

CABINET

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

4 JULY 2011

The meeting commenced at 9.15 am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillors: Pam Hargreaves (Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio Holder),

Officers: Alyson Carman, Head of Legal Services
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

21. Apologies for Absence

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond, Robbie Payne (Deputy Mayor) (Finance and Procurement Portfolio Holder).

The following Members apologies were noted following them being advised not to attend at the required time due to the notified absence of both the Mayor and Deputy Mayor due to unavoidable and extraordinary circumstances; -

Councillors Jonathan Brash (Performance Portfolio Holder) Gerard Hall (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder), Cath Hill (Children's Services Portfolio Holder), Peter Jackson (Cabinet Member without Portfolio), Hilary Thompson (Culture, Leisure and Tourism Portfolio Holder),

22. Inquorate Meeting

It was noted that the meeting was not quorate. Councillor Pam Hargreaves (Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio Holder) noted that in the notified absence of both the Mayor and Deputy Mayor due to unavoidable and extraordinary circumstances, the meeting was Inquorate and therefore adjourned to be reconvened on Thursday 7 July 2011 at 9.15 a.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool to conduct the business of the agenda.

The meeting stood adjourned at 9.16 a.m.

7 JULY 2011

The meeting reconvened at 9.15 am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond - In the Chair

Councillors: Pam Hargreaves (Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio Holder),
Gerard Hall (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder).
Hilary Thompson (Culture, Leisure and Tourism Portfolio Holder),

Also Present: Councillor Marjorie James, Chair of Scrutiny Coordinating Committee
Councillor Sheila Griffin, Vice-Chair of the Health Scrutiny Forum.
Councillor Ray Wells.

Officers: Paul Walker, Chief Executive
Chris Little, Chief Finance Officer
Peter Devlin, Chief Solicitor
Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Denise Ogden, Assistant Director, Neighbourhood Services
Dale Clarke, Estates and Asset Manager
Tom Britcliffe, Principal Planning Officer
Nicola Bailey, Director of Child and Adult Services
Jill Harrison, Assistant Director, Adult Social Care
Sally Johnson, Assistant Director, Prevention, Safeguarding and Specialist Services
Danielle Swainston, Sure Start, Extended Services and Early Years Manager
Catherine Frank, Local Strategic Partnership Manager
Joan Stevens, Scrutiny Manager
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

23. Apologies for Absence

Councillors Jonathan Brash (Performance Portfolio Holder), Robbie Payne (Deputy Mayor) (Finance and Procurement Portfolio Holder), Cath Hill (Children's Services Portfolio Holder), and Peter Jackson (Cabinet Member without Portfolio).

24. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

25. Inquorate Meeting

It was noted that the meeting was not quorate. The Mayor indicated that (as permitted under the Local Government Act 2000 and the Constitution) he would exercise his powers of decision and that he would do so in accordance with the wishes of the Members present, indicated in the usual way. Each of the decisions set out in the decision record were confirmed by the Mayor accordingly.

26. Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2011

Confirmed.

27. Final Report – Connected Care *(Health Scrutiny Forum)*

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

The purpose of this report is to outline the findings and conclusions of the Health Scrutiny Forum's investigation into 'Connected Care'.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Vice-Chair of the Health Scrutiny Forum outlined the overall aim of the scrutiny investigation, terms of reference, methods of investigation, findings, conclusions, and subsequent recommendations.

Cabinet welcomed the report and its findings and thanked Scrutiny for the work completed. Cabinet Members indicated their strong support for the model of Connected Care that had proved so successful in the Owton Ward. It was highlighted that this success was built upon the detailed knowledge of the ward and residents by groups that were embedded within the local community. The Owton scheme had been visited by past and present government Health Ministers who had shown great interest in the Connected Care Model.

There was some confusion amongst some Cabinet Members as to whether Connected Care was a brand, a process or an organisation. The Director of Child and Adult Services commented that she perceived Connected Care as a model; a method of bringing different organisations together to support the needs of an individual. The Director also referred to Who Cares North East which was a Community Interest Company which would host some of the services currently provided through Connected Care. It had to be noted that while the Council would be funding these services to the tune of £50,000 a year the vast majority of the money was NHS funding and in particular included the Reablement funding recently reported to the Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio.

The Mayor indicated that Cabinet had been and continued to be a strong supporter of Connected Care. The Mayor was, however, concerned at some of the references to officers of partner organisations in the associated action plan. The Mayor proposed that the approval of the action plan should be deferred at this point to allow Cabinet an opportunity to consider the action plan in more detail and to establish how the actions would be linked and how they would be responded to by considering the council position in relation to the facilitation of Connected Care.

Cabinet Members wished to record their support for Connected Care. It was highlighted that the authority would be taking on the responsibility for the promotion of public health and wellbeing in the near future and it was appropriate to ensure one of the most effective examples of partnership working was taken forward.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee was concerned that the rollout of Connected Care didn't slow down. Work had been on-going with Burbank residents over the last six months to develop a Connected Care scheme for their area. The Mayor indicated that that would not be the case and hoped that the action plan report could be brought back within a month.

Decision

That the recommendations set out below of the Health Scrutiny Forum following its investigation into 'Connected Care' be approved and adopted: -

"The Health Scrutiny Forum has taken evidence from a wide range of sources to assist in the formulation of a balanced range of recommendations. The Forum's key recommendations to the Cabinet are as outlined below:-

- (a) That a strategy is devised to identify those communities within Hartlepool who may benefit from the delivery of the Connected Care model;
- (b) That once recommendation (a) is completed, Connected Care is rolled-out to other communities in Hartlepool:-
 - (i) Ensuring that the necessary governance structure is in place;
 - (ii) Identifying the needs of the individual community from residents and ensuring the delivery of a bespoke service that covers any gaps in existing provision;
 - (iii) Ensuring that partnership arrangements are in place for current service providers and that duplication of work does not occur for those providers already delivering relevant services in that community; and
 - (iv) That a feasibility study is carried out into support for the Connected Care roll-out through the transfer of staff and / or resources.

- (c) That following the completion of the work being undertaken by the LSE:-
 - (i) That the findings are shared with the Health Scrutiny Forum; and
 - (ii) That where evidence demonstrates the financial benefits of Connected Care, those organisations benefitting from early intervention by Connected Care, are invited to support or further support the Connected Care programme through resource allocation.
- (d) That in order to ensure the safety of Connected Care Navigators and as part of a multi-disciplinary approach to meeting the needs of individuals, that a feasibility study be undertaken into Navigators accessing Care First, Rio, Employee Protection Register and other related systems.”

28. Action Plan – Connected Care (*Director of Child and Adult Services*)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To agree an Action Plan in response to the findings and subsequent recommendations of the Health Scrutiny Forum’s investigation into ‘Connected Care’.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The report included brief background information into the ‘Connected Care’ scrutiny investigation and provided a proposed Action Plan set out at Appendix A to the report in response to the Scrutiny Forum’s recommendations.

Decision

That the Action Plan in response to the recommendations of the Health Scrutiny Forum’s investigation into ‘Connected Care’ be deferred for further consideration.

29. Final Report – The Provision of Face to Face Financial Advice and Information Services in Hartlepool (*Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee*)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To present the Final Report of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee following its investigation into ‘The Provision of Face to Face Financial Advice and Information Services in Hartlepool’.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Chair of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee outlined the overall aim of the scrutiny investigation, terms of reference, methods of investigation, findings, conclusions, and subsequent recommendations.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee referred to the Action plan submitted in response to the investigation report and commented that the provision of an appropriate database (recommendation (b)) could be met by the utilisation of the national Consumer Advice Bureau database, with some amendments to meet the needs of the authority. Also, the Chair of Scrutiny Coordinating Committee indicated that the provision of an Integrated Advice and Guidance (IAG) Service (recommendation (k)) would fit in with anticipated government legislation though the authority would need to be proactive in spending the significant budget already committed to the various advice and guidance services in place now in a smarter more effective fashion.

The Mayor and cabinet Members welcomed the report and indicated that it contained some very useful information and revealed the depth of the financial problems faced by many people in Hartlepool. The report would be an excellent piece of evidence when considering the budget for 2012/13. The Mayor, however, commented that there was significant work ongoing on the Community Pool and the future commissioning of services rather than grant allocation. The report showed how organisations could come together to provide better services to people in Hartlepool and as the work on the Community Pool was not yet completed, the Mayor suggested that it would be appropriate not to approve the action plan until it could be reviewed alongside the community pool work. The role of the Credit Union as a key provider of face-to-face advice also needed to be included.

Cabinet Members supported the Mayor's view and also commented that the Economic Development Team needed to be included in the action plan where there were references to careers and employment.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee was concerned that additional information was being added at this stage and questioned whether the report needed to be referred back to Scrutiny Coordinating Committee for review. The report did not exclude any partner organisations that provided advice and guidance. The implementation of the generic IAG would have all these various organisations behind it.

The Director of Child and Adult Services commented that the statutory responsibility for providing information, advice and guidance to young people that currently sat with connexions would move to the schools. Schools would then have a statutory responsibility provide information, advice and guidance for their pupils and the associated funding would move from the Local Authority to the schools.. Alongside this shift of responsibility to the schools the government was developing a new nationally based all age information, advice and guidance service that maybe likely to be web

based. In the future the Council would only be responsible for providing the information, advice and guidance service to vulnerable young people and those with complex needs. The Chair of Scrutiny Coordinating Committee was very concerned that the IAG services to young people that had previously been provided by Connexions could move to a web based system.

The Mayor thanked scrutiny for an excellent report but did feel that any actions should be deferred to allow time to review how best to meet the recommendations in light of the other work ongoing elsewhere in the authority.

Decision

That the recommendations set out below of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee following its investigation into 'The Provision of Face to Face Financial Advice and Information Services in Hartlepool' be approved and adopted: -

"The Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee has taken evidence from a wide range of sources to assist in the formulation of a balanced range of recommendations. The Committee recognises that face to face financial advice and information services are effectively provided in Hartlepool and commend providers on their commitment to improving the health and wellbeing of residents.

In taking forward / improving the provision of face to face financial advice and information services in Hartlepool, the Committee's key recommendations to the Cabinet are as outlined below:-

- (a) That, in thinking laterally about the how face to face financial advice services can be configured / provided in the future, a mechanism be put in place under the banner of 'Connected Care' that focuses on the provision of core 'holistic' baseline services with the ability to 'bolt' on other services to meet the specific needs of individual communities;
- (b) That a criterion and formal monitoring mechanism / database be developed, with full Elected Member involvement, for the award of all funding from the Council (including the Community Pool) and other partners for the provision of face to face financial advice and information services;
- (c) That within the criteria (outlined in recommendation b):-
 - (i) Emphasis must be placed upon:
 - Simplicity of language and processes;
 - Accountability and performance, to be achieved through the effective monitoring / evaluation of activities and outcomes;
 - (ii) Clear 'baseline' aims and objectives must be defined for the provision of face to face financial advice services in Hartlepool, against which each application would be measured;
 - (iii) There must be a requirement for each applicant to clearly define

- their aims / objectives, and specifically the activities they intend to be undertaken, in providing face to face financial advice services;
- (iv) There should be a requirement that no person waits more than a maximum of 10 days for a specialist face to face financial advice appointment and that an effective emergency response must also be available;
 - (v) Details of the specialist the training and qualifications should be clearly specified, against which organisations can be assessed (i.e. showing that they either have, or are working towards, Matrix accreditation);
 - (vi) In relation to Community Pool Funding, the capacity to retain part of the funding to be used to assist in achieving accreditation. 100% funding at first, decreasing in future applications; and
 - (vii) Each organisation should be required to participate in a mechanism that enables the effective monitoring and evaluation of their outcomes against the agreed aims, objectives and activities.
- (d) That a web based monitoring process / database be identified that:
- Is implementable and accessible by all organisations who receive funding for the provision of face to face financial advice services, in a secure, transparent and generic way; and
 - Can be easily monitored in a consistent manner across all organisations.
- (e) A strategy needs to be developed to ensure that new financial advisors are trained and accredited in order to meet future demand;
- (f) That the centralised CAB case management database be utilised to help focus the provision of face to face financial advice services / resources and identify potential issues for inclusion in ward specific advice packages;
- (g) That work be undertaken to improve the transmission of information between all organisations (navigators and providers);
- (h) That in light of the vast resource of expertise that exists across the town, ways of improving partnership mechanisms to facilitate the sharing of this expertise, and information on the availability of services, need to be explored;
- (i) That in recognition of the importance of preventative services, funding should be found to enable the continued provision of money skills / management sessions in schools, in partnership with Barclays Money Skills Project / Hartlepool Financial Inclusion Partnership;
- (j) That consideration be given to creating a generic Information Advice and Guidance (I.A.G.) Service which meets the needs of all residents at all stages of their lives, in partnership with current providers. This Service to work closely with the national CAB as a means of ensuring that Hartlepool does not lose out on access to national monies and

recognised monitoring mechanisms, whilst ensuring that advice is readily available in community settings that are accessible to residents; and

- (k) That the provision of a Generic I.A.G. Service, which incorporates Careers, Jobs, Training, Money Management, Benefits, Housing and Retirement, etc, and runs alongside/incorporates the roll out of the Connected Care model, be explored.”

30. Action Plan – The Provision of Face to Face Financial Advice and Information Services in Hartlepool *(Director of Child and Adult Services)*

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To agree an Action Plan in response to the findings and subsequent recommendations of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee’s investigation into the provision of face-to-face financial advice and information services in Hartlepool.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The report provided brief background information into the Scrutiny investigation in to the provision of face to face financial advice and information services in Hartlepool and provides a proposed Action Plan set out at Appendix A to the report in response to the Committee’s recommendations.

Decision

That the Action Plan in response to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee’s investigation into the provision of face to face financial advice and information services in Hartlepool be deferred for further consideration.

31. Adoption of the Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Budget and Policy Framework.

Purpose of report

The report sought approval to adopt The Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which would guide future minerals and waste development in Hartlepool for the next 15 years.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Mayor reported that the Joint Tees Valley Minerals and Waste DPDs set out the spatial planning framework for guiding the development of minerals and waste facilities and operations. They had been prepared jointly by the five Tees Valley authorities.

Following the submission to the Secretary of State of the Joint Tees Valley Minerals and Waste DPDs and a schedule of minor changes in November of last year, an independent examination was held in February 2011. In his subsequent examination report dated the 16th May 2011 the Inspector found both DPDs sound and proposed no further changes to the documents.

On adoption the Minerals and Waste DPDs would form part of the Development Plan for the Borough and would replace all Minerals and Waste policies in the adopted Local Plan (2006). The Tees Valley authorities had set a preliminary adoption date of the 15th September 2011.

The Mayor indicated that this was a very robust document which would assist in the control of illegal waste site operations and the document had already been used in dealing with a number of planning applications.

Decision

That Cabinet recommends that Council adopt the Tees Valley Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents in so far as they relate to the Borough of Hartlepool.

32. Review of Community Involvement and Engagement (including LSP Review) *(Assistant Chief Executive)*

Type of decision

Key Decision (test ii applies). Forward Plan reference number CE43/11.

Purpose of report

The purpose of the report was to inform Cabinet of the views received from Council Working Group and partners on the proposals put forward to Cabinet on 6th June 2011. Cabinet was requested to consider those views when agreeing the future approach of the Local Authority to community and stakeholder involvement and engagement and the Local Strategic Partnership, including theme partnerships.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Mayor reported that the report set out the comments received from Council Working Group and partners on the proposals put to Cabinet on 6th June 2011. The report from 6th June 2011 set out a series of proposals which, if agreed, would change the Council's approach to community engagement and involvement including through the Local Strategic Partnership. It included proposals for the development of a Strategic

Partners Group and Face the Public events as well as changes to the current arrangements for theme groups, Neighbourhood Consultative Forums, Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) and resident representation. The report also included proposals to end a number of current arrangements. Cabinet was requested to consider the views received when deciding on the range of proposals put forward.

The Mayor considered that in light of the comments received and the disparate views received it was appropriate that Cabinet had a further chance to review the comments received and balance them against the original proposals. This view was supported by Cabinet and one Cabinet Member commented that there was a need for some kind of wider public meeting arrangement. A process diagram setting out both of the options included in the report was also requested.

Decision

That consideration of the future approach of the Local Authority to community and stakeholder involvement and engagement and the Local Strategic Partnership, including theme partnerships be deferred for further consideration of the responses received to the consultation process.

33. The Munro Review of Child Protection (*Director of Child and Adult Services*)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

The purpose of the report was to brief Cabinet on the contents of the Munro Review of Child Protection (which was published by the Department for Education in May 2011) and to outline the impact of the report on local arrangements.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Assistant Director, Prevention, Safeguarding and Specialist Services reported on the key findings and recommendations of the Munro Review of Child Protection. The review examined in detail the current arrangements for child protection and how existing practice had evolved over many years and become too focused on process and targets rather than being responsive to the needs of individual children and their families. There were strong messages in the review about the need to reduce the level of government prescription and allow for a greater emphasis on local discretion and professional judgment.

The review set out what it considered to be the principles of an effective child protection system and these principles underpinned the recommendations for reform. It promoted the need for systems to be child centred, aimed at helping children and their families and that support and services needed to be delivered across a broad range of provision. It

identified early intervention and prevention as being critical to improving outcomes for children and noted it was clearly better for children to receive help before they had any, or only minor, adverse experiences. It made recommendations for reform to the inspection framework and also how the Local Safeguarding Children Boards should have greater accountability to local leaders.

The review made the case to radically improve the knowledge and skills of social workers and highlights the critical importance of being skilled in developing sound working relationships with children and families. It noted that achieving the required reforms will depend heavily on strong and skilled leadership.

The Mayor commented that there were no costs identified within the report for the changes to service delivery that would be required. The Assistant Director reported that there were no significant costs identified as much of the work that was needed was around reshaping service delivery.

Decision

That the report be received and endorsed and the Child and Adults Services Department develop a plan to implement the recommendations of the review subject to adaptation once the government response was received.

34. Peer Review of Adult Safeguarding – May 2011 (*Director of Child and Adult Services*)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To inform Cabinet of the outcome of a Peer Review of Adult Safeguarding completed in May 2011.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder reported that the Council commissioned Local Government Improvement and Development (LGID) to undertake a peer review of adult safeguarding arrangements. The aim of the peer review was to assist local agencies to respond to the changing agenda for adult safeguarding. The peer review is a learning process which assesses current achievements and areas of good practice and identifies areas for improvement.

The review explored ambitions, performance and delivery structures against LGID Standards for Adult Safeguarding which had been developed in conjunction with the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS), the Local Government Association, the Social Care Institute for Excellence and the NHS Confederation.

A peer review team visited Hartlepool for five days commencing 9 May 2011. The review team undertook a programme of focus groups, individual and group meetings with leaders, senior managers, staff, partners, people who use services and the wider community.

On the final day of the review, the team presented initial findings to lead officers and key strategic partners. The findings focused on strengths and areas for consideration / development across each of the key themes of the inspection. A summary of the strengths, including the passionate, enthusiastic and committed adult social care staff and the areas for consideration resulting from the inspection were set out in the report.

A Feedback and Planning Session for all Board members, facilitated by LGID took place on 25 May. The findings of the review were discussed and members were asked to consider next steps and how the Board should move forward. It was agreed that current structures needed to be reviewed, and that the Board would hold a development day in September prior to being re-launched.

A development day had been planned for 20 September 2011 which would:

- Review and clarify the role of the Board;
- Agree practical issues including chairing, roles of sub groups, meeting structures, membership and terms of reference;
- Agree priorities for the coming two years, taking into account the priorities of the Tees-wide Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Board, which focus on personalisation, financial abuse, conviction rates for perpetrators and hate crime.

The first meeting of the re-launched Board would take place on 15 November 2011. Quarterly adult safeguarding updates would continue to be provided through the Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that when things go wrong in adult safeguarding they tended to go wrong on a major scale as could be seen from the BBC Panorama investigation into the adult care home in Bristol. Locally the care of vulnerable adults was taken very seriously and was constantly promoted with staff and service users through the 'no secrets' campaign.

The Mayor indicated that he would wish to see what involvement the Community Safety Partnership could bring to some of the areas highlighted in the report as requiring consideration. The Chief Executive commented that the officers in this area needed to be congratulated on the excellent work they undertake as was reflected in the peer review report.

Decision

That the report be noted and that the staff in Adult Safeguarding be thanked for their excellent work and commitment as reflected in the peer review report.

35. Jacksons Landing “Take Off” *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Key Decision test i and ii apply. Reference Number: RN 41/10

Purpose of report

The purpose of the report was to seek approval to purchase Jacksons Landing to facilitate a landmark regeneration scheme for the town.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio Holder reported on proposals for the acquisition of a strategic and prominent building identified in the central investment framework. The acquisition would provide the opportunity for a transformational flagship development to be brought forward diversifying and underpinning the town’s economy and bringing into use a key vacant building. It was highlighted that much of the detailed financial information, risks and terms of the potential purchase were set out in the exempt appendix to the report. Details of the strategy and business case were set out in the confidential appendix to the report which contained exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006) namely (para 3), information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The Mayor highlighted that as a departure from the budget and policy framework, the prudential borrowing would require the approval of Council. The decision to purchase and subsequently make the request for the prudential borrowing lay with Cabinet.

The Mayor commented that he had been surprised by the high quality suggestions for the building and the site that had come forward since the Council’s interest had become known. This stage was the culmination of several years work with the current owners and showed that if the council did show an imaginative, entrepreneurial attitude great benefits could be reaped. It had to be acknowledged that there were risks in such a venture and those should not be underplayed. However, all Members that had been advised of the scheme – the proposal had been discussed at Scrutiny – believed it was a financial risk the council should take in terms of the wider potential regeneration benefits.

The Cabinet Members present unanimously supported the proposal. A Member did feel that the public may question why the council was spending this kind of money when it was cutting services. The Mayor commented that there was the potential for both a regular income through car parking and capital income for the authority. The Council would also be in a position to control any development in the future in both terms of timescale and content which had to be a significant positive.

Decision

1. That the report be noted.
2. That Cabinet seeks approval of Council to using Prudential borrowing to purchase Jacksons Landing by 31st August 2011, whilst noting the potential financial risks to the General Fund Revenue budget if a 'back to back' deal takes longer to complete, or is not achieved.
3. That the proposal to purchase be referred to Full Council on 4th August 2011 for final approval so that the purchase can be completed by the 31st August 2011 deadline.

36. Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

Minute 37 General Purposes – Review of Selection for Redundancy in Youth Offending Services - This item contained exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972, namely

37. General Purposes – Review of Selection for Redundancy in Youth Offending Services (*Director of Child and Adult Services*) This item contained exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972, namely para. 1

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To provide the information necessary to enable Cabinet to make a final decision on the deletion of a number of posts which affected the compulsory redundancy of employees.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

Details of the Cabinet's consideration of this matter are set in the Exempt section of the minutes.

Decision

That the report be noted.

The meeting concluded at 10.50 a.m.

P J DEVLIN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

PUBLICATION DATE: 13 JULY 2011