

Time began: 6.00pm
Time ended: 7:02pm

COUNCIL CABINET
3 August 2016

Present Councillor Banwait (Chair)
 Councillors Afzal, Bolton, Eldret, Hussain, Rawson, Repton,
 Russell and Shanker

In attendance Councillors Graves, M Holmes, Skelton and Smale
 Andy Smith – Strategic Director People
 Janie Berry – Monitoring Officer
 Martyn Marples – Director of Finance
 Clare Davenport - Director of Leisure, Culture and Tourism
 David Potton – Head of libraries
 Chris Nightingale – Outdoor Recreation Development Officer

This record of decisions was published on 5 August 2016. The key decisions set out in this record will come into force and may be implemented on the expiry of five clear days unless a key decision is called in.

36/16 Apologies

There were no apologies received.

37/16 Late Items

There were no late items.

38/16 Receipt of Petitions

There were no petitions received.

**39/16 Identification of Urgent Items to which Call In will not
 Apply**

There were no items.

40/16 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest

41/16 Minutes of the Meeting Held on 13 July 2016

The minutes of the meetings held on 13 July 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Matters Referred

42/16 Recommendations from Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Recommendations from Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board. The Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board met and discussed items contained within the Council Cabinet Agenda. The report enabled the views and recommendations resulting from these discussions to be formally shared with Council Cabinet. These were submitted to Council Cabinet as Appendix 2, prior to commencement of the meeting.

Decision

To receive the report and consider the recommendations alongside the relevant report.

Key Decisions

43/16 Reconfiguration of Children Centre Services

The Council Cabinet considered a report on the Reconfiguration of Children Centre Services.

As a result of the Government continuing to cut local government funding, the Council had to make substantial changes to its budget. The Council had already delivered £116m of savings between 2010 and 2015, with a further £45m to deliver between 2016 and 2019.

The report set out proposals to save £300,000 by re-configuring seven of the seventeen children's centres. (£151,285 building costs and £150,000 related staffing costs). It was important to note that there was no intention in reducing the delivery of Children's Centre services and the city would still be able to ensure that the Children's Centre core offer was maintained and its statutory duty was met. Front line staff would continue in the Council's employment to ensure delivery to the most vulnerable children and their families.

The seven centres contained in the report for re-configuration had been identified because they were centres built in later phases of the children's centre programme, and six of these were in less deprived areas of the city than the ten centres it was proposed were not affected. In addition, all of the seven centres were on or near schools sites, and it was proposed that schools take over the management responsibility and all running costs of the seven buildings. There was a strong appetite from head teachers in all seven areas to this proposal.

The proposal would result in the Children's Centre portfolio retaining responsibility for ten centres, with the following children's centres reconfigured:

- Mickleover/Littleover
- Chellaston
- Meadow Lane
- Oakwood
- Westend
- Babbington
- Spondon

Public Consultation took place from Monday 6 March 2016 until Friday 27 May 2016 in line with both Children's Centre Statutory Guidance and Local Authority Consultation Guidance. The consultation was completed through a variety of mediums including on line, paper format and focus groups with both service users and partners.

The Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board made no recommendations, however the Board wished to commend officers on the resulting proposals put forward to Council Cabinet on this item

Options Considered

1. Retain all of the centres with a reduced offer of services and opening times with a hope that this would reduce costs.
2. There had been some interest from Public Health and Voluntary organisations to use the buildings and this could be explored further should not all of the schools move forward with the reconfiguration proposals. It was important to stress that this would require any other third party to be able to cover the costs of their usage. Offering the buildings out to other organisations to deliver services would be a lengthy process and more of a challenge to ensure that services for under 5's could be delivered thereby reducing the risk of capital clawback.
3. Do nothing and make no savings.

Decision

1. To note the completion of and responses to the public consultation on re-configuring seven of the Children Centres in the city.
2. To agree the proposal to reconfigure seven of the 17 Children's Centre buildings and continue to operate a children's centre service across the city from the remaining ten centres.
3. To progress formal negotiations with schools on the process for handover of management, running costs and responsibility of seven Children's Centre buildings to the relevant schools.

Reasons

1. The Children's Centre budget had already taken a 67% reduction over the past three years. This had included:
 - A complete re-structure of the service from individual children centre teams into a locality model
 - A reduction of opening hours in half of the centres across the localities
 - The tendering out or closure of childcare delivered by the local authority in the Centres
 - A reduction in evidence based parenting programmes delivered to families
 - A reduction in the number of PEEP programmes delivered
 - Maintenance of essential spend only for the last three years which had prohibited any new developments taking place.
2. The severe financial pressure the council was under meant that all options had to be explored to make further savings.

44/16 Libraries Strategic Review – Options for a New Service Delivery Model

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Libraries Strategic Review – Options for a New Service Delivery Model. As a result of the Government continuing to cut local government funding, the Council had to make substantial cuts to its budget. The Council had already endured £116m of savings between 2010 and 2015, with a further £45 million to cut between 2016 and 2019.

Under the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), Libraries were required to absorb a further budget reduction of £648k. Savings on this scale, on top of those already made in previous years, could not be achieved without transformational changes to the current service delivery model.

To ensure compliance with the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, major changes to the service delivery model must be based on a needs assessment that had, at its heart, a full public and stakeholder consultation.

The paper included, at Appendix 2, the final report of a public and stakeholder consultation exercise carried out between November 2015 and February 2016. It went on to describe the needs assessment that was undertaken using the data collected during the consultation exercise, and a range of other information derived from various sources.

Based on the needs assessment the report described four versions of a service delivery model that would each, if adopted, deliver the required MTFP savings – Options A to D. The number of libraries run by the Council would fall from 15 to four under Options A and B, to eight under Option D and to 10 under Option C. A one page summary of the four options was provided at Appendix 4 of the report.

Under all four options it was proposed, subject to approval of a detailed business case, that city centre lending services would move from the Central Library to be delivered from a new 'Derby Riverside Library,' to be located on the ground floor of the Council House. Weekly opening hours would increase by 55%, from 33 to 51.

The Labour administration was determined to avoid the necessity for library closures, so under Options B and D the Council would work closely with local people with a view to creating a number of Community Managed Libraries, outside of its statutory offer. A financial and in-kind support package was proposed to assist local groups in establishing and maintaining effective volunteer-run libraries in place of the existing Council-run service points.

The report discussed the relative merits of the four options and one – Option B – was identified as the preferred way forward for Derby's library service.

Option B would result in the Council continuing to run the following four libraries: Alvaston, Pear Tree, the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library, and Derby Riverside Library replacing the existing Central Library. The opening hours of all four libraries would be greater than the current offer, with an average increase of 52%. The 11 remaining libraries would potentially become community managed, with a support package being made available to volunteer groups willing to take them over.

Since the Council took over responsibility for running library services in the city at Local Government Reorganisation in 1997 there had never been a formally agreed statement of the service vision and objectives. The paper sought to make good this omission, basing its proposals on the recent statement of corporate priority outcomes and on the findings of the public and stakeholder consultation.

The report recommended that the public and service stakeholders be consulted on the four options, and on the proposals for the future of lending services in the city centre. It proposed that following consideration of the findings, a further report recommending a new service delivery model be presented to Council Cabinet alongside a full Equalities Impact Assessment of the recommended option.

The Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board recommended Council Cabinet that contingency plans are drawn up as part of any proposals resulting in the running of libraries by communities.

Options Considered

During the course of the Libraries Strategic Review four options for a new service delivery model had been developed and worked up in detail. All four were described in the report. Continuing to deliver the service in its current form was not an option given the scale of the budget challenge that the Council continued to face.

Decision

1. To adopt the service vision and objectives described in paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 respectively of the report.

2. To approve the needs assessment ranking shown in paragraph 6.20 of the report, and the methodology from which it was derived including the double weighting of the socio-economic component (paragraphs 6.1 to 6.19 of the report).
3. To support the proposal that for the reasons outlined in paragraph 6.25 of the report that the Derby Local Studies and Family History Library be included within the Council's statutory offer.
4. To support in principle the proposal, subject to approval of a detailed business case and consideration of feedback from the 'phase 2 consultation', to relocate city centre lending library services from the Central Library to Derby Riverside Library on the ground floor of the Council House (paragraphs 6.26 to 6.36 of the report).
5. Subject to the Riverside Library project going ahead, to support the proposal to maintain a supplementary off-site stock collection at Blagreaves Lane Library, on rolling stacks currently occupied by the Derby / Derbyshire Joint Fiction Reserve, and the slimming down of the current Fiction Reserve to accommodate it (paragraph 6.37 of the report).
6. To support the proposal that, if the Council adopts Community Managed Libraries (CMLs) as part of its strategy for the future of the Library Service in Derby, a financial and in-kind support package be provided to assist in their establishment and sustainability. The precise details of that package, and allocation of available resources between CMLs, would be determined later in the Review (paragraphs 6.42 to 6.53 of the report).
7. If, as part of the proposal, any CMLs are established in Derby, to support the proposal principle that they be deemed to be outside the Council's statutory offer (paragraphs 6.54 and 6.55 of the report).
8. To agree the proposals for the core elements common to all four service delivery model options, as outlined in paragraphs 6.56 to 6.62 of the report.
9. To note the four versions of service delivery model described in this report (paragraphs 7.1 to 7.18 of the report).
10. To agree that Option B be acknowledged within the proposed 'phase 2' consultation process as the Council's preferred option (paragraphs 7.19 to 7.34 of the report).
11. To authorise a 'phase 2' public and stakeholder consultation (paragraph 7.37 of the report), which would cover and seek feedback on:
 - the preferred service delivery option and the three other options described in the report
 - the proposal to close the Central Library and deliver a replacement city centre lending service from Derby Riverside Library at the Council House
 - the working assumptions described in the report for the operation of CMLs.

12. Contingency plans be drawn up as part of any proposals resulting in the running of libraries by communities.

Reasons

1. Clarifying the role and purpose of the library service would provide a firm foundation for future decisions about a new service delivery model.
2. The needs assessment ranking provided an objective and systematic framework against which future decisions about a new service delivery model could be made. Double-weighting the socio-economic component gave some priority to areas of the city where libraries had the greatest potential to contribute to the Council's aspiration to try to 'close the gap for economic and social inequalities within Derby'.
3. The Derby Local Studies and Family History Library was not susceptible to the needs assessment methodology, so a decision on its future had to be made based on other criteria.
4. The Central / Riverside Library proposal enabled the continuation of city centre lending services in an appropriate modern environment while releasing resources that could be re-directed to support library services elsewhere in the city.
5. A supplementary off-site collection at Blagreaves Lane would allow the breadth and depth of the city's library stock to be maintained following closure of the Central Library. The shelves at Blagreaves Lane that were earmarked for it were currently full and some would need to be cleared to make space for the new collection.
6. Providing a support package for CMLs was more likely to enable them to get off the ground and then to thrive.
7. Excluding CMLs from the statutory offer ensured that the Council would not need to step in, and incur extra costs, if a CML proved to be unviable.
8. The core elements describe the services that the Council proposed to provide.
9. The options describe four strategies for meeting the MTFP savings target while continuing to deliver a service that complied with statutory requirements.
10. Option B was judged to be, on balance, the most robust version of the service delivery model, the version that offered the greatest resilience in the longer term for a much-loved service that may be confronted by demands for further budget savings.
11. Major decisions on the future shape of the service should not be taken without consultation with the public and stakeholders. Consultation would help Council Cabinet to objectively assess the options presented in this report.

45/16 Health and Care System Sustainability and Transformation Plan for Derby City and Derbyshire

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Health and Care System Sustainability and Transformation Plan for Derby City and Derbyshire. The NHS Five Year Forward View, published in October 2014, considered the progress made in improving health and care services in recent years and the challenges that the system faced leading up to 2020/21.

One of the consequences was that the NHS was required to produce a five year Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) which was place-based and should drive a new vision for the future of Health and Care services.

It was envisaged that the development and implementation of an effective STP should support the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) in its duty to encourage integration and in the delivery of its key objectives.

Given the closeness of the ambitions of the STP and the HWB, it was envisaged that the both City and County HWBs could have a significant role to play in the development, delivery and oversight of the STP. A recent Joint meeting of Derby City and Derbyshire HWBs considered the role of HWBs alongside STP development. The first stage in the development of the STP had rightly been about analysing our challenges within the Derby City and Derbyshire health and care system, whilst fostering strong local leadership and collaboration to progress the plan.

Analysis had identified five key priorities (place based care, urgent care, prevention, efficiency and system management). However, there were a number of other plans being developed in specialist service areas to support system sustainability and transformation.

The Council's Home First Service already worked closely with health colleagues to support the care system. Further leadership and operational integration opportunities may be possible to enhance the service whilst realising efficiencies. To frame these opportunities consultation was required with key stakeholders.

Going forward it was imperative that all partners agree system governance arrangements and processes in order to have effective partnership working to implement the STP.

The Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board were in support of these proposals and recommendations put forward to Council Cabinet in this report.

Options Considered

None.

Decision

1. To approve the further development and delivery of the Derby City and Derbyshire Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP).
2. To approve joint working with other system leaders in NHS and local government in support of meaningful health and care integration, improving the health and wellbeing of our population to reduce health inequalities.
3. To approve the development of clear and agreed system wide governance arrangements in support of an effective STP to achieve recommendation 2.2 of the report.
4. To approve consultation on an integrated delivery model for Home First services.
5. To accept the recommendation of the Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board to support these proposals.

Reasons

1. Supporting the development and delivery of the STP would:
 - Assist in achievement of financial sustainability across the local health and care system and help reduce the gaps of health and wellbeing; and care and quality.
 - Encourage health and care integration and assist HWB in meeting its responsibilities via the Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2014-2019 to improve the health and wellbeing of the local population.
 - Assist local government to effectively deliver upgraded prevention, social care services and public health improvements for our communities;
 - Demonstrate that successful STPs must harness the energies and knowledge of local government and health and wellbeing boards to deliver population health. It was acknowledged that a number of STP footprints were being led by local government leaders.
2. Supporting clear governance arrangements (whilst not altering the local, statutory architecture for health and care) would:
 - Provide a clear structure for organisations to work effectively together at scale and pace across communities to make positive progress in addressing the needs of their population, and delivering the Five Year Forward View.
 - Permit the incremental development of a different type of planning process going forward to allow partners to work across organisational boundaries

and sectors, and to foster necessary change not just in terms of process, but in also in terms of culture and behaviour.

3. The Home First service could be enhanced through integration with community health services.

46/16 Outdoor Football Pitch Provision

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Outdoor Football Pitch Provision. Rationalisation of outdoor football pitch provision in Derby was proposed over the next 3 years to support the delivery of recommendations within the current Outdoor Sports Strategy 2013-18, and contribute to savings of £60,000 within the Parks service within the financial year 2016/17 part of the Councils three year budget approved in February 2016.

The rationalisation programme developed a hierarchy of provision for outdoor sports through implementation of a “hub” approach. This provided a core of 7 tier 1 hub sites as well as working with community organisations to provide a number of satellite tier 2 and 3 sites.

The rationalisation programme reduced the number of sites managed by the City Council in 2016/17 from 13 to 7 for formal football fixtures while still meeting the demand for football pitches from teams within the city. The programme also aimed to increase the number of tier 2 & 3 sites managed by community organisations or clubs through asset transfer and work with stakeholders to assess future provision in Derby.

The 7 sites proposed to be maintained (Alvaston Park, The Racecourse, Sinfin Moor Park, Darley Fields, Chaddesden Park, Chellaston Park and Moorways) would act as tier 1 hub sites for outdoor sport providing in excess of 3,500 football fixtures in 2016/17 across all formats of the game including mini soccer, youth, adult men’s and women and girls.

The principle of rationalisation of football provision was approved as part of the budget consultation process for 2016-19; in addition officers had undertaken direct consultation with all city football leagues, current clubs using Derby City sites, and the Derbyshire FA.

The Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board recommended to Council Cabinet that the rationalisation process includes options to allow local teams and groups to continue to use and operate on home pitches not included in the remaining provision if they are willing and able to meet the financial and legal requirements of license agreements.

Options Considered

The option to not use a hierarchy hub approach and continue to provide management of tier 2 & 3 sites sustaining football at a wider number of facilities. This would limit the ability to contribute to service savings and impact on the approach to

focus resources across a number of smaller sites with the aim of improving the infrastructure and service provided at tier 1 level.

Decision

1. To approve the implementation from 2016/17 of the proposed rationalisation programme noting the key objectives to achieve service savings and deliver recommendations within the current Outdoor Sports Strategy while continuing to meet the demand for football pitch provision in the city.
2. To note the reduction in the number of sites managed for formal football without reducing capacity to meet current demand within the city.
3. To accept the recommendation of the Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board to allow local teams and groups to continue to use and operate on home pitches not included in the remaining provision if they are willing and able to meet the financial and legal requirements of license agreements.

Reasons

1. The withdrawal of facilities for league fixtures at the 6 tier 2 and 3 sites meant a loss of 24 fixtures per weekend over 11 pitches. The remaining tier 1 sites provided capacity for 318 fixtures per weekend with current usage on average 109 fixtures per weekend. Overall therefore there was capacity for an additional 209 fixtures meaning the 24 fixture loss was easily offset via the use of the proposed facilities. In addition the 7 remaining sites would be reconfigured to ensure they met the current trend in growth of junior football and static need for adult football. There would be an overall net gain in 2 youth pitches, 1 mini soccer pitch and a net loss of 8 adult pitches as part of tier 2 provision.
2. Savings from withdrawal of facilities for league fixtures at the 6 sites amount to around £27,000 due to efficiencies in staffing costs and maintenance.
3. A robust consultation process had taken place over a period of 4 months including highlighting the budget proposals as part of the Councils budget planning for the next 3 years. Consultation included direct email with leagues and clubs, delivering presentations alongside Derbyshire Football Association for clubs and leagues and meeting individually with stakeholders when requested.
4. Delivering the recommendations within the Council's adopted Outdoor Sports Strategy 2013-18 including "reviewing the viability of sites with only a limited number of football pitches and relocating to hub sites using the hierarchy of outdoor sports provision model, where this was feasible."

Budget and Policy Framework

47/16 Single Discretionary Award Scheme

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Single Discretionary Award Scheme. On 8 December 2015, Council Cabinet agreed

- the content of the Welfare Strategy for Derby and
- to publicly consult on the Single Discretionary Award Scheme Policy.

The Single Discretionary Award Scheme brings together the application process for Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) Council Tax Hardship (CTH) and the Local Assistance Scheme (LAS).

It also introduced the integration of a person centred and needs tailored programme of support. The support programme would focus on the needs of the customer and include money advice, digital skills support, housing advice, affordable banking and ethical lending, benefits advice and better off calculations, education and training and towards work support.

The public consultation included both the content of the Welfare Strategy for Derby and the Single Discretionary Award Scheme policy, along with the proposed changes to the application and award processes (Appendix 4 for the proposed Policy).

The twelve week public consultation on the Strategy and Policy ran from 24 February 2016 to 23 May 2016, with 17 responses being submitted via both online and paper questionnaires.

The Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board recommended to Council Cabinet:

- 1) that the scheme would be reviewed in light of any changes to the welfare system to ensure that applicants to the Single Discretionary Award Scheme are not disadvantaged; and
- 2) that any learning from the introduction of the Single Discretionary Award Scheme Policy would be passed on to others when appropriate in relation to the introduction of Universal Credit.

Decision

1. To note the consultation report and corresponding responses in Appendices Two and Three of the report
2. To agree an implementation date of 30 August 2016 for the introduction of the Single Discretionary Award Scheme Policy and service.
3. To accept the recommendation of the Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board to ensure that applicants to the Single Discretionary Award Scheme are not disadvantaged; and any learning from the introduction of the Single Discretionary Award Scheme Policy would be passed on to others when appropriate in relation to the introduction of Universal Credit.

48/16 Quarter 1 Capital Monitoring 2016/17 – 2018/19

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Quarter 1 Capital Monitoring.2016/17 – 2018/19.

The report provided details of the revised financial position for the 2016/17 Capital Budget for Quarter 1. This was in line with the agreed strategy of reporting capital monitoring figures on a monthly basis to Chief Officer Group and on a quarterly basis to Council Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

The report highlighted a Capital programme of £92,592,000 for 2016/2017, after reflecting revisions to the Capital programme of (£7,201,000). The changes required were shown in table 1 of section 4 and detailed in Appendix 2 of the report. Significant changes over £200,000 were also detailed by strategy area and scheme in section 4.6 -4.16 of the report.

The report also highlighted programme area risks on deliverability of the programme together with mitigation and a RAG rating detailed in paragraph 4.14 of the report.

A revised indicative programme for 2017/18 – 2018/19 detailed in table 3, paragraph 4.15 of the report.

A revised funding position was shown in Table 4, section 5 of the report.

Details of additional S106 required to be added to the 2016/17 – 2018/19 capital programme were detailed in paragraph 5.10 of the report.

Details of the Local Authority Co-ordinated Voluntary Aided Programme (LCVAP) funding.

The Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board made no recommendations, however, the Board wished to recommend to the Audit and Accounts Committee that particular attention is given to the quarterly Capital Programme reports to highlight and deal with issues around slippage and delivering elements of the programme within the timescales identified at quarter 1 as early as possible.

Decision

1. To approve the changes and additions required to the 2016/17 capital programme as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.
2. To note the revised programme for 2016/17 in table 1 and the revised indicative programme for 2017/18-2018/19 as shown in table 3 of the report.
3. To note the changes to 2016/17 capital funding as detailed in Table 4 Section 5 of the report.
4. To approve the allocation of S106 funding as summarised in paragraph 5.10, table 5 of the report.

5. To note the LCVAP funding allocations detailed in section 6 and Appendix 3 of the report.
6. To recommendation to the Audit and Accounts Committee that particular attention is given to the quarterly Capital Programme reports to highlight and deal with issues around slippage and delivering elements of the programme within the timescales identified at quarter 1 as early as possible.

Contract and Financial Procedure Matters

49/16 Contract and Financial Procedure Matters

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Contract and Financial Procedure Matters. The report dealt with the following items that required reporting to and approval by Council Cabinet under Contract and Financial Procedure rules:

- Addition of funding to contingency budget
- Reallocation of contingency budget
- Change to corporate capital receipts policy
- Review of match funding linked to previously approved external funding bid

The Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board made no recommendations, however the Board requested that it is kept updated on the future position in relation to the delivery of the Living Wage and potential impacts on the Council's pay line.

Decision

1. To approve the allocation of £64,133 additional grant funding received in 2016/17 to the Corporate Contingency, as detailed in section 4 of the report.
2. To approve the reallocation of funding from the Corporate Contingency in 2016/17 to fund costs associated with the implementation of the Living Wage allowance, subject to separate approval at Personnel Committee on 4 August 2016. The part year effect was estimated to be approximately £15,000, dependant on implementation date. Further details could be found in section 5 of the report.
3. To approve changes to the corporate capital receipts policy, as detailed in section 6 of the report.
4. To approve the use funding from the Derby Enterprise Growth Fund Reserve for the D2 Business Development Programme, without ERDF match funding. This was subject to the approval of our funding partners to the revised proposal, as detailed in section 7 of the report.
5. To kept updated on the future position in relation to the delivery of the Living Wage and potential impacts on the Council's pay line.

MINUTES END