

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 18th December 2012

Time: 10.00 am – 11.45 am

Present: Chairman: Councillor N Clarke

Councillors I Bates, D Brown, S Count, M Curtis, D Harty, T Orgee, M Shuter and S Tierney

Apologies: Councillor L W McGuire.

Also present: Councillors: J Batchelor, K Bourke, S Gymer, J Reynolds, T Sadiq, T Stone and V de Ven.

674. MINUTES – 27th NOVEMBER 2012

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 27th November 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

675. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The following Member declared a non statutory disclosable interest in line with paragraph 10.1 of the Members Code of Conduct:

Councillor Curtis in item 8 “Housing Related Support for Older People” as the Vice chairman of the Roddons Housing Association

676. PETITIONS

Cabinet received one petition which had been received by the deadline of five working days before the meeting. As the petitions had 50 or more signatures, a spokesperson was permitted to speak on the petitioner’s behalf, for a maximum of three minutes.

Adoption of an One Hour Parking Ban Concept to be added as one of the options in the Cambridge South Area Parking Review

The petition had 90 signatures and read: “We the undersigned request that the concept of a 1 hour parking ban be included in the options for consideration in the South Area Parking Review

The 1 hour ban involves:

- On one side of the road – a one hour parking ban (say 13.00 to 14.00 p.m. Monday to Friday) with unrestricted parking outside this period

- Unrestricted parking on the other side of the road, where the road is wide enough
- 20 mph speed restriction throughout the area.”

Roger Crabtree Chair of the Rustat Neighbourhood Association addressed Cabinet on behalf of the petitioners. Cabinet Members heard how the parking problems in the Cambridge Station to Addenbrookes corridor were mainly caused by all day parkers and were generally considered to be people who worked or studied locally or commuted to London. He indicated that although the South Area Parking Review had been set up over 12 months ago progress had been slow and he was seeking to persuade Cabinet Members that a one hour parking ban should be one of the options on the table for resolving the parking issues.

He indicated that a survey of the area showed it was the most popular option. Petitioners fully accepted that it would not suit all streets, but was a good solution for quite a few. The proposals were that, on Monday to Friday, one side of a road should have free parking for all, except for one hour - say mid-day to 1.00 p.m. Where a road was wide enough, it was proposed that the other side of the road would have free parking at all times and, to restrict speeding caused by emptier roads, the whole area should have a 20 mph restriction. This he believed would add flexibility by barring all day parkers from one side, it would clear the road for a range of shorter term parkers like visitors, local shoppers, district nurses, delivery vehicles, tradesmen's vans and vehicles picking up disabled people. All of these currently had difficulty finding a space. He also suggested that residents should also be allowed to park, apart from during the banned hour. By allowing free parking on the other side, he believed the displacement effect would be reduced and believed it was easier to monitor and control, as the focus would only be for a one hour period. He also suggested that a precedent for such parking proposals was the parking arrangements around Whittlesford and Huntingdon stations and that it was also a common feature of roads around tube stations in London.

He highlighted that currently officers had refused to agree to including the proposed additional option and believed their objections were based on the fact that such a scheme would not be a revenue earner for the Council. He also highlighted that one option already on the table - extending 8 to 5 parking restrictions – was in his opinion just the same, in terms of both set up costs and income generation.

On being invited to ask questions of the spokesman, Councillor Bates received a positive response to his question regarding if the survey results of 300 houses undertaken by the spokesperson in February 2011 referred to in the presentation had been passed on to officers.

Councillor Orgee indicated that although he had been informed that the proposal was against County Council parking policy, he would be prepared to look at the proposal again as the idea had merits but further indicated that the call for a 20 mph speed limit would be treated as a separate issue as he had also been approached by the City Council regarding such speed limits. The response in reply to the petition would therefore be in relation to the proposal for the one hour ban as an additional option and as there was no report on the agenda, a written response would be sent to the spokesperson within 10 working days following the meeting.

677. MATTERS ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES: JOINT REPORT FROM THE SAFER AND STRONGER AND THE ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES: ROAD SAFETY MEMBER LED REVIEW

Councillor Tariq Sadiq the chairman of the review task and finish group introduced the report indicating that the review of the Council's Road Safety Strategy was initiated after concerns were raised about the impact of the restructuring of the Road Safety Team that took place in late 2011. He reported that Members had been concerned that the expertise in road safety education had been diminished amidst fears that the steady decline in road safety casualties was beginning to plateau with an increase being seen in casualties suffered by cyclists.

The key points arising out of this report were highlighted as being as follows:

- The consultation on the restructure proposals had been inadequate. Key partners were not been asked their views and the assessment of the impacts of the changes on vulnerable groups had not been properly made.
- The Review confirmed the shift away from education as the balance of expertise in the team moved towards those with engineering experience rather than a background in education.
- The onus was on schools and hard-pressed head teachers to take the lead on road safety education whilst the Road Safety Team provided a more passive and reactive service. It was considered that this meant that few schools would be able to find the time for effective road safety education particularly in the most deprived areas where children were five times more likely to suffer road traffic accidents than those in the most affluent areas.
- Significant dissatisfaction had been found with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership (RSP) including a highlighted lack of leadership and direction and little co-ordination of partners, some of whom were dissatisfied to the extent that they had threatened to withdraw from the partnership altogether.
- Revenue from Driver Awareness Courses which were considered an effective tool to improve safety and which could be used to resource road safety activities was being lost because the service was outsourced.

He also highlighted what was considered to be a much more effective safety partnership operated by Lincolnshire. The review recommended inviting Lincolnshire RSP to give a presentation to members and officers.

Councillor Sadiq also pointed out that the Road Safety savings taken in the previous budget had been higher than had been required and was seeking reassurance that the recommendations of the review group as set out in the current report were being taken into account before Economy, Transport and Environment Services (ETE) officers considered any further potential savings in the road safety team as part of the further restructuring of the ETE service currently underway.

Councillor Orgee speaking on behalf of the response from Cabinet accepted the criticisms concerning the safety partnership and highlighted that a meeting held in October had included partners re-emphasising the importance of carrying on its work as part of a new, refreshed, partnership vehicle. He went through each of the recommendations explaining, as set out in the text of the responses, the reasons for those not or only partly accepted.

Attention was drawn to paragraph 2.3 of the report which showed that Cambridgeshire had seen a sustained reduction in road traffic casualty figures over the last two to three decades and it was highlighted that the trend was continuing, with fewer people killed or seriously hurt on Cambridgeshire roads which included a quarter reduction in a six and a half year period.

Dr Liz Robin the Director of Public Health was asked to comment from a medical research point of view on the evidence base for how to reduce road traffic deaths and injuries and made reference to John Moore's University of Liverpool evidence review. She indicated that this had found evidence for the effectiveness of environmental interventions for reducing road traffic accidents (RTAs) and injuries, one example being the use of area-wide traffic calming interventions. There was also evidence for safety cameras, for promoting the use of safety equipment such as booster seats for children, and for multi-component community interventions that worked with a range of local organisations in an area to reduce RTAs and injuries. There was also evidence to suggest that safety education for child pedestrians, and mass media road safety campaigns could improve knowledge and safety behaviours, but there was less evidence for their impact on injuries. It was considered that while Driver training and education programmes could improve driver knowledge and hazard perception, they seemed to have little effect on RTAs or injuries. It was agreed that action in the future in terms road safety initiatives required to be evidence based, while also recognising that some of the time it was difficult to be able to show the impact of particular measures.

The Leader of the Council made the point that as Cambridgeshire was a rural county, it was known that cars parking near schools were a danger, and that care needed to be taken by drivers turning right and that greater consideration required to be shown by all road users to help improve road safety around children. In relation to this he commented that cyclists also had their part to play in improving road safety by ensuring that at night they used lights to help improve their own safety and give car drivers a chance of avoiding them. He also highlighted the need for the University in Cambridge to have a role in helping educate new and foreign students to ensure that they used lights at night. In response to a question in relation to how the County Council could assist in this area, it was indicated that the County Council had circulated leaflets at the start of the term, as well as having a scheme to offer to assist the purchase of bicycle lights for those who could not afford them.

It was resolved:

- a) to note and to thank the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the work in relation to the review;

- b) to support a review of the road safety strategy;
- c) to support the ongoing review and refresh of the Road Safety Partnership;
- d) to support the concept of continuing the move to project based delivery and funding of targeted interventions;
- e) to support the provision of appropriate resources to evaluate opportunities for future income generation, including developing business plans and tender documents as appropriate;
- f) To approve the responses as set out in section 2.5 of the report without amendment.

678. CAMBRIDGESHIRE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Cambridgeshire County Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was adopted in 2006 and sets out the Council's processes for engaging local communities in:

- preparing the minerals and waste management planning policy; and
- the determination of planning applications (county development, and minerals and waste management).

Since adoption, there had been significant changes to the planning system, through changes in legalisation and regulations and consequently, the SCI was now out of date and required review. However, as it would not be possible to complete a full review of the SCI until the end of 2013 / early 2014, the report proposed an Addendum to the existing SCI which would:

- update and more clearly articulate requirements for community involvement in planning applications.
- set out the Council's requirements for consultation associated with planning applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP).
- update the section in the existing SCI on the preparation and review of a new SCI. as the procedures had significantly changed since 2006

The report detailed the proposals for public consultation to be undertaken with local communities and other consultees over a six week period, as part of the preparation of the SCI, with the proposed timetable set out in paragraph 3.3 of the report.

In addition to addressing community involvement in planning applications and the preparation of minerals and waste planning policy, it was also advised that it would also be beneficial for the SCI to be extended to address community involvement in the areas listed in paragraph 3.1 of the report as this would offer greater transparency and certainty on how the County Council would consult and involve communities. This approach was supported as cabinet wished to ensure the views of local people were taken account of.

On a separate issue from the specific report, the Leader of the Council asked for an update in relation to the progress on the issue of public notices (e.g. traffic regulation

orders etc) having to be advertised in costly local published media, as this had been an area he had asked that officers action several months ago to also include consultation with Central Government in order to aim to streamline the costs of such advertising through the use of electronic advertising media / the Council website, if legally permissible. In response to the question, John Onslow Service Director: Infrastructure Management & Operations, (ETE) indicated that ETE officers were still working out the details with Legal officers. The Leader of the Council considered the delay unacceptable and instructed that he should be provided with a written explanation of the reasons for the delay in enacting the new arrangements.

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the Addendum to the 2006 Cambridgeshire Statement Community Involvement;
- b) to approve undertaking a full review of the Cambridgeshire Statement of Involvement 2006: and
- c) to agree that a written explanation should be sent to the Leader of the Council on the reasons for the delay on moving publication of public advertisements away from local printed media.

699. ALLOCATION OF SECTION 106 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCHEMES IN AREA CORRIDOR TRANSPORT PLANS

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to spend Section 106 contributions in accordance with the recommendations outlined for projects within the Southern, Northern and Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan areas of Cambridge / South Cambridgeshire.

A process was in place between Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and the County Council for making recommendations to allocate the Section 106 funding to enable a rolling programme of schemes to be delivered over time, in line with the aims of the Area Transport Corridor Plans. This focused on priority being given to the views of local members and the community. The report included the most recently identified 20 priority schemes which had been agreed locally and were now being recommended for approval for funding. It was clarified that the current stage was only for approval to allocate the s106 funding to schemes to enable the proposals to come forward for detailed work as part of the Council's Capital Programme and subsequent approvals for schemes might still be required.

In his introduction to the report the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning indicated that he had received emails / telephone calls from 15 members of the public supporting the proposals to review and improve the Fen Road Traffic Calming proposals for East Chesterton and Milton of which the details were set out in paragraph 3.4.8 on page 9 of the report. He also drew attention to positive comments provided by the local Member, Councillor Manning.

Councillor van de Ven the Liberal Democrat Transport spokesman supported proposals to improve the safety of cycling facilities / additional cycling facilities which she believed were a necessity rather than a luxury for a congested city like Cambridge. She specifically referred to the scheme to consider introducing lighting on the Guided Busway Cycleway (from the City Rail Station to the Trumpington Park and Ride site) as there had been recorded accidents along this route and was aware that women felt unsafe due to it currently being unlit. She also made reference to a 250 signature petition organised in May supporting improvements indicating her own support to the Long Road cycleways improvement proposals which was particularly important in view of the Clay Farm residential development. She queried why there was a proposal for a feasibility study to explore the potential to providing a pedestrian / cycle access from Hauxton Road Highway Bridge over the Guided Busway near the Trumpington Park and Ride site to provide better access (to the Guided Busway). She believed there was already very good access to the park and ride site and did not understand why it should be improved.

Cabinet Members comments included:

- querying the apparent high cost of reviewing bus delays and parking on Cambridge Road and New Road (£50K) and whether such a review could be undertaken cheaper (paragraph 3.4.4) with the same Member also querying whether £250K was a good use of money to address safety issues caused by vehicles speeding between Milton and Landbeach by providing a shared use pedestrian / cycleway when the population was so small and therefore whether the likely use justified the cost of the scheme. (paragraph 3.4.5) In response officers indicated that the costs for Cambridge Road and New Road were only an estimate and that if the final costs were less then that estimated remainder of monies unspent would go back into the pot for re-allocation. Regarding the proposed cycleway, officers confirmed that the A10 Corridor suffered from peak time congestion and with growth planned along the corridor, there was a need to encourage a modal shift away from people using cars to other forms of transport. The aim was to improve cycling and walking links between Cambridge and the key destinations and necklace villages to help improve accessibility and reduce congestion related to growth. This linked to the wider vision for long-term transport strategy that was developed for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and additional funding was also being secured from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund to help deliver such cycling and walking routes such as this related to the key economic corridors.
- Another Member speaking made the point that the two villages were either side of the A10 and therefore what was also needed was a safe crossing area.
- One Cabinet member in supporting the proposals for improving cycle routes indicated the need to provide greater publicity to advertise them to the wider community to ensure that they were well used in order to better justify the large capital outlay on them.
- In relation to the proposals for Fen Road there was a rail line safety issue and officers were able to confirm that there were ongoing discussions with Network Rail regarding the Fen Road crossing.

- One Cabinet member was concerned that on reading the report it could give the impression that the County Council hated cars and wanted to wish them away and reminded the members that Section 106 monies was received to help infrastructure for everyone, not just cyclists, and wished to see in future more of a balance on what the money was spent on, as the current schemes appeared very cyclist centric.
- The Leader of the Council taking on board the views of the previous Member made the point that many of the Section 106 agreements were very old and inflexible and he would wish to see officers and partners seeking monies to create new road junctions to help alleviate congestion issues on new developments. He took the view that valuable section 106 monies needed to be used for the greatest benefit to all transport users whether cyclists or car users. In response to the issue of tackling road congestion, the Head of Service for Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding, ETE indicated that officers from the County worked closely with the district councils to review proposals for funding in line with the Area Corridor Plan approach which was well established and successful. Also officers were looking to develop a longer-term vision and strategy for transport and accessibility in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire which would included considering capacity, improvements to maximise efficiency of the network in support of growth and that the aim would be to develop a draft Transport Strategy coming forward for consultation in the summer.
- As a balancing view another Cabinet Member supported the schemes being put forward which improved safety for cyclists as this was a benefit to all road users and also highlighted that currently many would be cyclists were potentially put off switching from their cars due to them feeling unsafe and this was even more the case in relation to parents letting their children go to school by bike.

It was resolved to approve the application of Section 106 contributions to the following schemes:

- a) Lighting on the Guided Busway cycleway: £100,000 (Trumpington)
- b) Feasibility study into installation of a bridge to link the Leisure Park with the Railway Station: £12,500 (Trumpington and Coleridge)
- c) Re-modelling of Long Road Cycleways: £100,000 (Queen Edith's and Trumpington)
- d) Re-siting of the two Brooklands Avenue bus stops away from grass verges or provide paved areas and improvements to the infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians: £50,000 (Trumpington)
- e) Radial Route Signing extended to include other major routes in the area such as Babraham Road, Queen Edith's Way, Mowbray Road and Fendon Road: £50,000 (Cherry Hinton and Queen Edith's)
- f) Improvements to Cherry Hinton High Street: £250,000 (Cherry Hinton)
- g) Feasibility study into improving Hauxton Road Bridge: £10,000 (Trumpington)
- h) Refreshing cycle path and cycle lane markings around the Perne Road/Cherry Hinton Road roundabout and improvements at this roundabout to address traffic flow and safety issues: £105,000 (Coleridge)
- i) Contraflow Cycling Signage following audit to identify need: £50,000 (All East Area Committee Wards)

- j) Tenison Road traffic calming scheme: £245,370 (Petersfield)
- k) Removal of unnecessary street signage: £50,000 (All East Area Committee Wards)
- l) Study into access link from the CB1 development to the Leisure Park, so that both sites could access the Leisure Park multi storey car park: £12,500 (Coleridge and Trumpington)
- m) Lighting along The Busway for pedestrians & cyclists: £100,000 (Orchard Park, Kings Hedges, Milton & East Chesterton)
- n) Station Road / High Street, Histon junction to improve traffic flow and increase safety: £70,000 (Histon and Impington)
- o) Existing traffic calming measures on Arbury Road, near King's Hedges Road: £150,000 (Arbury)
- p) Review bus delays and parking on Cambridge Road and New Road, Impington: £50,000 (Histon and Impington)
- q) Milton to Landbeach Cycle Route: £250,000 (Milton)
- r) Improvements to Gilbert Road/Milton Road junction: £20,000 (West Chesterton)
- s) Ring Fort Path: £350,000 (Orchard Park)
- t) Fen Road Traffic Calming: £100,000 (East Chesterton and Milton)

700. STREET LIGHTING PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE – DE-ILLUMINATIONS

At the request of the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure this report (which was indicated as a report to follow on the published agenda) had been deferred from the current meeting and moved back to the later January Cabinet meeting to allow greater detail to be provided before Cabinet were asked to make a decision.

701. HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT FOR OLDER PEOPLE

Cabinet received a report outlining the case for approval of contract exemptions for a range of contracts providing housing related support to older People.

The housing related support service in sheltered housing schemes was currently provided by 17 providers across the five districts as detailed in the report providing services to about 5 per cent of older people i.e. those living in sheltered housing as the vast majority of older people (95 per cent) lived in the wider community with the total value of the contracts across the five districts is £1,447,568 per annum.

Cabinet was informed that the service was currently being remodelled to focus on enabling, helping people to develop or maintain their independence within their home or the community, linking with other services, for example the Community Navigator Project and the village warden services run by the voluntary sector. Its emphasis would be on promoting independence and avoiding creating dependency by focussing on achieving outcomes. This would result in moving away from a model based solely within sheltered housing schemes to a more holistic support service for older people, irrespective of where they lived. Pilots undertaken in Cambridge City and Fenland indicated that it was possible to deliver the new service within existing resources as they had demonstrated that many older people who contacted the service needed one-off or short term interventions to enable them to continue to live

independently. It was emphasised that the support needs of those living in sheltered housing would continue to be met, with older people in the wider community also having the option to access the service.

Cabinet had previously granted in December 2011 an exemption from council regulations for one year for the contracts. During this time a project board has been established and an initial consultation exercise carried out to ascertain how services in Cambridgeshire were helping people to maintain a healthy and independent life - what works well and what they thought was missing. Recent advice received from Legal Services recommended that further consultation was required as the proposed re-modelling represented a significant change to the current service provided and the additional time would enable full consultation with stakeholders, partner agencies that work with older people in the wider community as well as with the wider public.

Councillor Batchelor speaking as the Liberal Democrat CYPS and Adult Care spokesman indicated that he was disappointed that the consultation was to be undertaken again and suggested that this was due to it having not been undertaken properly in the first place. Also while he fully supported the vision of providing a holistic support service for older people he questioned the practicalities of whether a service could be delivered to a catchment of 100% of over 65s within the parameters of no increase in the resource base. Responding the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing considered the Member's opening remarks to be unhelpful as there was no suggestion that the consultation undertaken had been wrong and as the report indicated the initial consultation had received 700 responses, with the further consultation being for the legal reasons set out in paragraph 3.3 of the report.

It was resolved:

To approve contract exemptions for a further nine months to 31st December 2013 for contracts with support providers (as listed in appendix 1 of the report) to enable further consultation to be carried out prior to tendering.

702. BLACK HORSE HOUSE CAMBRIDGE – GRANT OF NEW LEASE

Cabinet received a report seeking authority to grant a new lease of Black Horse House and some adjacent space on the Shire Hall Campus and to delegate approval of the detail to the portfolio holder for Resources and Performance in consultation with the relevant senior officer. Cabinet was reminded that the details of the lease were still confidential as negotiations were ongoing.

Councillor Bourke speaking as the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group indicated that while it was good news that a prospective tenant had been found, he criticised the fact that it had taken a year to find a tenant leaving a building empty at a large cost to the ratepayer, which he did not believe represented best value for money. He also suggested that if the County Council was serious about providing best value to the residents of the County it should market the Castle Court / Shire Hall site for conversion to luxury flats or a hotel development as the site was located on prime estate and would generate a significant return. He called for a study to be undertaken. In reply members of Cabinet asked whether Councillor Bourke was able

to provide evidence that the Council had failed to seek to obtain best value or had not marketed the property appropriately, while at the same time strongly defending officers involved in the negotiations. He was reminded that even in an area as affluent as Cambridge the present market conditions in the rental / sale of property market sector was extremely difficult. The lead officer in later questioning also confirmed that the marketing of the property had been undertaken by a respected firm of local agents and had been advertised in the Cambridge News. It was also pointed out that the previous tenant had unsuccessfully marketed empty floors in the building.

On being asked where he would relocate staff currently employed on the Shire Hall campus, Councillor Bourke responded that he believed it would be feasible to design and build a functional new, purpose built energy efficient building, citing Northstowe as a likely site. He requested that his proposal should be the subject of a further study. In response, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, made it clear that the current difficult financial climate with tight budget constraints was not the time for a “Shiny new headquarters for the council” as the County Council needed to be focused on transforming services for the elderly, those with learning disabilities, the young, schools etc.

The officers were congratulated on the hard work already undertaken with a request for an update report in due course.

It was resolved:

- a) To agree to the granting of a new lease of Black Horse House and some adjacent space on the Shire Hall campus and to delegate to the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance in consultation with the Corporate Director: Customer Service and Transformation the authority to agree detailed terms.
- b) To receive a report back to the committee following the completion of the lease.

703. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL

Cabinet received a report updating members on the progress of work to date on a Greater Cambridge City Deal, and sought approval to finalise and submit an expression of interest in a City Deal to Government.

The Government announced the introduction of city deals in its “Unlocking Growth in Cities” white paper in December 2011. This involved the devolution of powers, responsibilities and funding streams from Government to individual city-regions (which are taken to represent functional economic areas), with city-regions in return moving to a more integrated approach to economic growth through a stronger, binding decision-making governance framework that operates across the city-region geography. The core principle behind city deals was to enable city-regions to take greater control of driving economic growth, with local and national benefits expected to be experienced. The ‘first wave’ of city deals concluded by June 2012 with a

second wave of city deals announced in October 2012 with Greater Cambridge being one of twenty city region invited to submit a proposal.

Section 2 of the report set out the work undertaken to date and the key partners involved with Section three setting out the process, next steps and the time frame for submitting a bid. In addition to the three Councils involved (City, South Cambridgeshire and the County Council) several key stakeholders had been involved in the outline work including the University of Cambridge and the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership. It was highlighted that the Second wave city deals were expected to be narrower in focus than the first wave deals, with Government asking for identification of the 'single biggest economic challenge' experienced in each city-region. As a result, it would be important for any proposal to target the unique features of the local economy, and the barriers to growth.

Local members speaking to the report included:

- The Local Member for Linton who approved the thrust of the proposals but suggested that the report should be amended in relation to:
 - page 16 to make reference to the correct title of the Babraham Institute in the sub bullet list.
 - making reference to the reference to the A14 on page 17 he made the point that the A505 was another important road for getting traffic through Cambridge and required improvements.
 - Asking where the money referred to on page 18 would be spent. In response it was indicated that at this stage it was only an expression of interest document and such detail would be included in later more detailed documents if the bid was approved and an allocation agreed.
 - Ensuring that all abbreviations were properly spelt out in the final version of the Expression of Interest Submission document.
 - Asking whether Members would have a further chance to see the final document before it was submitted to Government for any final comments. In response the Leader of the Council agreed that while this was desirable this but might not be practicable as the document was being finalised with various partners in order to meet the strict Central Government timescale submission deadline of 15th January 2013. He would however look to officers sharing it via email.
- The Local Member for Melbourn who also broadly supported the proposals made points that included:
 - That there was currently no reference made in the document to Melbourn science park.
 - She also made reference to sustainable transport schemes being developed in Melbourn to get into Cambridge as currently the roads could not cope with the level of traffic which required transport infrastructures monies and consultation with other counties such as Hertfordshire. It was explained that currently that the discussions were limited to the three Councils in order to make it easier to agree a final document which could only at the current time provide a flavour of the proposals and not the detail.

- One of the local Members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington Councillor Gymer in speaking declared an interest as an employee of the University and while supporting the proposals requested that:
 - discussion should be undertaken with parishes
 - officers needed to look at finding the best travel solutions for staff travelling between the main sites of the University and Addenbrookes Hospital to their other facilities. In response to the first two points above, it was indicated that the City Deal was at a strategic rather than local district level and that issues such as travel to work would be looked at later if the money was secured and enablement powers granted.
 - Reference being made in the document too the Vision Park, Histon.

On being questioned on the proposals the lead officer indicated that it would be for the County Council to justify the bid in terms of the additionality it would provide to the UK economy.

The delegation granted was changed from that in the written report to reflect that Councillor Clarke would be the lead.

It was resolved:

- a) to agree to the principles included in the expression of interest document attached in Appendix 1 and approve the submission of a fully worked up version of this document to government.
- b) to delegate to the Leader of the Council with support from the Executive Director - Economy, Transport and Environment Services the authority to:
 1. finalise the expression of interest document and submit this to government.
 2. work up a full deal with government if the expression of interest is successful, which should include:
 - presenting and negotiating this deal with government, and formation of a negotiating group that takes forward this stage of the process.
 - Formation of a negotiating group to take forward this stage of the process

704. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Cabinet received a report with details of the current status of corporate risk.

Following the review of corporate risk by Strategic Management Team (SMT) this report indicated that SMT were reporting that they were confident that the Corporate Risk Register was a complete expression of the main risks faced by the Council and that mitigation was either in place or in the process of being developed to ensure that each risk was appropriately managed. The only risk showing a changed score was Risk 4 in respect of procurement and contract management as detailed in paragraph 2.4 of the report where the score had been increased to better reflect the impact on the Council should this risk occur, although it was noted that the residual

risk was still at a very low level.

It was resolved:

To note the position in respect of corporate risk.

705. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS AND / OR OFFICERS

Members received a report on progress on matters delegated to individual Cabinet members and or/officers, up to 23rd October 2012.

It was resolved:

To note the progress on delegations previously granted at earlier Cabinet meetings as set out in the report.

706. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA – 15TH JANUARY 2013

Members noted the draft agenda for the Cabinet meeting to be held on 15TH January 2013, including the following changes made since the publication of the agenda:

Chairman
15th January 2013