

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE



Date: Tuesday, 24 January 2017

Democratic and Members' Services
Quentin Baker
LGSS Director: Law and Governance

10:00hr

Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge
CB3 0AP

Kreis Viersen Room
Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge, CB3 0AP

AGENDA

Open to Public and Press

CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

- 1 **Apologies for absence and declarations of interest**
Guidance on declaring interests is available at
<http://tinyurl.com/ccc-dec-of-interests>
- 2 **Minutes - 10th January 2017 and Action Log** **5 - 12**
- 3 **Petitions**

KEY DECISIONS

- 4 **Insurance Procurement 2017 – Delegation of Authority To Let Contract** **13 - 18**

OTHER DECISIONS

5	Business Plan 2017-18	19 - 32
6	General Purposes Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies, Partnership Liaison and Advisory Groups, and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels	33 - 44

The General Purposes Committee comprises the following members:

Councillor Steve Count (Chairman) Councillor Roger Hickford (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Anna Bailey Councillor Ian Bates Councillor David Brown Councillor Paul Bullen
Councillor Edward Cearnns Councillor Steve Criswell Councillor Adrian Dent Councillor John
Hipkin Councillor David Jenkins Councillor Mac McGuire Councillor Lucy Nethsingha
Councillor Tony Orgee Councillor Peter Reeve Councillor Ashley Walsh and Councillor Joan
Whitehead

For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact

Clerk Name: Michelle Rowe

Clerk Telephone: 01223 699180

Clerk Email: michelle.rowe@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

The County Council is committed to open government and members of the public are welcome to attend Committee meetings. It supports the principle of transparency and encourages filming, recording and taking photographs at meetings that are open to the public. It also welcomes the use of social networking and micro-blogging websites (such as Twitter and Facebook) to communicate with people about what is happening, as it happens. These arrangements operate in accordance with a protocol agreed by the Chairman of the Council and political Group Leaders which can be accessed via the following link or made available on request: <http://tinyurl.com/ccf-film-record>.

Public speaking on the agenda items above is encouraged. Speakers must register their intention to speak by contacting the Democratic Services Officer no later than 12.00 noon

three working days before the meeting. Full details of arrangements for public speaking are set out in Part 4, Part 4.4 of the Council's Constitution <http://tinyurl.com/cambs-constitution>.

The Council does not guarantee the provision of car parking on the Shire Hall site and you will need to use nearby public car parks <http://tinyurl.com/cac-carpark> or public transport

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 10th January 2017

Time: 10.00a.m. – 11.50a.m.

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

Apologies: Councillors Bates, D Brown and Cearns

299. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

300. MINUTES – 20TH DECEMBER 2016 AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 20th December 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the inclusion of Councillor Walsh in the list of apologies. The Action Log was noted.

301. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

302. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – NOVEMBER 2016

The Committee was presented with the November 2016 Finance and Performance report for Corporate Services and LGSS Cambridge Office. A year-end overspend on revenue of £636k was being forecast, which was primarily due to the overspend on the Corporate Redundancies budget. The Committee would be asked to consider a possible policy change to manage these costs at its next meeting. The IT Managed budget remained in line with projections.

One Member queried how the improved rates of collection of debt would contribute to the overall picture, as detailed on page 29. The Chief Finance Officer (CFO) explained that this reflected cash flow, which would return to revenue, as well as amounts written off.

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

303. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30TH NOVEMBER 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 £1.8m which was the same net position as last

month. Although there had been a slight improvement in the position of Children, Families and Adults (CFA), there had been an increase in pressure on the Looked After Children (LAC) budget over Christmas.

One Member queried whether the overall outturn £1.8m overspend included the £3m for LAC. The CFO confirmed that the £3m was included in the overall £1.8m overspend figure. The Chairman added that £3m had been found throughout the organisation for this year's budget and there would need to be an increase of £3m in next year's budget. Given the recent speech by the Prime Minister on mental health, one Member drew attention to the underspend of £250k in Older People and Mental Health – Shorter Term Support and Maximising Independent and asked for assurances that this did not reflect a shortfall in services. The Chairman was happy to give this assurance.

The Chairwoman of Children and Young People Committee (CYPC) drew attention to the performance of Secondary, Primary and Special Schools in relation to those schools judged good or outstanding by Ofsted. Together with the Chairman, she was particularly pleased to see the improvement in Secondary Schools from just over 50% to 66.3%. It was hoped that this performance would continue to improve.

The Chairman continued to express concern regarding the way the media attributed blame in relation to Delayed Transfers of Care. There had been a significant improvement in the County Council's performance and it was not solely to blame for this issue. He drew attention to the fact that a Government report had identified a small number of hospitals where this was a problem. Other Members commented on the complex nature of this issue and the need to work constructively with and support the Council's partners. The Council had a good working relationship with its partners which involved quarterly liaison meetings with the Health Committee. The Chairman recognised the work of partners but highlighted the need to get the media balance right. The CFO agreed to work with the External Communications Manager and Service Directors to address this issue. **Action Required.**

The Chairman drew attention to the forecast year-end overspend of £1.8m and how this would impact on the production of a balanced budget for 2017/18. The CFO reminded the Committee that there was likely to be more movement before the end of the financial year. It was important to note that the Council was better placed than last year. He explained that the Committee would receive a report at its next meeting detailing an approach to capitalisation and flexibilities in the system which could help to reduce the overspend.

It was resolved unanimously to:

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

304. 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. The Chairman reported that the Community Impact Assessments for this item were

incorrect. The correct version was circulated to Members and published on the web. This also meant that Appendix B for the Business Planning Overview item was incorrect. In considering the report, some Members commented on the requests as follows:

a) Enhanced Response Service – Falls and Telecare

- welcomed the proposal which would provide peace of mind as part of an integrated pathway.
- queried who would respond if someone had a fall. It was noted that the Reablement Team would be the first point of call. Telecare would send an ambulance if it was a medical emergency. The Joint Emergency Team would attend if it was a medical emergency which did not require hospital treatment.
- highlighted the need to extend this proposal beyond people with a community alarm. The proposal was based on the number of ambulance call outs made by telecare users which were not needed; this totalled 4,500 calls. It was acknowledged that there was greater demand for this service. Conversations were taking place with the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service to respond to falls.
- queried the way the return on investment had been reflected on page 73. There was no investment shown for 2018/19 onwards. The CFO was asked to review whether an ongoing investment should be shown which would deliver a bigger saving. **Action Required.** It was also queried why there were no savings shown for 2016/17 and 2017/18. The CFO reported that a prudent approach had been taken as savings over and above investment were difficult to predict. The Chairman asked the CFO to review the savings position for 2017/18 to see whether more clarity or earlier savings could be achieved. **Action Required.** The CFO commented that the figures were presented in such a way to differentiate between business as usual.
- queried why the possible partnership with the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service was not included in the report. It was noted that discussions were still taking place with the Fire and Rescue Service about the potential for it to get involved.
- queried whether a clinician would be involved in responding to calls. It was noted that there would be no involvement from a clinician. The Service was currently working with Public Health and the Ambulance Service to develop a series of set questions for call handlers to ensure that nothing serious was missed. One Member raised concern about corporate responsibility if a call handler missed a condition which needed a medical response. It was noted that unless the call was clearly an emergency, the response times for an ambulance and the Reablement Team were likely to be the same. However, it was noted that the Ambulance Service would be able to react immediately if the call turned out to be a medical emergency. The Chairman asked the service to identify this as a risk on its risk register and monitor accordingly. **Action Required.**

- highlighted the need for there to be no silo mentality between the North and South Teams if there was a capacity issue.
 - highlighted the fact that there would be savings for both the NHS and Ambulance Trust. The Chairman queried the contributions being made by these partners. It was noted that the Clinical Commissioning Group was preparing a business case which would take 3 to 6 months about funding the involvement of the Fire and Rescue Service from the savings achieved by the Ambulance Service. The Chairman asked the Chief Executive to raise this as an issue at Public Service Board. **Action Required.**
- b) 'No Wrong Door' hub model to improve outcomes for children on the edge of care, looked after and care leavers**
- acknowledged that the proposal should go ahead but suggested that the report did not make clear the current situation and how the proposal would improve it. The Interim Service Director explained that there were a range of groups working separately with young people which made it difficult to respond to pressures. A more reactive service which would provide a known child or young person with a rapid response was needed. The Committee noted examples which included supporting Foster Carers to help children or young people with attachment disorder, which would encourage them to keep foster caring.
 - queried whether it would be a 24hour service. The Interim Service Director confirmed that it would be a flexible clock. She drew attention to an example where a key worker might sit with a child or young person who was wrecking his/her home at 10.00p.m. The proposal was about getting the whole network together via an active responsive service to secure the child or young person. It was noted that this proposal was aimed at the most challenging children and young people.
 - queried whether this was the best proposal. The Interim Service Director explained that the Council was using the best research evidence to respond quickly.
 - highlighted the fact that one of the measures of success was keeping adolescents at home. One Member raised the fact that keeping adolescents in families could be a source of many problems for children and young people. He suggested that it was not necessarily a good measure. The Interim Service Director acknowledged the point raised but commented that removing adolescents from families had a worse impact on outcomes. She explained that there was a balance. Removing very small children was likely to see improved outcomes but evidence showed that removing adolescents usually resulted in poorer outcomes and a decrease in wellbeing. The Service therefore had to make it as good as possible for these children and young people.
 - queried how the care hub process would operate. The hub would provide a place for young people to stay in order to keep families together. It would work with young people and families to reintegrate the young person back into the family. It

was acknowledged that the complete role of the hub still needed to be defined. There was also a need to identify a hub in the south of the county.

- queried how the Council managed children and young people who could be in a dangerous situation. It was noted that the Council performed well in relation to child protection. It currently had 48 children per 10,000 in the system. There were 645 LAC of which 581 were not unaccompanied asylum seeking children; this put the Council mid table in the region after being low three years ago. The Interim Service Director reported that she was chair of the Threshold Panel which met fortnightly and was attended by legal. She added that financial considerations were not part of the threshold process. She explained that it was very rare to see any inappropriate cases. Child Protection Plans were reviewed after nine months which was a legal process. It was important that children and young people did not remain in abusive situations but in relation to outcomes it was important to note that there were usually best brought up by their families.
- queried the return on investment. It was noted that funding would be needed to pump prime the proposal. It would then become part of the Service's sustainability plan.
- welcomed the proposal to train staff to provide a fostering system in order to achieve greater flexibility. One Member acknowledged the detrimental effect of removing older teenagers from families. He was of the view that the proposal would achieve better outcomes and save money.
- highlighted the importance of working on communication skills and building in a different way to manage crises. One Member suggested that these families might need to go through the Troubled Families Programme. In response, it was noted that the families covered by this proposal had already gone through this programme.
- highlighted the need to change the name 'No Wrong Door' as this approach was already used to manage crises. The name needed to reflect that someone would be there readily available at the point of need.
- queried the contribution being made by partners who would benefit from this proposal. It was noted that the Police, Health and Housing were contributing financially or in kind. It was requested that partner organisations savings should be tracked on all proposals as well as the Council's, regardless of whether they had contributed. The Chairman asked to also be kept informed of partner contributions to transformation proposals. **Action Required.**
- queried the sample size on which the figure of 86% of adolescents remained at home. It was noted that it was based on 30 to 40 adolescents. The sample size figure was likely to be similar for Cambridgeshire. The Chairman acknowledged the risk associated with this proposal given the small sample size.

It was resolved unanimously to approve the following business cases and associated investment from the Transformation Fund, and recommend their inclusion in the Business Planning Tables:

- b) Enhanced Response Service – Falls and Telecare
- c) 'No Wrong Door' hub model to improve outcomes for children on the edge of care, looked after and care leavers.

305. LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT 2017-18

The Committee was provided with an update on the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement. Members were reminded that they had received a briefing paper before Christmas. It was noted that the final 2017-18 settlement would be confirmed later in January. The Revenue Support Grant was as set out in the Business Plan. There were a couple of exceptions relating to the New Homes Bonus which was less than expected but the amount recycled to Adult Social Care was in excess of expectation. Although the changes had benefitted the County Council, it was important to note that overall the county itself was receiving less resources. The CFO offered to circulate a note prepared for Group Leaders to the Committee. **Action Required.** The Council was still awaiting the announcement of several revenue grants including the Better Care Fund. The provisional announcement was expected week beginning 9 January with the final announcement expected in late January/early February.

Members made the following comments in relation to the report:

- noted that there was unlikely to be a significant variance in the forecast Improved Better Care Fund for the next two years.
- highlighted the fact that the frontloading of the Adult Social Care (ASC) precept detailed in section 2.7 was counter intuitive. The Chairman drew attention to the table at the end of the action log which showed that impact of different rates of increase in ASC precept.
- queried whether the Council was protesting at the level of cuts it was sustaining. The CFO reported that the Council had responded in a non-political way to a number of issues, which included as part of the LGSS family and as a single authority. He agreed to circulate these responses. **Action Required.** The Chairman raised the need to lobby Government to make sure the Council was represented well in relation to the new needs assessment formula for the distribution of business rates. It was important to remember that the Council was part of a business rate retention pilot which had made available £4m extra funding to those authorities taking part. It was noted that the Local Government Association was protesting. An independent Councillor had also started a petition to ask the Government to reduce foreign aid to use it to fund social care.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- Note the impact of the provisional local government finance settlement on the Council's Business Plan.

306. OVERVIEW OF BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS

The Committee received an update on the Business Planning Process. In its co-ordinating role, it was asked to comment on any of the business planning activity which had been discussed and approved by Service Committees. Members were reminded that the Business Plan was based on a 0% general Council Tax increase and a 2% increase in ASC precept. The CFO reported that there was an unbalanced budget position at the moment but with potential options to achieve a balanced position, which would be presented to the next meeting. Full Council had a statutory responsibility to set a balanced budget. The CFO apologised for the wording in Appendix C which was misleading as the positives and negatives were the wrong way round. The Chairman commented that the next report would reflect the latest outturn position.

The Chairwoman of CYPC raised the need for a narrative to identify all the changes easily and the impact of reductions in budget on services. The CFO explained that the Community Impact Assessments detailed the impact of budget reductions on services.

The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group reported that she would be bringing alternative budget proposals to the next meeting on 24 January. She raised the importance of all Members understanding the implications of budget cuts. She highlighted two particular areas relating to the Learning Directorate, which included the support available for struggling schools and central support for the Cambridgeshire Race and Diversity Service.

The CFO reminded the Committee that there was a protocol for debating the Council's proposed Business Plan. Due to the complexity of the Business Plan and the need for financial compliance this Protocol varied the Standing Orders in relation to amendments. Any significant amendments to the Business Plan had to be submitted to the Section 151 Officer, and the Democratic Services Manager, at least five working days before the date of Full Council in order to enable the Section 151 Officer to confirm whether the proposed amendments would result in a lawful budget. Any minor amendments must be submitted to the officers above at least one working day before the date of Full Council. The Chairman urged all Groups to submit amendments to General Purposes Committee first if they wished them to have credibility.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) comment on the Business Planning proposals that had been considered by Service Committees; and
- b) note the remaining milestones in the Business Planning Process.

307. CHANGES TO ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL AUDITORS COMMITTEES

The Committee received a report summarising the changes to the arrangements for appointing external Auditors following the closure of the Audit Commission and the end of the transitional arrangements at the conclusion of the 2017/18 audit of the accounts.

The CFO reported that the Council could save between 10 to 20% of the fee of £120k if it entered into a partnership arrangement with its LGSS partners.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) endorse for Full Council approval the decision to opt-in to the sector led body (Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA)) for the national procurement of external auditors and ultimately the Council's external auditors from 2018/19; and
- b) ask Officers to write to the PSAA and request to meet with the Chief Officer at PSAA to seek assurance that a single auditor be appointed for the LGSS Partners setting out the clear rationale in terms of the efficiency and value for money that this would achieve.

308. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER UPDATE

The Committee received a report detailing the current status of corporate risk. In discussing the report, Members raised the need to add sufficient before "funding" to Risk 9: Failure to Secure Funding for Infrastructure. There was also a need to include the City Deal as part of this risk. In response to a query from the Chairman, the Director of Customer Service & Transformation reported that the failure to sign up to a multi-year settlement had increased the Council's risk.

It was resolved unanimously to note the position in respect of corporate risk.

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

The Committee considered its agenda plan and training plan.

It was resolved unanimously to:

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

Chairman

INSURANCE PROCUREMENT 2017 –
DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO LET CONTRACT

To: **General Purposes Committee**

Date: **24th January 2017**

From: **Chief Finance Officer**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **2017/011** *Key decision:* **Yes**

Purpose: **To seek approval for the delegation of authority for the letting of insurance contracts, likely to be valued in excess of £1m per annum and to run for a minimum of 36 months, to the Council's Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with Chairman of General Purposes Committee.**

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

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Chris Malyon
Post:	Chief Finance Officer
Email:	chris.malyon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 699796

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Existing contracts of insurance held by the Council expire on 30th September 2017, it is proposed that an EU compliant tender process is undertaken to procure contracts of insurance to replace existing arrangements.
- 1.2 Current insurance arrangements are aligned with other LGSS partner and client Councils, therefore a joint procurement exercise is being prepared which will look as far as possible to align insurance protection and contracts in order to achieve cost and contract management efficiencies.
- 1.3 The Council currently spends approximately £1m per annum on insurance cover from external insurance providers. In common with many of its peers the Council insures the majority of its risks in a traditional manner with relatively high self insured retention levels. Self insured retentions are catered for within the Council's insurance funding provision.
- 1.4 Ahead of the tender specification being issued we will review the Council's tolerance to financial risk, the level at which it buys insurance and what insurances it buys. As a result of this work, with the support of the Council's appointed insurance brokers, we will design an optimised insurance programme which will serve, in the medium to long term, to reduce the overall total cost of insurable risk. It follows therefore that the Council is unlikely to procure insurance on a like for like basis to that it currently holds.
- 1.5 The Council's appointed brokers will lead the procurement exercise with the support of LGSS Procurement to undertake a fully compliant marketing exercise engaging as many leading insurers as possible. The tender will be issued to the market in February 2017 with responses due April 2017 for assessment and decision by July 2017. The new contracts of insurance will commence on 1st October 2017.
- 1.6 It is essential that the Council has in place a robust programme for protection against the financial exposure to insurable risks, alternative programme and design structures will be considered and the final structure will be agreed by Insurance in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer.
- 1.7 Due to the timing of the tender process it is efficient for authority to be delegated to the Chief Finance Officer, to be exercised in consultation with the Chairman of General Purposes Committee.

2. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1 Market intelligence suggests that insurers are being more selective about the risks they insure and the level of premium they apply to insurance arrangements. We are seeing a position where insurers are looking to adjust their rates particularly in respect of education, highways and social care risks, therefore the general indication would be toward an increase in current premium levels or a significant increase in self-insurance.
- 2.2 The Council's renewal premium for 2016 was £1,064k. In assessing the cost for the next few years no account has been taken of the changing size and

shape of the Council, i.e. projected figures contain an element of uncertainty as they only reflect the 2016 position in terms of asset holding, employee costs and service provision.

- 2.3 The projected future insurance premiums, based on current programme structures are shown in the table below for reference.

	Previous Year*	Current Year*	Forecast	
	2015	2016	2017	2018
	£000	£000	£000	£000
External premium	986	1,064	1,127	1,249

* Figures relate to Insurance year rather than Financial year (i.e. October to September)

3. WAYS OF WORKING

- 3.1 By undertaking a full review of insurance needs we will run the procurement on a joint basis with the Northamptonshire, Milton Keynes and Northampton Borough programmes, this will bring out procurement and administrative efficiencies. We shall identify the potential for sharing joint insurance policies with Northamptonshire County Council, Milton Keynes Council and other LGSS clients where appropriate to provide a more efficient delivery model without unduly exposing any one organisation to increased risk or uncertainty.
- 3.2 By tendering the insurance needs for both Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire, Milton Keynes and other LGSS clients at the same time the insurance market may be more receptive to offering up some rate reductions, assisting in the delivery of a best value outcome.

4. ALIGNMENT WITH PRIORITIES AND WAYS OF WORKING

4.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications for this priority.

5. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Resource and Performance Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The financial implications arising out of this procurement are set out in 2, above.

5.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

Statutory, risk and legal implications have been considered. It is worthy of note that the Council is only obliged to insure fidelity guarantee risks. All other risks are subject to the availability of an exemption due to the status of the Council. The Council however chooses through risk management and financial prudence to retain insurance for liability, property and motor vehicle exposures.

The key risks arising from this proposal and the procurement are as follows;

Insurance team fails to oversee robust tender process leading to breach of EU regulations	Process is being managed by the Insurance Manager in consultation with LGSS Procurement and Council appointed insurance brokers to ensure full compliance with contracting regulations
Poor evaluation and decision making result in increased insurance costs over life of contract	Evaluation will be undertaken in consultation with appointed insurance brokers to ensure errors or omissions in bids are identified and final recommendations represent most economically advantageous outcome for the Council. The final recommendations will then be peer reviewed by a Senior Manager from within the brokers who has not been involved in the evaluation to ensure robust decision making.
Poor financial evaluation leads to selection of inappropriate levels of self-insurance leading to higher lifetime costs	Working with appointed actuaries the Insurance Manager is undertaking a review against deductible of the Council's long term claims spend across liability and property risks to ascertain an appropriate level of self-insurance for the Council in the future.

5.3 Equality and Diversity

There are no significant implications within this category.

5.4 Engagement and Communications

There are no significant implications within this category.

5.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement – Service Responsibility

There are no significant implications within this category.

5.6 Public Health – Public Health

There are no significant implications within this category.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Chris Malyon
Has the impact on Statutory, Legal and Risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Are there any Equality and Diversity implications?	No Name of Officer: Not applicable
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	No Name of Officer: Not applicable
Are there any Localism and Local Member involvement issues?	No Name of Officer: Not applicable
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	No Name of Officer: Not applicable

Source Documents	Location
None	Not applicable

BUSINESS PLAN 2017-18

To: **General Purposes Committee**

Date: **24 January 2017**

From: **Chief Finance Officer**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **Not applicable** *Key decision:* **No**

Purpose: **To present the Council's Business Plan covering the period 2017-18 in detail, and 2018-19 through to 2021-22 in outline, for:**

- **Committee consideration,**
- **Committee recommendation (with or without amendment) to Council for approval.**

Recommendations: **It is recommended that the Committee:**

- 1. Considers the Business Plan, including supporting Budget, Community Impact Assessments, Consultation Responses and other material, in the light of all planning activities undertaken to date.**
- 2. Approves the allocation of the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Implementation Grant 2017-18 to Children, Families and Adults (CFA), to ensure that this funding is used as intended by Department for Education (DfE).**
- 3. Notes the recommendations and alternative options for bridging the budget gap for 2017-18 presented to the Committee on 10 January 2017, as set out in the table within paragraph 3.3.**
- 4. Recommend to Council the following:**
 - a. That approval is given to the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan.**
 - b. That approval is given to a total County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £780,393,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.**

- c. That approval is given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £262,235,777.24, as set out in Section 2, Table 6.3 of the Business Plan (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995).
- d. That approval is given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of “Band D” equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (220,287), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% increase in the County Council element of the Council Tax:

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

- e. That approval is given to the report of the Chief Finance Officer on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out within the Section 25 statement.
- f. That approval is given to the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan.
- g. That approval be given to capital expenditure in 2017-18 up to £264.9m arising from:
- Commitments from schemes already approved; and
 - The consequences of new starts in 2017-18 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 6.9 of the Business Plan.
- h. That approval is given to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan, including:
- i. The Council’s policy on the making of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) for the repayment of debt, as required by the Local Authorities (Capital Finance &

**Accounting) (England) (Amendment)
Regulations 2008**

- ii. **The Affordable Borrowing Limit for 2017-18 as required by the Local Government Act 2003)**
 - iii. **The Investment Strategy for 2017-18 as required by the Communities and Local Government (CLG) revised Guidance on Local Government Investments issued in 2010, and the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.**
- 5. Endorse the priorities and opportunities as set out in the Strategic Framework**
- 6. Authorise the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the Business Plan, including the foregoing recommendations 4a to 4i to the County Council, so as to take into account any changes deemed appropriate, including updated information on District Council Tax Base and Collection Funds, Business Rates forecasts and Collection Funds and any grant changes.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Chris Malyon
Post:	Chief Finance Officer
Email:	chris.malyon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 699796

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 It is a statutory requirement under the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for the Council to set a balanced budget “before 11 March in the financial year preceding that for which it is set”. In doing so, the Council undertakes financial planning covering a five year timescale that creates links with its longer term financial modelling and planning for the growth in demand for services. The budgets set out in this report are relatively robust for 2017-18 given the information the Council has available at this point, but they also suggest likely budget figures for 2018-19 and for the three years after this.
- 1.2 The Business Plan forecasts become more difficult to project with the passage of time and are therefore updated annually to reflect more accurate information as it becomes available. In recent years, inflation and interest has been relatively stable and therefore those elements of the cost base have been reasonably straight forward to project. However, demand for services has been far less stable, particularly when coupled with projecting the impact of service transformation on demand-led services.
- 1.3 This paper is designed to take General Purposes Committee (GPC) through the key issues contained within the Business Plan prior to formal recommendation by GPC for Council decision in February. The accompanying draft Business Plan will be circulated separately to this paper and will not be re-issued in full prior to Council on 14th February.

2. UPDATE ON BUSINESS PLAN PROPOSALS AND FUNDING

- 2.1 There have been some amendments to the draft revenue proposals since the last update to GPC on 10 January 2017. The changes are shown in the table below. Negative figures improve the position, positive figures worsen the position.

Reference	Title	2017-18 £'000	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	2020-21 £'000	2021-22 £'000
Savings to find as per 10 January 2017		4,510	1,692	10,656	12,187	9,879
A/R.4.020	Learning Disability	-200	-	-	-	-
A/R.4.022	Ongoing underspends redistribution and rebaselining	200	-	-	-	-
A/R.6.245	Cambridgeshire Race, Equality and Diversity Service (CREDs)	600	-	-	-	-
A/R.7.106	Reduction in income de-delegated from Schools to CREDs	-600	-	-	-	-
C/R.6.107	Capitalisation of redundancies	-1,000	-	1,000	-	-
G/R.6.004	Capitalisation of interest on borrowing	-2,098	-161	310	1,215	-22
Revised savings to find		1,412	1,531	11,966	13,402	9,857

2.2 The supporting narrative for these changes is given below:

- **Capitalisation of redundancies** – The Flexible Use of Capital Receipts direction allows qualifying expenditure to be funded from capital receipts received in that year. Qualifying expenditure is expenditure on any project that is designed to generate ongoing revenue savings in the delivery of public services and/or transform service delivery to reduce costs or demand for services in future years for any of the public sector delivery partners. Within this definition, it is for individual local authorities to decide whether or not a project qualifies for the flexibility. As the Council's redundancy costs will be a direct result of transformation, this is deemed to qualify.
- **Capitalisation of interest on borrowing** – The Council is looking to amend its accounting policy in 2017-18 to include the capitalisation of the cost of borrowing within all schemes until the point at which they become operational. Although the capitalised interest will initially be held on a Service basis within the Capital Programme, the funding will ultimately be moved to the appropriate schemes each year once exact figures have been calculated. This approach is permissible under the capital finance regulations that govern the framework within which local authorities operate.

2.3 Included in the savings gap above are a number of proposals which were rejected by Service Committees during the development of the Business Plan:

	2017-18 £000
B/R.6.106 – Remove Transport & Infrastructure Policy & Funding services that are not self-funding	20
B/R.6.107 – Remove Transport & Infrastructure Policy & Funding services that are not self-funding	30
B/R.6.104 – Reduction in Passenger Transport support	694
B/R.6.105 – Reduce staff following reduction in provision of passenger transport services	90
B/R.6.210 – Reduce Community Resilience and Development delivery work	85
B/R.6.215 – Reduce service levels in Archives	75
B/R.6.214 – Remove community grants	15
Total	1,009

All rejected proposals only had an impact in 2017-18.

2.4 The two corresponding capital schemes in relation to the Capitalisation of redundancies and the Capitalisation of Interest have also been included within the Capital Programme. These are the only changes to the Capital Programme since GPC on 10 January 2017.

3. BRIDGING THE BUDGET GAP

3.1 Since we commenced the process of reviewing the 2017-18 Business Planning process the Council has had a budgetary gap for each financial year of the Plan. Significant work has been undertaken to review all proposals within the Plan and validate projected savings against actual deliverability. As a consequence some savings have been scaled back and new savings have been identified. Some

proposals, whilst deliverable, have been removed by Members as described in paragraph 2.3.

- 3.2 As notified to GPC on 10 January 2017, the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement published in December 2016 announced the Adult Social Care (ASC) Support Grant for 2017-18, resulting in an increase in funding compared to that budgeted of £714k. This is included in the budget figures provided throughout this report. Also announced through the settlement was the additional flexibility for social care authorities in levying the ASC precept, affording councils the option to 'front-load' the levy. The budget figures provided and the Business Plan as a whole is predicated on the assumption that the Council will not take advantage of this 'front-loading' and therefore will levy an increase in ASC precept of 2% and no increase in general Council Tax.
- 3.3 The options that can be provided, at this point, to bridge the gap of £1.4m and balance the budget are accounting/tax raising adjustments which fundamentally do not reduce the operating costs of the Council. These opportunities are set out in the table below and will enable each political group to consider alternative budget proposals.

	Opportunity	2017-18 Budget £m	Advantages	Disadvantages
1	Increase ASC precept to 3% for 2017-18 and 2018-19	2.5	Would ensure that the revenue is raised early. Would also provide opportunity for some additional investment.	Would marginally raise less than a 2% increase for each of the next three years. Additional revenue would need to be utilised for the delivery of ASC.
2	Increase general Council Tax by 2%	5.0	Would increase the cash value of future tax and ASC precepts. Would also provide opportunity for some additional investment.	Contrary to the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) agreed by Council in October 2016.
3	Use of funding released by change in Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy to balance budget deficit	1.4	Easily deliverable.	Does not improve overall position of the Council's finances (as this is one-off funding) and reduces the scope to fund future years' transformation investments.
4	Re-instatement of the deliverable savings removed by service committees (does not include Council decisions)	1.0	Service savings are deliverable	Service committees have stated the proposals are too unpalatable. This option alone would not be sufficient to bridge the gap.
5	Use of the General Reserve	1.4	Easily deliverable.	Does not improve overall position of the Council's finances (as this is one-off funding). Short term solution as the sum would need to be replaced in 2018-19. Increased risk given the growing pressures of delivering a balanced outturn.

The amount of MRP funding shown in option 3 within this table represents that required to set a balanced budget. Members should note that the total MRP funding amount for 2017-18 not taken to the revenue account is £8.6m, but this reduces every year by around £0.6m.

- 3.4 The Chief Finance Officer's recommendation is option 3 – use of MRP funding. The impact of this on the budget over the period of the MTFS is shown in the table below:

	2017-18 £'000	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	2020-21 £'000	2021-22 £'000
Savings to find	-	2,943	11,966	13,402	9,857

4. STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

- 4.1 The Strategic Framework sets out the Council's vision and high level priorities for the Business Plan period. Included within the Strategic Framework is detail around how the organisation intends to achieve its strategic aims, as well as the measures it will use to assess performance.
- 4.2 The Strategic Framework reflects the continuation of the Council's move to a new way of business planning. The development of the Council's Transformation Programme is reflected in the Framework, which in particular sets out the outcomes that will guide how the Council plans and operates to ensure that:
- Older people, people with disabilities and those at risk of harm live well independently
 - Children reach their potential in settings and schools
 - Children are safeguarded
 - The Cambridgeshire economy prospers to the benefit of all Cambridgeshire residents
 - People lead a healthy lifestyle and stay healthy for longer
 - The places where people live supports a good quality of life
- 4.3 The Strategic Framework deliberately and consciously recognises that there has been significant progress made in moving to a model of transformation but that there is still a great deal of development needed to fully transform the Council and to fully establish a new business planning process.

5. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

5.1 Budgetary Context

- 5.1.1. Following the vote to leave the European Union (EU) and looming Article 50 negotiations, the forecasts for UK economic growth have been revised down from 2.2% to 1.4% GDP growth per year to 2020-21. It is likely that the sluggish growth in the Eurozone and the slowing of the Chinese economy will also have an impact on domestic growth. Inflation in the UK fell below the government target of 2% for the first time since late 2009, reaching -0.1% in April 2015 as a result of reductions in the price of oil and food. However, Consumer Price Index (CPI) inflation is forecast to rise to 2% in early 2017, then to rise further before peaking at 2.6% in mid-2018. It is still expected that relatively high, and rising, employment levels will

have an inflationary impact in the medium-term. Whilst forecasts take into account some assessment of risk, the uncertain international economic situation, and in particular the decision to leave the EU, could have a significant impact on the UK's position.

- 5.1.2 The Government's economic strategy, reconfirmed by the Chancellor in the Autumn Statement, remains committed to rebalancing the economy through a programme of austerity. However, the aim to return public finances to balance has been deferred to the next Parliament and, in the interim, cyclically-adjusted borrowing should be below 2% by the end of this Parliament instead.
- 5.1.3 The cyclically-adjusted budget deficit was halved during the last Parliament but the rate of reduction is now expected to slow and the latest forecast from the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) expects a deficit to remain until at least 2021-22, following the higher public spending announced in the Autumn Statement. The Government still plans to eliminate the deficit by a mixture of spending and fiscal consolidation. Current estimates indicate that Total Managed Expenditure will be reduced from 40% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2016-17 to 38% of GDP by 2019-20 and remain at that level through to 2021-22.

5.2 Revenue Budget 2017-18

- 5.2.1 For 2017-18, Cambridgeshire will receive £568m of funding, excluding grants retained by its schools but including the new Combined Authority Levy. The key sources of funding are Council Tax, for which an increase of 2% has been assumed (through the ASC precept) and Central Government grants (excluding grants to schools) which see a like for like reduction of 9% compared to 2016-17.
- 5.2.2 Total expenditure is £568m. The costs of the Council have risen primarily through inflationary and demand pressures, especially in respect of Adult Social Care and, increasingly, Children's Social Care.
- 5.2.3 In order to balance the budget in light of these pressures and reduced Government funding, savings of £32m have been required for 2017-18. In developing the proposed savings there has been a focus on the objectives set out in the Council's Strategic Framework.
- 5.2.4 This year the Council has revised its policy for fees and charges which is now supported by Best Practice Guidance, set out as an appendix to Section 2 of the Business Plan. The Council adopts a robust approach to reviews of fees and charges to ensure that it makes a conscious decision not to increase charges rather than this being the default position. The presumption within the MTFS, and therefore the budget allocations, is that fees and charges have been increased in line with inflation. This has enabled service committees to determine charges based on relative service priorities and outcomes. Detailed schedules of fees and charges were reviewed by the relevant service committees during the 2017-18 business planning process:
- CFA schedule of fees and charges ([Appendix 3](#))
 - CS schedule of fees and charges ([Paragraph 5](#))
 - ETE schedule of fees and charges ([Appendix 4 – Statutory](#); [Appendix 5 – Non Statutory](#))

- 5.2.5 For further information on the revenue budget, see sub-sections 4, 5 and 6 of the Budget Strategy (Section 2) within the Business Plan.

6. CAPITAL STRATEGY

- 6.1 Including current commitments, the Council will be spending £855.3m on capital investment in the county over the period of the Business Plan. This is in addition to previous expenditure of £407.1m on some of these schemes, creating a total Capital Programme value of £1.26 billion. For 2017-18, the Council's proposed expenditure on its capital programme is £264.9m. This is financed by a combination of the following funding streams:
- Central Government and external grants (£81.4m);
 - Section 106 and external contributions (£37.1m);
 - Prudential borrowing (£62.5m); and
 - Capital receipts (£83.9m).
- 6.2 Alongside updates to previously agreed schemes, additional investment proposals this year include several new school schemes, capitalisation of Integrated Community Equipment (13m), Citizen First, Digital First (£3.5m), Capitalisation of Transformation Team (£2.6m), Capitalisation of Redundancies (£2m) and Capitalisation of Interest Costs (£9.5m).
- 6.3 The value of Invest to Save or Invest to Earn capital schemes (schemes that pay for themselves over the medium term through revenue savings or increased income generation) has increased this year, primarily due to the Housing Provision schemes. Investing in housing as a commercial developer will be delivered through the Council's wholly owned company. The company was incorporated in 2016 and the first new homes will be delivered by the company in 2017.
- 6.4 An advisory debt charges limit was set by Council early in the 2015-16 business planning process. Despite an increase in the level of borrowing required (excluding changes to Housing schemes), the programme has actually managed to achieve a saving on the debt charges budget when compared to the 2016-17 Business Plan; this budget is now forecast to spend £22.7 million in 2017-18, increasing to £22.9 million by 2021-22. This is as a result of a combination of factors, including; additional slippage on the current Capital Programme, an updated forecast for MRP charges, a change in policy to capitalise interest costs for non-operational schemes, a favourable change to medium-term interest rate forecasts and updates to how the Housing schemes are shown within both the Capital Programme and the debt charges budget.
- 6.5 Although the majority of funding for significant Government capital grants has already been announced for 2017-18, the Council is still expecting DfE announcements regarding Devolved Formula Capital and School Condition Allocations, however these are anticipated to be in line with previous years.

7. ROBUSTNESS OF ESTIMATES AND ADEQUACY OF RESERVES

- 7.1 The Local Government Act 2003 (Section 25) requires that when a local authority is agreeing its annual budget, and precept, the Chief Finance Officer must report to it on the following matters:

- the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of the calculations; and
- the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves.

- 7.2 This statement will be considered in full within the Business Plan papers by Council in February. However, to assist the Committee in being able to recommend a budget to Council an overview of the current position is set out below.
- 7.3 The Council continues to balance rising demands for services through the general growth in population and increasing longevity rates. Over the last twelve months there has been substantial pressure within the Looked After Children area which has created significant pressures on the budget for the year. This shows no sign of abating going in to 2017-18.
- 7.4 A significant amount of work has been undertaken during the year to re-align budgets to more accurately reflect the actual demand for services. This has resulted in some movement in budgets between adults' and children's services. This has also led to some re-assessments of a number of the savings proposals that were included within the base budget for the year that, in hindsight, were undeliverable to the level proposed. As a consequence of this re-baselining there is more confidence in the deliverability of the financial plans as set out in the 2017-18 Business Plan.
- 7.5 Delivering a balanced outturn for 2017-18, however, is not without its challenges. We have seen within the current year that in spite of significant scrutiny and challenge the Council as a whole is likely to have a small overspend by the year end. These challenges will only exacerbate going forward as the Council rightly strips out all contingencies that are built in to the base budget.
- 7.6 As the budget becomes leaner, dealing with exceptions – be these the weather or other non-predictable factors beyond the Council's control – becomes increasingly more difficult to manage within the base budget. In previous years, the Council was able to draw upon substantial departmental reserves to mitigate against financial difficulties in year, which at one point were well in excess of £10m. GPC agreed a change to the policy of having departmental reserves and these reserves will be fully expunged by the end of this financial year. Removing in-built contingencies and departmental reserves should not be seen as negatives, however, as that is the purpose of carrying the General Reserve.
- 7.7 The General Reserve is specifically held to mitigate against any in-year pressures beyond those that have been built into the Business Plan. Four years ago the Council agreed a policy that the General Reserve should be held at no less than 3% of gross non-school spending to cover any such incidents. This currently equates to a figure of £16.3m.
- 7.8 When the Council agreed to increase the General Reserve to 3% of gross non-school expenditure it did so against the backcloth of a risk assessment that reviewed key areas of spend and the likelihood of significant budget variations in those areas. The risks associated with delivery have not diminished and therefore it is the Chief Finance Officer's opinion that the level of the General Reserve should remain at 3%. As a consequence, any known draw on this Reserve that takes it below this threshold should be balanced with a contribution from within the base budget for the following financial year.

- 7.9 Members will be aware that in the current year the projected outturn as set out in the Integrated Resources and Performance Report shows that it is anticipated that there will be an overspend of around £1.8m. Elsewhere in the proposals set out in this report is a proposal to capitalise 2017-18 and 2018-19 redundancy costs that in 2016-17 are currently being charged to revenue. It is permissible under the capital regulations within which local authorities operate to capitalise such expenditure, but to date the Council has not adopted this approach.
- 7.10 Were it to do so for 2017-18, it would be logical to do so for the costs incurred within 2016-17, if sufficient Capital Receipts are available (the Council is predicting to receive over £3m in receipts by the end of the year, however only £0.2m have actually been received to date). As a consequence, this would reduce the projected overspend by around £1.5m and the balance of this overspend then becomes immaterial and can be funded through the residual sums held within office reserves. Therefore, subject to obtaining sufficient Capital Receipts, Council can consider the proposals contained within the Business Plan unfettered by any considerations of having to make a further contribution to the General Reserve.

8. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

- 8.1 The Council is required to approve Prudential Indicators for 2017-18 to 2021-22. These include indicators showing the cost of servicing debt as a percentage of revenue expenditure and the Council's underlying borrowing requirement. Fixed and variable interest rate exposure and the maturity profile of debt are also reported.
- 8.2 An under borrowed position will be maintained throughout 2017-18. This means that borrowing has been reduced through the use of cash balances thereby keeping borrowing costs down. As a result cash balances are generally low and the level of loan debt is lower than it might otherwise be. However loan debt is expected to rise significantly throughout the Business Plan period as a direct result of capital investment.
- 8.3 The Council will continue to prioritise the security and liquidity of capital and achieve an investment return that is commensurate with these priorities. A prudent investment strategy is followed and external advice provides a guide on the creditworthiness of institutions. The majority of the Council's investments are in liquid instruments and shorter term deposits with Money Market Funds and high credit quality banks.

9. COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

- 9.1 The Equality Duty set out in S149 of the Equality Act requires the Council to consciously think about the following three aims as an integral part of developing policy, making decisions, and providing services:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the act
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it
 - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it

- 9.2 The Council takes very seriously the need to be aware of the impact that our policies, decisions, and services have on communities across Cambridgeshire, and the importance of using this information to inform the preparation of the Business Plan. Where relevant, for each of the detailed proposals, services have undertaken a Community Impact Assessment (CIA).
- 9.3 CIAs have been prepared alongside the development of detailed proposals and are published in Section 4 of the Plan.

10. BUDGET CONSULTATION

- 10.1 The Council carries out an extensive consultation process to inform the business planning process. This year's methodology was as follows.
- 10.2 A household survey of approximately 1,300 residents was undertaken, so the results are significant at a County level. The sample was a stratified, random sample – that is to say that participants were randomly selected within the criteria of having a final sample that reflects the age and location structure of the County's population. The survey was competitively tendered and awarded to M-E-L Research, who undertook a public survey to better understand residents' views on Council priorities and a proposed increase to Council Tax. In total 1,327 residents participated in a face-to face interview during the month of September 2016.
- 10.3 As with previous years there was an accompanying digital / on-line consultation with a short animation to explain the Council's budget position. Unlike last year where the on-line survey was the main element of our consultation, this year the approach was very much to see this as an additional activity. The on-line survey was made available on the Council's website and supported by a short animated video. The links to the survey and video were then promoted on the front page of the Council's website, via mailing lists to organisations such as parish councils, and via Facebook. A total of 201 people responded to the survey.
- 10.4 Officers took the opportunity to attend community events during the consultation timescale (September 2016) to talk to the public in detail about the budget options and the challenges faced by the organisation. Council Members and officers talked with well over 350 people (some interviewed as part of groups) at five separate events around the County. 342 people were able to indicate the level of Council Tax increase that they would be happy with. This choice was made after people were shown information about the Council's budget challenge and the current costs of services. The interviewers asked people why they were making their particular choice and which services were particularly valued.
- 10.5 The results of this consultation activity were reported to GPC in November 2016; the full consultation report is included as Section 5 of the Plan.

11. ALIGNMENT WITH PRIORITIES AND WAYS OF WORKING

- 11.1 The Business Plan's purpose is to consider and review the Authority's vision and priorities therefore no additional comments are made here.

12. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 Resource Implications

This report outlines the overall resource position for the Council over the business planning cycle 2017-22.

12.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

Business planning proposals will inevitably carry statutory, risk and legal implications. These are addressed alongside each proposal where appropriate, and also in more detail at service committee meetings. More generally, it is recognised that the Council requires significant transformation of its services, in collaboration with partners, in order to meet the challenges ahead. There is significant risk if that transformation is not achieved.

Effective risk management is a fundamental requirement for the treasury management function, and this theme runs clearly throughout the Treasury Management in Public Services: Code of Practice and Cross-Sectorial Guidance Notes. The Council's Treasury Management Policy, Treasury Management Practices (TMPs) and Schedules, and Treasury Management Strategy for 2017-18 outline the ways in which treasury management risk will be determined, managed and controlled.

The Council is obliged to carry out its treasury management activities in line with statutory requirements and associated regulations and professional guidance.

12.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

Community Impact Assessments have been completed for the proposals considered in this report, and are attached as appendices.

12.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

Significant consultation has been taken out as part of the Business Planning Process. This is highlighted within section 9 of this report.

12.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

Business Planning Proposals have been developed with significant Member involvement and consideration of the implications for localism.

12.6 Public Health Implications

These are dealt with specifically in the proposals relating to the Health Committee, and where there are implications for work of other Committees these are highlighted.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Chris Malyon
Has the impact on Statutory, Legal and Risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Fiona McMillan
Are there any Equality and Diversity implications?	Yes Amanda Askham
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Mark Miller
Are there any Localism and Local Member involvement issues?	Yes Mark Miller
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Tess Campbell

Source Documents	Location
The County Council 2016-17 Business Plan	http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20043/finance_and_budget/90/business_plan_2016_to_2017
Consultation Results for the 2017-18 Business Plan	http://tinyurl.com/juhee27

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

Published on 3rd January 2017
As at 16th January 2017



Cambridgeshire
County Council

Notes

Agenda Item No.6

Committee dates shown in bold are confirmed.

Committee dates shown in brackets and italics are reserve dates.

The definition of a key decision is set out in the Council's Constitution in Part 2, Article 12.

* indicates items expected to be recommended for determination by full Council.

+ indicates items expected to be confidential, which would exclude the press and public. Additional information about confidential items is given at the foot of this document.

Draft reports are due with the Democratic Services Officer by 10.00 a.m. eight clear working days before the meeting.

The agenda dispatch date is six clear working days before the meeting.

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Spokes meeting date	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
24/01/17	1. Minutes – 10/01/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		11/01/17	13/01/17
	2. Transformation Strategy/Strategic Framework	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	3. Capital Receipts Strategy (if required)	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	4. Treasury Management Strategy	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	5. Business Plan*	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	6. Tender for insurance cover for the Council	M Greenhall	2017/011			
<i>[28/02/17] Provisional Meeting</i>					15/02/17	17/02/17
21/03/17	1. Minutes – 24/01/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		08/03/17	10/03/17

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Spokes meeting date	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	2. Quarterly Risk Management Report	S Norman	Not applicable			
	3. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (January)	R Bartram	2017/002			
	4. Resources and Performance Report (January) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	5. Treasury Management Report – Quarter 3	M Batty	Not applicable			
	6. Transformation Bids	C Malyon	2017/016			
	7. Community Resilience and Cambridgeshire County Council's Innovation Fund – Monitoring Report	S Ferguson	Not applicable			
	8. Community Hubs	C May	2017/019			
	9. Workforce Strategy*	L Fulcher	Not applicable			
	10. CREATE Project Investment	W Ogle-Welbourn	2017/018			
<i>[25/04/17] Provisional Meeting</i>					25/04/17	13/04/17
06/06/17	1. Minutes – 21/03/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		23/05/17	25/05/17
	2. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (March)	R Bartram	2017/003			
	3. Resources and Performance Report (March) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	4. Treasury Management Report – Quarter 4 and Outturn Report*	M Batty	Not applicable			

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Spokes meeting date	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	5. Assistive Technology in Older People's Care & Assessments – Monitoring Report	C Black	Not applicable			
25/07/17	1. Minutes – 06/06/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		12/07/17	17/07/17
	2. Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the Period Ending 31st March 2017	R Bartram	2017/026			
	3. Integrated Resources and Performance (May)	R Bartram	2017/022			
	4. Resources and Performance Report (May) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	5. Medium Term Financial Strategy	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	6. Capital Strategy	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	7. County Council Consultation Strategy	S Grace	Not applicable			
<i>[22/08/17] Provisional Meeting</i>					09/08/17	11/08/17
19/09/17	1. Minutes – 25/07/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		06/09/17	08/09/17
	2. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (July)	R Bartram	2017/017			
	3. Resources and Performance Report (July) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	4. Treasury Management Report – Quarter 1	M Batty	Not applicable			
	5. Corporate Risk Register	S Norman	Not applicable			

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Spokes meeting date	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	6. Review of actions to target outstanding debt	C Law	Not applicable			
24/10/17	1. Minutes – 19/09/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		11/10/17	13/10/17
	2. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (August)	R Bartram	2017/023			
	3. Resources and Performance Report (August) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	4. Service Committee Review of Draft Revenue Business Planning Proposals for 2018/19 to 2022/2023	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	5. Draft 2018/19 Capital Programme and Capital Prioritisation	C Malyon	Not applicable			
28/11/17	1. Minutes – 24/10/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		15/11/17	17/11/17
	2. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (September)	R Bartram	2017/024			
	3. Resources and Performance Report (September) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	4. Treasury Management Report – Quarter 2*	M Batty	Not applicable			
19/12/17	1. Minutes – 28/11/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		06/12/17	08/12/17
	2. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (October)	R Bartram	2017/025			
	3. Resources and Performance Report (October) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	4. Amendments to Business Plan Tables (if required)	C Malyon	Not applicable			

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Spokes meeting date	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
09/01/18	1. Minutes – 19/12/17	M Rowe	Not applicable		21/12/17	29/12/17
	2. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (November)	R Bartram	2018/001			
	3. Resources and Performance Report (November) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	4. Local Government Finance Settlement	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	5. Draft Business Plan	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	6. Quarterly Risk Management Report	S Norman	Not applicable			
23/01/18	1. Minutes – 09/01/18	M Rowe	Not applicable		10/01/18	12/01/18
	2. Transformation Strategy/Strategic Framework	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	3. Capital Receipts Strategy	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	4. Treasury Management Strategy	C Malyon	Not applicable			
	5. Business Plan*	C Malyon	Not applicable			
<i>[27/02/18] Provisional Meeting</i>					14/02/18	16/02/18
27/03/18	1. Minutes – 23/01/18	M Rowe	Not applicable		14/03/18	16/03/18
	2. Treasury Management Report – Quarter 3	M Batty	Not applicable			
	3. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (January)	R Bartram	2018/002			

Committee date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Spokes meeting date	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	4. Resources and Performance Report (January) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	5. Quarterly Risk Management Report	S Norman	Not applicable			
<i>[24/04/18] Provisional Meeting</i>					11/04/18	13/04/18
29/05/18	1. Minutes – 27/03/18	M Rowe	Not applicable		16/05/18	18/05/18
	2. Integrated Resources and Performance Report (March)	R Bartram	2018/003			
	3. Resources and Performance Report (March) – Customer Service and Transformation and LGSS Managed	S Heywood	Not applicable			
	4. Treasury Management Report – Quarter 4 and Outturn Report*	M Batty	Not applicable			

Notice made under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 in compliance with Regulation 5(7)

1. At least 28 clear days before a private meeting of a decision-making body, public notice must be given which must include a statement of reasons for the meeting to be held in private.
2. At least 5 clear days before a private meeting of a decision-making body, further public notice must be given which must include a statement of reasons for the meeting to be held in private, details of any representations received by the decision-making body about why the meeting should be open to the public and a statement of the Council's response to such representations.

Forward plan reference	Intended date of decision	Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Decision maker	List of documents to be submitted to the decision maker	Reason for the meeting to be held in private

Decisions to be made in private as a matter of urgency in compliance with Regulation 5(6)

3. Where the date by which a meeting must be held makes compliance with the above requirements impracticable, the meeting may only be held in private where the decision-making body has obtained agreement from the Chairman of the Council.
4. Compliance with the requirements for the giving of public notice has been impracticable in relation to the business detailed below.
5. The Chairman of the Council has agreed that the Committee may hold a private meeting to consider the business referred to in paragraph 4 above because the meeting is urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred for the reasons stated below.

Date of Chairman's agreement	Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Reasons why meeting urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred

For further information, please contact Quentin Baker on 01223 727961 or Quentin.Baker@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN	The Training Plan below includes topic areas for GPC approval. Following sign-off by GPC the details for training and development sessions will be worked up.	
---	---	--

Ref	Subject	Desired Learning Outcome/Success Measures	Priority	Date	Responsibility	Nature of training	Attendance by:	Cllrs Attending	Percentage of total
	Strategic finance and budgeting	Members will gain a more detailed understanding of the strategic financial management of the Council's budget, and the future challenges associated.		TBC	Chris Malyon				
	The Council's asset portfolio and approach to asset management	Background knowledge on the Council's asset portfolio, and understanding of the approaches taken to best utilise this		TBC	Chris Malyon				
	Background to services provided by Customer Service & Transformation	Members will gain an insight into the range of frontline and back-officer services provided across CS&T: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation 		24 Nov	Sue Grace Mike Soper / Elaine O'Connor	Presentations & Q&A.	Cllrs Schumann, Count, Leeke, Kavanagh, Rouse, Orgee, Hickford, Bates. Criswell, Cearns, Tew, Reeve,		

Ref	Subject	Desired Learning Outcome/Success Measures	Priority	Date	Responsibility	Nature of training	Attendance by:	Cllrs Attending	Percentage of total
							Bullen, Jenkins, Nethsingha & McGuire		
	Understanding Health and Social Care integration	<i>Collaboration with Service Committee development around the Better Care Fund to be explored</i>		TBC	TBC				
	Regional governance	Understanding the range of regional governance structures that exist across Cambridgeshire, such as the LEP. Also understanding potential future models of governance for local public services		TBC	TBC				
	Equality and Diversity responsibilities	Understanding the responsibilities the Committee has to comply with equality legislation and to provide services for all Cambridgeshire communities		20 Oct 2015	LGSS Law / CS&T		Cllrs Bailey, Bates, D Brown, Count, Criswell, Hickford, Hipkin, Jenkins, McGuire, Reeve, Tew, Walsh, Divine, Williams		

Ref	Subject	Desired Learning Outcome/Success Measures	Priority	Date	Responsibility	Nature of training	Attendance by:	Cllrs Attending	Percentage of total
	Background to services provided by Customer Service & Transformation	Members will gain an insight into the range of frontline and back-officer services provided across CS&T: Information Security & Sharing		22 Dec 2015	Sue Grace Dan Horrex. (CS&T)	Presentati on & Q&A.	Cllrs Bailey, Bates, D Brown, Bullen, Cearn, Count, Criswell, Hickford, Jenkins, McGuire, Orgee, Reeve, Tew, Whitehead		
	Emergency Planning	Members will gain an insight into the role of Emergency Planning		14 Jan 2016	Sue Grace Stuart Thomas	Presentati on & Q&A.	Cllrs Bailey, Bates, D Brown, Cearn, Count, Criswell, Divine, Hickford, Hipkin, Orgee, Reeve, Rouse and Tew		
	Open Data & Cambridgeshire Insight Training			15 March 2016	M Soper	Presentati on & Q&A.	Cllrs Bailey, Bates, D Brown, Bullen,		

Ref	Subject	Desired Learning Outcome/Success Measures	Priority	Date	Responsibility	Nature of training	Attendance by:	Cllrs Attending	Percentage of total
							Cearns, Count, Criswell, Hickford, Hipkin, Jenkins, Nethsingha, Reeve, and Tew		
	An overview of information management at CCC including the new data protection regulations			29 November 2016	D Horrex	Presentation & Q&A	Cllrs Bailey, Bates, D Brown, P Bullen, E Cearns, S Count, A Dent, R Hickford, D Jenkins, L Nethsingha, T Orgee, P Reeve and J Schumann		

