

STRATEGY, RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: 23rd October 2025

Time: 10.00a.m. to 1.32p.m.

Venue: Red Kite Room, New Shire Hall, Alconbury Weald

Present: Councillors Dupré (Vice-Chair), Galbraith, Hathorn, Keane (substituting for Councillor Goldsack), Ioannides, Martin, Meschini, Murphy, Navarro (substituting for Councillor A Beckett), Tong, A Whelan, C Whelan (substituting for Councillor Nethsingha), Wyatt (substituting for Councillor Wilson), and Young

14. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Councillors A Beckett, Boden, Goldsack, Nethsingha and Wilson. There were no declarations of interest.

15. Minutes – 24th June and 23rd September 2025 and Action Log

The minutes of the meetings held on 24th June and 23rd September 2025 were agreed unanimously as a correct record and signed by the Chair. The action log was noted.

16. Petitions and Public Questions

No petitions or public questions were received.

The Chief Executive informed Members that this would be the last meeting for Sue Grace, Executive Director of Strategy and Partnerships, and Janet Atkin, Service Director: Human Resources, who were retiring at the end of the year and October, respectively. He thanked them both for their long service and extensive contributions to the Council.

17. Integrated Finance Monitoring Report for Period 5 2025-26

The Committee was informed that the Council continued to forecast an overspend in the revenue budget currently at a slightly improved position of £12.3m. This forecast overspend reflected pressures in supporting children in care, learning disabilities, home to school transport, as well as higher capital financing costs and lower than expected income. Attention was drawn to the mitigations set out in the report to address the overspend, which was at an unsustainable level without further action. Members were reminded that offsetting these pressures was corporate funding agreed in the business plan. The forecast in-year pressure in the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) was £32.5m with a cumulative £95.3m deficit projected. Although this deficit was ringfenced until March 2028 through Government regulations, it was still costing £3.5m in debt financing costs. It remained a major risk as national reforms had been delayed until 2026. A

balanced position was forecast for the Capital Programme with funding expected to be fully spent.

Members noted the following responses to their questions:

- new Social, Emotional and Mental Health provision in Wisbech had slipped following a recent annual rebaselining exercise where capital funding had been rolled forward for this scheme to 2025-26.
- the red (not expected to fully achieve) and black (not expected to achieve) RAG rated savings were included in the forecasts for the relevant directorates. The need for adjustments would be considered in the upcoming business planning process.
- Adult Social Care (ASC) debt was a revenue pressure. Provision had been made for doubtful debts, which would only become a revenue pressure if the debt had to be written off. The current debt position was monitored closely by Adults and Health and Audit and Accounts Committees.
- there were a number of reasons for ASC debt including people who did not want to pay but also many who were not able to pay. The number of deaths also increased the debt as settlement had to allow for probate and other issues. It was noted that the Debt Recovery Team prepared profiles on all amounts based on circumstances. The debt was broken down into different elements and reported to Adults and Health and Audit and Accounts Committees.
- a settlement had been reached between the Council and the Integrated Care Board (ICB) to clear the historic debt for pooled budgets. There was still ASC debt relating to individuals and their contributions to care but as the NHS was a public body, the Council did not make significant provision within its budget for this debt.
- it was not clear what the Council's future funding position would be and therefore how much funding would be needed to meet any overspend. The Executive Director of Finance and Resources would present a Section 25 report to the January meeting covering the robustness of budget estimates and the level of reserves held by the Council in order to assess and ensure its financial sustainability. In the meantime, the Council needed to address the overspend position in year, which included the introduction of enhanced controls.
- the Council did receive a share of business rates growth, which was collected by District Councils. An estimate was received at the start of the calendar year to inform the business plan with the final figure reported in February.
- the mitigations to address the overspend were forecasted in projections with the relevant policy and service committee monitoring performance. The Committee would receive updates on this position at every meeting. Members were reminded that the Fair Funding Review was still awaited. Although the overspend had reduced slightly, there were still a number of red and black RAG rated savings. Officers had reviewed the mitigating factors around these savings and drawn up additional savings plans. There was still a need to enhance financial controls and as such new

measures had been introduced to manage essential spend. Some Directorates had spend below the base budget in order to compensate for the overspend.

- internal reports indicated that the overspend was likely to come down further for the December meeting. It was noted that if further actions were required they would be presented to this meeting.
- there had been a significant overspend in the central legal budget primarily due to the increased cost of litigation for children in care.
- the Residential Strategy – Children in Care placements £581k saving related to two farmhouse buildings to be converted into council owned Children’s Homes. Implementation delays, partly through the planning process, meant that they would not be delivered in 2025/26. The £650k revenue funding set aside to support these homes had therefore been released.
- the nature of the savings in relation to process change and efficiency or budget was set out in the Business Plan with a reference number attached to each saving. The Vice-Chair asked officers to consider whether a summary could be circulated to Members. **Action Required.**
- the closing deficit balance in the table at 2.2.2 should read 2025/26 and not 2024/25.
- the DSG budgets for 104 out of 151 upper tier authorities were in a deficit position with Warwickshire, Worcestershire and Kent County Councils’ deficit double that of Cambridgeshire. The County Councils Network was lobbying government for reform, as by the end of the financial year the national debt position would be £12.2b, and £17b by the end of the decade.
- the demand for Education Care and Health Plan (ECHP) assessments and subsequently specialist school places and sufficiency for special schools in the area was increasing. The original safety value agreement had included the delivery of two special schools by the Department for Education, but this programme had currently been paused. Without those schools more children would need to access specialist independent provision leading to increased costs.
- Government had promised that there would be a Schools White Paper published in the autumn but this had now been delayed until early 2026 with no precise date. Although this provided an opportunity to co-produce the reforms with parents and carers, it did not help local government. It was also very disappointing that the Education Secretary’s letter on this issue had made no mention of the role of local government in the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) system. The system needed reforming both from a financial aspect but also to better address outcomes for children and young people. Staff in the SEND service were working hard to manage the most challenging and emotive issues in order to support families.

Individual members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- conveyed strong support for Recommendation d) with the hope the Committee would receive updates on how the investment was being utilised including key performance indicators, which could be analysed by Children and Young People Committee at every meeting. Another Member highlighted that this funding was insufficient with more resource needed to ensure families across Cambridgeshire did not suffer.
- expressed disappointment at the delay in the Schools White Paper and the need for the Council to consider its own self-reliance.
- acknowledged that the Council was not in a good position with a significant overspend projected. However, it was important to thank officers for the work they were doing to reduce this figure. It was important to recognise that some services were not meeting their statutory responsibilities. It was therefore essential that detailed scrutiny took place at every policy and service committee and the relevant people were held to account.

The Vice-Chair acknowledged the challenge and the work being undertaken to achieve a balanced budget particularly when managing the growing demand for statutory services. Following the Covid pandemic, there had been a rise in the number of children needing high levels of support in school than previously. The Council was operating in an environment of national pressure on funding and uncertainty. However, Members were receiving better financial, risk and performance information than before to inform high spending decisions.

It was resolved unanimously to approve:

- a) virements to allocate £10.6 million of corporate pressure funding from corporate items to directorates, as per 3.1.2 of Annex A
- b) virements within Adults, Health and Commissioning, totalling +/- £1.2 million, as per 3.2.1 of Annex A
- c) a virement of £0.3 million to correct the capital rebaselining virement previously agreed by Committee, as per 4.5.1 of Annex A
- d) reserve allocations of £0.78 million for Special Educational Needs and Disability performance improvement work, as per 5.1 of Annex A

18. Business Planning and Budget Setting 2026-27 – 2028-29

Members received a report outlining the background, process and timeline for the development, scrutiny and sign-off of the Business Plan and Budget 2026-27-2028-29 alongside plans for engagement and consultation with residents and key stakeholders. Attention was drawn to the background which set out the Council's ambitions, the context and the national financial position. The proposed process included two phases of engagement with residents and stakeholders before the draft Business Plan and

Budget went through the committee process for presentation to Full Council in February.

Attention was drawn to the current financial position. At this stage, the Council could expect to receive a £18m increase in general funding, assuming a 2% increase in Council Tax; combined with other funding increases from growth in the Council Tax base and Business Rates this would amount to an overall 3% increase. However, compared to the projections presented in February 2025, the budget gap for 2025-26 had increased to over £40m with the unbridged budget gap over the next five years expected to total £136m. The Council had campaigned for many years for a Fairer Funding Formula but could not rely on the outcome of the Fair Funding Review due in this year's settlement. Attention was drawn to the need to fund inflation of £23m, as well as demand projections of the same amount. The current reserves forecast trajectory was set out in the table at 3.7.

Individual members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- stressed the need to introduce a priority ranking for question three in the Phase One Engagement Questions rather than the option to select up to three services in order so as to give a clear indication of what residents valued most. Members were reminded that the engagement and consultation arrangements were part of an ongoing process to provide a picture over the year as to resident and stakeholder priorities. The first phase of engagement was designed to generate general input around the areas of focus before the formal consultation focused on specifics. The option to select three services was based on the need to analyse the data within a short time frame.
- highlighted the importance of basing the selection of three services on policy and service committee structures, as the current process did not allow for residents to differentiate a preference between funding highways or green infrastructure for example. The Vice-Chair acknowledged that it was difficult for a survey of this type to enable people to say what they wanted to say given its limitations. However, it was important to bear in mind that it would be considered alongside the Quality of Life Survey which provided a detailed source of information. It was felt that to break the survey down further would be complex and time-consuming. It was noted that there was always the opportunity for residents to write in.
- reminded Members that last year's phase one consultation survey had included a preamble based on the Council's ambitions with a request for residents to rank options in order, thus setting the scene for increasing Council Tax or cutting services.
- explained that green investment by the Council was largely revenue generating energy schemes and flood prevention.
- highlighted the importance of prioritising in terms of budget in order to represent the needs of residents and asked if this could take place in future. Members were informed that the results of the statistically robust Quality of Life Survey provided a greater understanding of the needs and priorities of residents. The second phase of

consultation would contain the draft budget proposals to close the budget funding gap and include direct consultation with key stakeholders and community groups.

The Vice-Chair reminded Members that there was three years' worth of Quality of Life Survey data to assist decision making. The survey detailed in the appendix was the first stage of a series of consultation exercises with residents and stakeholders. It was noted that the Council had improved its understanding of the needs and priorities of residents significantly over the last three years.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- Approve the process and timelines for setting the Business Plan and Budget 2026-27 – 2028-29;
- Approve the plans for engagement and consultation with residents and key stakeholders;
- Delegate any amendments requested by the committee to the Executive Director of Finance and Resources and Executive Director of Strategy and Partnerships, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Strategy, Resources and Performance Committee.

19. Quality of Life Survey 2025 Results

The Quality of Life Survey continued to provide valuable insight into the experiences of residents across Cambridgeshire as part of the Council's commitment to be an evidence-led organisation. This was the third year of this independently produced survey commissioned by the Council and three partners. The survey had reached 5,501 residents (roughly 1,100 in each of the five Districts) and was representative of the resident population. It showed that most residents continued to feel happy and safe. However, there were some areas of concern relating to cost of living pressures, and mental health and loneliness particularly amongst young people. Residents also continued to raise concerns about the maintenance of roads and pavements. It was noted that the survey provided important contextual information to support the shaping of business planning decisions, intelligence for Council services in their planning, and evidence to inform the planned review of the Strategic Framework.

In welcoming the report, individual members raised the following queries:

- whether there had been any further examination of the correlation between people who answered in certain ways and their life experiences. For example, for people who did not feel connected to their community did they also feel unhappy, or experience financial and health pressures. It was noted that the Council had only received the findings of the survey about six weeks ago, but there were plans to delve deeper into the data by demographics in order to carry out comparisons.
- how residents accessed the survey particularly as only half of the residents felt the Council kept them informed. Members noted that there were three elements to the survey, which included a stratified sample carried out through the web and telephone calls, the general survey conducted through the Council's social media

channels, and the targeting of hard to reach residents with the support of the Communities Team and wider partnerships.

- what low cost interventions were available to address loneliness in young residents and how these interventions were measured. Members were informed that the Library Service had received grant funding from the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport for a project to engage young people particularly those who did not socialise very often. Officers were currently considering how this project could be evaluated. The Executive Director of Strategy and Partnerships offered to provide a briefing. **Action Required.** The Chief Executive drew attention to the Council's recent Local Government Chronicle award for community involvement in Fenland recognising the collaborate work of the Fenland Youth Work Network and the Fenland Youth Tribe. The Council continued to take active measures to engage young people despite a funding reduction in youth services.
- whether the survey questions were available to view, if the survey was statistically significant for the sample size, and if the questions and scale of response was the same as questions asked in different places. It was noted that these questions were answered in the full pack available on the website but it was acknowledged that they could be reflected in more detail in future reports. Members were also informed that the Local Government Association's questions were mirrored in the survey.

One Member highlighted the need to fix the basics when only 29% of residents were satisfied with the maintenance of the county's road and pavement network. The Vice-Chair commented that satisfaction levels had improved but the Council was having to deal with decades of neglect with limited resources. It was important to acknowledge that the Council was investing an additional £20m a year to address this issue which had resulted in an improvement in satisfaction levels.

Another Member commented that this data should not be used solely to set the budget as residents' priorities had not yet been established. It was also important to bear in mind that the survey had only been running for three years when concluding that residents views on the Council's performance were the most positive since tracking began. One Member highlighted the link between loneliness, anxiety and mental health issues in young people and transport opportunities, which were delivered in the main by external partners. The Council therefore needed to focus on what it could do in order to put a safety net under young people.

It was resolved unanimously to note the key findings from the Quality of Life Survey 2025 and consider the implications of these findings for the council's Business Plan and Budget setting process.

20. Change Portfolio Update

The Committee received an overview of the Council's Change Portfolio programmes and projects as at August 2025. This first biannual report was part of the process of embedding the project management framework which had been agreed previously by committee, and needed to be considered alongside the Integrated Finance Monitoring, Performance, and Risk reports in order to provide a holistic view of the health of the organisation. Change was managed through three portfolios and governed by a

Change Board led by the Chief Executive. The Council was always looking for ways to validate its approach to ensure it aligned with best practice and had recently taken part in a free benchmarking exercise, which had led to further refinements. Attention was drawn to 10 active programmes and 16 projects which were RAG rated accordingly.

The Chief Executive explained that whilst the report provided greater assurance and oversight for Members, it also provided greater public transparency regarding how the Council was managing large scale change. The Change Board meetings were about driving accountability to achieve improved governance and delivery.

In welcoming the report, individual members raised the following queries:

- why the Waste PFI project was RAG rated red as unachievable. It was noted that it was rated red as it was not currently possible to deliver a solution. However, there was a clear programme and strategy in place to move forward at the end of the year once third party clarification had been received.
- whether there were any contingencies in place to manage the savings shortfall in 2025/26 from the In House Review (Adults) project. It was noted that this year's shortfall in savings would be managed by one off additional grant funding for care pressures. Savings were being identified across operations and commissioning for 2026/27.
- how the Fostering Savings – Fostering Review and Fostering Allowances project had changed from red to green in one month, and the Learning Disability Partnership (LDP) Reconfiguration Project had changed from red to blue in the same period. Members were informed that blue reflected the formal closure of the programme but work could still continue as business as usual. It was noted that the LDP Reconfiguration Project reflected the decoupling of the partnership with the ICB and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, which was now complete, with the legacy work reflected as business as usual. The same Member suggested that it would be helpful if the blue rating indicated whether the project had been delivered or not. The Chief Executive confirmed that officers would consider this issue for the next iteration of the report. **Action Required.** He added that every project closure report considered business realisation.
- why the report summary had four projects rated amber but the table at the end only described three projects. Officers acknowledged the mismatch due to reporting timelines which would be addressed in future reports.
- requested more information on the Education Staffing and Non Staffing project which was not listed in the table. It was noted that there had been a delay due to the need to scope service redesign. Some of the redesign would be focused on SEND delivery so the investment approved by the Committee would need to be complemented by a robust process.

It was resolved unanimously to review and scrutinise the status of the Council's Change Portfolio of significant programmes and projects.

21. Customer Feedback Policy and Care Standards

Following the introduction of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman's revised complaint handling code in 2024, the Council had considered changes to the non-statutory complaints process which would be implemented from April 2026 together with improvements to its policies, standards, IT system and processes. Attention was drawn to the key changes which included the move to a two stage non-statutory complaint process from 12 January 2026, a new IT system to improve the ability to track feedback, report on performance and identify lessons learnt, and the inclusion of customer feedback within the current performance reporting process. Members were informed of the roles and responsibilities of senior officers and elected politicians set out in the Customer Feedback Policy. It was noted that all public facing policy documents and internal procedures relevant to customer feedback had been updated. This revised process would be supported by training for staff.

Individual members raised the following queries in relation to the report:

- whether there were any parts of the policy which went further than just meeting the code. It was noted that updating Customer Care Standards to reflect the Council's current values and to respond to the ways people contacted the Council was not part of the code. The Reasonable Adjustment Policy had also been identified as a gap. Whilst the Customer Feedback Policy addressed the two stage process, it also amplified how people could expect to be treated and what was expected of them, as well as linking them to other process such as Freedom of Information (Fol) requests, which went beyond the requirements of the code.
- how would the Council prevent complainants being passed from one service to another. Members were advised that complaints were reviewed by a triage team within each Directorate who could liaise with the relevant Executive or Service Director to ensure a complaint was allocated to the correct person to respond at stages one and two. If a complaint covered more than one Directorate, there still needed to be one person accountable for the response at each stage.

One Member stressed the importance of addressing those legitimate complaints which were complex and difficult, but essential for trust.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the revised Customer Feedback Policy, subject to recommendation d);
- b) Approve the revised Customer Care Standards, subject to recommendation d);
- c) Approve the Reasonable Adjustment Policy for Customers, subject to recommendation d);
- d) Delegate authority for any adjustments to these policies and standards to the Executive Director for Strategy and Partnerships in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of this Committee.

22. Annual Health and Safety Assurance Report 2025

The Committee received a report setting out arrangements in place to ensure the Council met its legal obligations in relation to health and safety. It included the health and safety governance framework, an oversight of incidents reported and key actions delivered to improve health and safety during the previous 12 months, and an overview of further enhancements planned over the coming 12 months. Members noted the background to the report which detailed the legislation underpinning health and safety. The Health and Safety Policy fulfilled the Council's legal and governance duties, and the annual assurance report confirmed the Council maintained a robust governance framework and a well-established Safety Management System. Attention was drawn to performance highlights and key achievements which included significant e-learning completion, increased risk assessment submissions, responsive learning and development support. It was acknowledged that there were several challenges requiring targeted action to ensure continued legal compliance, and operational effectiveness.

The Chief Executive reported that regrettably over the last 12 months there had been an increase in abuse of council staff and contractors. It was important to note that the Council had a zero tolerance approach to this type of behaviour. Action was taken internally to report these incidents which were reviewed by Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) who received weekly incidents reports, and such incidents were report to the Police where necessary. It was noted that services were withdrawn from residents who continued to abuse council staff and contractors.

Individual members raised the following queries in relation to the report:

- what action was being taken and who was responsible for addressing under-reporting of incidents, inconsistent training, and the oversight issues in relation to contractor safety and property compliance. It was noted that incident reporting had improved following significant consistent internal messaging. The policy set out the roles and responsibilities of officers at various levels. There was a corporate group which met quarterly and separate groups led by each Executive Director to review reporting in their areas. CLT received a monthly health and safety dashboard including a report from the Property Compliance Team. The Internal Audit Service also reviewed how well these operations were being conducted.
- staff satisfaction regarding the support received following an incident. It was noted that there was a clear process in place for reporting, which included responsibilities for line managers. The incident was then picked up by the Health and Safety Team who engaged with the individual and line manager to progress the report and ensure appropriate support. Members were reminded of the wellbeing offer for staff who needed additional support, and noted that there had been some positive feedback on this process from staff.
- the difference between a council employee having a problem and a contractor. It was noted that the Council had a legal duty to protect people on its premises including those working on its behalf, visitors and service users. Contractors were asked to report incidents to the Council and also to their own managers. It was noted that contractor compliance was managed by the Property Compliance Team.

- what action was being taken to address the lack of appropriately sized personal protective equipment particularly for female staff at Highways Depots. It was noted that this issued had been flagged with the Health and Safety Team so hopefully would be addressed soon.
- the categorisation of Councillors. It was noted that Members were defined as office holders and were covered by the policy as volunteers. The importance of security briefings and personal safety training for Members was highlighted.
- whether incidents were logged differently for various groups. It was noted that the reporting system provided a breakdown to reflect different groups to enable a review of the different types of abuse and incidents.
- how had the number of incidents changed over time. It was noted that although the numbers had increased, it was not clear whether that was due to better reporting or a general increase. There was concern about the lack of reporting of near misses so it was important to drive up reporting in order to analyse the trends to avoid an incident happening in the future.
- what support was available for Teaching Assistants. It was noted that a Health and Safety Business Partner was available to visit schools to put different types of support arrangements in place based on the type of school.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the updated Health and Safety Policy for the Council and delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee to finalise and publish the updated policy.
- b) Review and scrutinise the annual assurance report to ensure the Council met its statutory obligations and effective organisation of health and safety arrangements.

23. Corporate Risk Register

The Committee considered the Corporate Risk Register (CRR). The key change was the increase in the residual risk score for Risk 3 “Risk that the Council does not have enough budget to deliver agreed short and medium-term objectives” from 16 to 20, which was above the Council’s tolerable risk appetite. This reflected the worsening financial position set out in the Integrated Finance Monitoring Report. A new risk had been added, Risk 14, “Lack of effective relationships and governance across the Integrated Care System (ICS) may lead to poorer coordination and worse outcomes for our population”, which reflected risks associated with the implementation of the NHS England 10 year plan.

The Chief Executive drew attention to Risk 14, he reported that the current ICB for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was being combined with Bedfordshire, Luton, Milton Keynes and Hertfordshire to cover 3.5m people. There was concern that this could take the focus away from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough so it was helpful that the Health Scrutiny Committee would be scrutinising the impact of these changes on Cambridgeshire. The reason for escalating this risk was that these reforms were being

conducted at speed and could not be delivered. ICB officers at risk of redundancy could not be made redundant because there was no funding available to fund the process. The NHS was being told to cut running costs by 50% but some staff were unable to exit the organisation meaning the new cluster arrangements could not be populated. As such, there was concern about the risk on commissioning budgets for health services if they were used to cover redundancy costs.

Individual members then raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- queried what immediate actions would be needed to bring Risk 3 below 16. The Executive Director of Finance and Resources reported that this score was likely to remain at 20 for the next quarter. Although there was likely to be movement in early 2026, there was still some uncertainty relating to the Fair Funding Review.
- questioned whether any risks had remained static or worsened despite mitigations being put in place. Attention was drawn to Table 1 in Section 3.3 detailing the direction of travel of each risk. It was noted that the CRR and the Annual Assurance Statement were scrutinised by the Audit and Accounts Committee.
- welcomed Risk 14 and asked what steps were being taken to ensure democratic accountability given the exclusion of Councillors on the new cluster board, and whether public health priorities were reflected in the new arrangements. It was noted that the NHS reforms would go live from 1 April 2026 so the Chief Executive retained a non-executive role on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough ICB. The NHS was proposing to set up a neighbourhood level committee reporting into the new cluster, which would include representation from organisations in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. However, the Council would have a constrained voice at sub-regional level. It was important to note that responsibilities would be transferred to the Mayor of the Combined Authority from April so the Council and Peterborough City Council were currently in discussion with the Combined Authority. Members were advised that the Directors of Public Health would be represented in their own right on the cluster board.

One Member expressed concern that Risk 3 had risen to 20 so action was required immediately. The Vice-Chair reminded Members of the statutory requirement to set a balanced budget and reiterated that officers were working hard to achieve that. The Executive Director of Finance and Resources reported that positive action was being taken to reduce this risk but it was unlikely to reduce this quarter. If the current trajectory of spend management continued then there could be reduction in the final quarter of the financial year. There would also be a greater understanding of the funding outcome from government expected on 18 December. Although forecasting had originally been scored as reasonable, 73% of children coming into care were unknown to the authority when setting the base budget, so it was important the Council reviewed its forecasting arrangements. Another Member highlighted the need for some narrative around Risk 3 as it was not unexpected at this time of year.

It was resolved unanimously to note the Corporate Risk Register.

24. Corporate Performance Report

The Committee considered an update on the performance monitoring information for 87 indices for quarter 1 of 2025/26, April 1st to June 30th.

Individual members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- suggested that the reason for the zero percentage of new EHCPs completed within a 20 week timeframe for indicator CYP 005 in June was due to the backlog being addressed. There was therefore a need to see the totality of referrals in the system, and how many were being completed between a banded timeframe above 20 weeks. It was important that officers reviewed this metric in order to provide Members with a full picture.
- highlighted the need to consider in relation to H&T 007 the time taken from reporting a defect on the highway rather than from the time when the works order was placed by an officer. Members were informed that this indicator related to defects identified by officers inspecting the highway. The introduction of a new Asset Management System had improved customer reporting of defects, so in the future there would be a measure to reflect the time taken to repair these defects, including the backlog, and the quality of repair.
- requested more information on the amber RAG rating for Indicator SRP 001: Proportion of Freedom of Information requests responded to within statutory timescales. **Action Required.**
- queried when the next Employee Engagement Survey would take place. It was noted that the Council was committed to carrying out a survey every other year. The results of this year's survey were currently being analysed and would be reported to committee.

25. Agenda Plan, Training Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels, and the Appointment of Member Champions

The Committee considered its agenda plan, training plan, appointments to outside bodies and internal advisory groups and panels, and the appointment of Member Champions. It was noted that there was a vacancy on the Huntingdon Freeman's Trust which covered Huntingdon Town. Councillor Bulat who did not represent a Huntingdon Division but did live in Huntingdon had confirmed that she was content to be appointed.

It was resolved unanimously to note the agenda plan and training plan, and appoint Councillor Bulat as the Council's representative on the Huntingdon Freeman's Trust.

Chair