

Cabinet

Thursday, 2 November 2017, County Hall, Worcester - 10.00 am

| | | Minutes |
|--|--|--|
| Present: | | Mr S E Geraghty (Chairman), Mr A T Amos, Mr A I Hardman, Mr M J Hart, Mrs L C Hodgson, Ms K J May, Mr A P Miller, Dr K A Pollock, Mr A C Roberts and Mr J H Smith |
| Also attended: | | Mr R C Adams, Mr P Grove, Mr P M McDonald, Mr P Middlebrough, Mrs F M Oborski, Mr C B Taylor, Mr P A Tuthill, and Mrs E B Tucker. |
| Available papers | | The members had before them: A. The agenda papers (previously circulated); and B. The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 September 2017 (previously circulated). |
| 1804 Apologies and Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 1) | | None. |
| 1805 Public Participation (Agenda item 2) | | None. |
| 1806 Confirmation of the Minutes of the previous meeting (Agenda item 3) | | RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 September 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman. |
| 1807 Worcestershire Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2016-17 (Agenda item 4) | | The Cabinet considered the Worcestershire Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2016-17. The details were set out in the report. Derek Benson, the Independent Chair and Sue Haddon, the Board Manager presented the Annual Report 2016-17 and made the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The report set out progress up to the end of |

March 2017 and it was acknowledged that a lot had happened since that date

- Ofsted had undertaken a review of the effectiveness of the Board and concluded that the Board required improvement to be graded as good. As a result an action plan had been devised and good progress had been made in this respect
- The Board had focussed on healthy relationships, child exploitation, Early Help provision, the integrated Family Front Door and appropriate thresholds, young people at the point of transition, children with disabilities and strengthening the Board's learning and improvement framework
- Child Sexual Exploitation – A revised plan was in place and this was progressing satisfactorily
- Early Help – This remained a significant area of concern with uncertainty about the Early Help offer in Worcestershire, the pathway to access the offer, whether there was sufficient capacity to meet demand in commissioned services and whether partner agencies were aware of their role
- Family Front Door – Following its launch in 2016, the service faced significant pressure in terms of inappropriate application of thresholds and whether processes and procedures were sufficiently robust
- Young People at the point of transition – The Board needed to work closely with the Safeguarding Adult Board to improve service provision
- No serious case reviews had been commissioned
- The Board had requested a report from the Health and Well-being Board on the work of the Child Death Overview Panel
- The Board had met its statutory duties although there was a degree of uncertainty going forward with possible changes to the legislation proposed by the Government
- There was a strong commitment amongst partner organisations to safeguarding however there had been systematic failings that had left children susceptible to harm. Progress was being made and strategies were in place to address the significant challenges going forward.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- Although further assurance was required, the report recognised that progress was being made. It should be acknowledged that the Council took safeguarding of children very seriously
- The Chairman of the Children and Families Scrutiny Panel expressed a concern about the Government's proposals to no longer proceed with Safeguarding Boards as statutory organisations and replace them with purely local arrangements. The Council's focus should be on improvement of service provision not the process itself
- It was crucial that all members, officers and partner organisations were supportive of the work going on in Children's Services
- A member from outside the Cabinet queried the different level of emphasis on the provision of the Early Help service by the Board in comparison with Ofsted. Derek Benson responded that Ofsted was required to select particular priority areas to investigate whereas the Board had a more general overview with the involvement of partner organisations. It did not mean that the Early Help service was any less of a focus for Ofsted. The Leader added that Ofsted had highlighted four key areas and the Council considered them to be equally important. He suspected that the Early Help service would be the subject of a future Ofsted visit
- The Cabinet Member for Children and Families commented that alongside the progress being made to improve performance, the Council was also required to present new ways of doing things. The Council could learn from the issues that arise from the regular national serious case reviews
- A member from outside the Cabinet expressed concern about the number of cases that were referred directly to the Family Front Door without any Early Help support. Derek Benson commented that it was important to have processes in place to ensure that referrals were made at the right time, to the right level and through the appropriate route
- In response to a query about the Government's review of safeguarding, Derek Benson argued that although processes could always be improved, he considered that progress had been made locally and the Government's review was necessary
- The Leader thanked Derek Benson and Sue

Haddon for their report. There was evidence (recognised by Ofsted) that progress was being made but he recognised that the Council needed to continue to improve and this would take some time.

RESOLVED: that

- a) the Worcestershire Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2016/17 be received; and**
- b) the progress of the work of the Worcestershire Safeguarding Children Board be noted.**

1808 Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Update (Agenda item 5)

The Cabinet received an update on the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS). The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The Cabinet Member for the Environment introduced the report and commented that the JMWMS was last updated in 2014 and an Addendum had now been produced to reflect changes to national policy and future demands and achievements since 2014. District councils were adopting the Addendum through their local processes. The Council had achieved its objective of reducing waste to landfill and the EfW plant had been more effective than originally envisaged. The Council was looking at further ways of reducing waste including encouraging everyone to take responsibility for waste separation, for example through composting
- Rather than separation at source, the Council had adopted the co-mingled approach to waste separation. The performance of the co-mingled plant at Norton suggested that this approach was working. Indeed the amount of municipal waste to landfill had reduced from 88% in 2000/01 to 6% in 2016/17
- A member from outside the Cabinet commented that the strategy to achieve the 50% recycling target was not ambitious enough. There was too much focus on a municipal approach rather than engagement with the public in particular in relation to food waste collection. The Leader responded that good progress had been made meeting this target and engaging the public but more progress needed to be made. The Cabinet Member for the

Environment added that the price of plastic and glass had reduced which meant that it was not prudent to further invest in this area. Bottom ash waste was now being processed at Hill and Moor Landfill site and the Council was waiting for the EA to recognise the waste from that process to be used as aggregate

- The lack of public understanding of what could be recycled was a national issue
- The amount of electricity generated by the EfW plant into the local grid should be acknowledged, it provided enough power for 32,000 homes. District Councils were having difficulties increasing the levels of recycling in their areas. Recycling schemes needed to be made easy for the public to understand. The co-mingled approach was less complicated, cheaper and produced better results. The Cabinet Member for the Environment added that district councils would be reminding the public on what could or could not be recycled and the Council would be providing information for schools
- The garden waste recycling service was an invaluable service for the public.

RESOLVED that the Addendum to the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) for Herefordshire and Worcestershire 2004-2034 be approved as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

1809 Worcestershire Rail Investment Strategy (Agenda item 6)

The Cabinet considered the Worcestershire Rail Investment Strategy. The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The Cabinet Member for Economy and Infrastructure introduced the report and commented that a rail consultant company (SLC Rail) had produced a strategy that provided an indication of the potential for improving rail traffic in the county. The train service to London from the County presently compared unfavourably with for example Staffordshire which was a similar distance away from London. The aim was to increase the number of trains to two per hour from Worcester, one of which would be a fast train with a further train service from Kidderminster to London. The Council was seeking to improve rail services to Birmingham through the West Midlands Rail Ltd and the dualling of the track to

London through the North Cotswold Line Task Force Group (costing £275m). There were enormous financial and employment opportunities for the Council in supporting this Strategy

- There was overwhelming support from the public and businesses for this Strategy. Hopefully it would focus the attention of Network Rail in improving the signalling at Worcester stations
- A member from outside the Cabinet expressed concern about the proposed service to Malvern. Did the two trains per hour to London include Malvern? Was the train service from Kidderminster in addition to the two trains from Worcester? Did the turn-back facility at Henwick mean that trains would not proceed onto Malvern/Hereford? The Leader responded that the purpose of the turn-back facility and the improved signally and infrastructure was not to reduce service provision but to maximise the capacity of the existing network. It was important to continue to lobby Government to ensure that services remained good to the west of Worcester. The Cabinet Member for Economy and Infrastructure added that the train service from Kidderminster to London was in addition to the two Worcester trains
- The Leader indicated that business leaders at the LEP had been impressed by the presentation of the Strategy by SLC Rail because it integrated the rail strategy with the economic plan for the County. It was clear that any decisions on future investment would need to be evidence-based and difficult investment decisions would need to be made
- The detail in the Strategy as to how the investment in Shrub Hill Station would fit in with Worcestershire Parkway was impressive
- A member from outside the Cabinet requested that the wording of the Strategy be amended to indicate that the two trains per hour went from Great Malvern to London. The Leader responded that it was not possible to amend the Strategy however it was possible that the point could be made to SLC Rail to be reflected in the published version
- The Strategy would reduce the number of cars on the road and pollution levels. The improvements to Droitwich Station with increased car parking were welcomed.

**1810 Pershore
Infrastructure
Improvements
(Agenda item 7)**

RESOLVED that the Worcestershire Rail Investment Strategy be formally endorsed and adopted.

The Cabinet considered improvements to Pershore Infrastructure. The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The Cabinet Member for Economy and Infrastructure introduced the report and commented that there were three elements to the scheme: the Northern Link Road, Pinvin Junction, and Station Road/Wyre Road Junction. The scheme would cost £11.6m, some of which had already been received from the LEP however the Council would be required to raise £5.6m. He particularly highlighted the improved access from Keytec Business Park to the A44 and the potential reduction in congestion and clarified the reference in the report should be to the B4083
- The local councillor welcomed the proposals and associated timeframe for the work. The proposal was supported by the County Association of Local Councils and Pershore Town Council. Local businesses had also liaised with the Council to establish a link road between the two parts of the trading estate
- The proposals were welcomed. The Council would need to borrow to complete the work but this was justified in terms of the substantial improvement in traffic flow in Pershore and the surrounding area as well as links to economic and housing growth.

RESOLVED: that

- a) the implementation of Pershore Infrastructure Improvements, (Pershore Northern Link Road, Pinvin crossroads and Wyre Road/Station Road Junction) be approved in accordance with the report, as shown on the plan (Appendix B) to the report, subject to the confirmation of planning permission and surety of funding;**
- b) the submission of a planning application for Pershore Infrastructure Improvements and applications for other relevant consents be approved, including those relating to**

environment, utilities and rail by the Council or by the relevant successful contractor as agent for the Council as Highway Authority;

- c) the commencement of a public engagement and information-sharing exercise regarding the scheme be approved;
- d) the acquisition of the land required for the scheme, as shown on the red line plan (Appendix C) to the report be approved and, should it not be possible to acquire all the land by negotiation, the acquisition of necessary land and rights over land be authorised through making of a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and the Director of Economy and Infrastructure be authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Economy and Infrastructure, to finalise the details and make a CPO including any compulsory acquisition of rights required for the scheme;
- e) the provision of up to £5.6M of Council funding to address the forecast funding gap for the scheme be approved, subject to sufficient external funding being secured to meet the total cost of £11.6M and relevant Local Transport Board approvals for the scheme;
- f) the Director of Economy and Infrastructure be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Economy and Infrastructure, to finalise and award a contract and other necessary agreements for the delivery of the scheme subject to funding being secured; and
- g) **TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** the addition of £11.6M to the Capital Programme with £6m being provisionally secured through Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership and local district council and developer contribution for the purpose of completing the Pershore Infrastructure Improvement scheme.

**1811 Kidderminster
Railway Station
(Agenda item 8)**

The Cabinet considered the progress to date and the delivery of the Kidderminster Station scheme. The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The Cabinet Member for Economy and Infrastructure introduced the report and commented that the existing facilities at Kidderminster Station were inadequate. The new scheme would cost £4.3m with Growth Deal Funding of £2.5m from Worcestershire LEP and £1.8m from Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP. Patronage of the station was 1.6m annually, the 2nd busiest station in the county. The new scheme had been designed in collaboration with the Severn Valley Railway and fitted in well with it aesthetically. The report set out a strong business case for the scheme. It was anticipated that the scheme would be completed by the summer of 2019. He pointed out the typo in paragraph 5 that the Stourbridge reference related to the northern route, not southern
- The proposed scheme would provide a modern state-of-the-art, fit-for purpose station to replace the existing station which was dark and dingy with inadequate facilities
- A local councillor welcomed the scheme but expressed concern about the insufficient parking provision. She felt the visitor survey had asked passengers the wrong question about how they had travelled to the station. Additionally she was concerned that Network Rail considered Blakedown Station to be a suitable alternative station. The existing cobblestones were unsafe and needed replacing
- In response to a query, the Leader commented that the budget was tight for this scheme and there were no additional funds for other matters such as parking. Further phases to the scheme might well be forthcoming in the future dependent on funding
- The Cabinet Member for Economy and Infrastructure clarified that the cobblestones would be replaced with the exception of those in front of the Severn Valley Railway. The new rail franchise West Midlands Trains Ltd were proposing to invest funds into providing 100 further car parking spaces at Kidderminster Station.

RESOLVED: that

- a) the progress to date and the delivery of the Kidderminster Station scheme be noted; and**

- b) **delegated authority be granted to the Director of Economy and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Economy and Infrastructure, to award a contract and associated agreements to deliver the scheme.**

1812 Infrastructure Engineering Term Contract (Agenda item 9)

The Cabinet considered the Infrastructure Engineering Term Contract. The details were set out in the report.

The Cabinet Member introduced the report and commented that the existing contract with Alun Griffiths Contractors Ltd was coming to an end and the Council required a new contract for an extended period. There would be a target price for each package of work with a 'gain share' mechanism which provided the contractor with an incentive to identify efficiencies during the delivery of the work. The maximum value of the contact would be £75m. There would be no obligation to award work. There would be a requirement for early contractor involvement in order to deliver best value schemes best suited to the user's needs.

RESOLVED: that

- a) **the approach to commissioning an Infrastructure Engineering Term Contract be endorsed and the commencement of the procurement process be approved; and**
- b) **the Director of Economy and Infrastructure be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Economy and Infrastructure, to finalise and execute an Infrastructure Engineering Term Contract.**

1813 Worcestershire Local Transport Plan 4 (Agenda item 10)

The Cabinet considered the Local Transport Plan 4. The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The Head of Legal and Democratic Services indicated that Appendix G to the report – Health Impact Assessment was unavailable but would need to be reported to Council. He therefore suggested that the Director of Economy and Infrastructure be authorised to finalise the LTP4 Health Impact Assessment for presentation to

Council

- The Cabinet Member for Economy and Environment introduced the report and commented that the Plan gave an indication of the direction of travel for the Council and the work that the Council would wish to do. It did not mean that all the work would be undertaken or that a budget would be available. The Council received a significant response to the consultation exercise and many of the suggestions received were included in the Plan. The Plan was split into three sections, North East Worcestershire, Wyre Forest and South Worcestershire. The Plan included a Policies Document, a Network Management Plan, a Strategic Environmental Assessment, a Habitats Regulation Assessment and a Health Impact Assessment. He emphasised that the School Crossing Patrol Policy was focussed on First and Primary school children
- The Leader of the Council indicated that the LTP3 had been successful in attracting funds to enable the delivery of a number of projects for the Council. A number of the schemes in LTP4 were aspirational at this stage but this showed the positive approach of the Council to the improvement of the transport infrastructure of the county. He accepted that there would be disagreement over the prioritisation of schemes within the Plan
- A good transport network was essential to economic success in a modern economy. Where investment in transport infrastructure had been inadequate, it had adversely impacted on future growth and confidence
- A member from outside the Cabinet commented that it was vital to have the infrastructure in place to support the housing and employment growth in the county. For example the dualling of the A449 from the Mitre Oak to Ombersley would improve the competitiveness of local businesses
- The Cabinet Member for Communities indicated that the School Crossing Control Policy had been produced to update existing policies to ensure that the Council was compliant with recent legislation. The aim was to provide a high quality service that was efficient and sustainable. The Council had a duty to show that crossings were selected based on the number of pupils using it, traffic flows, sustainability and other associated factors
- A member from outside the Cabinet welcomed the Plan but questioned whether it was flexible or

ambitious enough to address the needs of the north of the County, in particular in relation to the A38. The Leader responded that it was essential to draw in extra funding for the proposed scheme for the A38

- A member from outside the Council highlighted the congestion issues between Holt and the Ombersley Island as well as over Holt Bridge
- The Cabinet Member for Economy and Infrastructure recognised the congestion problems in Bromsgrove and would be meeting representatives of Bromsgrove area CALC to hear their views. In relation to the A38, additional funding was being sought. The only solution to the congestion issues at Holt Bridge would be the creation of a further bridge to the south to reduce traffic flows
- A member from outside the Cabinet indicated that improvements to cycling and walking facilities would have no impact on the congestion issues in Bromsgrove. The Leader responded that it was important to improve all modes of travel and provide a sustainable approach to transport.

RESOLVED: that

- a) TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL the adoption of the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) 2018-2031 for Worcestershire as part of the Council's Policy Framework;**
- b) the Director of Economy and Infrastructure be authorised to finalise the LTP4 Health Impact Assessment (Appendix G to the report) for presentation to Council; and**
- c) the School Crossing Control Policy for Worcestershire be endorsed and adopted.**

1814 Updated Policy on Delayed and Accelerated Pupil Transfer (Agenda item 11)

The Cabinet considered the updated Policy on Delayed and Accelerated Pupil Transfer. The details were set out in the report.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Skills introduced the report and commented that more parents were exercising their right to delay entry to school for summer born children. There were a number of good educational reasons for placing pupils out of their chronological age group including summer born children starting school.

**1815 Adoption
Regionalisation
(Agenda item
12)**

RESOLVED: that

- a) the updated policy document and the reasons for the update be approved; and**
- b) the Director of Children, Families and Communities be authorised to publish and implement the updated policy with immediate effect.**

The Cabinet considered the business case for Adoption Regionalisation. The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report and commented that this proposal was in response to the Government Policy Paper and created a shared service arrangement between this Council and Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull Councils to provide greater options in the delivery of adoption agency functions. The Council had adopted the Partnership/Host Model. This model involved the creation of an Executive Board with senior representatives from each council. It was intended to consult staff before a gradual implementation of the arrangements, going live on 1 February 2018. It was intended to operate within the existing financial envelope however the key driver for the proposals was to provide greater opportunities for young people
- This proposal should be supported as it would provide children with safeguarding and security in a family environment as quickly as possible. There were too many children presently in care.

RESOLVED: that

- a) the options outlined in the Business Case attached to the report be noted;**
- b) the information contained in the report be considered;**
- c) the outcomes of the staff engagement and service consultation and the equality impact assessment be considered;**

- d) the Council entering into a Partnership and Hosting Agreement alongside Solihull Metropolitan Council, Warwickshire County Council and Coventry City Council for Adoption Central England (ACE) be approved in principle to undertake the delivery of Worcestershire County Council's adoption service and delegated authority be granted to the Director of Children, Families and Communities to approve the final details of the Partnership and Hosting Agreement;**
- e) the Council entering into a partnership arrangement alongside Solihull Metropolitan Council, Warwickshire County Council and Coventry City Council for ACE be approved in principle to undertake the delivery of Worcestershire County Council's Special Guardianship services and delegated authority to the Director of Children, Families and Communities to approve the final details of the arrangement;**
- f) Warwickshire County Council becoming the host authority to facilitate the operational delivery of the adoption service and Special Guardianship support services on behalf of Worcestershire County Council be approved;**
- g) the provisional financial proposals as outlined in the financial implications proposals set out in the report to fund ACE as agreed by the ACE Executive Board be agreed; and delegated authority be granted to the Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Director of Children, Families and Communities to agree the final value of the total cash limit;**
- h) the Director of Children, Families and Communities be authorised to progress staffing secondments to Warwickshire County Council as the host authority and to review the status of those agreements within the first twelve months; and**
- i) it be noted that implementation of the decisions pursuant to the above recommendations are subject to the agreement of the Secretary of State, as a result of the Secretary of State's Direction with respect to child care services at**

**1816 Council
Provided Day
Services for
Adults with a
Learning
Disability and
Connect Short
Term Service -
Proposed
Engagement on
Options
(Agenda item
13)**

Worcestershire County Council.

The Cabinet considered the Council Provided Day Services for Adults with a Learning Disability and Connect Short Term Service - Proposed Engagement on Options. The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The Cabinet Member for Adult Services introduced the report and commented that £3.9m had been spent on the relevant Learning Disability Day and Connect Services. The aim of this review was to work out options to increase the efficiency of the service and choice to people requiring services. A three month engagement programme had been devised in liaison with 'SpeakEasy Now' to ensure that service users and carers provided input into the service looking ahead. This would be followed by a twelve week consultation period for changes requiring consultation. Staff members would also be consulted. It was intended that a decision would be made at the April meeting of Cabinet, having regard to the engagement carried out. He wanted to put service users at the centre of the change. He thanked 'SpeakEasy Now' for their contribution to the process
- The proposal ensured that the Learning Disability Service would be stream-lined in consultation with users to incorporate their individual needs
- The Leader emphasised the importance of engagement with service users at the start of the process.

RESOLVED: that

- a) the continued effort to encourage a vibrant and varied range of day service provision across Worcestershire in order to maximise choice, independence and wellbeing for individual service users, and the related need to resolve the current issues regarding the ongoing financial sustainability of Council-provided day services for adults with a Learning Disability (Resource Centres, Connects and Leisure Link) and the Connect Short-term Service be noted;**
- b) the intention to use a co-production approach to future service development and delivery,**

engaging with people using services, family carers and staff to gather ideas which will inform future proposals for how services are delivered be endorsed;

- c) the Director of Adult Services be authorised to carry out engagement with individuals using the Resource Centre service, family carers and staff to explore options to increase usage, options for income generation and ideas for more efficient operation of the services;**
- d) the Director of Adult Services be authorised to explore the option and potential impacts of partially reducing or fully closing the Connect Short-term Service to new referrals, through engagement with partner organisations and staff, and detailed impact assessment;**
- e) the Director of Adult Services be authorised to carry out engagement with individuals using the Connect Learning Disability day services and the Leisure Link service, family carers and staff to explore alternative delivery options for each of the services; and**
- f) a further report, informed by the proposed engagement exercises and detailed impact assessments, be brought to Cabinet by April 2018, with proposals for future service delivery, including proposals for formal consultation where required.**

1817 Resources Report (Agenda item 14)

The Cabinet considered the Resources Report. The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The Leader introduced the report and commented that the Council faced continued financial pressure, particularly with regard to children's safeguarding and the impact of placements as well as the delays in the transformation programme. There was a gap of £6.8m for 2017/18 although the figure had reduced from last month. The Council continued to bring income forward, generate new ideas and manage within its resources. He welcomed the funding from the Government for Phase 4 of the Southern Link Road and urged Council to adopt it. A proposition

for business rates had been agreed with district councils. If approved by Government, it would mean that the Council would retain more of the funding it generated and help the Council towards self-sufficiency

- The Head of Legal and Democratic Services provided an update on the joint submission to the DCLG by all Worcestershire authorities. The submission stated that based upon the forecast business rates data for all areas the pilot proposal showed a gain of £5.7m for Worcestershire. It was proposed that the business rates retained locally were split 50% Districts: 49% County: 1% Fire which would generate additional resources for the County Council (a gain) of £3.5m. This split ensured a fair balance of risk and reward for participants and ensured that all authorities gained from the proposal
- The Cabinet Member for Adult Services commented that the Independent Living Fund Grant had now been received by the Council and was in line with the Council's budget expectations. The Council managed its debt within prudential boundaries however it needed to be mindful of the impact on its borrowing arrangements of any changes to interest rates.

RESOLVED: that

- a) the Cabinet Member's conclusions concerning revenue budget monitoring up to 31 August 2017 be endorsed;**
- b) TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL to approve the addition of £62 million to the Capital Programme for A4440 Worcester Southern Link Phase 4 Carrington Bridge to Powick and that the cash limits are updated accordingly;**
- c) the submission made by the Interim Chief Financial Officer to participate in the pilot for 100% Business Rates Retention be supported and TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL to endorse the submission; and**
- d) the Cabinet Member's conclusions regarding the treasury management half-yearly progress report be endorsed.**

The meeting ended at 12.25pm.

Chairman