



**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEES HELD IN THE
COUNCIL CHAMBER- TOWN HALL
ON 8 FEBRUARY 2017**

Present: Councillors J Peach (Chairman), S Allen, L Ayres, R Bisby, J Bull, CAV M Cereste, OMRI OSSI, J Davidson, A Ellis, H Fuller, C Harper, M Hussain, A Iqbal, M Jamil, D King, S Lane, S Martin, E Murphy, B Rush, N Sandford, B Saltmarsh, L Serluca, J Shearman, M Sims, J Whitby,

Also Present: Co-opted Members:
Parish Councillor, Keith Lievesley,
Parish Councillor, Neil Boyce
Parish Councillor, Henry Clark
Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University, and Communications
Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health
Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital
Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene
Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources
Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development
Councillor Casey, Cabinet Advisor to the Cabinet Member for City Centre Management, Culture and Tourism (Culture and Recreation)
Councillor Stokes, Cabinet Advisor for Children's Safeguarding and Education
Councillor Goodwin, Cabinet Member for City Centre Management, Culture & Tourism

Officers Present: Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive
Kim Sawyer, Director of Governance
Wendi Ogle-Welbourn, Corporate Director of People and Communities
Lou Williams, Service Director Childrens Services & Safeguarding
Terry Reynolds, Service Director for Education
Dr Liz Robin, Director of Public Health
Adrian Chapman, Service Director, Adult Services & Communities
Steven Pilsworth, Service Director, Financial Services
Jane McDaid, Head of Peterborough Property Services
Paulina Ford, Senior Democratic Services Officer

1. Appointment of Chairman

The Senior Democratic Services Officer opened the meeting and advised the Committee that in accordance with *Part 4, Section 8 – Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules, section 13*, Joint Meetings of Scrutiny Committees a Chairman would be required to be appointed from among the Chairmen of the Committees who were holding the meeting. Nominations were sought from those Chairmen present at the meeting which were Councillor Peach, Chairman of Growth Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Allen, Chairman of Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Cereste, Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Peach was nominated by Councillor Cereste and seconded by Councillor Allen, there being no further nominations Councillor Peach was appointed Chairman.

The Chairman welcomed everyone present and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for all members of each Scrutiny Committee to scrutinise Phase 2 of the 2017/18 Budget, Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2026/27 as part of the formal consultation process before being presented to Cabinet on 27 February 2017 and Full Council on 8 March 2017.

2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Brown, Councillor Fower, Councillor Over, Councillor Ali, Councillor Dowson, Councillor Sylvester, Councillor Judy Fox, Councillor John Fox, Councillor Shaheed, Councillor Barkham and Councillor Lillis. Councillor Hussain was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Ali and Councillor Davidson was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Fower.

The following co-opted members also sent apologies: Alistair Kingsley, Liz Youngman, Flavio Vettese, Parish Councillor Susie Lucas, Parish Councillor Richard Clarke. David Whiles, Chairman for Healthwatch Peterborough also submitted apologies.

Apologies for absence were also received from Councillor Lamb, Cabinet Member for Public Health Services and Simon Machen, Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration.

3. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

4. Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2017/18 - 2026/27

The Cabinet Member for Resources gave a brief introduction to the Budget and Overall Budget Position including the Report of the Chief Finance Officer, Revenue Outturn Forecast and Budget Proposals, Key Figures & Cash Limits and Council Tax.

Each section of the budget was then taken in order according to how it was presented in the Budget Book. The relevant Cabinet Members for each section of the budget were given an opportunity to introduce their area of the budget before taking questions from the Committee.

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	Introduction of the Budget and Overall Budget Position including Report of the Chief Finance Officer, Revenue Outturn Forecast and Budget Proposals, Key Figures & Cash Limits and Council Tax	Clarification was sought on whether all of the Adult Social Care Precept would be used on Adult Social Care and which aspects of Adult Social Care would be supported if the precept were to be agreed.	All of the Adult Social Care precept (£1.9M) would be used on Adult Social Care with an additional amount of £2.4M being provided from the extra council tax. The detail of where the precept will be spent was listed on page 28 of the MTFs book.
		Page 3 Overall Position table. Is it possible to predict the Grant Equalisation (GE) reserve add back for 2019/20 and 2020/21. Where did this money come from.	<p>The GE reserve came from additional savings made in last year's budget. The intention was that this reserve would be used over the following two years to smooth the impact of the grant reductions facing the council. The budget strategy for the next two years will see the grant reserve used and therefore there were no further figures for later years.</p> <p>Page 12 of the MTFs book and the table on the Overall Position provided further explanation and was repeated in the Overall Position table on page 3 of the Cabinet report.</p>
		Page 19, paragraph 11.10 – General Fund working balance. Concern was raised that the Council had one of the smallest level of reserves compared to other Unitary Councils. Were there any plans to raise the reserves.	The minimum working balance had been at £6M since 2006. Every year the overall adequacy of the reserves and balances were assessed and there was no reason to believe that £6M in reserve would not be adequate. There was no plan to increase or decrease the amount in reserve.
		How was the figure of £6M reserve arrived at.	<p>The following areas would be taken into consideration when deciding on a figure and the assessment would be completed annually:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size of the budget and individual risks • Impact on local economy • Any potential in year risks • High risk budgets

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track record of the authority delivering its budget • Regard of any other reserves that could be called upon 	The Committee noted this section of the budget.
People and Communities Appendix 2 (Pages 15 - 23)	Adult Precept allocation of funds. Clarification was sought with regard to the funding agreement for the Dementia Resource Centre. The current agreement was for 3 years and then an additional 2 years. The first of the additional 2 years had been agreed but not the second year. Confirmation was sought as to whether the second year of funding would be put in place. Assurance was sought that the additional money for Adult Social Care would go to front line services. Concern was raised regarding the announcement sent out from the Corporate Director of Growth and Regeneration on how the money would be spent in the Can-do area. There had	Following on from a previous question on allocation of funds from the Adult Precept Members were referred to page 16/17 and informed that the service area would forecast the total overall budget and requirements. If any Member required further detail of the budget for this area they could contact the finance area for the People and Communities Directorate. The extension for the first year of the additional funding had been confirmed and the additional funding for the second year would be considered later this year. The money that was in the budget would go to provide the services needed. A comprehensive paper had been prepared on the budget drivers in Adult Social Care detailing all areas with budget pressures. Members were referred to Pages 33-34 of the Report of the Chief Finance Officer which provided the detail of budget pressures (assumptions) on Adults Commissioning 2017/18. To secure the investment there was a need to be clear about what the community investment could support based on evidence need. At this stage only two areas of activity had been referred to. Investment one was a physical building on derelict land in Lincoln	

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>been no consultation with ward Councillors or community groups.</p>	<p>Road and the second investment was to public realm improvements along Lincoln Road. Members were assured that any further investment would include the appropriate consultation with ward councillors.</p>
		<p>Page 19, Passenger transport. Clarification was sought with regard to which routes would be reviewed and possibly cut.</p> <p>Further clarity was sort as to the meaning of passenger transport.</p>	<p>Members were advised that short term savings included a review of routes to ensure that duplication was avoided and routes were merged where possible as well as a review of social care vehicle leases in an effort to reduce cost.</p> <p>Passenger transport referred to transport to and from school, people in care, social care transport for adults and the Dial a Ride and Community Link transport provided by social services. It did not refer to general passenger transport.</p>
		<p>Page 23, Environmental Enforcement. Assurance was sought that when engaging the private sector enforcement agency Kingdom to target environmental crime such as fly tipping and graffiti in the Can-do area that this would not reduce the current number of Prevention and Enforcement Service offices in operation in the Can-do area.</p> <p>It was noted that if approved the Kingdom contract would be shared between Peterborough City Council and Fenland District Council. Was the money ring fenced. If insufficient fines were generated would the Council need to top it up.</p>	<p>The Kingdom resource would be an additional resource to the existing Prevention and Enforcement Service (PES) officers and there was no intention to reduce the number of PES officers in the Can-do area.</p> <p>It was ring fenced in that it was contributing to the bottom line of the directorate. The contract for Kingdom would be at zero cost to the Council and there would be an income target included in the contract which was based on quality ticketing and tickets paid. Kingdom had a number of contracts with other councils. The contract would be a pilot for a year and a contracted service not a partnership or collaboration.</p>

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>Investment in Operation Can Do area. It was noted that a capital investment of £7.5M was proposed for targeting issues in the Can-do area. Why had other areas of the city not been considered for capital investment.</p> <p>Page 21, Schools Organisation Plan. Which schools were being referred to that need further grants.</p>	<p>The Can-do area represented some of the most deprived areas in Peterborough and suffered from deeply entrenched issues. Attempts in the past to make improvements had not yielded results. The belief was that regeneration of the physical space in the Can-do area with a leaning towards health and wellbeing would make a difference to the community. It was a densely populated area with no scope for growth as opposed to other areas of the city which were also densely populated but did have scope for growth.</p> <p>There was a report to Cabinet that covered the specific schools requiring further grants and this could be provided to Councillor Ayres.</p>	
<p>The Committee noted this section of the budget.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources to provide a copy of the Cabinet report detailing the specific schools requiring further grants to Councillor Ayres.</p>			
<p>Resources</p> <p>Appendix 3 (Pages 24 – 35))</p>	<p>How did Peterborough Today know before councillors that the contract with Amey was to be terminated.</p>	<p>Rumours had got out and there was a duty to the employees of Amey who had a scheduled meeting with their employers on a certain date. It was therefore decided that it would be better to provide an embargoed briefing to the PT rather than they publish something from the rumours to allow time for Amey to deliver the news to their employees before it became common knowledge.</p> <p>The rumours had come from someone on the budget working group.</p>	

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>Could you provide more detail on the type of contract and what alternative ways were being considered to deliver the services that Amey currently provide.</p> <p>When will the Amey contract be terminated.</p>	<p>The intention was to have a mutual termination with Amey to be completed during the summer.</p> <p>Future arrangements. The Council was not looking to put the contract out to tender and not looking to put it out to the private sector again. The Council were considering a potential public partnership with the Nors Group who were the commercial trading arm of Norfolk County Council which was part of the Norfolk Property Services NPS Joint Venture Company. Part of the property work done by Amey would naturally fit with work done by NPS. The remaining services provided by Amey would come under a separate Joint Venture with the Nors Group.</p>
		<p>£100K is to be cut from the budget from 2018/2019 due to the termination of the Amey contract. Could the saving be made this year.</p> <p>Clarification was sought as to what had changed to bring about the decision to terminate the Amey contract.</p>	<p>This was an £8M contract and the predictions had been frugal with regard to savings and until the new operating model was in place it was difficult to accurately predict the savings therefore none could be made in 2017/2018.</p> <p>The intention was to bring the service back into the local authority so that any money coming back to the Council would be reinvested in the services.</p> <p>The termination of the contract was by mutual agreement. Amey were now owned by a Spanish company who were changing their model and as such were happy to terminate the contract without financial penalty on either side. This would not have been the case a year ago. In 2011 the original contract was with Enterprise and Amey subsequently bought Enterprise out.</p>

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>Members were concerned that there was a lack of long term co-ordination from the Council with regard to a long term financial strategy. An example of which was the Amey contract and savings that had been made in 2013 to services such as grass cutting, shrub maintenance, park attendants and trees. However In Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the current budget it was showing £20K going back in to grass cutting, £83K going back into shrub management, over £50K going in to park attendants and £400K going into trees.</p>	<p>There had been a £2M saving when the Council first entered into the contract with Amey. There were two areas for consideration. The first being a decision the Council made around the standard of service and when the contract was entered into the Council made a decision as to the standard of service. The standard of service had to be separated from that of trees and arboriculture. There were clear reasons and evidence from surveys as to why money needed to be put back into trees.</p>
		<p>Page 29. Increase to the cost of residential parking permits. It was unfortunate that there was to be an increase in residential parking permits from £19 to £25. Issues had been raised with officers regarding the number of cars being parked in the Can-do area. An officer had confirmed that regulations regarding parking permits had not been adhered to correctly therefore allowing a household to have 5 or 6 parking permits. The officer had since advised that the regulations would now be adhered to which would mean a reduced number of parking permits for any household. Had this reduction in income from parking permits been factored into the figures.</p>	<p>The increase of £6 per annum for residents parking permits would seem a lot but it should be noted that the last increase was in 2007.</p>
		<p>Members had understood that the money from residents parking permits was ploughed back into those areas of the</p>	<p>The Corporate Director for Resources was unaware of this and asked Members to provide him with the details of where this information could be found.</p>

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		city where the resident parking zones were?	
		Was there a limit to the number of resident parking permits issued to the amount of space available to park the cars?	The information was not available at the meeting. The Corporate Director advised that there were many areas that needed further investigation with regard to permit parking including business / commercial permits. The Corporate Director invited Members to submit any further questions to him directly and he would provide a detailed briefing note. The Cabinet Member for City Centre Management, Culture and Tourism advised that a briefing note had already been provided to Councillor Fower and this could be forwarded to Members of the Committee.
		There was concern that the increase may put people off signing up to future residential parking schemes.	Until the consultation had finished it was difficult to know if people would be put off signing up to future schemes. However it should be noted that the increase only amounted to 10p a day for five days a week parking outside their home.
		There were often issues regarding residents parking on grass verges and Members asked if consideration could be given to implementing a fee for doing this.	Members were informed that there was currently an Officer Working Group looking at parking on grass verges and would shortly be providing a report with recommendations. Some of the recommendations may be around increasing the capacity for enforcement and also turning some of the grass verges into permanent parking spaces.
		Page 32-33. Eye Green Nature Reserve. Will Buglife be managing the site on a voluntary basis and if so was there a cost saving on the £10K allocated per year.	The information was not available at the meeting.
		Concern was raised regarding the proposal to establish a Peterborough local lottery and that people who were	Subject to approval of the scheme policies which were already being drafted that were required to establish a lottery scheme and to ensure the necessary

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>already in financial difficulties could end up in further debt. Assurance was sought that it would only be available online.</p>	<p>safeguards were in place. The option of a full blown scheme would be a question for Council in the future if the scheme proved to be successful.</p> <p>The proposal was for a third party to run the scheme.</p>
		<p>Clarification was sought with regard to Disability Parking and if a person using a disability badge was given a parking fine would the fee be enforced.</p>	<p>The Corporate Director for Resources advised that he did not have the information at the meeting but would find out.</p>
		<p>Clarification was sought as to why there had been £600K put aside from capital to fund the provision of Chromebooks for staff. Members queried why there were no other budgets in place for equipment replacement.</p> <p>It was noted that there would be a reduction in desks in the agile working environment and a reduction in printers. Clarification was therefore sought as to whether there would be a saving by moving to agile working as no further laptops, printers would be required and less desks would be required. Was the £600K a net figure.</p> <p>How much of the cost was due to going over to google.</p> <p>How many of the people getting the Chromebooks will be getting them for the first time and how many Chromebooks are replacing other pieces of equipment.</p>	<p>Members were referred to page 35, Agile working. Chromebooks were an enabler for the council to move to agile working. There was no money in the budget to buy Chromebooks and Chromebooks were integral to agile working. Without Chromebooks the plan for agile working would be severely impacted.</p> <p>The cost of the Chromebooks was approximately £400K further detail of how the £600K was made up could be provided.</p> <p>It was not about moving to google it was about moving the organisation to an agile working environment.</p> <p>None of the Chromebooks were replacing other Chromebooks as they had not been used within the organisation before.</p>

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>Some Members had felt that it had not been a good decision for Cabinet to promote online gambling through their decision for a local lottery scheme. This may encourage people to get further into debt. Councillor Murphy put forward a recommendation for Cabinet to review their decision.</p> <p>In light of earlier comments made regarding resident parking permits Councillor Murphy also recommended that Cabinet consider using the income from the revenue received from Parking Permits to improve traffic management conditions and road conditions for cyclists and pedestrians in the most deprived areas of the city where the parking schemes were in place.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy also proposed that Cabinet check whether there were any other budgets that could be used to fund the issue of new Chromebooks and to consider if there had been any savings made by moving over to agile working to reduce the £600K investment from capital.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy seconded by Councillor Shearman proposed the following recommendation be put forward to Cabinet:</p>	

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>That Cabinet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review their decision to provide the facility for online gambling through the provision of a local lottery scheme. 2. Consider using the income from the revenue received from Parking Permits to improve traffic management conditions and road conditions for cyclists and pedestrians in the most deprived areas of the city where the parking schemes are in place. 3. Check whether there are any other budgets that can be used to fund the issue of new Chromebooks and to consider if there have been any savings made by moving over to agile working to reduce the £600K investment from capital. <p>The recommendation was put to the vote and approved. (10 in favour and 9 against)</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>The Committee recommend that Cabinet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review their decision to provide the facility for online gambling through the provision of a local lottery scheme. 2. Consider using the income from the revenue received from Parking Permits to improve traffic management conditions and road 			

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<p>conditions for cyclists and pedestrians in the most deprived areas of the city where the parking schemes are in place.</p> <p>3. Check whether there are any other budgets that can be used to fund the issue of new Chromebooks and to consider if there have been any savings made by moving over to agile working to reduce the £600K investment from capital.</p> <p>ACTIONS</p> <p>1. The Committee requested that the Corporate Director for Resources provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Further details on the Nors Group and how they are currently working with the public sector and what services they can provide. b) Information on if there is a limit on the number of resident parking permits issued according to the amount of space available for car parking. c) A detailed briefing note with regard to parking permits and the Cabinet Member for City Centre Management, Culture and Tourism to provide a copy of the briefing note sent to Councillor Fower on the same subject to all Committee Members. d) Clarification on whether Buglife intend to manage the Eye Green Nature Reserve on a voluntary basis and if so will there be a saving of £10K. e) Any Member with information on a policy which states that money received from residents parking permits should be invested in the areas where there are resident parking zones to provide the Corporate Director for Resources with the information. <p>The Service Director for Adults and Communities to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A briefing note on Disability Parking and clarification with regard to Disability Parking and if a person using a disability badge was given a parking fine would the fee be enforced. b) The outcome of the officer review into Grass Verge Parking to be shared with all Councillors and Councillors to be advised of when any approved recommendations would be implemented. 			
<p>Growth and Regeneration</p> <p>Appendix 4 (Pages 36 – 39)</p>	<p>Page 38, Investment Capital. Junction 18 Rhubarb bridge (A47/A15). This was a major scheme and a number of people living in the locality have expressed some concern that there had been no public consultation. Members requested that proper public consultation should be</p>	<p>The bridge required extensive work and would need to be replaced, however public consultation would be arranged, the timescale for this was still to be arranged.</p>	

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>arranged.</p> <p>Concern was also raised regarding the removal of the footbridge and cycle way and future ease of accessibility across the road.</p> <p>Page 37, Capital Receipts update. It was noted that the Council had and would be selling some of the council assets. Members were not being informed and consulted when assets within their wards were being disposed of. Could the Council look at retaining some areas for future housing.</p> <p>Investment property receipts. Clarification was sought with regard to information being received that the Paston and Gunthorpe Community Centre had been handed over to a community organisation. This was a council asset and why had ward Councillors not been informed.</p> <p>Page 38. Public realm – Broadway, Midgate and Northminster. Members noted that not much detail had been included and were concerned that improvements might include cutting down</p>	<p>Any comments raised should be fed into the public consultation.</p> <p>The Council's policy requires that all ward Councillors be consulted on any asset disposal within their ward. If Councillors were not being consulted they should inform the Corporate Director for Resources immediately so that it can be investigated.</p> <p>Before any asset was sold the Council determined whether it could be better used by the Council and consideration was always given to whether it could be used within a local housing company.</p> <p>All community centres had discussions before Christmas in relation to how the Community Asset Transfer would be taken forward in each particular instance. A 25 year lease was being offered at £1 per annum and the community organisations would take on the responsibility for repairing and insuring the building. The negotiations would start now that the Council knew where each community organisation would like to take their community centre. There had been discussions regarding freehold disposal with some organisations where they had expressed an interest but none have taken place yet.</p> <p>The public realm areas of the city were critical to the improving economy of the city. It was important to continue to improve the public realm of the city.</p> <p>Public realm money was not revenue money and</p>

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>trees and providing street furniture. Why was this being treated as a priority when there were shortfalls in areas of the budget such as Adult Social Care.</p> <p>Page 36. Opportunity Peterborough. Was Opportunity Peterborough on target for growing the 20,000 jobs in the city and 25,500 houses over the next 9 years by attracting inward investment and marketing the city to businesses.</p> <p>Could Opportunity Peterborough's costs against inward investment be provided.</p>	<p>could not be used on services.</p> <p>Opportunity Peterborough provided a huge amount of assistance to the Council and in particular the growth targets. They were currently on track with the targets.</p> <p>The information was not available at the meeting. Members were informed that it might be useful for Opportunity Peterborough to provide a presentation to all Councillors on the work that they do.</p>
<p>The Committee noted this section of the budget.</p> <p>ACTIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee requested that the Head of Peterborough Property Services provide confirmation that no community assets had been handed over to any community organisations yet. 2. The Committee requested that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development provide the following information: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Further detail with regard to the public realm work to improve Broadway, Midgate and Northminster areas of the city centre. b. The Committee requested that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development ask the Chief Executive of Opportunity Peterborough to arrange a presentation to all Councillors on the work of Opportunity Peterborough. This to include Opportunity Peterborough's costs against inward investment. 			

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
Governance Appendix 5 (page 40)		Organisational Change and Adult Social Care Systems. A request was made that service areas build into their budgets the replacement of ICT systems.	Members were informed that the current Adult Social Care ICT system was quite old and no longer fit for purpose and would therefore need replacing. In Childrens Social Care Liquid Logic required a number of upgrades to make it fit for purpose. The Social Care team would be issued with Chromebooks to assist them with agile working. This revenue expenditure was therefore about making staff more effective and efficient.
The Committee noted this section of the budget.			
Staff Implications Appendix 6 (Pages 41-42)		Page 41. Living wage increase and employee terms and conditions. Reference was made to the proposal to increase the mileage rate from 25p to 30p after it was reduced from 45p in 2016/17. Why had this now been increased again a year later.	Members were informed that the Unions had worked with the Council to make £100K worth of savings. Union members had not been happy with the reduction in mileage rate and therefore negotiated an increase as part of the overall negotiations. The increase in rate was not in conflict with the Councils Green Travel plans, an increase in rate did not mean that people would travel more than before.
		Page 41. Discussions with Unions were ongoing to make further changes to staff terms and conditions totalling an annual saving of £760,000 from 2017/18. Clarification was sought that staff had been consulted with regard to the proposal to remove a number of allowances for staff above a certain pay grade such as weekend enhancements and professional subscriptions.	The Unions were the staff representatives and when proposed changes were put forward to staff terms and conditions there would always be a discussion with the Unions. The Unions represented the views of the staff and if an agreement was made with them it was deemed to be an agreement with all staff. The discussions with Unions formed part of the formal consultation process and the Unions balloted their members on any proposals. Additionally all staff were regularly updated with any proposed changes and there was also an area on Insite called Ask Gillian where staff could ask any questions.

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>Clarification was sought on how much of the £760K savings had been secured and when would the savings be achieved. Concern was also raised that if the Unions did not reach an agreement and the savings could not be achieved what would happen.</p>	<p>The proposals were about regularising some of the allowances and not all of them would change. Further information on this could be provided to Councillor Davidson as requested.</p> <p>Agreement had not yet been secured and the Unions were currently balloting their members but it was hopeful that agreement would be secured for the amount of £760K. If the agreement was not reached then a different approach would have to be taken as to how the savings would be achieved. As the agreement had not yet been reached none of the savings had yet been achieved.</p>	
<p>The Committee noted this section of the budget.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>The Director of Governance to provide Councillor Davidson with information on which allowances were being proposed to be regularised and which ones would remain in regard to the changes to staff terms and conditions.</p>			
<p>Treasury Strategy, & Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Schedule D (Pages 67 - 94) Asset Investment, Strategy, Acquisition Strategy, Capital Programme & Disposals 2017/18-2026/27 Schedule E (Pages 95 – 137) Asset Management Plan Schedule F (Pages 138 – 167)</p>	<p>Page 147. Asset Management Plan, Portfolio Intelligence. “A lack of ‘portfolio intelligence’ means that strategic opportunities within the portfolio may be currently overlooked. Clarification was sought as to what was being done to address this shortfall and particularly in the fiscal year 2018/19 when there will be a significant funding gap.</p> <p>Could some capital receipts be used for running costs.</p>	<p>Work was being carried out to improve the portfolio intelligence to allow more informed decisions.</p> <p>Norfolk Property Services had the information about the Council’s portfolio and were currently looking to employ more asset managers to bring a professional oversight to make sure the Council were making the best of the assets they had.</p> <p>Under the policy and subject to a financial revenue limit, capital receipts could be used for revenue. Capital receipts as an income could be used for</p>	

Item	Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
			mitigating having to borrow. Capital expenditure had very strict rules as to what it could be used for.
The Committee noted this section of the budget.			
General Comments, any overall recommendations and Conclusion			
	There were no further comments, questions or recommendations.		

The Chair thanked all members of the Scrutiny Committees for attending the meeting and the Cabinet Members and Directors for attending and responding to the questions.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Resources

The Committee recommend that Cabinet:

1. Review their decision to provide the facility for online gambling through the provision of a local lottery scheme.
2. Consider using the income from the revenue received from Parking Permits to improve traffic management conditions and road conditions for cyclists and pedestrians in the most deprived areas of the city where the parking schemes are in place.
3. Check whether there are any other budgets that can be used to fund the issue of new Chromebooks and to consider if there have been any savings made by moving over to agile working to reduce the £600K investment from capital.

ACTIONS

People and Communities

The Cabinet Member for Resources to provide a copy of the Cabinet report detailing the specific schools requiring further grants to Councillor Ayres.

Resources

1. The Committee requested that the Corporate Director for Resources provide the following:
 - a) Further details on the Nors Group and how they are currently working with the public sector and what services they can provide.
 - b) Information on if there is a limit on the number of resident parking permits issued according to the amount of space available for car parking.
 - c) A detailed briefing note with regard to parking permits and the Cabinet Member for City Centre Management, Culture and Tourism to provide a copy of the briefing note sent to Councillor Fower on the same subject to all Committee Members.
 - d) Clarification on whether Buglife intend to manage the Eye Green Nature Reserve on a voluntary basis and if so will there be a saving of £10K.
 - e) Any Member with information on a policy which states that money received from residents parking permits should be invested in the areas where there are resident parking zones to provide the Corporate Director for Resources with the information.
2. The Service Director for Adults and Communities to provide:
 - a) A briefing note on Disability Parking and clarification with regard to Disability Parking and if a person using a disability badge was given a parking fine would the fee be enforced.
 - b) The outcome of the officer review into Grass Verge Parking to be shared with all Councillors and Councillors to be advised of when any approved recommendations would be implemented.

Growth and Regeneration

1. The Committee requested that the Head of Peterborough Property Services provide confirmation that no community assets had been handed over to any community organisations yet.
2. The Committee requested that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development provide the following information:
 - a. Further detail with regard to the public realm work to improve Broadway, Midgate and Northminster areas of the city centre.
 - b. The Committee requested that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development ask the Chief Executive of Opportunity Peterborough to arrange a presentation to all Councillors on the work of Opportunity Peterborough. This to include Opportunity Peterborough's costs against inward investment.

Staff Implications

The Director of Governance to provide Councillor Davidson with information on which allowances were being proposed to be regularised and which ones would remain in regard to the changes to staff terms and conditions.

CHAIRMAN

The meeting began at 6.00pm and ended at 8.15 pm