

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 5th February 2019

**Time:** 10:30am – 3:42pm

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillor M Smith (Chairman)

Councillors: D Ambrose Smith, A Bailey, I Bates, C Boden, A Bradnam, S Bywater, A Costello, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, P Downes, L Dupre, L Every, J French, R Fuller, I Gardener, D Giles, M Goldsack, J Gowing, L Harford, N Harrison, A Hay, R Hickford, M Howell, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, L Jones, N Kavanagh, S Kindersley, S King, I Manning, M McGuire (Vice Chairman), E Meschini, L Nethsingha, L Nieto, K Reynolds, C Richards, T Rogers, T Sanderson, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, A Taylor, S Taylor, S Tierney, P Topping, S van de Ven, D Wells, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson and J Wisson

**Apologies:** Councillors: H Batchelor, D Connor and K Cuffley

The Chairman opened and adjourned the meeting for five minutes to try and resolve issues with the YouTube recording. Unfortunately it was not possible to resolve these issues so this meeting is not available on YouTube.

### 126. MINUTES – 11TH DECEMBER 2018

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 11th December 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 127. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

Councillor Meschini was invited by the Chairman to pay tribute to the late Mayor of Cambridge, Nigel Gawthrope.

The Chairman invited Councillor Shellens to speak to the Council and he provided the following address:

“Arising from comments made at previous Council, I wanted to be unequivocally clear that I have not, never have, and do not contend that our budgets are criminally fraudulent, and have never intended to suggest they were. Nor were any of my words intended to reflect the views of the Audit & Accounts Committee.”

### 128. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman reported that the Deputy Monitoring Officer had exercised her discretion to grant a dispensation to all elected members of Cambridgeshire County Council taking part in the debate on the Council's Business Plan.

There were no other declarations of interest under the Code of Conduct.

## **129. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The Chairman reported that four questions had been received from members of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

## **130. PETITIONS**

The Chairman reported that no petitions had been received from members of the public.

## **131. COUNCIL'S BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET PROPOSALS 2019-24**

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman of Council, Councillor McGuire, and resolved unanimously to suspend any standing orders in connection with the Business Plan debate in order to accommodate a procedure agreed by the Council's Group Leaders.

As the General Purposes Committee had put forward a range of options for Council to decide how it wished to balance the budget, the Chairman of Council, seconded by the Vice-Chairman of Council, moved the Council's Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2019-24, as set out within Agenda Item 6.

The Chairman invited the Leaders of the Groups to make their opening statements on the Business Plan. In his speech the Leader of the Council and other Group Leaders paid tribute to the hard work undertaken by officers during the Business Plan process.

The Chairman then opened the debate on all sections of the Business Plan and invited amendments to the overall budget proposals.

Councillor Count moved an amendment, seconded by Councillor Bailey, as set out in **Appendix C**.

Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was carried. [The voting record is attached as **Appendix D**].

Councillor Nethsingha moved an amendment, seconded by Councillor Dupre, as set out in **Appendix E**.

Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was lost. [The voting record is attached as **Appendix F**.]

Councillor Whitehead moved an amendment, seconded by Councillor Jones, as set out in **Appendix G**.

Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was lost. [The voting record is attached as **Appendix H**.]

In opening the debate on the main Business Plan, the Chairman invited all Policy and Service Committee Chairmen/women to speak if they so wished.

Prior to the vote being taken on the motion, the Liberal Democrat Group Leader indicated that her preference would have been for a separate vote on the Council Tax increase, which her Group would have supported.

Following further discussion, the substantive motion on being put to the vote was carried as set out in the voting record attached as **Appendix I**.

*[Following the closure of the vote, Councillor Downes indicated that he had voted in error in abstaining on the substantive motion and requested that the record should show that he had meant to vote against.]*

It was resolved to:

1. Note and approve 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 (given in Section 3).
2. Approve the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan including capital expenditure in 2019-20 up to £269.9m arising from:
  - Commitments from schemes already approved;
  - The consequences of new starts in 2019-20 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 6.7 of the Business Plan.
3. Approve 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 2019-20 as required by the Local Government Act 2003)
  - iii. The Investment Strategy for 2019-20 as required by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) revised Guidance on Local Government Investments issued in 2018, and the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.

- 4a. Approval be given to the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan, to be balanced and amended with the following adjustments:

<b><i>Revised budget gap as proposed £000</i></b>		<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
		12,234	11,434	4,349	8,035	5,144
<b><i>Permanent change by year £000</i></b>		<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
b	Staffing budget/reduction to organisational savings	+£930	-	-	-	-
c	Additional highway condition and maintenance investment	-	+3,000	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
<b>Revised budget gap after new commitments</b>		<b>13,164</b>	<b>14,434</b>	<b>5,349</b>	<b>9,035</b>	<b>6,144</b>
<b><i>Financing adjustments</i></b>						
d	Application of smoothing fund (Council tax policy as of Feb 18)	-9,100	-	-	-	-
e	General Council tax at 2.99% rather than 1.99% for 2019/20	-2,728	-78	-74	-76	-76
f	Redirection of MRP policy change surplus towards gap	-1,336	-	-	-	-
<b>Revised budget gap after financing adjustments</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>14,356</b>	<b>5,275</b>	<b>8,959</b>	<b>6,068</b>

- g. Approval be given to a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £809,473,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.
- h. Approval be given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £297,967,322.32, 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).
- i. Approval be 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 (227,090.2), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% ASC precept increase and a 2.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	874.74
B	7/9	1020.53
C	8/9	1166.32
<b>D</b>	<b>9/9</b>	1312.11
E	11/9	1603.69
F	13/9	1895.27
G	15/9	2186.85
H	18/9	2624.22

5. Authorise the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the Business Plan so as to take into account any changes deemed appropriate resulting from the final Local Government Finance Settlement and other updated information, as set out in paragraph 2.7 of this report.

## 132. QUESTIONS:

- (a) **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee** (Council Procedure Rule 9.1)

Six questions were submitted under Council Procedure 9.1 of the Council's Constitution, as set out in **Appendix J**.

- (b) **Written Questions** (Council Procedure Rule 9.2)

Four written questions were submitted under Council Procedure 9.2, as set out in **Appendix K**.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 5TH FEBRUARY 2019  
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**PEOPLE**

**Mayor of Cambridge - Councillor Nigel Gawthrope**

The Council was saddened by the recent death of the Mayor of Cambridge, Councillor Nigel Gawthrope. Councillor Gawthrope was elected to Cambridge City Council serving King's Hedges ward for Labour in 2012 - and again in 2016 - before taking up the mayoral role in May. The Council's thoughts are with his family, friends and colleagues at this time.

**Eileen Hickey**

It is with deep regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of Eileen Hickey. Eileen worked at Grafham Water Centre, as a Catering & Hospitality Assistant, and had been with the Council since 15th February 2016. The Council's thoughts are with her family, friends and colleagues at this time.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 5TH FEBRUARY 2018****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question</b>
1.	Dr Lesley Dee  Member of the Public	Councillor Josh Schumann  Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee	In view of the proposed sale of County Hall for development purposes I would like to ask a question about public access to the path that runs from the top of Magrath Avenue through to Castle Hill. A survey that was carried out in 2011 showed that the path was used by more than 100 cyclists and pedestrians per hour. If the figures have changed, they are most likely to have increased due to encouraged use of cycles and walking, and particularly the change of Castle Court to student accommodation: the students walk or cycle back and forth along the path accessing the buses and nearby shops, for instance. My understanding is that this is a private and not public right of way and that part of the path belongs to Trinity College and the rest to the County Council. In the interests of residents and other users, what steps have been taken by the Council to safeguard public access to the path in the future?
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Councillor Josh Schumann  Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee	Dr Lesley Dee	Thank you Chairman and if I may respond, and start by providing a brief bit of history about how the access path came to be. The County Council sold the site of 35 Magrath Avenue on 31st March 1989 to Granta Housing, who subsequently sold the site to Trinity College. The 1989 transfer required Granta to build a cycle path and a footpath to Shire Hall, and preserve rights for the County Council and its successors to use them. It should be noted that the creation of a public right of way was not intended, and the transfer stated that the Right of Way may be closed once a year to ensure that a public Right of Way was not created. Over the 30 years since, the access path has regularly been used by members of the public, County Council staff and occupiers of Trinity College buildings, but I reiterate this is not a public Right of Way. I can assure you though, that the County Council's intention is to lease or sell the site with all rights as they exist, and these will be recorded on the Title of Transfer when it occurs. As with the existing right of transfer of sale, any intention bearing upon right of access will be subject to contractual negotiation between the landowner and Trinity College. I hope that answers your question.

	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	
	Dr Lesley Dee  Member of the Public	Councillor Josh Schumann  Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee	So in view of what the Councillor has just said, what assurances can the County Council give that if Shire Hall is sold or leased, that the current agreement with Trinity over public access, will be maintained in perpetuity?
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	
	Councillor Josh Schumann  Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee	Dr Lesley Dee	If I may just reiterate Chairman, the assurance is that this will be transferred with any Title, so the current agreement ... it will be transferred with the Title.
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question</b>
2.	Antony Carpen Member of the public ( <b>not present</b> )	Councillor Mathew Shuter  Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee	<p>I am concerned about press reports of possible further cuts to the library services budget. I am also concerned from your published report to Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee on 11 Sept at the funding shortfalls.</p> <p>Furthermore I am concerned that not nearly enough progress has been made to generate income from other streams - including the Library Extra, and donations. I have seen very little publicity for both on your social media streams and in your corporate communications.</p> <p>Finally, I am very concerned about the lack of support for staff at the Cambridgeshire Collection, which I use on a weekly basis and have been bringing in new members of the public with my free monthly talks there on the staffed Saturdays.</p> <p>I feel that I am going out of my way to promote the libraries and archives at growing financial cost to myself, while experiencing a decline in services because over-stretched staff are not being provided with the resources by executive councillors who are not tabling the necessary motions to full council to vote through the resources our libraries and archive services need and deserve.</p>



			Please can you therefore:  1) State what social media activities the council has taken to encourage donations to the libraries and archive services since September 2018 2) State what actions councillors have taken to encourage financial donations from their high net worth friends and associates, as well as from constituents, to our libraries and archive services - mindful of the examples set by the late Baroness Trumpington and Alderman Kelsey Kerridge - both prominent Conservative councillors in Cambridge in the 20th Century 3) Confirm whether my previous requests for prominent and easy-to-use online payments systems and room booking systems have been implemented by your web and comms teams 4) State what the intentions are of executive councillors regarding the funding of existing library and archive services - including the necessary investment needed to generate additional and new independent funding streams.										
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>										
	Councillor Mathew Shuter  Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee	Antony Carpen	In the absence of the public questioner, Councillor Shuter agreed to provide a written response as set out below:  Social media activities run by our communications office are as below: <table><tr><td></td><td><b>POST</b></td><td><b>FACEBOOK</b></td><td><b>TWITTER</b></td></tr><tr><td>18 Dec</td><td>Our head of <a href="#">Cambridgeshire Libraries</a> Sue Wills was on <a href="#">BBC Radio Cambridgeshire</a> last Saturday to present <a href="#">#ChristmasAtTheLibrary</a> and talk about our new Adopt a Book scheme.  Listen again on replay here: <a href="https://www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/p06sb4r5...">https://www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/p06sb4r5...</a> If you are still looking for original Christmas present ideas 💡, choose a book to adopt from 80,000 titles in our Cambridgeshire Collection. More info here =&gt; <a href="https://goo.gl/y9cUfm">https://goo.gl/y9cUfm</a></td><td>Reach : 1,768 Engagement: 10</td><td>Impressions : 1,589 Engagement: 12</td></tr></table>				<b>POST</b>	<b>FACEBOOK</b>	<b>TWITTER</b>	18 Dec	Our head of <a href="#">Cambridgeshire Libraries</a> Sue Wills was on <a href="#">BBC Radio Cambridgeshire</a> last Saturday to present <a href="#">#ChristmasAtTheLibrary</a> and talk about our new Adopt a Book scheme.  Listen again on replay here: <a href="https://www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/p06sb4r5...">https://www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/p06sb4r5...</a> If you are still looking for original Christmas present ideas 💡, choose a book to adopt from 80,000 titles in our Cambridgeshire Collection. More info here => <a href="https://goo.gl/y9cUfm">https://goo.gl/y9cUfm</a>	Reach : 1,768 Engagement: 10	Impressions : 1,589 Engagement: 12
	<b>POST</b>	<b>FACEBOOK</b>	<b>TWITTER</b>										
18 Dec	Our head of <a href="#">Cambridgeshire Libraries</a> Sue Wills was on <a href="#">BBC Radio Cambridgeshire</a> last Saturday to present <a href="#">#ChristmasAtTheLibrary</a> and talk about our new Adopt a Book scheme.  Listen again on replay here: <a href="https://www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/p06sb4r5...">https://www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/p06sb4r5...</a> If you are still looking for original Christmas present ideas 💡, choose a book to adopt from 80,000 titles in our Cambridgeshire Collection. More info here => <a href="https://goo.gl/y9cUfm">https://goo.gl/y9cUfm</a>	Reach : 1,768 Engagement: 10	Impressions : 1,589 Engagement: 12										

			20 Nov	When physicist James Clerk Maxwell – "the man whose work changed the world forever" according to Albert Einstein died in 1879, some of his books were donated to the Cambridge Free Library including his own prized copy of Newton's Principia Mathematica. This is now in our Cambridgeshire Collection, along with 80,000 other books and pamphlets dating from 1762 to the present. You can now adopt Maxwell's book or any other book in the collection. Learn more here: <a href="https://goo.gl/LPZwZT">https://goo.gl/LPZwZT</a> #OurDay	Reach: 690 Engagement: 7	Impressions: 1,248 Engagement: 2
			13 Oct	This #LibrariesWeeek we've been shouting about our libraries and the many wonders they can do for you. If you want to support your Cambs Libraries with a small donation, you can sign up to our new Library Extra membership. Read more here: <a href="http://ow.ly/Lf8m30md3BK">http://ow.ly/Lf8m30md3BK</a>	Reach: 2,366 Engagement: 52	Impressions: 4,615 Engagement: 26
			28 Aug	We've just launched our new Library Extra Membership. Sign up today and receive a little extra from your library. Your generosity directly supports <a href="#">Cambridgeshire Libraries</a> and helps us improve our services, collections and venues. Find out more on our website here: <a href="https://goo.gl/wnbm92">https://goo.gl/wnbm92</a>	Reach : 1,440 Engagement: 30	Impressions: 2,085 Engagements: 69
			Dec 18	<b>Christmas at the Library Campaign</b> Campaign to highlight events for young and older people in libraries and gift ideas for book bugs and library fans, including the Adopt a Book scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Posters in libraries,</li><li>• Social media activity</li><li>• Interview on BBC Radio Cambridgeshire - Sat 15 December.</li></ul>		
			In addition the libraries themselves have been actively promoting income generating activity in the following ways:			

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twitter – Communication team posted Libraries Week and libraries re- tweeted on October 13th and 28th August</li> <li>• Further Facebook and Twitter promotion on 4th Jan 2018</li> <li>• “What’s On” booklet - summer print run 5,000, autumn 10,000, Winter 5,000, available in all libraries and a variety of other community venues</li> <li>• Sept e-Newsletter sent to 62,000 customers</li> <li>• Dec e-Newsletter sent to 62,000 customers</li> <li>• Christmas greetings e-newsletter sent to 62,000 customers</li> <li>• Website page – ongoing promotion of activities and events, and encourages donations</li> </ul> <p>I am not aware of the actions of individual councillors and cannot speak on their behalf, however Members are very supportive of our partnership working with the philanthropic organisation CIVIC, which is connecting the library service to prominent philanthropists and businesses nationally, with a view to making the service more financially sustainable.</p> <p>Implementing an e-commerce solution (online shop) requires resources and funding to design, build and deploy as we do not have access to an off the shelf system that could be implemented quickly and cheaply. We are currently investigating what the costs would be and where this work would lie in the list of priorities for the IT resources required.</p> <p>An interim room booking solution is currently being tested and the procurement of a corporate booking system is about to get underway. The current corporate system unfortunately does not meet the Library Services requirements.</p> <p>Councillors are highly committed to maintaining our library and archive services and unlike many other authorities are committed to keeping all our libraries open despite the reductions in local authority budgets. We are also investing more than £5M in a new archive centre for Cambridgeshire Archives, due to open later this year. The Library Service is set to benefit from the following capital investments over the next few years, as set out in the Council’s draft Business Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Milton Road Library redevelopment</li> <li>• Sawston Library redevelopment</li> <li>• Barnwell Library redevelopment as part of East Barnwell Hub project</li> <li>• Darwin Green – new library</li> <li>• Alconbury – new library</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northstowe – new library</li> <li>• 2 new mobile libraries</li> <li>• Investment in Open Access system across all libraries, extending opening hours</li> </ul> <p>Recent capital investments have seen a new library built as part of the Clay Farm Centre in Trumpington, a newly refurbished library in Sawtry, and there is investment to fully update all the public network computers across libraries (due to take place from April).</p> <p>Specifically in terms of investment to support income generation activity, we have funded an additional 1 year post in the Library Service to lead income generation and marketing activity.</p> <p>We are also introducing card payments on all of the self-service machines in libraries over the next two months to make it easier for people to pay library fees and charges. And we are introducing a 'Donate' button on every self-service machine to encourage library customers to donate to the service. This initiative is a first in libraries across England.</p> <p>Therefore I think it is fair to say that Cambridgeshire County Council members are investing more than most other authorities into their library and archive services, which is testament to the commitment and support Councillors have for these services. This includes some specific funding to support income generation activity, as well as an exciting new partnership with an organisation that will help us connect with much higher profile businesses and philanthropists. We believe that the more we make our libraries and archives attractive, modern and fit-for purpose, and the more we broaden the services they offer, this will help drive up footfall and use, which in turn will help to bring income to support these services.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
3.	Marisha Ray  Member of the public	Councillor Anna Bailey  Chairwoman of Adults Committee	Can the Council assure the public that the Council has no current plan to close The Haven in Wulfstan Way or to compel any of its residents to leave The Haven and, what measures will it put in place to inform the residents of The Haven that they will not be required to move and to ensure that they fully understand their rights? Why has the Council not been more sensitive in its handling of the needs of the vulnerable residents whose distress is reported in our local community? May I make the Council aware of the potential threat as an authority, to have a conflict of interest given its roles as a safeguarding authority, its role in housing development and its role in providing mental health support and other social care.

	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	<p>Councillor Anna Bailey</p> <p>Chairwoman of Adults Committee</p>	<p>Marisha Ray</p> <p>Member of the public</p>	<p>Thank you Chairman. Thank you Ms Ray for your question. Work has been carried out to assess the viability of the support service provision at The Haven to ensure that it meets the needs of the current residents who reside there, and that the environment is appropriate to those needs and that, as part of the Council's duties to ensure that resources are allocated appropriately, the service will continue to meet needs in the most effective way.</p> <p>Plans regarding proposed changes to the service offer, or investment in the building and longer term requirements for the service will be presented to the local elected member and members of the Adults Committee for discussion and approval before any further action is taken. The Haven will remain open with current support arrangements in place whilst this work and subsequent Committee approval is undertaken.</p> <p>Each resident of the service who currently lives there holds a tenancy for their accommodation with Aldwyck Housing (formerly King Street Housing). The Housing Provider (Aldwyck) has been involved in providing support to current tenants around their rights under individual tenancy arrangements, and as such, this is an agreement between the Landlord and the individual tenant and, dependent on the terms of the tenancy, so there are no legal options for the Council to compel people to move out of The Haven. Each individual's rights under their tenancy agreement are protected and would not be revoked through any changes to the support arrangements by the County Council at The Haven. The option to remain at The Haven, albeit with potential changes in the way support is delivered to ensure they meet needs, is a further option that forms part of the overall discussion with the current residents.</p> <p>As part of the review process being carried out at The Haven, a number of actions have been taken to ensure that the Council is carrying out its duties to the individuals currently residing there and to ensure their wellbeing, and these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that all residents have been allocated a Mental Health Social Worker to carry out a review of their needs under the Care Act. This involves the individual and their families/circle of support and looks at each resident's current and emerging needs in a holistic way including mental health and physical needs, emotional needs and any aspirations for the future. This may include where people want to live as well as what support they may need now and in the future. This work is being overseen by a Senior Mental Health Social Worker. The allocated Mental Health Social Workers</li> </ul>

			<p>have extensive knowledge of the residents who are currently residing at The Haven and are monitoring their wellbeing as the discussions about any potential changes are taking place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All residents have also been offered support to access an Independent Advocate should they wish. This is in addition to the collaborative approach to each individual's assessment of needs and provides support for the individual to have their voice heard through an Advocate acting on their behalf.</li> <li>• The current Support Provider has been fully involved with the discussions around the needs and wellbeing of the current residents. As an on-site provider they have been able to monitor the residents on a daily basis and highlight any significant issues as they arise to the allocated Mental Health Social Worker.</li> </ul> <p>Mental Health Social Workers, with the knowledge of each individual's history and presentations, ensure that each resident is informed about the current circumstances and options available to them. The capacity for each resident to understand information provided and make decisions is also monitored at every visit.</p>
	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	
	<p>Marisha Ray</p> <p>Member of the public</p>	<p>Councillor Anna Bailey</p> <p>Chairwoman of Adults Committee</p>	<p>I would like to ask a supplementary question. In view of the inadequacy of the existing support, which has been reported to the Council's Chief Executive, what changes will be made to improve the support, the distress was such that I had to immediately correspond with Democratic Services because of the nature of the distress that was caused, and I understand that Councillor Taylor has also immediately corresponded with the Chief Executive on this same matter. Secondly (<i>indistinct</i>) the process of the review and I draw the council's attention to the limited accuracy of the information on the nature of the building which was uncovered to be very different from that in the Planning Permission granted for the building, therefore the building was being assessed on the basis of inaccurate information, and the conclusions from that inaccurate information could only be wrong.</p>
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	
	<p>Councillor Anna Bailey</p> <p>Chairwoman of Adults Committee</p>	<p>Marisha Ray</p> <p>Member of the public</p>	<p>Thank you very much. I will just refer back to my former answer, you know, every resident who is currently at The Haven has been allocated a Mental Health Social Worker who is qualified and is duly monitored and has processes to ensure they are doing things properly, and a senior social worker overseeing that process. They have also been given the option of</p>

			<p>an individual advocate should they wish. It is my wholehearted belief having spoken to staff there that individual residents are being well supported through this process.</p> <p>On the issues of the assessment of the building, it's my understanding that the building was never set up to cater for very frail older people in to older age, and we worked very hard with the previous owner of the building to seek the option of making adaptations to the building to meet the changing needs of the residents who reside there, everybody who is facing older age and is becoming frailer and more disabled, does face the need to review their accommodation arrangements and try and make them suitable. The previous owner of the building was not willing to undertake any changes to the building to meet people's needs. However we have a new conversation with the new owner of the building, so that conversation is now changing and is ongoing and we are seeking opportunities around that.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
4.	<p>Tom Jefford</p> <p>Business Development Director Family Psychology Mutual Community Interest Company</p>	<p>Councillor Simon Bywater</p> <p>Chairman of Children and Young People Committee</p>	<p>Family Psychology Mutual is a spin out from Cambridgeshire County Council and CPFT NHS Trust, created with staff, ex-staff from the County, with public financial support, and the consent and support of the County. Just nine months into a tendered three year contract establishing the spin-out, the County has sought to end the contract using a no-fault clause at the first anniversary. The service delivers Multi Systemic Therapy, a highly regarded specialist adolescent edge of care intervention with a high threshold. Analysis of cases in this year showed early help and other interventions had neither succeeded nor produced a change. The service is at capacity and has retained young people at home when they showed a high likelihood of entering care. The service is valued by operational leads and social workers alike. MST has a strong research underpinning and in Cambridgeshire we have a demonstrable record and evidence of achievement on outcomes over the last 17 years. We have clear independent evidence of cost effectiveness. This is a major loss for Cambridgeshire. Cambridgeshire loses highly trained staff, high performance and sustainable outcomes for some of our most vulnerable families in the county.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire loses an intervention with a clear therapeutic model of intervention that delivers consistent and sustainable behavioural change. Our offer of a negotiated reduced contract value has been rejected, even though it would have retained the expertise and save £180,000. Cambridgeshire families with high needs would lose a service and their outcomes will be the poorer. Cambridgeshire also seriously blights other services from spinning out if contracts can be withdrawn, without fault, because Cambridgeshire decides to end them. We wish the Council to reconsider.</p>

			Madam Chairman, why is Cambridgeshire ending a high performing, highly valued and cost effective service for young people on the edge of care, when the consequence will be more young people entering care with poorer outcomes and higher costs?
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>Councillor Simon Bywater</p> <p>Chairman of Children and Young People Committee</p>	<p>Tom Jefford</p> <p>Business Development Director</p> <p>Family Psychology Mutual Community Interest Company</p>	<p>As currently contracted, the commissioned MST service costs the council £640,000 per annum, and is contracted to work with up to a total of 43 young people in any one year – a unit cost of around £14,800 per young person. The revised offer of a reduced service for a lower annual cost of £459,000 would work with up to 31 young people at the same unit cost of £14,800.</p> <p>There is no doubt MST is an effective programme for some young people. The largest UK study of its effectiveness undertaken by the University College of London published in January 2018 found that outcomes, including the likelihood of whether a young person remained at home, was not statistically better for MST than outcomes for similar young people who were being supported by more usual services including youth work and family support services.</p> <p>The argument from Family Psychology Mutual that its services are preventing young people from coming into care needs to be seen in the context of this national research. It means that while MST is likely to be effective in preventing some young people from coming into care, statistically it is no more effective in doing so than the other much lower cost services.</p> <p>De-commissioning MST would enable the Council to do two things. Firstly it would mean that we can protect other early help and preventative services from the savings that we need to make. Secondly, and under the proposals before Council, it would mean that we can invest more money into our other early help and preventative services – these are the same types of services that the University College London research said were as effective as MST at 18 months. Under these proposals, of the £641,000 currently funding MST, £321,000 will go towards the savings that the Council needs to make, which means protecting other services from reductions, and £320,000 will be invested in increasing the capacity of our other prevention and early help services. When Ofsted came a couple of weeks ago they stated that our Clinicians, Missing/Exploited/Trafficked hub and adolescent services were providing effective services.</p>



			<p>As an example, £320,000 would fund an additional ten youth workers or family support workers. At a case load of 12-15 children and young people per annum, open for six months, this investment would mean that we could work with between 240 and 300 more vulnerable children and young people a year. This compares with the 31 that would access services under the reduced MST contract at £459,000 per year.</p> <p>In coming to this recommendation to full Council, we have considered the options very carefully. It is always difficult to de-commission a service. Nevertheless the Council does need to consider how we can use our resources to the greatest affect. This has always been true, and is even more so when we are faced with continued reductions in the amounts we have available to support vulnerable people.</p> <p>Given the high unit costs of MST and the results of the University College research, I do not think we have any option available to us other than to de-commission the MST service and invest half of the savings into services at much lower unit cost. Doing so means that we can reach many more vulnerable children and young people while spending less of our precious resources.</p>
	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	
	<p>Tom Jefford</p> <p>Business Development Director Family Psychology Mutual Community Interest Company</p>	<p>Councillor Simon Bywater</p> <p>Chairman of Children and Young People Committee</p>	<p>I think it's a great shame that officers use research evidence to partially and intellectually to justify the cuts while ignoring local outcomes. We have presented local outcomes of our outcomes to you, where we have demonstrated sustainability beyond the 12 month period – we think it's unlikely that the successor service will achieve the same. In the Chamber there is no-one here to advocate the needs of young people with the highest needs from the age of ten. It's a shame that Cambridgeshire has not looked at other authorities like Leeds, who have an expanded their MST service, and Sheffield who are reintroducing an MST service after having previously abandoning it, and I have been in contact with the Director of Children's Services in Sheffield, and she would say decommissioning MST was the worst decision she made, which is why they are putting a new service in place.</p> <p>It's also a shame that the local authority did not have the grace to enquire as to whether a new social enterprise, created using ex-staff from the authority would survive this unjustified, unexpected and unexplained cut.</p>

	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	
	<p>Councillor Simon Bywater</p> <p>Chairman of Children and Young People Committee</p>	<p>Tom Jefford</p> <p>Business Development Director</p> <p>Family Psychology Mutual Community Interest Company</p>	<p>I totally understand the question, all I can say is that the CYP Committee and others have looked into the evidence, it is complicated, but I think I have clearly outlined my response to the question.</p>

**COUNTY COUNCIL: 5TH FEBRUARY 2019**

**Agenda Item No. 6 – Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2019-24**

**AMENDMENT**

Proposed by Councillor Count, Seconded by Councillor Hickford

**Delete recommendation 4 and replace with**

- 4a Approval be given to the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan, to be balanced and amended with the following adjustments:

<b><i>Revised budget gap as proposed £000</i></b>		<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
		12,234	11,434	4,349	8,035	5,144
<b>Permanent change by year £000</b>		<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
b	Staffing budget/reduction to organisational savings	+£930	-	-	-	-
c	Additional highway condition and maintenance investment	-	+3,000	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
<b>Revised budget gap after new commitments</b>		<b>13,164</b>	<b>14,434</b>	<b>5,349</b>	<b>9,035</b>	<b>6,144</b>
<b><i>Financing adjustments</i></b>						
d	Application of smoothing fund (Council tax policy as of Feb 18)	-9,100	-	-	-	-
e	General Council tax at 2.99% rather than 1.99% for 2019/20	-2,728	-78	-74	-76	-76
f	Redirection of MRP policy change surplus towards gap	-1,336	-	-	-	-
<b>Revised budget gap after financing adjustments</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>14,356</b>	<b>5,275</b>	<b>8,959</b>	<b>6,068</b>

- g. Approval be given to a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £809,473,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.
- h. Approval be given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £297,967,322.32, 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).

- i. Approval be 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 (227,090.2), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% ASC precept increase and a 2.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
------	-------	------------

A	6/9	874.74
B	7/9	1020.53
C	8/9	1166.32
<b>D</b>	<b>9/9</b>	1312.11
E	11/9	1603.69
F	13/9	1895.27
G	15/9	2186.85
H	18/9	2624.22

COUNCIL						5 <sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2019		APPENDIX D			
COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ADEY D	Ind				X	HUNT W T I	Cons	X			
D AMBROSE-SMITH	Cons	X				JENKINS D	LibD		X		
BAILEY A	Cons	X				JONES L	Lab		X		
BATCHELOR H	LibD				APOLOGIES	KAVANAGH N	Lab		X		
BATES I C	Cons	X				KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		X		
BODEN C	Cons	X				KING S	Cons	X			
BRADNAM A	LibD		X			MANNING I	LibD			X	
BYWATER S	Cons	X				MCGUIRE L W	Cons	X			
CONNOR D	Con				APOLOGIES	MESCHINI E	Lab		X		
COSTELLO A	Cons	X				NETHSINGHA L	LibD		X		
COUNT STEVE	Cons	X				NIETO L	Cons	X			
CRAWFORD S	Lab		X			REYNOLDS K	Cons	X			
CRISWELL S J	Cons	X				RICHARDS C	Lab		X		
CUFFLEY K	Cons				APOLOGIES	ROGERS T	Cons	X			
DOWNES P J	LibD		X			SANDERSON T	Ind		X		
DUPRE L	LibD		X			SCHUMANN J	Cons	X			
EVERY L	Cons	X				SCUTT J	Lab		X		
FRENCH J	Cons	X				SHELLENS M	LibD		X		
FULLER R	Cons	X				SHUTER M	Cons	X			
GARDENER I	Cons	X				SMITH M	Cons	X			
GILES D	Ind		X			TAYLOR A	LibD		X		
GOLDSACK	Cons	X				TAYLOR S	Inde		X		
GOWING J	Cons	X				TIERNEY S	Cons	X			
HARFORD L	Cons	X				TOPPING P	Cons	X			
HARRISON N	LibD		X			VAN DE VEN S	LibD		X		
HAY A	Cons	X				WELLS D	Cons	X			
HICKFORD R	Cons	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HOWELL M	Cons				X	WILLIAMS J	LibD		X		
HOY S	Cons	X				WILSON G	LibD		X		
HUDSON P	Cons	X				WISSON J	Cons	X			
						WOTHERSPOON T	Cons	X			
						TOTAL	56				
						Possible maximum					
						58					

**COUNTY COUNCIL: 5TH FEBRUARY 2019**

**Agenda Item No. 6 – Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2019-24**

**AMENDMENT**

Proposed by Councillor Nethsingha, Seconded by Councillor Dupré

**Amend recommendation 2 to reflect the impact of:**

- Redirection of £6.06m (-) from Alconbury hub scheme towards
- £2m (+) Road maintenance
- £0.66m (+) Improving Street lighting
- £3.4m (+) School buildings maintenance and efficiency.

**Delete recommendation 4 and replace with**

- 4a Approval be given to the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan, to be balanced and amended with the following adjustments:

<b><i>Revised budget gap as proposed £000</i></b>		<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
		12,234	11,434	4,349	8,035	5,144
<b>Permanent change by year £000</b>		<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
b	Reduce central services future risks	-406				
c	Reduce the number of committees by 2	-53				
d	Reduce SRAs paid to Chairs/Vice Chairs	-49				
e	Remove the Area Community Champion roles	-20				
f	Reduce number of senior directors by 1 shared role	-83				
g	Continue to fund Multi-Systemic Therapy	321				
h	Invest in school place planning	90				
i	Re-introduce universal youth services across the county	111				
<b>Revised budget gap after new savings and commitments</b>		<b>12,145</b>	<b>11,434</b>	<b>4,349</b>	<b>8,035</b>	<b>5,144</b>
<b><i>Financing adjustments</i></b>						
j	Application of smoothing fund (Council tax policy as of Feb 18)	-9,100	-	-	-	-
k	General Council tax at 2.99% rather than 1.99% for 2019/20	-2,728	-78	-74	-76	-76
l	Redirection of MRP changes (including redeployed funding for Alconbury hub scheme)	-317				
<b>Revised budget gap after financing adjustments</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>11,356</b>	<b>4,275</b>	<b>7,959</b>	<b>5,068</b>

- m. Approval be given to a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £809,473,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.
- n. Approval be given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £297,967,322.32, 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).
- o. Approval be 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 (227,090.2), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% ASC precept increase and a 2.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
------	-------	------------

A	6/9	874.74
B	7/9	1020.53
C	8/9	1166.32
<b>D</b>	<b>9/9</b>	1312.11
E	11/9	1603.69
F	13/9	1895.27
G	15/9	2186.85
H	18/9	2624.22

5 <sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2019						APPENDIX F					
COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ADEY D	Ind				X	HUNT W T I	Cons		X		
D AMBROSE-SMITH	Cons		X			JENKINS D	LibD	X			
BAILEY A	Cons		X			JONES L	Lab			X	
BATCHELOR H	LibD				APOLOGIES	KAVANAGH N	Lab			X	
BATES I C	Cons		X			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD	X			
BODEN C	Cons		X			KING S	Cons		X		
BRADNAM A	LibD	X				MANNING I	LibD	X			
BYWATER S	Cons		X			MCGUIRE L W	Cons		X		
CONNOR D	Con				APOLOGIES	MESCHINI E	Lab			X	
COSTELLO A	Cons	X				NETHSINGHA L	LibD	X			
COUNT STEVE	Cons		X			NIETO L	Cons		X		
CRAWFORD S	Lab			X		REYNOLDS K	Cons		X		
CRISWELL S J	Cons		X			RICHARDS C	Lab			X	
CUFFLEY K	Cons				APOLOGIES	ROGERS T	Cons		X		
DOWNES P J	LibD	X				SANDERSON T	Ind	X			
DUPRE L	LibD	X				SCHUMANN J	Cons		X		
EVERY L	Cons				X	SCUTT J	Lab			X	
FRENCH J	Cons		X			SHELLENS M	LibD	X			
FULLER R	Cons		X			SHUTER M	Cons		X		
GARDENER I	Cons		X			SMITH M	Cons		X		
GILES D	Ind	X				TAYLOR A	LibD	X			
GOLDSACK	Cons		X			TAYLOR S	Inde			X	
GOWING J	Cons		X			TIERNEY S	Cons		X		
HARFORD L	Cons		X			TOPPING P	Cons		X		
HARRISON N	LibD	X				VAN DE VEN S	LibD	X			
HAY A	Cons		X			WELLS D	Cons		X		
HICKFORD R	Cons		X			WHITEHEAD J	Lab			X	
HOWELL M	Cons				X	WILLIAMS J	LibD	X			
HOY S	Cons		X			WILSON G	LibD	X			
HUDSON P	Cons		X			WISSON J	Cons		X		
						WOTHERSPOON T	Cons		X		
						TOTAL	55				
						Possible maximum					
						58					



**COUNTY COUNCIL: 5TH FEBRUARY 2019**

**Agenda Item No. 6 – Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2019-24**

**AMENDMENT**

Proposed by Councillor Whitehead, Seconded by Councillor Jones

**Delete recommendation 4 and replace with**

- a. That the Council's budget for 2019-20:
- has the main aim of protecting early help and preventative services and that budget proposals therefore concentrate primarily on children and young people’s services
  - is balanced through drawing on a combination of financing changes to smoothing fund, MRP redirection and the transformation fund
  - includes an additional 1% in Council tax on top of that currently planned, to be spent on provision of services and justified by the need to avoid reductions in certain children’s services

and that approval is therefore given to the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan, to be balanced and amended with the following adjustments:

<b><i>Revised budget gap as proposed £000</i></b>		<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
		12,234	11,434	4,349	8,035	5,144
<b>Permanent change by year £000</b>		<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
b	Application of Smoothing Fund (Council tax policy as of Feb 18)	-5,000				
C	Redirection of MRP policy surplus throughout MTFS period	-4,000				
d	Application of Transformation Fund (gradual run-down of fund)	-3,234				
<b>Revised budget gap after financing adjustments</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>11,434</b>	<b>4,349</b>	<b>8,035</b>	<b>5,144</b>
e	Reversal of 2019/20 element of Looked After Children savings	1,311				
f	Increase in Schools funding for High Needs Block	1,000				
g	Continue to fund Multi-Systemic Therapy	321				
h	Investment in improvement of school standards	100				
i	Reversal of School Facing Traded Services saving	151				
j	General Council tax at 2.99% rather than 1.99% for 2019/20	-2,728	-78	-74	-76	-76
<b>Revised budget gap after Children’s spending plans</b>		<b>155</b>	<b>11,356</b>	<b>4,275</b>	<b>7,959</b>	<b>5,068</b>
k	Increase in number of Health Visitor posts	378				

l	Removal of libraries computer charges	325				
m	Additional funding for libraries book fund	325				
n	Investment in improving street lighting	450				
o	Staffing budget/reduction to organisational savings	930				
<b>Revised budget gap after additional spending plans</b>		<b>2,563</b>	<b>11,356</b>	<b>4,275</b>	<b>7,959</b>	<b>5,068</b>
p	Application of Smoothing Fund (Council tax policy as of Feb 18)	-2,563				
<b>Revised budget gap after financing adjustments</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>11,356</b>	<b>4,275</b>	<b>7,959</b>	<b>5,068</b>

- q. Approval be given to a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £809,473,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.
- r. Approval be given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £297,967,322.32, 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).
- s. Approval be 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 (227,090.2), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% ASC precept increase and a 2.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
------	-------	------------

A	6/9	874.74
B	7/9	1020.53
C	8/9	1166.32
<b>D</b>	<b>9/9</b>	1312.11
E	11/9	1603.69
F	13/9	1895.27
G	15/9	2186.85
H	18/9	2624.22

COUNCIL						5 <sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2019						APPENDIX H					
COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote						
ADEY D	Ind				X	HUNT W T I	Cons		X								
D AMBROSE-SMITH	Cons		X			JENKINS D	LibD			X							
BAILEY A	Cons		X			JONES L	Lab	X									
BATCHELOR H	LibD				APOLOGIES	KAVANAGH N	Lab	X									
BATES I C	Cons		X			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD			X							
BODEN C	Cons		X			KING S	Cons		X								
BRADNAM A	LibD			X		MANNING I	LibD			X							
BYWATER S	Cons		X			MCGUIRE L W	Cons		X								
CONNOR D	Con				APOLOGIES	MESCHINI E	Lab	X									
COSTELLO A	Cons		X			NETHSINGHA L	LibD			X							
COUNT STEVE	Cons		X			NIETO L	Cons		X								
CRAWFORD S	Lab	X				REYNOLDS K	Cons		X								
CRISWELL S J	Cons		X			RICHARDS C	Lab	X									
CUFFLEY K	Cons				APOLOGIES	ROGERS T	Cons		X								
DOWNES P J	LibD			X		SANDERSON T	Ind	X									
DUPRE L	LibD			X		SCHUMANN J	Cons		X								
EVERY L	Cons		X			SCUTT J	Lab	X									
FRENCH J	Cons		X			SHELLENS M	LibD			X							
FULLER R	Cons		X			SHUTER M	Cons		X								
GARDENER I	Cons		X			SMITH M	Cons		X								
GILES D	Ind			X		TAYLOR A	LibD			X							
GOLDSACK	Cons		X			TAYLOR S	Inde	X									
GOWING J	Cons		X			TIERNEY S	Cons		X								
HARFORD L	Cons		X			TOPPING P	Cons		X								
HARRISON N	LibD			X		VAN DE VEN S	LibD			X							
HAY A	Cons		X			WELLS D	Cons		X								
HICKFORD R	Cons		X			WHITEHEAD J	Lab	X									
HOWELL M	Cons				X	WILLIAMS J	LibD			X							
HOY S	Cons		X			WILSON G	LibD			X							
HUDSON P	Cons		X			WISSON J	Cons		X								
						WOTHERSPOON T	Cons		X								
						TOTAL	56										
						Possible maximum											
						58											

COUNCIL						5 <sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2019						APPENDIX I				
COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote					
ADEY D	Ind				X	HUNT W T I	Cons	X								
D AMBROSE-SMITH	Cons	X				JENKINS D	LibD		X							
BAILEY A	Cons	X				JONES L	Lab		X							
BATCHELOR H	LibD				APOLOGIES	KAVANAGH N	Lab		X							
BATES I C	Cons	X				KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD							X		
BODEN C	Cons	X				KING S	Cons	X								
BRADNAM A	LibD				X	MANNING I	LibD		X							
BYWATER S	Cons	X				MCGUIRE L W	Cons	X								
CONNOR D	Con				APOLOGIES	MESCHINI E	Lab		X							
COSTELLO A	Cons	X				NETHSINGHA L	LibD		X							
COUNT STEVE	Cons	X				NIETO L	Cons	X								
CRAWFORD S	Lab		X			REYNOLDS K	Cons							X		
CRISWELL S J	Cons	X				RICHARDS C	Lab		X							
CUFFLEY K	Cons				APOLOGIES	ROGERS T	Cons	X								
DOWNES P J	LibD			X		SANDERSON T	Ind		X							
DUPRE L	LibD		X			SCHUMANN J	Cons	X								
EVERY L	Cons	X				SCUTT J	Lab		X							
FRENCH J	Cons	X				SHELLENS M	LibD							X		
FULLER R	Cons	X				SHUTER M	Cons	X								
GARDENER I	Cons	X				SMITH M	Cons	X								
GILES D	Ind			X		TAYLOR A	LibD		X							
GOLDSACK	Cons	X				TAYLOR S	Inde	X								
GOWING J	Cons	X				TIERNEY S	Cons	X								
HARFORD L	Cons	X				TOPPING P	Cons	X								
HARRISON N	LibD		X			VAN DE VEN S	LibD		X							
HAY A	Cons	X				WELLS D	Cons	X								
HICKFORD R	Cons	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X							
HOWELL M	Cons	X				WILLIAMS J	LibD		X							
HOY S	Cons	X				WILSON G	LibD		X							
HUDSON P	Cons	X				WISSON J	Cons	X								
						WOTHERSPOON T	Cons	X								
						TOTAL	53									
						Possible maximum	58									

*[Following the closure of the vote, Councillor Downes indicated that he had voted in error in abstaining on the substantive motion and requested that the record should show that he had meant to vote against.]*

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 5TH FEBRUARY 2019  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW &  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.1**

**Questions to the Council's Appointee on the Combined Authority –  
Councillor Steve Count**

**Question from Councillor Dupré**

My question is around the Strategic bus review by Members – my question is bearing in mind that we now know that last year there were 100,000 fewer bus journeys beginning in Cambridgeshire than in the year before; bearing in mind that we now know that's the lowest number since records began, and it's down nearly three million in ten years, given that the public financial support from central government has fallen in that time from £4M ten years ago to £2.4M now, even without allowing for inflation. Bearing in mind it's taken us now nearly two years to get to having a bus review report to the CA, and bearing in mind that it will be another two years to get to the business case stage, Can I ask Councillor Count when the CA expects to see that trend in fall in bus use and the fall in bus journeys actually reduce, and I'm quite happy to take an answer after the meeting.

**Response from Councillor Count**

Yes thank you Madam Chairman, I will supply a response in writing.

**Question from Councillor van de Ven**

We had an email a few days ago announcing that our bus subsidies would continue in the coming financial year, which of course is very welcome news for those who are (*indistinct*).

Needless to say there is a good deal of anxiety throughout the universe awaiting the situation for the coming year because it's been like this for quite some time. So my bus user group in my area that I chair welcomes the Bus Review's acknowledgement in detail of the plight of rural isolation, and it did go into some in depth understanding of predicaments that people around the county face who don't have certain public transport. However, as I said we are living from year to year, and we understand that it will be some time before the Bus Review results in a new way of doing things, and an assured way of providing bus services. So my question is what I should be telling the bus users in my area about the following financial year, do we expect that these subsidies will be in place for this year, for the services they currently use, are we sure about that, and do we have to wait a year from now for the next budget to know about the following year, is that is how we should be expected... is that how you perceive our situation?

**Reponse from Councillor Count**

So the first point I'd like to make is about the quantum of money available for subsidies moving forward. So the email that went out basically confirms that the amount available for subsidies which is the levy proposal to the Combined Authority (*indistinct*) has been agreed at the same level as the quantum that is there at the moment, so there has been no cuts in the amount of money available for subsidies. When you break that down into individual areas, there are of course a number of bus contracts that will be coming up for renewal, subsidised ones, so depending on what the answers that generates, if that generates the same level of demand for resource, it will be the same, if there's a decrease, somebody else may come in with resources, if

it goes over that there may be a slight issue by the fact that the amount of resource available is the same as now, and there might be demand (*indistinct*) in which case it will need to be considered as to what happens in that case. What happens in that case is that obviously this year and next year, is that the Combined Authority is being asked to consider how to better framework the way bus subsidies are handled. So at the moment its very much a responsive thing, if a commercial operator no longer finds itself viable in a certain area and requests a subsidy, then you have to consider whether its given or not, but the basis on which it's considered isn't under a determined framework, but it's anticipated that the Combined Authority will be putting through their Board process a framework to consider on how these requests in the future, and it might be things like is there an alternative means of travel, is there another bus service, how big is the village/town/hamlet that they will be serving, and how often will we need the buses to run. So we should be seeing that later this year, through the Combined Authority, in dealing with that they've allocated £1m for next year, and £1m in the year after, separate to the amount that's available for bus services, to actually deliver the report on the potential changes to which we subsidise bus services. In there (*indistinct*) until we've got the actual answer to that, we don't know. But I think that in the future what we will find once there is an agreed way forward there is for subsidies, that's the way in future the Combined Authority will (*indistinct*).

### **Questions to the Council's Appointee on the Combined Authority Overview & Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Lucy Nethsingha**

#### **Question from Councillor Scutt**

Councillor Nethsingha, I would like to direct this question to you if I may. It appears that last year the charity (*indistinct*) under the auspices of the Combined Authority, and if you are unable to answer now, if you could have it in writing:

- The full cost of the dinner, including the hire of the venue in Ely, and including all in-house costs, including staff time, and so on, so all the full costs;
- What amount was raised that was to go to the charity, that it was alleged to be held for;
- The name of the charity that the monies went to;
- The make-up of that charity in terms of what trustees of the charity has;
- And finally whether the venue in Ely has actually been paid their costs of hire.

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

This did come up at Scrutiny Committee, and what Scrutiny Committee has asked for a report from the Monitoring Officer. At the time of the Scrutiny Committee our understanding was that the cost of the Ball had gone through the Combined Authority accounts, they had recovered and money had been paid to the charity, and therefore we had some questions about the propriety of the Combined Authority bank account being used for that purpose, and staff time, but we didn't have any other questions. Since then, today, I have received some information that in fact the charity doesn't seem to have received any of that money, so I think that there are more questions to be asked, and Scrutiny will be looking into them, and I can't answer your questions yet, but just send them to me, I will send them on and I will do my best to answer.

#### **Question from Councillor Boden**

Would Councillor Nethsingha confirm, and I hope she will as I was present at the meeting, that at the last Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting considered amongst other things the budget for the forthcoming year which was tens of million of pounds, the projected potential capital spend of over £6 billion, and would she not also agree that anyone who would divert from talking from those items to talk about items of a few hundred pounds is guilty of irresponsible political posturing.

### **Response from Councillor Nethsingha**

I can confirm that at our last Committee meeting scrutinised the budget, and spent considerable time scrutinising Combined Authority finance, and the scrutiny of those items is extremely important and it is absolutely the right thing to spend considerable time scrutinising the CA's finance, because at the moment those finances are very far from clear, which means currently as a member of the scrutiny Committee as you know they are much better than they were, but there are very significant jobs still to be done. What I would not agree is that we should therefore not bother to do that other stuff because it is small fry, because the numbers in the context of the Combined Authority are not large, I agree, however it is important that we look at the way in which the Mayor's money is spent, and the way the Mayor is using that, so I do not agree that that would be a waste of our time (*indistinct*)

### **Question from Councillor Topping**

I would just like to say to Cllr Nethsingha, to make amends for my harsh words earlier, I thought she chaired the Overview and Scrutiny Committee very well and was entirely proportionate in the sense that there was a question about the Ball, and she sort of dealt with that. But she made sure that most of the focus of the meeting was on the finances of the Combined Authority and the bus franchising proposals which are far more important for the people of this county than any of this sort of (*indistinct*)

### **Response from Councillor Nethsingha**

Thank you very much.

### **Question from Councillor Harrison**

Would Councillor Nethsingha agree with me that there is a danger of the Scrutiny Committee appearing to participate in a cover-up if it were not to look at the small amounts of financial potential (*indistinct*) Would she perhaps agree with me that that's what MPs, (*indistinct*) Councillors Topping and Boden's approach, that what MPs thought of the Expenses Scandal?

### **Response from Councillor Nethsingha**

The Scrutiny Committee will not be involved in any cover-ups. And I don't actually think that Councillor Boden was not suggesting that we should (*indistinct*) not but should spend more time on the budget and more important issues.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 5 FEBRUARY 2019**  
**WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

**1. Question from Councillor Sandra Crawford**

I was approached by a resident who was distressed by the sudden announcement of the closure of the Hinton Grange Care Home last October (28<sup>th</sup>) 2018.

This is an excerpt from her email:

“I write regarding the proposed closure of Hinton Grange nursing home, Cherry Hinton.

The home is currently proposing to close for refurbishment in early December 2018 for 18 months.

Relatives and staff were told 2 weeks ago and are all completely dismayed by the proposed closure - to implement a cinema room, a coffee bar- none of which I feel are essential, basically they want to update the home and also do some refurbishments to toilet areas.”

On the 13th November 2018, the Cambridge City MP, and the leader of the City Council published accounts of the distress that residents had experienced at the suddenness of the closure, the lack of consultation and the lack of concern for the people living at the home which included 20 County residents (approx.).

Daniel Zeichners’ publication included:

“Daniel Zeichner, MP for Cambridge, and Councillor Lewis Herbert, local Councillor for Coleridge where the home resides and Leader of Cambridge City Council, have condemned the actions of care provider, Care UK, after telling residents of Hinton Grange care home that they will be closing the site for refurbishments a few days before Christmas Day Care UK has provided less than two months formal notice to residents and their families, who are now trying to find alternative care provision in the run up to Christmas.

Mr Zeichner and Councillor Herbert have been contacted by a number of families in recent weeks affected by this announcement, informing them that residents and families are experiencing serious levels of stress due to the short time frame before the 21st December. Hinton Grange care home is currently set to close for refurbishment for 18 months with all residents needing to find alternative care during that time. It is understood that staff face losing their jobs, however have been offered alternative locations to work, some of which are outside the city.

Daniel Zeichner MP said: “I am dismayed by the complete lack of compassion shown by Care UK for the residents and staff of Hinton Grange. To announce that the home will be closing just 4 days before Christmas and only providing two months’ notice is simply not acceptable. I understand that many residents are frail and families are worried about the affect this move will have on their mental wellbeing.”

“The Chief Executive of Care UK needs to provide some answers. We need to know who made the decision to move 37 elderly residents, some in very vulnerable situations, on 21st December. That is the time of year when people should be enjoying the festive celebrations in familiar settings, not going through a traumatic and stressful move.”



I had a meeting with Wendi Ogle-Welbourn about this, after the Adults Committee in November.

I asked her:-

- 1) Why we had not been given any official notification of this closure, as my first knowledge of this came from residents, Councillors and MPs. I was extremely upset at not first being told by officers, especially being a member of the Adults Committee and feel it is very undermining and wrong.
- 2) How long the refurbishments would take and what would happen to those County residents, who would have to find other arrangements while this was happening. Wendi Ogle-Welbourn told me that no one would be moved unless suitable accommodation was found.

I was subsequently given updates by Will Patten. The residents have now all been moved out and the care home has closed.

This event has still left questions to be answered.

- 1) It appears that Care UK intend to demolish the Home and rebuild it, which will take far longer than any refurbishments thus causing more distress to the residents. Is the Council being informed that this will still be an affordable home for County residents that wish to return? Will this cause problems for finding new placements especially in this area?
- 2) In the light of the behaviour of Care UK, will the County continue to consider them a responsible and reliable company for the purpose of caring for County residents?
- 3) Why was the Adults Committee not updated at all at any stage of this process?
- 4) Why was there so little time for consultation with the residents and their families?
- 5) Will the County insist in any new contracts that any company that the Council uses for caring for people keeps both the County and the families updated on any plans at least six months in advance and that proper consultation is carried out?
- 6) Daniel Zeichner has stated in his publication of Care UK that  
"The company have in the past been involved in controversy over tax issues, wage-cutting and political donations to local former Conservative MP and Health Secretary Andrew Lansley." Could the Council use companies that have not only a more ethical approach to residents and their families in terms of consultation, but also in their conduct to staff and tax.
- 7) According to another member who reported about the threatened closure of care home in Queen Edith's - this was also not in reports to the Adults Committee. Can we make sure that members are updated in good time in future?

### **Response from Councillor Anna Bailey, Chairwoman of Adults Committee**

**Why we had not been given any official notification of this closure, as my first knowledge of this came from residents, Councillors and MPs?**

Care UK discussed the action to refurbish Hinton Grange Care Home at a board meeting on October 8th, and subsequently informed residents at a meeting on 11th October. Officers became aware of the situation when residents and their families brought it to the attention of officers following disclosure by Care UK.

Care UK notified officers that they were required to discuss the proposal at their board and then meet with staff in line with their statutory responsibilities. Officers did discuss this at the first meeting held on the 25th of October where it was highlighted that the local authority also have a statutory duty to ensure residents were safe, and the lack of reasonable notice, coupled with the timing of the closure risked compromise of delivering on those duties.

Once officers were made aware of the situation the service director for commissioning was in dialogue with the Councillor Crawford to ensure regular updates were shared.

**How long the refurbishments would take and what would happen to those County residents, who would have to find other arrangements while this was happening?**

Care UK did not give any details on how long the refurbishment would take. Care UK had developed a transition plan to relocate residents. However in order to satisfy the Council's statutory responsibility to ensure residents were safe the Council began to work with residents and their families to relocate them.

A contract governs the relationship between the Council and Care UK for the provision of Hinton Grange, the contract states that six months' notice is required to close the provision, and residents could be moved in that time.

Council officers were able to move the residents in a three month period, however it is important to note that where there was a financial increase between the weekly rate being paid at Hinton Grange and the new placement, the Council are pursuing Care UK to recover the cost.

**It appears that Care UK intend to demolish the Home and rebuild it, which will take far longer than any refurbishments thus causing more distress to the residents. Is the Council being informed that this will still be an affordable home for County residents that wish to return? Will this cause problems for finding new placements especially in this area?**

Care UK have not shared information regarding the new provision and its future fees. There is currently a strategy to increase the capacity of care homes across Cambridgeshire to meet current and future demand. Therefore it is not expected that this delay will cause challenges in finding new placements in Cambridge City.

**In the light of the behaviour of Care UK, will the County continue to consider them a responsible and reliable company for the purpose of caring for County residents?**

Care UK have one other care home in the County. Field Lodge in St.Ives. Placements are still being commissioned for this home and there are no concerns regarding quality of care at this time. We will need to ensure robust due diligence is undertaken if, and when the new home is completed.

**Why was the Adults Committee not updated at all at any stage of this process?**

It is with regret that Adults Committee were not updated with this information. Learning is taken from this and updates will be forthcoming in future. In addition, we will ensure that Division Councillors are kept informed of provider issues in their area.

### **Why was there so little time for consultation with the residents and their families?**

Care UK informed the residents before Council officers were made aware. Despite our best efforts, we were unable to extend the timeline between notification and closure. In consultation with families, it was clear that we would not be able to change the decision, and the more protracted the timeframe, the more distress would be experienced with residents and their families. Therefore resources were concentrated to undertake the required assessments, identify other settings that best met the needs of residents and manage safe transfer of those residents in time to allow them to settle in before Christmas.

Resident's social workers supported the transitions alongside Care UK staff and other health professionals. This was a very intensive piece of work delivered in a complete, sensitive and diligent manner.

### **Will the County insist in any new contracts that any company that the Council uses for caring for people keeps both the County and the families updated on any plans at least six months in advance and that proper consultation is carried out?**

The requirement to provide six months' notice is outlined in the contract and the Council insisted that this clause was followed by Care UK. It is good practice for providers to consult with residents and their families where changes are proposed, however to ensure the Council has a more robust contractual position, the clause for notice will be enhanced to incorporate the need for an appropriate level of consultation to take place.

### **Daniel Zeichner has stated in his publication of Care UK that**

**"The Company have in the past been involved in controversy over tax issues, wage-cutting and political donations to local former Conservative MP and Health Secretary Andrew Lansley." Could the Council use companies that have not only a more ethical approach to residents and their families in terms of consultation, but also in their conduct to staff and tax.**

Due diligence is carried out on new providers who are awarded contracts to ensure they are compliant with our requirements and legislative obligations. This includes:

- Insurance (Public Liability, Employers Liability, Professional Indemnity & Medical Malpractice)
- Policies and procedures (eg Safeguarding)
- Business Continuity Plans
- CQC registration certificate
- Most recent Care Quality Commission (CQC) outcome.
- 

Any concerns identified in this process are interrogated. Further routine contract monitoring is conducted where issues arising around these obligations maybe picked up.

We will be recharging Care UK if the cost of care incurred for residents in the new setting exceeds the cost that would have been due had residents remained in Hinton Grange until the contract term date of 31st March 2019

**According to another member who reported about the threatened closure of care home in Queen Edith's - this was also not in reports to the Adults Committee. Can we make sure that members are updated in good time in future?**

It is regrettable that this was not completed for Hinton Grange & the Supported Living facility in Queen Edith Division. This will be part of the process in the future and as previously mentioned, it is our intention to contact Division Councillors when issues arise with care providers within their Division. This will include provision of regular updates

**2. Question from Councillor Amanda Taylor**

The proposals to close The Haven supported living facility in Queen Edith's continue to cause deep anxiety amongst its residents.

Given the need for adaptations to the building to get it up to standard for disabled residents, will she make available a detailed report on what adaptations are required?  
Will she also assure residents and the local community that The Haven is staying open?

**Response from Councillor Anna Bailey, Chairwoman of Adults Committee**

The Council is continuing to explore all opportunities to meet the needs of the individual residents at The Haven and will continue this alongside the on-going review of support needs. This includes the possibility of investment in the building and facilities to enable the current cohort to continue to reside at the accommodation in line with their current and emerging individual requirements. As the Council does not own the building, work had focused around the Landlord's ability to invest in the changes to the building that would be required to modernise elements of the accommodation and communal facilities. In addition a review of the needs of the current residents is being carried out to understand what aids and adaptations could be provided as well as what permanent alterations may be required. At the time of initial discussions, the Landlord had expressed that significant capital investment was not possible. Following the merger between Aldwyck Housing Group and King Street Housing during 2018, The Haven now forms part of the housing stock for Aldwyck Housing Group and Officers have been able to re-open conversations relating to possible capital investment and adaptations.

Council officers met with a representative from Aldwyck Housing group on January 24th 2019 and are awaiting the outcome of their internal reviews to make an assessment of the Landlord's ability to invest alongside any adaptations that may be required at The Haven. Many of the other accommodation options within Cambridgeshire for older people have been significantly modernised and adapted over the last 15 years and may provide a more appropriate alternative.

Work will continue to be carried out to assess the viability of the support service provision at The Haven to ensure that it meets the needs of the current residents, that the environment is appropriate to their needs and that, as part of the Council's duties to ensure that resources are allocated appropriately the service meets needs in the most effective way.

A broader plan regarding any proposed changes to the service offer, investment in the building and longer term requirements for the service would be presented to the local elected member and members of the Adults Committee for discussion and approval before any further action is taken. This will include any reports relating to investment in the building and adaptations that may be required. The Haven will remain open with current support arrangements in place whilst this work and subsequent Committee approval is undertaken.

### **3. Question from Councillor Amanda Taylor**

What is the total number of requests for disabled parking bays over the current and past municipal years and what is the average length of time between request and installation?

#### **Response from Councillor Shuter, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

Total number of requests for Disabled Persons Parking Bays (DPPBs):

2018/19: 63

2017/18: 60

2016/17: 40

2015/16: 45

2014/15: 57

There are two types of disabled parking bay that can be installed, mandatory and advisory bays. Mandatory bays require the making of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which includes the advertising of two public notices in the local press. Abuse of these bays can result in a Penalty Charge Notice. Advisory bays consist of just the road marking and no legislative sign, but cannot be enforced. As advisory bays do not require the making of a TRO and the advertisement of public notices in the press and don't require the installation of a post and sign plate they are cheaper and quicker to install.

To maximise the number of bays that can be installed with the annual accessibility budget where the installation of bays require TRO's, Orders are 'batched' together to maximise cost efficiency when publishing press notices. For example a yearly TRO is made for Cambridge City disabled persons parking bays that have been applied for that year and advertised in one press notice.

Through batching up the applications, advisory bays cost approximately £80 to install whereas Mandatory bays cost approximately £1,150, therefore more bays can be installed with the annual budget. Mandatory bays are installed in restricted areas or potentially restricted areas such as Cambridge City, Ely, St Neots, St Ives and Huntingdon but in all other rural areas advisory bays are more commonly installed (but applications will be assessed on a case by case basis).

#### **Time taken from receipt of application to installation;**

Mandatory bays take longer to process from receipt to installation due to the requirement to follow the statutory TRO process. Whilst only interested parties (neighbouring properties, local Council's and Councillors) are consulted prior to installation of an advisory bay. The average length of time taken from receipt of application to installation is,

Advisory bays: 4 months

Mandatory bays: 9 months

This time can vary depending on available budget, receipt and nature of objections, weather conditions and availability of lining contractors. Lining of bays are usually batched together due to lining contractors charging day rates.

Not all requests for DPPBs result in the implementation of a bay. Out of the 63 applications received during 2018/19, 21 were withdrawn. The remaining 42 comprises of 22 advisory bays and 20 mandatory.

#### **4. Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven**

Cambridgeshire County Council has a statutory obligation to make non-British EU citizens living in Cambridgeshire aware of the need to apply for Settled Status, post-Brexit, in order to secure their right to remain living in the UK; and also, to apply for Settled Status on behalf of vulnerable children and vulnerable adults, although Government has not yet provided a definition of what constitutes a vulnerable adult.

A resident in my division who might be designated as a vulnerable adult has endeavoured to apply for Settled Status in the public test phase that commenced on 21 January. This process has highlighted procedural points of concern, and questions about who should be considered a vulnerable adult.

The resident is a German citizen 80 years of age, resident in the UK for 58 years, divorced from a British spouse, with limited income, a council tenant, no private transport, no Android phone and no computer or internet access.

The application for Settled Status must be done on-line: this can be done via computer rather than smartphone, however required documentation must first be scanned via a Home Office app downloaded onto an Android device with specified features.

The nearest Cambridgeshire Libraries are in Cambridge or Great Shelford, but there are no bus services from this person's village to either destination. Nevertheless, once at a library, help would be required to set up a first-time email account and help with navigating a computer and internet, in order to work through a lengthy and complex application process.

In this person's case, a neighbour offered to help scan required identity documents with his Android phone, but could not successfully download the app (in common with experience reported by Addenbrooke's when its non-British EU employees went through the pilot phase in Nov-Dec 2018).

If an applicant cannot complete document scanning via an Android device, he or she needs to visit an EU Settlement Resolution Centre, of which there are none in Cambridgeshire. The nearest to South Cambridgeshire is the Hertfordshire Register Office in Hatfield, but this person has no access to transport to reach the centre. Once at the centre, the service provided would be limited to the scanning of documents. The application process would then need to be resumed on line at a library or private computer.

This person's experience raises the following questions:

How will the Council identify its vulnerable adults?

Will the Council adopt its own compassionate definition of vulnerable adults to include people who are frail, isolated and on limited income?

In addition to the waiving of library internet charges, what steps can the Council take to facilitate the ability of EU residents to access and complete the application process for Settled Status?

#### **Response from Councillor Anna Bailey, Chairwoman of Adults Committee and Councillor Shuter, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

The Council recognises that, for many EU citizens resident in our county, it is a worrying and uncertain time, and we are working hard to ensure they are given as much information as possible to reduce these concerns. We have produced an impact assessment based on

the facts as we know them at present, and have formed a broad officer group to take forward direct action, particularly in relation to citizen engagement, led by one of our directors. The Government announcement of additional funding to support our efforts is very welcome, and we are currently discussing how best to deploy this resource to best effect.

Although we want to support all of our EU citizens with the information they need to secure settled status, we are of course particularly keen to ensure those in our care, such as looked after children and vulnerable adults, are particularly well supported through the process. I'd therefore like to thank Councillor Van de Ven for sharing the experiences of one of the residents in her Division, which provides us with some valuable early insights.

It is perhaps helpful to remind Members that, at present, the EU Settlement Scheme is not fully launched; the scheme is operating currently in a public test phase which limits somewhat the support available both locally and at a national level. The full scheme is due to launch on 30 March.

To respond to the specific questions raised:

**1. How will the Council identify its vulnerable adults?**

The Council records ethnicity and nationality against the majority of the children, young people, adults and older adults on the Council's information systems and we are currently analysing this information to enable us to make contact with anyone who may need support to apply for settled status. As part of our statutory assessment and review process we will ensure staff discuss issues related to settled status and support people to complete this process if it is needed.

We will also ensure our Adult Early Help Team and other services such as Reablement that have a wider reach signpost anyone who they come into contact with to the necessary support to apply for settled status.

More broadly, we also work closely with voluntary, community and faith sector organisations, and as part of our communications and engagement work, we will ensure these groups are provided with information and support to reach out to EU citizens including those who are more vulnerable.

**2. Will the Council adopt its own compassionate definition of vulnerable adults to include people who are frail, isolated and on limited income?**

Our overarching aim is to ensure that all EU citizens resident in Cambridgeshire are provided with the correct information as soon as we have it. As Councillor Van de Ven acknowledges, we are still waiting for guidance from the Government on their requirements for local authorities to support vulnerable adults. As soon as we receive this we will of course review it to ensure it aligns to our own principles of ensuring our most vulnerable residents receive the support they need, and will adjust our approach accordingly.

**3. In addition to the waiving of library internet charges, what steps can the Council take to facilitate the ability of EU residents to access and complete the application process for Settled Status?**

I'm pleased to confirm that internet access to all gov.uk web sites is free of charge in our libraries.

It is our intention to offer an Assisted Digital Service in some of our libraries, to support all of our EU citizens to secure settled status, particularly those who are more vulnerable. We

are currently piloting this approach in Cambridge Central Library, but will aim to roll this out in as many other libraries as possible.

The service offered is a complete application process including document scanning and completion of the application with the resident – staff have been specially trained to undertake this task. Additionally, all libraries across the county can provide general assisted digital support, including pointing people to the correct website, helping them to get online, booking them time with a volunteer Computer Buddy or onto a digital skills course. Whilst this may not be suitable for the specific resident referred to in the Question, it will help to ensure others can receive the help they need.

We also understand that the Government will be offering assistance by telephone and home visits from WeareDigital. We assume that this will be available from 30 March when the scheme opens in full.