



Democratic Support Service
PO Box 136
County Hall
Northampton
NN1 1AT

MINUTES of the Business Meeting of the NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL held at County Hall, Northampton on 24 November 2016 at 10.30am

PRESENT:

Councillor Jim Harker OBE (Chairman)
Councillor Dudley Hughes (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor	Paul Bell	Councillor	Derek Lawson MBE
"	Wendy Brackenbury	"	Stephen Legg
"	Julie Brookfield	"	Chris Lofts
"	Michael Brown	"	Malcolm Longley
"	Robin Brown	"	Arthur McCutcheon
"	Mary Butcher	"	John McGhee
"	Adam Collyer	"	Allan Matthews
"	Elizabeth Coombe	"	Andy Mercer
"	Gareth Eales	"	Dennis Meredith
"	Brendan Glynane	"	Ian Morris
"	Matt Golby	"	Steve Osborne
"	André Gonzalez De Savage	"	Bill Parker
"	Christopher Groome	"	Suresh Patel
"	James Hakewill	"	Russell Roberts
"	Eileen Hales MBE	"	Ron Sawbridge MBE
"	Mike Hallam	"	Mick Scrimshaw
"	Stan Heggs	"	Judy Shephard
"	Sue Homer	"	Heather Smith
"	Jill Hope	"	Danielle Stone
"	Sylvia Hughes	"	Michael Tye
"	Cecile Irving-Swift	"	Sarah Uldall`
"	Joan Kirkbride	"	Allen Walker
"	Phil Larratt	"	Malcolm Waters
"	Graham Lawman	"	

Also in attendance (for all or part of the meeting):

Honorary Alderman Gina Ogden
Dr Paul Blantern, Chief Executive
Laurie Gould, Monitoring Officer
Lesley Hagger, Director of Children's Services
Paul Hanson, Manager, Democratic Services
Dr Carolyn Kus, Director of Adult Social Care Services
Jenny Rendall, Democracy Officer (Minutes)
David Watson, Independent Chairman of the Audit Committee

And 33 members of the public.

62/16 Apologies for non-attendance:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sally Beardsworth, Jim Broomfield, Michael Clarke, Alan Hills, Derek Lawson MBE, David Mackintosh, Bhupendra Patel, Bob Scott & Winston Strachan.

Apologies were also sent by Councillor Jill Hope for late arrival.

63/16 To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2016:

RESOLVED that: Council approved the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 6 October 2016 as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

64/16 Notification of requests by members of the public to address the meeting

Agenda Item No: 11b - Cabinet Business

- Mrs Catherine Bennett

Agenda Item No: 13(a) - Motion submitted by Councillor Danielle Stone

- Dawn Wright from the Lowdown
- Impi Farookhi, Chief Executive from the Lowdown

Agenda Item No: 13(b) - Motion submitted by Councillor Michael Brown

- Mr Colin Bricher

65/16 Declarations of Interest by Councillors:

There were none.

66/16 Chairman's Announcements:

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting including those watching via a live webcast.

He then informed Council of the death of former Councillor David Hugheston-Roberts who had passed away the previous Saturday evening. He was a councillor between 2005 and 2013 serving as Deputy Chairman of the Children's Scrutiny Committee and Deputy Chairman of the Council between 2008 and 2009. His funeral would take place on 1 December 2016 at Gayton Church from 2pm. The Chairman offered to write to his widow to offer the Council's sincere condolences.

At the Chairman's invitation the following members of Council then stated the following in relation to Councillor David Hugheston-Roberts:

- Councillor Brendan Glynane had first met Councillor Hugheston-Roberts shortly after the Easter Floods in Northampton. He had joined a local group because he had an interest in flooding and the development that was taking place where he lived. He considered him to be really effective member of the Flood committee, holding people to account and being very thoughtful.
- Councillor John McGhee felt Councillor Hugheston-Roberts had been a good man and he had found him to be an extremely good councillor.
- Councillor Christopher Groome felt Councillor Hugheston-Roberts had found out very quickly after he had joined the Council that Councillor Groome had been in flood defence and made it his job to encourage Councillor Groome to share his views. He felt his ability to quickly identify potential allies demonstrated how effective he was.

The Chairman then stated his letter to Councillor Hugheston-Roberts' wife would reflect the tributes paid from all parties in the Chamber to her husband.

Council then observed a minute's silence in memory of former Councillor David Hugheston-Roberts

The Chairman then invited Council to agree the following dates for meetings of Full Council during 2017-2018.

- Thursday 11 May 2017 (AGM) already agreed
- Thursday 15 June 2017
- Thursday 21 September 2017
- Thursday 23 November 2017
- Thursday 22 February 2018 (Budget)
- Thursday 22 March 2018
- Thursday 17 May 2018 (AGM)

The Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service were nearly halfway through the consultation on their Community Protection Plan which would run until 21 December 2016. The plan set out the current profile, achievements and the direction of travel over the next three years. Further information could be found on the NCC Consultation Register.

Copies of the LGSS Councillor Satisfaction Survey had been left on councillors chairs that morning for completion and return to the appropriate officer.

RESOLVED that: Council agreed to meet on the following dates during 2017-18:

- **Thursday 11 May 2017 (AGM) already agreed**
- **Thursday 15 June 2017**
- **Thursday 21 September 2017**
- **Thursday 23 November 2017**
- **Thursday 22 February 2018 (Budget)**
- **Thursday 22 March 2018**
- **Thursday 17 May 2018 (AGM)**

67/16 Petitions:

There were none.

68/16 Opposition Priority Business:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Brendan Glynane proposed the following motion:

"The Northamptonshire County Council recognises the value of community pharmacies as an important primary healthcare service and the role they play in our local community. Our local pharmacies offer a range of services not only dispensing prescriptions but promoting health and well-being providing advice such as on smoking cessation, flu vaccination and sexual health.

Pharmacies provide help and advice from pre-natal care to support for and advice services to elderly care homes.

We also believe that the integration of pharmacy services with GP practices leads to improved health outcomes for patients and a better level of service.

This Council is greatly concerned about Central Government cuts to pharmacy support of 12% from December 2016 with a further reduction of 6% in 2017. This could lead to the loss of up to a quarter of our local chemist shops across Northamptonshire.

Service cuts to community pharmacies will put residents at risk and increase pressure on already stretched GPs and A&E Departments leading to an increase in NHS costs.

Council asks the Leader of the Council, the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Health, NHS England and to our Peter Bone MP, Michael Ellis MP, Christopher Heaton-Harris MP, Philip Hollobone MP, Andrea Leadsom MP, David Mackintosh MP, Tom Pursglove MP Members of Parliament for Northamptonshire calling for an immediate review of the proposed cut to funding for this vital local service.”

In moving the motion, Councillor Glynane stated it was concerned with changes to chemists that would affect those living in rural and urban areas of the county. More than 1,600 pharmacies in rural areas faced closure because they would not benefit from the Government's latest financial package. These cuts could cause residents to walk more than a mile to get the medicines they required. He also noted a record 2.2million people had signed a petition against it and the government had admitted withdrawing the subsidy would put many pharmacies in the UK at risk. He thought the cuts would take affect from December creating a need to act quickly and ask MPs to lobby the Minister and Health Service on the Council's behalf.

He did not intend to accept the amendment from Councillor Sylvia Hughes because he felt it was pushing the issue into the 'long grass'. By the time scrutiny had looked at this many of the elderly and frail of the county would have already been affected by the cuts.

He noted the Government kept directing people to community pharmacies as an alternative to visiting their doctor or A&E departments and the 111 number also directed people to pharmacies for advice so this appeared to be at odds with the proposed cuts.

He concluded by stating he felt the amendment should be rejected in favour of the Council raising concerns with local MPs who could in turn raise them with the Minister and Department of Health with the intention of assisting the frail and vulnerable in the county. He also noted many pharmacies offered a delivery service for those unable to leave their homes.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Sarah Uldall.

Councillor Sylvia Hughes then proposed the following amendment:

To delete the last 3 paragraphs and replace them with:

“Given the direction for remodelling community pharmacy services that have now been communicated by Government, this Council resolves to explore the potential implications in our county through the appropriate scrutiny committee. Then consider the appropriate action including any communication with Northamptonshire MPs.”

In proposing the amendment Councillor Sylvia Hughes stated the Council recognised the value of community pharmacies as an important lifeline. They provided health and advice in many areas and the integration of pharmacies with GPs would improve the outcomes for patients and provide a better level of service. She noted the Government view that they played a vital role in the health service which was the reason for reforming them and creating good services. 2 out of 5 pharmacies were within a 10minute walk of 2 or more

other pharmacies and the current funding system for the community pharmacy did not always promote efficient high quality services. The Government had recently announced reforms to simplify the outdated pay structure for community pharmacies which would enable funding to be given back to health. For the first time pharmacies would be paid for quality and not just prescriptions and the reforms would relieve the pressure on other parts of the NHS. Patients requiring repeat prescriptions would be referred to pharmacies and a minor ailment service would also be delivered by pharmacies by April 2018. A new integration fund would provide programmes to embed them better into the NHS and the new pharmacy access scheme would ensure there were services in the communities where they were needed.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Jim Hakewill.

Councillor Glynane did not accept the amendment and it was debated as follows:

- After speaking with local pharmacies some councillors had been informed it would mean 1 or 2 redundancies in each of the pharmacies and many in rural areas would have to close as they could not sustain themselves purely on profits from drug companies and prescriptions.
- Several councillors commented on good advice they had received from their local pharmacies.
- It was noted the Minister had already been contacted and their answer had been received. Not all members had seen this response and requested to view it.
- Some felt the amendment would assist to solve some of the problems the motion had as it spoke about the value of community pharmacies whilst also stating integration with GPs would improve the system. Pharmacies however were not allowed to open in GP practices some time ago in order to protect them.
- Some felt the middle paragraph was the most important part of the motion. Boots for instance had a target to assist people in checking if they required antibiotics. Many of these preventative activities assisted GPs and the county was short of GPs.
- Some councillors felt part of their role was to fight for their communities' issues and it was noted there was an increasing reliance on community pharmacies.
- It was noted some pharmacies also included a lot more services such as an Eastern European worker and Asian workers who between them could speak many languages as needed in multi-cultural and diverse communities. There was a need for the early prevention, early help and self-help these pharmacies provided.
- It was noted the strategy of the Government was one that had been followed for a number of years. It was felt by some to be sensible to have scrutiny take the time, care and trouble to understand what was happening within the county.
- The state of social care nationally and locally and the big deficit and pressure on the NHS was well known. Both the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) had been requesting pharmacies do more for some time but this was difficult when the funding was removed.
- The motion was noted as asking the 7 MPs in the county support A&E Departments, the CCGs, councils of the county and residents by lobbying the Minister.
- Some felt this had already been debated by the Government prior to the House of Commons voting for the proposed changes.
- Reference was made to a report published the previous year; The Pharmacy Critical Needs Assessment which had been produced by the Health & Wellbeing Board. It stated availability was currently adequate to meet the population's needs but not any additional demand for various services. Rises in the Northamptonshire population would increase demands significantly. It was therefore suggested this report be passed to Government to demonstrate a need for them to change their minds.

- Some felt reducing the number of smaller independent pharmacies would undermine the Council's strategy on adult social care because it would leave a gap and reduce choices.
- Concerns were raised that elderly people living in remote areas would be hit hardest by the changes. It was also felt the cuts could damage social care and push the pressure back on to GP's and A&E Departments.
- Some suggested a formal scrutiny process could be undertaken to which pharmacists could be invited as well as the relevant portfolio holder.

In reply Councillor Sylvia Hughes stated her disappointment that some opposition councillors appeared to be 'scaremongering'. She felt there was no point writing to MPs and that the plans to reform services would provide a better service.

Upon a recorded vote of 33 for and 15 against the amendment was accepted as the substantive motion

In reply to the main debate, Councillor Glynane stated he felt Councillor Sylvia Hughes could have requested scrutiny look at this issue at any time. He felt stating that 1,600 pharmacies would close was not scaremongering. He also felt people were being referred to pharmacies for advice that were closing and the frail and elderly would be disappointed by the approach of the portfolio holder.

RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion as amended was accepted.

69/16 Business Items (including Budget & Policy Framework items, Appointments & Annual Reports):

(a) Treasury Management Report, Mid Year Update 2016-17

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Robin Brown proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating the investment returns demonstrated in the report had been appropriate to benchmarks. No long term loans had been raised or repaid during the quarter and at the end of September the Council held £23million in short term bonds. It was anticipated that any loans raised were likely to be short to medium in nature and the Council would continue with its strategy of internal borrowing. The Municipal Bonds Agency was expected to issue its first bond on behalf of Local Authorities in the next month and Northamptonshire County Council was expected to take part in that. During the quarter the Council had operated within treasury limits as set out in the Treasury Management Statement and in compliance with statutory treasury allowances.

The report was seconded by Councillor Bill Parker.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Some felt there was a need to ensure the Council was doing well and achieving some of the returns that other Councils received. A request was also made for a benchmarking exercise.
- It was noted there had been a 23% increase in the Council's debt which highlighted what some considered to be a crisis for the Council.

In reply Councillor Robin Brown stated he was concerned about the Council's debt and was doing whatever he could to ensure the Council adhered to all the relevant rules and regulations.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the Treasury Management Report.

(b) Youth Justice Plan:

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Matt Golby proposed this report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating he was pleased to introduce a very positive report. The service was exemplary and had been recognised nationally. He was very proud to be associated with it. He stated it was a partnership with the police and council joining with other services. They had all been contributing to the tailored review of the future of youth justice. All performance indicators were being met and they would continue to focus on the county's looked after children and the court service.

The report was seconded by Councillor Suresh Patel who stated he was pleased to see the particular focus on looked after children. The Youth Offending Service had engaged with the partner agencies in the existing system to work effectively at preventing unnecessary criminalisation

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was felt a lot of excellent work had gone into the report but concerns were raised that it had reached the point at which any further reductions would impact on the service's ability to perform. It was also noted a lot of risks had been flagged up as a red risk to delivery. Some felt there was a real need to ensure the service was maintained and more people were kept out of the criminal justice system.
- Thanks were sent to the team who had achieved so much.
- Concerns were raised about the number of looked after children the service engaged with and it would be nice to see that percentage reduce each year.

In reply Councillor Golby stated the funding was reflection of pressures on the public sector and how it delivered to external groups. Keeping the county's looked after children out of the criminal justice system was a priority.

RESOLVED that: Council: approved the Youth Justice Plan 2016/17.

(c) SACRE Annual Report:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Wendy Brackenbury proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating a new RE advisor had been appointed in July, partly funded by the Council in partnership with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The Committee had met 4 times during the year and the report detailed the work undertaken during that year. It had also identified key areas of work for the coming year which included reviewing the syllabus. The outgoing Chair, Mrs Jenny Dixon was thanked for her work and the new Chair, Justine Davies was welcomed.

The report was seconded by Councillor Dudley Hughes who stated the previous Chair, Jenny Dixon had put in a tremendous effort. He also noted the British Humanist Association was also now a member of SACRE and the Chairman of the Northamptonshire Supplementary Schools was also welcomed. He noted the Council had to have a SACRE and he recognised the tremendous work undertaken by SACRE supporting communities.

Councillors commented as follows:

- The importance of the work undertaken was recognised but a concern was raised that the remit only covered local authority schools which for Northamptonshire meant a reducing number of primary schools. It was felt a lot of challenges would be faced in moving ahead at trying to keep the profile of RE within schools.

- It was felt a lot of work was required in ensuring communities understood each other and the differences and similarities between them. It was felt strong messages were required to address that and it was suggested more resource be put into this.
- Collaboration was recommended and it was hoped that Peterborough, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire would continue to learn from each other.

In reply Councillor Brackenbury stated the new RE Advisor would be reaching out to schools in the county and development networks and establishing various programmes for schools. Areas for development included areas in all stages of school including at GCSE and 'A' Level. Working in partnership with Peterborough and Cambridgeshire ensured SACRE provided value for money.

RESOLVED that: Council approved the SACRE Annual Report, to be published to schools in order to improve the quality of provision for Religious Education and collective worship.

(d) Efficiency Plan Report:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Robin Brown proposed this report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating it summarised the medium term plan that had been approved in February alongside the 4-year budget. It had been available to scrutiny from 13 October and submitted to the Department of Communities and Local Government the following day. The expected total receipts during 2016-17 amounted to a potential of £21million and this sum had been included in the budget. Approval for this was sought.

The report was seconded by Councillor Bill Parker who stated the autumn statement the previous year had enabled them to capital receipts for transformation purposes.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Concerns were raised that Council was being asked to approve 'selling the family silver' to fund the transformation plan which would be used to fund the capital programme. Further concerns were raised that the plan for that year included a 23% net increase. Although they were currently in a historically low interest rate environment, all indications were that it would rise and the Council would need to pay more interest on borrowings.
- Concerns were raised that the efficiency plan could leave the Council less efficient.
- Further concerns were raised that the cost of the next generation council was approximately £50million and it was felt Council was out-sourcing many areas that it shouldn't. It was then suggested the quality of the service within the next generation model required proper scrutiny.
- A question was raised about how the next generation model would be funded should the efficiency plan not be delivered.
- Concerns were raised that the efficiency plan would not be delivered, particularly as there had been many issues in meeting the most recent budgets set. Concerns were also raised that there was a need to demonstrate the Council could manage the next generation working model with revenue funding.
- The Council had pressed its need for further funding at every opportunity. It was not the only under-funded council but there was a need to move things forward in a way that ensured it could manage the most efficient services possible.

In reply Councillor Brown stated there was no silver to sell and this was the most effective way to provide the services required. Central Government were well aware of the serious difficulties in funding and there was a need for the Council to balance its accounts.

RESOLVED that: Council:

- 1) noted the Council's Efficiency Plan and Capital Flexibility for Transformation; and**
- 2) Approved the use of additional Capital receipts in line with the capitalisation flexibility of transformation costs as published with the Local Government Settlement December 2015.**

(e) Annual Report by the Pensions Committee:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Graham Lawman proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating this was the first Pensions Committee annual report outside of the Council's usual process. There were now 11 separate fund managers to deal with and a further 3 just agreed. The value of the fund had risen to £2.1billion but low gilt yields had also caused liabilities to rise. He thanked all staff for their help to ensure a good year.

The report was seconded by Councillor Jim Hakewill who also commended the staff for all their efforts to make it a good year.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the content of the Annual Report by the Pensions Committee.

(f) Amendments to the Constitution:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Robin Brown proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated).

The report was seconded by Councillor Allen Walker who stated a lot of work had been undertaken by the Councillors Services & Governance Working Group which was represented by all parties.

Councillors suggested a panel should be convened to appoint assistant chief officers as it was felt this was something that was the responsibility of councillors

RESOLVED that: Council agreed:

- 1) the changes to the constitution as set out in Section 4 of the report and in appendix 1 to the report; and**
- 2) That these changes would take effect immediately and agreed that the Monitoring Officer be delegated authority to make these amendments, any associated conforming amendments and to republish the Constitution.**

(g) Report by the Independent Panel for Councillors' Allowances (IPCA):

At the Chairman's invitation the Independent Chairman of IPCA, Mr Jim Gammons introduced the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) who stated there was never a good time to review allowances especially those of a councillor. In the current economic climate the council also had a statutory duty to review these allowances. Consideration was taken from a number of councillors. The framework was also reviewed and the overall conclusion was that although some changes had happened that affected councillors there was no scope to change any allowances at the current time.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Heather Smith to propose the report who stated the Council was obliged under the 2003 regulations to undertake the review. The basic

allowance was lower than the average in a number of other county councils and she agreed that there was no need to increase allowances at the current time.

The report was seconded by Councillor Robin Brown who thanked the Independent Panel for the work they had undertaken.

Councillors felt that whilst it was always very difficult balancing between providing sufficient allowance and the affordability of a scheme it was also important to take adequate account of an independent panel's recommendations.

RESOLVED that: Council:

- 1) received the report on Members' Allowances (Appendix 1) prepared by the Independent Panel for Councillors' Allowances;**
- 2) accepted the recommendations of the Independent Panel for Councillors' Allowances and to implement those provisions as the Scheme of Members' Allowances for Northamptonshire County Council with effect from 1 April 2017;**
- 3) formally revoked the existing Members' Allowances Scheme with effect from 31 March 2017; and**
- 4) authorised the Monitoring Officer to implement the new scheme effective 1 April 2017 to reflect the outcome of the Council's deliberations and to take any consequential action arising.**

70/16 Questions, if any, to the Chairman of the Audit Committee relating to the work of the Audit Committee since the last ordinary meeting:

At the Chairman's invitation the Independent Chairman of the Audit Committee addressed Council stating there had been 3 meetings since he had last addressed Council. The June meeting had discussed the draft accounts and in September they had discussed the report from the auditors. The November meeting had reviewed the year. Currently the audited reports were required to be signed off by the end of September and this deadline would move to 31 July from 2018. The following year there was an aim to get the reports signed off in July. This meant the planning meeting would be held in February, and an interim meeting be held in April. There were always issues when the same amount of work was being planned in a restricted time period which would require changes to the way of working. This would put pressure on internal staff. Concerns were raised that there would be an under delivery of 200 days internal audit that year and the team was doing its best to ensure this did not impact on external work. There was a need to ensure everything was brought under control to ensure everything was covered.

The downside of audit work was that you never knew when it was wrong until something went wrong because it was very difficult to track back and identify where the issue arose. The council was in an area of change and the next couple of years would be critical.

Questions were answered as follows:

- The external auditors had 2 principle jobs, the first being ensuring the accounts were properly prepared and fairly represented the numbers. The going concern was generally taken as the ability to pay your bills and continue for at least 12 months beyond the date that the audit report was signed. The external auditors were subject to regulation in much the same way as the Care Quality Commission regulated the care industry. The external auditors would probably take 6 weeks to examine the work that had been undertaken. The external auditors had signed off the accounts so were completely satisfied that the Council had sufficient funds to continue trading for a couple of years.

- Looking further ahead the auditors were less convinced. This was due to the fact that they had not been given adequate information about the next generation working model to satisfy their requirements. He did understand that the papers relating to the next generation working model had been further developed since the external auditors had made their requests for information and that a lot of what was undertaken was politically sensitive. He did not feel however that there was a risk of insolvency in the short term.
- There was an item in the current accounts relating to unfinished work that once completed would be capitalised. The Auditors had gone through that and it affected where things sat within the accounts. Although it sounded like a big number it was materiality. The auditors had only reported on it because they were required to.
- The accounting standards when published were required to be effective from a future period and the Council would be required to adopt them for the following year's accounts. They also had the opportunity to adopt them for this year's accounts as well should it wish. At the beginning of the previous week they had been withdrawn so it was good luck that the Council had decided not to adopt them early.
- Termination of benefits was a social issue. There was a requirement in a set of accounts to disclose the salaries of certain employees at a senior level. There were others that were recorded in bands (e.g. the number of employees in each of those bands). There was a termination package during the year to one of these and this was reported.
- There had been concerns that year with reports out of audit particularly as half way through the year they had undertaken less than a quarter of the work. The 200 days was effectively one person. Since the re-organisation of LGSS with Milton Keynes a new audit manager had come in who should be able to address the issues.
- Tracking software was always helpful when it worked. It had not been considered to date but the new Audit Manager could perhaps look at it.
- There was a need to remember that any required work internal audit did not undertake would be undertaken by external auditors at a higher cost.
- There was a requirement to undertake school audits. The majority of a school's budget would be spent on salaries so what was left was a small sum. The benefits of undertaking this type of audit were debateable and they were changing how some of that work would be undertaken.
- The whistle blower audit which had been deferred for almost 2 years was now being undertaken. This was considered important as it not only reported the effects but it would also inform some of the work that was still to be undertaken under the next generation scheme.
- There was a scheme for bringing in trainees which would assist with staffing issues.
- Grant Thornton were the auditors of the subsidiary training companies and the training company accounts were now consolidated into the Council's accounts. KPMG as the external auditors and who were required to ensure nothing came out of the work of Grant Thornton that could affect the Council's accounts were not reporting any issues with this,

RESOLVED that: Council noted the information provided by the Independent Chairman of the Audit Committee.

71/16 Modern Slavery:

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Bill Parker introduced this presentation stating he had seen it at the Northamptonshire Adults Safeguarding Board. He had been invited to the modern slavery sub group meeting which was also attended by Northamptonshire Police. He felt it was important for the Council to understand that whilst this was not yet an issue, the Council and Northamptonshire Police did have responsibilities.

The Chairman then invited Northamptonshire Safeguarding Adults Boards Modern Slavery Sub Group Chairman, Emma Hildreth to provide a presentation who highlighted the following:

- There was a joint role between the Council and Northamptonshire Police.
- Modern slavery was about safeguarding children and adults.
- The work of the Police was just one strand of work.
- It involved various activities including child trafficking and enforced labour.
- Criminal exploitation was where people worked in say a cannabis factory or in gangs pickpocketing. People working in this way were often subject to violence or threats of violence.
- Domestic servitude was when people worked in private households but treated like a slave, perhaps having to live where they worked, having little pay and little time off.
- It was not just about crime and investigation but about safeguarding and it did happen in Northamptonshire. The nature of where Northamptonshire was located in the country meant it was easy to bring people in and the number was starting to rise. The police had recorded 12 offences in the past year.
- Victims could be referred to the National Referral System which was funded by the Government and provided 45 days in which to discover what had been happening.
- Under the Board a local multi-agency group had been established which she chaired and for which they were looking to recruit to the role of a co-ordinator.
- Multi-agency visits were also undertaken. The Fire Service for example often visited homes where they might see victims of modern slavery. Where it was identified, the environmental health or police were employed to disrupt the activity.
- Any potential victim that had been referred had 5 days during which it would be decided if they would be taken. They were working with a company in Leicestershire to provide a crisis bed for victims. If they were not accepted, they tried to work with other agencies to provide the bed.
- The signs of being victimised were not always recognisable so there was work to do to ensure people could better recognise it.
- Any business with a turnover of £36million or more had to issue a statement annually around what they were doing to tackle modern slavery. This could be a real challenge for those with a large supply chain. There was however a centre of excellence emerging through the university.

The Northamptonshire Safeguarding Adults Boards Modern Slavery Sub Group Chairman was accompanied by Detective Superintendent Steve Lingley who stated the following:

- This was a priority for Northamptonshire Police and it fitted into their approach for safeguarding and protecting vulnerable people from harm.
- As this was new business for them they had re-engineered their service to be able to deliver in various areas. This included a dedicated vulnerable adult's team that worked with the Council.
- The Home Secretary had provided additional money to assist law enforcement in this area. They had improved their investigative response and used analytical data. Of the 19 referrals made, 6 would not have been reported unless they have undertaken the investigative work. One involved a welfare visit with partners that did not raise any concerns but they went away and undertook some intelligence work and investigated the people working there who were only earning 13p an hour and living in squalid conditions on the site. They took 11 workers away, found them support from the Salvation Army, 6 of them were referred and 3 arrests made.

Questions on the presentation, were answered as follows:

- Getting support for victims was an issue. If they did not meet the national referral mechanism criteria there was no issue but there was a gap which they were attempting to resolve locally.
- They did manage some campaigns and they attempted to view it from the safeguarding adults point and there was a need to get the information across the health sector. It would be good for the Council to assist in managing campaigns. The way forward was to disrupt activities and protect and dismantle regionally.
- They did have a member of the sub group from the asylum team within the Council's children's service. Northamptonshire Police regularly met with the Council's Social Care teams to gain an understanding of the needs of looked after children.
- The national assessment from the Environment Agency set out risks on modern slavery that filtered down to regional arrangements which filtered to local arrangements. They did engage at a regional level and they had the opportunity to understand emerging markets and communities.
- There was monumental development taking place. The Chief Constable and the Police and Crime Commissioner were both very committed.
- There were some issues around supporting victims particularly in accommodating them. Although it was everyone's business it was not always treated like it was everyone's financial responsibility. Children's services were specifically looking at the child trafficking work and issues around this. They were also aware that there was a need to shift to a more balanced focus between adults and children.
- There was some printed literature that could be provided for councillors.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the presentation on Modern Slavery.

(Councillor Jill Hope joined the meeting at this point)

72/16 Cabinet Business:

At the Chairman's invitation, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Heather Smith presented her report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating her disappointment that nothing had been announced for social care in the previous day's autumn statement. The Council would continue to lobby for more support. In the report by the County Councils Network it had stated Northamptonshire was a medium sized county but it was hoped the saving required would not be as much as £80-100million. A clear steer was required from Government on what they would accept in terms of unitary authorities and the Council would continue to discuss the possibility with the local district and borough councils. Baroness Janet Scott had provided a presentation for cabinet members and opposition leaders and would be invited to provide her presentation to all councillors

The Chairman then referred Council to the list of written questions and answers (copies of which were circulated at the meeting) and took supplementary questions to those as follows:

- The Youth Parliament would be included in the review currently being undertaken by the Director of Children's Services.
- The budget had no allowance for salary increases for staff.
- An assurance was given that the Council would be able to balance the budget and meet all its commitments.
- There were a lot of people working hard to provide the very best facilities and education for the International Academy and Wootton Hall Park Schools. They were both free schools and the demand in Northampton for school places remained. Some of those in temporary accommodation such as those at Wootton Hall Park

were in better facilities than some of those in permanent buildings. Both new schools would be completed at the appropriate time.

- The majority of the county's secondary schools were academies and it was therefore up to them to provide relevant levels of service. The portfolio holder was sure from all he heard that appropriate relationship and sex education was in place.
- It was considered important to provide defibrillators at schools. The Cabinet Member for Education would be pleased to work with colleagues to raise the profile of this.
- An apology was made for the fact that it had been 3 years since the Grange Care Home had closed. Its future was most likely as an addition to the Children's Centre that was adjacent to it and the Council had discussed this with Daventry District Council.
- The Cabinet Member for Transport would be willing to look at the issue of lighting on South Bridge and asked Councillor Brendan Glynane if he would also like to discuss the lighting with Northampton Borough Council.
- The Cabinet Member for Transport would ask the Environment Agency to provide an answer to his written question.

Verbal questions were answered as follows:

- The Leader of the Council's report was written before she had met with Northampton House Sanctuary but she had met with a group organised by Councillor Danielle Stone regarding their concerns. The group had been very responsive to her request to seek more foster carers and tried to reassure them that it did not take as long as they might think, particularly in terms of asylum seeking children.
- The Leader of the Council had met with the regional committee for migration and was expecting to meet with the Chief Executive of East Midlands Council to discuss some of the issues. The Government had decided the number of unaccompanied children each authority should be caring for and Northamptonshire was in excess of that by approximately 20 children. There had been a suggestion that a scheme be set up whereby responsibility could be transferred to another authority. Unfortunately this would be a voluntary scheme and all other councils in the East Midlands region had said they did not wish to take part. One issue was the time it took social workers to visit the Council's looked after children placed in various part of the country. Oundle appeared to be taking 2 families coming in from Syria. Many of those coming in were placed in rural communities where the local schools did have some places.
- The Leader of the Council was not aware of trafficking in the county but the Council did have a number of children who had gone missing over a long period of time.
- The sum of money coming into the county was not under the Leader of the Council's control but the county was under-funded and repeatedly highlighted this to Government. Should the Council receive more money than expected, it could change some of its plans for the services provided.
- The Leader of the Council had been supporting a few areas in the county to provide a defibrillator. The number provided in the county was rising.
- It was not possible to set a budget for something that was unknown and there was therefore nothing in the budget for performance related increments for staff.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) Council noted the report by the Leader of the Council and responses to questions raised both prior to and during the meeting; and**
- 2) That Councillor Morris would ask the Environment Agency to provide an answer to Michael Brown's question of when the standard of flood protection for flood defences in Northampton would be reviewed and what the process for a review is and who triggers it**

73/16 Report by the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee:

At the Chairman's invitation, the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee, Councillor Jim Hakewill proposed his report (copies of which had been previously circulated) highlighting that the list of dates for the budget scrutiny process would be provided imminently.

The report was seconded by Councillor Dudley Hughes who stated the Children, Learning and Communities Scrutiny Committee had deferred its next meeting to January 2017.

In answer to a query on the report it was confirmed the Council had embedded modern slavery issues into the way in which it undertook its procurement.

In reply Councillor Hakewill stated that if there was a desire for any subject to be scrutinised, the relevant scrutiny committee would consider including it in their work plan.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the Report by the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee and responses to questions raised at the meeting.

74/16 Motions submitted by Councillors under Rule 13.1:

(a) Motion submitted by Councillor Danielle Stone:

At the Chairman's invitation the following people addressed Council stating:

Impi Farookhi, Chief Executive from the Lowdown Counselling Service stated he had serious concerns regarding the mental health and wellbeing of the county's young people. He understood the pressures of local government which led to hard choices. The mental health and wellbeing of young people however had to be a national issue. He noted mental health services had been under-funded nationally and this was 40% extra to the national average. The waiting list was currently 13 weeks and up to a year for many priority cases. GPs were directly referring young people to the Lowdown because of the risk of deterioration whilst these young people waited a year to be seen. Agencies such as the Lowdown were accessible and friendly but extremely vulnerable to changes in funding.

Dawn Wright from the Lowdown Counselling Service referred to a letter that had been sent to councillors expressing their concerns. Whilst she understood the financial pressures she also recognised that not fixing something now would cost a lot more in the future. In the last quarter they had experienced a 20% increase in referrals and 44% of all mental health support for young people had been provided by youth counselling services like the Lowdown. She also referred to a young girl who was ripping skin of her face with the finger nails because she could not cope with her life. For this young woman they offered counselling and scratch gloves. She also referred to a mum who had rung them that morning because their daughter had suddenly flipped, stated she wanted to hurt someone and used a bottle to make some swellings on her similar to leukaemia. She had also stated a wish to become a prostitute. These were people who had been assessed by the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) as not meeting their criteria. She felt services from the Lowdown were very cost effective and were badly needed in the county. She also felt that if there was no investment in young people there would be no leaders or contributors to society in the next 10 years and it would become dysfunctional.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Danielle Stone to submit the following motion:

“This Council accepts that the mental health of our children is an important issue. Children and Young People need to be able to access support for their mental health as they need it. The work done by our young leaders demonstrated that young people need access to up to date and quality information about services that are available in their area. They also need to be able to self-refer where appropriate in addition to being referred by other agencies. Organisations such as Lowdown provide easy access for Children and Young People. They provide highly engaging services of excellent quality.

This Council will work with voluntary sector organisations like the Lowdown to ensure their services are sustainable and that there is capacity in the County to meet the mental health needs of our children.”

In moving the motion, Councillor Stone stated that from all agencies providing support, schools, counselling services and their own experiences councillors knew there had been an increase in the reporting of issues of mental health in young children. There had also been an increase in many issues affecting young people and she was concerned that this was producing generations of unhappy children. She also noted that the sooner disorders were identified the better the outcome for those young people. She also felt it was essential that young people were also able to self-refer. They could not self-refer to CAMHS and CAMHS did not offer a weekend service. Sunday nights were particularly worrying. The Lowdown and services like it were good examples of an accessible service. They offered a range of services and the Lowdown in the past year had assisted 92 people to deal with suicide and suicidal feelings. The running costs of the Lowdown were £130,000 per annum and for that they provided a drop-in centre that met the needs of 4,000 people. They employed 5 staff and many volunteers and if the Council withdrew from its Section 75 Agreement with the NHS for mental health services it could put future programmes at risk. She asked that councillors support the motion and agree that mental health services were a priority and improve and extend services.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Julie Brookfield who stated she felt the key word was ‘capacity’ and there was a need to build it in to ensure a sustainable service. The voluntary sector had a good track record of supporting young people both with counselling and referrals but they could not do it all alone. They required support from Council. She knew there was a lot of work being undertaken via NHS choices and she felt early intervention by services could stop someone from becoming worse. She felt it was beholden on all councillors to do that and noted that 1 in 10 people faced some kind of issue and needed reassurance that they were not alone.

Councillors commented as follows:

- The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services had recently met with the Director for Children’s Services and a group of young people working on the ‘Talk out Loud’ mental health stigma programme where they were asked some very challenging questions. One overwhelming factor from that and the discussion with young people at the Corporate Parenting Board the previous week was how they could present themselves. They took away a challenge to return to those young people in 6-12 months stating what they had undertaken to improve the system.
- The Section 75 Agreement was currently being discussed with the CCGs and other providers to ensure the best services were provided in the county.
- The Mental health Concordat was owned by the Health and Wellbeing Board to whom any gaps and trends were reported.
- It was felt by some that services from the Lowdown in Northampton, CHAT in Oundle and Service 6 in Wellingborough had to be supported properly, particularly as they filled gaps in service.

- It was noted the Health and Wellbeing Board was fully committed to improving mental health and wellbeing in the county and had identified this as a key strategical priority. It was firmly embedded in the way the Board operated and they were continually building on the specific actions undertaken. A full needs assessment had been published as part of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and there was a revised action plan to support suicide. They were also working with partners to deliver more sports activities.
- It was noted CHAT in Oundle worked with local schools. It was managed on a voluntary basis but qualified counsellors required a wage. A lot of their work was health related and their funding came from health. The divisional councillor in that area often gave money from their empowering councillors funding and whenever they had anything unspent, they gave it to CHAT.
- Some noted the pressure on young people and it was suggested Norman Lamb be written to as he had undertaken much in this area. It was also suggested youth centres be created to provide a place where young people could obtain help and advice. These centres were not youth clubs as they offered more.
- It was noted First for Wellbeing was not just a service for those aged 18 years and over. It was universal and covered all ages.

In reply Councillor Stone stated the First for Wellbeing Service did state on its website that it was for over 18s. She felt as a growing county with a growing number of young people experiencing increased levels of stress there was a growing need for value for money services. They required protection. She also noted pooled funding was an issue and there was a need to be vigorous in understanding what was already there. Then there was the need in 6-12 months' time to be able to report how services had been improved.

RESOLVED that: Upon a unanimous vote the motion was accepted.

(b) Motion submitted by Councillor Michael Brown:

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr Colin Bricher addressed Council stating how wonderful it was that so many staff had received such a high rating. He felt the Council should reward high achieving staff and expressed serious concerns, one of which was the inadequate consideration that had been given to the scheme. He did not feel the Council had a poor view of workers but their actions suggested they were slightly removed from them. He urged the whole chamber to support a motion that seemed to him to be an excellent compromise. He felt a promise was a promise and noted the trade unions were angry at bosses making empty promises. But was the Council expected to bankrupt itself or hit the vulnerable harder he asked. He felt it was not the first time that the Council had got it wrong but did feel the motion should be accepted and confirm how Council valued its staff.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Michael Brown to propose the following motion:

“Council notes that the staff bonus scheme has been completely withdrawn this year, because of “too many” staff receiving an “exceptional” or “highly effective” rating, resulting in the scheme not being “sustainable and financially viable.”

Council believes that commitments made to staff should be honoured. We therefore resolve that bonus payments should be made to staff who achieved the qualifying ratings. In order to avoid additional financial pressure on the Council, the amounts paid should be set in such a way that the overall total amount budgeted for bonus payments is not exceeded.”

In moving the motion Councillor Brown stated he was very surprised to have had to put the motion forward. Although management made strategic decisions, it was staff who carried the activities out. The previous year a scheme had been put in place to reward those that performed and 61% of staff had qualified. The Council however felt too many people had achieved the higher grades as only 25% had been expected. The cost of full implementation would have been £1million against a £400,000 budget. The Council had decided to scrap the deal rather than take 4 days mandatory unpaid leave or make 40 people redundant. He felt however that this was more about saving money and nothing to do with staff ratings. He felt it was against the Prime Minister's wish to help those who were just about managing. Having a highly effective workforce was good but how would the Council attract any new people to the county when they discovered how the Council managed its systems. Many members of staff would have used their increment to fund the new parking charges and it also affected staff pensions. He noted the Council was in dispute with the trade unions and queried how anyone would ever believe any future decisions.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Adam Collyer who stated the Leader of the Council was now stating there had never been any budget for this. He understood the Council was in a difficult financial situation but moving forward there was a need to ensure the increments were budgeted for. £600 as the average raise per year might not seem like much to many of those sitting in the Council Chamber it was a lot to those only earning £12,000 per year. He felt Council had to recognise it was treating staff badly by promising the scheme and then going back on it. It was important to give recognition to staff members and suggested some additional leave the following year might be something.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Brendan Glynane to propose the following amendment:

“Council notes that the staff bonus scheme has been completely withdrawn this year, because of “too many” staff receiving an “exceptional” or “highly effective” rating, resulting in the scheme not being “sustainable and financially viable. Council believes that commitments made to staff should be honoured in full.

In moving the amendment Councillor Glynane stated it was pretty self-explicit. He felt it was an issue of trust and he felt the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council should not have broken that trust. He felt a promise once made should be kept and almost 2/3 of staff had been deemed as performing well. He felt therefore that the Council should find the money to pay hard working members of staff.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Jill Hope who felt that once a promise was made it should be kept. She referred to the Council's need to attract more staff and rely less on agency staff that were costing a fortune. She felt the Council was promising the earth and then not paying it.

Councillor Michael Brown did not accept the amendment.

At the Chairman's invitation the Chief Executive, Paul Blantern stated he was sorry for the fact that the PADP scores that year meant there was inadequate funding to pay increments. The PADP system usually paid for itself through the turnover of staff which ran at the national average of 12%. Managers sat with their staff and agreed their performance which was then collated centrally. Under normal circumstances approximately 38% of people achieved the required target. In this particular year the Council had estimated this incorrectly. Pay gradings were built into the base wage bill which was increased for future years. The Council had agreed with unions to consider if

there was anything else that could be offered but this more likely to happen the following year. The increment had never been budgeted for and a 1% pay award had been paid from April.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was noted the Council had many fantastic staff who all worked extremely hard.
- It was also noted that this was not a bonus scheme but an incremental one and many staff were already at the top of their scale. It was also up to each department to absorb any increment offered to staff.
- It was felt by some that staff deserved what they had been promised and this was now an issue of trust. It was noted the majority of staff would receive £600 per year.
- Concerns were raised that morale which was already low would be lowered further.
- Councillors asked where the sum of £1million could be found to pay the increments. In response to this it was suggested the investment to Chester Farm could be diverted to fund the increments.
- Some felt that a commitment once made should be kept and it was suggested that expecting only 25% of staff to have achieved their increment was disappointing.
- It was noted that regular discussions had been held regarding the best way in which to recruit, motivate and retain staff. Not paying their increments did not appear to be a good way of keeping staff.
- It was suggested that only expecting 25% of staff to achieve their increments was a failure of senior management and it was further suggested that had the PADP process been managed properly 61% achieving would not have been a surprise.

Upon the vote the amendment was rejected.

In reply to the original motion Councillor Michael Brown agreed that the Council employed fantastic staff many of whom logged into the system and worked during the evenings. He felt a way should be found to reward these staff and suggested a one-off payment be made as something was better than nothing. He referred to the need to retain these members of staff to take the Council forward and noted there was already a shortage of social workers in the country. He then asked which of the social workers would want to work for an organisation that did not honour a promise to pay anything. He concluded by noting the sum of paying the increments was in fact £400,000 and asked Council to look after its staff.

Upon the vote the motion was rejected.

RESOLVED that: Upon the vote, the amendment was rejected.

(c) Motion submitted by Councillor Sarah Uldall:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Sarah Uldall proposed the following motion:

"That the Bus Services Bill currently passing through Parliament includes Clause 21 that will effectively "prohibit a local authority from forming a company for the purposes of providing a local bus service".

That the Localism Act (2011) provides general powers of competence to local authorities. That municipal bus companies can provide some of the best bus services in the country and have a successful track record of increasing bus passenger numbers and providing high quality bus services.

That polling by We Own It found that a majority of the public (57%) oppose clause 21, whilst just 22% support it. The opposition to Clause 21 is consistent across voters from all political parties

That the cross party Local Government Association has also made clear its opposition to Clause 21.

This council believes:

- *Clause 21 contradicts the general powers of competence and the spirit of the Localism Act 2011.*
- *If there is a need, and councils can offer a value for money service, then Councils should be able to provide their own bus services.*
- *Should they wish, Councils should be legally able to follow the model developed by councils including Reading and Nottingham.*
- *Consequently Clause 21 should be omitted from the Bus Services Bill.*

This council resolves:

- *To write to The Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP the Secretary of State for Transport and to call on the his Department for Transport to omit Clause 21 from the final legislation*
- *To write to Peter Bone MP, Michael Ellis MP, Christopher Heaton-Harris MP, Philip Hollobone MP, Andrea Leadsom MP, David Mackintosh MP, Tom Pursglove MP to ask them to oppose clause 21 when the Bus Services Bill reaches the House of Commons and ask them to write to The Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP and the Department of Transport to raise concerns about Clause 21.*
- *To work with any organisations such as “We Own It” to publicise our opposition to clause 21 in local media.”*

In moving the motion Councillor Uldall stated this had caused a stir in politics. Clause 21 would prohibit local authorities from forming their own bus companies and literally rob communities of the opportunity to address bus companies. Many local authorities had formed their own companies putting money back into the public purse. The Localism Act of 2011 provided general powers to local operators but Clause 21 did not and she was therefore asking that it be omitted from the legislation.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Chris Lofts.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was noted Clause 21 had been recommended for omission from the legislation by the House of Lords. The Local Government Association also supported this.
- It was further noted that whilst Stagecoach did a good job in Northamptonshire there were many other areas where a local authority was running a good service.
- Some felt that next generation council was based on the premise of localism but because Clause 21 outlawed a local authority from owning a public company next generation council would not be possible.
- Some felt that the removal of the Clause 21 in the House of Lords made this motion null and void.
- It was noted Clause 21 could be added back when the Bill returned to the House of Commons and it was further noted that in a few years' time when the Council would be expected to be more self-funding, all opportunities should be available for making money to provide services.
- It was also noted the motion asked for support to ensure Clause 21 be kept out of the Bill when it returned to the House of Commons. It was about adding some support to MPs to understand that Clause 21 had to be kept out of the Act.

Councillor Uldall had nothing to add in reply.

Upon the vote the motion was rejected.

RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion was rejected.

(d) Motion submitted by Councillor Jill Hope:

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Jill Hope proposed the following motion:

"This Council notes:

That this council acknowledges with regret the fact that the Legatum Institute's Prosperity Index for 2016 (<http://uk.prosperity.com/>) lists Northampton our County town as 348th out of 389 towns and cities reviewed under the 7 headings of Economic quality, Business environment, Education, Health, Safety and security, Social capital and Natural environment. This positions Northampton below Corby, below Great Yarmouth and below Hartlepool.

This council further notes that the prosperity is as much about wellbeing as it is about wealth. That the opportunity to flourish does not reach all citizens. Far too many cannot achieve their potential, for them aspiration and opportunity have been extinguished.

This Council Believes that:

In order to improve Northampton's position on this league table, this council resolves to adopt the strategy proposed by the Legatum Institute and investigate the idea of forming a Local Prosperity Partnership (LPP) to identify the need for economic and social investment in the area, and then to deliver on that investment – to ensure that economic growth feeds into local communities.

Further the LPP would be made up of representatives from:

- *The local authority or authorities*
- *Third-sector organisations*
- *Community leaders*
- *Local Clinical Commissioning Groups*
- *Key local schools*

This LPP would sit alongside SEMLEP and would focus on social development to ensure that the economic growth actually feeds into local communities. SEMLEP and the now defunct NEP concentrated on economic growth and development, but the aim of a LPP is to tie economic growth into community growth. That we need a council with vision, leadership and deliverability.

This council resolves:

That this council calls on the leader to adopt the LPP strategy and to report to full Council within the next three months detailing plans to raise the prosperity of our citizens across Northamptonshire."

In moving the motion Councillor Hope stated the report ranked Northampton 348 out of 389 towns in a towns and cities review. This was not just for one thing but on a whole raft of issues including employment, the environment, education, health, social capital and the natural environment. The specific areas that really pulled Northampton's rating down were

in education and safety. She felt the motion was about localism and was in line with next generation council and suggested a group of people be formed to solve this issue.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Brendan Glynane.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was noted the motion, concerned about Northampton was being presented to a local authority concerned about the county and it was suggested the motion be presented to Northampton Borough Council.
- It was further noted that the report had not taken account of the employment rate which was the highest in the East Midlands. A report by Grant Thornton published the previous week had ranked Northampton 59 out of 324 local areas for prosperity. It was therefore felt that reports could produce varying results.
- Concerns were raised that this report suggested prosperity of the county town was not where it should be. It was suggested the Council work with the third sector organisations, the local CCGs, schools and local authorities to ascertain how Northampton could be improved.
- It was felt another quango was not required and the organisations already working in the area should be trusted and assisted.
- Some voiced concerns that the report did not reference any business leaders or organisations. Safety and security did not mention emergency services either. It appeared to some to be a selection of politically useful headings rather than listing anyone who might support the town.
- It was noted there were other reports that noted other achievements in the town such as the new train station, bus station, county council HQ and new university campus.

In reply Councillor Hope stated she was interested to hear about Northampton Enterprise Partnership and the South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership, the first of which had failed because it cost a fortune but achieved nothing. She felt the other had prospered and done much for the county. It was about doing something good for the community for nothing.

Upon the vote the motion was rejected.

RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion was rejected.

75/16 Urgent Business:

There was none.

76/16 Exempt Items:

There were none.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 4.25pm.

Jenny Rendall
Democratic Support

Chairman's Signature:-

Date:-



NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Recorded Votes for Council:
Date of Meeting: 24 November 2016
Item No: 8 Opposition Priority Business (Amendment to the Motion)

Surname	First Name	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Beardsworth	Sally				√
Bell	Paul	√			
Brackenbury	Wendy	√			
Brookfield	Julie		√		
Broomfield	Jim				√
Brown	Michael		√		
Brown	Robin	√			
Butcher	Mary		√		
Clarke	Michael				√
Collyer	Adam	√			
Coombe	Elizabeth		√		
Eales	Gareth		√		
Glynane	Brendan		√		
Golby	Matthew	√			
Gonzalez de Savage	Andre	√			
Groome	Christopher	√			
Hakewill	James	√			
Hales	Eileen		√		
Hallam	Mike	√			

Surname	First Name	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Harker	James	√			
Heggs	Stanley	√			
Hills	Alan				√
Homer	Sue	√			
Hope	Jill				√
Hughes	Dudley	√			
Hughes	Sylvia	√			
Irving-Swift	Cecile	√			
Kirkbride	Joan	√			
Larratt	Phil			√	
Lawman	Graham	√			
Lawson	Derek	√			
Legg	Stephen	√			
Lofts	Chris		√		
Longley	Malcolm	√			
McCutcheon	Arthur		√		
McGhee	John		√		
Mackintosh	David				√
Matthews	Allan	√			
Mercer	Andrew	√			
Meredith	Dennis		√		
Morris	Ian	√			
Osborne	Steve	√			
Parker	Bill	√			
Patel	Bhupendra				√
Patel	Suresh	√			

Surname	First Name	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Roberts	Russell	√			
Sawbridge	Ron	√			
Scott	Bob				√
Scrimshaw	Mick		√		
Shephard	Judy	√			
Smith	Heather	√			
Stone	Danielle		√		
Strachan	Winston				√
Tye	Michael	√			
Uldall	Sarah		√		
Walker	Allen	√			
Waters	Malcolm	√			
Totals					
		33	14	1	9

Questions submitted under rule 10.2

1. Question to Councillor Heather Smith, Leader of the Council from Councillor Danielle Stone:

What are the plans for the Young Leaders Scheme and youth Shadow Board?
Lesley dealing.

Services are currently being reviewed and there is currently a consultation underway with staff which ends on 14th December. There are 2 FTE posts in the new CFE structure to focus on this, and other youth engagement work.

2. Question to Councillor Heather Smith, Leader of the Council from Councillor Brendan Glynane:

What does the leader of the Council say to the exceptional or highly effective hard working council staff the 61% who hit the challenging targets of the PADP's, boosting standards across the local authority. The PADP's were entered into in good faith, if people hit a required level then increment rises would be paid, these were consequently agreed and were promised to staff. Now your Conservative administration has reneged on this agreement how can staff trust a word you say in the difficult times ahead?

I say thank you. I say thank you for the undoubtable commitment they show to this council and our residents. I am very much aware that the recent decision not to reward our staff via the annual performance appraisal process has been hard to swallow. It is not something we wanted to do, but in these challenging times we must consider all options that help to protect frontline service budgets. I can say to staff that we will continue the dialogue with the trade unions and we have already committed to reviewing the PADP scheme to ensure that it fair, equitable and suitable for the needs of the Next Generation Council.

3. Question to Councillor Robin Brown, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Finance from Councillor Danielle Stone:

Are we moving to a 4 year budget?

Yes. We are already in the first year of a four year budget.

4. Question to Councillor Robin Brown, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Finance from Councillor Danielle Stone:

How are we going to manage the budget gap for adult social care?

We have been completely open and transparent about how we are managing the pressures within our budgets including adult social care.

In the last few months each monthly finance report has outlined what mitigating action is being taken to off-set in year pressures and I refer the councillor to these reports.

5. Question to Councillor Robin Brown, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Finance from Councillor Danielle Stone:

Having a qualified opinion from the external auditors on value for money is a serious issue. What are the lessons being learned from this?

In addition to the budgetary controls and budget planning improvements already put in place this year, we are working with KPMG to help them understand our local programmes and decision-making processes. These will be evaluated against best practice and any recommendations that arise from the review will be considered and implemented where appropriate.

6. Question to Councillor Matt Golby, Cabinet Member for Children's Services from Councillor Danielle Stone:

How are we to guarantee quality of experience for the children who have starting secondary school in mobile classrooms at Wootton Hall Park and Northampton International Academy? They have inadequate facilities, with no labs, no art rooms, no gyms and inadequate play-space. There is a great inequality here. For how long will the children be in mobile classrooms?

The plans to develop these two new schools have been known for some time. I disagree with the sentiment of the question and the assertion that students at Wootton Hall Park and Northampton International Academy have inadequate facilities.

Approval for the operating arrangement for the new school is the responsibility of the Regional Schools Commissioner in partnership with the Education Funding Agency. The current accommodation, albeit temporary, is of good quality and provide a good learning environment.

Firstly, at Wootton Hall Park, the modular building is a fully functioning school with the majority of the facilities parents and students would expect. Indeed feedback from parents is positive. As the building is of a modular construction the entire internal space has been fitted from new. In effect it is a brand new build. With regard to facilities, there is a fully functional science laboratory including gas connections, a specialist art studio, a MUGA (multi use games area), two football pitches and the adjacent sports pavilion.

At the two recent Year 6 open events, there were over 2,000 visitors to the school. In addition, the DfE Inspector that visited two weeks ago commented to the Head that it was the best start to a free school that he had ever inspected.

In terms of NIA, the school opened with mobile classrooms some 8 weeks ago. All of the students have settled remarkably well. This was affirmed by a DfE advisor during the first monitoring visit on the 15th of November. The principal areas for assessment such as leadership, teaching & learning and behaviour & welfare of pupils was all positive and sets a good platform for building on the potential this school.

NIA has two Science rooms, equipped with benches and gas taps. There is a MUGA for play and games. In addition other local facilities are used for sport. The football team has already played against another school and other fixtures are planned. In this half term Year 7 pupils go to the Mounts for swimming as part of the PE curriculum. Indoor PE can be carried out in the hall at Castle Academy – it is another EMLC school and the sites are adjacent. Pupils work an extended school day, working to a 3E's curriculum – Entitlement,

Enrichment and Extension. There are a range of activities delivered as part of Extension and Enrichment, including Art and crafts.

The Councillor is welcome to visit these two new schools at her convenience if she wishes to experience the schooling conditions for herself.

7. Question to Councillor Matt Golby, Cabinet Member for Children's Services from Councillor Danielle Stone:

When are we going to ask our schools to develop a sex and relationship curriculum?

Some schools have relationship and sex education in place. Schools can access the 0-19 team to deliver sessions on SRE. This needs to form part of a wider health and wellbeing agenda in schools. Primary schools are offered the healthier child programme looking at all aspects of health. Secondary schools will be invited to take part in the Health Related Behaviour Questionnaire to assess the health needs of their school to inform work that needs to take place in the school with regards to health and wellbeing.

8. Question to Councillor Matt Golby, Cabinet Member for Children's Services from Councillor Julie Brookfield:

Are there plans to assist schools to purchase a defibrillator? Is the DFE scheme to put a defibrillator in every school still running?

The Department for Education has produced national guidance for schools:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/519994/AED_guide_for_schools.pdf

DFE and the County Council share the view that such equipment can help to save lives. The information provided in the guidance is not an instruction to purchase as it states "installation of AEDs are entirely for schools to determine".

It also explains how they should go about procuring, installing and maintaining Automated External Defibrillators (AEDs). In view of the vital role that AEDs can play in saving the lives of pupils, staff and other users of school premises, the Department for Education is encouraging all schools to consider purchasing these devices as part of their first-aid equipment.

For schools and other eligible settings that would like assistance to do this, the Department for Education, working with the Department of Health, has negotiated an arrangement with NHS Supply Chain for schools to purchase AEDs from them at reduced cost. NHS Supply Chain, under contract with the Department of Health, has a procurement framework agreement in place with a wide range of AED suppliers.

As NCC we have a number of community defibrillators managed by NFRS and EMAS, and in addition to national and local procurement options there is also potentially the option for schools to procure via the British Heart Foundation, as long as the initiative is linked to their HeartStart campaign.

Most of the options can help bring the unit cost of a defibrillator down from somewhere between £1,500 to £2,000 per device to around £600.

The Chief Fire Officer has confirmed he is more than happy to assist schools with explaining options for procurement and partnership schemes that are available. NFRS can offer access to advice and training via Heartstart and our Immediate Emergency care trainers.

Additionally, the British Heart Foundation offers CPR training packs free to all secondary schools in the UK. Each school that applies receives a pack of 35 kits, each containing a lightweight manikin and a 30-minute DVD which includes familiarisation on the use of AEDs – enough to allow every young person in a class to learn CPR first-hand. Secondary schools can order kits through the British Heart Foundation website at <http://www.bhf.org.uk/lifesavers>

9. Question to Councillor Matt Golby, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Councillor Bill Parker, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Adult Care Delivery from Councillor Danielle Stone:

How can Northamptonshire be a great place to live and work if we are cutting essential services such as Children and Adolescent Mental health services?

NCC funding for mental health and wellbeing, including CAMHS services, is being reviewed to ensure that we have clearly defined services that are commissioned in partnership with the CCG. The task is to ensure that the right funding is provided by the right part of NCC for the right services, and similarly that the CCG is providing the right funding for the services that it has a responsibility to resource – this does not mean that services will be ‘cut’.

The Council helps to fund ‘Ask Normen’, an online gateway for everyone with an interest in the emotional wellbeing and mental health of children and young people in Northamptonshire – including an interface for reporting concerns.

We are actively involved in NorPIP the charity which helps parents who are struggling to form a secure attachment with their babies that many Members are also actively engaged with too.

We have Wellbeing advisors in place through First for Wellbeing and School nurses available in our schools can help to identify those at risk in addition to our traditional safeguarding services.

Through our local STP and transformation plan for health and social care around improving early intervention and prevention and better joining up of services.

NCC is working together with local partners across the NHS, with Nene CCG as the lead partner, children’s services, education and youth justice sectors and voluntary and community sectors to develop Local Transformation Plans for delivering improvements in children and young people’s mental health and wellbeing in Northamptonshire over the next 5 years.

10. Question to Councillor Bill Parker, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Adult Care Delivery from Councillor Adam Collyer:

The Grange Care Home in Daventry was closed approximately three years ago. So far no plans for the future of the site have been published.

I have previously asked questions about this, but been told that no plans are available and there is no timing for when the plans are likely to be announced.

Since this is a waste of a valuable council asset, can Cllr Parker tell me what the plans are for the site, and explain to me why it has taken three years for the council to decide what to do with it?

Adult Social Care Services and Olympus Care Services has been reviewing its property requirements as part of their Accommodation Strategy. There have been a number of options for developing our property portfolio as Members will be aware.

Adult Social Care Services has recently confirmed that it does not require the Grange Care Home in Daventry and therefore the property was opened up for other considerations.

Children, Families and Education is currently considering its potential use.

11. Question to Councillor Ian Morris, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport, Highways & the Environment, from Councillor Sally Beardsworth:

Can the portfolio holder how much tell me how much has been spent on the Cock Hotel junction in Kingsthorpe in the last 12 years? How many redesigns it has had in the last 12 years? Can he also tell me the number of reported accident that have taken place in the last 12 years broken down by the number and type of accident for each year?

Estimated spend of around £208k. The cost provided relates to improvement works only for traffic signal improvements towards the Scoot Traffic signal system. SCOOT is an adaptive traffic control system which coordinates the operation of all the traffic signals in an area to give good progression to vehicles through the network.

Whilst coordinating all the signals, it responds intelligently and continuously as traffic flow changes and fluctuates throughout the day. It removes the dependence of less sophisticated systems on signal plans, which have to be expensively updated. The total cost for the entire scheme on the whole route (Kingsthorpe Corridor) was in the region of £30K with works at the Cock Hotel costing around £8K which would include works and design.

In 2010/11 the Kingsthorpe Corridor scheme was introduced at a total cost of £4.234m. Although we do not have a specific breakdown of how much the Cock Hotel junction element of this works cost it is likely to be in the region of £150 to £200K. This work included new signals and minor kerbing alterations.

There has only been one re-design in the last 12 years, works that were part of the Kingsthorpe Corridor development. Previous works before that would have been when all the red shelters/boarders went in which would have been in the 1990s.

In terms of accidents there have been 33 traffic collisions reported over the 12 years since September 2003. 31 or 94% were classified as 'slight' accidents, with 2 of the 33 being serious. From the collisions there have been 45 slight injuries reported and 2 serious. There have been no reported fatalities.

Collisions					Casualties				
Fatal	Serious	KSI	Slight	Total	Fatal	Serious	KSI	Slight	Total
0	2	2	31	33	0	2	2	45	47

12. Question to Councillor Ian Morris, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport, Highways & the Environment, from Councillor Brendan Glynnane:

Residents of Cliftonville Court have contacted me about cars that are consistently parked at the entrance to Cliftonville Court before 8am in the morning, which makes it very difficult for residents to safely exit and enter the Court throughout the day. A resident has been told by this Council that out of their 278 visits this year only 2 tickets were issued and the level of visits 'CANNOT BE SUSTAINED'. Can the portfolio holder tell us what the policy on enforcement is and what can be done to help my residents in Cliftonville Court?

The Parking Enforcement Policy is contained in the Council's Network Management Plan – Section 12.8 and this can be viewed on line.

<http://www3.northamptonshire.gov.uk/councilservices/northamptonshire-highways/transport-plans-and-policies/Documents/Network%20Management%20Plan.pdf>

Cliftonville Court has been reported several times previously as an area with repeated problems of people parking on a small stretch of double yellow lines. It is claimed that such inconsiderate parking causes access/egress issues and each time the complaint has been received, and Parking Enforcement Officers have acted on this. For information, for the year to date, 310 visits have been carried out to this specific location, totalling 13:74 hours and 3 Penalty Charge Notices have been issued.

We are continuing with a higher presence in the area but due to the geographical area our officers have to cover the county; it is not possible to have an officer on almost permanent duty in this area to prevent anyone parking in this location. Regrettably many motorists park illegally taking a risk often without recourse and although physical measures such as bollards along the pavement have been considered, this would not really offer a solution as this could prevent pedestrians safely walking particularly with wheelchairs or pushchairs.

The suggested solution is for affected residents to contact the Civil Enforcement team direct to report a problem and when an officer is available, they will send someone to patrol. The phone number is 0845 680 0153 selecting Option 3 and will go through to NSL's control room.

13. Question to Councillor Ian Morris, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport, Highways & the Environment, from Councillor Brendan Glynnane:

Can I thank Northamptonshire highway for the repairs to South Bridge, Northampton. Before the repairs started I spoke with highways to ask about the lighting. There were four Lamp standards on the bridge parapet before the accident occurred then there were three, I suggested that that they should do the work to replace the fourth standard at the same time, they said were looking into it. Now we're have a bridge repaired the gateway to Far Cotton and Delapre, with three lamp standards one missing and only two of the three remaining ones working, can the Portfolio holder update me on progress with this situation?

The new street lighting installed around South Bridge (Bridge Street / Cotton End) fully lights the road to the Council's required standard irrespective of whether the decorative lighting on the bridge is lit. The decorative lights are therefore surplus to requirements and do not need to be in light. However, we are currently exploring whether there is a case for the decorative lighting units to be retained as an historical feature (albeit unlit) and where then the responsibility for maintaining those units should rest. The fourth light that was

removed from the bridge at the time of the accident damage is currently held in safe storage by Balfour Beatty.

14. Question to Councillor Ian Morris, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport, Highways & the Environment, from Councillor Michael Brown

Can the portfolio holder tell me when the standard of flood protection for flood defences in Northampton will be reviewed in the light of latest Climate change predictions? Can he also tell me what the process for a review of the standard is and who triggers it?

This matter relates to the River Nene which is the main river in Northampton and the responsibility for which is coordinated by the Environment Agency (EA). Therefore this question should be posed direct to the EA.

Our defences are inspected annually by the Environment Agency and there is a programme for model review and update.

The Standard of Protection of the defences in the centre of Northampton was last reviewed in the 2010 report titled 'The Northampton Standards of Protection Review'.

This report was commissioned by the Anglian Regional Flood and Coastal Committee in order to address concerns raised by the Nene Flood Prevention Alliance and individuals. It cost in excess of £100,000 and demonstrated that the current standard of protection remains 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability or the risk is managed to the level of a flooding event that might happen once every 200 years – higher than most other flood defence schemes in the country.

The Environment Agency's river models are reviewed regularly and updated on a rotational basis – the Upper Nene Phase V model is due to be updated in 2020/2021. In line with industry practice, this is when we will update the model with the new climate change predictions.

We have identified a need to consider adaption for climate change in the future for Northampton. This work is in the pipeline for projects beyond the current 6 year Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) programme.

All Flood Risk Management assets in Northampton are inspected at least once every year by Environment Agency Asset Inspectors. Any issues identified are managed either directly by the Environment Agency or by working with the riparian landowner (riverside) and/or asset owner.

15. Question to Councillor Ian Morris, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport, Highways & the Environment, from Councillor Michael Brown

Can the portfolio holder confirm that this County Council has no plans to cease taking in old fridges and freezers from the public. Can he also confirm that there is no issue now or for the foreseeable future with the companies that recycle these items in order to remove the dangerous gasses within these items. Can he confirm that we do not have a back log of collections of these items sitting in our HWC's throughout the county?

There are no plans for the Council to cease accepting old fridges and freezers at our HWRCs. There are currently no issues with the producer compliance scheme used by the Council's contractor for the collection of these items from the HWRCs for reprocessing. Should an issue develop, there is a mechanism which the Council can use, which was

established by the Department for Business Innovation & Skills (BIS). Finally, I can confirm that there is not a backlog of waste electrical and electronic equipment awaiting collection from the Council's HWRCs.

16. Question to Councillor Sylvia Hughes, Cabinet Member with responsibility for Public Health & Wellbeing from Councillor Eileen Hales:

In recognition of the fact that not all disability is visible, and that the signs for Disabled Toilets should change to "Accessible/Disabled Toilets" will the County Council support and promote the campaign for Accessible toilets?

We are supportive and have for example sought to ensure accessible facilities are available with Angel Square and the residual County Hall sites. All toilet signage (i.e. male/female and accessible) is both worded, pictorial and in Braille format. The current facilities available at County Hall such as lifts and toilets with a hoist will remain available. Within the boundaries of available resources I am happy to explore what further the County Council can do to raise awareness and promote the campaign through its communication function.