



Record of decision

THE FOLLOWING DECISIONS WERE TAKEN ON TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010 BY THE CABINET

THE CALL IN PERIOD FOR THESE DECISIONS EXPIRES AT 5.00 PM ON THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010

Members of the Cabinet who were present

Cllrs David Pugh (Chair), Barry Abraham, Dawn Cousins, Edward Giles, Tim Hunter-Henderson, Roger Mazillius

Members also present (non voting)

Cllrs Reg Barry, Vanessa Churchman, Rodney Downer, Stuart Dyer, John Hobart, David Knowles, Geoff Lumley,

Apologies

Cllr George Brown

Confirmed as a true record of decisions taken

Leader of the Council

Agenda item	Minutes of the Last Meeting
Decision reference	29 (10/11)
Decision Taken	That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2010 be agreed
Questions / Amendments	None.

Agenda item	Declarations of Interest
Decision reference	30 (10/11)
	None declared at this stage

Agenda item	Public Question Time
Decision reference	31 (10/11)

Questions

A Written Question was received from Mr Pete Mawhood of the Fire and Rescue Service with regard to when Fire Control stopped being a part of the Isle of Wight Fire and Rescue Service and when the Council decided that they no longer wished to keep the Fire and Rescue Service on the Island.

The Cabinet Member responded by advising that the mobilising of assets to meet the fire authority's needs under the Integrated Risk Management Plan could be safely transferred to another provider, whilst maintaining the Isle of Wight Fire Authority's strategic function to run a safe and efficient Fire Control. It was further noted that the decision to keep the Isle of Wight Fire & Rescue Service within local control and governance on the Island was taken following a review of service and resources which were being put in to modernise the service and keep it sustainable and safe for the future, with command of the Services' assets on the Island.

A Written Question was received from Ms Julie Brown of the Fire and Rescue Service with regard to how moving Isle of Wight Fire Control to the mainland contributes to the Eco Island principles, the One Wight campaign and self sufficiency.

The Cabinet Member responded by advising that key services across the Island could be maintained, whilst carrying on effective and efficient Fire Control arrangements through another authority as well as achieving financial savings prior to Regional Control Centre coming on line.

A Written Question was received from Mr Andy Cooper of the Fire and Rescue Service with regard to what other solutions had been explored in keeping Fire Control on the Island as well as which other emergency facilities such as the Ambulance Service had been consulted with a view to a dual Island control.

The Cabinet Member responded by advising that following a scoping study undertaken by involving other emergency services on the potential for blue light working which considered a joint control room, the initiative was not progressed as any additional time and resource would have had the consequence of reducing any window of opportunity for efficiency savings. Furthermore the Isle of Wight Ambulance Service had been investing in a new control room which may impact upon any decision to combine with other agencies. Additionally Hampshire Police had invested in their control solution at Netley.

A Written Question was received from Ms Helen Scholes of the Fire and Rescue Service with regard to often confused, dazed, injured and disorientated callers to Fire Control sometimes unable to answer, in full, the most simple of questions such as "Where are you?" and whether such people would feel confident in mainland individuals with no knowledge of the geographical area of the Isle of Wight.

The Cabinet Member responded by advising that the development of Regional Control Centre's (RCC) was an undertaking of the Government and as such the Isle of Wight Council, as the local authority, had committed to the solution. The Islands response arrangements for call handling and mobilisation would be no different in terms of local knowledge whether it was outsourced to another Fire and Rescue Authority or via the future RCC solution. Local knowledge would be maintained on the Island through responding crews and officers, mitigating the loss of local Fire Control staff in terms of responding to the incident, although not at the call handling stage.

A Written Question was received from Ms Clare O'Mara of the Fire and Rescue Service with regard to whether members were prepared to take responsibility for any possible loss of property and life as a result of the proposals as well as the risk of prosecution under Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007.

The Cabinet Member responded by advising that the Islands members and officers of the council took their responsibility to members of the public and the local community very seriously and as such, any decision that would be taken had to be viable and would be made for the benefit of the wider public agenda.

A Written Question was received from Mr Mark Turner of the Fire and Rescue Service with regard to the Outline Business Case (OBC) that other mainland Fire Control services would be more resilient and effective than the Isle of Wight Fire Control and asked what examples could be given as to when the Isle of Wight Fire Control had not been resilient or effective.

The Cabinet Member responded by advising that the OBC did not state that the IOW Fire Control had not been resilient or effective in the past, but did make mention of the difficulties attributed to spate conditions, which was a reality for any service area during such events. Resilience, as referred to within the context of the paper, related to the ability to meet any current or future requirements placed

upon the provision of call handling and mobilising functions.

Three written questions were received from South Wight Housing Association with regard to proposals within the Medium Term Budget Review around the issues of Personal Budgets for vulnerable people.

Whilst the question was received within the deadline required, no person was forthcoming to put the question to Cabinet and it was therefore noted that a full written response would be forwarded on in due course.

A written question was received from Mr James Bell of Carisbrooke with regard to the public being consulted on any possible future proposals around the future of Tourist Information Centres and what consultation would take place.

Whilst the question was received within the deadline required, Mr Bell had not been forthcoming to put the question to Cabinet and it was therefore noted that that a full written response would be forwarded on in due course.

A written question was received from Mrs Jackie Hawkins of Newport with regard to how the Council had come to the conclusion that the best use of Section 106 monies, was better spent on traffic proposals for Newport, when such resources could be better utilised on things that were of greater benefit to the community and if such consultation had taken place, would such a conclusion had been arrived upon.

The Cabinet Member responded by stating that Section 106 agreements needed first and foremost to be relevant to the development in question. Newport was the busiest town on the Island and it was therefore the case that traffic and transport would be a priority when considering Section 106 contributions in relation to developments in and around the town. However, it did not preclude contributions to other areas such as those mentioned in the question following tests of relevance, fairness and proportionality.

A written question was received from Mr Steve Shakeshaft of Newport asking why no mention or reference was made to link and justify the new gyratory roundabout at Staplers with regard to the Strategic Highway Network Improvements for Newport.

The Cabinet Member responded by stating that the proposed new gyratory roundabout in Staplers Road, as

	<p>well as the new roundabout in St Georges Way, were primarily for the purpose of linking the Pan Meadows development to the existing highway network</p> <p>The justification for the junctions and their design had been determined through the planning process and they would be constructed with the benefit of full planning permission.</p>
--	---

Agenda item	Medium Term Budget Review
Decision reference	32 (10/11)
Summary of discussion	<p>The Cabinet was presented with a report by the Leader of the Council which provided an update on the progress made in implementing the recommendations that were agreed in the Budget Review that went to Cabinet on 13 July 2010.</p> <p>It was noted that the recommendations outlined within the report were to recommend the proposals to Full Council and that no decision was being taken by Cabinet. All members of the council would have an opportunity to contribute to the proposals at the meeting on 22 September 2010.</p> <p>Members were advised that the council needed to make difficult decision following the emergency national budget of June 2010 and ahead of the comprehensive spending review of Oct 2010. The Isle of Wight Council was no different to many authorities across the UK being faced with hard-hitting budgetary issues.</p> <p>Proposals within the report were then summarised and the relevant Cabinet Members highlighted recommendations within their area of remit.</p> <p>It was noted that with regard to the recommendations around Westminster House, the proposals were in no way a reflection of the staff, but more to do with the building itself which had become unfit for purpose. A WholeLife Service Group had been set up, Chaired by the former Cabinet Member who represented Adult Social Care and which included senior members of staff from Westminster House as well as a number of carers and NHS representatives who had been to visit the proposed facilities at the Adelaide and Gouldings and had the unanimous view that services would be better delivered there. It was noted that most of those had been impressed with the proposed new facilities and a number of carers had also been taken there by senior council staff and feedback on this had been positive. However, comments and views from all staff would continue</p>

to be taken into account.

Members were asked to note that whilst many issues around Fire and Rescue had been addressed at Public Question Time at the start of the meeting, it was worth noting that the proposals would assist the council in implementing the best service possible for the Island. It was also stated that concerns around people not being certain as to where they were calling from in an emergency would be addressed with new technology which allowed mobile phone users to be identified at all times when making or receiving calls.

With regard to Children and Young People Services, it was noted that steps were being taken to look at increasing services at Beaulieu House Respite Care. Members were also advised that with regard to the proposals around the post-16 transport, there would be a consultation process to remove the discretionary element of the concessionary fares scheme around this as well as consultation on the removal of discretionary travel subsidy for denominational school transport from September 2011 and that that the contribution made to travel costs be increased from £27.50 per term to £60 per term or the equivalent to £1 per day as from the beginning of the January term.

On the issue of Performance and Transformation, members were advised that savings had been identified in reducing publications and that the One Island magazine would become cost neutral by the end of the financial year. The revised internal transformation savings total therefore would be £3million for 2010/11.

Members were advised that with regard to Parking Income and Permits, a revised recommendation (1(h) in Decision Taken) was proposed, which took into account the need to contain net revenue spend and the delivery of a balanced budget and that a final set of recommendations would be published prior to the meeting of Full Council on 22 September 2010 which would allow for further representations to be taken into account.

At the meeting of Cabinet on 7 December 2010 the issues around Wightbus and the Cowes Chain Ferry would be addressed.

It was noted that with regard to paragraph 1 (g) of the recommendation, the word "International" should be replaced with "Island" to read Island Games and that paragraph 2 of the recommendation should be amended to

	<p>finish with April 2011.</p> <p>It was further noted that in Appendix 5, page B38, there was a typographical error in the Race Table of the qualities profile of users and beneficiaries where the figures for “White British” should have under “Any Other White” and vice versa.</p>
<p>Issues Raised by Other Members</p>	<p>Cllr Lumley expressed great sadness at the administrations reaction to the budget which was contained within the report. With regard to Westminster House, Cllr Lumley asked if it was the opinion of all staff that the new facilities were impressive as it appeared from the reaction of Westminster House Staff in the Public Gallery that this was not the case.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by stating that it was the opinion of the WholeLife Service Group and that of a delegation of staff members from Westminster House.</p> <p>It was further noted that anybody was free to inspect the minutes to the WholeLife Service Group meetings where all attendees were encouraged to speak their minds about the proposed move.</p> <p>Cllr Barry asked whether the total risk figure of £6.5million was as a result of government policy or council budget measures. The Leader responded by saying that the figure was largely due to responding to the Coalition Government measures. However the council still needed respond to the needs of the Islands community by working within a balanced budget.</p> <p>Cllr Downer asked how residents who lived far away from the proposed Westminster House replacement facilities at Freshwater would be supported with regard to transport needs as well as the time required to adapt to change.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by stating that each individual would be supported to make the transition and specific needs would be reviewed, including any method of transport. Individuals and carers would be assisted to ensure a smooth transition would be achieved. Additionally their would be the option to use a minibus to support those with any difficulty in transport as well as an expectation that individuals use their Disability Living Allowance (DLA) mobility component to help with transport costs. Induction periods for individuals and staff would also be encouraged.</p> <p>Cllr Knowles stated that the administration should have</p>

	<p>been more prudent with regard to the proposals over the future of Fire Control and felt it was wrong that the council's finances and the UK recession were being used as an excuse to move services. Cllr Knowles also praised the work of the Chief Fire Officer for the recent Fire Service awards received by the service.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by advising that the development of Regional Control Centre's (RCC) project was a Government Policy which the Isle of Wight Council was signed up to and had to be a part of.</p> <p>Cllr Knowles questioned whether there was as much need for major projects as in the past and asked when the One Island Magazine would become cost neutral</p> <p>The leader responded by stating that there were many major projects which still needed addressing. The Cabinet Member stated that the One Island Magazine would become cost neutral by the end of the financial year as forecast.</p> <p>Cllr Churchman expressed concerns over whether it was the duty of the council to be involved publications that could take advertising away from other Island companies.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by advising that One Island Magazine was published with cooperation and input with other Island Strategic Partners and was a good vehicle to inform Island residents and visitors of what the council was intending to do. The council did not compete unfairly and would never undercut any other Island business.</p> <p>Cllr Churchman also raised concerns over prohibitive costs of the proposed parking permits and the risk of driving residents out of town centres and into the large supermarkets out of town.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by informing members that many mainland permits were considerably higher than that of the Island and that the costs which were being considered for recommendation to Full Council still represented good value.</p>
<p>Decision taken</p>	<p><u>Option 2:</u></p> <p>1. THAT the financial position facing the council as set out in the report was considered and the following actions taken to date to contain budget pressures be recommended to Full Council:</p>

	<p>a) They confirm the need to contain net revenue spend for the Council to the level agreed by Council on 24 February 2010</p> <p>b) Officers undertake the necessary consultation and impact assessments on the proposals set out in paragraph 23 i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the eligibility threshold (in line with FACS (Fair Access to Care Services) criteria) used to determine who the council provides adult social care services to so that those with the greatest needs are assured of support while those at greatest risk are also provided with targeted support in those areas in which they are most vulnerable. [Full year saving of £1.5m] • Revise the council's charging policy so that all people are assessed to contribute to the cost of the support that they receive on the same basis, irrespective of their age, disability or health condition. This would mean that people aged over 80 years would be assessed on the same basis as those aged under 80 years. [Full year saving of £1.25m] • Revise the council's charging policy so that all people are assessed to contribute on the basis of the overall value of their allocated personal budget rather than how they are choosing to spend it. This would mean that whether people use their personal budget for home care, day care, meals on wheels or any other support, they would be charged on an equitable basis.[Full year saving of £900k] <p>(c) After considering the equality impact assessment the proposed re-provisioning of services from Westminster House as set out in Appendix 5 be agreed and implemented forthwith.</p> <p>(d) Officers undertake the necessary consultation and impact assessments on the proposed removal of the discretionary element of the concessionary fares scheme for post-16 transport and on the removal of discretionary travel subsidy for denominational school transport from September 2011, subject to the proposed Cabinet Member delegated decision authorising this consultation being agreed in the near future.</p>
--	---

	<p>(e) As an immediate measure for post-16 students the contribution they make to their travel cost is increased from £27.50 per term to £60 per term (equivalent to £1 per day) as from the beginning of the January 2011 term, subject to the proposed Cabinet Member delegated decision being agreed in the near future.</p> <p>(f) An in-principle decision is made to combine the Council's fire control centre with that of another authority in order to deliver a cost effective service with the necessary resilience. Officers are tasked with progressing the necessary arrangements to implement this proposal, subject to a final Cabinet Member delegated decision.</p> <p>(g) The leisure facilities improvement programme is reconfigured in order to deliver an effective programme at a revenue cost of £250k less than currently agreed. Improvement works to the Westridge facility to be completed as planned in order for it to be ready for the Island Games in 2011.</p> <p>(h) The parking income and permit options as set out in Appendix 4 are further considered in the context and the need to contain net revenue spend (as per paragraph 1a above) and to deliver a balanced budget. Furthermore, a final set of recommendations will be published by the Cabinet Member for the Environment, Transport and Corporate Services prior to the September Full Council Meeting, with a view to making a decision enabling implementation of any changes with effect from 1 January 2011.</p> <p>2. THAT the necessary reports, results of consultations and final impact assessments flowing from decisions at Council on 22 September at the budget setting Full Council meeting in February 2011 in order to make any relevant decisions about the implementation of proposals with effect from 1 April 2011 be agreed to be considered.</p>
<p>Reason for decision and corporate themes it aligns with</p>	<p>To allow all elected members to consider the impact of the budget decisions of 24 February 2010 and whether there needed to be any in-year changes to ensure the delivery of a balanced budget for the remainder of the 2010 -11 financial year.</p> <p>To align with the following corporate themes:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thriving Island • A healthy and supportive Island • A safe and well-kept Island • An inspiring Island
Options considered and rejected	<p><u>Option 1</u> Not to take any further action at this stage and report back to Council in December 2010 when the decisions of the Comprehensive Spending Review and Financial Settlement are known.</p> <p><u>Option 3</u> To accept some of the proposals and recommend them to Full Council on 22 September 2010, and consider any alternative proposals for savings or agree that the projected shortfall is met from general fund balances.</p>
Declarations of Interests	Cllr Roger Mazillius declared a personal interest as his mother-in-law resided in a residential home and received various council benefits.

Agenda item	Strategic Highway Network Improvements for Newport
Decision reference	33 (10/11)
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Cabinet Member presented a report which sought the approval of the proposed strategic highway improvements for managing traffic in Newport.</p> <p>Cabinet was advised that the recommendation within the report would be subject to a full and proper planning process and would not therefore be a decision to proceed with any of the proposals.</p> <p>Should any decision be made in the future then any cost would be met by Section 106 monies and the only cost to the council itself would be for officer time.</p> <p>Proposals included a review of Hunnyhill / Hunnycross Way junction and the widening of all the approaches to the existing traffic signals to provide dedicated right turn lanes, creating a new, signalised 'T' junction on Parkhurst Road to the north of the St Mary's roundabout linking directly with Forest Road and closing the access from High Street onto Coppins Bridge and diverting traffic via St James' Street, Hunnycross Way and Riverway onto Medina Way. These options would be considered in a future report.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and Ward Member for Newport North expressed support as it</p>

	<p>stood, but would continue to monitor progress.</p> <p>Cabinet also expressed an urgent need to address traffic hot spots as soon as possible</p>
Issues Raised by Other Members	<p>Cllr Lumley refuted the claims within the report that consultation had taken place with Newport residents and Ward Members and that options were presented at a public meeting in Newport in January 2008 which he had chaired. Cllr Lumley also stated that there was unanimous objections to the proposals from Newport Parish Council.</p> <p>A concern were also expressed over the apparent intention within the report to pedestrianise the lower end of Newport High Street and was of the opinion that the High Street was not designed for such a venture.</p> <p>It was therefore requested that the decision be deferred until more clarification was established over the issue of consultation.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by stating that there was no clear indication to pedestrianise the High Street within the report and could not comment on the public meeting in January 2008 as he had no personal knowledge of it.</p> <p>It was further noted that there was a focus within the report to address the issues around the four main junctions as well as an overall direction of travel and that further consultation would take place. The request to defer the report to a later date was rejected.</p> <p>It was finally noted that the issue of consultation should be clarified and addressed. However, the proposals would not be substantially altered as a result of any amendment.</p>
Decision taken	<p>Option -2 - THAT the identified strategic highway improvements for Newport be approved.</p>
Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with	<p>To assist fulfil the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 statutory requirement to replace the current statutory development plan (the Unitary Development Plan 2001) with a new Local Development Framework (the Island Plan) and will be a key element of delivering the Community Strategy, the Local Area Agreement and Economic regeneration</p> <p>To help improve and maintain the condition of the Island's road network and align with the Roads PFI scheme, one of the councils seven key priorities.</p>

	To align with the following corporate themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thriving Island • A safe and well-kept Island • An inspiring Island
Options considered and rejected	Option 1 - Not to approve the identified strategic highway improvements for Newport.
Declarations of Interests	None declared

Agenda item	Interim Municipal Waste Plan April 2008 – March 2011
Decision reference	34 (10/11)
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Cabinet Member presented a report which provided an update on the Council's Interim Municipal Waste Plan (IMWP) for the period April 2008 to March 2011 as well as providing an update on the progress and plan for delivering the Long Term Waste Strategy and the re-let of the Council's Waste Collection and Disposal contract.</p> <p>The Cabinet was advised that generally the plan was on course but there was a desire to improve the Islands recycling rates and that any future Waste Collection and Disposal contract would need to be better than any previous ones.</p>
Issues Raised by Other Members	<p>Cllr Barry asked if the Member Review Board would be politically proportionate, given the important nature of the project.</p> <p>The Cabinet member responded by stating that no decision had been made but reminded members that there was the opportunity for the Environment, Economy and Transport Scrutiny Panel to exercise its powers in ensuring that any future waste plan was carried out effectively.</p>
Decision taken	<p>Option A THAT the Governance arrangements proposed in paragraph 28 of the report to oversee the development of the long term waste strategy and the re-let of the Integrated Waste Management contract.</p> <p>THAT the establishment of a member review board proposed in paragraph 28 to scrutinise and oversee progress against the strategic objectives set out for the long term waste strategy and the contract re-let be agreed.</p>
Reason for the decision and	To ensure that the Long Term Municipal Waste Strategy and the re-et of the integrated waste management contract

corporate objective it aligns with	<p>is undertaken in such a way as to reduce as far as possible the need for landfill whilst ensuring value for money and future proofing through the procurement of the new contract.</p> <p>To meet a number of Strategic Objectives, including a Safe and Well Kept Island, and Delivering Better Services. It also supports the delivery of the Eco-Island vision.</p> <p>To align with the following corporate themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thriving Island • A safe and well-kept Island • A healthy and supportive Island
Options considered and rejected	Option B - To note and amend the proposed governance arrangements and establishment of a member review board.
Declarations of Interests	None received

Agenda item	Council Procurement and the Island Economy
Decision reference	35 (10/11)
Summary of Discussion	<p>As a result of a recommendation from the Quarterly Performance and Strategic Risk Management Report – Quarter 1 2010/2011 approved at the Cabinet meeting on the 27 July 2010, the Cabinet Member presented a report on how the local economy could be supported and sustainability and reductions in carbon footprint could be better achieved through the procurement process. The report also outlined progress which had already been made and further actions which were planned to better achieve these outcomes.</p> <p>Cabinet highlighted the drive towards greater transparency were details of all payments greater than £500 would be published on the council's website from October 2010.</p> <p>The Cabinet was also mindful of the increasing importance of working in conjunction with other authorities to enter into joint procurement agreements in order to achieve possible savings.</p>
Issues Raised by Other Members	None
Decision taken	Option A – THAT the direction set out in the report for the ongoing development of the council's procurement framework be approved.

Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with	To activity support the achievement of the council's strategic themes and priorities identified within the council's corporate plan. To align with the following corporate themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thriving Island • A healthy and supportive Island • A safe and well-kept Island • An inspiring Island
Options considered and rejected	Option B – to amend the direction set out in this report.
Declarations of Interests	Cllr Mazillius declared a personal interest as his son was a Director of ERM Ltd who provided an Architectural related service to the Isle of Wight Council and therefore abstained from the vote.

Agenda item	Consideration of the Forward Plan
Decision reference	36 (10/11)
Issue Raised	The Foreword Plan was reviewed and it was noted that a future Forward Plan would include a Cabinet item with regard to the OFSTED inspection which was being carried out within the council's Childrens Services.
Declarations of Interest	None declared.

Agenda item	Delegated Decisions
Decision reference	37 (10/11)
Questions	It was noted that since the previous meeting of the cabinet on 27 July 2010, the following decisions had been taken via Cabinet member delegated responsibility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisions To Cabinet Member Responsibilities – August 2010 – Decision taken on 13 August by Cllr Pugh • Solent Local Enterprise Partnership – Decision taken on 1 September 2010 by Cllr Brown • Integrated Transport & Road Safety Grant – In Year Budget Reductions - Decision taken on 10 September 2010 by Cllr Giles
Declarations of	None declared

Interest	
-----------------	--

Agenda item	Members Question Time
Decision reference	38 (10/11)
Questions	No questions were received
Declarations of Interest	None declared.