

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

1st March 2011 at 6.05 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Neale (Chair); Councillors Bullock, Burnett, Gale, Rutstein and Stewart.

CO-OPTED MEMBER Mr. P. Jerred

22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (REF: 1)

Apologies for absence from the meeting were received on behalf of Councillors Dolling and Garrett, and Ms J. Chipperton (Co-opted Diocesan Representative).

23 CHAIR'S UPDATE (REF: 3)

The Chair had nothing to report under this item.

24 OVERVIEW: REVIEW OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES IN LUTON, ONE YEAR ON OF SEPT (REF: 7)

Sally Morris, Director of Operations and Declan Jacob, Director of Mental Health Bedfordshire & Luton gave a presentation gave in regards to SEPT MH Services, one year on and future plans for Luton and Bedfordshire.

The Service Transformation objectives were to introduce a service model that was supported by strong clinical evidence and 'best practice'. There would also be clustering of key inpatient services together and more effective use of scarce resources.

Members were informed that by strengthening community services and clustering inpatient services to make them clinically safer and more responsive would:

- Make recovery the main focus of care
- Improve patient and public safety
- Increase service quality
- Enhance patient experience
- Provide better value for money
- Replace buildings that were outdated, not appropriately situated or up to modern standards
- Ensure services were not isolated from each other and difficult to access

It was added that in order to make the better use of scarce resources, SEPT would:

- Release unnecessary spend in buildings to improve frontline clinical services, especially community services
- Increase the ratio of assessment beds to reduce inappropriate admissions
- Linking primary, community and social care services together in localities
- Introduce flexible working to ensure services respond flexibly to the needs of patients in the community

The Board were informed that a 60 day public consultation carried out by SEPT had ended on the 20th December 2010, where it was found that there was overwhelming support for the four key aims and seven proposals for transforming Mental Health in Bedfordshire and Luton. The consultation findings had been approved by the JHOSC on the 21st January 2011, and that the outcome of the Formal Public Consultation had also been approved by NHS Bedfordshire Board.

Declan Jacob, Director of Mental Health Bedfordshire & Luton added that there were key milestones in the programme that were hoped to be in place by March 2011. These services proposals included:

- Proposal 1 - Moving Townsend Court to Robin Pinto 2 Ward
- Proposal 3 - Moving Poplar Ward to Calnwood Court
- Proposal 4 - Moving Beech Ward to Townsend Court
- Proposal 5 - Milton Ward (Weller Wing) to Fountains Court, Bedford

He added that Proposal 2 was to move Oakley Court to Limetress by March 2012. It was also anticipated that that Proposal 6 (Move Chaucer Ward (Weller Wing) to Cedar House) and Proposal 7 (move Keats Ward, Phoenix Unit, Section 136 (Weller Wing) to a New Build at Bedford Health Village) by December 2012.

In regards to proposals from Bedfordshire and Luton Commissioners, there was a potential divestment from 2012/13 that included:

- Well Being and Personalisation
- Bed Requirement
- Dementia Services
- CMHT Redesign
- LD Physical and Mental Health Pathways

As part of SEPT's transformation milestones, Year one centred around enabling community streams, and included:

- Bedford Heights Exit Strategy – completed November 2010
- Community Relocations to Charter House – completed December 2010

Members were informed that the key achievements of SEPT were:

- Introducing Single Point of Access for community Services offering same day triage and rapid response
- Short term treatment options and longer term recovery service
- Significant reduction in CAMH waiting times
- Rated in the top 20% for patient satisfaction in 2009 national inpatient survey
- SEPT one of the top performers in voluntary 2010 inpatient survey
- Establishing Acute Assessment units – reduction in length of stay and enhanced crisis and home treatment pathway
- Major environmental improvements across Trust Services
- Section 136 suites opened
- Shortlisted for National Patient Safety Awards 2010
- SHA commended for Infection Control

The achievements and success in Learning Disabilities Services included:

- Proposals developed for a new community-based Health Facilitation Service across Bedfordshire
- Development of the Access to Acute Services service

Sally Morris, Director of Operations reported that as part of SEPT's developments, its plans for the future fell into two areas, Locality Services across the Spectrum of Care and Enhancing the Primary/Secondary Care Interface.

The Locality Services across the Spectrum of Care incorporated:

- Closer links with Intermediate Care Services
- Older People and Adolescent Mental Health Services
- Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services
- Substance Misuse and Dual Diagnosis Services
- Specialist Learning Disability Services

The Enhancing the Primary/Secondary Care Interface would incorporate:

- Capacity to work differently with Primary Care in the future
- Supporting primary care colleagues and acting as a bridge between services:
 - Primary Care Facing
 - Assessment, advice and management
 - Facilitating safe discharges into primary care teams
 - Fast Track into Secondary Care when indicated
 - Proposed pilot sites

The Chair enquired to what extent early intervention would be identified.

Declan Jacob, Director of Mental Health Bedfordshire & Luton replied that the burden of mental illness fell within primary care. He added that one in four patients who consulted their G.P's had mental health issues. Sally Morris, Director of Operations added that the Dementia Service was also being looked at, as early detection allowed people to prepare for the onset of dementia. She added that this would also generate financial savings as the long term burden of the illness was reduced as Luton had traditionally under invested in this particular area.

The Chair enquired how SEPT could measure how realistic its performance targets were.

Sally Morris replied that a performance monitoring reports was submitted on a monthly basis detailing any hotspot areas, and that a more in-depth report was submitted quarterly which were publically available. She added that surveys had indicated that areas around in patients were good but that community issues needed improvement. Also, service user meetings were held where 'soft' information could be fed back.

A Member welcomed the proposed clustering of services by SEPT, but raised concern that no provision for a hospital in the Bedford Village had been identified.

Sally Morris, replied that by clustering services, it would allow SEPT to deliver the service that it wanted to. She added that SEPT wanted to locate all acute services together; therefore hospital services would not be required on the Bedford Village site. She added that SEPT would still maintain a presence at the A & E in Luton and Dunstable Hospital, with a nominated nurse in the Crisis Team.

Resolved: (i) That Sally Morris, Director of Operations and Declan

Jacob, Director of Mental Health Bedfordshire & Luton be thanked for their presentation.

(ii) That a further Report on SEPT be submitted to the September meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board.

(Note: Councillor Gale declared a Personal but not prejudicial interest in Salaried Dental Services as he was a Member of SEPT.)

25 OVERVIEW: REVIEW OF THE JOB CREATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY TASK AND FINISH GROUP (REF: 8)

The Chair of the Job Creation and Economic Growth Scrutiny Task and Finish Group. He expressed the thanks of the Group to all those involved and particularly the LSP Performance Officer. He advised that the final report would be submitted to the Executive meeting to be held on 28th March.

Members were informed that five meetings in total had been held to gather information. Unfortunately, there had been a very limited number of people giving evidence but information gathered was of a high quality. He went on to say that the Group chose to scrutinise practical and down to earth issues including attracting businesses to Luton and the quality of jobs. Also, the Group looked at the infrastructure of Luton and came to the conclusion that it was everyone's responsibility to bring prosperity to the town.

The Chair of the Job Creation and Economic Growth Scrutiny Task and Finish Group commented that the Group as a whole felt despair in regards to certain issues such as the M1 Junction 10A, Power Court and Napier Park as the Group, that these areas could be addressed more quickly.

In regards to transport, the Task and Finish Group had received lots of feedback commenting that the bus companies in the town were not in touch with the needs of Luton. It was also suggested that a travel card could be issued in order to promote public transport. He added that although the guided bus way and interchange would be good for the town, they would not necessarily encourage economic growth.

Members of the Board commented that the final report on Job Creation and Economic Growth was one of the best reports that had been submitted to the Board.

A Member commented that although the report highlighted the issue

of education and training, it did not mention the Sixth Form College.

The Chair of the Job Creation and Economic Growth Scrutiny Task and Finish Group replied that no evidence had been submitted by the Sixth Form College.

A Member highlighted a couple of minor inaccuracies in the report, these were:

- Land at the railway station would be land swapped and not bought from Network Rail.
- Butterfield Business Park was listed as Butterworth Business Park.

A Member referred to the TOKKO project and raised concern that the aspiration to employ labour from the local area was commendable, it would be unrealistic as the appointed subcontractors employed people from far afield.

A Member raised concern that the town was saturated with food outlets of a similar type, and was pleased that the Task and Finish Group had identified this with a recommendation for Licensing and Planning to try and preventing it.

A Member of the Board, that the report highlighted the need for skills and training. He added that jobs available in Luton needed to advertised locally in the first instance rather the further afield.

Members commented that emphasis needed to be placed on the visual environment impact of the town and its evening economy. Also residents of Luton felt that the town centre was a dull place and needed to be freshen up even further in order to attract new business.

The Chair commented that the report mirrored that of the Tackling Alcohol Related Crime and Disorder Task and Finish Group.

Resolved: (i) That comments and amendments listed above be incorporated in to the Final Report of the Job Creation and Economic Growth Scrutiny Task and Finish Group

(ii) That the Final Report of the Job Creation and Economic Growth Scrutiny Task and Finish Group be approved for submission to the Executive at its meeting on the 28th March 2011.

(iii) That a formal response from the Executive be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Board within two months of its meeting of the 28th

March 2011.

**26 OPERATION OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY: REVIEW OF THE
WORK OF THE FINANCE REVIEW GROUP (REF: 9)**

The Chair of the Finance Review Group informed the Board that the Finance Review Group had considered its performance on the review of the transformation and budget proposals and made the following comments.

As the process had started earlier than in 2009/10, the Group had more opportunities to examine the proposals. Information had been received much earlier than before and at same time as Executive Members. Information that had been provided in confidence, had not been breached at any time, which was a very important issue. It was clear that Executive took the Finance Review Group more seriously than last year.

He added that Members had agreed to examine parts of the tracker, although with limited success.

It was found that the individual tasks allocated had looked too much at specifics, and not enough at umbrella issues of what was being achieved, which was a weakness. Also, it was noted that the Group needed to be more strategic.

The Chair of the Finance Review Group went on to say that although a shared services review was fundamental, very little done on it. He added that more could have been done. Similarly, the I.T project Genesis, was a big spend but had not been looked at.

Some Members thought that the task was too large for the time available and that a larger group was needed to share the burden. He went on to say that next year should be easier, if work started soon after Borough Elections in May 2011. Also the whole structure of the Finance Review Group needed to be reviewed and its work prioritised. There was a need to stand back and take a strategic look at the budget.

Overall, the Group had achieved more than the previous year, but more was needed for next year. In conclusion the Finance Review Group should:

- Consider the potential changes in local government arising from the localism agenda;
- Consider what services the Council and other partners provide;

- Examine progress against the projected budget changes during the year.

The Chair of the Finance Review Group added that the Group's Final Report was presented to Executive on 24th January 2011. The Report contained 16 recommendations: of which 12 had been accepted by Executive, one was the responsibility of Administration Committee, one was a non-Executive function and two were work in progress. He added that Members believed this to be a successful result to the work of the Group. He concluded that the review was the largest scrutiny consultation undertaken by the Council and had involved over 1000 people.

Resolved: That the Report (Ref: 9) be noted.

27 OPERATION AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY: REPORT FROM THE INFORMAL SALARIED DENTAL SERVICES REVIEW PANEL (REF: 10)

The Chair reminded Members that proposal's for change within the Salaried Dental Health Service were considered at the Overview and Scrutiny Board at its meeting on 19th January 2011. The Board considered it then to be a substantial variation for consultation purposes and invited NHS colleagues to provide more details evidence to us, so that the Panel could determine the next step.

The Chair, together with Cllr Margaret Simons, had met informally with a delegation from the NHS on Thursday, 24th February 2011, at the Town Hall.

Members were informed that Patients were referred to the specialist service from their High Street dentists due to physical/ learning disability or mental illness/ anxiety/ phobia. A proportion of anxious patients might be helped with counselling to return to High Street dentists, if assessed as suitable by the specialist dentists, but no one would be forced to do so.

The two sites in Luton (Liverpool Street and Marsh Farm) are not affected as they meet modern infection control standard. So, impact on Luton residents will be minimal;

He further advised that the Dunstable surgery was due for closure, as it was not Disability Discrimination Act compliant. He added that Patients from Luton who went to Dunstable, could re-locate to Houghton Regis or sites in Luton itself, or return to mainstream practices.

However, the Houghton Regis surgery would be modernised and re-opened in order to take cases from Dunstable. It would also be opened

on Sundays and Bank Holidays, and would be able to take more special needs cases from Marsh Farm, to release capacity there.

The Committee were informed that Transport was not provided, but needy patients would be sign-posted to transport provisions. A mobile service was also available for those who could not attend the clinics.

The Chair advised that £1 million savings over 2 years were sought from the proposed changes, affecting about 100 staff across all whole service – not all FTEs. He went on to say that some 20 (not all FTEs) posts would be deleted across all sites, but the exact posts had not yet been identified, and that some posts were vacant. He added that staff would be fully consulted, but all HR processes would be implemented.

There Committee were informed that the proposals would not see any changes in overall number of patients seen. The exact number of sites had not been set, and was awaiting the final business case.

In terms of timing, engagement with service users and their carers would take place up to June 2011 first from all sites. Letters and leaflets would be posted to all patients' home addresses, and that depending on the outcome, changes would start from July 2011.

The Chair concluded that the most impact was in Central Beds, with only one site in Bedford affected. Their O&S committees have been informed. It seems that they will consider if it is a substantial variation after the consultation in June 2011. There appears to be no appetite for a joint health overview and scrutiny committee on this matter at the moment.

Resolved: (i) That Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Board see the consultation documents by week ending 4 March 2011, to provide sufficient time for comments before they go out to the users and their carers.

(ii) The Overview and Scrutiny Board requested that although any impact was less significant in Luton, that it still be kept informed a=of any proposed changes to the Salaried Dental Service.

(iii) That NHS Bedfordshire inform the Overview and Scrutiny Board OSB of analysis and results of the consultation in June 2011.

28 OVERVIEW: BRIEFING ON THE LOCALISM BILL (REF: 11)

The Overview and Scrutiny Manager gave a presentation in regards to the Localism Bill which gave an overview of the governments localism proposals.

The Board was informed that the Localism Bill was published in Autumn 2010 and was currently at the committee stage in the House of Commons. He added that it was therefore likely that it would not be until 2012 before the powers contained within the Bill would come into effect. He went on to say that the underlying aim of the proposals was a shift in power from central government back into the hands of individuals, communities and councils.

Members were notified that main elements of the Bill related to councils included giving them a general power of competence. It would also allow councils to choose to return to the committee system of governance and allowed for referendums for elected mayors in certain authorities. The Bill would also abolish the Standards Board regime, and model code of conduct, and introduce local accountability and a criminal offence of deliberate failure to declare a personnel and prejudicial interest in a matter. He added that residents would be given the power to instigate local referendums on any local issue and the power to veto excessive council tax increases. The Bill would also provide new powers to help save local facilities and services threatened with closure, and would give voluntary and community groups the right to challenge local authorities over their services.

The Overview and Scrutiny Manager added that the Bill linked into the 'Big Society' with communities taking ownership, give power to the lowest level possible and active voluntary citizenship.

In regards to housing provision, the Bill would abolish the requirement for Home Improvement Packs, and reform the Housing Revenue Account System. It would also allow local authorities to discharge their duties to homeless people by using private rented accommodation and the power to limit who could apply for social housing within their areas. He added that the Tenant Services Authority would be abolished and provided for a transfer of functions to the Homes and Communities Agency. It would also amend the way in which a social tenant could make a complaint about their landlord and improve the ability of social tenants to move to different areas.

He went on to say that the planning and regeneration provision of the Bill would abolish Regional Spatial Strategies and the Infrastructure Planning Commission and return to a position where the Secretary of State took the final decision on major infrastructure proposals of national importance. The Community Infrastructure Levy would be amended, which would allow councils to charge developers to pay for infrastructure, with some of the revenue being available for the local community. He added that the neighbourhood would be provided with plans which would be approved if they received 50% of the votes cast in a referendum. Also

neighbourhood development orders would be provided to allow communities to approve development without requiring normal planning consent. However, there was a concern at a national level amongst planning professionals about these changes.

Members were informed that the Local Government Association (LGA) welcomed the thrust of the Bill and the Government's aims to decentralise power and decision-making. It also supported a General Power of Competence for councils and the possibility of broad devolved powers for councils with directly-elected mayors, although it opposed moves to force English councils to pay parts of fines imposed on the UK national government by the EU.

He went on to say that the LGA welcome the dismantling of the current housing finance system. However, they were concerned that powers for Whitehall to reopen what was supposed to be a clean break settlement would stop councils managing their housing assets for the benefit of local residents, and that they should be reconsidered.

The LGA also strongly support the aim of helping people at neighbourhood level have greater control over public services and planning. However, in some areas the Bill text demonstrated how challenging it had been for the government to translate Ministers' policies into legislation. The LGA wanted to see a Bill that fully reflected the localism agenda Ministers had previously supported and reduced, rather than added to, red tape and complex processes facing local people and councils.

Finally the LGA were of the view that Whitehall was clearly struggling to understand and implement the "post-bureaucratic age" so enthusiastically championed by Ministers. The Localism Bill consisted of 405 pages, 208 clauses, 24 schedules and at least 142 order and regulation-making powers, which the LGA did not believe it was the intention of the Government when they set out their localism agenda.

He concluded that Luton Borough Council would need to consider the following as part of the Localism Bill:

- Would its democratic arrangements need to alter to ensure that its communities were able to a full in decisions effecting them?
- What support might those communities need?
- Are governance arrangements fit for purpose? Did the Council want to explore alternative models?
- On what key issues should the Council make use of the general power of competence?

- How should the Council make this all happen within a tight funding envelope?
- Would Luton gain or lose from the changes to funding for housing?
- How many referendums would there be and at what cost?

A Member commented that although the Bill highlighted a return to the old committee, he was on the understanding that it would be a hybrid combining elements of the Executive and Scrutiny system. He went on to enquire to what devolving down to lower levels would actually mean, as the local community had not yet been defined. He also commented that whoever was decided upon as being the 'local community' would need to be held accountable.

The Overview and Scrutiny Manager replied that the Council would decide on what was a 'Local Community'. He added that in Luton the threshold would be low, and that safeguards would need to be built in. Also, Luton was behind in regards to Neighbourhood Governance.

A Member raised concern that at devolving money to local communities and referred to the New Deal project which had proven to be a disaster.

Resolved: (i) That the presentation be noted.

(ii) That the Overview and Scrutiny Manager be thanked for all his work over the previous two years in bringing the Scrutiny process in Luton from the brink to an exemplary model on how the Overview and Scrutiny Process should run.

29 **OVERVIEW: SUMMARY BRIEFING NOTE ON GOVERNMENTS RESPONSE TO THE HEALTH WHITE PAPER CONSULTATION (REF: 12)**

The Programme Director for Business Support Transformation and the Overview and Scrutiny Manager gave a presentation in regards to the Governments Response to the Health White Paper Consultation.

Members were informed that the scope of the white paper provided an overview of the governments proposals for reforming the health service with a specific focus on 'Health Watch' and Health Scrutiny.

The Health and Social Care Bill had arisen from legislation flowing from the summer 2010 White Paper entitled 'Equity & Excellence: Liberating the NHS' and was introduced into Parliament on the 19th January 2011.

The Board were informed that as part of the Bill, NHS Commissioning would make GP's become responsible, in consortia, for commissioning a wide range of healthcare services. The GP consortia would be overseen by the National Commissioning Board, and would have set outcomes with allocated resources. The Board would also be authorised to establish the consortia and commission services such as primary medical services.

The Programme Director for Business Support Transformation went on to say that the Strategic Health Authorities would be abolished in April 2012, and the Primary Care Trusts in April 2013. He added that all NHS Trusts would become Foundation Trusts by 2014.

Members were informed that in regards to Public Health the Secretary of State would be responsible for the protection of public health and in association with Local Authorities, improvement of public health. He added that Directors of Public Health would be jointly appointed by Local Authorities and the Secretary of State. Local Authorities would receive a public health grant for local areas.

The Bill also detailed the establishment of the Health and Wellbeing Boards which would have the following functions:

- Overseeing the development of a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)
- Overseeing the development of a Joint Health & Wellbeing Strategy which would be the strategic response to the JSNA
- The promotion of Integrated Working

Members were notified that the Health and Wellbeing Board would be a committee of the Council, whom would be accountable. The minimum membership of which would be an elected member, the Director of Children's Services, the Director of Adult Social Services, the Director of Public Health, a GP Consortium representative and a Health Watch representative. The Board would need to be in shadow form by 2012 and in place from 2013, with a transitional period taking place in 2011.

The Overview and Scrutiny Manager said that the Council would need to determine which committee would scrutinise health matters and that Overview and Scrutiny and Executive members had already indicated that this should remain with the Overview and Scrutiny Board. He added that the Government was considering giving committees the power to review private bodies that received NHS money, including GP Consortia, and other powers to stay essentially as they were now. The Council would also have the power of referral to the Secretary of State, and would

become a Council power. The Board would also be able to recommend that the new Council established a standing Health and Wellbeing Review Group as a sub committee of the Overview and Scrutiny Board.

The Overview and Scrutiny Board would have several issues to consider, including:

- What added value would Overview and Scrutiny have to address local health matters?
- How would the relationship between Health Watch/the GP Consortium and the Health and Wellbeing Board and Overview and Scrutiny Board develop and become mutually beneficial?
- How could Overview and Scrutiny play an ongoing role in the developments of the JSNA and commissioning strategies?
- How would Overview and Scrutiny engage with the public to help ensure that they had a say on the major health issues affecting the town.

Members were informed that a report would be submitted to the Executive on the 7th March 2011 making the following recommendations:

- a) To appoint the Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care to chair a shadow Health and Wellbeing Board with a view to establishing a Health and Wellbeing Board if and when required by legislation;
- b) To appoint the Portfolio Holder for Children's Social Care as vice-chair of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board;
- c) To appoint the Corporate Director, Children & Learning and the Corporate Director, Housing & Community Living as members of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board;
- d) To invite the joint Director of Public Health to be a member of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board;
- e) To invite Luton's shadow GP commissioning consortium when formed to nominate a member of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board;
- f) To invite the Shaw Trust, as the organisation that manages the Local Involvement Network, to nominate a member of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board;
- g) To invite NHS Luton to nominate a member of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board;
- h) To request the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board to develop its terms of reference in line with the provisions within the Health and Social Care Bill, including considering whether to extend its membership beyond those referred to in recommendations a) to g);

- i) To request the Luton Forum to re-name and re-constitute its existing theme group for health and wellbeing, pending future decisions about the Forum's governance structure;
- j) To agree that Luton should join the network of early implementers for health and wellbeing boards;
- k) To request the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board to report to the Overview & Scrutiny Board by the end of September 2011 on progress in developing the Board.

Members of the Board commended that the voluntary sector needed to be involved in the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Chair enquired what value the Luton Forum could provide to the Health and Wellbeing Board, and how it could feed into it.

The Programme Director for Business Support Transformation replied that the Council would need to promote integration across all multiple agencies currently involved with health issues, and observed that a principle purpose of local strategic partnerships such as the Luton Forum was itself to promote integrated working across agencies.

The Chair commented that it would look beyond the current boundaries of the Council, and added that he was unsure what role Luton Forum would have. He went on to say that the Health White Paper was at juxtaposition with the Localism Bill.

Resolved: (i) That the Programme Director for Business Support Transformation and the Overview and Scrutiny Manager be thanked for their presentation.

(ii) That the Chair of NHS Developments and Savings be thanked for her contribution.

(iii) That the recommendations to the Executive be supported.

(iv) That once constituted the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board should:

- a) Consider how it would ensure that the voice of the voluntary and community sector would be built into the Health and Wellbeing Board's operation.
- b) Reflect on whether its membership as currently constituted gave sufficient voice to democratically elected representatives.

(v) That the new Administration of the Council establish a Health and Wellbeing Review Group, the membership of which should be predominantly Elected Members, with representation from the voluntary sector.

30 OPERATION OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY: WORK PROGRAMME AND EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN (REF: 14)

Members raised concern that the April meeting was too close to the Borough Elections, and suggested that it be cancelled.

Resolved: (i) That the Report (Ref: 13) be noted.

(ii) That the April meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be cancelled.

(Note: The meeting ended at 9.20 p.m.)