



Meeting	OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
Date	27 November 2025 (commencing at 10.30am)

Membership

COUNCILLORS

Cathy Mason (Chairman)
Terry Cox (Vice-Chairman) - **apologies**

Stuart Bestwick
Kevin Brown
Faz Choudhury
David Clark
Liz Clunie
Kev Dale

Bruce Laughton - **apologies**
Gaynor Mann
Sam Smith
Brian Wheatcroft
John Wilmott

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Councillor Janette Barlow substituted for Councillor Bruce Laughton
Councillor John Semens substituted for Councillor Terry Cox

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Dawn Justice – Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health
Councillor Stuart Matthews – Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources
Councillor James Rawson – Deputy Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

OFFICERS

Sara Allmond	Advanced Democratic Services Officer
Thomas Dunn	Deputy Director, Public Health and Communities
Martin Elliott	Senior Scrutiny Officer
Vivienne Robbins	Director, Public Health and Communities
Nigel Stevenson	Service Director, Finance, Infrastructure and Improvement and Section 151 Officer

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 5 NOVEMBER 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2025, having been circulated to all Members, were taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted from:

- Councillor Terry Cox (other reasons)
- Councillor Bruce Laughton (other reasons)

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no declarations of interest.

4. FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT PERIOD 5 2025/26

Councillor Stuart Matthews, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources introduced the report which provided an update on the current financial monitoring process and a summary of the budget monitoring position as at period 5 2025/26.

The following information was provided by Councillor Stuart Matthews, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and Nigel Stevenson, Service Director, Finance, Infrastructure and Improvement and Section 151 Officer in response to comments and questions asked by Members of the Committee:

- In response to a question regarding the current predicted overspend of £5 million within the Adult Social Care portfolio, and the level of risk of the overspend increasing further, Members were advised that there were pressures due to the provision of these services being demand led. A budget had been set with the intention of being as close as possible to the amount needed, but services would be provided whatever the budget level and therefore this was a pressure which would continue to be managed across the whole Council budget.
- In response to a question regarding the level of remaining contingency given there had been significant draws on it already, Members were advised that funding had been allocated from contingency in relation to the staff pay award which had now been finalised. £5 million remained in contingency, a level at which the Section 151 Officer was comfortable with.
- In relation to a question regarding the budget deficit in the Dedicated Schools budget due to SEND costs and planned savings, Members were advised that the Council was now in a similar position to many other authorities. The Government had recently announced it would be taking on SEND funding entirely from 2028, however there was no information yet regarding how the negative balances councils were carrying would be managed. The planned savings of £2.7 million that were set out in the Budget Update report were interventions to reduce SEND Transport Growth, however, the overall demand for the service was expected to continue to increase.

- In response to a question relating to the anticipated additional borrowing of £10 million during 2025/26, Members were advised that it was anticipated at the Budget last February that borrowing was not required as the Council used its reserves. It was noted however that as the reserves were used there would likely be a need to borrow. Previously, the Council had been repaying debt and not taking additional borrowing which had been the right strategy through that period when interest rates were high.
- In response to a question regarding capital programme slippage, Members were advised that the capital programme listed all planned projects, if a project was delayed it would likely mean that the capital project would be delayed to a later year but would still be achieved.
- In response to a question regarding joint funded care for care packages, Members were advised that the Integrated Care Board (ICB) were under financial pressure, and they were challenging more in relation to whether a package that was being provided to a service user was health related, or social care related. As the packages were jointly procured there was a potential that the Council would now be paying more for the delivery of care packages.
- In response to a question regarding inflation such as wage and fuel inflation and its impact on the Council's budget, Members were advised that wage inflation and general inflation staying higher for longer was adding pressure to the Council's budget and made it harder to find efficiencies, this however would always be a pressure. There was a particular pressure in home to school transport due to the increased costs of wages and fuel being higher than anticipated. It was being managed in year and would also be considered as part of the preparation of the 2026/27 budget.

RESOLVED 2025/017

- 1) That the established processes for monitoring the budget be noted.
- 2) That the considerations and comments of Overview Committee on the 2025/26 Period 5 Budget monitoring report be noted.

5. BUDGET UPDATE REPORT

Councillor Stuart Matthews, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources introduced the report which provided an update on the budget development process for 2026/27.

The following information was provided by Councillor Stuart Matthews, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, Nigel Stevenson, Service Director, Finance, Infrastructure and Improvement and Section 151 Officer and Councillor James Rawson, Deputy Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources in response to comments and questions asked by Members of the Committee:

- Members were advised that the increase in national minimum wage set out in the Budget would be a significant cost to Adult Social Care and Children's Social Care with costs likely to be higher than the assumed figures in this update of the Medium-

Term Financial Strategy. There was no clear information currently regarding how much the Council would receive in additional funding for SEND provision.

- Members were advised that in relation to transport moving over to the East Midlands Combined County Authority (EMCCA), it would be cost neutral to the Council, as EMCCA would charge the County Council for funding to cover the cost of running the services.
- Members were advised that it was not currently clear what the Council could expect to receive in relation to the financial settlement from Government, and expectations had been dampened recently regarding expectations of receiving additional funding. As such the assumptions that had been previously made around this currently remained the same. In response to a question regarding lobbying on the fairer funding formula, Members were advised that the Cabinet Member had written to Government three times and had so far received no response. The Leader and other Members had also lobbied through the County Council's Network and officers had raised the matter through their professional bodies.
- Members asked questions around the assumptions in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy being underestimated, such as pay awards being assumed at 2%, when it the pay award had been 3.2% this year and on whether the proposed savings plans of £45 million were achievable. In response, Members were advised that in relation to the pay awards the amount agreed for 2025/26 was within tolerance. The expected increased demands in relation to the Higher Needs Block would need to be considered in the preparations for the 2026/27 budget. There was confidence in the interventions working to generate savings, but there was now a need to accelerate some of them. Savings were already being found by careful review of high-cost care packages and through the natural turnover in staff numbers.
- In response to a question regarding how the public were being consulted on the budget proposals, Members were advised that the budget survey had recently launched and the outcomes of it would be considered as part of the budget report to Cabinet in January 2026.
- In response to a question regarding the assumptions being made in the budget and what would happen if they were too optimistic, Members were advised that the Government had already announced the minimum level of the funding settlement. As such the current assumptions had been based on that figure, so there was confidence that the figures being used were not an overestimation. All assumptions made in the budget were risk based and that determined how much funding should be set aside in the general fund balance to mitigate any risk.
- Members were advised that the proposed savings related to providing earlier interventions with service users to reduce the demand on higher level services as their outcomes had been improved at an earlier stage. Examples of this included supporting a whole family rather than an individual child, and in Adult Social Care providing tech enabled care which might allow a service user to stay at home and be independent for longer. All were aimed at improving outcomes for residents which would also lead to a lower cost in their delivery.

RESOLVED 2025/018

- 1) That the significant challenges presented by the financial landscape the Council operates within be noted.
- 2) That the process in establishing the Council's budget for 2026/27 be noted.
- 3) That the comments and considerations of Overview Committee on the current assumptions that have been made in the Council's Medium-Term Financial Strategy be noted.

6. PUBLIC HEALTH PERFORMANCE, RISKS AND FINANCIAL POSITION QUARTERS 1 AND 2 2025-26

Councillor Dawn Justice, Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health introduced the report which provided a summary of Public Health performance, Vital Signs, departmental finance, and risks along with the current Public Health Outcome Framework (PHOF) to allow the Committee to consider any areas they wished to scrutinise in more detail.

The following information was provided by Councillor Dawn Justice, Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health, Vivienne Robbins, Director of Public Health and Communities and Thomas Dunn, Deputy Director of Public Health and Communities in response to comments and questions asked by Members of the Committee:

- In response to a question regarding underperforming measures and how they were being tackled, Members were advised that there was a robust performance management programme to monitor the performance targets. There were two areas currently underperforming. These were the C Card Scheme (condom distribution scheme) and the Health Checks scheme. Members were advised that the C Card scheme had seasonal variations in demand with less take up during the school summer holidays, this situation was being monitored. On the Health Checks scheme, Members were advised the Health Check service had been reprocured recently and with the payment method being changed to ensure that the people who would benefit most from the health checks were being made a priority target for uptake. This change had resulted in an increase in the number of those who had received a health check then receiving interventions meaning the quality of the service was increasing.
- In response to a question regarding the underspend of the Public Health grant, Members were advised that this was due in part to recruitment and staff vacancies. The post of the Deputy Director of Public Health and Communities had now been filled and only those posts that were really needed were recruited to. The sexual health service was also carrying an underspend as the service was demand led and there had not been the demand for the service that had been expected. The Public Health grant was ring fenced so any underspends went into a separate pot and would be spent on Public Health matters such as trials of new services.
- In response to a question regarding the impact of pressures on NHS budgets and its ability to maintain performance, Members were advised that there was a tremendous

amount of change in local government due to upcoming Local Government Reform. Work had also been carried out with NHS partners in terms of the changes to the Integrated Care Boards (ICB) which were clustering into broader regional ICBs. There were also a number of cost pressures around the NHS more generally. Public Health worked closely with NHS colleagues to support each other in areas of pressure, for example around vaccine uptake.

- In relation to a question regarding in-person health visits to new mums, Members were advised that there had been a slight dip in performance however, the attendance rate was still over 85%. There had been some recruitment issues due to capacity issues nationally. The service had gone through a lot of change since its re-procurement and was now settling in.
- In relation to a question regarding inequalities in relation to vaccination and screening programmes, Members were advised that it was a national issue. In Nottinghamshire this was being addressed through the health protection teams and health protection board looking at how to engage with different communities to reduce stigma, improve communication material and increase uptake.
- In response to a question regarding why there was an increase in the number of health care associated infections due to lower vaccine take up, Members were advised that there was a national downward trend. Nottinghamshire had a higher rate of vaccine take up than the national average but there were some areas of the county where more work was required to improve vaccine uptake. Delivery of vaccines currently sat with NHS England and would likely transfer to the ICB in 2028. Work was being carried out to understand areas such as uptake of vaccinations in pregnancy and which communities were known to be less likely to have vaccinations and how it would be best to engage with them.
- In response to a question regarding substance misuse, Members were advised that Public Health worked closely with the police through the Safer Notts Board. The substance use team also worked closely with the Police and Crime Commissioner and the police with joint commissioning of services. There were several key performance indicators (KPIs) along with a national dataset in relation to the successful completion of treatment. The service was also delivered in a holistic way and provided wider support to get service users back on their feet. As such, the service might initially work for a longer period with service users so that they would not need to be rereferred for further support in the future.
- In response to questions regarding smoking cessation and weight loss, Members were advised that rates of smoking were continuing to fall and there was an aim for Nottinghamshire to be smoke free by 2030, which meant less than 5% of the population being smokers. Obesity was a national and international issue and support was provided to those that wanted to lose weight. A wider range of services was provided and there was significant weight loss through non medicine methods. It was however a complex issue.
- Members asked which public health outcome indicators were of most concern and what was being done about improving outcomes for residents. Members were advised that some of the outcomes and inequalities in child health, around best start

indicators were of concern, which the new healthy families programme should provide some improvements on. It was also noted that inequalities in women's health had been looked at within the Director of Public Health and Communities annual report and there was a comprehensive action plan as part of that work which was being overseen by the Health and Wellbeing Board.

- Other areas of concern and the response to these challenges also included:
 - Persistent geographic health inequalities. The Health Scrutiny Committee would be looking into these during 2025/26
 - Substance misuse support had now received some additional funding which would enable more support to be provided around treatment and recovery.
 - Housing and employment for people with disabilities and serious mental illness was of concern, with the opportunities of working with EMCCA and Local Government Reorganisation being developed.
 - It was noted that many of these areas were however very complex and that outcomes would not change in the short term, but activity was being focussed to deliver improvements in the longer term.

RESOLVED 2025/019

- 1) That the comments and considerations of Overview Committee on Public Health's performance, Vital Signs, financial position and key departmental risks, be noted.
- 2) That the comments and considerations of Overview Committee on Nottinghamshire's current Public Health Outcome Framework performance.
- 3) That the following issue raised by the Committee in its consideration of the report be progressed:
 - a) That further information be shared with members of Overview Committee on the work that is being carried out by Public Health around improving outcomes around substance use in Nottinghamshire.

7. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMMES

The Senior Scrutiny Officer, Martin Elliott, introduced the Committee's current work programme. The work programmes for each of the select committees were also appended to the report.

The following information was provided in response to comments and questions asked by Members of the Committee:

- Council Buildings and Property item was scheduled for May as it was a complex matter due to the possible implications of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). As such further information was required from Government on LGR before any work could be undertaken. Once ready to start, the work could be carried out as a review.

- Members requested that the committee carry out scrutiny activity in relation to the development of a Council-wide menopause policy.

RESOLVED 2025/020

- 1) That the Overview Committee work programme be noted.
- 2) That the work programmes of the three select committees be noted.
- 3) That committee members make any further suggestions for consideration by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman for inclusion on the work programme, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member(s) and senior officers, and subject to the required approval by the Chairman of Overview Committee.
- 4) That further scrutiny activity be carried out, in a format to be agreed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, and in consultation with officers on the development of Council-wide menopause policy.

The meeting closed at 12.39pm

CHAIRMAN