

South Cambridgeshire Hall  
Cambourne Business Park  
Cambourne  
Cambridge  
CB23 6EA

t: 08450 450 500  
f: 01954 713149  
dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15  
minicom: 01480 376743  
[www.scambs.gov.uk](http://www.scambs.gov.uk)



6 September 2006

To: The Leader – Councillor Dr DR Bard  
Deputy Leader – Councillor Mrs DSK Spink MBE  
Members of the Cabinet – Councillors SM Edwards, Mrs VG Ford, JA Hockney,  
RMA Manning and Mrs DP Roberts

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **CABINET**, which will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **THURSDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2006 at 10.00 a.m.**

Yours faithfully  
**GJ HARLOCK**  
Chief Executive

---

## AGENDA

## PAGES

### PROCEDURAL ITEMS

1. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** 1 - 10  
To authorise the Leader to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2006 as a correct record.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

### RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

3. **Adoption of Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 - Sex Establishments** 11 - 12  
Cabinet is requested to recommend to Council the attached minute extract from the Licensing Committee and Environmental Health Portfolio Holder.

4. **Treatment of Receipts from Repaid Capital Grants** 13 - 16

5. **Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) Checks for Councillors** 17 - 26

### POLICY ITEMS

6. **'State of the Nation' Report** 27 - 38

7. **Biodiversity Strategy** 39 - 42  
A copy of the Biodiversity Strategy is enclosed separately for members of Cabinet; it can also be viewed on the Council's website at [www.scambs.gov.uk](http://www.scambs.gov.uk).

|            |  |                 |
|------------|--|-----------------|
| <b>8.</b>  | <b>Whistleblowing Policy</b>   | <b>43 - 56</b>  |
|            | <b>OPERATIONAL ITEMS</b>   |                 |
| <b>9.</b>  | <b>Performance Management - First Quarter 2006/07</b>  | <b>57 - 76</b>  |
| <b>10.</b> | <b>Sub-Regional Choice-Based Lettings Scheme: Pre-Consultation Draft Lettings Policy</b>   | <b>77 - 80</b>  |
| <b>11.</b> | <b>Abingtons By-election</b>   | <b>81 - 82</b>  |
|            | <b>INFORMATION ITEMS</b>   |                 |
| <b>12.</b> | <b>Treasury Management</b>   | <b>83 - 88</b>  |
|            | <b>STANDING ITEMS</b>  |                 |
|            | <b>MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE</b>   |                 |
| <b>13.</b> | <p><b>Call-in to Scrutiny &amp; Overview Committee</b><br/> The Scrutiny and Overview Committee on 20 July 2006 made a recommendation to Council regarding the call-in of the decision made regarding the Climate Change Group. If Council wish to amend the decision they must pass it back to Cabinet, who must then meet within <b>5 working days</b> of the Council meeting. This five-day rule makes it impossible to comply with the access to information rules. Cabinet is therefore requested to consider if it wishes to either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Schedule a meeting directly after Council on 28 September, or</li> <li>(b) Request Council to suspend the 5 working day rule as detailed on page H6, paragraph 12.12.2 of the Constitution, to allow the matter to be discussed at October's Cabinet meeting on 12 October.</li> </ul> |                 |
| <b>14.</b> | <b>Updates from Cabinet Members Appointed to Outside Bodies</b>  |                 |
|            | <b>CONFIDENTIAL ITEM</b>   |                 |
| <b>15.</b> | <b>Milton Country Park - Management Proposals</b>  | <b>89 - 102</b> |

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on  
Thursday, 13 July 2006

PRESENT: Councillor Dr DR Bard (Leader of Council)  
Councillor Mrs DSK Spink MBE (Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder and Deputy Leader of Council)

|              |                |  |
|--------------|----------------|--|
| Councillors: | SM Edwards     | Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services<br>Portfolio Holder |
|              | Mrs VG Ford    | Community Development Portfolio Holder                                   |
|              | JA Hockney     | Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning<br>Portfolio Holder  |
|              | RMA Manning    | Environmental Health Portfolio Holder                                    |
|              | Mrs DP Roberts | Housing Portfolio Holder   |

Councillors RF Bryant, R Hall, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs EM Heazell, SGM Kindersley, DC McCraith, Mrs CAED Murfitt, RT Summerfield and Dr SEK van de Ven were in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors JD Batchelor, Mrs PM Bear and Mrs HM Smith.

---

**Procedural Items**

---

**1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Leader was authorised to sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 8 June 2006, subject to the following amendment:

**Climate Change Group** (Minute 13(j))

“...Planning Policy Guidance 25 (PPG25) required authorities...”

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations were made:

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Councillor JA Hockney     | One of the clients of his employers was Mouchel<br>Parkman Highways |
| Councillor SGM Kindersley | As an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor                      |
| Councillor DC McCraith    | As an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor                      |

---

**Recommendation to  
Council**

---

**3. RACE EQUALITY SCHEME**

The Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder commended to Cabinet the updated Race Equality Scheme (RES), which took into account progress made implementing the action plan, consultation responses and recommended practice

from the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE). He pointed out, that in addition to the consultation replies from parish councils in Appendix A of the report, Bar Hill Parish Council had also responded to the consultation and supported the RES.

In view of the CRE's "Common Ground" report, the portfolio holder also proposed the establishment of a small RES Member Working Group of two or three members to consider its implications in more detail. The Council needed to work towards an overarching strategy document for its approach to Traveller issues, albeit that the completed Strategy would not be published until after the adoption of the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document. At the same time, he considered that it was important that the Race Equality Scheme did not focus on any particular minority group. Members' attention was drawn to the relatively high levels of ethnic minorities working as taxi drivers and in local hotel and agricultural industries. He undertook to add cultural awareness training for all members to the Member Training Advisory Group work programme.

The following amendments were made to the Race Equality Scheme:

- Paragraph 1.3.2: "This updated version has now been produced in the light of...(b) new ODPM Circular 1/2006 on 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan sites' (February 2006). This circular aims to ensure that Traveller site provision is increased, Traveller needs are dealt with fairly and effectively, and that the traditional travelling way of life of Gypsies and Travellers is recognised, protected and facilitated";
- Paragraph 1.4.2 (also paragraph 10 of the Cabinet report be amended to highlight the role of all portfolio holders for promoting race equality and good race relations, through all Council services, particularly those for which they have responsibility";
- Paragraph 2.1.4: "The travelling community, including travelling showmen, has been a traditional part of rural life in South Cambridgeshire...";
- Paragraph 2.3.5 (Promoting good race relations): To include the Council's response to the Tsunami disaster during the 2004 Christmas break, when the Council offices were opened up as a collection point for donations and aid supplies, and both councillors and officers interrupted their holidays to help out. This initiative involved close liaison with the local Sri Lankan community;
- Action plan - section B.1 (Developing policies and strategies relevant to race equality): "Highlight to the Cabinet and the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document Member Reference Group findings and recommendations from ODPM Circular 1/2006 and the CRE's 'Common Ground' report which may be appropriate to the Council's strategic approach to Traveller issues and the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document. This will include consideration of how to strengthen the Council's practices on recognising, protecting and facilitating the traditional travelling way of life of Gypsies and Travellers, whilst respecting the interests of the settled community." This action should be actioned by the RES Member Working Group with a deadline of 31 October 2006;
- Action plan - section B.5 (Publishing results): Amend the public launch date to July 2006, not 2007; and
- All references in the Race Equality Scheme to "LDF supplementary guidance" be updated to "Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document".

Cabinet **RECOMMENDS TO COUNCIL** that the updated Race Equality Scheme for 2005-2008, including the additions and amendments made by Cabinet, be approved.

Cabinet thanked officers for their hard work preparing the scheme.

---

**Decisions made by Cabinet**

---

**4. SUB REGIONAL STRATEGIES FOR CAMBRIDGE SUB REGION: QUALITY OF LIFE**

Mr Peter Studdert, Director for Sustainable Communities at Cambridgeshire Horizons, made a presentation to Cabinet, highlighting the amount of local authority work already underway which would be supported and extended by the four Quality of Life Strategies / Studies for the Cambridge Sub-Region. These strategies / studies had status in the Local Development Framework, being referred to in some of its policies, but, due to the time and costs involved, had been circulated widely for stakeholder input rather than being issued for formal public consultation.

The Community Development Portfolio Holder commended the strategies but cautioned about the financial considerations behind all the proposals and asked Cabinet to welcome the documents as a basis for partnership working rather than endorsing them at this stage.

Issues raised by members included:

- The number of organisations proposing to make temporary use of the existing buildings at Oakington Barracks and whether artists could be reminded of facilities at Wysing Arts;
- Whether the Olympic size pool proposed for the University West site would be owned by the University of Cambridge and whether the 25 metre pool proposed for Northstowe could be enlarged, although members noted the possible financial burdens of swimming pools;
- The importance of addressing arts and cultural provision very early on;
- The omission of the Botanic Gardens in the analysis of existing arts and cultural facilities; and
- The additional demands on the transport infrastructure that would be generated by the creation of regional and sub-regional Sports and Arts venues.

Queries were raised about funding, particularly with regard to officers, and Mr Studdert explained that many of the recommendations integral to the work were already underway as part of the regular planning process. Long-term proposals, such as a concert venue, could be submitted to Olympic Lottery bids.

The Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder reported that the Conservation and Design Advisory Group supported the development of the Green Infrastructure Strategy and urged Cabinet to support adoption of the Strategy as Council Policy.

Cabinet **ENDORSED** the Balanced and Mixed Communities: A Good Practice Guide and the Green Infrastructure Strategy, and **WELCOMED** the Major Sports Facilities Strategy and the Arts and Culture Strategy.

Cabinet thanked Mr Studdert for his presentation.

**5. STANSTED AIRPORT - CONSULTATION ON APPLICATION (RE: USE OF EXISTING RUNWAY)**

Cabinet was asked to respond to consultation on a planning application to Uttlesford District Council submitted by BAA and Stansted Airport Ltd for planning permission to

vary / remove conditions attached to its previous planning permission, allowing greater use of the existing runway. The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder had received on 12 July the Health Impact Assessment: any decision by Cabinet would be subject to his comments once that document had been reviewed.

The Leader drew Members' attention to the effects of air travel on carbon emission targets. The figures of 450ppm and 550ppm in the report referred to atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, not emission rates as the wording seemed to imply. He pointed out that, even if atmospheric carbon dioxide levels were stabilised at 450ppm, the probability of global mean surface temperature (GMST) stabilising at 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels (the current EC limit for 'acceptable' climate change) was only 50/50, at 550ppm, this probability fell to 18%.

Members noted that the Examination in Public of the Regional Spatial Strategy had deleted suggestions for a new settlement at Great Dunmow, which was seen as a strong argument against development of a second runway. Concerns were expressed about the "honeypot" effect of the number of people who would want to live within commuting distance of Stansted but away from the airport noise. It was noted that the modest projections supplied by BAA for increased housing demand as a result of the expansion, took into account only people directly employed at the Airport, not the wider effect on the sub-regional economy.

Cabinet **AGREED** to respond to Uttlesford District Council in the following terms, subject to the addition of any comments from the Environmental Health Portfolio Holder on the Health Impact Assessment:

- (a) South Cambridgeshire District Council supports the East of England Regional Assembly position that accepts the expansion of the airport up to the full capacity of its existing single runway (Policy ST5) but it does not support a second runway; and
- (b) With regard to the current application, if Uttlesford District Council is minded to approve the application, it should be subject to appropriate conditions and obligations to mitigate the impact of the additional car trips generated.

## **6. NORTH WEST CAMBRIDGE AREA ACTION PLAN: ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

The North West Cambridge Member Reference Group and the Cambridge City Council Environment & Scrutiny Committee already had considered the Issues and Options Report for the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (AAP). The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder highlighted two key issues: the scale and location of development and its impact on the Green Belt, and transport. The County Council had commissioned a separate transport study which would be a supporting document to the Issues and Options report, to be published for a six-week consultation period starting in September 2006.

Mr Michael Monk, the planning policy consultant engaged on behalf of the Council for the North West Cambridge AAP, advised that the transport study would consider measures for public transport along Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road, which were both subject to congestion which could be made worse as a result of further development. The need for north-facing slip roads from Madingley Road to the M11 was also likely to be assessed. Members also raised the issue of access to the crematorium at Huntingdon Road / A14 although it was noted that this was a matter for the A14 improvements rather than the AAP. The transport study should aid in understanding and assessment of issues, assist in public participation and inform the preparation of Preferred Options. Mr Monk advised that the Issues and Options report would address in more detail that there was scope for innovative energy measures such as small-scale

community-based renewable energy provision, and that the University, having control over much of the development, could ensure a high level of renewable energy generation and a low-carbon development.

Members expressed concern about references to “appropriate” separation between Cambridge and Girton, and it was clarified that the separation would be appropriate to maintain village character and identity. A decision on the final wording was delegated to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder with advice from officers.

Councillor Dr SA Harangozo asked Cabinet to request that the Sustainable Development Officer prepare a list of sustainability barriers faced at Northstowe and what has been achieved.

Cabinet **AGREED**

- (a) The draft Issues & Options Report, as amended by the recommendations of the Joint Member Reference Group and the changes agreed by Cambridge City Council's Environment Scrutiny Committee, for public participation;
- (b) The principles for Issues & Options consultation and the list of specific and general consultation bodies, as amended by the recommendations of the Joint Member Reference Group and the changes agreed by Cambridge City Council's Environment Scrutiny Committee;
- (c) That any editing changes, including any arising from the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment, be delegated to the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder;
- (d) That a technical examination of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment be included.

Cabinet **NOTED** the North West Cambridge Landscape Study.

## 7. **REVIEW OF INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY (ICT) SECURITY POLICY AND USAGE GUIDELINES**

The revised ICT Security Policy and Usage Guidelines were presented, incorporating changes following the return to an in-house support provision for ICT services. This policy was specific to officers and a separate policy for members would be produced in due course.

The Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder amended E-mail Policy No. 10 to include a prohibition on using e-mail or the Internet service to send or receive racist material, and E-mail Policy No. 11 to “Avoid responding to unsolicited mail *not relating to the Council's business*”.

Subject to the incorporation of these amendments, Cabinet **AGREED** the revised Information & Communications Technology (ICT) Security Policy and Usage Guidelines June 2006.

## 8. **LINTON: EXTRA HOUSING CARE AT FLAXFIELDS**

Cabinet, at its meeting of 14 October 2004, agreed to dispose of fifteen sheltered housing units and a communal facility at Flaxfields, Linton, to Hereward Housing Association on a free of charge basis to enable Hereward to provide a new facility of affordable extra care sheltered units. The scheme was unsuccessful in the 2006/08 National Affordable Housing Programme, but would be re-submitted to the Housing Corporation during its summer 2006 “mini bid round”.

It was hoped that £2 million Social Housing Grant (SHG) could be achieved through the mini bid round, funding the 100% extra care scheme as approved by Cabinet in 2004. The Housing Portfolio Holder explained that, to ensure that a scheme was provided even if the bid round were unsuccessful, officers were proceeding with an alternative option, to provide an extra care scheme of mixed tenure which could be made available without the SHG as long as the land were supplied to Hereward at nil cost. The Executive Director explained that the report considered the capital costs of conversion, and that, while the Primary Care Trust (PCT) had placed the scheme at the top of its priority list for revenue funding, such revenue funding was likely but not guaranteed.

Councillor Mrs EM Heazell reported that both local members, Councillors JD Batchelor and Mrs PM Bear, supported the schemes absolutely, and that an alternative scheme had become necessary because the government had changed the funding scheme after the Council had embarked upon this project.

Cabinet **AGREED** that

- (a) If Option One, to provide a 100% Affordable Housing Extra care scheme consisting of 24 rented units and 17 low-cost home ownership units, could not be achieved because of a lack of capital funds, the land be disposed of to Hereward Housing Association on a free of charge basis for Option Two, to provide an Extra care scheme of mixed tenure, consisting of 11 rented units, 14 low-cost home ownership units and 16 units for outright sale, subject to the Council's costs being met in line with Cabinet's existing decision of 14 October 2004; and
- (b) If Option Two were progressed and funds became available during the construction process because of the release by the Housing Corporation of resources from slippage elsewhere, then Hereward Housing Association amend the tenure mix to move as close to Option One as possible.

## 9. CONCESSIONARY FARES - PAYMENT OF 'ADDITIONAL COSTS'

The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder explained that the purpose of this report was to agree to reimburse bus operators the 'additional costs' incurred for implementing the concessionary fares scheme. She confirmed that further negotiations would take place on 19 July at the Cambridge Area Bus Development Board, details of which contained commercially sensitive information which could not be discussed at a public meeting. All partners were working in the best interests of the community.

Following concerns about ticket information being unsubstantiated, as it did not include details of residents trying to use bus passes which were no longer accepted, the final sentence of paragraph 6 of the report was amended to refer to "early indicators" rather than "ticket information" from the first couple of months of operation of the scheme.

Cabinet **AGREED** payment of £21,375.83 for the 'additional costs' incurred by Whippet.

## 10. APPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY GROUPS, JOINT AND OUTSIDE BODIES

### Independent / Labour Group Nominations

Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt offered to fill the Independent / Labour Group vacancies on the Milton Country Park, Planning Policy, and Waste Management Advisory Groups, subject to the agreement of the other Independent / Labour members.

### Milton Country Park Advisory Group

The Community Development Portfolio Holder explained that it was imperative for this body to meet as soon as possible. She asked members to note that she had not been consulted before the Advisory Group Chairman had cancelled the meeting scheduled for



20 July.

It was clarified that vacancies on bodies to which seats had been allocated on a politically proportionate basis could not be transferred to other parties.

Cabinet **AGREED** that appointments to the Milton Country Park Advisory Group be done on a politically proportionate basis, rather than establishing it as an area body, and that its current size of seven members be maintained.

Cabinet **CONFIRMED** the following appointments to Advisory Groups, joint and outside bodies:

#### Advisory Groups

##### **Community, Arts and Sports**

CON RE Barrett, R Hall, RM Matthews, DC McCraith  
 IND / LAB NS Davies, vacancy  
 LD Mrs PM Bear, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs HF Kember

##### **Conservation and Design**

CON Mrs JM Guest, R Hall, Mrs CA Hunt, RM Matthews, EJ Pateman, RJ  
 Turner, NIC Wright (DCCC Chairman)  
 IND / LAB RF Bryant, NN Cathcart, Mrs SJO Doggett, vacancy  
 LD Mrs PM Bear, AN Berent, Mrs A Elsby, SGM Kindersley (DCCC Vice-  
 Chairman), JA Quinlan, Dr SEK van de Ven

##### **Housing for Older People**

CON 4 vacancies  
 IND / LAB RF Bryant, Mrs SJO Doggett  
 LD Mrs EM Heazell, Mrs HF Kember, Mrs VM Trueman

##### **Land Drainage**

CON EW Bullman, BR Burling, Mrs PS Corney, NIC Wright  
 IND / LAB MJ Mason, vacancy  
 LD SGM Kindersley, Mrs JE Lockwood, Mrs HM Smith

##### **Member Training**

CON RE Barrett, Mrs SM Ellington, Mrs JM Guest  
 IND / LAB Mrs SA Hatton  
 LD Mrs EM Heazell, JF Williams

##### **Milton Country Park**

CON R Hall, PT Johnson, RJ Turner  
 IND / LAB Mrs CAED Murfitt, vacancy  
 LD Mrs HM Smith, RT Summerfield

##### **Planning Policy Advisory Group**

CON RE Barrett, Mrs PS Corney, R Hall, CR Nightingale, NIC Wright  
 (DCCC Chairman)  
 IND / LAB RF Bryant, MJ Mason, Mrs CAED Murfitt  
 LD Mrs A Elsby, SGM Kindersley (DCCC Vice-Chairman), RB Martlew,  
 JH Stewart

##### **Waste Management Advisory Group**

CON RE Barrett, EW Bullman, Mrs SM Ellington, CR Nightingale, EJ

Pateman, Mrs BE Waters  
 IND / LAB Mrs SJO Doggett, Mrs CAED Murfitt, NJ Scarr  
 LD JP Chatfield, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs EM Heazell, RT Summerfield

Joint and Outside Bodies

Names in italics have been nominated since the 8 June 2006 meeting of Cabinet.

#### **Cambridgeshire Councils' Association**

CON Leader of Council  
 IND / LAB *Mrs DP Roberts*  
 LD *JD Batchelor*

#### **County Council / Cambridge City / South Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Forum**

CON Leader of Council, Planning and Economic Development Portfolio  
 Holder (substitute required)  
 IND / LAB Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio  
 Holder (*Mrs DP Roberts as substitute*)  
 LD RT Summerfield (*JD Batchelor as substitute*)

#### **South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee**

CON Leader of Council, Planning and Economic Development Portfolio  
 Holder (*DC McCraith as substitute*)  
 IND / LAB Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio  
 Holder (*RF Bryant as substitute*)  
 LD JD Batchelor, SGM Kindersley (*RT Summerfield as substitute*)

---

### **Information Items**

---

#### **11. REVIEW OF THE 2004-07 COMMUNITY STRATEGY FOR SOUTH CAMBS**

The Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder congratulated officers for progress made delivering the priority actions in the Community Strategy, and advised that more joined-up thinking between portfolios would be necessary for the 2007-10 Strategy.

The Head of Community Services explained that the Council was well advanced in some areas and must focus on completing the remaining targets and preparing the next strategy. He updated members on the Local Public Service Agreement target relating to increased road safety, which, if maintained would pass the 60% trigger to receive reward grant money. The reward grant would be paid to Cambridgeshire County Council and shared equally amongst all five Local Strategic Partnerships. Should the grant be achieved, he had proposed to the Local Area Agreement (LAA) board that 5-10% be 'top-sliced' to support the officer structure for Community Strategy work. He undertook to bring to Cabinet in September or October a report on progress towards, and possibility of achieving, reward grants.

Concerns about road safety in and between villages were expressed, although it was understood that any improvements were for Cambridgeshire County Council to deliver.

Cabinet **NOTED** the progress made in delivering the priority actions in the Community Strategy 2004-07.

**12. RESPONSIVE REPAIRS ACTION PLAN PROGRESS UPDATE**

The Housing Portfolio Holder introduced the report, which provided an update of progress made on the 22-point action plan adopted in January 2005 improve the responsive repairs service. She had been critical of the service in the past, but appreciated the work undertaken in the past few months and thanked the previous Portfolio Holder, former Housing and Environmental Services Director, the implementation group and all others involved for their efforts and determination to improve the situation. She expressed her confidence in the people involved in the project and highlighted the improvement in staff morale. Councillor Mrs EM Heazell singled out the Echelon consultancy staff and Matthew Baxter in particular for commendation.

The Executive Director was hopeful that the Direct Labour Organisation (DLO) would break even this year, and confirmed that monitoring of the situation would continue.

Cabinet **NOTED** progress in implementing the responsive repairs action plan to date.

**13. EFFICIENCY SAVINGS UPDATE**

Cabinet received an update on the main efficiency savings achieved in 2005/06 and the Council's forward-looking Annual Efficiency Statement (AES) for 2006/07, which set out plans for further efficiencies.

The Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder confirmed that the Council was above target for savings achieved in 2005/06 and projected to be above target for 2006/07. At the same time, the detailed official guidance meant that although further savings had been made by the Direct Labour Organisation and service improvements had been achieved via the fortnightly refuse and recycling collection scheme, unfortunately, these did not count as efficiencies.

He offered his thanks to officers for their work identifying savings and compiling the AES Backward Look and AES Forward Look documents in light of the government changing its guidance every few months.

Cabinet **NOTED** the progress outlined in the report, especially the 2006/07 Annual Efficiency Statement – Forward Look.

**14. PROVISIONAL OUTTURN 2005/06**

The Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder commended to Cabinet the actual expenditure figures for 2005/06.

Cabinet **NOTED** the report.

**15. QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT AND PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS, INCLUDING TRANSFORMATION PROJECT COSTS / SAVINGS**

The Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder presented the report on actual income and expenditure against budget, including the three-monthly report on savings arising from the Transformation Project.

Cabinet **NOTED** the projected expenditure position and the monitoring of prudential indicators, and **REFERRED** the report to the next meeting of the Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder for more detailed consideration.

---

**Standing Items**

---

**16. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE**

Cabinet **NOTED** that the Scrutiny and Overview Committee would be reviewing on 20 July 2006 the decision not to establish an official Climate Change Advisory Group and replace it with a standing item on the Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder meeting agenda.

**17. UPDATES FROM CABINET MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

Councillor Mrs DSK Spink reported that Crossroads Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire had merged with Peterborough to become West Anglia Crossroads. The merger should help reduce overheads as all staff would be located in the same office.

**18. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) (exempt information as defined in paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act).

---

**Confidential Item**

---

**19. RENEWAL OF CONTRACT - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder reminded Cabinet of the financial risk associated with posts funded by Planning Delivery Grant (PDG), but noted that the post was essential for the Council to maintain its performance to justify further PDG.

Cabinet **RECOMMENDS TO COUNCIL** the renewal of the contract for the administrative post (D.6.9) in the Major Developments Team for a further two years, accepting the financial risk arising from the temporary nature of Planning Delivery Grant funding.

---

**The Meeting ended at 1.15  
p.m.**

---

**MINUTE EXTRACT****FROM****LICENSING COMMITTEE AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER****MEETINGS HELD ON 10 AUGUST 2006**

the Licensing Committee

**RECOMMENDS** to the Environmental Health Portfolio Holder, Cabinet and Council,

- (a) the adoption of Part 2, Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 in respect of the licensing of Sex Establishments,
- (b) that subject to the amendments at (i) and (ii) above, the standard conditions of licensing as stated in Appendix A to the covering report be approved,
- (c) the agreement of the policy for the setting of the fee for the application, renewal or transfer of a licence for a sex establishment is set at £3500,
- (d) that the applications for sex establishment licences are put before a 5-Member Sub-Committee to be named 'Licensing Sub-Committee (Sex Establishments)', and
- (e) no restrictions on the numbers considered relevant for the district at this time

the Environmental Health Portfolio Holder

**RECOMMENDS** to Cabinet and Council the recommendation of the Licensing Committee as detailed above.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**REPORT TO:** Leader and Cabinet  
**AUTHOR/S:** Chief Executive/Principal Accountant

14 September 2006

**THE TREATMENT OF RECEIPTS FROM REPAID CAPITAL GRANTS AND LOANS**

**Purpose**

1. To ask Members how they would like the receipts from repaid capital grants and loans to be used and make recommendations to Council.

**Effect on Corporate Objectives**

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 2. Quality, Accessible Services | Additional funds could be made available for conservation, renovation and disabled facilities work.                                      |
| Village Life                    | Preserving, renovating and adapting buildings may enable a more diverse range of people to remain in villages                            |
| Sustainability                  | Historic building grants and renovation grants and loans help to preserve buildings thus reducing the need for new materials to be used. |
| Partnership                     | Some grants and loans are awarded in partnership with other organisations.   |

**Background**

3. A revised legislative framework for housing assistance, which came into force in July 2003, enabled the Council to provide loans for disabled works over and above the £25,000 mandatory grant limit and for loans for renovation work subject to a test of resources.
4. In June 2003 Cabinet considered a new housing improvement grant and loan policy and agreed to the introduction of zero interest loans for discretionary disabled facilities work and, following the receipt of additional information in October 2003, also agreed to zero interest loans for renovation work. These loans become a charge on the property and are repayable to the Council in the event of a sale or transfer.
5. In addition to the zero interest loans introduced in 2003, renovation grants made under the earlier legislation and historic building grants are both subject to a provision that some, or all, of the grant is repaid when a property is sold within a set number of years.
6. In the event of an historic building grant being repaid, the income received has (since prior to the 1974 reorganisation) been recycled to fund further historic building grants.
7. The demand for home improvement work is very difficult to predict with any degree of certainty and as a consequence in the past there have been years where there has been a significant under-spend and years where there has been a need for extra funding. In the current financial year, £50,000 has already been vired from another part of the approved capital programme in order to support additional expenditure on disabled facilities grants.

8. Earlier in this financial year, £11,300 was repaid in relation to a renovation grant made under the earlier legislation and officers have asked whether this money can be used to further increase the current year's budget for disabled facilities grants.
9. There does not at present appear to be an approved policy on this matter and Members are, therefore, requested to consider the use of funds received by the Authority from the repayment of capital grants and loans.

### **Considerations**

10. At the moment, there are around 80 historic building grants with a value of approximately £250,000 that could potentially be repaid. However, repayment is only required when a property is sold within three years of the final grant payment being made. Whilst so far this year two grants have been repaid, normally, presumably as a consequence of the short timescale, very few grants fall to be reimbursed to the Council and in the last two financial years no income at all has been received from this source. It is, therefore, suggested that the existing practice of recycling recouped historic building grants to enable further such grants to be made is continued.
11. There are 18 renovation grants awarded under the old legislation with a value of around £300,000 that could still be recouped if a property is sold or transferred. The repayment condition only applies where a property is sold within five years of the final grant payment being made and the outstanding value will have reduced to zero by July 2010.
12. The renovation loans awarded after October 2003 are repayable in perpetuity and eight of these loans have so far been made with a total value of £78,000.
13. Thirteen discretionary disabled facilities loans (given in addition to the statutory maximum grant of £25,000) with a value of around £186,000 have been made to date and, again, these are a charge on the property with an obligation to repay on sale or transfer, in perpetuity.
14. The combined value of both types of loan made to date is over £260,000 and will, almost certainly, grow year on year. Whilst none of these loans have so far been recouped, in some years, substantial sums may fall to be repaid to the Council.
15. The use to which the Council can legally put any funds from repaid capital grants and loans will vary depending on the amount involved, with any repayments in excess of £10,000 being classified as capital receipts and only useable to fund capital expenditure. However, repayments below the £10,000 threshold (which can be used to fund revenue expenditure) are likely to form only a very small proportion of the overall reimbursements.

### **Options**

16. The options under consideration for the treatment of the income from repaid grants and loans are that:
  - (i) it is all recycled to fund additional grant expenditure;
  - (ii) it is all retained to provide additional funding for revenue and/or capital in general; and
  - (iii) a combination of recycling and retention; with the suggestion that the income from recouped historic building grants is recycled (to enable additional historic building grants to be awarded) and the income from



disabled facilities loans and renovation grants and loans is made available, if required, to meet additional demand for these grants and loans in the year in which the reimbursement takes place. Any amounts outstanding at the end of the financial year could then be utilised to provide funding for expenditure in general.

### **Financial Implications**

17. In the future substantial, though unpredictable, additional funding could become available. If this is totally reserved for similar grant and loan expenditure then there could be lost opportunity to fund needed expenditure on other areas within the capital programme. If income is received in a year where extra funding is required then it would seem preferable to use this rather than reduce another part of the capital programme in order to pay for grants.

### **Legal Implications**

18. Repaid capital grants of over £10,000 are capital receipts and as such can only be used for capital purposes.

### **Staffing Implications**

19. There do not appear to be any direct staffing implications.

### **Risk Management Implications**

20. There do not appear to be any risk management implications.

### **Conclusions/Summary**

21. Earlier this financial year a renovation grant was repaid to the Council when a property was sold. The 2006/07 budget for mandatory disabled facilities grants (£450,000) is already almost fully committed and officers have asked if this unexpected income could be used to support additional grant expenditure.
22. There does not appear to be a policy on the treatment of any income received from the repayment of capital grants and loans and Members have therefore been requested to consider the matter.
23. For the life of this Authority historic building grants have been recycled to enable further grants to be awarded. Because these grants are only repayable if a property is sold or transferred within three years of the final grant payment, there are very few such reimbursements. It is suggested, therefore, that the established treatment continues.
24. With regard to the repayment of discretionary disabled facilities loans and renovation grants and loans, because any loans awarded after the new regime came in to effect during 2003 are repayable in perpetuity, the amounts involved are potentially substantial. As a consequence, it does not seem appropriate to totally reserve such funds to the detriment of the Council's other projects. It is suggested, therefore, that, to avoid pressure on the rest of the capital programme, reimbursed grants and loans should be made available for any additional funding requirement for these grants and loans that may arise during the year and any amounts outstanding at the end of the year should be returned to balances.

**Recommendations**

25. Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council that:
- (a) the existing treatment of repaid historic building grants, whereby income from this source is returned to the historic building grant reserve for reuse, is ratified;
  - (b) income from the repayment disabled facilities loans and renovation grants and loans is made available to fund these grants and loans if, and only if, additional funds, over and above those in the budget, are needed in the year the repayment is received; and
  - (c) income from repaid discretionary disabled facilities loans and renovation grants and loans not required in the year, rather than being earmarked for any particular purpose, is returned to balances and thereby made available to support service expenditure in general in future years.

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Item 6 of the 5<sup>th</sup> June 2003 Cabinet Agenda – New Housing Improvement Grant Policy

Item 4 of the 30<sup>th</sup> October 2003 Cabinet Agenda – Housing Renovations Assistance

Statutory Instrument 2003 no 3146 – The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003

**Contact Officer:** Gwynn Thomas - Principal Accountant (Housing)  
Telephone: (01954) 713074

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

|                   |  |                   |
|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| <b>REPORT TO:</b> | Cabinet  | 14 September 2006 |
|                   | Council  | 28 September 2006 |
| <b>AUTHOR/S:</b>  | Chief Executive/Senior Democratic Services Officer |                   |

**DEVELOPING A POLICY ON CRIMINAL RECORD BUREAU (CRB) CHECKS**

**Purpose**

1. To propose that Cabinet recommend that Council agree a policy on Criminal Record Bureau Checks for Councillors.

**Background**

2. At its meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2006, Council agreed that all members should undergo mandatory CRB checks. However, Council did not determine how this process should be governed.
3. The Scrutiny and Overview Committee examined this issue at its meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2006. The Committee recommended that Cabinet develop a policy on CRB checks which:
  - (a) Subjects all newly elected Councillors to a standard CRB Check
  - (b) Encourages all existing Members to agree to a standard CRB Check
  - (c) Ensures the results of the CRB Checks be first reviewed by a manager of appropriate responsibility
4. The full draft minute is attached as appendix B.

**Legal and Risk Management Implications**

|    |                           |   |
|----|---------------------------|---|
| 5. | Financial                 | The cost of 57 standard checks will be £1,767 (57 multiplied by £31). A budget will need to be identified.  |
|    | Legal and Risk Management | Members undertake a wide range of roles, particularly in relation to community leadership. The public therefore have the right to expect that Members will demonstrate high standards of integrity. Failure to implement this policy could lead to loss of public support, loss of confidence in elected members and the possible prosecution of, and negative publicity for the Council. |
|    | Staffing                  | The implementation of this policy will mean extra administrative work for staff which will have to be absorbed into their other duties.   |

**Consultations**

6. Cambridgeshire County Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and Cambridge City Council have been consulted.

**Considerations**

7. In a District authority most of a Councillor's activities will not involve direct unsupervised access to children and vulnerable adults; however, councillors do

undertake a wide range of roles, particularly in relation to community leadership and their constituency work. As an employer, councillors should also be expected to give a lead to employees, partner organisations and stakeholders by participating in their own disclosure checks.

8. Normally it is a criminal offence to pass on information revealed by a standard or enhanced certificate. It is imperative that the Council does not use information obtained via disclosure checking to discriminate unfairly against any Member who has a criminal record. It is therefore suggested that the results of the CRB check should only be sent to the member and the HR Manager, who will require a background check to become a counter signatory (further cost of £36.00). If the certificate reveals a relevant conviction or warning the details will be passed to the Monitoring Officer who will then discuss this matter with the member concerned.

**Enhanced or standard check?**

9. Standard Disclosures are primarily for posts that involve working with children or vulnerable adults. Standard Disclosures may also be issued for people entering certain professions, such as members of the legal and accountancy professions. These disclosures contain the following;
  - details of all convictions, cautions, reprimands and warnings held on the Police National Computer (PNC);
  - information from the Protection of Children Act List (PoCA);
  - Information from the Protection of Vulnerable Adults List (POVA); and
  - Information held by the DfES under Section 142 of the Education Act 2002 of those considered unsuitable for banned from working with children.
10. Enhanced Disclosures are for posts involving a far greater degree of contact with children or vulnerable adults. In general, the type of work will involve regularly caring for, supervising, training or being in sole charge of such people. Enhanced Disclosures are also issued for certain statutory purposes such as gaming and lottery licences.
11. Enhanced Disclosures contain the same information as Standard Disclosures but with the addition of local police force information considered relevant by Chief Police Officer(s).
12. It is very unlikely that a Member on Council business will require an enhanced check as this authority is not responsible for social services or education. It is therefore recommended that members undergo standard checks.
13. An enhanced disclosure will show all previous convictions. If Cabinet considers that Members should be subject to an enhanced check then it will need to consider what action should be taken should a disclosure reveal spent convictions.

**Recommendations**

14. Cabinet discuss the issues raised in this report and recommend to Council that
  - (a) All newly elected Councillors are subjected to a standard CRB Check
  - (b) All existing Members are encouraged to agree to a standard CRB Check
  - (c) Approve the proposed process as set out in Appendix A for managing applications for Criminal Bureau Records checks by Councillors.

**Effect on Corporate Objectives**

|     |                              |  |
|-----|------------------------------|--|
| 15. | Quality, Accessible Services | The implementation of CRB checks for all Council will help to establish public confidence in its elected officials. Public confidence is essential in the achievement of the Council's corporate objectives. |
|     | Village Life                 |  |
|     | Sustainability               |  |
|     | Partnership                  |  |

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: None

**Contact Officer:** Patrick Adams - Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713408

This page is intentionally left blank

## **DEVELOPING A POLICY ON CRIMINAL RECORDS BUREAU (CRB) CHECKS**

The Human Resources Manager presented this report, which recommended the development of a policy on Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) Checks for Councillors. She explained that the Human Resources section was responsible for the CRB check policy for officers but no policy existed for councillors. Whilst relevant staff were subject to a CRB check before being offered employment there could be no such requirement for Councillors who were elected by the District's residents and were not employees of the Council. She concluded that the development of a policy had to be a member-led process.

### **Enhanced or standard checks**

It was suggested that there could be a two-tier system with enhanced checks for Chairmen and Cabinet members and standard checks for others. The Human Resources Manager responded that enhanced checks were usually demanded only for those who work specifically with children or vulnerable adults. She advised that standards checks were sufficient for all Councillors.

### **Viewing the results of checks**

The Human Resources Manager explained that the officer who receives the results of the checks also has to be responsible for administrative tasks, such as checking a Councillor's identification. It was therefore suggested that the Chief Executive and his PA should be responsible for the process.

### **Councillors who refuse to submit to a check**

It was understood that members were most likely to be in contact with children and vulnerable adults whilst working with residents in their wards. It would be impossible for the Council to prevent councillors who refused to submit to the check, from continuing to carry out this work. It was suggested that the only action the Council could take in these circumstances was to exclude councillors who refuse to submit to a check from any work in an official capacity with children, young people or vulnerable adults.

### **Non-transferability of checks**

The Human Resources Manager explained that unfortunately the results of checks carried out by another organisation, such as the County Council, could not be shared with another local authority, so those councillors with a dual role would have to submit to two tests.

It was suggested that all those standing for election in 2007 should be informed that all successful candidates will be subject to a standard CRB Check.

The Committee **RECOMMENDED** that Cabinet develop a policy on CRB checks which

- (a) will subject all newly elected Councillors to a standard CRB Check
- (b) will encourage all existing Members to agree to a standard CRB Check
- (c) will ensure the results of the CRB Checks be first reviewed by a manager of appropriate responsibility.

This page is intentionally left blank



**1. COUNCILLORS NOT WISHING TO UNDERGO A DISCLOSURE CHECK**

- 1.1 A councillor who does not wish to undergo a disclosure check will not be eligible to become involved in work of any kind in an official capacity with children, young people or vulnerable adults. Instead the Councillor will be offered appointment to other service areas / outside bodies, where there will be no anticipated contact with children, young people or vulnerable adults. Should a councillor wish to work with vulnerable client groups at a later date, s/he will be required to undertake a disclosure check before doing so.

**2. DISCLOSURE APPLICATION**

- 2.1 A disclosure application form, which includes personal details will need to be completed by the councillor and submitted with evidence of identity (ie passport, driving licence, birth and marriage certificates, bank and building society statement, utility bill, credit card statement) to the HR Manager. The HR Manager will be the Council's authorised signatory for CRB purposes and will check and sign all applications from Members.
- 2.2 Authorised signatories are registered with the CRB in that capacity and are subject to strict requirements for confidentiality.
- 2.3 Failure to disclose a conviction when completing a disclosure form particularly when seeking appointment to a role working with children or vulnerable adults may be considered a breach of the Code of Conduct, which will be referred to the Monitoring Officer for review and/or action.

**3. PRINCIPLE OF CLEARANCE**

- 3.1 Disclosure certificates are generally processed within three weeks of the CRB receiving the completed application form, together with any additional information requested. The CRB disclosure will be sent to the councillor and a copy to the HR Manager.
- 3.2 In the vast majority of cases, CRB checks will show "no trace". Once a councillor's disclosure has been returned without conviction, that councillor will be able to exercise any functions and activities which may bring them into contact with children or vulnerable adults.
- 3.3 Members who refuse to apply for a check or have relevant disclosures will not be permitted to have access to children or vulnerable adults through either the Council's activities or by appointment to any outside body.
- 3.4 A list of councillors without relevant disclosures will be retained by the Monitoring Officer.
- 3.5 Those councillors who have been cleared will be entitled to an identity badge issued by the Council, which specifies that they have undergone a CRB check. This can be used by councillors when undertaking visits to organisations which may require a check to be undertaken before granting access to the premises.

**4. WHERE A DISCLOSURE CHECK REVEALS A TRACE**

- 4.1 If the certificate reveals a relevant conviction or warning the Monitoring Officer will contact the councillor regarding the course of action to be taken from the options set out in paragraph 4.2 below. This will include a discussion as to whether the returned data is accurate and, if so, the circumstances surrounding the offence and any mitigating circumstances and the reasons if appropriate as to why the information was not disclosed earlier by the councillor.
- 4.2 In cases where a disclosure appears, the councillor concerned may wish to exercise one of the following choices:
- a) to agree not to be appointed to any position which may involve contact with young people / vulnerable adults;
  - b) to discuss his / her appointment to any positions either within or outside the authority with his / her political Group Leader;
  - c) to submit additional information regarding the CRB certificate;
- 4.3 The Council will not use information obtained via disclosures to discriminate unfairly against any councillor who has a criminal record. However a councillor who has received a sentence of 3 months imprisonment or more, without the option of a fine, either 5 years before his / her election or since election will automatically become disqualified as a councillor.

**5. RETENTION OF DISCLOSURE INFORMATION**

- 5.1 The Council is subject to the code of practice published under the Police Act 1997 which provides assurance to those applying for disclosures that information will be used fairly with proper safeguards for storage and handling.
- 5.2 All information supplied during the checking process, including the final certificate will be held securely by the HR Manager and dealt with as set out below.
- 5.3 The HR Manager will
- Maintain a database of disclosure checks undertaken, including date of disclosure, name of Member, type of appointment, CRB reference number and name(s) of those to whom the disclosure information has been revealed.
  - Ensure that access to the database is restricted to the Monitoring Officer only.
  - Ensure that the disclosure certificate and any associated material will be shredded after 6 months or immediately after all issues have been resolved, whichever is the sooner.
  - Prohibit the photocopying or scanning of disclosure checks, or copying or representing the contents in any way.

**6. FREQUENCY OF CRB CHECKS**

- 6.1 Individuals registering for election will be advised that a CRB check will be required. All newly elected councillors will be required to undertake an enhanced check once elected.
- 6.2 For serving councillors the following approach is proposed:
- Inform all existing councillors of the Council's policy on disclosure.
  - Provide councillors with a CRB disclosure application form and request its completion by a specified date. This should be accompanied with a reminder to declare all convictions, cautions, bindovers etc. Forms must be submitted with evidence of identity (ie passport, driving licence, birth and marriage checks, bank and building society statement, utility bill, credit card statement).
- 6.3 The CRB suggest that checks should be renewed at three yearly intervals. So members will be subjected to CRB checks following their election (or re-election).

**7. MONITORING AND AUDIT**

- 7.1 The Council will:
- Undertake its own audit of the disclosure process on a regular basis.
  - Cooperate with any compliance check or audit from the CRB.
  - Report any suspected malpractice to the CRB.
  - Report any loss of disclosure information to the CRB.
  - Use disclosure information for appointment purposes only.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**REPORT TO:** Leader and Cabinet

14 September 2006

**AUTHORS:** Chief Executive and Executive Director

**“STATE OF THE NATION”  
NEW MANAGEMENT TEAM PROGRESS REPORT**

**Purpose**

1. We have now been in post as the new Senior Management Team since the end of June. In that time we have listened to the views of staff, management and Members and given a good deal of thought about the future direction of the Council. In this report we want to share what we have learnt; to set out our views about what needs to be done; and to make recommendations to meet immediate and pressing staffing needs.

**Effect on Council Priorities**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2. Improving Customer Service               | The core purpose of this report is to put forward changes which will enable the Council to be clearer about and to achieve its priorities. |
| Affordable Housing                          |  |
| Sustainable communities in the growth areas |  |

**Challenges Facing the Council**

3. There are a range of difficult challenges facing the Council. These are well known to Members. They include:
  - a) The medium term financial position, as a result of capping.
  - b) Planning for, and meeting the needs of, new communities at Northstowe and other growth areas.
  - c) Responding to rising expectations about the quality of services provided by the Council.
  - d) Recruitment and retention difficulties.
  - e) Adapting to new roles such as community leadership and to new ways of working – for example through the LSP and LAA strategic partnerships.
4. The Council's CPA rating is "Fair". This rating was confirmed by the recent inspection of the planning service, which concluded that the current service is fair, but with unlikely prospects for improvement. Last year's Use of Resources judgement gave us a score of 2 out of 4, compared with higher scores achieved by neighbouring authorities. The Direction of Travel statement highlighted a number of areas where we need to improve our corporate governance arrangements.
5. The Audit Commission recently published a "basket of PIs" which is one element it would use to decide whether councils should undergo a CPA re-assessment. On these PIs, the Council was below average on the proportion of PIs which had improved since 2002/03 and on the proportion of PIs in the top quartile of district councils in 2004/05. While we demonstrated high performance in some areas (notably recycling, processing benefit claims and proportion of decent homes), performance was weaker in others - eg planning applications (time taken and satisfaction) and street cleaning. The Performance Management report on this

agenda sets these results more in context.

6. Performance has improved in some areas, but the overall conclusion is that this is not a strongly performing council. There are, and continue to be, examples of excellence, but there is a need to achieve more consistently improving services through greater unity of purpose and planning for the future.

**What sort of Council do we need?**

7. The consequences of not responding effectively to the situation facing us could be serious for the public and the Council. This is particularly so in the case of the new settlements, where failures now could have significant repercussions for years to come. As a result of our discussions and deliberations, our conclusion is that the Council will fail to address the challenges facing it, without radical changes in the way Members and officers work.
8. We believe that the Council needs to embrace the following principles:
  - (a) **“One Council”**: an end to narrow silo behaviour at departmental and portfolio level. There is a need to be able to plan and implement change, working together across the Council – for example in relation to the growth areas. All Members and staff should be working to the corporate priorities and plans.
  - (b) **A Clear Vision**, supported and owned by Members and staff, about what the Council wants to have achieved in five years' time and beyond. We also need clear plans to get there and indicators to measure and manage our progress. Each year we should have an achievable number of specific and tangible corporate targets for the year ahead.
  - (c) **An Inclusive Council** where all staff and Members feel that they can contribute. In particular, we intend to involve second and third tier officers in strategy and policy development.
  - (d) **New “Member Contract”**. It is important for the time of both Members and officers to be sharply focused on improving and developing services, each making their different but complementary contributions. Currently, Member issues, which are not related to service delivery take up a disproportionate amount of senior officers' time and energy. Last year, Members indicated that they would modify their expectations on officers in the light of capping and this now needs to be followed up. We recommend that an agreement be developed and agreed by Council which would set out guidance for the role of Members, including, for example:
    - More active engagement and leadership at the strategic and policy development level.
    - Greater clarity about the respective roles of Members and senior officers - less Member involvement in operational matters, but more emphasis on strategic direction and on performance management to ensure that strategies are implemented and are delivering real improvements.
    - Ensuring that Member enquiries are directed to officers at an appropriate level (with operational matters being dealt with by operational officers) and with realistic expectations about the timing of replies.
    - Other Members and officers to be treated with respect
    - Meetings to be kept to a minimum and resulting in clear outcomes for the delivery of council service.

- Greater emphasis on structured development for Members.
- (e) **Empowerment of staff** - managers and their teams to be encouraged to take greater responsibility and control over their services, free from interference and bureaucracy – but judged by results (ie the performance targets achieved and their contribution to corporate aims).
- (f) **Service First** – in everything we do, for Members and officers, the question should be “How does this improve services to the public?” The Council needs to be externally focused and to engage service users and citizens in the development of its services.
- (g) **Balanced medium term financial strategy** - improved financial planning linked to our priorities and improved financial control.
9. These principles have guided our current actions and future plans which are detailed in the remainder of this report.

### **Achieving the Council we need: The Transformation Project**

10. We see the Transformation Project as the principal means by which the above principles will be delivered. The project should be seen as more far reaching than previously envisaged and concerned with establishing new cultures and ways of working as well as new structures. We have made the following progress:-
- a) We have allocated service responsibilities between us. We have established arrangements for meetings of the new Senior Management Team (SMT) and for the Executive Management Team (SMT plus relevant Heads of Service). We have worked on improving communication to staff through regular emails and briefings.
- b) We are considering options for the restructuring of the second tier service heads. The outcome of this review is crucial in giving the Council the strategic management it will need to meet the challenges ahead. We want to ensure that the appointed service heads have a clear remit to manage their services within the principles we have set out and have a wider role in the strategic management of the Council.
- c) A Project Manager has been appointed to run the business process reviews. We are recruiting to the two business analyst posts, but experiencing some difficulty in obtaining the skills and experience required. Planning will be the first service to undergo a business process review. The Medium Term Financial Strategy assumes savings in 2006/07 and 2007/08 onwards from the reviews. There is a likelihood of slippage in achieving these savings. The running and implementation of the reviews will be a major undertaking for the Council in the next year.
- d) We want to be clear about the objectives of the business process reviews. Our starting point is that the reviews should not lead to a deterioration in the service received by customers (as defined by performance indicators, service standards or other measures). Within this constraint, our view is that the first priority must be to achieve the savings included in the Medium Term Financial Strategy. If further savings are possible, consideration can then be given as to whether they should be used to improve services or used to balance the Council's financial position.

- e) The Service First project is moving forward. The customer service standards will be publicly launched in October. The Service First Project Team is developing its future work programme which will include monitoring the effectiveness of the standards; continuing to build customer care awareness within the Council; and developing the complaints process. We will soon fill the new post of Customer Services Project Officer, which will support the Service First project.
11. We have worked to attract external support and capacity to implement the Transformation Project – eg:
- (a) **IDeA support.** We have received an approach from IDeA to provide free consultancy time. This will provide project management and change management support to the business process reviews and enhance our capacity to tackle similar projects in the future.
- (b) **Building Capacity East (BCE) bids.** We have made substantial bids to this partnership for funding to enhance our capacity to support the Transformation Project. We expect to know the outcome of the bids on 15<sup>th</sup> September. The bids cover areas such as: Member training and development; improved team working between the Cabinet and Management Team; the secondment of a senior “Change Manager” to the Council; a training and development programme for second tier service heads; and a programme to enhance Members’ community leadership in their local communities.
12. As Members will be aware, the Audit Commission will carry out a corporate governance inspection in the period 4<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> October. The inspection will be focused on how the Council can enhance its corporate capacity to plan and deliver improved services. We will work with the Audit Commission to try to ensure that the inspection supports the programme of change we are pursuing.

### **Planning and Prioritisation**

13. A central issue for us is to improve corporate planning in two ways:
- a) To set clearer targets for what the Council wants to achieve in the next five years.
- b) To integrate policy, financial and workforce planning to achieve these targets
14. These are essential to deliver our “One Council” and “Clear Vision” principles and are also a response to the necessities facing the Council - in particular, the scale of the call on the Council to respond effectively to the growth agenda.
15. It will not be possible to provide all current services in the way they are currently provided and difficult decisions will have to be made. Clarity will be required about objectives in order to ensure that limited resources are effectively directed. This will be the key role for Members and Management Team. There are also important strategic issues we need to address – such as how the Council will change to meet the challenge of providing services to the growth areas which will be more urban in character and how the Council will balance the needs of the growth areas with other parts of the district.
16. The Council and the South Cambs LSP are currently reviewing the Community Strategy to cover the period 2007 to 2010. It is the Council’s plan to integrate our Council objectives with the Community Strategy when the new strategy comes into effect from April 2007. We will be working with our partners to ensure that the new Community Strategy is focused and realistic.



17. The new Community Strategy will probably not be available to influence our 2007/08 budget and policy objectives. We therefore recommend that for 2007/08 the Council retain its current three priorities (customer service, growth areas and affordable housing) for 2007/08, but set clear targets for each of the priorities. Our thinking behind this recommendation is:
  - a) It will continue to be essential for the Council to work towards the growth areas in 2007/08 and future years.
  - b) While much has been achieved in improving customer service, work needs to continue in order to achieve the full benefit of the Council's ICT investment; maximise the effectiveness of the Contact Centre; and fully implement customer service standards. This will be pursued through Service First, the Transformation Project and other measures.
  - c) Affordable housing continues to be a high priority for the public and the growth areas provide timely opportunities to address this need.
18. Members are invited to give serious consideration to the issue of priorities for 2007/08. Resources are unlikely to be available to progress other initiatives.
19. We have been working with service heads to prepare a Workforce Plan. This work has identified a number of pressing problems:
  - a) Recruitment and Retention issues are affecting a number of services. This is placing pressure on staff and affecting the ability to achieve performance targets.
  - b) Workforce Profile. One of the long term problems affecting this and other councils is an imbalance towards older employees, with a consequent threat of loss of skills, knowledge and experience as those employees retire.
  - c) Staffing shortages. Some services are under intense pressure - for a variety of reasons, including the impact of capping and growth in service demands. In some cases this has had an adverse impact on staff health.
20. We will bring a full workforce plan to Cabinet in November. However, in the meantime we feel it is essential to address the most critical staffing shortages referred to in (c). We have set out our proposals in the **Appendix**.
21. The proposals in the Appendix would add a further £255,000 to the budget in 2007/08 and upwards of £212,000 pa thereafter. As Members will be aware, the Medium Term Financial Strategy includes no provision for additional spending and any additional posts will have to be met from savings within the budget. It is certain that there will be substantial additional future spending needs – for example additional planning and development staff for the growth areas; additional refuse collection and street cleaning capacity; and possibly some provision to meet changes in Planning Delivery Grant. Officers are currently identifying other spending pressures. Members are therefore requested to approve the proposals in the Appendix in principle at this stage, with final approval being considered at the October meeting with the revised Medium Term Financial Strategy.
22. Some of the additional staffing proposals relate to the growth areas. We are continuing to work with Cambridgeshire Horizons to secure external funding for such posts where we can. There might also be scope for the funding of posts through developer contributions. This raises a number of issues, but such arrangements apply in other authorities and we feel the possibilities should be investigated.

23. There are other services where a strong case can be made for further investment. A particular area is street cleaning, where the Council is one of the lowest spending councils per head of population and, on the relevant national performance indicator, South Cambs is in the lowest quartile. The main problem in South Cambs is not litter, but the detritus on the roads which arises from being a rural authority. Despite the strong case for investment in this service, it is not facing a critical position and we recommend that further investment be considered as part of the medium term planning process against other potential calls and in the light of savings available.
24. There is a pressing need to bring together our financial policy planning and the following steps are envisaged over the next months:-
- **October Cabinet:** Consideration of a draft Medium Term Financial Strategy, taking into account projections of spending pressures in the period 2007/08 to 2011/12 and with indication of the level and phasing of savings required. Consideration and approval of the posts in the Appendix.
  - **November Cabinet:** Final agreement to revised Medium Term Financial Strategy, including detailed savings required. Consideration of Workforce Plan and targets for our priorities for 2007/08
  - **December Cabinet:** Consideration of detailed departmental budgets for 2007/08
25. Our forward plans will be subject to further review for 2008/09 onwards in the light of the revised Community Strategy.

#### **Our Work Programme over the coming months**

26. Over the next few months our main priorities will be to maintain momentum on the Transformation Project and financial and workforce planning for 2007/08 and future years. However, there are other major issues that we will also address:-
- a) The Corporate Governance Inspection and follow up.
  - b) Implementation of BCE bids (if approved)
  - c) Growth area project team: a review of the arrangements for managing the growth agenda more corporately.
  - d) Housing Stock: a proposal to carry out a new stock condition survey has been approved. The information from the survey will feed into a review of the Housing Business Plan and future financial modelling to enable the future options for the stock to be assessed.
  - e) Contact Centre Management: a review of the management arrangements (including the future of the e-gov Board)
  - f) LSP/LAA support: a review of how the Council supports the LSP and LAA.
  - g) Government White paper: developing a response to the White Paper – which is expected to include a greater emphasis on the LSP/LAA model of working.
  - h) The proposed Member Contract.
  - i) A continued emphasis on communication with staff – including the re-launch of the lunchclub sessions to share learning and discussion on issues important to the Council.
  - j) Service First: launch of the customer service standards and development of further plans.
  - k) Traveller and equalities issues.

### **Financial Implications**

27. The main financial implications from the report arise from the staffing proposals at the Appendix. The implications for the Medium Term Financial Strategy are discussed in paragraph 21 above.

### **Legal and Staffing Implications**

28. No significant legal implications. Staffing implications are discussed at paragraphs 19 to 23. It bears repeating that there are significant current pressures on the workforce and senior management and the work programme in paragraph 26 will add to them.

### **Risk Management Implications**

29. There are risks involved with many of the issues raised in this paper – these include risks as to whether the Transformation Project will achieve the savings and outcomes required. However, the most significant long term risk facing the Council and the district is if the planning and development of the growth areas results in social and other problems which would be a burden for the Council and other authorities for years to come.

### **Conclusions/Summary**

30. The Council is entering a period of major change. The Transformation Project will require officers to work in very different ways. It is necessary for Members also to approach their role differently. The Council needs a change in culture to one of working together to tackle the issues facing the Council and the district and a sustained focus on improving the services provided to customers.

### **Recommendations**

31. Our recommendations to Cabinet are as follows:
- (a) To note the report and the major issues facing the Council,
  - (b) To support the principles in paragraph 8,
  - (c) To agree in principle to a Member Contract – with the details being prepared with the Leader of the Council and the Chairman for circulation to all Members and consideration by Scrutiny Committee, prior to reference back to Cabinet,
  - (d) To approve in principle the staffing proposals in the Appendix, with final approval being given in October in the light of the revised Medium Term Financial Strategy,
  - (e) To recommend the Council to retain the current Council priorities (customer service, affordable housing and growth area) for 2007/08 with clear targets being set for each priority for 2007/08,
  - (f) To request the Growth Areas Project Team to investigate the possibility of developer contributions to posts required for the planning of the growth areas and report back to the Planning and Economic Development and Resources, Staffing, Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holders, and
  - (g) To agree the programme for financial and policy planning for 2007/08 onwards in paragraph 24.

**Background Papers:** all significant documents which have been used in the preparation of this report are already published documents.

**Contact Officers:** Greg Harlock, Chief Executive (01954 713081)  
Steve Hampson, Executive Director (01954 713021)



## APPENDIX

## STAFFING PROPOSALS

Given below are details of the staffing proposals referred to in paragraph 20 of the main report.

|   | Post                                   | Proposal  | Justification  | Costs (£000s) to GF |       |                   |
|---|--|---|--|---------------------|-------|-------------------|
|   |  |   |  | 06/07               | 07/08 | Ongoing *         |
| 1 | Affordable Housing Development Manager | Replacement of post lost through capping                    | <p>This is a priority area for the Council. 2 posts were lost from a team of 5 as a result of capping. One of the posts (relating to the growth areas) has been replaced as a joint post with Cambridge City funded through RSLs. This proposal is to replace the other post whose responsibilities are largely concerned with managing village housing schemes outside the growth areas, of which there are currently 91 schemes (1,333 units) in progress or in the pipeline. Without this post schemes will be delayed and we could lose funding for these and other schemes, if they are not worked up for the bidding rounds or to take up slippage. Pursuing this work is also now impacting upon the staff time available for the growth areas.</p> <p>The cost of the post is £47,000 pa. It is probable that the post can be financed from commuted payments towards affordable housing gained through planning agreements. This could be possible for four years from the Papworth Section 106 agreement. This will not be possible thereafter under the Council's current policy that all commuted sums should be used within the relevant area. The use of commuted sums for this purpose is the equivalent of 2-4 housing units, but the net effect taking into account the contribution made by the post will almost certainly be a gain in units, but it is not possible to quantify it. It is recommended that the post be approved, subject to funding through commuted payments being confirmed.</p> | 0                   | 0     | 0 (until 2011/12) |
| 2 | Web Services Officer                   | Continuation of fixed term appointment as a permanent post. | <p>Currently a fixed term post extended (using virement) to March 2007. The increasing use of the web site for transactional services is a key element of the Council's future transformation and customer service strategy and a potential source of future efficiencies. It is our policy to web-enable as many services as possible. The post is also essential to respond to changing government requirements for web sites; to update links to partners and other sites; to keep data up to date Current satisfaction with the web site is 64%; we are aiming for an improvement to 70%, rising to 80% by 2008/09 which will not be achievable without this post.</p>   | 0                   | 37    | 37                |

|   | Post   | Proposal   | Justification  | Costs (£000s) to GF |                 |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------|-----------------|
|   |  |  |  | 06/07               | 07/08 Ongoing * |
| 3 | Procurement Officer                          | Continuation of fixed term post for further 2 years.                         | The current postholder has achieved savings through reviewing contract and procurement arrangements and has supported services on procurement projects in a number of areas. This has contributed to our Gershon and other savings. There is still considerable scope for procurement savings and there is substantial work required in improving our procurement processes, including electronic procurement. We recommend that the post continues for a further two years with an annual report to the portfolio holder on savings made through procurement improvements. By that time, the contract and post will be deemed to be permanent under employment legislation and redundancy provisions would apply. It is expected that the post will be self financing with savings achieved being set against the cost of the post. | 0                   | 0               |
| 4 | Corporate Projects/<br>Travellers Officer    | Continuation of fixed term contract as a permanent post.                     | Currently a fixed term post terminating in March 2007. The current postholder has worked on the co-ordination of the Council's response to Traveller issues. This work will continue for the foreseeable future. The post also gives the Council much needed capacity for the project management and co-ordination of other corporate projects   | 0                   | 40              |
| 5 | Growth Areas<br>Corporate Project<br>Manager | New post   | There is an urgent requirement to provide overall project planning and co-ordination to the Council's activities in relation to Northstowe and other growth areas. This post was put forward but not approved as a result of capping and not funded by Cambridgeshire Horizons. We have included the post (on a one year basis) in our BCE bid. There might also be other scope to finance this or other growth area bids from developer contributions. If we cannot attract other funding for this post, we strongly recommend that it is funded by the Council.  | 15                  | 50              |
| 6 | Urban Designer                               | New post   | This post is urgently needed in connection with the planning and development of Northstowe and other growth areas. This is a skill required to meet the design challenges of the higher densities and more urban environment of the growth areas. This post was put forward but not approved because of capping. There is no likelihood of it being funded through Horizons at present.  | 12                  | 44              |
| 7 | ICT Project Officers                         | The continuation of 2 fixed term posts (at 3 days per week) until March 2008 | The proposal is to extend 2 current posts until the end of the business process reviews (Transformation Project) at which time one of the Transformation Project business analysts will return to ICT. One of the posts is to extend DIP (Document Image Processing) and Workflow. The other is to support other projects to maximise the use of our ICT investment and ensure that services improve as a result. The work of both posts will support the implementation of the business process reviews.  | 0                   | 42.5            |
| 8 | Revenues                                     | New part time  | Costs in 2006/07 can be met from virement.<br>Following changes made to respond to capping, difficulties are being   | 5                   | 15              |

|    | Post                     | Proposal                                   | Justification   | Costs (£000s) to GF |       |           |
|----|--------------------------|--|---|---------------------|-------|-----------|
|    |                          |  |   | 06/07               | 07/08 | Ongoing * |
|    | Administration Assistant | post.                                      | experienced in processing postal payments. It has proved necessary to provide cover from other revenues teams at peak periods to prevent backlogs and this is having a detrimental effect on the performance of those teams and potentially the wide range of performance indicators for Revenues Services  |                     |       |           |
| 9  | HR and Payroll           | Increased hours for one post + new PT post | 1.5 FTE (55.5 hours per week) posts have been lost in HR during the last year . This has resulted in unacceptable pressure on the service and delays in essential processes such as recruitment, payroll and new starter contracts. The current vulnerability of payroll is of particular concern. It is proposed to increase the hours of one HR post and to add a new part-time HR and Payroll Co-ordinator. This will provide a resilient payroll service and also greater support to service managers and the HR aspects of the Transformation Project. | 10                  | 26    | 26        |
| 10 | Section 106 Solicitor    | New post                                   | The increased number and complexity of Section 106 Agreements is placing pressure on legal services and delaying planning applications. An additional post is recommended, on the basis that the costs would be met from developer contributions. The post would help to improve our performance on BV109 (time taken to process planning applications) but the impact cannot be quantified,  | 0                   | 0     | 0         |
|    |                          |  |   | 42                  | 254.5 | 212       |

\* The ongoing column has been used to indicate whether there will be ongoing costs. At this stage the cost of future increments etc has not been allowed for.

This page is intentionally left blank



**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

|                   |                                    |                   |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>REPORT TO:</b> | Leader and Cabinet                 | 12 September 2006 |
| <b>AUTHOR/S:</b>  | Executive Director/Ecology Officer |                   |

---

**SCDC BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY****Purpose**

1. To present to members of the Cabinet the final draft of the SCDC Biodiversity Strategy and to seek support for adoption of the document as Council Policy.

**Background**

2. On the 26 January 2005 the Conservation Advisory Group considered a report on the developing *Biodiversity Strategy* that was to be a statement of the Council's policy with respect of the preservation and enhancement of the district's biodiversity.
3. A further version of the Strategy was presented to the Group on the 27 April 2005 where the content and vision of the document was considered.
4. A final pre-consultation draft of the Strategy was presented to the Group on the 14 December 2005 for consideration and comment prior to its final draft production and undertaking of the consultation exercise.
5. Following printing of the draft Strategy, it was issued for public consultation via Members, all parish councils and selected conservation bodies and development organisations on the 10 March 2006. It was also published on the Council's website. The consultation period closed on 14 April and a report was presented to the Group on the 26 April 2006. A number of comments were received after the end of the consultation period, most significant were those received from the County Council relating to Local Sites as presented in the Defra guidance April 2006 *Local Sites: Guidance on their Identification, Selection and Management*.
6. On the 12<sup>th</sup> July 2006 an amended version of the Strategy was presented to the Conservation and Design Group incorporating amendments responding to the consultation exercise. The following recommendation was made, "Support the Strategy and recommend that the Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder presents the South Cambs. Biodiversity Strategy to Cabinet to seek its approval and adoption as Council Policy, subject to reference being made in it to the continuing need to adapt to the impact of climate change on biodiversity, and the addition of wording reflected in the fourth paragraph of Minute no. 5 of the Conservation Advisory Group meeting held on 26 April 2006."
7. All of the requested amendments are contained in the version now put before Cabinet.

**Considerations**

8. All relevant comments from consultees have been incorporated and tables published upon the SCDC website to illustrate how the comments were taken into account. The

version of the Strategy presented is in accordance with Government's policy guidance.

9. The Strategy is now considered suitable to be adopted as Council Policy in support of biodiversity both within development schemes and through the council's own actions and initiatives.
10. The Strategy has been promoted in the South Cambs magazine and is also placed upon the council's web site. [www.scambs.gov.uk/biodiversitystrategy](http://www.scambs.gov.uk/biodiversitystrategy)
11. The format of the Strategy is such that it can be adapted to become Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD) under the LDF once the latter has been approved in 2007. It will serve to guide development from adoption as Council policy.

### **Options**

12. Cabinet is requested to either:
  - (a) approve the adoption of the SCDC Biodiversity Strategy as Council Policy, or
  - (b) require officers to bring a further revised version of the SCDC Biodiversity Strategy to a future meeting of the Cabinet incorporating additional amendments as agreed by Cabinet.

### **Implications**

13. The production of the Strategy in its printed form has financial implications due to its cost of approximately £10 to produce. A minimum number of copies will therefore be produced in-house.
  - (a) All parish councils and local libraries will be supplied with copies as will the following partnership bodies:
    - (i) Environment Agency
    - (ii) Natural England
    - (iii) Cambridgeshire Horizons
    - (iv) Cambridgeshire County Council
    - (v) Cambridge City Council
    - (vi) Wildlife Trust
    - (vii) Woodland Trust
    - (viii) RSPB
    - (ix) National Trust
  - (b) The Strategy will also be provided to the planning teams and appropriate council officers. This is likely to result in the provision of 120 copies. This is considered to be a necessary expenditure in order to ensure that the Strategy reaches a wide range of persons and organisations.
  - (c) Councillors will be encouraged to download the Strategy from the web. However, paper copies will be provided if requested.
  - (d) The Strategy will be available to download from the web for the general public and development companies. Copies will also be available for sale.

|     |                     |  |
|-----|---------------------|--|
| 14. | Legal               | The Strategy sets out requirements to be met by development proposals. Following adoption of the new LDF (due 2007) the Strategy will be reviewed and cross-referenced to the relevant policies contained within the LDF.<br>The Strategy provides information the level of protection afforded to certain species and sites.  |
|     | Staffing            | None specific, but the adoption of a clear policy on the conservation of biodiversity will assist the Ecology Officer and planning staff in the consideration of planning applications.  |
|     | Risk Management     | Through the emerging LDF the council has identified the need to strengthen biodiversity conservation and to produce detailed biodiversity guidance for the development control process in accordance with PPS9: <i>Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</i> . Failure to complete the publication and adoption of the Strategy may result in a lack of clear guidance and missed opportunities for biodiversity conservation as well as undermining the LDF. |
|     | Equal Opportunities | None specific  |

### Consultations

15. Externally the draft SCDC Biodiversity Strategy has been considered by a wide group of organisations including all parish councils and local environmental groups as well as selected development companies and agents. In spring 2006 the results were presented to the Conservation and Design Advisory Group on the 26<sup>th</sup> April 2006.
16. Internally consultation was with all area planning teams, the planning policy team, the Land Drainage Manager, the Strategic Development Officer and the staff of Milton Country Park as well as members of the Conservation and Design Advisory Group.

### Conclusions/Summary

17. Adoption of the SCDC Biodiversity Strategy initially as Council Policy will help to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the district's biodiversity through the following means:
  - (a) Providing clear *Biodiversity Statements* to explain the Council's approach to biodiversity conservation.
  - (b) Providing information on the variety of species and habitats within the district – *the biodiversity resource*.
  - (c) Production of a *Council Biodiversity Action Plan* to focus the conservation activities of the Council and its partners.
  - (d) Provision of *planning guidance*, particularly through Local Development Control Principles and good practice guidance and examples.
  - (e) Requirement for applicants seeking planning consent to complete the *South Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Site Checklist* in order to ensure that planning decisions are based upon the relevant up-to-date information about a site and its possible species.
  - (f) Detailing the range of *partnership activities* that the Council is currently involved in with a view to establishing further partnerships.

### Recommendations

18. It is recommended that the Cabinet approve the adoption of the SCDC Biodiversity Strategy as Council Policy.

**Effect on Annual Priorities and Corporate Objectives**

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 19. Affordable Homes              | None specific. However, appropriate provision for biodiversity within new developments will be expected inline with Government Planning Policy Statement 9.                            |
| Customer Service                  | The Strategy will improve customer service by explaining the requirements for biodiversity conservation within the planning system and setting a programme for action and enhancement. |
| Northstowe and other growth areas | The Strategy will be an important document for shaping and ensuring adequate biodiversity provision within, and around, the growth areas.  |
| Quality, Accessible Services      | The Strategy develops planning policy and provides guidance to clearly explain what is expected in support of development applications through the SC Biodiversity Site Checklist.     |
| Village Life                      | The Strategy will assist in the conservation of biodiversity within the villages thus enriching village life.  |
| Sustainability                    | The conservation of biodiversity is a key test of sustainability and the implementation of key targets will contribute to addressing climate change.                                   |
| Partnership                       | The Strategy identifies existing partnerships and sets a timeframe for positive action to facilitate future partnership action to enhance village life.                                |

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Report to the Conservation and Design Advisory Group on the 26 April 2006.

**Contact Officer:** Rob Mungovan – Ecology Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713402

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

|                   |   |                   |
|-------------------|---|-------------------|
| <b>REPORT TO:</b> | Leader and Cabinet  | 14 September 2006 |
| <b>AUTHOR/S:</b>  | Chief Executive / Assistant Solicitor, HR Manager and Finance Project Officer |                   |

---

**WHISTLEBLOWING POLICY****Purpose**

1. The purpose of this report is to request Cabinet to approve the adoption of a revised Whistleblowing Policy for the Council.

**Executive Summary**

2. The Council's Whistleblowing Policy needed to be updated. A working group of nominees from Standards Committee and officers reviewed the policy. Standards Committee have recommended to Cabinet that the revised Policy be adopted.

**Background**

3. The Council's Whistleblowing Policy ("the Policy") was previously approved by the Finance, Resources and Staffing Committee in April 2000 and updated in 2002. The Council has instigated several significant changes since then and it had been considered an appropriate time to review the Policy and update it as necessary.
4. Standards Committee considered the Policy at its meeting on 21 November 2005 and, following correspondence between the Chairman and the then Finance and Resources Director, appointed Mr P Brindle and Councillor RF Bryant as Standards Committee's representatives on a working group to review the Policy.
5. Research was carried out on other councils' whistleblowing policies in order to identify best practice and the following guidance documents from Unison and Public Concern at Work were reviewed and have been incorporated as appropriate into the proposed revised Policy:
  - (a) "Speaking out without fear" - this guide from Unison provides advice on whistleblowing procedures;
  - (b) "Whistleblowing Best Practice" - this guide from Public Concern at Work summarises the most up to date best practice, drawing on recommendations from the UK Committee on Standards in Public Life and the Code of Corporate Governance.
6. Standards Committee commended the proposed revised Policy at its meeting on 9 August 2006 and supported subscribing to the Public Concern at Work "starter package", costing approximately £310 per annum, which provided a compliance toolkit, helpline subscription, posters to promote the policy and a newsletter. The Committee decided to recommend to Cabinet that the revised Whistleblowing Policy be adopted. Standards Committee members were asked to submit any comments to the Deputy Monitoring Officer for consideration by the working group and inclusion in the revised policy as appropriate.

**Considerations**

7. The review has suggested that, while the structure of the Policy was basically sound, some amendments were required in order to bring it up to date and comply with best practice. The amendments made can be summarised as:
  - (a) taking into account the provisions of the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998;
  - (b) extra clarification to individuals considering invoking the Policy;
  - (c) giving examples of the types of concerns people may wish to raise;
  - (d) mentioning the availability of independent, confidential advice;
  - (e) identifying the Council’s Monitoring Officer as the first point of contact;
  - (f) specifying what the whistleblower must not do;
  - (g) expanding previous guidance on:
    - (i) how to raise a concern;
    - (ii) how the Council will respond; and
    - (iii) how the matter can be taken further, if necessary;
  - (h) streamlining the process for monitoring and review and incorporating the Standards Committee in this.
  
8. The full text of the proposed revised Policy is provided with the agenda papers for Members’ information.
  
9. The revised Policy would be re-launched to existing staff and Members, through briefing sessions, promotion on In-Site, the Council’s intranet, and a series of posters and handouts. The Policy would be brought to the attention of new staff and Members through the Council’s induction processes. Periodic reminders would be issued, regarding this and other associated policies. The annual monitoring report would be made available to staff and Members.

**Options**

10. Cabinet could decide not to change the current Policy; however, this would mean that the Policy would not be entirely up to date, nor fully compliant with best practice.
  
11. Cabinet could decide to approve the proposed revised Policy and recommend to Cabinet that it be adopted.
  
12. Cabinet could decide to make other changes to the Policy.

**Implications**

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| 13. Financial | The advice Public Concern at Work gives is free of charge to those who seek it; however, it does ask those organisations that refer their staff directly to them to consider a subscription, which helps to meet the costs of providing the helpline service. Their “Starter Package” comprises a copy of their compliance toolkit and revised editions, a helpline subscription with posters to help promote our Policy and internal contacts and a newsletter with updates on developments in whistleblowing. This package would be for a minimum of three years, at an annual cost of £250 plus 10p per employee (i.e. approximately £310 per annum). There is no current budget for this, but it could be incorporated in the revised estimates for 2006/07 and in the budget for 2007/08. |
| Legal         | Any matters brought to the Council’s attention under this Policy would be dealt with by the procedures outlined in it.   |

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Staffing            | Some of the amendments reflect responsibilities attributable to particular posts and officers. Staff raising concerns under this Policy will be aware of the safeguards available to them.  |
| Risk Management     | The Policy is part of the Council's arrangements for ensuring that proper standards of financial conduct are maintained, and that fraud and corruption are prevented and detected. By revising the Policy as recommended, the Council will be complying with best practice. |
| Equal Opportunities | The Policy is available for any member of staff, or contractors or Members to access.   |

### Consultations

14. At the outset of the review, the working group met to receive the suggestions made by the Standards Committee. The draft revised Policy was provided to Councillor Bryant and Mr Brindle for their consideration and further comments were incorporated. Following its meeting on 9 August 2006, some Standards Committee members submitted comments which the working group has considered and included in the final document as appropriate. (Any further comments received will be reported verbally to the meeting.)
15. The proposed revised Policy has been provided to Unison and GMB for their consideration. (Any comments received will be reported verbally to the meeting.)

### Effect on Annual Priorities and Corporate Objectives

|                                   |  |                  |  |                  |                                   |                              |              |                |             |
|-----------------------------------|--|------------------|--|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| 16.                               | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Affordable Homes</td> <td rowspan="7">South Cambridgeshire District Council is committed to the highest possible standards of openness, honesty and accountability. The Whistleblowing Policy encourages Council employees, contractors and Members with concerns about any aspect of the Council's work, to report such matters without fear of intimidation or reprisal.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer Service</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northstowe and other growth areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quality, Accessible Services</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Village Life</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sustainability</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Partnership</td> </tr> </table> | Affordable Homes | South Cambridgeshire District Council is committed to the highest possible standards of openness, honesty and accountability. The Whistleblowing Policy encourages Council employees, contractors and Members with concerns about any aspect of the Council's work, to report such matters without fear of intimidation or reprisal. | Customer Service | Northstowe and other growth areas | Quality, Accessible Services | Village Life | Sustainability | Partnership |
| Affordable Homes                  | South Cambridgeshire District Council is committed to the highest possible standards of openness, honesty and accountability. The Whistleblowing Policy encourages Council employees, contractors and Members with concerns about any aspect of the Council's work, to report such matters without fear of intimidation or reprisal.   |                  |  |                  |                                   |                              |              |                |             |
| Customer Service                  |  |                  |  |                  |                                   |                              |              |                |             |
| Northstowe and other growth areas |  |                  |  |                  |                                   |                              |              |                |             |
| Quality, Accessible Services      |  |                  |  |                  |                                   |                              |              |                |             |
| Village Life                      |  |                  |  |                  |                                   |                              |              |                |             |
| Sustainability                    |  |                  |  |                  |                                   |                              |              |                |             |
| Partnership                       |  |                  |  |                  |                                   |                              |              |                |             |

### Conclusions/Summary

17. Some amendments are required in order to bring the Policy up to date and comply with best practice. Standards Committee have recommended that Cabinet approve the adoption of the revised Whistleblowing Policy.

### Recommendations

18. Cabinet is recommended to approve the adoption of the revised Whistleblowing Policy and to support subscribing to the Public Concern at Work "starter package".

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

The Council's current Whistleblowing Policy  
Whistleblowing policies from a range of other councils  
"Speaking out without fear", Unison's guide to whistleblowing  
"Whistleblowing Best Practice", Guidance from Public Concern at Work

**Contact Officers:** Fiona McMillan – Assistant Solicitor, (01954) 713027  
Susan Gardner Craig – HR Manager, (01954) 713285  
John Garnham – Finance Project Officer, (01954) 713101

This page is intentionally left blank





# Whistleblowing Policy

## **Contents**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Aims and scope of the policy**
- 3. Safeguards: Harassment or victimisation**
- 4. Confidentiality**
- 5. Anonymous allegations**
- 6. Unfounded or untrue allegations**
- 7. Support to staff and Members**
- 8. Independent advice**
- 9. How to raise a concern**
- 10. How the Council will respond**
- 11. How the matter can be taken further**
- 12. Monitoring and review**

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Council staff, contractors or Council Members are often the first to realise that something seriously wrong may be taking place or have occurred within South Cambridgeshire District Council or its activities. However, they may not express their concerns because:
- they may feel that speaking up would be disloyal to their colleagues or to the Council; or
  - they may fear that they or someone else might be harassed or victimised.
- 1.2 South Cambridgeshire District Council is committed to the highest possible standards of openness, honesty and accountability and therefore wishes to be alerted to any problems at the earliest opportunity. The Council therefore encourages staff, contractors and elected Members who have serious concerns about any aspect of the Council's work, to come forward and voice those concerns.
- 1.3 This policy makes it clear that they may do so, irrespective of seniority or status, and without fear of intimidation, victimisation, subsequent discrimination, disadvantage, or other reprisal. The Council recognises that most cases will have to proceed on a confidential basis.
- 1.4 The policy has been written to take account of the provisions of the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, which protects workers making disclosures about certain matters of concern. The Act is incorporated into the Employments Rights Act 1996, which also already protects employees who take action over, or raise concerns about health and safety at work.
- 1.5 The policy encourages and enables staff and others to raise concerns within the Council, rather than either overlooking a problem or reporting the matter externally. This will enable the Council to take action, as appropriate to:
- pre-empt crime or other wrongdoings, where possible;
  - bring the perpetrators to account;
  - minimise and contain any adverse impact;
  - take corrective action to eliminate or significantly reduce the scope for repeat occurrences.
- 1.6 The word "whistleblowing" in this Policy refers to the disclosure by staff and others, either internally or externally, of malpractice, as well as illegal acts or omissions at work. Malpractice includes any form of corruption, favouritism or discrimination, gross negligence in performance of duty by officers or Members, etc. The policy outlines the procedures to be followed if and when such matters arise.
- 1.7 The word "whistleblower" in this Policy refers to the person raising a concern, whether that person is a member of staff, a contractor, a Council Member, or someone else.

## **2. Aims and scope of the policy**

- 2.1 This policy aims to:
- encourage staff and others to feel confident in raising serious concerns and to question and act upon those concerns;

- provide avenues for people to raise concerns and to receive feedback on any action taken;
- ensure that any matter reported is taken seriously and dealt with quickly and appropriately;
- ensure that any matters raised are treated as confidential as far as practicable;
- reassure people that they will be protected from possible disadvantage, reprisals or victimisation if they have a reasonable belief that they have raised their concerns in good faith;
- ensure that people receive a response to their concerns and that they are aware of how to pursue them if they are not satisfied;
- allow people to take the matter further if they are dissatisfied with the Council's response.

2.2 The Council has a range of policies and procedures which deal with employment policies, standards of behaviour at work and other issues or matters of concern, including:

- Anti Theft, Fraud and Corruption Policy;
- Disciplinary Policy and Procedure;
- Financial Regulations;
- Contract Standing Orders;
- Grievance Policy and Procedure (e.g. to enable Council staff to lodge a grievance relating to their own employment);
- Harassment and Bullying at Work Policy and Procedure;
- Recruitment and Selection;
- Members' and Officers' Codes of Conduct.

(This list is not exhaustive; a full list of the Council's current policies and procedures can be found on In-Site, the Council's intranet, at [http://insite/PoliciesStrategiesProcedures/.](http://insite/PoliciesStrategiesProcedures/))

2.3 There are provisions within these policies for concerns relating to them to be raised and dealt with. Where appropriate, therefore, issues of concern should be raised under the provisions of the relevant policy and procedure, in preference to the Whistleblowing Policy, which is not intended to cover these matters. If the Monitoring Officer considers that a concern raised under the Whistleblowing Policy should more properly be dealt with under the provisions of another policy, he would refer the whistleblower to that policy.

2.4 There may be times, however, when the matter either does not relate to one of these policies or needs to be handled in a different way. The Whistleblowing Policy is intended to cover major concerns that fall outside the scope of other policies and procedures. Those concerns may be about something that:

- is unlawful; or
- is contrary to the Council's Constitution and policies; or
- falls below established standards or practices; or
- amounts to improper conduct.

2.5 Examples may be:

- malpractice;
- ill treatment or abuse of a client/customer by a member of staff;
- repeated ill treatment of a client/customer, despite a complaint being made;
- a criminal offence has been, is being, or is likely to be committed;

- disregard of legislation, particularly in relation to health and safety at work;
- showing undue favour over a contractual matter or to a job applicant;
- a breach of any code of conduct or protocol;
- miscarriage of justice;
- information on any of the above has been, is being, or is likely to be concealed.

(This list is not exhaustive.)

2.6 All staff and Members have responsibility to express concerns about unacceptable practice or behaviour. Although it can be difficult to raise such concerns, particularly about a colleague, they are encouraged to act to prevent an escalation of the problem, or even to avoid being potentially implicated themselves.

### **3. Safeguards: Harassment or victimisation**

3.1 The Council recognises that the decision to report a concern can be a difficult one to make, not least because of the fear of reprisal from the person(s) who are the subject of the issue raised. The Council will not tolerate any harassment or victimisation of a whistleblower (including informal pressures) and will treat this as a serious disciplinary offence, which will be dealt with under the Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.

### **4. Confidentiality**

4.1 All concerns raised will be treated in confidence and the Council will do its best to protect a whistleblower's identity when they do not want their name to be disclosed. It may be possible to establish the truth about allegations from an independent source and the Council will seek to do this where possible. However, it must be appreciated that the investigation process may reveal the source of the information and a statement by the whistleblower may be required as part of the evidence.

4.2 If the situation arises where the Council is unable to resolve the concern without revealing a whistleblower's identity, the matter will be discussed with the whistleblower to determine how the matter is to proceed.

### **5. Anonymous allegations**

5.1 The Council encourages whistleblowers to put their name to their allegation. Concerns expressed anonymously are much less powerful, but they will be considered at the discretion of the person to whom they are made.

5.2 In exercising this discretion, the factors to be taken into account would include:

- the seriousness of the issue(s) raised;
- the credibility of the concern(s); and
- the likelihood of confirming the allegation(s) from attributable sources.

5.3 Anonymous whistleblowers should also bear in mind that, if they do not make their name known, the Monitoring Officer will not know whose identity to keep confidential and their name may be inadvertently disclosed. It will also not be possible to provide direct feedback to them on the progress and outcome of any investigations.

## **6. Unfounded or untrue allegations**

- 6.1 Where it is established, after investigation, that the allegations are unfounded, then the whistleblower will be notified. The Council will deem the matter “closed” and will not expect the issue to be raised again unless new evidence becomes available.
- 6.2 If a member of staff makes an allegation in good faith and has a reasonable belief in the truth of the allegation, but it is not confirmed by the investigation, no action will be taken against them. If, however, there is clear evidence that a member of staff has made a malicious or vexatious allegation, then disciplinary action may be taken against them.

## **7. Support to staff and Members**

- 7.1 It is recognised that raising concerns can be difficult and stressful. Accordingly, where requested, advice and support is available to staff from the HR Team, a trade union representative, the member of staff's line manager, or the Employee Assistance Programme (tel: 0800 282 193, or look on In-Site, the Council's intranet, web address: <http://intranet/hrfiles/PPC/ppcIndex.html>).
- 7.2 Staff who are subject to investigation following concerns being raised will also be entitled to similar support, although ideally not from the same individuals.
- 7.3 Advice and support to Members is available, where requested, from the Monitoring Officer.

## **8. Independent advice**

- 8.1 If you are unsure whether or how to raise a concern or you want confidential advice, you can contact the independent charity Public Concern at Work on 020 7404 6609 or at [helpline@pcaw.co.uk](mailto:helpline@pcaw.co.uk)). Their legal advisers can give you free confidential advice on raising a concern about serious malpractice at work.
- 8.2 You can also contact Unison or GMB for independent advice.

## **9. How to raise a concern**

- 9.1 Before initiating the whistleblowing procedure, staff should normally discuss their concerns with their immediate manager or supervisor. However, this depends on the seriousness and sensitivity of the issues and who is thought to be involved.
- 9.2 The Council's Monitoring Officer has overall responsibility for the maintenance and operation of this policy and procedure and maintains a record of concerns raised and the outcomes (in a form which does not endanger confidentiality).
- 9.3 Staff should therefore raise concerns with the Monitoring Officer, telephone number 01954 713060.
- If staff feel that they would prefer to talk to another senior officer, they should approach the HR Manager, telephone number 01954 713285.
- 9.4 If staff do not feel able to approach either of the above, they should contact the Internal Audit Manager, Deloitte, email address [internal.audit@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:internal.audit@scambs.gov.uk).
- 9.5 In some circumstances, it may be appropriate for staff to ask their trade union or

professional association to raise a matter on their behalf.

- 9.6 Contractors or Members should raise their concerns with the Monitoring Officer.
- 9.7 The earlier concerns are expressed, the easier it is to take action. Concerns are better raised in writing and whistleblowers are encouraged to do so, setting out, in as much detail as possible:
- the background and history of their concern (giving names, dates and places where possible); and
  - the reason(s) why they are particularly concerned about the situation.
- 9.8 If a whistleblower does not feel able to put their concern in writing, they can report it verbally, either by telephone or by meeting the appropriate officer.
- 9.9 Whistleblowers may invite a trade union or professional association representative, friend or colleague who is not involved in the area of work to which the concern relates, to be present during any meetings or interviews in connection with the concerns they have raised. Such meetings can be held off-site if desired.
- 9.10 Although whistleblowers are not expected to prove the truth of their allegation to the person they have contacted, that person will need to be satisfied there is sufficient evidence in support of the allegation before proceeding.
- 9.11 Once the whistleblower has raised their concern, they must not:
- contact the suspected perpetrator in an effort to determine facts or demand restitution;
  - discuss the case facts, suspicions, or allegations with anyone else within or outside the Council (including the press);
  - attempt to personally conduct investigations or interviews or question anyone.

## **10. How the Council will respond**

- 10.1 The Council will take whistleblowers' concerns seriously. Whistleblowers are asked to bear in mind that investigating concerns is not the same as either accepting or rejecting the validity of the allegation.
- 10.2 In order to protect the whistleblower, the Council and those accused of misdeeds or possible malpractice, initial enquiries (usually involving a meeting with the whistleblower) will be made to decide whether an investigation is appropriate and, if so, what form it should take.
- 10.3 The overriding principles that the Council will follow are to establish the facts and to protect both the whistleblower and the public interest.
- 10.4 Concerns or allegations that raise issues which fall within the scope of other specific policies and procedures (for example, discrimination issues), will normally be referred for consideration under those policies and procedures.
- 10.5 Following this, the Monitoring Officer will, within ten working days, write to the whistleblower:

- acknowledging that the concern has been received;
- where initial enquiries have been undertaken and further investigation of the matter is considered unnecessary, advising them of the reasons for this decision; or
- informing them that an investigation will be carried out;
- indicating how he/she proposes to deal with the matter;
- giving an estimate of how long it will take to provide a final response;
- confirming that any investigation will be carried out in the strictest confidence.

The Monitoring Officer can decide to take no further action if a complaint appears to be trivial, malicious or vexatious.

- 10.6 If an investigation is required, the Monitoring Officer will consult as necessary and designate an appropriate person to investigate the concern. The action taken by the Council will depend on the nature of the concern and, where appropriate, the matters raised may:
- be investigated by management, internal audit, or through the disciplinary process;
  - be referred to the police;
  - be referred to the external auditor;
  - form the subject of an independent inquiry;
  - in certain circumstances, necessitate a report on the outcome of the investigation to be made to the Council;
  - be referred to the Monitoring Officer or to the Standards Board for England if in respect of breaches of the Members' Code of Conduct;
  - be dealt with under the Council's Complaints Procedure.
- 10.7 Some concerns may be resolved through discussion or agreed action without the need for investigation. However, if urgent action is required, this may be taken before any investigation is conducted.
- 10.8 Where possible and subject to legal constraints, the Monitoring Officer will also keep the whistleblower informed about how the matter is progressing. The amount of contact between the whistleblower and the officer(s) considering the issues will depend on the nature of the matters raised, the potential difficulties involved and the clarity of the information provided. If necessary, the Monitoring Officer will seek further information from whistleblowers.
- 10.9 The Council will take steps to minimise any difficulties that staff or Members may experience as a result of raising a concern. For instance, if they are required to give evidence in criminal or disciplinary proceedings, the Monitoring Officer will advise them about the procedure. The Council cannot provide legal representation for staff or Members, but, where appropriate, counselling may be provided by the Council.
- 10.10 The Council accepts that the whistleblower needs to be assured that the matter has been properly addressed. Thus, subject to legal constraints, they will be informed, in confidence, about the outcomes of any investigation, or any action taken to correct working practices that have been found to be at fault by the investigation.
- 10.11 In the event that the whistleblower is unhappy with the outcome and/or response received at the conclusion of the investigation, they will be provided with details of whom to contact should they wish to raise the matter externally.
- 10.12 All matters will be referred to the Monitoring Officer for record keeping purposes.



## 11. How the matter can be taken further

11.1 This policy is intended to provide a whistleblower with a procedure to raise concerns within the Council. The Council hopes the whistleblower will be satisfied with any action taken. If they are not, and feel that it is right to take the matter outside the Council, the following are possible contact points:

- the local Council Member (if the staff member lives in the area of the Council) – if unsure who it is, contact Democratic Services (tel: 01954 713016; email:Democratic.Services@scams.gov.uk), or look on In-Site, the Council's intranet (web address: <http://scdcsql:8070/mgMemberIndex.asp>), or website (web address: <http://www.scams.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Councillors,WardsandParishes/>);
- the Chairman or any member of the Standards Committee – for details of current membership please contact Democratic Services (tel: 01954 713016; email:Democratic.Services@scams.gov.uk), or look on In-Site, the Council's intranet (web address: <http://scdcsql:8070/mgCommitteeMailingList.asp?ID=415>), or website (web address: <http://213.210.33.5/mgCommitteeMailingList.asp?ID=415>);
- the external auditor, RSM Robson Rhodes, Daedalus House, Station Road, Cambridge, CB1 2RE, telephone number 01223 368020;
- relevant professional bodies or regulatory organisations;
- a solicitor;
- the Police;
- an independent person or organisation nominated for the purpose by the Council, if appropriate to the nature of the concern raised – the Monitoring Officer would inform the whistleblower how to contact them;
- Public Concern at Work (tel: 020 7404 6609; web address: [www.pcaaw.co.uk](http://www.pcaaw.co.uk));
- a recognised trades union;
- the Local Government Ombudsman, web address: <http://www.lgo.org.uk/contact.htm>.

11.2 If the whistleblower does take the matter outside the Council, they need to ensure that they do not disclose confidential or legally restricted information or that disclosure would be privileged. The whistleblower should check with the person they initially contacted about that.

## 12. Monitoring and review

12.1 The Monitoring Officer will monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the policy and procedure and will submit an annual monitoring report to the Chief Executive and to the Chairman of the Standards Committee on any matters raised under this Policy and the subsequent outcome in each case. The Standards Committee will monitor the implementation of the recommendation(s) of the investigation.

12.2 Management Team and the Standards Committee will each review the policy and procedure and evaluate its effectiveness in the light of issues raised or identified as part of the monitoring process. Revisions to the policy or procedure will be made, where necessary, following endorsement from Management Team and the Standards Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Leader and Cabinet  
**AUTHORS:** Senior Management Team

14 September 2006

---

**PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT: FIRST QUARTER 2006/07****Purpose**

1. This report provides Cabinet with a first opportunity to review progress on corporate performance indicators and milestones for 2006/07 and to initiate action to address any areas where end of year targets may not be met.

**General**

2. The Council set performance indicator targets for 2006/07 in the Performance Plan for 2006. There are 109 corporately important PI targets for 2006/07 of which 76 are appropriate for quarterly monitoring.

**Performance Indicators Where End of Year Targets are at Risk**

3. After the first quarter, we are pleased to report that the vast majority of performance indicators are on track to meet or exceed their targets. There is a small percentage (10%) of performance indicators where end of year targets may not be fully achieved, but action is being taken to improve performance. These are listed below, with the relevant performance figures given in **Appendix 1**.

- (a) **The % of conservation areas with up-to-date character appraisals and published management proposals (BV219a & c).** The officers who would be working on conservation areas have been diverted to important design issues relating to the growth areas, in accordance with the Council's priorities. Planning Delivery Grant will be used to finance consultants to carry out work in relation to conservation areas. This work has been put out to tender and consultants selected. We are still on course to achieve our target of covering all conservation areas in five years.
- (b) **The % of historic buildings at risk taken off the register (SP903).** Progress has been hampered because appointment to a vacant post was delayed, firstly as a result of capping and then due to recruitment difficulties. Available staff resources have been used on essential work in relation to statutory processes (listed building applications etc). A new member of staff will be in post from October, but it is now unlikely that the target of 6% of buildings removed from the register will be fully achieved in the remainder of the year.
- (c) **The number of landscape schemes implemented (SP 931).** A new Landscape Assistant started with the Council at the end of July and the position on this indicator will be reviewed for the next meeting.
- (d) **The % of benefit calculations which are correct (BV79a).** The Council is required to check 125 randomly selected benefit claims each quarter for accuracy and in the first quarter 5 of the cases checked were found to contain errors (all which were minor and did not result in significant over or under payments). Given

the exacting target of 99%, this will now only be achieved if all the cases in the next three quarters are correct. There were no significant patterns in the five cases where errors were found. The benefits service already works proactively to improve quality through its quality checking process and training programme. A training needs analysis was undertaken last year which is enabling training to be better targeted. There has been a number of new staff as a result of turnover. The number of applications dealt with has increased this year, with an improvement in the processing time, but with the same number of staff.

- (e) **The % of benefits overpayments which are recovered (BV79bii)**. An update to the benefits system has been recently installed and the reports produced by the new system are not felt to be fully reliable at this stage. Hence, we cannot yet be sure about the end of year position on this and other PIs. The problem also affects other councils with the same software and is being addressed with the suppliers.

An additional resource of 0.5 FTE has now been allocated to this service area and it is anticipated that this will lead to a steady improvement in collection.

It should be noted that whilst there is room for improvements in these two performance indicators the overall performance of the Benefits Service is rated as excellent using the self-assessment tool provided by the Department for Works and Pensions.

- (f) **Average time to respond to a standard search (SX25)**. The performance on this PI in 2005/6 was 10 working days. A target of 4 days was set for the current year in the expectation that the service would be computerised. It is now unlikely that the service will be in a position to offer a fully computerised service in 2006/07, not least because of national problems about a standard format for land and property based information. It is not possible to make a significant improvement on this PI without computerisation and we shall be keeping progress on this project under review.
- (g) **% of non-urgent housing repairs completed on time (SH 301)**. The position on the first quarter is 79% against a target of 93%, although it is still felt that the end of year target is achievable. The main reason for the lower figure in the first quarter is where the DLO has not requested extensions of time for works that cannot be completed by the response time for legitimate reasons; e.g. special orders for goods and materials, appointment time inconvenient for tenant, no access etc. This has now been raised with the officers concerned. We do not currently feel that further action or resources are required at this stage, but will review the position again at the second quarter stage.
- (h) **Affordable housing permissions as a % of all residential permissions (SH 320)**. The data for this PI is not yet available. Development Control officers are seeking a meeting with County Council officers to agree how best to carry out this monitoring. We believe that it is important to report on this PI as it will enable the Council to assess the success of our planning policies in delivering affordable housing, one of our priorities.

6. We have considered whether further action is required by Management Team or Cabinet to ensure that the above PIs achieve their end of year targets. At this stage we feel that all reasonable actions are being carried out. While all our performance indicators ultimately affect the quality of service received by the public, we are

particularly concerned with those (such as the indicators above relating to searches and housing repairs) which relate directly to the service received by service users.

7. A common factor in a number of the above cases is problems in recruitment - in particular where posts have not been filled because of recruitment problems or because of turnover. Service managers are working to overcome this problem on a case by case basis. However, more general approaches are also being considered for presentation in the Workforce Plan to come to Cabinet in November.

### **Financial and Performance Reporting**

8. Last year's Use of Resources Judgement commented that we do not report performance and financial management performance in an integrated way. At present quarterly reports on budget monitoring and performance are made separately to Cabinet. There are substantial benefits in integrating this process – for example it would enable underspends to be re-directed towards the achievement of priorities or key performance indicators.
9. We shall seek integration of this process for the second quarter reports. In the meantime, Members may wish to refer to the latest financial monitoring report (which went to the July meeting of the Cabinet) and indicated the following projected underspends for 2006/07:-

|                         |          |
|-------------------------|----------|
| General Fund            | £66,070  |
| Housing Revenue Account | £7,700   |
| Capital                 | £218,850 |

### **Corporate Milestones – Progress Report**

10. The Performance Plan sets out 27 major Corporate Milestones to progress our three priorities (Customer Service, Affordable Housing and the Growth Areas) in 2006/07. An up to date position statement on all the milestones is given in **Appendix 2**.
11. Of the eight milestones which should have been achieved by the end of June 2006 (Q2 2006), three milestones were completely achieved on time:-
  - M1** Achievement of 100% of electronic service delivery for relevant services (BV 157)
  - M9** Commence public examination for LDF
  - M16** Affordable housing – annual review and report to portfolio holder on arrangements within the Council to promote affordable housing.

and the remainder will be achieved with minor slippage which will not have implications for our overall timetables.

12. There are some slight delays in some milestones relating to Customer Service, but these are being managed and in some cases progress is outside our control. Overall progress is good and our overall plans for the year will be achieved. The public launch of the service standards has been postponed to October to enable further staff consultation and preparation.
13. On the growth areas, again there are some delays, but overall progress is being made. Particular issues of note are:-

- (a) There could be some concern arising from the fact that the first two councils to have put their LDF to Public Examination have been required to begin their preparation again. Officers have reviewed the Inspector's Reports for those LDFs and consider that the Development Plan Documents that the Council has submitted to the Secretary of State have more closely followed the new statutory procedures. The Inspector's binding report on the Core Strategy DPD is expected towards the end of October.
  - (b) Progress is likely to be affected by the changing timescale arising from English Partnerships taking control of the Oakington Barracks/Airfield site and the submission of revised proposals probably in the form of a new planning application during 2007.
  - (c) There is a pressing need for a corporate project manager and project plan to coordinate the Council's preparations. This need is also referred to in the "State of the Nation" report.
  - (d) There is concern about progress on the Northstowe Sustainable Energy Partnership (**M15**) and other sustainability aspects of the development, following the departure of the Strategic Development Officer and the interval until a successor comes into post.
14. On affordable housing, progress on **M17** (arrangements to monitor affordable housing permissions) and **M18** (development and use of standard Section 106 agreements) continue to experience delays. Otherwise, good progress is being made. Where there are delays, it is largely as a result of delays in partnership working.
15. On the milestones relating to other major corporate projects, progress on the Transformation Project is reported in the "State of the Nation" report.
16. Overall, we are satisfied with progress on the milestones. In most cases, the achievement of the milestones is dependent on other partners or government agencies. Given this factor and the resource and other pressures on the Council good progress is being made and the challenging programme of work reflected in the milestones for 2006/07 will be substantially achieved.

#### **Other Performance Management Developments**

17. **Audit Commission Basket of PIs.** As mentioned in the "State of the Nation" report, the Audit Commission have published a "basket of performance indicators" which will be used as one of the criteria for deciding whether councils should undergo a CPA re-assessment. A similar basket was used in connection with the Direction of Travel assessment.
18. The basket includes 36 indicators covering Environment, Culture, Community Housing (including benefits) and Housing Management. Most of the PIs are national indicators, but five of them are housing statistics which are collected through the HIP (Housing Investment Programme) process. They are listed in **Appendix 3**.
19. The report from the Audit Commission uses the basket of PIs to identify two key statistics:-

- The proportion of PIs where the council improved between 2002/03 and 2004/05. On this statistic the council scores 42% in comparison with an average of just over 50%.
  - Quartile position in 2004/05. On this statistic the council has 21% of PIs in the top quartile.
20. The statistics arising from the basket of PIs are not as favourable to the Council as would be the case if all national PIs were used (as is the case in the Performance Plan). Also, some of the PIs are weighted for deprivation and other factors. The information is historic and there was improvement in 2005/06, which has not yet fed into national comparative figures. It is also necessary to take into account the fact that on most services the Council is among the lowest spending quartile. Nevertheless, as these PIs are planned to be used for Audit Commission assessments, it is clearly important to reflect them in our performance management system. In particular, it is recommended that the HIP statistics used should be adopted as local PIs and progress included in future quarterly reports.
21. **Data Quality:** the Audit Commission are currently carrying out, for all local authorities, an inspection of their arrangements for ensuring the quality of data used in reporting performance and other purposes. This is being carried out in conjunction with the annual audit of performance indicators. For example the inspection will look to see that councils have in place policies, procedures and responsibilities for ensuring that data used in providing Council services is accurate. A further report will be made to the Cabinet when the outcome of the inspection and the audit of performance indicators is complete.
22. **Three Yearly Best Value Surveys.** We are currently carrying out the statutory three yearly satisfaction surveys. These include separate surveys for planning applicants, benefits applicants and tenants as well as the general survey. All the surveys include national performance indicators and the questions are set by the Government. We shall report the results to enable Cabinet to consider potential improvements in customer services to respond to the views of users of services.
23. **Replacement for PIMMS.** The Council's current computer system for recording, monitoring and retrieving performance data was produced in-house and launched, in 2002, as a simple system. At the same time the external market has been transformed with an increasing number of very capable packages at lower costs. Also Performance Management has developed in importance and there is a greater impetus to integrate it with other Council systems.
24. Some of the functions which we now need from a performance management system which are not supported by PIMMS are:-
- a) The ability to hold milestones as well as PI data.
  - b) The ability for Members and managers to see summary performance on a pre-selected number of PIs of importance to them.
  - c) The ability to search on a range of criteria – eg officer, portfolio holder, team, objective.
  - d) The provision of traffic lights or some other way to graphically show whether targets are being achieved. Improved graphical presentation of PI data.
  - e) A simple user friendly interface which is similar to other Windows/internet interfaces.
  - f) The ability to generate automatic reminders to inputters or automatic reports to managers or members

- g) The ability to link PIs and milestones to strategies, Council aims/challenges and potentially finance.
  - h) Ease of administration and automatic generation of overall and comparative figures – particularly important with the reduction in the Policy and Performance Team.
25. Other systems are currently being viewed with a view to drawing up a specification and a procurement process later in the year. As part of this process, the Council's performance management framework will be revised to ensure that the new system reflects what the Council want to get out of it. At present there is no budget provision for a new system and this will be put forward as a bid for the 2007/08 budget process.

### **Conclusion**

26. One of our aims as a Management Team is to place a clearer emphasis on the consistent improvement of services through performance management. In this report we have outlined some of the current steps we are taking to achieve this aim. The "basket of PIs" compiled by the Audit Commission is an indicator of the need for a sustained focus on service improvement. We also want to link performance management with our financial systems to ensure that we use resources more effectively in improving services. Given our current and future resource position the Council will need to be clearer on which PIs are the most important and where effort and resources should be focused.
27. At this early stage in 2006/07, good progress is being made on performance indicators and milestones, but the overall position will become clearer in the 6 month report in November. In the meantime portfolio holders, staff and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are requested to keep focused on maintaining service levels, particularly during the changes that will be taking place in the organisation in the coming months.

### **Recommendations**

28. Cabinet is recommended:-
- (a) To note the progress on performance indicators and milestones in the first quarter of 2006/07.
  - (b) To consider whether further action is required to address any of the other performance indicators (paragraph 3) or milestones (paragraphs 10-15) where end of year targets are at risk
  - (c) To support the steps being taken to strengthen performance management.

**Background Papers:** The Performance Plan 2006.

**Contact Officers:** For general performance management issues:

Greg Harlock, Chief Executive  
Steve Hampson, Executive Director

For detailed matters: Ian Salter – Performance Improvement Officer (01954 – 713018)





APPENDIX 1

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2006/07

EXCEPTION REPORT – YEAR END ESTIMATES BELOW TARGET

Performance Summary

|                               |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Total Number of corporate PIs | 109 |
|-------------------------------|-----|

| TREND     |   |
|-----------|---|
| Up        | ↑ |
| No change | ↔ |
| Down      | ↓ |

| #  | Description   | 06/07<br>1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 06/07<br>2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 06/07<br>3rd Qtr | 06/07<br>4th Qtr | 06/07<br>target | 06/07<br>estimate<br>actual | 1 <sup>st</sup><br>Quarter<br>Trend<br>against<br>target |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>FINANCE &amp; RESOURCES – REVENUES – HOUSING BENEFITS</b>   |   |                              |                              |                  |                  |                 |                             |  |
| BV 79a   | % cases where benefit calculation was correct                           | 96 %                         |                              |                  |                  | 99 %            | 98 %                        | ↓  |
| BV 79bi  | Benefit overpayments recovered as % of overpayments deemed recoverable. | 130.7 %                      |                              |                  |                  | 52.5 %          | 52.5 %                      | ↑  |
| BV 79bii   | Benefit overpayments recovered as % of total overpayment debt.          | 24.18 %                      |                              |                  |                  | 29 %            | 29 %                        | ↓  |
| BV 79 biii   | Benefits written off as % of total overpayment debt.                    | 0.23 %                       |                              |                  |                  | 3 %             | 3 %                         | ↓  |
| <b>FINANCE &amp; RESOURCES – LEGAL SERVICES – LAND CHARGES</b> |   |                              |                              |                  |                  |                 |                             |  |

| #  | Description  | 06/07<br>1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr | 06/07<br>2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr | 06/07<br>3rd Qtr | 06/07<br>4th Qtr | 06/07<br>target | 06/07<br>estimate<br>actual | 1 <sup>st</sup><br>Quarter<br>Trend<br>against<br>target |
|--|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| SX 25  | Average time to respond to standard search                         | 10 days                      |                              |                  |                  | 4 days          | 10 days                     | ↓  |
| <b>DEVELOPMENT SERVICES – CONSERVATION</b>             |  |                              |                              |                  |                  |                 |                             |  |
| BV 219b  | % conservation areas with up-to-date character appraisal.          | 11.9 %                       |                              |                  |                  | 16.47 %         | 12.94 %                     | ↓  |
| BV 219c  | % Conservation areas with published management proposals           | 11.9 %                       |                              |                  |                  | 16.47 %         | 12.94 %                     | ↓  |
| SP 931   | The number of landscape schemes implemented                        | 0                            |                              |                  |                  | 72              | See comment in report       | ↓  |
| SP 903   | % Historic buildings at risk taken off the register                | 0 %                          |                              |                  |                  | 6 %             | 2 %                         | ↓  |
| <b>DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</b>                            |  |                              |                              |                  |                  |                 |                             |  |
| SH 320   | Affordable Housing permissions as % of all residential permissions | Not Known                    |                              |                  |                  | Not set         | Not Known                   | ?  |
| <b>HOUSING - HOUSING SERVICES – TECHNICAL SERVICES</b> |  |                              |                              |                  |                  |                 |                             |  |
| SH 301   | % Non-urgent completed on time                                     | 79 %                         |                              |                  |                  | 93 %            | 93 %                        | ↓  |

## APPENDIX 2

### COUNCIL PRIORITIES AND MILESTONES – 2006/07

#### 3 MONTH (END OF 1<sup>ST</sup> QUARTER) REPORT – AS AT 30<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2006

##### Key to symbols:

- ✓ Action completed.
- ☺ Not yet completed but the responsible officer has indicated that it is on schedule.
- ☹ The responsible officer has indicated that it is likely to be on schedule or there may be some, but acceptable. delay. The achievement of the target will still be achieved by the year end and it will not hold up other key milestones.
- ☹ The responsible officer has indicated that this milestone will not be on schedule and may affect other milestones -
  - Unless action is taken/authorised by MT or CABINET to recover the situation.
  - Because of factors that are completely out of the control of South Cambs.

##### By When:

Q1 2006 – By end of March 2006

Q2 2006 – By end of June 2006

Q3 2006 – By end of September 2006

Q4 2006 – By end of December 2006

## PRIORITY: IMPROVING CUSTOMER SERVICE

| # | Milestone  | Officer               | PFH    | By when |
|---|--|-----------------------|--------|---------|
| 1 | <p><b>Completing IEG in terms of 100% for BV157 and achievement of the required priority outcomes.</b></p> <p>IEG and completion of 100% BVPI 157 / priority outcomes, was successfully achieved ahead of the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006 deadline. Further work to fully develop opportunities presented by this initiative is ongoing.</p> <p><b>Contact Centre – completion of Phases 1 and 2 with integration with CRM.</b></p>   | Steve Rayment         | RSI&CS | Q1 2006 |
| 2 | <p>Works to integrate the CRM with the back office systems continues, both partners (Northgate IS and Cambridgeshire County Council) are working with us to achieve the identified integration. Delays in implementing the works have been incurred but are being managed to achieve the required outcome at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><b>Publicity for availability of transactional services on our web-site (with launch of customer service standards).</b></p> | Steve Rayment         | RSI&CS | Q2 2006 |
| 3 | <p>The communications team will do all that is required once the revised launch date is confirmed (# 4 refers).</p> <p><b>Service First – public launch of new customer service standards.</b></p>   | Sally Carroll & SR/SH | RSI&CS | Q2 2006 |
| 4 | <p>The launch has been postponed to October 2006 to enable further staff consultation and preparation.</p> <p><b>Service First - First integrated half year monitoring report on customer service standards and complaints.</b></p>  | Steve Hampson         | RSI&CS | Q2 2006 |
| 5 | <p>Permanent agenda item at the Service 1<sup>st</sup> project team meetings.</p> <p><b>Service First: Approval of a Customer Access Strategy.</b></p>   | Steve Hampson         | RSI&CS | Q3 2006 |
| 6 | <p>The production of a customer access strategy will be considered as part of the review of the Egov board's work in respect of customer service, in conjunction with the service first project team, and as part of the transformation project's business review programme.</p>   | Steve Hampson         | RSI&CS | Q3 2006 |

## PRIORITY: NORTHSTOWE AND OTHER GROWTH AREAS

| #  | Milestone  | Officer        | PFH    | By when |
|----|--|----------------|--------|---------|
|    | <b>Northstowe: Completion of Local Management Organisation Study.</b>  | Jane Thompson  | CS&CP  | Q2 2006 |
| 7  | The consultants final report is completed but a number of issues arising from that process are still outstanding and further discussions with partners are taking place before a final meeting in September 2006. This is the first stage of a process that will continue over the next year and beyond; including decisions on a range of governance and management issues.   |                |        | ☺       |
|    | <b>Civic Hub proposals completed, including specification.</b>   | Simon McIntosh | CS&CP  | Q2 2006 |
| 8  | Progress has been affected by the changing timescale for completion of the master planning and town centre work, arising from English Partnerships/Gallaghers expected new application. Consultants report also delayed, due largely to health rethink and proposal to include health services within the Civic Hub. Anticipate revised target Q3 or Q4 2006.  |                |        | ☺       |
|    | <b>LDF - Commence Public Examination.</b>  | Keith Miles    | P&ED   | Q3 2006 |
|    | This milestone has been achieved because the public examination will commence by September 2006.   |                |        |         |
| 9  | Three Development Plan Documents (DPDs) are required for the determination of any Northstowe planning application – Core Strategy, Development Control Policies and the Northstowe AAP itself. Now that the Examinations have started the programme is set by the Inspectors in consultation with the Council. It has been stressed to the Inspectors that the binding reports for all of these DPDs must be received by end March 2007. Core Strategy Examination ended 27 <sup>th</sup> July and the binding report has been promised by early October. Development Control Examination begins 3 <sup>rd</sup> October and Northstowe begins 1 <sup>st</sup> week in December. The Inspectors have promised to meet the end March 2007 deadline. |                |        | ✓       |
| 10 | <b>Medium Term project plan – programme for all growth areas with resource and workforce projections.</b>  | Greg Harlock   | Leader | Q3 2006 |

| #  | Milestone   | Officer        | PFH    | By when |
|----|---|----------------|--------|---------|
|    | <p>A funding bid has been put to Building Capacity East (BCE) that includes one element, which would go a long way to help us achieve this milestone. The bid result will be known on 15<sup>th</sup> September. The relevant element is designed to “enhance the Council’s corporate capacity to effectively deliver sustainable communities in the growth areas” and if successful we will “Appoint a short term contract Growth Areas Project Manager who would:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>enable the Council to clarify its objectives and strategy for the growth areas</li> <li>develop a project plan which would co-ordinate all the Council’s activities in relation to the growth areas, together with the plans of partners.</li> <li>establish effective arrangements for co-ordinated working and communication”.</li> </ul> <p>The post would also “assist and provide a model for effective corporate working”. The “State of the Nation” report also recommends the Council to fund this post if BCE funding is not received.</p> | Simon McIntosh | CS&CP  | Q4 2006 |
| 11 | <p><b>All Community facility and service proposals completed including specifications and developer contributions required.</b></p> <p>Progress affected similar to 8 above. We are about on target for the planning of community facilities but once the new masterplan and application have been drawn up the timescales can be reviewed.</p> <p><b>Northstowe Draft S.106 statement complete.</b></p>  | Jane Green     | P&ED   | Q4 2006 |
| 12 | <p>Actions that are under the control of South Cambs are on target. However pre-application discussions to finalise as far as possible requirements for the revised applications and content of the S.106, minimising areas of difference pending Inspector’s reports is now anticipated to be completed by ‘pre-March 2007’.</p> <p><b>Northstowe: completion of Town Centre strategy.</b></p> <p>The Town Centre strategy work has now been caught up by the Examinations and a new timetable for its completion is being prepared. Completion by end 2006 is still possible but is no longer critical owing as the involvement of English Partnerships and the prospect of a new planning application may delay the earliest date that an application could be determined by 6 months.</p>   | Keith Miles    | P & ED | Q4 2006 |
| 13 | <p><b>LDF - Adoption by Council.</b></p> <p>Now that the Examinations have started the programme is set by the Inspectors in consultation with the Council. The Inspectors have indicated that the Cambridge Southern Fringe and Cambridge East Area Action Plans will be examined in June and July 2007. Those examinations are likely to be very short and binding reports may well be received by end Q3 2007. That leaves the Site Specific Policies DPD. This is yet to be programmed and the duration will to a very large extent be set by the Core Strategy binding report to be received in October 2006. Inspector’s conclusions on the strategy will have implications for objections to the Site Specific Policies – if the strategy rules out objections then they will not be examined.</p>   | Keith Miles    | P&ED   | Q3 2007 |
| 14 |   |                |        |         |

| #  | Milestone  | Officer         | PFH   | By when |
|----|--|-----------------|-------|---------|
| 15 | <p><b>Northstowe Energy and Utilities: to complete a detailed risk assessment and feasibility study to enable the Northstowe Sustainable Energy Partnership (NSEP) to be progressed.</b></p> <p>It is likely that the departure of the Strategic Development Officer in mid-August will have some affect on the speed of future progress. This vacant post will be advertised in early September but it is not clear when a replacement will be in place. It will probably not be filled before late November at the earliest. Given that this project is approaching a critical point, other officers will do their best to provide cover. However, in view of their own, existing workload pressures, the capacity constraints should be noted."</p> <p>Progress has been made in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Waste, Energy and Utilities Section 106 Topic Group has actively progressed the energy grid/CHP/ESCo concept: relevant details are now included in the latest draft Heads of Terms.</li> <li>• Renewables East (an NSEP member) has recently completed its own study, which assessed the viability of establishing a regional ESCo that would deliver biomass CHP in all new large-scale developments across the East of England: the findings were reported to the Northstowe Member Reference Group on 8 August.</li> <li>• Arups have been commissioned by a joint venture between Gallaghers and English Partnerships to prepare a new energy and utilities strategy for Northstowe: this study (due to be reported in late 2006) is reviewing the prospect of an energy grid/CHP/ESCo and considering the developers' approach to the potential involvement of external partners (eg NSEP).</li> <li>• A half-day (officer level) workshop (for partners involved in discussions so far) is being arranged for late November to identify the best means of ensuring CHP provision at Northstowe and progressing the NSEP. The aim of the workshop will be to identify the best means of ensuring CHP provision at Northstowe and progressing the NSEP. Given that one option will be for an SCDC 'invest to save' opportunity, it will be very important to maintain SCDC's corporate involvement in NSEP from now until the Strategic Development Officer post is filled.</li> <li>• There remains the need for a risk assessment concerning NSEP itself.</li> </ul> | Tim Wetherfield | CS&CP | Q1 2007 |





## PRIORITY: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

| #  | Milestone  | Officer       | PFH     | By when      |
|----|--|---------------|---------|--------------|
|    | <b>Report annually to portfolio holder on arrangements within the Council for promoting affordable housing and on any obstacles.</b>   | Denise Lewis  | Housing | From Q2 2006 |
| 16 | Report to Housing PFH in April 2006 and Cabinet in May 2006 on outcome of NAHP 2006-08 which included implications for South Cams and options to be pursued to maximise resources for affordable housing including 'without grant' and cross-subsidy schemes.  |               |         | ✓            |
|    | <b>Planning service: establish monitoring of affordable housing permissions.</b>   | Gareth Jones  | P & ED  | Q2 2006      |
| 17 | Development Control has indicated that it will be able to monitor the impact of officers actions on the number of affordable housing planning permissions and that MT and Cabinet will have an effective means of monitoring this area in 06/07. However no timetable has been identified as to when the first monitoring report will be produced.   |               |         | ☺            |
| 18 | <b>Develop standard S106 Agreements in order to provide greater certainty to developers and speed up the approval process, consistent with a sub-regional approach.</b><br>Due to the absence of Colin there is likely to be a delay in progressing this milestone.  | C Tucker / GJ | P & ED  | Q3 2006      |
|    | <b>With partner authorities in the sub-region, agree and implement new commissioning arrangements to meet housing research requirements.</b>   | Denise Lewis  | Housing | Q3 2006      |
| 19 | A proposal by the County Council Research Group is currently under consideration by the sub-regional LAs and a decision on an agreed approach should be made by the end of Q3 2006.  |               |         | ☺            |
|    | <b>Agree a programme for the use of commuted sums for affordable housing development.</b>  | Denise Lewis  | Housing | Q3 2006      |
| 20 | No monies as yet received so too early to agree a programme. A major sum is expected in respect of a scheme in Papworth but this will be triggered by the commencement of this development, which is not within the Council's control. There is no news as to when this development may start on site at this time and therefore it is not known whether the milestone can still be achieved. Once this and/or other significant sums have been received affordable housing schemes still without funding will be considered for inclusion in a proposed programme for Cabinet approval. |               |         | ☺            |
| 21 | <b>Agree split between rented and intermediate tenures and selection of RSLs for affordable housing development for Northstowe.</b>  | Denise Lewis  | Housing | Q4 2006      |

| #  | Milestone   | Officer      | PFH     | By when |
|----|---|--------------|---------|---------|
|    | <p>Negotiations are still ongoing with the developers and other partners (e.g. Housing Corporation) around draft heads of terms for the affordable housing provision at Northstowe. The target is still to agree these by December 2006 although it is not certain at this time whether this date can be achieved.</p>                                  |              |         | ☺       |
| 22 | <p><b>Complete an appraisal of Council held land and property to identify opportunities for the development of affordable housing, working through RSLs.</b></p> <p>There has been a significant delay with commencement of this project due to staff shortages/sickness. However, it is still hoped to complete this project by end of March 2007.</p> | Denise Lewis | Housing | Q1 2007 |
|    |   |              |         | ☺       |

## OTHER MAJOR CORPORATE PROJECTS

| #  | Milestone  | Officer         | PFH    | By when |
|----|--|-----------------|--------|---------|
| 23 | <b>Travellers – approve detailed Travellers service plan.</b>  | Tim Wetherfield | Leader | Q2 06   |
|    | Service plan has been produced and discussed by Cabinet in June 2006 as part of discussion on Performance Plan.  |                 |        | ✓       |
| 24 | <b>Transformation Project – appointments to revised first two tiers.</b>   | Greg Harlock    | Leader | Q4 06   |
|    | The new two person top tier was in place from July 1 <sup>st</sup> . The 2 <sup>nd</sup> tier appointments will be in place by Dec 06.   |                 |        | ☺       |
| 25 | <b>Completion of Business Process Reviews.</b>   | Greg Harlock    | Leader | Q2 07   |
|    | The original Transformation project plan assumed a one-year timescale. Geoff Bridgeman, the project manager, started with us in early July and is on a 12-month contract. It is possible that things might take a little longer, though. Making processes more effective is well worth doing and it's important to take the time needed to get it right. Geoff Bridgeman is working on a project plan and timetable. We are keen that staff can comment on the draft plan and can get involved in the BPR process. |                 |        | ☺       |
| 26 | <b>Gershon: Ensure implementation of £415,000 efficiency savings in 2006/07 and identify a similar level of savings for 2007/08.</b>   | Tim Wetherfield | RSI&CS | Q1 07   |
|    | Planned efficiency savings for 06/07 highlighted in Forward Look Annual Efficiency Statement, which was reported to Cabinet in July 06. On course to meet/exceed official target, albeit the usual health warnings apply (e.g. a budget reduction does not count as an efficiency if service performance goes down).   |                 |        | ☺       |
| 27 | <b>Publication of second Community Strategy</b>  | Simon McIntosh  | CS&CP  | Q1 07   |
|    | Consultation well underway, with report from consultants on residents' priorities and findings on Quality of Life survey. On target.   |                 |        | ☺       |



## APPENDIX 3

## Performance Indicators in Audit Commission Basket

|          |  |
|----------|--|
|          |  |
| BV109    | Time taken to determine planning applications  |
| Bv111    | Satisfaction with the planning service   |
| BV199    | % of land littered to a significant or heavy extent  |
| BV 89    | Satisfaction with cleanliness of public space  |
| BV 82    | Household waste - % recycled or composted  |
| BV 84    | Kilograms of waste per head  |
| BV91     | % of population with kerbside collection of recyclables  |
| BV 90    | Satisfaction with waste collection and recycling   |
| Bv179    | % of standard searches carried out within 10 working days  |
| Bv63     | Average SAP rating of local authority dwellings  |
| BV166a   | Environmental Health best practice checklist   |
| BV199a-c | Satisfaction with sports & leisure, parks and open spaces, museums and galleries and arts activities |
| Bv62     | % of unfit private sector dwellings made fit or demolished as a result of council action             |
| HIP      | % of private sector homes vacant for 6 months or more  |
| BV183a   | Average weeks spent in B&B   |
| BV183b   | Average weeks spent in homeless hostels  |
| HIP      | % of homelessness applications accepted that are repeats   |
| Bv78a    | Average time for processing new benefit claims   |
| BV 175   | % of racial incidents reported and acted upon  |
| Bv176    | Domestic violence refuge places funded per 10,000 population   |
| Bv184a   | % of non-Decent Homes  |
| Bv74a    | Tenant satisfaction  |
| Bv75a    | Tenant satisfaction with opportunities for participation   |
| HIP      | % of urgent repairs completed on time  |
| HIP      | Average time to complete non urgent repairs  |
| BV 185   | % of response repairs for which the authority made and kept appointment                              |
| BV66a    | % of rent collected  |
| HIP      | Average relet period (voids)   |
| HIP      | Average housing management cost  |
| BV164    | CRE code of practice in rented housing   |

This page is intentionally left blank

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Leader and Cabinet 14 September 2006  
**AUTHORS:** Executive Director/Housing Advice and Options Manger

---

**CHOICE BASED LETTINGS – CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT LETTINGS POLICY  
AND PROPOSED MEMBER’S ADVISORY GROUP**

**Purpose**

1. To advise on the current development of the proposed letting policy for the sub-regional Choice Based Lettings (CBL) scheme and the proposed consultation.
2. To consider options for Member involvement including the setting up of an advisory group.
3. **Effect on Corporate Objectives**

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Quality, Accessible Services | Development of Choice based lettings scheme, which focuses on applicants for social housing having increased choice.                                  |
| Village Life                 | As part of an options package allows those in housing need to exercise choice over their rehousing options  |
| Sustainability               |   |
| Partnership                  | This is a sub-regional scheme involving 5 Local Authorities in Cambridgeshire, St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath and local Registered Social Landlords. |

**Background**

4. In the Housing Green Paper of April 2000 *Quality and Choice: A Decent Home for All* the Government put forward its proposals for reforms to lettings policies to give tenants in social housing real choice over the house they live in.
5. By offering people choice about where they live it is envisaged that tenants will be more satisfied, stay longer, pay their rent, look after their homes and tenants will invest in and engage with their local communities. In addition, by giving housing applicants a more active role in the process, it is hoped that applicants with very little chance of getting the housing they want will make greater efforts to look for alternative solutions.
6. The ODPM published targets for moving towards greater choice in spring 2002 as follows:
  - a. 25% of local authorities are required to have CBL schemes by the end of 2005 and,
  - b. 100% of local authorities to have a CBL scheme by 2010
7. Further the government have stated that they want to see CBL schemes developing on a regional or sub-regional basis.
8. Cabinet agreed in principle on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2005 to proceed to implement a sub regional choice based lettings (CBL) scheme in order to achieve compliance with

CBL delivery by 2010. An application by the seven sub regional partner authorities to the ODPM for funding successfully attracted £181,000 which will be used to fund a sub regional project manager and purchase of software.

9. The successful applicant under a CBL scheme will be the one that has the highest priority for the property for which they have made a bid. The relative priority of one applicant over another will be determined by the Lettings Policy adopted by the sub-region.
10. The main difference between the traditional approach to lettings and CBL is that applicants are required to be proactive in seeking a home rather than wait for a local authority or housing association to contact them about a property they can be 'allocated'. It is therefore important that the system is straightforward, understandable, transparent and fair.
11. For these reasons in many of the existing CBL schemes a banding system has been preferred as this is considered to be more simplistic and easier for applicants to understand than points systems.
12. Another feature of CBL is that feedback needs to be made available to unsuccessful applicants so that they can understand why their application was not successful. This feedback will help applicants assess their likelihood of receiving an offer for any similar properties that may arise in the same area and decide whether to review their expectations and search criteria in order to find a suitable home including reviewing other options.
13. A sub regional project management infrastructure has been agreed and various sub groups have formed to progress the various aspects to the scheme, including a policy sub group who have been working on a draft lettings policy.

### **Considerations**

14. The lettings policy will be a sub-regional policy covering all partners of the sub regional scheme. There was a strong preference from all partners to move towards a banding system to achieve an understandable and transparent policy.
15. It had been hoped to commence formal consultation in September, following Cabinet approval. However the draft policy is not currently at a stage to go through this process. In addition, delaying the formal consultation will allow time for a court ruling regarding a CBL related lettings policy and guidance from the DCLG to be available, as well as further testing of the proposals by partner agencies.
16. However, informal consultation will commence in September and include such activities as articles in South Cambs Magazine, on the website, distribution and availability of leaflets, focus groups etc to raise awareness of the move towards Choice Based lettings and to help shape the draft lettings policy further.
17. As this is a major change in the lettings policy a consultation period of at least 12 weeks is required to consult with RSL's, and those who will be affected by the change. It is anticipated that the formal consultation will now commence in the spring 2007.
18. To progress this further at a local level it is proposed to set up a member's advisory group, which under the Council's constitution should not comprise of more than 9



members (plus the relevant Portfolio Holder), and would have to comply with the political proportionality rules.

19. The terms of reference for this group would be to assess how the proposed sub-regional CBL scheme and associated lettings policy would:
- make best use of both the existing and new affordable housing in terms of meeting the housing needs of the district/sub-region
  - offer appropriate housing choices to those in housing need including vulnerable groups
  - ensure equality of access to housing
  - to contribute to maintaining sustainable communities within existing villages and the creation of balanced communities in the major new developments
  - make recommendations in respect of the local implementation of the scheme

It is suggested that Members will be asked to attend no more than three meetings between September 2006 and March 2007'

### **Financial Implications**

20. A commitment has already been given to fund the CBL local implementation costs within existing budgets.
21. The Council is committed to meeting a share of the implementation costs of the Sub-regional scheme which is currently £17,000 based on estimated costs, the amount of DCLG funding made available and there being a minimum of 7 partners. This position could change over the course of its implementation eg due to unforeseen additional costs and/or increase/decrease in number of partners but the project is currently within budget.
22. The Council's contribution of £17,000 is being accounted for over 3 financial years with £2,000 having been paid in 2005/06 and £9,000 provided for within the 2006/07 Housing General Fund Estimates.

### **Legal Implications**

23. The scheme will need to meet the legal requirements for the allocation of social housing as set out in the Housing Act 1996 (as amended by the Homelessness Act 2002).

### **Staffing Implications**

24. The Council have already agreed to the recruitment of a Choice Based Lettings Project Officer to enable implementation at a local level, the cost of which will be met from existing budgets. The development of this scheme requires commitment and input from various services across the Council, and a local corporate implementation group has been set up to facilitate and manage the project.

### **Equal Opportunities Implications**

25. In line with general and specific statutory duties under the Race Relations Act 1976 and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, the Council operates a Race Equality Scheme (RES) in order to eliminate unlawful discrimination and to promote race equality and good race relations. This was last revised and agreed by the Council in July 2006, with an update of the 2005-08 action plan. The Council is

committed to treating everyone fairly and justly, whatever their race or background. The proposed lettings policy will include a statement on equal opportunities and consultation will take place with the local community, including voluntary and statutory agencies that assist and support vulnerable groups. BME housing register applicants currently represents 4.3% of those aged under 60 and 1% of those aged 60 or over on our housing register and 1% of transfer applicants. Translation of leaflets and information will be made available when this is required.

### **Consultations**

26. The consultation required will need to be managed at two levels. At the sub-regional level the partnership can jointly consult with stakeholders in common such as RSL partners, statutory agencies and others. At the local level the Council will need to ensure that other stakeholders eg tenants, applicants, Parish Councils, Members and other locally based organisations whose clients may be affected by the implementation of a CBL scheme are fully consulted.
27. In order to ensure engagement with Members on the CBL project it is suggested that the creation of a Cabinet Advisory Group could be an effective means of achieving this provided there is a sufficient level of interest across the political groups. An alternative would be to run a series of workshops with open invitations to all Members to attend to discuss particular aspects of the scheme eg the draft lettings policy so that their views can be fed back to the Sub-regional partnership.

### **Conclusions/Summary**

28. The Council are working with partners across the sub-region to develop a choice based lettings scheme. This will fulfil the requirement by the government that all authorities are operating such a scheme by 2010. A new lettings policy is required that satisfies our legal obligations and addresses the needs of households across the sub-region, as well as being transparent to applicants. Consultation will play a large part in the development of this policy including with Members of this Council.

### **Recommendations**

29. It is recommended that Cabinet,
  - (a) note the proposals for consultation, and
  - (b) agree to the setting up of a Cabinet advisory group with terms of reference as set out in paragraphs 19 of this report and to determine the size of the group.

### **Background papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:**

Housing Green Paper: *Quality and Choice: A Decent Home for All*  
ODPM April 2000

Allocation of Accommodation: Code of guidance for local housing authorities  
ODPM November 2002

**Contact Officer:** Sue Carter – Housing Advice and Options Manager  
Telephone: (01954) 713044

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**REPORT TO:** Leader and Cabinet 14 September 2006  
**AUTHOR/S:** Chief Executive /Electoral Services Manager

**USE OF CABINET CONTINGENCY FOR THE ABINGTONS WARD BY-ELECTION**

**Purpose**

1. To request that the cost of the by-election in the Abingtons Wards be paid from the Cabinet Contingency budget. The estimated cost is £2,613.70.

**Effect on Corporate Objectives**

|    |                              |     |
|----|------------------------------|-----|
| 2. | Quality, Accessible Services | N/A |
|    | Village Life                 | N/A |
|    | Sustainability               | N/A |
|    | Partnership                  | N/A |

**Background**

3. After the Council was capped in 2005 officers were told to remove contingencies from their budgets and instead rely upon a central contingency fund should the need arise.

**Considerations**

4. The Electoral Services budget has been reduced as far as possible. Central Government gave £43,000 to be used to implement the new Electoral Administration Bill. £10,000 of this was allocated to fund the new requirement to conduct a personal canvass and the remaining £33,000 added to central funds. Subsequently it transpired that a further £4,250 would be required to enable the Council to meet its statutory requirement surrounding postal vote checks. This budget was found by using underspend from the election budget from May 2006.

It is also proposed that a budget for by-elections be added to the precautionary items from next April to alleviate the need to ask Cabinet.

**Options**

5. (a) To permit the cost of the by-election to come from the Cabinet Contingency  
 (b) For the 2006/7 Elections budget to be overspent.

**Financial Implications**

6. The estimated cost is a relatively small amount and should not cause any particular financial impact.

**Legal Implications**

7. The election must be run in accordance with legislation, therefore the funds will have to be made available.

**Staffing Implications**

8. None.

**Risk Management Implications**

9. None.

**Consultations**

10. N/A.

**Conclusions/Summary**

11. The budget for by-elections was removed on the understanding that any costs would be covered from a central contingency.

**Recommendations**

12. To recommend that money be vired from Cabinet Contingency to fund the Abingtons Ward by-election.

**Contact Officer:** Laura Lock – Electoral Services Manager  
Telephone: (01954) 713287

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Leader and Cabinet

14 September 2006

AUTHOR: Chief Executive/Chief Accountant/Principal Accountant

## TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2005/06

## Purpose

1. To report on the performance of the treasury management function.

## Effect on Corporate Objectives

- |    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| 2. | Quality, Accessible Services | This report has no direct implications for any of the Corporate Objectives but any improvement in the performance of the treasury management function within the context of the Council's investment strategy would create additional resources which could be used to achieve those objectives. |
|    | Village Life                 |  |
|    | Sustainability               |  |
|    | Partnership                  |  |

## Background

3. The Investment Strategy approved by Council on 23 March 2006 requires an annual report to be presented to Cabinet after the end of the financial year.

## Considerations

4. Investments at the year end were:

| 31 March<br>2005  |  |  | 31 March<br>2006  |  |
|-------------------|--|--|-------------------|--|
| £                 |  |  | £                 |  |
| 9,500,000         | Clearing Banks                             |  | 4,500,000         |  |
| 2,000,000         | Banks, other                               |  | 2,000,000         |  |
| 0                 | Money Market Funds                         |  | 450,000           |  |
|                   | Building Societies with assets:            |  |                   |  |
| 5,000,000         | greater than £10,000 million               |  | 3,000,000         |  |
| 4,500,000         | between £5,000 million and £10,000 million |  | 3,000,000         |  |
| 8,500,000         | between £1,500 million and £5,000 million  |  | 6,500,000         |  |
| 8,000,000         | between £250 million and £1,500 million    |  | 8,000,000         |  |
| <u>37,500,000</u> | Total                                      |  | <u>27,450,000</u> |  |
|                   | Principal Investments analysed by maturity |  |                   |  |
| 23,000,000        | 2005/06                                    |  | 0                 |  |
| 5,000,000         | 2006/07                                    |  | 20,950,000        |  |
| 4,500,000         | 2007/08                                    |  | 3,500,000         |  |
| 4,000,000         | 2008/09                                    |  | 2,000,000         |  |
| 1,000,000         | 2009/10                                    |  | 1,000,000         |  |
| <u>37,500,000</u> |  |  | <u>27,450,000</u> |  |

5. The Council is a member of a benchmarking club on treasury management, which is organised by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy. The results of this benchmarking exercise for 2005/06 were issued at the end of July and the accumulated results over the last six years are shown in **Appendix A**.
6. The results for 2005/06 show that South Cambridgeshire achieved another creditable performance for the third year running with a return of 4.84% on combined investments (less than and more than 365 days) compared to 4.76% for its comparator group and 4.71 % for the overall group. South Cambridgeshire was second highest in the comparator group of 11 other organisations and ninth highest in the overall group of 134 other organisations.

### **Options**

7. In view of the in-house performance, there seems little point in considering out-sourcing all or externally managing part of the funds available for investment. External managers usually require a minimum external investment of £10 million for a period of at least three years and with the current pressures on capital receipts and other reserves, it is difficult to predict confidently that these requirements can be met.

### **Financial Implications**

8. The in-house treasury management function achieved an average rate of 4.84% on combined investments compared to an overall group average of 4.71%. The differential of 0.13% on the average amount invested of £41.0 million during the year amounts to additional interest of over £53,000.
9. The cost of the in-house investment function, covering dealing, cash flow forecasting and planning and control, is estimated at £40 per million invested compared to an overall group average per million invested of £450 for in-house costs plus £1,490 for external fund managers. The benchmarking cost calculations exclude staff who spend less than 25% of their time and, therefore, the results are skewed in favour of smaller local authorities. Accurate comparisons of costs on a true like for like basis can be complex and time-consuming and there may be some questions over the validity of benchmarking data on costs.

### **Legal Implications**

10. None.

### **Staffing Implications**

11. None.

### **Risk Management Implications**

12. The principal risk is loss of principal and the action taken to minimise this risk is to restrict:
  - the range of counterparties to local authorities, United Kingdom and Irish banks, building societies and money market funds;
  - the type of investments to non negotiable where the amount repaid is always the same as the amount invested; and
  - dealing to investments denominated in £ sterling with payments and repayments only in £ sterling.

**Consultations**

12. None.

**Conclusions/Summary**

13. The in-house treasury management function has achieved a creditable performance in 2005/06 at a minimal cost.

**Recommendations**

14. It is recommended that Cabinet note the performance of the treasury management function.

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Treasury Management Benchmarking Club Reports 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006.

**Contact Officer:** Adrian Burns, Chief Accountant, Telephone No. (01954) 713072  
Sally Smart, Principal Accountant, Telephone No. (01954) 713076

This page is intentionally left blank



## Treasury management Investment Performance

|  | 2000/01        |            | 2001/02      |            | 2002/03        |            | 2003/04      |            | 2004/05      |            | 2005/06      |            |
|--|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|
|  | SCDC Ranking   | Group Size | SCDC Ranking | Group Size | SCDC Ranking   | Group Size | SCDC Ranking | Group Size | SCDC Ranking | Group Size | SCDC Ranking | Group Size |
| Less than 365 days<br>(in-house, fixed term and callable)<br>SCDC<br>Comparable Group<br>Overall Group   | 6.16%          |            | 5.02%        |            | 4.02%          |            | 3.81%        |            | 4.69%        |            | 4.66%        |            |
|  | 6.19%          | 5          | 4.95%        | 3          | 4.12%          | 9          | 3.75%        | 5          | 4.64%        | 3          | 4.74%        | 11         |
|  | 6.07%          | 23         | 4.87%        | 26         | 4.07%          | 58         | 3.71%        | 64         | 4.64%        | 20         | 4.72%        | 92         |
| Over 365 days<br>(in-house, fixed term and callable)<br>SCDC<br>Comparable Group<br>Overall Group  | 6.61%          |            | 6.09%        |            | 5.40%          |            | 5.01%        |            | 5.07%        |            | 5.08%        |            |
|  | not calculated |            | 6.07%        | 2          | not calculated | 4          | 4.84%        | 3          | 4.92%        | 4          | 4.94%        | 7          |
|  | not calculated |            | 6.41%        | 8          | not calculated | 18         | 4.94%        | 7          | 5.06%        | 25         | 4.95%        | 42         |
| Combined Investments<br>(externally managed)<br>Comparable Group<br>Overall Group  | not calculated |            | 4.60%        | N/A        | 4.83%          | N/A        | 3.10%        | N/A        | 4.70%        | N/A        | 4.66%        | N/A        |
|  |                |            | 4.60%        | N/A        | 4.69%          | N/A        | 3.21%        | N/A        | 4.65%        | N/A        | 4.60%        | N/A        |
|  |                |            |              |            |                |            |              |            |              |            |              |            |
| Combined Investments<br>(fixed term, callable, call<br>and money markets)<br>(all period: in-house<br>and externally managed)<br>SCDC<br>Comparable Group<br>Overall Group | not calculated |            | 5.29%        |            | 4.01%          |            | 4.12%        |            | 4.84%        |            | 4.84%        |            |
|  | not calculated | 129        | 4.77%        | 1          | 4.17%          | 10         | 3.77%        | 6          | 4.72%        | 2          | 4.76%        | 11         |
|  | not calculated |            | 4.81%        | 6          | 4.19%          | 98         | 3.65%        | 6          | 4.66%        | 4          | 4.71%        | 134        |

Coincidentally, exactly the same return of 4.84% was achieved for 2004/05 and 2005/06

## APPENDIX A

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank