

CABINET

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 19 April 2011 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.20 pm.

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Keith R. Mitchell CBE – in the Chair
Councillor David Robertson (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor Arash Fatemian
Councillor Ian Hudspeth
Councillor Jim Couchman
Councillor Kieron Mallon
Councillor Louise Chapman
Councillor Michael Waine
Councillor Rodney Rose
Councillor Mrs J. Heathcoat

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Anne Purse (Agenda Item 6)
Councillor Charles Shouler (Agenda Item 6)
Councillor Janet Godden (Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Liz Brighthouse (Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Jenny Hannaby (Agenda Item 8)
Councillor Zoe Patrick (Agenda Items 10 & 13)

Officers:

Whole of meeting Joanna Simons (Chief Executive),
Sue Whitehead (Committee Services Manager)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item

	Officer
6.	Huw Jones, Director for Environment and Economy; Rebecca Harwood (Waste Management)
7.	Meera Spillett, Director for Children, Education & Families
8.	John Jackson, Director for Social & Community Services
9.	Barbara Chillman (Children, Education & Families)
10.	Barbara Chillman (Children, Education & Families)
11.	Sue Scane, Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting, and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

42/11 MINUTES

(Agenda Item. 3)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2011 were agreed subject to the following amended wording (shown in bold italics and strikethrough) of comments from Councillor Godden on Minute 35/11:

“She highlighted ***improvements shown in the report in areas with which the Council had struggled for some time, such as caseloads for children's social workers and capacity issues; and finding concerns over workloads and capacity with which the Council had struggled for a long time. She also stressed the importance of*** suitable accommodation for people leaving care as it often unlocked access to jobs and training.”

43/11 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda Item. 4)

Councillor Jean Fooks had given notice of the following question to the Cabinet Member for Transport:

“Residents in Lower Wolvercote are very alarmed at the possibility that the Godstow Road bridge over the canal and the railway may not be strengthened or rebuilt to an adequate capacity. As part of the only road access to the village which is suitable for heavy goods vehicles, the bridge must be capable of taking vehicles up to at least 26 tonnes, if not 44 tonnes, gross laden weight. Until February this year, the County Council, in partnership with Network Rail, was proposing to replace the bridge with a new one which would take vehicles up to the higher limit. County engineers feared that if the bridge was removed from the capital programme, it might even be restricted to a 3-tonne limit – and probably Network Rail would only strengthen or rebuild to their liability, an 18-tonne capacity.

As an 18-tonne limit would prevent refuse vehicles, large construction vehicles, removal lorries, and other heavy goods vehicles from accessing Lower Wolvercote, I should like an assurance from the cabinet member that the County Council will either reinstate the bridge in the capital programme or obtain an assurance from Network Rail that they would maintain the bridge at a carrying capacity of at least 26 tonnes. “

Councillor Rose replied:

“In July last year ALL Capital schemes were placed in moratorium due to Oxfordshire County Councils need to aid the National Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government in its attempts to correct the massive deficit left by the outgoing Labour Government, in the hope we in the UK would not follow the route taken by Countries such as Ireland and Portugal. This is still the aim of the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition, and of this Council. All Capital schemes have been prioritised since that time by the Council. I am sure Councillor Fooks would be hard pressed to make a case for OCC to spend £3.6M on a bridge belonging to others in the current financial climate,

while, say, school classrooms are not built and prevent Oxfordshire's children getting an education. All Councillors have been made aware that ANY change to the Capital program requires an equivalent saving somewhere else, but Councillor Fooks gives me no clue as to what this Council should NOT do to release £3.6 million.

Councillor Fooks is also somewhat economic with the truth in stating that HGV's and dustcarts will be prevented from gaining access to Lower Wolvercote, should there be any change to the weight limit on the unrestricted rail bridge, as there is another route into the area. This alternative route does carry a 7.5T Environmental weight limit, but this only prevents access to through traffic – any vehicle needing access can lawfully use this way into the area. Should Network Rail only give strengthening or replacement to their bridge to an 18 tonne limit, then buses will be unaffected. This project was not envisaged to be completed within the Medium Term Plan, and I intend to keep dialogue with Network Rail over this period. I am also considering continuing the design side of collaboration with the bridge owners.

So the answers to the two questions posed by Councillor Fooks are:

1. The County Council will NOT reinstate bridge works in the Capital program in the Medium Term
2. Discussions will be ongoing with Network Rail, but I can give no guarantee on any capacity over 18 tonnes”

Supplementary Question: Councillor Fooks questioned whether the Cabinet Member was aware of the suggested alternative route and received an assurance that he had driven it several times and with his experience with heavy goods vehicles understood what was required of such a route. He noted that if the rail bridge was to be repaired then the alternative route would be the only access for vehicles for household rubbish collections.

Councillor Richard Stevens had given notice of the following question to the Cabinet Member for Adult Services

"Annex 2 to the Director for Social & Community Services' report to Cabinet on 21 December 2010 contained an Option Appraisal Summary. Option D was a transfer of "most" internal home support staff to a social enterprise. Will Cllr Fatemian circulate the Council's evaluation of this rejected option?"

Councillor Fatemian replied:

"Annex 2 to the Director for Social & Community Services' report to Cabinet on 21 December 2010 contained an Option Appraisal Summary. Option D was a transfer of "most" internal home support staff to a social enterprise. Will Cllr Fatemian circulate the Council's evaluation of this rejected option?"

This option was not pursued for a number of reasons which were summarised in the options appraisal included in the report last December

and updated in the report to the Cabinet today. The main reason was that any transfer to a Social Enterprise organisation would mean that under TUPE arrangements, current terms and conditions as well as pension arrangements would continue to apply making this option as unaffordable to people on a personal budget as maintaining an in-house service. As Annex 2 of the report on today's agenda makes clear this option would not make the service viable.

Small groups of staff are able to get around this by leaving the Council to set up their own organisations with their own terms and conditions. This is being encouraged where staff are showing an interest in pursuing this route. Under this arrangement they may be able to provide clients with a cost effective competitive service.

We reviewed in great detail what had happened in Essex in the formation of Essex Cares. However this service is certainly much smaller than its home support predecessor as well as being able to maintain its relatively high cost of operation by delivering enablement services. In Oxfordshire, enablement services are provided currently by Oxford Health.”

Councillor John Tanner had given notice of the following question to the Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure

“Does the Cabinet member agree that the proposed closure of Oxfordshire's largest recycling centre, at Redbridge, to the public during the week, will be a significant deterioration in service to the overwhelming majority of Oxford people and will the County Council continue to talk with Oxford City Council, which owns the land on which Redbridge HWRC sits, to ensure that, within the County Council's financial constraints, Redbridge is open to the general public as much as is possible?”

Councillor Hudspeth replied:

“I refer Cllr Tanner to the answer I gave to him to a similar question at December's Cabinet”

44/11 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item. 5)

A petition was presented by Angie Goff, representing the Wolvercote Commoners requesting Oxfordshire County Council to ensure that the Godstow Road bridge over the canal and railway remains able to carry heavy goods vehicles up to at least a 26 tonne limit, until and when it is strengthened or rebuilt

The following requests to address the meeting had been agreed:-

Item 6 - Household Waste Recycling Centre Strategy	Councillor Anne Purse, Shadow Cabinet Member,
--	---

	Councillor Charles Shouler, speaking as Efficiencies Champion at the invitation of the Chairman
Item 7 - Children, Young People & Families Service Redesign	Cllr Janet Godden, Shadow Cabinet Member, Cllr Zoe Patrick (as local member) Cllr Liz Brighthouse, OBE (as local member), Cat Hobbs, Save Our Services Charlie Riley, Save our UK Youth Clubs but speaking on behalf of an individual Club
Item 8 - Changes to the Internal Home Support Service	Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member
Item 10 - Charlton Primary School	Councillor Zoe Patrick (as local member)
Item 13 - Delegated Powers of the Chief Executive	Councillor Zoe Patrick, Opposition Leader

45/11 HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING CENTRE STRATEGY

(Agenda Item. 6)

Cabinet considered a report that set out and sought approval for a strategy for Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs).

Councillor Anne Purse, Shadow Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure, welcomed the increase in the range of recycling and the possibilities for re-use at the Kidlington site. She referred to the existing problems of fly-tipping and expressed some concern, being anxious at anything which made it less easy to dispose of rubbish which would lead to an increased risk of fly-tipping. She noted the enforcement activity and hoped that surveillance would also increase. In response to a question from Councillor David Robertson querying whether she would support putting cameras into vulnerable spots, Councillor Purse replied that she would support any action that was proved to work. All options to take action should be looked at. Responding to a further question about the practicality of electronic chips in bins Councillor Purse indicated that that was not necessarily what she was meaning.

Councillor Shouler as the Efficiencies Champion referred to the reduction in the savings set out in paragraph 46 of the report. He expressed concern at a trend at this early stage of the budget year not to achieve the target savings as it could undermine the validity of the budget and he queried what alternative savings would be found. He also commented on the public consultation noting that the changes were not as a result of such consultation

but that in any case where there were reductions in services then there was bound to be an adverse public reaction.

The Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure in introducing the report highlighted that it was difficult to make assumptions about the level of household recycling at sites given the success of District Council collections. He stressed that the strategy was about household waste, noting that fly-tipping was often commercial in nature. He understood the concerns expressed by Councillor Shouler but felt confident that the savings target overall would be met by the Directorate. The Director of Environment & Economy reinforced the assurance given by the Cabinet Member that the agreed target savings for the Directorate as a whole would be met from within the Directorate:

During discussion Cabinet Members referred to recycling initiatives in their local areas and also commented on the level of facilities provided. The Cabinet Member for Police and Policy Coordination referred to the high degree of cooperation between District Councils and the County Council. There was some debate on the merits of surveillance cameras at fly tipping problem spots.

RESOLVED: to:

- a) Approve the Household Waste Recycling Centre Strategy as detailed in this report;
- b) Authorise detailed implementation plans, including minor changes to the strategy, to be approved by the Director for Environment and Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Growth and Infrastructure.

46/11 CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE & FAMILIES SERVICE REDESIGN

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet considered a report that set out a proposed new direction for the provision of services for children, young people and families in Oxfordshire, including the creation of a new, single integrated Early Intervention Service and changes to the provision of Education Services and Children's Social Care Services. The report sought Cabinet approval to proceed with the implementation of service redesign taking account of the outcomes of extensive consultation, an assessment of equality and inclusion and a financial appraisal.

Councillor Janet Godden, Shadow Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families noted that consultation on the current proposals had been very thorough but commented that there had been two other restructures in recent years, the latest in 2008. She referred to the low number of schools responding and was concerned that schools and Governing Bodies were not ready and that attainment would suffer. She commented on the early

intervention proposals and would have liked to have seen more in the proposals about health and well being, highlighting the concerns in the consultation about the loss and dilution of skills. She felt that there was not sufficient information about the budget and to the financial outcome and reputational risks to the Council of the proposals.

The Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement commented that the previous changes had not been as far reaching as the current proposals.

Councillor Zoe Patrick, speaking as a local member referred to the potential closure of facilities in Grove and Wantage. She was working together with Councillor Hannaby to see what could be done. An application under the Big Society Fund had been submitted but there were many calls on this funding. She referred to the work of the Sweatbox and Beatbox and the high levels of local use. Beatbox provided a valuable service for people with learning difficulties. She asked that the Cabinet rethink how the service redesign would impact on those areas without a hub and what could be revised to help.

Councillor Liz Brighthouse, speaking as a local member, expressed frustration around contradictions she found in the paper between statutory responsibilities, the concept of universal provision and targeted services. She highlighted the position of Wood Farm Youth Club which was run by volunteers and noted that it was in one of the most deprived wards. She believed that the report did not look at the specific impact of the proposals on the families in deprivation and poverty. The proposals would lead to a lack of the universal services they required and she asked that Cabinet look again at how areas in deprivation could be best served to provide the best outcomes for young people. She commented that young people wanted somewhere to go and without the Youth Club were more likely to be perceived as likely to offend. The aim should be to help young people stay out of the higher end of social care provision. Some facilities had been given an extra year and she asked that Wood farm Youth Club be given the same so that a solution could be found.

Cat Hobbs, Save Our Services, speaking against the proposals for youth services commented that that it looked like a 100% cut in services with 21 centres closing to be replaced by 7 hubs, with satellites and some open access youth work and no funded youth worker posts. She highlighted the difference between targeted support and open access. Young people chose to access the youth centres as a safe space to learn, have fun and to be supported. She did not believe that the Big Society could cover what was needed and that this was not the same as professional support. She recognised that the Council had to make serious cuts but believed that the proposals would cost more in the longer term due to the danger that more young people would be at risk of becoming involved in antisocial behaviour, crime and drugs use. The most vulnerable would be hardest hit.

Charlie Riley, a service user of Oxford City Detached Youth Team spoke in support of the current youth service provision. She referred to her experience

of youth services and stressed that it was her choice to go and that this was important. She referred to the positive benefits as a result of the support she had received. Youth services had a huge impact on a lot of people and although there was a need for cuts young people had done nothing wrong.

Councillor Louise Chapman disputed the figures contained in Ms Hobbs addresses and reiterated that the proposal was not to make a 100% cut in youth work and said that it would be helpful to receive the information that was being used.

The Director for Children, Education and Families in introducing the report referred to the need to make savings of £19m over the next four years and that the service redesign would contribute approximately £5m towards those savings. She indicated that she had included information on the structure proposals and that the consultation feedback was currently being considered and there were likely to be changes to the final structure as a result of the feedback from staff and unions. She indicated that with colleagues from legal services, the directorate had reviewed its statutory responsibilities and the service proposals would ensure the Council continued to meet its statutory duties to children, young people and families. She confirmed that the Service and Community Impact Assessment had been reviewed in the light of consultation responses. The director outlined that over 290 children and young people took part in the service consultation and over 50 parents and carers responded. Partners were working with the Council to consider how multi-agency resources could best be used in supporting children and their families. The director indicated that the proposals would support the provision of good universal services, meet early needs and provide holistic support to those most in need or with complex needs, protect children and where necessary remove them from harmful situations. The proposals were evidence based and did require a significantly redesigned structure with staff working differently. They would be working in an integrated way but there would still be professional distinctions and youth workers would be part of this way of working.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families responded to the comments made agreeing that there had been a very full consultation. The balance between early intervention and universal services had been raised quite rightly but the localities approach would address some of these concerns. She gave an assurance about the continued importance of public health and provision of mental health social care. The use of multi trained workers would make access easier for families who would have one contact person. The proposals focussed on the front line. She accepted that there were risks but explained the context of the changes in relation to reduction in central government funding. The proposals were radical but based on outcomes. It was impossible to fund everything and she stressed the importance of local members acting as champions. She would work with local members. Referring to the position in Oxford she highlighted that there were 2 hubs plus satellite facilities in the City. The Big Society and Chill Out Funds were available to Wood Farm Youth Club. Universal services had always been provided by many groups over many years and this would

continue. She disputed absolutely the figure of a 100% cut referred to by Ms Hobbs stating that the reduction was amongst the lowest in the country being around 30%. Referring to alleged comments from a member of staff she was clear that the officer concerned was a hard working and dedicated officer and Councillor Chapman was certain that she would not have suggested that there would be no youth workers. She welcomed the contribution from Charlie Riley and gave an assurance that the City would continue to have some detached youth work. She recognised the skills of the youth workers and that young people did value speaking with them; she hoped to retain as many as possible

Referring to the contents of the report Councillor Chapman emphasised that the Directorate had had to make savings but that there were no cuts in direct social care staff for young people. The proposals ensured that all statutory duties were met. She explained the nature of the hub model stressing that they were not merely big youth clubs. They were places where all sorts of people would come for all sorts of reasons. There would be out reach from there and there would be satellites. The hubs were not magnets and they would work also through the existing 45 children's centres. She referred also to the Big Society Fund which had already had 40 expressions of interest some in areas that had never had any youth facilities. Some facilities affected were on school sites and she was confident that some would continue. With regard to the rest local members should be acting as champions for their local areas and she would work with any local member in this regard. She stressed that the Council was listening to staff and young people.

The Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement referring to comments from Councillor Godden stated that the proposals reflected the current position whereby primary responsibility for attainment lay with schools and the funding streams went into schools to support this. The risk would lie in not acting on this. Hubs would take ownership of families and see them through difficulties. Sure Start would go back to its core purpose, meeting the needs of the most deprived. Discussions with schools and governors were ongoing. The Directorate structure was aimed at building capacity to meet new expectations. Schools were rising to the challenge but would still need help and challenge. There would still be a role for intervention in low attaining schools.

During discussion Cabinet Members supported the proposals, with one member referring to the opportunity to provide a less structured approach making use of and developing the voluntary sector provision. He did not like the use of the term deprivation preferring to stress the future rather than the past. His area used the term 'Brighter Futures' to express hope in the future. A Cabinet Member whilst recognising the opportunities in the new approach vocalised the concerns of her local communities in and around Faringdon who felt that there were a lack of local facilities. She was working with them to access other funding such as the Big Society Fund but it was very complex. For remote areas transport costs were an issue. A Cabinet Member highlighted that Carterton whilst being the seventh largest town was not to

get a hub. There was a young population associated with the MoD facility many of whom had had a disrupted school and social life. He was confident that a building could be found but stressed that they would need access to a youth worker. He believed all such facilities would need such access and asked that consideration be given to the redistribution of resources.

Councillor Chapman responded that she liked the term Brighter Futures and that it was perhaps something that could be considered by scrutiny. She agreed that it was important not to forget rural isolation but hoped that the proposals also addressed that. With reference to individual facilities she stressed that the proposals were based on need.

RESOLVED: to approve the proposed service redesign and implementation of services for children, young people and families as detailed in this report

47/11 CHANGES TO THE INTERNAL HOME SUPPORT SERVICE

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet considered a report that set out the results of a 3 month consultation exercise into proposed re-provision of a range of internal Home Support services which employ around 320 staff and support 500 Service Users and that sought final approval of the proposed changes to service provision.

Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services expressed her admiration for the staff who provided a flagship service that was the envy of other authorities. She stated that she had spoken before about her concern over the speed of the changes and the impact on the ability to assist the most vulnerable users of the service. She was pleased that the contract would be monitored and she would be pressing for a regular report to the Adult Services Scrutiny Committee. There was still a lot more assistance required by staff who were required to adjust to a working life outside the Council and she urged continued support. The financial savings would not be known until the process was completed and she hoped that the changes would not be in vain with the savings not achieved. She sought clarification on Annex 2 and assurances about service continuity and cost for service users in the event of a service provider not delivering. She continued to have some concerns over quality and supervision and hoped that the Council would be sure of providers' ability in terms of capacity, expertise and financial stability before their inclusion on the contract list.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Services in introducing the report stated that they had listened and taken on board the comments made during the consultation. He added his thanks to the internal Home Support Service staff for their efforts. He praised the positive manner in which they had approached the consultation. He emphasised that the approach was largely the same as that agreed in December but highlighted the changes made following the consultation. He added that only 20% of services were provided by the internal service and that the cost was no longer affordable. In a recent

inspection the existing external providers were found to be good or excellent and he was confident that new providers would be found likewise. The providers were well aware of the cost structure so he was confident in moving the recommendations to proceed.

The Director for Social & Community Services stated that the changes were being proposed with regret but were necessary to maintain a viable service. This was largely accepted by both service users and employees. He understood the concern to protect staff and to maintain continuity of care. In relation to contract monitoring the Directorate was well used to dealing with the issue of service failure. The Contracts Team work closely with providers and this was the value of having a wide range of providers. They had experience of stopping provision where necessary and finding alternative provision for service users. Contracts were actively managed and they had 20 years experience of commissioning services. With regard to staff he believed that for many the right way forward was to become personal assistants. This allowed people to provide care for users on a personal basis allowing continuity of service married to the needs of the providers. The authority could provide practical assistance in this regard.

RESOLVED: to

(a) note the outcome of consultation with staff and Service User groups, and agree the changes to original proposals set out in paragraph 7 of the report;

(b) agree that the internal Home Support Service will cease to operate by April 2012, subject to satisfactory reprovision arrangements set out in paragraphs 10-13 and any other necessary actions required to maintain continuity of service; and

(c) request a progress report from the Director of Social and Community Services to Adult Services Scrutiny Committee in December 2011.

48/11 NEW MARSTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

(Agenda Item. 9)

New Marston Primary School is a primary school for 3-11 year-olds in the north-east of Oxford. Its catchment area includes Headley Way and Northway. Until recently the school had planned to admit 30 children each year. Due to rising numbers of children needing primary school places in Oxford, the school agreed to take more than its admission number in September 2009 and 2010. The school's admission number for 2011 was published at 60 and Cabinet considered a report seeking a decision whether to permanently expand the school to 2 forms of entry (with an admission number of 60), requiring an enlargement to the physical capacity of the school.

The Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement referred to the issues raised that related to traffic and access. These issues were a concern for many of the County's school sites. The Travel Plan was in need of an update,

RESOLVED: to approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of New Marston Primary School, Oxford as detailed in the report.

49/11 CHARLTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

(Agenda Item. 10)

In recent years the Wantage and Grove area had experienced a significant and sustained rise in primary pupil numbers due to birth rates and recent/current housing development in Wantage. Following local consultation, Cabinet considered a report seeking a decision on whether to permanently expand the school to 2 forms of entry (with an admission number of 60), which will require an enlargement to the physical capacity of the school.

Councillor Zoe Patrick, as a local member commented that the number of children in Grove and Wantage was growing. She had attended a local meeting on the proposals that had been generally positive but there were concerns over traffic. She referred to the plans to improve the car park and to the Travel plan. She accepted the loss of the swimming pool although it was a shame. She welcomed the extra space as ideally all local children should be able to go to a local school of their choice.

RESOLVED: to approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Charlton Primary School.

50/11 FINANCIAL MONITORING - APRIL 2011

(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet considered the latest financial monitoring report for the 2010/11 financial year that covered the period up to the end of February 2011. Parts 1 and 2 included projections for revenue, balances and reserves. The Capital Monitoring was included at Part 3. Funding changes and Other Financial Issues were included in Part 4.

Cabinet noted that the current report was the last Financial Monitoring Report before the Provisional Outturn Report to Cabinet on 22 June 2011.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Property commented on the amount of funding that had come through from a variety of sources since the budget had been set in February 2011. He referred particularly to the improved position in respect of poled budgets where money had been received from the PCT.

The Deputy Leader whilst recognising that the underspend position would assist the current year's budget sought some assurance that there had been sufficient resources available to spend what had been in the budget. The Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer commented that capacity was a concern but that there would be a focus on key deliverables. The Cabinet Member for Finance & Property added that the budget for the year had been set prior to the new Government giving rise to the emergency budget and the late settlement.

RESOLVED to:

- (a) note the report;
- (b) Agree the contribution of £0.266m from the Efficiency Reserve to offset the shortfall of in-year grant reductions as set out paragraph 56;
- (c) Agree the bad debt write off as set out in paragraph 53;
- (d) Agree the Pre-Planning and Archaeology charges set out in paragraph 72 and Annex 7;
- (e) Agree to defer a decision on the use of the extra funding of £1.941m, notified for services for which funding has already been agreed, until the outcomes of the consultations are known as set out in paragraph 67;
- (f) Agree that the grants provided for the provision of additional services of £4.295m are spent in accordance with the terms and conditions attached to them and are allocated to the appropriate Directorates as set out in paragraph 68;
- (g) Approve virements for financial year 2011/12 included in Annex 10 and set out in paragraph 73.

51/11 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

(Agenda Item. 12)

The Cabinet considered a list of items for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet together with changes notified at the meeting.

RESOLVED: to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.

52/11 DELEGATED POWERS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE - APRIL 2011

(Agenda Item. 13)

Cabinet noted the schedule of executive decisions taken by the Chief Executive under the specific powers and functions delegated to her under the terms of Part 7.4 of the Council’s Constitution – Paragraph 1(A)(c)(i) in the period January to March 2011.

Councillor Zoe Patrick expressed some concern over a trend evident in the schedule for short term contracts. The Leader of the Council stated that he was consulted before such decisions were taken and he gave an assurance that he always checked that the Monitoring Officer had cleared the decision to be taken and that there was good reason for it. It was usually a matter of timing.

..... in the Chair
 Date of signing 2011
