

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

**Committee Members Present:** Councillors J Peach (Chairman), K Aitken, A Ali, R Bisby, R Brown, J Bull, G Casey, CAV M Cereste OMRI OSSI, A Dowson, A Ellis, J A Fox, J R Fox, H Fuller, J Goodwin, C Harper, M Hussain, A Iqbal, M Jamil, N Khan, D King, S Lane, S Martin, E Murphy, G Nawaz, S Nawaz, B Rush, N Sandford, L Serluca, N Simons J Whitby

Parish Councillor Co-opted Members: Neil Boyce, Keith Lievesley,  
Co-opted Members: Dr Steve Watson

**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 Elsey, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene  
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 Stokes, Cabinet Advisor for Children's Safeguarding and Education  
Councillor Allen, Cabinet Advisor to the Leader

**Officers Present:** Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive  
Peter Carpenter, Service Director, Financial Services  
Marion Kelly, Interim Corporate Director Resources  
Adrian Chapman, Service Director, Communities and Safety  
Fiona McMillan, Interim Director of Law and Governance  
Simon Machen, 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's Services & Safeguarding  
Annette Joyce, Service Director, City Services and Communications  
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 Peach, Chairman of Growth Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Fuller, Chairman of Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Goodwin, Chairman of Children and Education Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Cereste, Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee was not in attendance at this point. Councillor Goodwin was nominated by Councillor Murphy and seconded by Councillor Jamil. Councillor Peach was nominated by Councillor Brown and seconded by Councillor Bull. There being no further nominations a vote was taken for each nomination. Councillor Goodwin received 8 votes and Councillor Peach received 13 votes. Councillor Peach 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 2018/19 Phase Two Proposals document as part of the formal consultation process before being presented to Cabinet on 26 February 2018 for approval and recommendation to Full Council on 7 March 2018.

## **6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Over, Councillor Shaheed, Councillor Barkham, Councillor Saltmarsh, Councillor Ferris, Councillor Johnson, and Councillor Mahabadi. Councillor Murphy was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Ferris.

The following co-opted members also sent apologies: Alistair Kingsley, Rizwan Rahmetulla, Parish Councillors Henry Clark, Susie Lucas and Richard Clarke and Education Co-opted members Liz Youngman and Flavio Vettese.

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

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

## **8. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS) 2018/19 - 2020/21**

The Cabinet Member for Resources gave a short introduction to the Budget 2018/19 Phase Two proposals document. Reference was made to the 'Stand up for Peterborough' Campaign. The Cabinet Member thanked Members for backing the Campaign.

Each section of the budget 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>Introduction of the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19 to 2020/21 Phase Two Proposals Document</p> <p>Cabinet report dated 9 February (pages 1 to 58) of the Budget 2018/19 Phase Two Proposals Document</p>	<p>Overall Budget Position. At the last meeting held in November consideration was being given to more shared services. How was this progressing in terms of savings?</p>	<p>Shared Services has been looked at with Cambridgeshire County Council and £9M savings would be achieved by year 3.</p> <p>The Shared Services arrangement was being progressed which included working out the Target Operating Model and financial assumptions. Proper reporting arrangements were being worked on and would be discussed with Members within the next few weeks.</p>
	<p>What progress had been made with Central Government on the 'Stand up for Peterborough' Campaign?</p>	<p>The campaign had focused on areas where funding was definitely required like schools funding and shared services transformation work.</p>
	<p>Shared Services arrangements should be looked at with other organisations and not just Cambridgeshire County Council.</p> <p>Members were concerned that shared services arrangements always appeared to be with Cambridgeshire County Council and that this might result in Peterborough merging back into Cambridgeshire.</p>	<p>Shared Services arrangements were already in existence with other authorities which included Fenland District Council, Rutland District Council and the West Country amongst others. The services being shared included legal and planning services.</p> <p>Councillor Holdich confirmed that the work being done with Cambridgeshire County Council would not mean going back to merging with them and Peterborough would retain its own sovereignty and budget.</p>
	<p>Members sought clarification as to how the savings made by sharing services with Cambridgeshire would be split. Would it be on a 50/50 basis or would it be weighted based on population and the</p>	<p>The largest proportion of savings would be on the back office costs.</p> <p>Discussions were being held with regard to how the savings split would be based and whether it would be based on the population</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>two budgets.</p> <p>Were the predicted savings figures provisional dependent on how the split would be decided upon between Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough?</p>	<p>size, population need etc.</p> <p>The figures in the budget were predicated on the best knowledge available at the time and were conservative figures but would be refined over time.</p>
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>Growth and Regeneration <b>Appendix A</b></p> <p>Service Implications <b>(Pages 59 to 60)</b></p> <p>Budget Reductions and Additional Income <b>(Pages 60 to 65)</b></p> <p>Budget Pressures <b>(Page 66)</b></p>	<p>Members referred to the increased charge for brown bins, charging for replacement bins and charging for new bins. Members sought assurance that the increase in charges would not result in an increase in fly tipping.</p> <p>Members sought clarification as to who owned the bin and were concerned that those people who were victims of theft or damage to their bin could end up not being able to afford to replace their bin.</p> <p>Some Members felt that the charge for the brown bin and replacement bins were socially regressive charges.</p> <p>It was noted that the council currently charged households £39 a year for one brown bin but did not charge households a recurring charge for a second brown bin. The council was however charged for both the first and second bin collections. The charge was rising from £35 a year to £45 a year to cover</p>	<p>Research undertaken with other authorities had indicated that an increase in charges and charging for a replacement bin had not resulted in an increase in fly tipping.</p> <p>The Council owned the bin and the charge was to cover production and an administration fee.</p> <p>If a bin was stolen or burnt out and it was reported to the Police a crime number would be issued and then it could be claimed for on their household insurance.</p> <p>It was not accurate to say that the charge would hit those people who could least afford to pay. Most new housing developments had smaller gardens and therefore only required one brown bin. It was difficult to predict who would be affected by the increase in charges.</p> <p>Most local authorities changed for the replacement of bins. Peterborough was currently one of only a few that did not currently charge.</p> <p>The agreement to not charge for</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>this deficit. It therefore appeared that people living in smaller properties with only one brown bin were therefore being penalised whilst those households with two brown bins were not having to cover the deficit for the second brown bin collection.</p> <p>The charge appeared to be hitting people who could lease afford to pay.</p> <p>Members commented that fly tipping had increased in certain areas of Peterborough since the charge for brown bin collection had been introduced.</p> <p>One Member suggested introducing a reduced charge for a second brown bin.</p> <p>It was noted that some households had their bins burnt out on a regular basis and the increased charge for replacement bins would mean they appeared to be victimised twice. The excess on household insurance was often more than the cost of the bin and therefore meant that it would not be worth claiming on their insurance.</p> <p>Members suggested that there should be no charge for bins for new build houses.</p> <p>Councillor Sandford seconded by Councillor Murphy recommended that Cabinet investigate and seek</p>	<p>the collection of a second bin had been agreed by Councillors when the scheme was first brought in.</p> <p>The second brown bin was provided free of charge to encourage people not to use the black bin for garden waste.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene did not agree that there should not be a charge for the supply of bins for new housing developments owned by private developers.</p> <p>If the property was owned by a housing association then they should bear the charge for the bins and the services provided to their incoming tenants.</p> <p>There was only approximately 10% of the properties in Peterborough that owned a second brown bin and therefore if the charge on the first brown bin was reduced and a charge was placed on the second brown bin there would be a huge gap in the budget.</p> <p>Even with the increase in the charges Peterborough was still in the bottom 20% of charging councils for garden waste collection service in the country.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>to reduce the amount of the increase in the charge for the collection of the first bin by imposing a charge for the collection of the second bin.</p> <p>A vote was taken on the recommendation (12 for, 15 against, 0 abstentions) the recommendation was defeated.</p>	
	<p>Members were disappointed to see the proposed closure of Bretton Water Park included in the budget proposals and felt that the savings of £18K could be found elsewhere in the budget. The facility was used by all the people of Peterborough.</p> <p>Bretton Parish Council did not have a huge budget and was not there to pick up what the council decide to no longer fund anymore, further more they had not been consulted on the possible closure.</p> <p>Councillor Ellis seconded by Councillor Murphy recommended that Cabinet look at finding the £18K to fund Bretton Water Park and take out of the budget the closure of Bretton Water Park.</p> <p>As Councillor Holdich had confirmed that Cabinet had already decided to take a further look at funding for Bretton Water Park no vote was taken on the recommendation.</p>	<p>The closure of Bretton Water Park had been discussed at the Budget Working Group but it had not been discussed with Bretton Parish Council as the consultation document had not been released then. Bretton Parish Council were a consultee and they learnt about the proposed closure on the day the information was made public.</p> <p>It was noted that the Bretton Parish Clerk had since mentioned on local radio that an option might be to add £1.50 to the precept to fund the Water Park.</p> <p>The Council has had to look at every area of discretionary spending and the Water Park was put forward as a discretionary spend for consideration as a saving.</p> <p>Councillor Holdich advised that Cabinet had agreed to look at all options as to how the Water Park could be funded and remain open.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	6.49pm – Councillor Judy Fox and Councillor John Fox left the meeting.	
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget noting that Cabinet had agreed to look at all options for funding of Bretton Water Park to prevent its closure.		
Public Health <b>Appendix B</b>  Service Implications (Savings/Investments) Budget Reductions and Additional Income <b>(Pages 67 to 68)</b>	Clarification was sought as to when the additional funding for Adult Social Care would be confirmed for the year 2020/2021.  It was noted that the Healthy Peterborough Campaign was important and had been successful. Members queried why the budget for the campaign had therefore been cut by £30K and what percentage of the budget had been cut.	Adult Social Care funding would not be known until the new deals on funding were released which would not be for another one or two years.  There had been an 80% cut in total but it would be mainstreamed and be made more efficient.
	Integrated 0-19 Service. It was noted that there would be no change in services for 2018/2019. Members were concerned as to what would happen after this and the uncertainty it would cause the affected service users. Members felt that the council would need to make its intentions clear as to what would happen sooner rather than later.	The Cabinet Member for Public Health confirmed that there would be no changes to the service this year but it would be carefully looked at after that.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
Resources (including Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships) <b>Appendix C</b>  Service Implications -	Capital Receipts. Where had the additional £1,822K come from and what revised asset sales had driven this receipt.  The consultation for the Local Plan concluded this	Members were informed that the detailed information would be circulated to the Committee after the meeting.  Members were informed that the Kiosk had been doing less and

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<p><b>(Page 69)</b></p> <p>Budget Reductions and Additional Income <b>(Pages 70 to 76)</b></p> <p>Budget Pressures <b>(Pages 76 to 79)</b></p>	<p>evening 20 February. It was noted that there was a proposal to close the Travelchoice kiosk however the Transport Policy within the Local Plan states that in all aspects of transport planning people would be encouraged to use local transport. Why therefore was the Travelchoice Kiosk which was a major source of public information on local transport enquiries being closed?</p> <p>What approaches had the council made to the bus company to take on the operation of the Kiosk so that the service can continue.</p>	<p>less business as more tickets were being bought online. The Kiosk was also in a very bad state. The majority of the service provided by the Kiosk would be transferred to the Visitor Information Centre including the sale of tickets.</p> <p>Councillor Holdich advised that he did not know but would find out.</p>
	<p>Budget Reductions and Additional Income. It was noted that there would be a £3,700K MRP Re-provisioning in 2018/19. It was also noted that some of the debts had been repaid early and clarification was sought as to whether the debts were due to be repaid or completed in 2018/19 and if not why the saving of £3,700K had not continued until the end of the debt period.</p>	<p>The MRP Policy and how it was applied was looked at last year and in doing that took more MRP for previous years than should have been. This therefore corrects the over MRP provision from previous years and therefore is a one off.</p>
	<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.</p> <p><b>AGREED ACTIONS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Cabinet Member for Resources to provide further detail on Capital Receipts and where the additional £1,822K had come from and what revised asset sales had driven this receipt.</li> <li>2. The Leader of the Council to provide details of what approaches the council had made to the bus company to take on the operation of the Travelchoice Kiosk so that the service can continue.</li> </ol>	



Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<p>Governance <b>Appendix D</b></p> <p>Service Implications <b>(Pages 80 to 81)</b></p>	<p>There were no questions or comments on this section.</p>	
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p>People and Communities <b>Appendix E</b></p> <p>Service Implications <b>(Pages 82 – 83)</b></p> <p>Budget Reductions and Additional Income <b>(Pages 83 to 84)</b></p> <p>Budget Pressures <b>(Page 85)</b></p> <p>Service Change <b>(Page 85)</b></p>	<p>Members noted the proposed service change to stop using the Manor for residential care for children with disabilities and increase outreach. Members requested more information on the alternative provision proposed.</p> <p>Members requested more up to date data be provided as the figures provided were from October 2015, and more information as to why the Manor was being closed</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services advised that further detail could be found in the Equality Impact Assessment on page 107 of the budget proposals document.</p> <p>There had been a £500,000 income target for the Manor and Cherry Lodge for a number of years. The target had been set when the Health Authority and other local authorities used to purchase a high level of placements. Over the last two year this income had fallen as Health and other authorities had moved to commissioning more support in family’s homes. The proposal was to not use the Manor for residential provision and work was being done with families currently using the Manor to find alternative provision. More link foster carers were also being recruited to provide overnight stays and some users will be able to go to Cherry Lodge for overnight stays if needed.</p> <p>The Manor was currently used 30% of the time for overnight stays and Cherry Lodge for 52% of the time for overnight stays.</p>
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.</p>		
<p><b>AGREED ACTIONS</b></p>		
<p>The Committee requested that the Service Director, Children’s Services and Safeguarding</p>		

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
provide more up to date data and more information with regard to the proposed closure of The Manor residential home.		
Staffing Implications <b>Appendix F</b>  Budget Reductions and Additional Income <b>(Pages 86)</b>  Budget Pressures <b>(Page 87)</b>	There were no questions or comments on this section.	
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget		
Equality Impact Assessments <b>Appendix I</b> <b>(Pages 88 to 112)</b>	There were no questions or comments on this section.	
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget		
<b>General Comments, any overall recommendations and Conclusion</b>		
Members referred to page 37 of the proposals document and noted that the proposal was to increase Corporate Expenditure by approximately £16M which was a considerable amount out of the revised deficit of £19M. What was the detail behind the Corporate Expenditure line?	The Corporate Expenditure line included the use of different things including the use of reserves and capital receipts.	
Members referred to Council Grants, page 44 and sought clarification as to when dedicated figures would be received from government with regard to the Dedicated Schools Grant, Flexible Homelessness Support Grant, Pupil Premium, Sixth Form Funding and Tackling Troubled Families Grant for 2019/2020 and 2020/2021.	A lot of the 2020/2021 figures were still provisional, a lot of the 2018/2019 figures were received towards the end of January / February and it was assumed that they would be the same for future years in a lot of cases.	

There were no further comments, questions or recommendations.

## **SUMMARY OF ACTIONS FOR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS) 2018/19 - 2020/21 ITEM**

### **Resources (including Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships)**

#### **AGREED ACTIONS**

1. The Cabinet Member for Resources to provide further detail on Capital Receipts and where the additional £1,822K had come from and what revised asset sales had driven this receipt.
2. The Leader of the Council to provide details of what approaches the council had made to the bus company to take on the operation of the Travelchoice Kiosk so that the service can continue.

### **People and Communities**

#### **AGREED ACTIONS**

The Committee requested that the Service Director, Children's Services and Safeguarding provide more up to date data and more information with regard to the proposed closure of The Manor residential home.

## **9. ROLLING MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY BUDGET PROCESS**

The Service Director, Finance introduced the report which set out the process to implement a rolling Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) budget process, whereby savings and pressures will be agreed by Council on a quarterly basis to enable savings and initiatives to be implemented more quickly.

The Joint Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members supported the proposal in principal.
- One Member commented that the London Borough of Wandsworth already followed the proposed process and it had proved to be very efficient and effective.
- By following the new process it would restore power to Full Council over setting the budget of the Council which would be a positive thing.

#### **AGREED ACTIONS**

The Joint Scrutiny Committee noted the report and **RESOLVED** to endorse the proposal to implement a rolling Medium Term Financial Strategy budget process for consideration by Cabinet on 26 February.

The Chairman thanked all members of the Scrutiny Committees for attending the meeting and the Cabinet Members and Directors for attending and responding to the questions on the Budget 2018/19 Phase Two proposals document.

CHAIRMAN

The meeting began at 6.00pm and ended at 7.25 pm

This page is intentionally left blank