

## **COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday, 28th March 2017

**Time:** 10.30 a.m. – 5.50 p.m.

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillor S Kindersley (Chairman)

Councillors: P Ashcroft, B Ashwood, A Bailey, I Bates, C Boden, D Brown, P Brown, P Bullen, E Cearn, B Chapman, P Clapp, J Clark, D Connor, S Count, S Crawford, A Dent, P Downes, L Dupre, G Gillick, R Henson, R Hickford, J Hipkin, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, G Kenney, A Lay, M Leeke, M Loynes, R Mandley, I Manning, M Mason, M McGuire, Z Moghadas, L Nethsingha, F Onasanya, T Orgee, J Palmer, P Reeve, M Rouse, P Sales, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, M Smith (Vice-Chairwoman), A Taylor, S Taylor, M Tew, P Topping, S van de Ven, A Walsh, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and F Yeulett

Apologies: R Butcher, S Bywater, S Criswell, D Divine, S Frost, D Giles, L Harford and D Harty

### **286. MINUTES – 14<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2017**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **287. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

### **288. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Chapman declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Practice in relation to Minute 293(a), as his daughter ran a nursery.

### **289. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The Council noted one question received from a member of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

### **290. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

## 291. PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2017/18

It was moved by the Chairman of Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Schumann, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Dent, that the recommendation from the Staffing and Appeals Committee as set out on the Council agenda be approved subject to the following amendment:

On the second line of paragraph 4.3 of the Statement to add the following additional wording underlined in bold:

“The Chief Executive, **in consultation with the Staffing and Appeals Committee,** determines the level of increase, if ....”

Councillor Schumann also explained that attention had been drawn at the Committee to an anomaly where the salary ceiling was less than the salary range given and where an individual appeared to be earning in excess of the ceiling, resulting in inaccurate information being included in the report appendix. The Head of HR Advisory Service had been asked to circulate the necessary amendments and an explanation. Councillor Schumann indicated that a revised spreadsheet had been received with an additional column showing the bottom of the payscale, and corrections made to salaries previously shown incorrectly on the draft received by the Committee.

It was resolved by a show of hands to:

agree the Pay Policy Statement 2017/18 including the pay multiple, as amended.

## 292. LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSION SCHEME (LGPS) INVESTMENT POOLING INTER-AUTHORITY AGREEMENT

It was moved by the Chairman of Pensions Committee, Councillor Hickford, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Smith, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

It was resolved by a show of hands to:

- a) approve the setting up of a joint committee with the ACCESS Authorities;
- b) delegate the functions as specified in section 4 of Appendix 1 of the report with effect from the date of execution of the Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA) to the Joint Committee;
- c) delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Chairman of the Pension Fund Committee to make consequential amendments to the IAA and to authorise execution and completion of the IAA on behalf of the Council;
- d) approve the changes to the Constitution recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee within this report together with the changes detailed in Appendix 2 of the report, for inclusion in the Council's Constitution, and any additional changes outlined in the report since the meeting of the Constitution and Ethics Committee on 26 January 2017;
- e) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of

the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of this proposal including any updates or amendments as a result of consequential amendments made to the IAA.

## 293. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Four motions had been submitted under the Council Procedure Rule 10.

### (a) Motion from Councillor Jocelyne Scutt

Before proposing her motion, Councillor Scutt proposed alterations (additions in bold and deletions in strikethrough below), which were accepted without discussion. Councillor Scutt then proposed her altered motion, seconded by Councillor Moghadas, as follows:

Many Cambridgeshire residents in paid employment or seeking paid work and who are parents of children under five wish to place their children in nursery care. Central government funding cuts render this more and more problematic. The latest policy announced by the Conservative government is increasing the problem.

Although promoted as positive for parents of young children, the proposed extension of free early years care and education to 30 hours per week is flawed. The so-called free provision solely applies to three to four-year-olds whose parents **earn or expect to earn the equivalent to 16 hours at national minimum or living wage over the coming three months, whether in paid employment, self-employed or on zero hours contracts** ~~are in paid employment of 16 to 30 hours per week.~~ This plan has major defects.

First, the serious government investment essential to support this programme is lacking.

Secondly, nurseries already experiencing difficulty in providing places for children entitled to nursery education and care will be pressured into denying those most in need because children of unemployed parents will be denied by a plan that favours those in paid work.

Thirdly, children of parents on zero hours contracts may have difficulty qualifying because zero hours contracts may not guarantee earnings or expected earnings equivalent to 16 hours at national minimum or living wage over the coming three months, ~~will not qualify because zero hours contracts do not guarantee set hours per week, and particularly not the required 16 to 30 hours.~~

Fourthly, this policy will result in one in 10 nurseries closing (National Union of Teachers' estimate) because already they face funding changes generating cuts to services and job losses.

Fifthly, remaining nurseries will be forced into compromises – cutting staff, cutting staff wages, and denying professional development to remaining staff, meaning they will be unable to provide services to children at the levels parents wish and the community demands.

This Council therefore requests the Chief Executive to write to the Minister responsible for Nursery Schools funding policy to demand that the Minister:

1. ensures that the proposed policy is amended so that the extension of free provision of childcare is made available to children of parents in paid work and those who are seeking paid work.
2. ensures that proper and adequate funding is made available to implement this policy through its effective application by nursery schools.
3. ensures that proper and adequate funding is provided for nursery schools so that existing nurseries are able to serve the needs of children through the work of trained staff, with all staff being able to participate in professional development.

Following discussion it was proposed by Councillor Count, and seconded by Councillor Hickford, that the question now be put. On being put to the vote, this proposal was carried.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, one Labour, one Liberal Democrat, UKIP and two Independents in favour; seven Labour, ten Liberal Democrats against; one Liberal Democrat and one independent abstained.]

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

[Voting pattern: Labour, Liberal Democrats, one UKIP and two Independents in favour; Conservatives and seven UKIP against; one UKIP and one Independent abstained.]

#### **(b) Motion from Councillor Joan Whitehead**

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

The National Audit Office (NAO) has been critical of the Government's capital spending plans, particularly in relation to its free schools programme. The Government is committed to creating 500 free schools by 2020. The NAO estimates that will mean the Department for Education (DfE) facing an estimated capital building bill of £2.5 billion by 2022. While some of these schools will be needed to meet growth in the school age population in certain areas, others will not necessarily be fully aligned with local need. There are plans, according to the NAO, to open free schools in areas where there was no need for another school thus creating a surplus of school places. This will have serious consequences for all schools in the area, including the new free school, as funding for schools is determined primarily by pupil numbers. If schools face falling rolls, or fails to fill its places, due to a surplus of school places locally they will lose funding.

The NAO has also warned the Government that the physical state of existing schools was getting worse. Many schools are housed in buildings that need replacement or extensive maintenance. The Chair of the NAO (Meg Hillier) has said 'The DfE needs to spend at least £6.7 billion just to bring all school buildings up to a satisfactory standard'. She goes on to say that the money Government is choosing to spend on its free schools programme, some of which are not needed, could be used to 'fund much needed improvement in thousands of existing schools buildings.'

The proposal before Council is that it requests the Chief Executive, the Executive Director for Children, Families and Adults, the Director for Learning and the Chair of the Children and Young People's Committee to write jointly to the DfE and The Education Select Committee to:-

1. Strongly urge the DfE NOT to approve the opening of new free schools in areas where the subsequent increase in school places is not aligned with local need – thus creating surplus school places which will potentially damage the funding and viability of all schools in the area.
2. That in order to ensure that any new free school is aligned with local needs the opening of any new schools must be done in conjunction with the Local Authority to determine both the location and the sponsors of the new school.
3. That the £216 million set aside in the Budget is totally inadequate for the upkeep and maintenance of existing schools and the DfE put in place a more realistic capital investment programme to ensure that existing schools are fit for purpose.

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

[Voting pattern: Labour, Liberal Democrats, two UKIP and two Independents in favour; Conservatives, seven UKIP and one Independent against; one Conservative\* and one Independent abstained.] *[Note - \*error Councillor Harford's voting consul was pressed accidentally].*

### **(c) Motion from Councillor Peter Downes**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Downes and seconded by Councillor Bullen with an alteration to the penultimate paragraph in bold from the version included on the Council agenda which was accepted without discussion:

#### **Council notes**

- a. that the revenue support funding of local government from central government has been significantly reduced over the last four years and will cease in the near future
- b. that this has profound implications for service delivery to residents
- c. that new patterns of expenditure on local services and activities are being introduced by the creation of the Combined Authority
- d. that joint working across traditional boundaries has been developed recently and is increasing
- e. but that all these changes have been super-imposed on the traditional democratic structure of parish/town councils, district councils and county councils

Council believes that it is therefore timely to ask officers to prepare information on options for the new Council to consider without any pre-commitment to a particular outcome.

Therefore:

This Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to explore alternative models of unitary governance across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough with a view to identifying savings and to improving efficiency, service delivery and outcomes for the residents of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

In doing so, this Council resolves to consult with District Councils, Peterborough **and Cambridge** City Councils and the Combined Authority to develop options which would include consideration of Parish arrangements and options for non-parished areas.

The Chief Executive will report back to Full Council within six months, providing a breakdown of the savings, efficiencies and implementation costs of each option for discussion.

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

[Voting pattern: Labour, Liberal Democrats, UKIP and one Independent in favour; Conservatives and three Independents against]

#### **d) Motion from Councillor David Jenkins**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Jenkins and seconded by Councillor Shuter, including the following alterations shown in bold and deletions in strikethrough which were accepted without discussion:

Council notes:

- a) that our high streets with their shops, banks, libraries, pubs and cafes and other services are crucial to the economy of Cambridgeshire and play a vital role in the character and identity of our local communities and their resilience;
- b) that both the devolution deal for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough and this Council's strategic priorities have a focus on economic growth and on developing the economy for the benefit of all;
- c) that Cambridgeshire's smaller towns and villages are an important part of this economic growth;
- d) that many of our local retail businesses are experiencing very real hardships in the current economic climate, **with reductions in business rates helping some whilst** ~~and as a result of~~ increases in rents and business rates taxes **adversely affecting others;**
- e) that many factors affect business rates taxes and that most of these are outside the control of this Council; and

- f) that rents are set by landlords, are agreed by negotiation with tenants and reflect a balance between short and longer term aspirations, and are not subject to regulation.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- i) call on the Government to carefully consider the impact of business rate taxes and revaluation on shops, banks, libraries, pubs and cafes and other high street services in our smaller towns and villages;
- ii) work with our District Council partners to ~~use~~ consider using powers of discretionary business rates tax relief to support the sustainability of our high streets;
- iii) include a focus on sustainable high streets as a part of our work on devolution and public sector reform;
- iv) work with our Local Enterprise Partnership and other partners to influence private, public and 3rd sector landlords so that they might better support retail businesses in smaller towns and villages;
- ~~v) instruct Council committees to explicitly address the sustainability of high streets in their decision-making processes; and~~
- ~~vi) ask the Chief Executive to work with councillors to develop an action plan and to bring this to the new Council in May.~~
- v) ask the Chief Executive to work with councillors to determine how this council and its committees can best respond to this issue, to develop an action plan and to bring this to the General Purposes Committee within 3 months of the new council being formed.**

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

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Labour, nearly all Liberal Democrats, UKIP and Independents in favour; one Liberal Democrat against]

*[Note - Councillor Downes indicated post meeting that he had voted for the motion but it had not been picked up on the electronic system. He asked that it be recorded in the minutes].*

## **294. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - ORAL QUESTIONS**

Two questions were asked, in accordance with the protocol agreed by Council on 14th February 2017, as set out in **Appendix C**.

## **295. QUESTIONS**

### **a) Questions on Fire Authority Issues**

Two questions were asked under the Council Procedure 9.1 as set out in **Appendix D**.

In response to a question from Councillor Simone Taylor, Councillor P Brown agreed to provide her with a commencement date for the training building, attached drill tower and gymnasium at Neots Fire Station.

**b) Oral Questions**

Nine questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix E**. The following items were agreed for further action:

- In response to a question from Councillor Bullen, Councillor Dent the Chairman of the Adults Committee, agreed to investigate further his request to consider launching an investigation into the registered social landlord Luminus following the recent report by the Homes and Communities Agency.
- The Monitoring Officer to prepare a note for the next municipal cycle on the status of whether local election campaign material was relevant to be discussed at a meeting of the Council.

**c) Written Questions**

Two written questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2. as set out in **Appendix F**.

**Chairman / woman**



**COUNTY COUNCIL – 28<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2017**  
**CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Before starting on his announcements the Chairman asked the Council to remain standing and to observe a few moments of silence to remember those Members of the Council who had died since the last local council elections namely Councillors' Steve Van de Kerkhove, Sandra Rylance, Phil Reid and John Reynolds and to also reflect on the recent tragic events on Westminster Bridge and at Westminster.

**PEOPLE**

**Lord-Lieutenant of Cambridgeshire, Sir Hugh Duberly KCVO CBE**

Her Majesty's Lord-Lieutenant of Cambridgeshire, Sir Hugh Duberly KCVO CBE, will be retiring as Lord-Lieutenant on 4th April 2017 when he reaches the retirement age of 75.

Former Cambridgeshire Chief Constable Julie Spence has been appointed as the next Lord-Lieutenant of Cambridgeshire.

Julie Spence was Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire from 2005 to 2010. Since her retirement from the police, she has served as Chair of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust and as a Trustee of Ormiston Families which supports young people from disadvantaged communities.

**SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

**The Huntingdon Reablement Service**

The Huntingdon Reablement Service has recently received the initial draft report of its first Care Quality Commission Inspection, following a formal inspection on 18 and 19 January 2017. Each of the three Reablement Teams will have their own inspection. The service in Huntingdon was rated as Good for each key line of enquiry, giving an overall rating for the service of Good. The five key lines of enquiry are as follows: Is the service safe, effective, caring, responsive and well led.

The inspector interviewed front line care staff, key stakeholders, including health care professionals, gaining information and feedback regarding the overall leadership and effectiveness of the service. During the second day, an 'expert by experience' contacted service users and family members for their direct feedback regarding the services they had received. One service user commented that "their personal care fostered independence to get them to walk again", and another informed the inspector that the support they received from staff had "tremendously increased" their confidence.

Key themes throughout the report highlight the strength in the leadership and identified that staff are well supported, well trained and competent and this is supported by positive comments received from service users. The report refers to good collaborative working with other social and health care professionals, ensuring the individual is at the centre of decision making.

We are very proud of this achievement and always work to improve the quality of the services we deliver. The draft report is available from Charlotte Black - Service Director for

Older People's Services, or Vicky Main - Head of Operations Access and Short Term. The final report will be available in the next few weeks.

### **County Council Election 2017 – Councillors not standing for re-election**

At the meeting, the Chairman, on behalf of the Council, paid tribute to those Councillors not standing for re-election on 4 May 2017.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Count, paid tribute to the following members of his Group who would be standing down: Councillors David Brown, Ralph Butcher, John Clark, David Harty, Mervyn Loynes, James Palmer, Mike Rouse, Mike Tew, and Fred Yeulett. He paid particular tribute to Councillor Tony Orgee who had been an elected Member since 1985.

The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor Nethsingha, paid tribute to the following members of her group who were standing down: Councillors Maurice Leeke, Barbara Ashwood and Ed Cearns. She also paid tribute to Councillor Sebastian Kindersley for his chairing of the Council meetings for the last two years.

The Leader of the UKIP Group, Councillor Bullen, paid tribute to all Councillors not standing for re-election but particularly to the Councillors from his group namely Councillors Daniel Divine, Alan Lay and Gordon Gillick.

The Leader of the Labour Group, Councillor Walsh, paid tribute to the Chairman Councillor Kindersley, the previous Chief Executive Mark Lloyd, the current Chief Executive Gillian Beasley, the Chief Finance Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Chris Malyon, and to the following members of his Group who were standing down: Councillors Fiona Onasanya, Zoe Moghadas and particularly the longest serving member of his Group, Councillor Paul Sales.

The Leader of the Independent Group, Councillor John Hipkin, paid tribute to the late Councillor Steve Van de Kerkhove, thanked the Chairman, and in paying tribute to the officers, highlighted for specific mention Gillian Beasley, Chris Malyon and the Democratic Services Manager, Michelle Rowe. As an update it was indicated that from his Group Councillor Chapman would also not be standing.

The Chairman used his Chairman's discretion for Councillor Sales to make a short statement and in thanking all officers Councillor Sales made special reference to Democratic Services.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 28TH MARCH 2017  
PUBLIC QUESTIONS****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Mr Antony Carpen</b>	<b>Councillor Mac McGuire</b>	<p>Cambridge University's Library has said they are interested in working with the Museum of Cambridge, the Cambs Collection &amp; the County Archives on working together especially in all things digitisation (such as of records, texts and creating online content).</p> <p>Please can the council convene a meeting with all interested &amp; influencing parties to explore this further.</p>
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Councillor Mac McGuire</b>	<b>Mr Antony Carpen</b>	<p>Can I first of all thank Mr Carpen for both the tributes as well as his question. Cambridgeshire Archives and Cambridgeshire Local Studies are very interested in working in partnership with the University Library, the Museum of Cambridge and other relevant bodies as much as possible. The Archives Manager met earlier this month with the University Library's Deputy Director of Research Collections to discuss, at a preliminary level so far, areas where there may be opportunities for working together and for sharing knowledge and experience between the two institutions including archives digitisation. There will be further meetings. Cambridgeshire Archives has also already begun to increase its level of engagement with the Museum of Cambridge. Earlier this year one of our archivists gave a talk at the museum and we are planning to stage a temporary display at the museum later this year. So in answer to the question, I don't think there's any need to convene a meeting, these are already happening Mr Carpen. But thank you for your question.</p>

	<b>Supplementary question from:</b>	<b>To:</b>	<b>Question</b>
	<b>Mr Antony Carpen</b>	<b>Councillor Mac McGuire</b>	Thank you very much Councillor for that response. The reason, or some of the other reasons why I'm picking up on this issue, are the conversations I've had with local historians and archivists is that we have got a huge amount of content that if it were digitised could not only inform more people about the history of our county but also be a potential source of revenue as indicated in my previous question. But the amount of content that there is, is significant. For example the figure that was quoted to me around digitising some of the photographs, glass lantern slides and nitrate slides, which are very very volatile runs into the hundreds of thousands of pounds. So one of the things that I want – have been trying to encourage – is the changing of the culture that we have had across the county so we've got collaboration more as something that's automatic as part of the way we all work rather than the silo systems that we've had in the past. I'll leave it there Mr Chairman. Thank you.
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>To:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Councillor Mac McGuire</b>	<b>Mr Antony Carpen</b>	Chairman I won't give a detailed answer but I am aware that Mr Carpen did in fact contact the Council back in early December with regard to digitisation in particular and I believe he had a quite extensive response from the Council at that time.

**County Council**

**Tuesday 28 March 2017**

**Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**Oral Questions**

**1) Question from Councillor Barry Chapman**

This is a question for Councillor Reeve. As an Independent member I understand that the Independent members are entitled to one seat on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. I understand that the seat is allocated according to those Independent members of an Independent Group on each council and yet when this appointment was made, it was somehow made via Huntingdonshire District Council whereby the Conservative and Liberal Democrat and Labour Members voted a non-Group Independent onto the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. I'm not sure who's running this Overview and Scrutiny Committee because the Independents across Cambridgeshire have been completely excluded from the Committee at the moment.

**Chairman**

Councillor Chapman, that question is properly directed to the Monitoring Officer, not to a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**Councillor Barry Chapman**

Thank you Chairman. It already has gone to the Monitoring Officer.

**2) Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven**

Please may I ask how will the Combined Authority work with the Greater Cambridge City Deal and not run into conflict with it? Thank you.

**Response from Councillor Steve Count**

Extremely well! No seriously – yeah - so of course you're represented by a number of the same people, so Lewis Herbert is there on the Combined Authority as well. What we're looking for if it's possible is to align the assurance payment with the monies so that we can actually make decisions in the same way, but the City Deal will be responsible for its money in its own governance structure and the Combined Authority on its own. What we're looking for is a way to align the way that we think about these things and if the assurance payment is aligned that will make it much easier. So it's something that everybody's aware of, the Assembly Board is aware of it, the Combined Authority is aware of it and we're asking government for permission to align some of the background stuff that aligns us to run more smoothly together.

**County Council**

**Tuesday 28 March 2017**

**Questions on Fire Authority Issues**

**Oral Questions**

**Councillor Sir Peter Brown, Chairman of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority**

Thank you Chairman. Before doing so (*i.e. responding to questions*) I'd just like to say a few words of thanks to the Members of the Fire Authority who are on this Council. For four years we've had a very smooth run Authority. We've had some difficult decisions to take over those four years and I don't think we've had any rancour whatsoever. So I'd like to thank everybody here today who sat on the Fire Authority at any time for all their work. Thank you.

**1) Question from Councillor Simone Taylor**

This is to do with – if it's not your remit and I understand - but if you could point me in the right direction for the answer I'd be grateful. It was St Neots Fire Station had permission granted for a – basically a training building, attached drill tower, a gymnasium. This was granted December of last year. Would you know the date that this is going to commence?

**Response from Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

I can't answer that question straight away but I know it has been passed and it will be going ahead. I'll find out.

**2) Question from Councillor David Jenkins**

In the report it talks about the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) 'business case'. I'm always wary about this use of the word 'business' in the local government environment, but from what I can understand this is all about merging the two forces. In business you don't bring different businesses together if they have different values, different ways of operating, different market positioning and that seems to be the case with the Fire and the Police authorities. I was wondering what Sir Peter thought about that.

**Response from Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

It's a matter that has been under discussion over the last year to eighteen months and the Fire Authority is completely unanimous that we wish to remain as an authority in our own right which is one of the options under the PCC Bill. The PCC commissioner has been aware of that. I don't think he entirely agrees with us but the business case is now being produced. We've appointed a firm called PA Marketing. They are currently interviewing members of the Fire Authority and the police force and I had my meeting last week with them and I was quite impressed by their openness. I made strong representation about keeping the Fire Authority, to which they didn't demur, although they made me aware that the police and crime commissioner had other issues but . . . . So the situation is that the business case will be completed hopefully within the next three weeks. So I cannot see anything happening with it before the fourth of May. After that it would be public for consultation and we'll see where we go there. When it's been through consultation the whole case has to go to upper tier authorities for agreement. Now my view is from here, if I read it correctly, that we do not

want to lose the fire authority and I gather that's the same in Peterborough City as well so where we go from there we'll have to see, but a rear-guard action is in place.

**Councillor Lucy Nethsingha**

Thank you. I'm afraid this is not a question but I just wanted to return the thanks that Peter made to Fire Authority. Peter has been an absolutely superb chair of the Fire Authority for the past four years. As he says we have had some really difficult issues to deal with. He has dealt with those with enormous skill and has kept the fire authority working together really happily and as a very co-operative group and I would like to thank him very much for that.

**County Council**

**Tuesday 28th March 2017**

**Oral Questions**

**1) Question from Councillor Roger Henson**

Yes Mr Chairman, thank you. It's a question on the footpath - cycleway Yaxley to Farcet, which has been in production now for three years from when it was passed to be built. There was a – two and a half years ago - we got public – (*inaudible*) that and put through the public and it's been a complete fiasco since then. I should here say I need to speak to Mr McGuire I realise, but I want everybody to realise . . . how bad things seem to be. The footpath's been half built and come to a full stop: the next section of land has not been bought and yet they had, two and a half years ago, the facility to buy it by compulsory purchase. Now I'm the ward councillor for that area along with Councillor McGuire. I've been getting a lot of flack virtually every day for the last three weeks since the job started and I don't like to think that this Council however well run it is . . . This is a complete fiasco and everybody thinks so from these two villages. So it's just a comment that I think everybody should realise that things don't run as smooth as they should. Thank you.

**Chairman**

Thank you Councillor Henson. I don't think there was a question in there. Rather there was a comment, so Councillor McGuire I'm not sure what you're going to answer but let's hear what you have to say.

**Response from Councillor Mac McGuire**

Chairman, first of all I'm going to contradict Councillor Henson because I don't believe it's been a complete fiasco. This privately owned land has now been compulsorily purchased, and there has to be a procedure you have to go through. You cannot just - we live in a democracy you can't simply take somebody's land just because we have the desire of the Council to build it. It has dragged on and nobody has been more involved than I have from the very start of this project. Councillor Henson is also incorrect in saying the work has come to a stop. I actually went past there a few days ago. They've already built half of it: what they call the subbase has been laid, by Skanska who are our contractors - interim issue – and they've even installed the concrete plinth. It was scheduled to start on the 1st of March, once most of the legal shenanigans had been over and done with and got through. There are the very minor details yet to be agreed with one of the landowners, very very minor. Skanska staff are working on it; if there's a perception that work is stopped it is possibly because on occasions there are emergencies which means that they have to take staff away to do with some emergency. The work is ongoing: it started on the 1st of March as agreed and I'm pleased to see it progressing. I think in fact what we should now be saying is "Hooray. The work is at long last started and is ongoing." I think it's completely false to say that there's a lot of complaints about it. Yes, it has been a long time coming, but as our legal department knows, and I'm sure that if they were able to say so would actually substantiate and I really think that, that is a very negative and unnecessary comment.

**Supplementary from Councillor Roger Henson**

Could Mr McGuire tell me when it's going to start again then, for the next section?



## **Response from Councillor Mac McGuire**

Chairman with respect, I've said the work has not stopped. If on occasions somebody goes by and sees that something appears not to be happening and there's nobody on site, it's often because they have done something elsewhere as emergency work and have had to take staff off site. As I said the subbase has been laid for half the area and the edging stones have been done and the work has not stopped, unless there has been some emergency of which I'm not aware of Chair.

## **2) Question from Councillor Barry Chapman**

This is a question for Councillor McGuire. It's a "yes" or "no". I would just like to ask, as Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee has he been made aware of any proposals for a blanket speed restriction across St Neots of 20 miles per hour?

## **Response from Councillor Mac McGuire**

No.

## **Supplementary from Councillor Barry Chapman**

Thank you Councillor McGuire. As the Deputy Chairman of the town council I was quite surprised to discover that apparently the town council has made proposals to the County for a 20 mile an hour speed restriction across the town. There is a lovely e-mail address on here that one can send one's email to, to get further updates, but thank you for your confirmation. I'll pass that on to all the residents who are concerned.

## **3) Question from Councillor Jocelynne Scutt**

My question is to Councillor Jenkins as Chair of the Health Committee. I refer to the meeting of the 16th of March, where the Health Committee sat in its overview and scrutiny role, addressing the Clinical Commissioning Group's proposed move of the out of hours service from Union Lane to Addenbrooke's. Arbury, Chesterton and King's Hedges residents are concerned that steps had already been taken in relation to the proposed move before the consultation had concluded. Steps understood to have been taken include:

- 1) setting up space for premises at Addenbrooke's for transfer of the out of hours service
- 2) entering into an agreement or arrangement to end occupation of the Union Lane premises and
- 3) further to 2, allowing the premises to go to a local GP practice for their occupation.

Did you have any knowledge of this, whether 1, 2, 3 or all three, and if so, do you not agree that this undercuts the integrity of the so-called consultation?

## **Response from Councillor David Jenkins**

Thank you for the question and you've given that in advance. We were aware of course that as the Clinical Commissioning Group is making plans, that those plans would have some substance behind them. Otherwise I don't think they'd be able to share them with anybody and so nobody would be able to comment on them. So, for example, Councillor Paul Sales and I and a City Councillor went out to the location of the proposed new service - out at Addenbrooke's. Whether or not they'd done the other things I don't know. As you'll be

aware, we have been very critical of the fact that the CCG has not been visible enough with the mitigation measures that they would propose, as a part of the proposed movement. I don't know if that fully answers your question.

### **Supplementary from Councillor Jocelynn Scutt**

Everybody or authority addressing the question of the proposed transfer, the Health Scrutiny Committee, the CCG governing body and the CCG itself acknowledge that the consultation was flawed and defective. In this circumstance and in light of the Health Scrutiny Committee's decision to effectively endorse or approve the move of the out of hours service from Union Lane to Addenbrooke's, do you not agree with me that confidence in the Scrutiny Committee cannot be maintained by the residents?

### **Response from Councillor David Jenkins**

I thought you were going to ask me a slightly different question. You were there at the Scrutiny Committee. You would know that we gave the CCG a fairly hard time. We accepted that they had done – remember this did go to a vote and if I remember right there were five votes for, three abstentions and in fact one vote against. I did not vote in any of those ways. We were critical of the consultation, sorry the Committee was critical of the consultation, but accepted that it had been complete and adequate in scope. We have required the CCG to come back to the Committee's June meeting and to give us an awful lot more information about what the new service would look like and what mitigation measures were going to be put into place. I personally was very proud of the performance of that Scrutiny Committee on that day and when we did debrief the Committee at the end - and we had a four hour committee meeting that day - every Member of that Committee was very supportive, including those who'd voted for and against and abstained in that vote. So "no" is the answer to your question.

### **4) Question from Councillor David Jenkins**

Question for Steve Count as Leader of the Council. Three years or so ago the doom merchants in this chamber were saying if we went to a committee system the Council would grind to a standstill, decisions would not be taken, we would be a laughing stock outside and we would regret it. Will Steve Count agree with me that that has not been the case, but that we have seen an increasing amount of engagement from Councillors in the decision making process through their participation in committees and that by and large, there's been a surprising amount of consensus developed as a result of our moving into a committee system?

### **Response from Councillor Steve Count**

Thank you Chair. I would certainly agree with some of the points you made in the fact that this Council has not degenerated into a laughing stock, primarily due to great leadership I have to say. (*laughter. Chairman interjects "and good chairing too and good chairing of course."*). It's a difficult one because when we moved to a committee system of course there was a heated debate on the subject as to the merits of the two different ways of running a council, the cabinet versus the committee, so things got said that were perhaps enlarged to make a view come across. So, do I think the committee system is a huge success? No I don't. Do I think the cabinet system is perfect? No I don't. I think that both of them are flawed in their own ways and both of them have values going forward. Where we will be in the future is hard to say - we don't have to revisit this decision in the near future, in fact it's impossible to change that decision for a couple of years - but I think we still have time to learn to either improve the committee system or find out whether the flaws are so severe that

you have to reverse it. So I would say that it wasn't as bad as some people made out, but I certainly wouldn't say that it can be retold in the glowing terms that you possibly think it is.

## **Chairman**

Do you have a supplementary Councillor Jenkins?

## **Supplementary from Councillor David Jenkins**

Yes I might as well. In the spirit of just picking up the last couple of sentences of what Steve said. If we are both back here, I would just ask to work with him and others in this chamber to continue to build on the success of the committee system over the last three years, so that we can be confident it is the right system to work for Cambridgeshire. Will he do that with me if we're both here?

## **Response from Councillor Steve Count**

Thank you Chairman. Of course we don't know who will be returned or even what position they will all be in. But the one thing that I would give my personal commitment to in any new council is, no matter who has the majority, or what system we have, there has been some improvements in the working across political groups - whether that's performed by the committee system or the cabinet system or whatever - I actually welcome that and think that, that has been an improvement. We don't always agree, but I always believe that there are benefits all the way round the room, on occasion, and I think that we should try and make more of that and continue to make more of that.

## **5) Question from Councillor Ian Manning**

This question is for Councillor Hickford who I believe is our representative on the City Deal Executive Board? I'm correct. Does Councillor Hickford recognise that there is a high level of public concern around the way the City Deal projects are run, particularly around the fact that ultimately decisions are only made by three councillors?

## **Response from Councillor Roger Hickford**

Well I haven't been given notice of this but I'll answer. There has always been concern that there's only been decisions by a few people, but that's the way the (Central) Government set it up.

## **Supplementary from Councillor Ian Manning**

Yes thank you for the answer. Would he be willing in that case, as he recognises those concerns, would he be willing, assuming he's still here after May, to make some modest calls for a review of the way decisions are taken as part of the City Deal Board, with a view to improving them?

## **Response from Councillor Roger Hickford**

As Chair of the City Deal Assembly, I think it's quite common knowledge that I've asked for a look again and a review of governance, and actually there's going to be working groups going forward and I'm on that.

## **6) Question from Councillor Steve Count**

This is a question for Lucy Nethsingha, who's the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group and

I'm hoping that she may as that Leader have some influence on the election campaign moving forwards. This is in two parts; the first one is quite minor. The results against the complaint against her - Councillor Nethsingha - for calling this Council "a Conservative administration, Conservative officers, Conservative run", has been upheld and they're looking for a local response to that and a simple apology and a commitment that you inform the electorate moving forwards that your group should not be publishing leaflets in that manner. It is simple enough for me; it's the last Council meeting of the year, so I hope you can agree to that and let's get that out of the way and put it behind us.

On a much more serious note, I don't have the original that Councillor Chapman did, but another Focus leaflet has come out, printing stuff that isn't true, worrying residents, scaring parents and children. It's talking about saving Townley School in Christchurch and it really intimates this school is about to shut because of government funding. Now the leaflet talks about a £72,000 reduction in funding. Please confirm with Keith Grimwade. The figure was £4000.00. Not £72,000.00. £4000.00 which was less than 1%. This Council is lobbying for more money for education. It's still trying to improve on that (Government) formula, but that formula came up with a figure of £4000.00. The article talks about a reduction of £858.00 per pupil, which would cause the school to collapse and fold, and the figure is £47.00 per pupil. This kind of electioneering is unacceptable, it really is and it's just one of a number of continual leaflets that are going out there to the public. I wouldn't mind if it just attacked politics, if it just worried the Conservatives, if it was having a go at me, but you are scaring parents and children with this kind of stuff. It is unacceptable.

### **Response from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha**

Thank you. I'm very happy to respond on both of those points. On the point about the complaint that was made against me about referring to this Council as Conservative run, I have said on a number of occasions that I am perfectly happy to make sure that our leaflets refer to this Council as Conservative led and if he's happy to accept that, then we can draw a line under that.

On the Focus leaflet and the issue of Townley School in Christchurch, I haven't seen the leaflet . . . but however, I have discussed with our candidate in that area the issues surrounding the future of Townley School and I think that it is absolutely accurate to say that the current funding situation is putting the future of that school at risk and I do not accept for a moment that, that is scaremongering. You can argue the figures about the reduction in funding, on a number of different bases. The basis for the figures referred to in the leaflet come from the teaching unions; they are based on the spending power available to different schools over a certain period. It would be perfectly clear where those figures come from. They may not be the same as the figures that Keith Grimwade would put forward, but they are absolutely valid figures and the issue about whether or not that school is at risk is an absolutely valid issue for this election campaign, so I stand by that leaflet entirely.

### **Councillor Reeve**

Point of order Chairman. Is campaign material the business of the Council and can the Monitoring Officer please clarify?

### **Chairman**

I'm not really in a position to accept points of order Councillor Reeve. I'm just going to carry on and let them have their barney.

*(Councillor Peter Reeve speaks, but without benefit of microphone)*

## **Chairman**

Thank you Councillor Reeve. Given what happened at the last Council meeting I am slightly loathe to bring any debate to a close. Given that this is the last meeting of the municipal cycle I'm going - you know we are hanging on by threads. So whilst I appreciate the gravity from the point of view of Councillor Count's question and the response given by Councillor Nethsingha and there is going to be no doubt a supplementary, preferably without the Greek chorus behind, ladies and gentlemen, I think the Monitoring Officer perhaps can prepare a note for the next municipal cycle. How about that? Would you be happy with that Councillor Reeve?

*(Councillor Peter Reeve presumed to answer in the affirmative)*

## **Chairman**

Thank you. Councillor Count. No doubt a supplementary.

### **Supplementary from Councillor Steve Count**

On the first point, am I happy for this Council to be called Conservative led? No I am not. The point as it's made, repeated to me, that when I'm Leader of the Council I am apolitical and I'm not expected to talk as a Conservative so I'm not content with that. Unless I'm talking as a Leader of the Conservative Group, plus, I must add, it's not in your position to start negotiating what you will and won't accept. The result of the review is that you have been found guilty of inaccuracies. But as far as the question regarding Townley goes, the one I was thinking of asking is how low will you sink to win a few votes? But considering I already know the answer, I'm not putting that question.

### **Point of Personal Explanation from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha**

Given that I have heard nothing from the Monitoring Officer, I absolutely do not accept that I have been found guilty of anything. Thank you.

### **7) Question from Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

My question is to the Leader of the Council but it also involves Adult(s) and social services, so perhaps the Chairman of that committee could just take note of what I'm saying. In an internal email yesterday, I was told that Four Seasons have informed the County Council of their intention to close Ringshill Care Home in Huntingdon that they had two meetings yesterday and I believe that is the final decision. Four Seasons have been discussing the rent arrangement with the landlord and have got nowhere, so they have no other intention but to close the centre down. They have informed the Council of an agreement around future costs has not been reached which makes the home unviable. The County Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group have 55 of the 87 residents at the home. I'm further told that the Huntingdon Locality Team are going to be working with the management team at the home to find homes for the people who have to leave and that will be done in a period of about three months. Now Mr Chairman, that building is built for purpose; quite clearly it is a residential home. Is there any reason why the Council could not get together with the CCG and look at ways of taking it over? Because it's one of three homes in Huntingdon and if it goes there are going to be probably about a hundred people that are going to have to be moved. Surely it would make sense to use that development for the purpose for which it was intended?

### **Response from Councillor Steve Count**

I became first aware of this yesterday Chairman and my immediate reaction was of concern for the potential welfare of the residents moving forward. Whether they are private paying, CCG or our residents is irrelevant. These people's lives will end up, no matter whether we can re-home them or not, being disrupted by this change and whatever we need to do we can make that smooth, should it come to pass. Because at the point in time that I was informed about this, it was still as far as I understood it, it was looking likely that the talks were going on. My immediate reaction was to ping an email across to Chris Malyon our Chief Finance Officer and copy in Wendi Ogle-Welbourn who's the CFA Director because my concern is we are a Council that's recently adopted a position of expanding our adults' social care placements, so the thought that one will be removed from the market in the near future is extremely worrying. So I put in an e-mail requesting an action plan and meetings takes place immediately, to see what possibilities there are such as the one that you've just alluded to yourself, whether it's ask the CCG, something else: discussions with the landlord. Whatever happens and we need to get in there, we need to act fast and we need to do what we can to try and recover this situation. So all I can give is my assurance to you and any residents that are concerned about this that immediate action has been taken and we will see where those conversations lead us.

#### **8) Question from Councillor Ashley Walsh**

Councillor Count will like this one. It's to Councillor Whitehead and it comes in two parts. Number one, is there a shred of truth in the claim levelled by Councillor Nethsingha at last week's General Purposes that any single one of the county's children's centres is in danger of closure and b) is it responsible to make such a claim?

#### **Response from Councillor Joan Whitehead**

Thank you Chair. There does seem to be a bit of confusion around the issue of children's centres. The Children & Young People's Committee is absolutely adamant, has stated this many times and it's been confirmed by the Director of Children and Young People's Services that there will be no diminishing of the provision of children's services throughout the County. These at the moment are delivered through a whole variety of centres in different buildings and different context. Many of you may remember that children's centres were set up as a result of the Sure Start programme and they had to be set up relatively quickly and as I said, were set up in a whole variety of different kinds of buildings. What we are taking the opportunity to do now is to look at those buildings and see if there might be a better provision in the same area, for the same parents and children, down the road or just round the corner. So there is no intention whatsoever for there to be any diminishing of the provision of children's centres and in fact we hope to expand that provision by including healthcare within it. So I think the confusion has arisen Chair where in some cases, the locality of the services may change slightly within an area, but the provision will still be there. And I would hope that there are Members of the Children & Young People's Committee in this chamber, that wherever they heard the rumour that children's centres are going to close, that they will make it clear that it is that the provision will remain but it may be in a slightly different building, but it will be within the same locality where parents and children can get to those centres. I hope that answers the question Chair.

#### *Supplementary question off mike*

. . . Chair I think I've made the position clear. I think it's up to everybody in this chamber who knows the answer to act responsibly and to contradict any statement that says we are reducing the provision for children and young people. Thank you Chair.

#### **9) Question from Councillor Paul Bullen**

Chairman my question is to the Chair of the Adults Committee. Bearing in mind the recent investigation and subsequent publishing of a report by the Homes and Communities Agency into the woeful failings of Luminus and the fact that it has been proven that they have broken the law by failing to comply with the Gas Safety (Installation and Use) Regulations and bearing in mind that I've put much evidence to this Council in the past and that the Health and Safety Executive is now also investigating Luminus for failing to comply with current legislation, will the Chair of the Adults now consider launching an investigation into this registered social landlord who provide social housing for a large number of our elderly and vulnerable residents.

### **Response from Councillor Adrian Dent**

Yes. I thank Councillor Bullen for the question; he did warn me about 40 minutes before we walked into here. With my limited knowledge of only being in the chair for a few months, I would like to take some time to go back and talk to the officers and yes I will follow up on this and yes I will provide answers to Councillor Bullen, but I'm afraid I have no knowledge, limited knowledge on this at this time.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 28 MARCH 2017**  
**WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

**Question from Councillor David Jenkins**

The Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) budget for 2017/18 includes provision to finance the accelerated delivery of a number of 'oven-ready' highways projects. May the list of these projects be published please?

**Response from Councillor Mac McGuire**  
**Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

There is currently no budget available for the development of project proposals which could then be used to attract funding as and when sources become available. The purpose of this amendment was to create that capacity in the system but as this is not until 2017/18 by implication no such schemes have yet been identified. It will be a key area of activity for Members of Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee early in the new democratic cycle after the election.

**Question from Councillor Mike Mason**

I refer to my speech at the last Council Meeting during the debate on the Business Plan, in which I mentioned a contract with a company named V4 Services, which had been signed in December 2015 with an initial value of £60,000 and due for review in 2016. I referred to payment data on the Web Site indicating that up October 2016 a total in excess of £490,000 had been paid to this company. Will Councillor Count please confirm the start date and review date of this contract and indicate which Officer/Member signed and/or authorised this contract and the review thereof. Will he please also indicate the closing date of the contract and the total paid up to the last payment in 2017.

**Response from Councillor Steve Count, Chairman of General Purposes Committee**

Thank you for your question regarding the Council's use of the consultancy company V4. As you know Council has embarked on a major programme that seeks to transform the way that we do business - to protect front line services, and to minimise the financial burden on our tax payers. Our officers have been charged with developing an alternative approach that focusses on really transforming how we deliver our services.

To achieve this the Council agreed to create a Transformation Fund through altering its policy on debt repayment (Minimum Revenue Provision), to establish a fund of £20m in order to secure the transformation required, as it was recognised that this couldn't be achieved through either, base funding or, by those staff that are fully occupied delivering their day jobs.

Having identified the initial opportunity to create a more integrated and strategic resource pool to drive this programme, it was clear that the organisation needed help to deliver it.

V4 already had a successful track record in delivering significant change and cashable savings for Peterborough City Council. The Chief Executive and the Chief Finance Officer met with a number of other companies providing similar services but they were unable to provide the confidence that they could mobilise in the timescales required. In contrast V4 identified specific consultants for the assignment and established its greater understanding of our organisation and its direction of travel.



The initial assignment related to the delivery of the Corporate Capacity Review and the creation of a transformation pipeline and process. Successful deliverables on this project now include

- a new staffing structure which will deliver annual savings of nearly £2m,
- corporate teams delivering council wide integrated transformation
- a corporate approach to project management governance
- a single communications approach across the Council
- business intelligence brought to life and being used to support strategy development
- corporate tools and processes in place
- a transfer of skills and expertise to the in-house team

On the back of the demonstrable delivery achieved through this piece of work, V4 were commissioned to deliver other key pieces of work. These have helped the Council deliver savings of £1m on the Highways contract, and major improvements in a number of other priority areas such as I.T. and they are now progressing a number of contract procurement opportunities.

Members of GPC have been aware of the council's use of external support. Two references were made in reports to General Purposes Committee to the need for additional budgetary provision to support the broader programme:-

- Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the period ending 31st March 2016
- Transformation Programme July 2016. This report explicitly stated that V4 were supporting the Council in this programme.

Although Members were aware of the use of these consultants from these reports and through V4 leading Members workshops, it is accepted that formal engagement of GPC in confirming ongoing work should have happened faster. However given the general awareness of the Committee about the company and its work with the council, continued and speedy delivery of outcomes was deemed a higher priority.

In financial terms alone the 17/18 budget will see savings in the base budget of at least £3m from the work developed and implemented by V4 which translates to savings of nearly 6:1 for every £ invested. This exceeds the criteria that we have set out for Transformation Fund investments. Furthermore the knowledge transfer to County Council staff that has been achieved will prove invaluable for the future.

Some of our commissions with V4 are on-going and some have been closed because the nature of the commission has been completed. These assignments have been procured through a professional services framework and have been funded within the base revenue budget or from within the Transformation Fund as part of a specific business case proposal

A summary of each commission, the associated costs and outcomes either delivered or expected are set out below.

## **Transformation Programme Support**

### **Rationale of requirement:**

Supporting the Council to deliver their transformation agenda by:

- Supporting the implementation of the Corporate Capacity Review

- Implementation support including the consultation and interview process through to recruitment
- Upon completion and release of the CCR1 consultation document, enable the commencement of CCR2 by undertaking analysis (including interviewing all 'in-scope' staff of the remaining areas (Communications, ICT, Workforce Development, Assets, Community Engagement and Connecting Cambridgeshire) with project sponsors
- Supporting the transformation/SMT work
- Providing strategic input around the Transformation work which covers the following areas:
  - Adult Services
  - Children's Services
  - Environment, Transport & Economy
  - LGSS & CCC Phase 1 - IT & Digital
  - Public Health
  - Finance & Budget Review
  - Customer & Community
  - Assets, Estates & FM
  - Commissioning
  - Contracts, Commercial & Procurement

## **Workforce Planning & Development**

**Cost: £242k**

### **Key Outcomes:**

- Transformation pipeline of proposals, business cases and projects established
- Corporate Teams established for:
  - Transformation
  - Business Intelligence
  - Communications and Information Services
  - I.T Strategy Team
- Data analysis provided to support the programme development (including the use of PowerBI)
- Creation and implementation of the Transformation Framework, PMO function and i-can ideas capture
- Support and delivery of various presentations and workshops with Members
- Review of the Councils senior management strengths and areas for development
- CCR 1 & 2 savings of £1.9m per annum

**Commissioning Officer(s): SMT**

**Open or Closed: Closed**

## **Contracts and Procurement**

### **Rationale of requirement**

This was one of themes of the Transformation Programme and priority areas agreed with General Purposes Committee.

## Executive Summary



### The headlines...

£514m total supplier expenditure (£501m 2014/15)	£273m (53%) spent with the top 50 suppliers (2015/16)	64% of expenditure is with suppliers not on the Corporate Contract Register
Spent with 5,458 suppliers, reduced from 5,946 in 2014/15	1,922 suppliers (35%) received total payments under £1,000, equivalent to 0.1% of total spend	96 contracts that should have gone through an OJEU process appear not to have done
£411m (80%) spent with 291 suppliers (5%)	473,000 invoices processed (average invoice value £1,087)	163 contracts are due to expire this financial year and are due to go out to market

A big opportunity

**£1.5bn (413 contracts) will need to be taken to market over the next 3 years**

Note: Figures stated are from CCC 2015/16 and 2014/15 data

[www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk](http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

**The scale of the opportunity was set out in most, if not all, of the aforementioned workshops. This slide was just one that illustrated why this area of activity was a key opportunity for driving out**

## Key Outcomes:

- Commercial Board established
- Produce draft Terms of Reference and supporting templates for Commercial Board
- Supported corporate communications in relation to the Board and its governance
- Revise role and TOR of the Commercial Board to reflect the new commissioning arrangements and governance within CFA
- Training and development for Board members in relation to the role requirements and ensuring the Board operates effectively
- Support in the development and production of specific Mandates
- Supporting the Head of Procurement in the operation of the Board
- Identified initial priority savings programme
- Delivery of procurement savings against specific mandates

**Cost: £400k (total cost subject to delivery of £2m savings)**

**Open or Closed: Open**

**Commissioning Officer: CFO (business case approved by GPC)**

## Key Outcomes (To date):

- Assessment of procurement opportunities/risks
- Robust contract register developed
- Significant support on the Coram contract
- Early analysis/support on Total Transport/ Private Transport for SEN
- Establishment of Commercial Board (including terms of reference)
- Business case produced for Property Services
- Priority mandates developed
- Currently commencing contract re-negotiations

## IT Support

### Rationale of requirement:-

The recent position of multiple failures across the IT estate could be allowed to continue. Aside from the inevitable user frustration and stress, it is estimated that approximately 20 hours of were being lost on a monthly basis due to system wide failures. Using an average salary of £25,000 including on costs and an indicative average of 2,000 concurrent users across CCC the hourly cost of lost productivity is approximately £28,000.

This means that the total cost in productivity loss was approximately £560,000 in November 2016 alone when the organisation experienced a major outage over a number of days. This

is before we factor in the costs that are incurred as a direct result of users not being able to access systems (e.g. not being able to discharge hospital patients). It is difficult to directly attribute a value to reputational damage but this is likely to manifest itself in OFSTED inspections that were taking place during system failures.

CCC have lost confidence in the ability of LGSS IT to provide a stable IT service to our end users. CCC are seeking to take back a degree of control in order to improve the stability of our core IT platform.

Initial Project Scope:-

Complete IT Strategy

Provide technical support to enable the establishment of IT Client Team

Re-design of CCC IT resource as part of CCR2

Technical/Process support for new CMS procurement

Assist with defining detailed Citizen First Digital First Projects

Other tasks and deliverables to be agreed with the Director of Customer & Communities

### **Change Request December 2016**

To provide the following:

- Management of IT Client Team
- Provide technical management resource to CFA technical team
- Provide technical advice and guidance to Citizen First Digital First programme
- Manage the IT and Digital Services CCR2 process including shortlisting / interviewing and establishment of team
- Provide ongoing operational support (utilising Client Team) and effective communication for IT including incident management
- Other tasks and deliverables to be agreed with the Director of Customers & Communities

**Cost: £ 115k (to date – on-going on rolling basis)**

**Key Outcomes to date:**

- Greater stability in the system now evident
- Perception of IT improving
- Significant reduction in 'fault' helpdesk calls
- Desktop ready reckoner of system availability
- Fault identification system introduced
- CCC Client Team established
- CCR 2 savings implemented
- Investment in infrastructure secured
- Stable Platform Plan agreed and being implemented.

**Commissioning Officer: Director of Corporate and Community Services**

**Open or Closed: Open**

### **Highways Competitive Dialogue Support**

Rationale:-

Concerns were being raised regarding how the dialogue process was progressing from both a political and provider perspective. There was a risk that at least one of the potential providers was going to remove themselves from the process. V4 were asked to identify a potential resource that could help the process get back on track. The resource was

commissioned from Cardiff City Council via V4 and their input was invaluable in delivering a successful outcome.

**Key outcomes:-**

- Prover concerns removed from process
- Two providers stayed in the process submitting competitive bids
- Competitive dialogue process completed on time
- Savings secured of £1m per annum

**Cost: £106k**

**Commissioning Officer: Executive Director ETE**

**Open or Closed: Closed**