	Funding secured and Achieving Goals & Dreams commissioned via the Commissioner's Office to deliver during the 6 weeks holiday		✓		
		Deliver project	Complete		✓		
<i>Promoting attractive and healthy environments</i>							
To provide clean, well maintained and well managed streets, town centres and parks & open spaces	New Cemetery for the District.	Finalise Contractor appointment for civil works and Reception Building	Finalised after Cabinet Report on 21 May 2020 approved	✓			
		Permission to Spend Report to Cabinet	Cabinet considered and approved the recommendations on 21 May 2020	✓			
		Start on site – Civils	Works started on site in June 2020	✓			
		Start on site – Reception Building	Works started on the Reception Building (off site) and electrics and utilities works for the building scheduled for Q3.		✓		

Approach	Key Project	Milestone(s)	Comments	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
		Completion of Works (Civils and Reception Building)	Some delays in sourcing materials have been experienced as a result of the pandemic. Completion of the civils and building likely to be in Q4.				
		Opening	As a consequence, the opening is likely to slip into Q1 2021-22 to coincide with the opening of the new private Crematorium				
Car Park improvement	New and improved ticket machines	Prepare Specifications and Tender Documents	Specifications and relevant documents completed				
		Procure, evaluate and contract award	Procurement process agreed with the County Council and following evaluation direct award confirmed to preferred provider (Ticket Machines and Pay by Phone option)				
		Install machines					
<i>To aim to become net carbon neutral by 2030</i>							
Undertake analysis and public engagement to prepare a costed 10-year climate change emergency action plan	Carbon Literacy Training	Complete Carbon Literacy training for all Elected Member and Senior Managers	Training has been put on hold following discussions with the training provider and to re-scheduled for Q3 and Q4				
	Commission baseline study and technical assessment		Baseline study was commissioned during Q1				
	Complete baseline study and technical assessment of options		Baseline study completed. Report and findings circulated to all Members on 9 th November 2020				

Item No. 4.7

Approach	Key Project	Milestone(s)	Comments	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
	Commission Citizens Assembly and other engagement work to consider options and feed into action plan.		Discussions have been undertaken in respect of this work with commissioning to be confirmed in Q4 and completion re-scheduled for 2021-22				▲
	10 year costed action plan for the District	Climate Change Emergency action plan - Report to Cabinet	Completion of costed action has been rescheduled to feed into Assembly discussion in 2021/22				▲

THE COMMUNITY RECOVERY ACTION PLAN

SUPPORTING VULNERABLE PEOPLE AND THE COMMUNITY

<p>Outcomes Required: To support the Districts community & individual recovery in the short-medium term To maximise the benefit of any legacy from the increase in the voluntary activity</p>
<p>COVID-19 Impacts: Pop up of multi aid groups (900+ volunteers) which have helped and supported huge numbers of individuals across the District with shopping, prescription collections, befriending etc. The full impact on the community and individuals will not be known for some-time – situation will need to be monitored</p>

Recovery Work Stream	Action	Lead Officer and Timescale	Comments	Progress indicator
Supporting Vulnerability People and the Community				
Phase 1 – Response				
	Set up and operation of the Community Hub to support vulnerable residents	Head of Housing & Partnerships		
	Identify the Vunerable cohort within the District	Head of ICT & Housing & Partnerships	7,500 residents identified – 4,700 letters mailed out	
	Undertake Safe and Well being calls	Head of Housing & Partnerships	3,000 calls completed – 52% contact made Calls have recommenced @ February 21 – 97 calls per fortnight are being made to CEV	
	Undertake home visits to vulnerable residents (living alone) who have not responded	Head of Housing & Partnerships	CEV residents home visits undertaken by PCSOs	
	Advice and support regarding payment of Council Tax, Housing Benefit applications	Local Taxation & Benefits Manager	On-going	

Recovery Work Stream	Action	Lead Officer and Timescale	Comments	Progress indicator
Phase 2 – Restore				
	Develop a delivery plan to support the continuation of support to those on the NHS Shielding scheme for the duration of the programme	Policy & Performance Officer		
	Continue to work with Support Staffordshire and Voluntary Sector to support and signpost the most vulnerable residents within the District	Policy & Performance Officer	On-going	
	Review ongoing support to food banks and local emergency food distribution	Head of Housing & Partnerships	January 21 - £12.5k funding allocation made	
Phase 3 – Reshape				
	Work with partners and internal services to establish the best means of identifying vulnerable residents and support providers	Head of Housing & Partnerships / Head of Technology	Determine Vulnerability Definition – for the purposes of responding to the 2 nd Wave the CEV category has been adopted.	
	Develop a strategy, working alongside the third sector, to build on community spirit and volunteering to establish ongoing support in local communities	Head of Housing & Partnerships / Consultation & Engagement Officer	Regular meetings in place with voluntary sector – building links through Support Staffordshire	
	Engage with partners regarding their recovery plans for their services and our communities	Head of Housing & Partnerships	SCC attend regular meeting with the voluntary sector & Support Staffordshire	

ORGANISATIONAL RECOVERY ACTION PLAN

SERVICES – EXTERNAL / KEY CONTRACTS

Services – External
Outcomes Required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure continuity of critical services at all times; • To restore services suspended or reduced during the lockdown and identify those that will not be delivered in future.
COVID-19 Impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste Collection Service has experienced an increase in waste and contaminated loads • Contact Centre and Waste Staff experienced an increase in calls and abuse • Loss of IHL Memberships and Income

Recovery Work Stream	Action	Lead Officer and Timescale	Comments	Progress Indicator
Phase 1 – Response				
Leadership Team	Suspension of all Leisure & Cultural Services – some of IHL’s staff supporting the work on the Community Hub	Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles		
Leadership Team	Management of issues arising from impact of COVID-19 on the Waste Contract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tonnage restrictions at MRF Site 	Waste & Engineering Services Manager	The Council, in partnership with other affected Staffordshire LAs, rejected tonnage restrictions and together following the re-opening of the HWRC’s, the restriction proposals were withdrawn.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase in contaminated and rejected loads 		Awareness sticker campaign on all recycled bins to be undertaken Mid-August 2020	

Phase 3 – Reshape				
Leadership Team	Determine interim strategy to realign waste contracts	Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles Waste & Engineering Services Manager	Impact on operation of services and financial Opportunity to realign contracts is linked to current procurement exercise – January 2021	
Leadership Team	To determine a Waste Management Strategy following outcome of Government consultation and Waste Strategy. (from the Community Wellbeing – Environment, Partnerships and Community Safety PDP)	Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles Waste & Engineering Services Manager	Outcomes from Waste Strategy consultation still unknown (Jan 2021) Impact on operation of services and financial	
Leadership Team	To commence procurement process for waste collection	Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles Waste & Engineering Services Manager	Joint tender exercise with other Staffordshire LA's Report to Cabinet is underway (January 2021) with evaluations to be completed during Feb/March 2021.	