

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEES MEETING  
HELD AT 6.00PM ON  
28 NOVEMBER 2018  
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Councillors N Simons (Chairman), K Aitken, A Ali, S Bashir, R Brown, G Casey, A Ellis, M Farooq, J A Fox, J R Fox, C Harper, S Hemraj, C Hogg, A Iqbal, M Jamil, D Jones, S Lane, S Martin, E Murphy, D Over, B Rush, B Saltmarsh, N Sandford, L Serluca, J Stokes, S Warren  
Co-opted Members: Parish Councillors Keith Lievesley, Neil Boyce, Susie Lucas, Junaid Bhatti, James Hayes, Richard Clarke

**Also Present:** Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority  
Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health  
Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education Skills and University  
Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development  
Councillor Lamb, Cabinet Member for Public Health  
Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources  
Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services  
Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities  
Councillor Allen, Cabinet Advisor to the Leader  
Councillor Fuller, Cabinet Advisor for Commercial Strategy and Investments

**Officers Present:** Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive  
Peter Carpenter, Acting Corporate Director, Resources  
Adrian Chapman, Service Director, Communities and Safety  
Fiona McMillan, Interim Director of Law and Governance  
Annette Joyce, Interim Corporate Director, Growth and Regeneration  
Wendi Ogle-Welbourn, Executive Director, People and Communities, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils  
Will Patten, Service Director Commissioning  
Dr Liz Robin, Director of Public Health  
Lou Williams, Service Director, Children & Safeguarding  
Jonathan Lewis, Service Director, Education  
Paulina Ford, Senior Democratic Services Officer

## **5. 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 Simons, Chairman of Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Stokes, Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Harper, Chairman of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Simons was nominated by Councillor Harper and seconded by Councillor Stokes. There being no further nominations Councillor Simons was therefore 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 the Medium Term Financial Strategy, Budget 2019/20 to 2021/22 Tranche Two proposals document as part of the formal consultation process before being presented to Cabinet on 3 December 2018 for approval and recommendation to Full Council on 12 December 2018.

## **6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Bisby, Councillor Barkham, Councillor Shaheed, Councillor Goodwin, Councillor Dowson and Councillor Joseph. Councillor Murphy was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Dowson. Councillor A Iqbal was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Joseph and Councillor Hogg was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Shaheed.

Councillor M Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene also submitted his apologies.

The following co-opted members also sent apologies: Education Co-opted members Peter Cantley and Flavio Vettese. Independent Co-opted Members Dr Watson, Alistair Kingsley, Rizwan Rahemtulla and Parish Councillor Co-opted Member Henry Clark and Barry Warne substitute for Henry Clark.

## **7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS**

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

## **8. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS) 2019/20 - 2021/22 – TRANCHE TWO PROPOSALS**

The Cabinet Member for Resources gave a short introduction to the Budget 2019/20 – 2021/22 Tranche Two proposals document accompanied by the Acting Corporate Director of Resources and went through a short PowerPoint presentation a copy of which can be found attached at Appendix 1 of the minutes.

Each section of the budget proposals document was then taken in order according to how it was presented in the Budget Book. The relevant Cabinet Member or Corporate Director were given the opportunity to introduce their section 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
<p>5. Presentation and Introduction of the Medium Term Financial Strategy Tranche Two Proposals Document</p> <p><b>Cabinet report dated 15 October 2018 (pages 1 to 37) of the MTFS 2019/20 to 2021/22 Tranche Two Proposals Document</b></p>	<p>Members sought clarification as to how much budget had been allocated to the ICT change in strategic direction.</p>	<p>The paper that went through Cabinet in July stated a total investment of £1.2m but this would vary year on year.</p>
	<p>Councillor Sandford commented that he had requested information on the cost of the transition between the Microsoft platform and google and the reverse from google to Microsoft on 1 October at the Budget Working Group and on several occasions since but had yet to receive the information.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources apologised for the late response to Councillor Sandford's request for detailed information regarding the ICT transition between the Microsoft and google platforms. An email providing a response had been sent out to members of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee of which Councillor Sandford was a member earlier in the day on 28 November.</p>
	<p>Councillor Sandford queried why the detail of the proposed public transport cuts had not been published in full as he had requested. The supplementary report on the Bus Subsidy Review and Savings published on 27 November had not contained full details. Concern was also raised that the proposed Cross Party Working Group had only been asked to meet on 27 November and not sooner.</p> <p>Concern was raised that the proposed savings would be pushed through at the next Council meeting on 12 December without proper consultation.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources advised that there was still a lot of consultation work to be undertaken which included engaging with groups such as the Youth Council, Pensioners Association and the Cross Party Working Group. It was an ongoing process including negotiating with Stagecoach to achieve the £150K savings. Stagecoach had already indicated that they could identify where those savings might come from.</p>
	<p>Members sought clarification as to how the budget control and if there had been an improvement or if the</p>	<p>A budget control report was presented to every Cabinet meeting to provide a continuous update throughout the year and</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>situation was worsening. Had there been any unexpected budget pressures which had previously not been taken into account.</p> <p>Had the Chancellor given any further detail on how the council may benefit from the increase in funding to public services?</p>	<p>the report indicated that the budget position was improving.</p> <p>The budget position at a high had shown an overspend of £6.4m in August, £5m of which was due to increases in Children's Services. Approximately £3.9m had been built into the budget to go towards Children's Services.</p> <p>The budget overspend as of last month had come down to £4.9m and further processes were being put in place to reduce this further.</p> <p>The major areas for funding to come out of the Chancellors speech was the additional funding for Winter Pressures and Adult Social Care. There was also additional funding of £1.5m for Highways pothole repairs which would need to be spent before the end of the financial year.</p>
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p><b>6.</b> <b>Appendix A</b> <b>Page 39 to 42</b> 2019/2020 – 2021/22 MTFS Detailed Budget Position <b>and Appendix B Page 43</b> Local Government Finance Event Timeline</p>	<p>What is the MRP Re – Provision listed under Table 2 Non repeatable One off Savings on page 3 of the report?</p>	<p>MRP is Minimum Revenue Provision and is the amount each year that the Council must fund from revenue for debt repayment. This item comes under Capital Financing Costs and the re-provision is monies that can be offset against these debt repayment costs (generally from Capital Receipts).</p>
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p><b>7.</b> <b>Appendix C</b> <b>Page 45 to 48</b></p> <p>Performance Data</p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<p><b>8. Appendix – D</b> <b>Page 49 to 51</b></p> <p>Capital Programme 2018/19-2021/22</p>	<p>It was noted that the Community Leadership Fund listed at £860K was underspent last year and the question was posed as to whether it should be reduced, remain the same or be disposed of.</p> <p>Some Members advised that it was used fully in their wards and they would not want it to be taken away.</p> <p>After a short discussion Councillor Over seconded by Councillor John Fox recommended that the Community Leadership Fund remain at £1000 per councillor and that any Community Leadership funding not spent by February of the current financial year should be pooled and redistributed to Councillors who had already spent their allocation and could use it for further projects within their area.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy recommended that the Community Leadership Fund be reviewed.</p> <p>Some Members felt that the rules on how the money</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Resources advised that there was a Capital Programme Board in place which challenged the Capital Programme thoroughly to reduce the overall amount.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council commented that it was sometimes difficult to spend the total amount allocated within one year and it would be more helpful if the funding could be rolled over to the next financial year. This might then provide funding for more meaningful projects.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>could be spent were quite restrictive.</p> <p>Members sought clarification on whether the figure of £860K was accurate and if it had been listed in the correct area of the budget.</p> <p>Councillor Jamil, seconded by Councillor Hogg provided an alternative recommendation to Councillor Over's recommendation recommending that if the Community Leadership Fund was not used within the financial year then it is rolled over to the next year so that it remained within the same ward rather than being redistributed, providing this was allowed within the rules of the Community Leadership Fund.</p> <p>Councillor Over agreed to Councillor Jamil's recommendation and it was therefore put to the vote.</p> <p>(17 in favour, 7 against, 2 abstentions) The recommendation was therefore agreed.</p>	<p>The Acting Corporate Director, Resources advised that he would have to confirm the figure after the meeting and would look at the figure as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Communities requested that when considering the rules of the Community Leadership Fund consideration could also be given to how the fund is allocated within the ward if a Councillor should resign. Currently if a councillor resigned their portion of the Community Leadership Fund was lost.</p>
	<p>Members were concerned that putting £18m this year and £10m next year into the Housing Joint Venture was putting 'all our eggs in one basket'. Members requested that Cabinet look at other funding streams and review the current housing situation.</p>	<p>The Leader responded that the government rules currently stipulate that the Combined Authority could not fund the housing associations however this was currently being looked at. Current funding was coming from the Department of Homes and Communities. The council were open to and bidding via every</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>Councillor Murphy seconded by Councillor Jamil recommended that Cabinet review the current housing financial situation and consider other funders and not put the £28m in to one vehicle for provision of homes.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote. (17 in favour, 0 against, 3 abstentions)</p> <p>The recommendation was therefore agreed.</p>	<p>avenue possible to build and obtain housing.</p>
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget and made the following recommendation.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Joint Scrutiny Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to recommend that Cabinet review the current housing financial situation and consider other funders and not put the £28m into one vehicle for provision of homes.</li> <li>2. The Joint Scrutiny Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to recommend to Cabinet that if the Community Leadership Fund was not used within the financial year then it is rolled over to the next year so that it remains within the same ward rather than being redistributed, providing this was allowed within the rules of the Community Leadership Fund.</li> </ol> <p><b>AGREED ACTIONS</b></p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee requested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Acting Corporate Director, Resources confirm if the figure of £860K listed against the Community Leadership Fund in Appendix D of the budget book is correct.</li> <li>2. The Director of Law and Governance to review the rules around the Community Leadership Fund following the recommendation made.</li> </ol>		
<p><b>9. Appendix E Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 Tranche Two Budget Proposals Document starting on page 53</b></p>	<p>There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.</p>	

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
Introduction, Budget Process, Priorities, Funding and Council Service Expenditure, Overall Budget Position, and Budget Consultation <b>Pages 55 to 63</b>		
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<b>10. Governance Budget Proposals</b> <b>Page 64</b>	Members noted the proposals regarding HR – supplies and services and salary cost savings through reduction of hours and sought clarification as to which staff would be affected. Members also asked if the provision of service would be affected.	It was only HR staff who would be affected and they did not provide any HR services to other authorities.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<b>11. Growth and Regeneration Budget Proposals</b> <b>Pages 65 to 67</b>  <b>Including the supplementary report published yesterday on Bus Subsidy Review and Savings separately numbered pages 1 to 6</b>	Members commented on the proposals to reduce the council's subsidisation of local bus routes and felt that the proposals targeted the evening and Sunday services on the core routes 1 to 6. The supplementary report mentioned that the detailed revised timetables were attached in appendix B and C however the appendices was not included with the report. Members therefore sought clarification as to what the savings entailed.  <i>7.04pm Councillor Ali left the meeting.</i>  Members were concerned that approval of the £150K savings might go through	Stagecoach had provided the council with details of savings of approximately £164K relating to the 60's service. The Cross Party Working Group had therefore been formed to consult on all of the subsidised journeys. The recommendation in the report was to approve the methodology for reviewing the Bus Subsidy in order to achieve the savings put forward in the Tranche Two savings proposal.  Stagecoach had responded to say that they had managed to find some savings across the 60's service however more detailed analysis would be required from Stagecoach.  Members were informed that Stagecoach had provided initial proposals and timetables. The

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>without any detailed analysis or public consultation.</p> <p>Some Members suggested that the savings be found elsewhere as there was concern that a cut in services would affect lifelines to rural communities.</p> <p>Confirmation was sought from the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development that full details of the cost saving proposals would be revealed before the next council meeting in December.</p> <p>It was noted that the Combined Authority was now responsible for transport and that they might decide in the future to reinstate the bus services and charge the council for the services. It was suggested that the council and the Combined Authority should work together on the Bus Subsidy review.</p> <p>Members suggested that the council should look at providing its own bus transport.</p> <p>It was suggested that the Cross Party Working Group should meet in public.</p> <p>Councillor Hogg seconded by Councillor Sandford recommended that the decision on the Bus Subsidy review and savings be</p>	<p>Cross Party Group would look at the full detail of the proposals before a decision was made.</p> <p>The council were working with partners to rationalise the subsidised routes to make the savings.</p> <p>A consultant had already been engaged and a route and branch review was already being undertaken to look at the bus routes around the city which were being under used.</p> <p>Members were reminded that the council had lost over £55m of revenue support grant. The council had to make decisions on what services could be provided. Bus subsidy was one area of scrutiny. The details of the passenger numbers were known and the detail that had already been provided supported the proposed savings of £150k.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development advised that some of the information provided by the bus companies may be commercially sensitive.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>deferred to Tranche Three to allow the Cross Party Working Group to come back with detailed proposals.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote (9 in favour, 13 against, 0 abstentions) The recommendation was defeated.</p> <p>Councillor Sandford seconded by Councillor Hogg recommended that in order to ensure transparency going forward that the Cross Party Working Group hold their meetings in public so that all details were made publically available subject to them not being commercially sensitive.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote (9 in favour, 14 against, 0 abstentions) The recommendation was defeated.</p>	
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p><b>12. People and Communities Budget Proposals</b> <b>Pages 68 to 75</b></p>	<p>Clarification was sought with regard to self-funders and elderly residents in nursing homes who may have dementia being moved from one home to another that would potentially be cheaper. Members were concerned that this could potentially put elderly residents at risk.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health gave a short introduction to areas within the budget which was covered by his portfolio.</p> <p>Self-funders. There was enormous pressure in the nursing market. Sometimes self-funders were misinformed with regard to the care home fees. When people ran out of funds it was the responsibility of the council to step in and provide suitable care. The Cabinet member advised that when this happened and the</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>Members were pleased to note the development of Care Suites across the city and wanted to know where they would be located.</p>	<p>council had to provide assistance in funding care arrangements. This did not necessarily mean that the resident would have to move to alternative accommodation but if this was the case the council would ensure that the accommodation provided was equal to what was already being provided. The same type of accommodation would be provided at an affordable price. The council would not want to see people moved unnecessarily. Cheaper accommodation did not mean worse accommodation, often it would be the same accommodation that they were already in but at a cheaper rate.</p> <p>The location of the Care Suites were known but because of commercial sensitivity they could not be named. However they would be located in Peterborough.</p>
	<p>Home to School Transport – Catchment Areas. Members sought clarification regarding the proposed reduction in home to school transport costs by reviewing the catchment areas of primary and secondary schools.</p> <p>Will the children who are currently using the home school transport still be able to continue using it?</p> <p>Members commented that anything that could be done to encourage cycling and walking would assist the reduction in home to school</p>	<p>The Director for Education responded that the catchment areas within Peterborough were very old and over the years the schools had changed. Some schools no longer existed and there were many new schools the catchment areas therefore needed to be rebalanced to reduce home school transport costs.</p> <p>This proposal was about planning for the future and therefore those currently using home school transport would not be affected.</p> <p>Cycles were already in the scheme and the LEA already promoted cycling to school and where appropriate promoted parents providing transport to</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	transport costs. Adequate school places within the catchment areas would also assist this.	school as this could often be cheaper and more cost effective.
	National Living Wage. It was noted that next year there was nothing in the budget and a -£300 saving for the following two years which was based on intelligence from reviewing the latest information and legislation coming from central government. Why was nothing entered for next year?	At the time the decision was taken the legislation was not quite clear and therefore there was an over provision in the budget as it was uncertain as to the exact costs associated with the National Living Wage. Due to the over provision it is correct that there would be no savings next year and savings of - £300 over the next two years. The money saved would go back into reinvestment into the service.
	Housing Needs. It was noted that the report stated that the council had made significant gains by increasing the number of temporary accommodation units to meet homelessness demands. How many properties had been acquired and tenancies created or dwellings for homeless people so far? Members suggested that the figure of £223K savings needed to be revised as it was believed that the figures would not be achieved.	The budget figures were accurate and reviewed on a weekly basis. Offers had been accepted on 23 houses and by Christmas 35 will have been secured and were on target to have achieved 55 by March 2019. 8 properties had been acquired on Cromwell Road which had been empty for some considerable length of time and were being converted into general needs accommodation. Medesham Homes, Midland Road properties will be listed in the coming weeks. 22 properties had also been secured at Tysedale in Bretton and were currently being converted into general needs stock. Additionally the council had secured and signed up 32 lease properties from the private sector.
	Term time only working. Have staff been consulted with regarding staff moving to term time only contracts resulting in a lower salary.	This related to Education Staff only and individuals affected were being consulted with. The number of people affected related to one or two people only.
	Virtual School. Members	The Virtual School provision for

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>were concerned about the savings identified with regard to the Virtual School as this affected children in care.</p>	<p>looked after children’s education was very important. The process and systems in place for the Virtual School has improved over the years and therefore some efficiency savings could now be made. There was also an additional grant from government which would cover the shortfall.</p>
	<p>Delivery improved performance by the Adult Social Care Team. Would there be any staff redundancies incurred through the £200k savings?</p>	<p>This was about improving productivity and working smarter and more efficiently. There would not be any staff redundancies.</p>
	<p>Community Capacity - Community Asset Transfer (CAT) Programme. If any group did not have the capacity to take on the asset could the council assist the group?</p>	<p>Officers have taken extreme care and sensitivity in the handling and transfer of assets and in particular cases which have been particularly difficult to resolve. The time, care and effort that had been put into the process had been excellent and would continue.</p>
	<p>PES / Community Safety Operating Model. Will the remodelling of the PES service have an effect on other service areas?</p>	<p>The PES continued to grow and extend delivery to all communities across the city and was made up of a range of different interventions. Some of these interventions were about raising revenue through an increase in enforcement activity. There was also the new HMO licensing regulations. Revenue raised would be used to offset the staffing costs. A large amount of the £350K savings was linked to the fact that the CCTV service was now shared with Fenland District Council which would mean sharing the staff and costs.</p>
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.</p>		

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<p><b>13. Public Health Budget Proposals</b> <b>Pages 76 to 77</b></p>	<p>Members were concerned with some of the proposed savings and in particular Public Health Staffing savings in respect of three vacant posts (Mental Health Promotion Officer, Senior Public Health Analyst and Drug and Alcohol Misuse Health Improvement Specialist. How long had the posts been vacant and how would the services provided by these posts be fulfilled.</p> <p>It was also noted that there would be a cut in sexual health and contraceptive services but recent public health indicators were concerning with regard to teenage pregnancies and sexual health. How can the cuts therefore be justified.</p>	<p>The savings for Public Health staff all related to posts in Cambridgeshire County Council. The Mental Health Promotion Officer post had been vacant for less than a year, the Public Health Analyst post had been vacant since December 2017 and the Health Improvement Specialist post went out to advert twice but it was not possible to appoint.</p> <p>In terms of cover for the posts the Mental Health Promotion Officer spent a lot of time working on the Keep Your Head mental health web site which consisted of an adult and children's section. The site has now passed to voluntary sector organisations.</p> <p>An agreement has been made with the NHS to appoint a full time person to the Analyst role which was a post that was originally only being funded for a part time role.</p> <p>The Health Improvement Specialist role was being covered by other areas of the team.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that there were some challenges in Peterborough with regard to teenage pregnancies and late diagnosis of HIV. In Tranche One of the budget the council invested heavily in the iCash service because the demand was so high. The council had now negotiated with the provider to mitigate some of that initial cost. Overall there was an investment in year. Consultation was underway with regard to making the savings and making a minimum impact to the service user.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<b>14. Resources Budget Proposals Pages 78 to 79</b>		The Cabinet Advisor for Commercial Strategy and Investments gave a brief introduction with regard to the councils Commercial Strategy.
	<p>ICT (Change of Strategy Direction). A request was made for a detailed breakdown of the budget pressure of £1,024m including costs relating to the transition to google from Microsoft and the reverse of this decision. Did the £1,024m include licences, training, equipment etc?</p> <p>Members requested information on what had been spent on contracts with Serco and Arcus over the past few years.</p>	<p>In 2013 / 2014 the direction of travel was to develop ICT solutions working with other partners. This had not quite developed as expected. The direction of travel had now changed to using solutions that were already on the market rather than developing our own. Part of the costs were for changing the strategy to deliver the new direction of travel and removing some of the targets that had been put in the original ICT strategy.</p> <p>The Acting Director of Resources advised that he would provide the information after the meeting.</p>
	Increased Council Tax Collection. How did the council propose to raise the additional amount of money?	Peterborough had been moving up the league tables in terms of council tax collection and had been cited as the most improved Unitary authority. Peterborough were now in the top end of the league table with regard to the collection of council tax. More money was collected more efficiently at an increased rate of half a percent.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<p><b>ACTIONS</b></p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee requested that the Acting Corporate Director of Resources provide information on how much money had been spent on contracts with Serco and Arcus over the past few years.</p>		

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<b>15. Staffing Implications</b>  <b>Page 80</b>	There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.	.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget		
<b>16. Appendix F</b> <b>Pages 81 - 154</b>  Equality Impact Assessments	Subsidised Transport Equality Impact Assessment (EIA). Members noted that the EIA stated that “It is not possible to identify which, if any individuals or groups will be affected until a review of the various supported services has taken place. A full assessment will be taken at that stage”. It also states that any positive or negative effects were unknown at this stage. Members had been advised that a comprehensive review would be undertaken and detailed information on the services would be submitted to the full council meeting on 12 December which left little time to carry out a detailed review and full equality impact assessment. Members sought assurance that a full equalities impact assessment would be carried out.	The Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development advised that an equalities impact assessment could only be carried out when it was known which bus routes would be affected. When the routes have been identified an impact equality assessment would be carried out.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget		
<b>17. General Comments, any overall recommendations and Conclusion:</b>  There were no further comments, questions or recommendations made.		

CHAIRMAN

The meeting began at 6.00pm and ended at 8.17 pm