

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

PRESENT

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

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

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Elsey.

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

None received.

### **3. MINUTES OF CABINET MEETING 5 NOVEMBER 2012**

Cabinet agreed that the minutes of the meeting held 5 November 2012 were accurate.

## **STRATEGIC DECISIONS**

### **4. CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND CHARGING POLICY**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to commence consultation on a number of measures designed to increase the emphasis on promoting independence and prevention amongst people with developing social care needs and to revise the eligibility criteria for Adult Social Care from April 2013. The report also proposed some changes to the Adult Social Care charging policy, including a review of the Disability Related Expenditure Disregard in the financial assessment and the introduction of new charges for assistive technology and the appointeeship service.

Councillor Fitzgerald introduced the report highlighting that new ways of working and qualifying residents for services were required in order to provide a more effective service delivering better value for money.

Following questions from Cabinet Members, the Council's Assistant Director Care Services Delivery and the Council's Executive Director Adult Social Care advised that:

- all service users and their families would be included in the consultation;
- it is unlikely that a change to eligibility criteria would affect any service user currently in residential care;
- the options for the future of the hot and frozen meal service were to be reviewed, but no one would be left without access to an appropriate meal;
- keeping people living independently wherever possible would remain the overriding priority;

- assistive technology included items such as smoke/gas detectors, water level detectors in baths, night time sensors etc.

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

1. Approve the commencement of consultation with social care service users, carers and partners on revising the Council's eligibility criteria for Council supported social care services.
2. Include within that consultation, proposals to enhance the range of preventative services available to people with care needs who fall below current or any revised eligibility criteria.
3. Approve consultation on a series of modifications to the Adult Social Care charging policy including a review of the treatment of Disability Related Expenditure in the financial assessment, the introduction of charges for the supply of assistive technology and the "Appointeeship Service" (as detailed in paragraph 4.15) and the removal of the subsidy to the home meals delivery service (as detailed in paragraph 4.16).
4. Note that phase three of the increases in charges agreed in 2010/11 is due to be implemented in April 2013 as set out in the attached schedule.

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

Consultation with those affected by a change to eligibility criteria would enable implications of those changes to be fully considered. It would provide opportunities for people receiving care services, their families and carers, and for partner agencies to give their views and to outline any concerns or consequences.

The consultation would also enable views and evidence to be gathered of the effectiveness of the current range of preventative services in place and views of where these might be developed should the decision be made to implement a change in criteria.

Consultation on the proposed revisions to the charging policy would enable views to be gathered from those likely to be affected by changes and for the impact to be fully considered prior to decisions being made. In relation to the Disability Related Expenditure disregard, consultation would involve discussion with disabled service users and with disability groups, including the Disability Forum, about the best ways of targeting resources and in this case income disregards to take account of the additional costs of living as a disabled person.

Given that each of these proposals, if implemented, would result in financial savings either through reducing costs or increasing income, consultation will also ensure that when decisions are made, consideration of the availability of resources and the service implications are appropriately balanced.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

### **Eligibility criteria**

Consideration was given to waiting for Department of Health guidance on eligibility criteria expected in 2015. However, it was felt reviewing the criteria now placed the Authority in a sound position to be prepared for the national changes being signalled in line with available resources.

### **Charging policy**

i) No review of the level of the Disability Related Expenditure Disregard could be undertaken and the DRED could be retained at the current level. This option was rejected as the current scheme did not take account of differing levels of need, and people with lower level requirements, in terms of disability related expenditure requirements, currently received the same level of disregard as people with higher requirements. In addition, it did not take account of the higher level of disregard allowed in Peterborough in comparison with other authorities.

ii) Leave the charging policy unchanged. This option was rejected because the charging policy would be inconsistent in its treatment of charges for different care services, and would not be in-step with national changes to the state pension age.

iii) Maintain the status quo in terms of charging for the appointee client income service and meals charges. This option was rejected because additional revenue could be reasonably raised from the application of a charge / charge increase for these specific care services.

The consultation would seek to explore the implications of the proposals set out in this report and may lead to alternatives or modifications being considered prior to final recommendations being made.

## **5. PETERBOROUGH CITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD) - CONSULTATION DRAFT**

Cabinet received a presentation and report seeking its approval of the City Centre DPD Consultation Draft (hereafter referred to as the 'City Centre Plan') for public consultation starting early in the New Year.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report highlighting that there were many aspects to be completed in the years ahead including new shops and housing, improved transport links and other infrastructure to turn the city from a local centre to a regional centre.

The Council's Principal Strategic Planning Officer advised Cabinet that the consultation video presentation would be put onto the website Youtube and be circulated to schools.

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

Approve the publication of the City Centre Plan (Consultation Draft Version) for six weeks public consultation starting in early 2013.

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

Cabinet was recommended to approve the City Centre Plan (consultation draft) for public consultation because it would help deliver the city's growth targets set out in the Core Strategy. It would help to encourage and coordinate further investment in the city centre and the regeneration of a number of large brownfield sites in the City Centre such as the former Hospital site, the Railway station and North Westgate.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The council was required to produce a City Centre Plan in accordance with its approved Local Development Scheme (LDS) and Core Strategy. The option of not producing a City Centre Plan would mean that the council would not be working in accordance with its LDS and would not be in a position to deliver the growth and regeneration for the city centre. Therefore the alternative option of not producing the City Centre Plan was rejected.

## **6. FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

Cabinet received a report requesting it adopted the Flood and Water SPD. The SPD would provide guidance to developers on flood and water management in Peterborough. It expanded on overarching headline policy contained in the Council's adopted Core Strategy and (assuming it was adopted on 5th December 2012) Planning Policies DPDs. The document had been subject to public consultation and had now been revised and updated accordingly ready for adoption.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report highlighting that the Environment Agency recognised the document as being best practice within their own agency and had proposed that it be used for wider promotion and suggested that Council officers be used to advise other Authorities on best practice in accordance with the contents of the SPD. Further to this, Anglian Water had also commented that the document stood out as best practice for others to follow.

Councillor Goodwin expressed her thanks to Officers for their work during the recent period of heavy rain that resulted in several flood alerts for local residents.

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

Adopt the Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document.

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

There was no statutory duty to prepare this SPD. However, without it, developers could be confused or misinformed as to how they can deliver fit-for-purpose development schemes in Peterborough that met flood and water management requirements. This could have an impact on development coming forward as additional time would need to be spent on negotiating applications where flood or water management issues occurred.

This policy document was supported by Peterborough's water management partners, improved current and future service delivery through the more efficient processing of planning applications and future drainage approval applications.

Overall, the document helps developers, helps deliver growth and helps achieve sustainable development.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Option 1 (Recommended) – Adopt this SPD so that developers and water management partners have clear guidance and policy to assist development in meeting local, national and European flood and water management requirements. The SPD also allows planning and development to make a smoother transition to, and be better aligned in the long term with, the new sustainable drainage provisions to be commenced by government in 2013/4.

Option 2 – The Council could decide not to adopt this SPD and leave policy to be produced nationally. This would leave more areas of European and national policy open to wider interpretation which would reduce the efficiency of Peterborough's planning service. It could be harder for local considerations to be taken into account when developers try to meet national flood and drainage legislation. Working relations with water management partners would also be less efficient due to the lack of formal local agreement on water issues.

Option 3 - The Council could undertake another public consultation on the SPD. This would lead to a potential adoption date of summer/autumn 2013. In the interim there would be less clarity over the inclusion of drainage and water environment issues within planning applications. Development may struggle to understand what is expected of it by Peterborough City Council and other water management partners.

## 7. OUTCOME OF PETITIONS

Cabinet received a report updating it on the progress being made in response to petitions in accordance with Standing Order 13 of the Council's Rules of Procedure.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report.

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

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

### REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Standing Orders required 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.

10.00 a.m.

This page is intentionally left blank