GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 25th October 2016

Time: 10.00a.m. – 12.55p.m. *(adjourned to 27 October 2016)*

Present: Councillors Bailey, Bates, D Brown, Bullen, Cearns, Count (Chairman), Hickford, Hipkin, Jenkins, Mason (substituting for Councillor Hipkin), Nethsingha, Orgee, Reeve, Schumann (substituting for Councillor McGuire), Walsh and Whitehead

Apologies: Councillors Dent, Hipkin and McGuire

264. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

265. MINUTES – 20TH SEPTEMBER 2016 AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 20th September 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman. The Action Log and following update from the Vice-Chairman were noted:

- the Chairman of Assets and Investments Committee would be meeting Cottenham Parish Council regarding the development of land at Rampton Road, Cottenham on 9 November. Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Mason, offered to provide any assistance required and attend the meeting.

266. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

267. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – AUGUST 2016

The Committee was presented with the August 2016 Finance and Performance report for Corporate Services and LGSS Cambridge Office. A year-end overspend on revenue of £179k was being forecast which included for Corporate Services £301k attributable to the Corporate Capacity Review (CCR) and for LGSS Managed £213k attributable to the wired area network and the roll out of laptops. Financing costs were currently predicting an underspend of £250k for the year. It was noted that further work was taking place to bring the CCR overspend down. The Chairman stressed the importance of reducing the overspend and thanked officers for their continuing work in this area. Some Members raised the following in relation to the report:

- queried how many of the Freedom of Information requests detailed on page 31 had been received from Councillors. The Director Customer Services and Transformation was asked to investigate. **Action Required.**

- queried why there was an overspend in IT Services in the LGSS Cambridge Office. It was noted that the expenditure related to staffing. One Member requested more information on what other actions were being taken to achieve savings in the LGSS Cambridge Office. **Action Required.**

- welcomed the reduction in the overspend attributable to CCR but queried who was monitoring staff leaving or staying. The Director Customer Services and Transformation reported that it was now clear who had been successful as part of the new structure. A number of staff were therefore leaving either voluntarily or as a result of the restructure. There was a three month transitional period to enable knowledge to be transferred to new teams. A longer period of notice had been negotiated to cover some areas of critical risk.

- queried who had overseen the CCR and whether the impact on staff morale and retention was being monitored. One Member was particularly concerned about the loss of expertise and the lack of Member involvement. It was noted that the CCR had been managed by the Chief Executive and Strategic Management Team (SMT). The Chief Executive highlighted the importance of the review which had been proposed as part of the Council's Peer Review in 2013. She acknowledged that redundancies would inevitably have an impact on staff morale. SMT therefore needed to understand this impact and take a dynamic lead in managing the new set of corporate capacity jobs. Energising and transforming services was vital in order to continue providing services to vulnerable people. It was noted that staff made redundant would be helped to find jobs outside the organisation. The Chairman of Staffing and Appeals Committee confirmed that he had regular meetings with the Chief Executive. He also drew attention to the action log where it was noted that a report on staff performance management would be brought to the Committee.

- queried the impact of a fall in the pound and possible increase in interest rates and whether both issues were being monitored. The Committee was informed that both issues were monitored very closely and any changes would be fed back quickly. The Chairman added that if interest rates did change they would not impact on areas where they had been fixed. However, it would affect the Council's ability to borrow in the future or refinance.

- requested an explanation regarding the contractual provision in relation to Capita/Mouchel latent defect corrections detailed on page 34. It was noted that this contract had been brought to an end several years ago. As it became clear that the corrections were not required funding had been released accordingly.

- the need to review the performance measurement for Deprivation measure – Number of physically active adults (narrowing the gap between Fenland and other) which did not provide any information about narrowing the gap and was measured as a percentage rather than a number. The Chairman added that this measure should be reported monthly or quarterly in order to monitor progress and target action effectively. There was also some discussion as to whether this measure should be monitored by Health Committee or General Purposes Committee (it should not be monitored by both) and clarification was requested. The Director of Customer Services and Transformation was asked to review the issues. **Action Required.**

- the need to expand the performance table to reflect the information in Appendix 7 so that it was easier for the public to understand. It was noted that the measure reflecting the proportion of all transformed transaction types to be completed online by 31 March 2015 would be reported in November and not October.

It was resolved unanimously to review, note and comment upon the report.

268. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST AUGUST 2016

The Committee received a report detailing the financial and performance information to assess progress in delivering the Council's Business Plan. Attention was drawn to the forecast year-end of overspend of £1.9m which was an increase of £1.3m on the position reported last month. The change was due to an increase in Children, Families and Adults (CFA) overspends, particularly in Looked After Children (LAC). Members were informed that the Capital Programme was near profile with £6m of the £25m being utilised. The programme was being monitored closely by the Capital Programme Board.

The Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee (CYPC) reported that all councils had agreed an approach to reduce the cost of agency staff and the numbers had been reduced. The Children's Change Programme would help reduce the number even further.

One Member queried whether the reduction in the proportion of children in year 12 taking up a place in learning was as a result of the cost of transport. The Chairwoman of CYPC drew attention to the negligible fluctuation in this measurement and the fact there had been no impact on the Not in Education, Employment and Training measurement. She added that she was not aware of any difficulties but it was important to note that transport was provided for those young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. Councillor Bailey reported that she was a member of the Needham's Foundation which gave out grants for education. However, it had not received enough requests coming forward. It was proposed that the Foundation's e-mail should be added to the letter to young people. The Chairman requested a short briefing note detailing the issues to establish whether there was a need for substantive work. **Action Required.**

One Member requested information as to what was being done to address the target relating to delayed transfers of care. The Chairman reminded the Committee that he had queried at the previous meeting the element which related to the Council. He was surprised that the status was not amber as there was some variance allowed. The Chief Executive highlighted the importance of the whole system working together. The Council was currently working with the Clinical Commissioning Group and Addenbrooke's with a meeting planned for week beginning 31 October. The Vice-Chairwoman of Adults Committee reported that although the number attributable to adult social care had gone up recently, there was overall a significant trend downwards with a 40% reduction. The Chairman reminded the Committee that he had asked the Chief Executive to take action to help the media understand the background.

Another Member queried whether the table on page 65 reflected historic Section 106 contributions such as for the development at Northstowe. It was noted that the table reflected the funding of this year's capital programme. However, there was a separate mechanism to record outstanding Section 106 monies.

It was resolved unanimously to:

> Analyse resources and performance information and note any remedial action currently being taken and consider if any further remedial action was required.

269. LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN STRATEGY AND SAVINGS

The Committee considered a report on the Looked After Children (LAC) Strategy to date and savings delivery. Attention was drawn to the fact that there was not sufficient funding in the budget to support LAC to meet demand at a safe level for Cambridgeshire. The strategic approach taken to date had not always had the desired impact by not being focussed on the right areas. Attention was drawn to an analysis of the LAC population which had been growing over the last three years beyond projection. There were currently 645 LAC, and approximately 65 unaccompanied asylum seeker children funded directly by government. In considering the report, Members commented as follows:

- highlighted the fact that the CIPFA benchmarking of a £4m average was not a guarantee as some authorities spent lower and others higher.

- welcomed the opportunity to understand fully the link regarding the increased mental health needs in children and young people.

- queried whether the Council was subsidising unaccompanied asylum seeker children. The Interim Service Director, Children's Social Care (Interim Director) reported that the whole placement cost was reclaimable from government. However, the Council was keen to ensure that these children received the necessary support such as the Virtual School and other support services in order to achieve a positive outcome. As far as she was aware government funding would not be removed for these children in the future.

- queried how the Council compared to its statistical neighbours. The Interim Director reported that performance data was considered by the Corporate Parenting Panel which focussed on key indicators such as placement moves. This indicator was at a medium level compared to the Council's statistical neighbours. It was noted that there would be a Transformation Fund request relating to foster carers in the future.

- expressed concern about children moving from foster placements many times and children being left suffering abuse and neglect as they would be more costly to look after in the future. The Interim Director reported that the Council needed to manage the balance appropriately with regard to intervening. It was noted that there were currently 24 unborn children with child protection plans. However, it was also important to note that a child was never left a risk.

- queried the action being taken to stop this becoming an annual event. The Interim Director drew attention to financial modelling underway as detailed in Section 7.7 to manage pressures and deliver savings. She added that re-baselining and a decrease in the number of LAC would enable the Service to achieve its savings. However, it was important to remember that a 10% change was a significant challenge.

- queried the scope for the prevention agenda in relation to how the Council supported communities and families. It was noted that the Council had a wide range of prevention services. However, it did need to target these services more effectively.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- note the identified pressures in the placements budget and the associated savings proposals and agree that these need to be addressed through the wider business planning process.

270. TRANSFORMATION FUND BIDS

The Committee received a report setting out requests for investments from the Transformation Fund that were required to deliver transformational improvements in service delivery and associated savings within the 2017-22 business plan. A brief presentation was received in relation to the following four requests:

a) Enhanced Intervention Service for children with disabilities;
b) Link workers within adult mental health services;
c) Systemic family meetings offered at an earlier stage to increase the number of children diverted from care; and
d) Improving commercial governance and investing in procurement savings opportunities.

Members made the following comments in relation to the requests:

<u>Enhanced Intervention Service for children with disabilities</u>

- queried whether the NHS was contributing to the proposal. Attention was drawn to the need to ensure partnerships, schools and health in particular were on board as detailed on page 101. The Interim Director, reported that health was on board and working with the County Council. However, this proposal was about investing in additional County Council staff; it was a social work project around family therapy rather than psychiatry which would be health. One Member commented that he believed that there should be greater commitment from health to this project. The Chairman queried whether it was possible to draw up a list of savings delivered to the NHS. Members noted that this proposal would have less pressure on the adult economy whether it was in relation to the core family or health care. The Interim Director acknowledged the importance of engagement with health colleagues to provide a lifelong service. The Chairman commented that health and social care had been integrated in the Manchester devolution deal.

- highlighted the fact that the proposal was not just about money, time and effort were also crucial. One Member commented that there was a considerable over lap between Educational Psychologists and Psychologists. It was therefore difficult to allocate funding responsibility to one or the other.

- queried the impact on the family of children with disabilities remaining at home. The Interim Director reported that the Council was always learning and growing from research which had shown that there was a positive impact if children with disabilities were cared for within their family. She acknowledged that this might not be the case for some children but she was confident that the Council would make the best plan for the child.

- queried why the impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics section on page 103 had not been completed. The Interim Director apologised for this error.

- queried what would happen to the three people being engaged as part of the project after it ended in two years. Members were informed that it would be included as part of mainstream work essentially by upskilling the existing workforce. One Member commented that the current assumption was that no additional expenditure would be needed to deliver the level of savings. The Chairwoman of CYPC reported that an Clinical Psychologist might be needed.

- highlighted the need to avoid cutting and pasting the draft community impact assessment in the future as it made frustrating reading.

- the need to review the return rate on page 99 which should be 1,232%.

<u>Link workers within adult mental health services</u>

- highlighted the importance of monitoring the reality of the proposal. The Chairwoman of CYPC suggested that most of these bids would inevitably report to her Committee as part of the business plan process. The Chairman requested that the reporting process should be identified. **Action Required.**

- queried the involvement of the Police in this proposal. The Interim Director reported that Children's Services was looking at the impact of adults taking drugs or abusing alcohol, which involved working proactively with the Police.

- queried again why the impacts on specific groups with protected characteristics section on page 105 was incomplete.

- queried what was meant by a reasonable assumption that 12 (8%) of these 160 children would be diverted from care per year. The Interim Director reported that this figure was based on 400 case files out of a total caseload of 2,500. She explained that more than a 10% change in the demographic group was ambitious.

- the need to avoid double counting adults by checking the assumptions in the financial modelling.

Systemic family meetings offered at an earlier stage to increase the number of children diverted from care

- welcomed this proposal focusing on the use of wider family as an asset.

Improving commercial governance and investing in procurement savings opportunities

- welcomed this innovative approach based on a commercial model of payment by results. It was clarified in relation to the last bullet on page 118 that this would be termination by the County Council.

- queried the membership of the Commercial Board. It was noted that it would include the Chairman of Assets and Investments and the Chief Finance Officer.

- queried the figures of £400k and £2m. It was noted that the first figure came from the Transformation Fund and the second figure was the estimated contracting savings. One Member commented that there would be an ongoing cost to this proposal.

- highlighted the need to commence this proposal and all the other proposals now rather than at the start of the next financial year. It was noted that the proposals would start as soon as possible to deliver savings in next year's budget.

It was resolved unanimously to approve the following business cases and associated investment from the Transformation Fund for:

a) Enhanced Intervention Service for children with disabilities;

b) Link workers within adult mental health services;

c) Systemic family meetings offered at an earlier stage to increase the number of children diverted from care; and

d) Improving commercial governance and investing in procurement savings opportunities.

271. WISBECH COMMUNITY LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

Members received an overview of the Wisbech Community Led Local Development (CLLD) fund. The Committee was asked to agree the Council's financial contribution to the management and administration costs, which would enable Cambridgeshire ACRE to bid into the fund as the Accountable Body for a Wisbech Programme. Attention was drawn to the proposal which was for a £2.1m programme which levered in £1.05m European Social Fund investment. It was noted that Wisbech CLLD offered a longer-term approach that builds sustainability and community capacity to manage funding, decision-making and strategy. It would also feed into the community strand of the Wisbech 2020 work. A copy of the Local Development Strategy was circulated at the meeting.

The Chairman reported that he supported fully the proposal which could help break the cycle of deprivation in Wisbech. One Member queried the lack of reference to Local Member involvement in the report. In response, the Chairman reported that Councillor Hoy and the Town Council were behind this proposal.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- agree the proposal for the County Council to give a commitment to contribute £21,400 per annum for five years to the management and administration costs of the programme.

272. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT REVENUE BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2017/18 TO 2021/22

The Committee received a report detailing an overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue Proposals for Corporate and LGSS Managed Services, and cross-Council proposals that were within its remit. Members noted the overview of the Council's position which outlined how transformation would contribute towards balancing the budget. Section four outlined the draft proposals that had been developed so far in the process. A considerable amount had taken place to prepare an early draft and further work would be required by senior officers to identify how to close the funding gap. It was noted that E in the table on page 125 should be D.

One Member raised concern that the Government was suggesting that the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) might go negative for the period of the budget. The Chairman acknowledged that the position was not clear. However, the RSG would not go negative for the period up to 2018/19. It was noted that the Government was asking local authorities to sign up to a multi-year settlement by 26 October 2016. Following protests regarding the acceptability of this deadline and the lack of information, the Government had moved its deadline to 28 October 2016. The Chairman suggested that officers should be asked to prepare a full briefing note for Members. **Action Required.**

Following a discussion, it was resolved unanimously to:

- adjourn the meeting to consider this item only, with the assistance of a briefing note providing additional information, to 4.30p.m. on Thursday 27 October 2016.

273. DRAFT 2017-18 CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND CAPITAL PRIORITISATION

The Committee receive an overview of the full draft Business Plan Capital Programme and results from the capital prioritisation process.

The Chairwoman of CYPC drew attention to the significant demographic pressure of school age children as reflected in the amount of school building. She questioned whether 1.4% for demography was correct. It was noted that this reflected the general population increase although the revenue costs of schools was funded by grant.

Another Member queried why the costs of schools in Section 4.5 had increased particularly given the deflation in building costs. The Chairman requested that this information together with the benchmarking on schools report considered by Assets and Investments Committee should be circulated to the Committee. It was agreed to take a report to the Capital Board and then circulate the response to the Committee. **Action Required.**

Another Member queried why developer contributions were not reflected for a number of schemes on pages 182 to 183. It was suggested that this reflected the issue relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Huntingdonshire District Council was refusing to pass on CIL funding to the County Council. It was acknowledged that there needed to be equitable contributions from all Districts. The Chairman of Economy and Environment Committee agreed to provide the Committee with a briefing note relating to this issue. **Action Required.** It was also noted that the spending profile was less than the one reflected on page 196 relating to Community Hubs-Sawston.

It was resolved unanimously to note:

a) the overview and context provided for the 2017-18 Capital Programme;

b) comment on the results of the capital prioritisation process, taking into consideration the most up to date estimations for financing costs and the overall revenue position; and

c) comment on the draft proposals for the full 2017-18 Capital Programme and endorse their development.

274. LEVEL OF OUTSTANDING DEBT

The Chairman, with the agreement of the Committee, withdrew the report in order to allow more work to be carried out in relation to how much debt was being written off and how different kinds of debt should be managed. A report would be presented to the December meeting. **Action Required.**

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

The Committee considered its agenda plan and training plan, and noted the following changes to the agenda plan:

- move “County Council Elections 2017”, “Buurtzog Business Case”, “Community Hubs” to December.

Adjourned and reconvened as follows

Date: Thursday, 27th October 2016

Time: 4.32p.m. – 5.55p.m.

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

Apologies: Councillors Hipkin and McGuire

272. SERVICE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF DRAFT REVENUE BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR 2017/18 TO 2021/22

The Committee reconvened to consider a report detailing an overview of the draft Business Plan Revenue Proposals for Corporate and LGSS Managed Services, and cross-Council proposals that were within its remit. Members had also received, as requested, a briefing note on the multi-year settlement and efficiency plan. The Chairman reported that he had spoken to Marcus Jones, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (Minister for Local Government), who had confirmed that it was the Government's intention to introduced a full Business Rates Retention System (BRR) by 2019/20. There would be no Revenue Support Grant (RSG) for any local authority. He added that there needed to be an assessment of the amount of BRR the Council would receive that year. During a detailed discussion, the following points were raised by some Members:

- disappointment at the way the Government was conducting business. However, all the available information had been presented to the Committee in a very short period of time. It was noted that the Council would not be in a worse position if it accepted the multi-year settlement with a caveat reflecting that. It would therefore be remiss to the people of Cambridgeshire if the Council did not commit to this position which provided a degree of certainty.

- disappointment at the timescale for responding to DCLG who had only extended its deadline by two days. One Member commented that the way central government was behaving gave Councillors no faith whatsoever in the reliability of its promise that the Council would not be in a worse position. There was concern that the Council was being asked to agree a four-year settlement on information it did not have and in relation to the BRR it was being asked, based on no information, to take this on trust.

- welcomed multi-year agreements. However one Member suggested that what the Government was trying to do ran contrary to this approach. The Chairman reminded the Committee that the Government Settlement had made clear the forecasts for 2017/18 and 2018/19; the forecasts for 2019/20 onwards had always been assumptions.

- expressed concern that the Council could have to give £7.1m of its BRR contribution to central government therefore giving it a negative RSG in 2019/20. One Member reminded the Committee that the Government had stated that the Council would not be worse off if it accepted the multi-year settlement but it could be less for those authorities which preferred not to have a four year settlement as they would be subject to a yearly negotiating process. The Chairman added that these Councils could be excluded from any distribution formula and might also have to share any future funding cuts to local government.

- expressed concern that the Council was being asked to accept the multi-year settlement without any mitigation. One Member stressed the need to sort out the BRR pilot first. The Chairman reminded the Committee that the Council was part of the pilot and was currently receiving additional funding. He commented that it was difficult to get a BRR figure for the whole country as everyone had a different idea of what constituted a needs assessment.

- queried whether the Government would be reducing its control over Council Tax. The Chairman explained that there was no proposed changed to government policy on Council Tax. The Chief Finance Officer (CFO) added that there was no plan to remove the Council Tax Regulations.

- queried whether the Council could trust the Government to ensure it was not worse off than had it not accepted the settlement. One Member commented that Cambridgeshire already suffered under the settlement process. He confirmed that he could not support a process which might undermine Cambridgeshire's position even further. He reported that there was no evidence that Cambridgeshire would benefit as part of BRR as it was possible funding would be channelled towards depressed local authorities. The Chairman explained that he was not planning for a hopeful settlement in year four but wanted the certainty that the Council would not be worse off.

- queried whether there was reasons to believe that the Government would accept the Council's caveat in Option 2 that it cannot be worse off than had it not accepted the settlement. It was noted that although it was the Government's stated position, there had been no definitive evidence provided such as Regulations for example. One Member suggested that the statement in 3.3 undermined the Government's position.

- queried whether the Council could mount a legal challenge to the Government's proposal to take £7.1m in 2019/20. The Chairman reported that he had checked with the LGSS Director of Law and Governance who had confirmed that a challenge could not be mounted.

- queried how many local authorities had accepted the multi-year settlement. The CFO believed that over 80% had accepted which was based on the Local Government Association Survey taken before the new information from Government. The Chairman reported that he had made contact with 14 upper tier/unitary authorities and all had accepted except for Surrey. The CFO reported of the 15 authorities receiving negative RSG in 2019/20 only Surrey and Lancashire had rejected the settlement.

- queried whether the Committee could constitutionally make a decision given the timing of the additional information. It was noted that the first meeting had been published according to the statutory timescales. The Committee had decided to adjourn this meeting to enable it to receive a briefing note to help it make a decision in relation to this item. The date of the reconvened meeting had been published on the Council's website. The Committee could therefore make a decision at the reconvened meeting. One Member felt that the decision should actually be taken by full Council.

Councillor Jenkins proposed an amendment detailed below, seconded by Councillor Walsh:

Additional recommendation

> refuse the multi-year settlement but argue the case that Cambridgeshire should not be disproportionately hit by funding reductions because of its current underfunding and its role as an engine of economic growth.

The Chief Finance Officer in acknowledging the Committee's frustration advised in his professional capacity as Section 151 officer that the Committee should accept the multi-year settlement with the caveat to the submission that the Council cannot be worse off than had it not accepted the settlement. He was of the view that the Council would be in a better position to secure funding in the future. Although a negative RSG was unpalatable, the Council would be able to draw from BRR pooling.

One Member suggested that Option 1 - accept the multi-year settlement as it was currently offered could mean the Council losing £7.1m whilst Option 4 refuse the multi-year settlement could mean the Council losing zero funding. The Chairman explained that whilst Members proposing to refuse the four-year settlement (Option 4) did so because they were worried about what might or might not happen in 2019/20. Pursuing Option 4 potentially risked the £15m the Council was expecting to receive for next year's budget. In summarising the situation, the Chairman suggested the Committee needed to consider carefully the impact on the £15.3m settlement for 2017/18 in both scenarios, noting that if the four year deal was accepted it would be forthcoming, but if the four year deal was rejected the £15.3m could be at risk and urged the Committee to listen to the independent advice of the S151 officer.

Before putting the recommendation to the vote, as permitted under Part 4 - Rules of Procedure, Part 4.4 - Committee and Sub-Committee Meetings, Section 18 Voting of the Council's Constitution, the majority of members of the committee requested a recorded vote. The amendment on being put to the vote was carried.

[Councillors Bullen, Cearns, Dent, Jenkins, Mason, Nethsingha, Reeve, Walsh and Whitehead voted in favour; Councillors Bailey, Bates, D Brown, Count, Criswell, Hickford, Orgee, Schumann voted against]

The Committee raised issues in relation to the rest of the report as follows:

- the need for the Council to access as much as possible of the nationwide pool resulting from the Apprenticeship Levy. The Chairman asked officers to work up a proposal to increase the amount to be accessed so that it at least balanced out the funding the Council was paying as part of the levy. **Action Required.**

- requested information regarding the savings identified for the Total Transport project on page 139. **Action Required.**

- the need for further organisational structure review to reflect crossing cutting outcomes.

- the need to increase Council Tax was proposed by one Member and opposed by another Member of the Committee.

With the agreement of the Council, the Committee withdraw recommendation c) which had already been agreed at a previous meeting and replaced it with the amendment agreed at the meeting.

It was resolved to:

a) note the overview and context provided for the 2017/18 to 2021/22 Business Plan revenue proposals for the Service.

b) comment on the draft revenue savings proposals that were within the remit of the General Purposes Committee for 2017/18 to 2021/22.

c) refuse the multi-year settlement but argue the case that Cambridgeshire should not be disproportionately hit by funding reductions because of its current underfunding and its role as an engine of economic growth.

Chairman