

HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

**CABINET
MONDAY, 19 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 2.00PM**

**COUNTY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 10.00AM**

Cabinet
Agenda Item No.

4i

County Council
Agenda Item No.

5A(i)

**COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE COUNCIL'S CABINET PANELS ON
THE INTEGRATED PLAN 2018/19 – 2021/22**

Report of the Director of Resources

Author: Deborah Jeffery, Assistant Democratic Services Manager
(Tel: 01992 555563)

Executive Member: David Williams, Leader of the Council (as responsible for
Resources, Property & the Economy)

1. Purpose of the report

1.1 To inform Members of the comments and conclusions of the County Council's Cabinet Panels on the draft Integrated Plan 2018/19 – 2021/22.

2. Summary and Background

- 2.1.1 As part of the Integrated Planning Process each of the County Council's service Cabinet Panels met during late January and early February 2018 to consider the integrated plan 2018/19 – 2021/22.
- 2.1.2 At its meeting on 14 February 2017, the Resources, Property & the Economy Cabinet Panel will consider the Integrated Plan for 2017/18 – 2019/20, the comments of the service Cabinet Panels, and the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on its scrutiny of the IP proposals (the Committee's report is attached as item 4(ii) of the Cabinet agenda / item 5A(i) of the Council agenda).
- 2.1.3 The relevant extracts from the minutes of the service cabinet panels' meetings, together with their conclusions, are attached as Appendix 1 to this report. The relevant extract from the minutes of the Resources, Property & the Economy Cabinet Panel meeting on 14 February, including its conclusions, is attached as Appendix 2 to the report (*to follow*).

3. Recommendation

- 3.1.1 That the report be noted and that the comments and conclusions of the Council's Cabinet Panels be taken into account by Cabinet and County Council in their consideration of the Integrated Plan 2018/19 – 2021/22.
- 3.1.2 Cabinet's recommendations to Council will be considered by County Council on 20 February 2018.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 The financial implications of the Integrated Plan proposals are as set out in the report at item 4(iii) of the Cabinet agenda and item 5A(i) of the Council agenda.

Background Information

Minutes of:-

- Adult Care & Health Cabinet Panel, January 2018
- Highways Cabinet Panel, January 2018
- Public Health, Prevention & Performance Cabinet Panel, February 2018
- Environment, Planning & Transport Cabinet Panel, February 2018
- Education, Libraries & Localism Cabinet Panel, February 2018
- Children's Services Cabinet Panel, February 2018
- Community Safety & Waste Management Cabinet Panel, February 2018
- Resources, Property & the Economy Cabinet Panel, February 2018

INTEGRATED PLANNING PROCESS 2018/19 - 2021/22: COMMENTS FROM SERVICE CABINET PANELS

1. Adult Care and Health Cabinet Panel (30 January 2018)

Members were presented with a brief overview of the full structure and detail of the council's Integrated Plan for 2018/19 -2021/2 (IP Plan) before discussing the detail of the section pertaining to Adult Care & Health.

The panel's attention was initially drawn to Part A of the IP Plan where a corporate summary highlighted the announcement from central government in their March 2017 budget of the allocation Additional Improved Better Care Fund monies (Point 1.12), and the risk associated with a court judgement in relation to Liabilities to Sleep Duties (Point 3.3). It was noted that both of these points were relevant and had been integral to the considerations and calculations made regarding the Adult Care & Health budget.

The Adults Care Services portfolio in Part B of the IP Plan was then considered by Members. It was noted that in terms of priorities, Adult Care Services had outlined four strategic area priorities for the forthcoming year.

It was noted that in terms of priorities, Adult Care Services had outlined four strategic area priorities for the forthcoming year, as outlined on page 21 of the report.

The pressures and challenges facing the department as detailed on page 22 of the report, were also outlined, with particular emphasis being placed on the market workforce pressures currently being experienced.

In response to a Member challenge as to why improving rates of delayed transfers of care from hospital had been identified as a risk, as detailed in the summary on page 19 of the IP report, it was explained that this was a risk partly due to the fact that the funding that had been received from the improved Better Care Fund, which had been largely directed towards hospital discharge and prevention of admission solutions, was provided in three individual, annually reducing payments over each of the three year span of the current programme, with only £5.8m due to be provided in 2019/20, compared to £13m when the funding had been first provided in 2016/17. Additionally it was noted that there was a further risk as it was currently unclear as to if and how future funding would be provided beyond 2019/20.

Members noted the key projects and programmes scheduled to be delivered by the department as outlined on page 24 of the report.

In response to a Member question it was confirmed that the savings achieved by reducing residential care placements would be offset by the expenditure on additional costs e.g. of homecare. It was confirmed that the savings from residential

care placements had been calculated based on the equation that each person who received homecare rather than residential care would receive an average of 16 hours of care per week. In response to a Member question, it was noted that this average had increased annually in line with the increasing complexity of the needs of residents.

Confirmation was received that 'extra care' and 'flexi care' were the same service, with flexi care being the term most commonly used within Hertfordshire.

During Member discussion it was noted that the Net Revenue Budget detailed on page 20 of the IP report was calculated based on a range of different factors including changing funding streams and changes in legislation, but predominantly it was based on increased demand and the yearly increase in demography. Member's attention was drawn to page 33 of the IP report which provided further detail on the key budget movements for the department.

Members received assurance that although the budget had been calculated on current demand, demography and legislation, there would be continued monitoring of any changes within these areas, and any significant impact that were to occur as a result of any change it would be responded to as appropriate.

By way of illustration of how legislation would affect the future budget, Members were advised that it was predicted that government policy on increasing the National Minimum Living Wage would end in 2020/21, which would mean that this would no longer be a budgetary pressure that would need to be taken into consideration.

It was also noted that the department recognised that government had yet to formally produce any legislation on the future funding of Adult Social Care, which would also potentially have an impact on future budget planning.

In relation to how the department has reviewed its effectiveness/value for money in delivering service outcomes, as outlined on page 29 of the report, Members were pleased to note that since the report had been published Hertfordshire Adult Care Services had now moved from 84th to 79th in the recently published 2016/17 Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework Measures.

Members noted the key risks in delivering the projects as outlined on page 31 of the report, and discussed in more detail the issues related to workforce pressures as briefly mentioned earlier in the meeting.

Members heard that 30,000 people work in Adult Social Care in Hertfordshire and annually approximately 1,000 per year leave the sector for alternative employment. In addition, an additional 1,000 posts must be recruited in order to meet the increasing demographic demand.

It was noted that the department had been very proactive in promoting recruitment and had explored a number of solutions to secure staff including a recruitment campaign, rebranding the job title, increasing and protecting the salaries of care workers, and recruiting trainee care cadets to fill vacancies, but there was still a gap

in recruitment.

In response to a Member question as to whether there could be consideration of promoting a career in social care in schools, it was agreed that this could be explored. It was noted that local colleges currently run courses, which are sometimes under subscribed. It was agreed that as the care profession was vocational rather than academic, it would not be appropriate to pursue the promotion of care work with the University of Hertfordshire.

Member observations on the cost of travel for care workers, and considerations around the age and gender appropriateness of care workers were noted.

Members were notified that a more detailed paper on the workforce strategy and pressures being experienced by the department would be presented to a future meeting of the Adult Care and Health Cabinet Panel.

The Capital Programme outlined on page 37 of the report was noted by the Panel. Members received clarification that EPH Provision as detailed on the Capital Programme stood for Elderly Person's Home provision.

During further discussion the risk regarding the proposal to submit an Invest to Transform Bid was noted and it was established that robust strategies would be in place should the bid be unsuccessful.

A Member observation that further integration work with the NHS should be considered when planning for future budgets was acknowledged by the panel. Members received assurance that ongoing discussions and meetings were taking place to achieve this.

Conclusion:

The Panel provided comment to Cabinet on the proposal relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of the Adult Care and Health Portfolio. The Panel also identified any issues that it felt that the Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals. These are outlined in the preceding text.

2. Highways Cabinet Panel (31 January 2018)

The Cabinet Panel received a report on the draft Integrated Plan (IP) in relation to the Highways Service, for comment and identification of any issues members felt that Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.

Agenda Item 4(i) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20 was presented to Cabinet on 22 January 2018 and set out the actions the County Council had taken to

engage and consult primarily with the public, in particular raising awareness of the financial pressures faced by the County Council. The results of the consultations were summarised within the related report and appendices.

Members' attention was drawn to an error in Agenda Item 4(ii) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2018/19 – 2021/2022 where a reduction in Driver Training income (of £250k pa) had incorrectly been included in the Environment, Planning and Transport portfolio pages (p115, 116 and p122) instead of the Highways portfolio movement. Members were asked to include this item in their consideration of the IP proposals; amended versions of the incorrect pages, i.e. 129,130,138 and 139, for the Highways portfolio were tabled and can be viewed at [Highways Cabinet Panel - 31 January 2018 – Item 5: Appendix B-pages 129 -130 and Appendix C-pages 138-139](#).¹

The following issues were discussed in relation to the report to Cabinet of 22 January 2018, agenda item 4(ii): Integrated Plan 2018/19 -2021/22:

Re page 14 of 17, members highlighted the potentially misleading title of an item in Table v in relation to the Highways Locality Budget (HLB). It was agreed that the description would be adjusted.

Officers clarified that the £500,000 'Income' figure referred to in 'Analysis of Revenue Budget by Objective Areas', page 140; related to income from third parties as a result of accidents causing damage to the highway.

Re page 141, Members welcomed the New Capital Bid of £5m in 2018-19 and £8m in each of the following four years for carriage maintenance. It was clarified that in Hertfordshire's working model the percentage of A, B & C roads requiring improvement was 3-6%, and that the extra funding would be used to reduce, potentially by half, the 15-16% of unclassified roads currently requiring improvement. If approved, the funding would not be equally spread between divisions but would focus on those unclassified roads most in need of improvement as identified by technical analysis of the road system.

The new funding stream would be delivered by the Integrated Works Programme (IWP) and a separate schedule issued to identify which unclassified roads would be involved, enabling members to ensure their HLB commitments did not duplicate work covered by the programme. To aid with this Assistant Highway Managers would check which roads were on the additional IWP and consult with the Local Member.

In relation to Revised Capital Bids – Annual Programmes (page 142) it was clarified that 'traffic signals replacement' also covered pedestrian crossings. Further to this, as there was already a programme of traffic signal refurbishment the additional funding would be directed to junctions.

Officers clarified that the revenue element of HLB not specifically mentioned in the 'Analysis of Budget by Objective Areas' on page 140 was included in the Traffic Management & Safety line.

In relation to Key Budget movements 'Reduced Street Lighting Scouting Frequency' (page 139), officers clarified that conversion of street lights to LED and in particular the introduction of a Central Management System (CMS) meant that scouting was unnecessary after conversion. However funds remained for this purpose and some scouting would continue for bollards and signage. It was highlighted that some street lights remained out after scouting due to UK Power Networks (UKPN) issues and were out of the control of the Council. Officers clarified that approximately £100,000 per year was spent on scouting of illuminated assets.

During discussion of the impact of the growth agenda on the highways, officers highlighted that the agenda to encourage modal shift already existed and, although the Local Transport Plan (LTP4) gave it greater emphasis, the approach to growth was changing and could result in greater pressure on the highways. The impact would be discussed with members as it was modelled.

During debate on the need to improve the Council's funding response to medium sized development applications, members who served as both county council and district/borough councillors were encouraged to become involved with the campaign of the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport (EPT) to ensure that the uplift in land values generated suitable levels of funding for Councils, as the consequence of development had impacts beyond the sites being developed. Emphasis was placed on highlighting to the District and Borough Councils that they were recovering insufficient funds to meet the costs of delivering the required infrastructure.

Furthermore, to enable the Council to bid for infrastructure funding via government funding streams for infrastructure issued at random and at short notice, the Executive Members for EPT and Highways had required the preparation of impact assessments for varying sizes of development. This would also provide the District and Borough Councils with the information on how much they needed to raise from planning consents to support infrastructure.

Emphasis was placed on ensuring that the Council's Development and Management Team put the right information on planning applications and that the District and Borough Councils incorporated this in the planning conditions or as an informative.

In relation to the projected reduction of £250,000 in Driver Training income in 2018/19 officers clarified that the surplus income from Speed Awareness Courses for drivers in lieu of points and fines was applied to road safety. Data suggested that the decrease in the number of individuals attending the course and concomitant decrease in this income stream would continue into the next year. Some counties were observing a similar decline in the throughput whilst others were not and the police were assisting in understanding the reasons behind this.

Members heard that recent press reports on the number of unfilled potholes in Hertfordshire were likely not informed by the same database as the County Council's and as a result at variance. Strategic proactivity on potholes centred on the Asset Management approach to maintain the roads in best condition and stop them from deteriorating within the funding available and, as part of this, the proposed additional

funding for unclassified roads would significantly reduce the number of potholes. The performance indicator of 'Carriageway Defects Reported by the Public and Attended Within the Prescribed Response Time', showed a 100% achieved rate in September 2017 which, alongside the Council's high repudiation rate for insurance claims relating to highway defects, further substantiated the service's high levels of performance in dealing with potholes within the intervention criteria. It was clarified that highway faults below the intervention criteria were not classified as potholes. Further to this, members' intervention in bringing the increased size of potholes previously categorised as below intervention level to the Highways Service's attention was constructive in getting them filled. On the need to ensure the quality of pothole repairs, comment was passed that in some cases, those now being undertaken appeared to last longer than the surrounding road.

During discussion of the need to widen the A1M between Welwyn and Stevenage to deal with the fact that it did not function appropriately between junctions 6 and 8 for large parts of the working day, officers highlighted that it was not appropriate for the County Council to fund works on another agencies' networks. However, Hertfordshire had lobbied Highways England (HE), via the Managed Motorways Scheme, to widen this stretch of road and had been advised that work would start in the 2019/20 calendar year.

Following concerns around the need for additional funding from HE for improvements to affected junctions to assist local traffic flows, members heard that the Strategy Document under development included A1M junctions 3 and 4. It would also establish the ability of the Highways Service to develop schemes to take advantage of any government funding and Local Enterprise Partnership monies that became available. To member observations that in the past feeder junctions had been funded by HE, officers commented that HE had recently taken a more enlightened approach to highway improvements and were taking complimentary measures to support associated junctions

Conclusions:

- 1.The panel commented as above to Cabinet on the proposals in the Integrated Plan in respect of Highways;
- 2.The panel identified issues as above that it felt Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.

3. Public Health, Prevention and Performance (2 February 2018)

The panel received a report which highlighted the areas of the Integrated Plan relating to Public Health, Prevention and Performance for members consideration and comment. The following issues were discussed in relation to the report to Cabinet of 22 January 2018, agenda item 4(ii): Integrated Plan 2018/19 -2021/22.

Members heard that the 2.5% reduction in the Public Health grant from September 2017 and rising to 7.5% by 2019/20 had been known and accounted for when preparing the proposed budget. Attention was drawn to PH's small capital budget of £725m, the key revenue pressures, savings proposals and capital schemes (page 152) and the service's strategy to work to maintain services and outcomes.

Officers clarified that, despite the proposal for 'Reduction in funding offered to district councils' (page 157: Key Budget Movements 2018/19-2021/22), the service was investigating ways of continuing to contribute financially to working with district councils which were well placed to provide particular PH agendas including weight management and physical activity. Member input to this issue was encouraged. Following observations from the Peer Challenge and PH's strengths in influencing across and between, and that partnership working and greater integration were the way forward, Members requested the full written report to the LGA Peer Challenge on Public Health.

Officers clarified that although Mental Health (MH) was not a mandated service for PH, to prevent a reduction in support for MH issues it was being written into children's centre, school nurses and health visitor service specifications currently being recommissioned by the County Council. The relevant MH staff budgets had been protected as had the staff budgets for school pastoral networks.

In terms of key risks in delivering projects and programmes for the PH portfolio and the risk of losing experienced PH staff, members heard that the performance monitor would now track vacancy rates and the use of agency staff.

Conclusions:

1. The Panel commented to Cabinet on the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Public Health, Prevention and Performance.
2. The Panel identified any issues that it felt that the Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.
3. Panel supported the Public Health Integrated Plan proposals.

4. **Environment, Planning & Transport Cabinet Panel (5 February 2018)**

The Panel was invited to comment and identify any issues on the areas of the Integrated plan which related to Environment, Planning and Transport.

Members were informed that following on from the Public Engagement on the Integrated Plan (IP) that 56% of responses said they would rather see an increase to council tax and 32% a reduction in services. The percentage of respondents that supported a reduction in expenditure on Environment and Planning was 42% lower than in previous years, whilst 21% supported a reduction in Highways and Transportation a slight increase on last year, but lower than the previous two.

Members noted that pressures added £325 in 2018/19 rising to £700,000 in 2021/22. This was mainly the 'Responding to Growth' item. Members' attention was drawn to the item of £3.491m on page 185 of the IP pack under the heading for Infrastructure and Investment, a substantial part of which was for the development of major infrastructure and sustainable transport schemes. It was further noted that savings of £515,000 had been identified for 2018/19 rising to £726,000 in 2021/22.

A concern was raised in relation to the merging of the Countryside Management Service (CMS) and the Rights of Way teams and the impact on the service when the team are reconvened. Members agreed that the work of both teams were valued and both provided a good service. Members were informed the £150k savings would be over the course of 2 years, it was noted that teams did have overlapping functions. The savings would be generated through a natural reduction of one person, thinning of the management structure and by taking over diversion orders from the district and borough councils which would generate income. The aim was that the merging of the two teams would be an improvement to the service. Members hoped that improvements to bridle ways could also be included.

A member questioned whether some of the infrastructure fund could be used to support a passing loop on the Abbey Line. It was noted that the rules for accessing the funds had not yet been agreed and that a bid to support an Abbey Line passing loop would need to be considered against the criteria once set.

Following a question from a Member in relation to the Savercard, the Chairman clarified that the proposal to raise the price of the Savercard ticket was not linked or contingent in any way on the efficiency savings expected from the wider concessionary fare scheme.

The Executive Member noted that the additional income from increasing the price of Savercards was relatively small and suggested the Panel recommended to Cabinet that, if further savings had been identified through the budget process, that Cabinet defer the increase to the Savercard. The Panel supported the Chairman's suggestion to Cabinet.

A Member queried what would happen to the budgeted £72m Capital money over the next three years if it was not used for the Metropolitan Line Extension. In response the Panel noted that the money was not predominately the County

Council's money and it was money that would have been received through the LEP and third party contributions. The Panel were informed that a certain amount of Capital money had already been committed. Members agreed the infrastructure fund for sustainable planning and the new team were welcome and there was an opportunity for Members to put forward schemes for consideration.

Conclusions:

That the Panel:

1. supported the Integrated Plan Proposals in relation to Environment, Planning & Transport
2. recommended to Cabinet that Cabinet consider deferring the increase in the price of the SaverCard if other efficiencies have been identified through the budget process
3. also identified any issues that it felt that the Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals. These are outlined in the preceding text'

5. Education, Libraries and Localism Cabinet Panel - Schools (6 February 2018)

The Cabinet Panel considered a report which highlighted the areas of the Integrated Plan which related to Education, Libraries and Localism (Schools) in order for Members to provide comment.

Members noted that the schools budget remained challenging although additional funding of around 1.4% from the Dedicated Schools Grant was welcomed. A total reduction of 1.1% was anticipated for the schools budget.

In response to a Member question in relation to the figures on inflation detailed at 4.4 of the report, it was advised that just over an additional £21 million was required to meet inflation costs however £10.3 million would be available after taking account of other budget pressures and savings, leaving approximately £10.9 million of inflation costs unfunded, which was equal to around 1.1% of the mainstream schools budget.

Conclusion:

The Cabinet Panel recommended the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Education, Libraries and Localism (Schools) to Cabinet.

6. Education, Libraries and Localism Cabinet Panel – Non Schools (6 February 2018)

The Cabinet Panel considered a further report which highlighted the areas of the Integrated Plan that related to Education, Libraries and Localism (Non Schools) in order for Members to provide comment.

Members acknowledged that there was around a £2 million reduction in budget due to the cessation of the Education Services Grant. It was proposed that this reduction was met by seeking de-delegated funding from maintained schools to assist with school improvement. In addition, proposals were underway to consider funding options for Hertfordshire Music Service. It was noted that Hertfordshire Music Service had a budget of £500,000 for 2017/18, which was proposed to reduce to £200,000 for 2018/19.

The implications of the Integrated Plan for Libraries were discussed. Members acknowledged the options being considered for the service to save £500,000. It was noted that the recommendations for an Alternative Library Model, were due to be presented to the Cabinet Panel in April 2018. Members acknowledged the New Capital Bid for the replacement of Library self-service Kiosks. It was noted that some Kiosks were 9-10 years old and required replacing.

Members noted that Special Education Needs Home to School Transport remained an ongoing pressure for this budget, with a current overspend acknowledged. It was noted that services were at a statutory level and the importance of the service recognised.

Conclusion:

The Cabinet Panel recommended the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Education, Libraries and Localism (Schools) to Cabinet.

7. Children’s Services Cabinet Panel (7 February 2018)

M A Watkin – by virtue of his wife being employed as a part-time teacher in the music service in Hertfordshire. He has been granted a dispensation by the Standards Committee to participate, debate and vote in business in which this Disclosable Pecuniary Interest is mentioned provided that the business to be considered does not directly affect his financial position or that of his wife; which he considered it did not.

The Panel was invited to comment and identify any issues on the areas of the Integrated plan which related to Children’s Services.

The Labour Opposition Member requested that his comments that, he was against the budget cuts to YC Hertfordshire and the Children’s Centres, be recorded in the minutes.

Conclusion:

The Panel provided comment to Cabinet on the proposal relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of the Children's Services Portfolio. The Panel also identified any issues that it felt that the Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.

8. Community Safety & Waste Management Cabinet Panel (8 February 2018)

Notification of a Declarable Interest: PV Mason declared that he was a member of the Ratty's Lane Action Group. No vote was undertaken on the agenda item and Cllr Mason was permitted to participate in the debate.

Prior to the report being discussed, the Chairman made the following announcement:

'All Members who have a disclosable pecuniary interest arising from an allowance from the County Council, another local authority in Hertfordshire, or a body to whom they have been appointed by the County Council, have received a dispensation to allow them to participate in debate and vote on the Integrated Plan.

All Members have been granted a dispensation to participate in debate and vote in any business of the County Council relating to setting the council tax or precept when they would otherwise be prevented from doing so in consequence of having a beneficial interest in land which is within the administrative area of Hertfordshire or a licence (alone or jointly) to occupy such land.'

Members were reminded that the Overview & Scrutiny Committee had undertaken a full day session looking at the Integrated Plan on 24 January 2018 where Executive Members and officers had answered questions from scrutiny groups. A report containing observations and recommendations from the scrutiny groups was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 1 February 2018.

It was explained that the Integrated Plan (IP) would be considered by Cabinet on 19 February before being finalised at County Council on 20 February 2018.

It was further explained to the Panel that the purpose of the report for panel was for Members of the Panel comment on the IP in relation Community Safety & Waste Management and to identify any issues that it felt the Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.

Member's attention was firstly drawn to the shorter of the two reports (document 4(i)) which set out the actions that the council has carried out to engage and consult with the public and partners.

Members noted that on page 5 of the report, which detailed the responses to a public questionnaire, that in a choice between service reductions and further council tax increases, 56% of respondents said that they would rather see an increase in council tax and 32% a reduction in services. It was noted that the graph at the top of page 4 illustrated that the percentage of respondents supporting a reduction in expenditure on

disposing of the council's waste was 26% (a reduction on the 28% last year and the 33% and 39% in previous years) while those supporting a reduction in expenditure on community protection was 17% (a reduction on the 22% last year and the 26% and 27% in previous years).

Members were then invited to consider the proposed Integrated Plan for Community Safety & Waste Management detailed on page 63 and 64 of the main report (document 4ii). It was noted that this contained the following elements; Key Priorities (pages 65 & 66); Key Pressures and Challenges (pages 66 to 70); Key Projects and Programmes (pages 70 to 72); Key Savings (page 72); how the departments have reviewed effectiveness and value for money (pages 73 to 75); and Risks in delivering projects (page 76).

The Panel noted the changes to the revenue budget were set out on pages 77 and 78. It was explained to Members that Service Specific Inflation was calculated to add £400,000 per year; Pressures add £2m in 2018/19 rising to £4m in 2021/22; while ongoing savings of £1.4m have been identified increasing to just under £2m in 2018/19. The total budgets for the services that make up the portfolio (page 80) totalling £78.8m in 2018/19 rising to £81.5m in 2021/22 and the capital programme Pages (81-87) for Community Safety & Waste Management to £30.5m over the four years of the plan were also noted by Members.

Members discussed the potential impact on the budget plans of the notification of a call in by the Secretary of State regarding the proposed development of an Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) at Ratty's Lane Hoddesdon, by Veolia (ES) Hertfordshire Limited. The panel noted that the Secretary of State's decision would add many months of delay to the project, but that, within the current IP period there are no immediate budget implications.

In answer to a question of what plans are in place if the ERF is not granted planning permission the Panel received assurance that arrangements had been secured for disposing of residual waste until March 2021 and contingency plans had already been considered. It was noted that the lack of a long term in county treatment solution would most likely mean out of county disposal routes would be necessary contrary to the proximity principle for disposing of waste close to where it's generated. It was agreed that the concerns of the Panel should be highlighted to Cabinet when making its final decisions in relation to the budget.

Members also raised concerns regarding the potential impact on the budget plans presented by the final decision not yet being announced by the Home Secretary regarding the potential transfer of governance of Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service from Hertfordshire County Council to the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Hertfordshire.

The panel were advised that a number of other local authorities were also experiencing delay in the decision regarding the transfer of governance within their own authorities, and as a result, discussions had taken place with the Local Government Association with a view to making a joint representation to the Home Office to outline the impact the delay in the decision being made was having on effective future planning.

Members agreed that risk to the budget plan regarding the delay in decision by the Home Secretary regarding the transfer of governance of Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service from Hertfordshire County Council to the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Hertfordshire should also be brought to the attention of Cabinet when making its final decisions in relation to the budget.

Conclusion:

The Panel provided comment to Cabinet on the proposal relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of the Community Safety & Waste Management Portfolio. The Panel also identified any issues that it felt that the Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals. These are outlined in the preceding text.

TO FOLLOW