

# AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

---

**Meeting:** Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee  
**Place:** Kennet Room - County Hall, Trowbridge BA14 8JN  
**Date:** Tuesday 1 March 2016  
**Time:** 10.30 am

---

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on **22 February 2016**. Additional documents are now available and are attached to this Agenda Supplement.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Kieran Elliott (Senior Democratic Services Officer), of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line (01225) 718504 or email [kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at [www.wiltshire.gov.uk](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)

---

2 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting (Pages 3 - 12)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2016 are attached.

8 **Executive Response to the Report of the Campus Governance Task Group (Pages 13 - 22)**

In January the Committee resolved to refer the Task Group's recommendations ii to v to the relevant Cabinet member for response at the Committee's next meeting on 1 March 2016.

The Committee also resolved to reconvene the Task Group to reconsider the Terms of Reference offered as a potential governance model, as had been included as an appendix to the report.

**This supplement was published on 26 February 2016.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

---

### **MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 12 FEBRUARY 2016 AT KENNET ROOM - COUNTY HALL, TROWBRIDGE BA14 8JN.**

#### **Present:**

Cllr Simon Killane (Chairman), Cllr Alan Hill (Vice Chairman), Cllr Glenis Ansell, Cllr Chuck Berry, Cllr Christine Crisp, Cllr Stewart Dobson, Cllr Jon Hubbard, Cllr Gordon King, Cllr Jacqui Lay, Cllr Jeff Osborn, Cllr Tony Trotman, Cllr John Walsh, Cllr Mary Douglas (Substitute), Cllr David Jenkins (Substitute) and Cllr Philip Whalley (Substitute)

#### **Also Present:**

Cllr Baroness Scott of Bybrook O.B.E, Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philipe, Cllr Dick Tonge, Cllr Stuart Wheeler, Cllr Keith Humphries, Cllr Laura Mayes and Cllr Jonathon Seed

---

#### **20 Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Bridget Wayman, Howard Greenman and Stephen Oldrieve.

Councillor Greenman was substituted by Councillor Philip Whalley.

Councillor Wayman was substituted by Councillor Mary Douglas.

Councillor Oldrieve was substituted by Councillor David Jenkins.

#### **21 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest.

However, Councillor Glenis Ansell withdrew from the Committee for consideration of Minute 26, Wiltshire Council Financial Plan 2016/17, Opposition Amendments, in order to present proposed amendments in her capacity as Liberal Democrat Group Leader, and would not participate in any debate or vote beyond presenting the proposals and answering queries.

#### **22 Chairman's Announcements**

With the agreement of the Chairman, Councillor Dick Tonge, Cabinet Member for Finance, updated the Committee on the final grant settlement from the

Department of Communities and Local Government that had been received on 8 February 2016. The overall grant levels had not change, but there were improvements from the initial indications.

A transition grant of £3.0m had been included as the revenue support grant would phased-out by 2019/20. It is proposed that £2.0m be placed in capital financing to allow borrowing at lower interest rates, with £0.5m put into the general fund, and another £0.5m used to offset grant reductions in housing benefit subsidy and local welfare provision.

The other change was an increase of £2.5m in the rural services grant, which it was proposed would be placed into a fund to support projects that enabled the Council to generate recurring savings to offset against future central government grant reductions.

23 **Public Participation**

Four public statements were received under Minute 27, Call-in of Cabinet Member Decision HT-03-16 on the RUH Hopper, in support of the requested call-in.

24 **Date of Next Meeting**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 1 March 2016.

25 **Purpose of Meeting**

The Committee noted the procedure for the meeting.

26 **Wiltshire Council Financial Plan 2016/17: Opposition Group Amendments**

The only proposed amendments to the budget proposals received were from the Liberal Democrat Group.

Councillor Glenis Ansell, in her capacity as Liberal Democrat Group Leader, presented the proposed amendments to the Executive budget as detailed in agenda supplement 2, which sought £0.225m of increased revenue investment funded through additional savings and a small amount of rural grant funding from previous settlement announcements that are unallocated, and £0.500m of increased capital investment funded through borrowing available as a result of recurring revenue savings. The proposals had been confirmed as fully costed, legal and viable by the Corporate Leadership Team in consultation with the Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer. The Committee, along with other members in attendance including members of the Executive, discussed the proposed amendments as detailed fully in the appended report, including examining the impact of any proposed savings and attendant investment increases.

Discussion was also had on the Good Neighbour's scheme, as detailed in the report, including proposed scrutiny consideration of the implementation of the devolution of the scheme to Area Boards.

At the conclusion of discussion, it was,

**Resolved:**

- 1) **To thank the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group for presenting their proposals, to add value to the policy development of the Council and enable robust scrutiny of all proposals ahead of determining the Budget on 23 February 2016.**
- 2) **That Council take note of the comments of the Committee as detailed in the report appended to these minutes.**

27 **Call-in of Cabinet Member Decision HT-03-16: Royal United Hospital (RUH) Hopper Bus Service**

On 5 February 2016 the Designated Scrutiny Officer and Acting Head of Corporate Support received a request from the requisite number of non-executive members that they wished to call-in Cabinet Member Decision HT-03-16: Royal United Hospital (RUH) Hopper Bus Service. An officer report had been circulated at Appendix 1, providing procedural advice to the Committee and background information and documents on the decision and the call-in.

The decision taken under delegated authority by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport covered the withdrawal of the service, which transported residents in West Wiltshire to the RUH in Bath, from May 2016.

The Chairman explained he had received several representations from members of the public regarding the decision and call-in. These would be forwarded to the Cabinet Member as the decision maker to provide a response.

The lead signatory of the Call-in, Councillor Jeff Osborn, thanked all those who had supported the call-in, and in particular the public who had made representations and signed petitions. He then outlined why he considered that the Decision had not been made in accordance with the principles of decision making as detailed in Part 2 of the Constitution.

Councillor Osborn referred to the documentation of the decision, including appendix 1, an equality analysis, and appendix 8, observations from the Wiltshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) when the issue was first raised in February 2015. He was of the opinion that this demonstrated that the Decision disproportionately impacted upon the elderly and infirm, and that there was no equivalent alternative service to mitigate that impact, and as such there was a failure to promote the wellbeing of the county. It was also contended that the disproportionate impact failed to show due respect for human rights and equality of opportunity, and that the negative impact of the withdrawal of the service meant that the desired outcomes and aims of the decision were unclear.

Councillor Osborn further stated that in his mind there had been a failure both of the council and the CCG to work in partnership to review and revise the service to make it more cost effective. He added that the lack of a similar service in

other parts of the county was not a reason to remove the service from another when it was vital to so many.

Other signatories of the call-in, Councillors Jon Hubbard, Glenis Ansell and David Jenkins, also spoke to the item, recognising the challenging financial situation in securing long term viability of the service, but also stated health costs would rise if people were unable to attend appointments, and that town councils in the area were now exploring options to help part fund the service following the decision of the CCG not to do so, and the Cabinet Member to withdraw the service as a result.

The Cabinet member, Councillor Philip Whitehead, then responded to the points raised and described how he had followed the necessary processes and principles of decision making. He reminded the Committee that the decision not to reinvest in the Hopper service as a result of the high-cost of the subsidy was taken in setting the budget last February. Subsequently, funding had been arranged through the Better Care Fund to enable the service to run through to April 2016 and also for further discussions to take place to see if the service could be made viable. This did not prove to be the case so the Cabinet Member confirmed the earlier decision.

The Cabinet Member stated the decision had been proportionate to the intended outcome, noting that the subsidy of the service was in excess of £10 per person per trip, for a service which was not the responsibility of the council. Although the elderly and infirm would be more affected than others, this was the case with all bus service changes. To protect the Hopper service would require a significant saving to be made elsewhere.

The Cabinet Member noted that Arriva run service commissioned by the NHS to transport those with an assessed medical or hardship need was available across the entire county and would transport people to all the local acute hospitals. The Hopper was not currently providing equality of opportunity, and retaining the service would subsidise a few residents at the cost of many others, including the elderly and infirm.

The Cabinet Member also stated that a reorganisation of the service had been looked into extensively, including raising fares and reducing the level of service but, without matched funding from the CCG, it remained unviable. Alternative funds to the level required from other sources mentioned such as town councils had not formally materialised.

The Committee then discussed the case made for the call-in and the Cabinet Member's response. Comments were also received from Mr David Noyes on behalf of the CCG who confirmed consultation with the Council including the Health Select Committee on the matter. He confirmed the CCG's position that the Arriva transport contract was in place to meet statutory responsibilities to transport people to hospital across the entire county coupled with the changing nature of the delivery of services away from the centralised acute hospitals.

The Committee recognised the very difficult decision that the Cabinet Member had faced, and acknowledged the extensive consultations that had taken place

on the options available. Some members expressed concern at the impact and lack of what they regarded as satisfactory alternatives bearing in mind the demographics of the area. However others felt that the Cabinet Member had demonstrated he had taken those considerations into account in making his decision, even if people had disagreed with the conclusion.

The Committee also discussed the possibility of alternate funding streams such as Town and Parish Councils, although acknowledged that the Cabinet Member had to take the decision based on the situation that existed at the time, and was not in a position to delay the matter any further.

To summarise, the Cabinet Member defended his decision on the grounds that no compelling evidence had been presented to demonstrate he had not followed the correct process of decision making, and that he had appropriately considered all relevant factors available to him at the time. An alternative service was available even if this did not serve as many as the Hopper, most residents of the county received no benefit from the service, it was not the responsibility of the council to fund the service, and to retain the service which required such a level of council subsidy could not be justified.

Those who had called-in the Decision reiterated how they felt the Cabinet Member had not considered all factors appropriately, particularly with regard to the disproportionate impact of the Decision without acceptable mitigating measures, and therefore had not followed the principles of decision making.

At the conclusion of debate, it was,

**Resolved:**

**On balance of the written and oral evidence presented, to find that there were insufficient grounds to demonstrate that the principles of decision making had not been followed by the Cabinet Member in this case, and therefore the decision can be implemented with immediate effect.**

28 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 10.30 am - 1.30 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Kieran Elliott (Senior Democratic Services Officer) of Democratic Services, direct line (01225) 718504, e-mail [kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

This page is intentionally left blank



Wiltshire Council

APPENDIX

Council

23 February 2016

---

## **Special Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Report on Proposed Amendments for the 2016-17 Budget**

### **Purpose of report**

1. To report to Full Council a summary of the main issues discussed at the special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee held on 12 February 2016. This was convened to consider proposed amendments from Opposition Groups to the budget recommended by Cabinet on 9 February 2016.

### **Background**

2. This special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee provided an opportunity for non-executive councillors to question Councillor Glenis Ansell, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, as the only group to submit proposals to the Committee, on her group's proposed amendments before the budget is considered by Full Council on 23 February 2016.
3. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group gave a presentation covering the proposed amendments to the Executive's budget. She made the following comments:
  - The proposals had been accepted as legal and financially deliverable by the council's Corporate Leadership Team in consultation with the Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer.
  - The group had aimed to add value to the work already undertaken by the Executive and officers in a challenging financial environment, setting out areas of further potential savings and priorities for further investment the group had identified.
  - These included reductions in catering and the council's fleet of vehicles, and additional funding through the rural services grant.

### **Main issues raised during questioning and debate**

4. The Chairman invited the Leader of the Council and other Executive Members to respond to the amendments to lead off discussion, before opening up to general queries from the Committee and other Members in attendance.

### **Leader's response**

5. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE, commented upon the proposals, detailed fully below, stating they would be looked at closely ahead of Full Council, although at this stage the potential savings and investment had not

raised significant policy concerns, and been cleared by the officers. The Cabinet Member for Finance confirmed that view.

#### Consideration of amendments (investments)

##### Investment in 'Pause'

6. Pause is a national initiative to reduce the demand/cost placed on Children's Services by working with families who have experienced or are at risk of repeated removal of children from their care in an attempt to break that cycle. A national pilot scheme is currently running.
7. The Liberal Democrat group's proposal was to invest £0.125m into the initiative, funded with savings as detailed at paragraphs 12-17.
8. The Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Councillor Laura Mayes, stated the initiative appeared worthwhile subject to further consideration.
9. The Committee discussed the amendment, including the current impact on families and particular children as well as the cost to the council of repeatedly taking the children of certain families into care, and the accompanying financial as well as societal benefits if this could be addressed with such an initiative. Members were informed the investment was a cost to get the initiative running in Wiltshire, and that feasibility studies with other local authorities had shown significant savings in following years as a result of successful implementation.

##### Adaptations and Equipment for Adults with Learning Disabilities

10. The Liberal Democrat group's amendment was to provide play and leisure equipment for adults with learning disabilities to reflect the growing population and enable greater development through play and work alongside care and leisure services. This would require a revenue investment of £0.100m to fund capital borrowing which would result in a capital investment of £0.469m.
11. The Committee discussed the proposals including the type of specialist sensory equipment this would provide, with details sought on the interest repayments required on any borrowing.

#### Consideration of amendments (savings)

##### Catering

12. The Liberal Democrat group's proposal was for Officers to review the current net cost of catering across all services (£0.289m) to look at pricing, controls, procurement etc. in order to reduce the spend and introduce commercial pricing in areas from the County Hall and Monkton Park facilities, as well as frontline services such as Leisure or activity centres such as Braeside in Devizes. This would seek to identify savings of £0.050m.
13. The Executive responded by stating there were no objections to reducing the budget if council approved.

14. The Committee discussed the proposed review and identification of savings, requesting details of any impacts particular in centres servicing external customers. It was clarified that beyond the Monkton Park and County Hall facilities little of the catering at other locations was under contract, and it was suggest many units might benefit from tighter controls on spend.

#### Vehicle Fleet

15. The Liberal Democrat group's proposal was to reduce the council's vehicle fleet by at least one further vehicle, saving an additional £0.025m on top of the the administration's proposed savings of £0.200m
16. The Committee discussed the proposal, seeking details of the current fleet and impact of existing Executive proposals and the additional proposal, as well as how much staff travel was undertaken using the vehicle fleet and if a reduction was viable.
17. It was reported that the majority of fleet costs related to vehicle maintenance rather than staff travel, but confirmed the further level of saving was achievable if supported by Council.

#### Rural Services Grant

18. The Liberal Democrat group's proposal was to utilise £0.150m of the rural services grant uplift as detailed by the Cabinet Member at the beginning of the meeting as a contribution towards funding the above investment proposals. The details of the final settlement figure from central Government would be included in a revised financial plan report to Council.

#### Consideration of amendments (policy)

##### Good Neighbour Scheme

19. The Good Neighbour Scheme consists of individuals who advise residents in rural areas and signpost them to relevant support services, and is operated by Community First.
20. In December it was decided to devolve responsibility for the scheme to Area Boards from April 2016, as detailed in [Councillors Briefing Note No.272](#).
21. The Liberal Democrat group's proposal is to reverse that devolution, claiming that valuable funding streams would be lost as a result.
22. The Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Public Health responded stating that the contract for this service with Community First was ending on 31 March 2016 following appropriate consultation and did not accept that the amendment was cost neutral. However the arrangements for implementing the decision to delegate responsibility for the scheme to Area Boards could be reviewed by Scrutiny.

23. The Committee discussed the proposal including whether there were specific budget implications, potential loss of operating knowledge and the alignment to the principle of increasing delegation for local provision to Area Boards. The Committee felt that the offer for scrutiny engagement was a positive one.

## **Conclusion**

24. That Council take into account the comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee in considering the proposed amendments to the financial plan 2016-17.

**Councillor Simon Killane**

**Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee**

---

Report Author: Kieran Elliott, Senior Democratic Services Officer, 01225 718504 or [kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk)

## Wiltshire Council

### Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

1 March 2016

---

#### Executive Response to the Report of the Campus Governance Task Group

##### Purpose

1. To present the response of the Cabinet Member for Communities, Campuses, Area Boards and Broadband to the Report of the Campus Governance Task Group presented to the committee on 5 January 2016.

##### Foreword

2. On 8 September 2015 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee resolved to convene the Campus Governance Task Group.
3. The task group adopted the following terms of reference:  
  
To provide constructive input to the development of
  - (a) An effective governance model for campuses relating to both how the Council's responsibilities and interests and those of the community and partners/stakeholders are best served;
  - (b) Future model of community engagement and role of area boards in respect of governing campuses; and
  - (c) A communications strategy for keeping communities informed about progress with revised campus developments.
4. The task group met on seven occasions between 7 October and 18 November 2015 with the following membership:

Cllr Mary Champion	Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Area Board
Cllr Christine Crisp (Chair)	Calne Area Board
Cllr Tony Deane	South West Wiltshire Area Board
Cllr Stewart Dobson	Marlborough Area Board
Cllr David Jenkins	Westbury Area Board
Cllr Magnus Macdonald	Bradford on Avon Area Board
Cllr Jeff Osborn	Trowbridge Area Board

5. On 5 January 2016 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee endorsed the Task Group's report, including the following recommendations:

That the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Communities, Campuses, Area Boards and Broadband;

- i. Considers the Terms of Reference offered as a potential governance model to deliver the community area's priorities as identified by the Area Board;
  - ii. Ensures there is clear delineation of the roles of area board, governance body and Health and Wellbeing team with regards to the HWC and delivering the community area's priorities as this would be crucial in maintaining supportive and harmonious working relationships between the three;
  - iii. Considers a review of the role and delegated powers of the area boards, as defined in the council's constitution, if it is necessary to ensure that these would enable the area boards to fulfil its role with regards to the governance of campuses;
  - iv. Considers offering some administrative support for the Governance Body;
  - v. Considers if, and if appropriate when, the Task Group should be reconvened in 2016 to provide constructive input to the development of "A communications strategy for keeping communities informed about progress with revised campus developments".
6. The Committee resolved to refer the Task Group's recommendations ii to v above to the relevant Cabinet member for response at the Committee's next meeting on 1 March 2016.
  7. The Committee resolved to reconvene the Task Group to reconsider the Terms of Reference offered as a potential governance model, as had been included as an appendix to the report.

#### **Deputy leader's response to the Task Group's recommendations**

8. Firstly, I would like to commend the work of the task group and the thoroughness undertaken on the review. I thank the members for their constructive contribution to the development of the council's health and wellbeing centre (campus) programme. In response to the recommendations, my comments are as follows;
9. **Recommendation i.**  
*Considers the Terms of Reference offered as a potential governance model to deliver the community area's priorities as identified by the Area Board.*

In devolving functions and powers to the area boards, the council has always avoided being over-prescriptive and has preferred to offer guidelines. Each area board has adopted an approach that reflects its local community and this is to be welcomed. On this basis, I do not consider that a 'one size fits all approach' is appropriate in relation to health and wellbeing centre governance.

For example; an area board may wish to establish a member group, or a preference may be direct reporting to the area board. The task group recognises this in paragraph 14 of its report. I agree with the group that area boards should be able to adopt local governance arrangements to suit local circumstances and in cases where an area board wishes to establish a local group to oversee this role, then I consider the draft terms of reference provide a useful model. I suggest some minor changes to reflect the differing roles and responsibilities of elected members and council officers within the campus governance model and to require meetings to be open to the public. I attach an amended version of the terms of reference (Appendix 1).

10. **Recommendation ii.**

*Ensures there is clear delineation of the roles of area board, governance body and Health and Wellbeing team with regards to the HWC and delivering the community area's priorities as this would be crucial in maintaining supportive and harmonious working relationships between the three.*

The health and wellbeing centres are a major step towards delivering a new way of working at community area level. They bring together facilities, services and partners in a community area enabling closer partnership working, sharing of resources and more effective working with local communities to tackle local priorities. I share the task group's view, that the boundaries between members' strategic roles and the operational role of officers should be clearly stated. Therefore, some additional guidance is required in this area - proposals to address this are attached (Appendix 2).

11. **Recommendation iii.**

*Considers a review of the role and delegated powers of the area boards, as defined in the council's constitution, if it is necessary to ensure that these would enable the area boards to fulfil its role with regards to the governance of campuses.*

The council has delegated significant powers to the area boards and while I am always happy to look at how those powers operate, I do not consider that any changes are required to facilitate health and wellbeing centre governance. The powers devolved to the area boards are set out in Part 3 (Para 4.18) of the council's constitution.

12. **Recommendation iv.**

*Considers offering some administrative support for the Governance Body.*

Whilst I appreciate the concerns raised by the task group, any operational support for the local governance arrangements will be provided by the local health and wellbeing management team and the community engagement manager. It is important that administration costs are kept to a minimum and that updates and reports are 'business as usual' for the health and wellbeing management team and is not viewed as an additional function. The frequency of any reports and where the reports are tabled needs to be agreed by either a local health and wellbeing management group or the area board. I have set this out in more detail in my response to Recommendation ii.

13. **Recommendation v.**

*Considers if, and if appropriate when, the Task Group should be reconvened in 2016 to provide constructive input to the development of “A communications strategy for keeping communities informed about progress with revised campus developments”.*

I agree that effective communication is critical to the success of the health and wellbeing programme and that a clear plan needs to be implemented. On this basis, I do not consider that it is necessary for the task group to reconvene. It will be a matter for each area board to agree a local communication strategy based on guidance previously issued by the Associate Director for Communities and Communication. The associate director will also provide communications and marketing advice to each health and wellbeing management team and the local community engagement manager, as required. The area boards have well developed networks including Our Community Matters, Twitter and Facebook accounts that are providing local channels for delivering an effective local communications strategy in each area.

**Next Steps:**

14. Having carefully considered the task group report and provided my amendments and additions, if the task group has no further observations, I propose to use my delegated powers to implement the governance arrangements as outlined in the form of policy guidance to the area boards.



## COMMUNITY AREA HEALTH AND WELLBEING GROUP

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### 1. Purpose and aims

##### **Purpose and aims of a Health and Wellbeing Centre (HWC)**

A health and wellbeing centre, is a place or places where communities and local partners jointly provide services to, and engage with, the public within a particular locality. The nature of the community offer will vary from place to place depending on the needs of the community and the local opportunities available. The aim of the centre is to enable public, voluntary, community and business organisations within a locality to share resources and work together to achieve strategic objectives, tackle locally agreed priorities and improve the health and general wellbeing of the area.

##### **Purpose and aims of the Community Area Health and Wellbeing Group (HWG)**

The HWG is a sub-group of the area board responsible for overseeing the delivery and promotion of the objectives of the HWC. It will consider matters relating to the HWC and report to the area board with its recommendations as necessary. It will work closely with and provide advice and guidance to the local Health and Wellbeing Centre Management Team (HWMT). Each HWG will be advised and supported by the local Community Engagement Manager (CEM) who will act as a single point of contact between the HWG and the HWMT. The HWG will work with the area board to deliver strategic objectives, tackle locally agreed priorities and improve the health and general wellbeing of the area.

#### 2. Establishment

The HWG will be established by the area board and reappointed each year.

#### 3. Role and status

The HWG will be a non-executive, advisory body established to advise and make recommendations to the area board on matters within its remit.

#### 4. Chairmanship of the HWG

Each year, the area board will appoint a member of the board to the HWG.

#### 5. Membership of the HWG

In consultation with the CEM, the chair of the HWG will identify proposed members of the HWG. This list will be presented to the area board for approval. In drawing up this list, the chair and CEM should have regard to the skills, knowledge, experience and interests required to ensure that the HWG can efficiently deliver the area board's strategic and local priorities and improve the health and general wellbeing of the area.

The area board will approve the members of the HWG by a majority vote on a yearly basis, having first decided that there is a need to establish or retain such a body.

The membership of the HWG will be reviewed by the area board annually with any changes proposed by the HWG chair in consultation with the CEM, to ensure that the membership is relevant to the area board's objectives.

During the year should any changes made by groups or organisations to their own representative, the HWG chair, in consultation with the CEM, will review the changes and make recommendation to the area board.

It is recommended that membership of the HWG should be no less than 5 but not exceed 11 members and a seat on the HWG should automatically be given to organisations with a direct financial interest in the HWC. Membership of the HWG is a matter for local decision, but might include representatives from some of the groups listed below:

- Area Board members (number to be agreed)
- Town and parish councils (one representative)
- Police
- Health
- Education (primary, secondary, higher, etc)
- Business (chamber of commerce, BID, FSB, etc)
- VCS
- Older People
- Youth
- Faith
- Tenants / residents association
- Sports and culture

Where possible, it would preferable for representatives to hold executive positions within the organisation concerned (for example Chair of the Chamber of Commerce, Older People Champion, etc.)

#### **6. Quorum and voting rights**

The quorum of the HWG shall be one quarter of the whole number of members present with a minimum of 3.

Every member of the HWG shall have one vote on any recommendations to be made to the area board.

The chairman of the HWG will have the casting vote.

#### **7. Officer support to the HWG**

The CEM will attend meetings of the HWG and will be the single point of contact for the HWG and the Health and Wellbeing Centre Management Team (HWMT). It will be the responsibility of the HWMT to provide management reports and the CEM will provide these reports and associated advice to the HWG on matters relating to the effective delivery of the aims and objectives of the HWC. When required, the HWG will be able to invite relevant Wiltshire Council and partner organisation officers to attend meetings for specific items.

Where possible, administrative support for the HWG should be sourced locally from somebody with a good knowledge of the area and the HWC.

#### **8. Meetings**

Meetings of the HWG shall be held in public unless there are specific matters of a sensitive or confidential nature. With the same proviso, all recommendations will be reported to the area board and considered in public.

**9. Frequency of meetings**

The frequency of meetings shall be a matter for local decision, but it is suggested that they are scheduled between area board meetings to facilitate reporting in a timely fashion.

**10. Notice, agendas and notes**

For the assistance of members, five clear days notice will be given of the dates of meetings.

**11. Reporting structure**

The CEM will provide regular reports to the HWG on key topics, including:

- Usage
- Progress against an agreed business plan
- Performance against agreed targets (aligned to the business plan)
- Operational changes
- Financial performance against budget
- Proposed staffing changes
- Complaints, customer feedback or any other significant issues
- Major events and programming
- Achievements / progress in delivering the council's policy on volunteering and apprenticeships.
- Promotion, marketing and publicity

The HWG will decide the frequency of these reports but normally this would not be more than quarterly.

**12. Communications, marketing and publicity**

The HWG shall ensure that an effective communications strategy is developed and delivered to ensure that the local community is kept informed and engaged in the work of the HWC. This shall be based on advice provided by the Associate Director of Communities and Communications.

Members of the HWT may not issue official media statements on behalf of the HWG, the area board or the council. Any media statements about the operation of the HWC should be agreed between the HWG chair and the chair of the area board in consultation with the council's news and information team.

The HWT may use social media to promote the objectives of the HWC and its business plan as appropriate. The HWG should seek to ensure that there is a single social media presence for the HWC to ensure that communications support the overall ethos of partnership working.

**13. Reporting to the area board**

A regular item will be included on the area board agenda for reporting, discussion and consideration of recommendations. The chairman of the HWG will present the group's recommendations at the area board meeting for consideration and approval.

February 2016

## HEALTH AND WELLBEING CENTRE MANAGEMENT TEAM TERMS OF REFERENCE

### 14. Purpose and aims

#### **Purpose and aims of a Health and Wellbeing Centre (HWC)**

A health and wellbeing centre, is a place or places where communities and local partners jointly provide services to, and engage with, the public within a particular locality. The nature of the community offer will vary from place to place depending on the needs of the community and the local opportunities available. The aim of the centre is enable public, voluntary, community and business organisations within a locality to share resources and work together to achieve strategic objectives, tackle locally agreed priorities and improve the health and general wellbeing of the area.

#### **Purpose and aims of the Health and Wellbeing Management Team (HWMT)**

The HWMT is responsible for the day to day delivery and promotion of the objectives of the HWC. It will take day to day operational decisions to ensure the effective, smooth and safe operation of the centre. Each HWC will have an appointed officer accountable for the exercise of these decisions in consultation and negotiation with the other principal users of the centre (and/or other centres in the area) and under the overall direction of the local area board. The HWMT will work with the area board to achieve strategic objectives, tackle locally agreed priorities and improve the health and general wellbeing of the area.

### 15. Membership

Membership of the HWMT will reflect the nature of the HWC and the offer it provides, but is likely to include:

- Community Engagement Manager (chair/convenor)
- The 'accountable officer' – in most cases this will be the Health and Wellbeing Manager or the principle service provider within the centre.
- Principal centre users (to be determined locally)
- Key stakeholders (to be determined locally)

The selection of HWMT members is a matter for local determination, although it is not expected that this would exceed seven in number.

#### **Role of Community Engagement Manager**

- To convene and chair meetings of the HWMT
- To act as a single point of contact between the area board and, where established, the area board's Health and Wellbeing Group (HWG) and the HWMT
- To report to the area board and the HWG on all matters affecting the operation and promotion of the HWC.
- To ensure that wider stakeholders are fully engaged and involved in the operation of the HWC.
- To ensure that the opportunities and resources provided by the HWC are maximised for the benefit of the local community.
- To ensure that communication is managed effectively to ensure that the HWC has a high profile within the local community.
- To coordinate activities with other principle service centres and facilities in the locality.

### **Role of the accountable officer**

- To act as key-holder for the HWC
- To act as the client for all facilities management matters
- To act as the manager of staff resources (in liaison with other external service users as appropriate)
- To act as the budget holder for the operational service budget associated with the HWC (in liaison with other delegated budget holders).
- To be responsible for the production, delivery and monitoring of the HWC business plan
- To be responsible for health and safety, safeguarding and risk assessments.
- To be responsible for letting, hiring and use of space within the HWC and for the charges and arrangements relating thereto.
- To be licensee and responsible person for events and activities delivered by the HWMT.
- To be responsible for service continuity and civil resilience plans and arrangements.

### **Role of other members**

All members will be required to:

- Agree to use resources and budgets in a manner that supports the aims and objectives of the HWC.
- Take an active part in the development, promotion and management of the HWC and its aims.
- Take responsibility for delivering specific actions within the HWMT business plan.
- Take responsibility for sharing information with the HWMT relevant to their areas of responsibility.
- Contribute any information that may have a bearing on the effective management of the HWC.
- Act as a champion for the HWC in the community.
- Be open and honest and work collaboratively.

## **16. Structure and operation**

The HWMT will take day to day responsibility for coordinating and planning all operational activities associated with the HWC working under the direction of the local area board (and/or the area board sub-group). The appointment of members shall be determined by the HWMT and reviewed periodically to ensure that the right people are involved. The area board may make recommendations regarding external bodies to be included.

Key responsibilities for the management team include:

- To be responsible for the development and, following approval by the area board, the delivery of the HWC business plan.
- To be responsible for managing all day to day operational matters including staffing, budgets, health and safety, risk management, safeguarding, business continuity, performance management, civil resilience planning, maintenance and repair, promotion, marketing, communications, lettings, hiring, rents and franchises.
- To report regularly to the local area board (and/or the Area Board Health and Wellbeing Group) on the overall operation of the HWC, its programmes, performance and budgets.
- To ensure that wider stakeholders are fully engaged and involved in the operation of the HWC and that regular feedback is sought from users.

- To ensure that the opportunities and resources provided by the HWC are maximised for the benefit of the local community.
- To ensure that a communication plan is developed and delivered effectively to ensure that the HWC has a high profile within the local community.
- To ensure that the views of the area board are addressed in a timely and efficient manner.
- To coordinate activities with other principle service centres and facilities in the locality.

The HWMT may invite representatives from local organisations/agencies to its meetings etc to provide expertise or to share local knowledge on activities, projects and programmes in the area.

The frequency, location and format of HWMT activities should be determined locally, however it is recommended that the management group meets at least six times per year.

#### 17. **Media Relations**

Members of the HWMT may not issue official media statements on behalf of the Community Area Board or the council. Any media statements about the operation of the HWC should be agreed with the chair of the area board in consultation with the council's news and information team.

The HWMT may use social media to promote the objectives of the HWC and its business plan as appropriate. There should be a single social media presence for the HWC to ensure that communications support the overall ethos of partnership working.

#### 18. **Review**

These terms of reference may be reviewed by the area board and cabinet member from time to time as necessary.

February 2015