

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 6.00PM ON  
18 DECEMBER 2019  
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Councillors C. Harper (Chairman), K. Aitken, R. Bisby, S. Bond, R. Brown, C. Burbage, G. Casey, L Coles, N. Day, A. Dowson, A. Ellis, John Fox, Judy Fox, T. Haynes, J. Howard, J. Howell, Amjad Iqbal, M. Jamil, Azher Iqbal, Joseph, D. Jones, E. Murphy, D. Over, S. Qayyum, L. Robinson, B. Rush, N. Sandford, N. Simons, H. Skibsted, S. Warren and I. Yasin.

Councillor S. Nawaz – Group Leader, Labour

Co-opted Members: Parish Councillors Lievesley, Boyce and Bhatti.

**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 Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health  
Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Education, Skills and University  
Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments  
Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance  
Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities  
Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation  
Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation  
Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment  
Councillor Bashir Cabinet Advisor for Children’s Services

**Officers Present:** Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive  
Peter Carpenter, Acting Corporate Director, Resources  
Wendi Ogle-Welbourn, Executive Director, People and Communities, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils  
Fiona McMillan, Director of Law and Governance  
Dr Liz Robin, Director of Public Health  
Steve Cox, Executive Director for Place and Economy  
Adrian Chapman, Service Director, Communities and Safety  
Lou Williams, Service Director, Children Services & Safeguarding  
Jonathan Lewis, Service Director, Education

Will Patten, Service Director Commissioning Cambridgeshire and Peterborough City Council  
Amanda Askham, Director of Business Improvement and Development  
Chris Stromberg, Head of IT – Peterborough and Cambridgeshire  
Jane Webb, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
David Beauchamp, 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 who were Councillor Simons, Chairman of the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Aitken, Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Harper, Chairman of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Harper was nominated by Councillor Bisby and seconded by Councillor Aitken. There being no further nominations, Councillor Harper was appointed Chairman of this committee.

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 2020/21 to 2022/23 Tranche One proposal document as part of the formal consultation process before being presented to Cabinet on 20 December 2019 for approval and recommendation to Full Council on 15 January 2020.

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors Fower, Hemraj, Wiggin, Goodwin, Ali and Barkham and Parish Councillors Lucas, Bull, Watson, Rahemtulla and Kingsley. Apologies were also received from Flavio Vetesse and Peter Cantley, Charlotte Black, Service Director – Adults Services & Safeguarding and Sue Grace, Director of Customer and Digital Services.

Councillors, Azher Iqbal, Amjad Iqbal, Joseph and Murphy were in attendance as substitutes.

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

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

## **4. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS) 2020/21 - 2022/23 – TRANCHE ONE PROPOSALS**

The Cabinet Member for Finance gave a short introduction to the Budget 2020/21 – 2022/23 Tranche One proposals document as per the Cabinet report dated 4 November 2019 in the agenda.

He advised members this was an important budget. Phase one centred on a sustainable budget consisting of ongoing savings rather than one off savings and phase two would ensure the budget was balanced with adequate reserves remaining in place.

He continued to say, the council faced severe financial challenges, the government grant had been reduced from £55million to £10 million per annum whilst the demand for services had increased significantly. Services to date had not been cut whilst some have been improved during this time. He paid tribute to the contribution made by partners, the voluntary sector, Local Government Association (LGA) and staff in achieving this. He advised that consideration had been given to making council assets work harder, increasing income through commercialisation, ensuring contracts represented good value for money and using automation to make services more efficient. Reviews were underway to ensure resources were being focused in the areas most needed.

Each section of the budget proposals document was then taken in order according to how it was presented in the Budget Book. The relevant Cabinet Member or Corporate Director was 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 from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
<p><b>4. Presentation and Introduction of the Medium Term Financial Strategy Tranche One Proposals Document</b></p> <p>Cabinet report dated 4 November 2019 Page 1 to 31 MTFS 2020/21 to 2022/23 Tranche One Proposals Document</p>	<p>Members sought clarification on the progress of the university and the impact this would have on the budget.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Education, Skills and the University, advised that work was proceeding to plan. It was anticipated that the preferred higher education partner for the delivery of initial phase would be confirmed in January. The pre-planning application would be submitted in the Spring 2020. The outline business case would move to tender for the construction contract for phase 1 for the multi-use academic building on the Wirrina car park and the final business case would be completed once tenders have been returned. The Combined Authority (CA) had allocated a budget of £20million for phase 1 and were exploring avenues for further funding. Peterborough City Council had provided the land at the Wirina car park which would result in a small reduction in car park spaces and revenue from car parking as a consequence from 2020/21 and additional car parking would need to be investigated to make up the shortfall.</p>
	<p>Councillors asked if there were reserves for unexpected events, such as Northminster car park.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Members for Finance responded that Northminster car park was a sudden and large issue. The recommended level of useable reserves was 5% of gross expenditure which for Peterborough was £20million. The council would move into 2020/21 with reserves of approximately £15million.</p>
	<p>How well placed was the council to proceed with financing the North Westgate Development and when would the work start.</p>	<p>The Leader of the Council advised that a proposal for the station quarter development would be released in January 2020 and discussions were underway</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>Was the council in a position to buy out all other landlords of surrounding areas, including Queensgate to complete the North Westgate development?</p>	<p>regarding the development of North Westgate and the compulsory purchase of necessary properties and land. Eight properties had already been purchased of which seven were currently being used for temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Queensgate were partners in the project and there was therefore no need to purchase their share, £15million was allocated in the budget to buy the remaining properties in conjunction with developers Hawksworth which would be sufficient to start the project.</p>
	<p>Members sought clarification that no One Off Savings were required to balance the budget?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Members for Finance confirmed that was the case. Going forward the aim was to proceed with a sustainable budget which minimised the use of One Offs.</p>
	<p>Were there any financial impacts on the existing policies of Climate Change and Fair Tax and if so, how much would that be?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Members for Finance advised that the actual implications would not be known until March. The Acting Corporate Director, Resources advised members a questionnaire would shortly be issued to suppliers regarding supply chains on the issue of Fair Tax.</p>
	<p>How would the £5million budget deficit be met?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Finance assured members this would be included in phase 2.</p>
	<p>Would the savings proposed be met in 2020 and 2021?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Members for Finance advised that the process to date was very robust and had been reviewed by senior officers. Controls and monitoring systems had been set up to monitor individual schemes which allowed mitigating actions to be carried out quickly if required.</p>
	<p>What were the major risks associated with savings items?</p>	<p>The Acting Corporate Director, Resources advised the major risk would be with the operational</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		model of the council such as contracts with SERCO, HR and other back office services which would affect all staff and councillors.
	The strategy featured a lower level of capital programme, would this be sufficient for the council to deliver its capital requirements?	The Cabinet Members for Finance answered yes. The aim was for a capital programme valued at £80million. The Acting Corporate Director, Resources advised that capital programmes had been rationalised in the last two years in line with what was required to support front line services. Previous programmes were usually around £80million.
	Did the council have adequate reserves for any issues which could occur in 2020 and 2021?	The Cabinet Members for Finance advised that the recommended level for reserves was 5% of gross expenditure, approximately £20million, and there was a vulnerability should the unexpected happened. The Acting Corporate Director, Resources advised that reserves would be further considered in stage 2 and there would be strengthened future audits. Both cabinet member and Officer were confident that the council was in a reasonable financial position.
	Had the budget shortfall, which was £5.5million in June and later increased to £5.8million, changed and if so, what was the new figure.	The Cabinet Member for Finance stated this overspend was in the current year and policies to address the overspend were contained within the report.
	How did the budget fit in with the climate emergency?	The Cabinet Member for Finance stated Item 9 included the carbon impact assessments which had been carried out on every proposal. A report would be due in March 2020 on the climate emergency. The Acting Corporate Director, Resources highlighted that the monitoring report presented to Council in October contained revised budget baselines. The

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		£5.5million overspend had been reduced to approximately £2million by January 2020.
	Had the School Transport budget considered the new proposed school at Hampton Water?	This was answered in item 7 of the running order (Appendix C).
	When would the council stop selling assets to meet the budget requirements?	The Cabinet Member for Finance advised there were no 'One-offs' within this budget.
	Members would like a better understanding on the work within urban area communities.	Cabinet Member for Communities and the Service Director, Communities and Safety would be available to answer any questions outside the meeting.
	When would the review on care packages be concluded?	The Cabinet Member for Finance advised this would be part of the consultation document further into the agenda (Appendix C).
	Clarification was sought what processes were in place to ensure the proposed savings would be met.	The Cabinet Member for Finance notified members that control and monitoring processes were in place to track individual schemes which reported on a weekly basis to the Chief Executive and Finance Director.
	Was this working towards a sustainable budget?	The Cabinet Member for Finance felt that it was working towards a sustainable budget and the future years' deficits were in line with the current year. The in-year savings did not rely on 'one-off' Savings. However, statutory services could be unpredictable, one specific child within our area needed £800,000 to £1million per year to provide the specialist care needed for example.
	If the funding assumptions were not achieved, what were the contingency plans for addressing the shortfall in income?	The Cabinet Member for Finance explained that usually the Local Government settlement would have been received at this time of year however due to the General Election, this had been delayed and receipt was not expected until after Christmas. Confirmation of

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		other government grants was anticipated in January although it was thought unlikely there would be any significant changes to the grants previously announced in October.
	£7.5million had been ring-fenced for improvements within the Can-do area in 2015 which to date had not taken place. Assurance was sought that this fund would be protected.	The Cabinet Member for Finance agreed there was still a capital budget for the Can-do area.
	Were additional resources being made available to address climate change issues?	The Executive Director for Place and Economy explained to members that the carbon impact assessments had provided an indication of the impacts of the savings as set out in the document. More detailed work would be carried out before March.
	How much of the New Towns Fund would be used on wards outside the city?	The Executive Director for Place and Economy advised that the New Towns Fund was a £3.6million fund available which allowed 101 towns to bid for funding up to £25million. The criteria for applications had now been set and the new board was due to meet in the new year to set an investment plan.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<b>5. Appendix A</b> <b>Page 33 to 34</b>  2020/2021 – 2022/23 MTF5 Detailed Budget Position-Tranche One	Was the planned expenditure on public health allocated to Peterborough or Peterborough and Cambridgeshire?	The Acting Corporate Director, Resources advised that the budget was for Peterborough City Council and referred only to Peterborough.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<b>6. Appendix B</b> <b>Page 35 to 37</b>  Capital Programme Schemes 2020/21 – 2024/25	There were no questions or comments for this section of the budget.	



Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<p><b>7. Appendix C</b> <b>Page 39 to 74</b></p> <p>Budget Consultation Document including Tranche One Budget Proposal detail starting on page 50</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction</li> <li>• The Budget Process,</li> <li>• Cabinet Priorities,</li> <li>• The Changing Structure of the Council,</li> <li>• Funding and Council Overall Budget Position,</li> <li>• Phase One Budget Proposals,</li> <li>• Changing Services to Reflect the Council of Today,</li> <li>• Redesign of Services,</li> <li>• Reduction of Provision,</li> <li>• Using Our Assets,</li> <li>• Funding Proposals and Corporate Savings,</li> <li>• Human Resources Implications</li> </ul>	<p>Members asked if the School Transport budget had considered the new proposed school at Hampton Water.</p>	<p>The Service Director, Education replied that school transport was provided in line with the statutory requirements according to the age of the children. The decision to build the Faith School had not yet been made; one of the considerations when making the decision was transport and local access to local pupils. It was not anticipated that there would be a transport cost associated with the proposed new school.</p>
	<p>Had the council's ambition to become the Environment Capital changed to being a leading city in environment matters and if so, why?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment advised members that the council had never claimed to be the environmental capital but that it aspired to be so and that aspiration had not changed.</p>
	<p>Members sought assurance that there would be no impact on safety by diming the streetlights and what part of the allocation to road safety budget was unused?</p>	<p>The Executive Director for Place and Economy explained that there had been no impact on road safety and the difference from the normal level of lighting was difficult to distinguish. Assessments were being conducted on the CO<sup>2</sup> benefits which was thought to be about 165 tonnes.</p>
	<p>How would the effect of the Revised Stay Well in Winter Campaign be monitored?</p>	<p>The Director of Public Health advised this was part of a wider public health project providing information on staying well in cold weather and explained the background to the fund in relation to the £50,000 (<i>given to Citizens Advice Bureau</i>). As the success of the project was difficult to measure and the impact on the Better for Care required outcomes was hard to demonstrate, funding could no</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>longer be used for that purpose. Alternative measures were put in place to enable people to get advice from other sources and to access grants available for keeping homes warm.</p>
	<p>How would people be signposted to Disability Peterborough and would other agencies provide the same level of support?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Communities explained that Disability Peterborough were unsuccessful in the recent bidding process. The bid was not strong enough to meet the council's criteria as they only offered assistance to those with disabilities rather than also those with learning difficulties. Advice services were available in several forms.</p> <p>The Service Director, Communities and Safety continued and explained their (<i>Disability Peterborough</i>) client base was very narrow and the new approach will reach more people. It was hoped to replicate the model currently in place at City College used for clients with learning disabilities. Councillors expressed an interest in visiting the City College facility.</p> <p>The Service Director, Communities and Safety, to arrange a visit to Peterborough City College for interested members, focussing on services for disabled people.</p>
	<p>Members expressed concern regarding the proposed cuts to the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) which was used by a wide range of people including the Council's Trading Standards Team.</p>	<p>The Service Director, Communities and Safety explained to members that the service offered by CAB had not been reviewed for a number of years. The service would need to change should a reduction of this magnitude be applied however the CAB had already implemented online and self-help support. CAB</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>remained confident that with the refocused funding of £150,000, service could be maintained for targeted Homelessness Prevention Advice and Guidance Service. Alternative sources of funding were being investigated and the Council were in early discussion regarding the potential to relocate to a more convenient building which would have reduced maintenance costs.</p>
	<p>What was the impact on public safety and anti-social behaviour when dimmed streetlights were adjacent to streetlights which were not functioning?            Could the streetlights attached to property owned by Cross Keys Homes, which were on 24 hours a day also be used more efficiently to reduce carbon impact.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Finance advised council that he was confident that Cross Keys Homes paid that bill and it was a matter to be discussed with them. The Executive Director for Place and Economy asked to be advised of any area where the light levels were considered too low and of any streetlights which were found to be out of order. Any visits to check light levels could be arranged outside of this meeting.</p>
	<p>Glue ear was the largest cause of hearing loss in pre-school children, how would this be identified if hearing screening ceased once a child reached school age?            What other means would be in place to identify children with hearing difficulties?</p>	<p>The Director for Public Health explained this was part of a wider set of measures which were being taken in conjunction with the Health Visiting Services. The evidence base for the screening programme was not clear. Cambridgeshire ceased hearing screening on school entry some time ago. The National Screening Committee advice was, that the evidence base for the screening programme was not clear. Now the authority was part of a joint management system with Cambridgeshire and part of a Section 75 Agreement the two services were being aligned. The Service Director, Education advised that other sensory services were available to support</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). There was a service available for schools to refer children whose hearing was impaired with several units across the city supporting children and parents with hearing difficulties. Referral back into health services was available if required.
	How will the council work with the proposed reduced level of staffing within the council and its partners?	The Acting Corporate Director, Resources advised that the council would be reshaped to deliver services within the financial envelope available. Support would be in place for budget managers and decision makers to ensure that decisions were made quickly. Technology would be used as much as possible. The Cabinet Member for Finance felt there were some good systems in place whose use was not being fully maximised.
	How did the council justify the raise in member car parking costs of over 100%? Why were printer cartridges no longer being provided?	The Cabinet Member for Finance advised this was a proposal and he welcomed any comments.
	If a councillor owned their own mobile device, would the council be able to install their software and monitor or censor the usage of the device? If the council took control of members' devices, members would lose control of their own equipment.	The Cabinet Member for Finance explained that discussions on the use of electronic devices had been delayed due to the General Election and were still to take place with Democratic Services. Other members had raised similar concerns previously.
	Members were disappointed with some of the results from the consultants on budget reductions and asked for consideration to be given to the following:	The Cabinet Member for Finance addressed the concerns raised and advised that paper could be used when dealing with the elderly. Subsidised parking had been previously discussed but

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>The payment to SERCO £45,000 for IT support for members</p> <p>The use of a letter in certain situations such as contact with the elderly.</p> <p>The issue of security when members used their own electronic devices.</p> <p>Subsidised parking for members which was in conflict to the council's commitment to climate change.</p>	<p>suggestions for changes to the scheme would be welcomed.</p> <p>There was a broad range of computer literacy amongst councillors and support services were provided to those who had not previously used emails and mobile phones. It was felt this service was no longer required and could be withdrawn.</p>
	<p>Councillors needed to be given adequate support. The potential savings on withdrawing mobile phone provision from councillors would save £15,000 however if councillors paid for the equipment themselves, they should be able to choose what device they had. The increased complexity and variation in equipment would lead to increased expenditure in support costs.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Finance thought this a very good point which had been raised by several councillors and suggested a meeting with the Director of Law and Governance to prepare a briefing note to be shared with all councillors. Changes to the proposal could be made up to presentation at full council.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Finance would arrange for a briefing note to be distributed to Members of the Committee providing a more detailed explanation and rationale for the proposals to withdraw the provision of I.T. equipment for Councillors.</p>
	<p>Had subsidised bus passes for members been considered as an alternative to subsidised car parking?</p> <p>Councillor Sandford, seconded by Councillor S. Bond proposed that the Committee should recommend to Cabinet that, in reviewing the support given to Councillors' Car Parking, consideration should be</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Finance advised this could be proposed as a recommendation which could then be investigated.</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>given to the subsidy of public transport as an alternative option.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote (14 in favour, 9 against, 2 Abstentions). The recommendation was therefore agreed.</p>	
	<p>How had the Prevention and Enforcement Service (PES) changed and were service levels affected?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Communities explained that originally some police officers were co-located with the PES team. This was no longer the case however they still jointly responded to neighbourhood challenges. Enforcement of environmental crime had been successful through the contract with Kingdom however this agreement had not been without issues and the city centre was regarded as being the area most targeted. There was a negative public perception of the service and it had been agreed to take the Kingdom contract in house. The budget proposals reset the PES and any budget surplus will be reinvested into the service. The number of enforcement staff would be increased and include a city centre and neighbourhood team. Proposals included a shared CCTV service with Fenland Council.</p>
	<p>Would consistency of care for children be maintained when the changeover in staff from agency to permanent staff takes place?</p>	<p>The Service Director, Children Services &amp; Safeguarding advised there were several agency staff who would be encouraged to become permanent members of staff. An extensive recruitment campaign was also in place.</p>
	<p>Would there be a reduction in the services Vivacity</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation advised</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	delivered and the Council's ability to monitor these?	that Vivacity were undergoing a review. The Service Director, Communities and Safety explained that a more collaborative relationship was evolving which would present more beneficial opportunities and the management of this new structure would be under his portfolio. As a result of the new strategic partnership, services would be maintained at their current levels and in some areas improved and diversified.
	More information on the House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) licences was requested and whether the reduction in anti-social behaviour (ASB) services would have an impact on low level crime.	The Cabinet Member for Communities advised that posts were being removed as the main issues should be dealt with by the police due to the level of criminality and were not for the council to address. Officers would still pick up low-level cases. Police community support officers (PCSOs) were trying to integrate with Parish Councils. The Service Director, Communities and Safety referred to a new definition of HMOs within the agenda and improvements to the council's ability to impose civil sanctions which avoided long and costly traditional prosecutions. Discussions were ongoing regarding Article 4 of the Planning Regulations around the provision of HMOs in new communities. The current selective licensing scheme had significantly improved public safety. This scheme was due to expire in 18 months and the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee have asked for a review into extending the scheme.
	With the reduced hospital beds at City Hospital when compared with the previous	The Executive Director, People and Communities, agreed that discharge planning was very

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	hospital and the removal of the Lead Care Practitioner Post, how would long waits for hospital beds be prevented in the future? What measures would be put in place to prevent overly long stays in hospital for the elderly as a result of services such as Lifeline being reduced?	important. The multi discipline team within the hospital was working well and there was no longer the need for a discharge nurse. This was endorsed by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health.
	Would the changes proposed to the Vivacity budget affect proposed future developments such as sports centres?	The Service Director, Communities and Safety confirmed new opportunities could be pursued under the new arrangement with Vivacity and a feasibility study was about to be commissioned into the provision of a sports facility for the North side of the city. He would discuss this outside the meeting with local councillors if required.  It was agreed that The Service Director, Communities and Safety would arrange a meeting with Members in the new year regarding the progress of a new sports centre in Werrington.
	Why was the council no longer regularly requesting court orders regarding anti-social behaviour (ASB) and would this change under the new system?	The Service Director, Communities and Safety advised there had been no reduction in the number of cases taken to court and the Council's position was to support others, such as social landlords, in doing so. ASB support would continue to be provided where appropriate and the changes should not affect the number of orders secured.
	Why were fostering and adoption services and the care of children not included in the budget?	The Service Director, Children Services & Safeguarding confirmed that fostering and adoption services were not



Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		included in the budget as although the service provided had changed, there were no savings or other budget implications anticipated within this area.
	What percentage of the service budget would be saved with the proposals on school transport and how will the savings affect contract costs, efficiencies and managing demand? Would the eligibility criteria be changed and impact the number of those who would qualify for school transport?	The Cabinet Member for Finance advised that the savings represented approximately 12.5% of the budget. The Service Director, Education advised that the eligibility criteria would not change as the council was operating in line with the statutory minimum regulations. Independent travel would be promote e.g. the use of public transport, the provision of bikes for children, encouraging the use of different routes and investigating providing places in nearer schools to prevent the need for school transport. The majority of savings would be achieved through contracting. The requirements for school transport varied each year depending on the council's ability to provide suitable school places.
	Had it been assumed the NHS Health checks were no longer needed and why was there an underspend on these services? Will preventative measures continue to be monitored?	The Director of Public Health advised that not everyone entitled to a health check accepted the offer; the uptake was approximately 50% and was insufficient to use the full budget available. There were also other pressures placed on practice staff other than actively seeking out patients for health checks. Greater focus would be given to the outreach services, part of the Integrated Lifestyles Contract, which were targeted to those considered to be most at risk. This change of emphasis was in line with the national review by Public Health England currently in progress on the benefits of health checks.

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	<p>Could the frequency of street cleaning in the Gladstone Street area be reconsidered and reduced further?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment notified members that all street cleaning requirements were being reviewed and would be adjusted accordingly.</p>
	<p>More detail was requested on the priorities of street cleaning. Could the reduction in response times for fly tipping issues be removed from the budget?</p> <p>Councillor Ellis, seconded by Councillor Murphy, proposed that the Committee should recommend that Cabinet reconsiders the £59,000 savings proposal to increase the non-hazardous fly-tipping removal period.</p> <p>The recommendation was put to the vote (15 in favour, 6 against, 8 Abstentions). The recommendation was therefore agreed.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment explained that the reduction in response times was included to contribute towards savings. The Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation advised there was a statutory requirement to collect fly tipping within 5 – 10 days and collections would continue unchanged in the short term. Other measures were being investigated following the cross-party recommendations.</p>
	<p>What was the council doing to safeguard young people and prevent the vulnerable being exploited should the budget cuts be made to youth services?</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member for Communities replied that funding for youth services from government was not forthcoming and it had been necessary to consider how services could best be delivered. The service was targeting its resources on the areas of most concern and need. Within the targeted youth services, efforts were concentrated on the Youth Offending Services, a statutory function and no cuts would be made to this area. Cuts would also be avoided for The Targeted Youth Support Service Social Workers function (TISS)</p>

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
		<p>helping children in need. There were many services available for young people that did not rely on council funding and these could be bought together on one platform to facilitate easier access.</p> <p>The Service Director, Communities and Safety reassured members that support for young people who may be at risk of entering into gang type behaviour were not affected. It was hoped to provide small community run services for local people across the area with support from parish councils and community volunteers.</p>
	Was it necessary to use plastic single use crime scene tape around fly tipping?	
	Could the council work together with Cross Keys Homes to see if savings could be made in fly tipping collection by working collaboratively?	The Cabinet Member for Finance advised this had been taken on board.
	Members sought reassurance that youth workers would be adequately trained and have appropriate Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks.	The Service Director, Communities and Safety confirmed youth groups would be supported by suitably trained and qualified people and a comprehensive toolkit had been prepared which included model documents and policies. Young people on the edge of engagement would be attracted to participate by a strong base.
	What percentage of the total budget was the reduction in the Vivacity budget and also the Young People's Service?	The Cabinet Member for Finance confirmed that there remained £1.2million in the Discretionary Youth Services budget and the subsidy for Vivacity was around £2.1million.
	Will the Vivacity subsidy be withdrawn completely? Was	The Cabinet Member for Finance felt that the discussion on Vivacity

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	the council showing big city aspirations but having a small town mentality?	budget cuts and reinvestment of these savings would be an annual discussion. If the individual communities worked together, good facilities for children could be provided, like those in Hampton where there was a youth club and both cricket and basketball clubs for young people. Ward councillors had a role to play to in setting up good facilities within their own communities.
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget and made the following recommendations:</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>1. The Joint Scrutiny Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to recommend to Cabinet that, in reviewing the support given to Councillors' Car Parking, consideration should be given to the subsidy of public transport as an alternative option.</p> <p>2. The Joint Scrutiny Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to recommend that Cabinet reconsiders the £59,000 savings proposal to increase the non-hazardous fly-tipping removal period.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS AGREED</b></p> <p>1. It was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Finance would arrange for a briefing note to be distributed to Members of the Committee providing a more detailed explanation and rationale for the proposals to withdraw the provision of I.T. equipment for Councillors.</p> <p>2. It was agreed that the Service Director, Communities and Safety, to arrange a meeting with Members in the new year regarding the progress of new sports centre in Werrington.</p> <p>3. It was agreed that the Service Director, Communities and Safety, to arrange a visit to Peterborough City College for interested members, focussing on facilities for disabled people.</p>		
<p><b>8. Appendix D</b> <b>Page 75 to 109</b></p> <p>Equality Impact Assessments</p>		There were no questions or recommendations on this item.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		
<p><b>9. Appendix E</b> <b>Page 111 to 116</b></p>	Councillor Day advised council that a Climate Change Working Group had	

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
Carbon Impact Assessments - Draft	been formed and a report was being prepared for release in March.	
	<p>Councillor Murphy, seconded by Councillor Sandford, proposed that the Committee should recommend that Cabinet reviews the budget to determine its effect on tackling the Climate Emergency.</p> <p>The recommendation was agreed unanimously.</p>	This recommendation was accepted by the Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment.
<p>The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget and make the following recommendation.</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny of the Budget Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to recommend that Cabinet reviews the budget to determine its effect on tackling the Climate Emergency.</p>		
<b>10. General Comments, any overall recommendations</b>	Discussion took place on how alternative proposals and suggestions to the budget were received and actioned.	
	What action would be taken to generate income for the city?	<p>The Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments agreed to be available to any member outside of the meeting regarding the planning, highways and regulatory services that the council currently sold.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Finance advised that the council had an income of £72million.</p>
	As one of the first digital cities, the council should be looking to generate new income from these services	The Cabinet Member for Finance agreed with this.
	Could important financial decisions be taken in a better way with Cabinet approving decisions which were taken	The Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments advised that Northminster car park decision required immediate

Item / Section of the Budget	Questions / Comment from Members	Response from relevant Cabinet Member / Corporate Director
	without time for the usual call-in process, to ensure there were no unseen financial implications?	action due to health and safety concerns.
The Committee <b>RESOLVED</b> to note this section of the budget.		

CHAIRMAN

The meeting began at 6.00pm and ended at 20:41pm