

## **MINUTES OF CABINET MEETING HELD 10 JULY 2012**

PRESENT

**Cabinet Members:** Councillor Cereste (chair), Councillor M Dalton, Councillor Fitzgerald, Councillor Hiller, Councillor Holdich, Councillor Lee and Councillor Walsh.

**Cabinet Advisers:** Councillor Eley, Councillor Goodwin and Councillor North

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Scott.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None received.

### **3. MINUTES OF CABINET MEETING 26 MARCH 2012**

Cabinet agreed that the minutes of the meeting held 26 March 2012 were accurate.

## **STRATEGIC DECISIONS**

### **4. ARMED FORCES COMMUNITY COVENANT**

Cabinet received a report seeking agreement on the adoption of the Armed Forces Community Covenant for the City of Peterborough. The Armed Forces Community Covenant is a statement of mutual support between the Armed Forces community and the civilian community in Peterborough.

Councillor Walsh introduced the report and introduced Councillor Victor Lucas, former Captain RN DL and Chairman of Cambridgeshire Reserve Forces and Cadets, who addressed Cabinet and spoke of the need for the military to work with local authorities and that he was looking forward to work in the future on joint projects. Group Captain Hill, Wittering Station Commander, also addressed Cabinet and welcomed the opportunity for closer working with the local authority to further improve relations and to access funding for community projects.

Councillor Lee added that work with the Territorial Army had already begun with the introduction of free gym passes for its members.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

Adopt the Armed Forces Community Covenant for the City of Peterborough.

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Armed Forces Community Covenant would bring benefits to the city. It would strengthen the relationship between the city, RAF Wittering and the Armed forces community and would open up the opportunity to apply for funding for community projects through the Community Covenant Fund.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The only alternative option was not to adopt the Covenant in Peterborough. Although it was entirely optional to implement a Covenant in the city it would prevent any community groups or organisations from having the opportunity to apply for funding from the Community Covenant Fund. This funding was specifically designed to fund projects that would benefit all members of the community.

## **5. CONSULTATION ON THE REVIEW OF THE OLDER PEOPLE'S ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY AND OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF CARE HOMES IN PETERBOROUGH**

Cabinet received a report seeking its approval for the Peterborough Older People's Accommodation Strategy 2012 and for Cabinet to agree adoption of the strategy and consequent consultation on the proposed closure of the two care homes: Greenwood House and Welland House.

Councillor Fitzgerald introduced the report, advising that officers sought approval for consultation to begin, not approval for closure of the homes. Cabinet was advised that neither care home had been at full capacity for some time and the standard of the buildings did not allow the best access to care that could be provided.

Tim Bishop, Assistant Director Strategic Commissioning Adult Social Care, addressed Cabinet and highlighted the updates to the strategy since 2007 which included the recommendation to close both Welland House and Greenwood House.

Ms Marie Skells, a representative of residents and families from the two care homes, addressed Cabinet, opposing the proposed closures and stating that equivalent specialist care for dementia and Alzheimer's sufferers was not available in the private sector and that the day services must also continue to be provided.

Sally Cartwright, representing the care staff from the care homes, addressed Cabinet, opposing the proposed closures, stating that assurances were given in 2011 that the homes would not close, a rebuild could be afforded from the proposed redundancy funds, referrals were not made to the homes ensuring they were not full, many residents would not cope with the stress of moving home and the rising demand in the city should see the homes remain or be replaced.

Councillor Saltmarsh, representing residents as a Ward Councillor for Dogsthorpe, addressed Cabinet, opposing the proposed closures and stating that residents from the recently closed Peverells had already moved to Welland House and would now have to move again, many jobs in the ward would be lost, land should be identified for rebuilds of the homes, a new home would ensure residents stayed with friends and known staff and the standard of care was first class in each home.

Councillor Cereste stated that all options would be considered during the consultation exercise.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. Approve the refreshed Peterborough Older People's Accommodation Strategy and;

2. Authorise consultation with residents and families, and appropriate staff, on the proposed closure of the two care homes: Greenwood House and Welland House.

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The previous strategy was now five years old and needed to be updated, taking into account modern standards and expectations of care provision for older people.

The Council needed to ensure people had access to good quality residential and nursing care in fit for purpose surroundings, which supported staff and managers to meet people's individual personalised needs.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The homes to continue to provide a residential service with no changes. This was rejected because the resident room sizes are small and do not meet modern standards, or the quality of provision that the Council wishes to provide for older people.

The homes to be sold as a going concern. This option has been rejected because the costs of running the homes and the improvement costs would not make them viable businesses to sell.

The homes be developed and improved. Significant costs would be incurred to improve the homes and it may be more cost effective to demolish and rebuild them. Initial cost modelling indicates that for the two homes, with like for like built on modern standards, the build cost alone would be circa £2.2m, with additional costs of demolition and fitting out. Given the national data and the number of rooms it is unlikely this would be a cost effective option and would still require residents to leave the homes while work was undertaken.

## **6. GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT ITEMS**

### **6.a ENDORSEMENT OF THE 2012-13 OPPORTUNITY PETERBOROUGH BUSINESS PLAN**

Cabinet received a report requesting it endorsed the Opportunity Peterborough annual business plan. As sole funder it was important that the council was satisfied that the draft business plan would deliver the objectives agreed.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report stating that many successes had been achieved over the previous 12 months. Neil Darwin, Director of Economic Development, addressed Cabinet highlighting successes included growing numbers of jobs, Skills Vision, investment in the city continuing from the private sector and good ratings had been received from investment and financial companies.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

Endorse the 2012/13 business plan for Opportunity Peterborough.

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

It was required that the Council considers and agrees the draft business plan. The specific schemes for implementation would potentially evolve during the course of the plan period and it was therefore appropriate that funding was approved by the Council through its normal decision-making processes.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The draft business plan could not be approved, which would significantly limit the operations of Opportunity Peterborough as the City's Economic Development Company.

## **6.b DELIVERY STRATEGY FOR SOUTH BANK AND SURROUNDING AREAS**

Cabinet received a report to consider the outcomes of the review of the options for delivery of the Riverside Opportunity Area and to agree the way forward.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report stating that the development of the area was moving forward well.

Councillor Dalton declared an interest as a Member of the Athletics Club, and asked if there were plans for the athletics track. Andrew Edwards, Head of Growth & Regeneration, advised that the plans would not be detrimental to the track. Councillor Lee added that any development would consider what enhancements could be made and would not look to move the track.

The Head of Growth and Regeneration further advised Cabinet that another location was being discussed with the operators of the Green Back Yard and would be of comparable size to the existing site.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. Agree that the South Bank Opportunity Area (SBOA) is renamed as the Riverside Opportunity Area (ROA).
2. Agree that the embankment and areas north of the river and Pleasure Fair Meadows car park are included within the ROA as shown in the plan at Appendix 1.
3. Agree the proposed delivery strategy for ROA and the outline scope of development as detailed in the report.
4. Delegate authority to the Head of Growth & Regeneration in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Economic Development, Business Engagement and Environment Capital, the Executive Director Strategic Resources and the Solicitor to the Council to procure a joint venture partner(s) to participate in a corporate joint venture with the council for the delivery of parts of the ROA including but not limited to Fletton Quays.
5. Delegate authority to the Head of Growth & Regeneration in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Economic Development, Business Engagement and Environment Capital, the Executive Director Strategic Resources and the Solicitor to the Council to negotiate with the freeholders to acquire land and assets necessary to support the successful development of the ROA up to a limit of £3m, subject to due diligence and a viable business case; to be funded through:
  - a. Up to £1m through the existing corporate Invest To Save budget in this financial year, for those assets where a clear Invest To Save business case can be demonstrated; and
  - b. Up to £2m for other assets, for which Cabinet is asked to support a growth bid for the FY13/14 budget process.

6. Support a growth bid in FY13/14 for £600k to cover the procurement and establishment of the Joint Venture.

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The recommendations were made to enable the delivery of regeneration on the South Bank area of Peterborough, now to be extended and known as the Riverside Opportunity Area. It was considered that without these steps it would not be possible to deliver timely and comprehensive regeneration on this key city centre site.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The alternative options were considered in the report at Appendix 2 and the reasons that these alternatives were not being taken forward were given.

### **6.c DEVELOPMENT OF GROUND MOUNTED SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC (PV) PANELS (SOLAR FARMS) AND WIND TURBINES**

Cabinet received a report seeking its approval for the development and delivery of ground mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) panels, known as solar farms, wind turbines and other types of renewable energy schemes on sites within the Peterborough area.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report stating that the city should aspire to become self sufficient and this project would move a long way to achieve this goal.

Cabinet considered the report and commented that renewable energy projects must be brought forward and money will be generated from the energy developed to alleviate budget pressures. It was requested that it be noted that Cabinet passed its thanks to John Harrison and his team for the development of the work and this report.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. Approve the outline strategy for the development of renewable energy parks at the three council owned agricultural sites identified in para 4.11.1 of this report, to include Ground Mounted Solar PV (solar farms), wind turbines or other types of renewable energy schemes;
2. Note that the delivery of the outline strategy for the above sites is subject to further due diligence and studies around planning, environmental, technical and financial issues;
3. Delegate authority to the Executive Director – Strategic Resources in consultation with the Leader of the Council and/or Cabinet Member for Resources to:
  - (i) identify further sites for development in the vicinity of the three sites set out in para 4.11.1, and carry out appropriate project appraisal studies in relation to them, and if not already in Council ownership to negotiate the acquisition of those sites or interests in them, (subject to further decisions of cabinet or the relevant cabinet member to approve such acquisitions before any commitment is made, as set out in recommendation 4 below);
  - (ii) to award contracts in respect of all sites identified as suitable for renewable energy projects for project appraisal studies and associated professional support;
  - (iii) to extend the current contract with AECOM for project appraisal studies and other preparatory work, if required, (see para 4.7), as the current financial limit is unlikely to be sufficient to carry out all work preparatory to development on multiple sites;

4. Note that subject to the outcome of the necessary studies and negotiations a further report will be brought back to Cabinet prior to submitting any planning applications and conclusion of negotiations; and
5. Approve the use of the Invest to Save budget to deliver the strategy, as outlined in para 4.21, including the need to ensure updates are included in the next refresh of the MTFS as necessary.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

To enable the Council to progress its “green” agenda by developing renewable energy technologies, thus generating income through sale of energy, reducing energy costs, and reducing CO2 emissions.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The Council could decide not to proceed with the studies and potential development of the identified sites. If it chose to do so, it would lose a valuable opportunity to progress its development of green energy. At this stage, no credible alternative sites to those proposed had emerged.

### **7. SAFER PETERBOROUGH PARTNERSHIP PLAN**

Cabinet received a report presenting the refreshed version of the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan seeking Cabinet endorsement prior to Full Council.

Councillor Walsh introduced the report highlighting reductions in crime figures and commended the hard work by officers to achieve this. Gary Goose, Strategic Safer and Stronger Peterborough Manager, addressed Cabinet advising that developments within the previous year enabled an update to crime targets and was ahead of national targets for this.

Councillor Walsh added that it would be highlighted to the new Police and Crime Commissioner the importance of the partnership in order to maintain its funding. Councillor Cereste requested that the success in reducing crime figures should be featured in the next press release to try to alleviate people’s concerns over crime rates.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

Endorse the 2012 revision of Safer Peterborough Partnership 3-year Plan (2011-2014) and recommend it to Full Council for approval.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998, revised by the Police and Justice Act 2006, required that the Community Safety Partnership publishes an annual Partnership Plan.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The previous partnership plan ran from 2008 – 2011.

### **8. POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

Cabinet received a report requesting it agree to the foundation of the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel as a joint committee of the seven Cambridgeshire authorities and to

nominate and appoint members to the Panel. Furthermore Cabinet was invited to agree that Peterborough City Council shall be the host authority to facilitate the operation of the Panel.

Councillor Walsh introduced the report advising Cabinet that there would be no allowance paid to members until the Members' Allowance Panel had considered it and reported to Council. Councillor Walsh further advised that the members from Peterborough would be Councillors Elsey, Khan and Walsh.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. Agree to establish the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel as a joint committee of the Cambridgeshire local authorities as defined in Section 28 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011
2. Agree that Peterborough City Council will be the host authority for the Panel.
3. Agree the nomination and appointment of three members and three substitute members of the Council to the panel as set out in paragraph 4.14 and authorises the Leader of the Council to appoint to any position becoming vacant
4. Agree to delegate authority to the Solicitor to the Council to finalise the terms of the panel arrangements for the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel, provided that the agreement is substantially in the form attached to this report.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 required that local authorities in each police force area established a police and crime panel, as a joint committee, primarily to scrutinise the commissioner.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

It was a statutory obligation to appoint a Police and Crime Panel. If the Council did not appoint a Panel the Secretary of State had the power to do so, and make appointments to that panel. It was considered preferable for the council to take this step for itself.

Being a county with seven authorities the statutory position required the Cambridgeshire authorities to establish a 10 member panel, however the Cambridgeshire authorities have opted for an 11 member panel as they considered that this offered the optimum level of skills and experience necessary for a successful panel.

The terms of reference and membership arrangements had been developed with the other authorities across Cambridgeshire and therefore no other arrangement options were available.

#### **9. BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FINAL OUTTURN 2011/12**

Cabinet received a report informing it of the final financial position for revenue and capital at 31 March 2012 and approve the reserves position for the council. The report also contained performance information on treasury management activities, the payment of creditors, collection performance for debtors and local taxation and benefit overpayments. This was introduced by Councillor Cereste.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the final outturn position on the council's revenue budget 2011/12 of £678k overspend, including the improvement of £1,431k since the provisional outturn position;
2. Note the final outturn position on the council's capital budget 2011/12;
3. Approve the reserves position for the council and note the refreshed five year forecast.
4. Note the performance against the prudential indicators;
5. Note the performance on treasury management activities, payment of creditors in services and collection performance for debtors, local taxation and benefit overpayments; and
6. Note that the uncertainty of local government funding arrangements from 2013/14 onwards, including the impact of the economic outlook and potential consequences on the level of reserves that council will deem to be sufficient under the new local government funding arrangements.

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

This monitoring report for the 2011/12 financial year was part of the process for producing the Statement of Accounts and final budget monitoring report for 2011/12.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

Not to report the final budget position for the Council to Cabinet. However, this report was the final budget monitoring report for 2011/12 financial year and was a management report of the Council's finances to supplement the publication of the Statement of Accounts reviewed by Audit Committee at their meeting of 25 June 2012.

## **10. IMPROVING CHILDREN'S SERVICES UPDATE**

Cabinet received a report updating it with details of improvement actions undertaken since the March Cabinet meeting in response to the findings of the Ofsted Inspection of Safeguarding carried out in August 2011. This was introduced by Councillor Cereste.

Malcolm Newsam, Director of Children's Services, addressed Cabinet and advised that the report to the Parliamentary Undersecretary of State from the chairman of the External Improvement Board had been submitted and stated that the service was on the right track to continue to improve. Mr Newsam emphasised that there was still the improvement programme - which was a long-term project - and he anticipated that it would take at least a further twelve months, nonetheless rapid progress had been achieved over the past six months and he expected this pace to continue.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

Note the improvement activity and progress within Children's Services.

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Council needs to secure immediate improvements to safeguard children and in the longer term put in place a sustainable high quality Children's Service in Peterborough.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

Not applicable.

## **11. OUTCOME OF PETITIONS**

Cabinet considered a report recommending it noted the action taken in respect of petitions presented to full Council.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report and requested that further information should be included in future reports on the outcomes of officer actions.

### **CABINET RESOLVED TO:**

Note the action taken in respect of petitions presented to full Council.

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

Standing Orders require that Council receive a report about the action taken on petitions. As the petitions presented in this report have been dealt with by Cabinet Members or officers it is appropriate that the action taken is reported to Cabinet, prior to it being included within the Executive's report to full Council.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

Any alternative options would require an amendment to the Council's Constitution to remove the requirement to report to Council.

11.45 a.m.

This page is intentionally left blank