

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 12th December 2017

Time: 10.30am – 12.55pm

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor M Smith (Chairman)
Councillors: H Batchelor, I Bates, C Boden, A Bradnam, S Bywater, D Connor, A Costello, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, K Cuffley, P Downes, L Dupre, L Every, J French, R Fuller, I Gardener, D Giles, J Gowing, N Harrison, A Hay, R Hickford, M Howell, S Hoy, B Hunt, D Jenkins, L Jones, L Joseph, N Kavanagh, S Kindersley, S King, I Manning, E Meschini, L Nethsingha, P Raynes, K Reynolds, C Richards, T Rogers, T Sanderson, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, A Taylor, S Taylor, S Tierney, D Wells, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and T Wotherspoon

Apologies: Councillors D Adey, A Bailey, L Harford, P Hudson, M McGuire, P Topping and S van de Ven

48. MINUTES – 17TH OCTOBER 2017

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 17th October 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendment to Appendix B (pages 13 and 14). The response from Councillor Raynes to read as follows (additions in bold and deletions in bold strikethrough):

*Thank you Mr Carpen for this question. You've left out of the account 27 people who lived in houses that were demolished to make way for the **Castle under William the Conqueror Council who were ordered to do so**. ...This Council has established a cross party member working group on the future of Shire Hall, which I chair. That reports to the Commercial and Investment Committee of the Council. Its remit is to explore options for the relocation of Shire Hall, including the best future use of this **site hall**. The working group is currently evaluating options. It will make recommendations to the Commercial and Investment Committee this winter. I'll make sure the working group is aware of Mr Carpen's suggestion and that it's taken into account.*

49. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made a number of announcements as set out in **Appendix A**.

50. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Jenkins declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 54a) as a trustee of 'The Morris Education Trust'.

51. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chairman reported that one question had been received from a member of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

52. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

53. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Treasury Management Report Quarter Two

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hickford, that the recommendation from the General Purposes Committee as set out on the Council agenda be approved. In response to a question from Councillor Shellens, Councillor Count undertook that where the Council was asked to agree an increase to the Council's prudential borrowing requirement, the report should provide the best estimate of the cost to the revenue account, separated out in terms of Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) and interest. This was on the proviso that it could only be an estimate, as the actual cost would be confirmed on the day the additional borrowing was taken out.

It was resolved by a show of hands to agree to:

note the Treasury Management Report.

54. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

It was moved by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Count, and resolved unanimously:

To approve the change in membership on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority to appoint Councillor M Shellens to replace Councillor L Nethsingha to come into effect from 1 January 2018.

55. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Four motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

(a) Motion from Councillor Peter Downes

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Downes and seconded by Councillor Whitehead:

Council welcomes the government's intention to implement a national funding formula for the distribution of resources to schools.

Council notes that this formula will begin to address the issue of inequity in school funding but fails to do so as fully as anticipated.

Council welcomes the government's announcement that £1.3 billion over two

years will be added to the quantum for schools.

Council notes however that this increase is not sufficient to compensate for the failure to fund inflation over the last 5 years and regrets the impact this is having on schools which are

- a. having to reduce the number of teachers
- b. narrowing the curriculum offer to students,
- c. restricting the support given to children with learning difficulties and
- d. finding it difficult to provide the equipment and materials needed for a 21st century education.

Council therefore calls on the Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Education drawing her attention to this motion and urging her to use whatever influence she has on the Chancellor of the Exchequer to increase the quantum available for education at the earliest opportunity.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Boden seconded by Councillor Bywater:

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

Council welcomes the government's intention to implement a national funding formula for the distribution of resources to schools.

Council notes that this formula will begin to address the issue of inequity in school funding but fails to do so as fully as anticipated.

Council welcomes the government's announcement that £1.3 billion over two years will be added to the quantum for schools.

~~Council notes however that this increase is not sufficient to compensate for the failure to fund inflation over the last 5 years and regrets the impact this is having on schools which are~~

- ~~a. having to reduce the number of teachers~~
- ~~b. narrowing the curriculum offer to students,~~
- ~~c. restricting the support given to children with learning difficulties and~~
- ~~d. finding it difficult to provide the equipment and materials needed for a 21st century education.~~

Council re-affirms the value of a cross-party consensus in Cambridgeshire in seeking improved schools funding levels in the County.

Given the increased expenditure already announced for education nationally, on-going representations to move towards fairer funding provide the most realistic opportunity to improve further the levels of school funding in Cambridgeshire.

Council therefore calls on the Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Education drawing her attention to this motion and move closer to a fairer national funding formula ~~urging her to use whatever influence she has on the Chancellor of~~

~~the Exchequer to increase the quantum available for education at the earliest opportunity.~~

Following discussion the amendment on being put to the vote was carried.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives in favour, Liberal Democrats, Labour and Independents against]

Following discussion the substantive motion on being put to the vote was carried.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives in favour, one Liberal Democrat and one Independent against, 12 Liberal Democrats, Labour and 2 Independents abstained.]

(b) Motion from Councillor Tom Sanderson

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Sanderson and seconded by Councillor A Taylor. The motion included alterations from the version included on the agenda and were agreed by the meeting without discussion:

[Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough]

Due to deductions for unsatisfactory performance under the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract for street lighting there is a forecast underspend of £384,000 in the budget.

This is due to the number of lights lit being ~~less~~ **fewer** than the contractual requirement as well as lack of repairs and inspection.

~~This council wishes to express its disappointment at the unsatisfactory performance regarding street lighting~~ **recognises the rigorous approach to contract management undertaken by Council officers, resulting in significant improved performance on the contract.**

However, in light of considerable concerns being expressed by residents as to the state of street lighting following reconfiguration carried out under the PFI contract, this Council wishes to express its disappointment at the unsatisfactory performance regarding street lighting.

This Council further recognises the view that this saving may be a 'one-off', yet simultaneously acknowledges that during the lengthy remaining period of 25 years the PFI contract is set to run this may not prove to be so.

Further, the Council ~~and~~ requests that a working party be established to allocate a percentage of the underspend to improve the quality and volume of lighting throughout the county.

Following discussion, the motion on being put to the vote was lost.

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats, Labour and Independent in favour; 29 Conservatives against; one Conservative abstained.]

(c) Motion from Councillor David Jenkins

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Jenkins and seconded by

Councillor Schumann. The motion included alterations from the version included on the agenda and were agreed by the meeting without discussion:

[Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough]

Council recognises:

- the value of music education; and
- the excellent work done by Cambridgeshire Music in delivering it.

Council notes that:

- music education is not a statutory responsibility of the Council and that its cost needs to be balanced against the revenues which Cambridgeshire Music earns and grants which it can secure against its social benefit; **and**
- **responsibility for the oversight of Cambridgeshire Music as a traded service now lies with the Commercial and Investment Policy and Service Committee.**

~~Council further notes that:~~

- ~~—— the CREATE project has been developed to enable young people to have access to digital music opportunities throughout Cambridgeshire via centres in or close to Cambridge, Huntingdon and Wisbech; and~~
- ~~—— earlier this year General Purposes Committee asked that a members' reference group be set up to oversee progress (with respect to the CREATE digital music project) and act as a steering group driving outcomes~~

Council therefore asks that **Commercial and Investment Policy and Service committee, jointly with the Children and Young People Committee:**

- **to form a representative panel drawn from the two committees to review Cambridgeshire Music's strategy and specifically its proposals related to digital music; and**
- ~~—— the members' reference group be set up to consider the future strategy of Cambridgeshire Music (including options for the development and implementation of the CREATE project); and~~
- this group reports back to the ~~Children & Young People Committee~~ **Commercial and Investment Committee** before 31 March 2018.

Following discussion and on being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by a show of hands.

(d) Motion from Councillor Elisa Meschini

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Meschini and seconded by Councillor Whitehead. The motion included alterations from the version included on the agenda and were agreed by the meeting without discussion:

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

This Council notes that:

- For most workers in local government and schools, pay and other terms and conditions are determined by the National Joint Council (NJC) for local government services.
- On average, across the country, NJC basic pay has fallen by 21% in real terms since 2010.
- NJC workers have had a three year pay freeze from 2010-2012 and have received only 1% pay increase annually since then.
- NJC pay is the lowest in the public sector.
- Differentials in pay grades are being squeezed and distorted by bottom loaded NJC pay settlements needed to reflect the increased statutory national living wage.
- ~~The likelihood of rising inflation following the vote to leave the European Union will worsen the current public sector pay inequality.~~

This council therefore supports **the offer made on behalf of employers.** ~~the principle of the NJC pay claim settlement for 2018, submitted by Unite, Unison and the GMB on behalf of council and school workers and calls for the immediate end of public sector pay restraint. NJC pay cannot be allowed to fall further behind other parts of the public sector.~~

~~This council also welcomes the joint review of the NJC pay spine to remedy the turbulence caused by bottom loaded pay settlements.~~

~~This council further notes the drastic ongoing cuts to local government funding and calls on the Government to provide additional resources to ensure all local authorities can fund a decent pay rise for NJC employees and the pay spine review.~~

This council resolves to ask the Chief Executive:

- To write to the Local Government Association (LGA) asking to make urgent representations to Government to fund the settlement offer. ~~NJC claim and the pay spine review.~~
- ~~To write to the Prime Minister and Chancellor supporting the NJC pay claim and seeking additional resources needed to fund a decent pay rise and the pay spine review.~~

~~To write to local NJC union representatives to convey support for the pay claim and the pay spine review.~~

Following discussion and on being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by a show of hands.

**56. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – ORAL QUESTIONS**

Four questions were asked under Council Procedure 9.1 and questions and responses are set out in **Appendix C**.

[The questions and answers were filmed and are available (2 hours 38 minutes into the recording on the Council's You Tube site at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X8E9_lxhQvM

57. WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Six written questions were submitted under Council Procedure 9.2 as set out in **Appendix D**.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 12TH DECEMBER 2017
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Former County Councillor Ramon Wilkinson

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of former County Councillor Ramon Wilkinson who represented Huntingdon North Division on behalf of the Conservatives from 1997 to 2005. During his time on the Council, Councillor Wilkinson was Chairman of the Education, Libraries and Heritage Committee and later the Cabinet Member for Education, Libraries & Heritage and Lead Member for School & Pupil Attainment and School Organisation. The Council’s thoughts are with his family and friends at this very sad time.

New Shared Service Director for Education

Following a meeting of Staffing and Appeals Committee on 31 October 2017, Jonathan Lewis, has been appointed the new shared Service Director for Education. The outgoing Cambridgeshire County Council Director of Learning, Keith Grimwade, retires at the end of the year.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

Making Every Adult Matter

From November, the Making Every Adult Matter coalition will bring together 25 local areas across England to develop coordinated, effective support for people experiencing multiple needs, made possible by new funding from the Big Lottery Fund. In these places, local authorities, statutory agencies and the voluntary sector are working together to transform the lives of people experiencing a combination of homelessness, substance misuse, contact with the criminal justice system and mental ill health. The local areas use a framework called the MEAM Approach to help shape their work and receive support and advice from MEAM coalition staff based across the country.

Some of the partnerships have already spent several years developing this work with the support of MEAM. Others are new areas starting a journey towards better coordinated services. The partnerships all share an ambition to work alongside people with lived experience of multiple needs to change systems for the better.

Over the next five years, Cambridgeshire County Council will work with the 25 MEAM Approach areas (rising to 40 by the end of the programme) and the twelve local areas that are part of the Big Lottery Fund’s Fulfilling Lives: Supporting people with multiple needs programme. By combining our evidence, knowledge and expertise, together we can ensure that everyone experiencing multiple needs across England reaches their full potential and contributes to their communities.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 12TH DECEMBER 2017

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
1	<p>Ms Nicky Shepard</p> <p>[Asking as a concerned resident of the affected area.]</p>	<p>Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council</p>	<p>My question is for Councillor Steve Count. As you may remember I was here eight weeks ago, presenting our petition to save the children's centres from the cuts that were pushed through in this council. The Conservative group made it very clear that this was not a cut to frontline services but actually an increase of 7% of the budget for hard-to-reach families.</p> <p>The Liberal Democrat group has since spotted and I believe it's now been acknowledged that the figure is actually only 3% of the budget and I would first like to challenge the council's whole financial justification for these cuts.</p> <p>The latest Social Mobility report shows that Cambridge as a city makes the 18th worst provision in the whole country for under-fives. This is why so many people across the county signed this petition. Also today the Local Government Association has released damaging figures showing that 500 child protection investigations are started every day across the country and a staggering 250% increase in the number of children being taken into care. That is actually 90 children entering the care system every day. These are exactly the children and families that the children's centres are there to protect and these cuts are going to mean that they are not helped. I've also heard from many of our children's centres where front-line employees have been put under risk of redundancy, managers don't know how they will finish out the academic year both at the children's centres and at some of the nursery schools on the same sites and this is without mentioning the numerous charities that depend on the children's centres and have not yet had time to find funding to fill the gaps.</p>

			Until your group can evidence that your budget savings actually put extra funding into the families who are worse off and that these cuts will not further damage the lives of under-fives in Cambridgeshire, nor will they affect any front-line services, would the leader of the council please please call a halt to any further damaging changes whilst the details of the plan are finalised and open to public scrutiny, so that people can plan accordingly? Thank you.
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	Ms Nicky Shepard	<p>I've got a quite simple answer to the question that's in front of me and I do appreciate that you were introducing other elements to it that I wasn't aware of, that I certainly am not prepared for today.</p> <p>So in terms of the front-line delivery, we have committed to retaining all front-line delivery, including a broader and increased outreach offer to communities. The savings will be made from the back office functions, such as management and buildings.</p>
	Supplementary question from:	To:	Question
	Ms Nicky Shepard	Councillor Steve Count	As a supplement I would like to ask that these plans are published in full to the public. There are a number of parents and community members and people who depend on it and as yet it all seems to be happening behind closed doors and people are really really worried about their jobs and services. So can you please publish these plans in full to the public?
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Steve Count	Ms Nicky Shepard	Thank you very much. As you know the consultation went out on a broad street of the strategic direction of the children's services, which is something that members are responsible for and make a decision to uphold at that point in time. The actual nuts and bolts of any movements moving forwards will be released as we are aware of them and as they come forward and you may scrutinise them at your leisure. But that's not in the strategic direction.

APPENDIX C

COUNTY COUNCIL – 12TH DECEMBER 2017

CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.1

Questions to the Council's Appointee on the Combined Authority –Councillor Steve Count

Questions from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha

[Reference - pages 23 and 30 of the report]

The first (three) questions are:-

Bearing in mind the decision of the Mayor to loan the Chief Executive from the Combined Authority to the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) as set out in item 3.3 of the decision summary of the meeting on the 29th November, could the Leader of the Council give an update on the current situation on the relationship between the LEP and the Combined Authority, could he give his view on whether the relationship between the LEP and the Combined Authority is currently constructive and positive and does the Combined Authority have any plans for further interventions in any other local partnership bodies within Cambridgeshire?

Response from Councillor Steve Count

The Council's representative on the Combined Authority

I'll go with the answers that I've been given assistance with so I don't miss anything out. The Greater Cambridgeshire and Greater Peterborough area has huge economic potential. If this potential is to be realised, a powerful partnership needs to exist between the public and private sectors. There's a report on the LEP Board on the 19 December to consider how a series of new arrangements could strengthen the strategic leadership of the area, create a new model of local enterprise partnership and provide the best value for the public purse. That was to assist with question 1.

Response to Question 2. There has been a formal request from government to the GCGP LEP to address how the LEP can:-

First of all, restore public sector confidence in its activities and it can deliver against the government's core mission. Secondly, work with the Combined Authority to ensure a shared strategy for growth and efficient ways of working, including the removal of unnecessary executive duplication, and thirdly the sign-off on a comprehensive set of financial accounts covering the operational budget of the GCGP LEP.

The Combined Authority and the LEP will work constructively together to address these issues to ensure that all funding streams for the area are protected. That's largely for your second question.

Response to Question 3. This was not a takeover by the Combined Authority. As stated the government had a number of concerns about the leadership of the LEP and have asked the LEP to address these. It is in the interests of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area for the Combined Authority to work with the LEP and government, to ensure that LEP is complying with the national framework and existing standards of governance, transparency and scrutiny, so that funding is restored to the area.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha

Councillor Count in answering the second question has said it was part of the Government's core mission and that they will work constructively. It doesn't sound as if that's necessarily very positive or friendly and I hope very much that the LEP following the intervention of the government and the Combined Authority will continue to work as an independent body and that relationships between the Combined Authority and LEP will improve in the coming months.

On the final question, a lot of Councillor Count's answers have focused on the intervention of government. I think it was felt that the intervention of government came partly as a response to interventions by local MPs and I hope very much that local partnerships will continue to work independently and not be interfered with by government as a result of interventions by MPs, but we shall see. Thank you.

Response from Councillor Steve Count

The first part was about the Government's core mission and by way of further explanation so it's not misunderstood - I think this might have happened – the government's core mission is to deliver sustainable economic growth in the area and that's what I meant by delivering the government's core mission, is to find the local network and design the local network capable of delivering that. In terms of the second part, I'm not sure where you've gone with this: it's neither ended in a question nor moved onto 4, so I clearly can't help.

[Reference – page 29 of the report]

Question 4 - Councillor Lucy Nethsingha

OK. A fourth question. The recent Combined Authority Board reviewed a paper on a levy of this council by the Combined Authority. I am concerned that the levy will tie this council into making a fixed payment to the Combined Authority, without any regard being given to other calls on this council's financial position. Can the Leader reassure this council that services to older people or children will not suffer greater cuts than would otherwise have been the case as a result of the Combined Authority levy?

Response from Councillor Steve Count

So the first part about the levy is, the levy was part of the devolution document that went through the full scrutiny of the full council and we all understood it and what it meant in terms of how it's applied and how it's voted for and the statutory instrument about how that's delivered is the simple terminology of moving forwards. Now to agree a levy, that needs to go through the Combined Authority Board on which I sit and the levy is applied to transport functions and the County Council has the power of veto on the budget for that, so therefore it definitely has due consideration of the impact on this council as we move forward to discuss any potential levies that may or may not come about. In terms of the first year of - I don't know the words - operation, so the 17/18 as the Combined Authority came into effect, the transport money that used to flow directly to us went to the Combined Authority and they simply passported the same as was in our budget, so we delivered our transport functions in exactly the same way and this is understood to be the same for 18/19. The levy is the statutory instrument where instead of having that arrangement, there is potential to have different arrangements. It's necessary to have that in effect; the statutory instrument also did cover the possibility of borrowing powers. In terms of cuts that would affect public sector, you know, whether it be older people or children, you know, I hope to remind this council that public sector reform was part of the Combined Authority's agenda and the aim of that is to ensure better outcomes for our residents, including older people and children. So hopefully that will satisfy as an answer.

Supplementary from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha

I'm reassured to hear that the levy comes under the budget and that therefore Councillor Count will have a veto on the levy if it's felt that that would have a detrimental impact on this council and I hope very much that he will make it entirely clear to the Combined Authority that if the levy would be putting increasing strain on other services at this council, he would use that veto.

Response from Councillor Steve Count

Thank you very much and to be perfectly candid, you mentioned it earlier on about partner organisations, the Combined Authority is a partner organisation. It's not the enemy so to speak. It's not there to actually subjugate us or master us in that way and so when I make it "perfectly clear" in your words, that is more in the nature of helping them to understand the needs of this council rather than any thoughts in my head at this particular point in time I'm going to be using the veto vote, because that would simply indicate that conversations have failed and I've failed to make myself understood. So hopefully that will provide some reassurance.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 12TH DECEMBER 2017
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2

1) Question from Councillor Graham Wilson

The LGSS Joint Committee papers for 24 November contain these statements in reports by independent consultants:

- *External audit report 2016/17* by KPMG page 11 – “In our view the current reporting process in place is not sufficiently robust for an organisation the size of LGSS ...”
- *LGSS ERP Gold [the new major computer system] implementation* review by Agilisys – “LGSS do not currently have robust enough plans as yet, that identify whether or not the programme could go live in April 2018, with a sufficiently high degree of certainty”. Another report, page 36 of the LGSS papers, states the system is currently running a year late and is forecast to be £1.275m overspent (increasing the cost from £7.138m to £8.709m).

Does the Leader share my concern at the findings of these reports and in particular the increasing cost of the ERP Gold system? What are the implications for Cambridgeshire and what actions is he taking to ensure the LGSS accounts meet good accounting and reporting practices and the county uses a modern, robust and fully integrated business system as soon as possible?

Response from Councillor Steve Count
Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee

The LGSS accounts do present a true and fair view of the financial reporting and accounting practices of LGSS. This is demonstrated through the independent audit of the accounts by the external auditors, KPMG who are required to meet independence and objectivity requirements as defined in the Code of Audit Practice. The 2016/17 LGSS have been audited with an unqualified audit opinion.

Although LGSS has achieved this outcome, it is true that since LGSS has grown with Milton Keynes Council becoming a Partner from 1 April 2016, the accounting and financial reporting arrangements have become more complex and the volume of data required to compile the accounts has increased. Both issues mean that the way the accounts are prepared is not as easy as it could be and this is acknowledged by LGSS management in the response to the audit recommendations raised in the IAS260 report from KPMG (page 15).

The new ERP Gold system being implemented for the 1 April 2018 will be a major improvement that will help to simplify the LGSS accounts production process by using a single ERP solution. A more fundamental review of the accounting arrangements is underway in relation to this matter, optimising the use of the new ERP Gold system, for which draft proposals are in place. This is being led by the LGSS Director of Finance and the Head of

In respect of the £1.275m capital cost increase for ERP Gold, this project is a 3-way investment by CCC, NCC and MKC into developing a single, modern shared ERP system to replace existing, end-of-life ERP systems. The increase of £1.275m is a shared (3-way) cost increase with the CCC portion of it being £410K to April 2018. To help mitigate this £410k capital increase for CCC, LGSS has identified additional ERP Gold related revenue savings for CCC of £150Kpa as from 2020-21 giving a full payback within 5 years of this additional capital request of CCC.

One of the main recommendations of the Agilisys report was to strengthen the existing ERP Programme Management capacity, and LGSS Business Systems has since moved very quickly to recruit a very senior, highly experienced Programme Director. He started work at the end of

November and was immediately asked to undertake a full review and challenge of the existing Programme Plan and its deliverability for an April 2018 go-live date. He has been actioned by the Joint Committee to report back (week commencing 11th December) on his view as to the viability of an April 2018 go-live date and the robustness of the plan. Early indications are that the plans still support a viable, sensible April 2018 go-live date, particularly given the recent very encouraging progress in data migration, and the subsequent user acceptance testing and payroll parallel running results.

It should also be noted that the original CCC/ NCC ERP Gold business case was planned and approved in July 2015, and based on replacing only the Oracle ERP systems of CCC and NCC by April 2017. However in April 2016 MKC joined LGSS and the ERP Gold project plan and its resources were consequently expanded to include the MKC SAP systems replacement requirements by April 2017. In addition to this extra complexity, several unavoidable and unforeseen business changes by councils, IT technical issues and the legacy data migration challenges, have all impacted on a ERP expanded project plans during 2016/17 resulting in the rescheduled go-live date of April 2018.

2. Question from Councillor Ian Manning

How many legal cases has the County Council lost in the last three years against families claiming it should fund SEN when the County Council contested this? What has been the total cost of legal bills in each year?

Response from Councillor Simon Bywater **Chairman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee**

The Local Authority (LA) has a duty to ensure suitable provision is available for pupils with SEN, and as such the LA would never go to Tribunal contesting whether we should fund SEN.

What we, the LA contest is funding provision over what is required to meet needs and thus unreasonable public expenditure (i.e. independent provision where needs can be met in maintained provision).

In relation to how many Tribunals have been lost where the Local Authority has been in dispute over the type/ level of SEN provision being sought for a particular child, e.g. independent placements, where the LA view is that needs can be met at maintained school or the level of therapy where our therapists do not agree the level of therapy being sought is required, these figures are presented below:

For the period 1 Sept 14 – 31 Aug 15:

No of registered appeals: 63
No of appeals settled prior to hearing/withdrawn: 46
No of appeals struck out: 7
No of appeals that went to hearing: 10
No of appeals won at hearing: 6
No of appeals lost at hearing: 4

From 1 Sept 2015 – 23 June 2016:

No of appeals registered: 51
No of appeals settled prior to hearing/withdrawn: 43
No of appeals struck out: 0
No of appeals that went to a hearing: 8
No of appeals won: 5
No appeals lost: 3

(June 2016 – change from Baker Small to LGSS)

From 23 June 2016 – 31st August 2017:

No of appeals registered: 51
No of appeals settled prior to hearing/withdrawn: 37
No of appeals struck out: 1
No of appeals that went to a hearing: 13
No of appeals won: 6
No appeals lost: 7

What has been the total cost of legal bills in each year?

2014-15 £120,000
2015-16 £120,000
2016-17 £73,567

3. Question from Councillor Ian Manning

As of writing how many minor highways schemes (ie those funded in whole or part by the Local Highways Initiative or Third Party Funded) has CCC not received payment for yet? How many have been completed? Please break this down by the year of submission of the scheme and include data for at least the last three years.

Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter **Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee**

Thank you Cllr Manning for this question. The figures you have requested are as follows:

Financial Year 2014/15

Private/Third Party Works - 13 submissions complete & payment received.

Local Highway Improvements - 77 submissions complete & payment received.

Financial Year 2015/16

Private/Third Party Works - 12 submissions complete & payment received

Local Highway Improvements - 61 submissions complete & payment received with the exception of one that remains unpaid [£420.81] and the Council has instigated the debt recovery process.

Financial Year 2016/17

Private/Third Party Works - 11 submissions complete and payment received

Local Highway Improvements - 91 submissions complete and payment received for 51 with 38 pending payment or invoicing.

4. Question from Councillor Lorna Dupre

The number of people killed and seriously injured on Cambridgeshire's roads rose by one-third last year, according to figures presented to the Fire Authority Overview & Scrutiny Committee in October. How likely is it that the local Road Safety Partnership will achieve its targets of reducing by 40 per cent by 2020 the number of people killed and seriously injured on our roads compared to the 2005-2009 baseline? What is the council's strategy for achieving this reduction?

Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter **Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee**

Thank you Cllr Dupre for this question. The Council has always and continues to take road safety seriously and has seen significant reductions in both killed and seriously injured and slight accident measures over the last ten years.

In terms specifically of Killed and seriously injured, there have been increases in numbers in both 2016 and 2017 and officers are looking in detail at the causes of this to identify if it is the start of a trend.

It is known that part of the cause of this is the introduction of a new reporting system for accidents operated by the police. The Department for Transport (DfT) has estimated that this is responsible over the country for between a 5% and 15% increase in the number of casualties recorded as seriously injured. However, as the number of casualties in Cambridgeshire has increased by more than the DfT estimate it is likely that there are other factors at work. The most likely of these is the growing economy and growing population which increases the amount of miles travelled and thus the potential for accidents.

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership has set a target to reduce the number of KSI casualties to no more than 314 by 2020. This was based on the old method of recording accidents and so some further work needs to be done to assess this target under the new system of recording, so at this stage, it is not possible to say definitively whether this target will be met or not. Further information will become available over the coming months as the trends are more clearly understood. Whatever the outcome though, the Council will continue to work with partners to reduce casualties on the county's roads including:

- Targeted road safety engineering measures;
- Continued training from primary age upwards to instill good driving practice;
- In partnership with Addenbrooke's Charitable Trust and Loughborough University, undertaking a £150k grant funded research project exploring the most severe collisions on our network that cause major trauma, and looking to pilot interventions to reduce these.
- Trialling a more preventative approach to road infrastructure interventions by examining the potential and actual risk of longer routes. This has seen a successful £1.3m bid to the Department for Transport's Safer Roads Fund for a section of the A1303 towards Newmarket.
- Reviewing the analysis of road casualties through the introduction of new software and a move to more risk-based analysis methods.

Every death and life changing injury on Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's roads or to a Cambridgeshire or Peterborough resident is one too many, and the social and economic burden of road casualties is felt much wider than just those immediately involved in the collision. Councillors can be assured that the Council's officers take this very seriously and are working hard to ensure the most effective use is made of the limited resources available.

5. Question from Councillor Claire Richards

The document titled 'Organisational Review' nominates a proposed saving in the Corporate and Managed Services budget of £800,000 for the 2018-2019 year.

- (1) Will the proposed saving affect staff in all areas of the County Council and if so, how – for example:
 - a Will staff numbers be cut?
 - b Will there be redundancies?
 - c Will there be reduction in hours so that staff wages and salaries are cut?
- (2) What written and oral information was given to Policy and Service Committees of the impact of the proposed £800,000 cut on County Council's staff conditions of service?

- (3) What steps were taken to ensure that all Committee members had information by which they could be clearly, concisely and precisely informed as to the impact of the proposed £800,000 cut on staff conditions?

Response from Councillor Steve Count
Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee

Our staff are very important to us and are at the heart of the provision of the services we provide to our communities. However we have a responsibility to ensure those services are provided as cost effectively as possible. We therefore continue to review our staffing structures, our employee packages, and the performance of our staffing resource. This proposal is simply the continuation of a process that we have been undertaking over a number of years. This has driven out significant financial savings that have been re-invested in the delivery of front line services to the communities that we serve.

This overarching proposal involves a review of organisational arrangements in a range of areas with a total estimated saving of £800k for 2018/19. A number of areas are being explored:

- Through a programme of Outcome Focused Reviews, we will ensure that all services are appropriately staffed for service delivery and are as lean as they can be.
- A review of spans of control is underway to reduce any unnecessary layers of management and to ensure that all managers have appropriate and consistent areas of responsibility.
- Terms & Conditions is an area that may have to be considered in future but the impact of this would be carefully considered.
- We will support managers to reduce team spend on mileage and increase productivity through better use of remote and flexible working systems and policies.

Any specific proposals that emerge from these areas of exploration that affect staff will be taken through the usual processes of consultation with Trade Unions and staff and will be reported to the relevant committee.

6. Question from Councillor Jocelynn Scutt

The ever-decreasing Revenue Grant has led, amongst other consequences, to Cambridgeshire, Peterborough and Northamptonshire/Milton Keynes (LGSS) sharing and integrating services and functions. This has resulted in 'flagship areas' (where monies are located) such as Pensions and Law being no longer in Cambridgeshire hands but administered from or based outside Cambridgeshire County Council and/or the region. This has a consequence of Cambridgeshire being effectively downgraded in comparison with Peterborough and Northamptonshire/Milton Keynes. Even if this is not the perception of Cambridgeshire County Council bureaucratic and/or political leaders, it is a view expressed by some residents, at least.

Therefore, please advise for the benefit of Full Council and Cambridgeshire residents and Council taxpayers:

- How the specific and general needs of Cambridgeshire Council tax payers are taken into account in these working together arrangements; and
- What steps are taken and what safeguards are built in to the structure and implementation of these arrangements,

to ensure that Cambridgeshire Council tax payers' specific and general needs are not 'lost' between serving the needs of Peterborough on the one hand, and Northamptonshire/Milton Keynes (LGSS) on the other.

Response from Councillor Steve Count
Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee

LGSS is a shared service between Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes council's. LGSS provide none of the Council's front line and therefore are not directly visible to the residents that we serve. Although we are proud of the success of LGSS which is recognised nationally, we are not the only pioneers in developing shared service solutions to drive out efficiencies in the delivery of back office functions. Every district council in this county has shared services operating across their geographic boundaries to some degree. I am pretty sure that the majority of local authorities across the country have some form of shared service delivery model. Functions provided by LGSS include:

Payroll
HR
I.T
Accounts Payable
Procurement
Law
And Democratic Services

All of the LGSS services that need to have regular contact with front line services continue to be provided from within the county and within Cambridge in particular. HR, Professional Finance, I.T, Law, Democratic Services all continue to be provided from this site. Some more integrated services are provided across the region. It is difficult to envisage that it is more important to the residents of Wisbech that our payroll is operated from Cambridge, rather than as cost effectively as possible.

With regards to the question of how the specific and general needs of Cambridgeshire County Council tax payers are taken into account in these working together arrangements; the cost of the back office services has reduced by nearly 40% in the 7 years of LGSS operations. Previous decisions made to progress in our relationship with LGSS have resulted in nearly £6m that this Council has been able to re-invest in front line services to our communities. Should any one wish to reverse that position, £6m of front line services would need to be cut in order to have slightly more direct control over the Council's support services.

With regards to the question of steps are taken and what safeguards are built in to the structure and implementation of these arrangements, the governance of LGSS is clear and set out in the Constitution. A Joint Committee of the three core authorities provides the governance on behalf of this Council. It would be helpful for Councillor Scutt to identify what in particular she feels is ineffective with these arrangements. Has she actually raised any concerns with the Council's representatives? In addition a Scrutiny Committee has also been established to bring challenge and to hold the executive to account on matters of operational and financial delivery.

The relationship with Peterborough is in its relative infancy. A number of senior management roles now operate across the two authorities including the Chief Executive, the Director of Public Health, and the Executive Director of People and Communities. This sharing of staff is again driven by our approach to reduce the cost of management overheads in order to maximise the resources available to support front line service delivery. All the management positions that are shared between ourselves and Peterborough operate equally from both Cambridge and Peterborough. I am therefore at a loss to understand where this perception that Cambridgeshire is being downgraded is derived. We make no apology for being the party that seeks to maximise efficiencies and minimise overheads.

I seriously hope that with the aid of these explanations that help plug gaps in actual knowledge or in artificially perceived differences, Councillor Scutt can agree with us that our residents want us to spend fewer resources on back office services and senior managers rather than cutting the provision of front line service delivery.