

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 24th January 2017

Time: 10.15a.m. – 2.00p.m.

Present: Councillors Bailey, Bates, D Brown, Bullen, Count (Chairman), Criswell, Dent, Hickford, Hipkin, Jenkins, Leeke (substituting for Councillor Cearn), McGuire, Nethsingha, Orgee, Reeve, Walsh and Whitehead

Apologies: Councillor Cearn

The Chairman apologised for the delay to the start of the meeting, which was due to the impact of the closure of the A10.

310. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

311. MINUTES – 10TH JANUARY 2017 AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 10th January 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to a correction at the top of page 10 where it should read a) and b) and not b) and c). The Action Log and following updates were noted:

- the need for Children, Families and Adults to identify on its service directorate Risk Register the risks associated with call handing and the mitigation measures necessary to reduce that risk to an acceptable level. **Action Required.**
- the Chief Executive had asked the Chair of the Public Service Board (PSB) to include an item on the next agenda covering what the County Council was doing in relation to transformation and the need to find a mechanism to identify benefits to partners such as the Police, Districts and Health. She agreed to bring back a formal response from the PSB to Committee. The Chairman acknowledged that the County Council might not be able to identify some of these savings in depth but it could instead provide an estimate. **Action Required.**
- the need to communicate the impact and importance of the decisions made as part of the Transformation Fund was ongoing. It was noted that there were three case studies as part of the introductory section in the Strategic Framework. **Action Required.**
- the Project Board dealing with elections had already met and was scheduled to meet again on 26 January. The costs would be brought back to Members. **Action Required.**

312. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

313. INSURANCE PROCUREMENT 2017 – DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO LET CONTRACT

The Committee was informed of the proposal to undertake an EU compliant tender process to procure contracts of insurance to replace existing arrangements, which were due to expire on 30th September 2017. A joint LGSS procurement exercise was being prepared which would aim to achieve cost and contract management efficiencies. Although the proposed timetable meant that Peterborough City Council could not be part of the exercise, it was proposed to consider benchmarking data and possibly align with the Council when the next review was undertaken. In response to a query, the Chief Finance Officer (CFO) confirmed that the work being undertaken by the Local Government Association regarding a national insurance programme option was included as part of the process.

It was resolved unanimously

That the Committee approve delegation of authority to the Council's Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with Chairman of General Purposes Committee, to agree and let contracts for the provision of insurance to the Council commencing 1st October 2017.

314. BUSINESS PLAN 2017-18

The CFO when introducing his report proposed an alteration in order to produce a fully balanced budget by replacing Recommendation 3 in the report with the following:

Agrees that the 2017/8 revenue budget gap, in the sum of £1.4m, be covered by utilising part of the MRP adjustment thereby reducing the sum that would otherwise have been added to the Transformation Fund.

Members received a report detailing the Council's Business Plan covering the period 2017-18 in detail, and 2018-19 through to 2021-22 in outline for Committee recommendation to Council for approval. They were reminded that, at their last meeting, they had been presented with an unbalanced budget position but with potential options to achieve a balanced position. Attention was drawn to Section 2.2 which set out how the budget gap had been narrowed. There was still a budget gap of £1.4m which was proposed to be covered by utilising part of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP). In response, one Member commented on the need to note that there would therefore be a shortfall in the Transformation Fund from this action.

In considering the report and Business Plan, some Members commented as follows:

- the need to avoid repeating Sections 2 & 3 in the Strategic Framework.
- the need to amend recommendation 6 to 4h instead of 4i.

UKIP Amendment

Councillor Bullen proposed an amendment (attached at Appendix 1), seconded by Councillor Reeve. In introducing his amendment, Councillor Bullen reported that UKIP

believed Council Tax was unfair and regressive, as it affected the less well off. He was of the view that the Council's budget situation was not as severe as reported and that the Council had the funds to provide a balanced budget both this year and next. He was concerned about the significant amount of funding which he believed had been wasted by the Council on large projects. He also felt that the Government should be funding Adult Social Care (ASC) rather than, what was in his view, less worthy projects.

In considering the amendment, some Members commented as follows:

- the need to focus on the Council's budget, as it was not possible to affect national policy.
- queried whether UKIP supported the ASC precept of 2%. Councillor Bullen reported that he regarded the precept as Council Tax money spent on ASC. He could not support any increase in Council Tax in any shape or form.
- noted that amendment numbers 2 and 3 were included in the recommendations to Committee. The CFO acknowledged this point but drew attention to the fact that they had not yet been approved. Councillor Bullen reported that when he had raised this issue at Group Leaders, it had been agreed to accept the amendment as drafted. The Chairman felt that there had been sufficient time for UKIP to alter its amendment to reflect correct information. One Member expressed concern that the Chairman was acting beyond his remit particularly as the amendment had been submitted in advance with officer advice.
- queried whether the amendment would produce a balanced budget. The CFO stated that it would.
- highlighted the fact that following comments raised by the Chairman, opposition groups had all prepared and discussed their amendments with officers in advance. Some groups had also shared their amendments. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group was critical of the fact that the Conservative amendment had not been shared. She felt that it would have been useful to have had early sight of the amendments at Group Leaders. The Chairman reported that he had only been offered the sight of the amendments ten minutes before the meeting. The Leader of the Labour Group reminded the meeting that the Council was no overall control and that there were therefore no opposition groups. The Chairman reported that he had submitted a formal complaint against the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group and the Liberal Democrat Group regarding reference to their statement that the Council was run by a Conservative Administration and officers. In response, the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group reported that she had never suggested the Council was run by officers but she was of the view that it was a Conservative led Council. The Chairman reminded the meeting of last year's budget which had been agreed at Council by political parties joining together.

One Member expressed concern at the piecemeal approach to amendments. She asked whether the Committee could be given time to review all the amendments as there might be overlaps which could be pursued. In response, the Chairman agreed to a short adjournment to enable all the amendments to be circulated and to give Members time to read them.

In considering the UKIP amendment, some Members commented as follows:

- noted that the UKIP amendment would result in further depletion of the Transformation Fund.
- expressed concern that the Council which had received £111m in Revenue Support Grant (RSG) in 2010 would not receive any Grant in 2019. It was not possible to provide the level of services the public expected without increasing the tax base. It was noted that there were already red risks for ASC, Children's Social Care and flooding. UKIP was proposing to reduce the Council's reserves so that they were smaller than the reserves for Cambridge City Council. In response, it was noted that UKIP was of the view that a Council Investment Strategy would avoid the need to be reliant on Council Tax.
- concern expressed by two Members that the UKIP Leader had stated in the introduction to his amendment that social care was a draw on society. The UKIP Leader reported that if he had said that then he apologised. He meant to say a huge draw on reserves.
- queried why Councillor Bullen was standing as the UKIP mayoral candidate if the party opposed the introduction of a Mayor for Cambridgeshire. Councillor Bullen reported that he would use the role to reduce the levels of bureaucracy.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

Liberal Democrat Amendment

Councillor Nethsingha proposed an amendment (attached at Appendix 2), seconded by Councillor Leeke. She expressed concern that the Conservatives were consistently refusing to raise Council Tax to support NHS Services. She drew attention to a letter from a major care provider who had stated that the current level of funding was unsustainable and if reduced further than required there would be a further crisis in the NHS. She was concerned that families were experiencing the trauma of having operations cancelled because there were no beds available. Reductions in the County Council's budget therefore went beyond care services, she was therefore of the view that the Council should be doing all it could to support its NHS colleagues. She drew attention to proposed budget cuts to children's centres, schools particularly support services provided by the Council, and bus services. She commented that by not increasing Council Tax by an additional 42p per week, the Council was choosing not to support services.

In considering the amendment, some Members commented as follows:

- support from the Leader of the Labour Group for the amendment. However, he highlighted the need to add another £400k to the budget for free parking at the Park and Ride sites around Cambridge, as it had actually cost £1.2m to fund. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group acknowledged the point raised and the fact that there would be a conversation with the City Council if there was a shortfall.

- queried whether the amount of money being proposed for the wide range of services except for Park and Ride was significant to make a difference. Another Member queried why the Liberal Democrat Group did not adopt the approach being proposed by Surrey County Council to increase Council Tax to cover the actual costs rather than tinkering with the figures to generate leaflets. He was surprised that these proposals had not been discussed at the Committees. The Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group acknowledged that the amount proposed for subsidising bus routes and community transport was woefully inadequate. He hoped that the new Mayor would consider the franchising of bus services. He reported that the £190k proposal to increase services to support young mothers and their babies detailed in 1a would support the cost of the current programme which did provide an adequate service. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group added that it would fund three members of staff so would make a difference. She added that the proposals addressed areas where it was needed. She made no apology for generating leaflets given the importance of the election process.
- noted from the Chairwoman of Children and Young People Committee that there would be no Children's Centre closures in 2017/18. There was a saving of £1m proposed in 2018/19. She drew attention to a recent Members' Seminar where detailed plans for Children's Centres linked to Community Hubs had been outlined which would hopefully avoid the need for future closures. One Member was concerned that the Liberal Democrat Group proposal for Children's Centres would undermine what was being proposed by officers. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group reported that the Children's Centres budget and Children's Change Programme were linked.
- expressed continued concern regarding the media reporting of Delayed Transfers of Care. The figures for September 2016 showed that ASC care delays accounted for 133 per 100,000 population compared to a total of 577. Cambridgeshire had one of the lowest figures in the area for delays attributable to ASC. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group acknowledged the complexity of this issue but the Council would not be doing everything it could if it did not fund services. She reported that the figures for November 2016 showed that ASC delays accounted for 991. Another member queried the accuracy and asked for the source and numbers to be validated.
- highlighted the fact that the joint commissioning of a specific home care service geared up to achieve rapid hospital discharge detailed in 2b of the amendment was to a large extent the Neighbourhood Cares Pilot Project set out in the Business Plan, which followed the individual into hospital. The pilot needed to be evaluated so it was not clear how the proposal in 2b would be implemented in the financial year.
- highlighted the fact that issues around recruitment of home care workers were more complex than just rate of pay. Another Member queried whether such a small amount of funding would be sufficient to attract and retain the required work-force. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group reported that a 1.4% increase was double the rate in the Business Plan.
- expressed concern about the misleading wording in 2a. The current business plan proposals were not from the Conservative Group but had been worked up through

the committee system which involved all parties. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group reported that the budget papers were based on the Conservative proposal of a 0% increase in Council Tax and a 2% increase in ASC precept. She highlighted the fact that the Business Plan did not reflect the Liberal Democrat, Labour or UKIP proposals. The Leader of the Labour Group reported that all groups had been given the opportunity to contribute to the Business Plan and submit an amendment. It was therefore not a Conservative budget.

- welcomed £6 million of new Government funding, separate to any other income streams, to spend between now and 2020 on schools across Fenland and East Cambridgeshire. The CFO was asked to clarify what the funding could or could not be used for. **Action Required.** The Chairman commented that the Schools' Budget had received increases over the last few years he believed were £26.9m and an additional £6m as a result of the new funding formula. However the figures would need checking as they were from memory. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group welcomed the increase in funding for Fenland and East Cambridgeshire but highlighted the fact that Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire had been affected adversely by the schools' funding formula.
- clarified that UKIP did not wish to privatise the NHS, as indicated in the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group's introduction. It wanted it to be fair and free for everyone.
- acknowledgement from the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group that Council Tax was a bad form of tax and that there were better ways to raise tax. Working within the current mechanism, it was better that people paid an average of an additional 42p per week over the increase already proposed for an improvement in services.
- clarified that the Liberal Democrat amendment was for 2017/18 and would increase the budget base.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

Labour Amendment

Councillor Walsh proposed an amendment (attached at Appendix 3), seconded by Councillor Whitehead. He drew attention to two alterations as follows: the addition of cuts after "devastating" in the fourth paragraph on page 1 and the change from "minority" to majority to the first sentence of A5.

Councillor Walsh reminded the Committee of the changes to the RSG which would not exist by 2019/20. He drew attention to the impact of growth, the risk of the proposed savings to adults and children in need, and no new financial support for care services. Whilst his group supported transformation, he could not support cuts classed as transformation which impacted on the disadvantaged such as cuts to Mental Health packages. He acknowledged that Council Tax was not perfect and did need re-banding. He drew attention to the spending proposals detailed in his amendment. He was therefore proposing to raise Council Tax by 1.99% over the coming three years and to raise the ASC precept by 3% over the coming two financial years.

In considering the amendment, some Members commented as follows:

- highlighted the fact that raising the ASC precept by 3% over the coming two financial years left an element of risk in relation to the third year. Another Member queried whether the Labour Group had considered spreading it out over three years as this would raise more funding. The Leader of the Labour Group commented that it was a marginal decrease. He considered it more important to have the funding now given the shortage of funds.
- highlighted the importance of the Transformation Fund being used to support the Council's Strategic Objectives rather than using budget cuts to transform lives.
- highlighted the proposal for a £23m commercial property investment fund at A10. The Chairman of Assets and Investments Committee reported that the Council already had such a fund managed by his Committee. The Chairman drew attention to the risks associated with the statement that each investment would produce a return of at least 6%. The Leader of the Labour Group acknowledged that the Committee was doing excellent work. With reference to the rate of return, he encouraged the Council to work with other authorities which had more experience in this area.
- welcomed many of the proposals set out in the amendment and suggested that the Leader of the Labour Group work with the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group to produce a joint amendment.
- expressed concern about A3 which did not include villages. Another Member reminded the Committee that it was setting a budget for the whole of Cambridgeshire and not just Cambridge City. One Member challenged this view as urban did not just mean Cambridge. The proposals covering the City Shuttle Bus and Park and Ride would also benefit people from outside of Cambridge.
- expressed concern as to whether it was right to raise Council Tax to get money to invest in property.
- expressed concern about the lack of additional investment in ASC. The Leader of the Labour Group drew attention to two proposals covering learning and autism which were part of ASC.
- highlighted the impact of Brexit talks on business rates in the future. Attention was drawn to the fact that the majority of people were willing to pay more Council Tax to protect services.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

Conservative Amendment

The Chairman agreed to vacate the chair to allow the Vice-Chairman to take the chair to enable him to propose the Conservative amendment.

Councillor Count proposed an amendment (attached at Appendix 4), seconded by Councillor Bailey. Councillor Count reported that his confidence in the Council's transformation of services meant that he could use the MRP to fund the costs of proposed investments detailed in his amendment and replace the funding with savings from an accelerated transformation process. This would avoid the need to increase Council Tax in 2017/18. He drew attention to proposals to increase spending on pothole repairs and carriageway cracks, gulley clearance, grass cutting and visibility splay grass cutting, sealing cracks in pavements and general footway improvements, Mental Health and early year's literacy. He also drew attention to a proposal to prepare £50m of congesting busting projects.

In considering the amendment, some Members commented as follows:

- expressed disappointment at the statement that the current set up was delaying transformation.
- highlighted the importance of the Early Years Community Literacy Projects.
- questioned which members of the Conservative Group had supported a 1.99% increase in Council Tax.
- questioned why the Conservative Group had not produced a four year plan with a table outlining spending and receivable revenue proposals.
- expressed concern about the purely speculative nature of the first paragraph of the amendment. Another Member argued that the amendment was incoherent as there was no evidence of how the savings would be achieved. He queried why the mental health proposal had not been taken through the committee system. As Chairman of the Health Committee, he confirmed that the proposal relating to Mental Health had not been raised directly with him. With reference to the proposal for early year's literacy, he reported that he had raised this with the Vice-Chairman of the Health Committee. The Leader of the Conservative Group reported that this proposal had been raised with him by the Director of Public Health.
- queried whether this amendment would provide a balanced budget as there was no explanation as to where the money would come from. The reference to the £50m did not relate to the Council's budget. The CFO explained that the proposal was to balance the budget drawing on MRP in 2017/18 and replenishing it with savings from transformation in 2018/19. With reference to the second point, the capital funding for schemes which were ready to go would need to come from other sources. He acknowledged that the written amendment did not sufficiently reflect his conversations with the Conservative Group and did not provide sufficient detail for a balanced budget.

Councillor Count withdrew his amendment. The Vice-Chairman exercising his discretion as Chairman adjourned the meeting for fifteen minutes to enable the amendment to be redrafted.

Councillor Count proposed a second amendment (attached at Appendix 5), seconded by Councillor Bailey. He reported that the narrative at the end of the amendment was the only addition to clear up the previous mismatch.

In considering the amendment, some Members commented as follows:

- questioned which members of the Conservative Group had supported a 1.99% increase in Council Tax. The Leader of the Conservative Group reminded the Committee that political group meetings were private.
- questioned why the Conservative Group had not produced a four year plan with a table outlining spending and receivable revenue proposals. The Leader of the Conservative Group reported that his Group had been fully engaged with the process throughout the year and concentrated on proposals not rhetoric therefore at this stage they did not need a five page document to outline their amendment.
- expressed concern that it was fiscally irresponsible to use the MRP to fund budget lines. Another Member highlighted the need for fully costed proposals. The Leader of the Conservative Group reported that his Group was the only one looking to replenish the MRP.
- expressed concern that this amendment was predicated on the overachievement of savings particularly given the situation relating to Looked After Children. It was suggested that the Council should not take risks with the Transformation Fund over and above what officers had indicated they could deliver. This amendment did not set a balanced budget this year and increased revenue spend over and above income. The Leader of the Conservative Group reported that he was not proposing an overachievement of savings, in fact he would be looking to draw up further savings.
- queried whether it was right to use the word investment to cover spending on pothole repairs. The Leader of the Conservative Group acknowledged the nuances associated with the word investment.
- highlighted the fact that funding of £50m of congestion busting projects was misleading. This statement should be amended to reflect County Council investment of £70,000 in revenue funding. The Leader of the Conservative Group identified other funding streams that necessitated projects being prepared to “oven ready” stage in order to qualify for funding. The £70k was the revenue implications in the budget to the County Council for that work.
- highlighted the fact that the amendment was inaccurate and disappointing with no input from the other parties.
- expressed continued concern about the purely speculative nature of the first paragraph of the amendment. The CFO reported that the amendment was using MRP to fund investment for one year. It would be taken from the total MRP funding amount for 2017-18 not taken to the revenue account of £8.6m. There was therefore no additional pressure on revenue. The organisation would need to identify £4.3m to replenish the MRP in 2018/19.

- noted that the Conservative Group was committed to radical transformation. One Member highlighted her experience at East Cambridgeshire District Council where such transformation had taken place. She expressed disappointment that members of the Liberal Democrat Group on Adults Committee had been unable to support a transformation proposal included in the Business Plan. She was of the view that the Council could do more transformation and this would happen if the Conservative Group was in control. The Leader of the Conservative Group added that a conservative majority would accelerate transformation, as it would remove the time spent by officers explaining bids.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

The Leader of the Conservative Group resumed the chair.

Amendment from Councillor Jenkins

Councillor Jenkins proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, as follows:

Additional funding of £XXX be made available to enable the Community Literacy Project in Waterlees, Wisbech, and other identified locations to go ahead.

The source of this funding be determined by the CFO in consultation with etc.

Councillor Jenkins reminded the Committee that the Council was responsible for public health. Its role was to provide a productive workforce and help people live more satisfying lives, which could involve changing behaviours. He highlighted the work of Professor Marmot much of which was aimed at addressing inequality. This work was supported by Health Committee which had received a report. He thanked the Chairman for his on work on Devolution 2 which included public health. He drew attention to the Community Literacy Project pilot which had taken place in Wisbech and welcomed the fact that the Vice-Chairman of Health Committee had seen fit to include it in the Conservative amendment based on four locations over five years.

A discussion took place regarding who had initiated the proposal. The Vice-Chairman of Health Committee reported that the Chairman of Health Committee had raised it with him. However, before he had reported it back to his Group, it had been included in the amendment. Whilst all the Groups supported the investment of £120k for Early Years Community Literacy Projects to be delivered in Wisbech, Huntingdon, North Cambridge and St Neots, there was concern as to where the money would come from. On the basis that this proposal had received general approval from the Committee, Councillor Jenkins agreed to withdraw his amendment to enable more work to be carried out to establish how it would be funded. The proposal would then be presented to full Council in February as part of the Business Plan. **Action Required.**

It was resolved to *(for clarity the recommendations which were not agreed have been struckthrough)*:

1. Consider the Business Plan, including supporting Budget, Community Impact Assessments, Consultation Responses and other material, in the light of all planning activities undertaken to date.
2. Approve the allocation of the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Implementation Grant 2017-18 to Children, Families and Adults (CFA), to ensure that this funding was used as intended by Department for Education (DfE).
- ~~3. Agrees that the 2017/8 revenue budget gap, in the sum of £1.4m, be covered by utilising part of the MRP adjustment thereby reducing the sum that would otherwise have been added to the Transformation Fund.~~
4. Recommend to Council the following:
 - ~~a. That approval be given to the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan.~~
 - ~~b. That approval be given to a total County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £780,393,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.~~
 - ~~c. That approval be given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £262,235,777.24, as set out in Section 2, Table 6.3 of the Business Plan (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995).~~
 - ~~d. That approval be given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of "Band D" equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (220,287), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% increase in the County Council element of the Council Tax:~~

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	£793.62
B	7/9	£925.89
C	8/9	£1,058.16
D	9/9	£1,190.43
E	11/9	£1,454.97
F	13/9	£1,719.51
G	15/9	£1,984.05
H	18/9	£2,380.86

- ~~e. That approval be given to the report of the Chief Finance Officer on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out within the Section 25 statement.~~

- f. That approval be given to the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan.
- g. That approval be given to capital expenditure in 2017-18 up to £264.9m arising from:
 - Commitments from schemes already approved; and
 - The consequences of new starts in 2017-18 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 6.9 of the Business Plan.
- h. That approval be given to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan, including:
 - i. The Council's policy on the making of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) for the repayment of debt, as required by the Local Authorities (Capital Finance & Accounting) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008
 - ii. The Affordable Borrowing Limit for 2017-18 as required by the Local Government Act 2003)
 - iii. The Investment Strategy for 2017-18 as required by the Communities and Local Government (CLG) revised Guidance on Local Government Investments issued in 2010, and the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.

5. Endorse the priorities and opportunities as set out in the Strategic Framework

~~6. Authorise the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the Business Plan, including the foregoing recommendations 4a to 4i to the County Council, so as to take into account any changes deemed appropriate, including updated information on District Council Tax Base and Collection Funds, Business Rates forecasts and Collection Funds and any grant changes.~~

315. GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES, PARTNERSHIP LIAISON AND ADVISORY GROUPS AND INTERNAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND PANELS

The Committee considered its agenda plan and training plan. It was noted that item 8 – Community Hubs to be considered in March would now be part of item 7.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) review its Agenda Plan attached at Appendix 1;
- b) review and agree its Training Plan attached at Appendix 2.

Chairman

UKIP has identified 5 core goals

1. To freeze council tax
2. To identify new revenue streams for CCC
3. To identify savings with no impact on service delivery
4. To better integrate the council with partner organisations
5. To ultimately move to a unitary authority.

This report identifies the UKIP group's proposal for new savings, new revenue streams and new ways of working not currently in the proposed CCC budget proposal adopted by CCC. The UKIP proposal identifies what we will do differently in order to achieve a council tax freeze whilst providing a balanced budget and no extra cuts to key front line services.

Background and national scene

The UKIP statement on the CCC budget plan proposal is aimed at achieving the five core goals above. We aim to make the organisation as efficient as possible while also addressing the critical need for new revenue streams.

Above all UKIP aims to initiate a cultural change in CCC to develop into an organisation willing to blur the organisational boundaries with partners and to start the transformational process into an organisation willing and capable of ultimately becoming a Unitary Authority.

We will illustrate how we will fund a tax freeze for Cambridgeshire tax payers without direct cuts to front line services beyond the current plan proposed by CCC.

The UKIP group recognises that these are difficult economic times for the people of Cambridgeshire. Residents and communities are suffering from the results of poor government decisions and difficult economic conditions.

At a time when residents are finding it difficult to pay their mortgage, heat their homes, put fuel in their cars to get to work and put food on their table, we believe that it is wrong for CCC to compound this problem further by taking more money from household budgets by increasing council tax.

UKIP is the party of small government and low tax, passionate about keeping money where it belongs, in the householder's purse, paying for essential and escalating household bills, rather than in the County Council's coffers.

UKIP is the party of efficiency, believing that councils should be as lean as possible in good economic times as well as bad.

UKIP is the party of transformation, seeking a radical agenda of change management to break down the barriers in the way of the council so that its partners are fit and willing to move to unitary status.

UKIP recognises that the changes that we seek to make would have been less challenging to implement in previous better economic times and regrets that the previous administrations did not tackle waste, inefficiencies and new revenue streams that financial pressures are now forced upon them. We are now suffering from the impact of poor past decisions.

UKIP believes that the move to the committee system of governance has allowed a more collegiate approach to decision making that has achieved greater consensus, better scrutiny and better and wider debate, more input from members and communities and better decisions.

UKIP regrets that previous administrations had not grasped the nettle of introducing new revenue streams and efficiencies over the last two decades that could have created a situation where the current financial pressures would be much less challenging.

The impact on Cambridgeshire households of the planned year on year tax rises is cumulative not just over time but also across other tax raising authorities in Cambridgeshire including district councils, Police and Crime Commissioner, Fire Authority and many town and parish councils planning to increase their tax take from limited household budgets.

UKIP opposed the introduction of a Mayor for Cambridgeshire and suggested that the original claims that the mayoral office need not cause extra cost beyond existing staff within local authorities were grossly exaggerated and whilst pleased to see more honesty in the figures of the cost of the Mayor's office being presented we believe that this is an unnecessary extra burden on the residents of Cambridgeshire. Two of the powers that the new Mayor will have are to add another line to council tax payers and business rates payers bills. UKIP oppose this extra taxation.

We recognise the urgent need for UKIP to enter the decision making institutions of national government that can positively impact local government budgets.

Despite the results of the referendum on UK membership of the EU, £55 million is still being given to the European Union every day by the UK, money which UKIP would use to provide services and infrastructure in Britain. Brexit provides the opportunity to move this spend back to the UK and directly back into local services. UKIP supports the Local Government Association position of demanding that significant amounts of the Brexit dividend are channelled to services provided by local government.

UKIP strongly believes that the UK must reduce the amount of money given away in the foreign aid budget and that it should be reduced to around £2bn which is still enough to provide essential foreign aid of water, inoculations and disaster relief. The remaining £10bn, that is currently in the foreign aid budget and which is often used on wasteful, ineffective and aspirational projects, and often provided to countries that are spending money on military, space and nuclear programmes. It is UKIP policy to channel this money back home to

support British residents in need in the UK. This is the only way of solving the funding gap in adult and children's social care and the NHS. Council tax rises fail to provide enough extra money to make a difference and add substantial extra pressure to already stretched household budgets.

Some EU legislation directly impacts CCC. Landfill tax alone costs CCC nearly £8million per year.

UKIP's national policies on health, education, defence, immigration, procurement, transport and Whitehall departmental structures will also have a positive impact on local government finance and service provision.

We acknowledge, however, that UKIP is not yet in government and Cambridgeshire County Council has to work within the constraints of the poor government decisions currently being made. We therefore have not used any of these figures in our plan.

Amendments to the 2017/8 budget

1. That Council tax be frozen.

This creates a deficit in the 2017/18 budget of £5,135m which when added to the current funding gap of £4.3m in the proposed budget produces a deficit that needs to be covered of £9.435m

2. That the redundancy budget be capitalised, which is permissible within the capital regulations and will create a positive impact on the revenue account of £1m
3. That the interest accrued on capital projects before assets become operational are Capitalised, this will create a positive impact on the revenue budget of £2.1m
4. Use MRP to balance the budget which will have a positive impact on the revenue budget this year of up to £4.3m of the £8.6m available leaving the remainder to further seed fund revenue generating and transformational projects.
5. Reduce the general reserve being held which is currently at £17m by £2.035m to £14.965m

UKIP will separately provide a statement on our medium and long term savings and investment strategy that will ensure future tax freezes without service reductions that will remain possible beyond the 2017/8 budget.

Liberal Democrat's budget amendments, February 2017

Preamble

The Liberal Democrat group believes that public services in Cambridgeshire are under unparalleled pressure across all sectors of service, as they are in the rest of the country. It recognises that strenuous efforts have been made by officers to provide services more cost-effectively. It is clear that:

- a. Demographic changes are increasing the demand for social care services for children and adults.
- b. Our transport network is hugely over-stretched.
- c. Central government grant has been significantly reduced over the last five years and will disappear entirely within two years

The government has allowed local councils a small level of discretion in setting council tax levels and the Liberal Democrats believe that this flexibility must be used to protect services for those who currently need them and to reduce the likelihood of even greater costs in the future.

Specific proposals

1. Children's services: additional spending	£1.795m
a. Increase services to supporting young mothers and their babies	£190k
b. maintain special needs support for schools	£270k
c. maintain central support for the Cambridgeshire Race and Diversity Service (CREDS)	£625k
d. support the work of locality teams	£310k
e. reducing children's centre closures	£400k
2. Services for Vulnerable Adults:	£1.905m
a. To allow for a higher percentage increase for care providers	£692k
b. jointly commission a specific home care service	£700k
c. increase the hourly rate for home care	£513k
3. Roads and transport	£1.3 m
a. free parking at Park and Ride sites for Cambridge	£800k
b. subsidise bus routes and community transport	£200k
c. better maintenance of verges and footpaths	£100k
d. additional maintenance for the County's roads, pavements and cycle ways	£200k
Total extra spending	£5.00m
Yield from increasing council tax by 2%	£5.00m

The rationale for these proposals is explained in detail below:

1 a The quality of care for young mothers and their babies is critical for their long-term well-being. The first three years of life are crucially important and international longitudinal studies demonstrate that it is a false economy to fail the youngest children, particularly those most vulnerable. 20% of Cambridgeshire 2 year olds are not receiving vital health checks.

1 b The proposals which have been presented at County Council committees remove specialist teaching support currently available to schools in Cambridgeshire. This support is particularly important for those schools in deprived areas who are struggling to meet required standards. The budget proposals suggest that schools would be able to buy back these support services from the Council. However the schools who need services the most are the least likely to be able to afford to buy in support services. We would maintain the current budget, as we believe ensuring that every child in Cambridgeshire is offered a high quality education ought to be a key aim of the County Council.

1 c The current proposals withdraw all central funding from the CREDS service. This service provides translation support to schools and other educational settings who are teaching children with diverse ethnic backgrounds, and who have English as an additional language. They also provide specialist support to gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, where the children tend to have prolonged absences from school. To remove the funding from this service, and require schools themselves pay for this support would again put undue financial pressure on those schools which can least afford it.

1 d Locality teams work with children in the most difficult and disadvantaged families. The council's children's change programme is recommending reducing the number of teams working with struggling families from 14 to 7. We believe the cuts being made to the service are too deep and too rapid. They will be counter-productive because they will lead to higher costs later on a child's life. This additional money would halve the level of cuts required in the service, and would be focussed on increasing the number of front-line staff.

1 e The current proposals include £1 million of cuts to the children's centres budget. Children's centres offer support to young mums and toddlers, and are crucial in making sure mothers are supported, and children are ready for school at age five. This level of cuts risks undoing years of invaluable work in supporting young families. Children's centres have also often become community hubs, and places where other activities can take place and families be supported by a range of services such as health visitors. The level of cuts proposed is too deep and will fall hardest on the most vulnerable communities, including the rurally isolated. Our proposal mitigates some of the damage that might be caused.

2 a There is widespread public concern about bed delays, ambulance attendance times and Accident and Emergency waiting times. The NHS is under unprecedented pressure. We are deeply concerned that current proposals from the Conservative group will add to these pressures by restricting the money available to those providing care outside hospital. Care providers already report problems in recruiting and retaining staff in Cambridgeshire, and the County Council is struggling to find places for some elderly patients when they leave hospital. The fact that these elderly patients have to stay in hospital longer because care at home is not available leads to cancelled operations, and has led to patients being turned away at A and E. The proposals for below inflation levels of cost increase are both unwise and unrealistic.

2 b The joint commissioning of a specific home care service geared up to achieve rapid hospital discharge and provide a range of health and social care tasks would allow patients to be discharged from hospital as soon as they are ready, and confident that the care they need will be available immediately.

2 c Increasing the hourly rate for home care workers would enable CCC to attract and retain the required work-force at a time when demand is growing and the available work force is shrinking.

3 a Cambridgeshire is the fastest growing economic area in the UK, and while we are proud of this success, the impact on the County transport infrastructure is of ever-increasing congestion. Free parking at the Park and Ride sites around Cambridge (which we suggest could be joint funded with Cambridge City Council) would ensure that those who need to come into the city to work have a fair alternative, and also discourage commuters from parking in residential streets.

3 b The historic Cambridgeshire Conservative decision in 2010 to eliminate all bus subsidies has weakened the rural bus network and necessitated a continual struggle for lifeline transport. Loss of bus services falls most heavily on the young and old, and those who are not able to drive for health or economic reasons. Liberal Democrats have long argued that maintaining bus services is critical in enabling rural mobility, and that this can require an element of subsidy. Simultaneously, financial support is essential for community transport organisations, who provide door-to-door lifeline transport and access where no other options exist.

3 c This money will be available both for cutting verges more frequently to allow motorists clearer views on corners, thereby increasing road safety, but equally importantly for cutting back of hedgerows along rural cycle paths, pavements and footpaths. Growth of hedges makes many pavements and cycle paths in rural areas almost unusable in the summer months, and can be dangerous, particularly if the pavement has been designated as a safe route to school.

3 d The County's roads, pavements and cycle ways are deteriorating at an ever-increasing rate. The number of potholes and uneven pavement surfaces has made many elderly people worried about going out in the dark, for fear of falling. It is important for health that people continue to lead active lifestyles for as long as possible. Making sure the pavements are safe, as well as filling pot-holes in the roads, should be a higher priority for road maintenance.

Increasing council tax

We fully recognise that nobody wants to pay more tax than necessary. Although council tax is broadly progressive i.e. those in the highest value houses pay most in cash terms, we also acknowledge that, as a proportion of disposable income, those in the lowest council tax bands are badly affected.

We feel that this proposed increase is justified in that most of the proposals outlined above specifically target the extra resources at those in greatest need. The extra 2% (i.e. on top of 2% for adult social care) will cost the average household 42p per week. We consider that to be a reasonable compromise in difficult times and we will be making that case during the coming weeks in the hope of persuading other groups on the County Council to back our budget proposals on February 14th.

**Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group
Alternative Budget
2017-18**

Overview

Cambridgeshire County Council has now faced seven years of relentless austerity. All Revenue Support Grant provided by national government – once the main source of funding for all councils – for the County Council will no longer exist by the financial year 2019-20. In 2010-11, the County Council's Revenue Support Grant was £111m per year. In 2014-15, it was £72m per year. By 2019-20, it will not exist.

Over the same period, Cambridgeshire County Council has experienced a growth in the number of adults and children in need of social care – yet all the government has done is cut the grant given to the County Council to meet that need. Due to a combination of the reduction in Revenue Support Grant, inflation, and growing demographic need, Cambridgeshire County Council slashed £225m a year between 2011/12 and 2016/17.

In social care, this meant cuts for all age groups worth £175m a year – with a further £26m a year added in 2016/17. More than two-thirds of the £26m savings were assessed by officers as having the highest level of risk in their impact on adults and children in need. In 2017-18, cuts worth £29m a year are required with £20.5m coming from Children Families and Adults Services – rising to £99m by 2021-22. Meanwhile, the Better Care Fund simply recycles existing funds and provides no new financial support for care services.

These devastating should not be dressed in Orwellian double-speak as 'transforming lives', 'service improvements', and 'building community resilience'. Let nobody make any mistake: these are immoral and unfair cuts impacting savagely upon the most disadvantaged and vulnerable in society. At the same time, councillors must stand up for Cambridgeshire by demanding proper funding for a civilised level of public services.

We regret that the government is essentially forcing councils to raise council tax in order to remain fiscally solvent. Raising council tax should always be a last resort but the government has left councils without any choice. The costs of failing to deliver proper services now will generate far bigger costs in the future. District councils also have the power to provide discretionary welfare support for those struggling to pay council tax. Labour-run Cambridge City Council provides such support and Tory district councils across Cambridgeshire should follow suit. The government also needs urgently to re-band council tax thresholds, since council tax rates now reflect property values poorly.

However, in the end, raising council tax is a more progressive measure than denying vital help to the neediest and most vulnerable. These services should be provided by government grant. But until the government wakes up to its responsibilities, Cambridgeshire County Council must step up to the plate.

As well as investing in public services, another way to reduce poverty and inequality is to grow the county's economy fairly and sustainably. But congestion and poor bus services in our urban centres are holding our economy back. The City Deal and devolution agenda aim to reduce congestion and pollution but the County Council could do much more to make its contribution by making bus travel more affordable and incentivising public transport.

Cambridgeshire Labour's budget amendment is designed to use what little power the County Council has to raise revenue in order to save crucial services and grow the economy fairly and sustainably. The government may be trying to reduce whatever revenue sources the County Council might have but we are determined to fight them with a responsible series of budget proposals funded from a combination of council tax and revenue-raising investments.

This budget amendment aims to protect vital frontline services for the neediest and most vulnerable in our county. It also aims towards financial prudence. We propose to establish a substantial commercial property investment fund on similar principles as the commercial property strategy currently being pursued by Labour-controlled Cambridge City Council. This will allow the County Council to use commercial rents in order to fund services independently either of council tax or national government funding. We also propose to increase the County Council's reserves from their current dangerously low levels so that the County Council is prepared for the unexpected and can invest more into services, such as its looked-after children, as and when it is required.

Spending

A1. The £8.25 pay rate set by the Living Wage Foundation instead of £7.20 for all direct County Council employees: £562k recurring

We propose to pay all County Council employees a proper living wage of £8.25 per hour instead of George Osborne's phoney 'living wage'. The proper living wage is set by the Living Wage Foundation in accordance with the Centre for Research in Social Policy at Loughborough University as the amount needed in order to pay for life's essentials. By paying public-sector workers a decent wage, the County Council will act as a positive role model for the private sector. A living wage would also contribute to kick-starting economic recovery by putting money in people's pockets and reducing the cost of living. In order to include agency-contracted workers, we will push to reform the County Council's agency policy so that only employers accredited by the Living Wage Foundation win contracts.

A2. Five new apprenticeship posts for the County Council: £102k recurring

We propose to create five new apprenticeship posts across all the County Council's service directorates in order to mitigate the impact of staffing cuts at the County Council and to create much-needed opportunity for young people

in Cambridgeshire. These employees would be paid the proper living wage. Again, the County Council would be contributing to economic recovery and acting as a model employer for the private sector.

A3. An emergency urban roads and pavements repair fund: £10m over four years

Over the next four financial years, we plan to plough an extra £10m into repairing roads and pavements in our urban centres. Roads and pavements in Cambridgeshire's towns and cities are a disgrace. In the busiest parts of the county, tripping hazards present a constant danger to the elderly and some streets are virtually inaccessible for wheelchairs and the disabled. Cyclists are at risk on roads and dual-use pavements. While hundreds of millions of pounds would be needed to reverse the county's backlog of repairs on roads and pavements, this fund is designed to provide an emergency measure for the most dangerous hazards.

A4. Restore Cambridge city centre shuttle bus service: £300k recurring

Together with the Labour Group on Cambridge City Council, we continue to regret the abolition of the city centre shuttle bus service by the Conservative administration several years ago. The service operated in an area not served by the commercial transport network and helped reduce congestion in Cambridge city centre. It also improved accessibility especially for the elderly and disabled.

A5. Reverse £1 Park and Ride charge: £1.2m recurring

The Park and Ride charge was imposed in the dying days of the minority Conservative administration despite howls of protest from the residents of Cambridge and the Labour Group. Implementation of the charge was a complete fiasco. Usage of the sites has plummeted. It has never raised the predicted levels of revenue. This has generated extra parking problems for nearby residents and worse congestion and pollution in the city centre. It is time those who supported the Park and Ride charge owned up and reversed their position. This budget line may come down by half in the event that the City Deal agrees to fund the other half of the cost of removing the charge.

A6. Fund streetlights on residential roads in Cambridge to 80% not 60% between 10pm and 2am: £10k recurring

Although the County Council rightly reversed its decision to switch off the streetlights at night at a recent full council meeting, many streetlights remain too dim. In a busy urban centre like Cambridge, it remains too dark between the hours of 10pm and 2am for young people, students, women, and other vulnerable groups.

A7. Remove the cut of £325k in spending on new library stock in B/R.6.209: £325k recurring

This is a decision only a total philistine would support. It is as good (or as bad) as closing libraries. Libraries are not simply the foundation of a civilised society. They provide vital recreational and employment opportunities for everyone – rich or poor.

A8. Reverse the cut to the Cambridgeshire Local Assistance Scheme in A/R.6.160: £163k recurring

The County Council nearly abolished the Local Assistance Scheme altogether before a motion from the Labour Group at full council rescued it. This is a last-resort, emergency crisis welfare fund for the neediest and most vulnerable victims of almost unimaginable circumstances. We opposed the remodelling of the service and, in the context of huge cuts, we believe the contingency is necessary and more should be done to advertise the fund.

A9. Reverse the cut to voluntary sector contracts for mental health services in A/R.6.167: £130k recurring

The voluntary sector is under too much pressure at present in delivering mental health support and the renegotiation of contracts risks resulting in deleterious outcomes for services which should be provided by local authorities.

A10. A £23m commercial property investment fund: £23m over four years

Over the coming four years, we propose to establish a commercial property investment fund and plough £23m into it. This fund would invest in commercial property primarily within Cambridgeshire but also within other opportunity areas in order to generate revenue from commercial rents which can be reinvested to deliver services. It would also be used to invest to increase revenues on County Council assets like the publicly-owned county farms estate. Each investment would produce a return of at least 6% per year. In the event that commercial opportunities exceed the budget allocated for the investment fund, the County Council might use prudential borrowing powers in order to purchase property and produce a further investment. This policy is currently being pursued by Labour-run Nottingham City Council.

A11. Invest £6.5m for adults with learning disabilities in A/R.6.114: £6.5m over four years

The County Council is proposing to cut funding for adults with learning disabilities by £8.036m over the next four financial years with the ostensible aim of 'increasing independence and resilience'. This cut would deny independence to those with learning disabilities and removal of services undermines their resilience. We believe this cut goes far too deep and will be counterproductive. The cut will be unachievable without hitting frontline services for adults with learning disabilities. We aim to mitigate the cut to more manageable levels with a savings target of £1.536m.

A12. Reverse the £2.191m cut for people with physical disabilities and autism in A/R.6.111: £2.191m over four years

The County Council's budget paper claim this cut will support people with physical disabilities and autism 'to live more independently' by slashing investment in their personal budgets. It is obvious to any sensible person that this will simply hit the most vulnerable the hardest.

A13. Reverse the cut for looked-after children by inflation savings in A/6.6.213 and add further investment in the look-after children's budget: £1.618m over four years

This cut relies on the unachievable aim of the County Council to reduce the number of children in care to 453 by 2020/21. We propose to reverse this cut and reallocate the funding within the look-after children's budget in anticipation of a likely failure to achieve this aim. We would also add a further £300k per year into the look-after children budget in light of the difficulties faced by the County Council to reduce the number of look-after children. The Department for Education's own research into children's services concluded: 'In the future, the local councils face risks such as the growing need among some groups in the population, for example child sexual exploitation and mental health, which are particularly uncertain and have implications for future spending. The capacity to forecast and prepare for these risks is very limited.' We propose, therefore, to improve Cambridgeshire County Council's capacity.

Revenue receivable

B1. Raise council tax to the full maximum amount allowed by the government without triggering a referendum

We propose to accept the freedom allowed to primary-tier authorities by the Conservative government to raise council tax by 1.99% over the coming three years and to raise the adult social care precept at 3% over the coming two financial years. The government has indicated that the adult social precept can only be raised by 6% in total over the coming three financial years. The limits on council tax increases is not clear beyond 2019-20 and the County Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) prudently assumes that the County Council will not be able to raise council at all in 2020-21. This budget amendment concurs with the caution of the MTFS and the Labour Group will reassess the situation as 2020-21 approaches.

B2 (A10): Return from the £23m commercial property investment fund

The £23m commercial property investment fund would produce a return of at least 6% on each investment.

Summary

Spending proposals (£)

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
A1	562k	562k	562k	562k
A2	102k	102k	102k	102k
A3	500k	4.5m	2m	3m
A4	300k	300k	300k	300k
A5	1.2m	1.2m	1.2m	1.2m
A6	10k	10k	10k	10k
A7	325k	325k	325k	325k
A8	163k	163k	163k	163k
A9	130k	130k	130k	130k
A10	1m	5m	9m	8m
A11	2m	1.5m	1.5m	1.5m
A12	791k	440k	505k	455k
A13	424k	410k	396k	388k
TOTAL	7.507m	14.642m	16.193m	16.135m

Receivable revenue proposals (£)

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
B1	7.693m	16.042m	16.347m	16.347m
B2 (A10)	300k	210k	630k	1.14m
TOTAL	7.723m	16.252m	16.977m	17.487m

Contribution to reserves (£)

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
TOTAL	216k	1.61m	784k	1.352m

Conservative amendment to the Council's business plan 2017 -18

The cost to the revenue budget is an extra £2.9m, over and above that worked up under the committee system in this no overall control Council. We do not believe that this increase has to be met by the local taxpayer. In May 2017 at the elections if the control of the council is returned to the Conservatives, we believe this cost can be met by accelerated transformation denied us in the present set up. Additionally we believe that the £1.4m MRP used to balance this years budget under the committee system should also be rebalanced in this way. We are therefore proposing no increase in Council Tax for 2017/18.

We intend to increase the spending on pothole repairs and carriageway cracks sealing by an extra £2.15m. This will enable us to approximately do an extra 67,500 Pot Holes and repairs a year.

We intend to increase Gulley Clearance, grass cutting and visibility splay grass cutting by £200k. This will roughly increase cuts of visibility splays from two to three a year and allow more preventative gulley clearing to reduce localised flooding problems. These investments will help prevent some of the costly emergency response work we and represents approximately a third increase.

A further £300k will be invested in sealing cracks in pavements and general footway improvements to prevent further deterioration and arrest some of the previous decline.

We will invest £60k Mental Health in order to implement the public mental health strategy commitments as previously approved by the Health Committee.

We intend to invest £120k on early year's literacy. These Early Years Community Literacy Projects will be delivered in Wisbech, Huntingdon, North Cambridge and St Neots. They have a proven impact – the initial project in Wisbech worked with 200 families and 450 children and contributed to a 26% increase in the children achieving the early year's standard over a two year period.

Last but by no means least we intend to prepare £50m of congesting busting projects that will help alleviate those delays in our longer journeys that have such a negative effect on those that need to commute to work.

It is by listening to the needs of our residents that we have put together a package of interventions over and above that agreed by the committees. And it is by our financial expertise that we know we can deliver these at no extra cost to the public.

Conservative amendment to the Council's business plan 2017 -18

The cost to the revenue budget is an extra £2.9m, over and above that worked up under the committee system in this no overall control Council. We do not believe that this increase has to be met by the local taxpayer. In May 2017 at the elections if the control of the council is returned to the Conservatives, we believe this cost can be met by accelerated transformation denied us in the present set up. Additionally we believe that the £1.4m MRP used to balance this years budget under the committee system should also be rebalanced in this way. We are therefore proposing no increase in Council Tax for 2017/18.

We intend to increase the spending on pothole repairs and carriageway cracks sealing by an extra £2.15m. This will enable us to approximately do an extra 67,500 Pot Holes and repairs a year.

We intend to increase Gulley Clearance, grass cutting and visibility splay grass cutting by £200k. This will roughly increase cuts of visibility splays from two to three a year and allow more preventative gulley clearing to reduce localised flooding problems. These investments will help prevent some of the costly emergency response work we and represents approximately a third increase.

A further £300k will be invested in sealing cracks in pavements and general footway improvements to prevent further deterioration and arrest some of the previous decline.

We will invest £60k Mental Health in order to implement the public mental health strategy commitments as previously approved by the Health Committee.

We intend to invest £120k on early year's literacy. These Early Years Community Literacy Projects will be delivered in Wisbech, Huntingdon, North Cambridge and St Neots. They have a proven impact – the initial project in Wisbech worked with 200 families and 450 children and contributed to a 26% increase in the children achieving the early year's standard over a two year period.

Last but by no means least we intend to prepare £50m of congesting busting projects that will help alleviate those delays in our longer journeys that have such a negative effect on those that need to commute to work.

It is by listening to the needs of our residents that we have put together a package of interventions over and above that agreed by the committees. And it is by our financial expertise that we know we can deliver these at no extra cost to the public.

The cost of these proposals set out in this amendment total £4.3m and we propose that for the financial year 2017/18 the cost of these investments be funded from the MRP. However we believe that further transformation proposals can be identified for 2018/19 that will therefore result in these investments be a single year proposal.