

Public Document Pack



**Service Director – Legal, Governance and
Commissioning**

Julie Muscroft

The Democracy Service
Civic Centre 3
High Street
Huddersfield
HD1 2TG

Tel: 01484 221000

Please ask for: Sheila Dykes

Email: sheila.dykes@kirklees.gov.uk

Wednesday 7 April 2021

Notice of Meeting

Dear Member

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

The **Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee** will hold a **Virtual Meeting - online** at **2.00 pm** on **Thursday 15 April 2021**.

This meeting will be webcast live and will be available to view via the Council's website.

The items which will be discussed are described in the agenda and there are reports attached which give more details.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Julie Muscroft".

Julie Muscroft

Service Director – Legal, Governance and Commissioning

Kirklees Council advocates openness and transparency as part of its democratic processes. Anyone wishing to record (film or audio) the public parts of the meeting should inform the Chair/Clerk of their intentions prior to the meeting.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee members are:-

Member

Councillor Elizabeth Smaje (Chair)

Councillor Andrew Cooper

Councillor Harpreet Uppal

Councillor Habiban Zaman

Councillor Andrew Marchington

Agenda

Reports or Explanatory Notes Attached

Pages

1: Membership of Committee

To receive apologies for absence of Members who are unable to attend the meeting.

2: Minutes of Previous Meeting

1 - 6

To approve the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18th March 2021.

3: Interests

7 - 8

The Councillors will be asked to say if there are any items on the Agenda in which they have disclosable pecuniary interests, which would prevent them from participating in any discussion of the items or participating in any vote upon the items, or any other interests.

4: Admission of the Public

Most debates take place in public. This only changes when there is a need to consider certain issues, for instance, commercially sensitive information or details concerning an individual. You will be told at this point whether there are any items on the Agenda which are to be discussed in private.

5: Deputations/Petitions

The Committee will receive any petitions and hear any deputations from members of the public. A deputation is where up to five people can attend the meeting and make a presentation on some particular issue of concern. A member of the public can also hand in a petition at the meeting but that petition should relate to something on which the body has powers and responsibilities.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10 (2), Members of the Public should provide at least 24 hours' notice of presenting a deputation.

6: Place Based Working Group - Final Report

9 - 62

The final report of the Working Group on Place Based Working will be presented for the Committee's consideration.

Contact:

Jodie Harris,

Principal Governance and Democratic Engagement Officer

7: Work Programme 2020/21

63 - 64

To give consideration to the Committee's Work Programme for 2020/21 and put forward potential items for inclusion in the Work Programme for 2021/22.

Contact:

Sheila Dykes,

Principal Governance and Democratic Engagement Officer

Contact Officer: Sheila Dykes

KIRKLEES COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday 18th March 2021

Present: Councillor Elizabeth Smaje (Chair)
Councillor Andrew Cooper
Councillor Habiban Zaman
Councillor Andrew Marchington

119 Membership of Committee

Apologies were received on behalf of Councillor Harpreet Uppal.

120 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24th February 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

The Chair provided updates to Members.

In relation to the Culture, Heritage and Tourism Strategies she explained that, since the meeting on 11th February, the Head of Culture and Tourism had contacted each of the three organisations who had made submissions;

- The Friends of Spen Beck/Mann Dam had been invited to make contact with the Council's Greenspace Team. This team were already working with local groups and ward members to develop a masterplan for a country park in this area, which would include tree planting as well as other ecological interventions, and the group would be invited to get involved.
- The Red House Heritage Group had been assured that citizens and communities would be at the heart of all three strategies. The Museums and Galleries Manager would continue to work with them to ensure that the community could still access Red House at points throughout the year as well as being able to access other facilities on the site on a regular basis.
- A number of the key points raised by Environmental Projects in Kirklees/Three Valleys Nature Park would be included in a brief for consultants to ensure that what was developed was about sustainable tourism and a respect for the landscape, rather than encouraging tourism which would lead to it being damaged and not able to be appreciated by future generations. Further engagement would be undertaken when developing the brief.

A submission had also been received from the Huddersfield Canal Society, following the meeting. Their constructive comments had been shared with the

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee - 18 March 2021

officers working on the Heritage Strategy to ensure that the canals were recognised within it. An assurance had been given that, when consultants were appointed to produce the Tourism Strategy, the canals would be included and the points made about how information was shared would be considered. (Minute 116).

In respect of the urgent officer delegated decision to enter into a collaborative agreement with the Department of Health and Social Care to deliver Covid-19 community testing in Kirklees; as requested, an update on community testing had been provided to the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Panel, as part of a wider update in respect of the local position and response to the pandemic, at its meeting held on 18th February 2021 (Minute 118).

121 Interests

No interests were declared.

122 Admission of the Public

All items were considered in public session.

123 Deputations/Petitions

No deputations or petitions were received.

124 Public Question Time

No public questions were received.

125 Local Flood Risk Management - Annual Review

Rashid Mahmood, Flood Manager, Planning and Development and Mathias Franklin, Head of Planning and Development were in attendance to present the annual report in respect of progress against the Action Plan of the Kirklees Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. The report also informed the Committee of the proposed revision of the local strategy to ensure that it was consistent with the new national strategy, published in August 2020.

Rashid explained that during the preceding twelve month period:

- £340,000 of Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Community and Business Grant support had been provided to flood victims following Storm Ciara/Dennis in February 2020.
- A West Yorkshire Innovative Resilience Fund bid for £9.8 million had been submitted in January 2021. A successful bid would provide the necessary funding to scale up the community and voluntary sector and natural flood management works in Kirklees.
- A Property Flood Resilience Grant had been launched in January 2021 with the aim of better protecting 170 properties flooded due to Storm Ciara/Dennis.

It was also explained that the current local strategy had been completed in 2013 and last revised in 2019. The adoption of the new national strategy was seen as an opportunity to review the local strategy and ensure that it was in alignment and this would include consideration of the following themes:

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee - 18 March 2021

- An emphasis on nature based solutions.
- A greater focus on creating resilient communities.
- Adaptive pathways and being agile to new climate hazards.
- A build-back better approach.
- Extending the support to local communities.
- Aligning incident response and recovery strategy.

Questions and comments were invited from Committee Members and the following key issues were raised during discussion:

- There were recurring issues with flooding caused by blocked gullies at certain locations.
- It would be beneficial to have a store of sandbags that could be easily accessed at short notice (particularly in/near to locations where there were recurrent issues) to minimise delay in deployment and assist people in the community to help themselves.
- It was acknowledged that climate change could mean that the position could get much worse, how would this be accommodated within the strategy?
- It was questioned whether enough was being done to ensure that SUDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) were used for new development.
- The programme and timeline for gully cleaning and clearing blocked drains, and the response time to requests.
- How was the Property Flood Resilience Grant being rolled out and what engagement had been undertaken to ensure that local communities were aware of it and knew how to apply?
- How would the review of the strategy address the ambition in the national strategy in respect of ensuring the right investment and planning decisions to secure sustainable growth and environmental improvements?
- Progress in relation to some of the actions had been outstanding for some time. It was questioned whether the targets would be reassessed as part of review of strategy and what were the limiting factors on progress.
- How often did engagement take place with the community and by what means?
- Could further information be provided in respect of the planning process for drainage provision on new development sites and future proofing against climate change impacts.

In response, Rashid and Mathias explained that:

- Work had been done to identify those gullies that, when they became blocked, could cause flooding and to monitor their condition.
- All priority gullies had been cleared at the end of 2021 and this work would be undertaken periodically.
- The policy in respect of the provision of sandbags was being reviewed. There was a need to identify the priority areas and to consider the logistics. Pro-active deployment of sandbags had been undertaken in advance of the most recent storm event.
- The review of the strategy was, in part, due to the need to consider and accommodate climate change and address its impacts on flood risk.
- Further information could be provided to Members in respect of the programme of gully cleaning; this work was undertaken by the Highways Service. Requests

for cleaning were dealt with on a reactive basis with priority given to those where there was a risk of flooding.

- Use of SUDs was at the top of the hierarchy in terms of the drainage strategy for new development where the ground conditions were suitable. However, in Kirklees, many areas were not suitable for infiltration due to geo-technical issues and/or topography. Each site was assessed on a case by case basis and if SUDs were not appropriate attenuation and storage would be used. Cost was not understood to be a barrier to the use of SUDs as this would normally be the least costly solution.
- The Local Plan had included some evaluation of sites in terms of their sustainability credentials, of which drainage was an element.
- The Property Resilience Grant scheme had an online portal which set out the criteria and provided an online application process. All those individuals that the Council was aware of, who were likely to be eligible, had been contacted via letter or email and attempts were now being made to contact people by telephone. There was a dedicated inbox and telephone number to deal with related queries.
- Kirklees had an up to date development plan which identified enough land through allocated sites, together with some windfall sites, to meet the district's housing and job growth needs. The allocated sites would be at the lowest level of flood risk or where technical solutions were available to address any issues. If decisions were taken in accordance with the plan then the Authority should be able to resist pressure on sites where flood risk was higher.
- In terms of community engagement (Ref 2.1 on the Action Plan), the programme was on track to complete all 23 wards by 2023.
- In general community engagement focussed on the highest risk properties with letters issued giving general advice. The consultation process in respect of the revised local strategy had not been decided at this point but would be digital by design and include Councillors and members of the public.
- A range of supplementary planning documents had been produced, including a new residential design guide for new build housing which required the provision of technical information, including that related to drainage. There was a West Yorkshire Combined Authority document which set out requirements such discharge rates and the on-site survey information expected from developers submitting a planning application. A planning application would not be validated without this information. The local validation checklist was currently being updated. The Lead Local Flood Authority would assess the information submitted and the Authority also had access to geo-technology support at regional level. If SUDs were achievable the policy was that they should be used.
- Consideration of climate change was at the heart of the planning system and additional capacity for storage on-site was a requirement of the drainage strategy for new developments. It was stressed however that new development was only a small part of the built environment and how to address issues affecting the existing network was the most important part of response in dealing with storm events.

Resolved –

(1) That the annual report in respect of flood risk management in Kirklees and the intention to review the local strategy to ensure that it aligns with the national strategy be noted.

(2) That officers be asked to give consideration to:

- The provision of an easily accessible supply of sandbags in particular localities, to reduce any delay in deployment to areas of need.
- Improvements in preventative work.
- Reviewing the Action Plan to assess if any improvements can be made to existing targets/timelines.
- The development of an engagement strategy in relation to the review of the local flood risk strategy.
- Ensuring that the local flood risk management strategy aligns with and links in with other Council strategy and planning documents.

126 Place Based Working Group - Progress

The Committee received an update in respect of the progress made by the Place Based Working Group since the last update to the Committee in August 2020.

The remit of the group aimed to review the development of the approach to place based working in Kirklees and how this approach would become embedded within the organisation and across Council partners.

Between September 2019 and March 2021, the group had gathered evidence to inform their work by receiving regular updates from key officers on the work that was being undertaken to progress place based working in Kirklees, the engagement processes (such as the use of the Place Standard Tool) and the planned next steps.

The group had held a joint meeting with the Place Partnership Leads on 17th December 2020 to discuss the progress of the Place Partnership pilot project since its introduction at Annual Council in May 2019. The feedback from the Place Partnership Leads would be incorporated into the group's findings.

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, the group had, throughout the process, considered the impact on planned work due to the subsequent additional demand that was placed on Council resources to support business continuity and communities. However, in some respects, the pandemic had also provided the opportunity to implement place based working practices to respond to the associated local challenges. The group had therefore received regular updates on the Council's Community Response to the pandemic.

At a meeting held on 26th November 2020 it had met with and gathered evidence from Third Sector Leaders and Community Anchor Organisation representatives to gain an insight to their views.

The Group had now drawn together its key findings, had considered a draft report and begun to finalise its recommendations for inclusion in the final report with the view for this to be presented to the next meeting of the Management Committee on 15th April 2021.

127 Establishment of Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel - Residential Housing Stock Health and Safety Compliance

The Committee was asked to consider a proposal to establish an Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel to look at Residential Housing Stock Health and Safety Compliance.

Resolved –

(1) That an Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel be established to consider Residential Housing Stock Health and Safety Compliance with the Terms of Reference set out in paragraph 2.2 of the report.

(2) That the membership of the Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel be on the basis of a 1:1:1:1 ratio together with a co-opted member and an independent specialist advisor.

128 Work Programme 2020/21

The Work Programme for 2020/21 was noted.

129 Any Other Business

Members were reminded that, at the meeting of the Committee held on 29th October 2020, a request had been made for an update in respect of the Place Partnerships Funding. Further to a recent Lead Member briefing with the Active Citizens and Places Manager, the Chair reported that:

- At the meeting of Cabinet held on 16th February, approval had been given to the allocation of a further £140,000 of the £1 million mental health themed budget to deliver the WEvolve Community Support Programme. This had brought the total amount allocated to approximately £950,000.
- On 16th March Cabinet had approved the allocation of £400,000 from the domestic abuse themed budget to build capacity, and to train and equip staff and communities to recognise the signs of domestic abuse and make links to local support networks to help mitigate the impact of domestic abuse.

KIRKLEES COUNCIL				
COUNCIL/CABINET/COMMITTEE MEETINGS ETC				
DECLARATION OF INTERESTS Overview & Scrutiny Management Committee				
Name of Councillor				
Item in which you have an interest	Type of interest (eg a disclosable pecuniary interest or an “Other Interest”)	Does the nature of the interest require you to withdraw from the meeting while the item in which you have an interest is under consideration? [Y/N]	Brief description of your interest	

Signed: Dated:

NOTES

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your disclosable pecuniary interests under the new national rules. Any reference to spouse or civil partner includes any person with whom you are living as husband or wife, or as if they were your civil partner.

Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner, undertakes.

Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses.

Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority -

- under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
- which has not been fully discharged.

Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.

Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.

Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) - the landlord is your council or authority; and the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.

Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -

- (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
(b) either -

the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.



Name of meeting: Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Date: 15th April 2021

Title of report: Final Report of the Place Based Working Group on Place Based Working

Purpose of report: To present the final report of the Place Based Working Group on Place Based Working.

Key Decision - Is it likely to result in spending or saving £250k or more, or to have a significant effect on two or more electoral wards?	Not Applicable
Key Decision - Is it in the <u>Council's Forward Plan (key decisions and private reports)</u>?	N/a
The Decision - Is it eligible for call in by Scrutiny?	N/a
Date signed off by <u>Strategic Director</u> & name	N/a
Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Finance?	N/a
Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Legal Governance and Commissioning?	By Samantha Lawton, Head of Governance on Behalf of Julie Muscroft, Service Director for Legal Governance and Commissioning on 26th March 2021
Cabinet member portfolio	Cllr Cathy Scott

Electoral wards affected: All

Ward councillors consulted: N/a

Public or private: Public

Has GDPR been considered? Yes, no personal details are included.

1. Summary

At its meeting held on 9 September 2019 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee considered a report from the Strategic Director for Corporate Strategy, Commissioning and Public Health and the Head of Democracy and Place Based Working, in relation to the developing approach to place based working (PBW) in Kirklees.

The Committee were informed that PBW was one of the core elements of the Corporate Plan, which put communities and their representatives at the heart of system design and delivery. The approach was predicated on the view that citizens and communities are best placed to know their own challenges and strengths but could not always achieve change alone.

It was explained that the implementation of PBW in Kirklees would require a cultural change across services and partners. The building blocks for creating the conditions for effective PBW were beginning to take shape, but further work was needed to develop a cohesive work programme and to establish the type of relationship that the Council wanted to have with citizens.

The Committee was asked to provide a steer with regard to the direction of the next phase of work and to determine how Overview and Scrutiny wished to consider the approach to PBW.

The Management Committee resolved to establish the Place Based Working Group drawn from members of the Corporate Scrutiny Panel and the Economy and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Panel to consider PBW in greater depth. The group's main objectives were to consider the development of the revised approach to PBW in Kirklees and how this approach would become embedded within the organisation and across Council partners, in accordance with the Terms of Reference set out below.

Terms of Reference:

The terms of reference (TOR) of the Group are set out below;

- 1) To gain an understanding of the background and work to date in developing a revised approach to place based working in Kirklees and to understand the aims of the work, anticipated timescales and outcomes.
- 2) To undertake pre-scrutiny work in commenting on proposals to implement aspects of place-based working.
- 3) To maintain an overview of the ongoing development and implementation of place-based working in Kirklees. As part of this the subgroup will consider:
 - How the revised approach to place-based working is developed and thereafter embedded within the organisation and across Council partners.
 - How working differently with communities will be achieved.
 - How Place Based Working and the approaches adopted, support the delivery of our shared outcomes.

- The approach to engagement and how it is evaluated.
 - The communications plan for the programme of work and how it will be delivered.
- 4) To monitor the delivery of the place-based working programme of work against indicative targets, key milestones and anticipated outcomes.
 - 5) To consider the outcomes of the work to identify the impact of the approach, including successful outcomes for communities arising from engagement. To identify any learning points, including barriers to delivery and maximising successful outcomes for communities.
 - 6) To produce an end of year report to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, summarising the work of the subgroup and making recommendations on the focus for the scrutiny of place based working in 2020/21.

2. Information required to take a decision

Between September 2019 and March 2021, the group received regular updates from officers involved in the work that was being undertaken to progress place based working in Kirklees, the engagement processes using the Place Standard Tool, and the planned next steps to gather the evidence used to inform the final report.

The group also received and considered early feedback on place based service delivery in practice by meeting with the Place Partnerships Leads, Third Sector Leaders and Community Anchor Representatives and the group incorporated their valuable contributions into its findings.

The final report, including the Groups findings, recommendations and associated Action Plan are appended to this report for the Committee's consideration.

3. Implications for the Council

There are no specific implications for the Council.

4. Next steps and timelines

Once the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has recommended the next steps to be taken officers will undertake the necessary work to be actioned.

5. Officer recommendations and reasons

That the Committee endorse the final report and recommend that the action plan be sent to the relevant Portfolio Holder and Strategic Director for completion as a part of the next steps.

6. Cabinet Portfolio Holder's recommendations

N/a

7. Contact officer

Jodie Harris
Principal Governance and Democratic Engagement Officer
01484 221000
Jodie.Harris@kirklees.gov.uk

8. Background Papers and History of Decisions

N/a

9. Service Director responsible

Julie Muscroft
Service Director – Legal, Governance and Commissioning

Report of Place Based Working Group

March 2021

**Democracy Service
Civic Centre III
High Street
Huddersfield HD1 2TG**

**Tel: 01484 221000
Email: scrutiny.governance@kirklees.gov.uk**

CONTENTS	PAGE
1. Foreword by the Chair	
2. Introduction, Terms of Reference and Methodology	
3. Background Information	
4. Summary of Evidence Received	
5. Findings	
6. Recommendations	
7. Action Plan (including response to recommendations)	

1. FOREWORD

by Councillor Harpreet Uppal, Chair of the Place Based Working Group.

- 1.1- I want to thank the members of the Place Based Working Group for their work on this project and to everyone who has participated and provided evidence to us. Special thanks go to our Governance Officer, Jodie Harris, who has pulled all our work together.
- 1.2- As a working group our aim was to determine and review the development of the revised approach to place based working in Kirklees and how this approach would become embedded within the organisation and across Council partners.
- 1.3- It is clear to me and members of the working group that place based working is the right approach to take. We must do more to engage citizens in their place, so they have pride in their area and know that they are being engaged with and that ideas are being enacted on. Councillors are representatives for citizens and must be engaged in the work taking place in their wards.
- 1.4- Several council colleagues, departments and local partners are working hard on implementing place based working and I and the group want to thank them for their work.
- 1.5- Work such as the Place Standard Tool has been warmly welcomed as a new way of engaging with residents. It is also clear the community anchor approach, where the Council has worked closely with the voluntary and community sector during the Covid-19 pandemic, has largely worked well and shown what can be done quickly in challenging times. This should be the approach going forward.
- 1.6- The response to the Place Partnership Model has been more mixed and whilst there have been some benefits in making decisions at a local level, it is clear some work is needed on its aims and objectives, buy-in and how decisions are made on themes and budget allocation. For example, the key themes to be addressed through the Place Partnership had already been decided rather than the Place Partnership Leads having a say in these.
- 1.7- The Council are on the right path with place based working. However, what is important now is that resources must follow. Culture change in the Council must also be embedded to ensure the effectiveness of place based working and, ultimately, for the best outcomes for our citizens.

2. INTRODUCTION, TERMS OF REFERENCE & METHODOLOGY

- 2.1- At its meeting held on 9 September 2019 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee (OSMC) considered a report from the Strategic Director for Corporate Strategy, Commissioning and Public Health and the Head of Democracy and Place Based Working, in relation to the developing approach to place based working (PBW) in Kirklees.
- 2.2- The Committee were informed that PBW was one of the core elements of the Corporate Plan, which put communities and their representatives at the heart of system design and delivery. The approach was predicated on the view that citizens and communities are best placed to know their own challenges and strengths but could not always achieve change alone.
- 2.3- The implementation of PBW in Kirklees would require a cultural change across services and partners. It was explained that the building blocks for creating the conditions for effective PBW were beginning to take shape, but further work needed to be done to develop a cohesive work programme and to establish the type of relationship that the Council wanted to have with citizens.
- 2.4- From a strategic perspective, the Chief Executive's report, presented to Annual Council in May 2019, introduced 'Place Partnerships', 'Ward and Sub Ward Partnerships' and the 'Place Standard Tool' as some of the practical mechanisms by which Kirklees would begin to deliver PBW.
- 2.5- The Committee was asked to provide a steer with regards to the direction of the next phase of work and to determine how Overview and Scrutiny wished to consider the matter of PBW.
- 2.6- Further to a discussion which covered a range of related issues, the Management Committee resolved to establish the Place Based Working Group drawn from members of the Corporate Scrutiny Panel and the Economy and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Panel to consider the matter of PBW in greater depth. The group's main objectives were to consider the development of the revised approach to PBW in Kirklees and how this approach would become embedded within the organisation and across Council partners, in accordance with the Terms of Reference set out in paragraph 2.10.

2.7- The members of the Place Based Working Group were:

Membership:

- Cllr Harpreet Uppal (Chair)
- Cllr Will Simpson
- Cllr Andrew Cooper
- Cllr Alison Munro
- Cllr John Taylor
- Cllr Cathy Scott (invited to attend as Cabinet Member)

Officers invited to attend:

- Carl Whistlecraft, Head of Democracy and Place Based Working
- Vina Randhawa, Active Citizens and Places Manager
- Rachel Spencer Henshall, Strategic Director, Corporate Strategy, Commissioning and Public Health

2.8- The Panel was supported by Leigh Webb and Jodie Harris from the Governance Team.

2.9- Terms of Reference:

The terms of reference (TOR) of the Group are set out below;

- 1) To gain an understanding of the background and work to date in developing a revised approach to place based working in Kirklees and to understand the aims of the work, anticipated timescales and outcomes.
- 2) To undertake pre-scrutiny work in commenting on proposals to implement aspects of place-based working.
- 3) To maintain an overview of the ongoing development and implementation of place based working in Kirklees. As part of this the subgroup will consider:
 - How the revised approach to place based working is developed and thereafter embedded within the organisation and across Council partners.
 - How working differently with communities will be achieved.
 - How place based working and the approaches adopted, support the delivery of our shared outcomes.
 - The approach to engagement and how it is evaluated.
 - The communications plan for the programme of work and how it will be delivered.
- 4) To monitor the delivery of the place based working programme of work against indicative targets, key milestones and anticipated outcomes.

- 5) To consider the outcomes of the work to identify the impact of the approach, including successful outcomes for communities arising from engagement. To identify any learning points, including barriers to delivery and maximising successful outcomes for communities.
- 6) To produce an end of year report to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, summarising the work of the subgroup and making recommendations on the focus for the scrutiny of place based working in 2020/21.

Methodology

2.10- Between September 2019 and March 2021, the group used a range of methods to gather the evidence used to inform this report.

2.11- The following officers attended some, or all, of the meetings of the group to give evidence:

- Carl Whistlecraft, Head of Democracy and Place Based Working.
- Vina Randhawa, Active Citizens and Places Manager.
- Rachel Spencer Henshall, Strategic Director, Corporate Strategy, Commissioning and Public Health.
- Hannah Elliott, Restorative Practice Co-ordinator and Transformation Lead, Strategy, Innovation & Planning.
- Tamsin Macdonald, Local Area Co-ordination Manager, Customer & Communities.
- Siobhan Finnigan, Transformation Programme Manager

2.12- In November 2020, arrangements were made for the group to meet with Third Sector Leaders and Community Anchor Organisations. The attendees were:

- Val Johnson, Chief Officer, Third Sector Leaders.
- Bridget Hughes, Development Manager, Community Learning Works, Third Sector Leaders.
- Paul Bridges, Huddersfield Mission Manager.
- Andy Petrie, Group Chief Executive, Local Services 2 You.
- Paul Jones, Chief Officer, Denby Dale Centre.

2.13- A joint session was also held between members of the group and the Place Partnership Leads in December 2020. The Place Partnership Leads in attendance were:

- Cllr Karen Allison, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield Central)
- Cllr Bill Armer, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield Rural)
- Cllr Gwen Lowe, Place Partnership Lead (Batley, Birstall and Birkenshaw)
- Cllr Andrew Pinnock, Place Partnership Lead (Spen Valley)
- Cllr Sheikh Ullah, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield North)
- Cllr Rob Walker, Place Partnership Lead (Colne Valley)

Commissioned Work

- 2.14- The Group received the details and findings of the following pieces of commissioned work in respect of PBW.
- Collaborate, who were commissioned to assess the current perspectives of local stakeholders and the Council regarding their understandings of PBW, the current situation in Kirklees and the potential barriers to going further.
 - The New Citizenship Project, a strategy and innovation consultancy, who were commissioned to support the Council's changing relationship with citizens.

3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1- The implementation of a placed based way of working in Kirklees originated from the recommendations made by the Kirklees Democracy Commission, as set out in their report "Growing a stronger local democracy, from the ground up", which was published on 30th June 2017.
- 3.2- The Democracy Commission was established by Kirklees Council to gather evidence about local democracy in Kirklees and to make recommendations based on their findings. The Commissioners were a cross-party group of Kirklees Councillors, with an independent Chair from the University of Huddersfield.
- 3.3- This was during a time when the Council's relationship with local people was changing in the context of: reduced resources; the regional devolution agenda (which presented opportunities to reinvigorate local democracy and deliver better outcomes for citizens); reduced voter turnout; and the new opportunities that were brought about by a digital age. Consequently, there was a compelling need to review what local democracy should look like in Kirklees.
- 3.4- The starting premise for the work was that a healthy and vibrant local democracy needed to be at the heart of any effective local government. The Commission therefore worked with citizens, council officers and partners to investigate what a strong local democracy should look like in Kirklees, for the next generation and beyond.
- 3.5- From the outset the Commission placed a strong emphasis on the notion of the 'Active Citizen' and the need for the Council to look at changing the relationship it had with its citizens to establish,
- 'an informed citizen-led democracy, with accountable elected representatives, who enable communities to influence and affect decisions governing their lives'.¹
- 3.6- The idea was to understand how Kirklees Council could create an environment in

¹ Kirklees Democracy Commission, Growing a stronger Local Democracy from the Ground Up, 30 June 2017, [Kirklees Democracy Commission – We're growing a stronger local democracy](#)¹.

which local democracy and citizen engagement could thrive; placing citizens at the heart of service design and making sure that the regional voice of Kirklees was rooted in the priorities of its local towns, villages and communities.

- 3.7- The Commission's full report set out 48 recommendations to achieve a strong citizen led local democracy in Kirklees, which was debated at a meeting of the full Council held on 10 May 2017.
- 3.8- In approving the Commission's recommendations, the Council took the decision to put a firm focus on a new approach to citizen engagement that harnessed the strengths and aspirations of the towns, villages and communities of Kirklees.
- 3.9- At the meeting of Annual Council held on 22 May 2019, a report (Ward and Place Partnerships) was presented by the Chief Executive to inform Council of the proposed changes to working in a place based way.
- 3.10- The report set out an ambitious vision for Kirklees Council which was to transform support for residents through PBW as a more effective (and cost-effective) means to make progress on the seven shared outcomes for residents, as set out in the wider strategic plan.
- 3.11- In summary, this vision was to grow stronger communities and a more cohesive Kirklees where high quality, joined up services enabled greater independence for residents, allowed them to access support and advice within their local area, and encouraged their engagement in local democracy and the decisions affecting the places where they live.
- 'We know that one size doesn't fit all, and we recognise the diversity and strengths to be found across Kirklees. We are committed to working with people to design, develop and deliver support and services. Place based working taps into the huge pride that the people of Kirklees have for the places in which they live, work and play, and their valuable skills, strengths and local knowledge'.²
- 3.12- The following key proposals were presented at the Annual Council meeting as some of the practical mechanisms by which Kirklees would begin to deliver PBW:
- Citizen engagement and the Place Standard Tool
 - Place Partnerships
 - Ward and Sub Ward Partnerships

Citizen Engagement and the Place Standard Tool:

- 3.13- The Kirklees Democracy Commission discovered that local people were increasingly skeptical of consultation. The Commission found that people were also more likely to have a stake in the place that they live, work or visit if there was a more genuine

² Kirklees Council, Our Corporate Plan 2020/21, [Our Council Plan 2020/21 | Kirklees Council](#)

approach to engagement and if they were able to influence the future of the place where they live.

- 3.14- The Kirklees Democracy Commission Working Group, (a cross-party group of Kirklees Councillors) was formed to oversee the practical delivery of the Commission's recommendations. They identified a number of priority recommendations in 2018 which included making 'Active Citizenship' a shared strategic priority.
- 3.15- As part of its work in advocating the notion of Active Citizen, the Cross-Party Working Group developed and endorsed a set of citizen engagement principles. In doing so they agreed that the Place Standard Tool should be the principal means by which the Council undertakes place based engagement, to build a different dialogue with local people and to create an environment where the notion of the Active Citizen can begin to develop and flourish.
- 3.16- The Place Standard Tool was originally launched in December 2015 to support the delivery of high-quality places in Scotland. It provides a simple framework to structure conversations to assess the quality of a place. The framework was designed to support communities, the public, the private and the third sector to work efficiently together to identify their priorities. It also enables the Council and partners to work with local people within the geography that they identify with.
- 3.17- In adopting the Place Standard methodology, a cross service and partner Citizen Engagement Reference Group was established to have oversight of all planned citizen engagement to ensure that it was being coordinated in accordance with the Place Standard framework.
- 3.18- In practice, this involved engagement being planned and commissioned based on three broad categories:
- Opportunistic: i.e. taking advantage of significant events to undertake engagement such as the Huddersfield Town Centre blueprint.
 - Councillor-initiated i.e. where Councillors wished to commission and undertake engagement in parts or across their ward.
 - Community / citizen initiated i.e. where community groups approached the Council to assist them in undertaking engagement.

Place Partnerships

- 3.19- Place Partnerships were created on the predicated view that there are strategic issues that are best responded to on a level greater than a singular ward area, but on a smaller scale than Kirklees wide.
- 3.20- To do this, seven 'places' were identified (the 'Place Partnerships') using demographics as a basis. A Place Partnership Lead Councillor was identified for each of the seven 'places' to work with ward councillors to propose interventions in response

to challenges at a Place Partnership level (on a scale larger than a ward but less than Kirklees wide) to strive to achieve better outcomes.

3.21- The Place Partnership Leads are:

Cllr Karen Allison, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield Central)
Cllr Bill Armer, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield Rural)
Cllr Gwen Lowe, Place Partnership Lead (Batley, Birstall and Birkenshaw)
Cllr Andrew Pinnock, Place Partnership Lead (Spen Valley & Mirfield)
Cllr Sheikh Ullah, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield North)
Cllr Rob Walker, Place Partnership Lead (Colne Valley)
Cllr Gulfam Asif, Place Partnership Lead (Dewsbury)

3.22- Intelligence and data were used to determine the key themes to be considered at a Place Partnership level. For 2019/20 the theme was improving mental health outcomes and domestic abuse and an additional £1m and £400k respectively was put in to the 2019/20 budget to support this.

Ward and Sub Ward Partnerships

3.23- The Chief Executive's report to Annual Council in May 2019 recognised that a core part of the role of a Councillor is to work alongside communities, the Council and its partners to build capacity within their wards, using the totality of resources available to facilitate activity. Councillors are also best placed to identify where gaps in capacity exist, using the intelligence and insight that they hold about local needs and aspirations.

3.24- The 'ward' was highlighted as an important building block in the implementation of PBW. The report introduced the proposal for the wards to produce a 'Ward or Sub Ward Plan' with clear priorities, that would become a pre-cursor, if required, to a Ward or Sub Ward Partnership.

3.25- Ward or Sub Ward Partnerships would be established to provide an opportunity for Councillors, Council staff, the Police, the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) and other key stakeholders to come together to ensure the delivery of those priorities identified.

3.26- It was highlighted that place based engagement activity, using the Place Standard, was the principal mechanism through which the approach to Ward and Sub-Ward Partnerships was to be developed.

3.27- It was felt that adopting such an approach would help to establish a clear sense of the priorities and aspirations that citizens have for their places. The aim was to develop a genuine "bottom up" picture of Kirklees which involved working with citizens from the outset holding them in view as an important asset as part of co-producing solutions, and leading the implementation of those solutions in some cases. It is also important

that Councillors play a key part in PBW and are brought in early on in local projects. It was acknowledged that this was a cultural change that will take time

- 3.28- At its meeting held on 9 September 2019 the OSMC received an update on the work that had taken place to progress PBW. Arising therefrom the Management Committee agreed to establish the Place Based Working Group to carry out overview and scrutiny on the developing approach to PBW.
- 3.29- It is also important to note the wider context in relation to the Covid-19 pandemic which began in March 2020 and subsequently brought about the need to implement place based measures to react to the challenges caused by the pandemic and to support communities.

4. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 4.1- During an informal meeting of the group held on 6th February 2020, it was agreed that the Group's starting point was understanding the rationale behind the concept of PBW, the progress to date, the engagement processes, and the planned next steps to determine its approach and areas of focus as part of its overview and scrutiny role.

Meeting held on 10th March 2020

- 4.2- The first business meeting of the group took place on 10th March 2020 when the Group considered the following documents by way of core background information:
- The Chief Executive's report that was considered and agreed at the meeting of Annual Council held in May 2019.
 - The detailed report (and associated papers) that were considered by OSMC at its meeting held on 9 September 2019 and,
 - The accompanying slides that formed the basis of the presentation to OSMC at its meeting held on 9 September 2019.
- 4.3- During this meeting, the group received information presented by the Director of Corporate Strategy, Commissioning and Public Health describing the key principles of PBW and the main challenges facing Kirklees in implementing place based ways of working.
- 4.4- The group noted the steps taken to progress PBW since the update given to OSMC in September 2019 and were informed of the plans for the next 12 months.
- 4.5- Key areas of focus were:
- The Strategic Context: Why PBW, what does PBW mean to Kirklees, and what does PBW mean in practice?
 - Collaborate findings
 - Strategic Co-ordination and Operational Support
 - The Place Partnerships

- The Ward and Sub-ward Partnerships
- Citizen Engagement and the Place Standard

Why Place Based Working?

- 4.6- The group was informed that the existing models of working needed to change to meet the challenges presented to the Council, key partners, the VCS and citizens in Kirklees more effectively. This was in addition to the fiscal climate at the time which called for new approaches to managing and meeting demand.
- 4.7- A different approach was needed which required partners to work together across organisational boundaries, to draw on a much wider range of community assets and resources so that support could be built around residents and the lives they lead.
- 4.8- The overall vision was to transform the support for residents through PBW, and to make progress on the seven Shared Outcomes as outlined in the Corporate Plan. The developing model was described as the 'Kirklees Way'.
- 4.9- In advocating the Democracy Commission's recommendation of taking a strategic approach to active citizenship, the developing PBW model recognises that it is communities that are best placed to identify their own local challenges, and the strengths they have within their communities, but they can't always achieve change alone.
- 4.10- By bringing services in the system closer to people and putting communities and their representatives at the heart of service design the aim was to deliver better outcomes for citizens in response to local needs.
- 4.11- The place based way of working also aimed to establish a different relationship between citizens and the Council. In supporting the idea of the 'active citizen' through PBW there was the opportunity to develop a stronger citizen-led local democracy in which people were enabled to influence and affect the decisions governing their lives, and to ensure that Kirklees regional voice reflected the priorities of its individuals and communities. For PBW to work well it is also important that the role of elected representatives is clearly defined in the process.

Place Based Working in Practice:

- 4.12- The group was advised that a range of local information, insight and intelligence was to be used to help achieve the best outcomes for individuals and communities. This was to involve understanding the geographical areas, the networks and assets within them, as well as working with partners to make sure that 'geographically' the whole system of the Council, its services and people, is aligned around local places with which citizens identify.

- 4.13- In practice this would mean working in the best interests of the community and the people, not the organisations involved, having different conversations with residents, and bringing multi agency teams together around a 'place' to work collaboratively and to share vital knowledge and skills.

Understanding the Starting Point and Challenges

- 4.14- The importance of understanding where Kirklees was starting from in terms of PBW was highlighted. This involved making sure that the views and perspectives of stakeholders, such as Council partners, were heard and considered in the forward planning of the PBW work programme.
- 4.15- The group was made aware that, for this reason, the Council had commissioned Collaborate to assess the current perspectives of local stakeholders and the Council regarding their understandings of PBW, the current situation in Kirklees and the potential barriers to going further.
- 4.16- The feedback from Collaborate identified 4 important shifts in behaviour, culture and practice for Kirklees to become enablers of the PBW vision and to achieve the shared outcomes. These were as follows,
- From organisations to system (PBW needs to become a collective effort, based on thinking systemically, developing system leadership and stewardship roles, and working collaboratively).
 - From Services to People (start with people in the places they identify with, then work out the implications for services and how they are configured).
 - From a 'better' council to a 'different council' (align roles, culture and capabilities to the goal of PBW, experiment and learn).
 - From doing to (or for) to doing with (embrace the assets and agency of people and communities, coproduce, support community initiative, build capacity, share responsibility).

Place Based Working and 'Geographies':

- 4.17- The group was advised that the concept of working in 'places' often gives rise to debate over geographical boundaries. The group noted that organisational boundaries often don't make sense to residents living in these places, but nonetheless the 23 wards and their elected representatives were the basic building blocks of Council governance and sat at the heart of the implementation of the PBW work programme.
- 4.18- This initiated further discussion of the matter of the geographical designation of places and how residents identify with areas.
- 4.19- The group described the important role that 'transport infrastructure and connectivity' played in influencing how residents operate within their daily lives, which services, shops and community groups they accessed and subsequently what they identified with locally.

Moving Towards Working in a Place Based Way:

- 4.20- The group was advised that the Council's four Early Intervention and Prevention (EIP) Hubs in Huddersfield Civic Centre, Dewsbury Town Hall, Batley Town Hall and Slaithwaite Town Hall provided a physical base for partners working in an area, particularly mobile workers who do not physically work from a fixed location.
- 4.21- It was noted that the physical location of Council and VCS staff could support a place based multi-agency approach to service delivery.
- 4.22- This brought about a discussion around asset transfer in the context of PBW, and the issue of viability in relation to asset transfer to the community. The group highlighted there were key skills and knowledge required to successfully take on a transferred asset. Two members of the Group noted that there is a cost to community volunteers who take on buildings in having to constantly fundraise which may divert attention away from other activities.
- 4.23- To follow, the group was reminded of the three proposals set out at the meeting of Annual Council held in May 2019 (see background) to establish an approach to:
- Place Partnerships.
 - Ward and Sub Ward Partnerships.
 - Place based engagement using the Place Standard tool.

Place Partnerships:

- 4.24- The Council established the Place Partnerships in May 2019 to respond to strategic issues on a geography greater than a ward, but less than Kirklees wide, with a commitment initially to improve mental health and domestic abuse outcomes with a budget of £1m and £400,000 respectively to support this.
- 4.25- The group was informed that a Place Partnership Lead Councillor had been allocated to each of the seven 'places' identified. From the outset Place Partnership Lead Councillors worked collaboratively to develop an overarching approach that they wished to take, which acknowledged that the seven Place Partnership areas were very different and therefore any initiatives developed would take account of and respond to the needs of each place.
- 4.26- The overarching approach involved:
- Engagement with Councillors, relevant departments, and sections operating in the designated area with responsibility for the priority themes, to understand what already exists and what the gaps are.
 - Engagement with the community and key stakeholder groups / organisations to ensure a wider partnership dialogue, co-production and solutions.

- 4.27- It was also explained how the project would progress from the engagement stage, to the point where recommendations based on the Place Partnerships findings would be made to Cabinet and to the implementation, evaluation and monitoring of outcomes.

Ward and Sub Ward Partnerships

- 4.28- As of the time of the meeting, the group informed that some wards had (or were in the process of developing) a Ward Forum or Ward Partnership. The engagement was planned to be delivered using the Place Standard Tool and the 'How Good is Our Place' framework.
- 4.29- **Stage 1 How Good is Our Place?** Place based engagement at a Ward and / or Sub-Ward level, that uses the Place Standard Tool to structure a conversation about place. This encourages citizens to consider the physical elements of a place (such as its buildings, spaces and transport links) as well the social aspects (for example, whether people feel they have a say in what happens where they live).
- 4.30- **Stage 2 Let's make it better together.** The collective response to place based engagement. The feedback from engagement is used as part of wider partnership discussion to collectively decide on priorities for action that would be formulated into a Sub-Ward or Ward Partnership Plan.
- 4.31- **Stage 3 How are we doing?** Monitoring and openly communicating Partnership Plan delivery and ensuring that re-engagement takes place to test that desired outcomes and citizen aspirations have been met over time.

New Citizenship Project

- 4.32- The New Citizenship Project, a strategy and innovation consultancy who work with organisations to create participatory strategies, cultures and projects that invite people to step into their power as citizens, had been commissioned to support the Council's changing relationship with citizens.
- 4.33- The findings of the commissioned work, which were presented to the Group, defined the building blocks of the 'Kirklees Way' approach and were also used to inform practical pilot projects in the participating communities of Fieldhead and Ashbrow. The feedback from the pilots was to be considered and used to determine the next steps and inform the basis of the cultural change that would need to take place across the organisation.

Place Based Engagement Using the Place Standard Tool

- 4.34- The group was provided with the following updates in relation to any engagement or planned engagement using the Place Standard Tool:

- There had been Place Standard engagements delivered in 8 neighbourhoods, covering 5 wards, to date. These sessions engaged with approximately 1,750 citizens.
 - Engagement was planned in 19 neighbourhoods, covering 11 wards (all involving Councillors). These were to be led by a mix of Councillors, (including Town Council Councillors) the community and Council services (where there was the opportunity for investment).
 - Place Standard engagement was being undertaken, as of the time of the meeting, to inform the Huddersfield Town Centre Blueprint.
 - Over 200 people had received training in delivering Place Standard conversations. This figure included staff from 26 service areas, 12 Councillors, 6 voluntary organisations and 39 residents.
- 4.35- In response to a question from the group regarding timescales, it was reported that the next Stakeholder Engagement Event was planned with Members and stakeholders following the local elections. The group noted this and requested that the feedback was presented at a future meeting.
- 4.36- At this early stage the group highlighted the importance of making sure that Councillors were central to communicating PBW to residents and helping to make the process work.
- 4.37- During the discussion that followed, officers explained that the Active Citizens and Places Team would act as a conduit between Council employees and Councillors.
- 4.38- The group considered that it was important to share stories with the community as a means of highlighting positive outcomes of PBW and to make the concept of PBW meaningful to residents, key stakeholders, and partners. It requested that good examples of Place Standard engagement be presented to the group at a future meeting.

Conditions for success and the planned next steps:

- 4.39- It was advised that, at this stage, the relevant Strategic Directors were working on the operating model for PBW and that the corporate centre was considering enabling support to facilitate the operating model in order to establish the correct conditions for the success of PBW in Kirklees.
- 4.40- In response to questions from the group about the governance arrangements and the member and officer protocols it was explained that the planned next steps were to:
- Define the full programme of work.
 - Determine the governance arrangements for the next phases of work.
 - Engage with all political groups and,
 - Develop a communication plan around the programme.
- 4.41- It was explained that new governance arrangements within departments were in place to deliver PBW, with the emphasis on Service Heads to embed a culture of enabling new ways of working with local communities within their teams.

- 4.42- After receiving the presentation the group summarised its initial understanding of the context of PBW in Kirklees and noted that PBW required a culture change within the organisation which embedded place based practices within Council service delivery and the services of the partners that the Council worked with to deliver those services.

The Impact of Covid-19

- 4.43- On 23rd of March 2020 the United Kingdom was placed into a national lockdown by the Government in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. The impact of the pandemic subsequently put increased demand on the Council's resources to support business continuity and communities.

Meeting held on 20th August 2020

- 4.44- At its next meeting, held on 20th August 2020, the group received an update in regard to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the progress of the PBW programme.
- 4.45- The group noted that resources had been targeted at the response to the pandemic and keeping residents safe, meaning that some of the proposed programme activity had been halted or impinged in terms of timescales.
- 4.46- However, the group was also advised that the pandemic had provided momentum and accelerated some PBW projects beyond the milestones originally projected.
- 4.47- The community response work had provided an earlier than anticipated opportunity to test the developing operating model across the four-hub footprint and therefore the process of evaluating and understanding some of the key learning was underway.
- 4.48- The relationship with the VCS has come into focus as volunteers, mutual aid groups and community anchor organisations came together as part of the community response. The group noted that this collaborative way of working to respond to the challenges presented by the pandemic had prompted an acceleration in the work to refresh the VCS strategy and the Council's wider relationship with the VCS.
- 4.49- The group was informed of the revised timescales as a result of the pandemic and noted that a forward plan for the next 6 months had been developed.
- 4.50- The forward plan stipulated that the learning gained through the community response to the pandemic was to be considered in the implementation of the wider PBW programme to build back better during the Council's recovery. The group noted that this added a new key area of focus to their overview and scrutiny of the PBW programme.

Stakeholder/Engagement Events

- 4.51- As requested at the group's previous meeting, an update on the outcomes of the Staff Engagement events was provided.
- 4.52- It was noted that just less than 300 members of staff from the Council and partners

had attended four engagement events, and that the 120 staff members, who had been unable to attend, responded to the survey.

- 4.53- The staff engagement sessions were held in Batley, Dewsbury, Huddersfield and Holmfirth. There were also 2 Councillor engagement sessions held in Dewsbury and Huddersfield which were attended by 24 Councillors. The group was advised that a number of key emerging themes were identified from the feedback which were to be used as a basis for developing the design principles for the PBW operating model.
- 4.54- The group received an update on the work of the Citizen Engagement Reference Group with regard to the Place Standard which provided a position statement in terms of planned engagement and set out all engagement that was currently being delivered, planned, or put on hold (as a result of the pandemic) across Kirklees.
- 4.55- In response, the group highlighted that in many cases the priorities raised by the community were not aligned with the priorities of the Council. The group stressed the need to ensure that the results of engagement on the ground filters up to inform policy development, funding and strategic decisions.
- 4.56- An update was provided in respect of Place Partnerships and it was reported that meetings with Place Partnership Lead Councillors had resumed at the end of May 2020. The purpose of the initial meetings was to reflect and revisit priorities in light of the impact of Covid-19 on communities. Further to this, the Leads met in July to report on progress and to discuss common priorities, opportunities for joint commissioning and share good practice.
- 4.57- An update was provided in respect of the engagement, with volunteers, mutual aid group members, Councillors, Council and partner staff and the VCS, that had been undertaken in order to understand the experience of working with and within the resource hubs during the pandemic. It was reported that the outcomes from this engagement were to be overlaid with the outcomes from previous work and would be used collectively to develop the operating model.
- 4.58- During discussion of the approach to partnership working during the pandemic, the group highlighted the importance of using the opportunities and learning from the pandemic to refresh and build on the relationship with Community Anchors and the Third Sector.
- 4.59- In response to a question concerning ward plans it was explained that a flexible approach would be taken to ensure plans reflected the views of the community. It was acknowledged that this may mean having a single overarching plan in some wards and multiple plans in others.
- 4.60- The group supported the need to be flexible and to avoid a 'one size fits all' model in respect of ward plans and advocated that Ward Councillors would be central to guiding which approach would be most suited to individual wards.
- 4.61- With regard to the issue of priority topic areas going forward, it was acknowledged that any new proposal needed to be fully evaluated against set criteria as part of a decision-making model

4.62- After hearing the update, the group then agreed and advised of its next steps:

- In recognising the importance of looking at how the Council facilitates cross ward working in areas where commonalities exist it was requested that arrangements were made for a joint session be held with the Place Partnership Leads and the PBW Group to examine existing structures and the issue of geographical boundaries.
- That the analysis of the ongoing engagement with partners be submitted to a future meeting setting out an evaluation which was to inform the development of the operating model.
- That a future meeting with Third Sector leaders and Community Anchor groups be arranged to discuss their work experiences during the pandemic.

Meeting with Third Sector Leaders and Community Anchors – 26th November 2020

4.63- At its meeting held on 26 November 2020, the group received feedback from Third Sector Leaders (TSL) and community anchor representatives. The representatives in attendance were:

- Val Johnson, Chief Officer, Third Sector Leaders
- Bridget Hughes, Development Manager, Community Learning Works, Third Sector Leaders
- Paul Bridges, Huddersfield Mission Manager
- Andy Petrie, Group Chief Executive, Local Services 2 You
- Paul Jones, Chief Officer, Denby Dale Centre

4.64- Each representative was invited to give their views on PBW in Kirklees within the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. During the discussion and questioning that followed a number of key issues and themes were raised by the Third Sector Leaders and community anchor representatives.

4.65- The group noted that the importance of working “with” local people and groups to meet local need was critical to the success of PBW. Inputs should be ‘person centred’ and not ‘service driven’, and residents should be listened to.

4.66- However, during the discussion it was noted that any individual organisation may not be able to resolve some challenges alone. In response, group members and the TSL and the community anchor representatives felt that there should be a focus on helping the Council and key council partners to become enablers. In supporting people to resolve their own issues greater independence and strength in local communities could be achieved, in accordance with the corporate shared outcomes.

4.67- The role of community anchors in supporting small informal groups and bringing together and co-ordinating the work of local organisations was a clear demonstration of how PBW had worked well in practice throughout the pandemic.

- 4.68- Clarity for organisations in respect of funding streams was needed and a trusting relationship between local organisations and funders was vital as a means of empowering communities to deliver real outcomes within their localities.
- 4.69- Recognition of the value of Third Sector organisations was important. It was suggested that secondments and placements within local community organisations could be used as a means of local authority staff gaining a hands-on understanding of how the Third Sector works.
- 4.70- The use of resourced community buildings to house multi-agency teams (including staff from the VCS and the Council) as a part of the Council's community response to the pandemic had helped to strengthen the relationship between the Council and the VCS and had enabled an effective, collaborative and place based approach to service delivery. However, the group noted that sustainable funding was required to support community groups if this was to be taken forward.
- 4.71- Flexible relationships were required. This included the issue of contracting arrangements and, whilst acknowledging the need for accountability for public funds, a trusted relationship focussing on the quality of outcomes was important when developing contracts.
- 4.72- The funding application process needs to be nimble and streamlined, with local elected member involvement prior to the commissioning process.
- 4.73- The concept of PBW needs to be embedded in the culture of the local authority and understood and advocated by staff at all levels. Going forward, the policies of the Council needed to be looked at and delivered through a place based lens.
- 4.74- Overall, the Third Sector Leaders and community anchor representatives were positive about PBW and highlighted that strong partnerships and better working relationships had developed as a result of the pandemic. The group noted that it was important to take this approach forward and apply this learning in the Council's recovery from the pandemic.
- 4.75- The PBW Group thanked Third Sector Leaders and the representatives from the community anchor organisations for their invaluable insight and contributions to the discussion and the group members agreed that the issues and points raised above be considered when devising potential recommendations.

Joint meeting of the Place Based Working Group and Place Partnership Leads – 17th December 2020

- 4.76- The Place Partnership Leads were invited to a meeting of the group on 17th December 2020. The Place Partnership Leads who attended were:
- Cllr Karen Allison, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield Central)
 - Cllr Bill Armer, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield Rural)
 - Cllr Gwen Lowe, Place Partnership Lead (Batley, Birstall and Birkenshaw)

- Cllr Andrew Pinnock, Place Partnership Lead (Spen Valley and Mirfield)
- Cllr Sheikh Ullah, Place Partnership Lead (Huddersfield North)
- Cllr Rob Walker, Place Partnership Lead (Colne Valley)

- 4.77- The purpose of the meeting was to hear from the Place Partnership Leads about their experiences in the lead role position and to examine existing structures and identify why some initiatives and workstreams had worked well in some areas and not others.
- 4.78- The group was advised that there had been some delays in starting project work following Annual Council in May 2019, as the framework and approach for Place Partnerships had to be developed with the Leads and engagement planned with stakeholders. This was further exacerbated by the pandemic which had impacted on the progression of work.
- 4.79- In response to questions from the group about timescales, the Place Partnerships Leads advised that the agreed two year timeframe, from the project's outset to making proposals to Cabinet, may seem slow from the perception of the public and there was a risk that the work may lose some of its focus.
- 4.80- However, Place Partnership Leads were concerned that a reduction in this timeframe would increase the pressure substantially and having to pull together proposals at a greater pace may not allow for detailed consideration to be undertaken of the outcomes for communities.
- 4.81- In respect of the physical location of the seven places identified, it was noted that where wards were geographically close there were shared interests which enabled more effective cross-ward working.
- 4.82- Place Partnership Leads were not able to choose their own areas of work and this felt very 'doing to' instead of 'with'.
- 4.83- All felt unanimously that the work of the Place Partnerships should be given more value and highlighted the importance of the outcomes having a higher profile. It was felt that once a decision had been taken by Cabinet that there was a lack of communication about the decision which left Place Partnership Leads feeling deflated. The example of a piece of work surrounding the menopause was given, where Place Partnership Leads felt it was important that there was further communications support, such as a press release, to help tackle the stigma surrounding the menopause.
- 4.84- There had been some difficulties in linking in with existing mental health services in Kirklees and it was felt that having a better overview of what is already provided by the Council and partner organisations at the beginning of the process would have made a difference to the speed in which work was progressed.
- 4.85- Following the discussion and after summarising the feedback, it was agreed that the group would give further consideration to the following themes:
- More robust communications support.
 - The introduction of an 'Area Committee' like working structure.
 - Reviewing subject areas and who has control over their allocation.

- Increasing Councillor engagement and understanding.
- Improving the value of the work of the Place Partnerships and raising their profile in the organisation.

4.86- On the whole it was noted that the Lead's overall experience of the Place Partnerships had been a positive one and it was agreed that all seven Place Partnership Leads were to be thanked and congratulated for their work.

4.87- Further compliments were given to the Council officers who supported the work of Place Partnership Leads in the background and it was agreed that the officers involved from the Active Citizens and Places and Community Plus teams were to be thanked for their time, contributions and professionalism.

Meeting held on 3rd February 2021

4.88- At its meeting held on 3rd February 2021, the group noted the revised work programme and forward plan that had been developed in light of the Covid-19 pandemic.

4.89- As at the time of the meeting, officers advised that the insight gained from the early feedback to the community response to the pandemic indicated that the overall direction for PBW was correct and that work has been undertaken to refine projects and activities to help to deliver any the changes needed.

4.90- In response to the group's request at the meeting held on 20th August 2020, a report setting out the analysis of the ongoing engagement with partners and the early evaluation work which was to inform the development of the operating model was provided.

Place Based Working Operating Model:

4.91- Members were reminded that the wider PBW programme involved instigating and embedding an organisational culture change across the whole of the Council, its services, and people and partners.

4.92- As reported at the group's meeting in August 2020, the pandemic, in some respects, accelerated parts of this work stream with the development of the Community Response Hubs and it had been recognised that the learning from this area of work (alongside the existing engagement outcomes) should be used to inform the next steps of the PBW work programme.

4.93- The group was informed that, in this context, three separate pieces of work had been undertaken as follows:

Early Lessons from the Work with Communities and Neighbourhoods in Kirklees during the Covid-19 Lockdown - Toward Resilient Communities and Place.

- 4.94- This report was a rapid review to identify how the Council coordinated responses to local communities and neighbourhoods during the initial 'lockdown' phase of the pandemic from March to early July 2020. The report focused on working arrangements with locality-based anchors and hubs, mutual aid groups and the role of the VCS. The report at the time of the meeting was still in draft form, but the key learning points relevant to the PBW operating model were extracted and presented to the group.
- 4.95- The key emerging design principles to take forward, as informed by the rapid review were:

Skills and Knowledge:

- In the context of understanding the place and the networks and knowledge of hyperlocal resources that exist in those places.

Ways of Working:

- To use the community response hub teams as the platform for wider staff development and reorientation.
- Being visible and present in places.
- Being agile in terms of decision making and communicating, coordinating efforts and seeking to work collaboratively.
- Co-produced asset mapping at a locality and neighbourhood level to fully understand the range of community resources.
- Re-design existing pathways and methods of resource allocation.
- The ability and readiness of teams and departments to be agile and pivot resources, to build relationships and new approaches to service working.
- Third Sector Leaders as an important conduit between the Council, anchor organisations, mutual aid groups and community groups.
- A conduit with local councillors.
- Reviewing communication in a way that is inclusive.

Leadership and Management:

- Senior leaders are visible, demonstrate clear values and are action focussed.
- 'Permission to act' is supported by a diffused leadership model.

Place Based Evaluation of the Community Response:

- 4.96- In March 2020 four Community Response Hubs were set up by the Council as the organisational vehicle for coordinating the local response to the Covid-19 pandemic and the UK wide lockdown. This was a collaborative response between the Council and communities and the approach was place based, set within a framework which enabled operations to respond and evolve through listening to, and learning from, the changing environment, as well as the knowledge of the people involved.

4.97- The community response was delivered by organisations and communities through formal and informal partnerships which involved the following:

- Anchor organisations
- Mutual Aid Groups
- Partner organisations
- Volunteers
- The Council

4.98- The group was advised that, as the first lockdown came to an end in July 2020, Kirklees was required to adapt to changing government public health guidelines. This provided the opportunity to reflect on the effectiveness of the Community Response Hubs.

4.99- The evaluation aimed to capture how well the approach through the community response had worked and the learning from it that could be applied to the Council's journey through recovery from the pandemic to long term transformation and change of public services.

4.100- The focus of the evaluation and survey was on the views of those involved in delivering the Covid-19 response and aimed to collate views from as many stakeholders as possible about their experiences of being part of the community response. With the resources available, officers advised that it was determined that the best way to facilitate a large-scale response that ensured honest responses was through an online questionnaire.

4.101- In addition to the values as set out in the Corporate Plan, the design of the questionnaire was informed by the ERA cycle (Experience, Reflection, Action) and restorative principles.

4.102- For information, the group was advised that the ERA cycle provides a simple guide and model of reflection as follows:

- **Experience-** The reflective cycle starts with an experience, either something we have been through before or something completely new to us. This experience can be positive or negative and may be related to our work or something else entirely.
- **Reflection-** Once something has been experienced, we will naturally start to reflect on what happened. This will allow us to think through the experience, examine our feelings about what happened and decide on the next steps.
- **Action-** What we do because of an experience will be different depending on our own feelings and experiences leading up to it. This action will result in another experience and the cycle will continue.

4.103- The group was presented with the draft report (Review of Community Response Hubs in Kirklees) which set out a summary of the survey's findings at the time of the meeting.

- 4.104- The questionnaire included 17 questions and, for most of the questions, respondents were asked to provide examples to illustrate their response. The group was advised that these examples, along with the responses to the questions, brought both qualitative and quantitative insight to the experiences had by those involved in delivering the Covid- 19 response.
- 4.105- Officers provided the group with an overview of the draft report and advised that 97 people completed the survey, with over half of these responses coming from Council officers. Therefore, it was acknowledged that though the data provided a useful insight, it was not necessarily representative of everyone's experiences.
- 4.106- In response to the group's questions about how the survey was communicated, it was advised that invitations to respond to the questionnaire were sent to mutual aid group contacts, the VCS, community anchor representatives, Councillors, Council staff and key partner organisations, all of whom were asked to pass on the survey to others that they felt might be interested.
- 4.107- The group noted that officers had recognised at the time that this method of collecting evaluation information had its limitations. However, the group were advised that the majority of survey respondents were at the frontline of the response. This provided a helpful understanding of how it felt working within a hub and how local operations connected with the centralised and strategic functions of the Council.
- 4.108- This reiterated a point raised by group members in a previous meeting relating to how strategic responses sometimes do not correspond with local situations and the difficulties that this can create. However, the responses also demonstrated how well things can work at a local level and how sharing practice between different localities can be highly beneficial to achieving better outcomes.
- 4.109- In summary, it was reported that most of those who responded felt that their contribution and the services and support provided during lockdown had a significant impact on people's lives and the sense of purpose and fulfilment that stakeholders felt from being able to meet the essential needs of residents was clear. Furthermore, respondents were asked which three words best described their experience of working as part of the hub. The responses reflected a range of emotions and experiences but were overwhelmingly positive.
- 4.110- The Group were informed that the key learning points were to:
- Consider how to provide 'system stewardship and leadership' and how to distribute power to communities, citizens and voluntary sector delivering local solutions.
 - Build learning and evaluation into everything the Council does from the outset.
 - Bring together learning, evidence and information from all partners and use it as the basis for intelligence-led decision making.
 - Be outcome focussed and person centred. Roles need to be based on providing a holistic response not the limits of a job description.
 - Be clear about the boundaries and overlaps in responsibilities and decision making (between organisations and roles).
 - Make sure that Councillors' links to strategic decision making and operational responses were stronger.

- Communicate in a clear, transparent and open manner. The Council (and officers) should be clear about what it can and can't do and why.
- Understand what good communication means for different stakeholders and how to deliver this.
- Make sure that adequate and appropriate time, resource and support was provided. Officers needed to be able to find the balance of caring for themselves and caring for others.
- Strategic decision making needed to listen to what works for different people and places, learn from this and respond in an agile and flexible way to create the conditions for them to thrive.
- Work collaboratively from the outset – value difference and use it to inform approaches and understand what is appropriate.

4.111- The group was advised of the planned next steps to gain a greater depth of understanding from the survey. This draft would be revised as appropriate to reflect as many views as possible and was to be circulated as widely as possible to those who were directly and indirectly involved in the Community Response Hubs to seek their comments and input.

4.112- Learning sessions were proposed for the start of 2021 with mutual aid group members, anchor organisations and other VCS representatives, Council officers and Councillors. The participatory sessions would provide a space for further reflection and exploration of the experience of working in hubs and how this might inform future ways of working. The group was advised that the draft document would help to provide a starting point and inform those discussions and that the outcomes would be reflected in the final document.

4.113- The group further commended the Hub Evaluation Model and offered and agreed that appreciation and congratulations should be given in relation to the work undertaken in response to pandemic and its invaluable support to communities and residents.

Community Response Satisfaction Survey

4.114- The group noted the findings of the Community Response Satisfaction Survey as follows.

4.115- Residents who requested support from April - June 2020 were invited to complete a ten-minute survey over the phone between June and August 2020. 1,171 people took part with many stating they felt grateful and reassured by the place based support that was available. It was noted that:

- 92% of people said it was easy to make contact with the Council for support
- 79% of people said the support they received helped them
- 89% of people said they would make contact with Kirklees Council again if they needed support in a time of crisis

4.116- Furthermore, officers advised that there was an opportunity to follow up the evaluation with a focus on 'lived experience' and the relationships built during the Covid-19

pandemic. This learning would be shared with specific place based teams and partners and would also inform the overall PBW programme and operating model.

What is meant by Geographies?

4.117- When meeting with the Place Partnership Leads, and discussing the effectiveness of the Place Partnerships, the group had previously expressed an interest in understanding the various geographies that currently existed in the context of PBW, in order to inform their thinking and recommendations.

4.118- This information was provided, and the group was informed that the respective and relevant geographies were as follows:

- Kirklees (Providing strategy and direction, universal services, programme of transformation, policy change, outcomes based budgeting)
- 23 electoral wards (Local representation and action through the place standard, place plans and ward partnership plans).
- Three Parish Councils and two Town Councils.
- Four Resource Hubs (Batley, Dewsbury, Huddersfield & Slaithwaite - Strategic coordination and allocation of staffing and budget resources and provide locality bases for workers).
- Community Response Hubs (established to respond to Covid-19 by bringing together Council Officers, Councillors and VCS).
- Seven Place Partnerships (Outcome focussed based around participatory, Councillor led partnerships, place based budgeting and commissioning with the VCS).
- KNH Neighbourhoods.
- Nine Primary Care Networks.

4.119- The group were advised that the place based engagement approach, using the Place Standard Tool, recognised that the geographies that people relate to varies according to their role or the activity that they are involved in. For example, sometimes 'place' might mean a street, sometimes a town or a village and sometimes place might mean the whole of the borough. In addition, members of the group noted that transport links added to the sense of a place.

4.120- It was noted that the response to the pandemic has demonstrated that working with people and partners is not dependant on geography and that the footprints that different organisations work on does not get in the way of focussing on people.

4.121- Furthermore, at its meeting held 3rd February 2021, the group had requested an explanation of the criteria used to form the Place Partnerships. The information provided had detailed that the forming of the Place Partnership areas was based on similarities in population size, profile and geographical proximity.

4.122- This information was considered ahead of the meeting of the PBW Group held on 18th February 2021 where members came together to discuss the key findings of their

overview and scrutiny of the PBW programme which would inform their recommendations.

5. FINDINGS -

TOR-1 - To gain an understanding of the background and work to date in developing a revised approach to place based working in Kirklees and to understand the aims of the work, anticipated timescales, and outcomes.

- 5.1- The group understood that the focus of PBW was on engaging people, building relationships with residents and partners based on trust, and working with people and communities to solve problems.
- 5.2- In working in a place based way with people and communities, the Council aimed to strengthen the voice of communities by bringing services closer to them and ensuring that the operation of services reflected local needs. The group noted it was also important that the role of elected representatives is clearly defined as part of PBW.
- 5.3- Whilst PBW was not a new concept, the group understood that it was important to understand the starting point for Kirklees, and the views of the Council's partners and key stakeholders in implementing new ways of working.
- 5.4- It was noted that the Council had been developing skills in restorative practice over the last year, enhancing staff behaviours, interactions and approaches to help build and maintain positive, healthy relationships, resolve difficulties and repair harm where there has been conflict.
- 5.5- The group understood that the principal mechanisms through which this would be delivered were the Place Standard Tool and citizen engagement, Ward and Sub Ward Partnerships and the Place Partnerships projects. The group confirmed their knowledge of where the projects were in their current stage of development and the planned next steps.
- 5.6- Upon hearing the background context of PBW in Kirklees, it was noted that the building blocks for creating the conditions for effective PBW were beginning to take shape, but further work needed to be done to develop a cohesive work programme and to establish the type of relationship that the Council wanted to have with citizens.
- 5.7- The group acknowledged that, to implement PBW effectively as a means for working differently with residents and achieving better outcomes, a culture change was required across the whole of the Council. To facilitate this, the group found that PBW practices, such as the use of the Place Standard Tool, would need to be embedded within all service delivery and an understanding of PBW would need to be communicated to staff of all levels.
- 5.8- It was noted that new governance arrangements within departments were in place to deliver PBW and the group were advised that this new way of working may lead to a possible refresh of the existing Member/Officer Protocol. The group highlighted that

any review of the protocol would need to consider structures, processes, culture, and the resources allocated to individual departments to deliver place based initiatives.

- 5.9- The group advocated that Councillors should be central to communicating PBW to residents, supporting the developing new relationship that the Council wanted to have with citizens and helping to make the process work. There also needed to be a systematic way of engaging Councillors within this process.
- 5.10- The group identified that sharing good news stories with the community was one of the possible means of communicating to residents that the Council was changing the way it was working and the positive outcomes as a result of place based initiatives. This would help make the concept of PBW more meaningful to communities and help to develop a different relationship between the Council and citizens.
- 5.11- The group noted that one of the key challenges to the success of PBW was that Kirklees, from the point of view of the resident, was often seen as an administrative boundary rather than a place with which they identified. The Council need to do more to identify with places as residents see them.
- 5.12- The issue of 'transport infrastructure and connectivity' was highlighted as an issue that was important to consider when working in a place based way. How people travelled commonly affected what services and facilities they chose to access and interact with in an area, which subsequently influenced local identity.
- 5.13- The group found, after hearing from officers, that it was important for the Council to operate in a way which reflected how residents identify with their 'place' and that PBW was an opportunity to increase the sense of place for communities.

TOR-2- To undertake pre-scrutiny work in commenting on proposals to implement aspects of place based working and TOR-3 - To maintain an overview of the ongoing development and implementation of place based working in Kirklees including:

- How working differently with communities will be achieved.
- The approach to engagement and how it is evaluated.
- The communications plan for the programme of work and how it will be delivered.
- How the revised approach to place based working is developed and thereafter embedded within the organisation and across Council partners.
- How place based working and the approaches adopted, support the delivery of our shared outcomes.

- 5.14- To maintain an overview of the ongoing development and implementation of PBW in Kirklees the group received regular updates and presentations on the progress to date, the outcomes of work undertaken and the planned next steps.
- 5.15- Each update presented to the group contained information on the key elements of PBW work programme which were;
 - Place based engagement using the Place Standard Tool.
 - Ward and Local Area Partnerships.
 - Place Partnerships.

- The Operational Model of PBW.
- The Community Response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

5.16- The group acknowledged the wide remit of the developing PBW programme and identified that it was important to differentiate in their findings between the following main areas which were :

- Place Partnerships.
- Place Standard Tool.
- the operation of Council services and,
- other overarching themes such as, the communications programme, the evaluation of the work, the physical location of staff and asset transfer and the role of elected representatives.

The Place Partnerships:

5.17- The PBW Group considered, throughout its work, the success of the Place Partnerships, with a key aim being to consider if it was more effective to respond to strategic issues on a geography greater than a ward , but less than Kirklees wide, with a commitment initially to improve mental health and domestic abuse outcomes.

5.18- The group reviewed the success of the Place Partnerships through considering regular updates on the progress of the work and outcomes, and by hearing directly from the Place Partnerships Leads about their experience in undertaking the role.

5.19- Overall, the group agreed that the Place Partnerships demonstrated that it was more effective, and more place based, to respond to some local challenges at a geography greater than a ward, but less than Kirklees wide.

5.20- A key finding was that the allocation of place level funding had been highly effective in helping to establish a sense of 'place' in enabling fast responses to local needs. This was particularly noted when reacting to the range of challenges presented to communities by Covid-19 pandemic. The additional £30,000 place level funding meant that Ward Councillors could act quickly and innovatively to support residents and communities as new challenges were presented.

5.21- However, the group identified that the way the Council operated needed to reflect the sense of 'place' from the point of view of the resident to establish and build upon the sense of local identity within Kirklees' diverse communities.

5.22- At its meeting held 3rd February 2021, the group had requested an explanation of the criteria used to form the Place Partnerships. The information provided detailed that the Place Partnership areas were identified based on similarities in population size, profile and geographical proximity.

5.23- The group found that forming the Place Partnerships geographies based on this data did not, in the case of every Place Partnership, reflect what citizens identified with in their local area. It was also felt that the imposition of the pre-set geographical areas led to some barriers in implementing change, and that more flexibility to use place

level funding to respond to cross ward challenges would be more effective.

- 5.24- The group further highlighted that the structures of the Place Partnerships should be driven by the 'place', to reflect what residents have an affinity with; the local services they accessed, and the local transport infrastructure that enabled them to do so.
- 5.25- Some members of the group also raised the 'Huddersfield question'. The question of clear structure and process for making decisions at Huddersfield level should also be considered.

The Approach to Engagement and how it is Evaluated:

The Place Standard Tool:

- 5.26- The group understood that the Place Standard Tool was the primary mechanism which had been implemented as a way of introducing a place based approach to engaging with communities, the VCS/private sector and Councillors to invoke active citizenship, gain a better understanding of local priorities and to inform service delivery from the place up.
- 5.27- In receiving and considering regular updates in respect of the Place Standard engagement sessions, which were facilitated by the Citizen Engagement Reference Group, the group advocated the use of the Place Standard and noted that this method of engagement was helping the Council to have more open and honest dialogues with citizens about their places.
- 5.28- The group highlighted that a particularly effective feature of the Place Standard Tool is the 're-engagement process' which enabled the monitoring and reviewing of the progress of an existing place.
- 5.29- The group suggested that the goal of engagement should be for the Council act as an 'enabler' and that going forward it was important to maintain and extend the open dialogue with citizens, the VCS, Councillors and partners to provide opportunity for regular feedback to be given that will inform the Council on how well it is working with them.
- 5.30- However, the group highlighted that ,when consultation was held with citizens on particular issues, there was the risk that the individuals who actively came forward to take part were commonly individuals with a particular interest in the issue under consideration, for example, appointed community representatives.
- 5.31- It was noted that listening to all citizens was important, but the group felt that in order to gain an accurate representation of the community picture it was important that the Council engaged with the everyday citizen and understood and tackled any barriers which prevented individuals from coming forward and having their say. It was suggested that one way of doing this was through using social media to reach a wider audience, but it was also noted that this should not be the only method considered.
- 5.32- Though the group were mainly positive about the use of the Place Standard Tool, there

were concerns from some group members as to where Councillors, as elected representatives of their communities, fit within the process of engagement. It was noted that the Council should make sure Councillors played a key role in this work.

Parish and Town Councils

- 5.33- In considering the role of elected representatives within Place Standard engagement, the group highlighted that Town and Parish Councils are a key part of Kirklees democratic system.
- 5.34- The group found that there was no systematic way of engaging with Parish and Town Councils, and that key data in respect of the priorities and challenges of the communities that they represent was therefore being bypassed.
- 5.35- It was suggested that Town and Parish Councils should be considered as stakeholders in consultations and engagement with them should be built into all PBW practice, such as Place Standard engagement, across the organisation in support of building service delivery and responding to local challenges from the place up.
- 5.36- The group also felt that this highlighted that there should be a wider review of the Council's relationship with Parish and Town Councils.

Ward and Sub Ward Partnership Plans

- 5.37- When discussing the Ward and Sub Ward Partnership plans, the group found that a key challenge was to engage services with the action plan and priorities identified following Place Standard engagement. This was especially true where the key priorities highlighted within a 'place' may not correspond with those held by the corporate centre.
- 5.38- Therefore, the group highlighted that capacity, resources and funding needed to be available to respond to the outcomes of Place Standard engagement and to ensure that the whole system of the Council, meaning its people and its services, are aligned with acting on the priorities identified by residents. This was important even when those priorities did not complement those of the corporate centre.
- 5.39- To achieve this, it was reiterated that the Council's culture would need to change to ensure that PBW could work effectively long term and that this must come from the top of organisation.

The Approach to Engagement and how it is Evaluated

- 5.40- When considering how the approach to engagement was evaluated, group members noted that they needed to be satisfied that there were sufficient measures in place within the PBW programme to understand and evaluate the progress of the work undertaken.

- 5.41- As a part of this the group considered the emerging design principles of the Rapid Review of the Council's Community Response to the Pandemic, a place based evaluation of the community response, and the Community Response Satisfaction Survey. The group understood that the pandemic provided an earlier than anticipated opportunity to evaluate early outcomes of PBW initiatives and recognised that this was a positive step in challenging times.
- 5.42- In being presented with an overview of the data collated, the group was informed that the conclusions drawn from the evaluation work largely correlated with the emerging themes from the place standard engagement workshops, which was an early indicator that things were going well.
- 5.43- However, there were concerns that the high number of responses from Council officers meant that the results, though insightful, were not a true reflection of experiences of individuals from outside of the organisation. It was suggested that work was undertaken to ensure that the survey reached a wider audience and that mutual aid groups, for example, were targeted for future surveys to give further views on how to shape the model.
- 5.44- Though it was noted that there was an element of PBW that could not be monitored quantitatively, it was acknowledged that it was important to evaluate both the outcomes of place based engagement as well as the ongoing approach to working with people, the VCS and partners.
- 5.45- The group found that rather than focusing on how well the Council is doing, the purpose of evaluation work should be to find out how well communities are doing, and how people feel about their places.
- 5.46- It was also important that there was a key focus on meeting outcomes and that the outcomes of place based engagement begin to play a key part in informing service planning, resource allocation and wider strategy and policy development.

The Council's relationship with VCS:

- 5.47- After hearing from the Third Sector Leaders and community anchor representatives, the group recognised the important role these groups had in coordinating the work of local organisations when putting PBW into practice in response to the pandemic and noted the successful outcomes of the Council's community response as a result.
- 5.48- The group felt that it was important that the positive steps taken during the pandemic should not be lost, and that work should be undertaken to build upon the progress made in respect of the Council's relationship with partners which extends the approach used during the pandemic and directs this towards other social issues.
- 5.49- It was further noted that the use of well known community buildings to house multi-agency teams had been instrumental in helping to strengthen the relationship between the Council and VCS staff and enabled collaborative place based service delivery.

- 5.50- In relation to this point, the physical location of staff in the context of PBW was brought into discussion and the group highlighted how the pandemic had provided the opportunity to rethink where staff would be operating from, through a place based lens, as a part of the Council's recovery.
- 5.51- Taking this into account, the group suggested that multi agency teams based in community buildings should be considered as a way of working in the longer term. These bases should also include senior officers, to enable them to have a better understanding of places, local challenges and of how to deliver services from the place up.

Asset Transfer

- 5.52- In relation to asset transfer to the community, some group members felt that supporting community groups to take on assets would help progress the place based approach going forwards.
- 5.53- However, some group members noted that vital skills, time and funds were required to successfully take on a transferred asset. It was important to consider that managing an asset may risk taking valuable time and resources away from community groups which they would otherwise dedicate to supporting communities.

The Communications Programme

- 5.54- The group considered the communications plan for the PBW programme and it was acknowledged that during the course of the pandemic communications had improved significantly.
- 5.55- In respect of internal communications, the 'Councillor Bulletin' was highlighted by some group members as a good example of keeping Councillors up to date on key issues. However, some members felt that more could be done to improve internal communications and highlighted that a more targeted, and place based approach was required.
- 5.56- After meeting with the Place Partnership Leads, the group found that there needed to be stronger communications support to highlight the positive outcomes of the project and to raise the profile and level of understanding of the work in the organisation.
- 5.57- In relation to external communications, social media was noted as one platform through which the Council could connect and communicate with different members of the community, but it was noted that it was important for Councillors to be made aware of any issues before they were posted to social media.
- 5.58- The group felt that a review of the communications plan for PBW was needed at this stage and that there should be resources allocated to PBW to ensure that success stories are widely promoted.

The Operating Model

- 5.59- In relation to the operating model, the group noted that the internal organisation of services for administrative and strategic purposes should not be visible to the resident, in order to build on and amplify the sense of local identity.
- 5.60- To engrain PBW as a basis for all service delivery, an organisational wide culture change is needed. This starts with ensuring that there is a clear understanding of what PBW is, and the importance of the work across the organisation to ensure meaningful engagement with residents. Therefore, the group felt that there should be a clear definition of PBW and what key elements and programmes fall within it.
- 5.61- To follow, all Council departments and staff should embed a place based approach to service delivery. However, in taking into account that one size doesn't fit all, there should be a recognition that the approach to service delivery might differ from place to place.
- 5.62- The approach to PBW should come from the top of the organisation and filter down and Service Heads and Strategic Directors need to make sure that budgets reflect the necessary requirements to implement place based service delivery that responds to local challenges, even where these may differ from the corporate centre.
- 5.63- In terms of monitoring how well the culture of the Council is changing and in order to make sure services are held accountable for responding to local priorities, the group suggested that Service Directors and the appropriate Cabinet Member report to Overview and Scrutiny on the steps they have taken to progress PBW within their service area and how they respond to local needs through their service.

How PBW will help achieve the Shared Outcomes

5.64- PBW is highlighted in the 2020/2021 refresh of the Corporate Plan as a key approach by which the Council aims to achieve the delivery of its shared outcomes. A number of PBW working proposals considered by the group impact on the Kirklees shared outcomes as follows:

Best Start and Well:

5.65- The goals of best start and well is to ensure that children have the best start in life and people in Kirklees are as well as possible for as long as possible.

5.66- Initiatives such as supporting young people's mental health in Batley, Birstall and Birkenshaw; Colne Valley; Huddersfield Rural and Spen Valley Place Partnerships will help:

- Ensure schools and families are better equipped with the tools they need to support the children's emotional and mental wellbeing.
- People in Kirklees to live well, by supporting families to maintain or improve their emotional and mental wellbeing.
- People to be independent by providing them with the tools they need to build personal resilience and take control of their own lives.
- Encourage people in Kirklees to have aspirations and ambitions, by providing them with greater personal resilience, confidence and self-belief.
- Ensure communities have access to local opportunities to improve health and wellbeing and they can access support, help and advice where they live.
- Ensure programmes are designed to support the wider needs of families and extended families. Many of them will help recognise and offer reduction in the effects of lower-level mental health, that can affect family and carers resulting in breakdown of relationships.
- The Councils work on family hubs are also important but should also recognise the sense of place for citizens.

Independent:

5.67- In supporting people in Kirklees to live independently and have control over their lives, the 'Mental Health Champions and Network' in all Place Partnership areas will help ensure that the right advice, help and support at the right time will empower people to take control of their own health and wellbeing, and connect people with caring and supportive communities.

Efficient and Effective:

5.68- The Place Partnerships supports the Council to deliver services efficiently and effectively by strengthening collaborative and responsive approaches that help improve outcomes and provide the opportunity to pilot and deliver innovative and creative responses at a local level.

Safe and Cohesive

- 5.69- In advocating active citizenship, the Council can build greater community cohesion by encouraging citizens to have their say on the decisions affecting the places in which they live. Place based citizen engagement and the Place Standard Tool enables citizens to become more active in their communities and engaged in local democracy. The Place Standard Tool helps to collate a range of views, brings together a wide range of individuals, community groups and different sectors and encourages everyone to work collaboratively to improve the places they are all stakeholders in. When used by, or with, communities, the place standard can provide a voice for local people. This strengthens individual views, as it draws together opinions into a collective structure and empowers local people to express their views and be confident that they will be heard. Members of the group also felt that engagement with Councillors is paramount to PBW.

Working with places through a crisis:

- 5.70- The Covid-19 pandemic meant that the Council had to respond as a whole system, within its places, in order to tackle challenges brought about by the crisis and to support communities. This helped accelerate the approach to PBW within the organisations, and the success of the community response demonstrated its importance.
- 5.71- During the pandemic it was proved that it was not only possible, but very effective, to have multiple agencies, all with different ways of working and objectives, working together to deliver services in a coordinated way. Strong partnerships between the Council and the VCS were further supported by the physical location of staff such as the four-hub approach and the method of housing multi-agency teams under one roof to improve collaborative PBW practice, and to better officer understanding of 'places'. Group members stated that this approach should continue in the longer term.
- 5.72- Building on previous place standard engagement work, the Council had delivered a series of ward-based workshops to understand local priorities and the learning from this will be used to develop the Council's future approach to working in a place based way in its recovery from the pandemic. It is important, however, that ward members play a central part in this work.

TOR-4- To monitor the delivery of the place based working programme of work against indicative targets, key milestones and anticipated outcomes.

- 5.73- The indicative targets and milestones for delivery of the PBW programme, and the anticipated outcomes, had been affected at an early stage, by the outbreak of Covid-19. Resources had been directed to respond to the impacts of the pandemic and to keep residents safe, meaning that some of the proposed programme activity had been delayed.

- 5.74- However, the group were advised that the pandemic had also provided momentum and accelerated some PBW projects beyond the milestones originally intended, due to the need to implement place based measures to react to the challenges brought about by the pandemic and to support communities.

TOR-5- To consider the outcomes of the work to identify the impact of the approach, including successful outcomes for communities arising from engagement. To identify any learning points, including barriers to delivery and maximising successful outcomes for communities.

Place Partnerships

- 5.75- The group noted, after meeting with the Place Partnership Leads, that their overall experience in the role was positive, and that the project in its pilot had provided opportunities to bring stakeholders together and test out innovative approaches which had led to the successful delivery of outcomes for communities.
- 5.76- For example, the Huddersfield Central Place Partnership had allocated funding from its mental health budget to support a two-year pilot for women experiencing the menopause and its impact on mental health, as a direct result of locally based dialogue to co-produce a creative solution with Councillors and partners.
- 5.77- Furthermore, to date, Place Partnerships had made recommendations on mental health proposals totaling £953,931.50 and a domestic abuse proposal totaling £400,000 that was approved by Cabinet on 16th March 2020.
- 5.78- However, there were some barriers identified around pre-imposed geographical areas and learning to be taken forward in respect of how the partnership areas were formed.
- 5.79- The group felt that the use of data to form the partnerships was not always reflective of what citizens identify with in their area, and that going forward the partnerships should be formed in a place based way.
- 5.80- For example, the formation of the partnerships should take into account factors, such as local transport infrastructure in recognition of how the services residents are able to access impacts on their sense of place.
- 5.81- In terms of key learning to take forward, group members approved of the place level funding, but felt that successful outcomes of the use of the funding were sometimes restricted by the imposition of the pre-set geographical areas.
- 5.82- The group suggested that place level funding which enabled working in collaborative cross-ward ways to respond to shared challenges on a more flexible basis, may be more effective in achieving better outcomes for communities than working within a pre-determined partnership.
- 5.83- Overall, the group felt that there should be a rethink of how the 'geographies' of the

Place Partnerships are formed as well as a review of the aims and objectives of the Place Partnerships, including the budget allocation and theme development. In particular, Place Partnership Leads should have more input into the chosen theme to be addressed through Place Partnerships.

Citizen Engagement using the Place Standard Tool

- 5.84- To date, 6,582 citizens have taken part in place standard engagement in 17 neighborhoods across seven wards across Kirklees as part of the 'How Good is Your Home and Local Place' engagement. Of these engagements, seven have been citizen lead, five have been Councillor led and six have been service led - all have involved Ward Councillors. The feedback from Place Standard engagement has been used to:
- Help identify potential wards for the Streets for People demonstration project.
 - Better understand the challenges to healthy ageing faced by people living in rural areas to inform a social isolation funding bid by Adult Services.
 - Inform discussion at Scrutiny with the Cabinet leads on Active Travel.
 - Add local context to Place Partnership profiles (Mental Health and Active Travel).
 - Contribute to discussions around Council and community buildings, as part of ward-based recovery meetings with Councillors.
 - Inform ward discussions with Councillors on the unclassified roads and pavements budget.
 - Develop an action plan as part of 'Ask Meltham' engagement that involved Meltham Town Council, Councillors, partners, stakeholders. Seven priorities were agreed as part of phase 1 which have been delivered with funding of £20,000 from the Town Council.
 - Develop an action plan in Shepley and Shelley with both village associations, Councillors, partners and colleagues from streetscene and highways service, with action agreed that need to be followed up.
 - Help inform future plans for Berry Brow flats.
 - Help inform future plans for Huddersfield Town Centre.
 - Help inform future management and maintenance arrangements for Council housing. Ward summaries currently being drafted to share with Councillors and discuss next steps on a ward basis.
- 5.85- The group welcomed the Place Standard Tool as a new way of engaging with residents and advocated that this approach should be taken forward as a means of establishing a new relationship between the Council and communities, and gaining a greater understanding of local challenges and priorities.
- 5.86- It was reiterated that a key feature of the Place Standard Tool is the 're-engagement' stage which assesses 'how the Council is doing' and enables the review of progress of an existing place, as the framework will be consistent and comparable over time.
- 5.87- A key barrier identified was that there were sometimes challenges in getting services to engage in responding to the challenges identified through the Place Standard

engagement, especially where local priorities did not correlate with those held by the corporate centre.

- 5.88- The group felt that in taking the approach forward that the outcomes of place based engagement would begin to be an important element in informing service planning, resource allocation and wider strategy and policy development. Some of the examples above demonstrate that this is beginning to happen organically in some cases, however it is important to ensure that this is built into the Council's changing culture and the wider system as a whole.
- 5.89- The group felt that more needed to be done in respect of engaging with Councillors early on in their respective ward and to make sure that, in going directly to the citizen that elected members were not bypassed. To make sure that this is done, there should be a clear, well defined role for Councillors within the PBW framework.

Town and Parish Councils

- 5.90- The group noted that where Parish and Town Councils were brought into the Council's Covid-19 response there had been key positive outcomes. For example, as the elected representatives for local communities they acted as an effective conduit for communicating messages relating to Covid -19 public health guidelines between the Council and citizens, as well as helping the Council to gather better knowledge of the community picture.
- 5.91- However, it was noted that this approach was not taken across the organisations, and that a systematic procedure for engaging with Town and Parish Councillors should be established, to make sure that the important insight to local priorities held by Town and Parish Councillors was taken into account in the implementation of PBW.
- 5.92- Further to this, the group acknowledged that Parish and Town Councils are self-governing but felt that more needed to be done to bring them into the conversation and it was suggested that a wider review of the Council's relationship with parish and town councils should take place.

The Community Response to the Pandemic:

- 5.93- It was noted that the recent challenges brought to Kirklees by the Covid-19 pandemic demonstrated that within local places there is a huge amount of knowledge and resource; in Councillors, the people who live in the community, the local third sector, public sector organisations and businesses.
- 5.94- The group highlighted that it was clear that the community anchor approach, where the Council worked closely with the VCS during the Covid-19 pandemic, had largely worked well and shown what can be achieved quickly in challenging times.
- 5.95- It was felt strongly by group members that this should be the approach taken forward throughout the Council's recovery from the pandemic and that work should be

undertaken to build upon the progress made and extend the approach used during the pandemic and direct this towards other longer term issues.

- 5.96- In considering the emerging design principles from the 'Rapid Review' the group noted that a key learning point was to use the Community Response Hub Teams as the platform for wider staff development and reorientation.
- 5.97- It was also noted that the developing place based approach should also be about being visible and present in places. The physical location of staff was important to the implementation of effective PBW and multi-agency teams based in community buildings across Kirklees should be considered as a way of working in the longer term. This should also include senior officers to ensure that they are understanding of, and well connected to the places that their services support.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review the aims and objectives of the Place Partnerships including the budget allocation and theme development. In particular, Place Partnership Leads should have more input into the chosen theme to be addressed through Place Partnerships.
2. Review the geographies of the Place Partnerships; the partnerships should be place based and reflective of what citizens identify with in their area, considering factors such as local transport infrastructure, rather than being driven by data.
3. There should be a clear definition of PBW and what key elements and programmes fall within it (e.g. Place Standard Tool, Place Partnerships). This is not clear and has led to some confusion about what PBW is.
4. There should be a clear, well defined role for Councillors in PBW. More needs to be done to engage Councillors early on in their respective wards.
5. A systematic procedure for engaging with Town and Parish Councillors should be established, alongside a wider review of the Council's relationship with parish and town councils.
6. The question of a clear structure and process for making decisions at a Huddersfield level should also be considered.
7. More decision making and budget allocation should be devolved to a local level. The additional £30,000 Covid-19 ward budget allocation for Councillors is seen as key strength and should be reviewed going forward given our communities are still likely to face long term challenges from the pandemic.
8. Clear resources should be set aside after place standard survey work to respond to residents' priorities, even where these priorities may differ from those of the corporate centre. Key timescales should also be set for when we expect actions to take place.
9. Multiagency teams based in community buildings across Kirklees should be considered as a way of working in the longer term. This should also include senior

officers.

10. Review the communications plan for PBW; ensure there is a communications lead for PBW and that success stories are promoted via print and social media. In respect of the Place Partnerships, stronger communications are needed to highlight the positive outcomes of the work.
11. Work should be undertaken to build upon the progress made in respect of the community anchor work with VCS partners which extends the approach used during the pandemic and directs this towards other longer term issues.
12. Organisational wide culture change is needed. This means all Council departments and staff should understand the importance of the work to ensure meaningful engagement from residents. This must come from the top of the organisation and filter down. Without this PBW will not succeed and the key outcomes of the work will not be met.
13. All Council departments and staff should embed a place based approach to service delivery, and Service Heads and Strategic Directors need to make sure that budgets reflect this. It should also be recognised that the approach might differ from place to place.
14. That Service Heads and appropriate Cabinet Member report to Overview and Scrutiny on the steps they have taken to progress PBW within their service area and how they respond to local needs through their services.

Action Plan

No.	Recommendation	Directorate and Cabinet Member asked to coordinate the response to the recommendation?	FOR COMPLETION			
			Do you accept the recommendation ? If no, please explain why.	How will it be implemented?	Who will be responsible for implementation?	What is the estimated timescale for implementation?
1.	Review the aims and objectives of the Place Partnerships including the budget allocation and theme development. In particular, Place Partnership Leads should have more input into the chosen theme to be addressed through Place Partnerships	Cllr Scott				

2.	Review the geographies of the Place Partnerships; the partnerships should be place based and reflective of what citizens identify with in their area, considering factors such as local transport infrastructure, rather than being driven by data.	Cllr Scott				
3.	There should be a clear definition of PBW and what key elements and programmes fall within it (e.g. Place Standard Tool, Place Partnerships). This is not clear and has led to some confusion about what PBW is.	Cllr Scott				
4.	There should be a clear, well defined role for Councillors in PBW. More needs to be done to engage councillors early on in their respective wards.	Cllr Scott				

5.	A systematic procedure for engaging with Town and Parish Councillors should be established and alongside a wider review of the Councils relationship with parish and town councils.	TBC				
6.	The question of a clear structure and process for making decisions at a Huddersfield level should also be considered.	TBC				
7.	More decision making and budget allocation should be devolved to a local level. The additional £30,000 Covid-19 ward budget allocation for Councillors is seen as key strength and should be reviewed going forward given our communities are still likely to face long term challenges from the pandemic.	Cllr Scott/The Leader				

8.	Clear resources should be set aside after place standard survey work to respond to residents' priorities, even where these priorities may differ from those of the corporate centre. Key timescales should also be set for when we expect actions to take place	Cllr Scott				
9.	Multiagency teams based in community buildings across Kirklees should be considered as a way of working in the longer term. This should also include senior officers.	Cllr Scott				

10.	Review the communications plan for PBW; ensure there is a communications lead for PBW and that success stories are promoted via print and social media. In respect of the Place Partnerships, stronger communications are needed to highlight the positive outcomes of the work.	Cllr Scott				
11.	Work should be undertaken to build upon the progress made in respect of the community anchor work with VCS partners which extends the approach used during the pandemic and directs this towards other longer term issues	Cllr Scott/ Cllr Davies				

12.	Organisational wide culture change is needed. This means all Council departments and staff should understand the importance of the work to ensure meaningful engagement from residents. This must come from the top of the organisation and filter down. Without this PBW will not succeed and the key outcomes of the work will not be met.	Cllr Scott				
13.	All Council departments and staff should embed a place based approach to service delivery, and Service Heads and Strategic Directors need to make sure that budgets reflect this. It should also be recognised that the approach might differ from place to place.	Cllr Scott				

14.	That Service Heads and appropriate Cabinet Member report to Overview and Scrutiny on the steps they have taken to progress PBW within their service area and how they respond to local needs through their services.	Cllr Scott				
-----	--	------------	--	--	--	--

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – AGENDA PLAN 2020/2021

Date of Meeting	Item / Lead Officer	Comments
9 June 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Priorities and the Covid-19 Response – Cllr Pandor / Jacqui Gedman • Devolution – Jacqui Gedman / Julie Muscroft • Appointment / Allocation of Co-optees 2020/21 • Re-establishment of Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel 	
Informal Meeting 10 July 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devolution mid-point consultation update – Julie Muscroft / Nick Howe • Work Programme 	
20 August 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our Council Plan – Rachel Spencer-Henshall / Kate McNicholas 	
Informal Meeting 29 September 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutiny Ad Hoc Panel reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EHE – Future Arrangements for the Council’s Residential Housing Stock 	
29 October 2020 1400	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devolution (representative from WYCA to attend) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Process in relation to and content of the Order – How scrutiny will work on a regional basis going forward • Crime and Disorder including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Domestic Abuse (update on the main strategy, responses to Covid-19 and Forward plan) – Refreshed Strategic Intelligence Assessment (SIA) – Refreshed Communities Partnership Plan – Alexia Gray, Jo Richmond, Jill Greenfield, Lee Hamilton 	All councillors invited to attend

Date of Meeting	Item / Lead Officer	Comments
3 December 2020 1400	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on Climate Commission - Colin Parr / John Atkinson Update on the Council's Covid response and winter preparedness (Rachel Spencer-Henshall) 	
11 February 2021 1400	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage/Cultural/Tourism Strategies - Adele Poppleton 	
18 March 2021 1400	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place Based Working Group - Update Annual Review – Local Flood Risk Management – Rashid Mahmood Establishment of Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel in relation to Residential Housing Stock – Health and Safety Compliance – Sheila Dykes 	
15 April 2021 1400	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place Based Working Group - Final Report 	