

**GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT  
'INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE  
PERIOD ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 2014**

**To:** Audit and Accounts Committee  
**Date:** 25<sup>TH</sup> November 2014  
**From:** Rob Sanderson, Democratic Services  
**Contact Details:** Telephone: 01223 699181  
E-mail: rob.sanderson@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

*Purpose:* This report should be taken at the same time as 8b). It provides Audit and Accounts Committee with details of the brief discussion from the General Purposes Committee meeting held on 4th November 2014 in relation to the Integrated Resources and Performance report to the end of September.

1. ***Background***

1.1 Different meetings receive the same Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the following reasons:

- General Purposes Committee to make decisions and approve virements;
- **Audit and Accounts Committee role is limited to consider whether effective processes are in place for financial management.**

It was agreed during the last administration that Audit and Accounts Committee meetings where practicable and time allowed, should receive details of the discussion included in the minutes of the previous Cabinet meeting and the Performance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee who may have also considered the same report in advance of the Audit and Accounts Committee. The arrangement is now continuing with General Purposes Committee and Cabinet.

2. **Extract of the Minutes from the General Purposes Committee 4<sup>th</sup> November. They will be formally agreed at their next meeting.**

**INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR  
THE PERIOD ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 2014**

The Committee received a report detailing the financial and performance information to assess progress in delivering the Council's Business Plan. It was noted that the overall revenue budget position was showing a forecast year end overspend of £0.7m, which was a decrease from the previous forecast. Although this was good news, it

was important to note that this was against a desperate financial position. The Capital Programme was showing a forecast year end underspend of -£44.1m, which was an increase on the previous figure. There had been a slight reduction in performance with four key performance indicators now recorded as red.

Members were advised of the need to consider bridging the funding gap caused by a delay in Section 106 funding in respect of two schemes. It was noted that this proposal would be met from within overall borrowing limits. The Committee was also asked to approve the allocation of the unringfenced Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Implementation Grant to Children, Families and Adults to enable the implementation of new legislative changes. Members were reminded that it was the Council's policy to hold unringfenced grants centrally unless they were specifically allocated to a service.

During discussion, members made the following comments:

- requested more detail in future reports regarding the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) schemes listed in 6.2.1 under "Promoting Economic Growth – Delivering Strategic Aims". **Action Required.**
- the need to review the performance indicator for ETE in relation to complaints. It was queried whether this target, which had been set some time ago, was still realistic given the significant reduction in resources. One Member highlighted the need to consider the outcomes and reasons why the target had been set as part of any review process. The Chief Finance Officer reported that the direction of travel, which was down for some indicators, needed to be considered against a good performance in the last monitoring report. The Director Customer Service and Transformation agreed to raise this issue directly with ETE. **Action Required.**
- the need to avoid creating silos when allocating the SEND Implementation Grant. It was suggested that there was a need to consider the impact on different committees when agreeing budget funding and/or reductions. It was queried whether committees affected by proposals agreed by a different committee should contribute funding e.g. the impact of budget reductions to Cambridgeshire Future Transport on Adults Committee. The Chief Finance Officer reported that he had received an analysis of how the grant would be utilised copies of which were available at the meeting. Members noted that it would be used solely for the implementation of the SEND reforms, which involved transferring children and young people from statements to Health and Care Plans. The Chairwoman of Children and Young People (CYP) reported that this funding was desperately needed to implement this new statutory burden. The Chief Executive acknowledged that

there would need to be an arrangement if a decision taken by a particular committee incurred expenditure for another committee.

- queried whether committees, which had overlapping areas, were liaising with each other as part of the budget setting process. The Chief Executive explained that officers across the services were working together and a General Purposes Committee Workshop involving key committee members had been scheduled. However, he acknowledged the need to do more and agreed to investigate whether something could be put in place for this budget year and next year. **Action Required.**
  
- highlighted the Council's good performance in relation to delayed transfers of care from hospital but noted with concern the overall position. Members raised the need to encourage the Council's partners to achieve the same performance. It was noted that Health Committee was looking at the Better Care Fund in an attempt to reduce admissions to Accident and Emergency (A & E). The Chairman of Health Committee reported that the levels of A & E Admissions were rising as the county grew. He congratulated the Council on its performance, which had involved putting the findings of a Member-Led Review into practice. He reported that he had been asked to attend a meeting at Addenbrooke's on 6 November where he would be provided with information to help understand what was causing the current situation. The Chairwoman of Adults Committee reported that she had also been asked to attend the meeting and was currently awaiting further information. Other Members raised the need to consider what other hospitals such as Hinchingsbrooke were doing in order to get the situation under control.
  
- the impact of the recent move at Addenbrooke's to eHospital. Members were informed that a Member-Led Review had acknowledged the need to move from a paper based system. The e-system was needed but the impact of going live immediately was always likely to have had some impact operationally. The Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure (H&CI) reminded the Committee that he was the Council's representative on the Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Board of Governors. He therefore encouraged Members to bring any issues concerning Addenbrooke's to his attention. He explained that Addenbrooke's was the NHS pilot for eHospital, and a significant amount of time had been spent on site training staff. The Chief Executive acknowledged that eHospital was part of the solution and it was important that the Council worked with Addenbrooke's to make it work. He informed the Committee that the Chair of Cambridge University Hospitals had contacted him regarding the need to brief politicians on recently cancelled operations.

- the importance of the recently signed Older People's Programme contract with UnitingCare Partnership, which was a consortium of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust with Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trusts. It was acknowledged that social care and health needed to continue to work together to address the issue of delayed transfers of care.
- queried why the Council's performance in relation to the indicator regarding "Reduced proportion of Delayed Transfers of care from hospital.." was considered good when the direction of travel was down and the status of the indicator was red. The Chairman reported that this indicator reflected the actions of all partners as well as the Council. Whilst the Council's proportion of the indicator was improving, others areas were getting worse. He therefore queried whether the Council had the right indicator, and suggested that it should only measure the part it was responsible for.
- queried action being taken to stimulate the home to school transport market. The Chairwoman of CYP reported that this area highlighted the co-operation between CYP and H&IC and Economy and Environment to make routes safe. She explained that an officer was being employed on a fixed term contract as part of an invest to save measure to review effectiveness and efficiency of this whole area. The Council had tried to stimulate the market but providers could not provide the service any cheaper. The Chairman reinforced this point by explaining that many providers had under bid at e-auctions and had since been hit by the reality of providing the service.
- requested another indicator in order to achieve transparency regarding how much the Council was spending on support staff such as personal assistants. The Chief Finance Officer explained that a challenge to the level of support staff should be raised as part of the business planning process rather than as an indicator to deliver an outcome. The Chairman asked the Councillor to meet with officers to define exactly what he wanted. **Action Required.**
- congratulated the Council's staff on their employment attendance particularly during a period of stress. The Chief Executive commented that the average number of days lost to sickness in the public sector was 12 so the figure of 5.65 for the Council was a remarkable achievement.
- suggested that the indicator relating to the percentage of Cambridgeshire residents aged 16-64 in employment was too bland. Members requested that it be broken down into full-time and part-time posts. The Chief Executive agreed to provide an analysis of full-time and part-time workers. **Action Required.**

- queried whether the Council was a Living Wage employer. The Chief Executive reminded the Committee that a motion from Councillor Walsh on the Living Wage had been defeated at Council. The Council had no staff on the minimum wage but did not pay as high as the Living Wage.
- noted that the Chairman had been informed that no slippage in the Capital Programme was due to a lack of resources at the County Council. The Chairman reminded the Committee that slippage was not good news as the costs associated with a project then ran the risk of increasing in the future. However, he welcomed the revenue saving. One Member welcomed the appointment of the Chairman on the City Deal Board in order to help address the threat associated with project delays.

With the unanimous agreement of the Committee, it was proposed to amend recommendation b) to remove “an increase of” and delete “Hall” and add Primary School Scheme in order to clarify the remit of the scheme.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) analyse resources and performance information and note the remedial action currently being taken and consider if any further remedial action was required;
- b) approve £1.3m in Prudential Borrowing in 2014/15 to bridge the funding gap caused by a delay in S106 funding in respect of the Hauxton Primary School Scheme (£0.4m) and Southern Fringe (£0.9m) schemes (section 6.5); and
- c) approve that the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Implementation Grant of £476,699 in 2014/15 be allocated in full to Children, Families and Adults (section 7.1).