



Scrutiny Committee

16:35 to 17:30

25 January 2024

Present: Councillors Ackroyd (chair), Thomas (Va) (vice-chair), Carrington, Catt (substitute for Galvin), Champion, Davis, Driver, Osborn, Prinsley, Sands (S) (substitute for Padda) and (Thomas (Vi).

Apologies: Councillors Fox, Galvin and Padda.

Also Present: Councillors Giles and Hampton

1. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2023.

3. Report from the Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee

(The chair took this item early.)

Councillor Prinsley the committee's representative on the Norfolk Health and Overview Committee (NHOSC) attended the meeting held on 18 January 2024, agenda and full minutes when available on the county council's website [here](#) and summarised the debate as follows.

The meeting discussed the digital transformation of the NHS, he highlighted that this was a massive project and that Norfolk was behind other areas in relation to the introduction of electronic health records. The implications of electronic health records were discussed in terms of who owns the data and how would it be used.

The meeting considered a report on actions taken in response to a review of mortality recording and reporting in Mental Health services across Norfolk and Suffolk by Grant Thornton. The review found shortfalls in relation to the recording and reporting of patient mortality by the Norfolk and Suffolk Foundation Trust (NSFT) and made a number of recommendations. Councillor Prinsley noted that it was acknowledged that there had been a failure on the part on the Integrated Care Partnership to hold NSFT to account.

He advised that a report by bereaved families [Gone Forever](#) provided an independent response to the Grant Thornton review. Families had been collaborating with a review of mortality since the Grant Thornton audit but had lost faith in the process.

He advised that NHOSC would be sending a letter to the Secretary of State calling for a statutory enquiry and that NSFT were to attend the May meeting of NHOSC and the committee would do what it could to hold them to account.

RESOLVED to note the update from the committee's representative on the Norfolk Health and Overview Committee.

4. Report from the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Sub Panel

(The chair took this item early.)

The chair advised that the council's representative on the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Sub Panel was unable to attend the meeting and it was noted that the meeting did not go ahead as it was inquorate. Councillor Osborn the council's substitute member advised that the panel were looking at reviewing its terms of reference and membership.

RESOLVED to note the update on the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Sub Panel.

5. LOVE Norwich Review

Members expressed concern and disappointment that the report was circulated late to committee and considered that it did not contain the necessary information. Members agreed that the item should be deferred to be considered at a future meeting of scrutiny committee to enable a more comprehensive update to be provided. Members also requested a separate briefing on the council's data capabilities in relation to mapping environmental crime across the city.

The Executive Director of Development and City Services apologised to committee for the lateness of the papers, he advised the intention was to provide a presentation to members of the database used to map environmental crime at the meeting today. He advised there was capacity to map trends across the city and it was hoped that ward specific data could be produced for members. There were licensing issues in relation to use of the database and therefore limited access but reports could be produced.

Members considered that they needed time to analysis the data prior to the committee meeting to discuss the report and a separate briefing was agreed.

Members discussed what points they would like a future report to include as follows:

- a) Benchmarking; where would we expect the figures to be at benchmarked against other similar local authorities, how do the city council's processes compare to that of other local authorities.

- b) What is the data in relation to trends/ hotspots for flytipping.
- c) How were the figures in relation to 2023 flytipping arrived at as they differ from the DEFRA figures for the same period.
- d) Where are the cameras referred to going to be located. Six cameras are referred to but there are ten hotspots, what accounts for this anomaly.
- e) A breakdown of the £100,000 project costs, the report notes £60,000 would be spent on cameras what is the remainder allocated for.
- f) The report to be clear on what action has been taken in relation to the recommendations from the task and finish group.
- g) A review with Biffa is referenced but there is no indication of what outcomes this seeks to achieve.
- h) Waste Amnesty review, waste amnesty is not referenced but bulky collection, could an explanation of how the two are linked be provided.
- i) Provide the communication used to publicise waste amnesty/ bulky waste events in order that committee can consider why there was limited take up of the offer. Was digital exclusion considered as a factor and how was this mitigated for.
- j) Why was the event at Mile Cross cancelled.
- k) In relation to communal bins can you advise how this has reduced flytipping.
- l) Provide the outcome measures for LOVE Norwich and information on how the project is performing against these measures.
- m) Upcycling/ reuse what has been done up to this point.
- n) Information on the reuse centre at the Benjamin Foundation and its impact on recycling rates.

A member referred to a walkabout he attended with officers in his ward to look at flytipping hotspots and asked if other councillors could be offered this opportunity. Councillor Giles, cabinet member for communities and social inclusion advised that this was part of the housing estate improvement project joint funded with the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. He advised that the location and nature of works reflected the data recorded and what was deemed the highest priority. He advised estate improvements had taken place at Heartsease, Mousehold and North Earlham and that significant progress in the condition of estates was being made.

In response to members requests to see the trends and benchmarking of data he questioned whether a longer period of time was need in order to see the benefits of the LOVE Norwich work.

The chair advised that a member of the council had requested to ask a question and invited Councillor Oliver to address committee. She asked:

“The proposal to make a bid to the Rural Payments Agency to fund an offer for a set price for six items for bulky collection will not help those who are unable to store six items what can we do to assist these individuals.”

In response the Executive Director of Development and City Services advised that the team could look at different sources of funding to provide a different scheme or a business case could be made for the council to fund one itself.

RESOLVED to:

- 1) request a briefing session be provided to members of the committee on the council’s data capabilities in relation to mapping environmental crime across the city; and
- 2) defer consideration of the LOVE Norwich Review to a future meeting of scrutiny committee.

6. Scrutiny committee work programme 2023-24

The Head of Legal and Procurement reminded members of the extraordinary meeting of scrutiny committee on 6 February to consider the NCS Business Plan. She referred to the topics scheduled for the March committee meeting, Biodiversity Strategy Review and Parks and Open Spaces Strategy and advised members to consider if they wanted any information to be covered in the report and to advise the committee officer if they had any suggestions.

RESOLVED to:

- 1) ask the committee officer to liaise with officers and members to arrange a briefing session on the council’s data capabilities;
- 2) ask the committee officer to liaise with members and officers to arrange an extraordinary meeting of scrutiny committee to consider the deferred LOVE Norwich Review subsequent to the briefing; and
- 3) note the scrutiny committee work programme 2023-24.

CHAIR