

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: 21 May 2019

Time: 2.00pm – 4.25pm

Venue: Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillors S Bywater (Chairman), S Hoy (Vice Chairwoman), D Ambrose Smith, A Bradnam, P Downes, L Every, M Goldsack, J Whitehead, J Wisson and S Taylor.

Co-opted member: A Read

Apologies: Councillor A Hay (substituted by Councillor M Goldsack)
Co-opted member: F Vettese

CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

211. NOTIFICATION OF THE APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN/CHAIRWOMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN/VICE CHAIRWOMAN OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE COMMITTEE

The Clerk reported that Council had been pleased to re-appoint Councillor Simon Bywater as the Chairman of the Committee and Councillor Samantha Hoy as the Vice Chairwoman of the Committee at the annual meeting of Council on 14 May 2019.

212. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received as recorded above.

Councillor Every declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 9: Free School Proposals as the Chair of Governors for a Cambridge Meridian Academies Trust school. Councillor Goldsack declared a non-pecuniary interest in the same item as the local member for a free school site listed in the report. Mr Read declared a non-pecuniary interest in the same item in relation to the Diocese of Ely Multi-Academy Trust's interests in the proposals relating to the St Bede's Inter-Church School and Alconbury Weald Secondary School.

213. MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 12 MARCH 2019

The minutes of the meeting on 12 March 2019 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

214. ACTION LOG

The Action Log was reviewed and the following updates noted:

- Minute 207: The note requested by a Member was no longer required.

215. PETITIONS

The Chairman stated that a petition had been received regarding the future of Whitworth House. As this related to the next item on the agenda it would be considered under that item (minute 216 refers).

KEY DECISIONS

216. HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES

The Committee received a report setting out the position in relation to Housing Related Support Services. The current budget stood at £7.4m, of which £1.76m related to services for young people. This funding supported a range of services to for vulnerable people including those at risk of homelessness, domestic violence, alcoholism, substance abuse and mental health problems. There was no statutory requirement to provide these services, but the Council recognised their value in helping vulnerable young people achieve and maintain their independence as part of its wider work on homelessness prevention. The provision had not been reviewed for a number of years and it was considered prudent that this should be done to ensure that support was reaching the right people.

An initial analysis of current Housing Related Support Services found that there was a general consensus that change was needed. Officers were therefore seeking the Committee's approval to move to a re-design stage. This would involve working with service users and providers to establish how best to meet this need going forward in a sustainable way. To allow sufficient time for this work to be carried out officers were seeking approval to extend a number of contracts for 18 months. Any proposed changes to service provision following the re-design exercise would be taken to the relevant Committee for decision.

The Chairman stated that a petition containing 13 signatures had been received from Lorne Williams, a Cambridge resident, regarding the future of Whitworth House. The text of the petition was read out to the Committee (copy attached at Appendix 1). In accordance with the Constitution, the Chairman stated that he would send a written response to the petition within 10 working days of the meeting.

The Chairman stated that he had received two requests to speak on this item from members of the public and three requests from local Members. Public questions would be heard first in the order in which they had been received, followed by questions from local Members. He invited Chris Jenkin, a Cambridge resident and Trustee of the Cambridge Churches Homeless project to speak first. Mr Jenkin had also requested to address the Adults Committee the following day on the same issue and the Chairman asked that he restrict his remarks to those matters for which the Children and Young People Committee was responsible.

Mr Jenkin commented that the Cambridge Summit on Homelessness the previous year had attracted 150 attendees. The 'It Takes a City (ITAC)' initiative had emerged from this and included an action group relating to homelessness amongst young people. This involved a wide range of stakeholders and aimed to achieve a significant and sustained reduction in homelessness in Cambridge and the surrounding areas. Mr Jenkin expressed appreciation of the willingness of councillors and officers to engage

with representatives of ITAC regarding future arrangements for Whitworth House and urged that the planned review should be considered within the context of the wider housing pathway and co-production models to achieve better, more sustained outcomes. There were no questions of clarification from the Committee on Mr Jenkin's comments.

The Chairman thanked Mr Jenkin for his remarks and invited Jo Wibberley, a Trustee of the Whitworth Trust, to address the Committee. Mrs Wibberley commented that she was also representing the Ely Diocesan Mothers' Union which had supported Whitworth House for around 19 years. She delivered a statement on behalf of Dr Ruth Jackson, Chairperson of the Whitworth Trust, who was unable to attend in person. The Whitworth Trust warmly welcomed the recommendation that the Council's contract with Whitworth House be extended for 18 months and the understanding that the Trust would be involved in the proposed redesign of service provision. Whitworth House was highly effective at preventing the downward spiral into homelessness and equipping residents for independent living. She paid tribute to the clear and articulate way in which residents of Whitworth House had advocated for the continuation of the service and called for a renewed commitment to safeguarding and improving provision for homeless women in Cambridge, including the provision of all-female spaces like Whitworth House. There were no questions of clarification from the Committee on Mrs Wibberley's comments.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Wibberley for her remarks and invited Councillor Claire Richards to address the Committee in her capacity as the local Member for Castle Division. Councillor Richards commented that, as the local Member for Whitworth House, she welcomed the report to Committee and the proposal to extend the contract with Whitworth House for 18 months. She did, however, have concerns about the process by which this position had been reached. Residents had been told of the proposed changes before these had been considered by the Committee or she had been advised of them as the local Member. The residents were an impressive group of young women who had produced a petition containing over 40,000 signatures in support of the service, but this had been a difficult time for them. Councillor Richards commented that she wanted to highlight the strategic and social importance of retaining Whitworth House as an all-female environment, given that the other all-female provision at Corona House only had a small number of places available and was heavily over-subscribed. She also wished to highlight the importance of developing independence to reduce future reliance on services. She concluded by noting that some residents of Whitworth House were care leavers and commented on councillors' duty to support them as corporate parents. There were no questions of clarification from the Committee.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Richards for her comments and invited Councillor Ian Manning to address the Committee in his capacity as the local Member for Chesterton Division.

Councillor Manning welcomed the report, commenting that whilst he would not want the impact of the uncertainty caused to residents of Whitlock House to be underestimated he felt it was fair to say that mistakes had been made, not all of which were on the part of the Council. He expressed his thanks to the Chairman and the Assistant Director for Housing, Communities and Youth for involving themselves in the issue and commented that he felt that a good place had been reached for the planned review to take place. Councillor Manning expressed the view that there was a need to rebuild the relationship

with Orwell Housing and that the question of the ownership of Whitworth House needed noting. There were no questions of clarification from the Committee. The Chairman thanked Councillor Manning for his comments and invited Councillor Jocelynn Scutt to address the Committee in her capacity as the local Member for Arbury Division

Councillor Scutt welcomed the proposed 18 month contract extension, but commented that she wanted to highlight the issue of homelessness for women, especially young women. There were fewer accommodation places available for homeless women than men in the City of Cambridge and Cambridgeshire as a whole and Whitworth House served the whole of the county. In her view the funding for initiatives of this type should not be set annually but over a longer period to provide greater certainty. Councillor Scutt commented that it was only due to the great work of Whitworth House residents that the current position had been reached. Councillor Scutt commented that the Council had a responsibility towards homeless people and that community resilience must not mean the Council withdrawing funding. There were no questions of clarification from the Committee.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Scutt and all those who had taken the time to share their views with the Committee and opened the report to debate by the Committee.

Arising from the report, Members noted:

- The concierge model of support was already in operation elsewhere within the county. The concierge service provided night cover for schemes. The post holder was trained to understand the needs of service users, but was not a support worker. In the event of an issue arising during their shift they would be able to contact the support provider;
- A lot of the services shown in the appendix to the report as relating to Cambridge City were also available via referral to residents of South Cambridgeshire;
- The proposed 18 month review should not be taken as an absolute deadline, rather it was considered a reasonable timeframe in which to carry out the necessary co-production, consultation and engagement to inform the service re-design. Once this was complete, costed and evidence-based proposals would be brought before the Committee for decision;
- The Vice Chairwoman welcomed the proposed review. She commented that the pressure on funding for services to young people must not be underestimated and it was right to consider how to deliver the best possible outcomes for service users whilst also achieving maximum value for money. She noted that the pattern of homelessness varied across the county and asked that this was taken into account in considering the shape of future provision. She noted that Peterborough City Council (PCC) had obtained some additional finances through the Rough Sleepers' Fund and asked whether the County Council was also eligible to apply for this funding and whether it could encourage and support District Councils to apply.

The Service Director for Community and Safety stated that the way in which the Council worked with PCC, City and District Councils to address homelessness was being revisited through the Housing Programme Board which involved all of these partner organisations. There was a recognition of the need for a local flavour to provision even though it was a county-wide commissioned service. The funding

obtained by through the Rough Sleepers' Fund by PCC was currently ring-fenced to Peterborough, but there were funding pots available where evidence of a partnership approach would support access to additional funding. Co-production would be a key element to this and it was hoped to pursue these opportunities in the future;

- The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Sub-Committee commented that she had a particular interest in how the proposed review would support the Local Offer to young people leaving care and sought confirmation that this would be taken into account. Stable housing was key to securing positive long-term outcomes for these young people by providing them with the security needed to enable them to focus their efforts on education, employment and training. The Service Director for Community and Safety stated that there needed to be a clear pathway for support for the duration of a young person's involvement with children's services. Depending on individual circumstances the young person might join or leave the pathway at various points, but there needed to be a clear understanding of the offer throughout the entire journey. Officers from the Commissioning team confirmed that they worked closely with colleagues in Children's Services as well as external partners to ensure this support;
- A Member commented that whilst the issue of homelessness amongst women was important, the majority of homeless people and rough sleepers within Cambridgeshire were male. They appreciated that mixed gender accommodation would not be appropriate for all service-users, but suggested that as well as looking at the necessity of accommodation like Whitworth House there should be a focus on how best to move young people on to independent living. This might include establishing smaller units where young people could be assisted to support each other. Officers confirmed that there was no 'one size fits all' model and that where possible services were tailored to best fit need. The Castle Project in Cambridge worked on a small unit model with visiting support and learning from this would be taken into account;
- Paragraph 2.2.5: Officers clarified that the visiting support service did not have staff permanently on site, but visited at specified times to provide support services. The floating support service was a county-wide resource with access via a named key worker.

The Chairman thanked the public speakers and the councillors who had spoken as local Members for their contributions. This issue presented a real challenge to all involved. The Council had made mistakes and for those he offered his apologies. As a parent and a former police officer he was acutely aware of the challenges which young people faced. Moving forward, co-production would be the way to get the best outcomes across Cambridgeshire.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) Review and approve the approach being taken to review Housing Related Support services;
- b) Consider and approve the extension to a number of young people's-related commissioned services, as described in sections 2.24 and 2.25;
- c) Agree to receive a further report on the detailed progress in Autumn 2019.

217. COMMUNITY SHORT BREAKS FOR DISABLED CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

The Short Break Duty 2011 placed a statutory duty on Local Authorities to provide a range of short break services. The Cambridgeshire offer was currently delivered through a closed framework of six providers at a cost of around £170k per annum. This framework would expire in September 2019 and it was proposed to replace it with an open framework. This would allow providers to join the framework at any point during the lifetime of its operation, creating greater flexibility in response to the changing needs of service users over time.

During discussion it was noted that:

- Some Members had found the report difficult to understand as it seemed to presume prior knowledge of the purpose and previous operation of the framework. They had also found some of the terminology unclear. Officers clarified that the framework model was used to provide a 'pick and mix' service offer from which the families of eligible children and young people could choose activities and short breaks. These were funded through the young person's personalised budget;
- Officers stated that the dynamic purchasing model had not been recommended on this occasion as that was used primarily for frameworks with larger numbers of providers;
- The Vice Chairwoman commented that there appeared to be a lack of capacity in the north of the county and suggested closer working with Peterborough City Council to address this. Officers stated that arrangements were already in place to allow both Councils to 'piggy-back' on the other's offer. A number of provider events had also been held to flag up gaps in provision to stimulate the market to fill these to deliver a more equitable offer across the county;
- The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Sub-Committee voiced support for the proposals, stating that the provision could make a significant difference to the quality of life of eligible young people and their families.

Summing up, the Chairman stated that the proposed open framework would allow officers to respond more flexibly to feedback from service users about the type of services they wanted to access. He asked that officers consider the terminology used in future reports to ensure greater clarity.

(Action: Head of Service – Children's Commissioning)

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the commissioning of an Open Framework for Community Short Breaks for Disabled Children and Young People;
- b) Delegate authority to the Executive Director for People and Communities, in consultation with the Chair of the Children and Young People Committee, to

award an Open Framework for Community Short Breaks for Disabled Children and Young People.

(**Action:** Executive Director, People and Communities)

INFORMATION AND MONITORING

218. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT - OUTTURN 2018-19

The outturn variance for 2018/19 against the element of the People and Communities' budget for which the Children and Young People Committee was responsible was a pressure of £3.7m. This figure was less than had been forecast at the previous meeting in March 2019. Section 2.2 of the report set out the main pressures. Most significant amongst these was the High Needs Block within the Dedicated Schools Grant which had ended the year with a pressure of £8.7m. This had been the subject of detailed discussion by the Cambridgeshire Schools Forum at its meeting the previous week. Over-delivery on some elements of the Children in Care placement budget had reduced the total pressure in this area. Work was continuing to produce a recovery plan for submission to Government by 30 June 2019. Four areas remained rated as red under the RAG (red amber green) rating system and these were unchanged from recent months. The savings tracker demonstrated that £18.3m of the planned £21.3m savings had been delivered across the budget for which CYP was responsible and that the total savings target across the People and Communities Directorate had been met in full.

Arising from the report:

- The Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Sub-Committee welcomed the increase in the number of children and young people placed for adoption within the year. The £0.6m pressure which this had created on the adoption budget resulted in reduced on-going costs within the placement budget, although not a fully balanced position;
- A Member commented that a report to the Cambridgeshire Schools Forum had stated that reserves of around £12m were currently held by maintained nurseries and primary schools. Given the significant pressures on the education budget they felt strongly that the issue of the size of reserves held by maintained nurseries and schools should be pursued.

The Chairman stated that he had raised this issue at the Schools Forum meeting and that it had not been well received. Officers stated that this issue was reflected nationally and that much of these reserves were already ear-marked for projects or committed future expenditure. However, they undertook to do some further analysis of this and report back at the next Schools Forum meeting. The Chairman stated that it would be important to work collectively on this issue and that the Committee's representatives on the Schools Forum would monitor this.

(**Action:** Strategic Finance Business Partner/ Democratic Services Officer)

- The Service Director for Children's Services stated that there had been a decrease in the number of children with a child protection plan per 10,000 children rather than an increase as stated in the report;
- Officers stated that the increase in the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) was in part due to a seasonal variation as a number

of young people had completed college courses and had not yet moved into another form of education, employment or training;

- A Member asked for more information about the funding of out of school tuition; specifically, how the funding related to what the school provided and what was provided by the Council;
(**Action:** Service Director – Education)
- Officers acknowledged that the presentation of RAG rating information at appendix 7 was a little unclear and stated that this was currently under review;
- A Member asked whether the threshold for the provision of additional education support services or the issuing of an Education, Health and Care Plan was so high that schools were discouraged from seeking this support. The Executive Director for People and Communities stated that the thresholds were set nationally and that there was a national requirement for schools to fund the first £6k of a child's additional support from within their own budgets. Should any particular schools have concerns about this officers could sign-post them to the relevant information;
- Officers confirmed that the Outturn pressure of £3.7m was net of the additional £3.413m allocated by the General Purposes Committee from the smoothing fund reserve to support Childrens' Services.

It was resolved to review and comment of the report.

219. FREE SCHOOL PROPOSALS

Declarations of interest in this item were made at the start of the meeting by Councillors Every and Goldsack and Mr Read (minute 211 above refers).

Waves 11,12 and 13 of the Central Free School Programme

Officers stated that there had been little change in relation to Waves 11 and 12 and that Wave 13 announcements had been put back to 31 May 2019. Arising from discussion of this update, Members:

- Sought clarification of the position regarding Godmanchester Secondary Academy. Officers stated that the Council's reservations about this proposal had been made clear, but that whilst the application remained live with the Department for Education (DfE) updates would continue to be provided;
- The local Member for Fen Ditton Primary School expressed relief at the delayed opening of the Wing Primary School due to their concerns about the potential impact this could have had on Fen Ditton.

New Voluntary Aided Schools

A decision was awaited from the DfE regarding capital funding for new voluntary aided schools. Officers were aware that an application had been made for a new voluntary aided school to be established at Northstowe. If this was agreed the DfE would fund 90% of the capital cost with the remaining 10% expected to be funded though the S106 contribution already negotiated with the developer.

Arising from the report, Members:

- Asked for clarification of the Council's policy around faith schools. Officers stated that the current policy had been set by the Children and Young People Committee on 9 February 2016. This specified that when proposals were received for the establishment of a new voluntary aided school or academy with faith designation, the Council would take into account, alongside wider considerations, whether there was unmet local demand for additional relevant faith provision; an established trend where parental preference exceeded the number of places available and which was forecast for the foreseeable future; and the potential for new denominational provision to alleviate demand on places in other schools in areas of high basic need;
- Noted that there would be a demographic need for a second primary school in Phase 2 of the Northstowe development. A Member expressed concern about potentially reaching a situation where parents did not have a local alternative to a faith-based school, commenting that this was a national issue. The Chairman stated that there was a difference of views within the Committee on whether this should be a cause for concern. The Co-opted representative of the Diocese of Ely commented that he was not aware of any examples of this having occurred in Cambridgeshire;
- Noted the proposed change from membership of one Multi-Academy Trust to another by Parkside Academy and asked whether the Council's agreement was required to transfer the lease of the site from one Trust to another. Officers undertook to look into this question and provide a note.
(**Action:** Strategic Education Place Planning Manager)

It was resolved unanimously:

1) For Members to note:

- a) the latest position regarding Wave 11 and Wave 12 free schools in Cambridgeshire approved to pre-implementation stage by the DfE
- b) the latest position regarding Wave 13 of the DfE's central free school programme
- c) the latest position regarding Wave 14 of the DfE's central free school programme

2) For Members to agree the arrangements for managing the consultation and representation processes if the Department for Education decides to award funding for a new Voluntary Aided (VA) school in Cambridgeshire.

220. MULTI-AGENCY SAFEGUARDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH

The Head of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Boards stated that in January 2018 the decision had been taken to merge the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Boards for both adults and children. This had proved successful and the joint arrangement had now been confirmed. There was no longer a statutory requirement to have a safeguarding children board and the new arrangement placed an equal duty of care on the Local Authority, the Clinical Commissioning Group and the police to work together to agree local safeguarding arrangements. An

Executive Safeguarding Partnership Board which included co-opted representatives from Public Health and the voluntary sector had been established which sat across the work of both the Adults and Children's Safeguarding Partnership Boards. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was one of the only areas to date which had chosen to publish its joint safeguarding arrangements and this had attracted positive national interest.

The Chairman stated that the change in legislation regarding safeguarding arrangements meant that it was no longer a requirement to include the Lead Member for Children's Services. He was therefore grateful to have been offered a seat on the Children's Safeguarding Partnership Board. The Executive Director for People and Communities noted that the changes had no impact on governance arrangements at the County Council.

Arising from the report, Members:

- Commented that the sharing of information between relevant organisations was a real issue and expressed the hope that this could be further improved. The Head of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Boards stated that whilst she was not yet in a position to say that this had been completely fixed, the position in relation to both adults and children had improved and that the Executive Safeguarding Partnership Board attached great importance to this issue;
- Noted that it was no longer a requirement to have lay members, but that a number of voluntary sector forums existed to discharge that role;
- Asked how schools fitted into the new structure. The Head of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Boards stated that in Cambridgeshire there was a recognition of the need to involve non-statutory partner organisations and that schools were included in local arrangements;
- Noted that the Safeguarding Board had links with Community Safety Partnerships and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Boards, but not with Crime and Disorder Panels.

The Chairman thanked the Head of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Safeguarding Boards for attending to brief the Committee and stated that he knew that a lot of hard work sat behind the revised arrangements.

It was resolved to note the report.

DECISIONS

220. AGENDA PLAN, APPOINTMENTS AND TRAINING PLAN

The Committee noted the following changes to the published agenda plan:

- a) July 2019: The Education Strategy Update, School Budgets report, High Needs Block Funding report and Children in Care Educational Performance report would be consolidated into a single report from the Service Director for Education;
- b) July 2019: The Service Director for Children and Safeguarding's report would include the Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services (ILACS) action plan.

The Members' Seminar item on 14 June 2019 on the Local Offer to Care Leavers and access to universal credit and benefits for care leavers would be added to the Committee training plan.

(**Action:** Democratic Services Officer)

The Committee reviewed current appointments to outside bodies and internal advisory groups and panels, noting that the first annual report on outside bodies had been submitted to Council on 14 May 2019. This had highlighted three appointments made by the Children and Young People Committee where it appeared that there was no longer a need for county councillor representation. These were Centre 33, the Thomas Squire Charity and the Warboys Board School Trust Fund. The Chairman invited Members' views on whether current appointments to these outside bodies should be ended and no further appointments made. A Member asked why a further appointment to Centre 33 was not proposed. The Executive Director for People and Communities stated that there was a balanced judgement to be made about whether it was appropriate to appoint a councillor to an organisation from which the Council commissioned services. To do so for one organisation would also raise the question of whether it should be done for all organisations in a similar position. On this basis the Member was content to leave the appointment to Centre 33 in abeyance.

It was resolved to:

- a) review the Committee agenda plan attached at Appendix 1;
- b) review the training plan attached at Appendix 2;
- c) agree the appointments to outside bodies as detailed in Appendix 3;
- d) re-appoint Councillor David Connor to the Manea Educational Foundation;
- e) end the current appointments to the Centre 33, the Thomas Squire Charity and the Warboys Board School Trust Fund and not re-appoint to these bodies;
- f) agree the appointments to Internal Advisory Groups and Panels as detailed in Appendix 4;
- g) note the Governor appointments attached at Appendix 5.

Chairman
(date)

Whitworth House – petition

Submitted by Lorne Williamson, Cambridge (13 signatures)

We understand that the Children and Young Persons Committee will be deciding on whether to continue the financial support they have given to Whitworth House at the meeting on 21st May. We believe the present grant to be £65k p.a.

As residents of Chesterton Road and close neighbours of Whitworth House we would ask you to take into consideration, not only the valuable service the Whitworth Trust provides for vulnerable and disadvantaged young women, but also the exemplary way in which Whitworth House is run and how the residents respect the environment in which they live.

Many of us have lived on Chesterton Road for many years and the residents and staff have been ideal neighbours. We think it important for the City that those less fortunate than ourselves, should be able to live and work out their problems near the centre of Cambridge.

We understand that others will be making out the economic case for the service provided but, at a weekly cost per resident of only £78, it is surely good value for the Council.

Supplementary comment 15 May 2019:

Neighbours of Whitworth House are aware that the threat of imminent closure has been lifted and very much appreciate the additional funding now agreed. However, we would like to re-iterate our support for the work of the Trust and hope that the Council will be able to agree long term funding when the review is carried out in the autumn.

Lorne Williamson