

|                         |                                    |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>CABINET</b>          | <b>AGENDA ITEM No. 3</b>           |
| <b>26 FEBRUARY 2018</b> | <b>SUPPLEMENTARY PUBLIC REPORT</b> |

|                                |   |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Report of:                     | Marion Kelly, Interim Corporate Director: Resources   |  |
| Cabinet Member(s) responsible: | Councillor David Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources   |  |
| Contact Officer(s):            | Marion Kelly, Interim Corporate Director: Resources<br>Peter Carpenter, Service Director Financial Services | Tel: 01733 452520<br>Tel: 01733 384564 |

### **MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2018/19 TO 2020/21**

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>U P D A T E D   R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S</b>  |                           |
| <b>FROM:</b> Cabinet Member for Resources   | <b>Deadline date:</b> N/A |
| <p>It is recommended that Cabinet notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The statutory advice of the Chief Finance Officer outlined in section 6, The Robustness Statement. This is required to highlight the robustness of budget estimates and the adequacy of the reserves.</li> <li>2. All the grant figures following the Local Government Final Finance Settlement, published on 6 February 2018 outlined in section 4.5. This details the following adjustments to the budget: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult Social Care Grant 2018/19- £0.496million</li> <li>• Business Rates compensation for limits increase in the NNDR £0.084million</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. The feedback received on the budget proposals, received via the consultation detailed in section 9 of the report, <i>Appendix J and the Supplementary Report</i>.</li> <li>4. The Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19-2020/21, detailed in Appendix L, which also includes an amendment following the Audit Committee meeting held on 12 February 2018.</li> </ol> <p>It is recommended that Cabinet approves and recommends to Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The Phase Two budget proposals, outlined in Appendix H, this includes a 5.99 per cent council tax increase, and a change in service delivery for the 0-25 Provider service.</li> <li>6. The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19-2020/21 as set out in the body of the report and the following appendices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix A – Budget Context highlighted in Phase One, MTFS for 2018/19-2020/21</li> <li>• Appendix B – 2018/19 MTFS detailed position</li> <li>• Appendix C – 2018/19 MTFS by department</li> <li>• Appendix D – 2018/19 MTFS by Service</li> <li>• Appendix E – Capital Schemes</li> <li>• Appendix F – Council Grants</li> <li>• Appendix G – Fees and Charges</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |                           |

- Appendix H – Budget Proposals (consultation document)
- Appendix I – Equality Impact Assessments
- Appendix J – Budget Consultation Feedback
- Appendix K– December 2018 Budgetary Control Report
- Appendix L– Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19-2020/21
- Appendix M– Asset Investment and Acquisition Strategy, Capital Programme 2018/19-2020/21
- Appendix N– Asset Management Plan

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. This supplementary report has been produced in order that Members receive the most up to date position regarding the Phase Two budget consultation.
- 1.2. This document also contains an additional list of consultation responses, which we were unable to include within the main report due to the timing of publication.
- 1.3. As the consultation still remains open until 5 March 2018, final feedback received between 22 February 2018 and the consultation close date on 5 March 2018, will be reported to Council on 7 March 2018.

### Changes to the Consultation Response

- 1.4. This update contains the 17 consultation responses received between 15 February 2018 and 22 February 2018.
- 1.5. Throughout the consultation process we have received a total of 51 responses. A summary of the 17 new responses received is given in this section, and the previous 34 responses are included in Appendix J of the main MTFs report.
- 1.6. **Question 1** - 16 Respondents answered question 1 which was *'Do you have any comments to make about the first round budget proposals?'*

| Response     | Number of Responses |
|--------------|---------------------|
| Positive     | 0                   |
| Neutral      | 3                   |
| Negative     | 13                  |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>16</b>           |

- 1.7. Within question 1 there were a few key themes from the responses, outlined in the following table:

| Response Theme  |
|---|
| The Manor service delivery change   |
| Council Tax Increase, higher than inflation putting additional pressure on the cost of living |
| Bretton water pack- transfer to the parish  |
| Brown bin charge increase   |
| Highways and potholes   |
| Homelessness and Anti-social Behaviour  |
| The Travel Choice Kiosk at the bus station  |

- 1.8. **Question 2** – Respondents were asked, after having read the consultation document, how much they understood the Council’s proposals. Answers can be broken down as follows:

| <b>Response</b> | <b>Number of Responses</b> |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| A great deal    | 1                          |
| A fair amount   | 12                         |
| Not very much   | 3                          |
| Nothing at all  | 0                          |
| Blank           | 1                          |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>17</b>                  |

- 1.9. **Question 3** – Of the 17 responses received, 11 answered question 3 which was ‘*If you have any specific ideas about how the council can save money and protect services, please state these here:*’. A list of subjects raised is given below.

| <b>Response Theme</b>  |
|--|
| look at procurement of products to seek better value for money |
| reduce spend on road works                                     |
| Look to bring services back in house                           |
| Charging for service users for service provision.              |
| combine and share services with Cambridgeshire                 |
| Councillor and Officer pay                                     |
| Reduce grants given to arts organisations                      |
| Reduce the frequency of cutting road verges                    |

**Feedback from the budget conversation survey**

The following table details the feedback received via the online survey:

|    | <b>Do you have any comments to make about the first phase budget proposals?</b>   | <b>Having read the phase two proposals document, how much do you now feel you understand about why the council must make total savings of almost £26million in 2018/19 and almost £42million by 2020/21?</b> | <b>If you have any specific ideas about how the council can save money or generate additional income to protect services, please state these here:</b> |
|----|---|--|--|
| 35 | Bretton water park is primarily used by Bretton residents. Its absolutely right that it should be paid for by the local parish council. Maybe that can cut back the spending on the 'festival'/ego stroking event they hold to the detriment of local residents every year.   | A fair amount  | Bring more services back in house. Stop outsourcing. If you want to do things more efficiently maybe share resources with neighbouring authorities.    |
| 36 | I am deeply concerned regarding the changes proposed to the care services for children with special needs, I feel that at no point were families with children with special needs were taken into account and how it would affect those families. With the changes proposed it will have an massive effect on lots of families that are trying their hardest not to reach crisis point. I believe the changes will cause more families to struggle. It is already a battle to get any bit of care that is needed to keep our children at home and not in care because of their high care needs. Taking away places like the Manor that is a much needed respite for families, myself included without there being something already in place is just dangerous, families will hit crisis point! The impact will be massive not just on the families but also the children that access places like the Manor, to have got to the point of needing somewhere like that is hard enough, to get awarded it is even harder and now its just going to be gone, I feel like you are ripping everything we need as a family away. How will we function? How will I manage to keep my family together? What about the impact on my children, who already deal with daily battles because of their disabilities? You cut these services and how will it | Not very much  | BLANK  |

|    |   |               |  |
|----|---|---------------|--|
|    | be more cost effect when more children will end up in care full time because the support is no longer there to keep families together!!   |               |  |
| 37 | Yes, I understand why monies need to be saved but why is the first thing to be cut is funding for services that are so greatly needed?? We need to make savings yet the local council are having new offices built and road changes made when that money could be used to fund vital support services.  | A great deal  | Stop wasting money on new offices, pointless road changes (bourges boulevard as an example!!).   |
| 38 | I don't agree with cutting provisions for children with additional needs. Families need all the help they can get. If they don't receive the help it will put a further strain on the social care and nhs budgets.  | A fair amount | BLANK  |
| 39 | You must not close respite for vulnerable people, it's such a needed service and these poor people are getting punished to much when they are the ones that need it the most  | A fair amount | Don't waste money on the likes of the Peterborough beach!!!!!!   |
| 40 | Cuts in the areas of mental health, care and respite are ludicrous. Statistics show that poor mental health is on the rise and the overwhelming reason for absenteeism from work. Respite care does not just help those afflicted but helps their carers get the break they need to maintain their own strong mental health.  | A fair amount | Savings should be made throughout the public sector at point of source. Contracts that hold services into purchasing paper roll for example for something like £12 a roll when the same can be sourced easily off the high st for less than half the price does not make commercial sense. |
| 41 | I say keep the manor open as it is desperately needed to help support disabled children and their families  | A fair amount | BLANK  |
| 42 | My comments relate specifically to the proposal to stop using the Manor Children's Centre for residential and day care and increase other short term options for families. I do recognise the overall budgetary pressure that the Council is under. How I use the Manor I am the single mum of a 17 year old daughter with significant learning difficulties. I have no immediate family and my daughter's father has for the last 18 months since our separation only seen her for c2 hrs during the week, occasional weekends and short periods in the school holidays although this is neither reliable nor predictable. I lead on all her arrangements both during term time and the school holidays. My daughter has used the Manor for many years initially only during the day but over the last 18 months | A fair amount | BLANK  |

she has enjoyed overnight stays as well one night a week. She has built friendships and gained in confidence and capability especially in relation to maintaining her own personal care and entertaining herself in preparation for independent supported living in the future. I have always known that she was safe and being well looked after. The Manor has been one of the points of continuity when there have been so many other changes in my daughter's life. The predictable, reliable, professional respite I have received from these overnight stays has, especially during the last 18 months been a lifeline and my only dependable break from my otherwise full time caring responsibilities. Consequences for us from this proposal specifically the loss of the overnight element For my daughter – the loss of the Manor would be yet another change in her life. We have started planning transition for when she turns 18 (although she is as yet unaware) but the loss of the Manor before that, the possible introduction of a temporary arrangement at short notice before yet another change will add to her stress and confusion potentially setting back yet again the progress she is making in independence and self-help at school. For me – I would lose my only reliable break in my caring responsibilities. Being able to anticipate a break when I will be able to recharge my own batteries to better care for my daughter has enabled me to undertake paid part time work, catch up on housework and gardening, complete the mass of paper work associated my daughter's transition to adulthood, my separation and divorce as well as write this comment, socialise with my friends and even volunteer as a Vivacity steward at Longthorpe Tower. It has enabled me to have a life of my own. Availability of alternative provision I am not aware of any alternative overnight provision available and so far my daughter's social worker has not been in contact to discuss how to meet our needs and seems unaware of what provision now or post-18 might be available to us. She is I think working on the basis that the Manor will close. My daughter already attends Guides (1.5 hrs Thursday evenings), trampoline club

|           |   |                      |   |
|-----------|---|----------------------|---|
| <p>71</p> | <p>(1 hr Friday evenings) and special needs gymnastics (1hr Saturday mornings). I take her to trampoline and gym club and on alternate Thursdays to Guides – the Manor staff taking her the other weeks. Additional sporting activities would be no substitute for us to the Manor. My daughter couldn't cope with the extra element and it would draw further on my time to take and collect her. Although Direct Payments might help me access day care at weekends and might be used to take her to her existing clubs it's unlikely to be any help overnight unless I have already planned to be away from home and can arrange for somebody to stay with my daughter in our house. I have provided stability for my daughter during these last turbulent 18 months and started to rebuild a life for myself but cannot continue to do so unaided. Looking after in effect a 5 year old on a full time basis for 17 years has taken its toll on my own life. Without adequate short term breaks to enable me to look after my daughter at home, I am now considering whether it would be better for my daughter to transfer to supported living when she is 18 rather than in her early to mid-20s as I had anticipated with consequential additional costs for the Council. The 'greater choice' proposed in the budget consultation feels to me like a superficial increase in activity without the quality of support I need. For me it feels a false economy to cut short term care. Support the parents of disabled children and we will largely support our children. Cut that support and we go under leaving the Council with a larger bill and huge personal distress.</p> |                      |   |
| <p>43</p> | <p>An almost 6% rise in Council tax seems excessive when inflation is running at less than 3% and is forecast to reduce by BoE in 2018. If there is rising demand for services let those receiving them pay something towards them rather than inflict the burden on all ratepayers! The increase should be restricted to 3% as originally intended.</p>  | <p>A fair amount</p> | <p>Charge those who use the services most in demand more.</p>   |
| <p>44</p> | <p>Please do not cut services at the manor and other likeminded places. This service gives so much support to families who struggle</p>   | <p>A fair amount</p> | <p>Allow road verges to grow into wildflower havens by cutting only once or twice a year. Save money and the bees/ other wildlife</p> |

|          |  |               |   |
|----------|--|---------------|---|
| 45       | <p>The role of City councillors is to hold the officers and executives to account. Yet they have approved the increase in the amount they are charging schools to convert to academies without waiting for the requested reports to be produced. on 5th July 2017 Schools forum requested details on what the LA costs were for conversion, this paper has not been present to their meetings in December 17 or January 18. Additionally, the Education Scrutiny committee requested comparison costs against other LA and yet no paper has yet been published The LA does have statutory duties to perform in the conversion process and these should not have a direct impact on the education or funding reductions to childs education</p>   | A fair amount | Does each ward really need 3 councillors to represent them<br>Combine more services and provision with other councils -<br>Cambridgeshire   |
| 46       | <p>Brown bin charges ideally should remain the same or be reduced to get more people to use the services rather than use the black bins or fly tipping to dispose of waste If an increase is justified then limit it to 3% along with general increase in council tax and apply similar increase to other serves/charges</p>   | A fair amount | reduces size of council and merge with Cambridgeshire   |
| 47<br>72 | <p>The operation of PCC gives the impression that residents don't matter. 5 months to over a year to reply. Comments like you will reply and no reply ever received. Barbaric overnight roadworks for convenience but a total failure to consider road safety for all the residents who live close to the road and based on scientific research are the equivalent of drunk drivers through no fault of their own. This dangerous policy costs extra money as you pay anti social hours rates and is likely to cost lives too. Potholes are like driving s slalom course to avoid them. Worst state the roads have ever been in. Then the surprise removal of lighting on the parkways. Do you not realise when we have ministers for loneliness you will be making it worse in the city as the change in lighting conditions at each junction older drivers will be slower to adjust to so unable to go out at night anymore. Did you consult the RNIB? Please no more speed humps it involved 3just to get to the physio with an injured spine do you have any idea how painful they are? Proper policing and driver re-education will do more to resolve this than humps. Devolved powers</p> | Not very much | <p>Why did we do stacks of unnecessary work on roads that were in a decent state and none on those in a dangerous state . You ask how money can be saved yet you committed to building a new HQ for PCC that it is obvious from the figures stated above. Make do and mend . Sell of your new HQ that should never have been commissioned if you did not have the money. You are not a private business but tax payer funded..You should be focussed on decent elderly and young care.proper services, road safety and make an agreement with every local authority in the country that none of you will pay chief executives or Senior council figures more than the prime ministers salary. If they want those salaries they can work in the tougher conditions of private industry. Only when you all agree will excessive salaries stop spiralling.</p> |

|    |   |               |  |
|----|---|---------------|--|
|    | please no. Given the appalling experience s I have had dealing with PCC and their unprofessional councillors this would be a travesty for the city. The city needs to tackle anti social behaviour, homelessness but some of tjis needs a change in National not local government to help addicts be helped in a way that dies not lead to housing benefit being used for drugs or alcohol. They can't help their addiction but a change in policy could help keep a roof over their heads. |               |  |
| 48 | BLANK   | BLANK         | BLANK  |
| 49 | Do not close the Manor, there are so many families out there that need a bit of respite. A break away from their child, shocked? Having direct payments is not always a break. If you don't utilise the service and put more kids in there, so many families are going to break down. But your be OK.in your new millions of pounds building and beach  | Not very much | Dont pay so much pay rises to the big chiefs, infact take some away. If your normal workers don't get a payrise and you pay yourselves 11% while stating your proposing to close the Manor to save money? How is this saving money? The building can't be sold?  |
| 50 | I understand the proposals including closing the travel enquiry office in the bus station. If this is true, I must protest in the strongest possible way. This is an essential and well used service in an excellent roomy bus station. You may not understand the concept of service without financial profit but its loss would make Peterborough a worse place to live.  | A fair amount | Not long ago the council announced a £50,000 grant to arts group Metal - why? As far as the majority of residents are concerned you might just as well as put the money in the rubbish bin. Stop this waste now and use the money in a beneficial way to Peterborough by keeping the bus station enquiry office open. Grants to arts group should be left to the arts council who are well known for wasting public money. |
| 51 | Make Peterborough United Football Ground bigger   | A fair amount | BLANK  |

### Feedback received from stakeholder group briefings

1.10. The Trade Unions meeting, was attended by Mandy Pullen, Gillian Beasley and Peter Carpenter on 14 February. A presentation on the budget was given and there were questions seeking clarification or confirming assumptions. The group were advised feedback could be given online until 5 March 2018.

1.11. The following feedback was received from the Peterborough Living Well Partnership, attended by on 20 February:

**Feedback:** Thank you for the presentation on PCC Budgets sent to members of the Peterborough Living Well Partnership for their meeting on 9 February.

I was sorry that neither you nor Debbie McQuade were there to answer a query I had.

I am aware of the tremendous effort which has been and continues to be made by both PCC and NWAFT to overcome the problem of Delayed Transfers of Care (DeToC).

It was reported in the news that Northamptonshire CC are in such dire financial straits that they are unable to meet their Social Care obligations.

In the light of the Budget Gap of £43.5M over the next 3 years for PCC, is there a likelihood that DeToC and ensuing Social Care for patients will be impaired?

**Response:** Whilst Peterborough has identified the £43.5m budget gap over the next 3 years and are in a similar situation to other local authorities, the council has a number of workstreams to mitigate risks and to try and ensure social care for those in greatest need will not be impaired. The Council are lobbying central government in terms of ensuring a fairer local settlement as are the Association of Directors of Adult Social Care and the Local Government Association for all local authorities.

In terms of Delayed Transfers of Care the council has invested in a number of additional services using the Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) monies to ensure delays attributable to Adult Social Care are minimal.

I hope this offers some assurance whilst recognising the next 3 years will be challenging

1.12. The following feedback was received from the Joint Budget Scrutiny, attended by the Corporate Management Team on 20 February (please note the following minutes are in draft form and may be subject to change):

**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

## 1. 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.

## 2. 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.

## 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

## 4. 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 /<br>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 two budgets.</p> <p>Were the predicted savings figures provisional dependent on how the split would be</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 size, population need etc.</p> <p>The figures in the budget were predicated on the best knowledge available at the</p>  |

| Item /<br>Section of the Budget  | Questions / Comment   | Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director   |
|--|---|--|
|  | decided upon between Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough?  | time and were conservative figures but would be refined over time.   |
| The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.  |   |  |
| <p>Growth and Regeneration<br/><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 this deficit. It therefore appeared that people living in smaller properties with only one</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 charged 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 the collection of a second bin had been agreed by Councillors when the scheme was first brought in.</p> |

| Item /<br>Section of the Budget | Questions / Comment  | Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director   |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
|                                 | <p>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>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 /<br>Section of the Budget | Questions / Comment  | Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director  |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
|                                 | <p>Councillor Sandford seconded by Councillor Murphy recommended that Cabinet investigate and seek 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>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 /<br>Section of the Budget   | Questions / Comment  | Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director   |
|---|--|--|
|   | <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>6.49pm – Councillor Judy Fox and Councillor John Fox left the meeting.</p>  |  |
| <p>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.</p> |  |  |
| <p>Public Health</p> <p><b>Appendix B</b></p> <p>Service Implications (Savings/Investments)</p> <p>Budget Reductions and Additional Income</p> <p><b>(Pages 67 to 68)</b></p>           | <p>Clarification was sought as to when the additional funding for Adult Social Care would be confirmed for the year 2020/2021.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>There had been an 80% cut in total but it would be mainstreamed and be made more efficient.</p> <p>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.</p> |

| Item /<br>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>Resources (including Strategic Commissioning and Partnerships)</p> <p><b>Appendix C</b></p> <p>Service Implications -<br/><b>(Page 69)</b></p> <p>Budget Reductions and Additional Income <b>(Pages 70 to 76)</b></p> <p>Budget Pressures<br/><b>(Pages 76 to 79)</b></p> | <p>Capital Receipts. Where had the additional £1,822K come from and what revised asset sales had driven this receipt.</p> <p>The consultation for the Local Plan concluded this 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>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>Members were informed that the detailed information would be circulated to the Committee after the meeting.</p> <p>Members were informed that the Kiosk had been doing less and 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>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> |
| The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.  |   |   |

| Item /<br>Section of the Budget   | Questions / Comment   | Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>AGREED ACTIONS</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |   |  |
| <p>Governance</p> <p><b>Appendix D</b></p> <p>Service Implications</p> <p><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</p> <p><b>Appendix E</b></p> <p>Service Implications</p> <p><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</p> <p><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>  |   |  |

| Item /<br>Section of the Budget  | Questions / Comment   | Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>AGREED ACTIONS</b></p> <p>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.</p>   |   |  |
| <p>Staffing Implications</p> <p><b>Appendix F</b></p> <p>Budget Reductions and Additional Income</p> <p><b>(Pages 86)</b></p> <p>Budget Pressures</p> <p><b>(Page 87)</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>Equality Impact Assessments</p> <p><b>Appendix I</b></p> <p><b>(Pages 88 to 112)</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><b>General Comments, any overall recommendations and Conclusion</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p>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?</p>  | <p>The Corporate Expenditure line included the use of different things including the use of reserves and capital receipts.</p>  |  |
| <p>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</p> | <p>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.</p> |  |

There were no further comments, questions or recommendations.

**SUMMARY OF ACTIONS FOR ITEM 4. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS)  
2018/19 - 2020/21**

**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.

**5. 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