NORWICH City Council

MINUTES

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16:30 to 18:35 **15 December 2016**

Present: Councillors Wright (chair), Maguire (vice chair) Bogelein, Bradford, Coleshill, Davis, Fullman, Grahame, Haynes, Malik, Manning, Packer and Peek

Also present: Councillor Alan Waters (Leader, Norwich City Council), Bob Cronk (Director of neighbourhoods, Norwich City Council), Dawn Bradshaw (Head of HR and learning, Norwich City Council), Nikki Rotsos (Head of customers and culture, Norwich City Council), Kate Price (Neighbourhood and community enabling manager, Norwich City Council)

1. Apologies

No apologies were received.

2. Public questions / petitions

No public questions or petitions were received.

3. Declarations of interest

No declarations of interest were made.

4. Minutes

In reference to resolution a) on page 12, it was noted that there are local cooperatives already investigating the possibility of opening a cooperative academy.

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016.

5. Scrutiny committee work programme 2016 -2017

A suggestion was made to consider the subject of sexual entertainment venues which the chair suggested should be taken as part of the work programme for 2017 – 18.

Members agreed that an additional meeting would take place on 6 April 2017 to explore the topic of city accessibility.

RESOLVED to hold an additional meeting of the scrutiny committee on 6 April 2017 to examine the issue of city accessibility.

6. Update of the representative for the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The representative for the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC) explained that the committee was still trying to raise the issue of a number of unexplained deaths within the Norfolk and Suffolk mental health trust as it was felt that the initial response was unsatisfactory. He said that the matter would be raised at the next NHOSC.

RESOLVED to note the update of the representative for the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

7. Draft equality information report

The director of neighbourhoods (Norwich City Council) introduced the report, particularly highlighting the following points:

- Norwich is a low wage economy
- There was evidence to suggest that since the referendum regarding UK membership of the EU, there had been an increase in hate crime. Due to a change in the way hate crime is recorded, however, it was difficult to directly compare data although he noted that community tensions had spiked since June.
- Ongoing work in the area of domestic abuse had ensured that the subject remained in the limelight.

It was noted that the introduction to the report (page 42 of the agenda) referred to the publishing of information as specified in the *Equality act (2010)*, whereas the requirement was now laid out as part of the *Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) Regulations 2011*.

In response to a member's questions, the head of HR and learning said that she would feed-back the suggested change of publication date from 31 January. She also clarified that a wide range of information – including information regarding staff members who were also carers – was captured, and whilst the resulting data may not always be published, it was used to inform policy-making.

Discussion ensued, during which the following points were made:

- Work was ongoing to determine the outcomes of the 'spray paint' campaign highlighting domestic violence, but it had generated a lot of discussion in many forums and early indications showed very positive responses to the work.

- Further work would be needed to address a highlighted gender pay gap regarding part-time workers hourly rates.

- There tended to be a reasonable take up of paternity leave around the time of birth. Decisions as to whether or not to take paternity leave were often financially-driven.

- There was no legal requirement to collect equality information regarding councillors and thus they were not included in equality monitoring.

- The head of customers and culture agreed to explore the extent to which the equality monitoring recording is explained to customers and would feed this back to members.

- A question was raised as to where data around gender specific hate crime could be located and if such information could be broken down by location. It was clarified that the breakdown criteria was set by the Home Office.

RESOLVED to:

a) consider if the current proposed timescale for producing and publishing the equality report is the most suitable or time appropriate.

b) change the final sentence of the equality information to report to refer to the *Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) Regulations 2011,* rather than the *Equality act (2010)*.

8. Draft corporate performance measures 2017-18

The leader of the council presented the report. Questions were raised by councillor Bogelein regarding the council's use of such data; querying the possibility of alternative formatting of results; suggesting the use of specific analysis technics, such as a chi-squared ($\chi 2$).

The leader of the council suggested councillor Bogelein take a strand of the report and operationalise it to illustrate the possibilities of this approach.

9. Neighbourhood model and ward councillors

The director of neighbourhoods presented the report. Discussion ensued – which included contributions from the neighbourhood and community enabling manager - during which the following points were made:

- For community groups to become involved via the neighbourhood model, they can be of any size and do not have to be constituted.

- The county council and clinical commissioning group had expressed an interest in a community currency and had also proposed the creation of a partnership for crowdfunding possibilities.

- Timebanking with peer to peer currency was also suggested as potential model for Norwich. It was explained that timebanking would require a broker to record what activity had taken place and the time credits earned.

- The neighbourhood and community enabling manager explained that a currency should be designed specifically for Norwich, with the aim of resultant spend going back into the community rather than being spent with large corporations.

- Concerns were raised regarding the possibility of a Norwich *Get Involved* crowdfunding scheme and whether this represented 'creep privatisation'. It was suggested as a way of enabling community ideas to come from residents themselves.

- Careful work would need to be undertaken with the enabling team and ward councillors to ensure a balance of community involvement across the city.

- It was emphasised that, although the policy was still in development, community involvement and crowdfunding would not be used for the provision of statutory services.

- To encourage volunteering among younger people, it was felt that attempts would be needed to 're-brand' volunteering.

- It was agreed that an all-councillor training session / workshop regarding this topic would be required.

RESOLVED to identify a suitable time early in 2017 and arrange an all-member training session / workshop to cover the issues raised by the topic.

CHAIR