

HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

**CABINET
MONDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2016 AT 2.00 P.M.**

Agenda Item No.

4(i)

**COUNTY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2016 AT 10.00AM**

Agenda Item No.

5A(i)

**COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE COUNCIL'S CABINET PANELS ON
THE INTEGRATED PLAN 2016/17 – 2019/20**

Report of the Director of Resources

Author: Elaine Shell, Democratic Services Manager (Tel: 01992 555565)

Executive Member: Chris Hayward, Resources & Performance

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 2016/17 – 2019/20.

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 2016 to consider the draft integrated plan 2016/17 – 2019/20.
- 2.1.2 At its meeting on 12 February 2016, the Resources & Performance Cabinet Panel considered the draft Integrated Plan for 2016/17 – 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(ii) 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 and Performance Cabinet Panel meeting on 12 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 2016/17 – 2019/20.
- 3.1.2 Cabinet's recommendations to Council will be considered by County Council on 23 February 2016.

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(iii) of the Council agenda.

Background Information

Minutes of:-

- Children's Services Cabinet Panel, January 2016
- Public Health, Localism & Libraries Cabinet Panel, January 2016
- Adult Care & Health Cabinet Panel, February 2016
- Environment, Planning & Transport Cabinet Panel, February 2016
- Enterprise, Education & Skills Cabinet Panel, February 2016
- Highways Cabinet Panel, February 2016
- Community Safety & Waste Management Cabinet Panel, February 2016
- Resources and Performance Cabinet Panel, February 2015

INTEGRATED PLANNING PROCESS 2016/17 - 2019/20: COMMENTS FROM SERVICE CABINET PANELS

1. Children's Services Cabinet Panel (28 January 2016)

The Panel received a report highlighting the areas of the Integrated Plan relating to Children's Services. It was noted that the core funding for 2016/17 had been significantly reduced by £24m, and although substantial efficiency savings had been identified, a further saving of £38.4m in 2017/18 rising to £71.4m by 2019/20 was required to meet the budget gap.

The Panel were asked to consider the elements of the Children's Service's budget in relation to financial pressures, savings and capital programme. The Integrated Plan report stated the financial impact of service plans and available funding to resource them over the next three years.

The Panel received a summary of pressures for change relating to Children's Services which included:

- Children Looked After (CLA);
- Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC)
- Adoption Reform
- Targeted Youth Support & Vulnerable Young People's Team – Leaving Care PA's
- National Living Wage for Commissioned Homecare
- National Insurance
- Revenue Effects of Capital LiquidLogic Children's Systems
- Youth Justice

Conclusion

Following general discussion in relation to the proposed savings for Children's Services at 4.4 of the report, the Panel commented as follows:

- a) Members had no comments;
- b) The Panel supported the savings proposal for Children's Services 2016/17, as detailed in 4.4 of the report;

It was noted that N Bell, L A Chesterman, R G Prowse and M A Watkin abstained.

2. Public Health, Localism & Libraries Cabinet Panel (29 January 2016)

The Panel received a report which highlighted the areas of the Integrated Plan in relation to Public Health, Localism and Libraries (PHL&L).

Officers reported that all savings proposals requiring a policy change had been taken through Cabinet Panel for Cabinet decisions throughout 2015/16.

It was highlighted to the Panel that the late timed (17 December 2016) Government announcement of a significant reduction and redistribution of central government funding, and Revenue Support Grant and other core funding (£24m lower than forecast) was a consultation figure and could still change.

Members heard that work was underway to make yet further savings during 2016 to be implemented in 2017/18 or sooner, and this would be brought to Cabinet Panel for consultation as soon as possible.

Officers clarified the 0% non-pay inflation would impact the PHL&L portfolio as it would reduce spending power, however it reflected the consumer price index. In terms of Public Health, the budget matched the grant.

Officers reported that it was proposed that there would be a 50% reduction in the Members Locality Budget.

Library Service:

Members commented that the library service already relied on volunteers, making further cuts to deliver the programmed £2.5m savings target difficult, and that generated income was unreliable.

In response to a Member's question over whether Library funding would be cut further, the Panel noted that further savings would have to be made in the coming years due to the cuts in government funding to 2019/20, and no such guarantee could be made.

A member of the Panel reflected that funding for Hertfordshire Adult and Family Learning Services (HAFLS) was modest. Officers clarified that they were looking to diversify funding sources and that £70k Skills Funding Agency (SFA) funding had been secured for Mental Health and that £5m of lottery funding was being sought to be used around barriers to employment.

Member's raised the issue of the amount of influence Hertfordshire Adult and Family Learning Services (HAFLS) had over the curriculum and officers clarified that certain areas were dictated by contract, however there was lot of scope to tailor it to specific targets. Public Health and HAFLS had worked together closely on joint outcomes.

Members Locality Budget

A protest was raised by some Members regarding the reduction in the Member's Locality Budget (MLB) who made the following points:

- The MLB was used by some Members to pump prime projects at a very local level and many of these projects signposted the public to initiatives aimed at for example, ill health prevention through exercise, resulting in a consequent effect higher up the chain in terms of public health;
- The small saving made by cutting the MLB would have a disproportionately negative effect locally;
- The Councillors' role locally would be damaged by the reduction of the MLB;
- There was little point in encouraging volunteering and then to cut funding that could be used to support it.

A query was raised by Members regarding whether any unused MLB from this year could roll over to the next financial year and officers agreed to consider whether this would be possible.

It was highlighted that the £10K MLB had been protected up until now and that Members would like it to be reinstated in the future if possible.

Members commented on the fact that, unlike the MLB, the Highways Locality Budget (HLB) remained untouched by the cuts. It was clarified that the HLB was funded by the Highways budget and that as there was a limited budget to spend on Highways a decision had been made to protect this area.

It was suggested that Members would need to prioritise their MLB to where it was most needed / most effective

In response to a general discussion about cuts to the locality budget, officers confirmed they would be working to provide guidance / signposting to other ways in which community groups could seek alternative funding / support.

At the suggestion that the County Council approach government to fight the cuts, Members heard that the Executive Member for Resources and Performance had made representation to government about the size of the cuts and the distribution method, and pointed out that a flaw in the formula used to calculate the cuts penalised Shire Counties. As a consequence the government were considering this issue and there might be some movement with respect to the cuts.

Public Health

Members voiced concern that the main County Council Public Health (PH) function was commissioning some preventive services from the County Council, and thus services would inevitably be cut. Members were concerned that different areas of health would be unequally affected because NHS services were receiving a financial increase while government was cutting County Council funding.

The fact that Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's) were receiving a 6% increase was noted by Members, also the need to ensure that CCG's received the message about focussing funding on health prevention. Officers acknowledged that PH would need to continue to work closely with CCG's to impress on them the importance of the prevention agenda and future savings that could accrue to the NHS by addressing preventable ill-health. The Panel noted that officers were looking at the possibility of co-commissioning with the NHS in terms of preventative care.

Conclusion

The Panel commented to Cabinet on the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Public Health, Localism and Libraries.

The Panel identified issues it felt that the Cabinet should consider in finalising the integrated plan proposals.

3. Adult Care & Health Cabinet Panel (1 February 2016)

The Panel considered the adult care and health elements of the Integrated Plan (IP), which detailed the financial impact of service plans and the funding available to resource the plans over the period 2016/17 – 2019/20.

Members' attention was drawn to the Future Strategic Direction for Health and Community Services (HCS), on page 13 of the IP, and were reminded of the strategic framework and supportive interventions as follows:

- To inform, advise and advocate for people and their family carers
- To develop community based services – to help communities support each other
- To enable people for the future – keeping people independent and safe
- Personalise people's care and support services
- Commission quality services and safeguard adults when they are vulnerable

The key pressures for HCS were discussed (page 14). It was noted that the cost of additional social care needs from demographic change amounted to £8.1m per annum. Members were advised that in order to meet the additional needs in Hertfordshire, 2000 additional adult social care recruits were required every year. It was noted that the Government's announcement to raise the minimum wage from £6.50 to £7.20 from 1 April 2016, and continue to increase this to £9.00 per hour by 2020 was welcomed, however, noted this would not directly impact front-line care staff in 2016, as most staff were being paid more than this amount. HCS were, however, looking to maintain a differential between the minimum wage and a competitive rate in Hertfordshire in order to attract and retain care workers.

Key projects and programmes that HCS needed to deliver between 2016/17 and 2019/20 were discussed. A bid to the HCC Invest to Transform fund had been made to take forward the Accommodation for Independence programme for people with learning disabilities; this involved converting existing residential care homes into modern supported living services. Demand for more modern and flexible day opportunities for people of all age groups was also a key area of work. Further projects were detailed on page 16 of the IP.

With regards to performance indicators, it was noted that operational performance data was collected nationally via the Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF) indicators. Hertfordshire obtained an average ranking of 73rd out of 152 Authorities across 24 of the 27 ASCOF Measures. Although Hertfordshire's performance was better than that of the Eastern Region and England averages across 9 measures, HCS strived towards a ranking within the top quartile, therefore all performance indicators were set with this target in mind.

Members' attention was drawn to page 20 of the plan which detailed the pressures faced by Adult Care & Health. Demography pressures for older people totalled £2.763m. It was noted that life expectancy for people with a learning disability continued to rise, creating a demographic pressure of £4.69m. This was similar for people with physical and mental disabilities, with budget movements totalling £326k and £276k, respectively. The Government's announcement to increase the

minimum wage to a national living wage would cause an increase in cost for care providers over the next four years – the IP makes provision for the authority to keep up with the national minimum wage in order to retain care staff; this pressure would continue in future years. £968k of the Care Act grant was being recycled back into the social care fund, as HCS had found more efficient ways to deliver the service; £1.5m would also be recycled back into the service which related to the cost of servicing deprivation of liberty applications.

During discussion with regard to attracting and retaining staff, it was noted that HCS used campaigns, such as the Herts Good Care Campaign, to promote careers in the care industry. The title of 'Care Worker' was also being changed to 'Health & Care Practitioner' in order to encourage recruitment within the profession. Further discussion took place around the use of privately run nursing homes and it was noted that HCS were in negotiations to see if an agreement could be arranged to enable the use of any spare capacity available. It was questioned how much emphasis was placed on 'safeguarding' when appointing Management within a care facility – in response, Members heard that all providers had to hold a Silver Membership within the Hertfordshire Care Provider's Association and all training was monitored to ensure the correct level of management was in place – this was reflected in the reduction of serious concerns being raised. Travel time for care workers and unpredictable gaps between travel time was discussed and it was suggested that this should be raised as an item for Scrutiny.

Members noted the existing and proposed savings as detailed on page 21. The use of community alternatives was queried, as the voluntary sector would find it difficult to provide Older People Homecare assistance (HCS024) with no funds available; it was also pointed out that locality budgets were being reduced. In response, it was noted that HCS would be looking for people to identify less formal community schemes, neighbours and friends to meet this saving in order to lower the level of statutory commissioned spend.

In relation to the capital programme as detailed on page 24, it was noted that HCS had proposed 3 new capital bids at the cost of £4.07m in 2016/17, with £20.7m of capital expenditure being required for the overall project. The supported living and disabled facilities projects were grant funded, however, £10m was required for completion of phase 3 of the Quantum Care project, therefore, it was likely that the authority would need to borrow funding to cover 2017/18 and 2018/19. Members' attention was drawn to the revised bid for an additional £1.52m on page 25, which related to part of the Quantum Care project (Bericot Way) and noted planning permission had been agreed and work would soon be underway.

Conclusion:

The Panel noted and approved to Cabinet the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Adult Care and Health.

4. Environment, Planning & Transport Cabinet Panel (2 February 2016)

The Cabinet Panel received a report on the Integrated Plan with respect to Environment, Planning and Transport (EPT) services.

Officers clarified that Agenda Item 4(i) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20 had been to Cabinet and set out the actions the County Council had taken to engage and consult with the public and partners.

The results of the consultations were summarised within the related report and appendices.

In reply to a Member's comment that responders to questionnaires were generally self-selecting, as only those who were interested responded giving biased results, officers clarified that the 'Citizen's Panel' was part of the process and responders to it were selected to be fully representative of Hertfordshire.

Members' attention was drawn to Agenda Item 4(ii) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20 and the revised budget gap of £38.4m in 2017/18 rising to £71.4m in 2019/20. Officers emphasised that this was subject to change from factors including final council tax figures and the final grant settlement figure.

Members heard that:

- the County Council's revenue budget for 2016/17 was £808, reducing to £798m for 2017/18;
- Revenue Support Grant was predicted to fall by 97% from £80m in 2016/17 to £2.7m in 2019/20;
- Council tax income was estimated to increase by 8.7% from 496m to £538m between 2016/17 and 2019/20;
- An estimated £43.5m would be raised from the Social Care Precept.

For specific Environment, Planning and Transport related matters officers directed Members to Pages 91 to 104 of the IP report.

Officers reported that:

- The budgets for Environment, Planning and Transport totalled £22.257m in 2016/17 falling to £20.48m in 2019/20
- Savings totalled £1.3m per year.

The key pressures being faced by Environment, Planning and Transport totalled £255,000 per year, rising to £305,000 in 2018/19.

The Cabinet Panel noted that the figures represented efficiency savings and previous policy decisions and did not require any new policies to be implemented.

Officers reported that:

1. the proposed capital programme for Environment, Planning and Transport totalled £21.9m (£1.1m of County Council funding) in 2016/17 and £23.3m (£8m of County Council funding) in 2018/19
2. Croxley Rail Link was largest item in this programme. Responsibility for

delivery of the scheme and any cost risk over the identified funding package had been transferred to Transport for London (TfL).

Withdrawal of funding to Transport for London (TfL) Buses:

Members queried the situation as regards the proposed cuts to the £390,000 of bus funding paid to TfL. Officers clarified that this figure was currently still in the budget. The Council had issued a letter of its intention to withdraw funding in December 2015 but had not yet received a formal response. Press reports indicated that TfL had said they would not be changing the relevant services. Officers informed Members that a paper was being brought to the March Panel to update them on the situation.

Dial a Ride:

In response to a Member's comment that the Adult Health and Care (HCS) Topic Group Scrutiny had concluded Dial a Ride (Env119) should move from the Environment, Planning and Transport portfolio to Adult Care and Health, officers reported that along with fleet services this was under discussion with HCS and it is expected that both services will move across to HCS in the next few months.

Flooding and Local Flood Authority status:

Concern was once again voiced by Members over the need for greater clarity over the role of the County Council in the protection of residents and properties from flooding.

In response to a suggestion from Members that the Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, lobby for more resources and powers from government, Officers confirmed that they were drafting such a letter for the Chairman to send to the relevant government minister and would copy in local Members of Parliament as matter of course.

The Cabinet Panel suggested that Members, who wished for clarification on where responsibility lay for keeping watercourses flowing, including enforcement powers, could attend the seminar on Flooding (touching on gully cleaning) on 24 March 2016. The aim of the seminar was to raise awareness and allow Members to request more detailed scrutiny of particular aspects of flooding if relevant.

Officers commented that as a rule of thumb, responsibility with watercourses lay with the riparian land owner, however the County Council had some powers to manage smaller water courses (ordinary watercourses) such as ditches and streams but this was a complex area and, following an increasing frequency of severe weather events, coming to the forefront of national debate. With respect to Sustainable Drainage, (SUDS) the County Council is a Statutory Consultee to the Local Planning Authorities (LPA) and the County Council Planning Authority. The LPA's can choose to accept or reject advice or comments. Officers emphasised that surface water flooding was the biggest issue in Hertfordshire.

Smart Cards for Bus Travel:

The situation with respect to the development of Smart Cards for Bus Travel was raised by a Member. Officers clarified that progress was still very slow and that

they were reliant on bus operators to roll out technology. In the long term, pressure from users would help to move this issue forward.

There were 6 approvals and 4 abstentions to the vote and the Labour Group requested it was minuted that they would be bringing forward alternative budget options later in the process.

Conclusion:

The Panel noted and approved to Cabinet the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Environment, Planning & Transport as set out above.

5. Enterprise, Education & Skills Cabinet Panel (4 February 2016) – Non Schools

The Cabinet Panel considered a report which highlighted the areas of the Integrated Plan which related to Enterprise Education and Skills in order for the Cabinet Panel to consider these and provide comment.

Members were advised that the proposed budget savings comprised almost entirely education costs. The Cabinet Panel were advised that the £310k efficiency savings proposed within the budget papers were a reflection of how the directorate were able to improve the efficiency of administration, photocopying and travel arrangements. Officers advised that the Directorate also routinely considered the possibility of deleting vacant posts and reorganising teams to avoid impacting upon service delivery.

In response to Member questions, it was confirmed that the £250k SEN Home to School Transport saving amount identified in 2016/17 would be achieved via new contractual arrangements.

Members raised concerns regarding the funding of school maintenance improvements. Officers advised that maintenance funding was received from central government and the capital maintenance improvement programme budget was held within the Resources and Performance portfolio. The Cabinet Panel were advised that Hertfordshire schools experienced particular maintenance issues largely owing to the age profile and nature of the building stock, however funding allocated to the maintenance of schools was limited to that received from external funding.

The Cabinet Panel were pleased to learn that in spite of concerns regarding availability of funding for schools expansions, officers were comfortable that sufficient was available for the programme through to 17/18 via Basic Needs Funding and Section 106 monies, which would enable the Local Authority to meet its statutory duty to provide adequate school places. However, it was acknowledged that owing to the complexity of proposed urban expansions, there were challenges to ensure school places are provided to meet the needs of new housing developments through planning obligations.

Conclusion:

The Cabinet Panel recommended the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Enterprise, Education and Skills to Cabinet.

It was noted that J Billing, A Joynes, M A Watkin, P M Zukowskyj abstained from voting on the item.

6. Enterprise, Education and Skills Cabinet Panel (4 February 2016) – Schools Budget

Members considered a further report highlighting the areas of the Integrated Plan which related to Enterprise, Education and Skills (Schools). The main pressures for change identified within the report were inflation on pay and prices (£9,237,000), National Insurance - ending of contracted out rebate (£11,429,000) and demography (£8,321,000).

The Cabinet Panel were advised as to proposed savings identified within the budget that related to Enterprise, Education and Skills. In particular it was noted that £2,687,000 identified in relation to 2 year olds, was a reflection of the 2 year old entitlement provision take up across Hertfordshire. As such it represented an adjustment rather than a saving.

Members were advised that the Dedicated Schools Grant announcement of an additional £2.1m of High Needs block funding represented the most material change to the budget. Following discussions at Schools Forum, it was proposed to use £1.3m of the additional resource to enhance the SEN strategy development fund and the balance to reduce some of the planned savings.

In response to a question regarding the savings proposals identified within the report in relation to reductions in spending on high level needs, Members were advised that savings requiring policy decisions had been taken through Cabinet Panels for Cabinet decisions throughout 2015/16 and as such, the full equalities impact assessments could be found with those reports.

Conclusion:

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

It was noted that J Billing, A Joynes, M A Watkin, P M Zukowskyj abstained from voting on the item.

7. Highways Cabinet Panel (9 February 2016)

The Cabinet Panel received a report on the Integrated Plan with respect to Highways services to comment on and identify any issues it felt Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.

Re: Agenda Item 4(i) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20:

Officers clarified that Agenda Item 4(i) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20 had been to Cabinet and set out the actions the County Council had taken to engage and consult with the public and partners. The results of the consultations were summarised within the related report and appendices.

Agenda Item 4(ii) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20:

Members' attention was drawn to Agenda Item 4(ii) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20 and the revised budget gap of £38.4m in 2017/18 rising to £71.4m in 2019/20. Officers emphasised that this was subject to change from factors including final council tax figures and the final grant settlement figure.

The Panel heard that:

- the County Council's revenue budget for 2016/17 was £808m, reducing to £798m for 2017/18;
- Revenue Support Grant was predicted to fall by 97% from £80m in 2016/17 to £2.7m in 2019/20;
- Council tax income was estimated to increase by 8.7% from £496m to £538m between 2016/17 and 2019/20;
- An estimated £43.5m could be raised from the Social Care Precept.

For specific Highways related matters officers directed Members to Pages 106 to 122 of the IP report.

Officers reported that:

- The budgets for Highways totalled £37.5m in 2015/16 and £41m in 2016/17;
- Savings totalled £674,000 in 2016/17 rising to £989,000 in 2019/20;
- Technical adjustments reduced the budget by £4.153m/year;
- Service specific inflation increase the budget by £2.765m/year;
- Other pressures added a further £1.3m/year;
- The proposed capital programme totalled £63m in 2016/17 (£29.5 HCC), £69.9m in 2017/18 (£25.8m HCC) and £78.9m in 2018/19 (£31.7m HCC).

Members queried why the £3m Projected additional Council Tax Income did not increase year on year to reflect additional houses in the county (page 20 of the IP 4(ii)). From subsequent research directly after the meeting, officers were able to report that the £3m was to reflect previous under-estimates by some districts in the Band D equivalent council tax. Increases in the number of houses were reflected in the Council Tax line which starts with £495.597m in the report.

With respect to Highways Maintenance and carriageway condition surveys, a Member enquired about footway condition and investment. Officers responded that this would be discussed within the TAMP APR report coming to a future panel.

In relation to the value for money (vfm) benchmarking exercise undertaken by the County Council for Highways Maintenance in 2013/14 (page 112 of the IP 4(ii)), Members commented that IP Scrutiny had suggested a nationwide benchmarking programme to overcome the challenge posed by the fact that different authorities

record data in different ways. However it was acknowledged that this would need to be led by Department for Transport (DfT).

Officers commented that should Highways England contribute towards the cost of reclassifying the A4146 to a 'B' road then the £200,000 in the budget for this would be reduced (Page 117 of the IP 4(ii)).

In response to a Member's question about the meaning of 'trimming' in relation to Street Lighting (page 112 of the IP 4(ii)), officers clarified that this was an energy saving strategy. The LED lights introduced to all sites currently in full night lighting did not require 'warm up time', so they could be switched on a little later than previously saving electricity and costs. In addition, dimming trials were underway to see if lights could be further dimmed beyond 25% without compromising safety, and the results would be brought back to the Panel.

Referring to Key Budget Movements (page 114 of the IP 4(ii)), Members discussed Unrecovered Highway and Bridge Accident Damage and Material Theft, and commented that it was difficult to recover this money from contractors unless very specific appropriate evidence was supplied.

In reply to Members comments that the Council should place more emphasis on recovery of monies for such damage, officers clarified that this was prioritised but that the potential sum recovered should exceed the cost of the legal fees incurred. The Panel suggested that planning authorities could impose a bond on developers for use to restore any damage, and that an enforcement regime was required particularly in respect of restorative works carried out subsequent to work on highways by the utility companies. Members observed that the relationship of the County Council with Local Authorities, who gave planning and building consent, was of critical to this issue, and requested that the recovery of costs for highway and bridge accident and damage and material theft be brought to a future panel as an agenda item.

Members commented on the need for general improvement of highways in Hertfordshire (e.g. sign cleaning, vegetation control and street furniture), and were advised that the Executive Member was working with officers to investigate whether there were resources that could be accessed for this work. Members were reminded that they could use their Highways Locality Budgets to fund activities not prioritised by the Contractor Directed Service. The panel were advised that responsibility lay with District Councils for clearing fly tipping and plastic bags on highways.

In relation to key pressures and challenges faced by the Highways portfolio (Page 109 of the IP 4(ii)) the amount of savings from reducing the Carbon Tax Footprint was discussed by Members. Officers agreed to report the overall savings to the Council using indicative savings calculations, but stressed that these would be affected by market sensitivity (e.g. fluctuating electricity prices).

Following a comment from a Member that Scrutiny Cafe had requested information separating Highways spending on Category 1 and Category 2, officers confirmed that responses were being tabulated along with other requests for information that had been made.

In response to a query from a Member about the Highways inflation, Officers confirmed that the Highways Specific inflation allocation was made up of two portions, viz. a 1.7% uplift associated with the Highways Term Maintenance Association index (which was under review) plus a further £2.3m to more reflect local market conditions.

In passing, a Member reflected on a death on a local road and that in time it might be appropriate to review the speed management strategy to recognise 20mph zones.

The Panel were reminded that the County Council were spending more money on Highways than they had done historically.

Conclusion:

The Panel commented to Cabinet on the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Highways.

The Panel identified issues that it felt that the Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.

The Liberal Group requested that their abstention to recommendation 4.2 be minuted.

The Labour Group requested that their abstention to recommendations 4.1 & 4.2 be minuted.

8. Community Safety & Waste Management Cabinet Panel (10 February 2016)

The Cabinet Panel received a report which highlighted areas of the Integrated Plan which related to Community Safety and Waste in order for the Cabinet Panel to consider these and provide comment.

Member's attention was drawn to the table on page 3 of the report which was amended by the correction sheet circulated separately which included a revised table. The Cabinet Panel were advised that the budget gap figures for 2017/18 to 2019/20 were understated in the original report and had since been amended. The revised table showed an estimated gap of £38.4m in 2017/18 rising to £71.4m in 2019/20, however, it was noted that the figures were subject to change from a number of factors; including final council tax figures and the final grant settlement figure.

The key pressures being faced by the services as outlined at page 65 of the Integrated Plan were highlighted. These totalled £771,000 in 2016/17, rising to £6.943m in 2019/20. Savings totalled £863,000 in 2016/17 rising to £1,020,000 in 2019/20. The total budgets for the services which the portfolio comprised totalled £109.7m in 2016/17 rising to £115.2m in 2019/20.

Member's attention was drawn to the proposed capital programme for Community Safety and Waste which totalled £5.001m in 2016/17 and scheduled to fall to £3.233m in 2019/20.

Following a question from a Member regarding waste management contracts scheduled to end in 2018, the Cabinet Panel were advised that contractual arrangements provided for extension to 2021 for which budgetary pressures had been acknowledged within the Integrated Plan Proposals 2016/17 – 2019/20. Proposals relating to the County Council's future waste management arrangements would be brought forward for consideration by the panel at its meeting scheduled for 4 March 2016.

Conclusion:

The Community Safety and Waste Cabinet Panel noted the proposals relating to the Integrated Plan in respect of Community Safety and Waste to Cabinet, no concerns or issues were raised as part of the discussion.

TO FOLLOW