

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16 OCTOBER 2018
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

1. Question from Councillor Ian Manning

In September, it was reported that some Councils have been developing profiling for at risk residents and/or families:

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/sep/16/councils-use-377000-peoples-data-in-efforts-to-predict-child-abuse>

Has the County Council any plan now or in the future to do this?

Response from Councillor Simon Bywater
Chairman of Children and Young People Committee

Cambridgeshire County Council has not been involved in trials of this nature and has no plans to develop profiling as a means to help identify risk in the way that some authorities have recently been reported. That said, we always ensure that we monitor the impact of approaches taken by other local authorities, and should schemes such as these be able to evidence value, we may wish to explore adopting similar approaches. We would only do so, however, in consultation with Members through the Children and Young People Committee.

2. Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven

Part of the division I represent has had no Local Highways Officer for nearly a year. Now the post of District Manager, who oversees the Local Highways Officers, is vacant.

Another Local Highways Officer from a neighbouring patch has been assigned to help cover the gap. He now has responsibility for 37 villages, and no money left until next financial year.

The County Council is doing its best to recruit to both the Local Highways Officer and District Manager posts.

As Local Member, what response should I give to requests from my residents for reasonable work that needs doing, knowing that existing staff are vastly overstretched and that money has run out less than half-way through the financial year?

Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter
Chairman of Highway and Community Infrastructure Committee

We have been actively recruiting a number of roles in the Highway maintenance team and have recently been successful in recruiting two Local Highway Officers and

a Highways Inspector to Cambridge City and Huntingdon areas. We are currently advertising for the vacant position in South Division.

As a temporary measure the area has been split between the other Local Highway Officers in the South Division. This was implemented and shared with the Councillors by the new interim District Highway Manager Dennis Vacher as soon as he was in post.

Whilst we are recruiting we are supporting the existing Local Highway Officers with another temporary Inspector resource supplied by our Cambridgeshire Highways partners Skanska. We are aware of the extra work load that members of the team currently have and are monitoring the effectiveness of our temporary measures, and if required we will add to these.

There currently is budget available across the divisions but at times there is a lack of understanding regarding budgets with some team members. The District Highway manager is holding regular team meetings to improve this, and ensure that appropriate messages are passed onto elected Members and the public. To confirm, in Councillor van de Ven's patch, we have available budget for traditional pothole crews, the new dragon patcher's, gully emptying, carriageway patching and are currently completing all our cyclic programmes, that include grass cutting, weed kill, and the large countywide surface treatments programme.

We ask that members of the public should be encouraged to continue to report all defects via our online reporting system. All reports are inspected by the team and assessed according to the Highway Operational Standards document known locally as the HOS. Orders raised for work are checked that they are coded to the most appropriate budget, and then programmed with the timescale for work fed back to the customer.

3. Question from Councillor Nichola Harrison

Do you intend to continue with the LGSS project or will it be closed down and the services it provides be 'repatriated' to the council, as some have already been to Northamptonshire?

**Response from Councillor Steve Count
Chairman of General Purposes Committee**

The Council is currently evaluating how its support services will be delivered in the future. At this point Northamptonshire County Council have repatriated Professional Finance and Democratic Services. These two service areas are a priority of this review process and the Council is working closely with Milton Keynes Council in this evaluation. A decision is likely to be made on these two service areas within the next month. All three core partners of LGSS have also commissioned an independent review of both the governance and operating model of LGSS from the Chartered Institute of Public Finance. This review is currently in hand and on the conclusion the report and any recommendations emanating will be considered by the three partner organisations and the future model agreed.

4. Question from Councillor David Jenkins

Would the Leader of the Council kindly advise how many people are now employed within the transformation team and what the annualised cost of this team is including NI and pension payments and full office and support costs?

**Response from Councillor Steve Count
Chairman of General Purposes Committee**

The Transformation Team has an establishment of 38.5 full time equivalent roles. The full cost of this establishment is £1.96 million with a direct cost to revenue of £0.15m. The remaining £1.81m is funded through the Government initiative on flexible use of capital receipts, which was introduced in April 2016. The team operates without business support roles and has no office costs beyond the usual overheads associated with any team based at the Shire Hall site.

The transformation programme has supported the organisation to deliver £140million of savings and has had significant impact across all areas of the business including:

- an ambitious and innovative programme of change in Adults services, focused on putting more choice and more independence directly into the hands of individuals and communities;
- development of a place based approach to support health and wellbeing - built on the assets of a place and fostering community-based support and capacity;
- support to accelerate our digital approach, releasing savings, improving efficiency and ensuring our citizens receive a customer focused service;
- development of an evidence base and intelligence led approach to decision making and performance management, using benchmarking, baselining and consistent metrics to review and redesign services;
- investment in building partnerships across the public and voluntary sector which reduce duplication and cost and amplify the positive impact for citizens.

We took the decision in 2016 to centralise our transformation resource - reducing both the size and cost of capacity by 40% and being proactive in building capability for new ways of working. Over the last two years the Transformation Team have driven shared direction, alignment, and commitment throughout the organisation as well as successfully delivering a very challenging programme of change and its associated financial benefits.

5. Questions from Councillor Lorna Dupre

1. Which hauliers have signed up to the county council's HGV Covenant since it was launched in February 2016, and with which parishes?
2. Where and when were counts carried out to establish a baseline for traffic volumes before the building of the Ely Southern Bypass, and when will such counts be repeated after the opening of the bypass to measure its effect on traffic volumes?

3. Given the county council's considerable purchasing power, why is it cheaper for parish councils to purchase Mobile Vehicle Activated Signs directly from the supplier than through the council?

Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter
Chairman of Highway and Community Infrastructure Committee

1. The companies signed up to the HGV Covenant as of October 2018 are:
 2. Amey
 3. Balfour Beatty
 4. Cornwell & Son
 5. Masters Logistical
 6. Mick George Ltd
 7. Skanska
 8. John Henry Group
 9. Cardinalis Concrete
 10. Geoff Hobbs Haulage Ltd
 11. Turners Soham Ltd

The form used for signing up to the Covenant does not ask for Parish information, therefore it is not possible to provide a list of Parishes.

2. As part of the planning application, a full transport assessment was undertaken in accordance with Department for Transport guidance.

Traffic data was collected in 2013 at the following locations:

- Angel Drove (A142) / Station Road mini roundabout
- Angel Drove / Bypass new roundabout
- Stuntney Causeway / Bypass new roundabout
- A10 / Cambridge Road / Angel Drove roundabout
- A10 / Witchford Road roundabout
- Stuntney Causeway (A142) / Queen Adelaide Way priority junction
- Queen Adelaide Way / Ely Road / Branch Road priority junction
- Station Road tidal flow signal controlled under railway bridge
- Ely level crossing and underpass

The data was factored for growth to give baseline data up to 2031. Further counts to validate modelled flows were undertaken in 2016 prior to the bypass construction and to measure wider potential impact arising from local concerns. These were at:

- A142/B1381 at Sutton
- A1123/B1381 (Earith)
- Angel Drove (A142) / Station Road mini roundabout
- Stuntney Causeway (A142) / Queen Adelaide Way priority junction
- Ely level crossing and underpass

A monitoring framework agreed with the Department for Transport will repeat these surveys at one and five years after the opening of the bypass.

3. The Council usually sources its Mobile Vehicle Activated Signs (MVAS) from the manufacturers via one of our framework contracts, such as with Skanska or the Eastern Highways Alliance. As part of this process, the contractor adds on an administration fee in accordance with the contract we have with them.

We usually order signs in bulk through this route once or twice a year. Typically, doing this, the price per unit is 5% to 10% cheaper than if they were sourced individually or if the Parish Councils sourced them directly from the manufacturer.

Our contract arrangements with our Framework Contractors do mean that if we order individual signs through them, they can be more expensive which is why we do not favour this approach and steer Parish Council's towards securing the signs through our bulk purchases although there are times when Parish Councils wish a quicker turnaround. In these cases, we will assist them to make the purchases individually.