

Minutes



Performance Scrutiny Committee - Partnerships

Date: 26 June 2019

Time: 5.00 pm

Present: Councillors M Rahman (Chair), Y Forsey, J Hughes, S Marshall, R Mogford and T Suller

In Attendance: Will Godfrey (Chief Executive), Daniel Cooke (Scrutiny Adviser) and Neil Barnett (Governance Officer)
Supt Ian Roberts (Gwent Police), Gary Handley (Coleg Gwent),
Ceri Davies (Natural Resources Wales) and C Doyle (RSL's)

Apologies: Councillors D Davies, M Spencer and K Whitehead

1 Declarations of Interest

None.

2 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 April 2019 were **approved** as a true and accurate record.

3 Public Services Board - Well-being Plan Annual Report 2018-19

Attendees:

- **Will Godfrey, PSB Intervention Lead for The Newport Offer** (Chief Executive NCC);
- **Supt Ian Roberts, PSB Intervention Lead for Strong Resilient Communities** (Gwent Police);
- **Gary Handley, PSB Intervention Lead for Right Skills** (Coleg Gwent);
- **Ceri Davies, PSB Intervention Lead for Green and Safe Spaces** (Natural Resources Wales);
- **Ceri Doyle, PSB Intervention Lead for Sustainable Travel** (RSLs)

The Chief Executive presented an overview of Chapters' one and two of the annual report and explained that the mid-year Well-being Plan had been reported to the Committee in January. The Well-being Plan was the most physical outcome of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act, and was created with partners and adopted formally in May 2018. It was coming to the end of the first year, and the annual report aimed to unpack the activity around the interventions. He also took the time to remind the Committee that while this report looked at the first year performance of the Wellbeing Plan, some interventions were working at different speeds and some had definitive outcomes that could be completed in a short space of time, whereas others had more long-term goals.

The report presented an overall picture of the performance for each of the interventions, each of which would be presented by the Lead Officer for the related intervention.

The Newport Offer

The Intervention Lead for The Newport Offer, the Chief Executive of Newport City Council explained that the intervention was aimed at attracting and retaining businesses to the City. Of the six steps outlined in the report, the first was the most defined. The vision of the city was being pursued with the creation of an Investment Brochure that would be published in a number of weeks, the City Centre Masterplan and a new website for the City. A working group had been created to implement actions within this intervention. The convention centre and chartist tower hotel were highlighted as key projects, both due for completion in September. Throughout the five interventions, case studies were included which highlighted cases of best practice.

Members asked the following questions:

- **Performance Measure - ‘% people saying Newport is a good place to live’.** Members asked how the target was set and would that target be used long term?

The Committee were informed that the target would move over time, the target was based on surveys conducted over previous years. The public's perception of the City peaked in 2015, corresponding with the opening of the Friars Walk, and it was hoped that with future investment the figure would improve. It was explained that that they would look to increase the target to more aspirational levels each year, they were only nine months into a five year programme and perceptions of the city needed to change to enable these performance measures to improve.

- Members stated that it was difficult for them to see the finished product when reading the Annual Report, but conceded that this might have been due to the short time frame since the programme began. The Committee discussed communication with the public from the partnership and how this could be utilised to increase positive stories and perceptions of the City.

The Intervention Lead advised that there was a need to create a balance between what came within the domain of the partnership and what should stay as an individual organisation's responsibility. The Newport Offer was not yet at a level of maturity, but as the Investment Brochure and the City Centre Masterplan took effect, this would change.

- A Member commented that the report needed to be clearer and more easily understandable by the public and there was a need to communicate the positives.

The Intervention Lead assured Members that the city website would present what was trying to be achieved through partnership working and how, and would go live soon. He advised Members of surveys undertaken across Newport, which had highlighted that people aged between 20 and 30, had a better perception of Newport than those who were older. It was the partnership's role to highlight and promote the positives such as: the Food Festival; Newport Marathon; new hotel, and; convention centre.

- The Committee enquired where the relatively new intervention would focus in the future. A Member commented that Maindee Festival, Pill Carnival, the running and cycling events were not included and asked would future reports showcase the multicultural and diverse city.

The Intervention Lead replied that when defining the work and focusing the intervention in the future there was more work to be done. This was the case for sharpening the vision and using more effective performance measures. He explained that it was tempting just to pour everything into the intervention but by highlighting examples of best practice and aiming for jobs creation etc. the intervention becomes more meaningful. This is why the annual report looked at the major events in the city, as these major events were where

the partnership level working is important and can help deliver outcomes across all five interventions.

The Intervention Lead stated that the economic growth of the city could improve with the publishing of the Investment Brochure. The hope was that the Brochure would drive up investment by directly targeting business.

Strong and Resilient Communities

The Intervention Lead for Strong and Resilient Communities, Chief Superintendent of Gwent Police introduced the Strong and Resilient Communities intervention to the Committee and the key points upon which they were trying to achieve a relationship with the public. This relationship would aim to engage, consult and understand their issues and those of their local area. The plans used in the Strong and Resilient Communities work plans were co-produced with members of the public. The intervention had short, medium and long term plans in place to develop neighbourhood hubs. In terms of activities last year the intervention engaged with communities and Mutual Gain, and received some Home Office funding for areas affected by crime. The Chief Superintendent informed the Committee that at their first event in February there had been 45 attendees, the attendees saw that something was starting to happen in their area and encouraged active citizenship, which was one of their goals. Most of the people who attended fed back that they had never attended a public meeting before. The main outcomes important to those that attended were the lack of provision for young people and more support for vulnerable adults who were isolated in the community. The goal of trying to get the community more involved, to create stronger networks, both physical and on social media had begun.

The Participation Panel, of 100 people from Ringland and Alway, was granted £150,000 to spend on their local area. The panel received bids from a number of local projects linked to the issues raised at the initial meeting. The projects the panel agreed to support included the local boxing gym, radio station, Cadets and Samaritans. Partnership events had been held since to see who else was able to provide support. Money was available for the CAMHS model and further work with communities. Action plans were being developed to establish how agencies and stakeholders could work together. The Chief Superintendent acknowledged that the focus of the work had been on Ringland and Alway, work was still ongoing in other areas but to maintain the level of detail the annual report looked only at these two areas. Examples of the additional work included all comprehensive schools had a crime education programme for year 7 and 9 pupils. Once this model of joint working had proven itself they would start to look for additional investment.

Members asked the following questions:

- Members raised concern of the safety of Newport citizens, and questioned whether the perception of high levels of crime was accurate.

The Intervention Lead for the Intervention spoke positively of the safety of Newport and explained that when compared to other comparable cities, Newport had lower levels of serious crime, more visible things such as rough sleeping and groups of young people on bikes, and negative stories from the media fuelled perceptions of problems in the city. There had been big improvements related to safety, the Police communicated this message through multiple mediums, but was not the public's perception. Newport's homicide rate compared to others was really low, but that was not visible, so hadn't impacted upon public perception.

- The Committee commended the work done upon this Intervention by the partners. They were pleased to the difference being made on the ground to the people of Newport. The work done would have had a positive effect on people's perception of Newport.

The Intervention Lead agreed and stated they were including those people that were spreading the narrative that impacted on how people saw Newport.

- The Members enquired how money and resources were allocated in the Partnership and how the different organisations were working together.

The Intervention Lead explained that there had been multi-million pound investment in the second intervention. The Police had brought funding from the Home Office, the Council and Newport City Homes had invested resources, as well as a number of other agencies. Welsh Government had been involved in the planning of workshops. All partners were contributing money from different funding streams, this included committing existing resources and new sources. Looking at new ways of working across communities included, Community and Psychology Teams devising a new model of mental health interventions for adults and young people. The main aim was to avoid duplication of work and create a synergy between projects.

- The Committee asked what had been the most challenging aspect of the last 12 months for the intervention.

The Intervention Lead believed that sustainability had been the most challenging. This he explained was due to some of the organisations that were commissioned to undertake the work being funded in the short term only. Funding in the short term was a risk to all those involved. Another challenge presented to the Committee was how one negative headline could destroy the positive work undertaken. An example of this was Pill, where it had been a difficult area to gather community support, but they had been gaining support and momentum.

Right Skills

The Intervention Lead for Right Skills, Coleg Gwent Campus Director introduced the Intervention to the Committee and advised that the different interventions were incredibly linked in terms of development of the Ringland Hub, and Hubs elsewhere in the city. It was important to assure that the funding provided the people with the right skills to enter further and higher education in Newport. Discussions taking place online were examined to inform the action taken in the communities. One aspect of this was training people on social media use to promote and present their local community in the best light possible. He highlighted another challenge was ensuring that citizens had access to the education and training that would allow them to take advantage of the employment opportunities available in Newport.

The partnership was working with local companies to identify pots of funding that could be used to deliver projects in the local areas. One example given was the retail park in Spytty, each of the shops there had charitable funds and the partnership had looked at ways of coordinating the local communities to bid for money. It was important for the partnership to ensure that the work being done was sustainable, to allow the work and its impact to be felt. Future work in this area would see more events taking place in the city to draw attention to the opportunities available, with a specific focus on the digital sector. To support this the partners were looking at primary school children learning to code so they would have the skills they needed in the future.

- The Committee enquired whether the Partnership was working with Community Councils.

It was explained that resources were an issue for the partners, especially when it came to staff attending meetings across the city. Community Councils had been invited to attend the Public Services Board Intervention and Engagement group. Longer term objectives included the Community Councils being more involved with the Public Services Board.

The attendees all agreed that improving the communication network across the city would have benefited the relationships and engagement of all stakeholders.

- The Committee expressed concern regarding the education system in Newport and asked what work was being undertaken by the partners.

The Intervention Lead explained that one piece of work was identifying who was delivering what across the city, and what gaps in provision there was. One of the large gaps in education across the city related to computing, there was a lack of training and skill attainment at the secondary level, which went far beyond A-levels. He advised that a centralised facility that provided a state of the art environment for staff and young people was needed. Schools needed to work together to ensure young people had the education that would allow them to take advantage of further education and employment opportunities in Newport.

Green and Safe Spaces

The Intervention Lead for Green and Safe Spaces, a representative from Natural Resources Wales, introduced a video that had been produced to explain the intervention and the work undertaken. She informed the Committee that the intervention's vision was to reconnect citizens of Newport with the green assets of the wider area. Newport benefitted from an influx of people travelling from surrounding areas to these green areas. Green and Safe Spaces had a network of 30 organisations and around 90 individuals for support and had a budget to use as seed funding for projects, and a Green and Safe Spaces Project Officer in post while the Public Services Board aligned its work streams.

The Intervention Lead explained that they were unable to put all of the green spaces of Newport into the annual report due to its size, but referred the Committee to its Green Asset List. The example given was the Mon Brecon Canal and how the intervention was establishing ways of partnership working and ways of promoting the canal.

Members asked the following questions:

- The Committee enquired whether Keep Wales Tidy not having a representative in Newport had hindered the intervention.

The Committee was assured that they had not been affected by this and that Keep Wales Tidy representatives regularly attended events.

- The Committee referred to page 42 of the report and how Growing Spaces, the mental health charity, were reliant on funding and resources from external sources and struggled with long-term sustainability.

The Intervention Lead advised that one of the aims of the intervention was to pull together organisations that could support each other to provide the sustainability required. The Partners were looking at ways of grant funding and strategic partnership projects that would further support the sustainability of projects and charities like Growing Spaces. This they believed was a key challenge and vital for success.

- The Committee were surprised that the green spaces in Newport were so under-utilised. One problem with an increase in human traffic was the litter it generated and asked did the intervention have a long-term solution to littering.

The Intervention Lead explained that they were trying to galvanise community groups and then using a zero tolerance approach. The more people took ownership and looked at

their own actions the more chance of people changing their behaviour. Increasing Newport citizen attendance at Newport green spaces was done through ensuring that the facilities were free to use, open access for all and easily accessible. The partnership stated that looking at ways of engaging private business, especially those that had a greater chance of being littered in solving the problems at a local level, was a future issue they wished to overcome.

- The Committee raised concerns about how some community groups were willing to undertake voluntary work to keep their local area clean and tidy but were unable to because of lack of equipment and funds to purchase essentials like insurance. The Committee enquired whether there was anything that could be done to enable volunteers to help the partners deliver their work programme.

The attendees explained that they were always looking to establish links with key people and physical assets in areas across Newport, and making these connections increased the level of support provided to an area and lessened the burden on the partners. The Intervention Lead advised that they would be looking at ways of recognising the good work members of these local communities did.

With regard to fly tipping the attendees explained that they were working with the local council and there was a need to push for greater penalties, which would hopefully act as a deterrent.

- The Members queried the Key Performance Measure – Community Green Flag Applications, and if the five applications were successful and what was being done for more sites to achieve green flag status.

The Intervention Lead explained that they needed to move quickly to foster more community support and groups to get green flags in their area and work needed to be done post award to maintain the required standard.

Sustainable Travel

The Intervention Lead for Sustainable travel, the representative from Newport City Homes, introduced the intervention. She explained that their priority was to diversify the intention, measures and how they calculated what was existing in Newport already. The purpose of the intervention was to provide safe and accessible transport, in the long term. One of the first focuses of the intervention was holding the partners to account for their use of low emission vehicles. The decision to not build the M4 relief road had been taken and the partnership would look at the impact on the city and how best to go forward. Other areas of focus for the intervention were: planning guidance; air quality, and; starting to look at transport measures that can be used in planning guidance. Work would be enhanced by securing 5.2 million pounds in funding under *Creating an environment where public transport, walking and cycling is prioritised*, (Step two in the report). Active travel routes, were not listed in the report, but were something that would have been monitored. This key area would be supported by the completion of on-street bike hire.

Work was being undertaken in primary schools to improve young people's knowledge and understanding of the importance of sustainable transport. These education projects would be expanded on going forward.

Another aspect of the sustainable travel intervention was the introduction of the Civil Parking Enforcement beginning on the 1 July 2019. This the attendees believe would have an impact all across the city. Medium and long-term plans include looking at the electric fleet of the partners and establishing a network of charging points across the city, and what this would look like. The Department of Transport had funded Newport Transport to obtain a fleet of

electric buses. These electric buses would be battery powered, a lot of the work had been already undertaken, but they were a long way from making the intervention as impactful as it could be.

Members asked the following questions:

- The Committee enquired as to how the removable batteries in the buses would work. They were informed that the batteries would be recharged in a large 'battery farm' overnight when the busses were no longer in service.
- The Members wished to have more information on Clean Air Zones in the City. The Attendees explained that the clean air zones were areas of the City where they have large amounts of standing traffic. These included the M4 motorway and Caerleon.
- The Committee enquired as to what potential funding and plans the partners were aware of and where the allocation would be best used to overcome some of the issues in the city. The Attendees explained that they it would have been a failure if they did not integrate plans and funding into the existing plans and infrastructure of the city. The Council would be responsible for ensuring that all planning developments took into account the sustainability principles and their implications. Sustainable transport is not just an issue for Newport, one that needed to be looked at a regional level and broader again.

The Chair thanked the Invitees for attending.

Conclusions:

1. The Committee **noted** the Public Services Board Well-being Plan Annual Report 2018-19.
2. The Committee **noted** that the Minutes of the Public Services Board held on 11 June 2019 would be circulated to the Committee once approved.
3. The Committee **agreed** to forward the Minutes to the Public Services Board as a summary of the issues raised and in particular wished to make the following comments to the Public Services Board:
 - The work undertaken in the first 9 months was very positively received by the Committee and they wished to commend all those involved for their hard work.
 - The 'Vision' for Newport was not clear enough in the Annual Report, which the Members believed made the scrutiny of the Public Services Board's performance more difficult.
 - The Members felt that the Annual Report was not easily accessible for lay people and would require additional knowledge or background reading to fully understand the report.
 - The performance measures used to monitor the performance were not fit for purpose. The Committee felt that they were not aspirational enough, that there were enough of them, they were subjective when they should have been objective and were not linked to the overall vision for Newport. The Committee stated that they believed the Performance Measures should be directly linked to the thirteen priorities of the One Newport Public Services Board Well-being Plan.
 - There was a lack of timescales in the Looking Forward section of the Annual Report. The Committee would have liked to have seen an '*in five year, in ten year, and in twenty years*' aspect to these sections. This would have fed into the aspirational vision aspect of the Annual Report.
 - The Committee felt that the sometimes negative perception of Newport needed to be countered by the Public Services Board with more force and consistency. Good news stories and successes needed to be promoted to the citizens of Newport.

- The Committee were enthused to hear about the partnership working between schools, colleges and universities to improve the prospects of young people in Newport. Especially those around Computing, which the Committee believed would increase the attraction of Newport to companies.
- With regard to the Relationship between the Green and Safe Spaces intervention and those individuals and groups who were already working in their local areas, the Committee felt that recognition of these individuals or an awards event would be a beneficial and warmly received.
- The Committee raised concern regarding Fly tipping and more needed to be done to push for greater penalties.
- The Committee requested an information report on the Clean Air Zones in Newport.
- With regard to Sustainable Travel the Committee requested more information on what guidelines were available to define what constitutes as sustainable.

4 **Draft Annual Forward Work Programme 2019-20**

The Scrutiny Adviser introduced the Draft 2019-20 Annual Forward Work Programme to the Committee and presented an overview of the suggested topics included for the Committee's consideration, the proposed Information reports and Briefing Sessions. The discussion ensured that the Committee was happy with the role of the Committee in scrutinising each topic and the reasons for their prioritisation for consideration. The Committee also confirmed that the proposed timescale for receiving the reports were acceptable. The Scrutiny Adviser clarified that if the Committee wished to add, remove or accept a report for information only in future they could do so at any Committee meeting. The Committee agreed that the topics proposed in the Draft Annual Forward Work Programme 2019 - 2020 were acceptable.

Conclusions:

1. The Committee **approved** the Annual Forward Work Programme for 2019-20.
2. The Committee **agreed** the 5pm start time for Committee meetings and **approved** the proposed schedule of meetings for 2019-20.

The meeting closed at 7.40 pm