

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Minutes-Action Log



Introduction:

This log captures the actions arising from the General Purposes Committee on 20th October 2015 and updates members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

This is the updated action log as at Friday, 13 November 2015.

Minutes of 20th October 2015

Item No.	Item	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Completed
157.	Minutes – 15th September 2015 and Action Log	C Malyon	Detailed proposals to be presented to the Committee regarding the associated costs of implementing the new Operating Model for Business Planning.	To be presented to the Committee in November.	Ongoing
160.	Ely Hub and Cambridgeshire Archives	Cllr Hickford & Spokes/ G Hughes	H&CIC to consider whether it wishes to review the Council's document storage policy.	To be considered by H&CI Spokes in December.	Ongoing

	As above	C Malyon	To identify the plans for relocating staff based at Noble House.	In the light of the Council's decisions in respect of the Ely Archive, and previously Centre E in Ely, the accommodation options for the teams occupying Noble House at lease expiry in 2018 will be reviewed through the Property Assets Board.	Yes
162.	Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the period ending 31st August 2015	C Malyon	How it was proposed to fund the overspend of £270k from "Passenger transport other" as it was not possible to stop this provision.	<p>The underlying overspend has now reduced to £92K.</p> <p>There continues to be an underlying overspend derived from the Park & Ride site income which is less than anticipated. Officers will continue to seek to increase income in this area and also review all budgets to offset this pressure.</p> <p>The underlying ETE overspend has been decreasing month on month and it is expected that this trend will continue as ETE is currently running a higher level of staff vacancies than expected. Some slippage of programmes is also possible. However, should the current underlying overspend of £92k not reduce as year-end approaches, a number of further corrective measures could be taken.</p> <p>The first choice would be to exercise even tighter control over spending that doesn't affect front line services such as training, travel and subsistence. If that is not sufficient, the area most likely to be used would be underspends on Community Transport in previous years to balance the</p>	Yes

				<p>budget. This funding that wasn't spent last year and was declared as Operational Savings has been allocated for Community Transport but currently has no specific use and would most likely be used in future years to protect current spend on Community Transport for longer as base budgets are cut.</p> <p>The assumption that these measures will work has been built into the above figures bringing the budget to break-even by year-end. The forecast outturn position will be monitored closely to ensure ETE balances its budget at year-end.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

	As above	C Malyon	The impact of a lack of available assessors in relation to the Mental Capacity Act/Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.	This is a national problem with all 152 local authorities having to deal with the same issues. In Cambridgeshire, we have been able to assess 32% of the referrals received between April 2014 to July 2015, leaving over 800 referrals outstanding and this is in keeping with national trend. To deal with the process of assessment, we have to use independent assessors at a cost of between £500-£700 per assessment plus approved doctors. Currently the CCG are making a contribution but there is no guarantee this will continue. In addition the Supreme Court has extended DOLS legislation to cover additional living arrangements such as supported and sheltered accommodation, which will increase the number of assessments that would be needed. Currently all such cases can only be authorised by the Court of Protection. Where cases are awaiting assessment, there is a possibility that the local authority could be charged with unlawful deprivation of liberty as they have not been authorised by us under Schedule A1 of the MCA.	Yes
	As above	K Grimwade	Requested a breakdown on the Ofsted key performance indicator figures for Secondary and Primary schools on a District basis.	Circulated via e-mail on 10 November 2015.	Yes

	As above	C Malyon	Why Nursing in table 4.3 appears to cost less than Residential.	<p>Residential care will usually be cheaper than nursing care when CCC purchases large volumes of standard care in these categories and the Older People's Service figures do show that nursing is more expensive in this area. However, in the Physical Disability and Adult Mental Health figures nursing is cheaper than residential because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There are a much smaller number of residential and nursing placements in these services, so outliers can more easily distort the averages. b) The cost of nursing is suppressed because there is some direct funding of nursing placements by the CCG (i.e. the Council is only funding part of the cost), in Older People's services, this is done at whole-service level. c) The residential average is higher because of the number of specialist residential placements (i.e. they are not standard residential in the high volume mode of OP services, but a more specialist type of provision aimed at younger adults), AMH has a number of residential placements costing more than £2k per week for instance, and 43% of the PD residential placements cost more than £1k per week. 	Yes
--	-----------------	----------	---	---	-----

165.	General Purposes Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies, Partnership Liaison and Advisory Groups, and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels	M Rowe	Review the wording in relation to “Decisions to be made in private”	Amended	Yes
-------------	---	--------	---	---------	-----

Item No.	Item	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Completed
	Carry over from meeting of 28 July 2015	C Malyon	Delegate responsibility to the S151 Officer in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman for GPC to develop and finalise an Accountable Body Agreement between Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership and Cambridgeshire County Council.	Final draft of the Accountable Body Agreement is still awaiting sign-off by the LEP’s legal team. <i>(no change from last time)</i>	