

# MINUTE

‘A’ & ‘B’

## Services Committee

Council Chamber, Town Hall, Lerwick

Thursday 30 August 2007 at 10.00am

### Present:

L Angus	L F Baisley
J Budge	A J Cluness
A T J Cooper	A T Doull
A G L Duncan	C B Eunson
E J Fullerton	F B Grains
I J Hawkins	R S Henderson
J H Henry	A J Hughson
W H Manson	R C Nickerson
F A Robertson	G Robinson
J G Simpson	C L Smith
A S Wishart	

### Apologies:

C H J Miller

### In Attendance:

M Goodlad, Chief Executive  
H Sutherland, Executive Director – Education & Social Care  
H Budge, Head of Schools  
A Cogle, Administrative Services Manager  
S Crook, Library and Information Services Manager  
M Duncan, Grants Co-ordinator  
C Ferguson, Head of Community Care  
M Finnie, Capital Programme Service Manager  
M Harris, Service Manager – Community Care Resources  
G Johnston, Head of Finance  
C Medley, Head of Housing & Capital Programmes  
B Robb, Acting Senior Assistant Accountant  
H Tait, Management Accountant  
N Watt, Sport & Leisure Services Manager  
A Williamson, Chief Social Work Officer  
L Geddes, Committee Officer

### Also:

S Laurenson, Chief Executive - NHS Shetland

### Chairperson

Mr L Angus, Chairperson of the Committee, presided.

### Circular

The circular calling the meeting was held as read.

### Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2007, having been circulated, and the special meeting held on 6 August 2007, were confirmed.

## **Members' Attendance at External Meetings**

Mr L Angus – Citizen's Advice Bureau Conference, Edinburgh

Mr A G L Duncan – Citizen's Advice Bureau Conference, Edinburgh

31/07 **General Fund Revenue Management Accounts 2007/2008 for the Period 1 April 2007 to 30 June 2007**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Finance (Appendix 1) and approved the recommendation contained therein on the motion of Mr L Angus, seconded by Mr G Robinson.

32/07 **Housing Revenue Accounts/Harbour Account/Reserve Fund Revenue Management Accounts 2007/08 for the Period 1 April 2007 to 30 June 2007.**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Finance (Appendix 2) and approved the recommendation contained therein on the motion of Mr G Robinson, seconded by Mr C L Smith.

33/07 **Developing a Four-Year Plan for Services Committee**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Social Care (Appendix 3) and on the motion of Mr L Angus, seconded by Mr C L Smith, the Committee approved the recommendations contained therein.

Members pointed out that the following amendments were required to the Appendix:

Page 1 – The Lead Members should also include the Chairperson of the Adult Services Board.

Page 7 – The phrase “Integrated Community Schools” should be replaced with “Integrated Children’s Services”.

Concern was expressed at the timetable for ‘Developing the Blueprint for Education’, and it was felt that things could proceed more quickly. It was also suggested that December 2007 would be an appropriate time to report on national and local priorities in education.

34/07 **Capital Grants to Voluntary Organisations – Hamnavoe Waterfront Development Association**

The Committee considered a report by the Sport and Leisure Service Manager (Appendix 4).

Members referred to the tremendous community involvement in these types of projects, and it was commented these projects helped keep communities active and vibrant, as well as assisting with potential economic development.

Mrs E J Fullerton moved that the Committee approve the recommendations in the report, and Mrs I J Hawkins seconded.

In commenting that funding required for leisure activities could be more wisely used to fund caring for the elderly and education, Mr A G L Duncan moved, as an amendment, that the monies required for this project should be transferred into the budgets used for schools and care homes. However his motion did not receive a seconder.

Mr A J Cluness referred to the economic development potential of these projects, but said that he also had sympathy with the view that other services needed to be protected. He suggested that it might therefore be more appropriate that funding for this type of project in future should instead be sought from the Shetland Development Trust or the Shetland Charitable Trust, and the Chairperson agreed to take this suggestion on board.

35/07

**Review of Council Support for Community Water Based Facilities**

The Committee considered a report by the Sport and Leisure Services Manager (Appendix 5).

Mr F A Robertson reiterated the tremendous efforts that local communities played in developing water-based facilities, and moved that the Committee approve recommendation 9.1(b) in the report.

Mrs L F Baisley seconded.

With the consent of his seconder, Mr F A Robertson agreed to incorporate a suggestion from Mr A T J Cooper that the remit of the Working Group should be widened to include consideration of the maintenance requirements and maintenance costs, given that there were concerns about the long-term maintenance of these structures.

Mr A G L Duncan moved, as an amendment, that the monies required for this project should be transferred into the budgets used for schools and care homes. However his motion did not receive a seconder.

It was commented that whilst Members shared Mr Duncan's wish to provide for the elderly, leisure facilities helped people to lead a more active life for longer, and the support of water-based facilities was one of the Council's corporate priorities.

36/07

**Capital Programme – Library Provision in Lerwick – Design Phase**

The Committee considered a report by the Library and Information Services Manager (Appendix 6).

Mr R C Nickerson expressed concerns regarding the future revenue costs for the preferred option and the structural state of the former library centre/museum. He therefore moved that the Committee defer any decision on this project until a full structural survey of the former library/museum building had taken place, and a full review of the library service in Shetland had taken place.

Mrs E J Fullerton seconded.

Mr W H Manson advised that a review of the library service had recently taken place so it would still be current, and that a recent structural report had been carried out which showed there were no major structural problems with the former library/museum building. Whilst he did not wish to incur increased revenue costs, it would be more costly to provide a new build. He therefore moved, as an amendment, that the recommendations in the report be approved, and Mr C B Eunson seconded.

Some concern was expressed regarding the increased revenue costs, the staffing implications, and the structure of the former library/museum building.

In response to a query, Mr W H Manson confirmed that his amendment would include consideration of the increased revenue costs.

The Library and Information Services Manager advised that a structural report had been carried out as part of the feasibility study, and there were no major structural problems although some re-roofing was required. A library service review had also been carried out recently, and it had taken the future needs of the service into account.

After summing up, voting took place by show of hands and the result was as follows:

Amendment (Mr W H Manson)	13
Motion (Mr R C Nickerson)	7

37/07

### **Review of Mid Yell Junior High School Project**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Capital Programme and Housing Service (Appendix 7).

Mr R S Henderson outlined the background to the project and advised that a considerable amount of consultation had taken place with staff, pupils and the community regarding their aspirations for the project. However the design that was presented today had been amended and he questioned the wisdom of building a school that would not be suitable for the educational needs of the community for the next 30 years. He also pointed out that the figures referred to in the report were misleading and not suitable for comparison. He queried the interpretation of the pupil/space ratio comparison with other Scottish schools, asserting that alternative calculations showed the Mid Yell proposals as 16.57m<sup>2</sup> per pupil rather than the 39.08m<sup>2</sup> quoted, and this was within the normal Shetland parameters. He went on to say that it was important to build a school which would serve the educational needs of the community for years to come and therefore moved that the Committee approve the additional funding of £1.7 million requested for this project, in addition to the £7.757 million target costs.

Mr C L Smith seconded.

Mr W H Manson referred to the plans presented for approval and said that whilst it was important to try and drive down the cost of capital projects, there should also be re-involvement of all potential users of the building in considering the amended plans. He agreed that the figures referred to in the report were misleading as sometimes they related to capacity and sometimes to school rolls, and he felt that the comparison with Nesting School was inappropriate as it was a small school with just two classrooms. He therefore moved, as an amendment, that the budget for this project should be set at £8.5 million, and Mr A J Cluness seconded.

Mr J G Simpson gave notice of further amendment.

Mrs L F Baisley referred to the work that the community had put into the consultation, and said that it appeared to have been a waste of time. She pointed out that the Mid Yell Junior High School could potentially become the main North Isles School depending on the outcome of the Education Service Review, so it was important to bear this in mind at this stage.

The Head of Finance commented that there would be serious difficulties in funding capital projects that met all the aspirations of the Committee, Council and the community. There was a need to get a clear and tight definition of all these projects so that there was some hope of balancing the funding aspirations against the available finance, as projects had to fit within the Council policy of sustainable finance. With this project, and the Anderson High School project, there tended to have been some 'drift' in relation to the specifications and the cost, and this had an undermining effect on the capital programme. Therefore there was a need to strike a balance between aspirations and the limitations of the financial resources as the continuing uncertainty was damaging to the community and the capital programme.

The Head of Schools confirmed that a lot of consultation had been carried out with the community, and it would be appropriate to take the information presented back to the community for consideration and to try and identify savings.

In response to queries, Mr W H Manson clarified his amendment in relation to the recommendations in the report, as follows:

- 7.1.1 the target cost parameter for the project should be set at £8.5 million;
- 7.1.2 the procurement process should not immediately continue;
- 7.1.3 this recommendation should be excluded;
- 7.1.4 the community aspirations should be included if they can be contained within the overall cost and are felt to be appropriate;
- 7.1.5 this would not apply as the budget would be set at £8.5 million;
- 7.1.6 this would be reported back to the Services Committee.

After hearing Mr W H Manson clarify his amendment, Mr R S Henderson withdrew his motion with the consent of his seconder.

Mr J G Simpson moved, as an amendment, that officials produce a report on the project that would save money whilst producing a design for a fit-for-purpose school, in consultation with school staff and users of the proposed building.

Mrs L F Baisley seconded.

Voting took place by show of hands and the result was as follows:

Amendment (Mr J G Simpson)	7
Motion (Mr W H Manson)	13

38/07

#### **Appointments to Strategy Groups**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Social Care (Appendix 8).

The Committee agreed recommendations 8.1.3 and 8.1.4 of the report, and further agreed to make appointments in respect of the following recommendations:

**8.1.1 - Inter Agency Looked After Children Working Group:**  
Mr W H Manson

8.1.2 - Community Care Services:  
Nordalea, Unst – Mr R S Henderson

Isleshavn, Yell – Mrs L F Baisley

Fernlea, Whalsay – Mr J G Simpson

North Haven, Brae – Mr A T J Cooper

Wastview, Walls – Mr F A Robertson

Overtonlea, Levenwick – Mr A G L Duncan

Freefield, Lerwick – Mr L Angus

Occupational Therapy (OT)/Aids and Adaptations – Mr C B Eunson

Edward Thomason House, Lerwick – Mr J H Henry

Viewforth House, Lerwick – Mr C L Smith

Taing House, Lerwick – Mr A S Wishart

Annsbrae, Lerwick – Mr A J Cluness

Newcraigielea/Sea View, Lerwick – Mrs C H J Miller (*in absentia*)

Independent Living Project, Lerwick – Mr C L Smith

Eric Gray Resource Centre, Lerwick – Mr G Robinson

Community Care Fieldwork – Mr W H Manson

8.1.4 – School Estates Review:  
Skerries Secondary Department – Mr J G Simpson

Sandness Primary School – Mr G Robinson

(in addition to the Chairperson and Children and Young People Spokesperson):

8.1.5 – Capital Project Teams:

Anderson High School:

Mr L Angus	Mrs L F Baisley
Mrs F B Grains	Mrs I J Hawkins
Mr J H Henry	Mr A J Cluness
Mr W H Manson	Mr C B Eunson

Mid Yell Junior High School:

Mr R S Henderson	Mr W H Manson
Mr J G Simpson	Mrs L F Baisley

Feasibility Study into Primary Education for Lerwick:  
All Lerwick Members plus Mr W H Manson

39/07 **Shetland Childcare Partnership: Services and Management Structure**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director of Education and Social Care (Appendix 9) and on the motion of Mr G Robinson, seconded by Mrs E J Fullerton, the Committee approved the recommendations in the report and appointed Mr A J Hughson and Mr W H Manson to participate in the Shetland Childcare Partnership.

40/07 **New Temporary Care Home for Lerwick**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Social Care (Appendix 10).

Mrs E J Fullerton declared a non-pecuniary interest as Chair of the NHS Board.

The Chairperson outlined the background to the report, noting that the proposals would be dependent on the outcome of the consultation exercise being undertaken by NHS Shetland. He thanked NHS Shetland for their co-operation in helping to produce this report.

It was noted that in paragraph 1.1 of the report, the reference to a new temporary care home for Lerwick should be replaced with “a new temporary care home *in* Lerwick”.

A Member commented that he had received negative representations regarding the proposal to move the 20 long-stay beds from Montfield, and it was also pointed out that it was important not to lose sight of a new build should the proposals in this report go ahead.

On the motion of Mr A J Cluness, seconded by Mr C B Eunson, the Committee agreed the recommendations in the report.

With the consent of his seconder, Mr A J Cluness agreed to incorporate the following suggestion from Mr A T J Cooper in relation to recommendation 8.1(c) into his motion:

“That a further report should be sought regarding how these proposals should be financed, making it the responsibility of the Chief Executive and the Executive Management Team to look across the whole Council to find savings to fund this proposal”.

It was agreed that all sources of funding should be explored, and that it would be legitimate for the Charitable Trust to be approached to assist with funding.

Mr W H Manson declared an interest as Chairman of Shetland Charitable Trust.

The Executive Director explained that all sources of funding would be considered. However she felt that it was a statutory responsibility of the Council to fund this proposal through the General Fund, although it was possible that the Charitable Trust could be approached for top-up funds and NHS Shetland approached for set-up costs.

41/07 **Developing a Workforce Development Strategy for the Department**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Social Care (Appendix 11) and on the motion of Mr A T J Cooper, seconded by Mr G Robinson, approved the recommendation in the report.

42/07 **Pre-School Funding**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Schools (Appendix 12) and on the motion of Mr A T J Cooper, seconded by Mrs E J Fullerton, the Committee approved the recommendations in the report.

43/07 **Vacancy on the Children's Panel Advisory Committee – Local Authority Nomination**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Legal and Administration (Appendix 13) and on the motion of Mrs F B Grains, seconded by Mr A T J Cooper, the Committee approved the recommendations in the report and appointed Mr C L Smith to the Children's Panel Advisory Committee.

44/07 **Performance Management Reporting – An Example**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Social Care (Appendix 14) and on the motion of Mr G Robinson, seconded by Mr W H Manson, approved the recommendations in the report.

In response to a query regarding the target times for the Interim Placement Unit, the Executive Director confirmed that the target was currently six weeks although sometimes people did have to wait longer for particular care packages to be arranged. If the new care home proposed was provided, it would help address some of these problems.

In response to a query regarding the ratio of community care assessments to reviews referred to on page two of the Appendix, the Chief Social Work Officer advised that some assessments could have resulted from reviews and others could be re-assessments, therefore it was not appropriate to set one figure against the other.

Members also commented on the Occupational Therapy waiting list and it was noted that the demand for the service was greater than existing staff resources. However the Head of Community Care explained that all referrals were very carefully screened and prioritised so that those who urgently required the service were prioritised and received a service quite quickly. The waiting list tended to include those with lower service needs and who were not at risk. In response to a query, she said that she would have concerns at applying the NHS model relating to waiting times, as a commitment across the whole range of services may mean that those with a higher level of need might have to wait longer, whereas they were currently prioritised.

In response to queries regarding occupancy levels of residential units, referred to in page seven of the appendix, the Head of Community Care explained that there were a number of reasons why there were sometimes delays in filling beds, usually because building work or new furnishings were required. It was suggested that efforts should be made to ensure that contractors were available to carry out the work at an early stage.

45/07 **Care at Home (Domestic) Update**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Community Care (Appendix 15)



The Executive Director summarised the main terms of the report, advising that it had been concluded that the best way to resolve the current problems was to move the management of the domestic element to local areas at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Chairperson reassured the Committee that staff were doing everything they could to resolve the current difficulties, and that efforts were being made to utilise staff who had said they were available to work extra hours, although not as many staff were available to do extra hours as had been reported.

On the motion of Mr A T J Cooper, seconded by Mrs E J Fullerton, the Committee approved the recommendations in the report.

46/07

**Additional Management Staff for the Education and Social Care Department**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Social Care (Appendix 16) and on the motion of Mrs E J Fullerton, seconded by Mr A G L Duncan, approved the recommendations in the report.

47/07

**Capital Projects Update**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Social Care (Appendix 17).

The Chairperson advised that he was hoping to get an indication from the Committee as to how they wished to prioritise the projects listed in the appendix.

Some Members commented that as the report had been presented for information only, they did not feel comfortable with making decisions regarding prioritisation at such short notice and would require more time for consideration.

Mr A J Cluness therefore moved that the Committee approve the recommendation in the report, and Mr G Robinson seconded.

In response to a comment from a Member regarding replication of services, the Executive Director advised that any duplication of services would be considered when drawing up the brief.

Some discussion took place regarding the Anderson High School project.

The Chairperson outlined the history of the project referred to in Appendix 2, and pointed out that consideration of the Clickimin site had reverted to the existing AHS site on the basis that it was estimated that there would be a saving of £14 million. The Services Committee had agreed that the AHS Taskforce should concentrate solely on the AHS site at that stage and only in the event of difficulties should the Clickimin site be considered as a second option. However there had been no further reports to say that difficulties were being encountered. When the options were presented the costs had gone up to £40 million, there had been a significant increase in the building size, and the hostel had become a separate project. He expressed concern as he felt that the project had grown without any apparent authorisation. He went on to say that it was also now necessary to consider the future of primary education in Lerwick, and one of the things that should be considered was whether to provide both primary and secondary education as part of this capital project.

Some Members pointed out that the Council had discussed the AHS project on numerous occasions, and they felt that the Council had made the relevant

decisions some time ago. It was pointed out that the appropriate place to raise this issue would be at the Council as it had been a Council decision.

The Head of Finance suggested that the crucial question for the Committee was whether the Committee was content with the specification of the project, if it was as specified, and if it was appropriate to meet the educational needs and requirements. There had been a lot of developments since the Committee had taken a look at the specification and there may be a case for the Committee to do so again. He urged that a firm and final decision was made as soon as possible as it was the biggest project the Council would undertake and was of huge financial significance. It was important that the Committee were certain about the project specification, size and location, and whether they wished to look at the question of an adjacent site for primary provision.

Mrs E J Fullerton requested that further information on the capital projects referred to should be presented to the next Services Committee listing the costs, timescale, service needs, benefits to Shetland and any possible reduction on costs.

47/07

**Minutes of Shetland College Board of Management – 4 July 2007 and 16 August 2007**

The Committee noted the above minutes (Appendix 18).