

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 28<sup>th</sup> February 2006

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.

**Present:** Councillor J K Walters (Chairman)

Councillors: V H Lucas, L W McGuire L J Oliver, D R Pegram J A Powley, J E Reynolds, J M Tuck. and F H Yeulett.

### Also in Attendance

Councillors: I.Bates\*, M. Ballard\*, J Huppert, A. Kent and S. Normington\*

\* for part of the meeting only

**Apologies:** Councillor S F Johnstone

## **126. MINUTES 7<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2006**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2006 were approved as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

## **127. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

None.

## **128. PETITIONS**

### **A) Forty Foot Petition – Petition 1**

A petition was received for Cabinet's attention containing 149 signatures from residents of Benwick and the surrounding area requesting a plea for action regarding the prevention of further accidents along the narrow road between Ramsey Forty Foot and Chatteris.

There was no spokesperson for the petition but it raised the same issues as another petition to be considered next on the agenda. As no report was included on the agenda, the petition was passed to officers for a response.

### **B) Forty Foot Petition 2**

A further separate petition was received, supported by members of Chatteris and Ramsey Town Councils and Benwick, Doddington and Warboys Parish Councils containing nearly 1600 signatures, co-ordinated by Ramsey Town Councillor Ray Powell. The petition was

presented by Cllr Chris Howes of Chatteris Town Council calling on Cambridgeshire County Council to take immediate measures to make the 40 foot road safe, following the deaths of 5 people in a 6 week period having been in vehicles which had left the road and fallen into the water ditch. They requested that the highways officers examine the issue of road safety on the treacherous stretch of road and should look with an open mind at different options to educate drivers and enforce safe speeds. They asked that the Cabinet should receive a report back to a future meeting.

In respect of both A and B above, the County Council's officers had been investigating for sometime what could be done to improve safety since the latest spate of accidents and this work was currently still ongoing. There was the need to investigate all the issues that had contributed to accidents at the Forty Foot Bank.

**It was resolved:**

That the officers be asked to bring back a report to a future meeting on any measures that may be possible to improve safety at Forty Foot.

**C) Richmond Fellowship Employment Training**

A petition of over 60 signatures has been received which read: "We the undersigned, call upon Cambridgeshire County Council to take all action feasible to stop the savage cuts in the work experience and training programmes provided by Richmond Fellowship Employment Training and to restore the invaluable services which have already been axed. The loss of these is wholly detrimental to the recovery and advancement of those who are disadvantaged by mental illness and other disabilities, resulting in much reduced work opportunities".

Jane Copping as the spokesperson introduced the petition, requesting that the County Council as the core funder should act in respect of the points made above. As there was not a relevant report on the agenda, the petition was received and passed to officers to look into and respond directly to Jane Copping.

**D) A605/B6761 Elton Major Safety Scheme**

Cllr Steve Jones from Elton Parish Council presented a petition from local village residents registering their objections to the County Council's proposals to cancel the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and withdraw support for a public inquiry into the CPO of the land required for the A605 roundabout. Their view was that action was still required to alleviate the dangers at the junction, and that if a public inquiry was held, there would be overwhelming local support for a roundabout. They were also concerned that future increased traffic flows would only worsen the dangers, if left unresolved. The

spokesperson requested that if the County Council did not pursue a public inquiry, then he called for necessary safety improvements to be made and monies allocated in the current year. This issue was to be dealt with as part of the next report on the agenda (See Minute 129 below).

The Chairman made the comment that if the numbers of petitions received continued at the same level at future Cabinet meetings, he would ask officers to review the petitions procedure.

## **129. THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP) 2006-2011 AND ASSOCIATED TRANSPORT STRATEGY ISSUES**

Cabinet received a report:

- To consider the draft Full Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2006-11, its appendices and the capital programme.
- In respect of other transport schemes including details of those that had been confirmed to receive the Government's Growth Area Fund (GAF) monies.
- Providing an update on progress on the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton improvement.
- Advising of the need to update existing parking policies and the consequences arising from this.
- Advising on the work to be undertaken to progress the replacement of the Cowley Road Park and Ride site.

One major change proposed to the capital programme for 2006/07 by the officers was a recommendation to defer the major safety scheme at Elton A605/B6761 and its replacement with the major safety scheme at "Hobb's Lot", the junction of the A141/605. Having taken into account the views of the petitioners, it was highlighted that the Council had received legal advice indicating that given the reduced rate and severity of accidents at Elton junction, the Council was unlikely to win a formal Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) inquiry. On this basis, Cabinet agreed that to continue such a course of action was futile and would cost ratepayers hundreds of thousands of pounds, which could not be justified. It was pointed out that it was not the County Council reneging on an earlier decision, but that it had been thwarted in its attempts to obtain the land necessary to build the roundabout by the refusal of the landowner to agree a negotiated settlement.

However, in amending the original officer recommendation and asking for a further report, Cabinet recognised that additional measures were desirable to make the junction safer. While the introduction of speed cameras at the junction had helped reduce the number of accidents, it had not addressed the dangers of turning right at the junction and also the risk of being hit by overtaking vehicles, which had resulted in the previous fatality. There was also evidence to suggest that drivers were avoiding using the junction due to its perceived dangers.

In terms of the current parking policies for Cambridge, these had been formulated a number of years ago and were now out of date in terms of the amount of development that was taking place and the current and predicted traffic and parking patterns. In relation to the report's recommendation to suspend the introduction of new residents' parking schemes until after a parking policy review was completed, it was discussed and agreed that officers should give sympathetic consideration to the parking needs of residents on new, small scale developments on a case by case basis.

Other points raised by Cabinet members included:

- The continued urgent need for the Ely bypass.
- On appendix B in relation to the listed outcomes of the Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) the point was made that it would not be possible to obtain a mode shift from private car to sustainable forms of transport in some rural areas where bus services were being cut. Further to this, the point was made that seeking Government funding should not be at the expense of local villages transport requirements.
- The in relation to the need to show reductions in carbon dioxide emissions, the County Council's own climate change initiatives required to be highlighted in the final TIF document.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the Full Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2006-11 and its appendices for submission to Council.
- ii) To approve the deferral of the A605 / B6761 Elton major safety scheme as currently planned and instruct the Deputy Chief Executive of Environment and Community Services to investigate alternative safety solutions for the junction and to report back to Cabinet.
- iii) To approve bringing forward the A141 / A605 "Hobb's Lot" junction major safety scheme to the 2006/07 capital programme.
- iv) To authorise the Lead Member for Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive for Environment and Community Services, to make any detailed changes necessary to the above documents prior to their submission to Council.
- v) To agree to suspend the introduction of new residents' parking schemes until after a parking

policy review was completed but that officers would look sympathetically at cases on very small new developments (no more than a few houses) where parking was required.

- vi) That in respect of the draft TIF Statement it was agreed to make reference to the County Council's own climate change policy initiatives to help reduce emissions.
- vii) To note that work taking forward the relocation of Cowley Road Park and Ride site would commence at the end of February 2006.

### **130. NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE (NHS) REFORMS ENSURING A PATIENT LED NHS**

With the agreement of Cabinet, the Chairman took this report out of sequence due to the number of people who been invited or had requested to speak on the issues set out in the report.

The report to Cabinet presented details of the National Health Services (NHS) consultations on the future shape of three NHS organisations serving Cambridgeshire namely; the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs), the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) and the Ambulance Trust (AT).

The deadline for responses to all three consultations had been set for 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006. As a result of this deadline, It was necessary to dispatch the Council's response to the Strategic Health Authority [SHA] and Ambulance Trust [AT] consultations following discussion at Cabinet, whilst noting in the response that these would need to be confirmed by Council on the 28<sup>th</sup> March. In relation to the Primary Care Trust [PCT] consultation it was noted that the Strategic Health Authority had agreed to accept a late submission of the Council's response on 28<sup>th</sup> March, following debate at full Council.

Previous discussions at a Community Learning and Development and Adult Social Care Service Development Group had brought forward the following recommendation to options in the consultation exercise:

- To support a single combined PCT for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
- To support a single SHA for the East of England
- To support a single Ambulance Trust for the East of England.

The Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee had also considered their responses to all three consultations. They had agreed the same set of recommendations as the SDG, with the exception of the Ambulance Trust, where they were undertaking further work before finalising their position.

Councillor Ballard spoke in favour of the recommendations put forward from the SDG, while recognising that there were pertinent issues of concern on a joint Cambridgeshire and Peterborough PCT as set out in paragraph 2.4 of the officers' report. He also made the point that if a Peterborough stand alone PCT resulted in a 25% reduction in population and subsequent resources and was set up on this basis, it might not have the necessary capacity to succeed, and that any subsequent failure in such an arrangement would then still require revisiting again in the future. His view was that the Government was not likely to allocate Peterborough to another PCT area other than Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Huppert while supporting the recommendations of the SDG, was concerned that the Council was not being given the opportunity to debate SHA and AT consultations due to the need to adhere to the 22<sup>nd</sup> March Government consultation deadline. He would wish to see more democratic control for all the new organisations. He had concerns on the role of the future SHA, as in his view it had not been particularly strategic in the past and questioned whether a separate authority was in fact necessary. On the Ambulance Trust, he took the view that if it was not possible to obtain a local solution, then harmonisation for greater efficiency appeared logical.

Councillor Huppert commented that it was important that PCTs fitted in with other services being provided within the same, social care boundaries. He would wish to see more democratic accountability and controls for future PCTs and was still concerned in relation to the current timetable being suggested for change.

It was reported that Huntingdonshire District Council had consistently supported the views expressed by Huntingdonshire PCT that a stand alone Huntingdonshire PCT would best serve the interests of local people and this had been confirmed at a District Council meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> February which had supported the retention of Huntingdonshire PCT as an independent trust, within the Strategic Health Authority area. Michael Lynch the Chairman for Huntingdonshire PCT argued strongly for this option, stating that the current consultation options had failed to take into account relevant local views as originally required by Lord Warner. He reported that 5 town councils, 25 parish councils and a large number of GP practices had supported the view that Hunts PCT should continue as a stand alone PCT, coterminous with Huntingdon District Council's boundaries. In response to a question on whether the local hospital supported this arrangement, he replied that their views were to be obtained at a meeting later in the week. He also drew attention to the findings of a House of Commons Select Committee who had fundamentally discredited the original purpose of the reconfiguration,

namely the dispersal of provider services by 2008 to external providers, which they considered to be a flawed policy.

Councillor Bates had requested to speak as a local member and declared a personal interest as the Leader of Huntingdonshire District Council. He made the points that:

- Great Yarmouth, Waveney and Peterborough PCTs had been given the choice of being an independent PCT and this was being denied to Huntingdonshire.
- The management cost savings quoted from the reorganisation for the eastern region (around £7.5m for the region and less than £3m across Cambridgeshire) were very small compared to the overall budgets and the debts that some PCTs were currently incurring. He considered these savings would be further eroded by redundancy/pension costs.
- There was a need for stability not further wholesale change. The reference to 25% reduction in Peterborough's population set out in paragraph 2.5 represented those in Huntingdonshire District Council's boundaries, and therefore would be better retained in Huntingdonshire.
- This was regional government by the backdoor.

Following discussion, Cabinet were in complete agreement regarding the SDG recommendations concerning the future RHA and the AT arrangements and supported them as proposed.

In terms of a combined Cambridgeshire PCT with or without Peterborough, the broad implications, advantages and disadvantages of both options had been outlined in the consultation document. As Peterborough had very different needs and health requirements to Cambridgeshire, Cabinet members were asked to consider whether they were satisfied that a single PCT would be able to provide equitable services across the two authorities. The advantages of separate PCTs for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough were set out in the officer's report.

After lengthy discussion, which included a number of members of Cabinet supporting the option of a Cambridgeshire PCT without Peterborough, the narrow majority view was that a single PCT would be able to provide equitable services across the two authorities and therefore Cabinet supported a combined Cambridgeshire PCT, including Peterborough. There was no support for a separate Huntingdonshire PCT, but the comment was made some of the best practice on service provision adopted in Huntingdon should be enshrined in any future structure. One member commented that the proposed response should ask the question on how General Practices would be able to manage the additional pressures related to their new commissioning role. The point was also made on the need to ensure that efficiency savings

accrued from the proposed PCT reorganisation should be reinvested in front line services.

**It was resolved:**

To recommend to the Council support for;

- A single combined PCT for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
- A single SHA for the East of England
- A single ambulance trust for the East of England.

**131. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO, AND ADOPTION OF, THE DRAFT CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT “THE DESIGN AND LOCATION OF MAJOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES”**

The County Council was required to prepare a Minerals and Waste Development Framework to guide future minerals and waste development in Cambridgeshire. One of the documents forming part of the Framework’s portfolio was a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on ‘The Location and Design of Major Waste Management Facilities’. The Minerals and Waste Scheme required that the SPD would be adopted by April 2006. Progress on such milestones was a criterion used by Government when considering the apportionment of future Planning Delivery Grant.

The current report to Cabinet made suggested changes to the draft document following a recent public consultation exercise, taking into account where appropriate or practicable, the subsequent representations received.

Clarification had been received from the Government Office that the SPD could not make new policy or be prescriptive but could only be linked to the previously adopted Waste Local Plan. One Member was of the view that this Plan, based on Government guidance had been flawed, as the guidance did not adequately protect local communities. The suggestion was made that there should be a reference in the SPD to say that it was written within the constraints or limitations of the WPD and that there were concerns over the lack of clear guidance on hazardous waste management and dealing with risks associated with adjacent flood plains. In response, it was reported that the SPD would explain that a new Minerals and Waste Plan was being prepared and it was anticipated that following the adoption of that Plan, the SPD would be reviewed and updated.

**It was resolved:**

- i) Approve the proposed amendments to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as set



out in the Officer's report and recommend its approval by Council;

- ii) To agree that it would be made clear in the SPD that it was linked to the adopted Waste Local Plan, and had been written within the context of that previously agreed Plan.
- iii) Delegate powers to the portfolio holder for Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services, to approve the final amendments to the SPD, prior to the SPD being considered for adoption by Council on 28 March.

### **132. SECTION 28 TRANSFER PROPOSALS – TRANSFER OF BUDGET AND RESPONSIBILITIES FROM PCTS TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

This report had been withdrawn, as it had not been possible to prepare a considered report for the current meeting following the late submission of proposals by the relevant PCT.

### **133. SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROVISION TO SERVE NORTHSTOWE**

This report:

- Advised Cabinet of the identified educational requirements for the new settlement of Northstowe;
- Sought Cabinet's approval to the proposal to establish an 11-16 Village College with co-located post-16 provision to serve Northstowe; and
- Advised Cabinet of the next steps in the decision-making process and the timetable for establishing the secondary school.

The planned new settlement of Northstowe was intended to be one of the key developments for meeting identified housing and employment needs, as required by Regional Planning Guidance. Based on a town of 8,000 dwellings the Children's Services Authority had identified the need for 2x children's centres, 5x2 form entry primary schools (420 pupils) and 1 x extended services secondary school with co-located post-16 provision in the new Northstowe settlement. It was expected that 2 of the 5 planned primary schools would be required by September 2009.

A member raised the issue that while 8,000 dwellings was being quoted, the Local Development Framework referred to a figure of 10,000 and whether therefore there was flexibility to accommodate

higher numbers of children within the set out proposals. In response, it was confirmed that there was the potential to expand to 9,000 or even 10,000 dwellings, which would present problems as it could take the secondary school beyond the preferred maximum size of 10 or 11 forms of entry. This also had direct relevance in terms of determining the school's catchment area, which would then need to be restricted to Northstowe.

In Councillor Johnstone's absence her views were orally reported. She strongly supported option 3 for the interim arrangements for a secondary school at Northstowe. She considered that it was vital in developing a sense of community in the new town, that secondary provision was available in situ from a very early stage. She supported a federation and suggested that geographically Swavesey would be best placed to provide support for Northstowe.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the identified educational requirements for the new settlement of Northstowe;
- ii) Endorse the recommendation that the secondary school for Northstowe be promoted as an 11-16 Village College with co-located post-16 provision; and
- iii) To note the next steps in the decision-making process and timetable for establishing the secondary school as set out in the officer's report.

**134. REVIEW OF PRIMARY EDUCATIONAL PROVISION IN EAST CHESTERTON – SHIRLEY COMMUNITY INFANT SCHOOL AND ST ANDREWS'S CHURCH OF ENGLAND AIDED JUNIOR SCHOOL**

This report advised Cabinet of the response of the St Andrew's Junior School site's owners, the Old Schools of Cambridge Trust, to the County Council's preferred option on clear educational grounds for the closure of St Andrew's Church of England Aided Junior School, the extension of Shirley Community and Infant and Nursery School to provide for the 3-11 age range and the relocation of the school to the site of the St Andrew's Junior School.

It was reported that a petition had been received from Doctor Marian Holness signed by 105 parents of children attending the Shirley School in East Chesterton which stated: "We are most strongly against any proposal to close this popular and highly successful school. We would like to see the current problems of educating the primary age children of East Chesterton solved by the extension of the Shirley to form a

community school, run by the Shirley team, covering the full 3-11 age range”.

Councillor Huppert as the local Member had requested to speak. He declared a personal interest as a governor of St Andrew’s and also indicated that he knew Doctor Holness, as another Fellow of Trinity College Cambridge. He spoke in support of the recommendations as set out in the report, stating that the education provision to the children was the most important consideration and that all steps needed to be taken to ensure that the appropriate provision was in place by 1st September. While closure of St Andrew’s and the expansion of Shirley would be the preferred option if the County Council had owned the land, he recognised that agreement with the Trust needed to be pursued.

The report sought various authorisations regarding continued negotiations and in respect of the publication of statutory notices for the Authority’s preferred option.

It was reported that the extent of capital costs likely to be incurred was still being explored, as were issues relating to the sale or transfer and value of the St Andrew’s Church of England Aided School’s site, owned by the Old Schools of Cambridge’s Trust. There were also still issues regarding revenue costs and the ability of St Andrew’s to operate as a financially viable school. It was therefore appropriate for Cabinet to receive a further report at the April meeting with both the outcomes of current negotiations and with identified funding requirements for the preferred option.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Confirm that it’s the County Council’s preferred educational grounds was the closure of St Andrews Church of England Aided Junior School, the extension of Shirley Community and Infant and Nursery School to provide for the 3-11 age range and the relocation of the school to the site of the St Andrew’s Junior School.
- ii) Approve the publication of statutory public notices proposing the closure of St Andrew’s Church of England Aided Junior School on 31 August 2006, the extension of Shirley Community Infant School’s age range to provide for children aged 3-11 with effect from 1 September 2006 and the relocation of the resulting Shirley Community Primary and Nursery School to the site of the former St Andrew’s Junior School
- iii) Support the proposal that the Children’s Services Lead Member in consultation with the Deputy

Chief Executive be granted reserve powers to conclude negotiating with the owners of the St Andrew's Junior School site with a view to securing the Authority's preferred outcome on terms which Cabinet consider represent value for money.

- iv) Support the proposal that alternative options should continue to be explored should it not prove possible to secure the preferred outcome.
- v) That a further report be presented to Cabinet at its next meeting on the outcomes of current negotiations with identified funding requirements for the preferred option.

### **135. ALLOCATION OF GRANT AID TO VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS**

This report advised Cabinet Members on the proposed allocation of grants to voluntary organisations in 2006/07 which was for final Cabinet approval, having first been considered by the relevant Service Development Groups and a specially convened panel to consider community grants overseen by the Cambridgeshire Community Foundation.

#### **It was resolved:**

To approve the recommendations for the allocation of the Grants to Voluntary Organisation in 2006/07, as outlined in the appendices to the report and as appended to the bound version of the Cabinet minutes.

### **136. STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER**

This report sought the Cabinet's approval the Council's key strategic risk register for 2006/07 and to endorse the progress made to date on embedding risk management within the Council services. The Register had been prepared having regard to the current year's risks, suggestions made by Members and officers and the conclusions drawn from the results of the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) inspection carried out in 2005.

It was noted that significant progress had been made in embedding a comprehensive risk management approach and that all Cabinet reports now included an assessment of the relevant risks.

In response to a question raised, it was confirmed that any major new risks not currently reported which arose during the year would be reported to Cabinet as a matter of course.

In response to a question regarding the assessment of risks to the local community, it was noted that these risks were addressed through the Community Risk Register and that the Strategic Risk Register considered the risk of the Council being unable to respond to these risks.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the register of prioritised key strategic risks for 2006/07 as set out in paragraph 2.5 of the Officer's report.
- ii) To note the progress made to date on the embedding of Risk Management process within the Council.

**137. SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CONSULTATION ON THE SUBMISSION DRAFT DOCUMENTS**

Cabinet had received at its last meeting a report setting out the key corporate responses to be made on the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Submission Draft documents which had been required to be submitted by 17<sup>th</sup> February. This update report set out details of the final representations made, following e-mail consultation with members of the Environment, Waste and Business and the Transport and Delivery SDGs as agreed at the last Cabinet meeting.

It was highlighted that with the Local Development Framework forecasting a substantial amount of new housing there were concerns at the quality of the house-building construction techniques and the County Council would be urging that they were built to significantly higher than lifetime standards, with environmentally sustainable features.

**It was resolved:**

To endorse the officers report and the schedules (web linked) as the Council's response to the consultation, which had been submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council via the delegated arrangements approved by Cabinet at its meeting of 7 February 2006.

### **138. BUDGET MONITORING 2005/06**

This report summarised the financial results for revenue, capital and trading units to the end of December 2005, including forecast outturn results for the current year. It was noted that the forecast overspends had been reduced and action was being taken to ensure a balanced budget. Details were shared of a very complimentary letter from the Audit Commission, which recognised that the County Council ran a tight budget.

A request was made that Cabinet should receive a report as soon as practicable on the future of the Catering Service, following the review currently being undertaken by Councillor Pegram.

#### **It was resolved:**

To note the forecast budget outturn for the end of the year 2005-06, and the actions proposed and in hand, to deliver financial balance as set out in the officer's report.

### **139. TOP 30 PERFORMANCE MONITORING 06/07 AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING – QUARTER 3**

Cabinet received a report:

- Presenting details of the proposed new, 2006/07 Top 30 performance indicators and targets to Cabinet for approval;
- summarising the performance on the Council's existing Top 30 Key performance Indicators for the third quarter 2005/06;
- summarising the latest performance on the Local Public Service Agreement for 2004-2007.

The proposed Top 30 performance indicators for 2006/07 had been chosen to reflect and support the attainment of the Council's priorities published in the Corporate Plan and Best Value Performance Plan. On appendix 1 there was a reference to the libraries indicator being under discussion. It was orally reported that the officers' view was not to report on this indicator in the next year, due to complications arising with the closure of the Lion Yard central library and the relocation of Huntingdon library in 06/07.

Attention was drawn to the following indicators where performance was off target.

- BVPI 54 / LPSA: Number of people aged 65+ Helped to Live at Home per 1,000 65+ population – this showed steady improvement and ways to capture additional activity was being undertaken with the PCTs to drive up performance. Improvements were still required.
- Local: Number of Library Accesses per Head of Population was both off target and had a downward trend largely due to a dip in

accesses over the festive period, which was experienced seasonally.

- Local percentages household waste recycled or composted while being slightly off target but had to be put into the context that Cambridgeshire's performance was currently still within the top 25% of English local authorities.

Thanks were recorded to staff for the performance on BV 162 "percentage of child protection cases which should have been reviewed during the year which were reviewed" with 100% being achieved in the 1st and 3rd quarters and 98.3% in the second quarter. The target was 98%.

Officers were asked to look at the feasibility of reporting progress on those action plan involving top 30 performance indicators only reported on an annual basis, as it would be useful for Cabinet to see how these were progressing.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Approve the proposed 2006/07 Top 30 performance indicators and targets with the amendment to the Libraries indicator;
- ii) Note the current performance on the Council's Top 30 Key Performance Indicators for the third quarter 2005/06; and
- iii) Note progress towards the County Council's second Local Public Service Agreement.
- iv) That the officers consider how to report action plan progress on those performance indicators only reported on an annual basis.

#### **140. SCHOOLS DISTRIBUTION FORMULA**

This report provided Cabinet with details of the proposed new funding formula for Cambridgeshire schools.

The methodology for distributing the budgets, known as Activity Led Resourcing, had been agreed by Cabinet in January 2004. The new formula took as its starting point the need to recognise the activities that the resources distributed to schools were supporting. This was in contrast to the existing approach which, at its crudest, was based on the concept that there were fixed costs for every school, irrespective of size, and variable costs that related only to the number and ages of pupils in the school.

It was confirmed that the new funding formula had the support of the Schools Forum.

**It was resolved:**

To agree the implementation of the new funding formula as detailed in the officer's report.

**141. SUPPORTING PEOPLE DISTRIBUTION FORMULA**

Cabinet received a report to consider the County Council's response to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's (ODPM) proposal to introduce a Distribution Formula for the Supporting People Programme.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) had confirmed Cambridgeshire's budget for 2006/7 to be £12.3M representing a reduction of £1m since 2003. The current consultation was on a draft distribution formula to redistribute the national Supporting People budget of £1.7bn between authorities. If the formula was implemented as proposed, Cambridgeshire's grant would be reduced by a total of 25.9% from the 06/07 level, resulting in an annual budget of only £9.3m.

The latest consultation asked 14 questions relating to how quickly the formula should be implemented and what it should contain. Appendix 2 of the report set out Cambridgeshire's proposed response to all the questions. A revised version had been tabled at Cabinet following amendments suggested from a Supporting People Joint Member Group who had met after the initial despatch of the Cabinet agenda. The letter of response to the ODPM stated that Cambridgeshire was strongly opposed to the introduction of the formula and should only be used to allocate growth monies.

Cabinet was pleased with the robust response as set out in the letter attached as appendix 1 to the officer's report and the revised responses to the questions.

**It was resolved:**

To endorse the response to ODPM as set out in the letter at Appendix 1 and the detailed response to the questions within the consultations document at Appendix 2 of the revised tabled document.

**142. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

Cabinet received a report on progress on matters delegated to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers to make decisions on behalf of the Cabinet up to February 2006.



**It was resolved:**

To note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions/take actions on behalf of the Cabinet.

**143. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA PLAN 8th APRIL 2006**

Cabinet noted the following Additional reports to be added to the agenda.

- 1) Section 28 Transfers  
(Transfer of Budget and responsibility from PCT to County Council)
- 2) Approval of the 2006/07 Forward Looking Annual Efficiency Statement
- 3) Waste Disposal Facilities and Council Land in the Cambridge Southern Fringe
- 4) Further report on final negotiations regarding Shirley Infants and St Andrews.

Reports no longer going forward:

Report 9. Cambridge Sports Lake

Report 10. Hills Road Bridge Public Consultation – moved to 13<sup>th</sup> June

In respect of Report 12 “Summary of Office Plans” clarification was being sought on whether this was still required to come forward.

**144. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**It was resolved:**

That under section 100 (a) 4 of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following report on the grounds that it was likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 9 of schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972 by virtue of the report referring to any terms proposed or to be proposed by or in the course of negotiations for a contract for the disposal of property.

#### **145. OPTION AGREEMENT ON LAND AT FORDHAM**

Cabinet received a report setting out the proposals for and the benefits of entering into an option agreement on an area of land (approximately 12.47 acres) off Soham Road, Fordham. The benefit of granting the option was that it would generate an immediate non-returnable receipt and the potential for future capital receipts during the term, providing the developer was successful in its planning representations to the District Council.

##### **It was resolved:**

To agree that the land should be declared as surplus to Council requirements and to authorise the Director of Property and Asset Management to grant an option agreement on terms to be agreed.

Chairman  
18th April 2006