



Council Meeting
Wednesday 25 January 2017

Public and Member Questions
and Responses



Derby City Council

COUNCIL – 25 January 2017
PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS

Questioner	Respondent	Subject
------------	------------	---------

Public Questions

A	Dorothy Skrytek	Councillor Shanker	Incineration of recycled waste
B	Brendan Connelly	Councillor Banwait	Council House catering
C	Steve Willoughby	Councillor Russell	Education, Health and Care Plans
D	Simon Bacon	Councillor Banwait	Legal costs relating to information request
E	Michael Winfield	Councillor Shanker	Election costs and electoral governance
F	Lynn Lambert	Councillor Repton	Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP): approval
	Liz James		STP: proposed savings
	Michael Giaquinto		STP: risk management
	Lynn Lambert		STP: consultation
	Liz James		STP: acute bed losses
	Michael Giaquinto		STP: moving patients into the community
G	Brendan Connelly	Councillor Shanker	Nottingham Road Cemetery toilets
H	Simon Bacon	Councillor Shanker	Air quality monitoring
I	Dorothy Skrytek	Councillor Shanker	Environment Agency consultation

Councillor Questions

J	Councillor Pegg	Councillor Banwait	Mad Hatters Tea Room rent
K	Councillor Naitta	Councillor Banwait	Leader's priorities
L	Councillor Ashburner	Councillor Shanker	Taxi Licensing
	Councillor Barker		
M	Councillor Graves	Councillor Rawson	Mackworth S106 funding
N	Councillor Skelton	Councillor Shanker	Voter ID
	Councillor Harwood		
O	Councillor Smale	Councillor Afzal	Raynesway Recycling Centre
	Councillor Graves		
P	Councillor M Holmes	Councillor Eldret	Resolution of industrial action
Q	Councillor Roulstone	Councillor Russell	Impact of industrial action
R	Councillor Poulter	Councillor Rawson	Asset valuation and use of reserves
	Councillor Ashburner		
S	Councillor Hassall	Councillor Afzal	Neighbourhood Working
T	Councillor Grimadell	Councillor Rawson	St George's Day celebrations
U	Councillor Care	Councillor Afzal	Recycling Tonnage
V	Councillor Carr	Councillor Rawson	Core Strategy Part 2
W	Councillor Graves	Councillor Banwait	Council House access
X	Councillor Poulter	Councillor Banwait	Budget Consultation
Y	Councillor Care	Councillor Russell	Education, Health and Care Plans

Z	Councillor Graves	Councillor Rawson	Alvaston District Centre
ZA	Councillor Care	Councillor Afzal	Highways and Transport Priorities

Public Questions

a. Question from Dorothy Skrytek to Councillor Shanker

Recycling collections are being dismantled to feed the incineration contract and previously recycled and recyclable plastics are now being thrown into the wrong bin i.e. the black bin.

Now that Derby is a Clean Air Zone, what is in the City Council's objection to the permit application to further worsen air quality in the designated Air Quality Management Area, through Shanks/RRS application to increase tonnages and incinerate reducible, reusable and recyclable plastic waste resources, in breach of the Environment Agency's position on Sustainable Waste Management i.e. that previously recycled and recyclable materials must not be used for incineration?

The claim that recycling has been reduced to 'feed the plant' is not correct. The operation includes a dedicated pre-screening system which will remove recyclates (including recyclable plastics and metals) before the waste is sent for processing. The Council's waste management section continues to work with residents to increase levels of recycling, and this is reflected in the fact that our recycling rate is one of the better ones across the country in its peer group. Additional money has been allocated under the Councils Delivering Differently project, to focus on continuing to divert potential recyclable materials from the black bin.

The plant is not increasing its waste handling capacity, the EA permit is being varied to align it to the existing planning permission which restricts the site to receive a maximum of 200,000 tonnes per annum. The air quality impact assessments produced as part of the original applications remain unchanged as they were based on the plant running at capacity 365 days per year. The Council's Environmental Protection Team has provided a consultation response to the EA in respect of the permit variation application.

b. Question from Brendan Connelly to Councillor Banwait

Is the cafe in the council house privately run and by whom?

The Council House cafe is currently run by Elior PLC. This is a private company.

c. Question from Stephen Willoughby to Councillor Russell

Where a child was assessed as needing an Education Health Care Plan (EHCP) as a result of a request for an assessment of Special Education Needs (SEN), what percentage of plans were issued within the required timeframe of 20 weeks in the academic year 15/16?

In the academic year 2015/16, 3 per cent of plans were completed within 20 weeks.

Up to the end of September 2015, approximately 17 plans had been completed in total. As of 16 January 2017, 211 plans have now been finalised and issued to parents, so this is an improving picture.

We are also tracking the new cohorts of requests for EHCPs. In spring 2016 a cohort of 36 plans were due for assessment within 20 weeks. 25 were moved to assessment and the others turned down since they did not meet the threshold for assessment and all 23 plans were issued within the timescales plus two exceptions which are recorded differently. 100% of the cohort, where exceptions did not apply, were completed within 20 weeks.

Since then we have completed similar cohort work. From 1 September 2016 onwards with each subsequent month being a different cohort. These are monitored closely. 83 new requests for assessment have been received in total since September 2016 and the breakdown by month for this is for September referrals received 15 – agreed to assess 10, October 17 referrals – agreed 10, November referrals 25 – agreed 17, December referrals 24 – agreed 21.

The first two EHCPs from the cohorts (September – December) have been finalised within the 20 week deadline to date. The cohorts are also all on track to be finalised in 20 weeks.

Despite dealing with historic cuts to the service which have impacted performance, I am very pleased that there is now an improving picture.

d. Question from Simon Bacon to Councillor Banwait

How much is the city council paying Eversheds to fight the Information Commissioners ruling that I should be given an unredacted copy of the joint waste contract and its associated documents?

The costs incurred to date for the appeal against the Information Commissioners ruling are £19,323 inclusive of VAT. The City Council will pay a third of that value, with the remaining amount being split equally between the other two parties to the contract. Further costs are entirely dependent on what direction the appeal takes but are in line with the agreed hourly rates for the Sinfin Waste Treatment Centre Project.

e. Question from Michael Winfield to Councillor Shanker

Given the current financial position of the council what was the total cost of the Allestree Ward by-election to local tax payers following the Conservative Group putting forward a fraudulent candidate. What governance improvements has the council made to try and stop this happening again?

Verbal response to be provided.

- f. **Questions relating to the Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) to Councillor Repton**

Lynn Lambert – STP Approval

Has the Derby City Council agreed to STP local proposals (Joined up Care) which suggest that the plan will lead to a reduction of 535 NHS beds in Derbyshire?

Liz James – Proposed savings

In the Sustainability and Transformation Plan, also known as “Joined Up Care Derbyshire”, which Derby City Council is required to “sign off”, reference is made to “£247m care delivered through Place...and a reduction in care delivered in specialist settings”.

What assurances can the Council give members of the public that the withdrawal of funding to specialist settings will not undermine the financial viability of these providers thereby threatening the facilities available to NHS patients?

Michael Giaquinto – Risk management

In the Sustainability and Transformation Plan, also known as “Joined Up Care Derbyshire”, which Derby City Council is required to “sign off”, finance shortfalls and delivery structures not being in place are identified as significant risks to the implementation of the plan. What is going to change in Derby and Derbyshire for these risks to be reduced or eliminated?

Lynn Lambert – Consultation

The council is committed to consulting members of the communities of the STPs plans. What has been done and what plans are in hand?

Liz James – Acute bed losses

In the Sustainability and Transformation Plan, also known as “Joined Up Care Derbyshire”, which Derby City Council is required to “sign off”, reference is made to the “Reduction of bed-based care – 535 fewer beds (c.400 acute: 300 within Derbyshire system)”.

What is the proposed breakdown of the acute bed loss between the hospitals in Derbyshire? Does this mean that 100 of the acute beds to go are not within Derbyshire? If so, where are these beds? From where are the other 135 (presumably non-acute) beds to be lost?

Michael Giaquinto – Moving patients into the community

What evidence is there that for moving patients out of hospital beds and into communities can be supported, given the cuts to health and social care services?

Six questions were submitted about the Derbyshire Sustainability and Transformation (STP) Plan – known locally as Joined Up Care Derbyshire. The questions are technical and beyond the jurisdiction of the Council to answer and the detailed response has been provided by the Chief Officer of the Southern Derbyshire Clinical Commissioning Group.

However, as means of introduction, as the Cabinet Member for Integrated Health and Care, and as a Labour administration, we are concerned about the NHS not being funded properly and want to see funding in England similar to that in France and Germany. As an administration we are actively campaigning for a properly funded, robust, publicly owned, free at the point of need NHS irrespective of what services are transferred into the community. Over the recent months I have personally met with members of a range of local organisations to discuss the STP and the Labour administration's concerns about insufficient funding to the NHS and adult social care.

As a Labour administration, in relation to the STP in Derbyshire, we like the vast majority of Councils have signed up “in principle “ to the plan and by doing so releasing more resources for community services, but only where it is safe and possible to release monies into providing better, joined up care, much closer to where people live. Our aim has to be to keep people healthy, offer the best care and run services well in the face of growing demand, respond to the higher numbers of older people with complex, long-term health needs, and the increasing costs for providing services. This is better than continuing to fund a fragmented, inefficient system that is failing so many people, and leading to delays in people being discharged from hospital. Similarly there are many people who could avoid going into hospital in the first place if there were more resources in the community to meet their needs.

Moving to the technical aspects of the questions, the Chief Officer of the Southern Derbyshire Clinical Commissioning Group has provided the following combined response to the questions:

One of the key principles for the STP is about sustainable services – not making the current organisation sustainable. This is about the STP ensuring people have access to the right service at the right time and that these services are clinically and financially sustainable. This is different to ensuring the financial viability of individual organisations/providers.

Excellent patient care is our priority. The work being done through Joined up Care Derbyshire is designed to make services more consistent in the future, to prevent gaps, duplication, and a 'postcode lottery'. Instead of continuing to work with an out-dated system we want to transform services so the care given matches patient need, and is offered in communities, rather than at a distance from a particular building. This is why particular focus is being given to providing more support out in communities. If people are ill and need specialist, residential or hospital care, that is what they will receive.

The STP recognises the financial challenge facing the health and care system across the county. The premise of the plan is to provide care more effectively and efficiently, particularly for those individuals who require the greatest levels of support and input.

We can make better use of our resources by getting care providers to work together more effectively – by joining up care.

Finance shortfall risks will be mitigated through:

- A greater clarity and transparency on the financial position across the whole of health and social care in Derbyshire – through regular reporting to the health and social care 'chiefs'
- Greater collaboration and financial management between commissioners and providers (health and social care)

Delivery structure changes will include:

- A countywide delivery structure supported by all organisations
- This will be a structure that 'ties' individual organisations in, as opposed to being separate and in addition to what structure already exists

Continuing to work as we do now, and not making any changes, is not sustainable – and crucially - patient needs are not being met in the best way.

The breakdown of reduced need for acute beds (see page 46, appendix 5 of the STP):

- Total = c.400
- Royal Derby = c.188
- Chesterfield Royal = c. 112
- Out of area = c.100

Sites of out of area beds include Nottingham, Mansfield, and Stockport

Other c. 135 beds:

- C.85 Community Hospital (from community hospital sites across Derbyshire)
- C.50 Mental Health (c.30 Acute, and c.20 community older persons mental health beds)

Elderly patients sometimes spend too long in bed-based care (acute and community) causing physical, psychological, cognitive and social deconditioning resulting in loss of independence.

In our system, 1% of the population (c.10, 000 people) account for 25% of NEL (Non-elective) admission and 64% of our NEL beds. Of these patients, once admitted, patients who stay more than 14 days account for 573 beds, of which 477 beds are used by patients aged over 65. These patients are usually complex in terms of the support they require and a fall often plays a part in their admission to hospital. In addition, over 95% of inpatient community hospital care supports people over the age of 65.

Patients are being admitted to hospital when they could be care for in alternative, more appropriate ways if necessary services were available. This includes care for our frail elderly patients but also ambulatory care for acute conditions (in particular UTIs and pneumonia) and chronic conditions (in particular Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) and heart failure).

We are not giving these people the right care they need and sometimes do more harm to them. We must find a way to change this.

Within the plan:

- Acute NEL bed reduction against baseline = 30%; evidence suggests c50% of acute NEL bed days could be treated within alternative settings

- Community hospital bed reduction against baseline = 40%; evidence suggests c. 60% of community hospital beds could be treated in alternative settings

We are going to be talking to the people of Derbyshire about how future services could, and should, be shaped. Any alterations to current services would involve local engagement and, if appropriate, consultation. Any consultation would follow legal guidance and involve as many people as possible.

Joined Up Care is not new and engagement and consultation work has been taking place in the north of the county (Better Care Closer to Home).

Derbyshire published its STP as soon as it was permitted to do so (November 18 last year) and since that time we have been working to develop a variety of means for people to get touch, either online and face-to-face. We're working with Healthwatch Derby and Derbyshire to draw on their expertise to make sure this is done in the best way so the maximum number of people can – and will want to – get involved.

We will promote opportunities to get involved through websites and media. To keep updated on Joined Up Care Derbyshire and how you can get involved please continue to visit www.southernderbshireccg.nhs.uk

g. Question from Brendan Connelly to Councillor Shanker

What progress has been made on the toilet situation at Nottingham Road cemetery as it's been a year now since the council took this matter to task?

Since the matter was raised officers have been developing a range of detailed options for consideration by Members. These options, which range from renovation of the existing toilet block to a new building nearer the main car park, are currently being costed by contractors; this will allow the viability and affordability of the proposals to be fully evaluated.

h. Question from Simon Bacon to Councillor Shanker

There is a proposal in place to burn more waste at the Sinfin incineration plant - which risks reducing air quality further in the community around the AQMA for Nitrogen Dioxide. The council does not carry out monitoring in the area of most risk of air quality breeches at the junction with the Ring Road and Victory Road, the Environment Agency does not carry out such roadside monitoring either and RRS / Shanks waste refuse to do so. Will Derby City Council install monitoring at this site to help protect local residents from poor air quality which reduces life expectancy.

I can confirm that the Council has been monitoring air pollution (specifically nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)) at the junction of Victory Road/Osmaston Park Road, since January 2016. We also have a further two monitoring locations along Newdigate Street, also specifically identified as high risk areas within the air quality modelling produced in connection with the Sinfin waste plant planning application. The monitoring data is public information and is available from the Environmental Protection Team at the Council upon request.

i. Question from Dorothy Skrytek to Councillor Shanker

Shanks, the incineration company, has been in talks with the Environment Agency since March 2016, about varying the incineration permit to destroy clinical waste which will contain radioactive waste and mercury, as well as dangerous chemicals and infectious material. Yet the people of Derby have only just heard about it and have until 20 Jan to respond to the EA. Kindly confirm that the city council has asked the Environment Agency for an extension to the consultation period and how the council, taking full regard of its Duty of Care, is going to inform the people living closest to the incinerator, who will be most affected by the smell, the pollution and the noise, namely on Victory Rd, Caxton St, Dryden St and environs?

The Permit Variation application submitted to the Environment Agency by Shanks is intended to increase tonnages for waste sent through the treatment process at the site. The amounts currently permitted under the Environmental Permit are based upon an estimated 325 days of operation per year. The proposal for increased tonnages would allow the plant to run at capacity, based upon 365 days per year operation. The revised tonnages are, however, in line with the existing planning permission which restricts the site to receive a maximum of 200,000 tonnes per annum.

Councillor Questions

j. Question from Councillor Pegg to Councillor Banwait

As the Cabinet Member with responsibility for finance, please could you confirm how much the current lease holders of the Mad Hatters Tea Room owe the Council in rent?

We are pleased to confirm that following Council intervention, there are no rent arrears. However, there have been historically.

k. Question from Councillor Naitta to Councillor Banwait

Please list all of the projects which are "Leader's Priorities" from the start of your time as Leader to the present day. Please also state the full cost of each project and whether they are completed, in progress or still to start.

Councillor Naitta, the administration's priorities have been listed in numerous documents over the years since we took control of the council. You are privy to the costs, timescales and all the other information you could possibly want by visiting CMIS and having a look for yourself. As a councillor, you are even privy to exempt information considered by Council Cabinet. I am not prepared to waste my time, or ask officers to waste theirs, doing your research for you.

I. Questions from Councillor Ashburner (1) and Councillor Barker (2) to Councillor Shanker

- 1) What will be the expected percentage increase in Taxi Licensing fees for individual drivers after the decision at the last Full Council meeting to adopt the second, points, based licensing system?**
- 2) As a result of the changes to the Taxi Licensing policy, the Council is proposing to recruit an additional five officers to the taxi licensing team at a total salary cost of £138,500. By law, the cost of administering Taxi licensing in the City has to be cost neutral and so these additional costs will have to be recovered by an increase in taxi licensing fees passed on to drivers and operators in the City.**

If this proposal was fully implemented, what would be the projected increase required in the fees charged by the Council for the following:

Hackney.

Private Hire.

Vehicle.

Operator Licences.

Verbal response to be provided.

m. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Rawson

I read in a news report that the car park in Mackworth opposite the shop on Prince Charles Avenue was to be funded by section 106 money which has not been received so far.

It was reported in political literature that Cllr Pegg had secured the money for this installation. I understand that section 106 contributions cannot be spent until the council has received it. This installation was used as a political election issue so can you explain the financial implications of this installation and assure the chamber that there were no underhand dealings in regard council procedures?

The new Mackworth district centre car park has proven to be a very successful scheme delivering much needed improvements for local people and businesses.

The delivery of the car park was a scheme included in the Council's annual capital programme. The original estimate for the work was £550,000 with the full cost being met from external S106 contributions. The project is now complete and the final cost has come in significantly below budget at £475,000.

It is correct to say that some of the S106 funding has not yet been received by the Council. However, this funding has been paid by the relevant developer to Amber Valley Borough Council and we have written confirmation from Amber Valley Borough Council that the money will be transferred to us and that it can be allocated against the car park scheme. We fully expect that the funding will be in our account this financial year and it was on this basis that the scheme was approved and delivered.

n. Questions from Councillor Skelton (1) and Councillor Harwood (2) to Councillor Shanker

- 1) How do you intend to implement the requirement for voter ID at polling stations for the local elections in May 2018?**
- 2) Following a letter signed by the three Derby City opposition leaders and sent to the Rt Hon Sir Eric Pickles, Government has selected Derby as a pilot area for identification to be required before a person is able to vote at polling stations in the 2018 local elections.**

Can the cabinet member explain why the Labour administration is opposed to this happening?

This is not correct. It is wrong to suggest your letter has had the impact you state, because the Cabinet Office has not yet made any decisions about a pilot scheme for May 2018 elections.

The Government's response "A Democracy that works for Everyone: A Clear and Secure Democracy" to Sir Eric Pickles review of electoral fraud does not say that Derby and the other 17 authorities are automatically included in a pilot scheme.

Once an invitation for volunteers is received, we intend to participate fully.

o. Questions from Councillor Smale (1) and Councillor Graves (2) to Councillor Afzal

- 1) With no refuse collections over the Christmas period, the refuse site at Raynesway was once again put under severe pressure to meet demand. The queues to access the site were excessive and caused significant disruption to the businesses on the industrial estate.**
- 2) Can the council confirm a plan is still being devised to resolve this on-going issue or is there no longer a plan?**

I do believe that this Labour Council likes to rely on the 'let's not talk about it and it will go away' syndrome. That is why I, as a dedicated local councillor I have to remind the council what they said and what has been overlooked.

The last time the Raynesway Recycling Centre was mentioned, by myself and Cllr Smale, you failed to answer a direct question, that of where the allocated funding had gone for alleviating the queueing problems for the Recycling Centre. Could you detail what happened to the budget allocation, for me, the local businesses and residents that are affected by the queues.

You also stated very clearly that these queues did not compound fly tipping incidents. Yet fly tipping is on the increase. Can you explain the logic in your thinking on this?

We have been working with our operators to look at a number of options to improve traffic flow and reduce waiting times at the site. The site is very limited in its size and not without its problems but we have now settled on a series of improvements which will reduce the impact on the surrounding area during peak demand. As all Household Waste Recycling Centres are included in the Derby and Derbyshire Long Term Waste Management contract, the improvements require a contract change. This involves legal agreement to the changes with the site operators, the waste disposal contractors and the investment banks providing the funding. These changes are in the process of being agreed and whilst we don't foresee any problems, this process does take some time. Subject to legal agreements the work is programmed for Q1 17/18.

The funding for the improvements is included within the 17/18 draft Local Transport Plan (LTP) programme which will go before Cabinet in March 2017.

Fly tipping is on the increase across the UK at an average of approximately 5% per year (LGA). The picture in Derby is somewhat mixed and whilst we saw increases from 2011 through to 2014, in 2015 the number of fly-tipping incidents actually dropped by 26% from the 2014 figures. The 2016 figures show an increase again but still below the levels of 2014. There are a number of external factors which influence these figures but it's clear that there's no relationship between fly-tipping incidents and the queues at Raynesway.

p. Question from Councillor M Holmes to Councillor Eldret

The Council appears no nearer settlement with Unison and the school teaching assistants / support staff that they represent.

Why has the council failed to secure a way forward to resolve this on-going dispute?

The issue of job evaluation and school support staff receiving the same amount of pay for an official 32.5 hour week and a 39 or 40 week year as other employees receive for a 37 hour week and 44/45 week year has been a long running issue. The Council has had no option other than to address these issues and this has led to an increase in pay for some school support staff, no change for some and a reduction for others.

To try to offset these losses, we have asked all the schools to offer extra hours and weeks to their staff, and all but three out of our seventy schools have managed to do this to some extent.

Our figures show that, despite what is quoted so often in the media, no more than 40 employees out of 2700 have lost 25% and many of those have been offered additional hours and weeks but either cannot or do not want to accept the additional commitment – that is entirely their choice.

Nevertheless, we remain very aware of the significant impact for this small number of staff. That is why we have made three offers over many months of negotiations. Our most recent offer would have cost the Council and schools a further £1.1m and included in excess of half a million pounds to help schools fund further mitigation.

We are working very hard to find a solution and the Council is very keen to get to an agreement and end these strikes.

q. Question from Councillor Roulstone to Councillor Russell

Does the Cabinet Member acknowledge that, far from "being minimal" as has been quoted by the council, the industrial action by Derby's Teaching Assistants is having a disproportionate and profound effect on the day-to-day lives and education of children with special needs as well as their families?

It is important to set the context and the offer which has been made to Unison members. We implemented job evaluation in June 2016 as required by National Agreement of which UNISON was a signatory. A number of employees saw an increase in pay, some stayed the same and others a decrease. However some school support staff were contracted to work 32.5 hours in term time only (39 weeks) but were receiving the same rate of pay as other school and council staff working 37 hours and a full year i.e. 44 or 45 weeks – this could not be allowed to continue – we have to be fair to the entirety of our workforce. We have worked hard with our three Trade Unions to introduce this major change so as to minimise the impact on staff and indeed the majority of schools have offered their staff extra hours or weeks to make up some or all of the reduction.

Despite our best effort approximately 350 out of 2700 school support staff have taken industrial action over a period of 7 months. Thanks to the efforts of the remaining dedicated staff, our Head Teachers, Teachers and volunteers from the community we have managed to keep all but 13 of our 70 schools almost fully functioning and of the 13 the remaining staff have kept all but two to five open each day. However we certainly acknowledge that this disruption has a significant impact on the education of the children in those schools.

The Council has made three separate offers to UNISON to end this and yet UNISON have not moved in their demands and I would encourage UNISON to work with the Council to resolve this dispute as quickly as possible.

**r. Questions from Councillor Poulter (1) and Councillor Ashburner (2)
to Councillor Rawson**

- 1) £550k was agreed last week by cabinet to fund work by consultants to carry out an audit of the Council's assets. This is as a result of council officers failing in their duties to carry out the work properly.**

On what date and under what circumstances were the issues with the Council's assets audit records first discovered or acknowledged by senior Council officers and when were they reported to the Labour administration leadership?

- 2) Will the use of £450,000 to pay for consultants to carry out the emergency valuation of Derby City property reduce the reserves below the Government specified limit?**

The Council's management procedures highlighted concerns to senior officers during September 2015 and October 2015. Appropriate action was immediately taken to fully investigate these issues. The initial investigation led to further formal measures being taken in early 2016. The individuals concerned left the Authority in June 2016. The full extent of the impact on the Council's accounts could only be established as part of the annual audit commenced by Ernst & Young from July 2016 onwards.

There is no government specified limit for the level of reserves held.

s. Question from Councillor Hassall to Councillor Afzal

Can the Cabinet Member detail how Derby City Council prioritises spending across the seventeen Derby City wards and can you confirm what resources, including money spent and officer time, has been given to each ward since the changes made to Neighbourhood Working by the Labour administration?

As agreed by Council Cabinet on 16.4.2016 neighbourhood working focusses on 12 neighbourhoods (based upon the nationally agreed indices of multiple deprivation and the available resources within the budget)
Neighbourhood managers, manage 6 neighbourhoods each and the 7 neighbourhood officers work in the following neighbourhoods:

- Normanton x1 officer
- Arboretum x1 officer
- The other 10 priority neighbourhoods x 0.5 officer

The neighbourhood officers are delivering work identified and prioritised by the neighbourhood board, responding to locally identified issues, associated with safer and cleaner agendas, alongside working with members and residents to build stronger neighbourhoods and communities.

Each neighbourhood officer spends 1 day per week on city wide work and agendas.

As also agreed at council cabinet the devolved funding to neighbourhood boards (£570k) was suspended. Therefore no neighbourhood boards receive any direct funding from the council.

t. Question from Councillor Grimadell to Councillor Rawson

Can the Cabinet Member confirm:

When and by whom the decision was made to remove, from the budget for the year 2017, the funding for St Georges Day celebrations?

When and by whom the decision was made to reinstate the celebrations for 2017?

Why there was no mention of St Georges Day Celebrations for 2017 in the Derby Live event calendar either online or in print?

The Council made a budgetary decision to withdraw funding from cultural events in February 2016. However, the administration has always recognised that it is important to retain a cultural offer. To that end, we made a decision before Christmas to revisit this and the inclusion of the St George's Day celebrations would have formed part of that. This intention was communicated informally to officers but no formal decision was made at that time as it was not required. The publicity in relation to St George's Day brought the matter forward, which is why we announced what we had planned to announce in February – that the St George's Day celebrations will go ahead as normal in 2017. This is also why it was not being promoted by Derby LIVE at the time.

u. Question from Councillor Care to Councillor Afzal

What are the most recent waste and recycling tonnages available for Derby, preferably for 2014-15, 2015-16 and the current year to date, with a breakdown by ward or postcode/geographic area if available?

What tonnage of recycling is being collected from bring sites operated by the council following the removal of blue bin collections from some areas?

What is the current cost, per tonne, for the disposal of each of black bin waste, recycling from blue bins and brown bin waste?

2014/15	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total for 2014/15
Household waste sent for recycling, reuse or composting (tonnes)	10,000.11	10,044.87	6,635.82	6,640.91	33,321.72
Total household waste collected for disposal (tonnes)	17,837.04	17,509.86	16,266.39	16,316.66	67,929.94

2015/16	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total for 2015/16
Household waste sent for recycling, reuse or composting (tonnes)	9,560.39	8,325.03	7,271.12	7,805.82	32,962.37
Total household waste collected for disposal (tonnes)	17976.60	18417.92	16518.41	15450.65	68363.59

2016/17	Q1	Q2
Household waste sent for recycling, reuse or composting	10,177.39	10951.81

(tonnes)		
Total household waste collected for disposal (tonnes)	17086.03	17167.87

Please note that Q2 2016/17 tonnages have yet to be validated by Waste Data Flow so may be subject to change.

We are unable to give tonnage information in geographical detail due to the nature of our tonnage reporting systems.

What tonnage of recycling is being collected from bring sites operated by the council following the removal of blue bin collections from some areas?

The few bring sites we operate are emptied by vehicles that carry out other work and therefore we are unable to identify separate tonnages.

What is the current cost, per tonne, for the disposal of each of black bin waste, recycling from blue bins and brown bin waste?

Black bin waste = £123.66 per tonne

Blue bin waste = £11.50 per tonne (please note that this value varies slightly dependant on contamination levels and annual tonnages)

Brown bin waste = £42 per tonne

v. Question from Councillor Carr to Councillor Rawson

Now that Part 1 of the Core Strategy has been agreed, it is vital for Derby that Part 2 be completed as soon as possible.

Can the Cabinet Member please tell Council the definitive date when this will be done?

Where so many other authorities have stalled it was an achievement to successfully get agreement for our Part 1 from the Planning Inspectorate. Part 2 is a more detailed piece of work adding flesh to those established bones of Part 1 and I agree that it is vital to get this prepared as quickly as possible.

As you may know to be successful Local Plans requires robust evidence based proposals that require thorough consultation and assessment.

It is not possible at the moment to say exactly how long this will take as it will still need to address a number of complex issues, such as giving a statutory framework to our City Centre master plan and considering the need for additional housing allocations. However, we are working to a timetable that would see it submitted for Examination within the next couple of years or so.

As there are so many variables in this complex process there is no definitive date but that is the time line that we are currently working towards.

w. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Banwait

In June 2016 this council was embarrassed by the Grant Thornton Public Interest Report. It criticised a great deal of dubious activity by the Labour Cabinet and officer procedures. The fallout from this still hangs over the council like a dirty shadow.

Today I would like to focus on the progress in Recommendation 10 and 11 of the report. Recommendation 10 states “The council should ensure that clear guidance is issued regarding the operation of the political cabinet PCCM and to ensure that both officers and members (councillors) understand it is not a properly constituted committee of the council and has no authority to make decisions.” And Recommendation 11 states “The council should develop guidance to ensure that persons who are not members (councillors) or officers do not attend Council meetings or access restricted papers.”

Actions from those recommendations were: Review the terms of reference of the PCCM to clarify the remit and responsibilities of this group in light of good governance standards; prepare and issue a guidance note; undertake an evaluation as to how PCCM is working; and regularly review and monitor progress. All these had dates ranging from July 2016 to December 2016 to complete.

You can imagine my surprise when one of the more serious issues was the provision of an official council pass and the attendance of, the Labour Party Agent at these meetings showed complete contempt when I filmed him at the PCCM meeting on 5th January 2017. Made worse by the fact that he had not been signed in under council procedural rules. His suspicious behaviour of trying to hide his face and then shouting abuse down the corridor at me leaves me with the concern that the Grant Thornton report is being sidelined by members of this political party.

**I am further dismayed that the official line is that the computer system was down (conveniently) that morning despite it working at 10am and no mention from operators there was any problems that morning.
Can you advise the chamber on what progress has been made on these two recommendations?**

Positive progress against all of the recommendations arising from the Public Interest Report continues to be made and is externally reviewed by the Council's Auditors.

Clear guidance was drawn up and implemented in July 2016, in relation to meetings of the Political Council Cabinet and a copy of the same is available from the Monitoring Officer.

Officers do not attend any meeting of PCCM unless it is with the prior approval of the Chief Executive, Strategic Director or Monitoring Officer and only then is attendance undertaken on an exceptional basis.

No Officers were present at the meeting you are making a reference to and I am advised by officers that the Council's Visitor Booking-in system was out of operation during the week of 2 January 2017 and was replaced by a manual booking in system.

x. Question from Councillor Poulter to Councillor Banwait

Can the Cabinet Member confirm:

The dates and number of days allowed for last years public consultation on the Councils budget proposals for the City and the number of public responses received?

The number of public responses received to this year's public budget consultation which ended on the 9th of January 2017?

The Budget Consultation 2016 to 2019 opened from 2 December 2015 to 5 January 2016, a total of 35 days.

In total there were 600 responses to the Budget Consultation 2016 to 2019. In addition there were non-survey responses from residents, schools and organisations within Derby, including letters and emails.

The Budget consultation ended on 8 January 2017. There were a total of 38 responses to the Budget Consultation 2017 to 2020, with 66 emails received to the corporate finance email address.

y. Question from Councillor Care to Councillor Russell

How many children and young people in Derby have a completed EHCP agreed by the Council, named school and parents? How many final EHCPs have been issued, but not agreed by all parties?

It is worth noting the history of the SEN assessment service. Cuts made between 2010-2012 reduced the service from a minimum of 12 Officers to 3. This was then expanded to 3.8 Officers. The service has been expanded in the last two – three years and the Vulnerable Learners' Service now has an establishment of 15 Officers, plus a manager. In addition, Officers are working on post 16 plans. The resulting impact of the reduction of Officers meant that in September 2015, only approximately 17 EHCP plans had been issued. The number of plans is now as shown below:

- a) completed EHCP agreed by the Council, named school and parents =211
- b) Plans out for consultation with schools and parents = 94

How many children and young people are currently awaiting completion of their EHCPs? Please break the numbers down by new plans and conversions.

It is worth noting that the council is intending to go to tender to procure a provider who may be able to support the council with the conversions. This is a process which has been used in some other LA areas.

- a) How many children and young people are currently awaiting completion of new EHCPs? Please see answer 1(b) above.
- b) How many children and young people are currently awaiting conversions? Pre-16- = 353 POST 16 = 109. These are young people who are awaiting a conversion. Consideration will be given to a further 680 in the future.

How many children and young people will be requiring an existing Statement of Special Educational Needs or Learning Disability Assessment converting to an EHCP up to April 2018 as they transition between school stages?

There are 1142 young people who currently have a statement or a LDA. During the statutory review process, it is decided whether they need to be converted to a EHCP or ceased. Therefore, we cannot provide an exact number to answer the question.

How many other children and young people are known to need EHCPs writing, not included above, and why?

0

z. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Rawson

Six months ago I asked this council what happened to the capital investment for the Alvaston District Centre that was allocated some years prior as it seems to have disappeared without trace.

Unfortunately the last time I asked where the money had gone, and as is customary, you never answered the question.

At the last Alvaston Board Meeting the Chairman of the Board, Cllr Bayliss was questioned about this and he revealed he had no idea when the council would make this available.

It seems odd that our shopping area was divided into 4 sections in the first place and a quarter done every couple of years which has resulted in the last phase being overlooked time and time again. Should we assume it is aborted?

You cited in your last answer that it was due to Government Cuts and yet since then you have spent £510,000 on rings at The Spot (an area that was developed only two years previously, and now plan to spend over £2m on the Council House, again after a very large investment recently. It does not bode well with residents when you have made these investments and then rely on the usual 'Government Cuts' line.

Can you now add this to the capital programme and help us to attract a more diverse set of businesses other than takeaways and charity shops? Your help in this matter would be greatly appreciated.

A programme of improvements have been made to Alvaston District Centre, the most recent being to the Shardlow Road section which started in April 2014 and were completed in November 2014 at a cost of £1,093,000. The final phase of the programme, London Road, was programmed to start in March 2015 for full completion in November 2015.

Early in 2015 the Council's budget pressures forced a review of all Capital Programmes, and funding for non-statutory works, allocated to schemes not in contract or not able to attract external/match funding were taken out of the capital programme. The impact on the Alvaston District Centre programme was cancelling of all planned works, with the exception of a new pedestrian crossing on London Road, close to the roundabout junction with the Ring Road. This has now been implemented.

The designs for the London Road phase of works are complete and could be implemented should funds become available. Officers are consistently looking for external funding opportunities to support the District Centre programme, including Alvaston.

To address the point in the question about The Spot – the cost of ‘the rings’ was £51k (not £510k) and this was met out of the D2N2 grant. The full cost of the scheme was £1.25m; £750k from D2N2 and the remainder from DCC.

za. Question from Councillor Care to Councillor Afzal

When we agree our ward priorities for highways and transport it appears that highways officers also have priorities though these are not given to us as ward councillors explicitly, except as a list of identified surface maintenance items.

What is on the priority list for other highways work across the city, including changes to improve traffic flow, improve safety, support modal shift (including buses) and other elements? How is priority between these items judged (including cost and available sources of funding)?

The Highways and Transport work programme contains core schemes and also local ward priorities. Core schemes are identified by officers and are more strategic, in line with our Local Transport Plan priorities of:

- Asset Management: maintaining what we have
- Network Management: managing traffic flows,
- Supporting 'Active Travel' and Public Transport: supporting and encouraging travel choice

The rationale for selecting schemes does vary between our strategy areas, for example Highways Maintenance schemes including those suggested to local groups for selection as local priorities have been identified following the recent Annual Engineer Inspection, which surveyed every road and pavement in the city and identified the current condition, the next treatment required and the optimum time for completion of that work. All locations in the programme are included on a condition/needs basis and are evidence to central Government that we applying asset management principles and pursuing efficiencies and best value.

Structures Maintenance schemes are selected following our continual principal inspection programme, which we are statutorily required to undertake. Equally, Intelligent Transport Systems Maintenance schemes are also selected on a needs/ condition basis.

Casualty Reduction scheme locations are chosen based on the occurrence of personal injury accidents on our highway network, that are constantly monitored.

The Local Traffic Management strategy area includes a significant number of locally selected schemes, but also a number of core schemes, which are selected from a more strategic perspective.

Where external funding has been secured, this is often focussed on a particular area and the schemes included are as per the bid submission, for example Local Growth Deal Funding for Infinity Park Derby, for which there is an extensive programme of sustainable transport schemes.

In compiling the draft programme, the reality is that negotiation and refinement is always required because need and expectations are always in excess of the budget available. This is initially between Strategy Managers and the Programme Manager, but the draft programme is also ratified by Infrastructure Programme Board.

We always endeavour to include all locally selected priorities.