

Public Document Pack

Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee

S&R/1

Monday, 21 March 2016

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

21 March 2016

5.00 - 8.00 pm

Present: Councillors Robertson (Chair), Sinnott (Vice-Chair), Benstead, Bick, Cantrill, Hipkin, Holt, M. Smart and Abbott

Leader of the Council: Councillor Lewis Herbert

Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources: Councillor George Owers

Officers:

Chief Executive: Antoinette Jackson

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Director of Business Transformation: Ray Ward

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Head of Revenues and Benefits: Alison Cole

Strategy and Partnerships Manager: David Kidston

Safer Communities Section Manager: Lynda Kilkelly

Strategy Officer: Graham Saint

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/1/SR Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Baigent and Sarris and Councillor Abbott attended as alternate.

16/2/SR Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made.

16/3/SR Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meetings of 18 January and 8 February 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

16/4/SR Public Questions

The Chair proposed that these be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item.

Re-ordering of the Agenda

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

16/5/SR Discretionary Housing Payment Update

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out an update on the funding and use of Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) to support those that were affected by Welfare Reforms.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the carry forward to 2016/17 of the unspent additional contribution

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Revenues and Benefits.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Asked what the likelihood of need for additional funding was anticipated for 2016/17.
- ii. Commented that whilst the Council was doing a lot to help people, there were a lot of policies on the horizon from Central Government which would impact on the City's residents.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Revenues and Benefits confirmed the following:

- i. It was difficult to predict the trend for additional funding required as a result of the welfare reforms, however if the Council mitigated all the changes which arose from the welfare reforms, the cost to the Council

could be £400,000. It was not the intention for the Council to mitigate funding gaps in each case; however each case would need to be judged on its own circumstances.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources commented that point 6 on page 42 of the agenda set out the Council's estimates in relation to need and the costings for 2016/17 and 2017/18.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/6/SR Climate Change Strategy

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report presented a new Climate Change Strategy for the five year period from April 2016 to March 2021. The report summarised the key issues raised by consultees following the public consultation and outlined the changes that had been made to the Climate Change Strategy in response.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Noted the key issues raised through the public consultation as set out in Appendix A and B of the Officer's report.
- ii. Approved the Climate Change Strategy presented at Appendix C subject to an amendment in the action plan attached to Objective Two to add an additional activity 2.15 (p116) to consider convening and leading a City Leaders Climate Change Group (comprising businesses, other major employers, voluntary and community sector) to establish a collective and mutually supportive approach to reduce the city's carbon footprint and agree an inspiring goal which the whole city can identify with and participate in.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Strategy and Partnerships Manager.

Mr Tuckwood addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. The Green Party had commented on the Climate Change Strategy and were happy that some suggestions had been taken forward.
- ii. Could not agree with the target date for the City to achieve zero carbon status by 2050. A much earlier date needed to be selected and it was suggested that the date was brought forward to 2030.
- iii. The energy usage from Cambridge City had increased in recent years.
- iv. Climate change was the biggest threat to public health.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources made the following comments:

- i. The Council had to operate within the national policy context.
- ii. The Council did not have a 'target' date but had an aspiration date to achieve zero carbon status. A target date was meaningless unless the Council had the means to make it happen.
- iii. It was worth having an aspiration but he did not believe in setting a target which could not be met without major changes from Central Government. Central Government had taken away the green deal and had cut feed in tariffs which did not assist the Council.

Mr Tuckwood addressed the Committee and made the following supplementary points:

- i. He understood the limits of Local Government however he stated that Cambridge needed to be taking leadership.
- ii. The Strategy recognised the challenge in the national context however it needed to set clearer target opportunities which had been missed.

Dr Eva addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. Targets gave clarity and focus, the 2 degrees drop in global warming may be a cornerstone of the strategy.
- ii. The Committee were turning their backs on the economy of Cambridge.
- iii. Need to have zero carbon status to reduce the increase in global warming to 2 degrees.
- iv. More than 50 cities had pledged to have zero carbon status but he questioned who would be the first.

- v. Stated that Cambridge had funding from the City Deal and should encourage the best and brightest individuals to develop innovations so that Cambridge could have zero carbon status.

The Executive Councillor made the following comments:

- i. The City Deal included South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council, it was not just the City Council.
- ii. The Council would do its best to achieve zero carbon status however there were other institutions which had more influence in the City to achieve this for example Cambridge University.
- iii. Requested practical examples which would provide the means for the Council to achieve zero carbon status.

Dr Eva addressed the Committee and made the following supplementary points:

- i. February 2016 had been the warmest February on record.
- ii. He had provided a suggestion that asked that Cambridge become the first zero carbon city in the United Kingdom.

Councillor Gillespie addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. It was obvious that people cared about climate change.
- ii. The Council did get opportunities to address climate change issues for example the University West of Cambridge site was an exemplar site for sustainability.
- iii. There were opportunities through the City Deal to look at the congestion in Cambridge.
- iv. The Council had tried to negotiate for more power over housing through the devolution deal, however the Council needed more power to be able to deliver zero carbon sustainable homes.
- v. Requested less spending on fencing and more spending on the insulation of Council housing.
- vi. Requested that the Council looked at their catering contracts.
- vii. Renewable energy did not have to be fed back into the grid.
- viii. Referred to the energy supply contract for Council and the commitment made at the October 2015 Council meeting to make Cambridge fossil free. Commented that if the Council did not choose an energy supplier which used 100% renewable energy then the Council may as well not have a Climate Change Strategy.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources made the following comments:

- i. The Council had procured electric vehicles.
- ii. The Council would not be able to get Central Government to be able to reverse national policy through the devolution deal.
- iii. The Council could do what it could to educate people to eat less meat but there were likely to be limits to the effectiveness of this.
- iv. The Executive Councillor for Housing would be the appropriate person to comment on housing.
- v. The Council had to take into account other factors when it conducted its procurement exercise to procure an energy supplier.
- vi. Investment in renewable energy without a feed in tariff had to be considered in relation to the Council's overall financial situation and ensure that there was a balanced budget.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. The point of the Climate Change Strategy was to inspire the City and to pull in partners to achieve the strategy's aims.
- ii. Meat and dairy were big factors in climate change but the Council did not have control over these things but could influence individual's behaviours.
- iii. Queried whether the Council's commercial properties had energy rating certificates.

In response to Members questions the Strategy and Partnerships Manager and the Head of Corporate Strategy confirmed the following:

- i. The Council had not focused on meat and dairy as it was not within the gift of the City Council to control however the contribution of these to carbon emissions was noted.
- ii. Referred to the Council's 'Greener your home' document which provided advice to residents on how they could change their behaviours to reduce their own emissions.
- iii. Would take advice from the Procurement Officer regarding the Council's catering contract.
- iv. Had spoken with the Head of Property Services who confirmed that a survey of the Council's commercial property energy ratings would be completed by September 2016, with any improvement plan in place by March 2017.

Councillor Bick proposed the following amendments to recommendation (b) (additional text underlined):

Amendment One

To approve the Climate Change Strategy presented at Appendix C amending the action plan in relation to the council's commercial property portfolio at 1.3 (p104) to add a performance measure for energy ratings on all commercial properties to be established by September 2016 and an upgrading strategy to be in place by March 2017.

Amendment Two

To approve the Climate Change Strategy presented at Appendix C amending the action plan attached to Objective Two to add an additional activity 2.15 (p116) to consider convening and leading a City Leaders Climate Change Group (comprising businesses, other major employers, voluntary and community sector) to establish a collective and mutually supportive approach to reduce the city's carbon footprint and agree an inspiring goal which the whole city can identify with and participate in.

Amendment Three

To approve the Climate Change Strategy presented at Appendix C amending the action plan in relation to the Council's tree strategy at 5.6 (p135) to add a performance measure the provision of a new planting budget to fund and incentivise tree planting across the city in 2016/17 and to amend the performance measure for tree canopy cover so that it applies to the whole city and not just the city centre.

On a show of hands Amendment One was lost by 5 votes to 3.

On a show of hands Amendment Two was agreed by 8 votes to 1.

On a show of hands Amendment Three was lost by 6 votes to 3.

The Committee endorsed the amended recommendations by 6 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/7/SR Public Spaces Protection Order - Punt and Tour Touting

The Leader confirmed that the decision on whether to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order – Tour and Punt Touting had been deferred as there had been over 941 responses to the public consultation on this issue. More time was needed, than was previously expected, to analyse the results in order to give fair and transparent consideration to all of the views expressed. A special meeting of the Strategy and Resources Committee may be convened to consider the issue.

16/8/SR Consultation on Draft Community Safety Partnership Priorities 2016-17

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out a draft Cambridge Community Safety Plan 2014-17 (Year Three). The Committee was asked to provide feedback on the proposed priorities, objectives and delivery of the plan.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Commented on the plan and endorsed the priorities set out in section 3.3 of the Officer's report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Safer Communities Section Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report.

- i. One of last year's objectives was to improve the reporting rates of domestic abuse crimes, however they could not find any detail within the report as to how effective the priority had been.
- ii. It was noted that a great deal of time could pass before a domestic violence crime was reported therefore it could be difficult to measure the results after a year and difficult to quantify the crime in the same way as other crimes.
- iii. Questioned the mental health impact priority detailed on p157 of the agenda pack.

- iv. Priority 1 on p149 of the agenda referred to a spike in crime in Market and Abbey wards, it was questioned whether this was due to an increase in crime or a change in reporting methodology.
- v. Priority 2 'What do we aim to do' seemed to be very Police lead.
- vi. Priority 4 on p152 detailed a decrease in anti-social behavior. Questioned what assumptions were being drawn.

In response to Members' questions the Safer Communities Section Manager confirmed the following:

- i. Domestic violence incidents had gone up, which was equated to better reporting.
- ii. The mental health report had not been published to date due to restructuring at the County Council. It was anticipated that the report would be made public after the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership meeting in April 2016.
- iii. It was not conclusively determined whether the spike in crimes in Market and Abbey ward was due to an increase in crimes or an increase in the reporting of crimes (or a combination of both).
- iv. Individuals were spending more time indoors on social media, this may have been why incidents of crime were decreasing, although there was no conclusive evidence of this.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The top 4 priorities detailed clear issues which affected the City and linked into Area Committees.
- ii. There needed to be better integration of objectives between the Council, the Police, the Police and Crime Commissioner and Area Committees.
- iii. Expressed thanks to Liz Bisset for chairing the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership as she was to stand down from the appointment. Lorraine Parker was to take this position over.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/9/SR Annual Update About the Work of Our Strategic Partnerships

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out an update on the key external partnerships that the Council was involved with.

Decision of the Leader:

- i. To continue to work with key external partnerships (LEP, City Deal, Cambridge Community Safety Partnership, Health and Wellbeing Board, Children's Trust) to ensure that public agencies and others can together address the strategic issues that affect Cambridge and that the concerns of Cambridge citizens are responded to.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Strategy Officer.

The Committee made the following points in response to the report:

- i. Questioned where the £1 billion referred to in point 5 of paragraph 5.3 on p164 of the agenda came from.
- ii. Questioned democratic principles in partnership working and how resident's views were considered.
- iii. Questioned how members could get involved in partnership working with other organisations.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Corporate Strategy confirmed the following:

- i. The £1 billion referred to in point 5 of paragraph 5.3 on p164 derived from Local Enterprise Partnership funding, developer's contributions from planning applications and any other relevant funding source (for example the New Homes Bonus).

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The City Deal took decisions through a governance structure which had been set up under the previous Council administration.
- ii. The Council wanted to be a good partner. Partnership working had a role to play and it was right that the Council looked at local government and restructuring. Some partnerships could work better and could provide better ways of delivering services.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/10/SR Cambridgeshire Mental Health Crisis Concordat

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out a proposal to join partners within a local concordat that aimed to deliver improvements in the care of people in mental health crisis within a national framework.

Decision of the Leader

- i. To sign up to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Crisis Concordat on behalf of the City Council and to encourage officers in the delivery of its aims.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Strategy Officer.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report.

- i. Expressed concerns that the concordat may not be a productive resource.
- ii. Expressed surprise at the percentage of the population that this strategy seemed to cover.

In response to Members' questions the Strategy Officer and the Chief Executive said the following:

- i. This was an opportunity to gain more knowledge about individuals and would assist organisations to make a decision whether individuals suffering from mental health issues required an immediate response.

- There was also a desire to ensure that people were not referred to the Police if that was not appropriate for their circumstances.
- ii. The Concordat was about joining up frontline staff; it had practical application with other agencies.
 - iii. The Concordat was only one part of the strategy followed by a series of interventions and treatments as required.
 - iv. The Vanguard Programme identified that people with mental health issues could be on low incomes.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/11/SR Shared Services

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report provided information regarding the terms of reference for the shared services Joint Group between the City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Huntingdon District Council and the business cases for ICT and Legal services.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the business plans for each of the shared services attached at Appendix 1 of the Officer's report.

Decision of the Leader

- ii. Approved the Terms of Reference (see Appendix 2) for the Shared Services Joint Group, to enable that Group to operate in a formal committee setting from September 2016, prior to which they will continue to be held on a quarterly basis in shadow format.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Director of Business Transformation.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Questioned how works would be funded between the shared services and the different authorities.
- ii. Questioned how the scrutiny process would work with the Shared Services Joint Group.
- iii. Asked what the costs would be of the Shared Services Joint Group.
- iv. The financial information should be provided in the same way in each of the reports on the three services and identify the costs and savings for each of the 3 authorities. Speed of service needed to be agreed as an objective for all 3 services. The ICT objectives needed to include value for money.

In response to Members' questions the Director of Business Transformation said the following:

- i. There was an inter-authority agreement which governed the relationship between the authorities who shared services. In relation to ICT and investment this would have to be judged on a case by case basis however the general principle was that costs would be shared however if there was a unique requirement of this Council, then this Council would bear the costs arising from the asset required. Similarly if there was a unique investment required by another authority then the City Council would not pay anything towards that asset.
- ii. Referred to 4.6 of the Terms of Reference which stated that overview and scrutiny would still have a role in the decision making processes of the Council. Officer contacts for each service would be made available.
- iii. The Chair of the Shared Services Joint Group would rotate between the authorities and the Democratic Services support would be undertaken by the Authority whose member was the Chair.
- iv. In the inter-authority documents 'value for money' may need to be stated more clearly. In terms of speed, requirements may vary between the authorities. At this stage the Council did not have the necessary analysis to have key performance indicators.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee would still get reports regarding ICT and Legal services.
- ii. Shared services were required in order to achieve savings as there were challenges regarding the Council's budget from 2018.

- iii. Looking strategically at Legal and ICT the Joint Committee may need to consider the standardisation of terms.
- iv. The City Council would still be in charge of the services that the City delivered.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendation at the meeting. The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendation by email after the meeting.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor and the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor or the Leader.

The meeting ended at 8.00 pm

CHAIR