To: The Council Leader and Members of Cabinet

Agenda

CABINET

A meeting of the Cabinet will be held as follows:

Date: Thursday 15 December 2016
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Cumbria House, 107-117 Botchergate, Carlisle CA1 1RD

Dawn Roberts
Corporate Director – Resources and Transformation

Enquiries and requests for supporting papers to: Jackie Currie
Direct Line: 01228 221030
Email: jackie.currie@cumbria.gov.uk

This agenda is available on request in alternative formats

Serving the People of Cumbria
MEMBERSHIP

Mr SF Young (Leader)  Ms B Furneaux
Mrs PA Bell (Deputy Leader)  Mr KA Little
Mrs A Burns  Mr DE Southward
Mr B Doughty  Mr I Stewart
Mrs C Feeney-Johnson  Mrs J Willis

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Agenda and Reports

Copies of the agenda and Part I reports are available for members of the public to inspect prior to the meeting. Copies will also be available at the meeting.

The agenda and Part I reports are also available on the County Council’s website – www.cumbria.gov.uk

Background Papers

Requests for the background papers to the Part I reports, excluding those papers that contain exempt information, can be made to Legal and Democratic Services at the address overleaf between the hours of 9.00 am and 4.30 pm, Monday to Friday.
PART 1: ITEMS LIKELY TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Members are invited to disclose any disclosable pecuniary interest they have in any item on the agenda which comprises

1 Details of any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.

2 Details of any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the authority) made or provided within the relevant period in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. (This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

3 Details of any contract which is made between you (or a body in which you have a beneficial interest) and the authority

(a) Under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and

(b) Which has not been fully discharged.

4 Details of any beneficial interest in land which is within the area of the authority.

5 Details of any licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy land in the area of the authority for a month or longer.

6 Details of any tenancy where (to your knowledge)

(a) The landlord is the authority; and

(b) The tenant is a body in which you have a beneficial interest.

7 Details of any beneficial interest in securities of a body where

(a) That body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of the authority; and

(b) Either –
(i) The total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or

(ii) If that share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

In addition, you must also disclose other non-pecuniary interests set out in the Code of Conduct where these have not already been registered.

**Note**
A “disclosable pecuniary interest” is an interest of a councillor or their partner (which means spouse or civil partner, a person with whom they are living as husband or wife, or a person with whom they are living as if they are civil partners).

3 **MINUTES**

To receive the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 24 November 2016 (copy enclosed)

(Pages 9 - 16)

4 **EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To consider whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item on the agenda.

5 **STATEMENTS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND CABINET MEMBERS**

To receive statements by the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Members.

6 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The following were deferred from the last Cabinet Meeting but have indicated they wished to attend December’s meeting.

a) Paul Carr will be attending to make a statement to Cabinet about Fluoridation

b) Dianne Standen will be attending the meeting and will ask the following question:

Infants fed with baby formula made up with fluoridated water are potentially receiving chronically damaging levels of fluoride. A breast fed infant receives 0.006 mg fluoride per litre of breast milk while a formula-fed infant receives 1mg fluoride per litre.

Advice should be given to avoid making up formula with fluoridated water.

Will Cumbria County Council follow the example of other fluoridated areas and communicate this information to West Cumbrian parents.
c) Colin Bell will be attending the meeting and will ask the following question:

In the USA, New Zealand and Eire fluoride levels have been reduced from 1.0ppm to a maximum of 0.7ppm, which is 0.3ppm less than that currently added to West Cumbria's drinking water.

Will Cumbria County Council follow the example of these fluoridated countries and reduce levels, preferably to zero, to avoid excessive accumulation of fluoride in the body?

d) Sheila Wood will be attending to ask the following question:-

Water companies have indemnity against legal action with regard to water fluoridation under the 2003 Water Act. Do Councillors have indemnity against action by parents or other members of the affected communities for failing to fulfil their public health role in informing the population about the health issues concerning ingested artificial fluoride (Hexafluorosilicic acid)?

e) Hilary Carr will not be attending but would like this question asked on her behalf:

A significant number of people living in the fluoridated area of Cumbria are using antidepressant medications that have a high fluoride content.

Will Cumbria County Council and PHE Cumbria circulate advice to doctors and local people about ways to reduce their daily fluoride exposure if they are using these drugs?

f) Joyce Alderson will not be attending but would like this question asked on her behalf:

The British fluoridation society have identified topical application of fluoride as the most effective deterrent of tooth decay. This accounts for the international improvements in dental health which are often significantly better than fluoridated countries. Can Councillors explain how fluoride in the body, through the water supply, is supposed to prevent dental decay in the targeted population?

g) Petition from Richard Watson re: Cockermouth Library

Mr Watson will be attending to present a petition about protecting services in Cockermouth Library

h) Margaret Mill from Cockermouth would like to ask Cabinet the following question:

"Would cabinet members agree to extend the period of public consultation in respect of both the proposed Community Asset Transfer of Cockermouth library and the proposed reductions in library services at Cockermouth, and ensure that community groups and user groups likely to be impacted are formally approached and their views invited?"
7. REFERRAL FROM LOCAL COMMITTEES

(A) REFERRAL FROM ALLERDALE LOCAL COMMITTEE RE: fluoridation

The Chair of Allerdale Local Committee to present a referral from Allerdale Local Committee re: fluoridation (copy enclosed)

(Pages 17 - 20)

(B) Response to Allerdale Local Committee Referral re: fluoridation

To consider a report from the Director of Public Health (copy enclosed)

(Pages 21 - 26)

REFERRAL FROM SCRUTINY

None for this meeting

8 SCRUTINY REVIEW - AUTISM TASK AND FINISH GROUP

(A) Scrutiny Review - Autism Task and Finish Group

To consider a report from the Chair of the Autism Task and Finish Group (copy enclosed) (Pages 27 - 52)

(B) Response of the Corporate Director to the Scrutiny Review – Autism Task and Finish Group

To consider a response from the Corporate Director – Children and Families Services (copy enclosed) (Pages 53 - 58)

9 SCRUTINY REVIEW - BUDGET CONSULTATION

(A) Scrutiny Response to Budget Consultation

To consider a report from the Chair of Scutiny Management Board (copy enclosed)

(Pages 59 - 64)

(B) Response to Scrutiny’s Response to Budget Consultation

To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Resources and Transformation (copy enclosed)

(Pages 65 - 72)
DIRECTORATE REPORTS - RESOURCES AND TRANSFORMATION

10  RESETTLEMENT OF SYRIAN REFUGEES IN CUMBRIA AND SUPPORT FOR UNACCOMPANIED ASYLUM SEEKING CHILDREN

To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Resources and Transformation (copy enclosed)

(Pages 73 - 114)

11  2016/17 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2016

To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Resources and Transformation (copy enclosed)

(Pages 115 - 178)

12  CORPORATE PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT – QUARTER 2 2016/17

To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Resources and Transformation (copy enclosed)

(Pages 179 - 220)

DIRECTORATE REPORTS - ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SERVICES

13  BARROW BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN - PUBLICATION CONSULTATION

To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Economy and Highways (copy enclosed)

(Pages 221 - 250)

14  NATIONAL GRID’S DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER CONSULTATION FOR THE NORTH WEST COAST CONNECTIONS PROJECT

To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Economy and Highways (copy enclosed)

(Pages 251 - 298)

DIRECTORATE REPORTS - HEALTH AND CARE SERVICES

15  HEALTH CARE FOR THE FUTURE - COUNCIL RESPONSE

To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Health, Care and Community Services (copy enclosed)

(Pages 299 - 368)
16  INCLUSION STRATEGY
To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Children and Families Services (copy enclosed)
(Pages 369 - 390)

17  DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT - HIGH NEEDS BUDGET 2016/17- 2018/19
To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Children and Families Services (copy enclosed)
(Pages 391 - 410)

18  SCHOOLS FUNDING FORMULA 2017/18
To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Children and Families Services (copy enclosed)
(Pages 411 - 420)

19  SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS 2018/19
To consider a report from the Corporate Director – Children and Families Services (copy enclosed)
(Pages 421 - 446)
PRESENT:

Mrs PA Bell (Deputy Leader)
Mrs A Burns
Mr B Doughty
Mrs C Feeney-Johnson
Ms B Furneaux
Mr KA Little
Mr DE Southward
Mr I Stewart
Mrs J Willis

Officers in attendance:

Chief Executive, Corporate Director - Economy and Highways, Corporate Director - Resources and Transformation and Assistant Director - Finance and the Chief Fire Officer

PART 1 ITEMS CONSIDERED IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

63 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr S F Young.

64 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest on this occasion.

65 MINUTES

RESOLVED that, the minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.
EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chair explained that she had agreed to take an additional item on the agenda for today’s meeting - Update on Commercial Matters, using the special urgency provision (paragraph 16 of Part 5D) of the Constitution in respect of this item. This item was a key decision which had not been included in the Forward Plan and as notice of it had not been given five days beforehand, it could only be taken with the agreement, of the Chair of the Scrutiny Management Board, who had agreed that the making of the decision was urgent and could not reasonably be deferred. The Chair of SMB had also agreed that this decision should be exempted from call-in on the grounds of urgency. This item would be taken at Agenda Item No 15.

RESOLVED that

(1) Agenda Item No. 14 Award of Contract – Provision of Residential and Nursing Care (Block Contract Arrangements) by virtue of Paragraph 3 of schedule 12A of Local Government Act 1972 as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of the any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

(2) Agenda Item No. 15 Update on Commercial Matters by virtue of Paragraph 3 of schedule 12A of Local Government Act 1972 as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of the any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and Paragraph 5 of schedule 12A of Local Government Act 1972 as Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

STATEMENTS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND CABINET MEMBERS

Statements were made by the following Cabinet Members;

The Deputy Leader made a statement regarding the Autumn Statement delivered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on 22 November 2016. She referred to the £198M savings that would have been delivered by the Council by the end of the 2016/17 financial year, and an expected £48M still to deliver over the 3 years from April 2017. She noted that the Chancellor’s speech had not referred to funding for key council services and concluded that the council’s financial planning assumptions for the
next 3 years remained unchanged. She stated that uncertainty would continue.

Cllr Little made an announcement about funding that had been secured from the Department for Transport to install cameras on key bridges. He stated that the first was installed yesterday at Greta Bridge in Keswick. When the water reached a certain level, inspectors would attend, and the images would be available on the county council website for the public to view. The images from weather cams used for winter maintenance operations would also be available on the website. This was to improve the availability and quality of information to the public.

68 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This item was deferred to the next meeting being held on 15 December 2016.

69 REFERRAL FROM ALLERDALE LOCAL COMMITTEE RE: FLUORIDATION

This item was deferred to the next meeting being held on 15 December 2016.

70 RESPONSE TO REFERRAL FROM ALLERDALE LOCAL COMMITTEE REGARDING FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

This item was deferred to the next meeting being held on 15 December 2016.

71 INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN (IRMP) YEAR 2 ACTION PLAN

A report was received from the Chief Fire Officer providing Cabinet with the year 2 action plan associated with the Fire and Rescue Service Integrated Risk Management Plan 2016-2020.

The production of an IRMP is a statutory requirement with the purpose of:

- identifying existing and potential risks to the community within the authority area
• evaluating the effectiveness of current preventative and response arrangements
• identifying opportunities for improvement and determine policies and standards for prevention and intervention
• determining resource requirements to meet these policies and standards

The document attached to this paper sets out the actions the Fire and Rescue Service would deliver against in 2017/2018 to ensure that the objectives set out in the IRMP 2016 – 2020 were progressed.

The Chief Fire Officer made particular reference to national fire reforms, blue light collaboration and the “Safe and Well” work being progressed, which developed the role of the Fire and Rescue Service in the wider health and social care agenda.

RESOLVED that, Cabinet endorse the actions identified in the year 2 Action Plan in order to deliver against the 2016-2020 IRMP.

72 FIRE SERVICE - STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE

Members considered a report from the Chief Fire Officer, which sets out the requirement for all Fire and Rescue Authorities to provide assurance annually on financial, governance and operational matters, and to demonstrate this, the Framework required that each authority must publish an annual Statement of Assurance.

This report sets out the approach adopted by Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service and seeks sign off of the Statement of Assurance 2015/16.

The Chief Fire Officer noted that confirmation had been received that Cumbria met all of the requirements of the National Framework.

Members commended the work of the Fire and Rescue Service in relation to this work.

RESOLVED that,

(1) Cabinet approve the Statement of Assurance 2015/2016, and

(2) Authorise the Chief Fire Officer and the Cabinet Member for Fire, Public Safety and Central Support Services to sign the Statement of Assurance prior to publication.
73 UPDATE ON PREVENT STRATEGY

Cabinet considered a report from the Chief Fire Officer which provided them with an update on the delivery of the Prevent Strategy that was agreed by Cabinet in October 2015 and the actions that had been carried out over the last twelve months to ensure the Council’s delivery of its Prevent duty. It also set out the proposals for activity over the next twelve months to facilitate the Council continuing to meet its responsibilities.

Members noted that Cumbria was a low risk area in relation to the national Prevent Strategy. The Chief Fire Officer noted that a recent Peer Review had highlighted the good practice in place, and had recommended that a Contest Board be put in place.

It was also noted that Prevent would be built into the arrangements for Member induction following the 2017 elections. A concern was raised about the implementation of Prevent in other parts of the country and sought reassurance that the same was not the case in Cumbria. The Chief Fire Officer referred to a small number of cases which had been identified and managed effectively through the local arrangements. Further work was requested to ensure that home educated children were considered and included in the work.

Updates were provided on progress against the priorities including:-

Partnership Working:
Leadership:
Capability

RESOLVED that,

(3) Cabinet to note the progress that has been made with the delivery of the Prevent Strategy.

(4) Cabinet to agree the proposals for activity as set out in the action plan over the next twelve months.

74 COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGY UPDATE

A report was received from the Chief Fire Officer providing Cabinet members with an update on the delivery of Community Safety activity within the Council.

Notable Successes in delivering on the Community Safety Strategy included the provision of two intelligence led pieces of work, the Joint
Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and the Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) that provided the Council and its partners with detailed information on which to base decision making. These two documents were also used extensively in the development of the community Safety Strategy.

The increased focus on Area Planning provided an opportunity for further discussion as to how Community Safety could be delivered at a local level through the work of Local Committees and the development of joint initiatives with local partners. This had been piloted in Barrow, with a number of agencies including the County Council concentrating resources on vulnerable people who would benefit most from partnership intervention.

Initiatives such as these and others that would naturally fall out of collaboration with partners and the Councils focus on area planning should form the basis for the refreshed Community Safety Strategy, due for approval in April 2018.

The Chief Fire Officer referred also to the work of the Youth Offending Service and the progress made in relation to securing PACE beds to avoid children being held in youth custody.

Members welcomed the report, making reference to the importance of partnership working, for example in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation and Domestic Abuse. The “one council” approach to community safety was welcomed, and the potential to develop further the links between the Community Safety Strategy and prevention agenda within health and social care.

RESOLVED that,

(1) Cabinet Members note the contents of the report.

(2) Cabinet Members approve the activity as set out in the action plan at appendix 1

75 ENGLISH NATIONAL CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL SCHEME 2017/18 - THE CUMBRIA SCHEME 2017/18

A report was received from the Corporate Director – Economy and Highways setting out proposals for the Cumbria Scheme for 2017/18 including the reimbursement rate to be paid to transport operators. The draft Cumbria Concessionary Travel Scheme for 2017/18 was attached at Appendix 1.
A mandatory national bus concession for older and disabled people has been in place since 2001. The concession had gradually been extended since its introduction and since April 2008 had provided free off peak local bus travel to eligible older and disabled people.

The Council’s current ENCTS Concessionary Scheme became live on 1 April 2015. The Council was required to publish the scheme each year. Legislation provided a mandatory process by which the scheme should be reviewed each year, including the requirement to negotiate the reimbursement rate with requisite transport operators. This paper and the resulting approved Scheme was part of that consultation process.

It was proposed that the current 2016/17 scheme be continued as the scheme for 2017/18. The proposed scheme was required to be published (on the web site and sent to Cumbria Bus Operators) by 1 December 2016 in order to meet the statutory requirements to notify operators regarding any changes and to enter into negotiations, with the Scheme to go live on 01 April 2017.

RESOLVED that,

(1) Cabinet approve publication, in accordance with paragraph 12, of the 2017/18 Cumbria Concessionary travel Scheme as set out in Appendix 1 which maintains the ENCTS basic reimbursement rate at 58%.

(2) Cabinet agree that following publication of the 2017/18 scheme any non-substantial amendments can be approved by the Corporate Director for Economy and Highways Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport.

76 AWARD OF CONTRACT - PROVISION OF RESIDENTIAL AND NURSING CARE (BLOCK CONTRACT ARRANGEMENTS)

A report was received from the Corporate Director – Resources and Transformation, which sought approval to award contracts in order to provide Residential and Nursing Care (Block Contract) across identified areas in Cumbria from 1st January 2017, for three years, with an option to extend for up to twelve months.
RESOLVED that,

(1) Cabinet is recommended to approve the award of Contracts to the following providers in order to provide Residential and Nursing Care in a ‘block’ arrangement for a period of three years in respect of 158 beds, beginning 1st January 2017, with an option to extend for up to twelve months:- Abbey Healthcare Ltd in Urban Kendal, Hillcroft Ltd in South Cumbria (including Lancashire), and Risedale Estates Ltd in Furness.

(2) Cabinet agrees the Corporate Director Health Care and Community Services endeavours to establish contractual arrangements to provide block beds in respect of 17 beds identified in paragraph 4 of the report.

77 UPDATE ON COMMERCIAL MATTERS

Members had before them a report from the Chief Executive relating to current commercial matters.

RESOLVED that,

(1) Option A in the report be approved

(2) the Chief Executive be delegated authority, in consultation with the Leader, the Deputy Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Highways, to undertake specific work as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 11.45am
Title of Report: Referral from Allerdale Local Committee Regarding Fluoridation
Report by: Alan Barry, Vice Chair, Allerdale Local Committee

Background

1. A member of the public (Mr P Carr) attended the Allerdale Local Committee meeting on 8th September to present a petition under the Public Participation agenda item.

   ‘Our petition requests the Council to debate at a full Council meeting, with the available information, the removal of artificial fluoride from Cumbrian water’.

2. An e-petition had previously been submitted on the County Council’s website which ran from 16 January 2014 to 27 February 2015 and was signed by 185 people. The text from the e-petition is attached to this briefing.

3. Mr Carr circulated some supporting information at the meeting which he read out to the Committee. He stated that the fluoridisation practice was outdated, and drew members’ attention to a number of other issues which he felt could help members form a balanced view. Copies of the supporting information are attached to this briefing.

4. The draft Minutes from that meeting record:

   The Chair of the Committee thanked Mr Carr and stated that he understood that fluoride was added to Allerdale and Copeland only, in Cumbria and with a new pipeline being built from Thirlmere and a wastewater treatment plant development at Bridekirk, he felt it was timely that a wider debate was held.

   It was MOVED by Eric Nicholson and SECONDED by Alan Bowness that Allerdale Local Committee refer to Cabinet that the fluoridation process in West Cumbria be investigated. By consensus of the Committee, it was

   RESOLVED that Allerdale Local Committee refer to Cabinet that the fluoridation process in West Cumbria be investigated.

5. This has been shared with the Director of Public Protection who has also prepared a report on this matter which will be brought to this meeting of Cabinet.
Recommendation

6. Cabinet is asked to investigate further the fluoridation of water supplies in West Cumbria.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

7. This has been addressed in the associated report of the Director of Public Protection.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be considered?

8. This has been addressed in the associated report of the Director of Public Protection.

Appendices and Background Documents

9. Appendix 1 – Details of ePetition

Key Facts

Electoral Division(s): Allerdale and Copeland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Decision</th>
<th>Key Decision Included in Forward Plan</th>
<th>Exempt from call-in</th>
<th>Exemption agreed by scrutiny chair</th>
<th>Considered by scrutiny, if so detail below</th>
<th>Environmental or sustainability assessment undertaken?</th>
<th>Equality impact assessment undertaken?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by Cabinet Member/s on – 31 October 2016

Previous relevant Council or Executive decisions
None

Consideration by Overview & Scrutiny
Not considered

Background Papers
None

Report Author
Lizzy Shaw – Area Manager Allerdale
Tel No 07825 103575 lizzy.shaw@cumbria.gov.uk
Appendix 1

DETAILS OF E-PETITION

We the undersigned petition the council to debate at a full Council meeting, with the available information, the removal of artificial fluoride from Cumbrian water

There are many public health issues related to water fluoridation.

In 2003, MP's were persuaded into assisting the extension of water fluoridation throughout the UK. They considered they had taken into account health concerns by including a statutory obligation on health authorities to monitor the health of people receiving fluoride in their water. The first four yearly report on health monitoring is due in March 2014.

Ten years on[and 50 yrs since its introduction in West Cumbria] health authorities have not even achieved a starting point by developing the guidelines to assess the effects of fluoride exposure.

In the absence of the monitoring required by legislation and in light of the following proven health concerns we believe any artificial water fluoridation in Cumbria should cease.

1]Fluorine is a halogen, chemically related to iodine, but much more active. As such, fluoride out-competes and displaces iodine at the receptor sites on the thyroid gland which respond to the thyroid stimulating hormone; less of this hormone reaches the thyroid gland resulting in decrease of the manufacture of the thyroid hormone.

The thyroid gland regulates metabolism among other functions. If the thyroid gland is under active our ability to burn fat diminishes and contributes significantly[alongside poor diet] to obesity.

2] In pregnancy, iodine helps the baby's brain and nervous system develop. Iodine deficiencies are the single most important cause of preventable mental retardation and brain damage worldwide. A lack of iodine during pregnancy has also been linked with an increased risk of miscarriage and stillbirth.

3] Water fluoridation will expose babies and young children to more than the recommended levels of fluoride and put their long term health at risk.

The British National Formulary outlines the following with regard to fluoride exposure. Babies under 6 months should not be exposed to more than 0.3ppm fluoride per day. Children under 3 years should not be exposed to more than 0.55ppm fluoride per day. Children under the age 6 years should not be exposed to more than 0.8ppm fluoride per day. The optimum (target) concentration of water fluoridation programmes is 1ppm fluoride.

4] Many medications for depression contain significant amounts of fluoride which considerably increase the daily intake contributing to the above problems and long term accumulation in the skeleton which is linked with arthritis and osteoporosis.

5] Those with low immune systems and poor kidney function will be unable to properly excrete fluoride and quickly build up more than the usual 50% of intake which is retained in the body for life.

6] Fluoride has been shown to increase blood glucose levels and impair glucose tolerance, likely by inhibiting insulin production or secretion. Impaired glucose tolerance, often a precursor to type 2 diabetes, has been found to occur in humans with fluoride intakes of only 0.07-0.4 mg/kg/day—a dose that will be exceeded in West Cumbria which aims for at least 1mg/kg/day Current fluoride intake, therefore, may contribute or exacerbate some types of diabetes. According to the National Research Council (2006), "any role of fluoride exposure in the development of impaired glucose metabolism or diabetes is potentially significant."

7] Dementia has been firmly linked with Aluminium. When fluoride is present, creating fluoroaluminates, they appear to be able to be more easily absorbed from the gut and can contribute to neuronal injury [conditions for onset of dementia].

This ePetition ran from 16/01/2014 to 27/02/2015 and has now finished.

185 people signed this ePetition.
This page is intentionally left blank
Committee: Cabinet

Date of meeting: 15 December 2016

Title of Report: Response to referral from Allerdale Local Committee regarding fluoridation of water supplies

Report by: Colin Cox - Director of Public Health

Cabinet Member: Ian Stewart – Cabinet Member for Public Health and Community Services

What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. The report sets out a proposed response to the referral from Allerdale Local Committee of a public petition regarding the fluoridation of water supplies in West Cumbria.

Recommendation of the Director of Public Health

2. Cabinet is asked to agree defer any further consideration of fluoridation in West Cumbria until the Catfish study (described in paragraphs 19 and 20 of the report) has provided sufficient robust local evidence on which to base this decision.

Background to the Proposals

3. A member of the public (Mr P Carr) attended the Allerdale Local Committee meeting on 8th September to present a petition under the Public Participation agenda item.

‘Our petition requests the Council to debate at a full Council meeting, with the available information, the removal of artificial fluoride from Cumbrian water’.

4. The Minutes from that meeting record:

The Chair of the Committee thanked Mr Carr and stated that he understood that fluoride was added to Allerdale and Copeland only, in Cumbria and with a new pipeline being built from Thirlmere and a wastewater treatment plant development at Bridekirk, he felt it was timely that a wider debate was held.

It was MOVED by Eric Nicholson and SECONDED by Alan Bowness that Allerdale Local Committee refer to Cabinet that the fluoridation process in West Cumbria be investigated. By consensus of the Committee, it was

RESOLVED that Allerdale Local Committee refer to Cabinet that the fluoridation process in West Cumbria be investigated.
5. Fluoride is a naturally occurring mineral found in water in varying amounts. It is also present in certain foods. In the early 20th century, lower levels of tooth decay were found to be associated with certain fluoride levels in drinking water. This observation ultimately led to the introduction of water fluoridation schemes to adjust fluoride levels in community water supplies, in an effort to reduce levels of decay in the populations they serve. Around six million people across England in the Midlands, North East, Eastern England, the North West, and Yorkshire and Humber receive water where the fluoride level has been adjusted. Some water supplies in England, serving around a third of a million people, naturally contain levels of fluoride close to those which fluoridation schemes seek to achieve.

**Water fluoridation in Cumbria**

6. Water fluoridation schemes were established under agreements made between what was Cumberland County Council and the West Cumberland Water Board to fluoridate the water supplied from the Cornhow plant of Crummock water in 1968 and with South Cumberland Water Board to fluoridate the water supply from Ennerdale water in 1971. Those agreements have been consolidated into the current legal framework and are now between the Secretary of State for Health and United Utilities.

7. The Cornhow treatment works supply water to most of Workington, Seaton, High Harrington and Great Clifton, the coastal areas from Silloth, through Maryport, to Flimby, and inland to Cockermouth.

8. Ennerdale water treatment works supplies water to residents living in Whitehaven, Arlecdon, St Bees, Frizington, Salterbeck, Egremont, Cleator Moor, Beckermet down the coast to Ravenglass and Bootle.

9. Fluoridation at Cornhow was stopped in 2006 and Ennerdale was stopped in 2011 to allow substantial maintenance work to be carried out. These works have totally replaced the fluoride plant and equipment at both Cornhow and Ennerdale water treatment plants. Fluoridation was re-introduced in a controlled and phased way at the beginning of September 2013 at both sites and was completed by mid-November 2013.

10. There are two major issues to be considered around water fluoridation: whether it is effective in reducing dental cares, and whether it is safe – the latter being the main focus of the petition received by Allerdale Local Committee.

**Safety**

11. Fluoride has been added to water in west Cumbria for more than 45 years. Since this time, no robust and reliable research has suggested that adding fluoride to the water at the level it is added in west Cumbria has any significant negative impact on people’s physical or mental health.

12. As the petition says, there is a requirement on Public Health England to carry out a four-yearly report monitoring the health effects of fluoridation schemes. The 2014 report (published after the petition was initially written) considers eight indicators where there is a plausible biological mechanism for fluoride affecting non-dental health and concluded:
• **Hip fractures**: There was no evidence of a difference in the rate of hip fractures between fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

• **Kidney stones**: There was evidence that the rate of kidney stones was lower in fluoridated areas than non-fluoridated areas.

• **All-cause mortality**: While there was some evidence that the rate of deaths from all recorded causes was lower in fluoridated areas than non-fluoridated areas, the size of the effect was small.

• **Down’s syndrome**: There was no evidence of a difference in the rate of Down’s syndrome in fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

• **Bladder cancer**: There was evidence that the rate of bladder cancer was lower in fluoridated areas than non-fluoridated areas.

• **Osteosarcoma (a form of bone cancer) among under 25-year olds**: There was no evidence of a difference in the rate of osteosarcoma between fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

• **Osteosarcoma (a form of bone cancer) among people aged 50 and over**: There was no evidence of a difference in the rate of osteosarcoma between fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

• **All cancer**: There was no evidence of a difference in the rate for all types of cancer between fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

13. The one area in which there is a clear negative impact from fluoridation is dental fluorosis (an aesthetic mottling of the surface of the teeth). The 2014 health monitoring report highlighted a study of fluoridated Newcastle upon Tyne and non-fluoridated Manchester which found that the number of 12-year old children with moderate dental fluorosis or more is very low, at around 1% in Newcastle and 0.2% in Manchester.

14. Improved dental health in childhood has one other significant safety benefit. Surgical dental extractions are the single biggest cause of children being placed under general anaesthesia, a procedure which in itself is not without risk. The 2014 health monitoring report found that in fluoridated areas there are 45% fewer hospital admissions of children aged one to four for dental caries (mostly for extraction of decayed teeth under a general anaesthetic) than in non-fluoridated areas.

**Effectiveness**

15. When fluoridation was introduced, it was based on the best evidence that was then available. What has changed over the last 45 years is the range of other factors that impact on dental health. Fluoride toothpaste is now very widely used and this will have a positive effect. On the other hand, consumption of sugary snacks and drinks is also much higher. Because of these changes, there is a real need to understand how effective fluoridation is as a dental health improvement measure so that decisions can continue to be based on the best available evidence.

16. The most recent (2001) UK systematic review of Water Fluoridation carried out by the University of York reports that the best available evidence suggests that fluoridation of drinking water supplies does reduce caries (tooth decay) prevalence and severity. The review stresses that the degree to which caries is reduced is not definitive and reports a wide range of effectiveness both in terms of prevalence and severity.
17. The 2014 health impact report found that on average, there are 15% fewer five-year olds with tooth decay in fluoridated areas than non-fluoridated area and when deprivation and ethnicity (both important factors for dental health) are taken into account, this figure rises to 28%.

18. Such reports do give some degree of support to fluoridation as an effective dental public health measure. However there is no doubt that many studies – both those whose findings support fluoridation and those that do not – are of poor quality or questionable relevance to the Cumbrian situation.

19. Recognising some of the historic shortcomings of previous research, Cumbria is currently participating in a major study into effect of water fluoridation on dental decay rates and on the economic costs and benefits of the schemes. This research is being led by the University of Manchester with partners from Public Health England and the Council through the Director of Public Health. The Programme is called “CATFISH” (Cumbrian Assessment of Teeth, a Fluoride Intervention Study for Health).

20. This research takes advantage of the recent break in fluoridation of West Cumbrian water supplies described in paragraph 9 above to analyse the impact this has had on the dental health of children. It will examine whether there are any differences in dental health outcomes between the children born during the period when there was no fluoridation and those born after the fluoridation scheme was reinstated. This study, which should give extremely robust and valid data on the benefits or otherwise of fluoridation in Cumbria, is due to report in 2021.

**Options Considered and Risks Identified**

**Option (a):** Agree to carry out a full review of fluoridation, with a further debate and resolution of this issue within the coming months.

21. The major risk associated with this option is that a debate at this point will not be fully informed due to an inadequate evidence base, and that in the event of a decision to end fluoridation harm would be caused to dental health in west Cumbria.

22. In addition this option would put the Catfish study at risk, as it would have to end should the decision be to cease fluoridation. This would reduce the evidence base on which future decisions could be based.

**Option (b):** Agree to defer any further consideration of fluoridation in West Cumbria until the Catfish study has provided sufficient robust local evidence on which to base this decision.

23. Given the lack of evidence to suggest any health damage from fluoridation, the main risk from taking option (b) is that the Council continues to fund an intervention that turns out to offer insufficient value for money.

**Reasons for the recommendation/Key benefits**

24. The recommended option is option (b).
25. Cumbria is currently in a unique position due to the Catfish study. This robust study will tell us about the impact of water fluoridation on our own community. The Catfish study is due to report in 2021 and it would be premature to debate this subject prior to that report as it will provide robust evidence to allow Cabinet to make an informed decision.

Financial – What resources will be needed and how will it be funded?

26. United Utilities invoices the County Council annually for the cost of the fluoride that is added to the water supply. While this cost varies annually depending on the cost of the fluoride to United Utilities, the amount that needs to be added to reach target concentrations, and any non-operational time of the fluoridation plant, the budget set aside for this is £100k per year.

27. This resource is transferred to the County Council as part of the public health ring fenced grant allocation.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be considered?

28. The Council has a statutory duty under section 77 of the Water Industry Act 1991 to inform itself as to the wholesomeness and sufficiency of water supplies in its area.

29. Part III of the Water Industry Act 1991 permits the Secretary of State to enter into, vary and terminate arrangements for the fluoridation of water on application from the relevant local authority.

30. Prior to making any such application the Council would be required to undertake a consultation with the Secretary of State, Water Providers and the general public as well as have due regard to the Council’s Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and available scientific evidence on the proposal in accordance with the Water Fluoridation (Proposals and Consultation) (England) Regulations 2013. The Council must also consider capital, operating and (if relevant) decommissioning costs when determining a proposal.

31. Should, following the proposed investigation, the Council propose to terminate the current fluoridation arrangements, but not implement the proposal the Council will be prohibited from making another termination proposal for a period of 20 years in accordance with Regulation 17 of the above regulations.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

32. Fluoridation is not explicitly mentioned in the Council Plan. However as any impact that it has is mainly on the dental health of children, reaching the best possible decision on the future of fluoridation would contribute to the Council Plan Priority To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential.
What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

33. Tooth decay is largely preventable, yet it remains a serious health problem affecting 29.6% of all five year olds in Cumbria and is the most common cause of hospital admissions among children aged between five and nine.

34. While there have been improvements in children’s oral health over the past 40 years, the rate of reduction in tooth decay levels has slowed in the past decade. Major dental health inequalities remain. Children from the most deprived areas experience the highest levels of decay. The consequences of decay are lifelong; extracted teeth are lost for ever; fillings need to be replaced.

35. Currently access to fluoridated water supply is inequitable across Cumbria. The agreements were made at a time when the local government administration and structure were very different. Over time the reconfiguration of these boundaries means that other areas of the current Council area do not have access to fluoridated water. However data on deprivation would suggest that the fluoridated area is the area that is most likely to need effective dental public health measures.
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What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. This report invites Cabinet to consider the findings and recommendations of the Scrutiny Task and Finish Group into Children and Autism in Cumbria. The report is based on witness statements that were presented to the Task and Finish Group.

Recommendation for Cabinet

2. Cabinet to consider the recommendations made by the Task and Finish Group.

Background

3. The Children and Autism Task and Finish Group was scoped by the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Board in May 2016.

4. Scrutiny Management Board (SMB) agreed that the aims and objectives of this review would be:

- To understand any issues faced pre-assessment, including wider awareness of Autism among families and professionals;
- Access to assessment across different age ranges under 25;
- Understanding of post diagnostic support and uptake of services;
- To understand gaps and delays, as well as best practice in relation to all of the stages described above.

5. The Task Group’s report is provided as Appendix One. The report includes the following recommendations which Cabinet are invited to consider and respond to.

6. Recommendation 1: The Task Group findings are reported to the Health and Well Being Board and assurances sought from partners about how the following issues of concern are being addressed in a co-ordinated way across agencies:

- Waiting times for assessment;
- Engagement with families and addressing their concerns;
- Training and early awareness of autism across education and early years’ settings;
- Effectiveness of services commissioned by the NHS, and implementation of the recommendations of the report by Dr Karen Horridge that was commissioned by Cumbria Partnership Foundation Trust;
- CAMHS performance in relation to autism;
- Consistency of specialist service provision across Cumbria;
- Post-assessment pathways;
- Support for people in transition to adulthood.

7. Rationale: Witness testimony overall suggested a mixed picture of service provision, and support, with particular concerns relating to health, education, support for the Third Sector and joining up of services pre and post diagnosis.

8. To be actioned: Corporate Director Children and Families Services.

9. Recommendation 2: The Task Group findings are reported to CASL and assurances sought from relevant local authority teams and CASL about how the following issues are being addressed by schools, and in particular in relation to the implementation of the Inclusive Cumbria Strategy that will be taken to Cabinet in December 2016.

10. Members are specifically seeking assurances on:

- Effectiveness of provision for autistic pupils on an Education Health Care Plan;
- Application of National Curriculum Guidance and examples of mainstream schools supporting pupils who are diagnosed to maximise their communication and independence;
- Effectiveness of multi-discipline support to ensure that the cognitive and behavioural needs of children is in place;
- Whether there is leadership in place to ensure that there is a whole school approach to autism;
- Effective work between the school, families and the child, to keep the child in education and maximise their chances (including provision of information and support in relation to statementing).

11. Rationale: Witness testimony suggested that the provision of support for autistic pupils ranges considerably from excellent provision that has been accredited with the National Autistic Society Standard, to cases of where there is minimal awareness and support in place. The Council’s draft Inclusive Cumbria Strategy highlights the growing number of autistic children who are on an Educational and Health Care Plan and an increasing mismatch between need and provision, particularly relating to autism.

12. To be actioned: Assistant Director Early Help and Learning.
13. Recommendation 3: Each Local Committee to receive a presentation from the SEND team that sets out the Council’s approach to inclusion, the profile of autistic children in their area along with any issues or barriers they or their families’ experience.

14. **Rationale:** Members heard evidence of the importance of raising general awareness in the community, particularly in relation to tackling Hate Crime, improving early diagnosis and reducing the day to day battles families’ experience. Members also heard evidence of the impact of small scale local activities, and the local parent and carer groups.

15. **To be actioned:** Area Managers working with the Chairs of Local Committee.

16. Recommendation 4: Consideration is given to the role the County Council can play in supporting people with autism to access employment and apprenticeship opportunities within the County Council.

17. **Rationale:** Gaining economic independence is a key aim for all young people as set out in the Cumbria Children and Young People’s Plan. Members heard testimony that more could be done to ensure young people on the autistic spectrum are given quality career advice and supported through existing mechanisms to maximise their chances of getting a job that is going to play to their strengths.

18. **To be actioned:** Assistant Director Business Services.

**Conclusion**

19. Overall the Task and Finish Group found that despite pockets of excellence, more needs to be done across all areas of service to improve things for autistic children and their families. The Task and Finish Group expressed support for the more joined up approach to children’s and adults commissioning that will hopefully tackle some of the issues highlighted in the report.

**Further Information and Background Documents**

(a) Appendix 1 – Children and Autism Task and Finish Group Report

**Report Author**

Joel Rasbash, joel.rasbash@cumbria.gov.uk
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Scrutiny Advisory Boards

Children and Young People

Children Young People with Autism
**Introduction**

The Children and Young People with Autism Task Group was established by the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Advisory Board and May 2016.

Scrutiny Management Board (SMB) agreed that the aims and objectives of this review would be:

*To review current arrangements to support children and young people with a diagnosis of autism, as well as their families, and to review support for their transition to adulthood.*

*To see how well provision for autism relates to the National Autistic Society Accreditation Standards.*

- To understand any issues faced pre-diagnosis, including wider awareness of autism among families and professionals.
- Access to assessment across different age ranges under 25.
- Understanding of post diagnostic support and uptake of services.
- To understand gaps and delays, as well as best practice in relation to all of the stages described above.

The Membership of the Task Group was:

- Val Tarbitt (Chair),
- Bill McEwan,
- Jane Murphy,
- Gillian Troughton,
Mike Hawkins,
Duncan Fairbairn,
Neil Hughes,
Kevin Hamilton,
Henry Wormstrup
Christine Bowditch.

The group benefitted from the fact that three Members are parents with direct experience of bringing up children with autism, and could feed their experience into the review.

Officer support was provided by: Joel Rasbash and Linda Graham (Policy and Scrutiny Team), John Barrett (Children’s Services).

The following witnesses gave presentations:
- Marion Jones, Service Development Manager, Autism, Cumbria County Council;
- Anne Sheppard, Strategic Manager, Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health, Cumbria County Council;
- Sheila Gregory, Senior Manager, Carlisle and Eden Mencap;
- Brian Eaton, Board of Governors James Rennie School, and Kris Williams, Headteacher, James Rennie School.

Individual members of the Task and Finish Group also took statements from the following people:
- Greg Everatt, Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group;
- Caroline Pollard, Professional Lead Special Advisor Teacher Autism Spectrum Conditions;
- Two written submissions from parents with children with autism;
- Interview with a parent of a child with autism;
- Statement to Council by Cllr. Mike Hawkins April 2016;
- Personal statement by Cllr. Val Tarbitt.

The Chair of the Task Group would like to thank everyone who supported and gave evidence to this review.

**Overview of Findings**

Overall the Task Group felt that there was a mixed picture in relation to children and young people who are diagnosed with autism.

There has been a sustained improvement in social awareness of autism, which makes it easier for families with autistic children than in the past. In terms of services there is clearly ample evidence of excellent practice from special schools to dentists to family support groups. Finally, it was clear that from the contributions of the Assistant Director for Early Help and Learning that there is strong leadership in place in terms of understanding autism, commitment to improving services and addressing commissioning issues in relation to transition from children’s to adults’ services.

In terms of the challenges Members were particularly concerned about the size of the waiting list for assessments. While they acknowledged this is a national issue, the performance in Cumbria was a concern with approximately 350 people waiting assessment through the Multi-Agency Assessment Team (MAAT).
Members were also concerned about the consistency of the educational and health offer, the post-diagnosis pathway, and whether specialist services had capacity to provide services to meet the level of demand.

Shortly after the completion of the Task and Finish Group a couple of developments have also been taken note of in the developing the recommendations.

On 2 October 2016, the Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust published an independent report by Dr Karen Horridge into support for autistic children in Cumbria and made a number of recommendations that reflects the concerns that parents in particular have been sharing with the Task and Finish Group:

- Co-design the autism pathway and process with parents.
- Develop plans to improve education and awareness of all services that come into contact with children and young people in Cumbria, including providing training to parents in promoting social communication and managing challenging behaviours.
- Agree an approach and develop plans to build multi-agency competency for all involved in the assessment, management and support of children and young people with autism spectrum conditions.
- Develop a robust mechanism for care planning and support for families at the point of diagnosis.
- Identify ways of strengthening partnership working with primary care to support those children and young people with autism spectrum conditions.¹

In December 2016 Cabinet will be considering the Inclusive Cumbria Strategy. The strategy was developed with Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders and the principles were taken to Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Advisory Board, who noted the high numbers of autistic children who are receiving Educational Health Care Plans against the existing specialist provision.

The recommendations below reflect the nature of these challenges.

**Recommendations**

Recommendation 1: The Task Group findings are reported to the Health and Well Being Board and assurances sought from partners about how the following issues of concern are being addressed in a co-ordinated way across agencies:

- Waiting times for assessment;
- Engagement with families and addressing their concerns;
- Training and early awareness of autism across education and early years’ settings;
- Effectiveness of services commissioned by the NHS, and implementation of the recommendations of the report by Dr Karen Horridge that was commissioned by Cumbria Partnership Foundation Trust;
- CAMHS performance in relation to autism;
- Consistency of specialist service provision across Cumbria;

• Post-assessment pathways;
• Support for people in transition to adulthood.

Rationale: Witness testimony overall suggested a mixed picture of service provision, and support, with particular concerns relating to health, education, support for the Third Sector and joining up of services pre and post diagnosis.

To be actioned: Corporate Director Children and Families Services.

Recommendation 2: The Task Group findings are reported to CASL and assurances sought from relevant local authority teams and CASL about how the following issues are being addressed by schools, and in particular in relation to the implementation of the Inclusive Cumbria Strategy that will be taken to Cabinet in December 2016.

Members are specifically seeking assurances on:
• Effectiveness of provision for autistic pupils on an Education Health Care Plan;
• Application of National Curriculum Guidance and examples of mainstream schools supporting pupils who are diagnosed to maximise their communication and independence;
• Effectiveness of multi-discipline support to ensure that the cognitive and behavioural needs of children is in place;
• Whether there is leadership in place to ensure that there is a whole school approach to autism;
• Effective work between the school, families and the child, to keep the child in education and maximise their chances (including provision of information and support in relation to statementing).

Rationale: Witness testimony suggested that the provision of support for autistic pupils ranges considerably from excellent provision that has been accredited with the National Autistic Society Standard, to cases of where there is minimal awareness and support in place. The Council’s draft Inclusive Cumbria Strategy highlights the growing number of autistic children who are on an Educational and Health Care Plan and an increasing mismatch between need and provision, particularly relating to autism.

To be actioned: Assistant Director Early Help and Learning.

Recommendation 3: Each Local Committee to receive a presentation from the SEND team that sets out the Council's approach to inclusion, the profile of autistic children in their area along with any issues or barriers they or their families’ experience.

Rationale: Members heard evidence of the importance of raising general awareness in the community, particularly in relation to tackling Hate Crime, improving early diagnosis and reducing the day to day battles families’ experience. Members also heard evidence of the impact of small scale local activities, and the local parent and carer groups.

To be actioned: Area Managers working with the Chairs of Local Committee.

Recommendation 4: Consideration is given to the role the County Council can play in supporting people with autism to access employment and apprenticeship opportunities within the County Council.
Rationale: Gaining economic independence is a key aim for all young people as set out in the Cumbria Children and Young People’s Plan. Members heard testimony that more could be done to ensure young people on the autistic spectrum are given quality career advice and supported through existing mechanisms to maximise their chances of getting a job that is going to play to their strengths.

To be actioned: Assistant Director Business Services.

Background and Context

General challenges for autistic people: People with autism face a number of challenges in society, and in the main this is down to the way in which their condition is understood and addressed by public institutions. The National Autistic Society carries out surveys of people with autism and have reported that:

- 34% of children on the autistic spectrum say that the worst thing about being at school is being picked on;
- 63% of children are not in the kind of school their parents believe would best support them;
- 17% of autistic children have been suspended from school;
- 48% of these had been suspended three or more times;
- 4% had been expelled from one or more schools;
- 70% of autistic adults say that they are not getting the help they need from social services;
- 70% say that with more support they would feel less isolated, and at least one in three adults are experiencing severe mental health difficulties due to a lack of support;
- 15% of autistic adults are in full time paid employment;
- 10% of autistic adults receive employment support but only 53% say they want it.2

In 2016 the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Advisory Board agreed to form a task and finish group to look into support and services for children and young people with autism in Cumbria.

The review came about initially because Members had been receiving petitions from constituents who have children diagnosed with autism, who have struggled in relation to receiving a diagnosis and post-diagnostic support.

It was agreed by the Board that this required a broader look at the key issues in Cumbria relating to autism. This would include:

- Reviewing the outcomes from the previous Scrutiny Review into Autism in 2007, to see what had changed, and what still needed to be addressed;
- Understanding the key emotional issues faced by families and the support available;
- Understanding how health and education are providing support, and what areas of focus Members need to have in terms of provision.

2 http://www.autism.org.uk/about/what-is/myths-facts-stats.aspx
What is autism? The National Autistic Society (NAS) provides an extensive definition of autism which focuses on the condition and what it means for people who are diagnosed:

‘Autism is a lifelong, developmental disability that affects how a person communicates with and relates to other people, and how they experience the world around them.

Autistic people see, hear and feel the world differently to other people. If you are autistic, you are autistic for life; autism is not an illness or disease and cannot be 'cured'. Often people feel being autistic is a fundamental aspect of their identity.

Autism is a spectrum condition. All autistic people share certain difficulties, but being autistic will affect them in different ways. Some autistic people also have learning disabilities, mental health issues or other conditions, meaning people need different levels of support. All people on the autism spectrum learn and develop. With the right sort of support, all can be helped to live a more fulfilling life of their own choosing.\(^\text{13}\)

How many people are diagnosed with autism? Latest prevalence studies of autism indicate that 1.1% of the population in the UK may have autism. This would mean that approximately 5,500 people in Cumbria may have autism of whom approximately 1,150 are aged 0-19.

The most recent population estimates of people diagnosed with autism dates to 2012.\(^\text{4}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allerdale</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lakes</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District not known</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>933</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
<td><strong>1224</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures do not reflect the underlying population breakdown of Cumbria – with South Lakes having a disproportionate number of people diagnosed and Cumbria a correspondingly low proportion of people diagnosed. In part this reflected the accessibility of diagnostic assessments at the time. Since then the Multi-Agency Assessment Teams have been rolled out across the whole of Cumbria, and future population estimates should reflect better the breakdown of the population.

---

\(^3\) [http://www.autism.org.uk/about/what-is.aspx](http://www.autism.org.uk/about/what-is.aspx)

\(^4\) Information submitted by Marion Jones as part of her testimony.
**National and local Policy:** Since 2009 there has been a continued government focus on autism as set out below.

**Autism Act 2009:** This is the first ever disability specific law, which put a duty on the Government to produce a strategy for adults with autism ‘Fulfilling and Rewarding Lives’, which was published in March 2010, followed by statutory guidance for local councils and local health bodies on implementing the adult autism strategy published in December 2010.

**2012 publication of NICE Guidelines on autism: recognition, referral, diagnosis and management of adults on the autism spectrum:** This guideline covers the care provided by primary, community, secondary, tertiary and other health and social care professionals who have direct contact with, and make decisions concerning the care of, adults with autism.

**Strategy Review 2013:** The Government asked for feedback from adults with autism, parents, carers and professionals, through a self-assessment framework, about how well the 2010 strategy had been implemented so far.

‘**Think Autism**’ 2014: This is a revision of the strategy for adults with autism was published in April 2014, followed by statutory guidance for local councils and local health bodies on implementing the adult autism strategy published in March 2015.

There have also been other more general legislation changes, most notably:
- Children and Families Act 2014;
- Special educational needs and disability (SEND) code of practice: 0 to 25 years (July 2014);
- Care Act 2014.

In addition there is the Cumbria Transforming Care Programme which is changing how partners in Cumbria are delivering and commissioning services, so that more people with learning disabilities and/or autism, with behaviour that challenges – including those with a mental health condition – can live in the community, closer to home.

**Autism Task and Finish Group 2007:** In 2007 there was a task and finish group which looked into provision for autism in Cumbria. The group mainly focused on services for adults with autism. A table summarising progress against the recommendations has been included as an appendix.

**Inclusive Cumbria Strategy 2016 and Horridge Report 2016:** These reports came out after the conclusion of the witness sessions for this Task and Finish Group, and have been included as they bring the local policy narrative on autism up to date.

The Horridge Report was an independent piece of work commissioned by the Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust into the state of services across Cumbria for autistic children. The report looked at the views of parents, multi-agency working and areas for improvement.

The Report highlighted the need to restore the confidence of families in services and paints a strong picture of the length of waiting times for assessment. The full recommendations of the report have been incorporated into Recommendation 1 of this report.

The Inclusive Cumbria Strategy is being developed currently and a draft version of the
principles of the strategy was taken to Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Advisory Board in October 2016. The information provided to scrutiny highlighted a significant rise in the numbers of autistic pupils who have an Education Health Care Plan, and the growing gap between specialist provision and need. The effective implementation of the Inclusive Cumbria Strategy has been incorporated into Recommendation 2 of this report.

Summary of Witness Statements

A witness session was held by the Task and Finish Group on 7 July, which concentrated on the viewpoints of service managers, third sector organisations representing families and children who have a diagnosis of autism, and schools with expertise in working with autistic children and young people.

Witness 1: Marion Jones – Service Development Manager, Autism, Cumbria County Council

Marion Jones is responsible for service development in relation to autism and has been in post for over 12 years. Her work covers all ages, bridges children’s and adults’ provision and she works extensively with partners in health and the third sector. Marion gave evidence to the 2007 Autism Task and Finish Group and was able to update Members on progress against the earlier recommendations, which are included as an appendix.

**Diagnosis** – There is a countywide diagnostic and assessment pathway. Diagnosis involves assessment by a multi-agency team that includes input from education and health. Referrals can be from schools, health or parents. There is a waiting list for this assessment, and at any time there will be around 350 families awaiting diagnosis in Cumbria. This is the main concern relating to diagnosis.

Early diagnosis is a key issue as it is more difficult to detect early signs of autism in young children. People in early years’ settings, midwives, health visitors, children centres should have the skills to pick these up. There are similar issues in relation to awareness for supporting children and young people post-diagnosis.

In the last 15 months the Council’s capacity to deliver training has been reduced – i.e. not enough staff to deliver training across the county. There is a view that there is insufficient training on autism and other high level conditions.

This is not a mandatory requirement on services or contractors, however it is something the Council could review.

**Post-diagnosis:** Once a child has been diagnosed there is a range of training opportunities for families including ‘Early Bird’ in West Cumbria and ‘What Now?’ which is available. These courses are delivered by a variety of professionals such as speech and language therapists, community learning disability nurses and autism family support advisers.

There is also support available for families via Mencap and the Community Learning Disability Nursing Team. Educational and short breaks support varies across the county.
**Post-diagnosis areas that require improvement:** The implementation of a post-diagnostic pathway would improve the experience of children and young people and their families. This should include – early intervention, direct support for families with a child with autism who does not also have a learning disability, support for children who have mental health needs, and support for siblings of children who are on the autism spectrum.

**County Council Policy around education and autism** – There is an Inclusive Cumbria policy, which is due to be renewed. This focuses on educational support for all kinds of disability including autism. One of the key challenges in delivering the policy is limited choice of schools for parents with autistic children. Sandside Lodge School and James Rennie School are established centres of excellence in supporting children with autism, however there are gaps in the south of Cumbria and funding challenges in providing a geographical spread of centres of excellence. There are also issues about some schools being oversubscribed, which is impacting on parental choice.

John Barrett advised that there are good examples of schools responding to having a child with autism, by ensuring all staff are trained in awareness and dealing with the condition. There are now different routes into teacher training, and more newly qualified teachers are getting additional training in special needs. So there should be an improvement in future years

**Additional health concerns for people with autism** - Marion reported that quality findings have been assessed recently by Ofsted, CQC and the JSNA. Approx. 70% of people on the autistic spectrum have mental health issues and it can be difficult for them to access mental health services. Health inequalities can lead to a reduced life expectancy with the main reasons for early deaths being suicide and epilepsy.

**Witness 2 – Anne Sheppard: Strategic Manager, Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health, Cumbria County Council**

**General Health and wellbeing challenges** – Everyday life for families with children and young people on the autistic spectrum is a battle that can result in higher instances of marital breakdown and mental health issues. Figures show 40% of people on the spectrum at any one time will be suffering an anxiety disorder of some kind. In the general population this figure is 15%, which shows a marked gap in levels of anxiety and related disorders among children on the autistic spectrum. This makes everyday living particularly challenging.

There are also other emotional health and wellbeing challenges that are growing, particularly around eating disorders and self-harm. While this has been raised for young people in general, it is less well known whether this is having a specific impact in relation to autism.

**Support available** – There is a wide range of support available, and not just in relation to CAMHS. In particular there is strong third sector support which is appreciated by families. One of the key challenges is around waiting times for services.

---

5 This issue was identified in a recent Cumbria County Council task and finish group into Cumbria Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services
Key barriers - There are two main gaps – one is around the integration between the different sectors of health and wellbeing and the other is around access to specialist CAMHS. This is something that has been highlighted by a previous Scrutiny review of transition between children’s and adults’ services. John Barrett advised that there have been improvements including the appointment of a new Assistant Director Jo Atkinson whose remit is to ensure that commissioning cuts across children’s and adults services, however gaps in support in different parts of the county remains an issue.

Promotion and awareness – A key role for the Council lies in promoting general social awareness of autism. There are several aspects to this, including the role of the arts, effective strategies to tackle disability hate crime, and working with employers around using apprenticeships and other schemes to help place young people with autism into jobs that play to their strengths.

Social media and a general media aware approach can also make a difference in raising awareness. This can be seen by the positive raising of public awareness nationally and locally as a result of the TV show the A-Word, that was based in Cumbria, and is something that should be shared with Members.

Many of the steps that could be taken to raise awareness could be done within existing channels and would not cost additional money. They could also make use of the strength of peer to peer support that is already going on through families and other groups that are working with children and young people with autism.

Witness 3 - Sheila Gregory, Senior Manager, Carlisle and Eden Mencap

Sheila Gregory is the senior manager for Carlisle and Eden Mencap and oversees their Cumbria-wide autism support and signposting service. The service brings Mencap into contact with a large number of families and historically operated in North Cumbria. Through a new contact with the County Council, the service is being taken countywide.

Emotional challenges for young people on the autistic spectrum – The autistic spectrum is broad and individuals diagnosed can have varying needs or challenges. Young people with autism can find the world very scary so they need coping strategies – they can get very anxious because it takes them longer to understand a situation.

There is also a major societal challenge around autism being perceived to be a male condition, and a lack of attention towards young girls who may be displaying signs of autism going unnoticed by families, schools and other settings.

Support for Families - Families need to know the range of services available for them how to access the help that is available. Mencap finds that it can set up parent carer groups and then the group will run itself – it just needs to get going and this can be done without a lot of money being spent.
There is also an 8 week multi-agency parent programme available following a diagnosis of autism. This encourages parents to be able to celebrate their child’s strengths and successes.

Overall, interventions and support for parents needs to begin as early as possible. Mencap has being carrying out projects with siblings who are not autistic to have a break from their sibling with autism. More could be done to help families and siblings to build resilience and provide support mechanisms. They have worked with youth clubs, dance clubs and other activities. The geography of the county can be an issue, both in terms of distance but also in terms of the consistency of what local level support is available.

Higher functioning autism - There are particular challenges for people who are higher functioning on the autistic spectrum, who tend to have no learning disability and are managing with minimal, or no, support in school, and tend to attract less in terms of packages of support. Mencap is experimenting with a pilot science holiday club. This is costly but a school could do this without needing to buy extra equipment. There is a need for more short breaks for parents. Autism friendly shows are being offered at cinemas and theatres in the county which are very welcome.

Assessment – The waiting list for assessment is long. This can be a problem in terms of access to the services Mencap offers. Due to limited funds, Mencap’s services begin where a child has a diagnosis.

Schools and awareness - Parents find that quite often schools have a limited awareness of autism. This can result in changes at school acting as a trigger that can result in the child’s detention or exclusion. Sometimes this can lead to violent incidents in the home, and a proper explanation of the change to the child could have prevented these outcomes.

Mencap are looking at developing courses that they could deliver to agencies for a fee.

Cumbria Constabulary has a good model for general awareness across their workforce, which is something the County Council could look at, and it may be possible that they could share what they are doing.

CAMHS - CAMHS can act as a barrier, particularly where they treat autism rather than an accompanying mental health condition as the main issue. Autism awareness among CAMHS staff would greatly assist in addressing this issue, particularly when parents are faced with a violent child, and it is not just a question of autism.

Witness 4 – Brian Eaton, Board of Governors James Rennie School, and Kris Williams, Headteacher, James Rennie School

James Rennie is a special school which has specific provision in relation to autism and has been judged as outstanding twice by Ofsted. The Members wanted to learn from the school about best practice in relation to autism.

James Rennie’s Policy on autism: The school has an Autistic Spectrum Conditions Policy in which autism is seen as a range of complex neurodevelopment conditions, characterised by social impairments, communication difficulties and restricted and stereotyped patterns of
behaviour. The policy does not view autism as a disability per se, rather focusing on the
skills and abilities people on the autistic spectrum have.

The school tries to make teaching interesting and to adapt this to the levels of the individual
child within the constraints of the national curriculum. This means thinking in terms of
building scaffolding around the child and then challenging this by “sabotage” to test whether
the child can manage if the scaffolding is breached. This helps build the child’s ability to
develop coping routines when their routine is disrupted.

They also work with the Pupil Referral Unit on establishing split placements with mainstream
schools, to try to ease pressure and prevent pupils ending up in the PRU because of their
condition.

They also work increasingly collaboratively with other special schools across Cumbria.

The school has applied for National Autistic Society accreditation to strengthen its approach
to supporting children and young people on the autistic spectrum in school and at home. The
accreditation takes them beyond what Ofsted looks at, and will require the school to:
- provide effective person centred support and rooted in current knowledge and
understanding of autism.
- understand each autistic person as an individual with their own unique qualities,
abilities, interests, preferences and challenges.
- enable each autistic person to carry out meaningful activities by using a range of
specific and personalised methods.
- demonstrate that autistic people achieve outcomes that have a positive and
significant impact on life.

Residential development: Brian spoke of the challenges faced by families, and children as
well as local authorities when a child has to be placed out of county. In part to address this,
the school is looking to use County Council funding to develop a residential unit designed to
cater for eight children and young people next to the school.

Key health and education related challenges: Engaging with health services has been
more difficult than with other partners. Despite having 147 children on roll with language
difficulties they have only 3 hours of speech therapy per year and they rely often on forms of
speech and language therapy that is available electronically. They have to pay for a school
nurse and health costs from their school budget. The budgets have not risen to reflect the
increasing numbers of children with autism.

Until recently there has not sufficient recognition in the Clinical Commissioning Group of the
needs of children who need higher level support for all the therapies – speech and language,
physio, occupational and psychiatric support. The services need to be as close to home as
possible, and cited the case currently of having to access psychiatric services in Newcastle.

There are pockets of excellent practice e.g. dental services at the Carlisle Infirmary. Yvonne
Halliwell is extremely patient and skilful in working with children with autism.

One of the main educational challenges highlighted was that Education and Health Care
Plans, are often weighted towards education, and ensuring they are balanced is particularly
important in relation to autism.
The other educational challenge is around funding. The County Council funding pays for standard staffing levels but the rising numbers of pupils with autism is placing an additional requirement for one to one teaching assistants which the funding does not meet.

**Challenges around parents getting a place at the school:** The school is full this year and next. On being asked whether changing the school’s designation would address this, Brian commented that a special school can be too difficult to manage and they have little capacity to extend on the site. Kris commented that there is not a primary specific unit in Carlisle and children can have difficulty in getting into specific secondary schools. Even the capacity on the current site will decline as the children in school grow up and get physically get bigger.

**Supporting teenagers towards employment:** The school had a Careers’ Fair a few years ago and they have a good rate at supporting pupils to be placed into jobs. Placements are designed on an individual basis, and even pupils unlikely to ever find a job allowed to do work experience as part of preparation for life.

**Additional Witness Information**

In addition to witness statements, members of the Task and Finish Group carried out visits and interviews with people in their local areas.

**Interview conducted on 2 August by Cllrs. Gillian Troughton and Mike Hawkins, with Greg Everatt Senior Commissioning Manager, Children & Families, Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)**

Greg was very welcoming and really keen to improve services for children on the autistic spectrum. The discussion covered a broad range of topics.

**CCG Strategy for autism, in terms of diagnosis, support and service delivery:** The multi-agency approach is critical to having services that meet the needs of autistic children. There have been challenges recently in terms of key people retiring or about to retire (including the person who was leading on the strategy, the Clinical Director of the Foundation Trust and the main Educational Psychologist). Raj Verma who has taken over as Clinical Director has moved to Cumbria from Blackpool and has a strong interest in autism, so there is potential for new momentum.

Accountability and oversight can be an issue, given the multi-agency nature of the work. There is an opportunity for the Children’s Trust Board to play a stronger role in scrutinising multi-agency working around autism, particularly through the Children’s Disability Sub-Group.

In terms of diagnosis, this is based on NICE guidelines. Historically the Multi-Agency Approach to Treatment (MAAT) has not been systematic and consistent across the county. Although this is being addressed and implemented countywide, there is a backlog due to the lack of previous delivery. Greg acknowledged that there is still some way to go to address these issues.

**Services currently commissioned and performance measures:** Diagnostic services are commissioned through the MAAT. Some specialist services are commissioned that have a
requirement to be able to offer specialist support in relation to autism as part of the offer – for example Speech and Language Therapy.

There has also been some change in terms of the transition from Statements of Special Educational Needs to Education and Health Care Plans (EHCP). Whereas the Statementing process resulted in the child having access to fixed amounts of support, the EHCP is based on allocating support as and when it is needed. The advantage of this approach is that if, for example, a child needed intensive speech and language therapy for a short period, the EHCP can accommodate this. The disadvantage is that services and families are taking time to understand the new way in which support is available.

The main performance measures are around the diagnostic process, and particularly around timeliness. However there is a question over the reliability of the data that being collected on the Partnership Trust's electronic patient record.

The MAAT has a “What next” process for those having been diagnosed, which includes information from the multi-agency team.

There was a discussion of the alternative process of assessment via the Child Psychologist, however this is problematic, as in some ways it would be better for all referrals to go through one place.

There are meetings with the Partnership Trust every two months, where issues can be raised and there are occasional special sub-groups to tackle specific problems.

**Planned future service improvements:** There are plans for an Early Intervention Behaviour Service. Although this will not be autism specific it will be using appropriate skills to pick up children with autism who might normally slip through the net and be labelled as disruptive or naughty.

How are the services commissioned by Cumbria CCG Children and Families linked with those from adults? How does this relate to the Cumbria County Council's Transition Protocols?

**The link between services commissioned by Cumbria CCG for children, services for adults and the County Council’s Transition Protocol:** The CCG is working on a transition strategy which will need to link with County Council’s approach to transition, which will also have to feed into commissioning. This would also have to work in terms of out of county placements, and the Education and Health Care Plans.

**Assessment of need, and involvement of service users:** The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment is an assessment of the needs of the population that is used to inform commissioning need. This includes prevalence data (numbers known to have autism and expected numbers) and is reviewed to assess whether the actual numbers reflected the initial projections, and provides an analysis of any changes.

Feedback is sought after as part of the MAAT process. This provides specific detail on how service users feel, however there are only ad hoc meetings with interest groups who represent users and families, and there is scope to improve this.
**Autism awareness in NHS services commissioned by the CCG:** Awareness tends to be on a case by case as raised by service users. This is an area that is being looked at in terms of user experience and contracts.

**Emotional support and CAMHS:** The Education Health Care Plans have the potential to go some way to addressing these needs in a more clinically appropriate way (i.e. access to services as needed rather being based on a snapshot of a person’s need at the point they were assessed).

There are still concerns about access to CAMHS, in particular about Tier 3 support, which in principle can support people with autism, but would struggle if many people with autism were trying to access support at the same time. Greg Everatt agreed to take the concerns that Members have to the Partnership Trust.

**Issues for the County Council:** The CCG is in the process of applying to change its boundaries, and there are opportunities and risks around how the Council collaborates with the CCG in terms of countywide commissioning once the new boundaries are in place.

There are also some concerns about people who have been admitted for services and are eligible for a Care and Treatment Review if they have a learning disability or autism. The aim of these reviews is to prevent future episodes, but the challenge is to work out which children and young people should have reviews.

The last issue is the quality of advocacy in relation to children and young people with autism. The skills and experience of working with autism is an issue, and many of the advocates are often current service users, which may or may not be most appropriate.

**Submission from Caroline Pollard SEND Teaching Support Team Specialist Advisory Teachers (Autism Spectrum Conditions)**

Working as part of the SEND county wide specialist team, our professional group is committed to maintaining an autism specific education service that provides intervention, support, and in the high number of statutory cases, long term involvement, to ensure equality of opportunity and high achievement for all children with autism spectrum conditions.

We offer and extend autism specific advice and inform best practice to schools, settings and parents on a preventative basis to boost earlier identification and intervention. We support the development of inclusive practices in all schools and settings by improving the understanding of autism and the provision that is made for children and their families. We guide schools and parents to make the best use of existing specialist provision for autism.

Each term, in each Locality, our specialist team provides two Levels of a comprehensive County wide autism awareness training programme. The undertaking of this is advised to schools in children’s Statements. The courses are often fully booked and there have been waiting lists in some areas. Some delegates migrate from other areas to attend training to ensure their attendance.

The Specialist Advisory Teachers and Specialist Higher Level Teaching Assistants work hard to develop better services for children with autism to ensure that needs can be properly addressed. We have forged strong links and good working relations with agencies including
Speech and Language Therapists, County Psychological Service, CAMHS, Community Nurses for CLDD, GPs, Community Paediatricians, Clinical Psychologists, Occupational Therapists, Connexions, Parent Partnership, DASH, NACRO, Youth Justice and the police.

It is our education based service that makes the most sustained and determined intervention for children with autism. We respond to the recognised complexities and increasing prevalence of autism and related conditions, amongst our young population in Cumbria.

The team fulfil the Inclusive Cumbria philosophy. There are many youngsters with a severe presentation of autism or Pathological Demand Avoidance who, with a high level of support and carefully shared expertise from SEND, are successfully provided for in our mainstream schools. These children, in other areas may be very likely to be placed in specialist or residential settings. Current statistics indicate a large number of children and young people with autism are excluded from schools. We play a key role in preventing this occurrence and are highly involved in facilitating re-integration by supporting schools with individualised information on autism.

Using our experience, qualified and specialist training, we make direct, skilful observation and specialist assessments to support children at the Early Help stage. Assessing children's strengths and weaknesses, we identify aspects of their different learning style and systematically develop wide ranging and detailed knowledge of individual presentations of children in relation to their autism. It is with this level of understanding that we make a difference. We are highly skilled and trained communicators and are able to explain some very difficult concepts to wide ranging audiences in order to help Head teachers, SENCo's, parents, teachers, teaching assistants and Health professionals to understand the subtleties of autism.

We routinely deliver training to whole school staff as well as bespoke presentations to raise awareness and improve understanding of autism in schools.

The success of our involvement is to increase confidence and “build capacity” in schools. We further support schools by helping to elicit and clarify realistic learning and achievement targets to help with monitoring progress. Drawing upon our experience and teaching background, we carefully consider and advise upon the provision of teaching and assessment in line with the National Curriculum. This may include the design of a specific educational programme that a child may benefit from.

We work hard to break the link between special educational needs and low attainment. The Specialist Higher Level Teaching Assistants, are involved in early intervention, planning with parents and schools. They skilfully advise and monitor the early use of appropriate and available resources or strategies and can work with the schools to ensure the implementation of specific programmes dovetail with the school curriculum. We set high expectations, using our judgement and assessment data to set realistic targets and identify areas where we can celebrate success to drive improvement. Our involvement at this stage influences whether or not parents or schools continue with a request for a Statutory Assessment.

Schools, parents and other agencies frequently report that our input is invaluable.

**Submission from a mother with son with autism to Cllr. Bill Wearing**

Cumbria County Council Scrutiny Task Group Autism

December 2016
A Member of the Task and Finish Group received a submission from a parent.

She provided a Brief outline of her experiences of local services to date:

- 18 month wait for Paediatric Child Consultant appointment to diagnose autism.
- Once diagnosed there was no post diagnostic pathway.
- There was a further 18 months to attend the “What next “course.She has attended several excellent workshops run by Marion Jones – to share her expertise.,
- Concerned that in relation to Education and Health Care Plans, a lot depends on the individual parent making the case for their child.
- Her son now has an excellent Teaching Assistant, who has a vast amount of experience, creativity and patience and has access to excellent Special Advisory Teachers who have attended his annual reviews and helped shape school support.
- She had a long wait for CAMHS appointment and the psychologist did not feel able to help due to lack of experience of autism.
- She has concerns about provision of post-16 education, employment and training for autistic young people.

**Interview conducted on 13 July by Cllr. Neil Hughes with a parent of a child with mid-spectrum autism**

The interviewee and her partner love both their children, though she stressed the unexpectedness that is still part of the experience of having a child with autism. This can be both pleasurable at times – her son loving and very bright – but also stressful with holiday periods and the beginnings of new terms at school especially so. Like most autistic children he prefers a routine he can become used to.

**Cuts to services and support:** She talked of her apprehension around recent and anticipated further cuts to dedicated services for young people with autism. Previously she and her son were able to make use of a programme of days out, craft activities etc. which was provided by a third sector organisation and to which she part-contributed financially. She thought this worked well but the funding was withdrawn a few years ago (the service is still accessible to those who pay the full cost but she says she can’t now afford this). On top of this there is no autism support group in her local area and the needs threshold to access any appropriate services has been raised, excluding her son.

**Schooling and health:** She stated that the secondary school support her son received is nevertheless excellent, where he has a dedicated key worker. He will receive an Education and Health Care Plan next year. However the school needs to match-fund any resources received from the local authority for this. Her son has settled at the school though needs close supervision, as he has no sense of impending danger (e.g. from road traffic) and is very sensitive to noise, which can have emotional ill-effects. She also spoke well of NHS understanding and is pleased that from 2017 all teachers will automatically receive autism awareness training.

**Emotional support:** Her son experiences ‘melt-downs’ from time to time; once her son was told to stand outside in a corridor as a result, but he feels that most teachers and teaching
assistants are now aware of his needs. He can be shy with those he doesn’t know, has few close friends (the nearest lives in 7 miles away) and this is part of the reason why holidays are difficult times. Confiding fears and bad experiences can be difficult for although her son does have a good relationship with his brother.

Being an adolescent is not easy for her son! Luckily he has not suffered from a great deal of bullying. He can (physically) choose his own menu at school and is allowed to leave a lesson early if things become too much for him.

**Talents and future:** Her son is very good at IT and once repaired a computer when the staff at school couldn’t! However he always has fears being late for school even this isn’t (objectively) an issue. He wants to go on to college and loves computers and different kinds of learning as well as music.

Her final comment was that ideally autism-related funding should be ring-fenced for local authorities – though she is well aware of the financial pressures all councils are under today.

**Information received via Bill Wearing from a parent of a child with autism**

Dear Mr Wearing,

I am interested in the discussions taking place on the subject of Autism and the support that is there for the children and their families.

I am a single mum of four children. Two of whom are on the Spectrum. My son is nearly 17 and was diagnosed with Aspergers before his fifth birthday. Back in those days the way in which children were diagnosed was much simpler. Since then the way in which the Children get a diagnosis in this area is far more complicated. The MAAT process, whilst I understand the reasons behind it, often has caused it to be a very long drawn out one. Often resulting in a difficult situation like my daughter’s where only one of the Team feels the need for more evidence and therefore despite being put forward several times to the team, a negative outcome.

We knew when my daughter was three that she had issues. As the years went passed and no help from the paediatricians because of the MAAT deciding she doesn’t fully “fit” in their ideal of autism, we as parents and the school she was in, worked hard to minimise the effect. The whole family suffered. The strain it caused was immense and partly contributed to my husband’s failing mental health.

More recently my daughter went downhill rapidly when she started at secondary school. To the point we had a 12 year old not attending school, self-harming, being violent towards members of the family especially her younger sister and me. We were told by CAMHS, school and doctors to call out the police. She spent several nights away on various children’s wards. It was only at this point people started to take us seriously. We all knew she needed immediate help. Unfortunately, by this point it meant she needed hospitalising and needed a CAMHS tier 4 bed. Unfortunately there are none around here for children in my daughter’s position. The fact she was a dual diagnosis meaning she had obviously an ASD and by this point was suffering with severe depression making her suicidal, meant nowhere nearby suitable.

Then in December 2014 her Dad committed suicide. I do feel the issues we were having with our daughter did effect him.
On January 12th 2015, 5 days after her dad’s funeral my daughter was sectioned and I do feel it took the suicide of her father to make agencies listen.

We are still battling today to get help, not only for her but also help for my son now who is struggling with his ADD, PTSD, Depression and Severe Anxiety, and who now is unable to carry on with his education. He is classed as "too complex a case" for CBT counselling by their CAMHS staff.

The system is failing on every level to offer support for parents. From diagnosis, teaching the parents skills to help, CAMHS, lack of specialist paediatricians (often meaning children are waiting years! ) No consistency with Psychiatrists, Children's Services being so stretched that even families labelled "child in need" not being seen by their worker. Schools funding for Statemented children being cut....on every level it is failing and subsequently we are having our children suffer. It is only a matter of time before we lose one. As it is I know of several families split because of this. And sadly we as a family feel it contributed to the death of my husband, my children's father.

Statement by Cllr. Mike Hawkins to Council April 2016

April was autism awareness month, which is a worldwide campaign to bring awareness of this condition to the general public. Autism awareness has risen in the minds of the public, particularly through the recent TV programme The A word which was filmed here in Cumbria. This has to be welcomed as autism is a serious, lifelong and disabling condition and without the right support, it can have a profound sometimes devastating effect on individuals and their families.

Autism is much more common than many people think. There are around 700,000 people in the UK living with autism that’s more than 1 in a 100. If you include their families, autism touches the lives of 2.8 million people every day.

Autism doesn’t just affect children. Autistic children grow up to be autistic adults. Autism is a hidden disability – you can’t always tell if someone has it.

While autism is incurable, the right support at the right time can make an enormous difference to people’s lives.

Colleagues this is a subject close to my heart as some of you know I have had the privilege of bringing up a son who has autism and has no speech and needs high level support. This can be a challenge that affects the whole family as over time we have to adapt to his way of dealing and understanding the world around.

In my house the bubble bath is always kept on the floor in a certain place and I have a toy abacus which is always on the floor outside my bedroom ready for someone to trip over in the night: all perfectly normal for an autistic household.

Like a lot of life’s problems I find that the best way is to look on the positive side. Okay, my son won’t ever marry or be able to have a career or provide me with grandchildren, but he has enriched my life tremendously, making be look on life from a different perspective one that is more understanding towards others’ needs.

A lot of the time an autistic person may seem locked into their own world, but every now and again you get a glimpse into their personality. My son is one of the funniest people I know. Last year, while on a hot day on holiday, he drank all the water. I said: “thanks I wouldn’t like
to be in the desert with you." Without hesitation he picked up the empty bottle and put it to
my mouth. As a drop came out he was chuckling to himself. So now our little joke is to
remember when he kept dad alive so he could look after him. This always brings a smile and
is just a brief insight into what is a very complex and interesting condition which we could
discus all day.

I would just like to finish with a poem that I first came across 16 years ago while studying
autism for a college course and as a Christian it moved me then and it still does today:

**HEAVEN’S VERY SPECIAL CHILDREN**

A meeting was held quite far from earth,
“It’s time again for another birth.”
Said the angels to the Lord above,
“This special child will need much love.”

“Their progress may be very slow,
Accomplishments they may not show.
And they’ll require extra care
From the folks they meet down there.”

“They may not run or laugh or play,
Their thoughts may seem quite far away.
In many ways they won’t adapt,
And they’ll be known as ‘Handicapped’.”

“So let’s be careful where they’re sent.
We want their lives to be content.
Please, Lord, find the parents who
Will do a special job for you.”

“They will not realize right away
The leading role they are asked to play.
But with this child sent from above
Comes stronger faith and richer love.”

“And soon they’ll know the privilege given
In caring for their special gift from Heaven.
Their precious charge, so meek and mild,
Is heaven’s very special child.”

Author: Edna Massionilla

**Autistic children become autistic adults – a personal observation by Cllr Val Tarbitt**

Today, getting the recognition that your child is on the Autistic Spectrum and accessing the
support needed can currently be a frustrating and somewhat lengthy part of the care cycle.

If you grew up in the 1940s/50s that recognition and support was rarely, if ever, available. If
you are on what we now recognise as the “high achieving end of the Autistic Spectrum” it is
more than likely that you moved into adulthood through college and work and those colleagues and friends around you noted your “differences” as being just “you”.

It is when those “differences” seriously impact on professional or personal life that confusion and difficulties can arise.

Physical disabilities are usually visible, Autism is not.

Recognising, for example, that a Senior Member of the University Faculty Team will never meet Marking deadlines, operates as a ‘loose cannon’ within the teaching structure and seemingly ploughs their own furrow in terms of Research demands, if that Senior colleague was known to be on the Autistic Spectrum rather than being subjected to disciplinary procedures, then the support of colleagues would be available and readily given.

Translate this into the realm of a personal relationship – if someone who operates on the “high end of the Autistic Spectrum” enters your life this can be a recipe for unhappiness. It is highly unlikely you will be shown affection; share a joke; engage in innuendoes or wordplay; your needs as a loving partner will not be understood and repetitive behaviour will frustrate.

Back to my earlier statement – “High End Autism” is an invisible disability.

My recommendation for the Group to consider is that within any supportive Transition Programme we recommend that young people are given the skills and confidence to talk about their disability so that they can move through life in the knowledge that they are more readily understood.

**Conclusions**

The Members of the Task Group were impressed with the levels of expertise, passion and experience that exist within Cumbria. Members were also assured that there was substantial agreement between people with personal experience of autism and professionals concerning the nature of the challenges facing young people with autism and their families.

Members would like to see continuing progress, and have recommended that they meet in six months to review progress and report to Scrutiny Management Board.
What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. This report provides the response of the Corporate Director of Children’s and Family Services to the report of the Children and Young People with Autism Task Group. The Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Advisory Board established the task group in May 2016. The group heard evidence from witnesses and took statements. Overall the task group felt there was a mixed picture in relation to services for children and young people with a diagnosis of autism. The task group noted evidence of good practice and strong leadership in addressing service gaps but were concerned by delays in diagnosis and inconsistency in post diagnosis pathways.

Recommendation of the Corporate Director

2. Recommendation – That Cabinet accept and approve all four recommendations made by the Scrutiny Board’s Children and Young People with Autism Task and Finish Group:

3. Recommendation 1: The Task Group findings are reported to the Health and Well Being Board and assurances sought from partners about how the following issues of concern are being addressed in a co-ordinated way across agencies:

- Waiting times for assessment;
- Engagement with families and addressing their concerns;
- Training and early awareness of autism across education and early years’ settings;
- Effectiveness of services commissioned by the NHS;
- CAMHS performance in relation to autism;
- Consistency of specialist service provision across Cumbria;
- Post-assessment pathways;
- Support for people in transition to adulthood.
4. **Recommendation 2**: The Task Group findings are reported to CASL and assurances sought from the Learning Improvement Service and CASL about how the following issues are being addressed by schools around the county, and in particular in relation to the implementation of the Inclusive Cumbria Strategy that will be taken to Cabinet in December 2016:

5. 

- Application of National Curriculum Guidance and examples of mainstream schools supporting pupils who are diagnosed to maximise their communication and independence;
- Effectiveness of multi-discipline support to ensure that the cognitive and behavioural needs of children is in place;
- Whether there is leadership in place to ensure that there is a whole school approach to autism;
- Effective work between the school, families and the child, to keep the child in education and maximise their chances (including provision of information and support in relation to statementing);

6. **Recommendation 3**: Steps are taken to raise Members’ awareness of autism and the availability of support in local areas so that Members can champion the provision of support for all people with autism and their families and carers through the work of local committees and through area planning.

7. **Recommendation 4**: Consideration is given to the role the County Council can play in supporting people with autism to access employment and apprenticeship opportunities within the County Council

**Background to the Proposals**

8. Autism is a lifelong developmental disability that affects how people perceive the world and interact with others. Autism is associated with a triad of impairments: i) social communication; ii) social interaction; iii) social imagination. There are a number of descriptors used to describe this disability – autistic spectrum disorder, autistic spectrum condition, autism. There is also other associated diagnosis including Aspergers Syndrome. Autism is a spectrum condition and each child will have a unique presentation of the triad of impairments. Diagnosis of autism is undertaken through multi-disciplinary team known as the Multi-Agency Assessment Team (MAAT).

9. The latest studies into the prevalence of autism indicate that 1.1% of the population of the UK may have autism. This would mean that there would be approximately 1,150 children and young people with the condition in Cumbria. There are currently just over 900 children and young people in Cumbria with a diagnosis of autism 735 of whom have an Education Health and Care Plan.

10. The NHS provide the lead in the delivery of the MAAT through the community paediatricians supported by speech and language therapists. The local authority provides direct input to the MAAT through the Educational Psychology Service and the Specialist Teachers for Autism. There is a well- established MAAT in the south of the county, a MAAT in the west of the county. The MAAT
for north and east Cumbria has only recently been established. There is a County Multi Agency Autism Group which has been focussed on improving the pre and post diagnostic pathway. In 2014/15 this group benefitted from additional funding for staffing to address waiting times. Since then both the NHS and local authority have faced challenges in recruiting appropriately qualified staff. As progress is made in this area so waiting times will reduce.

11. A report commissioned by Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust and undertaken by Dr Karen Horridge has identified a number of strengths in services but also highlighted a similar need to improve the diagnostic process.

12. Educational provision for children and young people is delivered in a variety of settings depending on the individuals’ needs. The knowledge, experience and skills of the whole school community in meeting the needs of pupils with autism is improving. Large numbers of pupils are well supported by their local school without the need for an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP). Where a pupils’ needs are greater and an EHCP is in place schools receive specific help and guidance in meeting the pupils’ needs from the Specialist Teachers for Autism. This includes advice on whole school approaches to autism.

13. There are clear gaps in educational provision for pupils who require more specialist support. Resourced provision for children with autism is currently insufficient across the county and is not equitably dispersed. Of particular concern is a lack of secondary and primary provision in the south of the county and primary provision in the Carlisle area. These gaps are being addressed through the Inclusion Strategy which will be brought to Cabinet in December 2016. In the south of the county the development of resourced provision centred around Sandside Lodge will make a significant contribution to meeting learner needs. Those young people needing the most specialist provision will benefit significantly from the development of a specialist residential unit at James Rennie School. This development will also improve transition to adulthood for these young people.

14. The council will continue to work with schools and colleagues in health to maintain an improving trajectory of services for children and young people with autism. The Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders have identified Inclusion as a key area for improvement activity and supports the delivery of new provision. Because autism is a lifelong condition this group of young people will also benefit from improved transition processes agreed with adult services particularly the earlier start to transition planning.

15. In 2010 the Government launched a national autism strategy ‘Fulfilling and Rewarding Lives: the Strategy for Adults with Autism in England’. Although an adult focussed strategy this policy had implications and lessons for children and young people’s services. A key strand of the strategy was to raise awareness of autism. The development of local member understanding and engagement with families will support the council in delivering the national autism strategy. A second key strand of the strategy was to support people with autism into employment. Maximising opportunities for young people with autism will again contribute to the council’s role in delivering the aims of the strategy.
16. During the next year the Multi Agency Autism Group will continue to develop pre and post diagnostic pathways and communicate these to families. Provision will continue to be developed through the review of the Inclusion Strategy and work at James Rennie and Sandside Lodge School.

Options Considered and Risks Identified

Option (a)

- Cabinet approves the recommendations of the Scrutiny Advisory Board’s report by the Task and Finish Group into children and young people with autism and notes the response of the Corporate Director for Children’s and Family Services as set out in this paper.

Reasons for the recommendation/Key benefits

- Autism is a lifelong condition and the better the quality of diagnostic and post diagnostic services for children and young people the better the lifelong outcomes for them as adults.
- The recommendations of the Task and Finish Group support the ongoing improvement of services and contribute to the delivery of the wider national strategy for autism in Cumbria.
- The recommendations of the group also support the work being undertaken following previous Scrutiny Advisory Board Task and Finish reports on transition and mental health.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

17. There are no direct financial implications associated with the four recommendations of the Scrutiny Board’s Children and Young People with Autism Task and Finish Group as they relate to the production of two reports, awareness raising and maximising existing opportunities, all of which would be undertaken by utilising existing staff resources.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be considered?

17. There are no direct legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

18. To safeguard children and support families and schools so that children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential. Council. We will:

- Continue to improve our services for vulnerable children and families.
- Deliver integrated support services for the most vulnerable families in Cumbria.
What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

19. Meeting the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review will contribute to reducing health inequalities and promote greater equity in service delivery.

Appendices and Background Documents

No appendices.

Key Facts

Electoral Division(s): All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Decision</th>
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<th>Exempt from call-in</th>
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Approved by the Cabinet Members (please specify date) 29/11/16

Previous relevant Council or Executive decisions

Consideration by Overview & Scrutiny

Scrubiny initiated the task and finish review and will receive reports on the progress against recommendations.

Background Papers

None

Report Author
John Barrett, Assistant Director Early Help and Learning.
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Committee: Cabinet  
Date of meeting: 15 December 2016

Title of Report: Scrutiny’s Response to Budget Consultation  
Report by: Chair of Scrutiny Management Board  
Cabinet Member: Councillor Patricia Bell – Deputy Leader of the Council

What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. The report provides a summary of Scrutiny’s engagement in Strategic Planning for 2017/18, and outlines key points and recommendations agreed by Scrutiny Management Board (SMB) as their formal response to the Budget Consultation.

Recommendation

2. Cabinet Members are asked to consider Scrutiny’s response alongside other responses received.

Background to the Proposals

3. Scrutiny’s engagement in the Strategic Planning process for 2017/18 began in July when SMB invited all non-executive Members to attend a Scrutiny Strategic Planning session at which Members had the opportunity to receive presentations and question the Deputy Leader, the Chief Executive and all Corporate Directors about the challenges facing the Council and direction of travel.

4. This was followed by a further SMB workshop held on 4th November 2016 providing the opportunity for all non-executive Members to consider the Budget proposals being consulted on between 20th October 2016 and 20th January 2017. This event was well attended with over 25 Members present.

5. Members received an update on the financial context for the Council and the proposed savings; and attended four workshops with the Corporate Directors, Chief Fire Officer and Assistant Directors. These provided an opportunity to consider in detail the future challenges and considerations for the Council.

6. SMB considered the collective feedback from the event on 23rd November and agreed the key themes and points set out below as their response to Cabinet in respect of the Budget Consultation.
Scrutiny Feedback – key themes

7. Scrutiny Members felt there were a range of themes that should be considered as context to this and future years Strategic Planning in order to address existing challenges pertinent to Cumbria; as well as in response to the national direction of travel across a number of policy areas.

8. These overarching themes were:
   - The Council’s approach to Treasury Management and the opportunities this presents for savings;
   - The uncertain context within which the Council is operating, particularly in relation to the impact of the Government’s proposed approach to business rate retention;
   - The Council’s ability to influence it’s income, funding and expenditure levels;
   - The need to address school size and organisation, high needs block funding and governance matters;
   - The challenges presented in relation to recruitment - particularly of foster carers and social workers;
   - The potential benefits of unitarisation;
   - The potential for increased collaboration with District Councils and other partners such as between the Fire and Rescue Service and the North West Ambulance Service (NWAS);
   - The organisational and funding relationship with health;
   - Ensuring a fit for purpose, skilled and well performing Council workforce;
   - The need to progress with pace a digital approach with customers, Members and the workforce.

9. In addition to these themes, Scrutiny provided specific feedback and commentary on Directorate areas of business as set out below:

10. Resources and Transformation

   - In relation to digital matters, Members raised the importance of progressing work towards the Council’s aspiration of joint working and integration of systems with District Councils in order to provide an integrated customer service offer for customers; and that developments should be future proofed.
   - The potential of the Service Centre is significant to resolve issues for people at first point of contact; and the interoperability of customer service systems between the County Council Service Centre and Districts was raised as an issue.
   - It was suggested by Members that significant savings could be achieved through transfer of relevant highways, children’s services and adult social care functions into the Council’s Service Centre at the earliest opportunity.
   - Members also emphasised the importance of ensuring Members – and in particular new Members – receive the correct ICT and digital support and equipment. Members sought assurances that the savings planned through restructure of services are being secured, and that a robust corporate overview is in place to ensure savings are being achieved following restructures.
Members highlighted the need for the Council to adopt a coherent approach to the opportunities provided through the Apprenticeship Levy – including the opportunity to fill skills gaps in the organisation and respond to the challenges of an ageing workforce through the recruitment of apprentices.

Members asked how the level of sickness absence will be reduced and also discussed the need for robust performance management.

It was suggested by Members that a move towards unitary local government in the County could be a critical factor in enabling the County Council and the other councils in the county to make the savings required over the coming years.

11. **Children and Families**

   - Members commented on the need for clear governance and transparency and also strong leadership if schools are to continue to act as a cornerstone for communities, especially in rural areas.
   - Members also commented on the need for stringent budget management controls with schools and were interested to hear about examples of how schools have, in other areas, come together as a Trust and reduced head teacher recruitment in an aim to create efficiencies.
   - Sizes of schools and school funding was raised by Members as an area for further exploration – with a need to be clear about areas with high deficits and declining secondary schools.
   - Members also asked if there could be cross county all age schools and what the options are for shared governance arrangements.
   - Underperformance of schools with Key Stage 2 tests was raised by Members and the challenges faced in terms of capacity to address the problems with progression and attainment in Cumbria’s secondary schools.
   - Members were supportive of further work being undertaken, through the development of an Inclusion Strategy, to assess how provision meets need in respect of High Needs school funding.
   - They also highlighted the need to build on current pilot work in respect of 16 year olds and under in Pupil Referral Units, and to tackle the lack of provision for 16 to 18 year olds not in education, employment or training.
   - Members also provided feedback about the importance of ensuring provision of high needs education receives the appropriate funding contributions from health partners alongside the Council.
   - There was also discussion about the challenges with recruitment of foster carers and the impact of decreasing numbers of foster carers.

12. **Economy and Highways and Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service**

   - Members raised the need to understand how the proposed change to the business rate retention scheme will affect different parts of the county and its future economic development; and commented that this perhaps is one of the biggest issues the Council will face in considering future budgets.
   - Members also commented on the impact across the county on business rates in relation to Sellafield.
   - Members emphasised the importance of ensuring that income – through developer contributions for example - is maximised when major
developments (infrastructure and large housing developments) have implications for the highway network in particular.

- Members expressed concerns that the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects planned in Cumbria will result in indirect capacity pressures for the Council for example increases in number of Freedom of Information requests received.
- Comments were made about the importance of developing stronger links with District Council functions to maximise efficiencies, for example links between County Council gully cleaning and District Council road sweeping.
- The challenges with the supply chain were raised by Members – both the ability of local suppliers to meet demand but also the impact of construction in areas such as Manchester which may be impacting on price.
- Members asked about sale of assets and how this would be progressed further.
- The waste contract was discussed and the limitations of two tier government in this area of activity.
- The synergy with the Fire and Rescue Service and Ambulance Service was recognised and it was acknowledged that significant change was being proposed nationally for the Fire Service.

13. Health, Care and Communities

- Members highlighted that there is potential for further integration with public health, the NHS and the local authority in order to ensure that these services can meet funding gap requirements; and there is a need for integrated health and care plans that allow progressive relationships to be built.
- There was also a discussion about the importance of proactively ensuring that that support for younger adults with complex needs receives the appropriate funding contributions from health partners alongside the Council.
- Members emphasised the importance of proactively engaging with GPs in order for the Council to secure the benefits of integration and Integrated Care Communities (ICCs) and questioned if there was an issue about the balance of funding the Council is paying for jointly funded placements versus the contribution health is making.
- Members were keen to hear more about Integrated Care Communities and felt the Council should proactively participate at a local level in the development of the ICC boundaries.
- Members suggested the Council should review taking back equipment that has been given out and is no longer used if it would make a saving.
- Concerns were raised by Members about the cost of agency staff for social care and the lack of consistency for individuals this can give rise to.
- Members also discussed the level of funding for Health and Wellbeing Co-ordinators (HAWCs) needed to ensure delivery of agreed savings.
Conclusion

14. Scrutiny Management Board welcome the opportunity to provide feedback to Cabinet on the budget proposals. This response provides insight from a wide range of Members about issues that need consideration as part of the Strategic Planning process. Scrutiny Management Board looks forward to Cabinet’s response to the points and recommendations made in this report.

Appendices and Background Documents

- No appendices

Background Papers

- None

Report Author:
Helen Blake, Senior Manager Policy and Scrutiny
helen.blake@cumbria.gov.uk
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What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. The report responds to the recommendations and feedback made in the Scrutiny Management Board report ‘Scrutiny’s response to the Budget Consultation 2017/18’.

Recommendation of the Corporate Director

2. Cabinet agrees the proposed responses contained in this report to Scrutiny’s feedback on the Budget Consultation.

Background to the Proposals

3. The Council is continuing to face significant financial challenges. In terms of the next three year Strategic Planning horizon, 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2020 there is uncertainty around central government funding to the Council.

4. Consequently, the focus of Strategic Planning and the development of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2017-2020 over the summer has been on the 2017/18 Budget. The proposals currently being consulted on would provide a balanced Revenue Budget Proposal for 2017/18 and based on current assumptions, £16 million of savings will be required for 2017/18 of which £15 million are new. The majority of proposals within the consultation relate to better management of the Council’s money.

5. As part of the Strategic Planning process, a programme of public consultation and engagement commenced on 20 October 2016 and will close on 20 January 2017. The feedback from the consultation will be considered by Cabinet and will inform the Budget they recommend to Full Council in February 2016.

6. As a key stakeholder group in the consultation, Scrutiny has been invited to consider the Budget proposals.
7. Scrutiny’s involvement in the Strategic Planning process this year is detailed in the report Cabinet has received from Scrutiny Management Board. Scrutiny Members have engaged from an early point in the process having the opportunity to discuss contextual information about the policy and financial context for the Council, and the opportunity to discuss the Budget proposals published for consultation directly with Corporate Directors and Assistant Directors.

8. The most recent event took place on 4 November 2016 to which all non-executive Members were invited. Members had the opportunity to discuss in detail the Budget proposals and future challenges for the Council.

9. The outputs of this session were considered by Scrutiny Management Board on 23 November and the key points from this session have now been presented to Cabinet for consideration. The recommendation from Scrutiny Management Board is for Cabinet to consider the feedback as part of their Budget discussions.

10. The report from Scrutiny raises a number of key themes as well as providing feedback and commentary about issues raised in Directorate workshops. This response will be made under the same headings as the Scrutiny report.

**Scrutiny Feedback – key themes**

11. Scrutiny Members highlighted the following as key themes

   - The Council’s approach to Treasury Management and the opportunities this presents for savings
   - The uncertain context within which the Council is operating, particularly in relation to the impact of the government’s proposed approach to business rate retention
   - The Council’s ability to influence it’s income, funding and expenditure levels
   - The need to address school size and organisation, high needs block funding and governance matters
   - The challenges presented in relation to recruitment - particularly of foster carers and social workers
   - The potential benefits of unitarisation
   - The potential for increased collaboration with District Councils and other partners such as between the Fire and Rescue Service and the North West Ambulance Service (NWAS)
   - The organisational and funding relationship with Health
   - Ensuring a fit for purpose, skilled and well performing Council workforce
   - The need to progress with pace a digital approach with customers, Members and the workforce.

12. **Response:** The overarching themes identified by Scrutiny are noted by Cabinet as they set out a number of the complex issues the Council is managing currently; as well as highlighting the uncertainty that lies ahead in relation to the future role, responsibilities and funding of the Council. These issues will be considered alongside all other consultation feedback received following the end of the consultation period.
13. **Resources and Transformation**

- In relation to digital matters, Members raised the importance of progressing work towards the Council’s aspiration of joint working and integration of systems with District Councils in order to provide an integrated customer service offer for customers; and that developments should be future proofed.
- The potential for the service centre is significant to resolve issues for people at first point of contact and the interoperability of customer service systems between the County Council Service Centre and Districts was raised as an issue.
- It was suggested by Members that significant savings could be achieved through the transfer of relevant highways, children’s services and adult social care functions into the Council’s Service Centre at the earliest opportunity.
- Members also emphasised the importance of ensuring Members – and in particular new Members – receive the correct ICT and digital support and equipment. Members sought assurances that the savings planned through restructure of services are being secured, and that a robust corporate overview is in place to ensure savings are being achieved through restructures.
- Members highlighted the need for the Council to adopt a coherent approach to the opportunities provided through the Apprenticeship Levy – including the opportunity to fill skills gaps in the organisation and respond to the challenges of an ageing workforce through the recruitment of apprentices.
- Members asked how the level of sickness absence will be reduced and also discussed the need for robust performance management.
- It was suggested by Members that a move towards unitary local government in the county could be a critical factor in enabling the County Council and the other Councils in the county to make the savings that will be required to make over the coming years.

14. **Response**: Cabinet note the issues and suggestions raised in this workshop, in particular the comments made about the potential savings unitarisation could offer. The feedback will be considered with all other consultation responses following the end of the consultation period.

15. **Children and Families**

- Members commented on the need for clear governance and transparency and also strong leadership if schools are to continue to act as a cornerstone for communities, especially in rural areas.
- Members also commented on the need for stringent budget management controls with schools and were interested to hear about examples of how schools have, in other areas, come together as a Trust and reduced head teacher recruitment in an aim to create efficiencies.
- Sizes of schools and school funding was raised by Members as an area for further exploration – with a need to be clear about areas with high deficits and declining secondary schools.
- Members also asked if there could be cross county all age schools and what the options are for shared governance arrangements.
• Underperformance of schools at Key Stage 2 tests was raised by Members and the challenges faced in terms of capacity to address the problems with progression and attainment in Cumbria’s secondary schools.
• Members were supportive of further work being undertaken, through the development of an Inclusion Strategy, to assess how provision meets need in respect of High Needs school funding.
• They also highlighted the need to build on current pilot work in respect of 16 year olds and under in Pupil Referral Units, and to tackle lack of provision for 16 to 18 year olds not in education, employment or training.
• Members also provided feedback about the importance of ensuring provision of high needs education receives the appropriate funding contributions from health partners alongside the Council.
• There was also discussion about the challenges with recruitment of foster carers and the impact of decreasing numbers of foster carers.

16. **Response**: Cabinet note that Scrutiny raised a wide range of issues in this workshop, some of which relate to schools, education and attainment; and others relating to the care of looked after children. The support for the development of an Inclusion Strategy is welcomed. The feedback will be considered with all other consultation responses following the end of the consultation period.

17. **Economy and Highways and Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service**

• Members raised the need to understand how the proposed change to the business rate retention scheme will affect different parts of the county and its future economic development and commented that this perhaps is one of the biggest issues the Council will face in considering future budgets.
• Members also commented on the impact across the county on business rates in relation to Sellafield.
• Members emphasised the importance of ensuring that income – through developer contributions for example - is maximised when major developments (infrastructure and large housing developments) have implications for the highway network in particular.
• Members expressed concerns that the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects planned in Cumbria will result in indirect capacity pressures for the Council for example increases in number of Freedom of Information requests received.
• Comments were made about the importance of developing stronger links with District Council functions to maximise efficiencies for example links between County Council gully cleaning and District Council road sweeping.
• The challenges with the supply chain were raised by Members – both the ability of local suppliers to meet demand but also the impact of construction in areas such as Manchester which may be impacting on price.
• Members asked about sale of assets and how this would be progressed further
• The waste contract was discussed and the limitations of two tier government in this area of activity.
• The synergy with the Fire and Rescue Service and Ambulance Service was recognised and it was acknowledged that significant change was being proposed nationally for the Fire Service.

18. **Response**: Cabinet note the comments made in this workshop and in particular the concerns raised about the direct and indirect impact on the Council as a result of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and potential changes nationally regarding the Fire & Rescue Service. The feedback will be considered with all other consultation responses following the end of the consultation period.

19. **Health, Care and Communities**

   • Members highlighted that there is potential for further integration with public health, the NHS and the local authority in order to ensure that these services can meet funding gap requirements; and there is a need for integrated health and care plans that allow progressive relationships to be built.
   • There was also a discussion about the importance of proactively ensuring that support for younger adults with complex needs receives the appropriate funding contributions from health partners alongside the Council.
   • Members emphasised the importance of proactively engaging with GPs in order for the Council to secure the benefits if integration and Integrated Care Communities and questioned if there was an issue about the balance of funding the Council is paying for jointly funded placements versus the contribution health is making.
   • Members were keen to hear more about Integrated Care Communities and felt the Council should proactively participate at a local level in the development of the ICC boundaries.
   • Members suggested the Council should review taking back equipment that has been given out and is no longer used if it would make a saving.
   • Concerns were raised by Members about the cost of agency staff for social care and the lack of consistency for individuals this can give rise to.
   • Members also discussed the level of funding for Health and Wellbeing Co-ordinators needed to ensure the delivery of agreed savings.

20. **Response**: These comments are noted and will be considered alongside other consultation feedback. Cabinet will also consider how some of the issues can be picked up as part of the ongoing work on health and integration.

**Options Considered and Risks Identified**

21. As the budget consultation continues until 20th January, Cabinet are yet to receive and consider all the feedback they are seeking through this process. Therefore Cabinet is not in a position to provide a final response on how they intend to deal with the issues raised by Scrutiny at this time.

22. Cabinet can agree the responses as set out in the report; or they may wish to provide an alternative response to Scrutiny on the feedback they have provided.
Risks

23. There are no risks identified for the Cabinet in receiving and considering the feedback from Scrutiny.

Reasons for the recommendation / Key benefits

24. Members of Scrutiny are key stakeholders in the budget consultation process and are in a position where they can provide insight and understanding into the potential impact of budget proposals. Therefore consideration of Scrutiny’s feedback is a valuable part of the process of developing a budget.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

25. Cabinet are required to propose a balanced budget for 2017/18 and MTFP to Council for approval. Consultation and public engagement are important parts of this process with feedback received being used to inform the draft budget and MTFP.

26. Should any saving propositions be rejected, or reduced, additional savings will be required to be identified as Council must set a balanced budget for 2017/18.

27. With regards to the recommendation in the report, there are no resources or value for money implications to be considered at this time.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be Considered?

28. This is an appropriate response for Cabinet to make at this time as the consultation is ongoing. Cabinet should take the response of Scrutiny into account alongside other relevant information when formulating its budget proposals.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

29. Agreeing to the recommendation supports the Strategic Planning process which focuses on supporting the Council achieve all its priorities.

What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

30. In considering this report there are no direct impacts relating to equality and diversity issues. Consideration will be given to health inequalities and equality and diversity issues as part of the broader strategic planning process.

Appendices and Background Documents
No appendices

Key Facts

Electoral Division(s): All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Decision</th>
<th>Key Decision Included in Forward Plan</th>
<th>Exempt from call-in</th>
<th>Exemption agreed by scrutiny chair</th>
<th>Considered by scrutiny, if so detail below</th>
<th>Environmental or sustainability assessment undertaken?</th>
<th>Equality impact assessment undertaken?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by Cabinet Member/s on (please state date) 25.11.16

Previous relevant Council or Executive decisions

- None

Consideration by Overview & Scrutiny

- SMB

Background Papers

- None

Report Author:

Julie Crellin, Assistant Director Finance
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Title of Report: Resettlement of Syrian Refugees in Cumbria and support for Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children

Report by: Dawn Roberts – Corporate Director Resources and Transformation

Cabinet Member: Councillor Stewart Young – Leader of the Council
               Councillor Anne Burns – Cabinet Member for Children’s Services

What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. The report seeks agreement for the County Council to act as lead authority for the provision of resettlement support in Cumbria for refugees. This is part of a countywide, multi-agency approach in response to the Government’s Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme.

2. It also seeks agreement for the County Council to sign the North West regional agreement to offer support to Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) in response to the Government’s National Transfer Scheme that has been established to help disperse children seeking asylum in areas such as Kent and unaccompanied asylum seeking children leaving Calais or other European Countries.

3. Both of these schemes have been established and are being led by the Government. Partners across Cumbria are collectively responding to the request made by the Home Office to provide resettlement support, with the County Council a part of that wider multi-agency response.

4. A refugee is defined as a person who has been forced to leave their country in order to escape war, persecution or natural disaster. They are defined and protected in international law, and must not be expelled or returned to situations where their life and freedom are at risk. The Syrian Resettlement Programme this report refers to will provide support for refugees.

5. An asylum seeker is someone who has asked the Government for refugee status and is waiting to hear the outcome of their application. Children coming to, or already in the UK under the Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children Programme that this report refers to will not have refugee status and will be asylum seekers.
Recommendation of the Corporate Director

6. **Recommendation 1**: Cabinet agrees that the County Council will act as the lead authority for the provision of resettlement support in Cumbria for refugees under the national Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme; and in order to avoid unnecessary delay, delegates authority to the Corporate Director Resources and Transformation, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, to take all necessary action to progress the arrangements, including agreeing a Memorandum of Understanding with delivery partners and associated funding agreements.

7. **Recommendation 2**: Cabinet agrees that the County Council sign the North West regional agreement to provide support to the National Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) Transfer Scheme.

Background to the Proposals – Syrian Refugees

8. Members of Cabinet will recall that prior to the flooding that took place in December 2015, planning with partners had started, to take refugees in response to a request for support from the Home Office. However work paused as a result of the flooding and the ability to offer support has been kept under review by the Cumbria Leadership Board (CLB).

9. Following an in principle agreement on 16th September by Cumbria Leadership Board (Chaired by the Leader of Carlisle City Council and with membership from a range of public sector bodies and the third sector), to provide resettlement support to Syrian refugees over the next three financial years, further work has taken place across partners to establish the level of resettlement support that could feasibly be provided across a wide range of partners.

10. Partners across Cumbria will make a collective offer to Government to resettle 285 refugees over three years between 2017-2020.

11. As part of the discussions with partners about the work needed to plan for and provide resettlement support, the need for strategic co-ordination and financial management of the work was identified, and it was felt the County Council was the best placed partner to undertake this lead role. Having a lead partner has been actively encouraged by the Regional Strategic Migration Partnership.

12. It is therefore recommended in this report that the County Council act as the lead authority for the resettlement programme which will entail managing the funding that will be provided by the Government for each refugee; ensuring it is used to secure the range of support specified by the Home Office. It will also require the Council to co-ordinate engagement with the Regional Strategic Migration Partnership and bring together a countywide multi agency Steering Group to oversee the work.
13. The role of lead authority will not mean the County Council takes sole responsibility for the resettlement of refugees; rather the Council will play a strategic co-ordination role as part of a much broader multi-agency approach.

14. The partnership Steering Group has already been established and has already played a critical role in the work to develop a proposal for the Cumbria Offer which all partners have or are in the process of considering.

15. The Group comprises senior representatives from all District Councils, Health (Clinical Commissioning Group and providers), the Police, the Third Sector, AWAZ, the Department of Work and Pensions as well as the County Council; and will support the partnership approach that will be needed to take this work forward.

16. In terms of delivering support to refugees; the proposal is to develop locality based models of support with the District Council, housing providers, third and faith sector and health all playing a role as well as the County Council.

17. Should Cabinet agree the Council will act as lead authority; the intention will be to enter into appropriate arrangements with partner agencies and recipients of funding to ensure delivery of the resettlement support that will be required as set out in the Home office Statement of Requirements. Appendix 1 to the report is the Home Office Funding Instruction which the Council will be expected to comply with. The Home Office Statement of Requirements is set out in Appendix 2.

18. Cabinet is asked to agree that the County Council will act as the lead authority for the provision of resettlement support in Cumbria for refugees under the national Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme; and in order to avoid unnecessary delay, delegates authority to the Corporate Director Resources and Transformation, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, to take all necessary action to progress the arrangements, including agreeing a Memorandum of Understanding with delivery partners and associated funding agreements.

**Background to the Proposals – Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children**

19. In relation to unaccompanied children there are two groups of children local authorities are being asked by the Government to support.

20. The first of these are children already in the UK in entry local authority areas such as Kent. These children are seeking asylum, are from a range of countries and have often entered the country in a spontaneous and unplanned way. They do not have refugee status.

21. The Government introduced a National Transfer Scheme in July 2016 to facilitate the dispersal of these children across the UK, because of the pressures being experienced in authorities such as Kent.
Local Authorities across the country have been asked by the Government to respond to this dispersal scheme - which is in addition to the provision of support for any children that could arrive unaccompanied into Cumbria out with the planned programme.

The second group of children local authorities are being asked by Government to support are unaccompanied children from the camps in a number of European countries. These children are being supported via what is referred to as the “Dubs Amendment” route and are also seeking asylum. Where there are family members in the UK, the children under this scheme will be reunited with family members if this is appropriate; but in other cases the children will enter the care of a local authority as per the National Transfer Scheme.

A number of letters have been sent to local authorities urging them to provide support to children under both these schemes. The most recent came on 10th November from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, the Home Secretary and the Minister of State for Vulnerable children and families, asking the Council to offer more places; and announcing a new Controlling Migration Fund which the Council can bid into to seek funding to support activity such as the training of social workers and foster carers or the provision of specialist counselling.

The response to the request for support from the Home Office for the dispersal scheme was considered through the North West RSMP and North West Association of Directors of Children Services (NWADCS) in September; and more recently consideration has been given to how children under the Dubs Amendment scheme can be supported.

There is in principle agreement between the NWADCS and RSMP that a collective regional offer should be made to the Home Office to receive 100 children by the end of the financial year; which equates to the 23 local authorities with responsibility for Children’s Services in the region each agreeing to take up to 4 Unaccompanied Children from either the dispersal scheme or under the Dubs Amendment.

Cabinet is asked to agree the Council sign the North West Regional Agreement which is provided as Appendix 3 to the report. This document sets out an in principle agreement to provide support to the programme of support being co-ordinated by the RSMP in response to the Home Office requests for support for unaccompanied children through the National Transfer Scheme and support for children under the Dubs Amendment.

The request from the RSMP is to provide support for 4 children before the 31st March 2017. This is not an annual commitment. The need for the region to offer further support through these schemes will therefore be reviewed by the region after March 2017. Should asylum seeking children arrive spontaneously in Cumbria, out with these schemes, they would be the Council’s responsibility as
Children Looked After; and be in addition to the 4 children that could be taken under the Government programme.

29. It should be noted the numbers of children the Council is being asked to take under these schemes are driven by the RSMP and their discussion with the Home Office about the level of support needed.

30. The Home Office Funding Instruction for this scheme is provided as Appendix 4.

Options Considered and Risks Identified

31. There are two options for Cabinet to consider for each recommendation:

**Recommendation 1: Option (a)** - To agree that the County Council will act as the lead authority for the provision of resettlement support in Cumbria for refugees under the national Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme; and in order to avoid unnecessary delay, delegates authority to the Corporate Director Resources and Transformation, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, to take all necessary action to progress the arrangements, including agreeing a Memorandum of Understanding with delivery partners and associated funding agreements.

**Recommendation 1: Option (b)** – To agree the County Council will not act as lead authority for the provision of resettlement support for Syrian Refugees.

This option would mean another organisation in Cumbria would need to take on this particular role to manage the funding from the Home office and provide strategic co-ordination of the multi-agency approach to the resettlement of Syrian refugees.

**Recommendation 2: Option (a)** – To agree the County Council sign the North West regional agreement to provide support to the National Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) Transfer Scheme.

**Recommendation 2: Option (b)** – To agree the County Council will not sign the North West regional agreement to provide support to the National Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) Transfer Scheme.

This option would mean the Council would not voluntarily take part in the provision of support to UASCs and would therefore not receive and support children from Calais or other parts of the country under this national scheme. The Home Office could chose to direct the Council to take part in the provision of support under this scheme if the Council did not sign up voluntarily.
Risks

32. There are no significant risks identified with the County Council acting as lead local authority for the provision of resettlement support for refugees under the Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme or Vulnerable Child Refugee Scheme.

33. The County Council will be expected to manage and disperse appropriately the funding for this programme, in line with the scheduled intake of refugees, however the Council has substantial experience of managing this type of arrangement.

34. The County Council and partners will need to meet the Government expectations in provision of support for Syrian refugees; however funding from the Home Office will be provided so that support can be procured or commissioned if required.

35. The recommendation in the report is for the Council to voluntarily play a role in the provision of resettlement support; however it should be noted Government is able to direct Councils to take refugees should they feel this is necessary.

36. With regards to the County Council’s signatory to the North West Agreement to provide support to Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children this does pose some risks to the Council given the challenges already experienced in Cumbria.

37. Cumbria already has a high number of children that are looked after; and whilst work has been ongoing for some time across the council to reduce this number, it remains a consideration. By taking UASCs the number of children looked after by the Council will increase; and there is potential for Cumbria to receive additional UASCs in an unplanned way, out with this transfer scheme, should children enter the county spontaneously.

38. Additionally there are challenges of recruiting foster carers and finding suitable placements within the county for children looked after; and pressures are already felt by some services such as CAMHs which are likely to be needed for children coming into the care of the Council under this programme.

39. The recommendation in the report is for the Council to voluntarily offer support to the UASC programme; however it should be noted that Government is able to direct Councils to take children under these scheme.

40. Despite the risks noted given the low numbers of Children the Council is agreeing to take; it is felt that adequate measures can be put in place to mitigate these risks in order to provide much needed support for some of the most vulnerable children now living in the country.
Reasons for the recommendation / Key benefits

41. Agreeing to act as lead authority for the provision of resettlement support for refugees under the Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme:
   
   - Enables the Council with other partners to respond in a planned and locally managed way to the Government’s request for support, which takes into account local circumstances and existing calls on service capacity.
   - Supports the co-ordination of a multi-agency approach to the provision of support.

42. Agreeing to sign the North West regional agreement to provide support to the National Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) Transfer Scheme.
   
   - Enables the Council to voluntarily play a role, as part of a regional response, to the request for support from the Government.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

43. Cabinet is asked to agree to the County Council acting as lead authority for the provision of resettlement support for refugees under the Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme. The County Council will be expected to manage and disperse appropriately the funding for this programme, in line with the scheduled intake of refugees. The County Council has substantial experience of managing this type of arrangement. Discussions with other local authorities have confirmed that in their experience the funding provided is sufficient to cover the costs. Based on the experience of other local authorities and our experience of acting as lead authority, there does not appear to be any significant risks with the County Council acting as lead local authority for the provision of resettlement support for refugees under the Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme.

44. Cabinet is also asked to agree to the County Council signing the North West regional agreement to provide support to the National Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) Transfer Scheme leading to an additional four children entering the care of the Authority. With regards to the UASC scheme the resource implications of accepting four children vary depending upon the age of the children, the needs of the children and the circumstances surrounding their asylum status. An unaccompanied asylum seekers grant would be provided to the County Council for each child depending on the age of the child.

45. According to research carried out for the Association of Directors of Children’s Services for every 100 children placed there is a net pressure created of £3.4million. Based on this research the estimated full year cost pressure for 4 children would be between £0.104million and £0.167million dependent on the age of the children.

46. There may be implications for individual school budgets. Where pupils move into school in the middle of the financial year, and have not been recorded on the school census, schools will not have received the basic per pupil entitlement (AWPU) funding for these pupils. If the pupils have additional needs (for example
an Education Health Care Plan (EHCP)), there may be further budget pressures for schools as each school is currently required to fund the first £6,000 of additional support a pupil with an EHCP requires.

47. Other cost implications are the costs associated with interpreters and other hidden costs of the burden on infrastructure.

48. The Home Office has stated to date it will not accept claims for actual costs but only the fixed rates stipulated in the guidelines which may present Cumbria with an additional budget pressure depending on the age and needs of the children.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be considered?

49. Recommendation 1 – Re-settlement support Syrian Refugees

- The authorisation for the Council to act as lead authority for the provision of the resettlement support in Cumbria for refugees under the national Syrian Refugee Resettlement Programme is a proper decision for Cabinet. Cabinet may under paragraph 2.2 part 3A of the constitution delegate authority to the Corporate Director, Resources and Transformation, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, to take all necessary action to progress the arrangements, including agreeing a Memorandum of Understanding with delivery partners and associated funding agreements.

50. Recommendation 2 – Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) Transfer Scheme

- The decision to sign the North West Regional Agreement to support the scheme is a proper decision for Cabinet.
- The young people the Council accommodates under the scheme will require access to specialist asylum and immigration legal advice. This will have to be commissioned externally by the Council.
- In the event the Council, as the receiving authority, deems it appropriate to carry out its own age assessment in respect of a young person it is to accommodate under the scheme and this assessment is subsequently disputed by the young person there is a risk of the Council having to defend judicial review proceedings. (EL 5.10.16)
- Under section 17(1) Children Act 1989, the Council has a duty ‘to safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need……by providing arrange and level of services appropriate to those children’s needs.’ Unaccompanied Asylum seeking children have no-one to look after them, often have little or no English and have no means of supporting themselves so are undoubtedly children in need. The Council is under a duty to conduct a s17 assessment of the child’s needs within 45 days of a child being referred for an assessment. These referrals are most likely to be made by the Home Office.
- In addition to the Council’s section 17 duties, there is a duty to accommodate unaccompanied asylum seeking children. Once a child has been accommodated by the Council for more than 24 hours the child becomes looked after by the Council.
- In the absence of a care order, the unaccompanied children do not have anyone exercising parental responsibility for them.
Schedule 12, Immigration Act 2016 removes the assistance given to care leavers who reach 18 and either do not have leave to enter or remain, are not asylum seekers or do not have a pending immigration application that is there first application for leave to enter or remain. They may be entitled to support consisting of accommodation and subsistence in certain circumstances. Section 10B Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 sets out these circumstances but support is not guaranteed and depends on the Secretary of State making the regulations.

A ‘unique unaccompanied child record’ must be completed for each child presenting to a local authority and must be submitted to the Home Office. The Home Office must be informed of transfer requests/acceptances and must be updated if a child has ceased to be looked after and why. The scheme is currently voluntary but the Secretary of State has the power under s72(3) 2016 Act to introduce a mandatory scheme.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

51. Agreeing to the recommendations aligns to the Council Plan priority:

- To support older, disabled and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives

What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

52. In making this decision there are a number of potential impacts relating to equality and diversity issues. The resettlement of refugees in the county and provision of support to Children Seeking Asylum in local communities will require careful planning, preparation of the community and ongoing support to ensure good community relations. There have been many offers of support from a wide range of community organisations and residents, and this is being coordinated through the Third Sector as part of the partnership approach.

53. Consideration will need to be given to where the most suitable locations will be for those being resettled; based on the refugees needs, availability of key services and understanding of communities. Engagement with AWAZ and the Police through the partnership will play an important role in the work to take this forward.

54. Individuals being resettled in the county are likely to need access to specialist health and support services; and this will also be an important consideration in the planning of support.

Appendices and Background Documents

Appendix 1: Home Office Funding Instruction for Syrian Resettlement Programme
Appendix 2: Home Office Statement of Requirements for Syrian Resettlement Programme
Appendix 3: North West Regional Agreement for UASCs
Appendix 4: Home Office Funding Instruction for UASC Programme
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1. SCOPE

1.1. The Syrian Resettlement Programme (the ‘Programme’) was announced by the Prime Minister on 7 September 2015.

1.2. Its primary purpose is to resettile 20,000 vulnerable Syrian persons from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region in a way that:
   1.2.1. Secures nationality security and public protection, and
   1.2.2. Has the wellbeing of the vulnerable persons and the welcoming communities at the centre of decision making, and
   1.2.3. Delivers value for money for the UK tax payer.

1.3. The Programme is run in partnership with the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (the ‘UNHCR’). It demonstrates the UK’s support for the UNHCR’s global effort to relieve the humanitarian crisis through the provision of resettlement opportunities for some of the most vulnerable Syrian people into communities within the UK, over the life of the Parliament, who:
   1.3.1. have registered with the UNHCR in Turkey, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt and other countries across the MENA region as a result of the current crisis; and
   1.3.2. the UNHCR consider meet one of their seven vulnerability criteria which are set out at Annex C.

1.4. The participating local or regional authority (the ‘Recipient’) has made commitments to support the Programme, and the Home Office (the ‘Authority’) has agreed to provide funding as further described in this document (the “Instruction”) to the Recipient to support eligible Syrians (‘Beneficiaries’) for the first 12-months after their arrival in the UK, through the provision of initial reception arrangements, and access to accommodation, casework support, education (incl. language skills), health care, and social care (collectively the ‘Programme’).

1.5. This Instruction sets out the terms under which the Authority will make funding available to the Recipient, in respect of expenditure incurred supporting eligible Beneficiaries brought to the UK under the Programme for the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017. The document should be read in conjunction with the:
   1.5.1. relevant claim form (at Annex A), and
   1.5.2. the outcomes to be achieved as described in the Statement of Outcomes (shown at Annex B).

1.6. Unless specifically stated otherwise, any funding will be in respect of a Recipient’s costs in fulfilment of its statutory duties and anything otherwise agreed with the Authority.

1.7. The Authority will provide funding to cover reasonable legitimate costs incurred in supporting all eligible Beneficiaries of the scheme for the first twelve months following their arrival in the UK.

1.8. In keeping with established HM Treasury funding policies, the Authority will issue a fresh Instruction for each financial year for which funding is approved. This will occur whether or not any changes are made.
2. **DEFINITION**

2.1. A ‘Beneficiary of the Scheme’ (also referred to as a ‘Beneficiary’) is defined as any person who has been classified as such by the Authority following a referral by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and has arrived in the UK having been admitted to the Programme.

2.2. The Authority is responsible for identifying eligible Beneficiaries for relocation to the UK in liaison with the UNHCR.

3. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

3.1. The Recipient undertakes to keep confidential and not to disclose and to procure that their employees, sub-contractors and agents keep confidential and do not disclose any information which they have obtained by reason of this Instruction.

3.2. Nothing in this clause 3 applies to information which is already in the public domain or the possession of the Recipient other than by reason of breach of this clause. Further, this clause 3 shall not apply to information which is required to be disclosed pursuant to any law or pursuant to an order of any court or statutory or regulatory body.

3.3. The Recipient shall ensure that any personal information concerning any Beneficiary disclosed to them in the course of delivering this Programme is treated as confidential and should only be disclosed to a third party in accordance with the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998. In the event of any doubt arising, the matter shall be referred to the Authority whose decision on the matter shall be final. In particular, the Recipient shall:

3.3.1. have in place appropriate policies and procedures to recognise and maintain the Beneficiary’s need for confidentiality; and

3.3.2. ensure that without the consent of a Beneficiary, details of that individual Beneficiary are not released to any organisation not party to this Instruction.

3.4. The Recipient shall not use any information which they have obtained as a result of delivering the Programme (including, without limitation, any information relating to any Beneficiary) in any way which is inaccurate or misleading.

3.5. The provisions of this clause 3 shall survive the termination of this Instruction, however that occurs.

3.6. In the event of any unauthorised disclosure, the Authority must be informed without delay. The Authority will decide on what, if any, remedial action should take place and the Recipient shall be bound by and will abide by the decision of the Authority.

3.7. Where a Recipient is responsible for an unauthorised disclosure in breach of this Instruction, that Recipient will be liable for any consequences of such unauthorised disclosure, including (but not confined to) any civil or criminal liability.

3.8. All approaches made by any person or organisation not party to this Instruction in respect of funding provided to deliver the Programme must be referred to the Authority’s press office for their advice and/ or action.
4. REIMBURSEMENT

4.1. Payment for each eligible Beneficiary supported by the Recipient will be at this standard per capita rate set by the Authority.

| UNIT COSTS FOR SYRIA VPR SCHEME* - LOCAL AUTHORITIES |
|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|----------|----------|
|                                 | Adult     | Other  | Children| Children | Children |
|                                 | Benefit   | Adults | 5-18   | 3-4      | U-3      |
| Local Authority Costs           | Benefit   | Adults | 5-18   | 3-4      | U-3      |
| Education                      | £         | £      | £      | £        | £        |
|                                 | 8,520     | 8,520  | 8,520  | 8,520    | 8,520    |
| Education                      | £         | £      | £      | £        | £        |
|                                 | 0         | 0      | 4,500  | 2,250    | 0        |
| **TOTALS**                     | 8,520     | 8,520  | 13,020 | 10,770   | 8,520    |

* These payments may, from time to time, be adjusted by the Authority following consultation with the Recipients.

4.2. The Recipient shall be responsible for ensuring that the appropriate level of funding is paid to places of education who accept Beneficiaries from the relevant age groups. Payments will be made to schools, academies, free schools and Further Education colleges, as appropriate.

4.3. The Recipient may request additional funding for educational purposes in respect of supported Beneficiaries who have not attained the age of 18 years and who are in full-time education, where compelling circumstances exist. Such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis, with the final decision on payment, duration and rate (which may be adjusted from time to time) to be set by the Authority.

4.4. Further additional payments may also be made in order to cover necessary costs of social care, where compelling circumstances exist. These will be assessed and made on a case-by-case basis.

4.5. Payments will be made throughout the 12 month period based solely on the age and status of the Beneficiary at the point of arrival in the UK.

4.6. Nothing in this Instruction shall be construed as providing or permitting the total relevant benefits to exceed the statutory limit (the ‘benefit cap’) prevailing at the time of payment.

4.7. On the day of arrival in the UK of a Beneficiary, the Recipient will be eligible to claim 40% of the total projected annual per capita amount for that person. The Recipient must make a claim on the standard claim form (attached as Annex A) in order to receive payment.

4.8. Following this, the remainder will be paid in two equal instalments at the end of the, fourth, and, eighth, months following the Beneficiary’s arrival in the UK. In each case, the Recipient must make a claim on the standard claim form.

4.9. The Authority must be notified at the earliest opportunity if a Recipient expects its funding requirement to be lower than expected, in order to avoid overpayments.

4.10. In the event that an overpayment is made, the Authority must be notified as soon as reasonably practicable. In such instances, the Authority may require immediate reimbursement of the overpayment or may adjust subsequent payment(s) accordingly.
4.11. Any payments made under this Instruction will also cover VAT or other duties paid by the Recipient.

5. CESSATION OF PAYMENT

5.1. The Authority’s responsibility for providing financial support under this Instruction will cease on the 12 month anniversary of a Beneficiary’s arrival into the UK under the Programme.

5.2. Payments may also cease where the Beneficiary:

5.2.1. dies;

5.2.2. leaves the relevant local authority area to live in another local authority area

5.2.3. indicates that they no longer wish to receive support under the Programme;

5.2.4. indicates that they are leaving the UK permanently;

5.2.5. applies for or becomes subject to some other immigration status within the UK;

5.2.6. otherwise leaves or becomes ineligible for the Programme.

5.3. In the event of any such occurrence under paragraph 5.2, the Recipient must notify the Authority without delay.

5.4. For the purposes of clause 5.1, the 12 month period will commence on the date of the Beneficiary’s arrival in the UK (whether under the Programme or otherwise) and will continue unbroken until the end of the 12 month period.

5.5. The Authority reserves the right to cease making payments if it has reasonable grounds to believe that the Beneficiary has sought to deceive the Authority, the relevant Recipient or a partner agency in relation to their circumstances, including their inclusion on the Programme or their activities whilst so involved.

6. DATA RECONCILIATION AND PAYMENTS

6.1. The Recipient shall complete applications for payment in the form set out in Annex A, which includes details of each Beneficiary and the financial support applied for.

6.2. Specific instructions for the completion of Annex A are included in the SRP LA funding Excel workbook, which will be supplied by the Authority. The Annex A should only be submitted to the SRP LA File via the Authority’s secure data transfer portal, “MoveIT DMZ”, to ensure compliance with 1998 Data Protection Legislation.

6.3. The Annex A submitted for payment must be received by the Authority no later than three months after the close of the period to which the application relates; late returns may result in payment being delayed. The Recipient will have the opportunity to make representations if they believe that the level of funding received is less than that to which they are entitled under the terms of this Instruction. Any discrepancies regarding the amounts paid must be notified by the relevant Recipient to the SRP LA Funding team within a month of the Annex A response being sent, following reconciliation against the Authority’s records. Retrospective payments for individuals not promptly included on Annex A may be agreed only where exceptional circumstances are shown.
6.4. Payments will be made by BACS using account details that the Recipient must supply to the Authority on headed notepaper. This is to include the bank address, account number and sort code, and be signed by the Finance Director (or equivalent). It is then to be forwarded to the Authority as a PDF file. In the event of a change in bank details, the relevant Recipient should immediately notify the Authority of the new information.

6.5. Payments will be made within thirty (30) days of receipt of a correctly-completed claim.

6.6. Payments will be referenced ‘SRP (LA) 15/16 POA Mth’ followed by the month numbers in the financial year; for example, the payment made for the period 1 January – 29 February will be referenced as ‘SRP (LA) 15/16 POA Mths 10-11’. The relevant Recipient should advise the cashiers’ department accordingly.

6.7. At the end of the period for which support is paid, final checks will be carried out to ensure that the payments already made accurately reflect the amounts to which the Recipient is entitled. Payments made as a result of applications are to be regarded as payments on account, which will be finalised when the final claim is confirmed by the Authority. The Recipient should note that the format of the claim spreadsheets must not be altered.

6.8. The Recipient must record expenditure in their accounting records under generally-accepted accounting standards in a way that the relevant costs can be simply extracted if required. Throughout the year, the SRP LA Funding team will work with the Recipient to ensure the accuracy of claims, thereby reducing the need for audits at year-end.

7. MONITORING & EVALUATION

7.1. Visits may be made from time to time by the Authority or its appointed representatives, including the National Audit Office. Whilst there is no requirement for submission of detailed costings, the Recipient must be able to provide the costs for individual cases and will, if required, be expected to justify, explain and evidence costs.

7.2. In all cases, to assist with monitoring and evaluation of the Programme, the Recipient shall supply the Authority with all such financial information as is reasonably requested from time-to-time, on an open book basis.

7.3. The Authority may require the Recipient to provide information and documentation regarding Beneficiaries for monitoring and evaluation purposes. This may include, amongst other things, requiring the Recipient to link Beneficiaries to unique identifier(s) in order to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of outcomes.

7.4. The Authority may also require the Recipient to clarify information or documentation that it has provided for these purposes.

8. BREACH OF FUNDING CONDITIONS

8.1. Where a Recipient fails to comply with any of the conditions set out in this Instruction, or if any of the events mentioned in clause 8.2 occur, then the Authority may reduce, suspend, or withhold payments, or require all or any part of the relevant payments to be repaid by the relevant Recipient. In such circumstances, the relevant Recipient must repay any amount required to be repaid under this clause 8.1 within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the demand for repayment.
8.2. The events referred to in clause 8.1 are as follows:

- The Recipient purports to transfer or assign any rights, interests or obligations arising under this Agreement without the agreement in advance of the Authority; or
- Any information provided in the application for funding (or in a claim for payment) or in any subsequent supporting correspondence is found to be incorrect or incomplete to an extent which the Authority considers to be material; or
- The Recipient takes inadequate measures to investigate and resolve any reported irregularity.

9. CONTACT DETAILS

9.1. For queries relating to this Instruction or the submission of payment applications, please email your SRP LA Funding team contact.

10. ACTIVITIES – GENERAL

10.1. The Recipient must ensure that all reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that they and anyone acting on their behalf shall possess all the necessary qualifications, licences, permits, skills and experiences to discharge their responsibilities effectively, safely and in conformance with all relevant law for the time being in force (so far as binding on the Recipient).

10.2. When procuring works, goods or services the Recipient must ensure that it complies with its statutory obligations, for example the regulations as transposed into national Law from the EU Directives on Public Procurement (2014) i.e. in England & Wales the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 [PCR2015]. In any event, the Recipient shall demonstrate value for money and shall act in a fair, open and non-discriminatory manner in all purchases of goods and services to support the delivery of the Programme.

10.3. Where the Recipient enters into a contract (or other form of agreement) with any third party for the provision of any part of the Programme, the Recipient shall ensure that a term is included in the contract or agreement requiring the Recipient to pay all sums due within a specified period: this shall be as defined by the terms of that contract or agreement, but shall not exceed 30 (thirty) days from the date of receipt of a validated invoice.

10.4. Monies provided must not be used for any purpose other than delivery of Programme outcomes detailed in the Statement of Outcomes, nor is it permissible to vire any such funds elsewhere without the express consent of the Authority.

10.5. No aspect of the activity funded by the Authority may be party-political in intention, use or presentation.

10.6. The funding may not be used to support or promote religious activity. This will not include inter-faith activity.
10.7. No aspect of the activity funded by the Authority may be intended to influence or attempt to influence Parliament, Government or political parties, attempt to influence the awarding of contracts and grants or to attempt to influence legislation or regulatory action.

11. INDEMNITY

11.1. The Authority accepts no liability to the Recipient or to any third party for any costs, claims, damage or losses, however they are incurred, except to the extent that they are caused by the Authority’s negligence or misconduct.

12. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

12.1. In the event of any dispute between the Parties, it will be resolved by the Parties.
ANNEX A – EXPENDITURE CLAIM PRO-FORMA

Excel spreadsheet to be provided separately.
Annex B – Statement of Outcomes

1. Section 1 – Delivery Outcomes

1.1 The SRP is made up of two elements:

1.1.1 Pre arrival – Provision of medical and travel services enabling the migration of accepted Beneficiaries to the UK; and

1.1.2 Post arrival – Housing provision, initial reception arrangements, casework and orientation support including English language provision.

1.2 This Statement of Outcomes describes the post arrival outcomes to be achieved.

2. Post Arrival Outcomes

Provision of accommodation:

2.1 The Recipient will arrange accommodation for the arriving Beneficiaries which meets local authority standards and which will be available on their arrival and is affordable and sustainable.

2.2 The Recipient will ensure that the accommodation is furnished appropriately. The furniture package should not include luxury items. This means that funding received through this Instruction should be used for food storage, cooking and washing facilities but should not include the provision of other white goods or brown goods, i.e. TV’s, DVD players or any other electrical entertainment appliances. This shall not preclude the Recipient from providing Beneficiaries with additional luxury, white or brown goods through other sources of funding.

2.2.1 The Recipient will ensure that the Beneficiaries are registered with utility companies and ensure that arrangements for payments are put in place (no pre pay/card accounts).

2.2.2 The Recipient will provide briefings on the accommodation and health and safety issues for all new arrivals including the provision of an emergency contact point.

Initial Reception Arrangements:

2.3 The Recipient will meet and greet arriving Beneficiaries from the relevant airport and escort them to their properties, briefing them on how to use the amenities.

2.4 The Recipient will ensure that Beneficiaries are provided with a welcome pack of groceries on their arrival – the content of this pack should take into account the culture and nationality of the Beneficiary(ies).

2.5 The Recipient will provide an initial cash allowance for each Beneficiary of £200 – this is to ensure they have sufficient funds to live on while their claim for benefits is being processed.
Casework Support:

2.6 The Recipient should ensure that Beneficiaries are provided with a dedicated source of advice and support to assist with registering for mainstream benefits and services, and signposting to other advice and information giving agencies – this support includes:

2.6.1 Assisting with registration for and collection of Biometric Residence Permits following arrival

2.6.2 Registering with local schools, English language and literacy classes

2.6.3 Attending local Job Centre Plus appointments for benefit assessments

2.6.4 Registering with a local GP

2.6.5 Advice around and referral to appropriate mental health services and to specialist services for victims of torture as appropriate

2.6.6 Providing assistance with access to employment.

2.7 The Recipient shall develop an overarching (or framework) support plan and bespoke support plans for each family or individual for the first 12 month period of their support to facilitate their orientation into their new home/area.

2.8 The Recipient shall undertake an assessment with each Beneficiary of their English language capability to determine appropriate support arrangements through provision of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) or equivalent. The purpose of the language tuition is to ensure that each Beneficiary is able to carry out basic transactions within the communities in which they have been placed. Beneficiaries should be able to access such classes within one month of their arrival and they should be made available until such time as suitable mainstream provision becomes available or until 12 months after arrival (whichever is sooner).

2.9 Any language support provision should be delivered by an accredited provider.

2.10 Throughout the period of resettlement support the Recipient will ensure interpreting services are available.

2.11 The above outcomes will be provided through a combination of office based appointments, drop in sessions, outreach surgeries and home visits.

2.12 The Recipient shall collate such casework information as is agreed to enable the Authority to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Programme’s delivery.

Requirements for Beneficiaries with special needs/assessed community care needs:

2.13 Where Beneficiaries are identified as potentially having special needs/community care needs the Authority will ensure, as far as possible that these needs are clearly identified and communicated to the Recipient six (6) weeks prior to the arrival of the Beneficiaries.

2.14 Where special needs/community care needs are identified only after arrival in the UK, the Recipient will use its best endeavours to ensure that care is provided by the appropriate mainstream services as quickly as possible.

2.15 Where sensitive issues (including safeguarding issues or incidents of domestic abuse, violence or criminality) are identified pre-arrival by the Authority, the Authority will notify the Recipient immediately, and not longer than 24 hours, after its receipt of the information.
2.16 Where sensitive issues such as the above are identified post-arrival by the Recipient, the Recipient shall notify the Authority within 24 hours, setting out what procedures are to be put in place to mitigate the situation.
3 General Requirements

Hours of operation:

3.1 The Recipient shall note that the Authority’s offices perform normal business during the hours of 09.00 to 17.00 on Working Days.

3.2 The Programme as defined in this Statement of Outcomes shall be provided at a minimum on each Working Day. The Authority recognises that in the interests of efficiency the exact availability and timings of the various service elements will vary. It is envisaged that some Out of Hours provision will be required from the Recipient.

3.3 All premises used to deliver the Programme elements should meet all regulatory requirements and be suitable for the purpose.

3.4 The Recipient and/or its Delivery Partners shall develop, maintain and implement the following procedures:

3.4.1 A procedure for Beneficiaries to complain about the support and assistance provided by the Recipient.

3.4.2 A procedure for managing and reporting critical incidents. The Authority must be advised of such incidents as soon as reasonably possible, but in any event by the end of the next Working Day.

3.5 A critical incident is defined as any incident where the outcome or consequence of that incident is likely to result in:

3.5.1 Serious harm to any individual;

3.5.2 Significant community impact; or

3.5.3 Significant impact on public confidence in the Authority, including the provision of the Programme.

Personnel standards:

3.6 The Recipient shall ensure that the recruitment, selection and training of its Staff, including persons employed by or as agents or sub-contractors to the Recipient, are consistent with the standards required for the performance of the outcomes. The Recipient will fully equip and train staff to ensure they are able to fulfil their roles and ensure that appropriate and sufficient security provisions are made for all staff undertaking face-to-face activities. Also, the Recipient shall ensure that staffing levels are appropriate at all times for the purposes of the delivering the Programme and ensure the security and well-being of all Beneficiaries, dependant children and its staff.

3.7 The Recipient shall ensure that all applicants for employment in connection with the Requirement are obligated to declare on their application forms any previous criminal convictions subject always to the provisions of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974.

3.8 In addition, the Recipient shall ensure that all Staff (including volunteers and sub-contractors):  

3.8.1 employed or engaged have the right to work in the United Kingdom under applicable immigration law, and

3.8.2 are subject to Disclosure and Barring Service checks. The results of such checks must be known before any employee undertakes duties requiring contact. Where such checks reveal prior criminal convictions that might reasonably be regarded as relevant to the appropriateness of the individual to have unsupervised access,
particularly to children under the age of 18, or where such checks are not possible because of identification issues, the Recipient shall follow its internal policy and carry out an appropriate risk assessment before an offer of employment is made, and

3.8.3 who are likely to have unsupervised access to children under the age of 18 has been instructed in accordance with the relevant national child protection guidelines (e.g. for people working in England, DfE’s Working Together to Safeguard Children, 2015) and Local Safeguarding Children Boards’ guidance and procedures, and

3.8.4 providing immigration advice should be known to the Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner (OISC) in accordance with the regulatory scheme specified under Part 5 of the Immigration & Asylum Act 1999. The Recipient shall use all reasonable endeavours to ensure that Staff do not provide immigration advice or immigration services unless they are “qualified” or “exempt” as determined and certified by OISC, and shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that it and anyone acting on its behalf shall not bring the Authority or the programme into disrepute, for instance by reason of prejudicing the Purpose and/or being contrary to the interests of the Authority.

3.9 The Recipient shall, on request, provide the Authority with details of all staff (and volunteers and sub-contractor agents) delivering the Programme.

3.10 The Recipient shall, on request, provide the Authority with CVs and/or job descriptions for all members of staff selected to work on the project.

3.11 The Recipient shall use all reasonable endeavours to comply with the requirements of the Computer Misuse Act 1990.


**Information sharing:**

3.13 The Authority expects the Recipient to share relevant information on the delivery of the Programme and on Beneficiaries by signing a Sharing of Information Protocol with relevant deliverers of the Programme.

3.14 Beneficiaries will be expected to sign a consent form to confirm their willingness to share personal data with executive bodies and relevant deliverers of the programme. The Recipient will retain these forms and will allow inspection by the Authority as requested.

**Programme Monitoring and Evaluation**

3.15 The Recipient should manage and administer the quality and level of delivery and its own performance and that of its Delivery Partners relating to delivery of all the outcomes identified in this Annex B.

3.16 The Recipient shall provide information as set out in a template reporting form which will be provided by the Authority.
Annex C – UNHCR vulnerability criteria

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has seven vulnerability criteria, which are:

- women and girls at risk;
- survivors of violence and/or torture;
- refugees with legal and/or physical protection needs;
- refugees with medical needs or disabilities;
- children and adolescents at risk;
- persons at risk due to their sexual orientation or gender identity; and
- refugees with family links in resettlement countries
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1. **Section 1 – Delivery Outcomes**

1.1 The SRP is made up of two elements:

   1.1.1 **Pre arrival** – Provision of medical and travel services enabling the migration of accepted SVPs to the UK; and

   1.1.2 **Post arrival** – Housing provision, initial reception arrangements, casework and orientation support including English language provision.

1.2 This Statement of Requirements describes the **post arrival outcomes** to be achieved.

2. **Post Arrival Outcomes**

   Provision of accommodation:

   2.1 The Recipient will arrange accommodation for the arriving SVPs which meets local authority standards and which will be available on their arrival and is affordable and sustainable.

   2.2 The Recipient will ensure that the accommodation is furnished appropriately. The furniture package should not include luxury items. This means that food storage, cooking and washing facilities can be provided but the facilities should not include the provision of other white goods or brown goods, i.e. TV’s, DVD players or any other electrical entertainment appliances.

   2.2.1 The Recipient will ensure that the SVPs are registered with utility companies and ensure that arrangements for payments are put in place (no pre pay/card accounts).

   2.2.2 The Recipient will provide briefings on the accommodation and health and safety issues for all new arrivals including the provision of an emergency contact point.

   2.3 The Recipient will meet and greet arriving SVPs from the relevant airport and escort them to their properties, briefing them on how to use the amenities.

   Casework support service:

   2.4 The Recipient will ensure that SVPs are provided with a welcome pack of groceries on their arrival.

   2.5 The Recipient will provide an initial cash allowance for each SVP of £200 – this is to ensure they have sufficient funds to live on while their claim for benefits is being processed.

   2.6 The Recipient will provide advice and assistance with registering for mainstream benefits and services and signposting to other advice and information giving agencies – this support includes:

   2.6.1 Assisting with registration for and collection of Biometric Residence Permits following arrival

   2.6.2 Registering with local schools, English language and literacy classes

   2.6.3 Attending local Job Centre Plus appointments for benefit assessments

   2.6.4 Registering with a local GP

   2.6.5 Advice around and referral to appropriate mental health services and to specialist services for victims of torture as appropriate

   2.6.6 Providing assistance with access to employment.
2.7 The Recipient shall put in place a support plan for each family or individual for the 12 month period of their support to facilitate their orientation into their new home/area.

2.8 The Recipient shall undertake an assessment with each SVP of their English language capability to determine appropriate support arrangements through provision of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) or equivalent. The purpose of the language tuition is to ensure that each SVP is able to carry out basic transactions within the communities in which they have been placed.

2.9 SVPs should be able to access such classes within one month of their arrival and they should be made available until such time as suitable mainstream provision becomes available or until 12 months after arrival (whichever is sooner).

2.10 This provision should be delivered by an accredited provider.

2.11 Throughout the period of resettlement support the Recipient will ensure interpreting services are available.

2.12 The above outcomes will be provided through a combination of office based appointments, drop in sessions, outreach surgeries and home visits.

Requirements for SVPs with special needs/assessed community care needs

2.13 Where SVPs are identified as potentially having special needs/community care needs the Authority will ensure, as far as possible that these needs are clearly identified and communicated to the Recipient 6 weeks prior to the arrival of the SVPs.

2.14 Where special needs/community care needs are identified only after arrival in the UK, the Recipient will use its best endeavours to ensure that care is provided by the appropriate mainstream services as quickly as possible.

3 General Requirements

Hours of operation:

3.1 The Recipient shall note that the Authority’s offices perform normal business during the hours of 09.00 to 17.00 on Working Days.

3.2 The Programme as defined in this Statement of Requirements shall be provided at a minimum on each Working Day. The Authority recognises that in the interests of efficiency the exact availability and timings of the various service elements will vary. It is envisaged that some Out of Hours provision will be required from the Recipient.

3.3 All premises used to deliver the Programme elements should meet all regulatory requirements and be suitable for the purpose.

3.4 The Recipient and/or its Delivery Partners shall develop, maintain and implement the following procedures:

3.4.1 A procedure for SVPs to complain about the support and assistance provided by the Recipient.

3.4.2 A procedure for managing and reporting critical incidents. The Authority must be advised of such incidents as soon as reasonably possible, but in any event by the end of the next Working Day.

Personnel standards:
3.5 The Recipient shall ensure that the recruitment, selection and training of its Staff, including persons employed by or as agents or sub-contractors to the Recipient, are consistent with the standards required for the performance of the outcomes. The Recipient will fully equip and train staff to ensure they are able to fulfil their roles and ensure that appropriate and sufficient security provisions are made for all staff undertaking face-to-face activities. Also, the Recipient shall ensure that staffing levels are appropriate at all times for the purposes of the delivering the Programme and ensure the security and well-being of all SVPs, dependant children and its staff.

3.6 The Recipient shall ensure that all applicants for employment in connection with the Requirement are obligated to declare on their application forms any previous criminal convictions subject always to the provisions of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974.

3.7 In addition, the Recipient shall ensure that all Staff (including volunteers and sub-contractors):

3.7.1 employed or engaged have the right to work in the United Kingdom under applicable immigration law, and

3.7.2 are subject to Disclosure and Barring Service checks. The results of such checks must be known before any employee undertakes duties requiring contact. Where such checks reveal prior criminal convictions that might reasonably be regarded as relevant to the appropriateness of the individual to have unsupervised access, particularly to children under the age of 18, or where such checks are not possible because of identification issues, the Recipient shall follow its internal policy and carry out an appropriate risk assessment before an offer of employment is made, and

3.7.3 who are likely to have unsupervised access to children under the age of 18 has been instructed in accordance with the relevant national child protection guidelines (e.g. for people working in England, DfE’s Working Together to Safeguard Children, 2015) and Local Safeguarding Children Boards’ guidance and procedures, and

3.7.4 providing immigration advice should be known to the Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner (OISC) in accordance with the regulatory scheme specified under Part 5 of the Immigration & Asylum Act 1999. The Recipient shall use all reasonable endeavours to ensure that Staff do not provide immigration advice or immigration services unless they are “qualified” or “exempt” as determined and certified by OISC.

3.8 The Recipient shall, on request, provide the Authority with details of all staff (and volunteers and sub-contractor agents) delivering the Programme.

3.9 The Recipient shall, on request, provide the Authority with CVs and/or job descriptions for all members of staff selected to work on the project.

3.10 The Recipient shall use all reasonable endeavours to comply with the requirements of the Computer Misuse Act 1990.

3.11 The Recipient shall implement the Programme in compliance with the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.

Information sharing

3.12 The Authority expects the Recipient to share relevant information on the delivery of the Programme and on SVPs by signing a Sharing of Information Protocol with relevant deliverers of the Programme.
3.13 SVPs will be expected to sign a consent form to confirm their willingness to share personal data with executive bodies and relevant deliverers of the programme. The Recipient will retain these forms and will allow inspection by the Authority as requested.
2 Breakdown of local authority funding for Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement scheme

Year 1 funding
Year 1 funding is available from the Overseas Development Aid budget to fund costs of Syrian refugees on a per person tariff basis. The year 1 tariff is £8,520 for direct local authority costs. There is also additional support for educational and medical needs. In addition, the refugee will be able to access welfare benefit payments (subject to the statutory limit) and other public services.

Year 2-5 funding
Year 2-5 funding for costs borne by a local authority are also calculated on a per person tariff. It will be paid to local authorities as an unringfenced grant to assist with costs incurred supporting refugees. It will be for the local authority to determine the best use of the funds to support the placements in their area. The type of services it will fund can include for example, integration support such as additional English language training and social care. Existing funding mechanism will be used to providing funding for schools and health services required by placements.

Funding is broken down as follows:
Year 2 tariff is £5,000
Year 3 tariff is £3,700
Year 4 tariff is £2,300
Year 5 tariff is £1,000

The extreme cases fund is worth 15% of the overall tariff costs each year. Across 2016/17 to 2019/20 we estimate that the extreme cases fund will be worth £16.5m

Payment mechanism
We will work with local authorities to agree payment mechanisms as well as details on how the extreme cases fund will be determined.
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**APPENDIX 3**

**Key Principles of a North West commitment to the Unaccompanied Minors Programme**

- We agree that regional co-ordination/strategic management of the programme will sit within the North West Regional Strategic Migration Partnership (RSMP). This will include relationship management with the Home Office, and responsibility in agreeing the appropriate placement of referrals with local authorities in order to fulfil any regional commitment. We will all commit to support that team in this role.

- We agree that all authorities will provide an appropriate single point of contact for the RSMP to liaise with in their allocation function, in order to ensure that referrals are considered and responded to swiftly and appropriately.

- Whilst acknowledging the benefits in specific cases of placing children in communities who already have people of similar backgrounds/nationalities, we agree that any commitment to this scheme must recognise:

  1. As in all our work with children and young people the focus of any move or change has to have their health and wellbeing as the central driver and our focus remains on securing the best possible outcomes for them.  
  2. Capacity, capability and existing pressures (including financial pressures) in relation to children in need and looked after children. Addressing availability of placements, physical and mental health support and available places in education.  
  3. Current pressures as a result of other migration programmes on children’s services across social care, education and health; with any voluntary pledge being cognisant of that.  
  4. Current and forecast numbers of unaccompanied minors being placed in the northwest by LA’s in other regions due to capacity issues in those regions.  
  5. A necessity for capacity/infrastructure building to commence in relation to this cohort being an existing requirement across the piece, owing to collective local authority commitments to asylum dispersal and refugee resettlement. Under that principle we agree that all authorities in the North West will contribute to the scheme (initially committing to ALL receiving 4 unaccompanied minors).

- We agree that a voluntary commitment to the scheme will be made in order to retain control over the numbers and process. This commitment will be to a finite number per authority and will based on an assessment of current and future capacity.

- We agree that upon any regional commitment being reached, the North West position will be reviewed. This will be done in the context of capacity and capability, but will also be done in the context of the wider national commitment e.g. no further commitment will be made on the initial pledge until it can be evidenced that a significant number of authorities outside the North West have made an equitable commitment to the scheme also, and that other regional leads have obtained, or are in the process of obtaining collective LA commitment.
• We agree to work together collectively to develop a regional approach to standards in working with unaccompanied minors. This will include, but not be limited to:

1. A regional approach to completing age assessments, aimed at reducing the likelihood of judicial review of decisions.

2. A regional approach in establishing a clear agreed threshold of “reasonability” of placement and support.

3. A commitment to shared learning from evidenced best practice within those authorities who hold more experience.

4. Consider joint opportunities to commission facilities that may build on and maximise current expertise, and which will deliver economies of scale.

5. A single approach to development of a marketing and communications strategy to attract interest from specific communities who may offer support and accommodation; with a focus on the development of shared accommodation and supported lodgings options.

• We agree to work with the RSMP to develop appropriate regional/sub regional high level strategic group/s and operational working group/s to effectively monitor and manage the programme and its impacts; and to collectively develop appropriate regional responses to meet any challenges that arise. The frequency and representation of these are to be agreed.

• We will continue to work together across the North West region to raise issues of concern with the Home Office, in order to ensure the best interests of young people can be effectively met and local authorities are mitigated from financial risk as much as possible. This will include seeking greater flexibility in financial support, and a formal Home Office commitment to provide swift and appropriate move on and support to those young people who are assessed not to meet the criteria for the programme.
Funding to local authorities
Financial year 2016/17

Home Office funding:

Unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC)

UK Visas and Immigration
Date of Issue: October 2016
Version: Final
1. **Scope**

This document sets out the terms under which the Home Office will make funding available to local authorities in respect to their costs of supporting Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) during the financial year 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017. The document should be read in conjunction with the UASC LA funding Excel workbook, which contains the relevant forms (Annexes A & B) and notes for their completion, and with the National UASC Transfer Protocol.

2. **Definition**

2.1 A UASC is defined as an individual who is under 18, has arrived in the UK without a responsible adult, is not being cared for by an adult who by law or custom has responsibility to do so, is separated from both parents and has applied for asylum in the United Kingdom in his/her own right. All children in local authority care and being accommodated by the local authority who satisfy these criteria may be included in an application for funding unless they fall into one or more of the exclusion categories listed below. For the purposes of this funding agreement the definition of a UASC does not include someone who was admitted to the UK on any other grounds that provides the LA with a basis on which funding may be claimed from the Home Office.

3. **Exclusions**

3.1 The following children are excluded:

(a) Children who have the nationality of an EEA State – including those who have been granted British Citizenship.

(b) Children who marry or form a civil partnership

(d) Children of a UASC.
4. Reimbursement 2016/17

4.1 The payment rate will change for new arrivals after 1st July 2016.

Subject to paragraph 4.2, payment for each eligible UASC will be at the rates set out in the table below. A “legacy” case is a UASC who entered the UK on or before 30 June 2016 and who has not been transferred to the care of another local authority from local authorities accepted by the Home Office as being significantly above the 0.07% ceiling as at 1 July 2016. The Central Admin Team should be contacted to confirm whether a transferring local authority is accepted as being significantly above the 0.07% ceiling as at 1 July:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>£ daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy UASC Under 16</td>
<td>£95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy UASC 16/17</td>
<td>£71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Rate UASC Under 16 (UK arrivals from 1 July 2016)</td>
<td>£114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Rate UASC 16/17  (UK arrivals from 1 July 2016)</td>
<td>£91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Referrals UASC Under 16 (UK arrivals up to 30 June 2016)</td>
<td>£114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Referrals UASC16/17  (UK arrivals up to 30 June 2016)</td>
<td>£91.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 If a local authority’s actual expenditure (for all eligible UASC supported) is less than a sum calculated by applying the standard rates, payments will be capped at the level of actual expenditure.

4.3 The Home Office should be notified at the earliest opportunity if the local authority expects its actual expenditure to be lower than would be allowed under the standard rates in order to avoid overpayments.

5. Cessation of payment

5.1 The Home Office will automatically cease payments under this Funding Instruction the day before the UASC turns 18.

5.2 Payment will also cease in the following circumstances:

a) UASC funding is not payable when a child is absent or in long term care (e.g. missing / hospital) for more than 28 days consecutively. When a child is absent or in long term care, the local authority must promptly inform the relevant contact(s) and reflect this on the application for payment form (Annex A). If the child returns to the local authority the Annex A should be updated. When the child is absent for a short period of time, that is for 28 days or less, the funding may be payable during the absence period.
(b) If the UASC is placed in a Young Offenders Institute, the local authority must promptly inform the relevant contact(s) and reflect this on the application for payment form (Annex A). If the child returns to the local authority the Annex A should be updated. When the child is in a YOI for a short period of time, that is for 28 days or less, the funding may be payable during the absence period.

6. Transfers and notifications

6.1 Where responsibility for a UASC is transferred between local authorities under the National UASC Transfer Protocol, funding eligibility passes from the entry local authority to the receiving local authority from the day the UASC physically transfers into the care of the receiving authority. The costs of the transfer will, unless mutually agreed between the authorities, and evidenced to the Home Office, be treated as borne by the receiving local authority.

6.2 To support fair allocation of UASC under the National UASC Transfer Protocol from 1st July 2016, the Home Office is developing a National UASC Database which will be administered by the UASC Central Administration Team. From 1st July 2016, local authorities are expected to notify the Home Office of each relevant change in their supported UASC population by sending the relevant Unique Unaccompanied Child Record proforma to the Central Administration team as set out in the Transfer Protocol. It is envisaged that the database will also enable funding applications to be reconciled more swiftly.

7. Data reconciliation and payments

7.1 Local authorities are required to complete a monthly application, by the 15th of each month, for payment in the form set out in Annex A, which includes up to date accurate details of each supported child and the support days applied for.

7.2 Specific instructions for the completion of Annex A are included in the UASC LA funding Excel workbook. The Annex A should only be submitted to the UASC LA Funding team via the Home Office’s secure data transfer portal, “MoveIT DMZ” to ensure compliance with 1998 Data Protection Legislation.

7.3 The local authority should ensure that all asylum claims from children are registered within twelve weeks of entering local authority care. Where there is a gap of more than twelve weeks between the dates on which a local authority claims to be looking after a child and the date on which the child registers his/her asylum claim, the local authority must provide evidence:
   i. of the steps it has taken to register the child’s asylum application, and
   ii. how it has been supporting the child since the relevant start date.
7.4 The April 2016 Annex A application for payment shall be a new submission, and not simply a continuation of the last monthly submission in the 2015/16 financial year. Subsequent Annex As must clearly highlight any additions and updates to the previous month’s application. The UASC LA Funding team will reconcile this data every month against Home Office records.

7.5 The monthly Annex A for payment must be received by the Home Office by no later than the 15th of the month following the month to which the application relates; late returns will result in payment being delayed. The submission must contain the data for the latest period, e.g. data received on 15 March must contain February data. Payments will be withheld if Annex A applications for payment are not submitted on a monthly basis.

7.6 Each month, once the information on the Annex A has been reconciled, local authorities will be advised of the individuals that will be paid for and the number of days. In some cases it will be necessary to seek further information from local authorities. Where this happens local authorities will be notified that these cases are ‘under review’ until it has been clarified that the claim made is eligible for funding under the terms of this Funding Instruction. Payments will reflect the number of children agreed for support for the relevant period, with adjustments made at a later stage for those cases which are ‘under review’, if the further information submitted shows that the individuals are, in fact, eligible. Any evidence to resolve anomalies, including ‘Not Valid’ forms and ‘Merton-compliant’ age assessments, must be forwarded by local authorities to the UASC LA Funding team within two weeks of that month’s payment being received. Failure to return ‘Not Valid’ forms within this timescale will result in future payments being delayed. The UASC LA Funding team will aim to conclude all under review cases within 60 days.

7.7 A maximum of 28 days’ funding will be payable (i.e. from the start of care) where a prompt Merton-compliant age assessment is conducted and the person claiming to be a child is found to be over the age of 18.

7.8 Local authorities are required to complete an ‘Age Assessment Information Sharing Proforma’ for confirmation of all age assessments. As a minimum requirement local authorities must provide the information that is on the model information sharing proforma (which is on the ADCS website - ADCS Link). This sets out the minimum information required to inform the Home Office of the outcome of the age assessment and to ensure that it is Merton and subsequent case law compliant. Funding payments can not be made by the Home Office to local authorities until the age assessment has been completed and the required information has been received.

7.9 Local authorities will have the opportunity to make representations if they believe that they have not received the funding to which they are entitled to under the terms of this Funding Instruction. Any discrepancies regarding the amounts paid must be notified by the relevant local authority to the UASC LA Funding team within a month of the Annex A response being sent, following reconciliation against Home Office records. Back payments for individuals not promptly included on Annex A will only be agreed where exceptional circumstances are shown.
7.10 Payments will be made by BACS using the account details already held by the Home Office for payments in previous years. If the local authority’s bank details change, it must immediately email the new information to: UASCLAFundingTeam@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk.

7.11 Payments will be referenced ‘UASC Asylum 16/17 POA Mth’ followed by the month number in the financial year. For example, the payment made for the period 1st April – 31st December will be referenced as UASC Asylum 16/17 POA Mth 9. Local authorities should advise their Cashiers’ department accordingly.

7.12 At the end of the financial year, final checks will be carried out to ensure that the payments already made accurately reflect the number of agreed support days. Payments made as a result of monthly applications are to be regarded as payments on account, which will be finalised when the final claim (which shall be in the form set out in Annex B) is confirmed by the Home Office. The final claim forms (Annex B) and specific instructions for its completion are included in the UASC LA funding Excel workbooks for each of the three types of funding i.e. UASC (Legacy), National Rate and Kent Referrals. An electronically signed Excel version of the final claim, together with an unsigned Excel spreadsheet (this is because some scanned copies cannot be filed) must be returned before 15th July 2017 by email to: UASCLAFundingTeam@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
No paper copy is necessary.

8. Audits

8.1 Local authorities should record expenditure in their accounting records under generally accepted accounting standards in a way that the relevant costs can be simply extracted if required. Throughout the year, the UASC LA Funding team will work with local authorities to ensure the accuracy of claims, thereby reducing the need for audits at year-end.

8.2 Visits may be made from time to time by the Home Office or its appointed representatives, including National Audit Office. Whilst there is no requirement for submission of detailed costings, Local authorities must be able to provide the costs for individual cases, if required, and will be expected to justify and explain costs, where necessary.
9. Contact details

9.1 For queries relating to this Funding Instruction or the submission of Annex A payment applications please email your UASC LA Funding team contact. If your query relates to the Annex B please email: UASCLAFundingTeam@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

10. 2016/2017 timetable

10.1 For the 2016/2017 financial year the following timetable will apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Annex A Submission Deadline</th>
<th>Payment Received by LA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>15 May 2016</td>
<td>30 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>15 June 2016</td>
<td>31 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>15 July 2016</td>
<td>31 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>15 August 2016</td>
<td>30 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>15 September 2016</td>
<td>31 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>15 October 2016</td>
<td>30 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>15 November 2016</td>
<td>31 December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>15 December 2016</td>
<td>31 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>15 January 2017</td>
<td>28 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>15 February 2017</td>
<td>31 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>15 March 2017</td>
<td>30 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>15 April 2017</td>
<td>31 July 2017*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To allow for final claim to be submitted.

Annexes

The annexes to these instructions are contained in the UASC LA funding Excel workbook with the following contents:

- Notes – Annex A
- Annex A (Monthly Claim)
- Notes – Annex B (Final Claim)
- Annex B (Final Claim)
- Notes – Not Valid form
- Not Valid form
- Classifications
What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. This report is the second Budget Monitoring Report to Cabinet for 2016/17 and sets out the Council’s financial position at 30th September 2016 (Q2); covering the Revenue Budget, Capital Programme and Treasury Management. Cabinet receive this report each quarter and Directorate and Corporate Management Teams receive detailed reports monthly.

2. The starting point for the 2016/17 Budget is the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) agreed by Council in February 2016. The financial context for the Council remains challenging. 2016/17 represents the seventh financial year of significant funding reductions from central government.

3. Cumulative savings agreed by Council in setting budgets since 2011 to 2016 totalled £153m and with the additional savings of £45.5m in this year this takes the value of savings that the Council has had to find over the last seven years to £198m. The £45.5m of savings in 2016/17 comprises of both the full-year effect of existing savings being delivered in the MTFP of £19.8m and a further £25.6m of new savings identified for 2016/17. This is the largest in year savings delivery target since 2011.

4. The revised total net expenditure budget 2016/17 for the Council is £391.611m as at 30th September.

5. The key messages for Cabinet are set out below:

a) The revenue budget is forecasting a net pressure of £1.501m, this is an increase of £0.763m since the Q1 position of a £0.738m net pressure. This arises from an increase in the Directorate net pressure position of £2.496m offset by an increase in the Corporate Items underspend of
b) The increase in the Directorate net pressure is largely due to additional cost pressures within the Children & Families Services Directorate, coupled with some non-delivery of 2016/17 savings. CMT have agreed a set of actions to mitigate the impact of this net pressure forecast and these are set out in para 73.

c) The £45.5m of savings was reduced to £42.282m as a delivery target following the utilisation of £3.178m of transitional funding as agreed by Council in February 2016. In this seventh year of budget reductions, the majority of these savings are forecast to be delivered. A total of £40.260m (95.2%) is forecast to be delivered by 31st March 2017 giving a shortfall of £2.022m which is largely unchanged from the position reported at Q1. Given the scale of the savings required to be delivered across the Directorates this is a significant achievement. The forecast savings shortfall is primarily being offset by alternative cost savings within directorates, such as vacancy management.

d) The increase in the Corporate Items underspend is due to increased Treasury Management savings of (£1.500m) following the decision by Council in November to change the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy (See para 55). This was indicated in the Q1 report to Cabinet in September. Further details are reported in para 55 of this report.

e) The overall impact of the forecast net pressure of £1.501m is that General Fund balances at the end of the year are forecast to reduce from £14.300m as at 1st April 2016 to £12.799m as at 31st March 2017. Corporate Management Team has agreed to some in year actions with the objective of achieving a balanced budget by 31 March 2017 (set out in paragraph 73).

f) Following the handing down of the judgment in the highways litigation dispute, in November where the Council was defendant, the award to Amey of £5.4m will be part funded from General Fund Balances (£3m) in accordance with the risk based assessment of the General Fund Balances agreed at Council in February 2016. The revised minimum General Fund Balance set by Council in February 2016 is £10m in light of the realisation of this risk.

g) As a result, the current prudent forecast balance on the General Fund Balance at 31st March 2017 is £9.799m. This is below the revised minimum General Fund Balance.

h) The Council approved a capital programme for 2016/17 in February 2016 of £119.151m for Council delivered schemes and £4.710m for
schemes where the Council is Accountable Body. The Capital Programme has been revised throughout the year and the Capital Budget 2016/17 presented in this report shows a net increase since the approval of the Quarter 1 monitoring of £0.732m. This gives a revised Council capital programme of £140.196m; this excludes the Accountable Bodies programme. This is set out in paragraph 81.

i) The forecast outturn expenditure at Q2 for the 2016/17 Capital Programme is £138.735m. Overall there is a variance against the Council capital budget of (£1.461m) that relates to slippage. Details of the projected slippage and underspends are in para 83.

Recommendation of the Corporate Director

Members are asked to:

6. Note the Revenue Budget at the provisional outturn for monitoring purposes of £391.611m as a result of the transfers from the Inflation and Contingency budget and agreed transfers from reserves (set out in Appendix 1).

7. Note the forecast Revenue Budget outturn of a net pressure of £1.501m.

8. Note progress in delivering the revised 2016/17 savings target of £42.282m; a total of £40.260m (95.2%) of the 2016/17 savings target is forecast to be delivered by 31st March 2017.

9. Note the actions agreed by Corporate Directors to bring the budget back to a balanced position set out in paragraph 73.

10. Note the forecast General Reserve balance at 31st March 2017 of £9.799m. This is below the revised minimum level of General Reserve Balances target set by Council in February 2016 of £10m.

11. Approve the transfer of £6.8m from Earmarked Reserves in respect of the Highways Litigation dispute payment.

12. Approve the transfer of £0.919m from the Contingency Budget to Directorate budgets as set out in Table 4 paragraph 62.

13. Approve the transfer of £4.000m in year MRP savings to an Earmarked Reserve to support the 2017/18 budget; as per the Budget Consultation 201/18 approved by Cabinet on 5th October (see paragraph 55).

14. Approve the additional scheme increases for 2016/17 referred to in Table 6 funded from external contributions and approve the increase in capital programme 2017/18 for the Houghton School s106 contribution of £0.233m and the increases in the 2017/18 and 2018/19 capital programme for the Countryside Access scheme of £0.450m.
15. Approve the utilising of the available Basic Need funding (already approved in the capital programme) and utilise priority schools maintenance funding to deliver the reconfiguration of Samuel Kings School building to accommodate both the secondary school and Alston Primary School in order to address funding requirements. Total scheme cost is £1.145m with planned spend in 2017/18.

16. Approve the inclusion of £0.300m of Growth Deal funding in 2016/17 as recommended by the LEP Investment Panel and recommend to Council the utilisation of County Council capital funding of £0.250m in 2017/18 to facilitate the delivery of the full LEP Kendal Infrastructure (Burton Rd cycleway) Scheme. The £0.250m County Council capital funding in 2017/18 will be repaid to the County Council from Growth Deal grant in 2018/19.

17. Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council in respect of the Capital Programme:-

   a) the inclusion of the £3.600m capital spend associated with the A591 flood recovery scheme and associated funding;

   b) the approval of the proposed reprofiling of £3.426m of approved capital spend into future years;

   c) the approval of £0.250m in 2017/18 for the LEP Kendal Infrastructure (Burton Rd cycleway) Scheme funded from County Council capital financing initially and repaid from Growth Deal grant in 2018/19.

18. Note the forecast outturn for the Capital Programme 2016/17 of £138.685m against a current budget of £140.146m (excluding Accountable Bodies) resulting in a variance of (£1.461m) which relates to slippage as set out in Table 7.

19. Note Treasury Management activities during Q2 have operated within the treasury limits set out in the Council’s Treasury Policy Statement and Treasury Strategy Statement and the Prudential Indicators set by Council in February 2016.

Background to the Proposals

Revenue Budget

The starting point for the Revenue Budget was the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) agreed by Council in February 2016. After taking account of adjustments to General Grants and transfers to and from reserves the revised total net expenditure budget 2016/17 for the Council is £391.611m as at 30th September. These adjustments are set out below:
Table 1 – Net Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Total Net Expenditure Budget</td>
<td>381.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Adjustments approved by Cabinet 22nd September</td>
<td>3.296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to General Grants (See paragraph 20)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from earmarked reserves (See paragraph 70)</td>
<td>8.292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to earmarked reserves (See paragraph 70)</td>
<td>(4.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from General Fund Balance (See paragraph 69)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Q2 Amendments</td>
<td>7.163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Total Net Expenditure Budget</td>
<td>391.611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Appendix 1 contains detailed information relating to the budget amendments and the allocation to Directorates where applicable. Further information regarding the changes to General Grants since the Q1 budget monitoring report is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of £0.009m in the 2016/17 Phonics Screening General Grant to £0.038m (Children and Families Services budget reduced).</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of £0.002m in the 2016/17 Additional Lead Flood Authority General Grant (Economy &amp; Highways Services budget increased).</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to a technical change the 2016/17 Staying Put General Grant has been reclassified as a Specific Grant resulting in a reduction to the Children and Families net budget but with a corresponding increase in the Children and Families gross budget. Overall no financial impact. The staying put grant supports young people who wish to stay living with their foster carer after they turn 18. This supported arrangement can continue until the young person’s 21st birthday.</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjustments to General Grants (0.129)

Revenue Budget Monitoring as at 30th September 2016

21. The 2016/17 Net Budget approved by Council in February was restated in Q1 to reflect the restructure of services within Directorates and the Extended Leadership Team structure effective from 1st July 2016. This restated budget is set out in Table 2. The forecast net expenditure for 2016/17 is £393.112m; resulting in a net pressure of £1.501m, an increase of £0.763 since Q1, this is summarised in Table 2.
Table 2: Revenue Budget Monitoring 2016/17 (as at 30th September 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restated Budget</th>
<th>As at 30th September 2016</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Forecast Expenditure</th>
<th>Variation from Budget</th>
<th>Q1 Variance reported</th>
<th>Change in VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69,142 Children &amp; Families Services</td>
<td>70,532</td>
<td>77,456</td>
<td>6,924</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116,932 Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>121,151</td>
<td>121,242</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116,072 Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>119,362</td>
<td>118,701</td>
<td>(661)</td>
<td>(988)</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,361 Fire &amp; Rescue Service</td>
<td>17,478</td>
<td>17,244</td>
<td>(234)</td>
<td>(233)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,989 Local Committees</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,334 Resources and Transformation</td>
<td>26,927</td>
<td>26,804</td>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>(600)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,336) Cross Cutting Management Saving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>349,494 Total Service Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>364,995</strong></td>
<td><strong>370,992</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,997</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,501</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,496</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,658 Other corporate items</td>
<td>26,616</td>
<td>22,120</td>
<td>(4,496)</td>
<td>(2,763)</td>
<td>(1,733)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>381,152 Total Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>391,611</strong></td>
<td><strong>393,112</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,501</strong></td>
<td><strong>738</strong></td>
<td><strong>763</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Finance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34,317 General Grants</td>
<td>34,894</td>
<td>34,894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62,046 Top Up Funding</td>
<td>62,046</td>
<td>62,046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58,557 Revenue Support Grant</td>
<td>58,557</td>
<td>58,557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,568 Retained Business Rates</td>
<td>20,568</td>
<td>20,568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205,413 Income from Council Tax</td>
<td>205,413</td>
<td>205,413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>380,901 Net Budget Requirement</strong></td>
<td><strong>381,478</strong></td>
<td><strong>381,478</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Appendix 1 sets out the Council’s Net Revenue Budget for 2016/17. It shows the movement in the Net Revenue Budget against which service expenditure is monitored, from an original budget of £381.152m when the budget was agreed by Council in February to £391.611m at 30th September 2016. The key variances within Directorate budgets are detailed in the relevant Directorate Appendices 3 (1-8) and summarised below:

**Directorate Budgets: Net Pressures**

23. The forecast outturn for the Directorate service budgets shows a net pressure of £5.997m. The net pressures is a result of pressures in Children & Families Services (£6.924m) and Health, Care & Community Services (£0.091m) Directorates offset by forecast directorate underspends in Economy & Highways Services Directorate (£0.661m), Fire and Rescue Services (£0.234m) and Resources & Transformation Directorate (£0.123m).

24. The net budget pressures in Children & Families Services (£6.924m) and Health, Care & Community Services (£0.091m) Directorates are explained further below:

25. Children & Families Services - a net pressure of £6.924m – The forecast net pressure is comprised of three key financial pressures affecting the budget; the additional cost of Externally Provided Workforce (EPW), Commissioning
of places for Children Looked After and a pressure relating to unfunded commitments, for example, to manage the improvement of the Children & Families Services Directorate:

26. **Additional cost of Externally Provided Workforce (EPW):** The Social Work Academy was set up in 2015/16 to develop new graduates into newly qualified social workers and reduce the reliance within the Directorate on EPWs. It was originally agreed to recruit 15 graduates per annum for 3 years however, following a successful recruitment campaign, it has subsequently been approved to recruit an additional 8 graduates in 2016/17 with these staff being funded from the Improvement & Efficiency reserve.

27. The overall additional cost of EPWs is currently forecast to be £2.249m. This is on the assumption that EPWs are released on the dates planned. If the EPW end dates are extended then additional costs will be incurred. Should all existing EPWs remain in place until 31st March 2017 expenditure this financial year would increase by £0.884m, this is not included in the forecast. Management actions are underway to review and accelerate EPW end dates.

28. An additional 14 EPWs have been appointed from August 2016 until 31st March 2017 to create an intake team in the South of the County to manage workload progression in light of the monthly Ofsted visits. Cabinet is requested to approve the funding of these posts of £0.309m from contingency as part of the recommendations for this paper.

29. Therefore the pressure from the cost of EPWs presented in this forecast is £1.940m (£2.249m less £0.309m). The additional cost of EPWs would have been in excess of £3m without the Social Work academy. The Social Work Academy is starting to deliver on its objective to have more employed staff rather than EPW's.

30. **Commissioning of places for Children Looked After (CLA):** The CLA budget is based on the overall mix of placement types (for example in-house fostering, residential care, external foster placements) and the number of children cared for in that setting. Overall expenditure is therefore a combination of the two variables above as the “unit cost” varies across placement type.

31. As part of the budget setting process in February 2016 additional investment of £5.655m was included in the CLA budget, this was due to having a higher number of Children Looked After with a different mix of placement types than originally assumed.

32. The additional investment was based on the assumption that the number of looked after children would reduce from 663 to 529 by 31st March 2017, and that efficiencies would be achieved from reviewing the mix of placement
types.

33. Following continual review of the number of Children Looked After across all placement types during both Quarters 1 and 2 of the current financial year a pressure of £2.000m was reported at Quarter 1 which has risen to £3.936m at Quarter 2. These pressures have arisen due to the numbers of CLA not reducing as planned but also variances in the mix of placement types. Work is continuing to review actions to manage this pressure in respect of CLA numbers and costs of placement.

34. *Unfunded commitments:* There is a budget pressure within the Directorate of £0.642m in 2016/17 relating to a delay in fully delivering the Children Services restructure and Business Support savings within Children’s Services. This delay in delivering these staffing savings is necessary to ensure there is sufficient staffing resource to deliver the improvement plans of the Children & Families Services Directorate.

35. Other cumulative variances across the Directorate totalling £0.405m result in the Directorate’s forecast of £6.924m. Within these other variances is an underspend of £0.230m against the Early Help contract.

36. Within the budget forecast there is an element of income from Health and other partners that reflects work that is ongoing to review where additional income can be recovered. Additional information on the directorate position is set out in Appendix 3 (1).

37. **Health, Care & Community Services – a forecast overspend of £0.091m** - A small overspend of £0.091m is forecast (£0.038m in Q1) compared to the net budget of £121.151m. There are several variances across the directorate budgets relating to movement in the timescale for delivery of savings, variances on spend in different areas and the use of reserves and legacy funding. A summary of all the changes since Q1 is provided in a table at the end of this section and the detail is included in Appendix 3 (2).

38. There are 20 MTFP savings schemes within the Directorate with under delivery of savings of £3.931m being reported across 4 of the more complex schemes, this compares £3.850m at Q1 of, a net movement of £0.081m, the main changes to the delivery of MTFP savings since Q1 are set out below:

a) The “how we review your care needs” scheme relates to the delivery of savings by reviewing systems, business processes and staffing structures that shape the current customer journey for those with social care needs with reference to legislation such as the Care Act. The savings target to date is £2.674m; £1.000m relates to 2015/16 and £1.674m relates to 2016/17. Work to date has delivered savings of £1.667m, a reduction of £0.107m from the position at Q1 due to
additional social work staff being appointed, giving an overall savings target shortfall of £1.077m. There is a further target saving of £1.326m to be delivered during 2017/18.

b) Plans to deliver the Day Care Service Review are progressing with extensive work being undertaken by the project team including engagement with Local Committee’s and service user organisations. The 2016/17 savings target is £2.500m resulting in a forecast overspend across day services of £0.324m (£0.141m relating to Cumbria Care, with the balance being within Younger Adults of £0.183m) compared to a forecast overspend across day services of £0.750m at Q1. This improved position is due to reduced activity on both purchased care for older people and on staff costs within Cumbria Care as vacancies were held due to the reducing demand. The position with regards to purchased care for younger people is not materially different from that reported at Q1.

c) Within the Cumbria Care residential reprovision programme public consultation was launched on 5th October 2016 and will run until 23rd December 2016. Alongside the consultation period the programme timeline has been revised resulting in an increase in the estimated pressure from £0.330m at Q1 to £0.630m at Q2 against the Cumbria Care budget line.

39. Officers are reviewing actions to accelerate delivery of savings in year with the outcome of these reviews to be included in future budget monitor reports.

40. There are several variances not related to savings schemes, the main changes since Q1 are set out below:

a) Further savings through the promoting independence programme are forecast in the Older Adults service totalling £0.093m.

b) In Q2 the younger adults budget has an emerging pressure totalling £0.330m. Pressures in the mental health budget of £0.150m and the learning disability budget of £0.680m are in part offset by slippage against the transitions budget of (£0.500m).

c) There is a potential risk the Directorate is seeking to manage relating to the need to utilise external funding, currently supporting the provision of support at home services, with a view to increasing the volume of reablement activity undertaken in order to support the reduction of Delayed Transfers Of Care attributable to Social Care.

d) A pressure of £0.250m is forecast against the budget for personal contributions. There has been a downward trend over recent years in charges for personal contributions reflecting lower numbers of customers
in statutory services in line with strategic aims and full fee payers making their own arrangements for care. Cabinet will remember the adjustments to the Budget last year and in setting this year’s original budget. These items will be followed up in the Q3 report to Cabinet.

e) Offsetting the above pressures is the use of the Health & Care savings transitional adjustment as agreed at Council on 18th February 2016 of £3.178m and the use of legacy funding £1.374m (£1.002m in Q1), these amounts total £4.552m and are located within the Other Services budget line.

41. A summary of the above variances compared to the net budget of £120 million is presented on the table below for clarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Q1 £m</th>
<th>Q2 £m</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under delivery of savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we review your care needs</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Services review</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>Cumbria Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Services review</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>Younger People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Services review</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td>Older People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability Services review</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Younger People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Care residential re-provision</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>Cumbria Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.850</td>
<td>3.861</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other variances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional effect of promoting independence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Pressures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>Younger Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Care – home care &amp; reablement</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>Cumbria Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of savings transitional budget</td>
<td>-3.178</td>
<td>-3.178</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy funding</td>
<td>-1.002</td>
<td>-1.374</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall on personal contributions</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>Personal Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities - Library Service</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.812</td>
<td>-3.840</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Overspend</strong></td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Budget (for information)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>121.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directorate Budgets: Net Underspends

42. The directorate pressures are partly offset by forecast directorate underspends in Economy & Highways Services Directorate (£0.661m), Fire and Rescue Services (£0.234m) and Resources & Transformation Directorate (£0.123m):

43. Economy & Highways Services – a forecast net underspend of £0.661m – the forecast net underspend has reduced by £0.327m since Q1, from (£0.988m) to (£0.661m). The main movements in the forecast net underspend from Q1 to Q2 are set out below:

44. The Highways and Transportation service forecast net underspend has reduced by £0.224m from (£0.663m) at Q1 to (£0.439m) at Q2. The main movement in this relates to a reduction of £0.100m from the previously forecast (£0.300m) underspend within Camera Safety Partnership, which has been used (vired) to support the delivery of the Winter 2016/17 gully cleansing programme.

45. The Economy and Environment service forecast net underspend has a variance of £0.145m from an underspend of (£0.062m) at Q1 to a net pressure of (£0.083m) at Q2. This movement relates to the cost of specialist advice totalling £0.145m relating to the Low Level Waste Repository planning application.

46. The Capital Programme and Property service forecast net underspend has reduced by £0.401m from (£0.916m) at Q1 to (£0.505m) at Q2. This is as a result of increased spend of around £0.179m within the Corporate Maintenance Fund, along with a forecast reduction in staff recharges to the Capital programme.

47. There is an additional forecast underspend of (£0.335m) at Q2 as a result of a number of vacancies due to reshaping within Directorate Support.

48. There is an increase to the Port of Workington pressure of £0.056m from Q1 to £0.501m, due to a further reduction in anticipated income. This continued pressure is predominantly due to the loss of a contract in early 2016/17 for £0.250m and a continuation of the income pressure of prior years. The earmarked reserve to fund pressures at the Port was fully utilised in 2015/16.

49. More information on the Directorate movements is set out in Appendix 3 (3).

50. Fire and Rescue Services – a forecast net underspend of £0.234m - The forecast net underspend is largely unchanged since Q1 and is due to savings arising both from the shared Chief Fire Officer (CFO) arrangements
with Cheshire Fire Authority and the holding of vacancies pending a further review of duty systems. Following discussions with Trade Unions, Lead Members and management earlier in the year, the day crewing plus duty system will not now be implemented and alternative ways of achieving the savings have been identified as part of the budget consultation documents approved by Cabinet in October. More information on the Directorate movements is set out in Appendix 3 (4).

51. Resource and Transformation – a forecast net underspend of £0.123m - The Directorate is forecasting an underspend of (£0.123m) at Q2, this is an improvement of (£0.600m) compared to the forecast overspend of £0.477m at Q1. The two most significant elements of the improved position are a forecast saving of (£0.173m) due to the correction of duplicate payments across the Authority, an increase in the forecast underspend in the Policy, Performance & Communications team of (£0.161m) due to vacancy management and an increase in the Finance underspend of (£0.083m) due to vacancy management, pending Service Review. Other movements in the Directorate forecast include savings of (£0.050m) due to an increase in the dividend received from the Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation and vacancy management savings totalling (£0.133m) mainly in Business Services and Transformation. More information is set out in Appendix 3 (6).

52. As is usual the Local Committees are presenting a forecast balanced budget at year end, this is consistent with previous years. However at Q2 there is a forecast net underspend of £0.545m across the Local Committees revenue budgets. Local Committee underspends require a Council decision to be carried forward into future years. The Local Committee forecast underspend includes £0.324m relating to Individual Local Members Scheme that has not yet been committed. Council agreed in June 2015, and confirmed this in February 2016, to extend the scheme until 31st March 2017 only, any underspend at this date for Individual Local Member Schemes will therefore be reported as such and will be released into Corporate Reserves. Further details are included in Appendix 3 (5).

Other Corporate Items Budget

53. The Other Corporate Items budget is forecast to underspend by £4.496m; £2.823m from Treasury Management savings, an underspend of £0.650m on the apprenticeship levy budget, and an underspend of £1.023m from the inflation budget as set out in paragraph 59 below.

54. The Treasury Management saving of £2.823m has increased by £1.733m since Q1 due to the outperformance in relation to interest rates receivable of £0.233m a benefit from higher than originally budgeted cash reserves due to receipt of recovery grants in advance. A further savings of £1.500m MRP is
55. Following the decision to change the MRP policy at November Council there is a saving of £5.500m in 2016/17 to be released. The amendment to the MRP policy was set out in the detail in the report to Council. The amendment represents a change to the method of accounting for repayment of borrowing to (part) fund capital programme. The change is a re-profile of repayment. This report recommends that £4.000m of this is transferred to an earmarked reserve to support the 2017/18 budget (as per the October 2017/18 Budget Consultation approved by Cabinet) resulting in an increase in the Treasury Management saving of £1.500m (£5.500m less £4.000m). The revised annual saving on the net interest budget is £2.823m (£1.323m plus £1.500m). This is in addition to the budgeted saving of £3.968m included in the agreeing the 2016/17 budget, for more information see the Treasury Management to 89.

56. Following the 2015 floods the Bellwin grant claim totalling £2.559m was submitted on 2nd June for response costs incurred over and above the Council’s £0.711m threshold that it is required to fund itself. The response costs and £2.559m grant were fully accounted for in 2015/16. A grant payment of £2.185m was received in early November from DCLG, this was £0.373m less than the grant claim and relates to Landfill Tax charges incurred by the Council in relation to the disposal of household waste as a result of the floods. DCLG are awaiting a decision from Ministers regarding these costs and therefore this is not included as an additional cost at this stage. This element presents a risk to the year-end forecast.

57. Following the handing down of the judgment in the highways litigation dispute, in November, where the Council was defendant, the award (including interest) to Amey of £5.4m. The Judge has made an order that the Council pays a proportion of costs incurred by Amey in respect of the litigation. This is subject to court processes and will be further reported in Q3 monitoring. A “payment on account” of £4.3m plus interest of £0.1m has been made in accordance with the Order. In summary £9.8m has been paid and this is funded from General Fund Balance (£3m) and a drawdown following the release of Earmarked Reserves of £1.3m from the Business Rate / Council Tax Volatility reserve, £3.5m from Property related reserves and £2.0m from the Modernisation reserve. See para 87 which refers to the Capitalisation Flexibility Proposals; this allows additional capital receipts going forward to fund revenue expenditure where it is shown that the investment in the up-front revenue costs will generate future ongoing revenue savings i.e. supplement the modernisation reserve.

58. In respect of Council costs, the Council has budgeted for and accounted for its costs of trial preparation since the commencement of the legal action.
There is a drawdown on Contingency requested in respect of the cost incurred since June relating to the October and November hearings.

**Inflation and Contingency Budget**

59. The original inflation and contingency budget includes provision for inflation of for pay, specific contracts, premises expenditure and other inflationary pressures and risks. There is a forecast underspend of £1.023m on the Inflation and Contingency budget. This relates to inflationary pressures and risks which is not expected to be required for 2016/17.

60. In Q2 there is a 4% inflationary increase (£0.055m) to the internal fostering fees and allowances Children & Families Services Directorate budget, this is effective from 1st December.

61. Following the announcement by the Living Wage Foundation to increase the Living Wage value from 31st October 2016 from £8.25 to £8.45 the Council will apply this increase from that date. The estimated cost of £0.040m will be funded from the risk element of the inflation budget.

62. In addition there is a General Contingency Budget of £1.500m. This budget has £0.031m remaining following the proposed net transfer of £0.919m set out over the page:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 General Contingency Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 approved budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from contingency for additional EPW social workers in the South of the County, see para 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from contingency for school intervention costs, additional interventions are required in at schools in an Ofsted category of concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of contingency for costs relating to the Litigation Team in relation to the contractual dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Contingency budget remaining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress on 2016/17 Savings Propositions**

63. Appendix 2 sets out the progress on delivering the original planned 2015/16 savings target of £45.460m; this is made up of £25.626m new savings for
2016/17 and £19.834m of existing savings.

64. It was recognised by Council in February 2016 that there was significant pressure to deliver the Health and Care savings in year and included a one off transitional budget of £3.178m. In applying the £3.178m transitional adjustment the overall savings target reduces to £42.282m for monitoring purposes. A total of £40.260m (95.2%) is forecast to be delivered by 31st March 2017 against this revised target, giving a shortfall of £2.022m; this is largely unchanged since Q1. The significant saving variances relate ‘Service Review - People Management’ (as discussed in Appendix 3 (6)), ‘Reshape the way waste services are managed throughout the county’, ‘Service Review - Learning Disabilities’, ‘Service Review - Day Services plan’, ‘Cumbria Care Older Adult Residential Re-provision’ and ‘Streamlining how we review your care needs’.

65. The forecast shortfall in the delivery of savings targets is partly offset set by other mitigating actions within Directorates, such as from vacancy management.

66. For those savings not planned to be permanently achieved in 2016/17 officers are reviewing actions to ensure they are delivered in 2017/18 unless already identified as a pressure in the budget consultation report agreed by Cabinet in October. Details are included in Appendix 2.

**General Reserve and Earmarked Balances**

67. The overall impact of the forecast net pressure of £1.501m is that General Fund balances at the end of the year are forecast to reduce from £14.300m as at 1st April 2016 to £12.799m as at 31st March 2017.

68. Following the handing down of the judgment in the highways litigation dispute, in November where the Council was defendant, the award to Amey of £5.4m will be part funded from General Fund Balances (£3m) in accordance with the risk based assessment of the General Fund Balances agreed at Council in February 2016. The revised minimum General Fund Balance set by Council in February 2016 is £10m in light of the realisation of this risk.

69. As a result, the current prudent forecast balance on the General Fund Balance at 31st March 2017 is £9.799m. This is below the revised minimum General Fund Balance.

70. The balance on Council earmarked reserves (excluding DSG funded reserves) at the 30th June 2016 is £74.178m. Movements on Earmarked Reserves in Q1 are summarised in the table below and the detailed position on reserves is provided in Appendix 4.
Table 5 – Movements in Earmarked Reserves (excluding DSG funded reserves)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 1st April 2016</td>
<td>78.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted transfer to reserves</td>
<td>(0.251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Q1 Transfers to reserves</strong></td>
<td>78.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Transfer to MRP Saving to support 2017/18 budget earmarked reserve</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2 Transfers from Reserves:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown of People Management Earmarked Reserve</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown to fund VR payments April-July from Modernisation Reserve</td>
<td>(1.052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown of Earmarked Reserve for Connecting Cumbria for project management costs</td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Improvement &amp; Efficiency reserve to fund new Corporate Director Post in 2016/17</td>
<td>(0.120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from DIT Survey Grants for Bridge inspections</td>
<td>(0.206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Business Rate Volatility Reserve for Amey</td>
<td>(1.308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Capital Programme and Property Reserves for Amey</td>
<td>(3.526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Modernisation Reserve for Amey</td>
<td>(1.966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Q2 Transfers from reserves</strong></td>
<td>(8.292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 30th September 2016</td>
<td>69.886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The bulk of Earmarked Reserves relate to the Equal Pay and Modernisation Reserve (£12.267), revenue grants received for future activities (£8.732m), Insurance (£8.701) and PFI schemes (£26.782m). These elements total £ 56.483m)

71. In respect of the highways litigation dispute and the £9.8m that has been paid to Amey this is funded from General Fund Balance (£3m) and a drawdown following the release of Earmarked Reserves of £1.308m from the Business Rate / Council Tax Volatility reserve, £3.526m from Property related reserves and £1.966m from the Modernisation reserve.

72. Directorate budgets have been adjusted for transfers from earmarked reserves in line with previously approved decisions for use of these reserves.

73. Following a review of the forecast net pressure of £1.501m Corporate Directors will put in place the following actions to manage the net pressure:

   a) Work is continuing to review actions to manage the pressure in respect of CLA numbers and costs of placement (para 23) Pro-active work to reduce the cost of placements is ongoing
b) Management actions to review and accelerate Externally Provided Workforce end dates across all services (para 23)

c) Wider review of the use of Externally Provided Workforce;

d) Review and challenge to not recruit into vacancies;

e) Reviewing actions to accelerate delivery of savings in year;

f) Review actions to ensure income targets are achieved across services; and

g) Stopping non-essential spend.

74. In addition to the pressures to be managed, a number of risks to the budget forecast are being reviewed. The two principal risks under review include the risk that flood related landfill costs submitted as part of the Belwin Grant Claim in June 2016 will not be recoverable. The personal contributions income budget within Health and Social Care is projecting a shortfall in recovery. An assessment of the shortfall, mitigations and implications is being undertaken.

**Capital Programme**

**Revisions to the Programme**

75. Council approved a capital programme for 2016/17 in February 2016 of £119.151m for Council delivered schemes and £4.710m for schemes where the Council is Accountable Body. The Council capital programme was revised to £169.151m in the Flood Recovery Capital Programme update to April Council, to £193.240m in the 2015/16 Provisional Year End report to Council in June and to £139.464m at the September 2016 Council meeting.

76. The Capital Budget 2016/17 shows a net increase since the approval of the Quarter 1 monitoring of £0.732m to reflect a number of changes to the capital programme outlined below, giving a revised Council capital programme of £140.196m, this excludes the Accountable Bodies programme. The changes are summarised in Table 6 overleaf.

77. Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council to approve the proposed reprofiling of £3.426m of approved capital spend into future years. Council will approve the full 2017-2021 Capital programme at its meeting in February 2017.

78. In respect of increases to the capital programme Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council the inclusion of the £3.600m spend associated with the A591 flood recovery scheme. The Council received DfT grant to finance the cost of the work by Highways England and hence the inclusion of the spend is matched fully by available grant. Inclusion of the spend is important
given the forthcoming changes to the valuation of the Highways Network Asset within the 2016/17 Statement of Accounts.

79. Cabinet is asked to approve an increase to the 2017/18 capital programme of £0.233m in respect of s106 monies received to finance the Houghton School Basic Need scheme. This does not impact on the 2016/17 capital programme but increases the overall capital programme 2016-2020.

80. Cabinet is asked to approve the inclusion of the additional £0.500m Countryside Access Scheme funded through the Rural Development Programme for England. This is to support flood recovery of the rights of way network and although not sufficient to deliver the full Rights of Way recovery programme it will allow the programme of work to begin. The profile of spend will be £0.050m in 2016/17, £0.281m in 2017/18 and £0.169m in 2018/19.

81. LEP Investment Panel at the October meeting approved the acceleration (re-profiling) of £0.300m of Growth Deal funded spend into 2016/17 for the LEP Kendal Infrastructure Scheme in order to deliver the Burton Road cycle way. This scheme was originally scheduled for 2018/19. To fully complete the scheme Cabinet is requested to approve the inclusion of the £0.300m element of the scheme in 2016/17 funded from Growth Deal grant and recommend to Council the additional re-profiling of £0.250m of spend required to complete the scheme into 2017/18 from 2018/19. The spend in 2017/18 will utilise County Council capital financing with Council being reimbursed for that with £0.250m of Growth Deal grant in 2018/19. This approach has been approved by the LEP Investment Panel in order to facilitate the delivery of the entire scheme in advance of the full Growth Deal grant being available. Growth Deal funding is approved annually although BEIS have provided the Council with a profile of the total Growth Deal 1 and 2 grant payments through till 2020/21. There is a risk that the Growth Deal funding will not get paid to the LEP in 2018/19 but it is minimal.

### Table 6 – Update to the Capital Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Capital Programme approved in February 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes approved by Council April 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes approved by Council June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes approved by Council September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(53.777)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 monitoring – Capital Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Re-profiles to future years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP – Devolved Major Transport Scheme Funding</td>
<td>(0.387)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7 – Capital Programme Provisional Outturn 2016/17 (at 30th September 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devolved to Local Committee 15/16 saving</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDR Land Purchase</td>
<td>(0.150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Local Flood Authority</td>
<td>(0.146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Barrow Waterfront</td>
<td>(0.193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP South Ulverston</td>
<td>(0.360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Kendal Infrastructure</td>
<td>(0.249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Acquisition and Investment Fund</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-located Emergency Response Centre - Ulverston</td>
<td>(0.847)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulverston Fire Station (new for 14/15)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total re-profiles</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3.426)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Contributions / Adjustments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport (Other) (ITB) – accelerated spend 2017/18</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP Optimising Connectivity</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP – Kendal Infrastructure – updated profile</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfT contribution for repairs to the A591</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDPE – Cumbria Countryside Access scheme</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Contributions / Adjustments</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.158</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Q2 Update to the Capital Programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.732</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarter 2 – Total Council Capital Programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>140.196</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Forecast Outturn Position

82. Appendix 5 details the original Capital Budget 2016/17 as approved in February 2016, together with a breakdown of the movement from the original approved programme, expenditure to date, forecast outturn and variances from the revised budget. This is summarised by the main elements of the Capital Programme in the table overleaf.
The forecast outturn expenditure at Q2 for the 2016/17 Capital Programme is £138.735m. Overall there is a variance against the Council capital budget of (£1.461m). This variance is made up of slippage totalling £1.461m. The variance is set out below:

a) Children and Families Services – £0.537m slippage due to profiling of the Early Education for Two Year Olds project whilst waiting on the EFA application decision (due December 2016) and a small element on Basic Need due to slippage on St Mary’s project. Cabinet is asked to approve the reconfiguration of Samuel Kings School building to accommodate both the secondary school and Alston Primary School in order to address funding requirements at a cost of £1.145m. This will use the remainder of the Basic Need budget already approved in the capital programme of £0.800m and include maintenance work that will be funded from the I Prioritised School Maintenance fund £0.345m.

b) Health, Care and Community Services – £0.406m slippage due to lower than expected forecast spend on Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons’ Adaptations.

c) Cumbria Fire & Rescue – £0.444m slippage on replacement of Major Fire Equipment and the Fire Vehicles Renewal Scheme. Both are dependent on spending requirement against the asset strategy and progress to date, which is continually being reviewed.

### Accountable Bodies

Accountable Body expenditure does not result in an increase in the value of assets owned by the Council, but it is included in this report for completeness and to support the Council’s monitoring responsibilities as...
Accountable Body.

85. The budget approved by Council in June included slippage on budgets for Accountable Bodies capital schemes of £0.837m and accelerated spend of £0.966m. The LEP Accountable Body schemes have been updated to reflect the latest spend profiles approved by the LEP Investment Panel. The forecast budget and outturn position for Accountable Bodies at 30th September 2016 is £6.776m.

Capital Receipts

86. In the original 2016/17 budget, agreed by Council in February 2016, it was estimated that £1.000m of general capital receipts would be received during the year, contributing to the funding of the Capital Programme. The capital receipts from sales completed during Q2 is £0.299m with a further £1.189m for properties that are sold subject to contract, giving a total of £1.488m. On the 16th November the Council received confirmation from DCLG that its efficiency strategy, agreed by Cabinet on 20th October 2016, had been accepted and that the Council is now formally on the Multi Year settlement for revenue grants (RSG, Rural Services Delivery Grant and Transition Grant) in 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20.

87. The Council’s efficiency strategy also set out how the Council proposes to use the new Capitalisation Flexibility Proposals. These proposals allow the Council to identify specific capital assets that can be sold to provide additional capital receipts that can then fund revenue expenditure where it is shown that the investment in the up-front revenue costs will generate future ongoing revenue savings. These capital receipts can also be used to transform service delivery to reduce revenue costs or to improve the quality of service delivery in future years.

88. The revised estimate of total capital receipts that could be received by the year-end (March 17) is potentially £3m against an original budget of £1m. Up to £0.5m could be identified as being available to be used to finance up front revenue costs to support savings as part of the approved capitalisation flexibility. The remaining additional receipts for 2016/17 can be utilised to fund capital investment in future years. In 2017/18 it is estimated that an additional £1.5m of capital receipts (above those already budgeted for) will be identified to fund further revenue costs to support savings as part of the 2017/18 capitalisation flexibility.

Treasury Management

89. The treasury management function supports the overall objectives and priorities of the Council, by the use of effective treasury management techniques. The aim is to manage risks and ensure there are sufficient cash
resources and long-term borrowings to finance the Council’s activities and capital investment programme whilst balancing this to the secondary objective of trying to minimise the costs of the net interest budget.

90. With long term borrowing of £294.7m (no change from 30th June 2016) and investments of £232.4m (£242.8m at June) as at 30th September, there is a significant net interest cost included in the Council’s budget. Successful treasury management reduces the cost of these transactions and helps to relieve the pressure on the revenue budget.

91. Annual savings on the net interest budget of £2.823m are being forecast as at 30th September 2016. Following the decision to change the MRP policy at November Council there is a further £5.500m saving in 2016/17, this report recommends that £4.000m of this is transferred to an earmarked reserve to support the 2017/18 budget (as per the October 2017/18 Budget Consultation approved by Cabinet) resulting in an increase in the Treasury Management saving of £1.500m (£5.500m less £4.000m). The revised annual saving on the net interest budget is £2.823m (£1.323m plus £1.500m). This is in addition to the budgeted saving of £3.968m included in the agreeing the 2016/17 budget.

92. The reported saving of £2.823m is due to:

a) A revision to the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy approved by Council in November generating savings in 2016/17 of £5.500m; £4.000m of this is transferred to an earmarked reserve resulting in an increase in the reported MRP saving of £1.500m from Q1.

b) An assumption that there is no requirement to undertake external borrowing during the year. The projected levels of internal borrowing, release savings of £0.767m. This represents the full year effect of internal borrowing;

c) Slippage on the capital programme at the end of 2015/16 resulting in a delay in the requirement to charge an element of MRP in 2016/17 releasing further efficiencies of £0.301m;

d) Outperformance in relation to interest rates receivable has delivered an additional £0.233m in savings in 2016/17;

e) Other various items have a further net underspend of £0.022m.

f) It should be noted that these underspends are all one-off savings relating to 2016/17 only.
Options Considered and Risks Identified

93. Cabinet may decide to make alternative recommendations after taking advice from the Assistant Director – Finance (s151 officer).

Reasons for the Recommendation / Key Benefits

94. In accordance with the Constitution the recommendations have been made to Cabinet to enable decisions to be made to enable the preparation of the statutory financial statements of the Council.

Financial - What Resources will be Required and how will it be Funded?

95. The resource and value for money implications are covered throughout this report.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be considered?

96. Cabinet is responsible for the implementation of the budget approved by Council. The recommendations in relation to transfers to and from contingencies and earmarked reserves and for capital programme schemes below £0.5m are those which Cabinet can directly approve. The recommendations relating to increases and re-profiling of capital schemes above £0.5million and forward funding LEP schemes are for full Council to determine on Cabinet’s recommendation, as outlined in the report.

97. It is within Cabinet’s authority to approve a secured commercial loan to a third party. It is relevant for the decision maker to consider how the Council will secure repayment of the loan in the event of default by a third party to which council funds have been loaned. SL 24/11/2016

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council's Stated Objectives?

98. The report links to the strategic planning framework for Cumbria, including supporting the delivery of the Council Plan 2016-19 priorities agreed by Council in February 2016, which are:

- To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential
- To support older, disabled and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives
- To enable communities to help shape their local services, promote health and wellbeing, and support those in poverty
- To provide a safe and well managed highways network, secure infrastructure improvements and support local economic growth
- To be a modern and efficient council

99. The effective management of financial resources is a requirement for making informed decisions when planning and delivering Council services.

What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

100. Not Applicable
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## 2016/17 Budget Net Expenditure - Movements in the Year

<p>| e5 codes - cost centre | 1608681 | 2601212 | 3688229 | 6202791 | 2686861 | 7108681 | 7108681 | 6185841 | MBS 4623211 | Ei 1085841 | Ei 688781 | Ei 771241 | Ei 1085841 | Ei 0740189 | Ei 0170841 | Ei 0490841 | Ei 0740189 | Ei 0170841 | Ei 0490841 | Ei 0740189 | Ei 0170841 | Ei 0490841 |
|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| REFERENCES | Children and Families Services | Health, Care and Community Services | Economy &amp; Highways Services | Fire &amp; Rescue Services | Local Committees | Chief Executive’s Office | Resources &amp; Transformation | Sub total - Service Area | Internet etc | Dept of Children &amp; Families | Principles Paid | Corporate Charges | Inflation &amp; Cont. | Other | Sub total - Other Items | Earmarked Reserve | General Reserve | NET BUDGET |
| £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's | £000's |
| <strong>APPROVED BUDGET COUNTY COUNCIL, 18TH FEB 2015 (B1 Upload)</strong> | 69,142 | 112,273 | 134,033 | 17,361 | 7,309 | 8,698 | 0 | 349,494 | 30,106 | (39,221) | 798 | 18,125 | 12,695 | 31,659 | (291) | 0 | 369,091 |
| <strong>Transfers</strong> | P | (20) | 21 | (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>Local Committees</strong> | Resources &amp; Transformation | Earmarked Reserve | APPENDIX 1 | P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>2015/16 OJ&amp;O Adjustments</strong> | 69,142 | 112,252 | 134,054 | 17,360 | 7,309 | 8,698 | 0 | 349,494 | 30,106 | (39,221) | 798 | 18,125 | 12,695 | 31,659 | (291) | 0 | 369,091 |
| <strong>1. Health and Wellbeing</strong> | P | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>2. Housing and Local Services</strong> | P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>3. Children and Families</strong> | P | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>4. Environment and Fire</strong> | P | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>5. Other</strong> | P | (13) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (13) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>Sub total 2015/16 OJ&amp;O Adjustments</strong> | P | (250) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (250) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>REVISED BUDGET AS AT 31ST MARCH 2016</strong> | 69,129 | 112,519 | 134,054 | 17,359 | 7,306 | 8,698 | 0 | 349,494 | 30,106 | (39,221) | 798 | 18,125 | 12,695 | 31,659 | (291) | 0 | 369,077 |
| <strong>1. Health and Wellbeing</strong> | P | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>2. Social Housing and Local Services</strong> | P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>3. Children and Families</strong> | P | 363 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 363 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>4. Environment and Fire</strong> | P | 450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>5. Other</strong> | P | (91) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (91) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>Sub total Revised Budget as at 31st March 2016</strong> | P | (250) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (250) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>REVISED BUDGET AS AT 31ST MAY 2016</strong> | 71,741 | 116,191 | 136,946 | 17,355 | 7,306 | 8,698 | 0 | 360,090 | 30,106 | (39,221) | 798 | 18,125 | 12,695 | 31,659 | (291) | 0 | 367,097 |
| <strong>1. Health and Wellbeing</strong> | T | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>2. Social Housing and Local Services</strong> | T | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>3. Children and Families</strong> | T | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>4. Environment and Fire</strong> | T | 1,720 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,720 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>5. Other</strong> | T | 404 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 404 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>Sub total Revised Budget as at 31st May 2016</strong> | T | (74) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (74) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>Notes</strong> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <strong>Final</strong> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewname</th>
<th>Permanent or Temporary</th>
<th>Children and Families Services</th>
<th>Health, Care and Community Services</th>
<th>Economy &amp; Highways Services</th>
<th>Fire &amp; Rescue Services</th>
<th>Local Committees</th>
<th>Chief Executives</th>
<th>Resources &amp; Transformation</th>
<th>Sub total - Service Exp</th>
<th>Internet etc</th>
<th>Deps Charg to Services</th>
<th>Principle Paid</th>
<th>Corporation Charges</th>
<th>Inflation &amp; Cont.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Sub total - Other Items</th>
<th>Externally Funded</th>
<th>General Reserve</th>
<th>NET BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from improvement &amp; efficiency Reserve for KSS Service Centre</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>20,996</td>
<td>20,996</td>
<td>(20,996)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation for facilities management</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(250)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from contingency for Children's Services Legal Team</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown of Special Purpose Earmarked Reserve to contingency</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of contingency to buffer for Winter Maintenance</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of contingency for Litigation Team</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of contingency for strengthening Commissioning activities</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown of Earmarked Reserve for Litigation Team</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVEALED BUDGET AT 30 JUNE 2016</td>
<td>70,618</td>
<td>126,100</td>
<td>119,490</td>
<td>17,129</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,009</td>
<td>363,137</td>
<td>29,231</td>
<td>(30,211)</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>18,291</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,731</td>
<td>(2,841)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>361,007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from E&amp;S to Fire for Schools RATS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from the main budget to childhoods</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(250)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVEALED BUDGET AT 31 JULY 2016</td>
<td>71,713</td>
<td>126,150</td>
<td>119,455</td>
<td>17,134</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,009</td>
<td>363,137</td>
<td>29,231</td>
<td>(30,211)</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>18,291</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,731</td>
<td>(2,841)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>361,007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation for Fire Service Pay award (Part Year)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer for Resilience Pay Award</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of People Management from Modernisation Reserve</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Economy &amp; Highways to Fire to Reinvest Centralisation of Business Support</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVEALED BUDGET AT 31 AUGUST 2016</td>
<td>71,804</td>
<td>126,707</td>
<td>119,725</td>
<td>17,256</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,009</td>
<td>363,137</td>
<td>29,231</td>
<td>(30,211)</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>18,291</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,731</td>
<td>(2,841)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>361,007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment for difference between depression 16/17 actual charges and budget (excluding Highways Network Asset depreciation charge)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(1,388)</td>
<td>(1,388)</td>
<td>(1,388)</td>
<td>(1,388)</td>
<td>(1,388)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in 2016-17 allocation for Phoenix Screening General Grant</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of statutory and postage budget adjustment</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of에 what?</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation for cross cutting service</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation for cross cutting service</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td>£000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from inflation to fund deficits on closed Adult Education Centres</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of contingency for Litigation Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from improvement &amp; Efficiency reserve to fund new Corporate Director Post in 2016/17</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to MRP Saving to support 2017/18 budget earmarked Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from General Fund Balance for Amey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Property Earmarked Reserves for Amey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from the Modernisation Earmarked Reserve for Amey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Business Rates &amp; Council Tax Earmarked Reserve for Amey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Flood Grant Earmarked Reserve for Bridge inspections</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVISED BUDGET AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2016</strong></td>
<td>70,532</td>
<td>121,151</td>
<td>115,362</td>
<td>17,478</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,027</td>
<td>364,895</td>
<td>22,231</td>
<td>(29,043)</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>28,419</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(7,133)</td>
<td>(5,050)</td>
<td>381,478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 - Summary of Progress on 2016/17 Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Lead Directorate</th>
<th>2016/17 £m</th>
<th>2017/18 £m</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>Saving Forecast to be Achieved</th>
<th>Saving Variance</th>
<th>RAG Rating (10% variance Amber, &gt;10% variance red)</th>
<th>Progress Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Service Review - Legal Services</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Service Review implemented across the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service Review - Policy &amp; Communications (includes part of reshaping resources existing savings)</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.340)</td>
<td>(0.340)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Service Review implemented across the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Service Review - Streamlining Corporate Governance</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Service Review implemented across the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Service Review - Performance &amp; Risk (includes part of existing reshaping resources saving)</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Service Review implemented across the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Service Review - Finance (includes part of existing reshaping resources saving)</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.255)</td>
<td>(0.628)</td>
<td>(0.628)</td>
<td>(0.255)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Service Review implemented across the service for 2016/17. Further review planned for 2017/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reduction in non staffing finance budgets</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Budget reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services Review</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(2.000)</td>
<td>(2.000)</td>
<td>(2.000)</td>
<td>(2.000)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Corporate Directors agreed allocation of savings in May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Digital solution to Committee Meetings</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Currently estimated that £0.015m would be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Digital solution to Council Publications</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Ceased production of Your Cumbria, saving will be delivered in full.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Contracts - Cost Reduction</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.550)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Contract procurement savings of have been achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Service Review - Procurement &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.521)</td>
<td>(0.521)</td>
<td>(0.521)</td>
<td>(0.521)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Expect to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Subscription payments reduction</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>£8k within Resources, £22k Economy and Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Development (purchasing budget) reduction</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.220)</td>
<td>(0.220)</td>
<td>(0.220)</td>
<td>(0.220)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Budget reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Service Review - People Management (includes existing MTFP saving for reshaping resources)</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(1.611)</td>
<td>(1.611)</td>
<td>(1.611)</td>
<td>(0.757)</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>The service review has delivered gross revenue savings of £1.6m and the staffing reductions expected in full, however, two factors have contributed to a net budget shortfall: - A number of posts that have been removed from the establishment have not resulted in a net revenue saving for example because they were historically funded from income or one off funding sources. - A number of VRs were counted towards cross cutting savings (Business Support and Management) instead of the service review. A permanent pressure has been included in the 2017/18 proposed budget to remove the saving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Service Review - Service Centre</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving expected to be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Service Review - ICT</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving expected to be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Business Support Review</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>(1.500)</td>
<td>(1.500)</td>
<td>(1.500)</td>
<td>(1.500)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving allocated across all services. Chief Execs and Economy and Highways allocation expected to be achieved in full, in year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources Subtotal:** (7.806) (8.277) (8.777) (6.937) 0.869
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Lead Directorate</th>
<th>2016/17 £m</th>
<th>2017/18 £m</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>Saving Forecast to be Achieved</th>
<th>Saving Variance</th>
<th>RAG Rating (10% variance Amber, &gt;10% variance red)</th>
<th>Progress Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Service Review - Short Breaks</td>
<td>Children &amp; Families Services</td>
<td>(0.450)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.450)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Savings due to be delivered from October 2016 as planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Targeted Youth Provision</td>
<td>Children &amp; Families Services</td>
<td>(0.550)</td>
<td>(0.700)</td>
<td>(0.700)</td>
<td>(0.550)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Work is progressing with the implementation of the revised structure for this service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.600)</td>
<td>(1.600)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Service Review - Contact &amp; Technical and Property Teams</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
<td>(0.263)</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving will be met not through staff savings as planned but through underspends elsewhere on service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Updated approach to statutory advertising notices spend</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving forecast to be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Service Review - Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving forecast to be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Service Review - Capital Programme Team</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving will be met not through staff savings as planned but through underspends elsewhere on service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Service Review - Environment and Regulatory Services</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Restructure in place, staff savings met, income generation being monitored to ensure increase in income element continues to be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Reduction in non statutory grants paid to external organisations</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.393)</td>
<td>(0.393)</td>
<td>(0.393)</td>
<td>(0.393)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>£250k relates to Adult Ed (resources) and this has been met along with £137k (H,C&amp;CS) and £6k (Childrens).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Energy &amp; Renewables Invest to save</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Solar panels not yet installed but saving will be met through underspends elsewhere on service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Accelerate Asset Management Strategy</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving was proposed based on the Area Programme, Areas will identify properties for closure to achieve the planned saving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reshape the way waste services are managed throughout the county by working with the District Councils</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>No arrangements in place with the DCs yet to meet this saving. Permanent pressure included in 2017/18 budget proposals to permanently remove saving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Changing the way we support Tourism in the County and removing grant funding to a range of specific organisations</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving forecast to be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Street lighting improvements</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving forecast to be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Route Efficiencies in Schools and College Transport</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving forecast to be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Lead Directorate</td>
<td>2016/17 £m</td>
<td>2017/18 £m</td>
<td>2018/19 £m</td>
<td>Saving Forecast to be Achieved</td>
<td>Saving Variance</td>
<td>RAG Rating (10% variance Amber, &gt;10% variance Red)</td>
<td>Progress Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Introduction of variable lighting levels for street lighting</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Highways Services</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Saving forecast to be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>(2.664)</td>
<td>(2.844)</td>
<td>(2.911)</td>
<td>(2.264)</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Service Review - Community Safety Team</td>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Expected to be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Service Review - Strategic Fire Management</td>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Expected to be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Service Review - Logistics &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>£25k agreed with H&amp;CS, £50k Property, £10k Fire and 15k Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Change On-Call Payment arrangements in the Fire Service</td>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Expected to be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>(0.485)</td>
<td>(0.585)</td>
<td>(0.585)</td>
<td>(0.485)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Short Term Accommodation</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.600)</td>
<td>(0.600)</td>
<td>(0.600)</td>
<td>(0.600)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Reablement - further savings</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Expected to be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Service Review - Domiciliary Care</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.260)</td>
<td>(0.390)</td>
<td>(0.390)</td>
<td>(0.260)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Plans in place to achieve within year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Service Review - Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(2.225)</td>
<td>(3.500)</td>
<td>(4.500)</td>
<td>(0.325)</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Savings are unlikely to be achieved purely via package reviews/reductions, alternative models of care and support will be required. Currently alternative housing models are insufficiently developed to provide the level of savings required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Service Review - Day Services plan (Cumbria Care and independent sector)</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(2.500)</td>
<td>(5.000)</td>
<td>(5.000)</td>
<td>(2.176)</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Extensive work being undertaken including engagement with Local Committees and service users alongside the evaluation of budgets based on current levels of demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cumbria Care Older Adult Residential Reprovision</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>(0.850)</td>
<td>(1.425)</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Programme slippage relating to the revised timeline for the initial phase of the residential reprovision in the Furness area has resulted in slippage to the profile of savings delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Better Care Fund: Integrating health &amp; social care and managing demand in key services.</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(2.500)</td>
<td>(2.500)</td>
<td>(2.500)</td>
<td>(2.500)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Lead Directorate</td>
<td>2016/17 £m</td>
<td>2017/18 £m</td>
<td>2018/19 £m</td>
<td>Saving Forecast to be Achieved</td>
<td>Saving Variance</td>
<td>RAG Rating</td>
<td>Progress Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Streamlining how we review your care needs</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(1.674)</td>
<td>(3.000)</td>
<td>(3.000)</td>
<td>(0.597)</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>The next stage of this service review, the redesign of the social care operating model, is about to begin and needs to take account of the changes that have taken place to both the integration agenda and to the implementation of legislation. Additional savings are therefore not expected to be made during the current financial year with the delivery of future savings to be reviewed and evaluated as the redesign process progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Promoting independence, managing demand through assistive technologies</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Improve the support available to people who misuse drugs and alcohol</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Working with Health to improve the way we offer services that support people’s independence and well-being</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.625)</td>
<td>(1.125)</td>
<td>(1.125)</td>
<td>(0.625)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Bring together a number of services and contracts to better support the health and wellbeing of Children in Cumbria</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Help people to continue to live independently by developing Extra Care Housing</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>At this stage of the financial year it is anticipated that this saving will be delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Establish a new lifestyle and wellbeing service for Cumbria Care</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Improve the way we commission sexual health services</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Reshape the commissioning of advocacy services to allow us to refocus the money where we have the greatest demand in the future.</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Promoting independence through the review of care needs</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.750)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(0.750)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Full Implementation of the Positive Attendance Policy in Cumbria Care</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Service Review - Community Services</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>(14.389)</td>
<td>(22.114)</td>
<td>(23.689)</td>
<td>(10.458)</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reg. No</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ref</strong></th>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lead Directorate</strong></th>
<th><strong>2016/17 £m</strong></th>
<th><strong>2017/18 £m</strong></th>
<th><strong>2018/19 £m</strong></th>
<th><strong>Saving Forecast to be Achieved</strong></th>
<th><strong>Saving Variance</strong></th>
<th><strong>RAG Rating</strong></th>
<th><strong>Progress Comment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Streamlining how we review your care needs</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(1.674)</td>
<td>(3.000)</td>
<td>(3.000)</td>
<td>(0.597)</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>The next stage of this service review, the redesign of the social care operating model, is about to begin and needs to take account of the changes that have taken place to both the integration agenda and to the implementation of legislation. Additional savings are therefore not expected to be made during the current financial year with the delivery of future savings to be reviewed and evaluated as the redesign process progresses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Promoting independence, managing demand through assistive technologies</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Improve the support available to people who misuse drugs and alcohol</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Working with Health to improve the way we offer services that support people’s independence and well-being</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.625)</td>
<td>(1.125)</td>
<td>(1.125)</td>
<td>(0.625)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Bring together a number of services and contracts to better support the health and wellbeing of Children in Cumbria</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.900)</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Help people to continue to live independently by developing Extra Care Housing</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>At this stage of the financial year it is anticipated that this saving will be delivered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Establish a new lifestyle and wellbeing service for Cumbria Care</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Improve the way we commission sexual health services</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Reshape the commissioning of advocacy services to allow us to refocus the money where we have the greatest demand in the future.</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Promoting independence through the review of care needs</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.750)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>(0.750)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Full Implementation of the Positive Attendance Policy in Cumbria Care</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Service Review - Community Services</td>
<td>Health, Care &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>This saving is on track to be delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Lead Directorate</td>
<td>2016/17 £m</td>
<td>2017/18 £m</td>
<td>2018/19 £m</td>
<td>Saving Forecast to be Achieved</td>
<td>Saving Variance</td>
<td>RAG Rating (10% variance Amber, &gt;10% variance red)</td>
<td>Progress Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>10% Reduction in Local Committee General Provision and 0-19 budgets</td>
<td>Local Committees</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Budgets for 2016/17 reduced, achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Inflation Savings</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(3.300)</td>
<td>(3.600)</td>
<td>(2.200)</td>
<td>(3.300)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Inflation budget allocated, inflation levels within budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Treasury Management savings</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(1.901)</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>(1.901)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Expected to be achieved based on current investment returns. Additional savings of £1.090m has been declared for Q1 monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Release of Earmarked Reserves ERDF</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(1.400)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>(1.400)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Review and release of earmarked reserves (Sea fisheries/ equal pay provision)</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Council Tax Savings</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(2.927)</td>
<td>(2.000)</td>
<td>(2.000)</td>
<td>(2.927)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Business Rate s21 grant - assume this continues into 16/17 and 17/18</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(0.840)</td>
<td>(0.840)</td>
<td>(0.840)</td>
<td>(0.840)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Removal of Risks built into the original MTFP</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(1.500)</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>(1.500)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Additional Dividend from Cumbria Holdings Limited</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Expected to be achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Early payment of 3 years LGPS deficit lump sum payment, following 2013 Actuarial Valuation</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(1.400)</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>(1.400)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved - final year of current 3 year arrangement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Technical Adjustments 1 - Care Act</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.900)</td>
<td>(6.900)</td>
<td>(6.900)</td>
<td>(6.900)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved when setting budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Technical Adjustments 2 - Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.159)</td>
<td>(1.433)</td>
<td>(1.133)</td>
<td>(1.159)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Achieved when setting budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19.027)</td>
<td>(9.606)</td>
<td>(6.906)</td>
<td>(19.027)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (approved by February Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(45.460)</td>
<td>(45.115)</td>
<td>(44.557)</td>
<td>(40.260)</td>
<td>5.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health, Care & Community Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Lead Directorate</th>
<th>2016/17 £m</th>
<th>2017/18 £m</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>Saving Forecast to be Achieved</th>
<th>Saving Variance</th>
<th>RAG Rating (10% variance Amber, &gt;10% variance red)</th>
<th>Progress Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>H&amp;C Transitional Funding (Council Feb16 Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget assumed transition relief would be drawn down by H&amp;C&amp;S, this is confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised total</td>
<td></td>
<td>(42.282)</td>
<td>(45.115)</td>
<td>(44.557)</td>
<td>(40.260)</td>
<td>2.022</td>
<td></td>
<td>% Achieved 95.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 (1) – Additional Information

Children & Families Budget Monitoring Report
At 30th September 2016

Overview:
As at 30th September 2016, Children and Families are forecasting to overspend by £6.923m during 2016/17. This is an increase of £2.640m from Q1, as detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Net Expenditure</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget to Date</th>
<th>Actual to Date</th>
<th>Forecast Outturn</th>
<th>Forecast Variance</th>
<th>Q1 Variance</th>
<th>Movement from Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Director &amp; Support</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 School &amp; Nursery Budgets</td>
<td>(1,300)</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>108,157</td>
<td>(1,300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,061 Inclusive Learning</td>
<td>6,954</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>7,357</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,199 Learning Improvement</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,360 Early Help</td>
<td>11,252</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>10,963</td>
<td>(286)</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922 Other Early Help &amp; Learning</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Families:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,461 Children Looked After</td>
<td>24,752</td>
<td>12,316</td>
<td>15,637</td>
<td>29,243</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>1,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,636 Child Protection</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>9,876</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,416 Child &amp; Family Support</td>
<td>4,759</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,392 Other Children &amp; Families</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>(51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,490 Other Directorate Budgets</td>
<td>10,590</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>9,037</td>
<td>10,910</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>(628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69,142</td>
<td>70,533</td>
<td>33,379</td>
<td>148,192</td>
<td>77,456</td>
<td>6,923</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projected £6.923m overspend is comprised of three key financial pressures affecting the budget. These are:

- The additional cost of EPWs
  Q2 £1.940m compared to Q1 £1.188m
- Commissioning of places for Children Looked After
  Q2 £3.936m compared to Q1 £2.000m
- A continuing budget pressure within the Directorate
  Q2 £0.642m as Q1 £0.642m

Externally Provided Workforce

The Social Work Academy was set up in 2015/16 to develop new graduates into newly qualified social workers and reduce the reliance within the Directorate on EPWs. It was originally agreed to recruit 15 graduates per annum for 3 years however, following a successful recruitment campaign, it has subsequently been approved to recruit an additional 8 graduates in 2016/17 with these staff being funded from the Improvement & Efficiency reserve.

The additional cost of EPWs is currently forecast to be £2.249m in 2016/17 with the assumption that EPWs are released on the dates assumed within the forecast. £0.309m of this expenditure relates to 14 EPW’s approved in August 2016 that are to be funded from contingency. Therefore the pressure
presented in this forecast is £1.940m.

This represents the marginal cost of employing EPWs rather than employed staff. Should all existing EPWs remain in place until 31st March 2017 expenditure this financial year would increase by £0.884m.

**Children Looked After**

The CLA budget is based on the overall mix of placement types (for example in-house fostering, residential care and external foster placements) and the number of children cared for in that setting. Overall expenditure is therefore a combination of the two variables above as the “unit cost” varies across placement type.

The CLA budget includes additional investment of £5.655m in 2016/17 based on a higher number of Children Looked After with a different mix of placement types than originally assumed.

This additional funding therefore allows for the 663 children that were looked after at 1st April 2016 with the assumption that the number of children would reduce to 529 by 31st March 2017, again with an assumed mix of placement types as shown in the table below.

Following continual review of the number of Children Looked After across all placement types during both Quarters 1 and 2 of the current financial year a pressure of £2.000m was reported at Quarter 1 which has risen to £3.936m at Quarter 2. These pressures have arisen due to the numbers of CLA being greater than planned across a number of placement types as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement type</th>
<th>April 2016 Actual</th>
<th>31/03/2017 Target</th>
<th>Q1 monitoring assumption</th>
<th>Q2 monitoring assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster placement - own provision</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster placement - own provision - family &amp; friends carer</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential placement - own provision</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster placement - other provision</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential placement - other provision*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptive placement</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed with parents</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - NHS/Health Trust/Independent living</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of CLA</strong></td>
<td><strong>663</strong></td>
<td><strong>529</strong></td>
<td><strong>615</strong></td>
<td><strong>662</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional investment in CLA agreed by Council</td>
<td>£5.655m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget pressure identified in monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2.000m</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3.936m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£5.655m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7.655m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£9.591m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Children Services Restructure**

There is a budget pressure within the Directorate of £0.642m in 2016/17 relating to a delay in fully delivering the Children Services restructure and Business Support savings within Children's Services. This delay in delivering
these staffing savings is necessary to ensure there is sufficient staffing resource to deliver the improvement of the Children & Families Services Directorate.

Other cumulative variances across the Directorate totalling £0.405m result in the Directorate's forecast of £6.923m. Within these other variances is an underspend of £0.230m against the Early Help contract.

Within the budget and forecast is an element of income from Health which has been invoiced for and included within the forecast at budgeted levels. There are currently no further health monies to be invoiced although additional analysis is being undertaken to ensure that all rechargeable health related costs are being fully recovered.
Appendix 3 (2) – Health, Care & Community Services Budget Monitoring Report

At 30th September 2016

The Health, Care and Community Services Directorate is forecast to deliver an over budget outturn position at year end of £0.091m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NET EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Annual Forecast</th>
<th>Forecast Variance</th>
<th>Forecast Variance</th>
<th>Prior Forecast Variance</th>
<th>Change in Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Sector Older Adults</td>
<td>64,010</td>
<td>41,236</td>
<td>33,689</td>
<td>63,918</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>(322)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Sector Younger Adults</td>
<td>47,007</td>
<td>11,371</td>
<td>23,357</td>
<td>49,420</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>25,268</td>
<td>16,076</td>
<td>11,945</td>
<td>21,793</td>
<td>(3,475)</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
<td>(3,278)</td>
<td>(197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Care</td>
<td>41,319</td>
<td>27,512</td>
<td>20,615</td>
<td>42,410</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Contributions</td>
<td>(38,697)</td>
<td>(20,872)</td>
<td>(13,281)</td>
<td>(38,447)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Care Fund</td>
<td>(23,052)</td>
<td>(15,368)</td>
<td>(11,700)</td>
<td>(23,052)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>(1,089)</td>
<td>(658)</td>
<td>(2,001)</td>
<td>(1,089)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Charges</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121,151</td>
<td>60,852</td>
<td>65,414</td>
<td>121,242</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The material variances are described below, on the whole the over budget forecasts relate to movement in the timescale for delivery of savings schemes with the under budget forecasts reflecting the release of funding to mitigate the aforementioned slippage.

The forecast spend in respect of commissioned services and service user income is based on information available which includes data from the new social care IT system Controcc. The process of implementation is ongoing and forecasts will be revised and updated as the implementation is finalised.

Slippage to the timescale on savings schemes.

There are 20 MTFP savings schemes within the Directorate for the current financial with under delivery of savings of £3.931m being reported across 4 of the more complex schemes.

When Council agreed the budget in February the challenge of securing Health & Care savings was recognised and additional transitional funding of £3.178m was provisionally allocated to Health & Care to help with the design, implementation and delivery of these savings. This budget monitoring report confirms that this transitional funding will be fully utilised in 2016/17.

The schemes reporting under delivery of savings in the current financial year are :-

The “how we review your care needs” scheme relates to the delivery of savings by reviewing systems, business processes and staffing structures that shape the current customer journey for those with social care needs with reference to legislation such as the Care Act.
This proposal was formulated during 2014 and proposed to Council on the 19th February 2015. Since that time there have been significant changes to legislation, such as the deferment of a substantial element of the Care Act and the funding that was assumed to follow, together with the Health and Social Care integration agenda taking considerable strides forward.

The savings target to date is £2.674m; £1.000m relates to 2015/16 and £1.674m relates to 2016/17 (the 2016/17 savings target was reduced by £0.576m from £2.250 to £1.674m by Council in February). Work to date has delivered savings of £1.597m, a reduction of £0.100m from the position at Q1, against a target of £2.674m to be delivered by the end of the current financial year, a shortfall of £1.077m. There is a further target saving of £1.326m to be delivered during 2017/18.

The next stage of this service review, the redesign of the social care operating model, is ongoing and needs to take account of the changes that have taken place to both the integration agenda and to the implementation of legislation. Additional savings are therefore not expected to be made during the current financial year with the delivery of future savings to be reviewed and evaluated as the redesign process progresses.

Plans to deliver the Day Care Service Review are in the process of being developed and refined with extensive work being undertaken by the project team including engagement with Local Committee’s and service user organisations. In order to ensure this element of the programme is inclusive and takes place effectively the timeline for implementation has been revised with implementation of actions relating to the service review expecting to be implemented towards the end of this financial year.

The current year forecast spend for all day services is £12.287m which represents a reduction of £2.176m from the 2015/16 budget after adjusting for inflation. The 2016/17 savings target is £2.500m resulting in a forecast overspend across day services of £0.324m (£0.141m relating to Cumbria Care, with the balance being within Younger Adults of £0.183m)

The reduction in spend of £2.176m consists of two elements,

- The first being the continuation of the position reported at 2015/16 year end which was £1.161m under budget. This under budget position was as a result of reduced activity and therefore lower than budgeted spend on both purchased care and on staff costs within Cumbria Care as vacancies were held due to the reducing demand. Following approval of the saving scheme by Council in February 2016 a further evaluation of demand was undertaken during Q1 and budgets adjusted accordingly which released the saving in these areas.

- The second being further actions taken within the current financial year which total £1.015m. These actions include holding additional staff posts vacant
within Cumbria Care services as demand continues to fall and the management of admissions to independent sector provision through the use of Direct Payments and alternative community based services.

With regards to the Learning Disabilities Service Review work is underway with service users to redesign care and support on an individual basis and this will require a longer lead in time to ensure that savings are delivered for 2017/18. Currently a shortfall of £1.900m against the younger Adults budget line is forecast.

Work is however ongoing through project boards with the aim of increasing the value of savings to be delivered in 2016/17 with this work being reflected and reported on in future budget monitors once plans are in place.

Alternative housing developments planned or in progress and scheduled for completion by early 2017 should ensure that 2016/17 savings will be delivered for 2017/18.

Within the Cumbria Care residential reprovision programme public consultation was launched on 5th October 2016 and will run until 23rd December 2016. Alongside the consultation period the programme timeline has been revised resulting in an estimated pressure of £0.630m against the Cumbria Care budget line.

Variance not related to savings schemes

Further savings through the promoting independence programme are forecast in the Older Adults service totalling £0.093m.

The younger adults budget has further budget pressures totalling £0.330m. Pressures in the mental health budget of £0.150m and the learning disability budget of £0.680m are in part offset by slippage against the transitions budget of (£0.500m).

Within Cumbria Care there are pressures totalling £0.321m with regards to staff costs. The material element of this pressure is as a result of the ratio of paid hours to direct care delivery hours within home care and reablement services being greater than target, i.e. more hours are being paid for than expected.

A pressure of £0.250m is forecast against the budget for personal contributions. There has been a downward trend over recent years in charges for personal contributions reflecting lower numbers of customers in statutory services in line with strategic aims and full fee payers making their own arrangements for care. Cabinet will remember the adjustments to the Budget last year and in setting this year’s original budget. These items will be followed up in the Q3 report to Cabinet.

Offsetting the above pressures is the use of the Health & Care savings transitional adjustment as agreed at Council on 18 February 2016 of £3.178m and the use of legacy funding £1.374m, these amounts total £4.552m and are located within the Other Services budget line.
In addition there is a forecast underspend of (£0.096m) within Communities which is the combined effect of pressures due to the reduction of income within Libraries, consisting of falling hire of audiovisual media and the cessation of charges for PC hire, offset by a forecast reduction of (£0.200m) in spend on the Libraries book budget.

Summary table

A summary of the above variances is presented on the table below for clarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>Budget line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under delivery of savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we review your care needs</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Services review</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>Cumbria Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Services review</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>Younger People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability Services review</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>Younger People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Care residential re-provision</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>Cumbria Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other variances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional effect of promoting independence</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Pressures</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>Younger Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Care – home care &amp; reability</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>Cumbria Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of savings transitional budget</td>
<td>-3.178</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy funding</td>
<td>-1.374</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall on personal contributions</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>Personal Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities - Library Service</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Overspend</strong></td>
<td>-3.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk**

There is a potential risk the Directorate is seeking to manage relating to the need to utilise external funding, currently supporting the provision of support at home services, with a view to increasing the volume of reablement activity undertaken in order to support the reduction of Delayed Transfers of Care attributable to Social Care.
Appendix 3 (3) – Additional Information

Economy and Highways Budget Monitoring Report

At 30th September 2016

The provisional outturn position as at 30th September is summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Budget Monitoring as at 30 September 2016</th>
<th>NET EXPENDITURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy and Highways</td>
<td>Original Budget £000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>43,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy &amp; Environment</td>
<td>37,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coroners</td>
<td>1,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Programme &amp; Property</td>
<td>15,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Charges and Insurance</td>
<td>18,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Workington</td>
<td>(142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Cumbria</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Tax</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross cutting</td>
<td>(2,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114,078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original budget for Economy and Highways at 1st April was £114.078m. A number of adjustments have been made to Quarter 2, or are expected to be made, to give a revised budget at the end of September of £119.362m as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Revised Economy and Highways Budget at 31st August 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Resilience to Fire from Regulatory Services</td>
<td>(£0.144m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of inflation incl Pay award and NI changes</td>
<td>£3.260m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from Contingency</td>
<td>£0.250m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Supplies and Services Review Saving</td>
<td>(£0.787m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>£0.737m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Capital charges as part of restructure</td>
<td>(£0.885m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralisation of Business Support, Postage and Stationery</td>
<td>£0.435m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Transfer of crosscutting savings to/from other directorates</td>
<td>£2.113m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Modernisation reserve to fund VRs</td>
<td>£0.305m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£119.362m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Economy and Highways Directorate at September 2016 is forecasting an outturn position of £118.701m, an underspend of (£0.661m). This is a reduction of £0.327m from the underspend position reported in Quarter 1.

The directorate has both areas of pressure and underspends forecast that contribute to this:

**Key Pressures:**

**Coroners**
Coroners has a pressure of £0.138m, which is an improved position of £0.070m from Quarter 1, largely due to a reduction in inquest costs. The continued
pressure is predominantly due to the increase in staff costs of £0.050m, along with additional spend on mortuary & undertaker fees £0.090m.

**Port of Workington.**
The Port of Workington has a pressure of £0.501m, which is an increased pressure of £0.056m from Quarter 1, due to a further reduction in anticipated income. This continued pressure is predominantly due to the loss of a contract in early 2016/17 for £0.250m and a continuation of the income pressure of prior years. However, discussions are ongoing regarding potential new contracts, if won this could result in additional income in Q4. This is not reflected in the forecast, therefore the £0.501m should be the worst case position for the Port.

**Economy & Environment.**
The service is currently forecasting an overspend of £0.083m, which is a movement of £0.145m from the underspend position of (£0.062m) forecast at Quarter 1, predominantly related to the Low Level Waste Repository planning application where specialist advice was required.

The position includes a drawdown from reserves to cover the legal and advisory fees incurred in respect of the current waste Shanks contract of £0.226m.

There is a forecast underspend of (£0.161m) on Waste, which is similar to that reported in Q1, as a result of an expected underspend on the Shanks contract based on current estimated volumes and mix of waste (£0.329m), along with an underspend on Kendal Fell of (£0.174m) as a result of a saving from the permanent reduction in pricing following contract negotiations. This is offset by a pressure of £0.345m on Recycling Credits, originally a £1.000m saving within the MTFP a pressure of £0.600m was agreed by Council in February, leaving a saving of £0.400m to be achieved, however, this is not expected to be met.

This is offset by forecast overspends within Economic Development and Infrastructure planning of £0.095m, which is similar to that reported in Q1 and is linked to the reshaping of the service, along with Regulatory Services £0.147m, which has increased from that reported in Q1 predominantly due to the Low level Waste Repository planning application where specialist advice was required, and where no Planning Performance Agreement is in place.

**Key underspends:**
Offsetting the key pressures above, the Economy and Highways Directorate has a number of areas where an underspend or additional income is forecast for 2016/17, as stated below.

**Director.**
There is a forecast underspend of (£0.335m), an increase from Quarter 1 which showed a balanced position and is as a result of a number of vacancies due to reshaping within Directorate Support.

**Highways & Transportation.**
The service is currently forecasting an overall underspend of (£0.439m), which is a reduction in the underspend at Q1 of £0.224m. This is in part as a result of
fluctuations within Integrated Transport and a reduction of £0.100m from the previously forecast (£0.300m) underspend within Camera Safety Partnership, which has been utilised as part of the Winter 2016/17 gully cleansing programme.

The material element of the continuing underspend are Camera Safety Partnership contribution (£0.200m), currently forecast as not being required.

Integrated Transport (£0.691m) partly in relation to staff vacancies (£0.128m), along with School Transport (£0.219m) and Supported Bus Services where the Bus Service Operators Grant (BSOG) of (£0.596m) is used to support expenditure in the community and voluntary sector. However, this is offset by a pressure of £0.298m for English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS).

Within Highways Network Management, there is a significant under recovery of income on Streetworks of £0.474m.

**Capital Programme & Property**

Capital Programme and Property is currently forecasting an underspend of (£0.515m), a reduction of £0.401m to the Q1 forecast underspend position of (£0.916m). This is as a result of increased spend of around £0.179m within the Corporate Maintenance fund, along with a reduction in staff recharges to Capital.

The material elements of the continuing underspend are set out as follows:

- A (£0.357m) underspend within Property. Estates are forecasting an underspend of (£0.243m), with (£0.104m) of this due to lower than budgeted property running costs and (£0.223m) from an increase in the income expected from rental income, offset by additional costs from surplus properties of £0.114m. There is also an expectation that income received from Industrial Estates will over achieve (£0.114m).

- An underspend of (£0.035m) is expected on Corporate Health and Safety as a result of lower than expected consultants fees.

- There is an underspend within Facilities Management, of (£0.254m). Of this, (£0.370m) is due to lower than budgeted energy costs within Street Lighting, the impact of lower energy prices and the lantern replacement scheme being ahead of programme. Offset in part by £0.100m relating to BP4W and £0.061m spend in relation to Swimming Pools, following the reduction in grants agreed in MTFP (2015 – 2018).

- There is a forecast overspend on Corporate Maintenance Fund of £0.179m following the identification of additional maintenance costs.

- There is a net underspend of £0.048m against other budgets.
Carbon Tax
An underspend of (£0.094m) has been identified in Q2 for Carbon Tax resulting in part, from an overestimate of the year end accrual (£0.052m), along with a continuation of lower expenditure levels within this year.
Appendix 3 (4) – Additional Information

Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service Budget Monitoring Report
as at 30th September 2016

The budget for Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service approved at February 2016 Council was £17.361m. This has since increased by £0.117m to give a revised budget of £17.478m as at 30th September 2016. The forecast outturn against the revised budget is £0.234m under budget at £17.244m.

The forecast outturn is largely due to savings arising both from the shared management arrangements with Cheshire FRS and the holding of vacancies pending a restructure. These savings will be used to help meet the 2017/18 savings target of £0.600m relating to changes in crewing. The changes will not now happen and alternative ways of achieving the savings are being considered.

The forecast outturn assumes that £0.300m, that was included in the base budget as part of the 2015/16 budget setting process, will be transferred to an earmarked reserve in Q3. The additional budget was intended to meet back dated employers contributions in respect of statutory changes to the firefighters pension scheme. It is now expected that, rather than making a one off payment in respect of back dated contributions, these will be recovered as part of the actuarial revaluation which will amend contribution rates.
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Appendix 3 (5) – Additional Information

Local Committees Budget Monitoring Report
At 30th September 2016

The forecast outturn position is summarised in the table below and detailed in the attached appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Annual Forecast</th>
<th>Forecast Variance</th>
<th>Forecast Variance</th>
<th>Previous Variance Reported Q1</th>
<th>Change in Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,845 Highways Maintenance - Basic Allocation</td>
<td>5,680</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Highways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Budget, incorporating General 1,120 Provision, School Crossing Patrols and 0-19 Services</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>(473)</td>
<td>(22.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(473)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Individual Local Member Schemes</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>(324)</td>
<td>(49.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Development-Area Support 613 Teams</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 Money Advice - CAB</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 Miscellaneous other</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>(67.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,144 Sub Total Non Highways</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>(929)</td>
<td>(24.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Highways &amp; Non Highways</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>(545)</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance assumed to be carried forward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,989 Total Local Committees</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this stage of the financial year; based on actual spend to date and any known commitments, Local Committees are forecasting to underspend by (£0.545m).

Included in the (£0.929m) underspend, is (£0.324m) relating to Individual Local Members Scheme. Council agreed in June 2015 and confirmed this in February 2016 to extend the scheme until 31 March 2017 only, any underspend at this date will therefore be reported as such and will be released into Corporate Reserves.

The remainder of the underspend is within the Discretionary budget (£0.478m) and the Miscellaneous budget of (£0.127m).

In respect of the Highways Maintenance Basic Allocation there is an accelerated spend position of £0.384m. The overall position is therefore a £0.545m underspend.

However, to be consistent with previous monitoring reports to Cabinet it is assumed that if the forecast underspend were to occur, then this will be carried forward to 2017/18, subject to Council consideration when it meets in June 2017. As such, the overall forecast has been reported as balanced.
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Resources and Transformation Budget Monitoring Report as at 30th September 2016

The provisional outturn position as at 30th September 2016 is summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NET EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Outturn</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance Q1</th>
<th>Change in Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000*</td>
<td>£000*</td>
<td>£000*</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000*</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000*</td>
<td>£000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£24.534</td>
<td>£26.926</td>
<td>£26.926</td>
<td>£26.926</td>
<td>13,692</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>26,004</td>
<td>26,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original budget for Resources and Transformation at 1st April was £24.534m. A number of adjustments have been made to quarter 2, or are expected to be made, to give a revised budget at the end of September of £26.926m as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>£24.534m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralisation of Occupational Health</td>
<td>£0.167m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Improvement and Efficiency Reserve</td>
<td>£0.301m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>£0.037m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Modernisation Reserve to Fund VRs</td>
<td>£0.273m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of inflation including pay award and NI changes</td>
<td>£1.687m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from contingency to Q2</td>
<td>£0.292m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of capital charges as part of restructure</td>
<td>£0.304m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of staff between Directorates</td>
<td>(£0.184m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cutting Savings allocated to other Directorates</td>
<td>£1.860m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cutting Savings allocated from other Directorates</td>
<td>(£2.345m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Resources and Transformation Budget at 30th September 2016

| Revised Resources and Transformation Budget at 30th September 2016 | £26.926m |

The Resources and Transformation Services Directorate at September 2016 is forecasting an outturn position of £26.804m to give an underspend of (£0.122m), an improvement of (£0.599m) from that reported in Quarter 1.

The Directorate has, during Q2, undertaken work to help mitigate the overspend forecast in Q1 and has identified a number of one off in year savings. The two most significant elements of the improved position are a forecast saving of (£0.173m) due to the correction of duplicate payments across the authority, and increases in underspends due to vacancy management in Policy, Performance and Communications (£0.161m) and Finance (£0.083m).
Procurement is forecasting a (£0.046m) increase in the dividend received from the Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation (YPO), ICT have reprioritised a number of ICT projects and there are a number of staff vacancies across the directorate.

**Key Pressures:**

**People Management**
The service continues to forecast an overall overspend of £0.668m which is a (£0.050m) improvement from that reported in Quarter 1.

The People Management, Learning & Skills staffing service review has delivered gross revenue savings of £1.6m and the number of post reductions expected in full, however, two factors have contributed to a £0.854m net saving shortfall:

- A number of posts that have been removed from the establishment have not resulted in a net revenue saving for example because they were historically funded from income or one off funding sources;
- A number of VRs were counted towards cross cutting savings (Business Support and Management) instead of the service review.

Learning and Development are continuing to work with Health and Care services with regard to their training requirements. The amount and range of training required for care and support staff in Cumbria Care is increasing, partly to reflect developments in care practice and in response to CQC regulation and monitoring, and could therefore result in a pressure on the corporate learning and development budget. Work is therefore being undertaken to review the delivery of this training to determine if it can be fully funded within the existing budget and not result in a pressure for the directorate.

Prior to 2016/17 a number of Adult Education Centres were closed either by the service or transferred onto a different delivery arrangement. At the time of closure a number of these centres were in a deficit position, with no means of recovery. As a result, the Q2 outturn report assumes that the balances totalling £0.240m are written off as a cost against the inflation budget.

**Key underspends:**
Offsetting the remaining pressure there are underspends in Finance, Policy, Performance & Communications, Transformation, Procurement and Business Services.

Legal is currently forecasting a balanced budget.
The outturn position is summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>NET EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Annual Forecast</th>
<th>Forecast Variance</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Q1 Variance</th>
<th>Change in Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
<td>£000 £000 £000 £000 £000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,106 Interest Payable, Minimum Revenue Provision and Investment Income</td>
<td>(30,221) Depreciation Charge to Services</td>
<td>(29,043) (7,261) 0 (29,043) 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798 Precepts Paid</td>
<td>1,197 0 0 174 (1,023) (85.5%) (1,023) 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,592 Residual Pension Costs</td>
<td>7,288 1,822 (1,588) 7,288 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,062 Corporate Insurances</td>
<td>512 Litigation Team costs</td>
<td>1,543 1,239 1,239 1,543 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,000) Dividend from Cumbria County Holdings</td>
<td>1,238 Other items</td>
<td>1,238 175 (1,427) 51 (650) (92.7%) (650) 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,658 Total</td>
<td>26,616 16,029 15,793 22,120 (4,496) (16.9%) (2,763) (1,733)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forecast outturn for the year for the directorate is an underspend of £4.496m against a revised budget of £16.816m for the year.

**Treasury Management**

The treasury management function supports the overall objectives and priorities of the Council, by the use of effective treasury management techniques. The aim is to manage risks and ensure there are sufficient cash resources and long-term borrowings to finance the Council's activities and capital investment programme whilst balancing this to the secondary objective of trying to minimise the costs of the net interest budget.

With long term borrowing of £294.7m (no change from 30th June 2016) and investments of £232.4m (£242.8m at June) as at 30th September, there is a significant net interest cost included in the Council’s budget. Successful treasury management reduces the cost of these transactions and helps to relieve the pressure on the revenue budget.

Annual savings on the net interest budget of £2.823m are being forecast as at 30th September 2016. Following the decision to change the MRP policy at November Council there is a further £5.500m saving in 2016/17, this report recommends that £4.000m of this is transferred to an earmarked reserve to support the 2017/18 budget (as per the October 2017/18 Budget Consultation approved by Cabinet) resulting in an increase in the Treasury Management saving of £1.500m (£5.500m less £4.000m). The revised annual saving on the net interest budget is £2.823m (£1.323m plus £1.500m). This is in addition to the budgeted saving of £3.968m included in the agreeing the 2016/17 budget.

The reported saving of £2.823m is due to:

- A revision to the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy approved by Council in November generating savings in 2016/17 of £5.500m; £4.000m of this is
transferred to an earmarked reserve resulting in an increase in the reported MRP saving of £1.500m from Q1;

- An assumption that there is no requirement to undertake external borrowing during the year for the projected levels of internal borrowing, releases savings of £0.767m. This represents the full year effect of internal borrowing;

- Slippage on the capital programme at the end of 2015/16 resulting in a delay in the requirement to charge an element of Minimum Revenue Provision in 2016/17 releasing efficiencies of £0.301m;

- Outperformance in relation to interest rates receivable has delivered an additional £0.233m in savings in 2016/17;

- Other various items have a further net underspend of £0.022m.

- It should be noted that these underspends are all one-off savings relating to 2016/17 only.

Inflation and Contingency Budgets
The inflation and contingency budget includes provision for inflation which is allocated once indexation rates are certain and a contingency to allow for changes from the original inflation assumptions and to smooth implementation of the budget. It is currently expected that there will be underspend of £1.023m on the inflation element of this budget at the end of 2016/17.

General Contingency
The general contingency included in this budget is £1.5m. The following allocations have been made from the general contingency so far in 2016/17:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Contingency</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 approved budget</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Resources and Transformation – Children’s Services legal Team</td>
<td>Agreement in Q1</td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Economy &amp; Highways Services for Winter Maintenance cover payments</td>
<td>Agreement in Q1</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Other Corporate Items for Litigation Team</td>
<td>Agreement in Q1</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of Sea Fisheries Contribution to Earmarked Reserve (as not required)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Health, Care and Community Services to strengthen Commissioning</td>
<td>Agreement in Q1</td>
<td>(0.150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>To be agreed in Q2</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of contingency for costs relating to the Litigation Team in relation to the contractual dispute</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Intervention Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional EPW Social Workers in the South of the County</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(1.469)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Contingency budget remaining</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.031</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Items**

The £0.650m budget for the Apprenticeship Levy is not required for 2016/17 as the levy will not be charged until 1 April 2017. This is included in the Other items section of the Corporate Budget and is reported as an underspend for 2016/17.

**Highways Litigation Dispute Payment**

Following the handing down of the judgement in the highways litigation dispute in November, where the Council was defendant, the award (including interest) to Amey is £5.4m. The judge has made an order that the Council pays a proportion of costs incurred by Amey in respect of the litigation. A payment on account of £4.3m plus interest of £0.1m has been made in accordance with the Order. The £9.8m has been funded £3m from General Fund Balances, £1.308m from Business Rate Volatility earmarked Reserve, £3.526m from capital property earmarked reserves and £1.966m from the Modernisation Reserve.
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### SUMMARY OF EARMARKED RESERVES

**APPENDIX 4**

**As at 30th September 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance at 31/3/16</th>
<th>Budgeted appropriations to reserves 2016/17</th>
<th>Budgeted appropriations from reserves 2016/17</th>
<th>Transfers Between Reserves</th>
<th>Transfers to Reserves</th>
<th>Transfers from reserves</th>
<th>Balance at 31/3/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN &amp; FAMILIES SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Academy</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Other budgets</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN &amp; FAMILIES SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH, CARE &amp; COMMUNITY SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Act</td>
<td>(469)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(469)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Assistance</td>
<td>(235)</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH, CARE &amp; COMMUNITY SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>(704)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(469)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMY &amp; HIGHWAYS SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Maintenance</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Ferry</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA Work</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks contract negotiations</td>
<td>(919)</td>
<td>(226)</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>(965)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTF Reserve</td>
<td>(107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour of Britain Reserve</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste PPP Contract (Shanks Unitary Charge)</td>
<td>(883)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(883)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 16 Transport</td>
<td>(400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Enterprise</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Cumbria</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Programme &amp; Property</td>
<td>(3,526)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,526)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP&amp;F West Coast Consortium</td>
<td>(121)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(121)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP&amp;F CMF - Education</td>
<td>(251)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(251)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMY &amp; HIGHWAYS SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>(6,518)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>(2,689)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE &amp; RESCUE SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Pension Liabilities</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRE &amp; RESCUE SERVICE</strong></td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES &amp; TRANSFORMATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Management Skills for Jobs / Future Jobs Fund</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Management - L&amp;D</td>
<td>(400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services ICT Infrastructure</td>
<td>(860)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(860)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated Funds - CDCC/Adult Ed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Copeland CDCCs</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES &amp; TRANSFORMATION</strong></td>
<td>(1,308)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(1,271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL COMMITTEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Committees</td>
<td>(899)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(899)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Member Schemes</td>
<td>(657)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(657)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL COMMITTEES</strong></td>
<td>(1,556)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRALLY HELD RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>(453)</td>
<td>(119)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(572)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Fisheries</td>
<td>(213)</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(316)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement &amp; Efficiency Reserve</td>
<td>(1,108)</td>
<td>798</td>
<td></td>
<td>(310)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to underwrite EA Cockermouth flood defence scheme</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven Schools’ feasibility study contribution</td>
<td>(250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Fleet Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>(875)</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWHF Volatility Reserve share</td>
<td>(380)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(380)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRP Saving to support 2017/18 budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatility Reserve</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(1,230)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF Reserve - Connecting Cumbria</td>
<td>(1,400)</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRALLY HELD RESERVES</strong></td>
<td>(4,145)</td>
<td>(1,452)</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,875)</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>(5,988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>(8,701)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8,701)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER CCC RESERVES</strong></td>
<td>(23,261)</td>
<td>(1,452)</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,875)</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>(19,380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODERNISATION RESERVE</strong></td>
<td>(15,285)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>(12,267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE GRANTS &amp; CONTRIBUTIONS RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDR Grant in Advance</td>
<td>(24,970)</td>
<td>(366)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(25,336)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire PFI Reserve</td>
<td>(1,368)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,444)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Grants received in March</td>
<td>(363)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(363)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Grants - PRG</td>
<td>(2,818)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,818)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Grants - Winter Pressures</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Adults</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributions - Local services</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned maintenance slippage</td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Grants - Fire</td>
<td>(543)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(543)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Standards Proceeds of Crime Act</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Grants - Environment</td>
<td>(392)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>(164)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Grant - Lead Local Flood Authority</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Grants - Focused Families</td>
<td>(425)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OTHER CCC RESERVES** | | | | | | 8,061 | (19,380) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance at 31/3/16</th>
<th>Budgeted appropriations to reserves 2016/17</th>
<th>Budgeted appropriations from reserves 2016/17</th>
<th>Transfers Between Reserves</th>
<th>Transfers to Reserves</th>
<th>Transfers from reserves</th>
<th>Balance at 31/3/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headstart</td>
<td>(404)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Grants - DfT Survey Grants</td>
<td>(1,294)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>(1,088)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Grant</td>
<td>(2,552)</td>
<td>(2,552)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN Reform</td>
<td>(450)</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Assistance</td>
<td>(950)</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>(685)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(685)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE GRANTS RESERVES</td>
<td>(37,049)</td>
<td>(444)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,978)</td>
<td>(35,515)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EARMARKED CAPITAL RESERVES**

| Capital Fund                              | (2,724)            |                                            |                                             |                           |                      |                        | (2,724)            |
| TOTAL EARMARKED CAPITAL RESERVES          | (2,724)            | 0                                         | 0                                           | 0                         | 0                    | (2,724)                |
| TOTAL CCC EARMARKED RESERVES              | (76,319)           | (1,896)                                   | 2,147                                       | 0                         | (4,075)              | (69,886)               |

**DSG FUNDED RESERVES**

<p>| Delegated Funds - Schools                 | (6,402)            |                                            |                                             |                           |                      |                        | (6,402)            |
| Central HQ Budgets - DSG                  | 1,190              | (1,720)                                   | 420                                         | (110)                     |                      |                        | (110)              |
| DSG FUNDED RESERVES                       | (5,212)            | 0                                         | 0                                           | (1,720)                   | 420                  | (6,512)                |
| TOTAL EARMARKED RESERVES                  | (63,531)           | (1,896)                                   | 2,147                                       | 0                         | (6,595)              | (76,396)               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Planned Outturn</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA - Flood Recovery</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lead Local Flood Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP - South Ulverston</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Communities Fund</td>
<td>19,094</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Improvements</td>
<td>15,490</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The scheme is now complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Square Development</td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitive Closure</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Travel Needs - Projects</td>
<td>8,225</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC - Ingestion</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment - Communities</td>
<td>7,195</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Travel Needs - Projects (new landfill sites)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP - Port of Workington Road</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Capital Programme monitoring to end June 2016</td>
<td>327,417</td>
<td>232,417</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Capital Programme monitoring to end June 2016</td>
<td>352,417</td>
<td>337,417</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding approved by LEP for 16/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountable Body</th>
<th>Scheme Title</th>
<th>Stages of Spend</th>
<th>Stage 1 (£000)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (£000)</th>
<th>Stage 3 (£000)</th>
<th>Stage 4 (£000)</th>
<th>Stage 5 (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEP - Port of Workington Road</td>
<td>Fire Behaviour Training Facility</td>
<td>Full spend anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP - Growing our Potential (Carlisle College)</td>
<td>Fire Vehicles renewal scheme</td>
<td>Full spend anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP - Advanced Manufacturing Centre</td>
<td>Capital Investment in Lazonby &amp; Bootle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP - Lazonby &amp; Bootle Gateway</td>
<td>Equipment - updating technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP - Nuclear Technology Innovation Accountable Bodies Programme</td>
<td>Breathing Apparatus Telemetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ulverston Fire Station (new for 14/15)</td>
<td>Full spend anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Programme monitoring to end June 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Title</th>
<th>Capital outturn</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Subtotal</td>
<td>154,517</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- Changes in the 2016/17 budget as at March 2016 are due to accelerated expenditure at 2015/16. 
- Changes in the 2016/17 budget as at March 2016 are due to changes in the 2016/17 budget as at March 2016. 
- Re-profiles to Sept 2016 (Qtr 2), updates, re-profiles 2016/17 changes to Dec 2016 (Qtr 3) 
- Re-profiles to Mar 2017 (Qtr 4) 
- Variance due to changes in the 2016/17 budget as at March 2016. 
- Explanatory Notes (Quarter 2)
What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. The purpose of this report is to provide Cabinet with a progress update on corporate performance, incorporating progress on:
   - Key service performance indicators for the 6 month period ended 30th September 2016, and performance indicators for the year to 31st October 2016 that are used to track progress against the Children’s Improvement Plan.

2. This report focuses on the refreshed Council Plan Delivery Plan for 2016/17 agreed by Cabinet in April 2016, which sets out how the Council will deliver each of its commitments under the 5 priorities in the Council Plan 2016/19 agreed by Council in February 2016.

3. Where performance indicators have dipped below target or baseline, officers are expected to take appropriate actions to improve performance in order to bring performance back on track. In these instances, remedial action is highlighted in this report and in the detailed commentary in the appendix.

Recommendations of the Corporate Director

4. **Recommendation 1:** That Cabinet note overall performance across the 5 Council Plan priorities, including progress against the Council Plan delivery plan for the quarter ended 30th September 2016.

5. **Recommendation 2:** That Cabinet note performance at 31st October 2016 across the performance indicators that are used to track progress against the Children’s Improvement Plan.
Background to the Proposals

6. The following paragraphs describe headline performance under each of the 5 Council Plan priorities in Appendix 1:

To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential - Highlights from the Council Plan Delivery Plan:

7. In terms of delivering, in partnership, the council’s improvement plan for children’s social care, audit and quality assurance activity is demonstrating continued progress and is focussing management activity appropriately. A review with DfE has taken place, and in line with the expectations set out in the Council Plan Delivery Plan, the outcome has been reported to the Leader of the Council. The next review is due in November 2016.

8. There was a dip in performance levels for the Children Looked After Strategy over summer due to staff unexpectedly leaving at short notice, however performance is beginning to return to expected levels. The Children in Care Council remain active in championing the Cumbria Promise to children who are looked after and this was included in a report to the Corporate Parenting Board in September 2016.

9. The final reshaping of targeted youth services is underway, with vacant posts in Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) teams out to advert.

10. To secure the most sustainable future for schools and school improvement to meet the County’s needs, work with the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders is on track and delivery of the plan is on schedule. Milestones and review processes are in place, and clusters are engaged in peer review and supporting the development of an accountability framework.

To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential - Children’s Services Improvement Plan Performance Indicators:

11. A full set of 36 Performance Indicators that are used to track the Children’s Improvement Plan are included in Appendix 1. These indicators are for October 2016 and will be reported to the Children’s Improvement Board on 8th December 2016. October performance shows a similar profile across the range of 36 performance indicators compared with the profile presented to Children’s Improvement Board in September 2016 (performance for July 2016).

12. When compared to July 2016, the number (and percentage) of performance indicators either on target, exceeding target, or within 5% of target remains consistent at 22 (61%), as does the number of Amber performance indicators 4 (11%), and the number of performance indicators that are off-target by more than 10%, 10 (28%). All targets remain at the 2015/16 level. For a number of indicators, there is evidence of further improvement in those rated consistently
GREEN and there is evidence of sustained performance for those rated AMBER.

13. Looking across a longer timeframe, cumulative performance figures over the previous rolling year to 31st October show a more positive picture of performance and improvement, with 25 (69%) of indicators rated Green when compared with target, 2 (6%) Amber and 9 (25%) Red.

14. The following 22 performance indicators are either on target, exceeding target, or within 5% of target (Green):

15. **Assessments completed within 45 working days (CS1.1)** – 92.3% of assessments completed in October were completed within 45 working days. This represents an improvement in performance compared with recent months and an improvement compared with the previous figure reported to the Board in July (85.9%). Latest performance is better than target of 90%.

16. **Child Protection Statutory Visits (CS2.4)** – The proportion of children with up to date statutory visits at the end of October has improved to 97% compared with the last rate reported to the board for July (87.8%). Performance has been relatively stable over the last year and has been above or close to the target of 96% for the majority of that time.

17. **Children looked after statutory visits (CS3.4)** - The percentage of looked after children with an up-to-date statutory visit rose to the highest level in over a year to 99.1% at the end of October and has now been better than target of 96% for the last 3 months.

18. **Children Looked After with 3 or more placements in a year (CS3.5)** – This is measured on a rolling 12 month basis and performance for the year to October saw an increase in the rate to the highest level in over 12 months (7.5%). Rolling annual performance has been consistently better than target (8%) at each month end for over a year (where lower figures are better), and despite the latest increase, performance remains better than national and statistical neighbour averages. Although this indicator continues to be better than target there have been significant difficulties in the October and November period in finding appropriate placements for children coming into care. This has led to more unplanned moves and may see the indicator deteriorate in the next report to the Board.

19. **Children Looked After living in the same placement for 2+ years (CS3.6)** – The proportion of children that had been in the same placement for two or more years has increased this month to 69.1% and is now within one percentage point of the target of 70%. Recent figures are demonstrating improvement and cumulative performance for the last 12 months also stands at 69.1%. This indicator continues to be an area of attention for the senior team. The intention is to improve support prior to crises that lead to disruption, and to increase overall the number of in-house fostering resources to improve placement choice/match.

20. **CLA with up to date Personal Education Plan (CS3.10)** – At the end of the summer 2016 school term 98.8% of children had an up to date PEP. Performance is very slightly below the target of 100%, and is the highest performance recorded
across the last 7 school terms now that a backlog at May this year has been addressed.

21. *Initial health assessments for children entering care (CS3.12)* – 88.2% of children who entered care during September had initial health assessment within the required timescale. For 8 of the previous 12 months, performance has been rated Green, and for the current year to date cumulative performance is 84.4% which is within one percentage point of target (85%).

22. *Review Health Assessments (RHA) for children aged under 5 (CS3.13)* – The rate of reviews of health assessments for children aged under 5 has improved from 80.6% in September to 85.2% in October (115 of 135 children), exceeding the target of 85%. Performance has improved significantly since February 2016 with performance better than target for 6 of the last 8 months.

23. *Review health assessments for children aged 5 and over (CS3.14)* – The rate of reviews for health assessments for children aged 5 continues to perform well. Performance for October was 96% (478 of 498 children) against a target of 85% and performance has remained well above target for over 12 months.

24. *Health assessments for children looked after for 12 months or more (CS3.15)* – The rate of reviews of health assessments for children looked after for 12 months or more continues on a recent trend of improved performance. Latest performance is 91.9% and since January 2016 monthly performance has consistently been better than target of 85%.

25. *Dental checks for Children Looked After for 12 months or more (CS3.16)* – Performance for October was 95.9% which is the highest rate achieved in over 12 months. Performance has remained better than target of 85% since March 2016.

26. *Immunisations for Children Looked After for 12 months or more (CS3.17)* – The rate of immunisations for children looked after for 12 months or more continues to be better than target of 90%. Latest performance is 96.6% and the rate has been consistent at 96%-97.5% per month for over a year.

27. *Care leavers aged 19, 20 and 21 in suitable accommodation (CS4.0)* – 91.6% (152 of 166) of former relevant care leavers who had their 19th, 20th or 21st birthday in the year ended 31 October were living in accommodation considered to be suitable at the time of that birthday. This is the highest rate recorded for over a year and remains above target of 83%, national and statistical neighbour figures.

28. *Care leavers aged 19, 20 and 21 in education, employment and training (CS4.1)* – 48.8% (81 of 166) of former relevant care leavers who had their 19th, 20th or 21st birthday in the year ended 31 October were in education, employment or training (EET) at the time of that birthday. Although this rate is now within one percentage point of the target of 49%, performance has declined slightly over the last year. We are working to improve performance further in partnership with colleagues in the apprenticeship service and Inspira. Meetings with Inspira are held on a regular basis to review individual young people's progress, and job leaflets and apprenticeship information is distributed to all care leavers. Quite a high percentage of our young people cannot work due to their emotional wellbeing and
that does impact on the EET rate. The lead manager for apprenticeships has offered guaranteed interviews for apprenticeships for care leavers.

29. **Percentage of social work vacancies covered by agency staff (CS5.0)** – The proportion of vacancies covered by agency staff has reduced to 14.4% compared with 15.9% for July reported at the last Board meeting. This rate is within one percentage point of the target of 14% and is the lowest rate recorded since March 2016. Work is in hand to ensure that the reliance on agency social workers is reduced. In the short term we are deploying existing staff in the most effective way and ensuring that absence is promptly addressed. In the longer term the Academy programme and the teaching partnership should strengthen our position in regard to achieving a more stable and secure workforce.

30. **Young People in Police custody (CS5.3)** – No young people were held overnight in police custody during October and average performance for the last 12 months on this measure (1 per month) was better than target (2 per month). The trend over the last year was broadly static, although with very small numbers the figures should be treated with caution.

31. **Child Protection Reviews - latest review up to date (CS6.1)** - The latest rate for up-to-date reviews was 95.4% which is within 2 percentage points of target (97%). Performance has dipped to slightly below target for the last 4 months and had been consistently above target for the 5 month period February to June 2016.

32. **Children Looked After – latest review up to date (CS6.3)** – The rate of reviews within timescale for October was 98.5% and remains above target of 90%. Performance has been consistently better than target of 90% for over a year.

33. **Children looked after – review participation for all reviews in the year (CS6.4)** – There has been steady improvement on this measure over the last year, up from 82% in May 2015 to 91.5% in July and October this year. As a result, this measure has moved from a RAG rating of red against the target of 92% to Green for the last 9 months, as it has been within 5% of the target. The MOMO App (Mind of My Own) is now being rolled out (this is an application which facilitates the participation of children and opportunities for consultation). Observations of conferences have identified a general lack of use of advocates and this will be discussed at team level to ensure all social workers are aware of the availability of advocates. A new advocacy contract is now in place.

34. **Children Looked After Review participation in latest review (CS6.5)** – Performance on this measure remains consistently high; standing at 96% at the end of October 2016 and has been better than the target of 92% consistently for over 12 months.

35. **Early Help Assessments (CS7.0)** – This is measured as a rate per 10,000 population aged 0-17. The actual number of Early Help Assessments initiated in September 2016 was 131 and is comparable with the figure for September 2015. The trend has been downward since January 2016, and at the end of September was only marginally above the target of 13.4 per 10,000 population (125 per month).
36. **CAMHS patients assessed as urgent seen within 48 hours (HE2)** – For the period August to October, 23 out of 24 referrals assessed as urgent were seen within 48 hours (96%). Performance in August and September was 100% and in October only 1 case was seen outside of 48 hours. The RAG rating for this measure is sensitive to change, particularly in months where there are small numbers of referrals.

37. **The following 4 performance indicators are within 5-10% of target (Amber):**

38. **Average time between entering care and placement with adoptive family (CS3.20)** - The average time between entering care and being placed with an adoptive family for children who were adopted in the year between April and October was 629 days, which is a slight improvement from last month's figure of 643.4 days, however this represents an increase compared with 600 days reported to the Board in September (July figures). Latest performance is now between 5% - 10% of the target of 586 days (Amber). We continue to make progress in placing children whose plans had drifted previously and current plans are being progressed in a more timely way. This will ultimately be reflected in the performance figures in future.

39. **Child Protection Reviews – all reviews in last year in timescale (CS6.0)** – At the end of October, 87.4% of children with a child protection plan had had all of their reviews within the previous year held within the required timescale compared with a target of 96.3%. Having been rated Red for 2 consecutive months at the turn of the last calendar year, performance has remained relatively stable at Amber for the last 9 months. Performance is below the national rate and the rate for statistical neighbours.

40. **Children Looked After – all reviews in last year in timescale (CS6.2)** – 488 out of 584 (83.6%) of looked after children had had all of their statutory reviews held within the required timescale during the year ending 31 October. Performance has consistently been within a range of 81% to 86% for over 12 months and remains within 10% of target (90%).Weekly oversight of this indicator is delivering sustained performance.

41. **Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) patients seen within 35 days of referral (HE1)** – County wide CAMHS performance has begun to recover following a period of workforce instability and declining performance over the summer months. Performance improved in October to 82% county wide, with East Cumbria achieving 100%. The longest wait in October of 61 days was with the West team, in South the longest wait was 58 days and East 35 days. Overall numbers of appointments have increased following a dip over summer. Performance has now improved to Amber having been Red for the previous 6 months.

42. **The following 10 performance indicators are more than 10% off target (Red):**

43. **Referrals within 12 months of a previous referral (CS1.0)** - The percentage of re-referrals has increased in October (up from 23.2% to 27.1%). Performance for the month of October was off target (23.4%), however cumulative performance for the current year to date was 22.6% and so better than target. There continues to be monthly fluctuations with this indicator, both at county and district level, however
the trend over the year continues to be slightly downward and the longer-term trend over the last 2 years continues to be more significantly downward, where a lower percentage is better. Performance has been the subject of a deep dive investigation during the autumn both within the County Council and LSCB. There are some key lines of enquiry now being followed up via a multi-agency audit; including, the application of thresholds, the effectiveness of plans, and the role of all partners in effecting change in children’s lives. This work will report to the LSCB in January with some single agency and some cross partnership recommendations aimed at reducing re-referral and the flux in performance.

44. **Initial Child Protection Conferences within 15 working days (CS2.1)** – latest figures show that performance has dipped this month to the lowest level for over a year (down from 80% in September to 49.2%), however performance had been consistently above target of 83.8% for the period January to April 2016, and for the current year to October 2016, 72.4% has been achieved compared with a target of 83.8%. Performance in Barrow and South Lakes and Carlisle and Eden was 100% in October, however performance in Allerdale and Copeland has dipped again this month to 9.1%. There are a range of causes for the decline in performance in Allerdale and Copeland, and in October the district management team has identified measures that have been put in place to improve performance. All s47 enquiries will now be tracked through to conference or other outcome by the business support team until we can be confident practice is embedded. There is a plan to co-locate the IRO and SW teams in the West, which will significantly improve communication and relationships. There has been further work to dig deeper into the reasons for each late conference and this is now being investigated. Agency Business Support has also been put in place to help alleviate some of the backlog.

45. **Social Work Reports for Initial Child Protection Conferences shared with family (CS2.2)** - The number of conferences where the social work report had been appropriately shared with families dipped this month (from 73.3% in September to 66.2%). Although performance for October was off target (75%), this appears to be a blip. Cumulative performance for the current year to October 2016 was 75.9% and better than target. The longer term trend remains one of improvement, with performance better than target for 10 of the previous 12 months. Performance is subjected to weekly challenge and the process for stepping down ICPCs resulting from not sharing reports on time is being reviewed.

46. **Children subject of repeat Child Protection plan within 2 years (CS2.5)** – 11.7% of children who became subject to a child protection plan in the year ended 31 October 2016 had had a previous plan which ended 2 years or less before, and this remains outside of the target banding of 5 -10%. The rate has remained consistent in the current year. As noted in paragraph 7.1 above, this is an aspect of the LSCB deep dive that is currently in progress. The results of this and recommended actions will be reported to the LSCB in January.

47. **Children looked after - number and rate (CS3.0)** – The number of Looked After Children has fallen for the third consecutive month to 652 at the end of October which is equivalent to a rate of 70.3 per 10,000 population aged 0-17 years. Although there has been a recent reduction, this remains above target of 66.5 per 10,000 population aged 0-17 years, above comparator figures nationally and above statistical neighbours. The number is very slightly down on a year to year
comparison. This compares well with the upward trajectory across England and in the North West.

- **Number of children entering care (CS3.1)** – the number entering care in October was 15 against a target of 12, the third lowest monthly number of children entering care in the last 12 months. For the 12 month period November 2015-October 2016 238 children entered care against a target of 144.

- **Number of children leaving care (CS3.2)** – the number leaving care in October was 25 against a target of 25, the third highest monthly number of children leaving care in the last 12 months. For the 12 month period November 2015-October 2016 240 children left care against a target of 300.

48. *Children looked after in purchased placements (CS3.7)* – At the end of October 38.8% of looked after children were living in a purchased placement. The rate has remained relatively unchanged for the last 12 months and remains above target of 30%. Although the percentage of external placements is almost the same as last month the costs of placements has risen.

49. *Children looked after placed outside Cumbria (CS3.8)* – The rate of children looked after placed outside Cumbria increased to 29.3% at the end of October (191 of 652 Children Looked After). This remains above target and is higher than the rate for statistical neighbours. The trend in this measure over the last year has been flat.

50. *Children placed for adoption within 12 months of the decision (CS3.19)* – Since the last report to the Board in September this year (46.4% - July figures), there has been a steady month on month improvement in August, September and October. Latest performance is 56.5% (26 out of 46 children) and this remains below the target of 78%. This represents the highest rate achieved since February 2016. We continue to make progress in placing children whose plans had drifted previously and current plans are being progressed in a more timely way. This will ultimately be reflected in the performance figures in future.

51. *Average time between court authority and match with adoptive family (CS3.21)* - For children who were adopted between April and October 2016, the average time between the granting of the placement order and a match being agreed to an adoptive family was 351 days, which is an increase compared with the previous figure reported to the Board (332 days: April – July) and remains above the target of 221 days. In line with CS3.19 above, we continue to make progress in placing children whose plans had drifted previously and current plans are being progressed in a more timely way. This will ultimately be reflected in the performance figures in future.

52. *Proportion of families who wait more than 3 months from approval to match (CS3.22)* – 13 of 17 (76.5%) of prospective adoptive families who were approved in the period between April and October waited for more than 3 months for a match with a child/children to be agreed. Although this represents an improvement when compared with the last report to the Board (80%: April – July rate), and is a marked improvement compared with April and May 2016, performance remains off-target
Adopters approved to take sibling groups, children over 2 and children with developmental uncertainty are matched quickly. We have some adopters approved with a limited offer and they wait longer for a match. This is reflected regionally. All adopters’ progress is individually tracked by the Adoption Support Team and their approval reviewed where necessary.

53. There is evidence of improvement in some of the RED indicators above, and some are sensitive to change due to the small numbers involved. Although rated RED, performance is understood and being acted on;

- there is a slight improvement in the year-on-year number of Children Looked After (CS3.0),
- the rate of Children Looked After in purchased placements has remained relatively stable year-on-year (CS3.7)
- since April 2016, there has been a consistent month-on-month improvement in the rate of children placed for adoption within 12 months of the decision (CS3.19).
- there were 46 children adopted in the year to October 2016, the highest number recorded since March 2016. Whilst the outcome for children looked after is good, high numbers of court orders can impact negatively on the average time for a match (CS3.21).
- the proportion of adoptive families who wait more than 3 months from approval to match (CS3.22), is subject to fluctuation and is sensitive to change due to the relatively small numbers involved.

To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential – School Improvement and Children’s Attainment Indicators:

54. The following performance indicators show notable performance for the latest quarter:

55. **Number of primary schools with a Requires Improvement Ofsted grade (out 270 schools)** – The number of schools judged as requiring improvement (primary) has fallen since last quarter (from 6.29% in Quarter 1 to 4.44% in Quarter 2). This is better than the target of 6.0%. Although an improved position, Schools causing concern remain at risk of an adverse inspection outcome if they are not yet effective enough to be judged good or better.

56. **Narrowing of achievement gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers – Key Stage 2 (reading, writing and maths - combined score)** – The achievement gap for Cumbria academic year 15/16 is 20.6% which compares to a national achievement gap of 21.3%. Note: the national figure is provisional with validated data expected in December 2016.

57. The following performance measures indicate areas for improvement:

58. **The proportion of pupils achieving at least expected standard in reading, writing and maths at Key Stage 1 is at least in line with national figures**

Cumbria achieved 51.3% compared to 60.3% nationally. However, due to reforms to Key Stage 1 2016 SATs, credible comparisons can't be made with...
previous years. Revised targets are to be agreed for 2017. Note: Results are as at end of academic year 2015/16.

59. The proportion of pupils achieving at least expected standard in reading, writing and maths at Key Stage 2 is at least in line with national figure Cumbria achieved 49.8% of children compared to 53.2% nationally. However as above, due to reforms to Key Stage 2 2016 SATs, comparisons can't be made with previous years. Note: Results are as at end of academic year 2015/16.

60. Number of secondary schools with a Requires Improvement Ofsted grade (out 38 schools) – The percentage of schools judged as requiring improvement (secondary) has slightly decreased (an improved position) between Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 (28.95% and 26.32% respectively). Although this indicator has improved from Red to Amber, this remains an area of concern, as these schools remain at risk of an adverse inspection outcome if they are not yet effective enough to be judged good or better. The proportion of secondary schools judged to require improvement remains too high overall compared to the national average. Of the 11 requiring improvement, 5 are academies that are beyond the control of the County Council.

61. Number of schools with an Inadequate Ofsted grade (out of 322 schools) - (schools with Statement of Action, Notice to Improve/ Serious Weakness or Special Measures) - The proportion of schools in an Ofsted category of concern (serious weaknesses or special measures) has risen (a worse position) since last quarter with 2.48% of schools with Inadequate Grade in Quarter 2 compared to 1.48% in Quarter 1. This is outside the target of 1.8%, and any schools in this position remain an area of concern.

62. Percentage of Early Help Assessments closed with a satisfactory outcome - 61.9% of Early Help Assessments were closed with a satisfactory outcome in Quarter 2, compared to 77.3% in Q1. This performance is below the target of 75%.

To support older, disabled and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives- Highlights from the Council Plan Delivery Plan

63. As part of the delivery of a health and social well-being programme, all health and well-being coaches are expected to be recruited by 4th October 2016, with 21 vacant posts offered to candidates; these are awaiting confirmation of acceptance and completion of HR process.

64. The new re-ablement model and staffing structure for the re-ablement service is complete.

65. To support the achievement of the Delayed Transfer of Care target in the Better Care Fund submission, actions arising from a point prevalence study and continuous improvement event are being implemented in north and south Cumbria. However, anticipated impact and improvement is not yet evident. Consequently the health and care systems in both north and south Cumbria have initiated whole system reviews of the management of Delayed Transfers of Care.
66. In the west, north and east of Cumbria there are three early adopter sites for Integrated Care Communities: (i) Maryport and Cockermouth, (ii) Workington and (iii) Eden. These have been in operation since June 2016.

67. In South Cumbria all seven Integrated Care Communities are operational although different Integrated Care Communities are concentrating on developing different parts of the Integrated Care Communities model. Organisational development events have been arranged across three Integrated Care Communities to continue to develop the core team including the voluntary sector, and six out of the seven Integrated Care Communities have now produced a plan to deliver improvement.

68. For the Day Care services review, the timeline is being reviewed to allow for the co-design stage to be extended, enabling a robust approach to co-producing the future model with all stakeholders. A revised timeline will be shared with Local Committees and further updates provided to Local Committees in quarter 4.

69. In regard to the programme of targeted investment in the modernisation of Cumbria Care Residential provision, two sites have been identified and secured in Carlisle and Copeland for new build Consultants have been appointed as client advisors in connection with the procurement of design and build contractors. Design development for both schemes is advancing.

To support older, disabled and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives - Performance Indicators

70. The following performance indicators show notable performance for the latest quarter:

71. **Reablement (increase effectiveness of) - discharge from hospital 65+** - This is a measure of the proportion of people who are 65 years and older, who are discharged from hospital into a reablement service and that remain at home for a period of 91+ days after discharge. Although performance has decreased slightly from 91.4% in Quarter 1 to 88.9% in Quarter 2, this is a provisional figure as more data is to be received and remains close to the target of 91.1%.

72. The following performance measures indicate areas for improvement compared with last quarter:

73. **% of Community Based Service Users in receipt of a Direct Payment or Individual Service Fund** – Performance remains stable at 41.7% in Quarter 2 compared with 42.3% in Quarter 1. District level data shows that 2 out of 6 districts are at a sustained level in Quarter 2 (South Lakeland and Allerdale), however Eden decreased by 3.9% and Furness decreased by 3.2%. Carlisle increased by 2.6% and Copeland increased 0.6%. The target for 2016/17 is 50%.

74. **Permanent admissions of older people (65+) to residential and nursing care homes** – In 2016/17, the actual annual number of admissions has reduced from 678 to 621 between Q1 and Q2. Comparing the same quarter end in 2015/16 with 2016/17, there has been a more significant reduction in
admissions; at the end of Q1 (down from 841 to 678), and at the end of Q2 (down from 750 to 621). Although this is clearly an improving situation, the target in 2016/17 (515 admissions) is significantly more challenging than the target in 2015/16 (679 admissions), and so currently we are not on course to hit the target of 515 by March 2017.

75. For the year to the end of quarter 1, the 678 admissions is equivalent to 574.5 per 100,000 population aged 65+, and for the year to the end of quarter 2, 621 admissions is equivalent to 526.2 per 100,000 population aged 65+. The 2016/17 target is 515 admissions which is equivalent to 436.4 per 100,000 population aged 65+.

76. **Waiting time from new referral to completion of first assessment (in days)** – Waiting time from new referral to completion of first assessment deteriorated from 47 days in Quarter 1 to 49 days in Quarter 2 for Cumbria. The waiting times increased within 3 districts - Copeland (by 12 days), Furness (by 7 days) and South Lakeland (by 9 days). This remains off target, which is set at 28 days. Improvement to this indicator is anticipated in the next quarter with management plans in place to review caseloads and response timeframes, however capacity is an issue.

To enable communities to help shape their local services, promote health and wellbeing and support those in poverty - *Highlights from the Council Plan Delivery Plan*

77. Community Services continue to deliver area working projects based on distinct local need and opportunities. Local teams are contributing to the reshaping of local services through support to large scale service reviews, including local support to the Day Services Review and the Cumbria Care Modernisation. All Local Committees have been engaged in refreshing the area plan delivery plans for each of their areas. These will be presented to respective Local Committees during the November/December 2016 cycle of meetings for endorsement.

78. Work with the third sector to agree and progress community based projects through local committees across Cumbria is gathering pace. The concept of area planning has been presented to the third sector network and a number of projects have been identified. Discussions will continue with a view to community driven projects being agreed by March 2017.

79. There is ongoing work to develop the integration of the COMPASS model into the emerging Health and Social Wellbeing system. Future Place Based community services (replacing the Neighbourhood Care Independence Programme) will adopt the COMPASS model and is expected to be operational by April 2017. The managed service provider continues to be funded within the contract until September 2017.

80. Four contractors were shortlisted to deliver the Furness Peninsula Blue Light Hub and a single preferred contractor has now been appointed.

81. The percentage of adult social care contracts being delivered by suppliers who commit to paying the Living Wage Foundation’s Living Wage rate of pay is 65% in September compared with a target of 57%.
To enable communities to help shape their local services, promote health and wellbeing and support those in poverty - Performance Indicators

82. The following performance indicators show notable performance for the latest quarter:

83. **Successful completion of drug treatment & non representation - opiate users** – Quarter 2 performance (13.0%) is slightly lower than Quarter 1 (13.5%) but continues to be better than for 2014/15 (12%) and is above the latest all England level (6.74%).

84. **Successful completion of drug treatment & non representation - non opiate users** – Quarter 2 performance (56.5%) is better than Quarter 1 (53.6%) and continues to be better than for 2014/15 (48%) and is above the latest all England level (36.98%).

85. **Number and rate of accidental dwelling fires** – there were 57 accidental dwelling fires in the second quarter of 2016/17 (2.3 per 10,000 dwellings). This represents a decrease of 19 compared with the Quarter 1 following targeted intervention by the service and this year quarterly performance is below target (less than 64 per quarter).

86. The following performance indicators highlight areas for further focus and improvement:

87. **NHS Health Checks – offered and uptake** – The Quarter 2 percentage of the eligible population receiving an offer of a health check (5.13%) is higher than Quarter 1 (4.83%), and is now above the 5% target. The rate of uptake of health checks offered is 46.9% in Quarter 2 which compares to 45.5% in Quarter 1. This is below the target of 50% for 2016/17 (and therefore rated Amber). 2016/17 is the final year of a 3 year rolling programme.

88. **Increase in families accessing free school meals** – In June 2016 Cabinet was informed that the latest nationally published data confirmed a decrease in the number of children eligible for free school meals since January 2015. It was also confirmed in June that there was no particular area or year group where this decrease was significant however an overall decreasing trend was evident. Numbers for the last three years (13/14, 14/15 and 15/6) were 7,402, 6,770 and 6,224 respectively.

Latest available figures from the May 2016 School Census show a slightly increased figure of 6,288, and compared to the previous January School Census there has been an increase of 44 from 6,244 to 6,288. The results of the October School Census will be available for the next Cabinet report.

Cabinet will recall that a briefing was circulated in August containing clarification and possible causes of the underlying decreasing trend. To date, no further clarification has been received to date on the planned roll-out of Universal Credit.
To provide a safe and well managed highways network, secure infrastructure improvements and support local economic growth - *Highlights from the Council Plan Delivery Plan*

89. To implement the Council’s Highways Strategy, Level 2 of the Department for Transport’s new self-assessment procedure was achieved in May 2016 and a Public Information Portal (PIP) is being developed in line with the programme. New tablets are currently being tested and an on-line mapping tool is built and is currently undergoing technical testing prior to roll-out for user testing.

90. Following the devastating floods caused by Storm Desmond, the programme of capital works is on track to have completed repairs to over 100 bridges by the end of October with further works continuing. Defensive works to bridges to increase resilience prior to 2016/17 winter high water levels is also currently being undertaken. A summary of the year 1 infrastructure recovery programme has been published on the Council’s website.

91. Deployment of currently surveyed work is progressing ahead of schedule in order to deliver the superfast broadband target for premises by the end of September 2016. At August 2016, 106,709 premises were able to access at least 24 Mbps download broadband services. This is 3,858 more premises since May (102,851 premises). The target by the end of September 2016 is 110,894. All work is on track to deliver 116,819 premises by 31 March 2018.

92. One of two community-led transport solutions has now been put in place. Working together, the Border Rambler group, together with communities from Brampton to Gilsland have established two new routes (BR3 and BR2).

**To provide a safe and well managed highways network, secure infrastructure improvements and support local economic growth - Performance Indicators**

93. The following performance indicators show notable performance for the latest quarter:

94. **% of road defects put right first time** – Both Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 achieve 97% of road defects which are put right first time. Performance remains well above target of 85%.

95. **Highways repairs, end to end times** – Quarter 2 performance (28 days) represents an improving performance when compared to Quarter 1 (34 days). This is as a result of the additional resources applied to address previous quarter’s performance above the target time of 30 days.

96. There are no performance indicators highlighting areas for further focus and improvement:

**To be a modern and efficient council - Highlights from the Council Plan Delivery Plan**

97. To address corporate performance on sickness absence, significant work has been undertaken to date and further measures are in progress to reduce sickness absence levels and the associated costs and impacts of absence.
Overall the impact of the measures and actions taken to date report a reduction in the number of working days lost per FTE of 3.3%, when compared to absence performance for 2015/16. However performance for Quarter 2 performance forecasts year end absence at 12.8 working days lost per FTE, which continues to be off target.

As a result People Management held a focussed workshop to prepare action plans specific to each off target service area and CMT agreed implementation through DMTs.

98. With regard to household bulky waste management, the Local Government Association funded project delivered by Resource Futures to review Cumbria’s bulky waste system has been completed. The recommendations and outcomes have been implemented into a Waste Prevention programme of work. The newly developed Waste Prevention Board will be used as a means of reporting progress made with regard to bulky waste re-use.

99. The Council’s service review programme remains on track and is in line with the position reported to Cabinet in June 2016. The service review programme is continuing to plan, working closely and sensitively with Trade Union representatives and service teams. The staffing reduction programme is forecast to achieve gross revenue savings of £5.2m as planned, however the Quarter 1 RAG rating is currently amber because:

- The Business Support Review for the Health & Care Services Directorate started later than planned and whilst is forecast to achieve the full year effect savings target; there is a risk at this stage that only part year effect will be achieved in 2016/17, with circa £150k at risk from the £5.2m.

- The People Management, Learning and Skills service review has delivered the planned staffing reductions and £1.6m gross revenue savings in full, however a net budget shortfall is forecast as a number of posts that have been removed from the establishment have not resulted in a net revenue saving because they were historically funded from income or one off funding sources and a number of VRs were counted towards Business Support and Management cross cutting savings instead of the People Management service review.

100. The Reshaping of the Council savings (in addition to the Service Reviews above) will be implemented by March 2017 and will deliver the £3.3m savings target in full.

101. Digital Strategy work is progressing and a redesign of the main Council website has been launched in line with the timescales for Cumbria House opening by November 2016, and work on a new Customer Portal is progressing. This is phase 1 of the project and further development of a digital platform will take place over the period to March 2017.
To be a modern and efficient council - Performance Indicators

102. The following performance indicators show notable performance:

103. Amount household waste per household /waste recycling rates – The total household waste produced has reduced since Quarter 1, from 497.6kg per head to 479.7kg in Quarter 2. This is below target of 483.7kg per person. The forecast for the proportion of household waste recycled is 43.6% in Quarter 2 which is an improvement on 42.9% in Quarter 1, and meets the target of 42.9%.

104. The following performance measures indicate areas for improvement compared with last quarter:

105. Amount and proportion of household waste sent to landfill – The forecast is based on latest figures reported for Quarter 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears. Performance is forecast below the original target because re-processed materials previously reported as recycled are now categorised under reporting guidance as landfill. Once an adjustment is made for this then performance for amount and proportion are on target.

106. Sickness absence reduced to 8 working days lost per full-time employee by 2017/18 – The forecast absence for the full year 2016/17 [(measured as the number of working days lost (WDL) per Full Time Equivalent (FTE)]] has increased from 12.3 in Quarter 1 to 12.8 in Quarter 2. This remains above the target of 9 WDL in 2016/17.

107. % of Freedom Of Information (FOI) Requests dealt with within statutory timescale – Of the 594 requests for information received under the FOI Act in the first 6 months of this year, 346 (58%) were dealt with within the statutory 20 day timescale. This represents a dip in performance compared with quarter 1 of this year and when compared with the full year 2015/16. Performance remains off target which is 90% for the year to March 2017.

108. The Council continues to receive circa 100 requests for information under the FOIA per month, which is in line with the rate received in 2015/16 and so there is no indication that the rate is likely to reduce, having increased year on year since the inception of the act in 2000. The recent year-on-year increases have come at a time when the Council has had to respond to significant financial pressures and has set challenging targets for year on year reductions in a range of Council budgets in the Council’s Medium Term Financial Plan. This has resulted in significant changes to services, and has coincided with an increase in requests for information as well as complaints about services, which are often complex and require significant work to be able to respond.

109. This increasingly challenging position has been reported to both the Council’s Audit and Assurance Committee and Scrutiny Member Performance Working Group in June 2016, including actions that were in place to reverse the trend in performance against a backdrop of stretched resources across the Council to respond to such requests as well as complaints.

110. At the June meeting, as part of the Scrutiny Member Performance Working Group’s routine scrutiny of corporate performance, Members asked for a further
report to be presented after quarter 3 of this year, by which time it was anticipated that planned remedial actions would deliver measurable improvement, and mitigate the risk of any potential monitoring arrangements being implemented by the Information Commissioner’s Office.

111. The following actions are in place and consequently it is anticipated that there will be a positive shift performance from October 2016.

- To improve management oversight, weekly detailed reports are being considered by Directorate Management Teams that highlight individual requests, which officer is handling the request, and requests that nearing the deadline for a response and that require action to ensure a response is provided in time. There are already positive signs that the backlog of requests is reducing and that requests are being dealt with timeously.

- A full review is underway to establish and maintain a list of responsible officers within Directorates who will take ownership of requests for information and ensure that arrangements are in place to provide a good quality response in a timely manner.

- In addition to reporting a year to date (from April 2016) performance rate for the Council and individual Directorates, a separate performance rate will be calculated to show expected improvement starting from 1st October 2016.

- Awareness sessions will be delivered in November and December 2016 for Senior Managers to emphasise manager responsibilities in regard to the Freedom of Information Act, the Data Protection Act, and in particular, responding to requests for information within required timescales.

- In line with the Scrutiny Member Performance Working Group request in June 2016, a detailed performance report will be prepared for consideration after Quarter 3 this year, highlighting the impact of action taken.

Options Considered and Risks Identified

112. **Option (a)** – Where performance is flagged ‘Red’ or ‘Amber’, service managers are expected to consider options to get performance back on track within target, or to increase the pace of improvement.

**Option (b)** – Where performance is flagged ‘Green’ and is either within 5% of target or exceeding target, Service Managers are expected to consider the options for delivering further improvement, setting more ambitious targets, or reducing performance in some areas to an acceptable level to invest in other lower performing services.

113. **Risks** - a number of performance risks have been flagged ‘Red’ in Appendix 1 where performance levels are off target by more than 10%. This is in line with tolerances previously agreed by Cabinet. Where performance is flagged ‘Red’ there is a risk that this will have an impact on the Council’s reputation, service standards and / or Council budget.
Reasons for the recommendation / Key benefits

114. The recommendations are intended to:
   - ensure that there is accountability at officer level for Corporate Performance and for the delivery of Council Plan priorities.
   - ensure public accountability for Corporate Performance and that the Council can demonstrate a good level of public performance reporting.
   - enable Cabinet to celebrate areas of Council services that are performing well and to consider appropriate action if performance is not at an acceptable level, or the pace of improvement is slower than expected.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

115. The Council’s Corporate Performance Report provides progress on the 2016/17 Council Plan delivery plan for the 6 month period ending 30th September 2016. It includes key service performance indicators and Children’s Improvement Plan performance indicators for the year to October 2016. There are a number of indicators flagged as ‘Red’ or ‘Amber’ in Appendix 1, and Service Managers are expected to consider options to get performance back on track. Where indicators are ‘Green’, service managers are expected to consider the options for delivering further improvement, setting more ambitious targets, or reducing performance to an acceptable level. In preparing these options, resource and value for money implications of each option are considered.

116. The Council Plan 2016-2019 sets out the Council’s priorities and aspirations. The resource and value for money implications of the Plan are considered as part of the annual budget planning process and papers debated by Council in February each year.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be considered?

117. The implementation of the Corporate Plan and Children’s Improvement Plan is an executive function, overseen by the Cabinet. This is a report for noting and there are no direct legal implications.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

118. The Council Plan Delivery Plan 2016/17 sets out the Council’s key programmes of work and activity to deliver on the priorities and commitments set out in the Council Plan 2016-2019. The content of this report highlights the extent to which commitments and targets have been met.

What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

119. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out in respect of the Council Plan 2016-2019.
120. It is the responsibility of the relevant Assistant Director to ensure that the considerations raised in any Service Equality Impact Assessment are considered when planning and delivering services.

Appendices and Background Documents

Appendix 1 – Corporate Performance Report, Incorporating Progress Against The Council Plan Delivery Plan – Progress to 30th September 2016 (including Children’s Improvement Plan Performance Indicators to 31st Oct 2016).

Key Facts

Electoral Division(s): All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Decision</th>
<th>Key Decision Included in Forward Plan</th>
<th>Exempt from call-in</th>
<th>Exemption agreed by scrutiny chair</th>
<th>Considered by scrutiny, if so detail below</th>
<th>Environmental or sustainability assessment undertaken?</th>
<th>Equality impact assessment undertaken?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by Cabinet Member/s on (please state date) 01/12/16

Previous relevant Council or Executive decisions

None

Consideration by Overview & Scrutiny

None

Background Papers

None

Report Author

Duncan McQueen, Senior Manager – Performance and Risk  
Duncan.mcqueen@cumbria.gov.uk (01228 226 242)

6th December 2016.
# CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

## INCORPORATING PROGRESS AGAINST COUNCIL PLAN DELIVERY PLAN

Progress to 30th September 2016

AND CHILDREN’S IMPROVEMENT PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Progress to 31st October 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAG Alert</th>
<th>Progress against plan</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Has missed or is expected to miss a key milestone date in the current plan</td>
<td>Off target by greater than 10% (urgent action required to improve performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>In jeopardy of missing a key milestone date but recovery plan in place</td>
<td>Off target but within target by 5-10% (some action required to improve performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>On schedule or key milestone date met</td>
<td>On target, exceeding target, or within 5% of target (action may be required to achieve further improvement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction of Travel** arrows indicates whether performance has become

- **better**
- **worse**
- **Stayed the same**
- **Since the last quarter**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Deliverable Achieved/ completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver, in partnership, the council’s improvement plan for children’s social care</td>
<td>Quarterly OFSTED reports to Children’s Improvement Board demonstrate ‘satisfactory progress’</td>
<td>Following a dip in reported performance in the summer remedial steps have been taken and performance is being restored to previous levels. Audit and quality assurance activity is demonstrating continued progress and is focussing management activity appropriately.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver the Children Looked After Strategy</td>
<td>A higher number of indicators compared to 15/16 are improving or at target against the strategy’s performance indicators when reviewed in March 2017</td>
<td>As indicated earlier there was a dip in performance in the summer. Performance is beginning to return to expected levels.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion the Cumbria Promise to children who are looked after</td>
<td>Children who are looked after can say what the Promise is and how the Council is meeting the Promise by March 2017</td>
<td>Children in Care Council are active in their promotion of the Promise through their routine activities and special events.</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver Early Help and Targeted Youth Services</td>
<td>Early Help Assessments closed in 16/17 demonstrate impact of assessments and plans with an increased percentage with a satisfactory outcome compared to 15/16</td>
<td>The number and level of assessments closed due to a ‘step up’ to statutory services or the removal of consent remains higher than desired at 25%.</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver Targeted Youth services</td>
<td>Reshaping completed by September 2016</td>
<td>Final reshaping of Special Educational Needs &amp; Disabilities Teams ongoing with vacant posts out to advert.</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement new model for integrated 0-19 public health services</td>
<td>By April 2017</td>
<td>A report requesting authorisation to proceed with commissioning of the 0-19 healthy child programme is to be presented to Cabinet briefing on 6 October by the Director of Public Health/Associate Director, Public Health and Communities.</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Priority: To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Delivered/Achieved/Completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will support the work of the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders (CASL) to deliver continuous school improvement</strong></td>
<td>• Work towards securing the most sustainable future for schools and school improvement to meet the county's needs</td>
<td>Work with CASL on future model progressed to planned milestones by March 2017</td>
<td>Revised Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders (CASL) plan with milestones and review process in place. Clusters engaged in peer review and supporting development of accountability framework.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will work with other organisations through the Children and Young People’s Plan to support all young people growing up in Cumbria to take advantage of the unique opportunities in the county that will come as a result of the significant inward investment taking place</strong></td>
<td>• Contribute to delivery of the Cumbria Children and Young People’s Plan</td>
<td>Improved educational outcomes of children and young people in Cumbria at EYFS, KS2 and KS4 compared to 2015/16</td>
<td>Early Years Foundation Stage results improved but a slower rate than the national results. The impact of new assessment arrangements is being analysed, however where comparable with previous years Key Stage 2 results have declined. Results remain in line with statistical neighbours. Key Stage 4 invalidated results show some improvement.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute as a key stakeholder to the Area Review process of Further Education</td>
<td>Provide views as a key stakeholder on emerging options by end of June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Area Review process has been completed with final report publication anticipated to be late October. Draft recommendations were welcomed by all stakeholders.</td>
<td>→ ▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority: To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfill their potential.

### Children’s Improvement Plan Performance Indicators for Oct 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator (HERD = blue)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate/Percentage</th>
<th>RAG (against target)</th>
<th>Trend over last year</th>
<th>Variance from target</th>
<th>Good performance is</th>
<th>Target 15/16</th>
<th>Cumbria 15/16</th>
<th>SN 15/16</th>
<th>National 15/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS0.1 Voice of the child</td>
<td>80.0% G</td>
<td>N/a +</td>
<td>High 80% N/a 74.2% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS0.2 Allocation of referrals</td>
<td>84.2% R</td>
<td>N/a 11.4%</td>
<td>High 95% N/a 85.0% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS0.3 Assessment standards</td>
<td>78.9% A</td>
<td>N/a 7.2%</td>
<td>High 85% N/a 74.0% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS0.4 Plans meeting minimum standards</td>
<td>80.0% G</td>
<td>N/a +</td>
<td>High 80% N/a 59.3% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS0.5 Case management</td>
<td>85.0% G</td>
<td>N/a +</td>
<td>High 80% N/a 61.8% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS0.6 Management oversight</td>
<td>90.0% G</td>
<td>N/a +</td>
<td>High 80% N/a 68.7% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.0 Referrals within 12 months of a previous referral</td>
<td>27.1% R</td>
<td>Improving 15.8%</td>
<td>Low 23.4% 24.3% 33.3% 19.5% 21.6% 22.3% 24.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.1 Assessments completed within 45 working days</td>
<td>92.3% G</td>
<td>Declining +</td>
<td>High 90.0% 94.3% 84.9% 86.6% 79.0% 83.4% 81.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.2 Initial Child Protection Conferences within 15 working days</td>
<td>49.2% R</td>
<td>Declining 41.3%</td>
<td>High 83.8% 85.5% 78.7% 78.5% 85.4% 76.7% 74.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.3 Social work reports for ICPC shared with family</td>
<td>66.2% R</td>
<td>Declining 11.7%</td>
<td>High 75% 74% 50.5% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.4 CP Statutory visits</td>
<td>97.0% G</td>
<td>Sustained +</td>
<td>High 96% 92% 99% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.5 Children subject of repeat CP plan within 2 years</td>
<td>11.7% R</td>
<td>Declining 17.0%</td>
<td>Low 10% 11.4% 6.7% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.6 Number/Rate of looked after children</td>
<td>70.3 R</td>
<td>Static 17.2%</td>
<td>Low 60.0 71.0 73 53.1 52.1 60 60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.7 Number of children entering care</td>
<td>15 R</td>
<td>Static 25.0%</td>
<td>Low 12 18 19 N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.8 Number of children leaving care</td>
<td>25 G</td>
<td>Static +</td>
<td>High 25 19 18 N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.9 Initial health assessments for children entering care</td>
<td>88.2% G</td>
<td>Sustained +</td>
<td>High 95% 79.5% 54.7% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.10 Review health assessments for children aged under 5</td>
<td>85.2% G</td>
<td>Improving +</td>
<td>High 85% 89.3% 75.7% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.11 Review health assessments for children aged 5 and over</td>
<td>96.0% G</td>
<td>Sustained +</td>
<td>High 85% 96.9% 94.2% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.12 Health assessments for children looked after for 12 months or more</td>
<td>91.9% G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>High 95% 92.0% 90.0% 89.5% 89.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.13 Dental checks for children looked after for 12 months or more</td>
<td>95.9% G</td>
<td>Improving +</td>
<td>High 85% 89.0% 81.0% 81.2% 85.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.14 Immunisations for children looked after for 12 months or more</td>
<td>96.6% G</td>
<td>Sustained +</td>
<td>High 90% 97.0% 94.4% 87.7% 87.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.15 Children placed for adoption within 12 months of the decision</td>
<td>56.5% R</td>
<td>Declining 27.6%</td>
<td>High 78% 54.2% 68.0% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.16 Average time between entering care and placement with adoptive family</td>
<td>629 A</td>
<td>Declining 7.3%</td>
<td>Low 586 610 537 - 547.6 - 593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.17 Average time between court authority and match with adoptive family</td>
<td>351 R</td>
<td>Declining 59.0%</td>
<td>Low 221 349 207 - 231.2 - 223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.18 Proportion of families who wait more than 3 months from approval to match</td>
<td>76.5% R</td>
<td>Static 66.3%</td>
<td>Low 46% 83% 67% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.19 Care leavers aged 19, 20 and 21 in suitable accommodation</td>
<td>91.6% G</td>
<td>Improving +</td>
<td>High 83% 90.1% 91.5% 79.1% 81.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.20 Care leavers aged 19, 20 and 21 in education, employment and training</td>
<td>48.8% G</td>
<td>Declining 0.4%</td>
<td>Low 49% 53.3% 51.8% 48.1% 48.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.21 Percentage of social work vacancies covered by agency staff</td>
<td>14.4% G</td>
<td>Declining 2.9%</td>
<td>Low 10% 10.4% 9.5% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.22 Young people in police custody</td>
<td>0 G</td>
<td>Improving +</td>
<td>Low 2 3 4 N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.23 CP Reviews - all reviews in last year held in timescale</td>
<td>87.4% A</td>
<td>Declining 9.2%</td>
<td>High 96.3% 87.4% 95.5% 95.1% 96.9% 93.7% 94.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.24 CP Reviews - latest review up to date</td>
<td>95.4% G</td>
<td>Declining 1.6%</td>
<td>High 97% 98.8% 99.1% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.25 CLA Reviews - all reviews in last year held in timescale</td>
<td>83.6% A</td>
<td>Static 7.1%</td>
<td>High 90% 85.3% 67.2% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.26 CLA Reviews - latest review up to date</td>
<td>98.5% G</td>
<td>Sustained +</td>
<td>High 90% 96.8% 90.8% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.27 CLA review participation for all reviews in year</td>
<td>91.5% G</td>
<td>Improving 0.5%</td>
<td>High 92% 88.3% 80.4% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.28 Participation in latest CLA review</td>
<td>96.0% G</td>
<td>Improving +</td>
<td>High 92% 95.9% 90% N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1.29 Early Help Assessments</td>
<td>14.1 G</td>
<td>Declining +</td>
<td>High 13.4 16.3 11.1 N/a N/a N/a N/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority: To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential - Attainment Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate/Percentage</th>
<th>RAG (against target)</th>
<th>Direction of travel</th>
<th>Variance from target</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHL1</td>
<td>% of 5 year olds achieving at least the expected ‘Good Level of Development’ in the Early Years Foundation Stage</td>
<td>64.9% (AY 15/16)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>Cumbria has improved by 2% from 2015 results, although remains lower than national - the emerging national figure is 69.3%. The validated national figure will be available in November. Nb - Results are as at end of academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL2</td>
<td>The proportion of pupils achieving at least expected standard in reading, writing and maths at KS1 is at least in line with national figures</td>
<td>51.3% (AY 15/16)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-15.0%</td>
<td>Cumbria is 51.3% compared to 60.3% nationally, so RAG rated red. Due to reforms to Key Stage 1 2016 SATs, comparisons can't be made with previous years. Revised target to be agreed for 2017. Nb - Results are as at end of academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL5</td>
<td>The proportion of pupils achieving at least expected standard in reading, writing and maths at KS2 is at least in line with national figures</td>
<td>49.8% (AY 15/16)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>Cumbria is 48.8% compared to 53.2% nationally. Due to reforms to Key Stage 2 2016 SAT's, comparisons can't be made with previous years. Nb Results are as at end of academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL6</td>
<td>Attainment 8 - new measure - average score based on the attainment of pupils across 8 GCSE or equivalent qualifications</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provisional data available in Qtr 3 2016/17. This is a new measure introduced this year, so target is set as 'in line with national'. New measure, so comparisons cannot be made with previous years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL7</td>
<td>Progress 8 - new measure - average score of progress made from end of KS2 to end of KS4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provisional data available in Qtr 3 2016/17. This is a new measure introduced this year, so target is set as 'in line with national'. New measure, so comparisons cannot be made with previous years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL8</td>
<td>The percentage of pupils achieving A*-C in E and M</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provisional data available in Qtr 3 2016/17. New measure - no target set for summer 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL9</td>
<td>The percentage of pupils achieving the English Baccalaureate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Provisional data available in Qtr 3 2016/17. No target set for summer 2016. due to reforms to GCSEs with respect to Progress/Attainment 8, so will be RAG rated against national.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL10</td>
<td>Narrowing of achievement gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers - KS2 (reading, writing and maths - combined score)</td>
<td>20.6% (AY 15/16)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>Due to reforms to KS2 2016 SATs, comparisons cannot be made with previous years. Target is 'in line with national'. National Disadvantaged gap is not yet available, but provisional emerging figure is 21.3, so Cumbria’s gap is narrower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL12</td>
<td>Number of schools with an Inadequate Ofsted grade (out of 322 schools) - i.e. schools with Statement of Action, Notice to Improve/Serious Weakness or Special Measures)</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>The proportion of schools in an Ofsted category of concern (serious weaknesses or special measures) have risen over the quarter (from 1.86% in Qtr 1 to 2.48% in Qtr 2). Any schools in this position should remain an area of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL13</td>
<td>Number of primary schools with a Requires Improvement Ofsted grade (out of 270 schools)</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>The number of schools judged as requiring improvement (primary) has fallen since last quarter (from 6.29% in Qtr 1 to 4.44% in Qtr 2). As with schools causing concern, this remains an area of concern, as these schools remain at risk of an adverse inspection outcome if they are not yet effective enough to be judged good or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHL13.1</td>
<td>Number of secondary schools with a Requires Improvement Ofsted grade (out of 38 schools)</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
<td>The percentage of schools judged as requiring improvement (secondary) has slightly decreased between Qtr 1 and Qtr 2 (26.95 and 26.32% respectively). As with schools causing concern, this remains an area of concern, as these schools remain at risk of an adverse inspection outcome if they are not yet effective enough to be judged good or better. The proportion of secondary schools judged to require improvement remains too high overall compared to the national average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Priority: To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential - Attainment Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate/Percentage</th>
<th>RAG (against target)</th>
<th>Direction of travel</th>
<th>Variance from target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHL14</td>
<td>Percentage of Early Help Assessments closed with a satisfactory outcome</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

The cumulative rate at Qtr 2 2016/17 is 61.9%, which is a red RAG-rating. This is a new local indicator, so no comparative 14/15 or national data is available.
## Priority: To support older, disabled and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Deliverable Achieved/completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will work with the NHS and with local people to reduce the need for social care and health care by delivering new prevention and public health services</td>
<td>• Deliver the Health and Social Wellbeing System programme</td>
<td>Recruitment of 30 Health and Wellbeing coaches by October 2016</td>
<td>Recruitment will be completed 4 October 2016 with 21 vacant posts offered to candidates; awaiting confirmation of acceptance and completion of HR process.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will work with the NHS and integrate the provision of reablement and recovery services and the greater use of technology, to support people to live independently and reduce pressure on hospital services</td>
<td>• Restructure the reablement service</td>
<td>Completed by June 2016</td>
<td>The new re-ablement model and staffing structure for the re-ablement service is complete.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce delayed transfers of care</td>
<td>Achievement of Delayed Transfers of Care (DTOC) targets as set through the Better Care Fund</td>
<td>In both north and south Cumbria actions arising from a point prevalence study and continuous improvement event are being implemented. However, the anticipated impact is currently not evident and no improvement has been made. Consequently the health and care systems in both north and south Cumbria have initiated whole system reviews of the management of Delayed Transfers of Care (DTOCs).</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve access to assistive technology</td>
<td>Transition to new Cumbria Telecare and Assistive Technology service by October 2016</td>
<td>The new contract with Wellbeing (new Cumbria Telecare and Assistive Technology service) will start as planned on 1 October 2016. Transition of existing customers is under way and due to be completed by 31 October 2016.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will work with other organisations to accelerate the delivery of Extra Care Housing across Cumbria</td>
<td>• Deliver the Extra Care Housing strategy</td>
<td>Outline business case complete for 6 CCC sites by 31st August 2016</td>
<td>A report is being presented to Cabinet asking for permission to procure a framework and a grant award programme for development of Extra Care Housing (ECH). The grant award programme, if approved, will enable us to progress with opportunities as they present. The framework will enable CCC sites to be advertised to the market for potential development.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority: To support older, disabled and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We will</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Deliverable Achieved/ completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>work with the NHS at local levels to establish Integrated Care Teams which serve local communities</td>
<td>• Engage in Integrated Care Community workstreams of Better Care Together and Success Regime</td>
<td>Completed evaluation of early adopter sites by 31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; March 2017</td>
<td>In the west, north and east of Cumbria there are three early adopter sites – (i) Maryport and Cockermouth, (ii) Workington and (iii) Eden. These have been in operation since June 2016.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In South Cumbria all seven Integrated Care Communities are operational although different Integrated Care Communities are concentrating on developing different parts of the Integrated Care Communities model. Integrated Care Communities are developing risk stratification and care planning through the Kendal and East Integrated Care Communities. Organisational Development events have been arranged across three Integrated Care Communities to continue to develop the core team including the voluntary sector. Six out of the seven Integrated Care Communities have now produced a plan on the page.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We will</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Deliverable Achieved/ completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ensure we meet our safeguarding responsibilities to protect people from abuse and neglect</td>
<td>• Co-locate safeguarding operations function within Commissioning</td>
<td>From April 2016</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement Making Safeguarding Personal</td>
<td>By December 2016</td>
<td>Making Safeguarding Personal has been implemented.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produce 3 year Delivery Plan</td>
<td>By June 2016</td>
<td>3 year Safeguarding Strategy is in place.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update safeguarding arrangements in line with Care Act Amendments</td>
<td>By June 2016</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: To support older, disabled and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will</strong> work with the NHS to modernise the support available in Cumbria for people with Learning Disabilities and people with Mental Health needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reshape day care services</td>
<td>Complete formal consultation to develop proposals by November 2016</td>
<td>For the Day Care services review, the timeline is being reviewed to allow for the co-design stage to be extended, enabling a robust approach to co-producing the future model with all stakeholders. A revised timeline will be shared with Local Committees and further updates provided to Local Committees in Qtr4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The reshaping of Learning Disabilities and mental health services</td>
<td>Transforming Care delivery plan by October 2016</td>
<td>Project plan in place, revised Local Implementation Group (LIG) in place, workstreams agreed, community model development required, financial implications paper prepared with recommendations. Continuing to track and monitor discharge from inpatient units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integration of mental health services with CCC services is complete by July 2016</td>
<td>The working end date for transition of mental health services (meaning all work would be passed between Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust and Adult Social Care accordingly) has been pushed back until at least the end of October. Discussions are ongoing with Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust to ensure we are on target for this. It should be noted that the migration of all cases identified – as part of transition work - has taken place and we are responding to social care need accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will</strong> deliver a programme of targeted investment in the modernisation of Cumbria Care Residential provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliver £3 million investment in new residential provision</td>
<td>By 31st March 2017</td>
<td>In regard to the programme of targeted investment in the modernisation of Cumbria Care Residential provision, two sites have been identified and secured in Carlisle and Copeland for new build. Consultants have been appointed as client advisors in connection with the procurement of design and build contractors. Design development for both schemes is advancing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rate/Percentage</td>
<td>RAG (against target)</td>
<td>Direction of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 1</td>
<td>Number of people who have assistive technology/telectare.</td>
<td>2408 G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 2</td>
<td>Ratio of safeguarding referrals to alerts</td>
<td>27.0% G</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 3</td>
<td>% of Community based service users in receipt of a Direct Payment or Individual Service Fund</td>
<td>41.7% R</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 4</td>
<td>Permanent admissions of older people (65+) to residential and nursing care homes per 100,000 population (NB Commentary contains actual numbers of admissions)</td>
<td>526.2 R</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 5</td>
<td>Effectiveness of Reablement services (discharge from hospital and did not return within 91 days – 65+)</td>
<td>88.9% G</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 6</td>
<td>New Eligible People Receiving Reablement 18+ (BCF 5)</td>
<td>909 G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rate/Percentage</td>
<td>RAG (against target)</td>
<td>Direction of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 7</td>
<td>Waiting time from new referral to completion of first assessment (in days)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 8.2</td>
<td>% of service users with an overdue review (12 months)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 9</td>
<td>Proportion of carers with evidence of direct support</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 10</td>
<td>Delayed Transfers of Care (delayed days per quarter)</td>
<td>see commentary</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Declining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Priority: To enable communities to help shape their local services, promote health and wellbeing and support those in poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Achieved/ completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will work with communities and the third sector to help them to shape, own, or run local services to meet their local needs and promote healthy communities</strong></td>
<td>Continue to develop area working to help reshape and transform the way services are delivered</td>
<td>Community Services continue to deliver area working projects based on distinct local need and opportunities. Local teams are contributing to the reshaping of local services through support to large scale service reviews, including local support to the Day Services Review and the Cumbria Care Modernisation. All Local Committees have been engaged in refreshing the area plan delivery plans for each of their areas. Following DMT/CMT consideration in October, these will be presented to the Local Committees during the Nov/Dec cycle for endorsement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Delivery Plans refreshed to reflect the wider Council reshaping by October 2016</td>
<td>The concept of area planning has been presented to the third sector network and a number of projects have already been identified and are gathering pace. Discussions will continue with a view to community driven projects being agreed by March 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with the Third Sector to agree and progress community based projects through local committees across Cumbria.</td>
<td>Timescales for delivery of projects identified and agreed by March 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will provide new public health services that empower people to take control of their own health and wellbeing</strong></td>
<td>Review the Neighbourhood Care Independence programme and establish a new model of provision that is integrated into the emerging Health and Social Wellbeing system</td>
<td>Ongoing work to develop the integration of the COMPASS model. Future Place Based community services (replacing the Neighbourhood Care Independence Programme) will adopt the COMPASS model. To be operational by April 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reshaped service established by October 2016</td>
<td>Continue to fund the managed service provider within contract until September 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will meet our statutory responsibilities for environment and regulatory services by focusing our work where the risks are greatest</strong></td>
<td>Adopt a targeted risk-based approach to regulation</td>
<td>Plans are being reviewed and updated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk-based enforcement plans updated to reflect new structure by December 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority: To enable communities to help shape their local services, promote health and wellbeing and support those in poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We will</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Deliverable Achieved/completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce the number of accidental dwelling fires</strong></td>
<td>Reduce to 264 by March 2017</td>
<td>The number of accidental primary dwelling fires Q2 16/17 has decreased to 57 (from 76 in Q1 16/17). This is below the quarterly target of 60 and now back on track to meet the annual target of 264. Revised Performance Management meetings remain in place across all Command areas. Performance Management is a standing agenda item at Service Management Team meetings. Operational Crews will have increased targets in relation to Home Accident Reduction Interventions throughout 2016/17. The fitting of a correctly located and working smoke alarm in domestic properties is a key performance indicator for the Fire and Rescue Service.</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Deliver Furness Peninsula Blue Light Hub | By December 2016 | Four contractors were shortlisted. A single preferred contractor has now been appointed. A drainage survey has now been successfully completed. | → |  |
| Implement new duty systems for regular fire fighters, whilst maintaining appropriate response levels to meet the risk | By March 2017 | Initial informal meeting with TU's has been carried out. Informal discussion at this stage around 12/8 hour shifts and full project plan to be in place by January 2017. Revised system across all Regular stations, with a view to leading to additional changes that may require an Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) consultation in 2017. | → |  |

| Explore opportunities for joint training facilities | Agreement on joint arrangements by March 2017 | Construction should start in December 2016. This is to deliver collaborative training with Cumbria Police - new training facility is at planning application stage (for location adjacent to Penrith Fire Station). On track to deliver new facility by March 2017. Engagement now taken place with Fire Brigade’s Union and informal dialogue with Regular firefighters. Ongoing discussions with North West Ambulance Service (NWAS) with the aim to have a pilot up and running by March 2017. | → |  |

| Explore opportunities for medical response arrangements | Agreement on joint arrangements by March 2017 |  | → |  |

| **Increase the percentage of adult social care contracts being delivered by suppliers who commit to paying the Living Wage Foundation’s Living Wage rate of pay** | Increase to 57% by October 2016 | Living Wage Foundation rate for Adult Social Care tenders beginning November 2015 is at 65% again in September, above target of 57%. | → |  |

*We will continue to pay the Living Wage Foundation’s Living Wage to all our employees and encourage other employers to do the same through our procurement processes.*
## Priority: To enable communities to help shape their local services, promote health and wellbeing and support those in poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate/Percentage</th>
<th>RAG (against target)</th>
<th>Direction of travel</th>
<th>Variance from target</th>
<th>Good Performance is</th>
<th>Target 16/17</th>
<th>Cumbria 15/16</th>
<th>Cumbria 14/15</th>
<th>SN 15/16</th>
<th>National 15/16</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2a</td>
<td>Number of accidental primary dwelling fires - no.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>&lt;=256 (&lt;64 quarter)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a yet</td>
<td>The number of Accidental Primary Dwelling Fires has decreased by 19 fires (from 76 in Qtr 1 to 57 in Qtr 2). A decrease in fires was seen across all districts. However, Copeland had the largest decrease from Qtr 1 of 5 fires, followed by Carlisle which had 4 less fires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2b</td>
<td>Number of accidental primary dwelling fires - per 10,000 dwellings</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>&lt;=2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a yet</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS2</td>
<td>Percentage of adult social care contracts being delivered by suppliers who commit to paying the Living Wage Foundation’s Living Wage rate of pay</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The percentage increase is predominantly relating to the new Adult Social Care contracts of late. Target will change to 57% in October.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH1</td>
<td>NHS health check - % of 40-74 yr olds offered health check</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5% per quarter</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>Qtr1 up by 0.3% from 4.83% in Qtr 4 (15-16) to 5.13% in Qtr 1. Qtr 1 above England average of 4.43%. 5 year cumulative (2013-18) above England: Cumbria: 73.9%; England: 61.5%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH2</td>
<td>NHS Health check - % of 40-74 yr olds offered health check who have taken up</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>50% per quarter</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>Qtr1 up by 1.42 from 45.52% in Qtr 4 to 46.94 in Qtr 1, above England average of 45.56%. 5 year cumulative (2013-18): Cumbria: 43.8%; England: 48.4%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH3a</td>
<td>Successful completion of drug treatment &amp; non representation - opiate users</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13.14%</td>
<td>13.14%</td>
<td>6.74% (Yr End May-16)</td>
<td>Data covers the period Yr to End Aug 16. Performance is above the national average of 6.61%. Compared to the previous year (14-15) the percentage has decreased by 0.44 (from 13.14% to 12.97%).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH3b</td>
<td>Successful completion of drug treatment &amp; non representation - non opiate users</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>36.98% (Yr End May-16)</td>
<td>Data covers the period Yr to End Aug 16. Performance is good in Cumbria and above the national average of 36.81%. Compared to the previous year (14-15) the percentage has increased by 6.51 (from 50.0% to 56.51%). Performance is above target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM1</td>
<td>Increase in families accessing free school meals and uniform grants</td>
<td>6288</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>6770</td>
<td>7402</td>
<td>This figure has been taken from the May School Census. Compared to the previous January School Census there has been an increase of 44 from 6244 to 6288. The results of the October School Census will be available for the next quarterly report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Priority: To provide a safe and well managed highways network, secure infrastructure improvements and support local economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Deliverable Achieved/completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will</strong> maintain the highways network to the best possible standard within our available resources</td>
<td>• Implement the Highways Strategy Level 2 achieved through the DfT’s new self-assessment procedure by May 2016. An improved customer web portal implemented by March 2017.</td>
<td>Achieved.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will</strong> lead flood recovery work to support communities to return to normal as soon as possible through working with the government and other agencies to secure the required resources to replace and repair the county’s infrastructure where it has been lost or damaged, and promote solutions which will be more resilient in the future where possible</td>
<td>• Develop and deliver a programme of capital works to restore damaged infrastructure A summary of the year 1 infrastructure recovery programme published on the Council’s website by June 2016 All major road bridges damaged or destroyed as a result of Storm Desmond to be opened through repair or installation of temporary bridges by December 2016</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will</strong> seek additional investment in our highways and transport infrastructure</td>
<td>• Work with Department of Transport to identify potential additional funding sources and opportunities The next round of Challenge Fund bids prepared for (target date subject to funding timeframe to be confirmed by DfT)</td>
<td>Currently discussing potential bid areas with Department for Transport (DfT) advisor prior to any announcement of available funding.</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will</strong> work with communities and the third sector to develop and deliver local transport solutions</td>
<td>• Work with transport providers, both commercial and voluntary sector and communities to provide local transport solutions 2 community-led transport solutions in place by March 2017</td>
<td>On track. The community led solution involving the Border Rambler group, with communities from Brampton to Gilsland, resulted in two new routes BR3 and BR2.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority: To provide a safe and well managed highways network, secure infrastructure improvements and support local economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will</strong></td>
<td>Work with the LEP to oversee and progress the delivery of the Cumbria Growth Deal programme</td>
<td>£19.5 million invested in Growth Deal projects in 2016/17</td>
<td>On track to achieve £19.5m spend in 2016/17. Variations to profile are reported to the Local Enterprise Panel Investment Panel. The Currock Bridge project was funded from Growth Deal funding and was completed in September 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further Growth Deal bid submitted to Government by the announced deadline</td>
<td>Growth Deal 3 bid submitted in July 2016 for £165m and a funding announcement is expected in November 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to increase the number of premises with access to superfast broadband speeds of at least 24 Mbps download</td>
<td>110,894 premises by 30 September 2016</td>
<td>Metric data for this programme is normally provided on a quarterly rather than monthly basis, however, the programme team has been pushing for this to be provided monthly. Based on current available data, provided in August, the current estimated number of properties passed at greater than 24Mbps is 106,709. We do not expect to reach the target of 110,894 by 30th September due to delays on the completion of some structures. However, work is in progress to contractually manage the delays in reaching the target and ensure the completion of the delayed structures wherever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116,819 premises by 31 March 2018</td>
<td>Deployment of currently surveyed work is progressing ahead of schedule. It should be noted that our delivery partner BT, has been asked to prioritise the completion of the phase 1 deployment ahead of works related to the phase 2 contract, to allow the phase 1 contract to be formally closed as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We will</strong></td>
<td>Commit to socially responsible commissioning and procurement activities and leading by example, invite contracted suppliers, the wider business community, other public sector bodies, and third sector organisations, to make the same commitment</td>
<td>Include social benefit clauses in all relevant tenders</td>
<td>Average percentage of contractors committed to social value increased to 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority: To provide a safe and well managed highways network, secure infrastructure improvements and support local economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate/Percentage</th>
<th>RAG (against target)</th>
<th>Direction of travel</th>
<th>Variance from target</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS4</td>
<td>By including Social Benefit clauses in all relevant tenders, the average percentage of local SME’s will increase to 75%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>There was a high number of transport tenders in September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW1</td>
<td>Right First Time</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>Prioritised resources applied to maintain compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW2</td>
<td>End to End Time</td>
<td>28 days</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Prioritised resources applied to address previous quarters position are showing improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW3</td>
<td>Improved network condition (PRN/NPRN)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Annual measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW4</td>
<td>Maintenance (Local Committee) programme of works completed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Work programmes continue to be delivered against profile and programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority: To be a modern and efficient council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Deliverable Achieved/ completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will use technology to improve council services for all our customers and reduce costs through the delivery of our Digital Strategy</td>
<td>• Implement customer portal and refreshed Council website By March 2017</td>
<td>A redesign of the main CCC website has been launched in line with the timescales for Cumbria House opening in Nov 2016. Work on a new Customer Portal is progressing. This is phase 1 of the project and further development of a digital platform for Council services will take place over the period to March 2017.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide public wi-fi in all Council buildings By December 2016</td>
<td>On track. All CCC buildings will have public WiFi by December 2016.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enable, through extending Service Centre operations, online transactions end-to-end for top 10 customer enquiries By March 2017</td>
<td>Close working across the Digital Strategy and Service Centre programme continues. Website metrics, alongside business intelligence will continue to be used to identify the most popular online transactions, and those that still need to be developed.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will support the development of the council’s workforce to ensure it has the right skills, competencies and behaviours to drive the council’s transformation</td>
<td>• Deliver the Workforce Plan Delivery Plan Pilots of ‘Team Leader’ Development programme &amp; ‘Aspiring Manager’ programme commenced from September 2016 A workforce skills framework implemented by December 2016 Sickness absence reduced to 8 working days lost per full-time employee in 2017/18</td>
<td>Pilot team leader programme to be delivered in October 2016, subject to nominations from Assistant Directors. ‘Aspiring Manager’ ready to roll out. Work is in progress to develop a workforce skills framework. However, significant service reshaping and stretched internal people management resources have impacted upon the progress of the development which will impact on implementation by December 2016. Significant work has been undertaken to date and further measures are in progress to reduce sickness absence levels and the associated costs and impacts of absence. Overall the impact of the measures and actions taken to date report a reduction in the number of working days lost per FTE of 3.3%, when compared to absence performance for 2015/16. However performance for September forecasts absence at 12.8 working days lost per FTE, which continues to be off target. Targeted action plan has been agreed by CMT and is being rolled out as a priority.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority: To be a modern and efficient council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Target value or date</th>
<th>Progress to Sept 2016</th>
<th>Direction of travel (Qtr1-Qtr2 2016)</th>
<th>Deliverable Achieved/completed (▲)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the management of household bulky waste and implement recommendations</td>
<td>By October 2016</td>
<td>The Local Government Association funded project delivered by Resource Futures to review Cumbria’s bulky waste system has been completed. The recommendations and outcomes have been implemented into a Waste Prevention programme of work. The newly developed Waste Prevention Board will be used as a means of reporting progress made with regard to bulky waste re-use.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, publish and deliver a new Waste Prevention programme</td>
<td>By October 2016</td>
<td>Following a team restructure, the reach of the authority’s waste prevention function has been extended via more formal links with area planning and collaborative efforts between the team and Community Development colleagues. Direction and management of the waste prevention programme will be delivered by a newly appointed waste prevention board. Current priorities for the programme include targeted project work focusing on bulky, food and garden waste.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in renewable energy technology on corporate buildings to generate a revenue stream</td>
<td>A saving of £75,000 generated from investment in solar panels on corporate buildings by March 2017</td>
<td>Inglewood - Solar PV is now installed and operational (savings being initiated) Lillyhall - Solar PV 75% installed, due to closure of Lillyhall office the remainder will not be installed until resolution of office solution (partial savings being initiated) Parkhouse – CCC agreement to Capita legal costs. CCC issued confirmation of agreement to Capita, pending completed response to trigger works in as soon as possible. Overall efficiencies being generated and monitored but due to issues at Lillyhall and delay due to Capita there is an increasing risk of not achieving the target. Alternative efficiency/income solutions being considered.</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Target value or date</td>
<td>Progress to Sept 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver the Council Medium Term Financial Plan (2016-2019) and the savings of £45.5 million for 2016/17 agreed by Council in February 2016</td>
<td>Service Reviews implemented by March 2017 to deliver additional savings of £5.2 million</td>
<td>The Council's Service Review Programme remains on track. The staffing reduction programme is forecast to achieve gross revenue savings of £5.2m, however it is currently RAG rated amber because the Business Support Review for Health and Care Services Directorate started later than planned and may only achieve part year effect in 2016/17. The People Management, Learning and Skills service review has delivered the planned staffing reductions and £1.6m gross revenue savings in full. However a net budget shortfall is forecast as a number of posts that have been removed from the establishment have not resulted in a net revenue saving because they were historically funded from income or one off funding sources and a number of voluntary redundancies were counted towards Business Support and Management cross cutting savings instead of the People Management service review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalise and, where properties are to be retained, invest in our properties to support redesign of services</td>
<td>Deliver a Capital Programme of schemes totalling £119 million in 2016/17</td>
<td>The Reshaping the Council savings (excluding the Service Reviews above) implemented by March 2017 of £3.3 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rate/Percentage</td>
<td>RAG (against target)</td>
<td>Direction of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS3</td>
<td>Sickness absence reduced to 8 working days lost per full-time employee in 2017/18</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPDP4</td>
<td>A saving of £75,000 generated from investment in solar panels on corporate buildings by March 2017</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG1</td>
<td>% of FOI and EIR requests dealt with within 20 day statutory timescale</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG2</td>
<td>% of corporate complaints dealt with satisfactorily at informal stage</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG3</td>
<td>% of Children Act Complaints resolved at stage 1</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Declining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority: To be a modern and efficient council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate/Percentage</th>
<th>RAG (against target)</th>
<th>Direction of travel</th>
<th>Variance from target</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG6</td>
<td>Average number of working days to resolve adult social care complaints.</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>The average number of days taken to resolve adult social care complaints in the first 6 months of the year was 28.5 days. This remains well above target and is a substantial improvement compared with the full year 2015/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG6</td>
<td>% of Subject Access Requests dealt with within 40 day statutory timescale.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Of the 86 Subject Access Requests received in the 6 month period to 30th September 2016, 46 (53%) were dealt with within the statutory 40 day period. Whilst this represents improvement compared with Qtr 1 2015/16 (48%), performance remains off-target. Awareness sessions will be delivered in November for Senior Managers to emphasise manager responsibilities in regard to the Data Protection Act, and in particular, responding to Subject Access Requests within required timescales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTF1</td>
<td>Increase by 10% from 344 to 378 the number of active volunteers by March 2017</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This target has been achieved. There are now over 378 volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS3</td>
<td>Reduce total household waste produced to less than 483.7 kg per person (14/15 total)</td>
<td>Forecast 479.7kg per head</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>The forecast is based on latest figures reported to Waste Dataflow for Qtr 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS5</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of household waste recycled above 15/16 rates (42.9% - provisional fig to be confirmed)</td>
<td>Forecast for whole year 43.6%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>The forecast is based on latest figures reported to Waste Dataflow for Qtr 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS6</td>
<td>Reduce the total tonnage of household waste sent to landfill to less than 35,000 tonnes (estimate based on 2xperforming MBTs and no external influences e.g. floods)</td>
<td>Forecast for year 43,380 tonnes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>The forecast is based on latest figures reported to Waste Dataflow for Qtr 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears. Performance is forecast below the original target because re-processed materials previously reported as recycled are now categorised under reporting guidance as landfill. If adjustment is made for this then performance is on target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS6</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of household waste sent to landfill to less than 15%</td>
<td>Forecast for year 18.1%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>The forecast is based on latest figures reported to Waste Dataflow for Qtr 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears. Performance is forecast below the original target because re-processed materials previously reported as recycled are now categorised under reporting guidance as landfill. If adjustment is made for this then performance is on target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Good Performance Target 16/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate/Percentage</th>
<th>RAG (against target)</th>
<th>Direction of travel</th>
<th>Variance from target</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG5</td>
<td>Average number of working days to resolve adult social care complaints.</td>
<td>Low 35 days</td>
<td>35 days</td>
<td>60 days</td>
<td>38 days</td>
<td>The average number of days taken to resolve adult social care complaints in the first 6 months of the year was 28.5 days. This remains well above target and is a substantial improvement compared with the full year 2015/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG6</td>
<td>% of Subject Access Requests dealt with within 40 day statutory timescale.</td>
<td>High 90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of the 86 Subject Access Requests received in the 6 month period to 30th September 2016, 46 (53%) were dealt with within the statutory 40 day period. Whilst this represents improvement compared with Qtr 1 2015/16 (48%), performance remains off-target. Awareness sessions will be delivered in November for Senior Managers to emphasise manager responsibilities in regard to the Data Protection Act, and in particular, responding to Subject Access Requests within required timescales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTF1</td>
<td>Increase by 10% from 344 to 378 the number of active volunteers by March 2017</td>
<td>High 378</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>This target has been achieved. There are now over 378 volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS3</td>
<td>Reduce total household waste produced to less than 483.7 kg per person (14/15 total)</td>
<td>Low &lt;483.7 kg per person</td>
<td>497.6</td>
<td>483.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The forecast is based on latest figures reported to Waste Dataflow for Qtr 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS5</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of household waste recycled above 15/16 rates (42.9% - provisional fig to be confirmed)</td>
<td>High &gt;42.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The forecast is based on latest figures reported to Waste Dataflow for Qtr 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS6</td>
<td>Reduce the total tonnage of household waste sent to landfill to less than 35,000 tonnes (estimate based on 2xperforming MBTs and no external influences e.g. floods)</td>
<td>Low &lt;35,000 tonnes</td>
<td>48,964</td>
<td>36,070</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The forecast is based on latest figures reported to Waste Dataflow for Qtr 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears. Performance is forecast below the original target because re-processed materials previously reported as recycled are now categorised under reporting guidance as landfill. If adjustment is made for this then performance is on target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS6</td>
<td>Reduce the proportion of household waste sent to landfill to less than 15%</td>
<td>Low &lt;15%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The forecast is based on latest figures reported to Waste Dataflow for Qtr 1. Figures are reported one quarter in arrears. Performance is forecast below the original target because re-processed materials previously reported as recycled are now categorised under reporting guidance as landfill. If adjustment is made for this then performance is on target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the Report About?

1. The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet Members about the Barrow Borough Council Local Plan Publication Consultation and to seek agreement to issue the proposed consultation response.

2. When adopted the Local Plan will identify key development sites and the policies to be used to determine planning applications up to 2030. The plan must be underpinned by robust evidence including that concerning infrastructure.

3. The Local Plan must be alive to the challenges facing the local community and in this respect the plan demonstrates an understanding of key issues. In particular it:
   - broadly meets with the Council’s overall vision and priorities;
   - gives weight to the delivery of necessary infrastructure to support the delivery of the plan;
   - recognises the opportunities created by the manufacturing sector and the importance of Waterfront Business Park;
   - seeks to enhance the town’s offer to employers, workers and visitors; and
   - has given due regard to strategic priorities and local evidence in infrastructure planning.

4. The plan nonetheless remains a work in progress, in particular it is considered that there will be a need for:
   - a clearer strategy to achieve the delivery of investment within the town centre.
   - a clearer articulation of how changes in housing demand over the plan period can be accommodated through policy.
   - greater clarity on how the development located in minerals safeguarding areas was considered.
Recommendation of the Corporate Director

5. It is recommended that Cabinet approves the strategic response outlined in this report and agrees that the technical response contained in Appendices A and B are submitted to Barrow Borough Council.

Background to the Proposals

6. The planning system in England is ‘plan led’, whereby there is a statutory duty for all Local Planning Authorities to prepare a Local Plan for their area. Barrow Borough Council has been preparing its Local Plan that when complete will identify key development sites and the policies to be used to decide planning applications up to 2030.

7. The Government requires that Barrow Borough Council works with the County Council during the development of the Local Plan. Such effective relationships should ensure that the County Council’s interests as a planning authority and infrastructure and service provider are appropriately taken into account in the development of Policy.

8. In keeping with its capacity as a consultee, the County Council has responded to the development of the proposed Local Plan on the following basis:

- Issues Consultation (Nov 2012) – Informal officer comments
- Issues and Options Consultation (Nov 2014) – Informal officer comments
- Preferred Options Consultation (Nov 2015) – Cabinet endorsed response.

9. Following the current consultation Barrow Borough Council will submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State who will determine whether the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound. Subject to the successful completion of this process, Barrow Borough Council would then be able to adopt the Local Plan.

Strategic Overview of Issues

10. In the past Barrow has been affected by the decline in its traditional manufacturing base and its relative remoteness from regional and national markets. Underpinned by the Furness Peninsula’s established expertise in advanced manufacturing, it is considered that over the next plan period Barrow will have an opportunity to challenge these negative trends and position itself as a driver of growth within the northern economy. Framed by this context, the Local Plan seeks to promote a deliverable strategy that responds to the economic potential of the Borough.

Distribution of Development

11. Authorities must positively plan their areas having regard to both the needs and sustainability of locations. This principle is important and the concentration of growth in accessible and attractive locations will help maximise the delivery of important County Council services and stimulate economic activity. In particular this approach should help maximise the benefits derived from the major new investments in the Borough.
12. Supporting these principles, within the Local Plan it is proposed that new development is focused on Barrow-in-Furness (including Walney). In particular, it gives weight to the Port of Barrow and the opportunity to deliver significant and lasting regeneration through the Waterfront Business Park and Marina Village housing development. The plan also proposes modest levels of growth at Dalton together with small-scale growth in Askam, Ireth, Newton, Lindal and within rural areas.

Town Centres

13. Within the Local Plan Barrow town centre is recognised as a key element in the Borough’s offer to workers, investors and employers. Notwithstanding this, the Local Plan is not sufficiently clear on how aspirations for the town centre can be delivered. To address this point, within policy there should be a clear commitment to the preparation of a comprehensive spatial strategy that can help stimulate investment and secure funding support. It is considered that such a strategy could identify the key development sites, highlight barriers to delivery and embed the key outputs of the recent Parking and Movement Study and Barrow Transport Improvements Study before setting out a co-ordinated delivery plan.

14. In a similar manner it is advised that greater weight needs to be given to the important role of Dalton town centre. To address this it is recommended that within the Local Plan there should be a commitment to the development of a strategy document that sets out a clear strategy for the delivery of growth and investment within the town.

Employment Proposals

15. Critical to the economy of Barrow is the advanced manufacturing sector which is underpinned by BAE and the major investment in the Successor Programme. Well related to these activities, Waterfront Business Park is the key strategic employment site in Barrow and the role of the business park and other smaller sites are supported within the Local Plan. This support is important, helping to secure investor confidence and infrastructure to help to deliver sites.

Housing Growth

16. The Local Plan proposes an annualised housing target of 105, below the previous requirement of 150. The County Council had previously raised concern that a reduced annual requirement could conflict with the economic potential of the borough which will, in part, rely upon the delivery of an attractive and mixed housing offer. Since then the Borough Council has prepared additional evidence to underpin this figure while making clear provision for windfall sites to come forward upon unallocated sites where they comply with policy requirements including ensuring the availability of infrastructure.

17. While the policy approach proposed is considered fundamentally sound, the plan would benefit in setting out that any additional land can be brought forward in response to increased demand or a failure or delay in the delivery of the proposed allocations. This is an important consideration given the potential demands created by investments from BAE and by National Grid.
18. The Plan also seeks to support the delivery of a housing mix that can meet the requirements of all in the community, including for Extra Care Housing and those with a requirement for affordable housing.

Infrastructure Delivery

19. The County Council and Barrow Borough Council have enjoyed a positive working relationship with respect to infrastructure planning matters borne out by Barrow’s signing of a “Statement of Intent” in which the Council’s commit to work together. The principles enshrined within this document supported the development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

20. The IDP has been underpinned by evidence including the Barrow Transport Improvements Study and assessment of matters like flooding and education in addition to strategic evidence including the Cumbria Infrastructure Plan. It is now also requested that the outputs of the West of M6 Strategic Study undergo inclusion. Alongside this, the IDP would benefit from strengthening content about the importance of enhancing access too and from the strategic road network.

21. The identification of infrastructure must dove-tail with a robust delivery strategy which will rely on effective working between Councils. To secure the delivery of infrastructure, Local Plan Policy together with the IDP set out key principles around the use of developer contributions and the delivery of improved infrastructure, including at schools. The IDP also details how external funding support would be important where development viability issues arise (e.g. the Growth Deal support for Marina Village).

Minerals and Waste Local Plan

22. A number of the proposed development sites lie within a mineral safeguarding area. In response to this it is advised that the Borough Council provides greater clarity on how sites were considered in the context of this designation.

County Council Property Assets

23. Within the response it is proposed to support the allocation of land in the following locations that are in the control of Cumbria County Council:

- 24.5 ha comprising Waterfront Business Park, (ref. EMR03) has been proposed as a location for employment development. This reflects its existing use and delivery of infrastructure there

- 0.8 ha comprising Land East of Park View School (ref. REC18) has been proposed as a location for residential development.

- 1.77 ha comprising Thorncliffe South (ref, REC19b) has been proposed as a location for residential development.

- 0.4 ha comprising the remaining part of Furness Business Park has been allocated for employment development.
Local Member Feedback

24. At a meeting on 11 November 2016 and through further written feedback the views of Local Members were sought. The comments provided are set out within Appendix C which is summarised below:

- Members raised the strategic importance of connectivity to and from Barrow via the A595 and A590 and the need for continued improvements.

- Members highlighted the importance of effective local road networks and their role in providing access to and from town centres, major employment sites, the port and Strategic Road Network.

- Members emphasised the need to ensure the Local Plan does not excessively focus on Barrow and ignore other locations including Dalton.

- Flooding on Walney was flagged up as a risk and would need to be addressed if further development were to take place.

- The impact on the highways especially around Jubilee Bridge is a significant issue and the delivery of enhancements is important.

Options Considered and Risks Identified

Option (a)

25. The strategic response outlined in this Report together with the technical response are agreed and are provided to Barrow Borough Council.

Option (b)

26. Cabinet adds further comments to the strategic response outlined in this Report before it is provided to Barrow Borough Council.

Option (c)

27. Do not respond. However, this would undermine any opportunities to influence the drafting of the Local Plan and its evidence in line with the Duty to Cooperate

Reasons for the recommendation/Key benefits

- It will help to ensure the Council’s interests and priorities are reflected within the Local Plan.

- It will ensure the integration of Local Plan growth and infrastructure planning

- It will ensure the deliverability of the Local Plan.

- It will ensure Local Plan policy maximises economic growth opportunities.
Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

28. There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations contained within this report, however the developments contained within the resulting Local Plan will have implications for the Council and these will become clearer as the planning process progresses.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be Considered?

29. There are no legal implications arising from the recommendation in the report. The Borough Council may accept or reject the suggested amendments put forward by the County Council but if they are not accepted the County Council will have the opportunity to make representations about the draft plan at any subsequent examination.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

30. The relevant Council Plan priority is:

   *Infrastructure: To provide a safe and well managed highway network, secure infrastructure improvements and support local economic growth.*

31. Supporting the development of the Local Plan will contribute to delivery of the Council’s priority by directly ensuring new development can be accommodated within the highway network, infrastructure needed to support growth is identified and is deliverable and that Local Plan policy promotes economic growth.

What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

32. Local Plan preparation follows detailed procedures for public engagement that Barrow Borough Council must adhere to.

Appendices and Background Documents
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Appendix A - Detailed Cumbria County Council Comments with respect to individual policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Policy DS3 Development Strategy

1. Barrow contains a diverse mix of urban and rural areas and with them a range of bespoke issues and challenges which the Local Plan should address.

2. County Council’s Area Plan for Barrow plays an important role in identifying some of our priorities. In particular it gives focus to:
   - Promoting sustainable economic growth, and creating jobs;
   - Improving educational achievement; and
   - Improving health and well-being and tackling poverty.

3. Barrow enjoys an important role as a manufacturing, shopping and leisure centre. Despite this, it has in the past faced long term economic difficulties brought about by the decline in its traditional manufacturing base and its relative remoteness from regional and national markets. However Barrow does also enjoy significant opportunities, not least due to the specialisms in the manufacturing sector highlighted by BAE’s major investment in the town.

4. Framed by this context, the development strategy set out in this plan is considered to be fundamentally robust, highlighting the need for the plan to support sustainable development while also addressing the challenges of delivering housing market renewal. Moreover the proposed approach to focus future growth at Barrow-in-Furness (including Walney) with smaller levels proposed at Dalton, Askham and Ireleth and outlying villages should promote sustainable development and not conflict with the need to deliver regeneration at Barrow-in-Furness.

5. The addition of a clear statement that the strategy seeks to build upon the opportunities enjoyed by Barrow and improve the offer of the town is welcome as are efforts to promote this strategy across the plan. By improving its proposition, workers and the supply chains associated with major investments will be encouraged locate in the town.

Policy DS1 – Council’s Commitment to sustainable development

6. The preparation of a policy that articulates the Council’s commitment to sustainable development is welcome. This commitment aligns with the NPPF and should ensure both the development industry and planning authority are working to deliver sustainable development.

7. We also welcome the improved wording in line with the previous advice of Cumbria County Council.
Policy DS2 – Sustainable Development Criteria

8. Given the importance of the development strategy set out through Policy DS3 it is recommended that it receives specific reference as part of this policy.

*Suggested Changes*

9. The policy should refer to development strategy set out within Policy DS3.

Policy DS4 – Opportunity Areas

10. The purpose of this policy, namely the promotion of significant yet challenging sites in a flexible manner is understood. Notwithstanding this, the policy needs to be clearer that uses promoted at these sites does conflict with the wider principles and policy contained within the Local Plan.

*Suggested Changes*

11. The policy should be revised to be clear that proposals for the Opportunity Sites must comply with wider Local Plan Policy.

Policy DS5 - Design

12. The delivery of good quality and inclusive development is fundamental to the robustness of the Local Plan. We welcome the latest version of this policy which is in line with the previous advice of the County Council.

Policy C1 – Flood Risk and Erosion

13. We welcome the update of this policy to reflect the previous advice of the County Council.

Policy C2 – Development and the Coast

14. The proposed policy is appropriate and should ensure development respects the important asset of Barrow’s attractive coastline.

15. Coastal and route based tourism can be an important element of the Furness Peninsula’s visitor offer. Recognising this and in line with the previous advice of the County Council, we welcome additional reference to the provision of improved coastal access where practical.

Policy C3 – Water Management

16. It is considered that this policy and its supporting text should receive some strengthening to better reflect legislation and good practice, to amplify the role of SUDs as part of good design principles and highlight linkages with the work of the responsible drainage and flooding authorities and bodies.
17. The beginning of criteria b) to the policy should be revised to state:

“b) New development will be required to ensure that natural drainage has been replicated as closely as possible and that there is no net increase in surface water runoff by considering the effect of development on existing flood risk and flows originating from off site and by designing sustainable drainage systems in accordance with the Non-statutory technical standards for. Developers must submit a Drainage Strategy that shows how foul and surface water will be effectively managed. Surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority:”

18. Paragraph 4.6.14 should be revised to state:

“Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are a key mechanism for improving water quality. Sustainable drainage systems are designed to control surface water run off close to where it falls and mimic natural drainage as closely as possible. They provide opportunities to:

- reduce the causes and impacts of flooding;
- remove pollutants from urban run-off at source;
- combine water management with green space with benefits for amenity, recreation and wildlife.

Cumbria LLFA is a Statutory Consultee to local planning authorities on the management of surface water when considering planning applications. All major development - developments of 10 dwellings or more; or equivalent non-residential or mixed development – must ensure that sustainable drainage systems for the management of run-off are put in place, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. Cumbria LLFA also expect to be consulted on smaller developments where there are records of surface water flooding or the area is shown be at risk on Environment Agency mapping (including flood risk from surface water) or where there is a watercourse within the development boundary.”

19. Paragraph 4.6.17 should be revised to state:

“On greenfield sites, applicants will be expected to demonstrate that they have replicated natural drainage as closely as possible and discharge from new development must not exceed greenfield discharge. On previously developed land applicants should target a reduction in surface water discharge to as close as reasonably practicable to greenfield discharge.”
20. In paragraph 4.6.19 after “Environment Agency” add or “Cumbria County Council as Lead Local Flood authority.”

Policy I1 – Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery

21. The County Council and Barrow Borough Council have enjoyed a positive working relationship with respect to infrastructure planning matters borne out by Barrow’s signing of a “Statement of Intent”. The principles enshrined within this document supported the development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

22. The IDP has been underpinned by evidence including the Barrow Transport Improvements Study and assessment of matters like flooding and education in addition to strategic evidence including the Cumbria Infrastructure Plan. Nevertheless the failure of the IDP to address the outputs of the Barrow Parking and Movement Study and the Cumbria LEP West of M6 Strategic Study represents are omissions.

23. The identification of infrastructure must dovetail with a robust delivery strategy which will rely on effective working between Councils. To secure the delivery of infrastructure the Local Plan and IDP recognises the role of developer contributions and external funding support, which are important where development viability issues arise (e.g. the Growth Deal support for Marina Village) or in the case of strategic infrastructure.

24. Overall the policy approach for developer contributions is considered to be strong and in line with the previous advice of the County Council. We support the updated policy wording, the acknowledgement of the potential role of CIL and the cross references to the Cumbria County Council Planning Obligations Policy (September 2013).

Suggested Change

25. Specific comments on the IDP are provided at the rear of the report.

Policy I4 – Sustainable Travel Choices

26. This policy correctly highlights the need for development to be accessible and sustainable. Notwithstanding this, the policy should highlight the need for the whole transport impact of development to be assessed through the transport assessment and amplify the importance of there being early engagement with the highways authority.

Suggested Changes

27. The policy should be revised to include reference to the need for Transport Assessment to be provided in some situations and the value of early engagement in schemes.

28. The words “well lit” should be replaced with “suitably lit”.

232
Policy I5 – Travel Plans

29. We support the revised policy wording in line with the previous advice of Cumbria County Council. Further to this an additional minor change is sought in the interests of clarity.

Suggested Changes

30. Within the Policy the word “Heavy Goods” should be replaced with “private cars”.

Policy I7 – Transport Links

31. Measures to improve accessibility of the Furness Peninsula to the M6 and West Coast Mainline are recognised as priorities in helping to facilitate the sustainable development of Barrow. In this respect this policy and the support it gives for these principles is supported. Building on this support, the policy should seek to protect land where it is required to support the delivery of critical new infrastructure.

Suggested Changes

32. The policy should include an additional element to enable the protection of land where it is required to support the delivery of new infrastructure.

Minerals Safeguarding

33. There are a number of issues raised in regard to the draft Plan’s approach to minerals safeguarding, which would benefit from enhancement to ensure consistency with national policy.

34. Figures 10 and 11 are not consistent with the Minerals Safeguarding/Consultation Areas identified in the most recent version (Publication Version, September 2016) of the Cumbria Minerals & Waste Local Plan (MWLP). To confirm, the data used in the MWLP is base dated 2013. Whilst it is noted that the MWLP is not yet adopted, it contains the most current information, and should therefore be used to inform the emerging Barrow Local Plan.

35. To clarify, the Minerals Safeguarding and Minerals Consultation Area boundaries defined by the MWLP are contiguous. It is recommended that Figures 10 and 11 clarifies this, and that the key refers to ‘Minerals Safeguarding/Consultation Areas’, in order to avoid confusion. The term ‘Minerals Consultation Zone’ (Figure 11) is no longer used.

36. Paragraph 5.7.3 should be amended accordingly, with the text “plus a buffer zone around them” deleted.

37. Guidance (NPPG, Minerals Safeguarding) states that district councils should have “regard to the local minerals plan when identifying suitable
areas for non-mineral development in their local plans.”, and consult with the minerals planning authority when determining planning applications in such areas. It is noted (para 5.7.2) that “some of the sites identified for allocation in the Barrow Local Plan are within MSAs”. Having reviewed the allocated housing and employment sites in light of the current MSA/MCAs, CCC would advise that a significant number of the identified development sites lie within the latter area. These comprise REC47, REC48, REC10, SHL005, REC52, REC43, REC25a, REC34, REC49, REC39, REC09, REC54, SHL068, SHL103, SHL071, SHL070a, REC18, EMR01, EMR05, SHL001, EMR03, REC26, REC05.

38. The only reference to minerals policy in the Local Plan sustainability appraisal refers to the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Plan – which is presumably a typographical error. It is not clear how potential mineral sterilisation is taken into account in the allocation of the proposed sites and it is requested that greater clarification is provided in this respect.

39. The paragraph states how; “it may be necessary to consider the potential impact that development may have on sterilising those minerals”. It is not considered that this text goes far enough in this regard to satisfy national and local policy requirements.

40. The reference to consultation with the County Council in regard to development that would affect the mining and working of minerals in MSA/MCAs 5.7.3 is welcome. The County Council would provide detailed advice at such time as any of the allocations noted above are subject to specific development proposals. It is considered in the first instance however, that Barrow Borough Council should assess the proposed allocations against the criteria contained in Policy DC15 ‘Minerals Safeguarding’ of the emerging Cumbria MWLP, in order to ensure that the issue of minerals safeguarding has been addressed at a strategic level, in conformity with national policy.

41. With respect to paragraph 5.7.1 is considered important to clarify that Cumbria County Council does not have responsibility for minerals and waste developments within the two National Parks.

Suggested Changes

42. Barrow Borough Council should review the proposed allocations against the criteria contained in Policy DC15 ‘Minerals Safeguarding’ of the emerging Cumbria MWLP, in order to ensure that the issue of minerals safeguarding has been addressed at a strategic level, in conformity with national policy.

43. Within paragraph 5.7.1 the first sentence should be amended to read: “…the rest of Cumbria, outside the two National Parks, is the responsibility of”...
44. Within paragraph 5.7.2 it is considered that the text be amended to read “Therefore it is necessary…”.

**Policy EM1 – Waterfront Business Park Strategic Employment Opportunity Area**

45. Economic growth in Cumbria is a key priority for the County Council. The Cumbria Economic Ambition and LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan highlight key priority sectors for economic growth. Of particular relevance to the Barrow area is the potential for business investment in the advanced manufacturing sector, which in Barrow, is underpinned by the marine engineering and major investments proposed by BAE and DONG.

46. Waterfront Business Park is the key strategic employment site in Barrow and its importance is recognised within the Local Plan. This recognition should send a clear message about the priority for public and private investment in the Borough. This policy is therefore supported

**Policy EM2 – Local Employment Sites**

47. We support proposals to allocate additional local employment sites within the Local Plan. and support the allocation of the remaining part of Furness Business Park (ref. EMR 01).

**Policy EC7 – Energy Use Opportunity Area**

48. To build on the economic strengths of Barrow, the Local Plan includes an Energy Opportunity Area North and South of Morecambe Gas Terminal. This area has been identified as having the potential to accommodate uses related to the generation and transmission of energy. While reference to the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment is noted it is considered that the policy would benefit from highlighting the need to comply with the wider policy framework set out in the Local Plan.

49. Paragraph 6.4.1 states in regard to the North West Coast Connections project that “Two connection options have been put forward, one which runs from Moorside to the North and one which runs to the South across the Barrow peninsula and through a tunnel under Morecambe Bay to Heysham in Lancashire”. This wording implies that one or other of these options, will be taken, not that both are necessary – as is actually the case.

*Suggested Changes*

50. The policy should highlight a requirement for proposals to comply with the broader requirements as set out in the Local Plan.

51. The wording of paragraph 6.4.1 requires clarification.
Policy H1 – Annual Housing Target

52. The NPPF is clear that local authorities must identify their annual housing requirement following an objective assessment of needs. This process should have regard to a number of considerations including economic development and employment, demographics, housing availability, affordability and migration.

53. The Local Plan proposes an annualised housing target of 105, below the previous requirement of 150. The County Council had previously raised concern that a reduced annual requirement could conflict with the economic potential of the borough which will, in part, rely upon the delivery of an attractive and mixed housing offer.

54. Since then the Borough Council has prepared additional evidence to underpin this figure.

55. While the policy approach is considered fundamentally sound, to ensure the provision of supply but also the ability to respond to any increase in demand the plan would benefit in setting out any additional land can be brought forward in response to increased demand or a failure or delay in the delivery of the proposed allocations.

56. Moreover it is considered that the policy approach can address the needs created by the major investments by Grid and BAE. In particular it is considered important that the Borough has facilities that can address the requirements of business visitors or contract workers who may have a short term accommodation requirement. In response to this the plan would benefit for being more promotional about role of hotel or other temporary accommodation.

Suggested Changes

57. In supporting text it should be made clear how any additional housing land would be delivered in response to any shortfall in delivery or increase in demand.

58. The Local Plan should contain a specific policy that would support the provision of new hotel or other temporary accommodation provided they comply with the wider policy of the plan (in particular sustainability and town centre policy).

Policy H2 – Distribution of Housing

59. The Local Plan proposes to concentrate future housing development in a hierarchal manner. It is proposed that Barrow-in-Furness would accommodate 1,357 dwellings, Dalton 340 dwellings, Askam & Ireleth 124 dwellings and Newton and Lindal 42 dwellings.
60. It is considered that the proposed distribution of development does align with the development strategy and the aspiration to support the sustainable growth and renewal of Barrow.

Policy H3 – Allocation of Sites for Housing Development

61. Detailed technical comments on the proposed housing allocations are provided within Appendix B.

62. With respect to Council owned land, the proposed allocation of the following land is supported:

- 1.77 ha comprising Thorncliffe South (ref, REC19b) has been proposed as a location for residential development. However it is considered this site can accommodate more than the 19 dwellings indicated.
- 0.8 ha comprising Land East of Park View School (ref. REC18) has been proposed as a location for residential development.

63. Given the strategic and transformational potential the continued allocation of the Marina Village site is also supported.

Policy H7 – Housing Development on Windfall Sites

64. The broad approach to the consideration of development on windfall sites is supported. Moreover given the high rates of windfall development in Barrow, it is anticipated that this policy can play a key role in supporting sustainable development.

Policy H10 – Housing Delivery

65. The updated policy approach is now considered appropriate.

Policy H11 – Housing Mix

66. The approach requiring developers to bring forward a mix of housing that reflects the needs of the community is supported. Through this approach it will be important that explicit regard is had to the needs of the disabled and the elderly.

Suggested Change

67. Within the policy it is considered that explicit reference should be made to the needs of the disabled and elderly.

Policy H12 – Lifetime Homes

68. The NPPF highlights the importance of ensuring that the housing requirements of those with special requirements are met. Specialist housing and house designs that can be adapted to meet residents’
needs over their entire lifetime are important in helping to maintain the independence of occupiers in their homes.

69. While the emphasis on encouraging developers to provide homes that meet the future needs of occupiers is welcome, we would be concerned that it is not sufficiently strong. An option would be to create a requirement for the developer to clearly state how their development will be able to meet the changing housing needs of occupiers.

70. The second element of this policy which offers support to delivery of specialist housing including extra care housing. The County Council’s Extra Care Strategy highlights a need for a stepped increase in the delivery of Extra Care Housing and we recognise the importance of our authorities working together to secure the delivery of this essential housing.

Suggested Changes

71. The policy includes a specific requirement for the developers to demonstrate how the proposed development would be able to meeting any changing requirements of occupiers.

Policy H13 – Regenerating the Housing Stock

72. The need to deliver the effect regeneration of Barrow is recognised as an important priority. Given this, we support the inclusion of this policy within the Local Plan.

Policy H14 – Affordable Housing

73. We understand that evidence now indicates the need for affordable housing to meet the housing requirements of the borough. We support the proposed policy approach which reflects the previous advice of the County Council requiring that subject to the viability of individual developments, a proportion of affordable housing would be sought on development sites.

74. It is also considered that with affordable housing sought, consideration be given to securing affordable extra care housing.

Suggested Changes

75. The policy should make reference to the potential for affordable extra care housing to be secured as part of the dwelling mixes on sites.

Policy R1 – The vision for Barrow and Dalton town centres

76. It is considered that the vitality of Barrow and Dalton town centre will be essential to the sustainable development of Barrow. The recognition of this principle within this and subsequent policy is welcome.
77. Notwithstanding this, the Local Plan is not sufficiently clear on how aspirations for the town centre can be delivered. To address this point, within policy there should be a clear commitment to the preparation of a comprehensive spatial strategy that can help stimulate investment and secure funding support. It is considered that such a strategy could identify the key development sites, highlight barriers to delivery and embed the key outputs of the recent Parking and Movement Study and Barrow Transport Improvements Study before setting out a co-ordinated delivery plan.

78. In a similar manner it is advised that greater weight needs to be given to the important role of Dalton town centre. To address this it is recommended that within the Local Plan there should be a commitment to the development of a strategy document that sets out a clear strategy for the delivery of growth and investment within the town.

79. In a similar manner it is advised that greater weight needs to be given to the important role of Dalton town centre and the plan should recognise the value in undertaking preparation of a strategy document to consider the role of the town centre.

Suggested changes

80. The Local Plan Policy should make a clear commitment to the creation of a robust spatial strategy to help drive forward comprehensive and transformative growth within Barrow Town Centre. In a similar manner there should be a commitment to prepare a strategy document to consider the role of Dalton Town Centre.

Policy GI1 – Green Infrastructure

81. The inclusion of a Green Infrastructure Plan is welcomed, in particular the links made to the delivery of sustainability objectives and the need to increase the areas resilience to a changing climate.

Policy HC1 – Health and Wellbeing

82. Promoting healthy and accessible communities is an important priority within the NPPF and the principles of this policy appropriately seek to reflect this principle.

83. While positively worded it is considered the manner in which the policy only seeks to encourage principles that support and health and wellbeing is too weak and needs to be strengthened.

Suggested Changes

84. In the first sentence of the policy the word “encouraged” should be replaced by “required”.
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Policy HC7 – Loss of playing fields, sports pitches or facilities

85. It is considered important that school playing fields are not included as part of playing fields as defined by this policy. Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 as amended by the Education and Inspections Act 2006, gives protection to school playing fields used by maintained schools in the last 10 years. The Act defines what is meant by a maintained school and such schools include those maintained by a Local Authority, including community, foundation or voluntary school, or a community or foundation special schools.

The Act gives the following protection:

'Where an area of playing land has not been used by a foundation, trust or voluntary school, or any of its pupils for educational or recreational purposes for a period of more than 10 years, its disposal would fail to be considered under the same procedures that apply to non-playing field land (set out in Schedule 22 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 as amended by Schedule 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006)'.

86. In practice both areas of legislation mean that for local authorities, governing bodies, foundation bodies and trustees in order to dispose or change the use of playing fields used by schools, they must seek the permission of the Secretary of State. It should also be noted that Section 77 (4) refers to changes of use that do not need to be referred to the Secretary of State. This includes if a local authority, governing body, or foundation body wishes to build permanent classrooms or install mobile classrooms on playing fields. Also included is the building of an indoor leisure centre for use by the school or community, or both.

87. In November 2012 the Department for Education updated Guidance entitled ‘Advice on The Protection of School Playing Fields and Public Land’. The purpose of the Guidance is to ensure that existing school playing fields are protected to provide for the future needs of schools and their communities, and to protect the land that is needed for the purposes of an academy. The Guidance explains that in order for local authorities, governing bodies, foundation bodies and trustees to dispose or change the use of playing fields used by schools, they must seek the permission of the Secretary of state.

88. It is important to note that applying for planning permission is a separate process concerned with the development of land, whereas Section 77 is concerned with the protection of school playing fields for indiscriminate disposal or change or use. Education ministers do not have any statutory powers to influence the future development of land; this is a matter for the local planning authority. However, it is expected that where Section 77 applies, the consent of the Secretary of State is sought before a planning application is submitted.
89. It is noted that the potential Policy would restrict the partial or total loss of open space. It is acknowledged that the NPPF states that playing fields should not be built on unless a number of criteria are met. However, it is considered that school playing fields should be recognised as being exclusively for school use, and should not be considered available for any other use or access without the consent of the governing or other controlling body. It is considered that the legislation detailed above will provide sufficient protection to school playing fields. Consequently it is therefore considered that the potential Policy relating to the loss of school playing fields should be amended to take account of the schools operational needs in the first instance. Failure to do so could conflict with the ability to conflict with ability to delivery improved education facilities.

Suggested Changes

90. The text supporting this policy should be clear that school playing fields are not affected by this policy

Policy HC15 – Education Provision

91. We support the proposed policy approach which reflects the previous advice of Cumbria County Council.

Policy G17 – Green Links

92. We support the proposed policy approach which reflects the previous advice of Cumbria County Council.

Policy G18 – New Woodland

93. We support the proposed policy approach which reflects the previous advice of Cumbria County Council.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

94. Infrastructure to support the growth aspirations of a location is essential in ensuring the deliverability of a local plan and the sustainability of the communities it seeks to create. It is therefore imperative that the Carlisle Local Plan is supported by a comprehensive Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that establishes what infrastructure is required to deliver the sustainable development aspirations of the Barrow Local Plan.

95. While the current IDP is considered to be fundamentally robust, it will need to be subject to continuing review as new evidence, for example about infrastructure needs and funding opportunities, becomes available.

96. The IDP has been underpinned by evidence including the Barrow Transport Improvements Study and the Cumbria Infrastructure Plan. It is now also requested that the outputs of the Barrow Parking and
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Movement Study and West of M6 Strategic Study also undergo inclusion. Moreover the IDP and supporting paragraphs within the main Local Plan should be more explicit in setting out the strategic importance of both the A595 and A590 in delivering access to the M6 and west Cumbria and the need for continued enhancement.

97. Alongside this, the IDP would benefit from strengthening content about the importance of improving access too and from the strategic road network and strengthened narrative about working with Cumbria County Council to promote enhancements to the strategic road and rail networks.

98. The junctions at either end of Jubilee Bridge face significant constraints and in recognition of this it is considered that the delivery of enhancements should be given greater weight within the IDP.

99. In addition to the above referred highway considerations, we consider that the IDP and Local Plan itself would benefit from being more explicit about the strategic value and need to deliver enhancements to the Furness Line and Coast Line.

100. Within the education element of the IDP, reference is made to 250 new homes in Dalton. The correct figure is 350 and education assessments were undertaken on the basis of that figure. This will require a small change.
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Comments on specific Development Sites

1. The below comments relate to the assessments of the specific development sites contained within the Local Plan and the Housing Assessment (check).

2. The comments provided here do not remove the requirement for the detailed consideration of applications underpinned by robust evidence including TA where relevant.

Opportunity Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>CCC Comments Publication Draft 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPP1</td>
<td>Land at Channelside (South) formerly SHL007b</td>
<td>A developer would have to demonstrate that safe access to the highway is achievable. Transport Assessment and Travel Plan would be required with detailed traffic analysis for any development exceeding 30 two-way trips during the peak hours. The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Access for public service operators should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP2</td>
<td>Former Golf Driving Range, Walney Road formerly SHL009</td>
<td>A right turn lane would be needed to access this site. A developer would have to demonstrate that safe access to the highway is achievable. Transport Assessment and Travel Plan would be required with detailed traffic analysis for any development exceeding 30 two-way trips during the peak hours. The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Access for public service operators should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP3</td>
<td>Salthouse Mills formerly SHL002</td>
<td>See previous comments relating to site SHL002. Significant access improvements are essential as from Salthouse Road is too narrow and any access from another direction is unlikely and would be away from key services so would be unsustainable for housing, town centre or significant trip generating uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP4</td>
<td>Phoenix Road (by Travelodge) formerly EMR16</td>
<td>Currently subject to planning application B16/2016/0634. TA and SuDS needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>CCC Comments Publication Draft 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMR1</td>
<td>Remaining Part of Furness Business Park</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMR3</td>
<td>Waterfront Business Park, Barrow</td>
<td>Areas are shown as at risk of surface water flooding within the site. A surface water management plan will be needed to enhance flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMR</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMR5</td>
<td>Land East of Park Road, Barrow</td>
<td>Transport Assessment and Travel Plan would be required with detailed traffic analysis for any development exceeding 30 two-way trips during the peak hours. The site is large enough that it may be served by a bus route so a key loop serving the extremities of the site should have a carriageway width of 6m with reductions on short sections for traffic calming measures. The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Access for public service operators should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMR6</td>
<td>Land West of Robert McBride, Park Road, Barrow</td>
<td>The development site has no highway frontage. A developer would have to demonstrate that safe access to the highway is achievable. Transport Assessment and Travel Plan would be required with detailed traffic analysis for any development exceeding 30 two-way trips during the peak hours. The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Access for public service operators should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMR7</td>
<td>Land South of Kimberley Clark, Park Road, Barrow</td>
<td>Large parts of the site have surface water concerns with probably at least one Ordinary Watercourse on the site. These areas should remain as areas that are allowed to flood and should be enhanced for flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits. Any culverted watercourses should be opened up. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space. Transport Assessment and Travel Plan would be required with detailed traffic analysis for any development exceeding 30 two-way trips during the peak hours. The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Access for public service operators should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMR8</td>
<td>Land West of County Park Industrial Estate, Park Road, Barrow</td>
<td>Areas of surface water flood risk shown within the site. These areas should remain as areas that are allowed to flood and should be enhanced for flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits. Any culverted watercourses should be opened up. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space. Transport Assessment and Travel Plan would be required with detailed traffic analysis for any development exceeding 30 two-way trips during the peak hours. The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Access for public service operators should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMR11</td>
<td>Ulverston Road,</td>
<td>Transport Assessment and potentially a travel Plan would be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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required with detailed traffic analysis for any development exceeding 30 two-way trips during the peak hours. The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Access for public service operators should be encouraged.

EMR12

Land at Billings Road, Dalton

In its current form the access from Billings Road is constrained. However should major improvement works take place (geometry and structural) then an application accompanied by a TA could be considered acceptable.

EMR13

Former Training Centre, North Scale

There will be a requirement for improved access to support future growth. Any application should be accompanied by a TA.

EMR15

Land Opposite Phoenix Court, Barrow

The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Access for public service operators should be encouraged.

Areas of surface water flood risk shown within the site. These areas should remain as areas that are allowed to flood and should be enhanced for flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits.

Housing Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>CCC Comments Publication Draft 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REC01</td>
<td>Land at Saves Lane, Ireleth</td>
<td>Site unchanged, previous comments apply. Large areas of this site at risk of surface water flooding so these areas within the site would be best left as open space and vulnerable uses such as houses should not be placed in these areas within the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC02</td>
<td>Duke Street, Askam in Furness</td>
<td>Site unchanged, previous comments apply. As commented last time it is hard to see how this site can be developed without either putting vulnerable uses at risk of flooding or increasing flood risk elsewhere as most of the site is at risk of flooding apart from a small area to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC03</td>
<td>Land at junction of Lots Road and Duke Street, Askam in Furness</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC05</td>
<td>Land South of Leece Lane</td>
<td>See previous comments for further detail. The site boundary has changed since our previous comments but there does not appear to be a safe access from Leece Lane under present road conditions. We request that the evidence of a suitable site access be provided for consideration. Included with this arrangement we would anticipate a requirement for extension of the 30mph limit together with new/improved footways to Barrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC09</td>
<td>Field between Netherby Drive and Ormsgill Lane</td>
<td>In addition to previous comments it should be noted that access should be taken from the southern half of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC18</td>
<td>Field to East of Park View</td>
<td>REC 18 must not rely on the B07/2014/0392 access from West Avenue as that access is already overstretched. A new access from Lesh Lane would address possible issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC19b</td>
<td>Thorncliffe South (former tennis court/field section)</td>
<td>See previous comments for further detail. Access should be provided from Thorncliffe Road, and from Lichfield Close to avoid creation of a long cul de sac. Areas shown as at risk of surface water flooding within the site should remain as areas that are allowed to flood and should be enhanced for flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space. No obvious point of discharge. The discharge must not increase pressure on the combined system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC25a</td>
<td>Land at Greenhills, Dalton</td>
<td>Pedestrian and cycle connections should to be created with the nearby residential areas to enhance the sustainability of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC26</td>
<td>Land East of Holbeck</td>
<td>See previous comments for further detail. Extend the 30 mph zone would be beneficial for the development of the site. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be required. See Rec 06. A TA and TP would be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC31</td>
<td>New road Askam</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC34</td>
<td>Long Lane Newton Rd</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC36</td>
<td>New Rd Askam</td>
<td>Frontage to new Road has not been demonstrated. There are concerns that access from Lots Road would be removed from local attractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC37</td>
<td>London Road, Lindal</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC39</td>
<td>Farmers Arms, Newton</td>
<td>See previous comments for further detail. Runoff from this site contributes to an existing flood problem. This site should be designed to slow the flow down the slope and must make sure that any discharge at the base of the slope is controlled, including exceedance flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC43</td>
<td>Greystone Lane, Dalton</td>
<td>A long cul de sac should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC47</td>
<td>Elliscales Quarry</td>
<td>See previous comments for further detail. Visibility concerns on Askam Road. Upgrade of St Helens would be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC048</td>
<td>Askam Road Dalton</td>
<td>A long cul de sac should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC049</td>
<td>Hollygate Road</td>
<td>Loweswater Terrace does not meet geometric standards. In particular road width) and footway width are both narrow which are likely to lead to conflict between vehicles and conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. It is unadopted and will not be adopted in its current form. An alternative access from Hollygate Road would either be - too close to the Loweswater Terrace junction; too</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
close to the brow of the hill causing visibility issues; on the hill with level difference causing problems. Any application for development would have to be accompanied by the appropriate TA and RSA and would most likely involve having to undertake large scale upgrade works. The applicant should be requested to submit further information showing the above is indeed acceptable to allow the LHA to take a positive view of the inclusion of this site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REC52</th>
<th>Tantabank Dalton</th>
<th>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REC54</td>
<td>Strawberry Ground, Croslands Park, Barrow</td>
<td>Flooding is apparent on the current road network, but not within this site. Litchmead Grove and Monksvale Grove seems capable of allowing increase. Should be acceptable. If the sites are linked then no issues from a highway point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL001</td>
<td>Marina Village</td>
<td>In addition to the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base there will be a need for multiple access points to serve the site. Moreover, where practical areas shown as at risk of surface water flooding within the site should remain as areas that are allowed to flood and should be enhanced for flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL005</td>
<td>Crooklands Brow</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL010a</td>
<td>Land at Mill Lane, Walney</td>
<td>A single point of vehicle access from Mill Lane or Trent Vale may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Mill Lane and Trent Vale. Should link Mill Lane and Trent Vale and desire lines should be left open. Linear surface water crosses this site which may be an unmapped watercourse and there is existing flood risk at this location. Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up. This is likely to be an ideal location to leave as open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL13b</td>
<td>Former Candleworks Site (South), Schneider Rd</td>
<td>If access can be achieved Developments with only a single point of access should be avoided as they segregate existing and new developments and do not provide for good walking and cycling connections. Future connections must be provided. Long cul de sacs should be avoided as they promote dependence on the car, and result in large vehicles having to turn in the road. Site has some surface water concerns. Discharge to adjacent beck will require check on capacity under Walney Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL017</td>
<td>Urofoam Factory Site</td>
<td>While it has been noted that the site boundary has been moved no further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL037</td>
<td>E5 Land South of Ashley &amp; Rock, Park Road</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL047</td>
<td>North Central Clearance Area</td>
<td>Southern part of the site shown as at risk of surface water flooding should remain as areas that are allowed to flood and should be enhanced for flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL059</td>
<td>Former Avon Garden Centre Mill Lane, Walney</td>
<td>Consideration of discharge point will need to have regard to site SHL010. A master plan for drainage with a view to joining up the potential sites would be worthwhile. A SuDS basin within the SHL010 site could serve this site as a regional basin in a masterplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL061</td>
<td>Former Kwik Save premises Holker St</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL068</td>
<td>Fields to rear of Croslands Park (Holly Croft)</td>
<td>Stoneleigh Close does not meet geometric standards. Any application for development would have to be accompanied by the appropriate TA and RSA and would most likely involve having to undertake large scale upgrade works. Additional investigative works should be done to show that this site is capable of inclusion into the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL070</td>
<td>Abbey Meadow</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL071</td>
<td>Smallholding</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL082</td>
<td>Rakesmoor Lane</td>
<td>We would require two vehicle accesses from Rakesmore Lane. This would need to be supported by an extension of the 30mph limits. In addition we would wish to see the provision of pedestrian and cycling linkages to neighbouring estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL096</td>
<td>Crompton Drive</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL100a</td>
<td>Solway Drive</td>
<td>This site has been expanded and now includes a large area to the north which is shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. This area should remain as an area that is allowed to flood and should be enhanced for flood risk, water quality, amenity and biodiversity benefits. It would be ideal to leave this area as open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL101</td>
<td>Solway Drive</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL103</td>
<td>Meadowlands</td>
<td>No further comment on the assessment provided within the Plan and evidence base. Advise that regard is given to the comments provided to planning application 2016/0116.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C – Local Member Comments

At a meeting on 11 November 2016 and through further written feedback, the members of Cumbria County Council Local Committee for Barrow were given the chance to feedback on the Publication Local Plan. This feedback and how this has been accommodated within the response is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Feedback</th>
<th>How it has been addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members raised the strategic importance of connectivity to and from Barrow via the A595 and A590 and the need for continued improvements.</td>
<td>With the response it has been requested that policy be more explicit about the protection of land from development where it is required to support future infrastructure improvements. Moreover officers have requested that within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan greater emphasis is given to the role of the A590 and A595 and the importance of securing upgrades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members highlighted the importance of effective local road networks and their role in providing access to and from town centres, major employment sites, the port and Strategic Road Network.</td>
<td>With the response it has been requested that policy be more explicit about the protection of land from development where it is required to support future infrastructure improvements. While the IDP does reference the outputs of the Barrow Transport Improvements study within the response it is advised that the IDP be more explicit in the promoting the importance of the local highway network and the need to deliver improvements to it. The response also requested the integration of outputs from the Barrow Parking and Movement study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members emphasised the need to ensure the Local Plan does not excessively focus on Barrow and ignore other locations including Dalton.</td>
<td>While the plan does contain policy applicable to the entirety of Barrow Borough the proposed response requests that Barrow Borough Council prepare a strategy to help shape future growth and investment within Dalton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding on Walney was flagged up as a risk and would need to be addressed to ensure the sustainability of development.</td>
<td>The County Council has helped shape policy on drainage and flooding. Within the proposed response further strengthening has been proposed. In the capacity as Lead Local Flooding Authority the County Council has also considered and offered advice on specific development sites on Walney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of growth on the highway, especially around Jubilee Bridge is a significant issue and the delivery of enhancements is important.</td>
<td>While the outputs of the Barrow Transport Improvements study are referenced within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and within the response Barrow have been advised to place particular emphasis on the importance of delivering improvements at both ends of Jubilee Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members wished to see a greater emphasis on the importance of rail investment in support the growth and regeneration of Barrow. Including recognition to the importance of the Coast Line and Furness Line.</td>
<td>Within the response it has been advised that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Local Plan would benefit from being more explicit about the strategic value and need to deliver enhancements to the Furness Line and Coast Line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members were supportive of the delivery of investment at Barrow Waterfront Business Park and Marina Village.</td>
<td>Both sites are promoted within the Local Plan and the proposed County Council response is supportive of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members wished to see the continued regeneration of Barrow Town Centre and to capitalise on the range of major investments now coming into the town.</td>
<td>This principle has at the heart of the County Councils engagement in the development of the Local Plan, fundamentally seeking to ensure the commercial, social, infrastructure, land and housing offer is attractive to the community, investor and workers. If this offer is sufficiently strong, then it should be feasible for Barrow get the most out of its significant industrial and energy strengths, creating a stronger social and economic legacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. National Grid plans to build a 400 kilovolt (kV) connection from the proposed Moorside Power Station to the national electricity grid at Harker, near Carlisle and Heysham, near Lancaster. This project – ‘North West Coast Connections’ – is a nationally significant infrastructure project (NSIP), which will be decided by the Secretary of State following an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) under the Planning Act 2008 (“the Act”).

2. National Grid is carrying out a public consultation on the North West Coast Connections (NWCC) project from 28th October 2016 to 6th January 2017. This is a formal consultation with the public and local authorities and is the main opportunity to comment on the project before the DCO application is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, currently scheduled for April 2017.

3. Cumbria County Council is a statutory consultee and this report contains a summary of the proposed response of the County Council. The Corporate Director has delegated authority in consultation with the Lead Member to respond to the consultation on behalf of the County Council and will agree the full technical response, but it is considered that Cabinet may wish to be aware of the proposed headline response before it is finalised.

Recommendation of the Corporate Director

4. **Recommendation** – That Cabinet notes the content of Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 as a summary of the Council’s draft response to National Grid’s formal consultation on the North West Coast Connections Project.

Background to the Proposals

5. National Grid plans to build a 400 kilovolt (kV) connection from the proposed Moorside Power Station to the national electricity grid at Harker, near Carlisle and Heysham, near Lancaster. This project will only be implemented if the new nuclear power station at Moorside goes ahead.
6. The proposed project (the subject consultation) includes the following principal elements:

- Construction of 400kV transmission connections totalling approximately 163km from Harker to Heysham. This connection comprises overhead lines, underground cables and the use of tunnelling technology;
- Construction of new 400kV substations at Stainburn and Roosecote and extensions to the existing 400kV substations at Harker and Middleton;
- Relocation of existing 400kV overhead line west of Harker;
- Construction of a tunnel beneath Morecambe Bay between tunnel head houses at Roosecote and Middleton (Heysham);
- Modifications to existing 132kV distribution infrastructure and removal of certain existing 132kV overhead lines;
- Works to modify the existing Electricity North West Limited (ENW) 132kV and lower voltage network where necessary to allow construction of the 400kV connections;
- Modifications to the railway network to provide access to temporary rail sidings in certain locations;
- Areas of mitigation, restoration and/or reinstatement; and
- Associated works, for example, temporary access roads, highways works, temporary compounds (rail, helicopter and general construction) two temporary shafts, work sites and ancillary works.


8. As a NSIP, the NWCC project needs approval from the Secretary of State following an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO). A DCO is a composite consent that avoids the requirement for several different consents for a single project. It authorises the carrying out of the development, so planning permission is not required, and can include provisions dealing with the compulsory acquisition of land and interests in land, the stopping up of highways and highway works. A DCO application is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) for determination.

9. Cumbria County Council is a statutory consultee in the DCO process and is classified as a ‘host authority’. Local authorities have an important role in the process in providing a local perspective and influencing the preparation of an application. Local authorities are encouraged to engage proactively with a developer and nothing is to be gained by disengaging from the pre-application consultation process. The Council’s role should ensure that the developer considers the likely impacts of the proposal and develops solutions for mitigation and, where relevant, that legacy benefits are provided. The Council should engage with the developer to influence the drafting of the DCO, as it will include requirements (planning conditions) that will regulate the development, and to negotiate with the developer any legal agreements that are necessary to make the proposed development acceptable and that are directly related to the proposed development.
10. The Council (jointly with the other Cumbrian Authorities affected by project, together with Lancaster County Council and Lancaster City Council) has entered into a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with National Grid to enable it to engage in a positive way and to reach an informed view on the impacts of the proposal. Consultants WYG are supporting the work of this PPA Group. WYG is preparing the technical consultation response to National Grid’s formal consultation on behalf of the PPA Group.

11. Following submission of the DCO, PINS will have 28 days in which to confirm their acceptance of the application. Within this period, the Council will have 14 days to submit comments on the Adequacy of Consultation. Once the application has been accepted, the Council will be asked to submit relevant representations within the next 28 days. To inform the Examination, the Council will also be invited to submit a Local Impact Report (LIR). The LIR sets out the Council’s view on how the project will affect the local area and its principal purpose is to highlight the potential impacts of the proposal with the benefit of local knowledge. The Council may also submit written representations, essentially detailed written evidence to the Examining Authority and participate in oral examination hearings, when invited to do so.

12. The expected timetable for the project is as follows:

- Submission of DCO application: April 2017
- Preparation of Local Impact Report: Summer/Autumn 2017
- Examination: Nov 2017 to April 2018
- Consent (if secured): October 2018
- Construction: 2019 onwards
- Operation scheduled to commence: 2024

13. The Council has worked with the PPA Group authorities to prepare a joint response to the consultation. Appendix 1 is a consultation response headline report prepared on behalf of the PPA Group. The detailed PPA Group’s technical response will be submitted jointly with the support of all the PPA authorities. The PPA Group’s concerns are focused on the following topic areas:

- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Visitor Economy
- Tunnel head impacts at Barrow and Heysham
- Transport and Connectivity
- Skills and Supply Chain.

**Landscape and Visual Impact**

14. Concern is raised about the likely significant impacts of the introduction of new and larger pylons both directly and cumulatively on the landscapes across Cumbria.

15. The principle to provide 23.4km (14.5m) of new 400kV underground cable through the western edge of the Lake District National Park and the removal of the existing ENW 132kV overhead line is welcomed. However it is important to recognise that the undergrounding in the Lake District National Park is a major
engineering operation. As such the implications of these works on ecology and the historic environment as well as the consideration of the location of compound sealing ends and their impact on vegetation loss and disruption to the landscape pattern needs to be properly addressed in far greater detail than currently to understand the impacts.

16. The alignment of the new overhead line beyond the boundary of the Lake District National Park is also a major concern. National Policy EN1; DCLG Guidance and the Electricity Act (1995) as well as current planning practice make it clear that the ‘setting’ of National Parks should be considered in the same way as those areas within National Parks. The County Council (together with the PPA Group) has previously raised strong concerns about impacts affecting landscape character and views in to and out of the Lake District National Park. Unfortunately National Grid’s consultation documentation makes little reference to the ‘setting’ of the Lake District National Park. This is of particular concern for the section of the proposed route that runs on overhead lines around the head of the Duddon Estuary. The County Council (together with the PPA Group) previously recommended undergrounding beneath the Duddon Estuary to avoid major adverse impacts, particularly at the Foxfield Ridge and the Duddon Mosses Special Area of Conservation, plus the wider landscape setting of the LDNP, but this recommendation has not been taken forward as part of the proposals now being consulted upon. The County Council disagrees with National Grid’s rejection of alternative options including the tunnel as this is based upon a flawed assessment of the landscape impact that does not appropriately take into account the ‘setting’ of the Lake District National Park. The County Council maintains the view that appropriate mitigation is required to ensure that any adverse impact, as a consequence of the NWCC project, on this area is avoided.

17. The Lake District has been nominated as a World Heritage Site (WHS), with an assessment currently being carried out by Unesco. The impact of the NWCC project has been identified by Unesco as a key risk to WHS designation, so it is imperative to avoid landscape impacts that may jeopardise a favourable outcome.

18. The cumulative impact of the vertical infrastructure, particularly in Allerdale, Carlisle and north Copeland and parts of the Furness peninsula (including Askam, Dalton, Ireleth and Lindal) is already a concern and larger pylons will further worsen this impact. The routing of the line from the Moorside site and the cumulative impacts on communities needs to be carefully considered and appropriate mitigation provided.

Visitor Economy

19. A large proportion of tourists to Cumbria are drawn to the scenery, the unspoilt nature of the area and for outdoor activities. The visual intrusion of a large overhead line has potential to harm the region’s tourism economy. A key concern is that the NWCC project (in combination) with other major projects has adverse impacts on perceptions of Cumbria and with significant potential to disrupt tourist trade through displacement and negative image. This will require proactive marketing activity to counter negative perceptions.
20. The linear nature of the proposals suggest that there is likely to be extensive disruption to cycle paths and public rights of way (PRoW), particularly during the six year construction period. These impacts need to be appropriately addressed. Suggested mitigation could include; permanency of required temporary paths and diversions, as well as a funded package of signage and promotion to improve recreational facilities and activities for visitors.

21. During the construction of the project there is potential for the influx of workers to have an impact on the supply and availability of visitor accommodation. Directly this is likely to lead result in over 1,800 workers over the breadth of the project, including a concentration of workers at the tunnel head at Barrow, where current shortages in worker accommodation and other major projects will emphasise the impact. Equally with under-grounding through the National Park, there will be a demand for worker accommodation in this locality that will need to be appropriately mitigated in Grid’s proposals.

Tunnel head impacts at Barrow and Heysham

22. National Grid proposes to construct a tunnel across Morecambe Bay tunnelling from both Roosecote and Heysham. The tunnel element of the project represents a significant project in its own right, with a build programme of 6 years, 1.2m tonnes of spoil generated and requiring over 380 direct workers at each tunnel head. It is disappointing that at this stage in the project there is no clarity on the waste disposal strategy because there is not agreed transport strategy. The preference of the Council to see spoil removal from the tunnel to be transported by rail.

23. Significant issues have been raised regarding the impact of the tunnel construction on the local community, transportation links and social infrastructure. Given the number of directly employed workers required for the construction of the tunnel, and the other major projects in the Barrow area, accommodation for workers is a key concern. In addition, the level of construction materials and tunnel spoil generated will place additional pressure on the transport infrastructure if a road based strategy is followed, hence the preference for a rail-led solution.

Transport and Connectivity

24. The County Council is concerned that National Grid is not consulting on a single and coherent transport strategy. Instead National Grid is consulting on both a ‘road based’ option and a ‘multi modal’ transport option. The County Council needs to understand the impact of the extensive traffic related to the importing (and decommissioning) of material for access and haul roads, construction materials, cables and waste. This needs to be informed by the modelling of traffic flows for the project and the cumulative impact of other developments. Given the lack of information it is suggested that a subsequent consultation be undertaken prior to the submission of the DCO.

25. The County Council strongly disagrees with National Grid’s assumptions of the impacts relating to the ‘road based’ and ‘multi modal’ options and assertions for not favouring the ‘multi modal’ option. For example the County Council does not agree that railway capacity issues should be a reason for not selecting the ‘multi
modal' option. The approach should be that the use of the railway would help to mitigate road capacity and disruption issues by helping to keep traffic off the highway network and also provide a legacy benefit of improved rail capacity. Furthermore, the Council believes there is potential for greater use of the ports at Workington and Barrow, in particular the Port of Workington can offer facility for consolidation and logistics activity.

26. Additionally, a number of rail and road construction sites are proposed to store and deploy materials; these are all along the route and are more concentrated in the areas where underground technology will be used, such as Drigg, Silecroft and Foxfield. The transport infrastructure across the many areas along the route and in these areas in particular is constrained, therefore, the impact of the movements are likely to require mitigation measures.

27. There is a lack of appropriate measures to mitigate the traffic impacts on the highway network and any measures need to be informed by appropriate modelling of traffic flows. The lack of mitigation is a serious concern that needs to be addressed to enable a full assessment of the project to be made.

Skills and Supply Chain

28. The PPA Group has been working with National Grid, local LEP’s and other key stakeholders to secure the maximum employment and skills benefits. National Grid has developed an Outline Employment and Skills Framework that sets out key principles that will be deployed to provide opportunity to local businesses and workers. This will require further development to ensure there is appropriate mitigation measures included within the final DCO application proposals. National Grid needs to satisfy the Council that it will ensure appropriate training is provided to enable local people, particularly economically inactive people, to be able to access the employment opportunities, as well as make commitments to creation of apprenticeship opportunities. Equally, National Grid also needs to demonstrate that measures will be put in place to develop local supply capacity and capability to maximise opportunities for local supply chain businesses.

Member Views

29. Members have had the opportunity to comment on the proposal at a National Grid briefing to the Nuclear Issues Working group on 15 November 2016. Their subsequent feedback has been collated and is attached as Appendix 2. Member’s comments related mainly to:

- Landscape impact both localised and extensive, particularly in respect of the Duddon Estuary. Members have expressed strong support for a tunnel under the Duddon Estuary to mitigate any adverse landscape impact;
- The cumulative impact of the vertical infrastructure, particularly in Allerdale, Carlisle and north Copeland and parts of the Furness Peninsula (including Askam, Dalton, Ireleth and Lindale);
- Support the implementation of a ’multi modal' transport strategy that would make wider use of the ports and rail and not just the road network;
- The need to consider the cumulative impact of other developments taking place and carefully consider the impact on existing infrastructure and consider what mitigation is required;
The adverse impact on the visitor economy;
• The need to secure a legacy benefit from this major infrastructure investment and that National Grid support skills and supply chain development.

Options Considered and Risks Identified

Option (a)

30. **Do Nothing.** The Council could choose not to respond to the National Grid’s consultation, however, it would not be fulfilling its obligations under the Planning Performance Agreement and as a statutory consultee. In addition, the Council would miss the opportunity to influence the development of the project and secure the best outcome for the community.

Option (b)

31. **Respond to the consultation.** The Council can respond to the consultation as set out in Appendix 1. This ensures the Council fulfils its responsibility as a statutory consultee and will maximise the opportunity to influence the project and achieve appropriate mitigation of impacts and legacy for the local community.

Risks

32. The size of the project and volume of consultation documentation provides a challenge, which the Council has addressed by entering into a PPA to adequately resource its involvement with the support of external consultants. Due to the scale of the project, it will have a significant impact on the economy, infrastructure and communities within Cumbria. It is important for the impacts to be properly assessed locally and therefore there is a risk that if the Council doesn’t respond, the local impacts may not be adequately considered by PINS.

Reasons for the recommendation/Key benefits

33. Ensure that the Council submits a robust response to National Grid to influence the design and delivery of the project, identify issues of concern, represent the interests of the local community, seek appropriate mitigation and maximise legacy benefits.

34. Enable the Council to fulfil its role as a statutory consultee.

35. Ensure appropriate engagement with National Grid in accordance with the terms of the PPA.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

36. There are no direct financial implications for the County Council arising from the recommendations within this report. The impact of construction of the connection between the proposed Moorside Power Station to the National Grid at Harker, near Carlisle and Heysham, near Lancaster on transport requirements, on economic activity within the County and on affected communities is likely to have implications for the Authority both in terms of consultation and potential financial implications. This will be considered in
preparing the response. Where further information is required to assess the implications this will be made clear in the response.

37. The County Council, as lead authority and accountable body for the Planning Performance Agreement, is able to recover costs incurred both in responding to this consultation, and in producing the Local Impact Report and Statement of Common Ground.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be Considered?

38. Local authorities have an important role in the DCO process. Participation is not obligatory but is strongly advised as a local authority will provide an important local perspective. Such participation will allow the Council to influence the proposal and have an input into mitigation measures that are considered necessary, if development consent is granted.

39. In addition, some restrictions that the Council considers necessary and some benefits that might accrue in connection with the proposal might not be secured by the requirements (conditions) attached to a DCO and separate legal agreements may be required. By participating in the process the Council may be joined as a party to such agreements and be able to enforce those obligations that relate to County Council functions.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

40. The Council is seeking to influence this multi-billion pound nationally significant infrastructure project to ensure the best possible outcome for Cumbria. If delivered successfully, the NWCC project will help in particular to meet the following Council Plan priority:

Infrastructure: To provide a safe and well managed highways network, secure infrastructure improvements and support local economic growth.

What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

41. The Council will seek to ensure that the health impacts of the NWCC project are considered. The Council have advised National Grid that a Health Impact Assessment needs to be prepared. Any adverse impacts of the development which are identified should be the subject of mitigation measures which the Council will work to consider through the DCO process.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1.1 The PPA Group welcome National Grid’s commitment to meaningful engagement on project design including technology choices and the significant mitigation that is required. The Group are pleased the informal engagement undertaken thus far has resulted in significant and much needed mitigation.

1.1.2 Based on the available information during the Route Corridors consultation (2014) the PPA Group provided positive feedback and support for the ‘Onshore North’ and ‘Onshore South with Tunnel Option’ including the Morecambe Bay tunnel.

1.1.3 The PPA Group have previously expressed support for the principle of rationalisation of existing overhead lines, therefore, the provision to take down lines is supported so long as the integrity of the electricity distribution network and connection opportunities is not be weakened as a result. Additionally, the Group consider that there are a number of locations where additional lines need to be removed to provide appropriate mitigation.

1.1.4 Furthermore, the principle to develop a new 400kV underground cable through the western section of the Lake District National Park is strongly supported, given the alternatives. However, the implications of undergrounding on other topic areas, such as ecology and historic environment must still be addressed. Furthermore, the decision to remove the existing Electricity North West (ENW) 132kV overhead line (OHL) is also strongly supported, given the benefit this will have on the landscape and views in the area.

1.1.5 The PPA Group welcomes continued engagement with National Grid and considers that adequately addressing the impacts raised in this paper will minimise the risks to the project through the DCO process, protect our communities and increase delivery certainty for National Grid. The Group wants to continue to engage in positive dialogue to enable delivery of the NWCC project in a way that meets both national and local needs, and is consistent with legislation and government policy.
1.2 Document purpose and structure

1.2.1 This report provides a summary of the PPA Group’s emerging consultation response and an outline of the headlines from the evaluation of the North West Coast Connections (NWCC) Preliminary Environmental Impact (PEI) Report issued for consultation by National Grid on 28 October 2016. The PEI Report provides a preliminary environmental assessment of the Project and proposed mitigation measures drawing on currently available information.

1.2.2 This Headlines Report has been drafted in advance of the PPA Group Joint Specialist Response to provide the PPA Group members with an indication of the key emerging issues at an early stage. It is intended that this Report will assist in the development of a joint PPA Group position on issues and help meet challenging committee schedules required for formal Council approval.

1.2.3 The Report has been informed largely by the views of topic specialists from WYG supplemented by comments from the PPA Group Authorities where available. It is based on a broad assessment of the extensive documentation and therefore, is subject to change as specialist assessments are undertaken.

1.2.4 The remainder of this Report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides an over view of the key headline issues; and
- Section 3 provides additional detail on the headline issues.
## 2.0 Key Headline Issues

### Landscape and visual impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary key points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td>Baseline information is sufficient but further engagement is required as the project moves towards the development of the Environmental Statement and DCO submission to develop a more refined assessment that considers additional visual impacts especially from community user/receptor perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>The methodology for identifying areas where mitigation is required and options should be assessed is flawed; adopting ‘particularly significant’ as the bar for mitigation need is not consistent with the EIA Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a flawed interpretation of national policy and guidance that defines and protects the Lake District National Park and its setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There has been a misrepresentation of the visual impact through use of photomontage tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The recently updated Cumulative Impact of Vertical Infrastructure tool does not form part of the methodology for the assessment set out in the PEI Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The PPA Group do not agree with that National Grid’s rationalisation policy (one-up-one down) results in a benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Cumulative and sequential impact is not adequately considered in the assessment along whole route. Specifically, the experience of visitors to the Lake District National Park protected landscape have not been adequately evidenced or addressed including the cumulative impacts of viewing this linear project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The application of the National Grid’s methodology including the Options Appraisal of Alternative Technologies methodology has resulted in the establishment of inappropriate areas for mitigation of the NWCC project. This has led to a piecemeal approach to mitigation and the consideration of alternative technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong></td>
<td>Lack of appropriate mitigation of landscape and visual impacts arising from the use of over head lines; in particular within the landscape setting of the Lake District National Park, and related to cumulative impact to the east of Whitehaven, east of Workington following the existing 132kV line north and in the area of the Hadrian’s Wall World Heritage Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The PPA Group disagree with the assessment and rejection of alternative options for the Duddon Estuary, including a tunnel option, which are based on the flawed assessment of impacts within the landscape setting of the National Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Visitor economy

### Summary key points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The baseline data set out within the PEI Report in relation to socio-economics, recreation and land use is generally derived from the appropriate sources. However, there is an overreliance on evidence from past projects, particularly in relation to the effects on the visitor economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a failure to provide adequate information and evidence on the impact on the visitor economy of Cumbria, which is the largest sector in the County's economy and growing. In particular, there is a lack of evidence to support National Grid’s position that Cumbria’s visitor image/brand will not be significantly damaged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although the overall approach to the identification and assessment of socio-economic effects is considered to be appropriate, at this stage, there is limited analysis of the Project’s alignment with key local and sub-regional policy, specifically in terms of the visitor economy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importantly, National Grid have failed to acknowledge the unique character of the Lake District National Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology adopted to assess the deterrence effect on visitors draws upon the results of survey evidence from other previous projects which raises several important issues; the transferability to NWCC study area, robustness and validity of this original research is uncertain, and there is substantial methodological criticism of the focus on survey-based approaches to evaluating impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key risks and impacts to visitors’ enjoyment of Cumbria’s landscapes and environment through access and recreation have not been adequately assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In particular, the issues associated with negative effects on visitor perceptions, as demonstrated by the recent floods, should be recognised. In addition, as previously noted, the PEI Report does not adequately assess the significance of impact at the local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of disruption to public access and to road and rail transport networks has not been properly considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The emerging assessment underestimates the project’s impact on the visitor economy in Cumbria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of appropriate mitigation of visitor economy impacts, including damage to Cumbria’s visitor image/brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of appropriate mitigation for disruption to public access and to road and rail transport networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is considered that appropriate mitigation, such as support for support small and medium sized businesses in the visitor economy and marketing and promotional activities are required to counter the disruption caused during the construction period and the negative perception driven by the adverse impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of NWCC on the landscape which attracts visitors.

Tunnel head impacts at Barrow and Heysham

### Summary key points

#### Baseline
- There is inadequate information provided on the storage, movement and final destination of tunnel spoil.
- No clear information on the need, purpose or use of the temporary works at the tunnel-heads.
- Noise, vibration, air quality, light, ecology and residential amenity impacts of development at the tunnel-head sites are not adequately stated.
- Transport assessments have not been carried out.

#### Methodology
- The PPA Group disagree with the determination of high sensitivity receptors assessment.
- Standard noise criteria for assessment is inadequate for project of this scale and location.

#### Assessment
- As the baseline data is largely absent the impacts have not been adequately measured and assessed.
- National Grid have drawn conclusions on accommodation availability. However, there is a lack of clarity regarding the required collaboration with accommodation providers to overcome existing shortfalls and/or raise standards of suitable worker accommodation.

#### Mitigation
- No meaningful mitigation is proposed to treat the noise, vibration, air quality, light, ecology or residential amenity impacts.
- No mitigation is proposed to address the impacts caused by the storage, movement and final destination of tunnel spoil.
- There is incomplete workforce planning and accommodation proposals at the tunnel-heads.

### Transport and connectivity

#### Summary key points

#### Baseline
- The PPA group are significantly concerned that the baseline is insufficient to allow selection of road or multimodal strategy.
- There is a lack of appropriate modelling of traffic flows to allow assessment and conclusions to be drawn.

#### Methodology
- A method has not been proposed to enable the selection of the road or multimodal strategy.

#### Assessment
- The key risks and impacts of traffic movements have not yet been addressed.
The PPA group strongly disagree with National Grid’s assessment that railway capacity issues should be a reason for not selecting the multi-modal option. The approach should be to mitigate the rail capacity issues, which would keep traffic off the highway and also provide a legacy benefit.

Furthermore, the PPA Group disagree with the assessment of impacts relating to the ‘road based’ and ‘multi-modal’ options. The multi-modal option will reduce the scale of HGV movements in some areas, which could have safety and environmental benefits.

Fundamentally, the cumulative impacts have not yet been assessed.

Key risks and impacts on PRoW and cycle paths have not been adequately addressed.

Mitigation

- There is a lack of appropriate mitigation measures and improvements to address the traffic impacts on the highway network. These measures need to be informed by modelling of traffic flows both for the individual development and for the cumulative impact, and is dependent upon the completion of survey data.

- Mitigation should also address the following, for which no detail has yet been provided; the safe management of traffic on minor roads; the impact of worker accommodation locations – for example for the underground section within the National Park, and the implementation of Travel Plans.

- The PPA Group are concerned that the PRoW Management Plan has yet to be developed. Additionally, the economic impacts upon the visitor economy need to be assessed.

- Measures should seek to provide a high standard of mitigation to address direct and indirect effects.

Skills and supply chain

Summary key points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The baseline data set out within the PEI Report in relation to skills and supply chain is derived from the appropriate sources, however, there is little detail available to assess the implications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The methodology is as considered to be appropriate at this stage, and is consistent with that used for other major projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PEI Report recognises that there are no published standards that define the sensitivity and magnitude of socio-economic effects. However, the overall conclusions are considered to be reasonable and consistent with that used for other major projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial work towards an Employment and Skills Framework is welcomed, however, it is disappointing that the content of the consultation proposals on what measures will be put in place to achieve the targets and objectives is at this stage inadequate to provide support for the proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PPA Group support the commitment to secure 20% as a minimum of the workforce from the local labour market – however, National Grid must provide commitment to providing support to target those that are currently economically inactive to help ensure they can secure work.

It is in the interests of National Grid and the local economy for the skills to be locally available and for the businesses to be equipped to become part of the supply chain. There will be a need for a financial commitment from National Grid to invest in local skills development and supply chain capability development.

There will need to be appropriate training facilities provided not only to support the existing population but also to help attract new workers and their families to come and work in Cumbria.

Ecology

**Summary key points**

**Baseline**
- The baseline fails to provide adequate information and evidence to enable assessment of risks and impacts on key habitats and protected species.
- There is an inadequate approach and failure to progress with the statutory Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) of the impacts of the project on internationally important wildlife.

**Methodology**
- The potential risk to biodiversity from the spread of invasive species from the construction of the project has been inadequately addressed in the methodology.

**Assessment**
- The assessment of impacts on habitats and species have been made in the absence of completed surveys.

**Mitigation**
- Lack of appropriate mitigation and compensation for impacts on habitats and species The PPA Group would expect these to be measures such as avoiding key hotspots, inadequate construction methods and lack of information regarding compensation for loss and disturbance.
- Significant risk of wildlife impacts from the spread of invasive species is not adequately assessed and mitigated; this is a major risk from such a large-scale linear project.

Historic environment and cultural landscapes

**Summary key points**

**Baseline**
- Inadequate evidence of impacts to the historic environment and archeology; in particular from underground construction methods including cabling in the LDNP and Roman Empire (Hadrian’s Wall) World Heritage site.
- The baseline focuses on providing information and evidence relating to
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeology, and is inadequate for listed buildings and Conservation Areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Methodology**
- Key risks and impacts to World Heritage Sites are not adequately addressed. In particular, only one of the three key features of the English Lake District nominated World Heritage Site have been considered.
- There is no evaluation of the setting of other elements of the historic environment for example listed buildings and Conservation Areas.

**Assessment**
- Inadequate assessment of impacts to the historic environment and archeology. This includes; historic buildings and underground construction methods including cabling.
- The PPA Group disagree with the conclusions of the assessment that there would be “a slight beneficial” significance of effect Roman Empire (Hadrian’s Wall) World Heritage site and the candidate English Lake District.

**Mitigation**
- Without an appropriate evidence base and assessment the PPA Group are unable to provide comment on mitigation measures.
3.0  Emerging Headlines

3.1  Landscape and visual impact

Mitigation Methodology

3.1.1  Fundamentally, National Grid’s approach to landscape mitigation, including the Options Appraisal of Alternative Technologies methodology (OAAT) remains flawed. The PPA Group concerns appear not to have been addressed; therefore, the application has resulted in the establishment of inappropriate areas for mitigation of the NWCC project. This has led to a piecemeal approach to mitigation and the consideration of alternative technologies.

Undergrounding in the National Park

3.1.2  The principle to provide 23.4km (14.5 miles) of new 400kV underground cable through the western section of the Lake District National Park (LDNP) is welcomed. The decision to remove the existing Electricity North West 132kV overhead line is also welcomed, given the benefit this will have on the landscape.

3.1.3  However, the implications of undergrounding on other topic areas, such as ecology and historic environment must be addressed. Additionally, there is a need to consider the appropriate location for the Compound Sealing End (CSE) required as an interface between OHL and the section of underground cabling. The long-term reversible effects of the vegetation loss and disruption to landscape pattern and features due to the implementation of the undergrounding do not appear to have been fully considered. The undergrounding is a major engineering development, and needs to be addressed in far greater detail than is currently in order to understand the potential scale of the temporary disruption to the landscape.

Impacts of the Special Qualities and Setting of the National Park

3.1.4  The proposals for use of pylons and associated cabling within the setting of the Lake District National Park are a major concern. The LDNPA and the PPA Group has very clearly and over a long period of time raised strong concerns about impacts affecting landscape character and views in to and out of the National Park. The PPA Group disagree with the assessment of impacts on the landscape setting of the Lake District National Park; particularly the flawed assessment of national policy and guidance that defines and protects the setting. The Group are concerned that this has led to an inappropriate proposal and the a lack of the required mitigation.
3.1.5 The PEI makes little reference to the ‘setting’ of the LDNP. The PPA Group’s position stated within the Stakeholder Feedback Questionnaire issued in September 2016 was clear that consideration of the wider landscape setting of the Lake District National Park is also of equal importance. Therefore, it is considered that the approach to mitigation currently proposed by National Grid is particularly deficient in its assessment of the effects on the ‘setting’ of the Lake District National Park.

3.1.6 Three issues on setting arise –

- Definition of setting in policy - this is a flawed definition that can be strongly challenged. It fails to consider the long established definition of setting for Protected Landscapes of assessing impacts from within AND outside of the designated area;

- Definition of setting for the NWCC project - the application of National Grid’s flawed definition of the setting set out above leads to a flawed assessment in the PEI in section 6A.3. The impact on receptors is framed entirely by those receptors within the National Park only;

- Landscape character types - the failure of the PEI assessment of landscape and visual impacts to recognise the continuity of landscape types and topography across the National Park boundary is a significant flaw that can be challenged.

3.1.7 The route to the north of the LDNP is to be carried on lattice pylons whilst the section through the LDNP is proposed to be undergrounded from the location of the CSE compound located to the north of Drigg. The baseline description of the area provides a description of the existing landscape and visual context; however, the presence of the Low Level Waste Repository at Drigg is a large repository site within the Subsection and is not referenced. The presence of this site is of particular importance in the consideration of the setting of the LDNP and the proposed 400kV route.
3.1.8 It is noted that there is a short length of undergrounding extending south of the LDNP boundary to a CSE at Silecroft, which is welcomed. However, following a preliminary review of the part of the Subsection that runs from the head of Duddon Estuary over the mosses to Kirkby-in-Furness, we would question why this section of the route is above ground when it forms the setting of the LDNP. Although, the alignment of the route is outside the boundary line of the LDNP designation, the area of land is of similar/equal value and susceptibility as the LDNP in landscape terms in providing the setting to the LDNP. It is therefore considered that this section should be considered for undergrounding. This option would avoid the considerable problems raised by the proposed route across Foxfield Ridge and the Duddon Mosses SAC, as well as in the setting of the LDNP that have been identified in the Duddon Estuary. Whilst we acknowledge that designing a route crossing the Duddon Estuary is challenging, it is vital that the appropriate design and mitigation is provided.

3.1.9 National Policy EN-1, DCLG guidance, the Electricity Act 1995 as well as current planning practice make it clear that the ‘setting’ of National Parks should be considered in the same way as those areas within the National Park. However, the approach to mitigation currently proposed by National Grid is particularly deficient in its assessment of the effects on the ‘setting’ of the Lake District National Park. Consideration of the wider landscape setting of the Lake District National Park is also of equal importance along the whole route of the NWCC Project. Landscape planning guidance from DCLG, including that shown on its website, provides clarity that development by ‘relevant authorities’ impacting on the setting of National Parks should be considered in the same way as those within the National Park. There is a long-established recognition that the legislative and policy framework, including current planning guidance, provides protection of the setting of National Parks. Although these areas are not designated as National Park, developments within the setting can impact upon their statutory purposes and Special Qualities.

The Duddon Tunnel

3.1.10 The PPA Group had also recommended undergrounding beneath the Duddon Estuary to avoid major adverse impacts, particularly at the Foxfield Ridge and the Duddon Mosses SAC, plus the wider landscape setting of the LDNP (see points above about setting of the LDNP). This would also avoid significant visual, landscape and community impacts of the proposals in the vicinity of Kirkby in Furness and Beckside and further south.
3.1.11 However, this recommendation has not been taken forward as part of the consultation proposals. The PPA Group disagree with the assessment and the rejection of alternative options for the Duddon Estuary, including a tunnel option, which are based on the flawed assessment of impacts within the landscape setting of the National Park.

**Cumulative Impact**

3.1.12 The cumulative impact of the vertical infrastructure, particularly in Allerdale, and Carlisle and north Copeland, and in parts of the Furness peninsula is already a concern and larger pylons will further worsen the position. Rationalisation of the Electricity North West (ENW) line has afforded some reduction in OHL clutter in a number of locations in the North Section and notably in the LDNP; however, this does not go provide sufficient mitigation (see below). The PPA Group do not consider that the PEI provides sufficient details to understand the cumulative impact of the project and further assessment is required to assess the impact of the new OHL cumulatively with the existing lines.

**Electricity North West Rationalisation**

3.1.13 National Grid has adopted a one-up-one-down principle in relation to the ENW 132kV OHL, with a number of other areas where additional lines are removed or transferred underground. These are largely focused on the North Section of the route, with additional rationalisation; in the area around the Hadrian’s Wall World Heritage Site (WHS), a section at Broughton Moor and in the area north of Westlakes Science Park. However, The PPA Group do not consider that the appropriate level of mitigation of landscape and visual impacts arising from the use of pylon and overhead cables has been proposed. In particular, to the north of the Moorside site, east of Whitehaven, east of Workington following the existing 132kV line north, and Hadrian’s Wall World Heritage Sites.

3.1.14 Although the additional rationalisation is largely welcomed where the 132kV cable is undergrounded there are concerns regarding the appropriate positioning of Cable Sealing End Platform Pylons (CSEPP), particularly where these are close to the highway or existing properties. This infrastructure is also required where 132kV and below OHL is placed underground to facilitate the cross of the new 400kV OHL.
Electricity North West 132kV Trident over head line

3.1.15 A new 132kV trident route on timber poles extends from Millom and converges with the proposed 400kV route near The Green, extending north beyond the 400kV route round the head of the Duddon Estuary. This line has just been revealed and is required to provide a 132kV connection to the Millom area and specifically the Haverigg wind farm extension. The line connects to a 132kV substation (not proposed within NWCC) and is considered to provide an ungraded local electricity distribution network, as well as connection opportunities in the areas of Millom.

3.1.16 The principle of upgrading the network in the Millom area is welcomed, however, it is considered that this route, albeit on timber poles, will result in a notable increase in visual clutter within the bottom of the valley. There is also concern about the additional visual clutter from the 132kV trident line and associated sealing end pylons around the wider Duddon estuary including at Foxfield, Kirkby in Furness and south to Lindal in Furness.

Methodology

3.1.17 The PPA group are very concerned by the lack of wireframe diagrams to support the photomontages. These make assessment of the impacts, particularly on skylining of the pylons and other infrastructure, difficult to assess. These have been requested by the PPA Group over a long period. While National Grid has very recently agreed to provide some basic wireframes for some viewpoints, this does not fully address the lack of vital information as a key tool for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

3.1.18 The selection of viewpoints for photomontages included in the PEI fails to address some of the concerns posed by the proposals. For example, the PEI viewpoints within the Whicham Valley fail to help assessment of the impact to receptors at lower elevation and from the coastal plain around Silecroft. These locations are within the setting of the National Park, and the PPA Group has been clear that this is a sensitive location. It is a flaw in the PEI to fail to adequately cover them in the viewpoint and photomontage assessments.

3.2 Socio-economics, recreation and land use

Visitor Economy
3.2.1 The NWCC project alone and in combination with other major projects has the potential to disrupt tourist trade through displacement and negative image. The PPA Group is concerned that National Grid underestimates the impact on the visitor economy across the area, by relying on limited local survey and other national tourism studies. Limited primary information regarding the visitor economy has been provided in the PEI, with full assessment of the impact on the visitor sector and visitor perceptions not available until the ES. The PPA Group consider that National Grid have failed to provide adequate information and the level of assessment required to understand the key risks and impacts on the visitor economy.

3.2.2 The impact of the project on Public Rights of Way (PRoWs), paths and cycleway could have significant implication for the visitor economy. This issue is set out below under paragraph 3.4.11 and 3.4.11.

3.2.3 The PPA Group consider that there is a lack of appropriate mitigation of visitor economy impacts, including damage to Cumbria’s visitor image, and the disruption to public access, road and rail transport networks. Appropriate mitigation, such as support for small businesses and marketing and promotional activities are required to counter the disruption caused during the construction period and the negative perception driven by the adverse impact of NWCC. In addition to specific mitigation measures for key tourism and visitor economy assets affected.

**Skills and Supply Chain**

3.2.4 The PPA Group consider that there is inadequate detail in the PEI to understand the impacts and assess the extent to which these are addressed. Initial work on an Outline Employment and Skills Framework (ESF) is encouraging, however, it is disappointing that measures, targets and objectives are not available is at this stage to support the proposals.

3.2.5 Review of the PEI reveals that National Grid is proposing that 20% of the project workforce and supply chain would be derived from the local area, however, detailed analysis of the PEI material must be undertaken to understand the justification and appropriateness of this figure. While the commitment to secure 20% as a minimum is welcomed, further investigation is required to understand how this level of involvement on NWCC will be secured; the Hinkley Point C Connections project secured a similar undertaking by a S.106 Agreement.
3.2.6 Furthermore, the PPA Group consider that it is in the interests of National Grid and the local economy for the skills to be locally available and for the businesses to be equipped to become part of the supply chain. However, this needs commitment from National Grid to invest in local skills development and supply chain capability development. Additionally, as part of the package of measures National Grid and their contractors should commit to target economically inactive people in the area and the recruitment of apprentices to support local skills training and development. These measures will help mitigate displacement impacts, however, they will require a funded programme of intervention and support and a commitment from Grid (and their contractors) to recruit from the pool of people that are supported.

3.2.7 The PPA Group are concerned that there is very limited detail on mitigation measures that will be required to address the impacts of the NWCC Project, and therefore, few details of how the mitigation will be secured and monitored. It is important that National Grid;

- makes clear and early commitments to providing funding to support the development of local business capability and capacity, working with the LEP and other local partners, through the development and implementation of a supply chain strategy;
- progresses the development of a detailed skills action plan to ensure that there is investment in skills development in advance of construction in order to facilitate employment and training of local people;
- makes early commitments to capital investment in training facilities;
- provides a clear procurement strategy and to develop specific interventions with measurable and enforceable targets that capture the local benefit for Cumbrian businesses.

3.2.8 Additionally, the PEI suggests that the need for investment in education and training facilities will be explored further, and if there is a need, any proposed support and investment measures will be reported in the Employment and Skill Framework and submitted with the DCO. The PPA group consider that such investment is required for appropriate training facilities provided not only to support the existing population but also to help attract new workers and their families to come and work in Cumbria. However, an understanding of the delivery mechanism is required to evaluate the appropriateness of this undertaking. It is also suggested that
Employment sites and land allocations

3.2.9 The PPA Group previously suggested a number of sites that should be considered for investment and use within the NWCC Project. A number of these have been proposed for use as construction, rail and helicopter compounds, notably sites at; Port of Workington and Kingmoor Park Lillyhall, Wigton, Aspatria, Flimby, and Heysham. There are also potential effects on land allocations at Barrow Port and Marina, as well as employment and current planning applications proposed for Roosecote Power Station, and land at Heysham, Heysham Port and Heysham Moss. The PEI considers that the likely effects of the NWCC Project would not be significant during both the construction and operational phases. Permanent land take effects would occur in relation to the proposed Tunnel Head and substation areas at Roosecote and Middleton. As both of these areas of ground are currently vacant at present, the PEI states that their use is expected to lead to longer-term beneficial effects. Similarly, their use is considered in the PEI to be consistent with policy objectives as set out in the respective Development Plans.

3.2.10 The assessment for the North Route identifies a number of planning site allocations in Local Plans, where there could potentially be conflicts during the construction phase. These include: the Ehen/Keekle Valleys Tourism Opportunity Site and the Whitehaven Eastern Relief Road; a possible Opportunity Site at Hensingham Common comprising 16ha of employment land of which 1.8ha would be used as a site compound; Whitehaven Commercial Park, Lillyhall Industrial Estate and Derwent Forest Site; Kingmoor Park Industrial Estate, Kingmoor Park Rockcliffe, Kingmoor Park Heathlands Estate, and land at Station Road Wigton. In terms of the operational phase, only the Ehen/Keekle Valleys Tourism site would seem to have any long-term effects, as all the others would be used for temporary site compounds.

3.2.11 In terms of the South Route, further investigation is required to assess the impacts on allocations described above especially in Barrow and Heysham. In addition the above new permanent lattice trident terminal pylons (with laydown), are shown to be located within the site boundary of a housing site next to Burlington School in Kirkby-in-Furness, which is allocated in the SLDC Land Allocations DPD. This will cut across the allocated site and could have a negative effect on the allocation.

3.2.12 Further investigation will be undertaken within the detailed response to understand the detail of National Grid’s proposals to ensure the impacts are considered and where possible legacy secured.
Ability to connect to the ENW network

3.2.13 The PPA Group has previously provided comment regarding maintaining the integrity of the ENW infrastructure in a number of areas across the route, while also ensuring the opportunity for new connections for both users and producers. National Grid’s proposed route makes provision for a number of additional 400kV substations, the extension to a number of 132kV substation and substantial re-configuration of the ENW infrastructure. Initial review of the PEI suggests that reconfiguration of the infrastructure could be better designed to meet future needs of users and producer, for example ensuring connection opportunities at the Stainburn substation. Additionally, previously expressed concern regarding the resilience of the ENW infrastructure to flooding does not appear to be addressed, indeed the Carlisle 33kV substation is not included in the project.

3.2.14 Furthermore, initial review of the PEI suggests that the integrity of the ENW network in the Millom area appears to have been addressed by the addition of a 132kV trident line that connects from a 132kV substation (not part of this project) near Millom, round the Duddon Estuary to the network at Lindal. However, it is understood that the new substation is contingent on the development of the Haverigg Wind Farm. The impact of the trident line is considered above.

3.3 Tunnel head impacts at Barrow and Heysham

Lack of details

3.3.1 Significant issues have been raised regarding the impact of the tunnel construction on the local community, transportation links and social infrastructure in Roosecote and Heysham. Initial review of the PEI suggests that there is limited information regarding the tunnel heads and the impact on the surrounding community. For example, information on the construction processes (such as the slurry treatment plant) will not be available until the ES. Proposed construction working hours are included in the Code of Construction Practice that accompanies the PEI Report. In the absence of vital information, the PPA Group considers that the impacts related to noise, vibration, air quality, light, ecology and residential amenity at the tunnel-head sites are not adequately measured, addressed, or mitigated. This issue is a significant concern.
Impact of Tunnel Head construction

3.3.2 Following on from the section above the PPA Group has significant concerns about both proposed layouts given their proximity to existing and proposed residential and commercial development, and adverse impacts on PRoW. Little information is available regarding the onsite processes, such as those relating to the 20m high slurry treatment plant or off site movements. Therefore, at this stage it is not clear whether the local areas will be subject to an unacceptable adverse impact on amenity and health for a prolonged period of construction.

3.3.3 As stated above, National Grid does not intend to provide more information on the project infrastructure, or an assessment of the impacts on the amenity of the local community until the Environmental Statement (ES) to be submitted alongside the DCO.

3.3.4 It should be noted that the indicative layout for the Roosecote tunnel head now reflects the submitted planning application by Centrica for a gas fired power station and energy storage plant. National Grid is confident that there remains sufficient space to accommodate the manufacture of all the concrete segments required for the tunnel. Additionally, after concerns were expressed regarding the location of the segment factory in Heysham, proposals do not include a factory on the Lancashire side.

Worker accommodation

3.3.5 During the construction of the project there is likely to be a concentration of over 380 workers at each of the tunnel heads at Barrow and Heysham. Given the number of directly employed workers required for the construction of the tunnel, and the other major projects in local areas, accommodation for workers is a key concern. The PEI concludes that there is limited effect in the Heysham area given access to transport links and the wider catchment of workers. However, the PPA Group consider that a workforce strategy is nevertheless required that will include commitments from Grid to support delivery of worker accommodation (including refurbishment of existing housing stock) so as to avoid adverse impacts on the existing housing market and visitor accommodation.

3.3.6 The impact in the Barrow area is acknowledged and National Grid commit to working with stakeholders to produce an Accommodation Plan to be submitted with the ES. There are currently no details on the content of the Plan. This accommodation will also cover the area of undergrounding in the LDNP.
3.3.7 The PPA Group is concerned that currently there is incomplete workforce planning and accommodation proposals at the tunnel-heads. The PEI Report does not indicate any collaboration with accommodation providers to overcome existing shortfalls and/or raise standards of suitable worker accommodation.

**Material, waste and tunnel spoil**

3.3.8 The Key Issues Report suggested that the level of construction materials and tunnel spoil generated will place extensive pressure on the transport infrastructure if a road based strategy is followed. Currently National Grid is consulting on both a road based, and multimodal transport strategy (see transport section below). Until a decision has been made it is difficult to appreciate the implications for the materials and waste resulting from the tunnel construction. This is a significant issue that needs addressed before the impacts can be appreciated. National Grid state they are happy to continue to discuss opportunities for the positive use of the tunnel spoil with the PPA Group. However, plans do not appear to have been progressed. A proposed use at Cavendish Dock has been rejected, as the site is part of a SSSI, a SPA and Ramsar, primarily for its bird interest, and National Grid consider that initial investigations suggest there is no reason for its de-notification.

3.3.9 National Grid has proposed a materials movement corridor on the causeway forming the southern edge of Cavendish dock. Movement options being considered include conveyors, narrow gauge rail or use of HGVs with traffic control. This route allows direct access to the Port of Barrow as means of importing and exporting materials and waste. However, some of these options may result in closure to the causeway, including a PRoW for the period of use, in addition to possible noise and amenity issues. The PPA Group suggest that there is inadequate information on the storage, movement and final destination of tunnel spoil.

3.4 Transport and connectivity

**Transport Strategy**

3.4.1 National Grid have yet to select the Transport Strategy, however, review of the PEI suggests that the key risks and impacts of traffic movements have not yet been addressed.
3.4.2 The PPA Group are significantly concerned that National Grid are not consulting on a single and coherent transport strategy. This is a major issue that has widespread impact across other topic areas, such as visitor economy and waste and material. Additionally, the PPA Group and affected communities need to understand how the project will be delivered and what the mitigation and transport improvements are. This approach is inadequate and therefore the PPA Group cannot support National Grid’s transport strategy at this point. Given these fundamental issues it is suggested that a subsequent consultation may be required when National Grid have sufficient information and a single strategy to appropriately address these issues.

3.4.3 National Grid conclude that there are no traffic reasons to favour the multi-modal option because of increased flows on more sensitive routes, the road option having a greater impact on the strategic routes which are generally less sensitive. The PPA Group do not accept this conclusion, as it is not clear that this is this appropriate and whether it should apply in all cases. For example, the multi modal strategy would reduce the number of traffic movements though Barrow.

3.4.4 Overall, the PPA Group strongly disagree with the assessment of impacts relating to the ‘road based’ and ‘multi-modal’ options. The multi-modal option will reduce the scale of HGV movements in some areas, while also having safety and environmental benefits. Additionally the Group are concerned that the cumulative impacts have not yet been assessed.

3.4.5 The multi-modal options will have a significant reduction in overall vehicle usage, especially for HGVs. This will reduce emissions and accidents, however, these benefits have not been considered.

3.4.6 Furthermore, the PPA Group do not accept National Grid’s assertions that railway capacity issues should be a reason for not selecting the multi-modal option. The approach should be to mitigate the rail capacity issues, which would keep traffic off the highway and also provide a legacy benefit.

3.4.7 For the central strategic route area National Grid suggest an additional reason for not choosing the multi-modal option is given as the impacts on capacity of the Cumbrian Coast Line, Workington Port and Workington Port rail depot, although it is understood that there is sufficient capacity at Workington Port to accommodate the additional tonnage.
Transport improvements

3.4.8 The construction of the NWCC project will require extensive traffic related to the importing (and decommissioning) of material for access and haul roads, construction materials, cabling and waste. There is concern about the cumulative impact of these movements on the transport network especially if a single source is used and a road based approach is adopted. Additionally, a number of rail and road construction sites are proposed to store and deploy materials; these are all along the route and are more concentrated in the areas where underground technology will be used, such as Drigg, Silecroft and Foxfield. The transport infrastructure along the route and in these areas in particular is constrained, therefore, the impact of the movements is likely to require mitigation measures to address pinch points on the network and improve the local highway network, and minimise impact on nearby residents and businesses including at Foxfield Business Park.

3.4.9 Fundamentally, there is a lack of appropriate mitigation of traffic impacts on the highway network, which needs to be informed by modelling of traffic flows both for the individual development and for the cumulative impact, and is dependent upon the completion of survey data. It is suggested that mitigation should also address the following, for which no detail has yet been provided; the safe management of traffic on minor roads, the impact of worker accommodation locations – for example for the underground section within the National Park, implementation of Travel Plans

3.4.10 Lack of information on mitigation is a serious issue that needs to be addressed to enable a full assessment to be made.

Public Rights of Way (PRoW), cycle ways and paths

3.4.11 The NWCC project will have temporary (during construction) and permanent effect on the PRoW across Cumbria and those related to the tunnel head at Heysham. This will include closures, diversions and a reduction in the amenity and ability of users to enjoy the routes.
3.4.12 Review of the PEI reveals that the project will have an adverse impact on a number of PRoW, paths and cycleways. Key risks and impacts on PRoW and cycle paths have not been adequately addressed. More in depth assessment is required to understand the extent of these impacts across the area, however, at this stage National Grid are proposing a package of measures to mitigate the closures and disruption to the routes. These will be set out in a PRoW Management Plan (PMP) that will form part of the application for DCO. In addition, a number of specific mitigation measures are proposed in certain locations, these relate to proposed plans for the mitigation of key features such as a proposed Hadrian’s Wall Mitigation Plan. These specific plans will also be secured in the DCO. The PPA Group are concerned that at this time there is a lack of clarity on appropriate mitigation measures that are required.

3.4.13 While the undergrounding through the Park be supported, in terms of setting, the A5092 transport corridor approach to the Western Lakes, along with the ‘view out’ of the National Park from Open Access and specific PRoW are undeniably affected by the proposed stretch of pylons that hug the National Park Boundary through Whicham and the Duddon.

**Construction Access Points**

3.4.14 WYG have been provided additional information outside the PEI showing the routes from the main roads, such as the A596, to construction access points. There are a significant number of access points to service the 1000 individual construction sites across the area. Some of the routes are on narrow lanes with tight bends, sharp crests, narrow bridges, NCN cycle routes or past schools, e.g. Beacon Hill School in Aspatria. Access to the Barrow tunnel head is off the A5087 which has residential frontage, on-street parking and a low bridge. No details of how these routes will be safely managed with the additional HGV flows have been provided. This should be part of the public consultation.

**Highway Assessment**

3.4.15 The impact of construction traffic has been assessed based on the average daily flow in the busiest peak four week period – based on engineering judgement. Whilst the principle that the impact should be reasonably prolonged (not just for a day or two) is accepted it is not clear why four weeks is appropriate.
3.5 Terrestrial and avian ecology

Habitats Regulation Assessment

3.5.1 The PPA Group are significantly concerned that there has been a failure to progress with the statutory Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) of the impacts of the project on internationally important wildlife. This has resulted in a failure to identify risks, such as those associated with the Ravenglass Estuary SAC of undergrounding/HDD operation, and of tunnel option on Morecambe Bay SAC/SPA. Furthermore, the PPA Group are concerned that a number of sites or sections which are hydrologically linked to European or International sites have been scoped out (e.g. South Solway Mosses SAC); Additionally, it is considered that the lack of any assessment of cumulative impacts on ecology, including EU protected sites and species, will affect the timescale for the HRA.

3.5.2 This could lead to significant delays to the acceptance of the DCO by PINS if not addressed.

Ecology Surveys

3.5.3 Many of the ecology assessments have been based on incomplete survey data, which will need updating when surveys have been completed. This information will now only be available for incorporation into reports at the ES stage so we will not be able to comment on any of the final ecology evaluations and assessments.

3.5.4 Additionally, some assessments provide a conclusion of no significant effect despite the fact that surveys are still ongoing.

Topics Scoped out

3.5.5 It appears that the existing incomplete information has been used to scope in or out various designated sites, habitats and species. This approach will not provide a robust assessment until all the information has been considered, and scoping out features prior to obtaining all the data may result in these features being ignored prior to the final ES. Provision of habitat areas in table format should be sought for the development order limits sections.

3.5.6 Issues have then been scoped out (habitats and/or species) from certain sections prior to assessing completed survey material. The PPA Group suggest this results in unreliable conclusions on significance of potential impacts.
Non-designated priority habitats

3.5.7 The PPA Group are concerned that non-designated priority habitats are not effectively assessed and therefore are not appropriately protected. This is of particular significance in the southern section where undergrounding is proposed which has potential to result in more significant damage to habitats. Additionally, parts of the assessment rely on Aerial Photo Interpretation and therefore it has not been possible to accurately assess the value of most habitats using this approach.

Invasive Non Native Species

3.5.8 Although invasive species have been recorded as present or absent within entire route sections there is no detail on location of Japanese knotweed where it may provide a constraint to the works. The PPA Group consider that in view of the large geographic extent of the linear project it is vital that non-native invasive species are dealt with extreme care due to the risk of spread over a wide area posing potential significant risks to biodiversity. In particular – Japanese knotweed can take many years to eradicate, therefore it will be important to deal with this problem well in advance of the proposed construction schedule.

Effective Mitigation

3.5.9 The PPA Group are concerned that the mitigation measures outlined are not considered adequate. There is a lack of appropriate mitigation and compensation for impacts on habitats and species; in particular not avoiding key hotspots, inadequate construction methods and compensation for loss and disturbance.

3.5.10 Design mitigation will be important to avoid impacts on several County Wildlife Sites and woodland areas. For example, the present route results in woodland areas, including parts of ancient woodland, being lost or the canopy removed. Compensation is proposed by National Grid to comprise planting of a similar area of woodland to that lost. However, loss of mature woodland and in particular ancient woodland cannot be mitigated or compensated for. The first consideration should be the avoidance of woodland through micro-siting but the information provided does not make it clear in most cases whether micro-siting has been considered and why this cannot be achieved.
The PPA Group consider that in all cases avoidance should be adopted, and if this is impossible then the reasons for this need to be highlighted and explained in detail. Additional compensation will be expected where loss of mature/ancient woodland is still being considered. It is also considered that a clear Code of Practice for any development work in the vicinity of ancient or mature woodland.

**Protected Species Impacts**

Clear rationale behind the selection of specific study areas for additional protected species survey and more detailed habitat/NVC survey is not provided other than an overview of methodology used. It is not always apparent how disturbance to protected species will be assessed and addressed during construction and maintenance phases.

**3.6 Historic environment and cultural landscapes**

**World Heritage Sites**

The PPA Group are concerned that the key risks and impacts to World Heritage Sites are not adequately addressed. In particular, only one of the three key features of the English Lake District nominated World Heritage Site have been considered. Although the assessment terminology used in the PEI is the same as in the ICOMOS HIA Guidance (2011), it exclusively focuses on the physical historic environment as an attribute of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). There is a tendency within the suite of PEI documents to treat World Heritage as solely a historic environment issue. However, this approach covers only part of the first of the three themes of OUV which have been identified for the English Lake District. There is a need to ensure that the HIA takes into account the full range of OUV attributes from the three main themes. There is also a need to make sure that the wider EIA also takes into account the full range of National Park Special Qualities. Currently it is not clear that the PEI has done this.

Furthermore, the PPA Group consider that there is a failure to provide adequate information and evidence to enable assessment of impacts on the Frontiers of the Roman Empire (Hadrian’s Wall) World Heritage site (FRE WHS).
3.6.3 The PEI concludes that for both the FRE WHS and the candidate English Lake District WHS, the net effect of NWCC would be “a slight beneficial significance of effect on this asset as a whole”. This appears to be based primarily on the removal of ENW infrastructure and improvement of the ability to appreciate the physical historic landscape. In terms of the Lake District National Park, this relates only to part of the first theme of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

3.6.4 The HIA should also assess the potential impact on OUV of the surface treatment of the undergrounded section within the National Park.

3.6.5 Without a demonstrably comprehensive HIA it is difficult at this stage to accept the conclusion that NWCC would have “slight beneficial significance” for the OUV of the candidate English Lake District WHS.

**Historic Environment and Archaeology**

3.6.6 The PPA Group consider that there is inadequate evidence and assessment of impacts to the historic environment and archaeology across the route, and in particular from underground construction methods including cabling in the Lake District National Park. Undergrounding will have a major impact on any archaeological remains within the corridor and although mitigation can be provided, in terms of evaluation and recording, there is a risk that any archaeological remains could be destroyed on the route and they are a finite and unrenewable resource.

3.6.7 A major concern is, however, that the desk based assessment and walkover survey of the route corridor has not, as far as we are aware, been complete; and no viewpoint analysis is provided in connection with potential impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets. It is understood that the results from this piece of work and other projects that have been recently completed (i.e. aerial mapping project/Romans in Ravenglass), have not been used in the PEI. We therefore do not feel at this stage that we have all the information available to be able to ascertain the overall impact on the historic environment.

3.7 **Project wide comments**

*Cumulative impact assessment*
3.7.1 As stated in the PPA Group comments on the PEI Cumulative Effects Briefing Paper, the adopted four-stage approach which reflects the approach within the PINS Advice Note 17 is welcomed. It is understood that the PEI will only contain stages 1 and 2 as set out in the advice note, and that the EIA procedure will enable decision making as to the actual final cumulative impacts to be assessed, their extent and residual outcomes.

3.7.2 As this is such a critical element for decision makers, whilst paragraph 22.1.6 states that “Consultee comments have been considered during the compilation of this chapter, with the ZoI and assessment methodology amended where appropriate”, it would be more helpful and clearer to the Planning Inspectorate in the future for a table be provided in the ES setting out whether or not the changes sought by the PPA Group have been accepted, and if they have not then there should be clear justification for doing so.

3.7.3 There are a number of specific areas that require clarification, which relate to the assumptions for the distances used for the Zones of Influence identified for each of the topic areas covering: landscape (10km), Socio economics (20km), terrestrial and avian ecology (20km), historic environment (10km), and waste (10km).

3.7.4 With regard to marine matters, we note and welcome that Table 22.1 now confirms that the Islet associated with the Morecombe Bay tunnel, consultation with relevant bodies and Government levels and that works in the Duddon and Ravenglass estuaries are to be included.

PEI consultation

3.7.5 In a letter dated 21 October 2016, the PPA Group had expressed concern to National Grid that despite a 10-week consultation period running from 28 October 2016 to 6 January 2016, this was a compromise position and had been based on assurances by National Grid that technical information would be released to the Authorities well in advance of the formal consultation date. This length of time was needed to allow all the PEI material to be properly considered and for that consideration to inform the Local Authorities’ consultation response.
3.7.6 However, notwithstanding that assurance, several deadlines offered by National Grid were passed without the technical information being released on time. Consultation responses have to be approved by the various Local Authority Executives prior to issue to National Grid, and there is a significant lead-in time for all Committee reports to be prepared by the Local Authorities. The delay by National Grid in presenting material in the PEI has therefore meant that a full consideration of all the documentation is a significant challenge within the timescales. As a consequence the original request that the S.42 consultation be extended to the 3 February 2017 still stands to enable the PPA group to provide National Grid with a properly considered and approved consultation response, and enable National Grid to have full information on local sensitivities and impacts when it finalises the application ready for the DCO submission.

Lack of information

3.7.7 There has been a general lack of sufficient information presented within the PEI for a full assessment of the potential effects of the development to be carried out by the PPA Group and its specialists at this formal stage of consultation.

3.7.8 There are gaps as well as well assumptions that have been made across almost all topic areas (including landscape, ecology, transport, historic environment, socio-economics, noise, hydrology etc). If this is carried through to the final Environmental Statement could lead to incorrect assessments and the wrong conclusions drawn on the likely affects. Additionally, the approach would be inadequate in terms of ongoing engagement with the PPA Group and other organisations. This is addressed in more detail in the topic-by-topic analysis and will be drawn out in the final PEI response.

3.7.9 The PPA Group are concerned that these matters need to be addressed and consulted on prior to the development of a Environmental Statement and the submission of the DCO.
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Members Comments

Appendix 2:

**Allerdale**

*Landscape and Visual Impact*

Consider use of the T pylons in west Cumbria as they take up much less ground space.

The documentation and presentation indicate that less attention has been paid to the visual impact in Allerdale than in other parts of Cumbria.

*Visitor Economy*

The disruption from increased traffic may impact on visitors to Cumbria but this does not appear to have been considered, concentrating more on the views/landscape rather than the practicalities.

Will there be an impact on availability of holiday accommodation during the construction period? Has the long term impact of this been considered?

*Transport and Connectivity*

We would seek reassurance that road traffic will be kept to an absolute minimum by fully utilizing rail and sea.

We would seek reassurance that measures are in place to monitor road use and to deal with it.
We would look for legacy benefits in terms of the roads infrastructure.

Other large scale projects and the negative impacts that come with them do not appear to have been fully considered.

*Skills and Supply Chain*

In areas of high unemployment, deprivation, low skills and aspirations in parts of Allerdale, we would like to see a focus for Cumbrian jobs in Allerdale. The commitment of 20% should not be split equally but be targeted to those areas most in need.

Allerdale members would also like to see investment particularly in young people in the area as part of a legacy benefit, for example running programmes covering leadership skills, team building / confidence building, sponsoring local young people on apprenticeships and university places, work placements.

Legacy benefits need to be clearer and support young people so that they stay in the area.

**Barrow**

*Landscape and Visual Impact (and Visitor Economy)*
Members expressed concern that the area of the Duddon Valley is not being treated similarly as the National Park in terms of visual impact both outwardly and inwardly. The area of the Duddon valley is advertised as the Western Lakes and members were concerned that the visual influence of the proposed pylons would have an impact on the tourist industry in this area. Members suggested the route should be under the Duddon not as currently proposed.

Members also expressed concern about the cumulative impact of vertical infrastructure particular in parts of the Furness Peninsula, including Askam, Dalton, Ireleth and Lindale.

**Transport and Connectivity**

In respect of the proposed transport strategy, Members commented that National Grid should make wider use of ports and rail not just the road network and that road shouldn’t be their sole / primary focus.

Members also questioned the potential impact of the project on the road network in Barrow itself when combined with the other developments in the area and that there was a need to look at the NWCC project in light of all of the other developments taking place at present was highlighted e.g. BAE, GSK, DONG etc and the cumulative impact assessed. There is a need to carefully consider the impact on existing infrastructure and consider what mitigation is required to manage increases in the volume of traffic. In particular consideration on the impact on the A590 which Barrow members consider is not fit for purpose.

**Skills and Supply Chain**

It was noted National Grid’s commitment was to use at least 20% local workforce during the construction of the project. This was felt to be far too low and should be much higher.

Members also consider that there was a need to ensure that there is a legacy benefit to communities from this project e.g. around education, housing, health and hospital provision etc.

**Carlisle**

Members expressed concern about the route alignment near Rockcliffe village and the resulting landscape and visual impact. They noted that local people had compared the scale of the proposed lines with the spire of the village church, noting that the proposed poles were higher than this village feature. It was asked whether either the line could be moved (preferable) or a different design be used on this stretch.

**Copeland**

Members commented that the public should be made aware of the size of the sealing end compounds which will be required at every point where the cables go from over ground to underground. Members expressed concern that National Grid have not given any information on this and that further information should be forthcoming.

Comments were received from a Copeland Member who shares the same views as Millom Without Community. These comments are presented below.
Visual Impact

The proposals to run 50 metre high pylons through both our beautiful and rural environment are an unacceptable proposition, with significant impacts.

The late announcement of the new 132kV (Trident Poles) in the final consultation phase has the community both upset and perplexed as to the significant impact on this community.

The Visual Impact will create an industrial landscape which will have a generational legacy.

National Grid has an opportunity to improve the area (by removal of existing pylons), but instead are choosing to considerably worsen it, with two major electricity highways (400kV + 132kV).

“An Equal Playing Field”

This area skirts the National Park Boundaries at many touch points of the spectacular Duddon Estuary. The Setting of the National Park demands we maintain a clear protected boundary which the Duddon is central to the National Park’s beauty and heritage, as well as the estuary in its own right.

The intention to underground many areas on the Southern Corridor route and stop at the door of the Duddon Estuary is neither credible nor justifiable to our community.

Economic Impact

The loss of significant rural land is a major concern for landowners, which questions the long term viability for some small holdings and farmers.

The “stay away effect” for our growing visitor economy with businesses now reflecting on their investment plans and small businesses contemplating the “lost opportunity” of significant future growth potential of this area.

The prospects of any credible realisation of community benefits from this Project are heavily balanced against the impact on local business and employment.

There Are Other Credible Options......

Not taking cables across or under the Duddon Estuary has for a long time been a principal point of contention for many local people and indeed people nationally who are fighting to protect the setting of the Lake District National Park and the unique Duddon Estuary.

National Grid’s study into the potential for a Duddon cable crossing has been poorly conducted, it has major gaps and is open to challenge.

A tunnel solution or an Off Shore Route could facilitate removal of existing pylons and remove the requirement for new ones leaving a pylon free environment.

Absent Engagement and Skewed Consultation

National Grid has continually to treat the community with a lack respect, by refusing invitations to meet and not acting on previous feedback to help improve the communication with our community.
National Grid has angered and frustrated the public by running the consultation over Christmas and New Year.

The questionable engagement with National Grid is further put into focus by the lack of balance on the primary consultation questions, which has excluded any discussion or feedback on the Duddon Tunnel. This lack of transparency, challenges the integrity of the consultation process.

South Lakeland

Transport and Connectivity (Highways Infrastructure)

There is great concern regarding the capacity of the local road network and its ability to support this development. The A595 reduces to 3.4 metres in places and is not suitable for large heavy goods vehicles or large volumes. Highways England has previously raised concerns about the resilience of this road.

In the past Barrow has been completely cut off as the A590 is very vulnerable to a number of incidents, including floods and traffic collisions. This needs to be improved for the future, not made worse. The A590 is the main route to and from Barrow and is National Grid’s preferred route to remove the spoil. Highways England must respond strongly to this consultation. This cannot be seen in isolation and Highways England need to assess the risks, impact and potential unintended consequences across the whole route. National Grid must seriously consider bringing in equipment and moving spoil around by sea and rail. They must lobby government directly for the infrastructure required to ensure their programme can go ahead.

The infrastructure development required around Moorside is small, whereas infrastructure required elsewhere in the county, particularly the A590 and NW connections is significant.

The South Lakeland area has a vibrant tourist economy and strong farming community. This cannot be jeopardised by this scheme. However, if the roads are affected it will significantly impact on other parts of the economy. National Grid must recognise that while this is a significant national infrastructure programme it needs to fit in and co-ordinate with other nationally important infrastructure developments.

Improvements are required to the railway and the use of ports to transport materials should be considered.

The West of M6 Strategic Study (looking to 2025) has stressed the need for increased capacity on the A590 and the existing traffic flows.

The traffic has increased on the A590 significantly over the years as has the number of accidents resulting in road closure as communities at Haverthwaite and along its length can attest. This increase has resulted in a marked decrease in speeds along the route and in places there are traffic jams at various times of the day. This in turn has an impact on the diversion routes or presumed ‘short cuts’ throughout our rural roads and villages, along the route.

Landscape & Visual Impact
The landscape and outstanding beauty of the Duddon Valley must remain unspoilt and not over-commercialised. Members do not want pylons in this area at all. The additional cost for a tunnel under the Duddon Estuary is only 9% of the total cost of the scheme and therefore is essential – this must be strongly pressed for.

As it seems that overall it would be less costly to underground, this should be done wherever geologically possible and certainly within/near LDNPA and the Duddon Valley.

Members also expressed concern about the cumulative impact of vertical infrastructure particular in parts of the Furness Peninsula, including Askam, Dalton, Ireleth and Lindale.

The World Heritage Site bid should not be compromised by this scheme.

**Skills & Supply Chain**

It is vital that a legacy benefit is retained from this major infrastructure investment. i.e. skills development & improved infrastructure. There is no substance on how National Grid will support skills development. Need to consider which businesses would realistically be attracted to this area and therefore what skills they require. National Grid should provide support in assisting with this identification and training.

Members queried where the workers required for the construction of project will live during the build and the level of impact on schools, housing and health care in the area.
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What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. This report asks Cabinet to consider its response to the consultation being undertaken on proposals to reshape the health system in West, North and East Cumbria.

Recommendation of the Corporate Director

2. Cabinet considers responding to the consultation.

Background to the Proposals

3. The West, North and East Cumbria Success Regime was established by the NHS in Autumn 2015 to tackle the long-standing and deep-rooted problems faced in West, North and East Cumbria in recruitment, finance and service quality.

4. The Success Regime is made up of local partner organisations, including NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group, Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, North Cumbria University Hospitals NHS Trust and North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust.

5. The health system in West, North and East Cumbria faces a number of major challenges. The Success Regime consultation document describes these challenges and some of the changes being proposed to address these and provide high quality care within budget.

6. The consultation document (appendix 1) explains how some services might change in communities and in hospitals. It details possible changes in services for maternity (including urgent gynaecology), stroke and acute medical patients, children's inpatient services, emergency surgery, and community hospital inpatient beds.

7. The consultation is running for twelve weeks from 26 September 2016. The responses received during the consultation will be analysed independently and a report will be presented to the NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group in early 2017. NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group and other local NHS organisations will consider the report before taking any decisions on service change. The independent report will be published.
8. Local Committees have considered the proposals being consulted on and their feedback is set out in Appendix 2. Carlisle Local committee met on the 7th December and the notes of that meeting will follow after publication.

9. Options Considered and Risks Identified

Option (a)
- Cabinet could choose not to reply the consultation on behalf of the council

Option (b)
- Cabinet could agree to submit a response to the consultation.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

10. There are no additional resource impactions associated with submitting a response to the consultation.

11. At the point local NHS partner organisations make decisions on the future of services within Cumbria any financial impact to the Council will be determined and reported to cabinet through the established strategic planning process.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be Considered?

12. Cabinet is the authorised to respond to the consultation on behalf of the Council in accordance with Part 2B of the Council’s constitution.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

13. To support older, disabled and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives we will:
- work with the NHS and with local people to reduce the need for social care and health care by delivering new prevention and public health services
- work with the NHS and integrate the provision of reablement and recovery services and the greater use of technology, to support people to live independently and reduce pressure on hospital services
- work with the NHS at local levels to establish Integrated Care Teams which serve local communities

What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

14. The success regime consultation sets out the health impact and the equality impact assessments for the proposals.
Appendices and Background Documents

(a) Appendix 1 – Consultation document
(b) Appendix 2 – Feedback from local Committees

Key Facts

Electoral Division(s): All in Allerdale, Carlisle, Copeland and Eden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Decision</th>
<th>Key Decision Included in Forward Plan</th>
<th>Exempt from call-in</th>
<th>Exemption agreed by scrutiny chair</th>
<th>Considered by scrutiny, if so detail below</th>
<th>Environmental or sustainability assessment undertaken?</th>
<th>Equality impact assessment undertaken?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What is this consultation document about?

The health and social care system in West, North and East Cumbria faces a number of major challenges. This consultation document describes these challenges and some of the changes we need to make if we are to address these and provide high quality care within our budget.

The document explains how some services might change in our communities and in our hospitals. It details possible changes in services for maternity (including urgent gynaecology), stroke and acute medical patients, children’s inpatient services, emergency surgery, and community hospital inpatient beds.

What is consultation?

Consultation in the NHS is a process of dialogue in which the objective is to influence formal decisions made by the NHS. Through consultation people who use NHS services are invited to give their views on proposed changes to those services.

Consultation is intended to help Clinical Commissioning Groups and other NHS organisations secure the best possible services that meet the needs of local patients and represent the best possible value for money.
The NHS has a legal duty to involve and consult with patients, the public and local organisations when developing and considering proposals for substantial variations in the provision of services. This legal duty is found in the NHS Act 2006, which was amended in the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

The outcome of public consultation is an important factor in health service decision making which will be fully taken into account. It is, however, one of a number of important factors. Others include clinical, financial and practical considerations. The results of public consultation do not represent a vote on, or a veto over, any form of change.

The outcome of this consultation will be reported to the NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group’s Governing Body, the West, North and East Cumbria Success Regime and to other local NHS Trust boards. The Clinical Commissioning Group will consider the outcome of the consultation – in partnership with the Success Regime, the local NHS Trusts and other partner organisations – before taking any decisions.

Who is conducting this consultation?

The West, North and East Cumbria Success Regime which was established by the NHS in autumn 2015 to tackle the long-standing and deep-rooted problems we face here in recruitment, finance and service quality. There are only three Success Regimes in England, the others are in Essex and Devon. Over the past year the Success Regime has been working with local NHS organisations, local clinicians and national experts to develop the proposals in this consultation document.

The Success Regime is made up of local partner organisations, including NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group, Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust which delivers a range of community services and mental health services, North Cumbria University Hospitals NHS Trust which delivers the services at West Cumberland Hospital and Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust which delivers paramedic emergency services, patient transport, and 111 services.

NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group is part of the Success Regime and has the legal responsibility for undertaking this consultation. The Clinical Commissioning Group is made up of 74 General Practices across Cumbria and holds the budgets to pay for the majority of NHS care provided for their patients. NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups hold the legal duty to involve local people and other partners in the decisions they make when a major service change is proposed.

In December 2015, the NHS asked every health and care system in England to produce a Sustainability and Transformation Plan, showing how local services will evolve to deliver better patient care and improved NHS efficiencies. The options for change detailed in this consultation document are in line with this sustainability and transformation planning for West, North and East Cumbria.

Changes to the health and social care system are required to ensure that the people of Cumbria receive the care they need, and that the health system does not exceed its allocated budget. This consultation details the challenges specifically faced by health services. Cumbria County Council has already consulted on the commissioning priorities for social care and on the way it needs to reshape social care and public health services.
Why should you read this consultation document?

If you live in West, North or East Cumbria it is important that you read this consultation document. It sets out options for change which may affect you.

The NHS in West, North and East Cumbria believes there can and will be a bright and vibrant future for services delivered in this area. In order to ensure this, we need health and social care services that work together more effectively, we need to live within our budget and we need to develop safe, quality services which attract the necessary staff. We also need to make some changes to the way services are delivered now. If we fail to make these changes we will not be able to maintain or continue to deliver decent services into the future. This is what we mean when we say our health and care services need to be “sustainable”.

The contents of this document may have particular impact for women who use maternity services, for the parents of children who may need health care, for those who use inpatient services in community hospitals and for people who live in West Cumbria. We will be consulting all of these groups and many others because the options for change described in this document will be of particular interest to them.

You can read more about our wider strategy for health and care in West, North and East Cumbria in the documents available on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk). These documents include the Pre Consultation Business Case and briefing notes on such issues as maternity and urgent gynaecology, children’s services, community hospital inpatient beds, emergency and acute care, hyper-acute stroke services, emergency surgery and trauma services, finance and workforce issues.

However, this document concerns some specific options for change that are designed to ensure that key services are made sustainable into the future as we implement our wider plan for a healthier, better integrated and high performing future.

In this consultation document the NHS is open and transparent about its preferred options but any decision about service change will take account of the outcome of this consultation.

On page 44 we explain how the health organisations in West, North and East Cumbria will make decisions once this consultation has been completed and we explain how you can have your say.

Please take the time to read this consultation document and let us know what you think. Your views are important in helping us to decide how we should develop health and social care for the future.
Introduction

The NHS in West, North and East Cumbria is facing some challenges.

- Overall the health of our local population is not as good as in other parts of the country.
- Locally the NHS finds it very difficult to attract the doctors, nurses, paramedics and other staff that are needed to deliver services.
- Some people are admitted to hospital, or stay too long in hospital, when they should have received care at home or in the community.
- The NHS in this area has significantly overspent its budget over a number of years.
- The Care Quality Commission, which inspects and regulates health and social care services, has declared some of our services to be either inadequate or in need of improvement.

These are significant challenges but we believe we can tackle them. We can do more to help people keep fit, healthy and out of hospital. We can ensure health and social care services work together more closely, we can encourage people to take better care of themselves and to look after their own health and we can change the way in which we deliver some services.

Building on the development of ideas that has taken place over many years and engagement with local communities such as the “Closer to Home” consultation of 2007/8, we have a new vision – developed and agreed by all the local health and care bodies – that we believe will help us attract the right staff and enable us to deliver services that are tailor-made for communities in West, North and East Cumbria. Our vision is to create a centre of excellence for integrated health and social care provision in rural, remote and dispersed communities.

“A centre of excellence for integrated health and social care provision in rural, remote and dispersed communities”

To turn this vision into reality we need to embrace change. Our services need to change, our staff need to change and we need to help the public understand the need for change too. If we continue to run the NHS just as we did 10, 20 or 30 years ago we will fail to achieve the improved patient results that are now possible.
The options outlined in this consultation document are only the beginning of the change process that the health and social care system needs to embrace. We are now in a period of constant and rapid evolution. The NHS cannot stand still. New ways of working, new treatments and new technologies all offer the potential for significant improvements in healthcare and there will inevitably be further challenges and more change in the future.

At the end of this consultation we will reflect on what we have heard and then take some decisions. Our intention is that these decisions will lead to higher quality services and better results for our patients, attractive jobs for our staff and value-for-money.

We need your help to make some decisions about the most immediate service changes that are necessary but we also need everyone – patients, public, community leaders, health and care staff – to come with us on the journey that takes us to our vision. We see a future in which fewer people need to go into hospital or, if they do, to remain in hospital for a much shorter period. We need people to take greater responsibility for their own health and to use the services and technologies that will ease the pressure on our hospitals. We need our health and care staff to find creative ways of making our services more efficient and effective. We would like you to be part of this journey.

The national case for change

Across the country our health and care needs are changing fast. People in England are living longer, but not always healthier, lives. There are more patients with long term health conditions like diabetes or high blood pressure and they rely heavily on health and care services.

The NHS Five Year Forward View sets out the challenges for the NHS over the next five years. It says that to secure the future of health and care we need to make far-reaching changes and ensure systems work together more effectively. Our changing needs combined with growing financial pressures have led to some serious challenges which the Five Year Forward View sets out. They include:

- The desire for people to become more involved in their own care.
- The need for hospitals to work more closely with GPs and for the NHS to work more closely with social care.
- The need for better access to advances in treatments and technologies to predict, diagnose and treat disease.

In the foreseeable future the NHS will not see a return to the 6-7% real annual increases in budget that it saw in the early 2000s. If we make no further efficiency savings in the coming years, the Five Year Forward View argues, the increasing demand for healthcare would lead to a financial shortfall of £30bn a year by 2020/21. A failure to act at this stage would lead to three widening gaps:
The health and wellbeing gap will increase without better use of preventive medicine. This would lead to a fall in life expectancy, widening health inequalities and an overspend on avoidable illnesses.

The care and quality gap will widen unless we change how we deliver care, exploit new technologies and reduce the variations in quality and safety of care. This would lead to unmet need, harm to patients and significant differences in the care that people receive.

The funding and efficiency gap will increase if we do not make wide-reaching changes to make our systems more efficient. This would result in poorer services, smaller numbers of staff, increasing deficits and new treatments being restricted.

The Five Year Forward View proposes action on four fronts:

- Tackle the root causes of ill health. We need better health prevention and we need action on obesity, alcohol abuse and other major health risks.
- Meet the needs of a population which lives longer, with closer working relationships between health and care providers.
- Develop new ways of delivering care and a more flexible workforce.
- Involve patients more with extra support for carers and third sector workers.

In preparing for the future, the NHS must plan at local level to use the resources we have effectively and efficiently. The Five Year Forward View invites health and care communities across England to respond by developing their own ideas. The ideas described in this consultation document are part of that process.
The case for change in West, North and East Cumbria

The challenges faced by the NHS across England are the same as those we find in West, North and East Cumbria along with some additional, specific, local challenges. These challenges – and their solutions – are linked and interconnected. For example, changes in children’s services will have an impact upon maternity services and the development of services in the community will have an impact on the number of hospital beds we need.

Quality of local services

Patient experience data suggests that local people value their local services. However, as the Care Quality Commission has noted, the way we currently run some of our services makes it difficult to comply with some aspects of national guidance and we are not always meeting basic standards such as the national four-hour waiting time A&E target, the Referral to Treatment standard and the 62-day cancer waiting times target.

The national four-hour waiting time A&E target is that 95% of people should be seen within four hours. The North Cumbria University Hospitals NHS Trust recent full year figures for this target were 94% (2012/13), 94% (2013/14), 90% (2014/15) and 87% (2015/16).

The national Referral to Treatment standard is that 92% of all patients who need to be seen in hospital should be seen within 18 weeks. The North Cumbria University Hospitals NHS Trust recent figures for this target were 89% (2014/15), 90% (2015/16) and 88% (for the early part of 2016/17).

Health inequalities

In West, North and East Cumbria there is a high rate of almost all diseases compared to the national average and other similar areas. Life expectancy within West, North and East Cumbria varies by almost 20 years between the areas where people live longest and those where life expectancy is shortest.

Workforce

The difficulty we face in recruiting enough hospital consultants, junior doctors, GPs, nurses, paramedics and therapists who are willing to live and work in West, North and East Cumbria is a major reason why we are proposing some of the changes detailed in this consultation document. We face staff shortages in primary care, community care and in hospital care too. This means we need to use locums and agency staff which is very expensive and leads to a loss of continuity of care.

We have made some progress in recruiting staff – there are now 12 GP trainees in West, North and East Cumbria, where last year there were none – but the challenge remains substantial. The latest vacancy rate for consultants at North Cumbria University Hospitals NHS Trust (September 2016) continues to be above 20% and of all the medical staff working at Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust in August 2016 almost 24% were either agency staff or NHS locums.
Financial

Local NHS organisations are currently spending well beyond their means. In the financial year 2015/16 they had a combined overspend of around £70m. This is projected to rise to £163m a year by 2020 if we do nothing. We are, in effect, spending money we don’t have. In order to address this the local health community will need to make efficiency savings of around 6.5% a year over the next five years. This compares with an average national efficiency saving requirement of around 3-4%.

By 2020 we anticipate we will be able to make efficiency savings of £85m a year through things like reduced agency staff costs, more collaborative working with other health providers and more effective purchasing arrangements. We also anticipate we can save £42m a year by 2020 with new ways of working. This includes providing more services in the community, more cost effectively, to help relieve the pressure on our local hospitals. By 2020 the direct savings from the preferred option service changes discussed in this consultation document would be approximately £2.1m a year. It is clear, therefore, that the potential service changes discussed in this consultation document are not primarily motivated by financial considerations.

This still leaves a potential financial gap of over £30m a year. We anticipate that in part this gap will be bridged with additional funding, but there may need to be further service changes if we are unable to close this financial gap completely. There is more information on this in the Pre Consultation Business Case available on the consultation website.

Changing population

By 2020 the total working age population of West, North and East Cumbria may fall and almost a quarter of all the people who live in West, North and East Cumbria are likely to be over 65 years old. The health and care needs of this group will grow rapidly over the coming years leading to higher demand for health services and increasing pressure on social care providers and there are planned developments in West Cumbria which could mean an influx of working age people if they go ahead.

Local geography

These challenges are made all the more testing by the rural and remote nature of much of Cumbria. It is the second most sparsely populated county in England with a population that lives in smaller, dispersed communities. This makes it more expensive to deliver healthcare and means travel time and public transport are important issues for people as they consider their local health services.

Together these challenges represent a compelling case for change. They mean that too many of our services are not safe or sustainable into the future. We need to make the entire health and social care system sustainable, viable and affordable for many years to come.

To address these challenges we need to deliver more services within the community, protecting and enhancing primary care and strengthening services that are delivered at or near people’s homes, while also encouraging individuals to change their behaviour to prevent poor health, to reduce reliance on hospital services and to reduce overall demand.

Our ambition is not new. Over a number of years local health and care organisations have worked hard to improve care and services. While there has been some success, improvements to date have been limited. The scale of change required is substantial. This is a compelling case for change and we now need to act.
Vision, ambition and progress

The NHS in West, North and East Cumbria faces some big challenges but it also has some tremendous opportunities. We intend to lead a process that creates something special, a centre of excellence for the kind of care that people in rural, remote and dispersed communities really need. We also have a clear vision of a health service that is financially stable, that is vastly more efficient and that doesn’t face quality problems or constant recruitment crises. Instead it should be a service with a reputation for facing difficult decisions, dealing with them and finding workable solutions.

We intend to become known as a place that changes for the better, with new ways of working and joined up services, a place that builds relationships with other parts of the NHS that can deliver high quality services for our local communities.

We have already begun the journey of improvement. Our GP practices are trying new ways of getting patients seen more quickly. We are making greater use of technology for electronic referrals and tele-consultations by phone or video link. Highly trained nurses are increasingly doing the things that junior doctors used to do. Occupational therapists working in the community, the hospitals and the social care system are now working together closely to deliver a more co-ordinated service. We are working with Newcastle Hospitals to develop the delivery of new cancer treatment services locally in Cumbria to ensure people in West, North and East Cumbria get the very best access to the most up-to-date treatment.

Attracting the staff we need

We are also trying hard to improve the recruitment and retention of staff in areas where we face shortages.

A flexible reward package has helped attract some doctors to work in our hospitals and in the community. NHS organisations across West, North and East Cumbria are working together on international recruitment initiatives both for doctors and nurses. This year, for the first time, the British Medical Journal jobs fair will have joint representation from NHS organisations in Cumbria and support from Allerdale Council and others as part of a joint approach to attracting staff to Cumbria.

NHS organisations are also working together on a possible international nurse recruitment initiative. The North West Ambulance Service is considering international recruitment opportunities while remaining committed to the development of its existing staff and we have organised a Cumbria GP Recruitment Fair with a second such fair now being planned.

Integrated Care Communities

We are making good progress in developing Integrated Care Communities designed to deliver joined up care involving the NHS, social care providers and the voluntary sector. We have organised West, North and East Cumbria into eight areas – based upon natural communities of between 20,000 and 70,000 people – to start working in an integrated way at a local level. These are our Integrated Care Communities.
Feedback from the public suggests people really value local primary care services and the relationship with their GP. They want to be cared for at home or as near to home as possible but they understand that for some services they will need to travel to get the best possible specialist care. People also tell us that they want care to be properly coordinated between health and social care, and between their GP and hospital specialists.

Integrated Care Communities are designed to address precisely these issues and to involve local people in designing new services which:

- Help more people lead healthy, active lives
- Enable more people to remain independent for longer
- Reduce the need to attend or stay in hospital
- Reduce the length of time people spend in hospital
- Predict needs and plan care to prevent problems before they arise
- Make greater use of technology and home adaptations
- Support carers in their role

Our Integrated Care Communities will have integrated budgets, enabling them to respond flexibly to local needs. They will form an extended primary health and care team each based upon a cluster of GP practices. By developing these Integrated Care Communities we will realise our ambition of being recognised for our expertise in delivering integrated health and care for people living in rural, remote and dispersed communities.

By transforming out-of-hospital care – and depending on the decisions to be taken once this consultation has concluded – we estimate that in addition to reducing the total number of inpatient beds in our community hospitals we will also be able to reduce the total number of inpatient beds at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital from around 600 today to around 500 by 2020/21.

Integrated Care Communities will also have an important part to play in the delivery of outpatient mental health services. It is our intention that inpatient mental health services will be the subject of a separate public consultation but our Integrated Care Communities will be strongly committed to the concept of “parity of esteem”, which sees people’s mental health needs being just as important as their physical health needs.
Hospital Services

As we develop integrated care communities, complementary changes need to happen in our hospitals. Treatments that have traditionally been provided in hospitals and hospital beds can now be delivered in the community, GP surgeries and patients’ homes.

There have been huge advances in medicine in recent years and these have brought significant benefits to many patients. Advances in surgery and anaesthetics mean that more operations can be done without patients requiring an overnight stay in hospital. These changes have been achieved because treatments are becoming more specialised with improved recovery and survival rates. We propose to develop the West Cumberland Hospital – with its high quality dedicated facilities – as a centre of excellence in this kind of planned diagnosis and treatment.

Furthermore when we bring specialists together, with the right facilities, evidence shows that fewer lives are lost and the results are better for patients. Specialist centres, seeing more cases, can deliver better care and better results. We have already seen this in West, North and East Cumbria following the centralisation of complex acute surgery and acute trauma at the Cumberland Infirmary in Carlisle.

These trends in modern healthcare also mean that doctors are becoming increasingly specialised. Twenty years ago surgeons were trained to perform a range of operations on different parts of the body but today they usually specialise much earlier in their careers and become expert in fewer procedures.

To develop and maintain their skills, though, surgeons and their supporting teams need to see more patients who need the same operation or procedure. This is why the Royal College of Surgeons recommends that a single hospital site undertaking emergency or complex surgery should be serving a population of at least 300,000 people.

As doctors become increasingly specialised, with greater expertise in specific areas, patients get better results but this means we cannot provide every specialty to the highest standard at every hospital.

In addition junior doctors are working fewer hours which means we need more junior doctors than we used to. Currently we are using large numbers of locums to make up the shortfall and provide the care we need in areas such as children’s care. This is not only expensive, it also fails to provide the vital continuity of care that patients need.

The combined impact of these workforce and specialism challenges means we need to concentrate some services if we are to have safe, high quality care. To meet these challenges our two hospitals in Whitehaven and Carlisle will need to work much more closely together as a single team.

Our plan is to create an integrated set of hospital services with the West Cumberland hospital providing a range of local acute services and developing as a centre of excellence for planned, diagnostic and outpatient care and being supported by the Cumberland Infirmary in Carlisle where we are likely to increasingly provide more complex and acute care alongside a modern new centre for cancer care.

By reducing the current variation in outcomes across West, North and East Cumbria, by having clinical teams located together and by giving clinicians greater control over patient pathways we would be able to give local people swifter access to specialist doctors and treatments, shorter waiting times, fewer cancelled operations and we would help ensure patients spent the minimum amount of time in hospital with lower risk of infections.
Our overall strategy is designed to bring more care closer to home and the changes detailed in this consultation document would ensure that in most cases more people from West Cumbria receive treatment in their local hospital at Whitehaven than do now.

We believe this model of hospital care will ensure we are able to provide safe, high quality care for the long term. We will need to organise our emergency medical services, our surgical services and our women and children’s services differently. If we do this we will save more lives, improve the clinical outcomes that patients get from their treatment, provide a first class experience of care and we will keep as many health services local as possible.

**Developing new partnerships**

NHS England is making good progress with The Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust as the proposed lead provider of specialised oncology, radiotherapy and chemotherapy services into West, North and East Cumbria.

Cumbria Health Scrutiny Committee is sighted on these proposals and has confirmed that provided radiotherapy continues to be delivered from Carlisle as, at present, there is no requirement for public consultation.

The return to a more effective professional connection with Newcastle as the specialised tertiary cancer centre is a much welcomed refresh in relationships with the North East, and will ensure that residents of West, North and East Cumbria will receive the very best access to the most up to date modern technologies and expertise.

This will not only enhance service provision by facilitating the opportunity to develop and maintain the necessary range of skills at the specialised end of the spectrum, but should also serve to bring about a greater confidence as to the challenge of recruitment and retention of staff.

The Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, in partnership with NHS England commissioners, has developed a clear plan to support the delivery of oncology, radiotherapy and chemotherapy in West, North and East Cumbria which to effectively introduce and sustain is subject to the provision of an essential quantum of capital funding coupled with the necessary recurrent revenues to reflect actual needs.

**Implementing new service design**

All of the clinical innovations proposed in this document flow from local invention, from going out and seeing what others are doing elsewhere in the UK, from the published evidence of the best way to do things and from national policy. Keeping at the forefront of how services could and should be developed is part of our strategy to attract staff to come and work here in Cumbria.

The health service faces constant change. Sometimes there are new threats, like antibiotic resistant bugs, sometimes there are big opportunities, like new treatments or new ways of providing treatment. Threats and opportunities all involve change and at the same time we are required to find ways of meeting ever increasing demand within constrained resources.

We are determined to rise to these challenges and that’s where our vision comes in. It emerges from a period of development that has involved clinical staff, health service leaders, national and local experts, patients, the public and many other key stakeholders. It’s a vision for the future and we are confident it will work.
Themes emerging from discussions to date

The engagement activities that preceded this consultation began in September 2015 and built on discussions and views captured in a number of previous health development programmes in West, North and East Cumbria.

The programme included opportunities for the public, patients, staff and others to be involved in the development of new ideas and to feedback their own views. The engagement programme was also informed by work undertaken by other organisations notably the Maternity Matters engagement project which was led by Healthwatch Cumbria in partnership with Maternity Services Liaison Committees around Cumbria.

The engagement programme involved:

■ 142 public or stakeholder meetings
■ 31 staff engagement meetings
■ 763 written engagement responses
■ 86 locations in which engagement activity took place
■ And the Maternity Matters engagement programme held 70 engagement sessions and received 1,234 responses

The key themes that emerged from this programme of engagement included:

■ Recruitment and retention is a major local concern. Some people believe more could and should be done to address the recruitment challenge but others believe that a clear vision with a bright future for services in Cumbria will help attract and retain staff.

■ A fully functioning hospital at Whitehaven, with A&E, maternity and paediatric services protected, is a key objective of the local community in West Cumbria.

■ While some people understand the difficulties associated with recruiting, retaining and rostering staff in community hospitals, there was significant opposition to the idea of removing inpatient beds from community hospitals.

■ Respondents generally agreed that better integration of hospital, community and social services is essential to improve healthcare in Cumbria.

■ There was widespread support for the increased use of tele-medicine in delivering efficient and effective patient care.

■ The rurality and geography of West, North and East Cumbria – and its poor transport links – was a central concern among many of the engagement responses.
How we developed our strategy and explored different options for change

Over the past year the health and social care organisations in West, North and East Cumbria have created a number of work groups, led by doctors and nurses, to look in detail at specific areas of health and care. The aim was to find ways of providing the best, most efficient and sustainable services which address the challenges faced by the local health and care community and which deliver the best possible care for patients.

A set of initial ideas was developed by these clinician-led groups, informed by independent, expert, clinical advice and by engagement with patients, the local community, staff and many others. In developing options for change we paid close attention to the Care Quality Commission’s report on acute services and the views of our own clinicians. We also received support from senior, external clinicians at the NHS Northern England Clinical Senate. The clinical senate is a non-statutory body which exists to provide independent clinical advice to health commissioners.

A two-stage process saw the evaluation of ideas into a ‘long list’ of possible options which were initially tested for their:

- Ability to comply with essential national standards for quality and safety
- Ability to be operationally delivered
- Contribution to reducing the financial overspend

Through this first stage of testing, the health community ruled out some options and created a shorter list of options to be tested in a second stage. This second stage examined each option for four criteria:

- Impact on the health and wellbeing gap
- Impact on the care and quality gap
- Impact on the funding and efficiency gap
- Ease of delivery

We paid particular attention to the needs of people living in rural areas and those with ‘protected characteristics’ who require special consideration. This included consideration of the fact that in West Cumbria deprivation is higher than the England average and that the population of West Cumbria is ageing rapidly.

We particularly noted that bringing services together can provide better care but patient access also has to be considered. We also noted that people living in deprived areas will generally experience poorer health and that changes to health and care services can impact on the health and wellbeing not just of patients but on carers and family members too.

We also considered the possible impact of each option on patient safety, patient outcomes and patient experience including access to services. In considering ease of delivery, we looked at how changes would affect staff and at how different services, such as maternity services and children’s services, are interlocked and co-dependent. Working with stakeholders, patients, service users and representatives of the local community we looked at the short list of options for each service, using the processes described in this section. The results of this were tested at a stakeholder workshop held on 5 May 2016.
What we are consulting on

In the introduction to this document we describe some of the challenges the health system in West, North and East Cumbria faces and we explain some of the ways in which we propose to address these challenges.

Some of our proposals involve substantial developments or variations in the provision of services and therefore public consultation is both helpful and necessary.

These services are:

- Maternity services (including urgent gynaecology)
- Children’s services
- Community hospital inpatient beds
- Emergency and acute care
- Hyper-acute stroke services
- Emergency surgery and trauma services

In the pages that follow we described how each of these services is currently organised, the case for change, the potential options for change and our preferred option. We also indicate whether we have considered and rejected other options and, if so, why we rejected them.

You can find more detailed information about each of these services, the case for change, the potential impact of different options and how we assessed the options for change by reviewing documents, such as the Pre Consultation Business Case, which can be found on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk).

Some of the service changes we are consulting on are dependent upon the decisions about other service changes. For example, the decision about changes to maternity services is closely related to the decision about changes to children’s services. Some changes can, therefore, be considered in isolation but others will need to be considered as a package.

Maternity services

HOW MATERNITY SERVICES ARE ORGANISED NOW

Currently there is a consultant-led maternity unit at both the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven. Both sites have a special care baby unit and both deliver antenatal and postnatal care. A midwife-led maternity unit is being developed alongside the consultant-led units in both Whitehaven and Carlisle. There is also a birthing unit at Penrith Community Hospital and a small number of women choose to give birth at home. Women and babies requiring specialist care are referred to or transferred to specialist centres such as the one at Newcastle.

Consultants in obstetrics and gynaecology also provide an emergency gynaecology service both at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital. Approximately 200 emergency gynaecology patients are seen at West Cumberland Hospital each year.

THE CASE FOR CHANGE

Between 1 April 2015 and 31 March 2016 there were 1,791 births at the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and 1,234 at the West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven. This meant these were two of the smallest seven consultant-led maternity units in England.
Maternity services are reliant upon a wide range of other specialisms and closely interconnected with children’s services. The availability of obstetricians (maternity doctors), midwives, anaesthetists, paediatricians (children's doctors) and other specialists is making it increasingly difficult, across the country, to provide 24-hour consultant-led maternity care in small district general hospitals with low numbers of births. Many hospitals are now struggling to recruit key staff. The number of available obstetricians is likely to fall further in the coming years and there is a national shortage of paediatricians with one in four senior trainee general paediatric posts vacant. Currently, across the country, over half of paediatric units are not meeting recommended staffing levels.

In addition we face a growing challenge to maintain the quality of maternity services. While the quality of the service for mothers and babies at West Cumberland Hospital and Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle is currently good, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain standards in small consultant-led maternity units, especially if we are not able to recruit the necessary staff.

A number of organisations have set standards for maternity care including the National Institute For Health and Care Excellence (Safe Midwifery Staffing for Maternity Settings), the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, Royal College of Midwives, Royal College of Anaesthetists and Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (Safer Childbirth: Minimum Standards for the Organisation and Delivery of Care in Labour) and the Obstetric Anaesthetist Association/Association of Anaesthetists Great Britain (Guidelines for Obstetric Anaesthesia Services).

**OPTIONS**

In 2014 we asked the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists to look at the issues we were facing in maternity services and to provide expert advice. Its report said that the preferred option should be to continue with two consultant-led units – one at the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and one at the West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven – with each one having an alongside midwife-led maternity unit. Alongside midwife-led maternity units are located close to consultant-led maternity units and are sometimes referred to as co-located units.

However, the report also said: “the delivery of this option will succeed only if the staffing and quality issues are met.” The report noted how difficult this would be and recommended that we should explore other options at the same time and be prepared to move on to one of these if the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists’ preferred option proved impossible to deliver within a reasonable timeframe.

Following publication of the report, we worked for over a year to explore how we could deliver and sustain consultant led units and other options. We have continued to meet with women who use the maternity service, local clinicians and regional and national experts. We have looked at maternity units that operate differently around the UK, and we have paid close attention to the National Maternity Review published earlier this year.

We would now like to hear your views on the following options.
Maternity Option 1

Option 1 involves the provision of a consultant-led maternity unit at both Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and at West Cumberland Hospital, an alongside midwife-led maternity unit at both sites, a full range of antenatal and postnatal care at both sites and the continued option of giving birth at the Penrith Birthing Unit or at home. There would be a special care baby unit at both Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital but the reduced availability of paediatric expertise at West Cumberland Hospital (see option 1 in children’s services) would mean that some higher risk births would take place in Carlisle.

What impact would option 1 have?

- This option would enable women to give birth in a consultant-led maternity unit in Whitehaven but it would make the achievement of clinical standards more difficult.
- This option may not be deliverable in the medium to long term because the recruitment of specialist consultants – and other grades of doctors – will continue to be difficult. This is particularly true for paediatricians. There is currently only one permanently employed paediatrician at the West Cumberland Hospital (see option 1 in children’s services).
- It would mean that approximately 100-200 births which would otherwise have taken place at West Cumberland Hospital would need to take place at Carlisle if the baby was likely to need full special care baby unit support.
- As related services would continue to rely on locum doctors there would be a continuing risk of closures at short notice due to lack of staff. This would be a particular risk at West Cumberland Hospital.

Maternity Option 2

Option 2 involves the provision of a consultant-led maternity unit at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle along with a full range of antenatal and postnatal care. At West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven it would involve a standalone midwife-led maternity unit for low risk births, open 24 hours a day 365 days a year, with antenatal and postnatal care delivered by both consultants and midwives and with consultants on site between 8am and 8pm.

The consultants would not provide intrapartum care (care during labour). It may be possible to offer low risk, planned caesarean sections at West Cumberland Hospital, once the midwife-led unit was fully established. Option 2 would also involve the provision of a dedicated ambulance, based at Whitehaven, to transfer any women who experience complications during labour or who need further pain relief, to the consultant-led unit at Carlisle. We anticipate that between 300 and 400 women a year would use the stand alone midwife-led maternity unit at West Cumberland Hospital once it was fully developed. As with option 1 women would continue to have the choice of giving birth at the Penrith Birthing Unit or at home.

What impact would option 2 have?

- This option would be more likely than option 1 to meet modern clinical care standards and may lead to improved outcomes.
- It would also be more deliverable and would carry a lower risk of maternity unit closures at short notice due to lack of staff.
- However, some women would have to travel further to give birth and there would need to be a robust, dedicated ambulance transfer system. We estimate that women travelling from West Cumbria postcodes to Carlisle to give birth would have an average additional journey time of between 45 and 48 minutes.
We would also need to resolve transport issues such as ambulances for women who would give birth at Carlisle.

In addition up to 80 women a year who need emergency gynaecology services in West Cumberland may need to be transferred to Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle.

This option would also involve the undertaking of risk assessments to ensure that women were able to give birth in the most appropriate place.

There would also need to be careful planning in order that the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle was prepared to deal with a higher number of births.

**Maternity Option 3**

Option 3 involves the provision of a consultant-led maternity unit at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle along with a special care baby unit, an alongside midwife-led maternity unit and a full range of antenatal and postnatal care. There would be no births at West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven but consultants and midwives would give antenatal and postnatal care at West Cumberland Hospital. As with option 1 women would continue to have the choice of giving birth at the Penrith Birthing Unit or at home.

**What impact would option 3 have?**

- This option would be most likely to meet modern clinical care standards and may lead to improved outcomes.
- This option is also more deliverable and would involve the lowest risk of maternity unit closures at short notice due to lack of staff.
- More women would have to travel further to give birth. We estimate that women travelling from West Cumbria postcodes to Carlisle to give birth will have an average additional journey time of between 45 and 48 minutes.

We would also need to resolve transport issues such as ambulances for women who would give birth at Carlisle.

In addition the majority of the 200 women a year in West Cumberland who need emergency gynaecology services would need to be transferred to Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle.

In addition there would need to be careful planning in order that the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle was prepared to deal with a higher number of births.

This option would be the most deliverable in the medium term as it would involve the greatest consolidation of clinical staff.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

This is going to be a very difficult decision and we want to hear views through the consultation process about how to improve the options described above. We would also like to hear any alternative options. There are a range of professional views about the best way forward but our consistent expert advice is that that option 1 will be difficult to sustain in the long term and although option 3 may be more straightforward it would mean there would be less choice for women in the West. Maternity Option 2 is therefore our preferred option.

**OTHER OPTIONS WE BELIEVE ARE NOT POSSIBLE**

We explored the option of providing a single consultant-led maternity unit at West Cumberland Hospital rather than at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle but concluded that this was not viable. More women currently give birth in Carlisle, which is also closer to specialist services in Newcastle for women and babies who need to be transferred there. Carlisle also has the critical mass of related staff such as anaesthetists, surgeons and paediatricians.
We also explored the possibility of a standalone midwife-led maternity unit at a new site. This would mean building a new unit away from West Cumberland Hospital and the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle, for example in Workington or Cockermouth. We concluded that this was not a viable option as it would further stretch the midwifery workforce, it would require considerable capital investment in a new building, and the unit would be located away from the other clinical services needed to deliver safe maternity care.

**SUMMARY OF THE OPTIONS**

The table below shows the estimated number of births that could take place at each hospital under each of the options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumberland Infirmary</th>
<th>West Cumberland Hospital</th>
<th>Penrith Birthing Unit</th>
<th>Home Births</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>1,900 – 2,000</td>
<td>1,000 – 1,100</td>
<td>20 – 40</td>
<td>20 – 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>2,600 – 2,700</td>
<td>300 – 400*</td>
<td>20 – 40</td>
<td>20 – 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 – 40</td>
<td>20 – 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is an estimated figure for the number of women who would choose to give birth in a standalone midwife-led maternity unit. This number does not include low-risk elective caesarean sections. Caesarean sections could increase the number of births at West Cumberland Hospital by a further 100 each year.
The table below summarises which types of services will be delivered at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital under each of the options described above. The Penrith Birthing Unit is unchanged in all options.

You can find out more about the options for maternity services in West, North and East Cumbria by looking at the documents available on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk). In particular the Pre Consultation Business Case contains a lot of information about maternity services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant-led unit</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alongside midwife-led unit</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standalone midwife-led unit</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antenatal and postnatal care</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special care baby unit</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children’s services

HOW CHILDREN’S HEALTH SERVICES ARE ORGANISED NOW

Currently there is a children’s inpatient unit at both the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and the West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven. Both sites have a paediatric (children’s) short stay assessment unit and both offer children’s outpatient services. Children who need specialist inpatient services are treated in specialist centres such as the Great North Children’s Hospital in Newcastle. Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust provides children’s community services.

CASE FOR CHANGE

Newly qualified paediatricians often find it most attractive to work in large specialist units or in a specific area of children’s medicine. In West, North and East Cumbria we cannot offer either of these benefits and, therefore, we find it hard to attract paediatric consultants into permanent employment. This means we rely heavily on locums which can interrupt continuity of care, is expensive and means the children’s service at both Whitehaven and Carlisle is sometimes at risk of temporary closure or reduction in service due to lack of staff. At West Cumberland Hospital just one in five of our consultant paediatrician posts is currently filled by a permanent member of staff.

In addition it is important to understand that children’s services are reliant upon a wide range of other specialisms and the provision of consultant-led maternity services is fully dependent on paediatric services. Furthermore, the way in which we treat childhood illness has changed considerably in recent years.

Fewer children now have long stays in hospital but more children have short episodes of ill health. In response to this change the NHS has developed short stay paediatric assessment units. We currently have two such units in Carlisle and Whitehaven.

These units assess, monitor and treat or discharge children and young people more quickly. The success of these units depends upon close working between hospital and community services, good community nursing services, rapid access to paediatrician-led clinics and the support of GPs. It also depends on effective services to support children and young people with long term conditions.

National evidence suggests that up to 97% of children who come to hospital as an emergency can be safely cared for in a short stay paediatric assessment unit without the need to be admitted as an inpatient. Currently, the majority of children who come to Carlisle and Whitehaven do not need to be admitted as an inpatient. Of the children who are admitted, 37% stay less than 12 hours and 83% stay for no more than a day. Developing and enhancing the short stay paediatric assessment units at Carlisle and Whitehaven – alongside enhanced community nursing services – would mean more children get the care they need without having to be admitted as an inpatient.

OPTIONS FOR CHANGE

Given the case for change described above we want to hear your views on the following possible options for change.
Children’s Option 1

This option involves the development of an inpatient paediatric unit serving West, North and East Cumbria based at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle along with a short stay paediatric assessment unit. At West Cumberland Hospital, Whitehaven there would be a short stay paediatric assessment unit for children requiring short term observation and treatment. There would also be some overnight beds at Whitehaven for children with less acute, low risk illnesses but children who needed more acute inpatient admission would be transferred to Carlisle.

What impact would option 1 have?

■ While there would be some overnight beds at West Cumberland Hospital for patients who were admitted during the day there would be no inpatient admissions during the night.

■ It would mean that a small number of children who were acutely unwell and who needed inpatient treatment would need to be treated in Carlisle rather than in Whitehaven. This would have a travel impact for their families.

■ Consolidating some inpatient paediatric services at Carlisle would help ease workforce pressures in the face of reduced availability of paediatric doctors and would reduce the risk of temporary closure or reduction in service due to the lack of staff.

■ This would in turn improve safety and outcomes for patients.

■ This option would have little impact on finances other than to reduce our reliance upon locums.

■ There would need to be a robust, dedicated ambulance transfer service.

■ We would also need to resolve transport issues such as ambulances for children who need to be admitted directly to Carlisle.

Children’s Option 2

This option involves the development of an inpatient paediatric unit serving West, North and East Cumbria based at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle along with a short stay paediatric assessment unit. At West Cumberland Hospital, Whitehaven – as with option 1 – there would be a short stay paediatric assessment unit for children requiring short term observation and treatment but there would be no overnight beds at Whitehaven for children. Any child who needed inpatient admission would be admitted to Carlisle.

What impact would option 2 have?

■ It would mean that all children who needed inpatient treatment or overnight observation would be treated in Carlisle. This would have a travel impact on those who would previously have been admitted to Whitehaven.

■ Consolidating all inpatient paediatric services at Carlisle would help ease workforce pressures in the face of reduced availability of paediatric doctors and would reduce the risk of temporary closure or reduction in service due to the lack of staff.

■ This would in turn improve safety and outcomes for patients.

■ This option would have a small and positive impact on operating costs and would reduce our reliance upon locums.

■ There would need to be a robust, dedicated ambulance transfer service.

■ We would also need to resolve transport issues such as ambulances for children who need to be admitted directly to Carlisle.
**Children’s Option 3**

This option involves the development of an inpatient paediatric unit serving West, North and East Cumbria based at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle along with a short stay paediatric assessment unit. At West Cumberland Hospital, Whitehaven there would be paediatric outpatient services only and no short stay paediatric assessment unit. All urgent care would be delivered at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle.

**What impact would option 3 have?**

- It would mean that all children who needed short stay assessment, inpatient treatment or overnight observation would be treated in Carlisle. This would have a travel impact on those who would previously have been assessed or treated in Whitehaven.

- Consolidating all inpatient paediatric services – including short stay assessment – at Carlisle would help ease workforce pressures in the face of reduced availability of paediatric doctors and would reduce the risk of temporary closure or reduction in service due to the lack of staff.

- Overall this would improve safety and outcomes for patients but the lack of paediatric assessment services in Whitehaven would have a negative impact upon access to services for families living in West Cumbria.

- This option would reduce operating costs and would reduce our reliance upon locums but would require some capital investment.

- We would also need to resolve transport issues such as ambulances for children who need to be admitted directly to Carlisle.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

Our preferred option is Children’s Option 1. We believe this option is the best balance of offering sustainability in the medium term while keeping significant children’s services at both West Cumberland Hospital and Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle. Under this option, we would create some overnight beds at Whitehaven for children with less acute, low risk illnesses and would review them regularly to assess how much they were used along with their impact and effectiveness. This option would be dependent on the successful recruitment of doctors and the training and development of advanced paediatric nurse practitioners to comply with current standards.

**OTHER OPTIONS THAT WE BELIEVE ARE NOT POSSIBLE**

We also explored but rejected some other options for the future of children’s services in West, North and East Cumbria.

The option of keeping services as they are – two children’s inpatient units at both the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and the West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven – did not pass the short-listing criteria described elsewhere in this document as it failed to address the issues described in the “case for change” section above.

The option of consolidating inpatient services at the West Cumberland Hospital rather than at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle was also explored but we did not consider this to be viable. This was because there are more children’s admissions at Carlisle (58% of the total Trust admissions compared with 42% in Whitehaven), because the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle offers greater access to a wider range of related hospital services such as emergency surgery and because Carlisle is closer to specialist services in the North East.
### SUMMARY OF THE OPTIONS

The table below summarises which types of services would be delivered at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital in each of the options described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>WCH</td>
<td>CIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Stay Paediatric Assessment Unit</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full inpatient service</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk inpatient service only</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can find out more about the options for children’s services in West, North and East Cumbria by looking at the documents available on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk). In particular the Pre Consultation Business Case contains a lot of information about children’s services.
Community hospital inpatient beds

HOW COMMUNITY HOSPITAL INPATIENT BEDS ARE ORGANISED NOW

We currently provide 133 community hospital inpatient beds spread across eight community hospitals and at an inpatient unit at West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven. The community hospitals are located in Alston, Brampton, Cockermouth, Keswick, Maryport, Penrith, Wigton and Workington.

The inpatient beds at these hospitals are for people who need medical, nursing, rehabilitation and end of life care but who do not need the services provided by an acute hospital. The number of inpatient beds at each site ranges from six to 28.

Of course, community hospitals have a much wider role than simply providing inpatient beds. They can offer outpatient care, treatment for minor injuries, nurse assessment units etc. These wider services will continue to be important particularly as we develop Integrated Care Communities but this consultation is simply about community hospital inpatient beds.

THE CASE FOR CHANGE

It is not good for patients to spend more time in a hospital bed than is absolutely necessary. It makes them vulnerable to infections, falls, and a general deterioration in well-being. We know from our experience in Millom and Carlisle that it is possible to reduce the numbers of community hospital inpatients and support more people at home.

We also face a major challenge recruiting and retaining the necessary staff to support inpatients in our community hospitals. Nationally the vacancy rate for the staff we need is 9% but across our community hospital inpatient units the vacancy rate is 28% for nurses and 6% for health care assistants with vacancy rates for qualified nursing staff rising to over 40% in some community hospitals. Part of the problem is that small, isolated units offer limited opportunities for training, limited exposure to clinical experience and lack support from colleagues within other professions.

In addition, rostering staff to support a small number of inpatients in a large number of isolated units is a significant challenge. When a small inpatient unit is staffed by just one nurse it is vulnerable to closure in the event of staff sickness. Furthermore, the small size of some of our inpatient units means it is difficult to meet clinical standards set down by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. The Institute’s guidelines recommend one registered nurse for every eight inpatients and we believe we should have a minimum of two nurses working together in any inpatient unit overnight. We do not, therefore, think it is feasible to have inpatient units that are less than 16 beds in size. Where beds are consolidated and managed as larger units they become more resilient in terms of staffing and clinical expertise, offering staff greater opportunity to develop and maintain skills, and offering patients a better service.
It is also important to recognise that the existing configuration of community hospital inpatient beds has developed historically and no longer entirely reflects the health needs of the local population.

The case for change with respect to community hospital inpatient beds is primarily a question of staffing and of achieving better outcomes. It is also worth noting, however, that some savings could be made by rearranging inpatient beds onto a smaller number of sites.

OPTIONS

A recent review of community hospital inpatient capacity suggests that West, North and East Cumbria has a significantly higher number of community hospital inpatient beds than other areas in England. Based on a population of 330,000 the data indicates the need for 84 community hospital beds (excluding end of life care).

When end of life care is included we believe the total number of community inpatient beds we should plan for is 102. In the options described below this number has been increased to 104 to reflect the requirement for beds to be provided in multiples of eight based on guidelines for safer staffing.

It is important to note that none of the options for change described in this consultation document involve community hospital closures. The options only relate to community hospital inpatient beds.

None of the options described below have inpatient beds at Alston because of the fragile staffing position in that hospital and none of the options propose inpatient beds at Maryport or Wigton because the relatively old buildings at these locations require substantial capital investment. Discussions are continuing about the precise mix of services that would be provided from these hospitals.

We would now like to hear your views on the following options.

Community Hospitals Inpatients
Option 1

Option 1 involves no community hospital closures but proposes the consolidation of inpatient community hospitals beds onto six sites. In total there would be 104 inpatient beds at Whitehaven (Copeland Unit), Cockermouth, Workington, Penrith, Brampton and Keswick.

What impact would option 1 have?

- This option would have a positive impact on quality and safety by providing robust and more sustainable staffing levels.
- Access to community inpatient beds would, however, be adversely affected in areas where community hospitals would no longer have inpatient beds.
- Community hospitals that no longer had inpatient beds (those at Alston, Maryport and Wigton) would have important roles within the new system of Integrated Care Communities.
- The financial impact of this option would be small but positive.
## Community Hospitals Inpatients

### Option 2

Option 2 involves no community hospital closures but proposes the consolidation of inpatient community hospitals beds onto five sites. In total there would be 104 inpatient beds at Whitehaven (Copeland Unit), Cockermouth, Penrith, Brampton and Keswick.

### What impact would option 2 have?

- This option would have a positive impact on quality and safety by providing robust and more sustainable staffing levels.
- Access to community inpatient beds would, however, be adversely affected in areas where community hospitals would no longer have inpatient beds.
- Community hospitals that no longer had inpatient beds (those at Alston, Maryport, Wigton and Workington) would have important roles within the new system of Integrated Care Communities.
- The financial impact of this option would be small but positive.

### Community Hospitals Inpatients

### Option 3

Option 3 involves no community hospital closures but proposes the consolidation of inpatient community hospitals beds onto five sites. In total there would be 104 inpatient beds at Whitehaven (Copeland Unit), Workington, Penrith, Brampton and Keswick.

### What impact would option 3 have?

- This option would have a positive impact on quality and safety by providing robust and more sustainable staffing levels.
- Access to community inpatient beds would, however, be adversely affected in areas where community hospitals would no longer have inpatient beds.
- Community hospitals that no longer had inpatient beds (those at Alston, Maryport, Wigton and Cockermouth) would have important roles within the new system of Integrated Care Communities.
- The financial impact of this option would be small but positive.
Community Hospitals Inpatients
Option 4

Option 4 involves no community hospital closures but proposes the consolidation of inpatient community hospitals beds onto three sites. In total there would be 104 inpatient beds at Whitehaven (Copeland Unit), Penrith and at a new site in the Carlisle area.

What impact would option 4 have?
- This option would have a positive impact on quality and safety by providing robust and more sustainable staffing levels.
- Access to community inpatient beds would, however, be adversely affected in areas where community hospitals would no longer have inpatient beds.
- Community hospitals that no longer had inpatient beds (those at Alston, Maryport, Wigton, Brampton, Cockermouth, Keswick and Workington) would have important roles within the new system of Integrated Care Communities.
- The long term financial impact of this option would be greater than the other options but it would require significant capital expenditure for a new unit in Carlisle and it could not be implemented quickly.

Preferred Option

Community Hospitals Option 1 is our preferred option. We believe it would be sustainable in the medium term and would offer better access to community inpatient beds than the other options. This option also makes the best use of our current buildings, ensuring the care we provide is delivered in environments that are suited to the needs and expectations of modern day health care.

Other Options that we believe are not possible

For the reasons described above we do not believe it is sustainable to retain 133 inpatient beds distributed across all nine sites and furthermore some of our community hospital buildings are older and therefore less able to deliver high quality inpatient care.

We have explored the possibility of configuring 104 inpatient beds across all nine sites but have concluded that this is not a sustainable option as it would mean a number of units operating below the minimum bed number of 16 required for safe and resilient staffing.

We have also explored the possibility of delivering all of our necessary community inpatient services through a hospital-at-home scheme or through local nursing home provision. This would involve the closure of all community inpatient beds in West, North and East Cumbria. In the long term, we aim to have our new Integrated Care Communities providing as much care at home or within nursing homes as possible. However, it became clear during our pre-consultation engagement that there is significant public opposition to this option particularly if it were to be implemented before new community services were in place. It will clearly take time to create the capacity needed to provide more care at home or in nursing homes and for these reasons we rejected this option at the present time.
### SUMMARY OF THE OPTIONS

The table below details the bed configuration at each site for each option. The first column show the number of community bed that are currently commissioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Existing beds</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alston</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle (new build)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven (Copeland Unit)</td>
<td>15 *</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workington</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *This number does not include four beds provided on the specialist palliative care unit, Loweswater adjacent to the Copeland Unit in Whitehaven. These beds are not affected by this consultation.

You can find out more about the options for community hospital inpatient beds in West, North and East Cumbria by looking at the documents available on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk). In particular the Pre Consultation Business Case contains a lot of information about community hospitals.
Emergency and acute care

HOW EMERGENCY AND ACUTE CARE IS ORGANISED NOW

Both Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven provide services for patients who suddenly fall ill or who are in need of urgent care. Both hospitals run 24 hour A&E departments and acute assessment and in-patient beds. They both receive ‘blue light’ ambulances and GP admissions, and provide early rehabilitation. Historically the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle has also had a number of more specialist services for both planned and emergency care. This is unusual for a hospital of its size but reflects the remoteness of Cumbria from centres such as Newcastle.

THE CASE FOR CHANGE

Acute services at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital face serious challenges for a number of reasons. Providing care across two sites stretches available staffing and is expensive, particularly because it requires more doctors to run two sets of emergency rota. Small teams and low volumes of activity on each site make roles less attractive and skills difficult to maintain. There are also difficulties providing the right sort of supervision and training for junior staff. The challenges are made more difficult by the fact that health regulation, professional standards and the expectations of the Royal Colleges are becoming more exacting.

There are workforce gaps on both sites in A&E and emergency medicine (40% staff vacancies in total) but these are most severe at West Cumberland Hospital.

Currently the middle tier of acute medicine doctors working overnight are ALL locums and just three of the 11 consultants slots are filled by permanent staff. The geographical location of West, North and East Cumbria is a challenge to recruitment and retention, as is professional isolation. Health Education North East forecasts that the current recruitment issues are likely to continue into the future.

In 2015 the Care Quality Commission judged general medical services at West Cumberland Hospital to be inadequate. This was largely due to the workforce difficulties and the lack of a plan to address these.

The hospitals in West, North and East Cumbria are facing rising levels of activity. A&E attendances have risen almost 10% over the past four years and emergency admissions have risen 20%. In 2014/15, the number of A&E attendances resulting in admission was more than 43%, compared to a national average of under 25%.

The Trust has made significant progress in improving emergency care both in Carlisle and in Whitehaven. The introduction of assessment by a senior clinician very early after admission and the recruitment of a group of nurse practitioners undertaking jobs previously done by junior doctors has helped but further change is needed if we are to maintain safe services.
OPTIONS

Health and care organisations in West, North and East Cumbria all agree that we need to develop the two acute hospitals in Carlisle and Whitehaven in ways which comply with national standards for the best clinical care, seven days a week.

During the process of developing ideas for improved services at these hospitals, it was agreed that certain core services should remain on both sites, specifically:

- 24/7 urgent care services providing walk-in minor illness and minor injury services
- Elective surgical care
- Full outpatient services
- Comprehensive diagnostic services
- The necessary services to support inpatient and outpatient activity

In developing options for emergency and acute care we paid close attention to the Care Quality Commission’s report on the acute Trust, as well as to the views of local people and the views of our own clinicians. A clinically-led group developed ideas for ways to sustain acute medical services in West Cumbria and were supported in this process by external senior clinicians from the NHS Northern England Clinical Senate.

We would now like to hear your views on the following options. Please note that in ALL options described below both Carlisle and Whitehaven would provide a range of urgent outpatient services to support the concept of Integrated Care Communities and to prevent unnecessary hospital admissions. They would also provide frailty assessment services.

Emergency and Acute Option 1

Option 1 involves a 24/7 A&E at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle along with acute medical inpatient services, including for the most complex cases. There would be assessment and inpatient beds for the frail elderly, as well as specialist rehabilitation. The number of intensive care beds currently on site would increase slightly, as would the number of emergency assessment unit beds.

There would also be a 24/7 A&E at West Cumberland Hospital along with acute medical inpatient services and rehabilitation. There would also be a small intensive care unit but some of the most seriously ill patients would be transferred to Carlisle if it was felt they would benefit from the extra support available there.

What impact would option 1 have?

- This option would have a minimal impact on access to care because the vast majority of care would continue to be delivered locally.
- It should also improve safety, quality outcomes and patient experience by ensuring care is delivered by well trained and well supported permanent staff working to best practice pathways.
- This option would have a positive impact on operating costs in the longer term but it would also involve a small amount of additional development cost.
- Delivery of this option is dependent upon the creation of a new workforce model for West Cumberland Hospital that involves the development of other clinicians (such as nurses) to take on acute care roles previously only performed by doctors. The creation of this new type of acute medical workforce would be a first in this country, and other areas would be looking to learn from our experiences.
Emergency and Acute Option 2

Option 2 involves a 24/7 A&E at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and acute medical inpatient services with extra capacity at night and for more complex cases. There would be assessment and inpatient beds for the frail elderly, as well as specialist rehabilitation. The number of inpatient beds and intensive care beds would increase, as would the number of emergency assessment unit beds.

At West Cumberland Hospital there would be a daytime only A&E service and a 24/7 urgent care centre which would see patients overnight with less serious injuries and conditions. Selected patients would be admitted by emergency ambulance and through referral from their GP during the day. There would be no intensive care unit at Whitehaven but there would be support from specialist clinicians for any very sick patients in order to provide immediate care prior to transfer. There would a number of assessment and in-patient beds including beds for the frail elderly who are medically stable and for rehabilitation.

What impact would option 2 have?

- This option would have a negative impact upon patients in West Cumbria who needed to access A&E services at night as they would need to travel to Carlisle.
- There is also a risk related to potential time delays and public confusion about the opening times and availability of different services.
- It should, however, improve safety and quality outcomes by ensuring care is delivered by well supported permanent staff working to best practice pathways.
- This option would have a more positive impact on operating costs than option 1 and no impact on capital requirements.
- This option would bring with it some moderate physical infrastructure and transport challenges, and would be reliant on improved patient flows at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle.

Emergency and Acute Option 3

Option 3 involves a significantly expanded 24/7 A&E at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle equipped to care for all West, North and East Cumbria patients brought in by emergency ambulance. It would also care for the majority of GP referrals. The number of emergency assessment unit, inpatient, and intensive care beds would increase to manage all acutely ill patients in this area. There would also be inpatient beds for the frail elderly, as well as specialist rehabilitation.

At West Cumberland Hospital there would be no A&E unit and no intensive care unit but there would be a 24/7 urgent care centre which would see patients with less serious injuries and conditions. The urgent care centre and outpatient services for those not requiring admission would be supported by specialist clinicians in the daytime but there would be no overnight care for acutely unwell patients. Medically stable frail elderly patients could be admitted as inpatients, and there would also be assessment services for the frail elderly along with rehabilitation beds.

This option would also require more paramedics and ambulances.

What impact would option 3 have?

- This option would have a significant negative impact on access to acute care for patients and their families living in West Cumbria. We estimate approximately 50 people a day would need to travel to Carlisle for treatment.
- It could, however, improve safety and outcomes across West, North and East Cumbria by consolidating the available staff and other resources.
- This option would have a significant positive impact on operating costs and affordability but would require some capital investment.
- This option would bring significant physical infrastructure and transport challenges.
PREFERRED OPTION

Our preferred option is Emergency and Acute Option 1, which sees the health and care economy implementing new ways of working to maintain 24/7 emergency and acute medical services at both West Cumberland Hospital and Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle. This option assumes a radically new way for staff to work together to deliver A&E, acute medicine and intensive care services at West Cumberland Hospital. It involves Advanced Clinical Practitioners and Physician Associates undertaking many clinical roles traditionally performed by doctors. This model builds upon experience gained at Whitehaven where the roles of some junior doctors are currently and successfully provided by other clinicians.

This option would allow services to be maintained in the west of the county and would help address the recruitment challenge described elsewhere in this consultation document. This new way of working would be at the leading edge of workforce development in the NHS.

This option is ambitious and not without difficulties and it may be necessary to make temporary adjustments to patient numbers at West Cumberland Hospital to ensure they can be safely managed by the available workforce but we believe that with the right support from academic and educational partners this option is achievable.

OTHER OPTIONS THAT WE BELIEVE ARE NOT POSSIBLE

We have explored the possibility of maintaining full A&E services in both Carlisle and Whitehaven without developing new ways of working but we believe this option is unsustainable for reasons detailed above in the case for change. This option did not pass the assessment hurdle criteria described elsewhere in this consultation document.
SUMMARY OF THE OPTIONS

The table below summarises which types of services will be delivered at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle (CIC) and West Cumberland Hospital (WCH) under each of the emergency and acute care options described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/7 Accident and Emergency</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime Only Accident and Emergency</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/7 urgent care centre</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very complex medical services</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency care for less complex cases</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and rehabilitation for frail elderly</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-up beds for the frail elderly</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient care</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can find out more about the options for emergency and acute care in West, North and East Cumbria by looking at the documents available on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk). In particular the Pre Consultation Business Case contains a lot of information about emergency and acute care.
Hyper-acute stroke services

HOW STROKE SERVICES ARE ORGANISED NOW

Currently patients with suspected stroke are assessed, treated for a blood clot if necessary, and admitted for acute care both at West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven and at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle. Patients also receive early rehabilitation on both sites.

Patients in the Carlisle can also receive early, intensive rehabilitation services that helps them to leave hospital more quickly and return to their own homes in order to maximise independence as quickly as possible after their stroke.

Outside of normal working hours CT scan images for patients with suspected stroke in both Whitehaven and Carlisle are reviewed remotely as part of our ‘telestroke’ arrangements with other hospitals.

THE CASE FOR CHANGE

Despite great strides in improving stroke services in West, North and East Cumbria they are still not as good as they should be. The care of stroke inpatients in both Whitehaven and Carlisle is provided in clinical areas not dedicated to stroke, services operate for just five days a week and it has proved very difficult to recruit more stroke specialists to extend the available service.

By 2020/21 the challenge will be even greater than it is now. It is estimated that the number of local stroke cases will have increased from an annual figure of approximately 600 admissions to more than 700.

Stroke services are measured against a set of national quality standards. We are not currently meeting a number of the highest standards for stroke care because we cannot recruit enough stroke specialists, we do not have dedicated stroke facilities and we cannot provide a full service seven days a week on two sites.

Nationally, across the country, the NHS is centralising immediate acute stroke care in well-resourced, specialist hyper-acute stroke units. The disadvantage of an increase in journey time for patients who live some distance from their nearest hyper-acute stroke unit is generally offset by the concentration of specialist skills and other resources, giving better access to assessment, diagnostics, initial treatment and aftercare.

OPTIONS

The options described below seek to address the fact that in West, North and East Cumbria we currently have thinly spread specialist stroke services duplicated across two sites and not operating seven days a week.
Hyper-Acute Stroke Option 1

Option 1 would largely maintain services as they are now but the service would be enhanced by ensuring improved, early supported discharge in both Carlisle and Whitehaven.

What impact would option 1 have?

- The current arrangements offer reasonable care for patients with stroke but not care which could be described as best practice and many elements only operate for part of the week.
- The service is currently reliant upon just two stroke consultants, one of whom is part-time. This makes the service highly vulnerable and it is highly unlikely that we would be able to replace either of these consultants – let alone expand the stroke service – with the current model which is increasingly considered to be out of date.

Hyper-Acute Stroke Option 2

Option 2 would see all acute stroke cases managed in a single hyper-acute stroke unit based at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle. Ambulances would take possible stroke patients direct to Carlisle. Patients arriving at West Cumberland Hospital by other means would be transferred by ambulance to Carlisle. On leaving the hyper-acute stroke unit patients resident in West Cumbria would be transferred to acute stroke and rehabilitation facilities at West Cumberland Hospital if further hospital care was needed. As with option 1 this service would be complemented by ensuring improved, early supported discharge in both Carlisle and Whitehaven.
What impact would option 2 have?

- Stroke patients throughout West, North and East Cumbria would be expected to significantly benefit from the establishment of a hyper-acute stroke unit. This would be complemented by rehabilitative and supportive stroke unit services (including speech and language therapy, occupational therapy and physiotherapy) along with multi-disciplinary teams on both sites, early supported discharge, ongoing rehabilitation and other after-hospital care services in community settings and people's homes.

- While a large number of people would benefit from this option there could be a very small number of people in West Cumbria – we estimate one or two a year – who would be affected by missing the time window for thrombolysis, but many more people in West Cumbria would gain from the existence of a hyper-acute stroke unit.

Preferred Option

An independent clinical review led by Professor Tony Rudd, National Clinical Director for Stroke, and involving members of the Northern England Strategic Clinical Network concluded that ‘hyper-acute stroke services should be centralised on one site’.

The key challenge for us is to create local stroke services that are sustainable in the future. This is far more likely to be achievable if we concentrate our resources for stroke assessment and treatment on one site rather than spreading them across two.

Clinicians and managers are acutely aware of the access issues this raises for patients who live a long way from Carlisle but after careful consideration we believe the Hyper-Acute Stroke Option 2 proposals provide the best possible care for patients in West North and East Cumbria with suspected stroke and that there will be a significant net gain for those living in all localities.

Other Options that we believe are not possible

We considered a model in which patients in West Cumbria who needed rapid treatment for a blood clot might receive that treatment, called thrombolysis, at West Cumberland Hospital prior to transfer to Carlisle. Such a model would not however meet current national requirements of stroke best practice and could compromise patient safety. Thrombolysis is itself a high risk treatment which carries a 1% death rate and a 3% risk of the patient experiencing a brain haemorrhage. Skilful patient management is therefore extremely important and it is essential to maintain the necessary medical and nursing skills for undertaking thrombolysis. This is easier to do within a hyper-acute stroke unit than elsewhere.

We also considered the development of a hyper-acute stroke unit in Whitehaven rather than in Carlisle. This was rejected chiefly because the additional services available at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle could provide extra support where this was required for the sickest patients and Carlisle is closer to specialist services in the North East which some patients might need to access.

You can find out more about stroke services in West, North and East Cumbria by looking at the documents available on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk).
Emergency surgery, trauma and orthopaedic services

HOW SERVICES ARE ORGANISED NOW

Trauma and Orthopaedics

Currently West Cumberland Hospital provides inpatient, day case and outpatient services for planned orthopaedic surgery. Fracture clinics are provided five days a week by trauma consultants. Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle provides a similar service but with seven day a week fracture clinics. It also manages the higher risk cases for all of West, North and East Cumbria and it undertakes all emergency orthopaedic operations along with weekend emergency assessment.

The previously agreed centralisation of emergency complex trauma and orthopaedic surgery at the Cumberland Infirmary in Carlisle took place in June 2013.

The decision to cease minor trauma operations, emergency admissions and the on-call service at West Cumberland Hospital was made in early 2014 on safety grounds. Since June 2014 there have been no minor trauma operations, emergency admissions, or out of hours assessment service at West Cumberland Hospital. Out of hours advice to A&E staff at West Cumberland Hospital is now provided by the orthopaedic team based at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle.

It is also important to note that more planned orthopaedic operations than ever before are now taking place at West Cumberland Hospital as surgeons work across both hospital sites to treat as many patients as possible locally.

Recently the NHS further increased the number of orthopaedic operations taking place in Whitehaven in order to fully utilise the state-of-the-art operating theatres in the new hospital which opened in October 2015.

General Surgery

Both West Cumberland Hospital and Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle provide planned inpatient, day case and outpatient services for patients with general surgery needs. However, all high risk cases are managed at the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle. As with trauma services it was agreed to centralise high risk emergency general surgery at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and complex planned surgery was centralised at the same time.

THE CASE FOR CHANGE

In the case of trauma and orthopaedics and general surgery we are considering the case for maintaining changes that have already been made, albeit temporarily. We are also considering some important potential further changes that will increase local emergency access for patients living in Copeland and Allerdale.

Trauma and Orthopaedics

When the majority of inpatient trauma services were moved to Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle it was intended to keep a smaller service at the Whitehaven site undertaking minor trauma procedures and with the ability to admit patients requiring non-surgical or very simple care. This was an attempt to ensure that patients in West Cumberland were treated as close to home as possible, to minimise travel for patients and relatives and to reduce the burden on the ambulance service.

However, review of these arrangements revealed problems with quality and safety so a decision was taken to cease minor trauma procedures and the admission of patients requiring non-surgical or very simple care. We have been monitoring the impact of this temporary decision. Since the decision has been made to change the trauma service, there is now far less need to use locum doctors, and the service is less vulnerable and more sustainable.
In 2013, a number of significant quality concerns were apparent in the small trauma service at West Cumberland Hospital. These included a lack of consultants with specific trauma expertise, difficulties in properly supervising locums, overseeing fracture clinics and reviewing admitted patients.

The re-organisation undertaken on safety grounds has allowed greater consultant input into the fracture clinics at West Cumberland Hospital, direct senior advice during the day into A&E and more effective expert trauma management at night.

Since putting in place the new arrangements monitoring of the service has shown an improvement in patient outcomes. Deaths as a result of all trauma have decreased – even for those communities in West Cumbria living furthest from the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle. Patient satisfaction levels have remained high.

The majority of trauma inpatients have hip fractures and we collect a lot of information about patients with hip fractures. As a result of the changes there have been some important improved outcomes:

- Deaths in patients suffering a hip fracture have reduced.
- The percentage of patients admitted within 4 hours has improved.
- More patients with broken hips are operated on within 36 hours.
- Patients are now looked after by a specific multidisciplinary hip fracture team and a specialist ‘orthogeriatric’ nurse and doctor.
- Rates of pressure ulcers have reduced.
- Lengths of stay for patients with broken hips have improved.

These achievements were recognised nationally in 2015 with North Cumbria University Hospitals NHS Trust becoming a finalist in the National Patient Safety Awards for the changes made in trauma services.

Although the major reason for reorganising these services was safety and quality, the changes have made it possible to provide services much more efficiently. The changes left very little trauma work at West Cumberland Hospital, with only one admission every three days and just three operations a fortnight on average.

General Surgery

There had previously been a number of serious incidents in relation to conditions generally considered to be routine and this highlighted the significant risks associated with emergency general surgery. This resulted in the changes described above.

The changes described above have reduced overall deaths relating to emergency general surgery. This is the case for the whole of West, North and East Cumbria and is true for those living in West Cumbria as well as for those living closer to Carlisle. In the National Emergency Laparotomy Audit for the past two years the Trust has performed amongst the best in the country for promptness of senior review of emergency patients, presence of consultant anaesthetists and surgeons during emergency surgery, and early recovery and discharge home after emergency surgery.
OUR PROPOSAL

We are proposing that the arrangements previously made on safety grounds are now made permanent BUT with some further changes which allow additional emergency surgery and trauma care to take place at West Cumberland Hospital. Specifically we are proposing:

- Additional minor trauma surgery will take place on some days each week at West Cumberland Hospital with any displaced planned surgery being managed in an additional weekly list at West Cumberland Hospital.

- Some non-complex day case general surgery is returned to West Cumberland Hospital including key-hole gall bladder operations, surgical treatment of abscesses, and investigation of abdominal pain (with key hole procedure if necessary).

- Single ‘Professional Point of Access’ communication arrangements are used to allow the referrer (often the patient’s GP) to discuss directly with the hospital based surgeon the best place to see and assess individual patients.

- Additional outpatient fracture clinics at West Cumberland Hospital.

This proposal has been demonstrated to result in better outcomes for patients, however, some patients will continue to have to go directly to Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle or be transferred there from West Cumberland Hospital.

A survey of patients who transferred between hospital sites in 2014 showed 85% of patients rated their experience of transfer as excellent, very good or good and 96% rating their care at the Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle excellent, very good or good.

This proposal would save the NHS nearly £500,000 a year through savings on temporary staff. This would be offset by a small cost of about £65,000 per year relating to the additional surgical list each week.

CONCLUSION

Some people might want to see much more emergency surgery and trauma provided at West Cumberland hospital in the way it was provided more than five years ago. We do not believe, however, that this is either sustainable in staffing terms or that it would deliver care that was acceptable to regulators and clinicians in terms of safety and quality. We are therefore consulting on making permanent the temporary changes described above.

You can find out more about emergency surgery, trauma and orthopaedic services in West, North and East Cumbria by looking at the documents available on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk).
How you can have your say

We welcome all responses to this consultation. You can respond by completing the questionnaire at the end of this document. Simply cut out the questionnaire, complete it and send it to: Freepost CUMBRIA NHS CONSULTATION.

There is no need to use a stamp. Please include this address on a single line without any other addressing details such as road, town or postcode. The address must be written using upper and lower case, exactly as above.

Alternatively you can visit the consultation website ( www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk ) where you can fill in the same questionnaire online.

Details of upcoming consultation activities, background documents and more information about this consultation can also be found on the consultation website.

If you would like to receive our regular, electronic consultation newsletter with updates on different activities please visit the consultation website, leave us your email address and we will add you to the mailing list.

What happens next?

This consultation will run for twelve weeks from 26 September 2016.

The responses received during the consultation will be analysed independently and a report will be presented to the NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group in early 2017. NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group and other local NHS organisations will consider the report before taking any decisions on service change. The independent report will be published.

In the spring of 2017, deliberating in partnership with other local NHS organisations and the NHS Northern England Clinical Senate, the Governing Body of NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group will then take a number of decisions on the matters detailed in this consultation document.

The decision making process will be assured by NHS England.
Appendix 1
Glossary

Services
Trauma and orthopaedic services – those concerned with injuries and conditions that affect the musculoskeletal system (the bones, joints, ligaments, tendons, muscles and nerves).

Orthogeriatric services – those that involve the care of older orthopaedic inpatients typically following a fractured hip. Orthogeriatrics was developed as a subspecialty to address the poor outcomes of hip fracture patients by caring for patients with the support of a specialist team.

Obstetric services – those concerned with childbirth and midwifery. Practiced by obstetricians and midwives.

Gynaecology services – those that deal with the functions and diseases specific to women and girls, especially those affecting the reproductive system. Practiced by gynaecologists.

Paediatric services – those that involve children and specific health issues, diseases and disorders related to stages of growth and development. Practiced by paediatricians.

Elective surgery – this is planned surgery that is scheduled in advance because it does not involve a medical emergency.

Care
Primary care – this is the advice, care and treatment people receive from their GP.

Community care – this is the care people receive close to home or in the home typically from health visitors, district nurses or physiotherapists.

Acute care – this is the branch of health care in which a patient receives active but short-term treatment for a severe injury or episode of illness, an urgent medical condition, or during recovery from surgery.

Antenatal care – this is the care women receive from healthcare professionals during pregnancy.

Postnatal care – this is the routine care women and their babies receive for 6–8 weeks after birth. It includes advice on breastfeeding and the management of common health problems in women and their babies after the birth.

Integrated health and social care – this is person-centred and properly co-ordinated care that brings together mental and physical health care along with health and social care. It is intended to ensure that health and social care services are not fragmented, confused, duplicated or delayed.
Maternity

Consultant-led Maternity Unit – a maternity unit that is staffed by a multidisciplinary team including midwives, obstetricians and anaesthetists. Care for women giving birth is often provided by midwives but doctors may be involved if needed.

Alongside Midwife-led Maternity Unit – alongside midwife-led maternity units are located close to consultant-led maternity units and are sometimes referred to as co-located units. Care in these units is provided by midwives.

Standalone Midwife-led Maternity Unit – standalone midwife-led maternity units are located away from consultant-led maternity units based in hospitals. Any woman who is giving birth in a standalone unit and who needs the support of a doctor would need to be transferred to a consultant-led unit by ambulance. Care in standalone units is provided by midwives.

Staff

Paramedic – an ambulance paramedic works predominantly out of hospitals dealing with medical emergencies. He or she may also deal with non-emergency tasks such as hospital admissions, discharges and transfers.

Advanced Paediatric Nurse Practitioner – this is a specialist children’s nurse who is trained to deal with more complex issues. Advanced paediatric nurse practitioners can take on work previously undertaken by junior doctors.

Advanced Clinical Practitioner – this is a clinician, typically a nurse, who has acquired the expert knowledge, complex decision making skills and clinical competencies to take on work previously undertaken by junior doctors.

Physician Associate – this is a health professional who supports doctors in the diagnosis and management of patients. A physician associate has post-graduate training and direct contact with patients. He or she may perform a number of tasks including taking medical histories, analysing test results and developing management plans.

Miscellaneous

Preventive healthcare – measures taken to prevent ill health rather than to treat ill health.

Thrombolysis – the administration of a clot-busting drug to try to disperse a blood clot and return blood supply to the brain. Typically administered to stroke patients.

Hyper-acute stroke unit – a unit where experts and equipment are brought together to provide rapid assessment and early treatment for stroke patients. They operate 24 hours a day, reducing death rates and long-term disability.

Integrated Care Communities – based upon natural communities of between 20,000 and 70,000 people Integrated Care Communities are groups of health and social care professionals working together to deliver properly co-ordinated care and to ensure services are not fragmented, confused, duplicated or delayed.
Appendix 2
Consultation Questionnaire

This questionnaire is in two parts. Part One concerns the options for service change described in this consultation document and Part Two concerns your personal circumstances. You are not obliged to answer the questions in Part Two but if you are able to do so it would help us to better understand the impact of any potential service changes upon different groups of people.

Could you please begin by giving us your postcode omitting the last two letters? For example, if your postcode is CA19 4QS, enter “CA194”; if it is CA28 7AA, enter “CA287”

My post code is: □□□□□

Part One

Question 1a – On page 18 of this consultation document we outline three options for the future provision of maternity services in West, North and East Cumbria including our preferred option. Please indicate in the boxes below the order in which you favour these options with your most favoured option ranked first (enter the number 1), your next most favoured option ranked second (enter the number 2) and your least favoured option ranked third (enter the number 3).

Maternity Option 1 □
Maternity Option 2 □
Maternity Option 3 □

Question 1b – Please tell us why you favoured your first option on maternity services. You may also wish to offer proposals of your own.
**Question 2a** – On page 24 of this consultation document we outline three options for the future provision of children’s services in West, North and East Cumbria including our preferred option. Please indicate in the boxes below the order in which you favour these options with your most favoured option ranked first (enter the number 1), your next most favoured option ranked second (enter the number 2) and your least favoured option ranked third (enter the number 3).

- **Children’s Option 1**
- **Children’s Option 2**
- **Children’s Option 3**

**Question 2b** – Please tell us why you favoured your first option on children’s services. You may also wish to offer proposals of your own.

**Question 3a** – On page 28 of this consultation document we outline four options for the future provision of inpatient beds in community hospitals in West, North and East Cumbria including our preferred option. Please indicate in the boxes below the order in which you favour these options with your most favoured option ranked first (enter the number 1), your next most favoured option ranked second (enter the number 2), your next most favoured option ranked third (enter the number 3) and your least favoured option ranked fourth (enter the number 4).

- **Community Hospitals Inpatients Option 1**
- **Community Hospitals Inpatients Option 2**
- **Community Hospitals Inpatients Option 3**
- **Community Hospitals Inpatients Option 4**

**Question 3b** – Please tell us why you favoured your first option on the future provision of inpatient beds in community hospitals. You may also wish to offer proposals of your own.
**Question 4a** – On page 33 of this consultation document we outline three options for the future provision of emergency and acute care in West, North and East Cumbria including our preferred option. Please indicate in the boxes below the order in which you favour these options with your most favoured option ranked first (enter the number 1), your next most favoured option ranked second (enter the number 2) and your least favoured option ranked third (enter the number 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency and Acute Option 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency and Acute Option 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency and Acute Option 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4b** – Please tell us why you favoured your first option on the future provision of emergency and acute care. You may also wish to offer proposals of your own.

**Question 5a** – On page 38 of this consultation document we outline two options for the future provision of hyper-acute stroke services in West, North and East Cumbria including our preferred option. Please indicate in the boxes below the order in which you favour these options with your most favoured option ranked first (enter the number 1) and your next most favoured option ranked second (enter the number 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyper-Acute Stroke Option 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyper-Acute Stroke Option 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 5b** – Please tell us why you favoured your first option on the future provision of hyper-acute stroke services. You may also wish to offer proposals of your own.
Question 6 – On page 41 of this consultation document we outline a proposal for the future provision of emergency surgery, trauma and orthopaedic services in West, North and East Cumbria. Please indicate below your views on our proposal for these services. You may also wish to offer proposals of your own.

Question 7 – Elsewhere in this consultation document we explain how the service change options described are to some degree interdependent and on page 12 we explain our wider health and social care strategy and our vision for the future. Please tell us what you think of our wider strategy and vision.

Question 8 – Do you have any other views you wish to share with us on the ideas described in this consultation document?
Part Two

We would like to understand more about you so that we can be sure we have received responses from the range of different people in our diverse community and so that we can better understand the background to your responses (for example, where you live in relation to your nearest hospital). You can help us by completing this part of the consultation questionnaire but completing this section is entirely voluntary.

**Have you read the consultation document?**  Yes ☐ No ☐

**What is your age?**  16-25 ☐ 26-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56-65 ☐ 66-75 ☐ 76+ ☐

**What is your gender?**  Male ☐ Female ☐ Prefer not to say ☐

**Is your gender different to that assigned to you at birth?**  Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to say ☐

**Are you married or in a civil partnership?**  Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to say ☐

**What is your sexual orientation?**

- Heterosexual ☐
- Gay woman/lesbian ☐
- Gay man ☐
- Bisexual ☐
- Prefer not to say ☐

If other, please write in:

---

**What is your religion or belief?**

- No religion or belief ☐
- Buddhist ☐
- Christian ☐
- Hindu ☐
- Jewish ☐
- Muslim ☐
- Sikh ☐
- Prefer not to say ☐

If other religion or belief, please write in:

---

**What is your ethnicity?**

Ethnic origin is not about nationality, place of birth or citizenship. It is about the group to which you perceive you belong. Please tick the appropriate box

**White**  English ☐

- Welsh ☐
- Scottish ☐
- Northern Irish ☐
- Irish ☐
- British ☐
- Gypsy or Irish Traveller ☐
- Prefer not to say ☐

Any other white background, please write in:
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups

White and Black Caribbean  White and Black African  
White and Asian  Prefer not to say  
Any other mixed background, please write in:

Asian/Asian British

Indian  Pakistani  Bangladeshi  Chinese  Prefer not to say  
Any other Asian background, please write in:

Black/African/Caribbean/Black British

African  Caribbean  Prefer not to say  
Any other Black/African/Caribbean background, please write in:

Other (please write in):

Do you consider yourself to have a disability or health condition?

Yes  No  Prefer not to say  
If you wish to give further information please do so here:
Do you have caring responsibilities? If yes, please tick all that apply

None ☐ Primary carer of a child/children (under 18) ☐
Primary carer of disabled child/children ☐
Primary carer of disabled adult (18 and over) ☐
Primary carer of older person ☐
Secondary carer (another person carries out the main caring role) ☐ Prefer not to say ☐

Are you currently pregnant? Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to say ☐

Do you have a child under 24 months? Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to say ☐

How do you think the options contained in this consultation document will particularly affect you?

How would you normally travel to your local NHS hospital?

own car ☐ on foot ☐ public transport ☐ taken by friend ☐ taken by relative ☐ other ☐

Please cut out your completed questionnaire and send it to:
Freepost CUMBRIA NHS CONSULTATION

There is no need to use a stamp.

Please write this address on a single line without any other addressing details such as road, town or postcode. The address must be written using upper and lower case, exactly as above.
This document is available in large print, audio and other languages on request.

Please contact us via the consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk) or write to us at The Consultation Team, NHS Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group, Lonsdale Unit, Penrith Hospital, Bridge Lane, Penrith, Cumbria CA11 8HX.
The Future of Healthcare in West, North & East Cumbria

The health and social care system in West, North and East Cumbria faces a number of major challenges. This consultation document describes these challenges and explains how some local services might need to change if we are to address these challenges.

You can read more about our wider strategy for health and care in West, North and East Cumbria in the documents available on our consultation website (www.wnecumbria.nhs.uk).
FEEDBACK TO CABINET ON VIEWS OF LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON SUCCESS REGIME PROPOSALS

ALLERDALE AND COPELAND LOCAL COMMITTEES

There are two bits of information that Members of Allerdale and Copeland Local Committee wish Cabinet to consider when drafting their response to the Success Regime:

1. The minutes from the presentation to Allerdale and Copeland Local Committee Members on 2nd November 2016 by the Success Regime on their consultation proposals
2. The key issues, questions, points of lobbying and suggested solutions that were not able to be raised on the 2nd November due to lack of time.

1. MINUTES

Members of Copeland Local Committee had been invited to attend the meeting for this item.

A presentation was given on Healthcare for The Future – Public Consultation by Stephen Childs, the Chief Executive of Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group and Dr Craig Melrose, Associate Medical Director for the Cumbria Partnership Foundation Trust, who worked for the Success Regime.

Mr Childs began the presentation explaining the differing roles of the Success Regime and Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group and then guided members through a number of slides which included information about the Consultation process, the big challenges that were facing Cumbria and how uncertainty was causing problems. He outlined the Vision for Cumbria and how services would be delivered through integrated care communities resulting in a financially and clinically stable service.

The potential service changes that were being consulted upon were Children’s services, Maternity services, community hospital inpatient beds, emergency and acute care and hyper acute stroke services and these were described in detail for the Committee, this included the preferred options for the County. Finally, the local NHS financial position and the future for West Cumberland Hospital were reported. During the presentation Mr Childs highlighted that a big challenge was attracting health professionals to west Cumbria which had led to the vision of Cumbria becoming a Centre of Excellence with a sustainable workforce with a good skills mix. He stated that although there was a £70 million deficit, finance wasn’t a driving force behind the proposed changes proposals would save £2.1 million per annum and went further than anything suggested in the past.

A member questioned why a holistic view had not been taken in the review of services; the Success Regime had been tasked with reviewing the health economy of Cumbria yet there had been no budget changes, staged options had not been discussed and reconfiguring the number of Trusts into one hospital which would have been viable within the stipulated timescale. It was questioned whether modelling had been undertaken in order to ascertain if savings could be made. Mr Childs responded, stating that a lot of work was taking place separate to the Consultation, for example with the financial deficit, which would be circa £163 million by 2020 but he did not think that the objective was to consolidate onto one
site. There was an intention to work to one budget as the view was that money was wasted with the local authority and health services working as separate entities and integrated care could lead to an accountable care system where working together would be more effective and efficient, making the Cumbrian pound go further and in an accountable system, all partners would be responsible for resources. It was confirmed by Dr Melrose that financial modelling had been undertaken, and that inefficiencies would be identified and the gaps closed. Mr Childs considered that the NHS funding formula did not recognise the needs of the Cumbrian dispersed population.

A member asked how services could be delivered using the A595 which he considered a road not fit for purpose, having recently been delayed in traffic along with two ambulances. Dr Melrose stated that even if the infrastructure was in place that the health issues (staffing in particular) would not disappear from west Cumbria and that patients’ needs would need to be met regardless of the road infrastructure; however this had been an important consideration at the outset of the services review.

It was highlighted that recruitment hadn’t been emphasised in the presentation as a major challenge; a member had grave concerns about the ability to manage and deliver services. Whether the use of helicopters had been considered in transferring patients was raised. Mr Childs advised that all modes of transport were being considered and Dr Melrose outlined the limitations of using helicopters for some transfers of patients. Mr Childs stated that recruitment was a fundamental issue in west Cumbria and that feedback had been obtained from Trust recruitment exercises and from staff who had left the Trust. Medical staff considered that a smaller flow of patients and low number of medical cases could result in a loss of their skills and high standards which were required by the Care and Quality Commission. There was a low number of call outs, less opportunities for specialisms and there were rota issues relating to the number of times staff had to cover an oncall duty system. Being based at a distance from local services was also an issue as was a lack of emphasis on training for staff. Mr Childs stated that these trends would need to be reversed in order to recruit a skilled and sustainable workforce.

Members highlighted that staff recruitment issues had been present for a number of years and questioned why this had not been resolved. Another member questioned how far the CQC report had impacted on the proposals and it was suggested that the proposals were financially driven. She explained bed blocking was taking place, patients were being redirected to other hospitals and that more than 104 beds were needed. Dr Melrose explained the reasoning behind identifying the configuration of community hospital inpatient sites; staffing sustainability had been reviewed in small hospital units and low staffing numbers caused issues in drafting rotas and also some of the hospital buildings required significant building work. He stated that if there were alternative ways of making the current sites viable then he would welcome suggestions during the Consultation process. He claimed that proposals were not financially driven, rather it was about delivering care for those in need and caring for people in their own homes, managing health in the community and supporting people to avoid health crises. He referred to ‘Hospital at Home’ in Carlisle where the number of people who could be cared for was doubled and care was given quicker therefore avoiding attending hospital. He suggested that hospital beds were not always the answer.

It was stated by one member that the Government should be informed that the funding formula for Cumbria was, and always had been incorrect, he commented on the potential need for hospital provision if there was an accident at Sellafield and that services were needed in west Cumbria.
The lack of reference to Risk Assessment in the proposals and the potential for staff who were not of qualified doctor status providing care in the 24/7 Accident and Emergency service was raised, in particular the lack of a consultant led maternity service at West Cumbria Hospital or confirmation of a consultant led Accident and Emergency facility. The member who raised these points felt that honesty was missing from the proposals and stated that if the maternity services were lost from West Cumbria Hospital, then Accident and Emergency would also be lost. She felt disappointed with the Success Regime and that there had been no innovative thinking in the proposals.

The future development at Moorside was raised by two members who asked whether there had been liaison with Sellafield and the Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership to discuss the future health needs of the 6,000 plus people who would move into the county to work at Moorside. It was stressed that changes to west Cumbria Hospital’s service provision should be made in the context of those expected 6000 people and their health needs. Mr Childs endeavoured to ascertain whether this liaison had taken place and check if the Moorside development was taken into consideration. He stated that there was a need for a fully functioning hospital at Whitehaven. A member stated that he understood that 8,000 people in the south of the county were from Millom and the assumption made by the Success Regime was that they would be covered by the Vanguard initiative. It was suggested that the residents of Millom were not keen to travel to the area covered by the Vanguard initiative, however Dr Melrose advised that from his experience from working around the county, Millom residents gravitated to Barrow for their health care. This was challenged by the member covering the area in question who stated that the majority of people preferred to travel north.

A number of members questioned whether the proposals had been rural proofed, whether the great number of tourists to the county who may require health care had been taken into consideration and if the requirement of nurses to travel to patients rather than being based in a hospital would be a barrier to recruitment. Dr Melrose informed members of the logic of a community hospital becoming a hub, explaining that this was happening in some community hospitals and that community nursing already operated on a hub and spoke model. The role for community beds was acknowledged, however there was a case for some patients being treated at home. Dr Melrose stated that he would welcome any suggestions for alternative options to be fed into the Consultation.

It was considered by one member that it would be difficult to obtain informed responses from the public. This was a particular issue for people in south Copeland as some were covered by the Vanguard initiative and others by the Success Regime which was leading to confusion. He felt that the consultation could be challenged due to a low level of understanding of the processes involved. Mr Child stated that he would endeavour to ensure that the different communities were identified in south Copeland to ensure that they had been captured within the consultation process.

A member who had previously been a non-Executive Director of the PCT commented that there should be a single health authority for Cumbria and asked for a comparison of management costs for the PCT and Cumbria CCG as he believed that the costs had significantly increased when staff had transferred into the CCG. Mr Childs advised that the management costs of the Cumbria CCG were two thirds of the management costs of the PCT and that the budget had been under-spent in 2015 with the remaining money being spent in the community.
Dr Melrose explained how West Cumbria maternity services would be configured and supported by staff under the proposals and how it was currently configured and staffed. This was in response to a member questioning whether there would be consultant led maternity care in west Cumbria and if there wasn’t a consultant led Accident and Emergency Service, whether this would be detrimental to the maternity service. Dr Melrose explained that because of recruitment problems, creative workforce planning was taking place.

In response to the proposals relating to strokes, a member questioned how bleeds and clots should be treated under the proposals for the hyper acute stroke services. The member who raised this issue explained the importance for early diagnosis and treatment after a stroke and how the time to travel to Carlisle for treatment would be a significant problem for patients in terms of them receiving a diagnostic CT scan and would also be in contradiction to clinical guidelines. Dr Melrose advised that evidence from research showed that a number of patients would not benefit from surgery and that the proposals in place offered the best medical care and follow up care such as speech therapy could be based locally. He advised that treatment within one hour was classed as gold standard. This was disputed by members.

Member’s attention was drawn to maternity figures outlined in the Consultation which differed to those included in the original proposal in the Business Case. Mr Childs offered to provide clarification to the Committee on the correct figures after the meeting.

The Chair thanked Mr Childs and Dr Melrose for their attendance at the meeting and advised that member’s concerns would be fed into the Consultation response from Cabinet.

2. KEY ISSUES WITHIN THE SUCCESS REGIME PROPOSALS INCLUDE:

- Concerns over the inequality of access to services and the impact the changes will have on low income or disabled families. These include problems around access to services due to increased travelling costs and expense of visiting family whilst in hospital, especially for parents of children in paediatrics and new mothers.
- It appears that despite Success Regime being set up to look at Sustainability and Transformation Propsals (STP) cost appears to be the primary focus of the proposed changes.
- The proposals rely heavily on a significant transfer of patients between the hospital sites. These will be undeliverable without significant investment in the ambulance service. The North West Ambulance Service (NWAS) currently appears to have a lack of capacity to deal with the rurality of the area, transport requirements and ambulance availability.
- The Travel information within the document is flawed. There is a difference between Transport vs Transfer which is not currently acknowledged. The document continually references Transport but is actually describing Transfer. This needs amended.
- Transport access to clinics, maternity, hospital for patients and visitors is different to NWAS emergency transfers and maternity requirements between hospital sites.
- Emergency surgery transport for trauma and minor trauma patients needs considered
- UCLAN and University of Cumbria both have current training provision in the area
- Waiting times at Accident and Emergency (A&E) has increased to 15,000 people waiting over 1 hour, where in 2013 it was only 3,000.
• The Success Regime consultation document identifies a potential increase in population with the proposal for a development at Moorside but the consultation proposals do not reflect the increased service requirements. It would seem appropriate to consider the needs and advantages to providing a Trauma service at West Cumberland Hospital over the duration of the major building works. Without these there is likely to be a negative impact on businesses (existing/start up) and restriction on Growth capacity for the area

• The document references that currently 8400 people in South Copeland choose to use Vanguard services. Local Members are aware that most people in the South of the borough actually choose to travel north to Whitehaven and this should be reflected in the transport times, usage of facilities and requirements of the availability of services.

Questions

1. The Success Regime is in place to look at how a sustainability and transformation Plan (STP), bringing together funding from local government and all health services, can deliver services in a more effective way for a rural area with two hospitals. The area currently hosts a number of different ‘trusts’ and managing organisations; Ambulance Trust, Acute Trust, Clinical Commissioning group, etc. The CCG are commissioned by the GP’s which in turn commission health services but GP’s are private providers. All of the trusts and organisations have their own management costs, HR costs, and policy processes. The options and proposals in this consultation appear to only provide tweaks to the current silos and separation of services rather than a fundamental shift. The current proposals will only provide £2.8m of savings. **Why is the Success Regime not looking at a fundamentally different operating model/s? Why not look to remove some of this duplication and look at creating one Health Trust incorporating and managing access to all services; Ambulances, CCG and Acute hospitals?**

2. With respect to linkages with community hospitals, **Are people getting the right treatment in the right place? Could different triage system be piloted through Nurse practitioners?** For example, when patients need to want referred to a consultant go to Nurse practitioner rather than GP

3. **The Success Regime is costing £6.4m but only looking to save £2.8m. Is this correct?**

4. Stroke services need to be different based on the type of Stroke – 15% are hemorrhagic (bleeds), 85% are Ischemic (clots), with a CT scan required within 1 hour. It would be quicker if stroke victims were given a CT scan at their closest hospital if thrombolysis (clot buster) is required on the spot. **What is the value of driving to Carlisle past a CT scanner if you have a haemorrhagic stroke? Why are there no proposals around a Treat and Transfer scenario?**

5. **With the transfer of services is there enough capacity at Carlisle and will Carlisle need to lose services to make room and if so which? If not will additional space be built for the additional services?**

6. **Capacity for paediatrics is already full at both Carlisle and West. How will these proposals impact on capacity?**
7. Why can Success Regime not remove/ separate out the PFI debt for the Carlisle Infirmary from these STPs?

8. Pg 15 of the document talks about a clear plan for oncology which requires capital funding and recurrent revenues needed – how robust is the plan?

9. Travel information refers to transfers, not transport. These are different. How are the Success Regime accounting for transport issues rather than the patient transfers?

10. Average transfer times are referenced in the document but this is misleading. If someone is living in Eskdale and needs to get to hospital it could take them an hour to get to Whitehaven before they then set off to Carlisle. Why does the Success Regime not acknowledge this in their consultation?

11. How many ambulances are sitting at Carlisle on a daily basis outside A&E?

12. How many ambulances that transfer patients to the NE return empty? Is there not a reciprocal service so ambulances are multi used?

13. How many ambulances sent to Carlisle with a transfer manage to get back to the West before they are sent to another call?

14. These proposals and changes are about being the best fit for the future, so why have medium term filters been applied?

15. Sellafield Sites Ltd has access to their own health centre but, due to insurance purposes, any incidents on site will always be transferred to WCH. With the proposed development at Moorside creating a large construction site with over 7200 workers a number of questions are raised;

   a. Has a consultant led A&E been considered to facilitate the development?
   b. Have discussion been undertaken with the developer over provision requirements to fulfil health cover to support a 24/7 work shift patterns for the development?
   c. Has the Success Regime ensured that the proposals and options recognise the impact of the additional 7200 workers on the current health services?

16. Will the 2nd stage of the West Cumberland build happen and if so when?

17. Where are the Palliative care proposals for Success Regime?

18. Government asks that services have been considered through ‘Rural Proofing’. How do these proposals measure against the Rural proofing agenda

19. What are the assumptions that are being made around ‘discharge planning’?

Potential opportunities for Lobbying
• This area is providing the growth potential and energy requirements for the nation. What discussions have the Success Regime had with NuGen and/or the LEP about the requirements for the Moorside development? Have the Success Regime had any discussion or coordination with the Moorside Strategic Development Group?

• Currently multiple ‘trusts’ exist in the area. Would there be merit in proposing a fundament shift in the operating models for a rural area like Cumbria and merge ‘trusts’ or create a new delivery model to pilot in Cumbria? For example merge Morecambe Bay Trust with North Cumbria Trust or create a new type of operating model which incorporates the hospitals, social care and ambulance services.

• With a major construction site based at Moorside over the next 10 years is it possible to lobby for a Trauma centre to be based here during the construction and build phase? If not how will the ambulance service ensure sufficient transport is accessible to deal with major incidents and/or moving injured construction staff to either the NE or NW trauma centres which are 2.5 hours away?

• In line with the Rural proofing agenda could a system be piloted where newly trained health staff are required to undertake a ‘rural employment probation period’ of c 2years before being allowed to choose where they locate?

Possible Solutions to propose to the Success Regime

• The benefits in either a PFI buy out or separation of the PFI debt from the current budget for services in the area.

• Opportunities to work with the private sector to provide a consultant led A&E or trauma centre to deal with a major construction site.

• Reduce duplication in management and silo working/thinking by merging the variety of ‘trusts’ operating in the area. Mention has been made that this could be through the ‘Integrated Care Communities’ but clarity is required on this model.
FEEDBACK TO CABINET ON VIEWS OF LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON SUCCESS REGIME PROPOSALS

EDEN LOCAL COMMITTEE

The following councillors were in attendance:

Miss HJ Fearon (Chair)    Mr N Hughes
Mr M Stephenson (Vice-Chair)  Mrs M Robinson
Mrs O Bateman         Mr G Strong
Mrs PA Bell            Mr T Wentworth Waites

At Eden Local Committee on the 30 November, councillors received a presentation from Debbie Freake, Director of Strategy for North Cumbria University Hospital NHS Trust on the Success Regime ‘Healthcare for the Future’ Public Consultation.

Following this presentation and the question and answer session that followed, Eden Local Committee would like to submit the following views into Cumbria County Council’s response to the consultation.

Eden Local Committee notes and supports the vision behind this consultation of keeping people fit, healthy and out of hospital via closer collaboration between health and social care services and encouraging people to take better care of themselves. However, the Local Committee is unconvinced around the proposals that are expected to enable this and does not have enough information to be sufficiently satisfied that this can be achieved.

The Committee is deeply concerned about proposals to reduce the 133 community hospital inpatient beds which are currently spread across 8 community hospitals and at the inpatient unit at West Cumberland Hospital in Whitehaven. Specifically in Eden, this impacts community hospitals in Penrith and Alston.

This concern is further compounded by the intended reduction of inpatient beds at Cumberland Infirmary Carlisle and West Cumberland Hospital from around 600 today to around 500 by 2020/21 – a move that would surely place further demand on community beds.

Based on the current evidence presented, Eden Local Committee objects to the removal of inpatient beds at Penrith and Alston Community Hospitals.

It is predicted that Eden will be disproportionately affected by aging population. By 2039, Eden will be the 21st out 326 authority areas in terms of having the greatest proportion of elderly people as a percentage of the population. As inpatient beds at these hospitals are for people who need medical, nursing, rehabilitation and end of life care but who do not need the services provided by an acute hospital, this increasingly elderly population would be expected to have greater demands on these beds, not less.

Furthermore, Eden is Cumbria’s largest district in terms of area but least populated meaning that our residents are spread across the district and often live in quite isolated, rural and difficult to reach areas. This is certainly the case in Alston, which currently hosts a community hospital which is not included in any of the proposals to retain inpatient beds.
While the consultation exercise claims that no decisions have yet been taken and nothing is predetermined, the fact that there are no options under consideration that involve community beds within Alston would suggest otherwise.

At 1000ft above sea level, Alston is extremely isolated, and it is therefore vital that a community service is maintained. The local committee is aware that discussions are ongoing with the community around this and that some concepts are now being modelled – this is very much welcomed. However, it is disappointed that such proposals were not included in the options proposed for consultation.

Historically, community hospitals have supported the full range of health and care services – including maternity and end of live care. They have always been and remain an important part of the community support network. Accepting that care services, and technologies, have clearly moved on, the Committee would urge that this in borne in mind when considering the future role of these services.

Furthermore, with the vision of a hyper-acute stroke services being centralised at one site and creating local stroke services that are sustainable in the future, it would seem counter intuitive that this can be achieved with fewer community beds.

The local Committee notes the ongoing work around Integrated Care Communities (ICCs) and accepts the need for groups of health and social care professionals working together to deliver properly co-ordinated care and to ensure services are not fragmented, confused, duplicated or delayed.

The Committee welcomes moves to help more people lead healthy and active lives whilst enabling more people to remain independent for longer. Furthermore, the Committee is delighted to hear about the need to work closely with communities as part of this however, the Committee remains unclear how this will work.

The ICCs are described as being based upon clusters of GP practices and the Committee would question whether this goes deep enough into a local level. Alston represents a clear example of where local need may be quite different to other parts of the ICC cluster.

Health service transport is another example of an area which will have quite different requirements depending on locality. The Committee notes the ongoing activity of a working group within this area and looks forward to hearing how outputs will support the geography of the district.

The committee would also seek further clarification as to how this cluster system would impact GP surgeries that cross current ICC boundaries such as Brampton and High Hesket.

The Committee welcomes the stated objective of the ICC in supporting carers in their role. However, with increasing numbers of more elderly residents, many of whom have no such support, the committee remains concerned that community beds may be removed before more local support networks and services can be provided.

The Committee would also like to feedback that it feels that the communication around this consultation could have been better.
The information available currently is somewhat complicated to understand. The public want to know that, if needed, they can be treated close to home, and that the access to this care is simple and easy to understand. An understanding of this has been lacking.

Feedback from local communities has been negative and the perception has been one of “done to” rather than “done with”.
What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. This report summarises the key elements of an Inclusion Strategy intended to update the 2002 Inclusive Cumbria policy. The paper and strategy identify key changes in the pattern of need presented by children with Special Educational Needs and sets out policy proposals to meet these needs within Cumbria.

Recommendation of the Corporate Director

2. That Cabinet adopt the Inclusion Strategy as the Council’s key strategic policy for delivering an inclusive education system over the next five years – Option A.

3. Cabinet approve the commencement of consultations on school organisational changes required to deliver proposals to deliver the objective of the strategy amending provision to meet need. These being specifically:

   - The consultation to provide a new model of resourced provision with a focus on meeting the needs of children with autism.
   - The review of governance of Pupil Referral Units and the delivery of an expanded remit to support a wider Alternative Provision offer.
   - Consultation which maybe required with schools and communities to develop a co-location model for special school provision.

Background to the Proposals

4. In 2002 Cumbria County Council adopted a strategy entitled Inclusive Cumbria which outlined the Council’s approach to meeting the needs of children with Special Educational Needs. Since 2002 much has changed and the Inclusion Strategy seeks to update Inclusive Cumbria to recognise the changed environment and to set a direction for the next five years in delivering services to meet the needs of children with Special Educational Needs.

5. Through the last 14 years much has changed in relation to special educational needs. In September 2014 a new legislative framework was put in place to assess and meet the needs of children identified with Special Educational
Needs most notably the change from statements of SEN to the new Education Health and Care Plans, however the biggest change within the legislation was the culture in which assessment and provision was undertaken placing more emphasis on joint, partnership assessment and family involvement in planning.

6. Over the same period of time there has been a significant change in the needs of children with special educational needs. This change in need has not been reflected in the balance of provision available in the County and the Inclusion Strategy focuses on some of the key areas of change needed in an attempt to rebalance that provision.

7. More recently the educational environment in which children’s needs are met has been reshaped. The advent of academies and free schools means that the school estate is now more varied in terms of governance and the way in which the local authority interacts with that varied estate has also had to evolve. The Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders is a local response to this changing landscape and seeks to deliver high quality educational outcomes collectively in Cumbria.

8. Finally the financial background for schools and the local authority has fundamentally altered combined with additional SEN pressures felt across all budgets, most recently highlighted by the growing pressure on the Dedicated Schools Grant High Needs Block. The strategy is a key component of the plan to ensure that following Schools Forum recommendations to address the immediate budget pressures changes in provision and practice ensure that the High Needs Block operates as a balanced budget in the future.

9. The Inclusion Strategy seeks to outline the Councils approach to special educational needs in three broad domains:
   - Available provision more closely matching need.
   - Greater capacity and effectiveness in assessing and meeting need.
   - Improved outcomes which place children and families at the centre.

10. Provision changes in the strategy focus on the areas where there is a divergence between need and provision. The first area is in resourced provision. Schools designated as resourced provision receive additional funding to develop expertise and to build capacity to meet the needs of children in a specific category of need. The single greatest need is autism and the strategy proposes to develop collaboratives of schools to act as resourced provision for autism taking advantage of economies of scale and ensuring a spread of provision. This would require public consultation with existing resourced provision schools.

11. One potential outcome of this consultation is that other types of resourced provision cease to be funded. Continuing provision for children with severe and profound needs is discussed below. Case study evidence shows that for profoundly deaf children the most effective response is to utilise the specialist teachers of the deaf to support a local school meet needs. Physical/medical needs are increasingly met within a child’s local school as the Council supports investment in making the school estate more accessible.
12. The second area of provision change relates to the Social Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health category of need. This area has seen a growth in the challenge and complexity of presenting children where their underlying SEN presents through their behaviour. This group of children require a bespoke and supportive curriculum offer to meet their needs, this is referred to as Alternative Provision. The strategy seeks to develop a robust model of Alternative Provision to meet these pupils needs which ensures that the local school community retains responsibility for learners as they are supported through additional provision in the Pupil Referral Units.

13. Cumbria’s Special Schools are highly expert in meeting the needs of children with severe, profound and complex learning needs. As pupil needs have changed the demand for special school places has risen. The strategy proposes to expand the influence that the special schools can have on the whole educational environment and increase the number of places accessing a special school curriculum by exploring models of co-location which offer the potential to replace severe learning designated resourced provision and to provide for a mixed mainstream, special school curriculum.

14. Enabling our special schools to expand into co-located settings is one way in which the strategy would support capacity building. In addition the strategy proposes a more focussed approach to capacity building through the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders which includes sharing good practice and ensuring that schools have access to clear pathways of support for children identified as having SEND.

15. The review of provision and the building of capacity are essential elements in delivering better outcomes for our children with special educational needs and disabilities. This will also be supported by continuing to develop more effective child centred assessment, ensuring that families have a meaningful input into service delivery and significantly improving the quality of jointly commissioned services.

16. The Strategy was presented to the Board of Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders (CASL) on 14 November 2016 and was endorsed by the Board. The Strategy if adopted by Cabinet will be reflected in the CASL plan inclusion priority.

17. On 17 November the Children and Families Scrutiny Board considered and endorsed the strategy. The views of scrutiny members are reflected in the strategy. Scrutiny will welcome the opportunity to review the progress in implementing the strategy.

18. The strategy is presented to Cabinet as a proposed policy statement which retains core principles of inclusion, recognises the changes in the educational and local government environment of the last 14 years and takes a multi layered approach to meeting the needs of our most vulnerable learners.
Options Considered and Risks Identified

Option (a)
- To adopt the Inclusion Strategy in full supporting activity across all key areas identified, - provision, capacity building and improved outcomes. By seeing to affect change across the three areas identified practice and provision will develop together reinforcing improved outcomes.

Option (b)
- That some elements of the strategy are adopted. This may be any one or two of the key strands.

Option (c)
- To determine not to adopt any of the Inclusion Strategy.

Risks – A decision to not adopt any of the Inclusion Strategy risks continued working within a model of provision which does not meet current need and is likely therefore to disadvantage children.
- If the provision changes (subject to consultation) in the Strategy are not adopted there will continue to be pressure on the Dedicated Schools Grant High Needs Block and County Council budgets from reliance on independent specialist provision.
- Adoption of new provision without a focus on building system wide capacity and focussing on outcomes risks that provision being utilised inappropriately.

Reasons for the recommendation/Key benefits
- The Inclusion Strategy proposes an rebalancing of provision to match patterns of need combined with changes in practice to support the supporting principles.
- Adoption of the Inclusion Strategy is a key element in the plan to address the budget pressures within the High Needs Block.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?
19. Funding for pupils with SEND is from the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant, with contributions from children’s social care budgets and the health service where these reflect the type of need.
20. The School and Early Years Finance Regulations define funding rates for each type of high need place. Place funding for resource provision, alternative provision and special schools is set at £10,000 per place plus pupil-specific top ups depending on the requirements set out in any Education and Health Care Plan. The revenue place funding and top ups for these places would be funded from the high needs block.
21. In terms of capital expenditure, it is expected that minimal costs are required to reshape resource provision and to support the co-location of special schools as existing sites can be utilised. The capital funding required for the development of alternative provision is yet to be determined. If this strand of the inclusion strategy is approved, this will be put forward to Council in February as a scheme for approval in the capital programme.

22. In terms of capital funding sources, the Department for Education (DfE) announced in its stage one consultation on a national funding formula for schools (March 2016) that £200m of capital funding would be available to support the expansion of existing SEND provision. The details of this are expected to be announced later in 2016-17. The financial savings from the proposals set out above would mainly be within the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant. The projected overspend on the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (further detail set out below) mean that the savings from the proposals would be required to reduce this and would not be available to fund prudential borrowing costs.

23. The high needs block overspent by £3.263m in 2015-16 and this annual overspend is projected to increase in future years as set out in the table below. Any overspends on the Dedicated Schools Grant are transferred into the Dedicated Schools Grant reserve at the end of each financial year. The Dedicated Schools Grant reserve ended the 2015-16 financial year with a deficit balance of £1.191m which is projected to increase, due to high needs, to £6.364m, if no intervention is made. Where the DSG overspends by 2% in-year, the Council is required to provide an explanation and details of a repayment plan to DfE. The Schools Forum has consulted schools on a range of proposals to address the projected high needs overspends and the proposals for changes in provision presented in this report would contribute towards this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>High Needs Block Budget</th>
<th>Projected Net Expenditure</th>
<th>Projected Overspend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>£33.863m</td>
<td>£37.125m</td>
<td>£3.263m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>£34.941m</td>
<td>£41.348m</td>
<td>£6.407m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>£34.941m</td>
<td>£43.518m</td>
<td>£8.578m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>£34.941m</td>
<td>£44.115m</td>
<td>£9.174m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. The Council awaits the publication of the government’s second stage consultation on school and high needs funding reform, the changes to which are expected to be implemented from April 2018. The first stage consultation (March 2016) proposed a change to how each local authority’s High Needs Block is calculated (moving to a formula basis) and therefore information on any changes to the quantum of funding available in Cumbria’s High Needs Block from 2018-19 onwards is awaited.
Legal Aspects – What needs to be considered?

25. The legal duties of the Council in respect of children and young people with special educational needs are numerous, but the most pertinent issues to consider in relation to the decision as to whether to adopt the Inclusion Strategy in full or in part are–

(a) Joined up working between education, social care and health is a requirement under section 25 of the Children and Families Act 2014 (CAFA) and the Council has the duty to ensure that the provision is integrated and effectively coordinated. Therefore, it is crucial that, as the Inclusion Strategy proposes, arrangements for joint commissioning and assessment are strengthened. As per section 37 of CAFA the Council is responsible for the preparation and maintenance of Education, Health and Care plans (EHCPs). This means that any joint working arrangements with health and other outside agencies need to be robust, so that the Council can effectively maintain control and fulfil its obligations.

(b) Under section 42 of CAFA the Council is obligated to secure the provision detailed in the EHCP. Comprehensive change to the provision on offer is suggested by the Inclusion Strategy, including the expansion of the offer for autism, restructuring of resourced provision and co-locational opportunities for special schools. It will be important that continuity and availability of provision is ensured during the restructuring process. It is noted that consultation is to be carried out and interested parties will be involved in the process. However, if the resultant changes trigger the need for children/young people to be moved from their current provision into new provision then there is a risk that this will be challenged by families through the legal process. Challenges could be brought through the Special Educational Needs and Disability Tribunal on the basis that the placement (or change of placement) suggested by the Council is not agreed. Alternatively, families may seek to challenge the decisions made through the judicial review process. Schools may object to the changes if it they impact on their funding streams. Further, if the restructure necessitates staffing changes then there will be employment law considerations to take into account.

(c) It is noted that part of the vision of the Inclusion Strategy is to recognise that “children thrive most within their own family and local community including access to learning with peers in their nearest school. Where this is not possible provision to meet needs should be as close to the child’s home community as possible to support family and social life”. From a legal point of view the emphasis of CAFA and the accompanying guidance is that each child and young person should be approached on an individual basis and assessed and provided for accordingly. Whilst for many children and young people provision as close to home as possible will be appropriate, for others it will not. The Council needs to ensure that a blanket approach is not applied without due consideration of the individual circumstances of each service user. The choice of the parents and/or young person is
paramount when it comes to deciding which is the preferred educational placement. When an EHCP is being put in place if a child’s parent or a young person makes a request for a particular nursery, school or post-16 institution, for the majority of cases the preferred placement should be named in the Education, Health and Care plan. The Council’s stated intention to have provision as close to a child’s home as possible may not be the preferred solution for all families. Flexibility of approach is required.

(d) A further strand of the current approach to special educational needs is that, as per section 49 of CAFA, parents and young people should be offered a personal budget if appropriate. The Inclusion Strategy as drafted does not address in detail how this element of the new system will dovetail into the Council’s proposals. Presumably the new and altered provision as set out in the Inclusion Strategy will form part of the local offer which families can buy into. However, families may look to use provision other than the provision envisaged by the Inclusion Strategy and it should be clear how this will be facilitated. If the use of personal budgets is unduly restricted by the Council this may trigger legal challenge.

(e) The Inclusion Strategy proposes involvement from CASL (and its subsidiary LASLs) when capacity building and ensuring improved outcomes. The legal duties for special educational provision rest with the Council and therefore any agreements between the Council and CASL and/or its subsidiary LASLs need to rigorous, so that the Council can be confident that tasks allocated to CASL are being carried out and legal obligations are being met. Council involvement on CASL’s board needs to be formalised and appropriate oversight and safeguards need to be put in place before statutory functions are outsourced.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

27. To safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment and can fulfil their potential as a council we will:

- Support the work of the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders to deliver continuous school improvement.

What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

28. The Inclusion Strategy outlines the principles underpinning the delivery of education to Cumbria’s most vulnerable learners and proposes changes in provision to improve educational opportunity for these learners.
Appendices and Background Documents

Appendix 1 – Inclusion Strategy

Key Facts

Electoral Division(s): All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Decision</th>
<th>Key Decision Included in Forward Plan</th>
<th>Exempt from call-in</th>
<th>Exemption agreed by scrutiny chair</th>
<th>Considered by scrutiny, if so detail below</th>
<th>Environmental or sustainability assessment undertaken?</th>
<th>Equality impact assessment undertaken?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved by Cabinet Member (please state date) 30 November 2016

Previous relevant Council or Executive decisions

Consideration by Overview & Scrutiny

Scrutiny were introduced to the Inclusion Strategy at the meeting on 18 October and further detailed consideration was undertaken by a group of members on 17 November 2016.
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1. Foreword

Cumbria has a strong record of inclusive education and continues to be committed to meeting the needs of the County’s most vulnerable learners as close to their home communities as is possible. In the years since the launch of Inclusive Cumbria the needs of children in the County have changed and in order to ensure that we continue to be able to meet the needs of learners we need to develop our provision. That development takes place in the context of a new legislative framework for the delivery of education for children with special educational needs and a strong collaborative of all those concerned for the delivery of high quality education embodied in the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders.

This strategy sets out proposals to enhance and improve our inclusion arrangements and will be delivered in conjunction with our partners. It builds on positive change in the education system in Cumbria over the last five years including the enhanced access to schools, the quality of our specialist services and schools and the strong leadership of the education system through the Cumbria Alliance. Developing new provision to meet current needs is at the core of the strategy but we know there are other areas we can improve on and the strategy also focuses on these as core activities including building capacity of all our schools to meet children’s needs and ensuring that we work more effectively with our partners and families.

We will keep the strategy under review as the needs of the County’s children change ensuring that in the future our approach to inclusion is dynamic and flexible recognising that children change and their needs change. At the heart of this approach is our ambition to ensure that we deliver the best education possible for all our children.
2. Introduction

All Cumbria’s children and young people deserve the best possible start in life and to benefit from the opportunities that living in the county presents. This means that they grow up in loving and supportive families, have positive educational and social experiences, and go on to meet their potential.

To meet our ambition for children and young people we have set a challenging agenda for improvement through the Cumbria Children and Young People’s Plan, the Children’s Improvement Plan and the Cumbria Alliance of Systems Leaders planning framework.

This ambition includes those children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities. Cumbria should rightly be proud of its record of delivering an inclusive education system which meets the needs of all its learners. There remains much to be proud of including our special schools, specialist teaching teams and inclusive practice in all Cumbria’s schools.

Despite this, there is more we need to do to continue to improve services for children and young people with SEND and to support their families and carers. The environment in which we operate has changed considerably since the original Inclusive Cumbria Strategy was agreed in 2002. This has meant the provision available for children and young people has not kept up with the changing environment and demands. In particular we need to have in place a long term strategy to address:

- The changes introduced by The Children and Families Act (2014), reformed the way support for children with special educational needs is provided;
- The changed needs profile of children being assessed as in need of additional support to meet their special educational needs;
- The governance arrangements across the schools of Cumbria which has changed over the past five years, with the development of academies and free schools;
- The significant changes to financial environment of schools and the County Council.

Inclusive Cumbria (2016-21) sets out the roadmap for how we will address these challenges, while continuing to improve the life chances of all children who are SEN.

3. Our Vision, Principles and Priorities

Vision for inclusion

Children, young people and their families should expect Cumbrian educators to deliver the best available provision to meet a child’s needs. This will be actively supported by all other agencies interested in the wellbeing and achievement of children particularly the health and care agencies.
We recognise that children thrive most within their own family and local community including access to learning with peers in their nearest school. Where this is not possible provision to meet needs should be as close to the child’s home community as possible to support family and social life.

**Principles for inclusion**

The following principles underpin our approach to inclusion:

- Learning provides the basis that enables people to participate fully in everyday life;
- All children should experience equality in access to high quality learning that meets their learning needs and can address any requirements relating to social background, culture and ethnicity;
- Inclusion is a collaborative activity which requires the engagement of children, families and providers;
- Inclusive values develop and evidence respect for difference, tolerance and understanding;
- All learners should be respected and valued and be able to access learning which offers the appropriate challenge and support;
- Cumbria’s learning providers will meet the needs of children and young people as close to their home communities as possible;
- Early identification of need and intervention to meet this need is the most effective way of ensuring that children and young people achieve;
- Inclusive education should support children and young people make progress towards their potential and assist them in meeting their aspirations;
- Effective inclusion is a shared responsibility which requires the agreement of learners, families and providers, including health education and social care who must engage with the underpinning policy and legislative framework.

**Priorities for inclusion**

The priorities for Inclusive Cumbria are based on a number of challenges and gaps in current provision. The key challenges are set out below:

- The need to further develop the specialism within mainstream schools in meeting the needs of children with SEND;
- Provision for children with autism lacks breadth and is inconsistently available across the County;
- A lack of alternative provision for children and young people presenting with challenging behaviours due to underlying SEND;
- An over reliance on external placements in independent provision for young people with Social, Emotional and Mental Health Needs;
- Gaps in health provision for children and young people with SEND, particularly in supporting their continuing health care needs and mental health;
- Further development of joint working between agencies to meet needs;
- Challenges of rurality are not always addressed, especially in relation to children with severe and profound needs;
- Some cases where children are still waiting too long for assessment of their needs;
- Educational progress of children with SEND needs to improve further;
- Joint commissioning is not as effective as it should be in developing and delivering services for children and young people with SEND;
- Parents and carers role is underdeveloped in the development of service models.

In response to these challenges the following priorities will drive the implementation of Inclusive Cumbria:
1. To review the model of resourced provision across the county to ensure the needs of autistic children can be met equitably;

2. To develop alternative provision and associated specialist provision for children and young people with behavioural, social, emotional and mental health needs;

3. To expand the opportunity for Cumbria’s special schools to enhance the provision for children with severe and profound needs and to support access to a wider curriculum for a larger number of children;

4. To develop a model of provision which addresses the challenge of equity and rurality in the county;

5. To work with the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders to improve outcomes for children with SEND and build capacity within Cumbria’s settings, schools and colleges;

6. To develop joint commissioning arrangements to ensure that children and particularly children with SEND are at the heart of commissioning decisions;

7. To work through enhanced joint commissioning arrangements that address gaps in health and care provision;

8. To further develop our approaches to assessment to ensure that statutory assessments are all completed within timescale;

9. To establish structures which allow parents and carers a meaningful voice in service development.

4. The National and Cumbria Context

National context


The Children and Families Act (2014) includes provision for the replacement of the Statement of Special Educational Needs with a Section 139a Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) for children with special educational needs. EHCPs differ from statementing in that they are:

- More person centred with greater engagement and involvement from parents, carers, children and young people in the process;
- More co-ordinated in terms of the assessment process across education, health and care services;
- Focusses on outcomes to be achieved for each child/young person;
- Runs from birth to age 25;

The legislation applies equally to all schools including academies and free schools, and national data shows that the percentage of children in primary or secondary academies with a statement is similar to locally maintained schools.\(^1\)

The revised new SEND Code of Practice came into force on 1st April 2015, and sets out four areas of Special Educational Need (SEN):

- Communicating and interacting – for example, speech, language and communication difficulties which make it difficult for a child to understand language or communicate effectively with others;
- Cognition and learning – for example, where a child learns at a slower pace than

\(^1\) National statistics on SEND and EHCPs are available on: [https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-special-educational-needs-sen](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-special-educational-needs-sen)
others their age, has difficulty in understanding parts of the curriculum, or with memory or other cognitive tasks. Sometimes they may have a specific difficulty affecting one particular part of their learning such as in literacy or numeracy;

- Social, emotional and mental health difficulties – for example, where a child has difficulty in their relationships with other people, they may be are withdrawn, or act in ways that have an effect on their health and wellbeing, and learning (or on other children’s);
- Sensory and/or physical needs – for example, a child with visual and/or hearing impairments, or a physical need that means they must have equipment and/or additional ongoing support.

The Equality Act (2010) defines a disability as ‘a physical or mental impairment which has a long-term (a year or more) and substantial adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.’ This includes, for example, sensory impairments such as those that affect sight and hearing, and long-term health conditions such as diabetes or epilepsy.

While some children who have SEN may also have a disability, not all children with SEN are defined as disabled under the Equality Act. Likewise, and not all children who are defined as disabled will have SEN. For example, pupils with severe asthma or diabetes may not have special educational needs but will have rights under the Equality Act. When addressing its provision of support for children who are SEN, a school still needs to consider its wider Public Sector Equality Duty.

**National trends:** One of the main trends since 2010 has been the overall rise in the numbers of pupils who have a Statement of Special Needs and an EHCP. The largest increases have been among people aged 5-10 and 16-19.

There has been a particular increase in the numbers of children with an assessment of autism and who have an EHCP relating to their Social, Emotional and Mental Health needs. This trend looks set to continue.

**National policy issues:** The changes introduced in the Children and Families Act has had implications for local authorities. Under the Act it is the local authority’s duty to:

- Identify all children and young people who have or may have SEN and/or disabilities in their geographical area;
- Carry out an EHCP needs assessment to identify needs and provision to meet those needs;
- Ensure that the educational provision is then made;
- Cover any resources that the educational establishment is unable to meet (this could be in terms of finances, skills, staffing or equipment);
- Cover any aspects of the EHCP that fall under a local authority’s social care responsibilities.

All health aspects of the EHCP are the responsibility of the Clinical Commissioning Group. This continuing statutory role has to be set against a more complex environment in which education is being provided. Most particularly the mix of locally maintained schools, academies and free schools in a local area requires effective leadership and partnership to make sure that there is consistency in relation to:

- The type of provision, and the policy goals to pursue (i.e. on mainstream provision, closeness to home and investment in pooled or dispersed resources);
- Addressing any budgetary impacts in relation to the High Needs budget;
- Effective partnerships with health services and school leaders, supported by the local authority.
These structural complexities cannot be seen in isolation from the overall increases in numbers being accessed for an EHCP and in the profile of need towards autism and Social, Emotion and Mental Health.

**Cumbria context: general overview**

**Population:** On 1 September 2016 2644 children and young people in Cumbria had an Education Health and Care Plan and just over 10,000 children had an identified Special Educational Need which was supported by their school.

**Assessments:** Cumbria performs favourably in relation to the 20 week timescale for the statutory assessment of children with SEND. In the academic year 2015 69.3% of assessments were within the statutory timescales which compared to 58.2% for the North-West and 59.2% nationally. Our performance is projected to improve to 80.9% for the academic year 2016.

**Attainment:** Progress and attainment of children with SEND has been inconsistent over time at all stages of development. Broadly, pupils with EHCPS have achieved in line with their peers nationally but those with SEN supported by school have not achieved as well as their peers.

**Exclusions:** There were eight permanent exclusions of children with an Education Health and Care Plan in 2015/16. There was a declining trend in the number of children with SEN who were subject to a fixed term exclusion. Attendance at school by children with SEND is better in Cumbria than for their peers nationally.

**Special Schools:** There are five special schools in the County, three across Barrow and South Lakeland, one in Allerdale and Copeland and one in Carlisle and Eden. These schools offer a total of 500 places. There is acute pressure on places in the west and north of the county.

**Pupil Referral Units** There are three Pupil Referral Units, on each area of the County. The Pupil Referral Units should be short stay schools but have developed into the only alternative provision available in the local authority area. This development has restricted the amount of early intervention they have been able to undertake.

**Designated Resource Provision:** There are currently 25 schools designated as resourced provision, 15 primary and 10 secondary. Some of these schools have a designation across two categories of need.

The table below sets out the relationship between the numbers of designated resource provision by type against the total number of EHCPs. The table highlights the high number of children with an EHCP identifying autism as the primary need against the low number of schools identified a resourced provision for autism. It also highlights the relatively high number of provisions designated for physical/medical need compared with a far smaller cohort of children identified with this as their primary need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of EHCPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Learning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Medical</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Resource Provision against EHCPs
The current mismatch between provision type and need means that currently half the places in resourced provision in the County are empty. This particularly affects the provision for physical/medical needs; as more schools are adapted to become fully accessible the number of children requiring access to the physical/medical provision has fallen.

A second factor is that the division of resourced provision across the County is inequitable with a higher number of designated provisions in the south of the County, nor does the split between the location and primary and secondary resourced provision support transition between primary and secondary.

**Cumbria context: changing patterns of need**

We recognise that the pattern of needs has changed and that there is a need to deliver a new model of provision to both address the needs of Cumbria's children and young people and to ensure that the resources available to the County are used as effectively as possible.

Since September 2014 there has been an 80% increase in EHCPs in Cumbria and the rate of increase is higher than the national average. This reflects a much longer term historical trend that underscores the scale of changes in patterns of need in the period since the previous Inclusive Cumbria Strategy was developing in 2002.

The table below shows rising trends across the board, with an especially high increase in relation Autism.

**Table 2: Cumbria profile of special educational needs 2002 to 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Area</th>
<th>Number of Statements April 2002</th>
<th>Number of Education, Health and Care Plans September 2016</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Language and Communication Need</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Learning Disability</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health</td>
<td>360*</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Falling Changed definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/ Medical and/or Physical Disability</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profound and Multiple Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Learning Difficulty</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Difficulty (Dyslexia)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School Census return identified children in Cumbria who had a low need, high incidence SEND who were supported in school without an Education Health and Care Plan. The October 2016 census identified that 11.68% of children in schools were identified as having an SEN.

Cumbria Context: School Governance

Over the last ten years new governance arrangements have been available to schools including the establishment of academies, multi academy trusts, free schools and university technical colleges. In Cumbria there are 342 schools, of which 48 area academies. There are five special schools of which one is an academy and three pupil referral units all maintained by the local authority. There is one all age free school in Cumbria, and plans are in place for a Free School that specialises in Autism.

5. Delivery, Performance Management and Review

Inclusive Cumbria will be delivered through multi-agency working. The lead agency will be the County Council supported by the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders and Clinical Commissioning Group(s).

The County Council will lead on all areas requiring formal consultation and the provision of information and data relating to school places and funding. The Council will also be the lead organization in supporting the development of Joint Commissioning models. Following formal consultation the Council will seek to identify the required capital resources to support development where this is required.

Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders (CASL) will work closely with the Council to identify the key opportunities to deliver the strategy as well as the building of capacity within the wider educational system.

Both the Council and CASL will work with partners in the NHS to identify the health needs of learners and ensure provision is in place deliver improved outcomes through better assessment and support for children with SEND and ensure that families are involved in the development of services.

Measurement of the success of the Inclusion Strategy will be divided into two parts. In the first two years of the strategy the focus will be on ensuring that the milestones in the action plan are met. In the 2019/20 academic year the focus will move to measuring the outcomes for young people and ensuring that there is evidence that all agencies are delivering on the aspirations encapsulated within the key principles.

6. Milestones
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To deliver an improved resourced provision offer for children with autism. | Undertake consultation on resourced provision focusing on delivery of a new model of provision in which collaboratives of schools deliver resourced provision for autism equitably across the County. Identify the required budget and support arrangements for collaboratives to develop their provision. Review complete and first placements into new arrangements. Deliver revised resourced provision offer across the County.  
**Key Performance Measures**  
- *Resourced Provision available for 4 – 19 year olds in each area of the County.*  
- *Transition between key stages possible within single district.*  
- *Identified need for resourced provision matched by availability of placements.*  
- *Reduction in use of external placement.*  
- *Improved outcomes for children in resourced provision.*  
- *Permanent exclusion of children with an EHCP is zero.* | Summer term 2017  
June 2017  
September 2017  
September 2018 |
| Develop alternative provision in each are of the County with associated specialist provision for Social Emotional and Mental Health Needs | Review current governance and leadership arrangements for Pupil Referral Units to ensure capacity for an expanded remit.  
Extend current pilot of provision in west to south and north of the County.  
Work with headteachers and other stakeholders identify potential sites and capital for investment in long term sustainable model which includes multi agency engagement.  
**Key Performance Measures**  
- *Provision available equitably across the County.*  
- *Permanent exclusion of children with an EHCP is zero.*  
- *Reduction in use of external placements.*  
- *Improved outcomes for children in alternative provision.* | April 2017  
September 2017  
April 2018 |
| Develop opportunities for co-location of special schools.                | Consultation on resourced provision to include option of special school co-location to support children with severe and profound needs particularly in rural areas.  
First co-location to replace existing SLD/PMLD resourced provision. | April 2017  
September 2017 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify schools with space and capacity to develop co-location. Define curriculum offer within co-located provision and cohort criteria. First co-location under strategy in place.</th>
<th>September 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key Performance Measures**  
  - Increase the proportion of children with EHCP highlighting severe or profound learning need accessing provision supported through special school.  
  - Improved outcomes for children with EHCP.  
  - Enhanced capacity to meet all SEND in schools with co-location. | September 2018 |
| Build capacity and improve outcomes for all children with SEND. | December 2016 |
| Ensure that inclusion and specifically SEND performance is integral to the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders (CASL) planning process. Work with and the Local Alliances (LASL) to identify areas of good practice and to challenge poor practice. Develop clear pathways for young people which support schools in identifying resource and support and offers clarity for children young people and families. Review the activity of central teams to ensure that they deliver improved capacity as well as child focussed support. Identify and explore best practice from outside the County and utilise CASL and LASL to share this in the County. Develop the use of focus groups with families to better understand their experience and how they would improve outcomes. | April 2017, January 2017, September 2017, September 2017, April 2017 |
| **Key Performance Measures**  
  - Children with SEN perform at least as well as their peers nationally at all key stages.  
  - Children with SEN begin to perform better than their peers nationally at all key stages.  
  - Early, supported, intervention reduces the number of children requiring an EHCP.  
  - Schools are able to demonstrate improved capacity through the Local Offer.  
  - Parents express improved levels of confidence. | |
<p>| Joint Commissioning | |
| Review current arrangements for joint commissioning. Ensure commissioning of services for children and young people with SEND are reflected in commissioning plan and at Health and Wellbeing Board. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Complete the reshaping of the SEND Team and ensure each child with an EHCP has a key worker.</th>
<th>January 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with colleagues and health to streamline the statutory assessment process.</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Key performance measures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assessments completed within timescale reach 100% target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All Statements transitioned to Education Health and Care Plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continued reduction in number of cases taken to SEND Tribunals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Establish and maintain a County SEND Reference Group to include local authority, health and parents.</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish parent led steering groups for shortbreak providers.</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish focus groups to review and support development of services.</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Key performance measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parents and carers report improved services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. This paper presents to Cabinet the recommendations of the Cumbria Schools Forum to manage the identified pressures within the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

2. The recommendations of the Schools Forum follow a consultation in September and October 2016 with all Cumbrian schools and academies on proposals to manage the budget pressures.

Recommendations

3. In line with recommendations from the Cumbria Schools Forum, Cabinet approves the deficit reduction plan set out as option (A) in this paper and further detailed in Appendix 1 which will pay down the high needs block deficit over a period of 3 financial years between 2017-2018 and 2019-2020.

4. Cabinet recommend that a budget plan is developed showing the timescales for implementation and delivery of the deficit reduction plan detailed above. This plan will be monitored by Schools Forum and by Cabinet. The monitoring to Cabinet will be as part of the quarterly revenue budget monitoring reports.

5. If at any time during the delivery of the deficit recovery plan the monitoring highlights concern as to whether the deficit reduction plan will be delivered in the timescale proposed the matter will be referred back to Schools Forum and Cabinet for consideration. Schools Forum will need to review alternative approaches to managing the deficit and if required Cabinet will review whether or not a transfer from the Schools block to the High Needs block should be made in 2018-2019 and/or 2019-2020 (if permitted).

Background to the Proposals

6. At the end of the 2015-16 financial year, the Dedicated Schools Grant reserve was in deficit with a balance of -£1.191m. Taking into account agreed commitments against the Dedicated Schools Grant reserve, the outstanding unallocated DSG reserve deficit at 31st March 2016 was -£1.679m.
7. In December 2015, Cabinet approved a Schools Forum agreed strategy to repay the projected deficit on the Dedicated Schools Grant reserve in 2016-17 by utilising budgets that had known reduced demand on them (within the 2016-17 Dedicated Schools Grant) totalling £1.720m. This did not reduce individual school budgets.

8. One of the main reasons for the overall deficit DSG reserve at 31st March 2016 was the overspend on the High Needs Block Budget in 2015-16: an overspend of £3.263m. As examined by Schools Forum in December 2015, May and July, the projected overspend on the High Needs Block is estimated to increase in 2016-17 and future years, due to increases in demand, namely an increase in Education Health Care Plans, and placements in independent specialist provision. The table below presents the projected in-year financial position for the High Needs Block for 2016-17 to 2018-19. This is set out in more detail at Appendices 1-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>High Needs Block Budget</th>
<th>Projected Net Expenditure</th>
<th>Projected Overspend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>£33.863m</td>
<td>£37.125m</td>
<td>£3.263m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>£34.941m</td>
<td>£41.348m</td>
<td>£6.407m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>£34.941m</td>
<td>£43.518m</td>
<td>£8.578m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>£34.941m</td>
<td>£44.115m</td>
<td>£9.174m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Prior to September 2014 the High Needs Block DSG budget was consistently reporting underspends, although not large underspends. The DSG budget is a ringfenced grant and any underspend or overspend across the block elements is transferred into the earmarked DSG reserve at the financial year end. Any surplus held in this reserve is either distributed out to all school budgets through the funding formula or held to support identified, specific, known costs.

10. At September 2014, however, a number of pressures had been identified. The council had taken responsibility for post 16 and post 19 high needs funding from the Learning and Skills Council and at the point of transfer it was noted that the funding provided was insufficient. A request was made to the Education Funding Agency for additional funding for post-16 and post-19 of £1.5 million and additional funding of £0.75 million was provided. This still represented a shortfall of £0.75 million and therefore in the 2014-15 financial year, a deficit on the High Needs Block started to appear.

11. For the financial year 2013/14 central government had indicated it’s preference for schools to take full responsibility for the funding of the first £6,000 of a child’s SEN funding. Cumbria had historically required schools to provide the first £3,000 of funding. On the recommendation of Schools Forum Cabinet determined to retain the £3,000 funding level. However the following year DfE made the provision of the first £6,000 of SEN funding by schools mandatory. To support this change, Schools Forum recommended and Cabinet agreed to a transfer of £3.2 million from the High Needs Block to the Schools Block to
compensate schools for this increased pressure. This funding was delivered through the overall school funding formula rather than being allocated to specific children with SEND. Also, a budget of £0.6m was ringfenced within the High Needs Block and allocated to schools that has a higher proportion of pupils with a statement/ EHCP. This enabled some targeted funding to be given to those schools most affected by this national policy change.

12. In September 2014 the Children and Families Act came into force and a new approach to supporting children with SEND was introduced. Following this change the council saw an unprecedented rise in the number of requests for statutory assessment leading to an Education Health and Care Plan. This pressure combined with existing pressure on the post 16 and post 19 budgets and an increase in the need to purchase provision from independent special schools to support the needs of particular pupils that could not be met within Council provision, saw the High Needs Block move into deficit in 2014-15.

13. In December 2015 Schools Forum considered proposals to address these pressures but recommended that no action be taken until the outcome of the consultation on the introduction of the national funding formula was known.

14. In May 2016, Schools Forum considered a range of strategies to manage demand within the High Needs Block and reduce the projected overspend and these were recommended to Cabinet to be implemented from September 2016. As these recommendations were not sufficient to clear the projected deficit, they were not taken to Cabinet.

15. It was agreed that further work was required on these proposals prior to a Cabinet decision being made, and that all schools and academies should be consulted on any proposed changes. The Schools Forum met on 8 July 2016 and agreed to consider:

- The longer term impact of paying down the high needs deficit, in particular, the impact that this will have on school budgets;
- Whether there are any other mechanisms that could be employed to address the high needs overspend;
- A possible ‘smoothing’ process to be adopted, paying particular attention to those schools that would be significantly affected by the proposals; and
- A mechanism for the Schools Forum to formally consult with all schools.

16. Following the above work, all schools and academies were consulted on a range of proposals in September and October 2016. Schools Forum met in October and November 2016 to consider these proposals and further refinements. The proposals recommended by Schools Forum at these meetings are set out in the table below. It is recognised that for all the changes proposed any change to services provided will be considered on an individual basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Date recommended</th>
<th>Date for implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove Early Years Enhanced Support Grant from High Needs Block for 2016-17 and transfer to the Early Years Block from April 2017</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of SEN Reform Grant to support DSG funded High Needs Staffing</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce a clawback from schools in respect of pupils moving from that school into independent specialist provision</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underspends on other DSG budgets (equal pay) transferred to the High Needs Block budget in 2017-18 (funding only available in 2016-17 and 2017-18)</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review application of the EHCP Assessment Criteria from January 2017</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for post-19 High Needs pupils from partner organisations (comprising several elements as outlined at Appendix 1).</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate projected contributions from other partners</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in hourly top up rate for EHCPs from £750 to £650 from 01/01/2017 to reflect actual cost of a Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of 2 hours of EHCP top up to schools</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Dedicated School Grant Funding formerly identified for voluntary redundancy to High Needs Block</td>
<td>30 November 2016</td>
<td>1 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Commissioned Resource Provision places from 172 to 128 from September 2017 (excluding Sandside Lodge referred to above)</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Provision Programme (September 2017) – development of in-county alternative provision places to support the reduction of</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2 – Schools Forum Recommendations</td>
<td>Date recommended</td>
<td>Date for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliance on external placements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where appropriate transfer pupils currently in independent day provision back to mainstream provision from September 2017</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cease external placements from September 2017 where appropriate on a case by case basis.</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review mobility funding from 2018-19 (contract ends 31/03/2018)</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rennie Capital Project (commencing September 2018) – transfer of pupils from external residential provision to in-county provision where appropriate</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandside Lodge Capital Programme including Autism Support (commencing September 2018)</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of new provision in County (commencing September 2018)</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. The impact of the above proposals on the projected High Needs Block overspend is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Deficit carried forward from the previous year</td>
<td>£1.679m</td>
<td>£5.918m</td>
<td>£3.970m</td>
<td>£1.382m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected In-year overspend on High Needs</td>
<td>£6.407m</td>
<td>£8.578m</td>
<td>£9.174m</td>
<td>£9.174m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Deficit on High Needs</td>
<td>£8.086m</td>
<td>£14.496m</td>
<td>£13.145m</td>
<td>£10.556m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Reduction in Budget Pressure from Proposals set out above</td>
<td>-£2.168m</td>
<td>-£10.525m</td>
<td>-£11.764m</td>
<td>-£12.152m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected High Needs Budget Deficit Carried Forward</td>
<td>£5.918m</td>
<td>£3.970m</td>
<td>£1.382m</td>
<td>-£1.596m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. As shown in the table, there is projected to be a deficit of £5.918m on the High Needs Block at 31st March 2017. The size of this deficit means that the Education Funding Agency will require an explanation for the deficit and detail of the plans to resolve it.

19. The cumulative effect of all the recommendations from Schools Forum is that the High Needs Block is projected to end the 2019-20 financial year with a surplus of £1.596m. Appendix 1 shows the full financial impact of this option.

20. There are other options, not recommended by Schools Forum, that would pay the deficit down over a period of two years rather than three years meaning the High Needs Block would be in surplus by the end of 2018/19. These options incorporate all the savings recommended by Schools Forum as well as additional savings as outlined below.

21. Option B - In 2014/15, the government required that schools fund the first £6,000 of SEN support. To facilitate this, a £3.2 million transfer to the Schools Block from the High Needs Block was made. In addition a central fund was established to mitigate the impact on schools with more than 2% of their pupils in receipt of an Education Health and Care Plan. These schools receive additional funding from this fund of £3000 for each child above the 2% threshold. This central fund amounts to £0.867m. Removing this fund from April 2017, alongside the savings proposals recommended by Schools Forum, would provide a projected surplus of £0.125m in 2018/19. (Appendix 2.)

22. Further options which could be considered involve a transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block in addition to the savings recommended by Schools Forum as follows:

- Option C - As noted above a £3.2m transfer took place from the High Needs Block to the Schools Block in 2014/15 and each year subsequently. Transferring this back from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block as a one off transfer in 2017/18 would provide for a projected surplus of £2.686m in 2018/19. (Appendix 3.)

- Option D – Alternatively, a transfer of £0.5m would deliver a projected surplus of £0.574m in 2018/19. (Appendix 4.)

23. A summary of the options is provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>2017/18 £m</th>
<th>2018/19 £m</th>
<th>2019/20 £m</th>
<th>Payback period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SF recommendation</td>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>3.971</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>(1.596)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SF recommendation and remove £0.867m central fund</td>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td>3.212</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
<td>(3.851)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>SF recommendation and remove £0.867m central fund and transfer £3.2m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block</td>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>(2.686)</td>
<td>(6.412)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SF recommendation and remove £0.867m central fund and transfer £0.5m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block

Appendix 4  2.763  (0.574)  (4.300)  2 years

24. In all of the options above schools projected to lose the equivalent of more than 3% of their combined 2016-17 Schools Block and High Needs Block budget are protected to ensure that the reductions to their budget do not exceed this threshold. The cost of this protection is incorporated into all of the options as shown in Appendices 1 to 4.

25. Schools Forum did agree a transfer of £0.5m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block to provide a budget uplift to Special Schools in line with the additional funding for secondary pupils in place since 2015/16. Also to provide revenue funding for alternative provision places.

Options Considered and Risks Identified

Option (A)

Cabinet approve the recommendations of the Schools Forum in paragraph 15 to deliver a surplus on the High Needs Block of £1.596m by the end of the 2019-20 financial year.

Cabinet recommend that a budget plan is developed showing the timescales for implementation and delivery of the deficit reduction plan detailed above. This plan will be monitored by Schools Forum and by Cabinet. The monitoring to Cabinet will be as part of the quarterly revenue budget monitoring reports. If the recovery plan is found not to be on track School’s Forum will be required to make further recommendations to manage the deficit and Cabinet may wish to consider a transfer from the Schools Block to High Needs Block for 2018-19 and/or if required and permitted for the financial year 2019-20.

Option (B)

Cabinet approve the recommendations of the Schools Forum in paragraph 15 and the removal of the £0.867m central fund to deliver a surplus of £0.125m by the end of the financial year 2018-19.

Cabinet recommend that a budget plan is developed showing the timescales for implementation and delivery of the deficit reduction plan detailed above. This plan will be monitored by Schools Forum and by Cabinet. The monitoring to Cabinet will be as part of the quarterly revenue budget monitoring reports. If the recovery plan is found not to be on track School’s Forum will be required to make further recommendations to manage the deficit and Cabinet may wish to consider a transfer from the Schools Block to High Needs Block for 2018-19 and/or if required and permitted for the financial year 2019-20.
Option (C)

Cabinet approve the recommendations of the Schools Forum in paragraph 15 and the removal of the £0.867m central fund and a transfer of £3.2m to deliver a surplus £2.686m by the end of the financial year 2018-19

Cabinet recommend that a budget plan is developed showing the timescales for implementation and delivery of the deficit reduction plan detailed above. This plan will be monitored by Schools Forum and by Cabinet. The monitoring to Cabinet will be as part of the quarterly revenue budget monitoring reports. If the recovery plan is found not to be on track School’s Forum will be required to make further recommendations to manage the deficit and Cabinet may wish to consider a transfer from the Schools Block to High Needs Block for 2018-19 and/or if required and permitted for the financial year 2019-20.

Option (D)

Cabinet approve the recommendations of the Schools Forum in paragraph 15 and the removal of the £0.867m central fund and a transfer of £0.5m to deliver a surplus of £0.574m by the end of the financial year 2018-19.

Cabinet recommend that a budget plan is developed showing the timescales for implementation and delivery of the deficit reduction plan detailed above. This plan will be monitored by Schools Forum and by Cabinet. The monitoring to Cabinet will be as part of the quarterly revenue budget monitoring reports. If the recovery plan is found not to be on track School’s Forum will be required to make further recommendations to manage the deficit and Cabinet may wish to consider a transfer from the Schools Block to High Needs Block for 2018-19 and/or if required and permitted for the financial year 2019-20.

Risks –

In relation to the options above there are some specific risks. In terms of option B, the removal of the central fund would impact disproportionately on those schools with high numbers of pupils with SEND. In terms of options C and D, for a transfer to take place between the Schools Block and the High Needs Block, the DfE must approve for the transfer of funds to be excluded from the general minimum funding guarantee for schools for a transfer above £0.5m to be affordable.

Reasons for the recommendation/Key benefits

- The recommendation of the Schools Forum has been made following a consultation with all Cumbrian schools and academies. The Cumbria Schools Forum is the statutory consultee on school funding matters.
Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

26. Option A is recommended by Schools Forum and results in a three year pay back of the deficit position. Options B, C and D provide the opportunity to repay back within a shorter time frame (2 years). Options C and D would involve a transfer of funding from the Schools Block element of the Dedicated Schools Grant to High Needs Block.

27. Several of the proposed savings recommended by Schools Forum (Option A), set out in Appendix 1, are based on estimates at this stage. The delivery of the actual savings will be monitored on a quarterly basis, and any variances reported to Schools Forum and as part of the quarterly budget monitoring reports to Cabinet.

28. If at any time during the delivery of the deficit recovery plan, the monitoring highlights concern as to non-delivery of the deficit reduction plan, in the timescale proposed, the Schools Forum will need to review alternative approaches to managing the deficit.

29. The Schools Forum may consider the allocation of the central fund of the High Needs Block (£0.867m referred to in Option B) on a case by case basis during the year, in line with the delivery of the deficit recovery plan, to provide some ‘headroom’ in the delivery of the reduction in expenditure.

30. The Council's Budget Forecast for the period 2017-2020 includes a forecast of that an additional £48m of savings will need to be delivered in addition to £198m that is has already identified in setting annual Budgets between 2011-2017. This means that the Council has limited ability to absorb deficits from any service across the Council, given its statutory requirement to set a balanced budget each financial year.

31. Therefore, there may be the requirement for Cabinet to review whether or not a transfer from the Schools block to the High Needs block should be made in 2018-2019 and/or 2019-2020 (if permitted) if the delivery of savings is not on-track and alternative approaches are not sustainable.

32. There remains uncertainty as to the date of implementation by Government of a national funding formula for schools. Government has indicated that it is considering introducing a Schools National Funding Formula from 2018/19. In addition, the Government has indicated that the individual blocks within the DSG will become ring-fenced and hence there will be no opportunity to transfer funding between the Schools Block and the High Needs Block from 2018/19. At this stage, the impact on both the Schools Block and High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant of a National Schools funding formula in 2018-19 is not known, and this remains a risk for the 2018-19 financial year.

33. Where the overspend on the DSG exceeds 2% of the grant allocation, the Department for Education make enquiry of the local authority and require a plan as to how the projected deficit will be recovered. Such a plan is expected to be required.
34. The total DSG received by Cumbria County Council in 2016-17 is £233.565m (July 2016 notification, after recoupment for academies). 2% of this allocation is £4.671m. After incorporating the savings proposals shown at paragraph 15, the projected deficit on the High Needs Block of the DSG at 31st March 2017 is £5.918m which exceeds this figure (2.5%).

35. It is expected that the DfE will apply the percentage threshold to all three blocks of the DSG at the end of the financial year concerned. The elements that are incorporated into the calculation are the Early Years Block, High Needs Block and the centrally retained elements of the Schools Block. Any overspends or underspends on individual school budgets are excluded as these form part of a school’s delegated budget, for which the balances are carried forward each year.

36. In relation to the applicable elements of the Schools Block and Early Years blocks, as at 30th September 2016, there is a projected net overspend of £0.464m, which mainly relates to funding for early years providers due to the higher number of term days in 2016-17. Taking the projected overspend of £0.464m on the Schools and Early Years Blocks and adding this to the projected overspend of £5.918m on the High Needs Block, gives a projected total overspend on the applicable elements of the DSG for 2016-17 of £6.382m, which is 2.7% of the 2016-17 DSG allocation of £233.565m. In terms of the projected overspend of £0.464m on early years, as for previous years, this will be addressed by the setting of the early years budget in 2017-18, where there are fewer term days, and a transfer to the DSG reserve will be made to fund the higher number of term days in 2016-17.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be Considered?

37. The responsibility for a deficit in the central expenditure of the DSG rests with the Council and not with the Department for Education. The conditions of grant 2016-2017 specify that there are three options to consider if a local authority overspends on the central expenditure of the schools budget, specifically –

A. The local authority may decide to fund all the overspend from its general resources in the year in question.

B. The local authority may decide to fund part of the overspend from its general resources in the year in question and carry forward part to the schools budget in the next year or the year after that.

C. The local authority may decide not to fund any of the overspend from its general resources in the year in question and to carry forward all the overspend to the schools budget in the next year or the year after that.

38. There is no indication that should the DSG cease and an overspend remain that the liability is removed from the Council.
39. It is paramount that the DSG is used in accordance with the conditions of grant, as the conditions of grant allow the Secretary of State to recover the grant where there is evidence that a local authority has used it for any purpose other than to support the schools budget (section 23 conditions of grant 2016 -2017). As indicated at paragraph 29 above, although a transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs block is permissible at present, from 2018-2019 this may not be possible and therefore options available to deal with the deficit may be more limited in future years.

40. Option (A) incorporates the recommendation of the Schools Forum as set out at paragraphs 15 and 16. These recommendations are numerous and the saving that some of the recommendations hope to achieve are uncertain. If implementing these recommendations alters the provision on offer to individuals then this could potentially be open to legal challenge by families, young people or their educational establishments.

41. The proposals put forward by Schools Forum reflect the wide ranging changes that are planned for Cumbria’s special educational needs provision, namely reducing the use of out of county placements, reducing the commissioning of resourced places in order to reflect current demand and endeavouring to move students back from independent day schools to maintained provision, facilitated by expansion of the in-county offer.

42. The focus of the current SEN regime is that needs are assessed and provided for on an individual basis and therefore any blanket policies may be subject to judicial review on the basis that the Council is fettering its discretion and not considering the circumstances of individuals. This risk can be mitigated by the proper application of policies on a case by case basis.

43. To summarise, by selecting option (a) Schools Forum are projecting a surplus by 2019-2020. However, there is the risk that the ability to achieve the projected savings may be diminished by the flexibility of approach that is needed for special educational needs provision and the continuing requirement to meet individual needs. Therefore, the progress of the projected savings will need to be carefully monitored throughout the 3 year period to ensure that the projected savings are on track.

Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

44. The proposal supports the Council’s priority: ‘to safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential’ by ensuring that the Dedicated Schools Grant funding is managed appropriately.
What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?

45. The recommendations of Schools Forum have been consulted with all schools and academies and where these affect individual schools, would be applied to all schools on the same basis. The proposals incorporate protection for school budgets and smoothing to ensure there is not a disproportionate impact on schools with SEN pupils.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A Schools Forum Recommended Option</th>
<th>2016-17 Financial Year (Projections)</th>
<th>2017-18 Financial Year (Projections)</th>
<th>2018-19 Financial Year (Projections)</th>
<th>2019-20 Financial Year (Projections)</th>
<th>2020-21 Financial Year (Projections)</th>
<th>2021-22 Financial Year (Projections)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Needs Block Summary Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clawback</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Forecast High Places</strong></td>
<td>3,065,019</td>
<td>2,996,596</td>
<td>2,987,065</td>
<td>2,987,065</td>
<td>2,987,065</td>
<td>2,987,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Net Budgets</strong></td>
<td>3,074,708</td>
<td>3,065,301</td>
<td>3,056,381</td>
<td>3,056,381</td>
<td>3,056,381</td>
<td>3,056,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>37,123,337</td>
<td>31,347,709</td>
<td>30,216,949</td>
<td>30,216,949</td>
<td>30,216,949</td>
<td>30,216,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected In-Year overspend on High Needs Block (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)</strong></td>
<td>2,262,172</td>
<td>5,606,945</td>
<td>6,517,519</td>
<td>6,517,519</td>
<td>6,517,519</td>
<td>6,517,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net underspend on other DSG budgets (e)</strong></td>
<td>2,071,772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DSG Deficit reserve carried forward (f)</strong></td>
<td>1,911,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitments against the DSG reserve (g)</strong></td>
<td>488,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFFIT (Total to save including high needs block deficit brought forward) (h) (i) (j) (k)</strong></td>
<td>3,189,700</td>
<td>8,685,942</td>
<td>14,695,934</td>
<td>14,695,934</td>
<td>14,695,934</td>
<td>14,695,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove Early Years’ Enhanced Support Grant from High Needs Block for 2016-17 and transfer to the Early Years Block from April 2017</strong></td>
<td>145,747</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce funding for pupils with more than 1% of pupils with a statement of EHCP for 2016-17 and remove the fund from 2017-18</strong></td>
<td>268,963</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of SEN Reform Grant to support DSG funded High Needs Staffing</strong></td>
<td>176,814</td>
<td>76,127</td>
<td>76,127</td>
<td>76,127</td>
<td>76,127</td>
<td>76,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DSG budget used to repay deficit reserve in 2016-17 and to increase the High Needs Block budget in 2017-18</strong></td>
<td>1,720,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce IEP/RP prevalence targets from 5/2017</strong></td>
<td>374,000</td>
<td>374,000</td>
<td>374,000</td>
<td>374,000</td>
<td>374,000</td>
<td>374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce funding for school with more than 1% of pupils with a statement of EHCP</strong></td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce non-core ELC/RP capacity from 5/2017</strong></td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Savings (i)</strong></td>
<td>2,187,785</td>
<td>10,629,254</td>
<td>17,653,644</td>
<td>15,152,265</td>
<td>15,152,265</td>
<td>15,152,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Deficit Balance on High Needs Block at 31st March (j)</strong></td>
<td>1,078,000</td>
<td>5,318,316</td>
<td>2,687,240</td>
<td>1,361,571</td>
<td>1,361,571</td>
<td>1,361,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repayment by 2019-20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### High Needs Block Summary Position

#### Option B - Schools Forum Recommended Option and remove the central fund within the High Needs Block to support schools with a higher proportion of EHCP pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015-16 Financial Year (Outturn)</th>
<th>2016-17 Financial Year (Projection)</th>
<th>2017-18 Financial Year (Projection)</th>
<th>2018-19 Financial Year (Projection)</th>
<th>2019-20 Financial Year (Projection)</th>
<th>2020-21 Financial Year (Projection)</th>
<th>2021-22 Financial Year (Projection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (£)</td>
<td>33,862,565</td>
<td>34,945,812</td>
<td>34,945,813</td>
<td>34,945,813</td>
<td>34,945,813</td>
<td>34,945,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Forecast Net Expenditure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (a)</td>
<td>33,862,565</td>
<td>34,945,812</td>
<td>34,945,813</td>
<td>34,945,813</td>
<td>34,945,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Projects:\n
- **Block:**
  - **Removal of In-Year Block from High Needs Block to support schools with a higher proportion of EHCP pupils.**
  - **2018/19 Financial Year Projection:** 3,283,791
  - **2019/20 Financial Year Projection:** 3,283,791

#### Financial Savings:

- **Arrears/forward funding on other related budgets (b):** 3,283,791

#### Ongoing financial savings (c):

- **3,283,791**

### Commitments against the ODS reserve (d) (not high needs block related)

- **488,000**

#### DEPFCIT - Total to save including high needs block deficit brought forward (b) (c) (d) (£):

- **1,619,046**

#### Proposed Savings:

- **High Needs Block (f) from schools with more than 25% of pupils with an EHCP:**
  - **2015-16:** 145,747
  - **2016-17:** 260,000
  - **2017-18:** 260,000
  - **2018-19:** 260,000
  - **2019-20:** 260,000

### Notes:

- **High Needs Block - Expenditure:**
  - **2015-16 Financial Year (Outturn):** 33,862,565
  - **2016-17 Financial Year (Projection):** 34,945,812
  - **2017-18 Financial Year (Projection):** 34,945,813
  - **2018-19 Financial Year (Projection):** 34,945,813
  - **2019-20 Financial Year (Projection):** 34,945,813
  - **2020-21 Financial Year (Projection):** 34,945,813
  - **2021-22 Financial Year (Projection):** 34,945,813

- **Total Forecast Expenditure:** 37,125,347

- **Total Projected Net Expenditure:** 33,862,565

- **Net Cash Released:** 3,283,791

- **ODS Reserve (c) (d) (£):** 1,619,046

- **Total Forecast Savings:** 1,619,046

- **High Needs Block Arrears brought forward from the previous year (b):** 3,283,791

- **Net Cash Released (not high needs block related):** 488,000

### DEPFCIT:

- **Total to Save:** 1,619,046

### Projects:

- **Removal of In-Year Block from High Needs Block to support schools with a higher proportion of EHCP pupils.**
  - **2018/19 Financial Year Projection:** 3,283,791
  - **2019/20 Financial Year Projection:** 3,283,791

### Financial Savings:

- **Arrears/forward funding on other related budgets (b):** 3,283,791

### Ongoing financial savings (c):

- **3,283,791**

### Commitments against the ODS reserve (d) (not high needs block related)

- **488,000**

### DEPFCIT - Total to save including high needs block deficit brought forward (b) (c) (d) (£):

- **1,619,046**
High Needs Block Summary Position

Year: 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>2015-16 (Actual)</th>
<th>2016-17 (Estimated)</th>
<th>2017-18 (Estimated)</th>
<th>2018-19 (Estimated)</th>
<th>2019-20 (Estimated)</th>
<th>2020-21 (Estimated)</th>
<th>2021-22 (Estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecast Net Expenditure:

**Schools (Primary and Non-Primary):**
- 99,966,100

**Special Needs Budgets:**
- 69,000

**Special Budgets:**
- 7,397,772

**Higher Education Budget:**
- 2,871,340

**Newly Appropriated Budget:**
- 1,744,890

**Bespoke Support Needs:**
- 6,269,698

**Previously Appropriated Needs:**
- 1,748,388

**High Needs Block Share of Central Budget:**
- 507,699

**Total Projected Net Expenditure:**
- 51,125,337

**Proposed Overhead on High Needs Block (a)**
- 3,282,772

**High Needs Block Balance brought forward from the previous year (d) (b) (c)**
- 7,187,000

**Disposal Reserve carried forward (e) (c)**
- 1,131,000

**Commitments against the Disposal Reserve (g)**
- 484,999

**Savers:**
- 13,049,999

**Savers - Total to save including high needs block savings brought forward (t) (b) (e)**
- 13,049,999

**Proposed Savings:**

**Schools Early Years:**
- 1,000,000

**Residential Costs:**
- 145,747

**Special Education Costs:**
- 260,000

**ASL Costs:**
- 2,871,340

**Other Costs:**
- 474,388

**Total Proposed Savings (j)**
- 2,167,685

**Proposed DfE Balance on High Needs Block at 31st March (k)**
- 1,874,909

40%
### High Needs Block Summary Position

#### Projected Clawback
- **Total Projected Clawback (b):** £1,125,337
- **Projected clawback to High Needs Block (c):** £64,093
- **Reduction in clawback to High Needs Block (d):** £1,061,244

#### High Needs Block Expenditure
- **High Needs Block to be carried forward from the previous year (d):** £1,087,090

#### Proposed Savings
- **Possible Savings (e):** £2,871,772

#### Total Projected Savings (f):** £3,059,065

#### Budget (a)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Financial Year (Provision)</th>
<th>Financial Year (Projection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>£1,082,565</td>
<td>£3,480,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>£3,440,813</td>
<td>£3,440,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>£3,440,813</td>
<td>£3,440,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>£3,440,813</td>
<td>£3,440,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>£3,440,813</td>
<td>£3,440,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Forecast Net Expenditure:
- **Capital (a) - Reduction in clawback (b):** £64,093
- **Reduction in clawback (d):** £1,061,244
- **High Needs Block share of further Education and Training (e):** £107,889

#### Total High Needs_block Expenditure (f):** £3,059,065

#### Proposed In-Year Overpayment on High Needs Block (g) [£]:** £2,262,772

#### Projected Ongoing Savings (h) (£):** £3,059,065

#### Repayment by 2018-19
- **Repayment of £1,087,090 from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block:** £1,087,090

---

**Note:** The document contains tables and figures that are not visible in this text format.
What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. In line with the School and Early Years Finance Regulations, Cabinet is the decision making body for the Cumbria School Funding Formula and is required to decide upon a formula for the 2017-18 financial year. This formula applies to all primary and secondary maintained schools and academies in Cumbria. Schools Forum has made a recommendation to Cabinet for the 2017-18 funding formula.

Recommendation of the Corporate Director

2. It is recommended that Cabinet approve the recommendations of the Cumbria Schools Forum that:

- The funding formula detailed at 7 is approved for 2017-18.
- Any change to the quantum of funding in the Schools Block as a result of the DSG settlement notified in mid-December is applied through the AWPU factor.
- Fir Ends and Coniston Schools are included as eligible for sparsity funding within the formula.

3. Cabinet is to note the following decisions of the Cumbria Schools Forum for school funding in 2017-18:

- The services detailed at 13 are funded from centrally retained DSG in 2017-18 as they have been in previous years.
- The £1.015m ESG retained duties funding transferred into the DSG in 2017-18 is centrally retained to support the statutory education services that this grant funds.
- The services detailed at 20 are de-delegated for maintained schools in 2017-18.
### Background to the Proposals

4. Schools and academies funding is calculated through a National Funding Formula within which the Local Authority has some local discretion. The Council Cabinet is the decision maker on these discretionary elements of the Cumbria School Funding Formula.

5. In line with the School and Early Years Finance Regulations the Council is responsible for setting the funding formula for both schools and academies within the county. Academies receive their funding directly from the Education Funding Agency, whereas the funding for maintained schools is passported to them through the Council. The funding which is allocated through the formula comes from the Schools Block of the ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant. There are three blocks in total that make up the Dedicated Schools Grant – the Schools Block, High Needs Block, and Early Years Block.

6. For maintained schools, the funding formula set for the financial year applies from April whereas for academies, this same funding formula is applied on an academic year basis and commences from September. For example, the funding formula for 2017-18 will apply to maintained schools from April 2017 but to academies from September 2017.

7. The Schools Forum has recommended that the formula set out below is applied for the 2017-18 financial year. The formula reflects that applied in 2016-17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula Factor</th>
<th>School Forum Recommended Approach</th>
<th>Allocation (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Per Pupil Entitlement (AWPU)</td>
<td>Comprises balance of funding after other funding allocated to other factors but ratio between the values (Primary-Key Stage 3-Key Stage 4 of: 1:1.23:1.52</td>
<td>Allocations will vary depending on the DSG settlement and the October 2016 census data. Allocations for 2016-17 were: Primary: £3,257 per pupil Key Stage 3: £3,991 per pupil Key Stage 4: £4,936 per pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Factor</td>
<td>School Forum Recommended Approach</td>
<td>Allocation (£)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Specified values per school phase</td>
<td>Primary: £75,000 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary: £175,000 per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparsity</td>
<td>Specified values per school phase (sparsity distance threshold set at 3 miles for primary and secondary schools; primary schools must have an average year group size of fewer than 21.4 pupils (secondary schools: fewer than 120 pupils))</td>
<td>Primary: £20,000 per eligible school (46 schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary: £100,000 per eligible school (11 schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation</td>
<td>Comprises 1.9% of Schools Block. Equal value for all eligible pupils (primary and secondary)</td>
<td>Allocations will vary depending on the DSG settlement and the October 2016 census data. The allocation for 2016-17 was: £425.58 per eligible pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSM Ever 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Cost High Incidence SEN</td>
<td>Specified per pupil values: £380 per eligible primary pupil and £889 per eligible secondary pupil</td>
<td>Primary: £380 per eligible pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary: £889 per eligible pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as an Additional Language</td>
<td>£100,000 to be allocated through this factor</td>
<td>Allocations will vary depending on the DSG settlement and the October 2016 census data. The allocation for 2016-17 was: £121 per eligible pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Factor</td>
<td>School Forum Recommended Approach</td>
<td>Allocation (£)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked After Children</td>
<td>£100,000 to be allocated through this factor</td>
<td>Allocations will vary depending on the DSG settlement and the October 2016 census data. The allocation for 2016-17 was: £314 per eligible pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>Based on estimated business rates cost</td>
<td>Varies by school as based on estimated cost per school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents</td>
<td>Relates to 5 schools where required rental costs are more than 1% of the individual school's Schools Block allocation</td>
<td>Varies by school as based on actual cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Following national changes to school funding from April 2013, a minimum funding guarantee is applied to the funding formula to ensure that no school loses more than 1.5% per pupil compared to the previous financial year.

9. Schools Forum has recommended that the funding factors outlined above remain the same for 2017-18. Actual allocations will be based on pupil numbers and data from the October 2016 school census which is provided to the Council by the EFA in December 2016 and therefore the quantum of funding against each factor for 2017-18 is not yet available.

10. The DSG settlement for 2017-18 is expected mid-December 2016. Schools Forum has recommended that, as for previous years, any difference in the settlement received is reflected in the AWPU (using the ratios above) rather than amending the other formula values.

11. As the data for sparsity eligibility is based on crow flies distances, the EFA permits schools to be considered as exceptional circumstances if geographical features mean that the crow flies distance is not reflective of the distance to the next nearest school. Schools Forum has recommended that Fir Ends and Coniston Schools are submitted to EFA to be requested as eligible for the
sparsity factor as their EFA calculated sparsity distance does not accurately reflect their circumstances. Where schools have been granted exceptional approval for sparsity by the EFA in previous years, these can carry forward into 2017-18 providing there is no significant change in pupil data. The inclusion of Fir Ends and Coniston Schools as eligible for sparsity funding increases the quantum of funding through the sparsity factor by £20,000 in 2017-18 (Coniston School already qualified in 2016-17), and therefore reduces the total allocation of funding through the AWPU factor in 2017-18 by £20,000.

12. In line with the EFA guidance on Schools Forum Roles and Responsibilities, Cabinet is the decision maker on the Schools Block Funding Formula. The Schools Forum is the decision maker for decisions around centrally retained and de-delegated budgets within the DSG.

13. In dealing with the projected deficit on the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant, should Cabinet decide that a transfer from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block is required in 2017-18, Cabinet is recommended to delegate authority to update the school funding formula to reflect this to the Corporate Director – Children’s Services

**Centrally Retained Budgets and ESG**

14. At its meeting on 30th November, Schools Forum decided that the following budgets would continue to be centrally retained for 2017-18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Description</th>
<th>2017/18 Budget (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools Forum</td>
<td>£0.092m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure Funded from Revenue</td>
<td>£1.712m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudential Borrowing Costs</td>
<td>£0.596m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Combined Budgets</td>
<td>£0.821m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Admissions</td>
<td>£0.539m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Licence Charge</td>
<td>£0.392m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4.152m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. All of the above budgets are expected to remain the same for 2017-18 with the exception of the central licence charge which is notified by EFA in December.
16. For 2016-17 and previous years, the Education Services Grant has been received separately to the Dedicated Schools Grant. It supports the provision of a range of statutory education services delivered by the Council.

17. The Education Services Grant is comprised of 2 funding rates. The general funding rate (£77 per pupil) is received by the Council in respect of maintained school pupils. For academies, the funding is received directly from the EFA. The Council also receives a £15 per pupil rate (the retained duties rate) in respect of all pupils.

18. From September 2017, the general funding rate will be removed for both councils and academies. The retained duties element (£15) of the ESG will be added to the Schools Block of the DSG for 2017-18. For Cumbria, for 2017-18 this is £1.015m.

19. The reduction in the general funding rate of the ESG from 2016-17 to 2017-18 (c£3.461m) has been accounted for in the Council’s medium term financial plan.

20. As stated in the Schools Revenue Funding 2017-18 Operational Guide, the EFA will amend regulations to allow local authorities to retain some of their Schools Block funding to cover the statutory duties that they carry out for maintained schools which were previously funded through the ESG, now that the retained duties element of the ESG has been transferred into the DSG.

21. Clarification of how this will operate for schools is still to be received from the EFA for 2017-18 and this will be provided to Schools Forum at its meeting in January 2017 for formal approval. However, Schools Forum approved in principle that the £1.015m is centrally retained to support the services funded by the Education Services Grant.

22. In line with EFA guidance, the maintained school representatives on the Schools Forum decided that the services below continue to be de-delegated back to the Council to be delivered on their behalf in 2017-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De-delegated in 2017-18</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. The EFA has set a deadline of 21st January 2017 for submission of the Council’s 2017-18 Schools Block proforma detailing the individual Schools Block budgets for all schools and academies, based on the approved funding formula. The full DSG budget for Cumbria for 2017-18 (showing all three blocks) will be presented to Cabinet in February 2017 as part of the MTFP.

24. The Council has a statutory duty to notify all maintained schools of their budget shares for the 2017-18 financial year by 28th February 2017. The EFA is required to inform academies of their general annual grant for the 2017-18 academic year by 31st March 2017.

25. **Options Considered and Risks Identified**

**Option (a)**
- Approve the recommendation of the Cumbria Schools Forum that the funding formula detailed at 7 is approved for 2017-18.

**Option (b)**
- Not approve the recommendation of the Cumbria Schools Forum and decide on an alternative funding formula for 2017-18.

**Option (c)**
- Approve the recommendation of the Cumbria Schools Forum that any change to the quantum of funding in the Schools Block as a result of the DSG settlement notified in mid-December is applied through the AWPU factor.

**Option (d)**
- Not approve the recommendation of the Cumbria Schools Forum that any change to the quantum of funding in the Schools Block as a result of the DSG settlement notified in mid-December is applied through the AWPU factor, and select an alternative approach to dealing with a variation in funding.

**Option (e)**
- Approve the recommendation of the Cumbria Schools Forum that Fir Ends and Coniston Schools are included as eligible for sparsity funding within the Cumbria Schools Block funding formula.

**Option (f)**
- Not approve the recommendation of the Cumbria Schools Forum that Fir Ends and Coniston Schools are included as eligible for sparsity funding.
within the Cumbria Schools Block funding formula. The schools’ eligibility for sparsity will be based on the EFA data.

Reasons for the recommendation/Key benefits

- Schools Forum has made a recommendation for the funding formula for 2017-18.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

26. The funding that is allocated to schools and academies through the funding formula is from the ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant. The DSG for Cumbria in 2016/17 before any deductions for institutions funded directly by the EFA is £335.09m. This funds all maintained schools, academies, Chetwynde free school and the University Technical College (UTC).

27. The EFA funds academies for their Schools Block funding formula directly whereas funding in respect of maintained schools is passported to them through the Council. The Council retains responsibility for funding high needs top up payments for both maintained and academy schools. The actual DSG received in the Council for 2016-17 is £233.565m.

28. The allocated DSG for Cumbria for 2017-18 will be notified in mid-December 2016. As detailed in the paper above, should further changes have been made to this allocation, any necessary impact on the Schools Block will be applied to the AWPU values.

29. The final DSG budget for 2017-18 will be reported to Council in February 2017.

30. There remains uncertainty as to the date of implementation by Government of a national funding formula for schools. Government has indicated that it is considering introducing a Schools National Funding Formula from 2018-19. In addition, the Government has indicated that the individual blocks within the DSG will become ring-fenced and hence there would be no opportunity to transfer funding between the Schools Block and the High Needs Block from 2018-19. At this stage the impact on both the Schools Block and the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant of a National Schools funding formula in 2018-19 is not known, and this remains a risk for the 2018-19 financial year.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be Considered?

31. The School and Early Years Finance Regulations provide that Local Authorities must consult their schools forum and schools maintained by them about any proposed changes in relation to factors and criteria taken into account and the methods principles and rules adopted when determining the school funding formula.
32. The County Council has now undertaken a process of consultation which has involved representatives of Cumbrian primary and secondary schools and academies; the Cumbria Alliance of System Leaders (CASL), LASLs and has arrived at recommendations from the Cumbria Schools Forum on the Cumbria School Funding Formula for the 2017-18 financial year. The results of which are contained in this report.

33. Cabinet is the decision making body for the elements of the schools funding formula highlighted in this report and must now consider the recommendations of the Schools Forum when making a decision on which school funding formula to adopt. Cabinet is not required to follow these recommendations but must make a decision on the funding formula. Cabinet is able to delegate authority to update the schools funding formula to the Corporate Director – Children’s Services in the terms outlined at paragraph 13 of the report.

**Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?**

34. To be a supportive council we will:

- Safeguard children and support families and schools so that all children in Cumbria can grow up in a safe environment, and can fulfil their potential by ensuring that schools are funded appropriately.

**What is the Impact of the Decision on Health Inequalities and Equality and Diversity Issues?**

35. The funding formula is applied equally to all schools and academies. The proposed funding formula values at 7 above have been recommended by the Cumbria Schools Forum (representative body of schools and academies) following consultation with schools.
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What is the Report About? (Executive Summary)

1. The paper sets out, at Appendix A, the proposed admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools, for which the county council is the statutory admission authority. The LA is required to consult other admission authorities on any changes to the policy, including on proposed reductions to published admission numbers (PANs). The LA must also consult the governing bodies of Community and Voluntary Controlled schools where it proposes to increase or retain the existing Published Admission Number (PAN) for 2018-19. Consultation on the 2018-19 arrangements took place for a 6 week period between 3 October 2016 and 13 November 2016.

2. On 22 September 2016, Cabinet resolved that:
   - the amended admissions policy for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools at Appendix A for consultation with the required groups as set out in the School Admissions Code 2014, paragraph 1.43 be approved. This included consultation on proposed changes to the catchment boundaries of Brunswick Infant School, North Lakes School and Beaconside CE School and the reduction in the PAN for Sir John Barrow School and Cambridge Primary School;
   - a further report would be brought back to Cabinet in December 2016 to provide feedback from consultation and for a decision to be sought on adoption of the policy;
   - the proposed coordinated scheme be approved;
   - consultation on PAN increases at Houghton CE School and Rockcliffe CE School, and on the retention of the existing PAN at all other Community and Voluntary Controlled schools be agreed; and
   - the nursery admissions policy for 2018/19 for Community and Voluntary Controlled nursery schools and infant/primary schools providing nursery education be agreed.
Recommendation of the Corporate Director

3. **Recommendation 1:** Approve the amended admissions policy for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for 2018/19 at Appendix A, including the proposed changes to the catchment boundaries of Brunswick Infant School, North Lakes School and Beaconside CE Primary School and the reduction in the PAN for Sir John Barrow School and Cambridge Primary School.

**Recommendation 2:** Agree PAN increases at Houghton CE School and Rockcliffe CE School, and the retention of the existing PAN at all other Community and Voluntary Controlled schools.

**Recommendation 3:** Request that the proposed reduction in PAN for George Romney Junior School be brought forward for inclusion in the consultation on the proposed 2019/2020 admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools during the autumn term 2017.

Background to the Proposals


5. The county council retains the role of admissions authority for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools in the county, and must determine admission arrangements, including the criteria to be applied to applicants in the case of oversubscription, by 28 February 2017 for the 2018-19 academic year.

6. The county council also retains responsibility for coordinating the main admissions round for all schools and academies in the county. It is required to formulate a coordinated scheme setting out the various stages in the admissions process by 1 January 2017 for the 2018-19 academic year.

7. Voluntary aided and foundation schools, free schools and academies are own admission authority schools. The governing body or academy trust is responsible for the admissions policy and make any decisions about the allocation of places. The Local Authority is not responsible for allocation decisions made by voluntary aided, foundation, free schools or academies. The parental information booklets for starting school and transfer to junior and secondary school make clear the distinction between own admission authority schools and those schools to which the Local Authority admissions policy applies.

8. Where changes are proposed to admission arrangements, including reductions in PANs (see paragraph 20), the county council is required to consult with:
   a) Parents of children between the ages of two and eighteen;
   b) Other persons in the relevant area which in the opinion of the admission authority have an interest in the proposed admissions;
   c) All other admission authorities within the relevant area (except that primary schools need not consult secondary schools);
   d) Whichever of the governing body and the local authority who are not the admission authority;
e) Any adjoining neighbouring local authorities where the admission authority is the local authority; and
f) In the case of faith schools, the body or person representing the religion or religious denomination.
(School Admissions Code 2014: paragraph 1.44)

9. There is also a requirement to consult the governing bodies of individual schools on the PAN the county council proposes to use for their school in September 2018 where it is proposed to remain unchanged or to increase.

10. The consultation process must last for a minimum of 6 weeks and can begin no earlier than 1 October 2016. Consultation relates only to the proposed admission arrangements; no consultation is required on the coordinated scheme. Consultation on the 2018-19 arrangements took place between 3 October 2016 and 13 November 2016.

Penrith Schools – Proposed Catchment Area Change

11. Penrith primary schools have collectively made a formal request that a change to the catchment area boundaries of Brunswick Infant School, North Lakes School and Beaconside CE Primary School be considered. Catchment boundaries form part of the county council’s admission arrangements and, as such, any proposed change to them must be consulted upon as part of the wider consultation exercise required.

12. The three schools are seeking to replace the current catchment boundaries with a single catchment area that will cover the town of Penrith. (St Catherine’s is also located in the town, but as a Catholic school does not have a defined catchment area.) Currently there is a split in the town between Brunswick/North Lakes and Beaconside CE Primary. Instead, it is proposed that there would be a single catchment area for all three schools. The external boundaries would remain as they are, i.e. there would be no change to the surrounding schools’ catchment areas. The map, attached as Appendix B, illustrates the current and proposed catchment boundaries.

13. All town pupils would, therefore, live in the catchment area of all three schools. The practical impact of this would be to give previously out of catchment siblings living in Penrith a higher priority than they currently have for the out of catchment school to which they are applying, i.e. a parent living in the previous Beaconside catchment area, but with an older sibling attending Brunswick Infant School would, in the future, have a better chance of also gaining a place for their younger sibling at Brunswick Infant School.

14. This proposal has been prompted by the nature of refusals and appeals over the previous two or three years, with a number of out of catchment siblings being refused a place at Brunswick Infant School in favour of catchment applicants. This is difficult for those families involved and it is often the case that the unsuccessful parents win their appeal, which then puts additional pressure on facilities at Brunswick Infant School.

15. The positive aspect of admitting more siblings would be offset by the negative of an equal number of parents who would have been offered a place previously
being refused in the future. This would have affected 4 families in 2016 and 3 in September 2015. Those 4 and 3 in-catchment families respectively offered the final places at Brunswick would have been denied places, whilst an equal number of out-catchment families with older siblings already attending the school would have been successful in their applications.

16. All of the Penrith schools are supportive of the change as is the local member for Brunswick. County Council members for Penrith East and Penrith North have also been updated about the proposed changes.

17. The head teachers of the four schools situated in Penrith have worked together to collectively support the proposed change of catchment area. In doing so they have discussed the proposal with, and highlighted the consultation, to the respective governing bodies. A joint letter from the four head teachers, explaining the proposed change has also been sent to parents/carers of all pupils currently attending Brunswick Infant School, North Lakes School, Beaconside CE School and St Catherine’s Catholic Primary School.

18. On balance, the general consensus appears to be that, whilst recognising not every parent can be allocated a place at oversubscribed schools, it would be less disruptive to accommodate siblings than to have parents facing the prospect of getting two children to different schools each day, or moving their older children from one school to another in order to avoid that prospect.

19. Undertaking a consultation at this stage does not commit the county council to redrawing the catchment boundaries, and nor does it indicate support for a change. Rather it allows people from the communities involved a formal opportunity to express their views, and members to subsequently make an informed decision.

20. Responses to the Consultation – A total of three responses to the consultation were received. Two of the responses are fully supportive of the proposed change to the catchment area boundaries for Brunswick Infant School, North Lakes School and Beaconside CE School, and of the need to adopt a local solution.

Rather than indicating support, or expressing any particular concern about the proposed catchment area change, the third response raised a number of specific questions that have been addressed in a reply to the individual.

Nursery Admissions Policy 2018/19

21. On 22 September Cabinet approved the nursery admissions policy for 2018/19 for Community and Voluntary Controlled nursery schools and infant/primary schools providing nursery education.

22. During the consultation period representation was received from two teachers’ associations, NUT and ATL, requesting that consideration be given to including an additional criteria in the nursery admissions policy:
‘Children with exceptional social, medical or pastoral circumstances who indicate attendance at a specific school would most appropriately meet their needs [written evidence from an appropriate professional such as social worker, doctor or priest would be required].’

23. A criteria similar to the one suggested above was previously included in the nursery admissions policy but it was removed for the following reasons:

- To ensure consistency across the LA admission policies, the nursery admissions policy was updated to bring it into line with the general admissions policy (which does not include a social, medical, exceptional criteria), and;
- Such a criteria is very subjective and is difficult to apply in practice. Evidence could be provided but experience would suggest that this can be difficult to measure objectively. Application of the criteria is an administrative process and it needs to be very clear to ensure both fairness, and that parents are easily able to understand the criteria against which their applications will be judged.

24. Cabinet approved the nursery admissions policy for 2018/19 for Community and Voluntary Controlled nursery schools and infant/primary schools providing nursery education on 22 September 2016. However, the inclusion of this, or similar criteria, can be reviewed and, if necessary, presented to Cabinet for further consideration when the proposed admissions arrangements for 2019/2020 are considered in autumn 2017.

**PAN Changes**

25. It is proposed that the following schools change their PAN from September 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current PAN</th>
<th>Proposed PAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Barrow, Ulverston</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Primary School</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton CE School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockcliffe CE School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. When a school asks to increase PAN, either temporarily or permanently, a letter is sent to the school that sets out the key issues for governors to consider. The letter also explains that county council funds are very limited and where a school has made the decision to increase the PAN or admission number they will not receive financial support from the county council to fund additional accommodation or staffing.
27. The availability of additional places potentially impacts on the intake not only of the schools where the PAN is changing, but also on the intakes of surrounding schools, where there may be a commensurate decrease in the uptake of places. The exact level of impact on any individual school is very difficult to predict, given that it will depend entirely on the pattern of parental preference in any given year.

28. The proposed amendments to PANs may see the county council’s ability to meet a greater number of first preferences improved.

29. As the statutory admission authority for the schools listed above it is for the LA to determine whether or not to amend the PANs; there is no compulsion to do so.

30. There is, however, a risk that refusing the PAN increases at this stage would still see children admitted to the schools in question, but via an appeal. This would reduce the number of first preferences the LA was able to meet at initial offer stage, involve significant officer time in preparing for and presenting the LA’s appeals case, result in additional costs to the LA of administering the appeals, but with the potential for the same outcome as if the decision been taken to increase the PANs. This is not inevitable, of course, but is likely to be the outcome, assuming there is sufficient demand.

31. The governors of Sir John Barrow have requested a reduction in PAN to recognise the changing use of classroom space in their school. A substantial number of children with complex additional needs are now attending the school, and internal modifications and/or the need for smaller classes has reduced the school’s capacity to accommodate 45 children in each year group. The net capacity of the school has been recalculated in line with national guidance, and setting a PAN of 30 is appropriate within the net capacity guidelines.

32. The effect of this will be to reduce the number of places available in the Ulverston area by 15/year group, 105 in total. Pupil projections indicate that there will remain sufficient capacity to accommodate future foreseeable intakes should the PAN be reduced. A reduction would also allow the school to plan budgets with greater certainty; intakes have typically been just over 30/year recently, and this is causing difficulties in financing the requisite teaching staff given the statutory limit on infant class sizes.

33. Cambridge governors have requested a reduction in PAN in order to reflect the redesignation of former classroom space. A new net capacity calculation indicates that a PAN of 30 is reasonable. The reduction will also assist the school in future staffing and budget planning by ensuring there is no more than 1 class required per year group. A PAN of 30 is expected to be sufficient to meet forecast demand.

34. It is proposed that the PAN at Houghton is increased to reflect the additional accommodation being provided as part of the LA’s capital programme. Cabinet approved the project in December 2015, and it will be completed ahead of the 2018 admissions round. Houghton governors need to formally approve the
expansion proposal, but this approval is expected to be in place prior to the admission arrangements consultation process.

35. An additional classroom at Rockcliffe CE was recently completed and it is proposed that the PAN is increased to 20 to reflect the additional accommodation. A recent net capacity assessment was carried out that indicated a PAN of 20. Prior to completion of the new classroom, a temporary arrangement had been agreed that the school would exceed PAN and admit additional pupils up to 20. The proposed increase has been discussed with the head teacher who is supportive of the proposal.

36. Responses to the Consultation – Two responses to the consultation have been submitted:

- Sir John Barrow School, Ulverston - This response confirms the support of the school and the governing body for the proposal to reduce the PAN of Sir John Barrow School from 45 to 30 from September 2018.

- George Romney Junior School – The head teacher and governing body of George Romney Junior School have formally requested that the PAN for the school is reduced from 60 to 45. The PAN of 60 was set when the school was designed with an ‘open plan’ setting. However, admission numbers have fluctuated between 35 and 45 for a number of years and projected numbers for future years indicate year 3 cohorts of 25 to 30 pupils.

Ideally, the head teacher and governing body would like the reduced PAN to be implemented from September 2018. However, there is insufficient time to carry out the required consultation on this proposed reduction in this cycle and therefore the request should be noted and included in the consultation on the proposed 2019/2020 admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools during the autumn term 2017.

Options Considered and Risks Identified

Option (a)

- Members can decide to approve the admissions policy for 2018/19 for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools, to include the changes to PANs and an amendment to the policy:

  - A change to the catchment boundaries of Brunswick Infant School, North Lakes School and Beaconside CE Primary School.

Option (b)

- Members can retain the existing policy without approving the amendment or PAN changes; PANs would remain at their existing level.
Option (c)

- Members can retain the existing policy with some PAN changes and others rejected, or determine an amended policy eg. by changing the existing oversubscription criteria with or without some or all of the proposed PAN changes.

Financial – What Resources will be needed and how will it be Funded?

37. Schools are financed through the Dedicated Schools Grant with funding allocated through a Schools Funding Formula recommended by the Schools Forum and approved annually by Cabinet.

38. The proposed amendments to PANs and catchment areas will have no effect on the distribution methodology of school budgets. There is potential for a small effect on school transport budgets if pupils need to be transported to their allocated schools. This is considered to be immaterial.

39. Capital works required to develop Houghton CE School to enable the PAN to be increased are included within the Council's approved 2016/17 Capital Programme and funded through a combination of the Basic Needs grant and a contribution via a s106 agreement.

40. Where schools request an increase to their PAN there is no additional capital commitment to support the increase from the Council other than those schemes already included within the current capital programme.

Legal Aspects – What needs to be Considered?

41. When deciding which of the above options to adopt Cabinet may find it useful to consider the following –

Proposed Catchment Area Change

42. The definition of a ‘catchment area’ within the glossary to the School Admissions Code states that it is ‘a geographical area, from which children may be afforded priority for admission to a particular school.’ The Code does not specify how a catchment area should be designed. However, at 1.14 of the Code it confirms that ‘catchment areas must be designed so that they are reasonable and clearly defined. Catchment areas do not prevent parents who live outside the catchment of a particular school from expressing a preference for the school.’ Consideration therefore needs to be given as to whether the proposed changes are reasonable and clearly defined.

43. Under paragraphs 1.1 and 1.8 of the Code any changes to the catchment area must comply with the Equality Act 2010 which requires that an admission authority must not discriminate against a person in the arrangements and decisions it makes as to who is offered admission because of their disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy or maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, or
sexual orientation (together known as the protected characteristics). The county council is also subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act. Accordingly, the county council must have regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations in relation to persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. It is unlikely that adopting any of the above options in relations to catchment area will trigger any particular consideration under the Equality Act.

44. Discrimination on socio-economic grounds is not a protected characteristic under the Equality Act, but paragraph 1.8 of the Code stipulates that ‘admission authorities must ensure that their arrangements will not disadvantage unfairly, either directly or indirectly, a child from a particular social…group’. It is therefore important consider the impact that the change to the catchment area will have on all social groups within the Penrith area. Consultation is now complete and there have been no objections raised in respect of the proposed alteration of the catchment area.

PAN Changes

45. As per section 1.3 of the Code, the county council is required to consult on a decrease to PAN as per paragraph 8 of this report. However, the county council is not required to widely consult on an increase to PAN. What is required in relation to increases is that the county council consults the governing body of the school at which it proposes to increase the PAN. This consultation is now almost complete and no objections to the changes have been received.

46. It is noted that detailed reasons for the proposed reductions to the PANs at Sir John Barrow and Cambridge Schools are given at paragraphs 31-33 of this report. These proposed reductions will need to be considered in light of the county council’s underlying duty to ensure sufficiency of school places, as per the Education Act 1996. It is noted that both schools requesting reductions to their PANS have only been admitting just over 30 students per year and therefore the risk that Cumbria County Council will not be able to ensure sufficiency of places due to these reductions is minimal.

47. George Romney Junior School contacted the county council as a respondent to the consultation and requested a reduction to its PAN from 60 to 45. As is set out at paragraph 8 of this report, certain bodies/individuals need to be consulted prior to a PAN reduction. A failure to consult would increase the risk of complaints and appeals and the possibility of Judicial Review. Such a consultation needs to take place for at least 6 weeks and needs to be completed by 31 January of the relevant year (for a change to the 2018-2019 arrangements this would be 31 January 2017). Given that Cabinet are not considering the request for the reduction until 15 December 2016, the timing for a further consultation in this cycle would be incredibly tight. Therefore, in order to ensure legal compliance, it is recommended that the requested reduction to the George Romney Junior School PAN should not be approved by Cabinet for the 2018-2019 academic year. In line with recommendation 3 in this report it is suggested that this request for a reduction in PAN is noted and included within the consultation carried out in Autumn 2017, with a view to the reduction (if approved) being introduced for the 2019-2020 academic year.
Council Plan Priority – How do the Proposals Contribute to the Delivery of the Council’s Stated Objectives?

48. To be a supportive council we will:

- Ensure that the most vulnerable people in our communities receive the support that they need; and
- Improve the chances in life of the most disadvantaged in Cumbria

by allowing parents to express preferences for a range of schools and by giving top priority in oversubscription criteria to children with statements of special educational needs and those looked after or previously looked after by a local authority.

Appendices and Background Documents

Appendix A Admissions Policy for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools
Appendix B Brunswick Infant School, North Lakes School and Beaconside CE Primary School – Proposed Catchment Area

Key Facts

Electoral Division(s): All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Decision</th>
<th>Key Decision Included in Forward Plan</th>
<th>Exempt from call-in</th>
<th>Exemption agreed by scrutiny chair</th>
<th>Considered by scrutiny, if so detail below</th>
<th>Environmental or sustainability assessment undertaken?</th>
<th>Equality impact assessment undertaken?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous relevant Council or Executive decisions
No previous relevant decisions

Consideration by Overview & Scrutiny
Not considered by Overview and Scrutiny

Background Papers
No background papers

Report Author
Contact: Sarah Wright, Tel: 07881845565, Email: sarah.wright@cumbria.gov.uk
APPENDIX A

Proposed Policy for the Admission Arrangements to Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools for 2018-2019

1. Introduction

These are the 2018-2019 admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled primary and secondary schools, i.e. those schools where the Local Authority (LA) is the admission authority.

2. Co-ordinated Admission Arrangements

In line with current legislation, the LA has drawn up a separate scheme to coordinate admissions to maintained schools and academies within Cumbria for the main admissions round.

3. Published Admission Numbers

The admission number the LA will publish for each community and voluntary controlled school is shown in Appendix 1.


The General Admissions Policy will be used to allocate places at those schools which are oversubscribed. This is attached as Appendix 2 for entry to Reception, Year 3 and Year 7 and as Appendix 3 for entry to Year 12.

5. Address to be Used in Determining Priority for Admission

If a school is oversubscribed, the address of the parent or carer with whom the child normally lives will be used in the allocation process. Where a child’s address is difficult to determine, for example where shared living arrangements are in place, the address of the parent or carer claiming child benefit will be used.

6. Fraudulent Applications and Withdrawal of a School Place

The LA will not withdraw an offer of a place unless it has been made in error or it is established that the offer was obtained through a fraudulent or misleading application. An application will not be withdrawn because an offer was made in error once the student has taken up the place at the school. Where an offer is withdrawn on the basis of fraudulent or misleading information, the application will be considered on the basis of the correct information, and parents or carers will have a right of appeal where no place can be offered.

Where parents or carers are found to make a fraudulent application for a school place and the LA decides not to withdraw that place in the best interest of the child, should a school place be sought for any other sibling or siblings the criteria that provide a higher priority for a school place for siblings will not be applied.
7. Parental disagreement

The management of school applications may be severely delayed during the main admissions round where separated parents or carers of the child each submit a separate application for different schools. The School Admissions Code 2014 states that only one offer per child is made by the LA. In this situation the LA asks that parents and/or carers attempt to resolve matters between themselves and inform the LA in writing of which application should be processed. The LA will not become involved in private disputes.

In a situation where parents and/or carers are unable to reach an agreement the LA will decide which application should be processed. In most circumstances the LA will process the application submitted by the parent and/or carer who is in receipt of child benefit for the child to whom the application relates.

8. The Admissions Timetable

The timetable for the September 2018 application and allocation processes will be in line with the co-ordinated admissions schemes with the exception of entry to Year 12. This will be in accordance with the timetable detailed in Appendix 4.

9. Late Applications

For oversubscribed schools, applications which are received or changed after the published closing date will only be considered in exceptional circumstances. Even if there are exceptional circumstances, applications submitted after the relevant published date, contained within this scheme, will not be considered until after allocations for those parents and carers who applied on time have been made. Any evidence submitted after the relevant date to support a late application or change of preference will not be considered. Affected applicants will not receive an offer with other parents on national offer day, instead receiving one on ‘reallocation day’.

10. Waiting Lists

Once places have been allocated, children refused a place will continue to be considered for any vacancies which become available up until the end of the Autumn Term 2018. Vacancies will always be allocated by applying the admissions policy and length of time on the waiting list will not be a consideration.

11. Early, Deferred or Delayed Entry to all schools and Part Time Attendance at Infant/Primary Schools

If a child who has not reached compulsory school age has been allocated a Reception place and their parent or carer wishes to defer entry to school, the place will be held open. Entry cannot be deferred beyond the point at which the child reaches compulsory school age and not beyond the beginning of the final term of the school year for which the place was allocated. Parents can request that their child takes up the place part-time until the child reaches compulsory school age.
Summer-born children do not attain compulsory school age until the September after they would normally start in Reception. In line with government recommendation, the county council will admit these children into a Reception class a year later than usual at their parents’ request. These children will remain eligible for their full entitlement to schooling, and will subsequently transfer to junior (where applicable) and secondary school with other children in the year group in which they have been educated, rather than with their ‘chronological cohort’

Other requests, for early or delayed transfer to secondary school, for example, will be considered on their individual merits. Unlike delayed entry for summer-born children, others have no automatic right to education outside of their chronological age group, although there is no legal bar to this.

Parents seeking early transfer should submit their request to the school admissions by 30 September for secondary applications, and by 31 October for primary applications in the year before that in which they would usually apply. This will allow time for the application to be considered prior to the closing date for applications. Parents will still need to submit preferences by the appropriate closing date.

Parents seeking delayed entry/transfer should submit their request by the same dates in the year in which they would apply if their child was transferring at the usual age. This will allow consideration of the request prior to the closing date for preferences to be submitted, allowing parents sufficient time to submit preferences in the event their request is denied.

12. Twins and siblings of multiple births

Where places are available for some but not all children from multiple births (including twins) the Local Authority will exercise the discretion offered by the Admissions Code to offer all of the children a place. Where this results in an infant class exceeding 30 pupils, additional children admitted under these arrangements will be treated as ‘excepted pupils’ for the duration of their infant education and will not constitute a breach of legislative requirements.

13. Admissions to Nursery Schools and Infant/Primary Schools Offering Nursery Education

These arrangements do not apply to the admission of nursery pupils. Nursery admission arrangements will be determined separately. Attendance at a school’s nursery does not guarantee admission to the school’s Reception group.

14. Admission to School Sixth Forms

These arrangements apply to the admission of students to school sixth forms (Year 12).
15. Catchment Areas

Cumbria County Council operates a ‘catchment area’ approach to school admissions. Most schools have a defined catchment area. Details of the arrangements for each school can be made available on request. Where an area is not included within an agreed catchment area, the “catchment area school” will be the nearest school to the parental home.

16. In Year Admissions

Where a parent or carer wishes to change school for any reason that is not caused by a change of address, the Local Authority may not offer a place at a community or voluntary controlled school before the first day of the term following receipt of form SA8 (request for an in year school place).

Any place offered must be taken up within 6 weeks or it may be withdrawn and offered to another applicant.
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Determined 2018-2019 Admission Arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools - Published Admission Numbers

The following are the proposed admission numbers the LA will publish for each community and voluntary controlled school as part of its 2018-2019 admission arrangements.

**Infant/ Primary Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Proposed 2018/2019 Published Admission Number</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Proposed 2018/2019 Published Admission Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Saints’ CE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Burlington CE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allithwaite CE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Caldw Lea</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allonby Primary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cambridge Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alston Primary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Captain Shaw's CE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlecdon</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cartmel CE Primary</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armathwaite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chapel Street Infants</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asby Endowed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield Infant</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Coniston CE Primary</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow Island</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Croftlands Infant</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassenthwaite</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crosscanonby St John's CE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckstone Primary</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cummersdale</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Vue Primary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Cumwhinton</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewcastle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dane Ghyl</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blennerhasset</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Derwent Vale Primary and Nursery</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Distington Community Primary</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton's CE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ellenborough and Ewanrigg Infant</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookwell Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ennerdale and Kinniside CE Primary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransty</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fellview Primary</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridekirk Dovenby CE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Frizington Primary</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Park Infant</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Goodly Dale Community Primary</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Street Primary</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Gosforth CE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brough</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grange CE</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton in Furness CE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grasslot Infant</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton Moor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Great Orton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Greystoke</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgh by Sands</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Haverigg</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawkshead, Esthwaite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hensingham Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron Hill Primary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Norman Street Primary</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Hesket CE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>North Walney Primary</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holm Cultram Abbey CE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme Primary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Netherton Infant</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme St Cuthbert</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Old Hutton CE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton CE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Orgill Primary</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Infant</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Ormsgill Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireby CE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pennine Way Primary</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irthington Village</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pennington CE</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Petteril Bank</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kells Infant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Plumpland CE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingmoor Infant</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Plumpton</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkbampton CE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ramsden Infant</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkbride Primary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Raughton Head CE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkby Stephen Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Richmond Hill</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkby Thore</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Robert Ferguson Primary</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkoswald CE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rockcliffe CE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamplugh CE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Roose</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanercost CE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Seascale</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langwathby CE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sedbergh Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees Hill CE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shankhill CE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levens CE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Silloth Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindal and Marton Primary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sir John Barrow</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindale CE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Skelton</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Marton Community Primary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Walney Infant</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>St Bees Village</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Furness CE Primary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>St Bridget's CE, Brigham</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowca Community</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>St Bridget's CE, Parton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryport Infant</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>St George's CE</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milburn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>St James' CE Infant, Whitehaven</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millom Infant</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>St Michael's CE Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milnthorpe Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>St Michael's Nursery &amp; Infant, Workington</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal CE Primary</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Staveley CE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor Row</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stoneraise</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moresby Primary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Storth CE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenthead</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Temple Sowerby CE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbarns Primary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Thornhill Primary</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlaithes Infant</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Threlkeld CE Primary</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Schools – Year 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursby</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Victoria Infant &amp; Nursery, Barrow</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thwaites</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Victoria Infant &amp; Nursery, Workington</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperby Primary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Westfield Nursery and Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Primary</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Wigton Infant</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarage Park CE Primary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wray CE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickerstown</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Schools – Year 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield Junior</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Monkwray</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Combe Junior</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Newlaithes Junior</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croftlands Junior</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>North Lakes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewanrigg Junior</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Seaton St Paul's CE Junior</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Romney Junior</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>South Walney Junior</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greengate Junior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>St James' CE Junior, Whitehaven</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Junior</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Thomlinson Junior</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingmoor Junior</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Victoria Junior, Workington</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryport CE Junior</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools – Year 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Schools – Year 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Hill Community</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Nelson Thomlinson, The</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowdales</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Netherhall</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ruskin</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Solway Community</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes, The</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millom</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where there are more applications than places available at a community or voluntary controlled school for entry to all year groups except Year 12, applications will be prioritised using the criteria below. They will be applied in conjunction with explanatory notes 1 - 6 which form part of the policy.

1. Children looked after and who were previously looked after, i.e. in public care, giving priority, if necessary, to the youngest child(-ren) - see note 1 overleaf.

2. Children living in the catchment area who have brothers or sisters in the school (or associated infant or junior school) at the time of admission. See notes 2 and 3 overleaf.

3. Children living outside the catchment area who, at the time of their admission, have brothers or sisters in the school (or associated infant or junior school) who were allocated a place at that school by the LA either (a) in the absence of a place being available in the catchment area school due to oversubscription and the school was identified by the LA as the next nearest with a place available or (b) the school is named in the sibling’s Statement of Special Educational Need/Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) - see notes 2, 3 and 4 overleaf.

4. In relation to Church of England Voluntary Controlled Schools, children living within the catchment area who with a parent regularly attend a church in membership of Churches Together in Britain or the Evangelical Alliance. See notes 5 and 6.

5. Other children living in the catchment area giving priority to those living closest to the school, measured by a straight-line measure between the centre of the pupil’s home address and a common point on the school site as determined by the LA - see notes 6 and 7 overleaf.

6. Children living outside the catchment area who have brothers or sisters in the school (or associated infant or junior school) at the time of their admission - see notes 2 and 3 overleaf.

7. In relation to Church of England Voluntary Controlled Schools, children living outside the catchment area who with a parent regularly attend a church in membership of Churches Together in Britain or the Evangelical Alliance. See notes 5 and 6.

8. Children living outside the catchment area, giving priority to those who live closest to the school, measured by a straight-line measure between the centre of the pupil’s home address and a common point on the school site as determined by the LA - see notes 6 and 7 overleaf.

Applications will be prioritised on the above basis. An exception will be made under the Authority's policy for the education of children with special needs (i) where a child holds 1.
a Statement of Special Educational Need or 2. an Education, Health and Care Plan, or (ii) is currently undergoing a co-ordinated assessment, and in either case it is considered that attendance at a particular school is necessary to meet the identified needs of that child.
Explanatory Notes
[These notes are part of the policy]

Note 1
A child looked after is a child in public care, who is looked after by a local authority within the meaning of Section 22 of the Children Act 1989. Children previously looked after are children who were looked after, but have ceased to be so because they were adopted (under the terms of the Adoption and Children Act 2002) or became subject to a Child Arrangements Order or Special Guardianship Order (Children Act 1989). The provision to give the highest priority to looked after and previously looked after children applies to all children who have been adopted from local authority care.

Note 2
In criteria 2, 3 and 6, priority will be given to those children with the youngest siblings. Brothers and sisters are those living at the same address and includes step and foster children. Priority will only be given where it is known at the time of allocating places that a sibling will be attending the school (excluding a nursery class) at the time of admission.

Note 3
Where reference is made to ‘associated’ infant and junior schools this is to describe those situations where infant and junior schools share the same catchment area.

Note 4
If parent or carers believe they qualify for consideration under criterion 3, they should indicate this on their preference form in the place provided for this purpose.

Note 5
To be considered under criteria 4 or 7 parents or carers must provide proof with the completed form that they regularly attend a church in membership of Churches Together in Britain or the Evangelical Alliance. ‘Regular’ is defined as at least twice a month. Attendance may be at more than one church but should be for at least two years prior to the application date.

In criteria 4 or 7 applications will be prioritised using the distance measurement methodology set out at Note 6 below, with those living closest to the school measured by the shortest straight line distance given priority.

Note 6
Distance measurements will be undertaken using the Local Authority’s computerised Geographical Information System [GIS]. This measures a straight-line measure between the centre of the pupil’s home address and a common point on the school site as determined by the LA.

Note 7
Random allocation will be used as a tie-break in categories 5 and 8 to decide who has the highest priority for admission if the distance between the children’s home address and the school is the same. This process will be independently verified.
Where there are more applications than places available in Year 12 at a community or voluntary controlled school, applications will be prioritised using the criteria below. They will be applied in conjunction with explanatory notes 1 - 4 which form part of the policy.

1. Students (children) looked after and previously, i.e. in public care, giving priority, if necessary, to the youngest child(ren) - see note 1 overleaf.

2. Students living in the catchment area who have brothers or sisters in the school at the time of their admission - see note 2 overleaf.

3. Students living outside the catchment area who, at the time of their admission, have brothers or sisters in the school who were allocated a place at that school by the Local Authority either (a) in the absence of a place being available in the catchment area school due to oversubscription and the school was identified by the Local Authority as the next nearest with a place available or (b) the school is named in the sibling’s Statement of Special Educational Need/Education, Health and Care Plan - see notes 2, and 3 overleaf.

4. Other students living in the catchment area.

5. Students living outside the catchment area who have brothers or sisters in the school at the time of their admission - see note 2 overleaf.

6. Students living outside the catchment area.

7. Where there is a need to prioritise places within any of the above criteria except criteria 1, priority will be given to those students who live nearest to the school – see note 4 and 5 overleaf.

Applications will be prioritised on the above basis. An exception will be made under the Authority's policy for the education of children with special needs (i) where a child holds 1. a Statement of Special Educational Need or 2. an Education, Health and Care Plan, or (ii) is currently undergoing a co-ordinated assessment, and in either case it is considered that attendance at a particular school is necessary to meet the identified needs of that child.
Explanatory Notes
[These notes are part of the policy]

Note 1
A child looked after, i.e., in public care, is defined as a child who is looked after by a local authority within the meaning of Section 22 of the Children Act 1989. Children previously looked after are children who were looked after, but have ceased to be so because they were adopted (under the terms of the Adoption and Children Act 2002) or became subject to a Child Arrangements Order or Special Guardianship Order (Children Act 1989). The provision to give the highest priority to looked after and previously looked after children applies to all children who have been adopted from local authority care.

Note 2
Brothers and sisters are those living at the same address and includes step and foster children. Priority will only be given where it is known at the time of allocating places that a sibling will be attending the school at the time of admission.

In circumstances where there is an application for more than one child in the family, and it is not possible to offer a place to all of the children concerned, it will be up to the parent or carers to decide whether they wish to accept the place[s] offered. This will also be the case in relation to twins, etc.

Note 3
If parent or carers believe they qualify for consideration under criterion 3, they should indicate this on their preference form in the place provided for this purpose.

Note 4
Distance measurements will be undertaken using the Local Authority's computerised Geographical Information System [GIS]. This measures a straight-line between the centre of the pupil's home address and a common point on the school site as determined by the LA.

Note 5
Random allocation will be used as a tie-break in categories 5 and 8 to decide who has the highest priority for admission if the distance between the children's home address and the school is the same. This process will be independently verified.
## September 2018 Admissions - Timetable

### For Entry Into Year 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority information out to schools for students and parent and carers</td>
<td>Autumn 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing date for students and/or their parents or carers to apply for a Year 12 Place</td>
<td>Friday 16 March 2018 Note: Some schools may encourage students to apply early to enable course options to be appropriately planned and resourced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority will notify students and or their parents or carers of their allocation</td>
<td>Friday 29 June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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