

SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES

MONDAY 17 SEPTEMBER 2012
7.00 PM

Bourges/Viersen Room - Town Hall

AGENDA

Page No

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Declaration of Interest and Whipping Declarations**

At this point Members must declare whether they have a disclosable pecuniary interest, or other interest, in any of the items on the agenda, unless it is already entered in the register of members' interests or is a "pending notification" that has been disclosed to the Solicitor to the Council. Members must also declare if they are subject to their party group whip in relation to any items under consideration.
3. **Minutes of the Meeting Held on 16 July 2012** 1 - 8
4. **Provision of Carers in Rural Areas** 9 - 12
5. **Provision of Primary Care in Rural Areas** 13 - 16
6. **Disability Issues in Rural Areas** 17 - 28
7. **Forward Plan** 29 - 38
8. **Work Program** 39 - 42
9. **Date of the next Meeting**

19 November 2012



There is an induction hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms. Some of the systems are infra-red operated, if you wish to use this system then please contact Paulina Ford on 01733 452508 as soon as possible.

Emergency Evacuation Procedure – Outside Normal Office Hours

In the event of the fire alarm sounding all persons should vacate the building by way of the nearest escape route and proceed directly to the assembly point in front of the Cathedral. The duty Beadle will assume overall control during any evacuation, however in the unlikely event the Beadle is unavailable, this responsibility will be assumed by the Committee Chair.

Committee Members:

Councillors: D Over (Chairman), D Lamb (Vice Chairman), D Sanders, McKean, E Murphy,
D Harrington and N Sandford

Substitutes: Councillors: S Allen, J R Fox and Sylvester

Further information about this meeting can be obtained from Paulina Ford on telephone 01733
452508 or by email – paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL
COMMUNITIES HELD AT THE BOURGES / VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL
ON 16 JULY 2012**

Present: Councillors D Over (Chair), D Lamb (Vice Chair), A Sylvester, D Sanders, D McKean and JR Fox

Officers Present: Richard Godfrey, ICT and Transactional Services Partnership Manager
Heather Darwin, Business Transformation Manager
Simon Machen, Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services
Steve Winstanley, Team Leader (Research and Information)
Gary Goose, Safer and Stronger Peterborough Strategic Manager
Laura Almond, Assistant Neighbourhood Manager
Leonie McCarthy, Social Inclusion Manager
Dania Castagliuolo, Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Murphy. Councillor Sylvester attended as substitute. Apologies were also received from Councillor Harrington and Councillor John Fox attended as substitute.

2. Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 18 June 2012

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2012, were approved as a true and accurate record.

4. Update on Superfast Broadband in Rural Areas

The report provided members with an update on the work being undertaken as part of the Connecting Cambridgeshire to Superfast Broadband Project.

The following key points were highlighted:

- Superfast Broadband would help to boost growth and create jobs, improve health and make life easier, learn new skills for success and support people who needed it.
- The roll out of better broadband services was due to begin in 2013 although it was too early to predict which areas would benefit first as these decisions would form part of the procurement process.
- The Commission were requested to note that the criteria for Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) funding highlighted that the implementation would focus on the areas deemed to be 'white areas' by BDUK to be the areas most likely to benefit from the changes. Although there was no guarantee where the infrastructure improvements would be across the country, some rural areas would be in the 10% not covered by the project to access superfast broadband.

- The project was set to deliver broadband speeds of 25MB per second across 90 percent of Cambridgeshire between now and 2015, the remaining 10 percent of the county would be looking at receiving a minimum of 2MB per second.
- There were two main arms of the project
 1. The demand registration piece
 2. The procurement of Broadband and of the supplier
- The demand registration hit 10,000 registrations. The demand registration would run through to December when the procurement exercise finished and the total figure estimated for registrations is 20,000
- The project had gone out to tender and five suppliers had passed the initial prequalification questionnaire stage
- An event was held to invite suppliers in and talk to them about what was expected from them and explain what the vision was in order to give them a chance to decide whether they wanted to proceed with their bids and all five wanted to continue
- The next stage would be an initial submission from the potential suppliers, which would be received at the end of July followed by a competitive dialogue phase then a supplier should be appointed by December to undertake the project

The following comments, observations and questions were raised:

- Members queried what figure for the demand register would be presented when going out to tender. *The ICT and Transactional Services Partnership Manager advised the Commission that the figure would be around 15,000 to 20,000.*
- Members were advised that the project was to be superfast broadband in the rural areas as well as urban areas and everybody would be on 2MB as a minimum.
- Members requested a break down of the 10,000 registrations by rural areas and Village. *The ICT and Transactional Services Partnership Manager informed the Commission that he would ask the team working on the demand registration for a breakdown of these figures although the actual number of registrations for Peterborough was only 751.*
- Members were concerned that because of the low number of registrations Peterborough would not receive the superfast broadband. *Members were advised that Peterborough would receive superfast broadband as the aim of the project was to upgrade 90 percent of Cambridgeshire.*
- The Chairman asked the Commission for any suggestions they had to advertise the need for superfast broadband in Peterborough. *The Business Transformation Manager informed the Commission that notification had already gone out to all schools and Parish Councils including the website address and how to register.*
- The ICT and Transactional Services Project Manager advised members that the number of registrations was simply to prove that there was a demand for superfast broadband in Cambridgeshire this would not affect which parts of Cambridgeshire would be issued with superfast broadband by the supplier.
- Members were concerned that without a high number of registrations from Peterborough the supplier would not feel it necessary to supply Peterborough with superfast broadband as they would not be gaining any business there. *The ICT and Transactional Services Project Manager advised the Commission that the supplier who would deliver the superfast broadband would not necessarily deliver it based on the number of registrations as this would be discussed as part of the competitive dialogue. He also informed the commission that the state funding allocated to this project currently only allowed the superfast broadband to go out to white areas that do not have very good broadband and this would initially exclude the City centres of both Cambridge and Peterborough..*
- Members queried how prioritisation was going to be carried out. *The ICT and Transactional Services Project manager advised the Commission that this query could not be answered until proposals from the companies had been seen and the competitive dialogue had been completed*
- Members commented on the importance of superfast broadband for silver surfers as they may not have had the ability to go out to do their shopping therefore they could do it

online and suggested they approached pension organisations and churches to inform them of superfast broadband and the requirement for registrations

- The Social Inclusion Manager informed the Commission that with the help of the Business Transformation Manager and the ICT and Transactional Services Project Manager they could draw up a plan for ways to advertise the need for superfast broadband in Peterborough and this could be presented at September's meeting
- Members questioned how they were going to obtain the interest of elderly residents in Rural Areas. *The Social Inclusion Manager advised members that a lot of work was currently being carried out with the voluntary sector and organisations such as Age Concern UK and care organisations. This would be covered in the plan.*

ACTION AGREED

The Commission requested that:

1. The ICT and Transactional Services Partnership Manager provide a breakdown of the number of people that have registered for superfast broadband from rural areas.
2. The Social Inclusion Manager work with the ICT and Transactional Services Partnership Manager and the Business Transformation Manager to write an action plan to promote the need for people in Peterborough to register for superfast broadband. This to include all diverse groups. To be presented to the Commission at a meeting in September.

5. Funding for Rural Areas

The report was presented to the Commission at the request of the Chairman who expressed concern that rural areas within the city could have been missing out on funding opportunities.

The report provided the Commission with details of funders whom whilst not having a specific rural community focus, would fund projects in rural areas providing they met the funder's criteria.

The following comments, observations and questions were raised:

- Members queried whether the Funding Central magazine was in the public domain and if not could they send copies to voluntary organisations. *The Business Transformation Manager advised members that Funding Central was in the public domain and could be passed on to voluntary organisations.*
- The Social Inclusion Manager agreed with the Commission that she would work with voluntary Organisations when applying for funding as this would avoid an influx of funding applications and requests.
- Members commented on how useful and informative the Funding Central magazine was and asked for an updated copy and if a copy could be emailed to the Commission on a monthly basis. *The Business Transformation Manager advised the Commission that the latest copy of the Funding Central Magazine would be emailed to each of them and to Parish Councillors monthly.*

ACTION AGREED

1. The Commission agreed that the Social Inclusion Manager worked with Peterborough Communities Voluntary Sector with regard to funding applications.
2. The Commission requested that the Funding Central Magazine be emailed to all Members of the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities and all Parish Councillors. The most recent issue to be emailed as soon as possible.

6. Overview of Emerging Changes to Planning Obligations (S106/POIS) and Details about a Proposed New Development Levy for Peterborough (Community Infrastructure Levy – CIL)

The purpose of the report was to provide a high level overview of the emerging changes to the way developer contributions were collected through the planning system as a result of regulatory changes to the existing approach. The proposal was to ultimately adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) although a number of stages of consultation and an independent examination would be required before the council could achieve this.

A CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule was currently being prepared and would be reported to Cabinet on 24 September 2012 for approval for the purpose of public consultation. The document and supporting papers relating to it would be in the public domain after 4 September 2012 therefore the report was used to brief members in general terms on the CIL and by ramification changes to changes to the Planning Obligations system. A full report on CIL would be presented to the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee on 6 September 2012.

The following key issues were highlighted:

- Whilst optional, choosing not to adopt a CIL would severely constrain Peterborough's ability to secure developer contributions towards infrastructure going forwards.
- Whilst a CIL is effectively a new form of 'tax on development, it was not strictly additional to existing requirements but rather it was partially replacing existing mechanisms, namely POIS. It would be set according to careful modelling and research in to what is technically viable and genuinely necessary to accommodate our growth targets without making development across the district unviable. This would be tested through an independent examination of proposals.
- It was legally and morally justified to seek to secure contributions for shared infrastructure from the private development sector since we all utilise it and benefit from its provision.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- Members queried whether a meeting would be acceptable with a Parish Councillor who would be representing all Parish Councils to discuss ideas of what villages would like to see for future infrastructure. *The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services advised members that this was already happening within the Community Action Plans and there would not be another consultation with Parishes and communities to ask what developments they would like as this work had already been completed. When the list of Community Infrastructure and the preliminary draft charging schedule had been completed there would be a round of Parish Council meetings to explain CIL to them.*
- The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services highlighted that requests for CIL funding would need to be evidence based as they would be tested through an independent examination. However there may be projects that would not be eligible for CIL funding but could possibly be obtained from other sources of corporate funding
- Members were concerned that plans would be agreed by the Council which villages would not be happy with. *Members were advised that parishes would be able to have their say as long as the requests were evidence based also there would be five percent of CIL money given to communities to spend on what they liked.*
- Members queried when the meetings with the Parish Councils would take place. *The Team Leader for Research and Information informed members that the earliest for this meeting would be in the Autumn*
- Members suggested that only five percent of CIL money going to local communities was a bit modest. *The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services informed members that the overall tab currently stood at 1.5 billion pounds to 2026 and development would not pay for all of the infrastructure costs therefore there would always be external funding sources for other projects.*

- Members were concerned that the Parish Councils did not understand the importance of CIL and had been confused by presentations at Neighbourhood Committee meetings. *The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services informed members that the presentations that had recently taken place at the Neighbourhood Committee meeting was for a recent consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement which had been completely separate to CIL.*
- Members requested information on the process of completing the lists for CIL and what evidence base was expected. *Members were informed that there was an evidence list already in existence outlining the infrastructure required for growth in the city which had already been tested through the process. The evidence list supported the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme (POIS) and was background to the core strategy putting Peterborough City Council ahead of most Local Authorities as Peterborough City Council had not had a roof tax or a development tariff system in place which was beneficial for the city. Peterborough had been engaging with communities and a number of other services e.g. Vivacity, Ambulance Service, Police, Fire Service and statutory undertakers as they all have defined infrastructure needs.*
- Members queried what would happen to the remaining POIS money that was placed into a pool to be used on Neighbourhood infrastructure. Certain villages had to bid for POIS money left in the pot when they required more urgent infrastructure due to growth. *The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services advised the Commission that was the Council's policy that had been agreed by full council.*
- Members queried who decided where the money would be spent. *The Head of Planning Transport and Engineering Services informed that members would decide where the money was spent within the community.*
- Members queried whether once POIS had moved to CIL decisions could be changed on plans for infrastructure. *The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services advised members that CIL had more flexibility on what the money was spent on.*
- Members were concerned that the Town and Country Planning Act stated that any funding granted from POIS to a specific area/development was to be spent in that area. *The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services informed members that effectively the Town and Country Planning Act stated that it must be proved that the money required through section 106 was necessary to complete the development.*
- Members were concerned that Neighbourhoods were losing out as they were unable to use development funding until the budget they have through Neighbourhoods had run out. Was this going to change. *The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services stated that this was the Council's Policy which members had decided and agreed to and that the £25,000 of neighbourhood budget was effectively funded by CIL*

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the report.

7. Update on Community Action Plans

The purpose of this report was for the Commission to note and update progress on the Community Action Plans.

Members of the Commission were asked to note the contents of the report and confirm their support or otherwise for the purpose of the Community Action Plans and their function within the structures of the Neighbourhood Committees, local communities, the council and wider partner service delivery.

The following key points were highlighted:

- Three Assistant Neighbourhood Managers had been appointed for each of the three Neighbourhood areas.

- The aim was to make sure that the Community Action Plans developed for rural neighbourhoods recognised the unique nature of the rural community which would be different from the other Community Action Plans.
- Concerns that the current Community Action Plan for the North and West area were not entirely suitable for each village.
- The draft Community Action Plans were written in March 2012 but were still a working progress.
- Each area needed to log developments that were needed in the area and prioritise the priority projects.
- Neighbourhood Delivery Team meetings were going to be set up in villages for officers to discuss rural issues and monitor the projects within the Community Action Plans
- The Assistant Neighbourhood Manager would be visiting Northampton District Council to talk to them about their Community Action Plans and work from their template.
- The Assistant Neighbourhood Manager would be based within the rural areas to help the Neighbourhood Management Team become more accessible specifically whilst trying to implement the Community Action Plans and Community LED Plans.

Observations and questions were raised and discussed including:

- Members commented that they would prefer that officers were based in the office coordinating the team that would produce the evidence for what would be required within the community action plans.
- Members were concerned that one of the issues in the past had been ward data from Census information . The age demographic profile needed to be collected as per the parish not the ward. *The Safer and Stronger Peterborough Strategic Manager advised Members that this issue would be considered as this was one of the distinct natures of rural areas*
- Members queried how many Community Action Plans had been received so far out of the twenty four wards. *The Safer and Stronger Peterborough Strategic Manager advised Members that they had received seven Community Action Plans matching the Neighbourhood Committee areas and there would be twenty four ward profiles completed*
- Members queried how the very small villages would get involved. *The Safer and Stronger Peterborough Strategic Manager advised that these were the type of issues that needed to be addressed in rural areas. The Assistant Neighbourhood Manager would need to be contacted in order to discuss a mechanism of incorporating the views of the very small villages.*

ACTION AGREED

The Committee noted the report.

8. Forward Plan

The latest version of the Forward Plan, showing details of the key decisions that the Leader of the Council believed the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would be making over the next four months, was received.

The Commission noted the Forward Plan and was advised that the latest forward plan for August to November was to be published on 17 July 2012. The Chairman therefore requested that the most up to date copy be emailed to him when published.

ACTION AGREED

A Copy of the latest forward plan to be sent to the Chairman.

9. Work Programme

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2012/13 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

ACTION AGREED

1. To confirm the work programme for 2012/13 and the Governance Officer to include any additional items as requested during the meeting.
2. The Commission also requested that:
 - The Provision of Primary Care report scheduled for September is to include within the report what the impact of the change over from Primary Care Trusts to Local Authorities in April 2013 was going to be regarding carers in rural areas.
 - The Affordable Housing report to be presented at the November meeting of the Commission should include an explanation on how the decision was made to have affordable housing in rural areas.
3. The Commission agreed that the Social Inclusion Manager provide a briefing note explaining how public health would link in with Neighbourhoods.

10. Date of Next Meeting

17 September 2012

The meeting began at 7.00pm and ended at 8.45pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES	Agenda Item No. 4
17 SEPTEMBER 2012	Public Report

Report of the Executive Director of Adult Social Care

Contact Officer(s) – Nick Blake

Contact Details – 01733 758408, nickolas.blake@peterborough.gov.uk

PROVISION OF CARERS IN RURAL AREAS

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities has requested a report on the provision of adult homecare support in rural areas.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities is asked to note and comment on the contents of this report.

3. LINKS TO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY

- 3.1 The provision of social care support to rural communities supports the delivery of the key outcome *Creating opportunities – tackling inequalities*, specifically in relation to improving health and supporting vulnerable people.
- 3.2 Community social care also supports the key outcome to *Create strong and supportive communities* in terms of empowering local communities and supporting people to engage in and be part of their local community.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Nationally people living in rural areas make up around one-fifth of the total population; recent DEFRA health statistics (June 2012) indicate that life expectancy in rural areas is higher than urban areas and that years of life lost to cancer, stroke and heart disease are lower. However, people in rural areas can be more at risk of isolation, support services are often based in urban centres and transport costs to access services can be higher.
- 4.2 Peterborough's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) shows that around 20,123 (12%) of Peterborough residents live in a rural area and that there are rural areas within the Unitary Authority boundary classified with high and low levels of deprivation.
- 4.3 The total cost of homecare purchased by Peterborough City Council from independent providers for 2011/2012 was £16.1 million.
- 4.4 A snapshot of Adult Social Care data covering April to July 2012 shows that there were 127 people (10%) living in a rural area receiving home care support from a total of 1271. The costs of purchasing homecare support in rural areas made up 10% (£14,900 per week) of total homecare spend (£147,000 per week). When this is compared to JSNA population data it appears that proportionally less homecare is purchased for rural areas. However, this could be due to differences in the definition of 'rural' between the two data sources; socio-economic factors could also play a part. Further analysis would help to develop a clearer view of the provision of homecare support across urban and rural areas.

5. KEY ISSUES

- 5.1 The process to access adult social care support is the same for people who live in rural areas as for people living in urban areas. In terms of community based support, there are two main ways for the Council to meet someone's assessed eligible needs: through managed services or through a Direct Payment.
- 5.2 Managed services involve the Council purchasing services to meet a person's needs, currently this is through a range of independent sector providers that the Council has formal arrangements with, mainly through the Independent Living Support Services (ILSS) framework.
- 5.3 The ILSS framework allows services to charge different hourly costs for delivering support in urban and rural locations, the intention being that the additional cost of providing rural support can be factored into charges so the Council pays a fair price for the support it purchases and people who need homecare are not disadvantaged by where they live.
- 5.4 In practice there are still challenges in arranging homecare in rural areas; providers will sometimes refuse to take on packages due to the additional cost associated with delivering the support. Feedback from providers indicates that, even with higher rates for homecare support in rural areas, it is not always financially viable to deliver individual support packages in some areas. The Council is reviewing the ILSS framework currently; more effective purchasing arrangements for rural homecare support will form part of this review. A key issue will be how the additional costs associated with travelling to rural areas are managed fairly and transparently.
- 5.5 Direct Payments involve the person, or a suitable person acting in their best interests and on their behalf, choosing to receive a cash payment in lieu of services. In this case the person might employ someone directly to provide the support needed. This is often an effective solution for people living in rural areas as they are able to directly employ someone who lives in the local area to provide homecare support and to support them accessing and being part of their local community.

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1 The Adult Social Care Strategic Commissioning Team has been consulting with providers on possible ways to improve how support is provided for people living in rural areas. People who use services and carers will be consulted on proposed changes.

7. NEXT STEPS

- 7.1 The issues associated with providing homecare support in rural areas, following further consultation, will be included in the planned review and restructure of the ILSS framework. Consulting on and co-producing a solution with people who use services and who live in a rural area will be an essential part of this development work.
- 7.2 In order to monitor homecare delivery for all service users, the Council will be requiring all homecare providers to use Electronic Homecare Monitoring systems from 1 October 2012. This will provide accurate information on whether homecare is delivered as commissioned by the Council and will immediately highlight and evidence if calls are not delivered or are being cut short.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 8.1 DEFRA Health Report, June 2012: available on the DEFRA website at <http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/files/HealthJune12.pdf>
- 8.2 Peterborough Joint Strategic Needs Assessment available on the Peterborough City Council's website at <http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/>

9. APPENDICES

9.1 There are no appendices to this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES	Agenda Item No. 5
17 SEPTEMBER 2012	Public Report

Report of the Interim Director of Primary Care

Contact Officer(s) – Peter Wightman

Contact Details – peter.wightman@peterboroughpct.nhs.uk

PROVISION OF PRIMARY CARE IN RURAL AREAS

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 Following a request from the Committee, this report describes current service primary care service provision in rural areas of Peterborough.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To note the current provision and current transition in NHS organisations.

3. LINKS TO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY

- 3.1 This is part of the PCT's responsibilities to ensure good access to Primary Care.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 NHS commissions primary care services from independent contractors for
- Medical,
 - Dental,
 - Pharmaceutical
 - Optometric services

- 4.2 Peterborough is primarily an urban area. The following services are located in

GP Practices:

Main sites

- Ailsworth Medical Practice (2350 registered patients)
- Thorney Medical Practice (7500 registered patients)

Branches

- Newborough Medical Practice - 650 patients (part of the Ailsworth Practice)
- Castor (branch of Park Medical Practice)
- Eye (branch of Thorney Practice)

Pharmaceutical Services

Community Pharmacy

- Thorney – Halls the Chemist, Church Street, Thorney
- Eye – Boots, High Street, Eye
- Newborough – Newborough Pharmacy, School Road, Newborough
- Castor/Ailsworth – Halls the Chemist, Church Hill, Castor

Dispensing Doctors

- Ailsworth Medical Practice – 337 dispensing patients
- Thorney Medical Practice- 1,544 dispensing patients
- Fletton Medical Practice – 342 dispensing patients

Dental Surgeries

Dental Surgery in Eye

Opticians

None in Peterborough villages

There is no restriction with regard to which pharmacy, dental surgery or optician patients can choose to attend. Patients can register with a GP surgery if they are in the practice's catchment area. Practices operate geographic catchment areas to ensure practical distances for home visiting.

- 4.3 NHS Peterborough consulted on a strategy for urgent and primary care in 2011 and signed off the strategy in March 2012. The consultation process included significant input from the Scrutiny Commission for Health Issues. The strategy sets a strategic approach to addressing the most pressing general practice primary care service issues. It includes a range of principles, one of which is that should a GP retire leading to a practice contract ending, if the practice is below 4000 patients the PCT would disperse patients to neighbouring surgeries. However, this would not apply in rural circumstances if there is not reasonable access to an alternative surgery. This principle applies in the intervening period prior to the NHS Commissioning Board taking on responsibility.
- 4.4 NHS Peterborough undertook a Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment, including a wide consultation process, to define the key health needs that would guide the PCT's approach to Pharmaceutical Applications. This concluded that there was not a requirement for additional pharmaceutical services.
- 4.5 Responsibility for primary care commissioning transfers to the National Commissioning Board from 1 April 2013. Shadow arrangements are being implemented during October 2012 to March 2013. During this period, commissioners are asked to maintain the status quo and focus on ensuring careful handover of responsibilities. There will be a Local Area Team of the NHS Commissioning Board with responsibility for East Anglia. The Local Area Team has equivalent responsibilities to NHS Peterborough with regard to consulting with local communities on service requirements and changes, as Clinical Commissioning Groups will not be taking on responsibilities for primary care contracts.

5. KEY ISSUES

- 5.1 There is a balance to be struck between provider size and locating a service in every community. Patients in rural areas without their own transport are often dependent on transport from friends and family or voluntary transport services.
- 5.2 There are no planned changes to services in rural locations.
- 5.3 Responsibilities for commissioning these services transfer from NHS Peterborough to the National Commissioning Board with effect from 1 April 2012.

6. IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no planned changes to the service located in rural areas.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The primary care strategy and the Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment included comprehensive consultation processes

8. NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 Comments from the Health Commission for Rural Issues will be passed to the NHS Commissioning Board as part of the handover process.

9. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 9.1 Peterborough Primary and Urgent Care Strategy
Peterborough Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES	Agenda Item No. 6
17 SEPTEMBER 2012	Public Report

Report of the Social Inclusion Manager, Neighbourhood Services

Contact Officer(s) – Leonie McCarthy
Contact Details – 01733 864308

DISABILITY ISSUES IN RURAL AREAS

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 To propose a series of access audits for rural areas by disabled people living in Peterborough working with Peterborough City Council and the Disability Forum.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Peterborough City Council works with the Disability Forum to provide comprehensive access audits across the rural areas of Peterborough, carried out and managed by the Disability Forum and DIAL.
- 2.2 To include this work as part of the Rural North Community Action Plan and as a pilot for involvement of disabled people in policies and planning for rural areas.

3. LINKS TO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY

- 3.1 This report and its proposals directly contribute across the entire Sustainable Community Strategy, by ensuring that all aspects of rural policy and service delivery consider and take into account the needs of people with disabilities.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 The Disability Forum has been working with Peterborough City Council, the Primary Care Trust, Peterborough City Hospital, Nene Park Trust, Peterborough Train Station, Van Hague Garden Park and various other organisations and businesses across Peterborough to provide advice, information and guidance on various aspects of disability awareness and accessibility issues. We have been asked by the Scrutiny Commission to explore access difficulties for disabled people living in rural areas.

5. KEY ISSUES

- 5.1 This proposal will ensure that the views and experiences of local disabled people are incorporated into any and all future developments, and provide suggestions for improving existing rural provisions.

In addition:

- i. Work to date on access audits for the city have been unfunded and provided through the goodwill of untrained volunteers
- ii. There is no organisation *currently* providing access audits for Peterborough on a voluntary basis

- iii. Access audits for projects of this nature by qualified consultants are estimated to cost in the region of £10k
- iv. Our access audits will be in the region of £1k – £5k depending on size and depth of audit required
- v. Our findings lead us to believe that many professional access audits are carried out without the involvement and inclusion of disabled people
- vi. Disabled people living in rural areas will have the opportunity to influence decision making and plans in their neighbourhoods; they will also be able to improve skills, reduce isolation and improve general health and wellbeing
- vii. This pilot project in the Rural Areas will be a unique example of best practice for involving local disabled people in rural issues related to access and inclusion
- viii. Older people are now living longer and we are finding that many of the issues affecting older people in terms of accessibility and 'getting around' are the same as those with a physical disability

6. IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 If the council chooses not to go ahead with this piece of work there may be lost opportunities for engagement with older and disabled people living in rural areas. Increasing our knowledge of access issues in rural areas will enable us to reduce isolation, improve health and increase opportunities for growth in tourism. By including disabled people throughout the process the council will reduce the need for revisiting work that doesn't meet the needs of disabled people.
- 6.2 There is a funding requirement for this work and it will be necessary to identify funding sources to enable this to progress. There may also be a resource implication as well as investment opportunities emerging from the audits, and any such agreed requirements will form part of the emerging community action plans for rural areas.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 We are working with professional access auditors who have worked on previous projects within the city to develop our model for 'Inclusive Access' volunteers. We will consult with all the disabled and older persons, groups and organisations in rural areas that we are able to make contact with to help in this work. The Disability Forum and DIAL will invite members to participate and will oversee the management of the work.

8. NEXT STEPS

- 8.1
 - To seek funding, including applying for external funds, to undertake access audits in rural areas
 - To identify priority areas with the Rural North Neighbourhood Committee
 - To identify disabled residents living in rural areas to assist with audits if appropriate

9. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

None

10. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Example Access Audit for Village Hall

**ACCESS AUDIT REPORT
on the
VILLAGE HALL
DOLTON**

**FOR
THE DOLTON VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE
DOLTON VILLAGE HALL
DOLTON
DEVON**

REVISION/ISSUE No.	A
DATE	Dec 04
PREPARED BY	PHF
CHECKED/APPROVED BY	

PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH:
Disability Discrimination Act 1995
Designing for Accessibility
Published by Centre for Accessible Environments
Part M of the Building Regulations 2004
BS 8300: 2001

DECEMBER 2004 Job No:

CONTENTS

		PAGE NO:
1.0	DEFINITION OF DISABILITY AND MAIN SUMMARY	3
2.0	PRINCIPLES OF AUDIT	3
3.0	INTRODUCTION	6
4.0	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
5.0	ACCESSIBILITY CHECKLISTS INCLUDING REMEDIAL ACTIONS, PRIORITIES AND COSTS	11
APPENDIX I:	PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORDS	
APPENDIX II:	MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES AND ASSOCIATED INFORMATION	
APPENDIX III:	USEFUL INFORMATION INCLUDING GROUND FLOOR PLAN	

1. MAIN SUMMARY

DEFINITION OF DISABILITY

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 states that a disabled person is a person who has "...a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on the persons ability to carry out normal day-today activities". The broader definition of disability includes those people with physical, sensory, mental health and learning difficulties and also includes cancer, facial disfigurements, incontinence, co-ordination, the ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects, speech, memory, ability to concentrate, learn or understand, perception of the risk of physical danger, epilepsy and those with multiple disabilities. Simply providing improved physical access does not address the broader needs of all disabled people.

SUMMARY

Dolton Village Hall occupies a site off South Street on the south west of the village. The original building was built in 1967, with an extension and alterations, incorporating a store room in 1969

The items costed below relate directly to the Accessibility checklist made of the building detailed in Section 5. These costs relate to individual items in isolation and do not allow for professional fees, VAT, contingencies, commissioning costs and preliminaries or ancillary costs as part of a larger refurbishment project.

Priority 1 items are defined as: implement immediately to eliminate a serious barrier or hazard to access and use of the building.

The estimated cost liability for Priority 1 items is in the region of £900. 00

Priority 2 items are defined as: implement as soon as possible to improve access.

The estimated cost liability for Priority 2 items is in the region of £8,800. 00

Priority 3 items are defined as: plan adaptation work to be implemented to suit identified building users requiring adaptations to be made.

The estimated cost liability for Priority 3 items is in the region of £8,550. 00

Priority 4 items are defined as: implementation as part of specific regular maintenance/renewal.

The estimated cost liability for Priority 4 items is in the region of £500. 00

2. PRINCIPLES OF THE AUDIT

- 2.1. The Access Audit has been undertaken to appraise defined areas of the existing accommodation to assess the extent of accessibility to services and facilities and propose the extent of works required to improve the current facilities in accordance with the definitions of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. The audit takes into account the needs of people with mobility impairments (including wheelchair users) and sensory impairments. The audit will identify physical barriers to access against pre-determined criteria identified below. The audit should be treated as the starting point of an ongoing access plan, constantly updated by the committee. This audit should only be seen as a snapshot of the position at the time of the report. Changes made after the site inspection may improve or reduce levels of accessibility. As the DDA evolves, so will buildings, and review of audits already completed should be considered on a periodic basis. The DDA is not compliance-based legislation and relates to discrimination, not directly to buildings and physical standards.

In physical terms a building could be made as accessible as the requirements of BS8300:2001 and Approved Document Part M 2004 Edition, although this will not protect an Employer or service provider from possible claims under the DDA 1995. Management and staff attitudes are equally important to ensure equality for all. It should be noted that the issues considered in the report will affect the convenience of the use of the building for all occupants and not just those users with identifiable disabilities. The audit focuses on key elements of the building including approach, entry, horizontal and vertical circulation together with essential facilities within the building.

The agreed appraisal criteria are:

- a) The need to maximise accessibility to the building for both the public and employees.
- b) Disability Discrimination Act 1995. This Act is sub-divided into several sections, but for the purposes of this report will focus on Part II Employment, and Part III, Goods, Facilities and Services.

Under the terms of Part III of the Act it has been made unlawful for service providers to refuse to serve disabled people because of their disability unless their action can be justified. This may be possible on grounds of health and safety although the reasoning must be well considered and clarified.

From 1st October 2004, the Act will cover all employers regardless of size, although a key factor with Part II is that Employers are only required to be reactive to the needs of an individual employee. With regards to Part III and Access to Goods, Facilities and Services, anyone providing a service is affected and a service provider must anticipate future need and therefore be proactive.

In general terms the service provider must not prevent disabled people having access to services that are available to non-disabled people.

In adapting a building to improve accessibility a service provider must consider making "reasonable adjustments" in order to improve access for all to the service being provided. At this time there is no clear definition of what is reasonable, although cost, practicability, effectiveness, health and safety and disruption are all factors. Reasonableness is likely to be more clearly defined in case law that occurs after 1st October 2004. Good practice should ensure that a service provider will 'anticipate need' as well as responding to individual circumstances as they arise. Frequency of need is no argument against not making a provision, although reasonableness can have a bearing on the solution.

Under the terms of the DDA, after October 2004 service providers must have considered alternative means of providing access to services where a physical barrier exists. These barriers may be altered, avoided or removed. Works should be executed in accordance with the current Approved Document M of the Building Regulations and the standards published in BS 8300 (October 2001). There is a further option to provide the service by a reasonable alternative means, although again this is subject to the definition of the term reasonable. This document is aimed at providing technical solutions to most building situations. Good Practice Guides such as the Designing for Accessibility (2004 Edition) document produced by the Centre for Accessible Environments have also been referred to.

- c) Provision of the Building Regulations Approved Document Part M. The main difference between Part M in its earlier form and the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) was that Part M only applied to certain new and refurbishment works whereas the effect of the DDA is retrospective. Now The Building Regulations 2000, Access to and Use of Buildings, Approved Document Part M Access to and Use of Buildings - 2004 Edition applies to material alterations of and extensions to existing non-domestic buildings. There is no exception for historic buildings, but the new edition of Part M contains guidance on such buildings.
- d) Currently published Good Practice and Design to make buildings more accessible.

- e) The need to observe reasonableness in practically providing and implementing improved access options.
- f) British Standard BS8300:2001 - Design of Buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of Disabled People - Code of Practice.

- 2.2. The dimensional criteria used within the report is based on the guidance given in Approved Document M of the Building Regulations (2004 Edition) with additional recommendations as given in Designing for Accessibility (2004) published by the Centre for Accessible Environments and BS 8300 'Design of Buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people- Code of Practice' October 2001.
- 2.3. An indication of the cost implications of the recommendations is provided. These costings are budget costs only and detailed estimates should be obtained prior to implementing the works. Each cost item refers to that element in isolation and does not include the ancillary costs that may be part of a larger refurbishment project. Where costs may be incorporated within general ongoing maintenance/ refurbishment works these have not been detailed as the works are related to a change of design/ approach rather than additional cost.

Although priorities have been allocated for individual elements we would strongly recommend buildings are not considered in isolation but instead a holistic attitude is taken. For example improving the access into a building will have little value if the user cannot get access to internal rooms, reach controls or access sanitation facilities.

- 2.4. Due to the restricted nature of the brief and following client instructions, we did not discuss any access issues with either current employees or visitors.

2.5. PRIORITIES

Various priorities have been given to the points raised in the accessibility checklist detailed in section 5 and are defined:

2.5.1. Priority 1

Implement immediately to eliminate a serious barrier or hazard to access and use of the building.

2.5.2. Priority 2

Implement as soon as possible to improve access.

2.5.3. Priority 3

Plan adaptation work to be implemented to suit identified building users requiring adaptations to be made.

2.5.4. Priority 4

Implementation as part of specific regular maintenance/renewal.

2.5.5. Priority 5

Arrange for assistance to be readily available where appropriate. This requirement is now included under Part 3 of the DDA Act 1995.

- 2.6. This audit is undertaken in accordance with the terms and conditions for the engagement of an access consultant or access auditor defined by the NRAC. These terms maybe downloaded from their website at www.nrac.org.uk/termsandconditions.

- 2.7. As regards Part IV of the DDA related to employment this audit will focus on accessibility issues. Comments on employment rights and duties and legal definitions are beyond the scope of this audit and separate legal advice should be sought.
- 2.8. Even if all the recommendations in this audit are adopted this will not guarantee compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. As previously stated, the DDA is not compliance based and relates to elimination of discrimination that cannot be solved by changes to physical features alone.
- 2.9. This audit should not be seen as a health and safety document in relation to egress in the event of an evacuation, and although comments will be made in relation to means of escape, any barriers should be discussed in detail with the local Fire Officer and a strategy agreed for implementation.

3. AUDIT INTRODUCTION

- 3.1. The Access Audit of Dolton Village Hall was carried out on behalf of Mr John Cotter, chairman of the Dolton Village Hall Committee on the 19th August 2004. The weather at the time of the survey was dry although overcast.

Dolton Village Hall occupies a site off South Street on the south west of the village. The original building was built in 1967, with an extension and alterations, incorporating a store room in 1969. The building is single storey with a main hall, a meeting room and a kitchen. There are male, female and an accessible toilet adjacent to the main entrance, with an additional toilet off the meeting room.

There are many possible activities and sports in which disabled people may wish to participate including keep fit, yoga, skittles, short mat bowls etc. Further details are shown in the appendices.

Access to the site is as indicated on the attached location maps and bus timetables.

4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Various photograph references are given throughout the summary of findings and these have been included as part of a photographic record in Appendix I. A general summary of issues follows for each building element. Due to the size of the inspection not all issues have been identified in the following text. Reference should also be made to the tables.

4.1. Approach, Routes and Street Furniture

Access to the building is poorly served by both pedestrian and vehicle access, although signage on the main vehicle and pedestrian route is limited (photographs i, 5 and 6). The nearest bus links are to be found in The Square, some 2-300m away. Improved signage would be of the greatest benefit to users and visitors to guide them in the right direction. Pedestrian access from South Street is provided with a combined pedestrian and vehicular access due to the narrow access width (photographs 2 and 3). Drop kerbs have been provided at various points, although not on all routes. Many of the routes to the Hall do not have footpaths causing visitors to use the carriageway. There are several points of traffic control to be dealt with in the village, but these are outside the scope of this report.

There is an alternative pedestrian access to the Hall from the Stafford Way estate by public footpath across 'Atkin's Field', although this is not practicable for people with disabilities as it involves the use of a stile and the crossing of an open field which often has horses grazing.

4.2. Car Parking

No accessible bays have been provided adjacent to the front entrance (photograph 20). Recommended standards suggest that a minimum of two bays should be provided, with transfer

space identified at the sides and rear of each bay to allow full circulation and loading around the vehicle.

4.3. External Ramps, Steps and Main Entrance

The main entrance has been provided with a level access into the lobby area. There are no other level accesses to the building. A ramp should be formed / provided at the fire exit from the main hall, as at present the step down from the outward opening door is difficult to traverse in a wheelchair and a serious tripping hazard for those with sight impairments.

The main entrance sits forward of the rest of the building and comprises an artificial stone porch in a greenish colour (photographs 19 & 22). The front doors are dark brown veneered and set back into the porch causing them to be difficult to see in some lighting conditions. The main entrance could be finished in a tonally contrasting colour to identify the entry point more easily for those with a visual impairment. For the first time visitor the main entrance location is unwelcoming and additional signage could be of benefit.

4.4. Entrances, Reception Area and Lobby

There is no reception area as such, merely the entry lobby. At some functions / events this is used as the meeting and greeting area, at others it is empty, and again for the first time visitor better signage would be an advantage.

There is no seating in this area and way finding signs should be provided to indicate the various areas of the building, especially as the smaller hall is often let separately to the main hall and users must retrace their steps and re-enter the building at the side entrance through the kitchen. This, the only other entrance is currently inaccessible, being a narrow door, with an awkward double step upwards.

There are user group notice boards on both sides of the lobby, these can again confuse the first time user as although there is some Hall information, it tends to be buried in the user group's notices.

The lighting in this area could be improved to give better transition between inside and out.

4.5. Corridors:

The corridor areas at the sides of the stage are restrictive due to the original building design, and the doors at the ends are too narrow to allow the passage of a wheelchair, but widening them would incur considerable expense and disruption to the building. Leading edges on corridor doors for wheelchair users are also insufficient. Access through an upgraded kitchen door would seem the only reasonable option.

Ideally all signage should be reachable by visitors and be embossed or have Braille added to them. Some signage within the building is located so that other visitors may obscure them. Consideration of relocation and upgrading the signs should be considered.

4.6. Internal Doors:

Generally the doors are all finished in a dark veneer, with the architraves being painted dark brown.

The entrance and inner lobby doors have a reasonable area of glazing, but are glazed in obscured glass which makes access difficult due to poor visibility (photograph 46). The inner doors to the kitchen and small hall from the main hall have no glazing, and it could be argued that a loss of privacy would occur if glazing were fitted, likewise the door between the kitchen and the small hall is unglazed. The external door to the kitchen is an unglazed ledged, braced and framed door, and as such would be difficult to install glazing. It might be preferable to fit a new part glazed unit when level access is installed at this entrance (photographs 52 & 55).

Door furniture varies in quality around the building and ideally should all be circular profile in a tonally contrasting finish to the door surface. Door closers should also be maintained to minimum opening pressures not to exceed 20N

4.7. Internal Stairs:

There are no staircases in this building.

4.8. Platform Stair lifts/ Lifts:

None currently provided in the building.

4.9. WC's, Changing Areas and Shower Facilities: General Provisions:

There are two separate facilities available for both male and female use. Off the main lobby on the left are male toilets, whilst on the right are the female. Behind the male toilet is an accessible WC. Whilst not to current standards in terms of fittings it is adequate in size for manoeuvrability. There is another single toilet off the small hall for the use of all, currently this is not accessible, it could be made so, but only by considerable modification (photographs 5863 & 66-69). No showers or specific changing areas are provided.

The standards of the sanitary facilities generally are not to current standards and no doubt will be upgraded at a time of general refurbishment.

The units are all white against light coloured walls.

Tonal contrast could be improved between the wall and floor surfaces and also the glare from the tiling may be confusing for someone with a visual impairment. The lowering of hand driers and dispensers should also be considered to a maximum of 1200mm above finished floor level. Obstructions such as waste bins under hand driers should be avoided.

Compartment doors to WC cubicles should be provided with lever handle locks that are easier to operate than the current mechanisms.

The provision of lever taps for hot and cold water supplies could also be considered to assist users with poor grip or manual dexterity disabilities. At present these are mostly pillar taps and with a twist action operation. No thermostatic mixing valves are fitted to the system, thereby creating a scalding risk if the hot water system becomes defective and overheats.

4.10. WC's: Wheelchair users:

One accessible WC has been provided in the building, the installation is fairly dated with fixed rails, an upgrade to meet current standards should be considered. It does however meet the size requirements set out in BS8300: 2001 and is located adjacent to the lobby (photographs 43 & 44).

Tonal contrast within the accessible WC is poor and should be improved between the wall and floor surfaces. Directional signage would also be of benefit. Tonal contrast between the fittings and the wall surface is poor, although the glare from the tiled wall surface may confuse a person with a visual impairment.

The accessible WC would also benefit from provision of a suitably sized mirror and also a shelf so that belongings do not have to be placed on the floor. Additional grab rails would be of benefit in both units.

4.11. Internal Surfaces:

All floor surfaces are suitable for the passage of wheelchairs and solid colours have generally been used avoiding bold patterns. If replacement of floor coverings is undertaken the replacement should be provided in a contrasting colour to the skirting and wall finishes.

Many switches and controls etc are hard to locate against wall surfaces of a similar colour. When replacements are required the controls should be replaced in a contrasting colour unit or provided with a clearly identified border for ease of identification.

Both the small and main halls have shiny floor surfaces suited to the various activities undertaken. The glare from these floors may be mistaken by someone with a visual impairment as a wet surface. Consideration should be given to reducing the glare on these surfaces (photographs 45 & 47).

4.12. Seating:

The movable seating provision could be improved by providing seats at a range of levels and with armrests to aid access.

4.13. Counters and Service Desks:

There is no counter or service desk provision.

4.14. Facilities:

Telephones: there is currently no public telephone in the building; provision should be considered due to the poor cell phone reception in the area. It should be fixed at a suitable height, and would benefit from being provided with a perch seat and shelf being fixed adjacent.

Alarms: if a fire alarm is fitted to, the building it should be supplemented by visual alarms and as the building is open to the public then particular care should be taken in the formulation and implementation of a controlled evacuation of the building.

4.15. Way-finding:

The improvement of signage internally generally would significantly improve way-finding around the building. Limited access to the kitchen and small hall should be highlighted.

4.16. Lighting:

Many of the lighting controls would benefit from a colour contrast to the surrounding walls surfaces to make them more identifiable.

The lighting provision is standardised throughout the building, consideration should be given to the provision of variable levels and patterns of lighting to suit differing functions and impairments

4.17. Acoustics:

Generally the acoustic standards internally are acceptable, although consideration could be given to the provision of an induction loop in the Main Hall. This may help users with a hearing impairment participate in organised classes, and aid their involvement in other functions. The space could then also be used to hold meetings if required.

4.18. Means of Escape:

As stated earlier no alarm system is fitted, and an audible system with visual back up to the alarm could be fitted.

All emergency exit routes should be made as accessible as the main entrance, i.e negotiable by a wheelchair users or someone with a disability (photographs 70, 72-74).

4.19. Building Management:

General maintenance and cleaning is carried out by a caretaker employed by the committee. As previously stated access to the building is freely available. The implementation of a coherent management and emergency evacuation policy and general improvements will benefit access for all visitors and staff within the building. The implementation of an access action plan should be agreed and continuously developed as works and improvements progress.

4.20. General:

Currently there is no access to the stage for people with a mobility disability, or suitable facilities for anyone with a visual impairment. Again the provision of such facilities would be expensive and difficult to install, feedback from the relevant users would be valuable to indicate the likelihood of such a need.

SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES	Agenda Item No. 7
17 SEPTEMBER 2012	Public Report

Report of the Solicitor to the Council

Report Author – Paulina Ford, Senior Governance Officer

Contact Details – 01733 452508 or email paulina.ford@peterborough.gov.uk

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This is a regular report to the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities outlining the content of the Council's Forward Plan.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Commission identifies any relevant items for inclusion within their work programme.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The latest version of the Forward Plan is attached at Appendix 1. The Plan contains those key decisions, which the Leader of the Council believes that the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Member(s) will be making over the next four months.
- 3.2 The information in the Forward Plan provides the Commission with the opportunity of considering whether it wishes to seek to influence any of these key decisions, or to request further information.
- 3.3 If the Commission wished to examine any of the key decisions, consideration would need to be given as to how this could be accommodated within the work programme.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Details of any consultation on individual decisions are contained within the Forward Plan.

5. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

None

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Forward Plan of Executive Decisions

This page is intentionally left blank

**PETERBOROUGH CITY
COUNCIL'S FORWARD PLAN
1 SEPTEMBER 2012 TO 31 DECEMBER 2012**

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS - 1 SEPTEMBER 2012 TO 31 DECEMBER 2012

During the period from 1 September 2012 To 31 December 2012 Peterborough City Council's Executive intends to take 'key decisions' on the issues set out below. Key decisions relate to those executive decisions which are likely to result in the Council spending or saving money in excess of £500,000 and/or have a significant impact on two or more wards in Peterborough.

This Forward Plan should be seen as an outline of the proposed decisions and it will be updated on a monthly basis. The dates detailed within the Plan are subject to change and those items amended or identified for decision more than one month in advance will be carried over to forthcoming plans. Each new plan supersedes the previous plan. Any questions on specific issues included on the Plan should be included on the form which appears at the back of the Plan and submitted to Alex Daynes, Senior Governance Officer, Chief Executive's Department, Town Hall, Bridge Street, PE1 1HG (fax 01733 452483). Alternatively, you can submit your views via e-mail to alexander.daynes@peterborough.gov.uk or by telephone on 01733 452447.

The Council invites members of the public to attend any of the meetings at which these decisions will be discussed and the papers listed on the Plan can be viewed free of charge although there will be a postage and photocopying charge for any copies made. All decisions will be posted on the Council's website: www.peterborough.gov.uk. If you wish to make comments or representations regarding the 'key decisions' outlined in this Plan, please submit them to the Governance Support Officer using the form attached. For your information, the contact details for the Council's various service departments are incorporated within this plan.

NEW ITEMS THIS MONTH:

Jack Hunt and Ken Stimpson Schools Boiler Refurbishment - KEY/02SEP/12

SEPTEMBER

KEY DECISION REQUIRED	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	RELEVANT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CONSULTATION	CONTACT DETAILS / REPORT AUTHORS	REPORTS
<p>Sale of surplus former residential care home - Eye - KEY/01OCT/11 To authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council, Executive Director – Strategic Resources, the Corporate Property Officer and the Cabinet Member for Resources, to negotiate and conclude the sale of a former care home now surplus to requirement -The Croft, Eye.</p>	September 2012	Cabinet Member for Resources	Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital	Consultation will take place with the Cabinet Member, & Ward councillors, as appropriate	Simon Webber Capital Receipts Officer Tel: 01733 384545 simon.webber@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Award of Contract - Bus Shelter Provision and Maintenance - KEY/01APR/12 Award of contract for the provision, installation, cleaning and maintenance of Bus Shelters.</p>	September 2012	Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning	Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.	Darren Deadman Travel Information and Monitoring Officer Tel: 01733 317464 darren.deadman@peterborough.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.

<p>Moy's End Stand Demolition and Reconstruction - KEY/03APR/12 Award of Contract for the Demolition of the Moy's End Stand and Reconstruction</p>	September 2012	<p>Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University, Cabinet Member for Resources</p>	Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital	Internal and External Stakeholders as appropriate.	<p>Richard Hodgson Head of Strategic Projects Tel: 01733 384535 richard.hodgson@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Organic and Food Waste Treatment Services Contract - KEY/01MAY/12 To Award a contract for Organic and Food Waste Treatment Services.</p>	September 2012	<p>Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning</p>	Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.	<p>Amy Nebel Recycling Contracts Officer Tel: 01733 864727 amy.nebel@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	A public report will be available from the Governance Team on week before the decision is taken.
<p>Roundabout Junction 5 and Boongate West Widening Scheme - Contract Award - KEY/04JUN/12 To approve the award of a contract for construction of the Roundabout Junction 5 and Boongate West Widening Scheme to the successful Midlands Highways Alliance (MHA) contractor (tbc).</p>	September 2012	<p>Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning</p>	Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital	Consultation on scheme was carried out in 2010 /11 Financial Year and budget allocated in the Medium Term Financial Strategy for implementation in the 2012/13 Financial Year.	<p>Stuart Mounfield Senior Engineer Tel: 01733 453598 stuart.mounfield@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.

<p>Delivery of the Council's Capital Receipt Programme through the Sale of Dickens Street Car Park - KEY/03JUL/11 To authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Solicitor to the Council, Executive Director – Strategic Resources, the Corporate Property Officer and the Cabinet Member Resources, to negotiate and conclude the sale of Dickens Street Car Park.</p>	September 2012	Cabinet Member for Resources	Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital	Consultation will take place with the Cabinet Member, Ward councillors, relevant internal departments & external stakeholders as appropriate.	Richard Hodgson Head of Strategic Projects Tel: 01733 384535 richard.hodgson@peterborou gh.gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is made.
<p>Management and Operation of Dogsthorpe Household Recycling Centre - KEY/01AUG/12 To award the contact for Management and Operation of Dogsthorpe Household Recycling Centre (HRC) (including the supply of containers and transportation of waste from the HRC).</p>	September 2012	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning	Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital	Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.	Paul Robertson Waste Project Officer Tel: 01733 864740 paul.robertson@peterborough .gov.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.
<p>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) - KEY/01SEP/12 To approve the draft CIL for public consultation.</p>	September 2012	Cabinet	Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital	Six week public consultation including Planning and Environmental Protection Committee.	Richard Kay Policy and Strategy Manager richard.kay@peterborough.go v.uk	A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.

<p>Jack Hunt and Ken Stimpson Schools Boiler Refurbishment - KEY/02SEP/12 Award of a contract to refurbish the boilers at Jack Hunt and Ken Stimpson schools under the PFI Conditions Fund works.</p>	<p>September 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<p>Sarah Walker Principal Assets Officer (Non Schools/PFI) Tel: 01733 864006 sarah.walker@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance team one week before the decision is taken.</p>
--	-----------------------	---	---	---	---	--

OCTOBER

There are currently no Key Decisions scheduled for October.

NOVEMBER						
KEY DECISION REQUIRED	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	RELEVANT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	CONSULTATION	CONTACT DETAILS / REPORT AUTHORS	REPORTS
<p>Rolling Select List - Independent Fostering Agencies - KEY/01JUL/12 To approve the list for independent fostering agencies.</p>	<p>November 2012</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Children's Services</p>	<p>Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities</p>	<p>Internal and external stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<p>Wendi Ogle-Welbourn Assistant Director for Strategy, Commissioning and Prevention wendi.ogle-welbourn@peterborough.gov.uk</p>	<p>A public report will be available from the Governance Team one week before the decision is taken.</p>

DECEMBER

There are currently no Key Decisions scheduled for December.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S DEPARTMENT Town Hall, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1HG

Communications
Strategic Growth and Development Services
Legal and Governance Services
Policy and Research
Economic and Community Regeneration
HR Business Relations, Training & Development, Occupational Health & Reward & Policy

STRATEGIC RESOURCES DEPARTMENT Director's Office at Town Hall, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1HG

Finance
Internal Audit
Information Communications Technology (ICT)
Business Transformation
Strategic Improvement
Strategic Property
Waste
Customer Services
Business Support
Shared Transactional Services
Cultural Trust Client

CHILDRENS' SERVICES DEPARTMENT Bayard Place, Broadway, PE1 1FB

Safeguarding, Family & Communities
Education & Resources
Strategic Commissioning & Prevention

OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT Director's Office at Town Hall, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1HG

Planning Transport & Engineering (Development Management, Construction & Compliance, Infrastructure Planning & Delivery, Network Management, Passenger Transport)
Commercial Operations (Strategic Parking and Commercial CCTV, City Centre, Markets & Commercial Trading, Tourism)
Neighbourhoods (Strategic Regulatory Services, Safer Peterborough, Strategic Housing, Cohesion, Social Inclusion, Neighbourhood Management)
Operations Business Support (Finance)

ADULT SOCIAL CARE DEPARTMENT Town Hall, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1FA

Care Services Delivery
Strategic Commissioning
Performance, Quality and Information

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES
DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2012/13

Updated: 5 September 2012

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
18 June 2012 <i>Draft report 31 May</i> <i>Final report 7 June</i>	<p>Review of 2011/12 and Future Work Programme</p> <p>To review the work undertaken during 2011/12 and to consider the future work programme of the Committee</p> <p>Contact Officer: Paulina Ford</p>	
16 July 2012 <i>Draft report 28 June</i> <i>Final report 5 July</i>	<p>Funding For Rural Areas</p> <p>To receive a report on funding opportunities for Rural areas and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Janet Brown</p> <p>Overview of Emerging Changes to Planning Obligations (S106/POIS) and Details About a Proposed New Development Levy for Peterborough (Community Infrastructure Levy – CIL)</p> <p>To receive a report on an overview of changes to planning obligations (S106/POIS) and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Simon Pickstone/Simon Machen</p> <p>Community Action Plans – Update</p> <p>To receive a report on Community Action Plans and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Adrian Chapman</p> <p>Superfast Broadband – Update</p> <p>To receive a report on progress on access to Superfast Broadband in rural areas.</p>	

APPENDIX 2

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
	Contact Officer: Paul Stevenette	
17 September 2012 <i>Draft report 30 Aug</i> <i>Final report 6 Sept</i>	<p>Disability Issues in Rural Areas</p> <p>Contact Officer: Bryan Tyler/ Leonie McCarthy</p> <p>Provision of Primary Care in Rural Areas</p> <p>To receive a report on the provision of primary care in rural areas and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Peter Wightman</p> <p>The Provision of Carers in Rural Areas</p> <p>To receive a report on the provision of carers in rural areas and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Terry Rich/Tim Bishop</p>	
19 November 2012 <i>Draft report 1 Nov</i> <i>Final report 8 Nov</i>	<p>Affordable Housing in Rural Areas</p> <p>To receive a report on affordable housing in rural areas and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Adrian Chapman</p> <p>Housing Allocation in Rural Areas</p> <p>To receive a report on affordable housing and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Adrian Chapman</p> <p>New Street Lighting in Rural Areas</p> <p>To receive a report on new street lighting in rural areas and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Mark Speed</p>	

APPENDIX 2

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
	<p>Making Villages Energy Sustainable</p> <p>Contact Officer: Charlotte Palmer</p>	
<p>14 January 2013 Draft report 27 Dec Final report 3 Jan</p>	<p>Educational Attainment in Rural Areas</p> <p>To receive a report on the educational attainment in rural areas and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Jonathan Lewis</p> <p>School Transport in Rural Areas – Update Report</p> <p>To receive a report on school transport in rural areas and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Jonathan Lewis</p> <p>Support for the Development of Community Centres and Village Halls in Rural Areas</p> <p>To receive a report on the support for the development of Community Centres and Village Halls and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Julie Rivett</p>	
<p>9 or 21 January 2012 (Joint Meeting of the Scrutiny Committees and Commissions)</p> <p>26 March 2013 <i>Draft report 8 March</i></p>	<p>Budget 2013/14 and Medium Term Financial Plan</p> <p>To scrutinise the Executive's proposals for the Budget 2013/14 and Medium Term Financial Plan.</p> <p>Contact Officer: John Harrison/Steven Pilsworth</p> <p>Flood Management</p>	

APPENDIX 2

Meeting Date	Item	Progress
<i>Final report 15 March</i>	<p>Contact Officer: Julia Chatterton Superfast Broadband</p>	
	<p>To receive a report on progress on access to Superfast Broadband in rural areas.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Paul Stevenette Community Safety</p>	
	<p>To receive a report on Community Safety and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Gary Goose Bus Services in Rural Areas</p>	
	<p>To receive a report on bus services in rural areas and make any recommendations.</p> <p>Contact Officer: Teresa Wood</p>	

Items to be programmed in: