

**Council****Thursday, 15 January 2015, 10.00 am, County Hall,  
Worcester****Minutes****Present:**

Mrs P E Davey (Chairman), Mr A A J Adams,  
Mr R C Adams, Ms P Agar, Mr A T Amos, Mrs S Askin,  
Mr J Baker, Mr R W Banks, Mr M L Bayliss, Mr A N Blagg,  
Mrs S L Blagg, Mr C J Bloore, Mr PJ Bridle,  
Mr M H Broomfield, Mr J P Champion, Mr S J M Clee,  
Mr S C Cross, Mr P Denham, Mr N Desmond,  
Ms L R Duffy, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr A Fry, Mr S E Geraghty,  
Mr W P Gretton, Mrs J L M A Griffiths, Mr P Grove,  
Mr A I Hardman, Mr M J Hart, Ms P A Hill,  
Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr C G Holt,  
Mr I Hopwood, Mr M E Jenkins, Mr R C Lunn,  
Mr L C R Mallett, Mr P M McDonald, Mr A P Miller,  
Mrs F M Oborski, Mr J W Parish, Mr S R Peters,  
Dr K A Pollock, Mr D W Prodger, Prof J W Raine,  
Ms M A Rayner, Mr A C Roberts, Mr J H Smith,  
Mr R J Sutton, Mr C B Taylor, Mr J W R Thomas,  
Mrs E B Tucker, Mr P A Tuthill, Mr R M Udall,  
Mr G J Vickery, Mr T A L Wells and Mr G C Yarranton

**Available Papers**

The Members had before them:

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. Ten questions submitted to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (previously circulated); and
- C. The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 13 November 2014 (previously circulated).

**1625 Apologies and  
Declaration of  
Interests  
(Agenda item 1)**

Apologies for absence were received from Ms R E Jenkins. One declaration of other interests disclosable was made:

Mrs L C Hodgson - Item 6(b) Cabinet Member at Worcester City Council and Trustee of food bank in Malvern.

**1626 Public  
Participation  
(Agenda item 2)**

Three members of the public participated at this meeting.

1. Mr Neal Murphy presented a petition which sought the imposition of a 20 mph speed limit on the Blanquettes Estate in Worcester. Mr Murphy explained that this was for the safety of all residents, particularly children.

2. Mr Sheridan Tranter asked questions relating to the Energy from Waste Plant in Hartlebury. The questions related to the Plant's viability and its operating costs and air quality monitoring once the plant was in operation.

3. Mr Rob Wilden also asked questions relating to the Energy from Waste Plant in Hartlebury. The questions related to air quality and emissions from the Plant and lifetime costs of the plant.

The Chairman thanked each participant and promised them a written response from the appropriate Cabinet Member with Responsibility in due course. These responses would be shared with all members of the Council.

**1627 Minutes  
(Agenda item 3)**

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.**

**1628 Chairman's  
Announcements  
(Agenda item 4)**

The Chairman welcomed Mr Sander Kristel (Director of Commercial and Change) to the Council. Members stood for a minute's silence in memory of former County Councillors Mrs Dorothy Dudley and Mr Brian Taylor, both recently deceased. The Chairman referred members to the other printed announcements.

**1629 Annual State of  
the County  
report of the  
Leader of the  
Council  
(Agenda item 5)**

The Leader of the Council presented his annual state of the county report which covered several overarching themes:

- A recap of the previous year
  - Open for Business
  - health and well-being
  - children and families
  - environment
  - delivering within our means
- 2015 - Delivery Year but still reforming
  - health and social care
  - environment
  - commissioning
  - impacting demand
  - seizing the opportunity of greater joined-up Government

The Leader answered questions about the report which included:

- the 'Open for Business' ambition and how this

might translate into jobs for local people. The Leader outlined his wish to attract high-skill jobs into the county and match average career salaries earned in other areas of the country.

- the return of powers to local authorities, the possibility of delegation to localities and the need to focus on the best outcomes for residents of the county whatever tier of local government was involved.
- schools consulting on changing age range and the arguments for and against 2 and 3 tier systems of education. The Leader stressed the roles of the Council as consultee and also the statutory duty of being 'guarantor' of education for all school-age students
- the potential shortage of qualified social workers and the desirability of having dedicated education social workers liaising with, and working in, schools. The Leader explained some of the incentives being used by the Council to recruit and retain social work staff
- the robustness of council procedures and audit trails in light of work being undertaken by the Audit and Governance Committee. The Leader reiterated that all officers were now adhering to the procurement procedures and that earlier published shortcomings had been resolved.
- an omission from the report was referencing plans for reducing congestion in Worcester city centre. The Leader explained aspects of the County Council's Transport Plan.
- a specific reference to flooding and that it was not restricted to outlying and low-lying areas. Mr McDonald gave details of a potential problem in his division and the Leader undertook to provide a written response.
- The Council's ambition and aim to continue reducing of carbon emissions and the effect of the Energy from Waste Plant.
- the Leader expanded upon his vision for financial "self-sufficiency for Worcestershire" and answered questions.

**1630 Reports of Cabinet - Matters which require a decision by the Council - Increasing Capacity at Timberdine Nursing and Rehabilitation Unit, Worcester (Agenda item 6(a))**

The Chairman thanked the Leader for his report.

The Council had before it a report recommending an amendment to the Capital Programme to facilitate building works to create an additional 11 beds at the Timberdine Nursing and Rehabilitation Unit in Worcester. The report described current provision at Timberdine, plans to increase commissioning of services and increases to provision to meet demands from other providers.

**RESOLVED that, following Cabinet's agreement to invest £620,000 capital from the Better Care Fund for the building works required to create an additional 11 beds at the Timberdine Nursing and Rehabilitation Unit, the Capital Programme be amended accordingly.**

**1631 Reports of Cabinet - matters which require a decision by the Council - Worcestershire Parkway Regional Interchange (Agenda item 6(a))**

The Council had before it a report recommending an amendment to the Capital Programme, the Treasury Management Policy and Prudential indicators to facilitate the provision of a Parkway Interchange in the triangle of land formed by the intersection of the Cotswold and Birmingham to Bristol railway lines and the B4084 near Norton.

The report contained a financial summary and the business case for such a project.

**RESOLVED that**

- (a) the spending of the £7.5m provisionally allocated to the County Council via the Local Growth Fund (SEP/LEP) be agreed for the purpose of completing the Worcestershire Parkway Regional Interchange scheme once it was confirmed and that the Capital Programme be updated accordingly; and**
- (b) the allocation of the balance of the circa £14.4m (including a contingency sum) required to complete the scheme, possibly through a loan from the Public Works Loan Board be agreed, and that the Council's Capital Programme, Treasury Management Policy and Prudential indicators be updated accordingly, as part of the normal budgeting cycle.**

**1632 Reports of Cabinet - matters which require a decision by the Council - Early Years Pupil Premium Grant 2015/16 (Agenda item 6(a))**

The Council had before it a report which set out that schools, nurseries and child minders within Worcestershire were to be given up to £300 for every three-and four year old from a low-income family to help prevent them falling behind before they have even started school. The Early Years Pupil Premium, totalling £50 million nationally, was designed to narrow the attainment gap between young children from low income families and their peers.

The report set out that nurseries would have the freedom to decide how to use this new money to help three-and four-year olds to learn and develop. The initial allocation for Worcestershire in 2015/16 was £383,962 which was based on 1,333 eligible children. Over the Autumn of 2015 the Government were going to undertake a mid-year survey to assess take up and make adjustments to the amounts allocated as appropriate.

**RESOLVED that the new Early Years Pupil Premium Grant funding for 2015/16 onwards be noted and the revenue cash limits updated accordingly.**

**1633 Reports of Cabinet - Summary of decision taken (Agenda item 6(b))**

The Leader of the Council reported the following topics and answered questions in relation to a number of them:

- 2015-16 Budget and Council Tax
- Formation of a Unique Joint Property Vehicle: Full Business Case
- Commissioning of the Worcestershire Hub Shared Service
- Scrutiny Reports: Food Banks
- The Future of In-House Fleet Services
- Formal Proposal to Cease the Mainstream Autism Base at Sutton Park Community Primary School
- Corporate Risk Report
- Balanced Scorecard - FutureFit Performance Update
- Resources Report
  - Revenue Budget Monitoring 2014/15 Outturn Forecast as at 30 September 2014
  - FutureFit Programme Update
  - Capital Programme Budget Monitoring: 2014/15 Actual Expenditure as at 30 September 2014
  - Treasury Management - Half Year Progress

**1634 Notices of Motion - Notice**

The Council had before it an altered Notice of Motion standing in the names of Mrs E B Tucker, Prof. J Raine,

**of Motion 1 -  
Funding for  
Rape/Sexual  
Abuse  
Counselling  
(Agenda item 7)**

Mrs S Askin, Mrs F M Oborski, Mr T A L Wells, Mr M E Jenkins, Ms M A Rayner and Ms R E Jenkins:

*"Council notes that the interim funding for Independent Rape/Sexual Abuse Counselling provided at short notice by the Police and Crime Commissioner, is currently due to end in March 2015 and that no local authority or Health Service provision exists to fill that gap.*

*Furthermore Council notes that whilst 1 in 20 young people suffer sexual abuse, and that locally the majority of such cases arise within the family and are not part of grooming by external gangs, there is no specialist service dedicated to providing counselling for these very vulnerable young people.*

*Victims are often faced with a three-month wait for an initial Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service appointment, with possible waits of a further 18 months for specialist services.*

*Noting that a Specialist Counselling Service for young people aged 11 – 21 could be provided for £25,000 per year, Council urgently requests Cabinet Members with Responsibility to seek funding for such a service in the Financial Year 2015/2016".*

The Motion as altered was moved by Mrs F M Oborski and seconded by Mrs E B Tucker who both spoke in favour of it.

The Council agreed to consider and deal with the Motion on the day.

It was then moved by Ms P A Hill and seconded by Mr C J Bloore as an amendment that *"Council notes that the interim funding for Independent Rape/Sexual Abuse Counselling, provided at short notice by the Police and Crime Commissioner, is currently due to end in March 2015 and that no local authority or Health Service provision exists to fill that gap.*

*Council urgently requests Cabinet Members with Responsibility to seek funding with all agencies especially the PCC, for such a service in the Financial Year 2015/2016".*

**On being put to the meeting this amendment was lost.**

The Council then debated the substantive Motion and the

**1635 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 2 - Rail Fares and Ticketing (Agenda item 7)**

following principal points were made:

- that this was a gender-free Motion
- the Motion sought to provide a level of support for some of the most damaged young people
- that statistics could be misleading but the thrust of the Motion was worthy of support and efforts should be made to secure funding for this service
- councillors were also reminded that money could be made available from the Divisional Fund.

**The Motion as altered was agreed.**

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion standing in the names of Ms P Agar, Mr G J Vickery, Mr P M McDonald, Mr R M Udall, Mr C J Bloore, Mr A Fry, Mr P Denham and Mr R C Lunn as set out in the agenda papers.

The Motion was moved by Ms P Agar and seconded by Mr G J Vickery who both spoke in favour of it.

The Council then agreed to consider and deal with the Motion on the day.

The Motion was debated during which the following principal points were made:

- pricing structures were unfair and rail passengers were not getting value for money. Certain cheaper fares were not available to some travellers as they relied on access to the internet or penalised peak-time travellers
- rail and other passenger transport options were not co-ordinated and were acting as a disincentive to use of public transport. A strategic view would provide better services, less road congestion and a healthier environment for the people of Worcestershire
- members raised a number of points about the level of investment in rail infrastructure and its adequacy or otherwise
- members raised a number of points about the subsidies received by train operating companies, the cost of tickets to the travelling public and the level of support from the public purse generally for the rail network and its services.

**On a named vote the Motion was lost.**

**1636 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 3 - Pressure on Hospitals (Agenda item 7)**

Those voting in favour were:

Ms P Agar, Mrs S Askin, Mr J Baker, Mr C J Bloore, Mr S C Cross, Mr P Denham, Mr A Fry, Ms P A Hill, Mr M E Jenkins, Mr R C Lunn, Mr L C R Mallett, Mr P M McDonald, Mrs F M Oborski, Prof. J Raine, Mr R J Sutton, Mr J W R Thomas, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr R M Udall and Mr G J Vickery (19).

Those voting against:

Mrs P E Davey, Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Mr A T Amos, Mr R W Banks, Mr M L Bayliss, Mr A N Blagg, Mrs S L Blagg, Mr P J Bridle, Mr M H Broomfield, Mr J-P Campion, Mr S J M Clee, Mr N Desmond, Mrs L R Duffy, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty, Mr W P Gretton, Mrs J M L A Griffiths, Mr P Grove, Mr A I Hardman, Mr M J Hart, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr C G Holt, Mr I Hopwood, Dr K A Pollock, Mr D W Prodger, Mr A C Roberts, Mr J H Smith, Mr C B Taylor, Mr P A Tuthill and Mr G C Yarranton (32).

Mr J W Parish, Mr S R Peters, and Ms M A Rayner abstained (3).

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion standing in the names of Mr G J Vickery, Mr R C Lunn, Mr C J Bloore, Mr A Fry, Mr P M McDonald, Mr R M Udall, Mr P Denham and Ms P Agar as set out in the agenda papers.

The Motion was moved by Mr G J Vickery and seconded by Mr R C Lunn who both spoke in favour of it.

The Council agreed to consider and deal with the Motion on the day.

The Motion was debated during which the following principal points were made:

- the difficulties in co-ordinating medical and social care staff to ensure discharges from hospital were not delayed. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Adult Social Care outlined the work being undertaken to address this and undertook to share details with all members
- that in part the current pressures on hospitals was due to increased use of Accident and Emergency services. This was partly as a result of the difficulty in some areas of securing GP appointments in a timely



manner

- that County Council staff had made every effort over the busiest periods to ensure a smooth transition for those leaving medical care
- a summit along the lines suggested in the Motion was unnecessary as the situation in Worcestershire was not the crisis which some members wished to portray. Staff from both the Health Services and the County Council had worked tirelessly to avoid difficulties encountered elsewhere in the country
- that an assurance needed to be given that funding in the Adult Services and Health directorate was not causing problems nor contributing to the difficulties being faced by the Health Service.

**On a named vote the Motion was lost.**

Those voting in favour were:

Ms P Agar, Mr J Baker, Mr C J Bloore, Mr P Denham, Mr A Fry, Ms P A Hill, Mr M E Jenkins, Mr R C Lunn, Mr L C R Mallett, Mr P M McDonald, Ms M A Rayner, Mr R M Udall and Mr G J Vickery (13).

Those voting against:

Mrs P E Davey, Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Mr A T Amos, Mrs S Askin, Mr R W Banks, Mr M L Bayliss, Mr A N Blagg, Mrs S L Blagg, Mr P J Bridle, Mr M H Broomfield, Mr J-P Champion, Mr S J M Clee, Mr N Desmond, Mrs L R Duffy, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty, Mr W P Gretton, Mrs J M L A Griffiths, Mr P Grove, Mr A I Hardman, Mr M J Hart, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr C G Holt, Mr I Hopwood, Mr A P Miller, Mrs F M Oborski, Mr J W Parish, Mr S R Peters, Dr K A Pollock, Mr D W Prodger, Prof. J Raine, Mr A C Roberts, Mr J H Smith, Mr R J Sutton, Mr C B Taylor, Mr J W R Thomas, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr P A Tuthill, Mr T A L Wells and Mr G C Yarranton (42).

Mr S C Cross (1) abstained.

**1637 Notices of Motion - Notice of Motion 4 - Council Expenditure**

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion standing in the names of Mr P M McDonald, Mr G J Vickery, Mr A Fry, Ms P Agar, Mr P Denham and Ms P Hill as set out in the agenda papers.

The Motion was moved by Mr P M McDonald and

**(Agenda item 7)**

seconded by Mr L C R Mallett who both spoke in favour of it.

The Council agreed to consider and deal with the Motion on the day.

A debate ensued during which the principal points were made:

- at a time of austerity the Council had to consider every area of expenditure and to observers this seemed to indicate a degree of profligacy; money that would be better spent on front-line services
- other members made the point that the Council was right to welcome guests and visitors and spending in this area was a matter of simple courtesy
- a scrutiny of this area would reassure the public that the Council was spending their money properly. Other members suggested this was unwarranted and this area of spending, whilst apparently large, did not justify such an effort.

**On a named vote the Motion was lost.**

Those voting in favour were:

Ms P Agar, Mr J Baker, Mr C J Bloore, Mr P Denham, Mr A Fry, Ms P A Hill, Mr R C Lunn, Mr L C R Mallett, Mr P M McDonald, Mr S R Peters, Mr R M Udall and Mr G J Vickery (12).

Those voting against were:

Mrs P E Davey, Mr A A J Adams, Mr R C Adams, Mr A T Amos, Mrs S Askin, Mr R W Banks, Mr M L Bayliss, Mr A N Blagg, Mr S L Blagg, Mr P J Bridle, Mr M H Broomfield, Mr J-P Champion, Mr S J M Clee, Mr N Desmond, Mrs L R Duffy, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty, Mr W P Gretton, Mrs J M L A Griffiths, Mr P Grove, Mr A I Hardman, Mr M J Hart, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr C G Holt, Mr I Hopwood, Mr M E Jenkins, Mr A P Miller, Mrs F M Oborski, Mr J W Parish, Dr K A Pollock, Mr D W Prodger, Prof. J W Raine, Ms M A Rayner, Mr A C Roberts, Mr J H Smith, Mr R J Sutton, Mr C B Taylor, Mr J W R Thomas, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr P A Tuthill and Mr G C Yarranton (42).

Mr S C Cross (1) abstained.

**1638 Reports of Cabinet Members with Responsibility - Report of the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Highways (Agenda item 8)**

The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Highways presented his report which covered a number of overarching issues:

- Public Transport Budget Reduction
- Road Safety
- Choose How You Move in Redditch
- Walking and Cycling Improvements
- Street Lighting
- Highways Maintenance Service Contract
- Snow, Ice and Floods
- Major Projects
  - Abbey Bridge and Approach Viaduct at Evesham
  - Public Realm Improvement in Bromsgrove High Street
  - Public Realm Improvement Scheme at Tenbury
  - Worcester City Carriageways and Footways Refurbished
  - Angel Place Refurbished
  - Major Works at the Ketch Roundabout
- Routine Maintenance
- Management of Utilities and Events
- On Line Access
- DfT Funding

The Cabinet Member with Responsibility answered questions about the report which included:

- the number of complaints about the bus service changes implemented in Autumn 2014. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility said that these were few because the Council subsidies were still substantial and in many instances services had not been removed, but their frequency had been reduced. In general passengers understood the reasons for the change
- it would be more constructive to have a whole county co-ordinated travel network ensuring that rural areas also had a level of service which permitted travel to work, school and other appointments. It was also suggested that up-to-date timetable information could be improved. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility said that this was an area where the Council was doing more work particularly "real-time" displays at bus stops

- concern was expressed that some bus operators were using older, less comfortable vehicles and this was acting as a disincentive to using public transport. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility said that this was monitored as part of contract scrutiny
- speeding traffic and the dangers to all road users was raised as a concern by a number of members. Questions were asked about what ideas the Cabinet Member with Responsibility had to address these – for example 20 mph speed limits. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility said this was always difficult especially as the police were reluctant to enforce some speed limits. However the Cabinet Member with Responsibility said he would continue to address these concerns. He also reminded councillors that they could make provision via Divisional Fund to install their flashing speed limit signs in particular high risk areas
- the Cabinet Member with Responsibility was asked whether the Council would continue to support the Tour series. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility confirmed that this would be looked at as the benefits to the county were recognised and acknowledged
- the Cabinet Member with Responsibility was asked about his views on the Council trying to reduce on street parking caused by people avoiding pay and display car parks. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility suggested officers might address this by way of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) but there were other ways to tackle this issue
- the levels of spending on footways. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility said there had been a general increase on highways spending including footways – but this was expensive work and there was never likely to be all resources that were required
- link between lights being switched off and car crime and anti-social behaviour. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility said this would be kept under scrutiny

- members also asked questions about street light replacement programmes, from high energy to low energy LED. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility gave details of how the Council wished to replace all the older lanterns but this could only be done in a phased way
- members also commented on road conditions and the difference between actual as opposed to perceived condition. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility concluded that this was a difficult area but a pothole filling programme was addressing many problems but there remained a negative perception about road condition which lagged behind the improvements made
- provision of green grit bins. Members were reminded that this was possible through members' Divisional Fund
- operation of the new repairs/defects reporting platform. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility said this was working well and members of public could follow progress of their enquiries online.

The Cabinet Member with Responsibility also promised written answers on:

- the average life span of a walking bus scheme
- creative solutions to maintaining local community transport schemes if the questioner supplied details of specific schemes in jeopardy.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for his report.

**1639 Key Issues Debate "Worcestershire Next Generation" (Agenda item 9)**

The Council had before it a report which set out that the Cabinet on 25 September 2014 had endorsed the Worcestershire Next Generation document which set out a shared long-term strategic vision for the county. Leaders from Worcestershire's businesses, voluntary, community and public sector organisations had pledged to work together as part of this new vision aimed at creating a better future for Worcestershire.

This had been launched on 1 October 2013 and Worcestershire Next Generation outlined 25 commitments which focused on three linked priorities; prosperity, community and environment, and are dedicated to preserving and enhancing the quality of life

for local residents by 2040 and beyond. Worcestershire Next Generation sought to stimulate cross-sector participation in shaping a prosperous, vibrant and inclusive county into the future on the basis that by working together far more would be achieved than if things were done separately.

The report suggested that the county's environment was what made Worcestershire a great place to live and work, but a number of challenges remained to be faced. Unemployment had fallen to its lowest level since July 2008 but the county could not afford to lose large employers and all the partners believed it was essential to do more to bring in new businesses and jobs, and better support smaller, locally-grown businesses as well. There were growing pockets of deprivation with significant gaps in life expectancy in different parts of the county. Worcestershire also had an ageing population, alcohol and obesity related health concerns and environmental challenges such as flooding. These issues were compounded by an increasing demand for services with less money to pay for them.

The Cabinet had concurred that what was needed was the creation of stronger socially inclusive communities, where the voluntary and community sector would play an increasingly important role in safeguarding local standards of living and where people took more personal responsibility for their health and well-being.

Having established that change was needed and identified what needed to be done, Worcestershire Next Generation would now challenge others as to how they could contribute to this shared vision and help improve the quality of life for those in generations to come. Worcestershire Next Generation could make a real difference to the people and communities of Worcestershire but to achieve this the Council would need it to be steering all its plans. There were several examples quoted where links already exist between Worcestershire Next Generation and the Council's Corporate Plan – FutureFit.

The Cabinet had suggested that any future reviews of the Corporate Plan would need to take into account the priorities within Worcestershire Next Generation.

Examples were given of other organisations that were already supporting or endorsing the initiative.

The report concluded by setting out the intention that the

Worcestershire Next Generation priorities and commitments would be reviewed every four years with progress towards delivering them assessed on an annual basis.

The report also posed the following questions:

- Which commitments are most important to WCC and what do we need to change as a result?
- What change are we currently delivering that works towards delivering this vision in 2040?
- How does WCC embed Worcestershire Next Generation in its future planning?
- What role should officers have in delivering Worcestershire Next Generation through the change programme?
- How can WCC increase the profile of Worcestershire Next Generation and encourage others to adopt this shared vision?

The Chief Executive gave an overview of Worcestershire the Next Generation and the Leader of the Council commented on the vision for the future that was contained within the document.

A discussion ensued during which the following principal points were made:

- this was a strategic vision which allowed everyone involved to consider the long-term future. As a result much of the content was "broad brush" and detail would be filled in as individual elements were addressed. This was not a corporate delivery plan but would inform County Council strategic planning in the future
- it had initiated a debate on how communities might wish to own their own destinies and create their own standards for living. This was not new but provided the opportunity for a new focus and emphasis
- the lack of detail gave the impression that certain aspects of the county's future had been ignored. It was re-emphasised that much of the detail would be rolled out in further consideration, however, the whole thrust of the document was that it intended to produce the best outcomes for Worcestershire and therefore nothing was "ruled out"

- a suggestion was made that consideration be given to a cross-party group; such a body could receive position papers from time to time to follow the process of implementation and reassure partners that the document had not been sidelined. A suggestion was also made that the document and its contents be considered by the OSPB
- as part of the consultation comments had been received about the horizon set i.e. 2040. For some consultees 2060 was identified as a more appropriate date. Members suggested that a process of this kind allowed a different vision of the future, beyond the usual electoral cycles of 4 – 5 years and new horizons would be identified in the future
- it was encouraging to see the level of engagement and the desire from communities across the county to be involved in building a better quality of life for Worcestershire as a whole.

The Leader concluded the debate and the Chairman thanked all participants.

**1640 Question Time (Agenda item 10)**

Ten questions had been received by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and had been circulated before the meeting. All the questions were asked (or taken as read). All answers are enclosed with these Minutes.

**1641 Reports of Committees - Summary of Decisions Taken by the Audit and Governance Committee (Agenda item 11)**

The Council received the report of the Audit and Governance Committee containing a summary of decisions taken.

The Council adjourned from 2.00 p.m. to 2.45 p.m. for lunch; the meeting ended at 4.38 p.m.

Chairman .....