



Record of decision

**THE FOLLOWING DECISIONS WERE TAKEN ON TUESDAY, 9 FEBRUARY 2010
BY THE CABINET IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER**

**THE CALL IN PERIOD FOR THESE DECISIONS EXPIRE AT 5.00 PM ON
THURSDAY, 18 FEBRUARY 2010**

Members of the Cabinet who were present

Cllrs David Pugh (Chair), Barry Abraham, Peter Bingham, George Brown, Dawn Cousins, Edward Giles, Tim Hunter-Henderson

Members also present (non voting)

Cllrs Jonathan Bacon, Reg Barry, Vanessa Churchman, George Cameron, Rodney Downer, Stuart Dyer, John Hobart, John Howe, David Knowles, Geoff Lumley, Roger Mazillius, Ian Stephens, Chris Welsford, Adrian Whittaker, David Williams, Wayne Whittle,

Apologies

None

Confirmed as a true record of decisions taken

Leader of the Council

Agenda item	Minutes of the Last Meeting
Decision reference	80/09
Decision Taken	That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2010 be agreed.
Questions / Amendments	None.

Agenda item	Declarations of Interest
Decision reference	81/09
	None declared at this stage.

Agenda item	Public Question Time
Decision reference	82/09
Questions	Ms Naomi Somerville, Chair of the Supporting People Provider Forum, put three written question to the Cabinet on how the Supporting People grant for Supporting People

Services was used, the plans in place to minimise the risk of the proposed cessation of the floating support services and which client groups would be affected by the reduction in Supporting People funding.

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Social Care, Public Health and Housing responded by stating that the Supporting People grant had underwritten the costs of the Supporting People team and had also provided funding for training for providers as well as the provision of a provider forum. It was noted that with regards to the plans to minimise the risk around the cessation of the floating support, the council would in conjunction with partners establish which resources would be available in order to meet the needs of the community, as well as review relevant contracts to establish whether there are opportunities to identify capacity for community based interventions. The priority with regards to reduction in funding would be hostel based accommodation.

Mrs Joyce Bogoni, President of the Fair Haven Housing Trust, put two written questions to the Cabinet. These were on the future of Meadowbrook whilst clients are being assessed for personal budgets and the position on residents in registered care homes being offered personal budgets.

The Cabinet Member responded by stating that providers could re-shape services to ensure they attract business from individual personal budget holders as well as market themselves to new holders. If outcomes are achieved, their future would likely be more secure. It was noted that residents in registered care homes should be provided with day opportunities via their current residential provider as stipulated as part of their residential contract with the council.

Mrs Jacqueline Hawkins of Newport put an oral question to the Cabinet with regards to the Music Service budget proposals and whether the Cabinet could re-consider them.

A member of the public from the gallery put an oral question to the Cabinet and requested that the council reconsiders its proposals for the Supporting People programme.

The Chairman responded to both questions by stating that the Cabinet budget proposals were just to recommend to Full Council on 24 February 2010. It was at the Full Council meeting where the decisions would be ratified, following consultation and debate. The Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Social Care, Public Health and Housing would also meet with relevant staff of Supporting People to discuss the

	proposals further.
--	--------------------

Agenda item	2010/11 – 2012/13 Budget Strategy and Council Tax Setting
Decision reference	83/09
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Leader of the Council addressed the meeting by stating that the 2010/11 – 2012/13 budget faced by the council was the most challenging and difficult one of recent times and had to be faced up to as a result of the national and global economic crisis. The council had to ensure that the priorities of residents, such as the low rise in council tax, as well as the continuation of core services were met. However, this could only be achieved by having to make tough decisions on how the council addresses its finances.</p> <p>The Leader reiterated that the proposals being presented are to recommend to the Full Council meeting on 24 February 2010. This would allow a further two weeks of consultation and also provide the opportunity for alternative measures to be suggested and tabled by other parties and groups. The final decisions would only be made following this process.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources presented the report and advised members on the recommendations outlined within. The recommendations set out the changes to the overall revenue and capital budget for the medium term as well as the proposed revenue budget and council tax increase for 2010/11.</p> <p>Members were advised that the impact of the economic crisis had led to the proposed measures and the council had no option but to produce a balanced financial plan.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member explained that the Corporate Plan which was ratified by Full Council on 25 November 2009 provided the basis on which the budget was built around.</p> <p>Many issues were highlighted which needed addressing and included the significant level of grant which would be taken away through “damping”, increase in energy costs , landfill taxes, the burden placed on the council through the concessionary fares scheme and the general increase in costs of contracts.</p> <p>Members were also reminded that the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 1 February 2010 also provided some valuable recommendations which would be considered and appropriately acted upon.</p>

<p>Issues Raised by Other Members</p>	<p>Cllr Lumley expressed his concerns at the lack of political consultation that was made available to opposition members and it was noted that an alternative budget would be presented to the Full Council meeting on 24 February 2010 which would provide the Island residents with a different choice, defending the services to vulnerable people.</p> <p>Cllr Bacon speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee raised several issues which included concerns of a lack of creativity and support for tourism and the cuts to the Supporting People services. Cllr Bacon also urged members to reconsider the proposals surrounding Westminster House.</p> <p>Cllr Brown referred Cllr Bacon to the presentation given to the Economy, Environment and Transport Scrutiny Panel on 3 February 2010 which demonstrated that the council was supporting tourism in an inventive way. The Leader also stated that should proposals be agreed, any changes to the Supporting People programme would be made in a phased manner dealing with those most at need first.</p> <p>Cllr Mazillius and Cllr Stephens expressed their desire to see an alternative budget reflecting the views of all opposition members.</p> <p>Cllr Stephens also raised concerns surrounding the proposed increase in parking permits and its impact on those working in the voluntary sector.</p> <p>Cllr Churchman raised further concerns with regards to the proposals on parking permits and questioned if such measures would increase the uptake of the concessionary bus fares scheme from pensioners, thus creating more financial problems for the council. Cllr Giles assured members that all implications surrounding parking permits had been taken into account.</p>
<p>Decision taken</p>	<p>1. THAT after taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The views and comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee from its meeting on 1 February 2010 be considered. ii. The results of the Budget Consultation exercises set out in Appendix 13 be considered. iii. The Equality Impact Assessment set out in Appendix 6

	<p>2. THAT the overall Budget and Council Tax Strategy be recommended to Full Council and in particular:</p> <p>a. The Medium Term Financial Strategy set out in Appendix 9.</p> <p>b. The Medium-Term Financial Plan as set out in Appendix 2.</p> <p>c. No use of general fund balances to be applied for 2010/11 budget.</p> <p>d. The schedule of savings set out in Appendix 4.</p> <p>e. An increase in the IOW Council element of Council Tax by 2.5% for 2010/11.</p> <p>f. The overall Capital Programme set out in Appendix 8.</p> <p>g. The Prudential Code Indicators, Treasury Management Strategy and Investment Strategy as set out in Appendix 14.</p> <p>h. The overall Council tax base of £55,167 for 2010/11.</p>
Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with	<p>To support the Council's priorities, provide resources for key projects and to meet the Council's vision and strategic objectives.</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	The report highlighted a number of options open to the authority and proposed an overall strategy to balance them.
Declarations of Interests	Cllr Bacon declared a personal interest as he was a member of the Isle of Wight Law Centre which received funding from the council.

Agenda item	Rural Schools Competition
Decision reference	84/09
Summary of Discussion	The Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and School Improvement presented to members a report which set out determining the way forward for the three rural area schools of Chillerton & Rookley, Godshill and Wroxall primaries which complied with the statutory requirements. Members were also provided with a summary of the process.

	<p>which led to the requirement of the report. It was noted that the IW Council had received a letter from the Schools Adjudicator advising that they wished to determine the statutory proposals in relation to middle schools. However, this, based on legal advice given, was not the view of the council, hence the decision on 1 October 2010 to determine the future on all Island middle schools.</p> <p>It was noted that owing to the urgency of the report and decision, the item had not appeared on the Forward Plan. The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been consulted and agreed to its inclusion on the agenda.</p> <p>It was further noted that in order to avoid a lengthy and possibly damaging legal battle within the courts, to see Godshill, Wroxall and Chillerton & Rookley schools come together and expand to include Year 5 from September 2010, the council would withdraw the statutory notices for the discontinuation of these three schools and seek a hard federation between them as an alternative way forward to ultimately achieve the outcome of one school.</p> <p>Members were asked to note that the recommended option was relatively cost neutral, had the full support from all three schools concerned and mitigates the risk of further uncertainty and disruption for pupils, parents and staff.</p>
<p>Issues Raised by Other Members</p>	<p>Cllr Bingham gave full support to the proposals and reported that he had also received support from the School Governors within his ward who were keen for the decision to be ratified as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Cllr Downer also expressed his support as well as those of the Schools within his ward, but wished to also put across his caution at ensuring all year 5 pupil places would be accommodated for.</p> <p>Cllr Welsford expressed some concern that the views of all parties concerned had not been taken into account. However, the Leader responded by stating all opinions were accounted for, although they would not necessarily be placated.</p>
<p>Decision taken</p>	<p>1) THAT Cabinet agree to withdraw the notices for the discontinuance of Chillerton & Rookley Primary School, Godshill Primary School and Wroxall Primary School, the Isle of Wight Council proposal for the new 'Rural' Primary School and therefore the Competition for the new 'Rural' Primary School and commence a new process to increase the upper age limit of Chillerton & Rookley Primary School, Godshill Primary School and Wroxall Primary School, including a 6 week consultation and</p>

	<p>publication of statutory notices, subject to a hard federation between the 3 schools.</p> <p>2) THAT the Director of Children and Young People be authorised to develop with the governing bodies of Chillerton & Rookley, Godshill and Wroxall Primary Schools an instrument of federation, and to support the governors' consultation on the school's federation with their communities.</p> <p>3) THAT officers be authorised to proceed with consultation on and, subject to the outcome of that consultation, publication of the statutory notices and proposals to increase the upper age limit to 11 years of age and, if required to enlarge, Chillerton & Rookley, Godshill and Wroxall Primary Schools, subject to a hard federation between them.</p> <p>4) THAT following the closing of the statutory period for representation and due consideration of any representation received, the decision to approve, reject, modify or withdraw these statutory proposals be made by delegated decision.</p>
<p>Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with</p>	<p>To raise educational standards and to provide greater opportunities for all young people of the Island. This was not only essential in enabling them to secure their future and economic well-being but was integral to the economic regeneration of the Island.</p> <p>To align with the following corporate themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thriving Island • An inspiring Island
<p>Options considered and rejected</p>	<p>Option A – Identify and refer those middle school proposals that are considered related by the Schools Adjudicator for their determination along with those proposals already referred to them.</p> <p>Option B - Seek a ruling on the disagreement with the Schools Adjudicator relating to the interpretation of the statutory guidance through the courts by way of judicial review.</p>
<p>Declarations of Interests</p>	<p>None Declared</p>

Agenda item	Consideration of the Forward Plan
Decision reference	85/09
Amendments / Additions / Removals	<p>The Forward Plan for the period of February – May 2010 was reviewed and the following issues were raised:</p> <p>Forward Plan Item 986 / 09 - Improving Performance in Permanency Planning and Family Finding, would be moved from Cabinet on Tuesday, 30 March 2010 to Tuesday, 11 May 2010.</p>
Declarations of Interests	None Declared

Agenda item	Delegated Decisions
Decision reference	86/09
Summary of Discussion	Members of the Cabinet reviewed the Delegated Decisions which had been taken by the relevant Cabinet members since the last Cabinet meeting on 19 January 2010.
Declarations of Interests	None declared

Agenda item	Members Question Time
Decision reference	87/09
Questions	<p>Cllr Reg Barry put a written question to the Cabinet on the percentage increase year on year of the IWC's revenue support grant from central government since 2004/2005 and how it compared year on year with other similar top level authorities.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by providing the information and summarised in stating that whilst the percentage increase in the Revenue Support Grant had only reduced from 5.7% in 2004/5 to 3.9% in 2010/11, with some variation in the intermediate years, the financial value of the increase had reduced from £6.6M in 2004/5 to £2.3M in 2010/11.</p>
Declarations of Interests	None declared.