

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 6<sup>th</sup> September 2011

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 11.45 a.m.

**Present:** Chairman: Councillor N Clarke

Councillors: I Bates, D Brown, S Count, S Criswell, M Curtis, C Hutton, L W McGuire, and M Shuter.

**Apologies:** D Harty.

**Present by invitation:** Councillors: G Heathcock, L Nethsingha, K Reynolds, C Shepherd, F Whelan and S Whitebread.

The chairman in apologising for a reported fault in the installed Loop system requested for the hard of hearing present that those presenting reports / answering questions, should speak both slowly and clearly. He also reminded those present that no permission had been granted to record or film the meeting.

### **426. MINUTES 5<sup>th</sup> JULY, 19<sup>th</sup> JULY AND 15<sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2011**

The minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on the 5<sup>th</sup> July, 19<sup>th</sup> July and 15<sup>th</sup> August 2011 were approved as a correct record.

### **427. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Bates and Criswell both declared a Personal Interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in item 6 “Draft Consultation Response to Huntingdonshire District Council’s Proposed Approach to Seeking Developer Contributions” as members of Huntingdonshire District Council.

### **428. PETITION FOR A SHARED USE CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PATH FROM ORCHARD PARK TO HISTON ROAD, ROUNDABOUT**

Cabinet received a petition with 475 signatures reading “We the undersigned residents of South Cambridgeshire District Council ask for the County Council to build a shared-use path for walking and cycling from Ring Fort Road to Orchard Park to the Roundabout on the A14 intersection at Histon”.

As the petition had 50 or more signatures and was received by the deadline of five working days before the meeting to secure speaking rights, the chairman invited the nominated spokesperson Klaas Bruman to speak in support of the petition. He had also provided in advance of the meeting for all Cabinet Members a glossy leaflet setting out the main issues in support of the shared use path proposed, in order to provide a direct access to the new upgraded crossings being built on the four sides of the A14 interchange.

Reference was also made to comments in support of the petition received from one of the local members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington.

**It was resolved:**

That the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning would provide a written response to the spokesperson within 10 working days.

**429. ADULTS AND WELLBEING OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (OSC) - MEMBER LED REVIEW OF DEMENTIA SERVICES**

Councillor Caroline Shepherd presented the findings and recommendations of the Adults Wellbeing and Health OSC member-led review of Dementia Services which had been formulated against the background of demography projections that the number of older people with dementia in Cambridgeshire (currently estimated at around 7,000) was expected to double over the next 20 years. As part of the introduction she thanked Jane Belman and the other officers involved and the Members of the review group as set out in paragraph 1.2 and 1.3 of the main report.

Cabinet was informed that the review had focused on the local implementation of Objective 4 of the 2009 National Dementia Strategy (NDS), 'Easy access to care, support and advice after diagnosis' as this had been identified as an area requiring significant work, with evidence that intervention at an early stage could have a positive impact on the quality of life of the person with dementia and their carer, help maintain their independence, and encourage early diagnosis. An analysis suggested that investing in services for early intervention and diagnosis could save £120m social care spending and £125m private spending over 10 years if it reduced care home admissions by 10%.

The review had sought to identify actions that would contribute to the achievement of NDS Objective 4 and identify where there were inequalities in access to services, including geographical variations in access to services. Cabinet was advised that the findings highlighted a lack of consistency in the extent to which the pathways worked effectively for individuals or their carers from when they first sought a diagnosis, through to obtaining care and support after diagnosis. The review identified a need for stronger inter-agency working at an operational level and paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 of the covering report summarised the key stages of the pathway where improvements were needed. The recommendations in the report were directed to both the National Health Service (NHS) and the County Council.

As part of the response from Cabinet, the Cabinet Member for Adult Services welcomed the findings and recommendations from the review, indicating that they had been used to inform the development of the interagency strategy on dementia that officers from NHS organisations and the County Council were currently working on. Cabinet welcomed further involvement of the Adults, Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Committee, in its overview role, during the autumn prior to the presentation of the strategy and a detailed action plan to December Cabinet.. It was highlighted that a meeting of officers from the agencies involved was due to take place the next day to inform the consultation with stakeholders during the autumn and a joint response would be provided to the next scrutiny committee meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> September.

It was highlighted as explanation that all the recommendations that were mainly the responsibility of the County Council had been accepted in full, but those that required further discussions with partners (where delivery was not the sole responsibility of the County Council) were only possible to partially accept. This oral, more detailed clarification was welcomed by the Leader of the Council, who requested that in future any recommendations from scrutiny that Cabinet was being recommended to not fully endorse, required to have sufficient explanation, for transparency reasons. He also wished to see timelines for responses provided to help Scrutiny in their follow-up monitoring role.

It was confirmed that Cabinet was fully committed to working with other agencies / initiatives e.g. Cambridgeshire Future Transport, in order to continue to develop interagency services as a way to improve adult social care through enhanced ownership and better targeting of limited resources, as in the current economic climate, there could be no guarantees of greater funding being made available.

There was discussion on the need to further develop preventative approaches in relation to dementia, recognising that early diagnosis and the acceptance of the condition was vital, and to identify what this would mean to the individuals and their carers, including the costs involved.

**It was resolved:**

- a) To thank the scrutiny committee for an excellent, thorough report.
- b) To agree the responses to the recommendations as set out in appendix 1 of the Cabinet response report.
- c) To request that in future Cabinet response reports, where recommendations are only partially agreed, more explanation should be provided on why Cabinet was not able to agree them in full.
- d) That future Cabinet responses to scrutiny recommendations should include timelines to help scrutiny in their monitoring role.

**430. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR PERIOD ENDING 30<sup>TH</sup> JUNE**

Cabinet received a report presenting financial and performance information to assess progress in delivering the Council's Integrated Plan. The key exceptions included in the summary analysis were:

- Revenue Budget; the budget position was showing a forecast year-end overspend of £6.3m (1.6%) a significant increase from the previous month, where an overspend of £2.3m had been forecast. This was mainly the result of a £4.8m pressure being reported within Adult Social Care – Older People this month with section 3.2 of the report proving the details and suggested actions to be taken.
- Key Performance Indicators; these were still under development with proposals to be taken to Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 9 September and with Cabinet due to receive a final report at its meeting on 27 September.

- Capital Programme; 133 out of 175 current projects were forecast to be on time and budget and those not to time and budget were mainly as a result of slippage and cuts to the programme. (Section 4.2 of the report provided further details and suggested actions).
- Balance Sheet Health; end of quarter (June) figure showed the variance of actual net borrowing which could vary considerably due to the profile of cashflows throughout the year. It was reported that there were no investments at the end of the quarter (June), resulting in a projected borrowing requirement of £51m. Interest rates were not predicted to rise until quarter 4, when a 0.5% increase was expected. This would have a favourable affect, as short term borrowing undertaken would be cheaper and debt charges were currently forecast to underspend by £1m.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance wished to place on record his appreciation of the efforts of officers who were involved in achieving projected underspends / reductions in forecast budget overspend activity and he also recognised that even where currently overspends were still being forecast, officers were working very hard to reduce them. He also highlighted that in terms of Adult Social Care transformation costs incurred, this could be partly offset from the Pressures and Development Reserve to reduce the final projected deficit.

He also highlighted that:

- a previous reported pressure on the Waste PFI balanced budget was likely to be offset by accrued savings and in line with the Integrated Planning Process requirements it was proposed to transfer the Waste PFI Credits budget to corporate ownership.
- There were indications that contract prices in some cases could rise by double the assumptions made for a 2.5% inflation increase and high commodity prices were also having an affect on inflation estimates.

The Liberal Democrat spokesman for Resources highlighted the continued concerns of her group regarding the projected Adult Social Care overspend (currently estimated at £7.7m an increase in the forecast overspend of £5.6m from the previous month) as this was now the fourth year in a row that this budget was predicting a substantial overspend which raised questions of the accuracy of the initial demographic assumptions made when setting the budget and also real concerns of whether there was sufficient quality / detailed information on where the money was being spent to allow the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership to be able to identify the main issues and control the overspends in pooled budgets shared with the NHS. She also expressed concerns regarding the use of vacancies to achieve savings especially at senior management level, and the potential detrimental effect these would have on future service delivery.

Reassurance was provide that senior members and officers were actively working to reduce the projected deficit in Adult Social Care, while also recognising the realities that it was a very complex area which accounted for half the Council's spend and involved statutorily required services to protect vulnerable people for which the continued increased demand could only be controlled by investing further in preventative, reablement and early intervention policies. The continued work with partners included sharing knowledge / expertise from other Councils to seek to achieve a more cost effective service. The current overspend predictions were on the basis that the actions detailed in the action plan set out

on pages 5 and 6 of the report would have no beneficial impact on the budget bottom line during the year and as a result, additional proposals were currently being brought forward to achieve the reductions required.

**It was resolved:**

- a) to note the resources and performance information set out in the report and the remedial action currently being taken.
- b) to approve the Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI) credits virement of £2,690,756 from Environment Services to the Corporate Financing budget (as detailed in section 3.2 of the report).

**431. DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S PROPOSED APPROACH TO SEEKING DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Cabinet received a report informing it of proposed changes to seeking developer contributions in Huntingdonshire as part of the district council consultation in relation to introducing the following two documents (for which the closing date for responses was 9th September):

- i) Huntingdonshire Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – this set out the proposed rates to be charged and was a new planning charge on development that came into force in April 2010. It was highlighted that no CIL payments were proposed for schools, libraries and community centres.
- ii) Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework: Draft Developer contributions Supplementary Planning Document – this set out the policies that were proposed for securing contributions from new developments in Huntingdonshire. The proposed charges for education and libraries / Life Long Learning in this document were welcomed.

It was noted that both County Council Members in Huntingdonshire and County Officers have been given the opportunity to comment on the documents and while the County Council was in broad agreement of the proposals, officers and lead members would need to continue discussions with the district council regarding issues such as the percentage of any administration charge to be levied, which Cabinet agreed needed to be resolved as soon as possible. Two main issues identified were that the percentage of the CIL income that would come directly to the County Council needed to be agreed quickly and prior to the next round of consultation and also that there was a lack of detail in respect of transport and highways which as a critical point, required to be rectified. The prepared response also requested more information on biodiversity, ecology and waste management and that adult social care should be considered alongside health. Councillor Hutton declared a personal interest during the discussion.

Cabinet noted that:

- Huntingdonshire District Council was proposing to levy CIL on most forms of development with Table 1 of the officer report identifying the proposed charges and County officers confirming that the figure of £100 per square metre for all development types (apart from those non residential rates separately specified) was reasonable in

the present economic climate. However as the 2009 viability assessment had suggested a maximum rate of residential development of £217 per square metre, Cabinet recognised that with a future upturn in the economy, the market might be able to sustain a higher figure and it was agreed that the response back to Huntingdonshire should strongly suggest that the proposed CIL rates should be reviewed on an annual basis.

- The only rate that County Officers had a concern with was in relation to the proposed charge for Health (£140 per square metre) which appeared to be high and it was proposed that Huntingdonshire should consider having separate rates for private and public healthcare.
- For developments of 200 units and above the, district council and County Council would be able to seek section 106 contributions in addition to CIL which had advantages in that the funding was paid directly to the County Council and as more potential overall monies would be available than previously the case, also reduced the risk of insufficient funding being secured for key infrastructure.

It was orally reported that the local Member for Brampton and Kimbolton had provided written comments suggesting CIL monies could be used to reinstate the Buckden Household Waste Recycling Centre closed in 2008. This was not supported due to the number of recycling plants already available covering the whole County, as well as in the particular district including the site at St Neots, at a time when other counties had closed many more recycling centres.

**It was resolved:**

- a) to endorse the draft consultation response as set out in Appendix A and Appendix B of the officer's report ; and
- b) to delegate to the Lead Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director for Environment Services and taking account of any views of Local Members received, the authority to make any minor changes to the draft consultation response prior to its submission.

**432. SOCIAL WORK – WORKING FOR FAMILIES PROJECT AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY RESPONSE**

Cabinet was reminded that in March 2011 it had endorsed plans to develop the Social work Unit Model in Cambridgeshire and following on from this a formal Consultation ran from the 28<sup>th</sup> March to 27<sup>th</sup> June 2011. The current report presented details of the responses received and the key changes planned in response to the consultation (set out in section 2.4 of the report) to address issues of concern, including relocating some of the Looked After Children Units so that there was now a presence in South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City (rather than the original intention that they should all be located in East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and Fenland). It also presented details of the planned recruitment exercise.

In presenting the response the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) thanked Niki Clemo, Adrian Loades and Claire Barrett for all the work undertaken in the review and putting the responses together, as well as thanking all the staff and the unions who had responded with comments. Cabinet noted that overall, the feedback from staff and stakeholders had been positive. Much of the feedback received supported the

principles and priorities underpinning the proposals and the Munro Review of Child Protection and the Government's Response to the Munro Review had helped to further endorse Cambridgeshire's plans to improve practice through the Social Work Unit Model, highlighting that Cambridgeshire's approach was receiving national recognition.

It was highlighted that at the beginning of the project, the aim had been to complete the implementation process over a 15 month period from January 2012 to April 2013. In June 2011, the timeline for the project was revisited and an options paper was developed to consider the strengths and weaknesses associated with the existing approach. On balance, it was agreed that an accelerated approach should be adopted with the aim of implementing the Social Work Unit Model by July 2012. It was acknowledged that this was an ambitious implementation timeline and there would be a need for flexibility including continually reviewing the key project milestones to assess the feasibility of achieving the new target date. The Project Team acknowledged that the transition period would be a time of particular risk and set out under paragraph 4.3 were details of measures that had been put in place to mitigate against such risk.

Councillor Whelan presented the CYPS Overview and Scrutiny Response as set out in report 7ii) and while accepting that the Leader had indicated that Cabinet intended to only note the recommendations (in order to avoid a precedent whereby scrutiny recommendations proposed changing policy as a last minute change, without a chance of a fully considered response and that it was more appropriate for overview and scrutiny changes to be included in the main report to Cabinet) she urged that Cabinet consider recommendation 4 in relation to the co-location of locality teams and children's social care teams which had come forward from a review of new communities. Reassurance was provided by the Cabinet lead member that the scrutiny recommendations would be taken into account in the future consideration of the service.

**It was resolved:**

- a) To note the changes planned in response to the Social Work – Working for Families Formal Consultation.
- b) To support plans to implement the Social Work – Working for Families Unit Model.
- c) To note the recommendations from the overview and scrutiny committee.

**433. SERVICE TRANSFORMATION – ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

Cabinet received a report requesting approval for expenditure for a project to implement changes in Adult Social Care. Cabinet was reminded that it had previously agreed to release capital funds for an upgrade to the latest version of SWIFT (a normal business issue) and to implement AIS, an application developed for SWIFT that provides additional functionality. The business case produced to support this decision included indicative projected savings, but did not include the costs of implementing business change. As a result, officers had undertaken further discussions with the system suppliers (Northgate IS) to investigate how this could be achieved, as it was highlighted that the Council had no specialist in-house expertise in the product. Northgate IS were subsequently commissioned to produce a costed proposal to implement business change, requiring both processes and the working culture, based on a risk share arrangement and a robust process for knowledge and skills transfer to County Council staff during the programme.

The Liberal Democrat Spokesman for CYPS and Adult Care expressed a number of concerns regarding the lack of detail in the report in relation to other options considered, staff reduction savings and how the savings would be achieved. She commented that while the savings were worthwhile, they still represented “a drop in the ocean” in relation to the current savings required to be made to offset the projected overspend in the service.

It was explained that the proposal, based on a programme of activity, would last up to 19 months, working across all relevant teams in the County Council and in Cambridgeshire Community Services with the last 3-4 months being spent on ensuring that new processes were embedded and working effectively. As a result, business practices would change to ensure that full advantage was taken of the opportunities presented – particularly mobile working and timely practitioner input at the time of a visit (electronically inputted as current practice included a considerable amount of duplication with prepared notes having to then be typed up by administrative officers at a later date, resulting in unnecessary delay between the first customer contact to service provision). There was also scope to improve the way teams worked, significantly reduce travel as a result of better route planning, reduce waste and duplication and improve record-keeping and real-time management information.

Cabinet was informed that the indicative position was that for costs of £636,700, plus VAT, savings of up to £3.66m were achievable. Some savings could be achieved later in the financial year if work started in September/October, with majority to be achieved on an accumulative basis from January 2012 through to December 2012. In relation to the savings achievable in activities carried out by Cambridgeshire Community Services, it was highlighted that details and costings still required finalisation, with fees to be met from amounts within the reserves set aside for Adult Social Care Transformation.

**It was resolved:**

- a) to approve in principle expenditure for a project to implement changes in Adult Social Care; and
- b) to delegate to the Acting Executive Director: Community and Adult Services, in consultation with the Cabinet portfolio holder for Adult Social Care, approval of the final business case and contract.

**434. ESTABLISHING A SHADOW HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

Further to the Department of Health announcement that Cambridgeshire would be an early implementer of Health and Well Being Boards (HWB) extensive work had been undertaken to establish a HWB in order to take a strategic lead in the area.

The report to Cabinet outlined options and proposals for the Shadow Health and Well Being Board and network which was intended to be piloted from September / October 2011. Cabinet was informed that the proposals formulated in Cambridgeshire had been driven by discussions with all partners in the health and wellbeing arena and the desire to be inclusive and engaging in developing the Shadow HWB and Network, had been a key driving principle.



It was noted that consultation had included a partnership questionnaire and a range of stakeholder events which had taken place over a period of months and included attendance by GPs, politicians, voluntary and community sector representatives and officers from councils and NHS Cambridgeshire. The views of stakeholders had set the foundations for the proposed Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board as detailed in section 2.4 of the report. One of the main themes that had emerged was that partners recognised that to be successful required the Board to be supported by a strong Network to facilitate a collaborative, inclusive approach. It was consistently emphasised that prevention required to be one of the core elements of the HWB Strategy and that service users and the public must be seen to inform decision making.

Of the two main models proposed, universal feedback from partners, including the GP Senate (whose views were orally reported at the meeting and had been passed to Members of Cabinet in advance of the meeting), was to support the adoption of Model 2. This model embedded the Shadow HWB within the network and linked to existing local and thematic partnerships for sharing intelligence / information / communications, but also linked to existing local and thematic partnerships for commissioning activity. The link in this model being provided by the HWB member attending local health partnership meetings.

The Liberal Democrat Health Spokesperson challenged the current proposed shadow board membership, suggesting it did not address the current democratic deficit in the NHS for including appropriate cross party elected member representation to reflect the different voting patterns of people in the County. He supported Cambridge City Council's view that one district councillor on the shadow board could not represent the diverse views and the range of separate urban / rural considerations present in different districts in the County. He therefore urged Cabinet to reconsider the membership in order for it to be more democratically inclusive.

In response to the above and as an oral update, Cabinet was informed that a meeting of Leaders / Chief Executive's the previous week had discussed the issues around only one District Councillor being appointed to the board, and that there was majority support from the district councils present (with the exception of Cambridge City Council) that such a restriction was appropriate in order to make the board size manageable. The majority however supported creating an underlying network hub of district councillors who could help support the one nominated district member and Cabinet agreed that the officer recommendations and the terms of reference should be amended to accommodate this operational support request. The Leader in supporting this proposed change indicated that it represented a practical / pragmatic approach and the very fact that it was a shadow board allowed for changes to be made in the future, as a result of its trial operation. It was highlighted that there was no restrictions to prevent the network appointing a Liberal Democrat councillor to be the one district representative on the shadow board, now or at a future point in time.

**It was resolved:**

- a) That after taking into account consultation responses received, to approve Model 2 as the preferred model for the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board with the addition of the creation of a working group of District Councillor Representatives from the four districts and Cambridge City Council as part of the wider network support structure, from which the one District delegate nomination could be drawn to serve on the shadow Health and Well Being Board.

- b) To approve the membership of the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board as set out in the report.
- c) To propose that the Leader of the Council should be the Chairman for the Shadow Board; and
- d) To endorse the initial draft Terms of Reference for the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board as set out in the report subject to making changes to take account of the proposals for an additional working group of District Council representatives.

#### **435. DEVELOPING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY AND THE HEALTH AND WELL BEING BOARD**

This report was taken at the same time as the above report with the chairman of the committee orally presenting to Cabinet the work being undertaken to develop the relationship between Overview and Scrutiny and the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board including:

- Successfully applying to the Centre for Public Scrutiny to be one of 8 centres of Public Scrutiny health reforms scrutiny development areas with details of the programme set out in the officer report.
- Holding a single Issue meeting between the Joint Workstreams Group and the Overview and Scrutiny (OSC) Working Group in early August with the main issues as set out in paragraph 2.1 of the report.
- Convening an information seminar for OSC on 15<sup>th</sup> September and other interested members on the role of HWB and how it was being developed in Cambridgeshire.

There was an acceptance that the Health and Wellbeing Board would evolve and where this occurred scrutiny would need to adapt its approach accordingly.

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

to note the contents of the report.

#### **436. WINDFARM DEVELOPMENT ON COUNTY FARMS ESTATE**

Cabinet received an update on the issues emerging from its decision in February 2011 to grant leasehold interests of Cambridgeshire County Council land in four parishes for the development of windfarms on terms to be agreed by the then Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance and the Local Government Shared Services Director of Finance.

Cabinet was reminded that the February Cabinet decision in favour of the windfarm proposal was strongly debated, with arguments both for and against and as a result, Cabinet agreed to reserve the ability for the Council to invest in the wind farm developments and seek a further approval from Cabinet before investment, as well as asking officers to continue to investigate opportunities for other forms of renewable energy, such as using solar photovoltaic technology (for which progress was continuing with a tender underway for panels on eight barns with completion expected at the end of the year).

Cabinet noted that at the behest of the new Leadership recent informal consultations had been undertaken to seek the further views of Elected Members in the affected electoral divisions and also those adjacent to the windfarm proposals. These had revealed a range of views, both their own, and those provided by local residents in their communities. It was highlighted that the Farcet and Chatteris sites had attracted mostly negative comments indicating that the currently suggested sites were not appropriate locations, while the Coveney and Littleport sites had received mixed views, with strong local concerns about the affect on the landscape and views in relation to the setting of Ely Cathedral.

Views and opinions of local residents / local members included:

- that Fenland had already approved more than its fair share of Windfarm sites and that an additional site in Fenland (one of the four in the current report) was not welcomed with one Cabinet Member at the meeting suggesting that the current number of sites in the Fenland area already provided more than sufficient electricity for the area's demand requirements,
- that there was a natural limit for windfarms in the County,
- concerns regarding the effect on the local landscape and that an increase in numbers would mean that it became the local landscape, especially in many areas of Cambridgeshire due to the flat nature of the landscape where the installations could be seen from miles around, as well as in neighbouring districts who would have no say in the final planning decision,
- concerns on noise pollution levels from the structures being proposed,
- the opinion in some quarters that onshore wind energy might not be the best long term solution for producing electricity,
- concerns regarding potential changes to current planning regulations;

As a result of the views received the current Administration no longer supported progressing windfarm development proposals on County Farms land, including small scale turbine development by individual tenants. The point was made that the savings identified as being possible from implementation of the scheme had not been taken account in the Integrated Plan and were subject to future planning consent being granted, which was far from certain, and therefore there were no current financial implications stemming from the decision.

The Liberal Democrat Spokesperson for Localism, Climate Change and Social Justice expressed her surprise that Cabinet was passing up the opportunity to receive in the region of a £1m per annum for a twenty five year period which could be used to keep libraries open / help subsidise currently threatened bus routes. She also questioned why:

- the report could not have been delayed until a later Cabinet meeting in order to take account of a relevant report commissioned by Cambridgeshire Horizons titled "Cambridgeshire Renewals Infrastructure Framework (CRIF) report which was looking at ways to address the energy gap and was due to be brought forward later in September and;
- individual tenants were to be prevented from investing in small scale wind turbines on their holdings.

The spokesperson further highlighted that paragraph 2.7 made reference to the previous Integrated Plan Strategic Objective 5 to "meet the challenge of climate change and enhancing the natural habitat" which was now no longer a strategic priority. In response to this point, the Chief Executive apologised for the inaccuracy and indicated he would be

reminding all senior officers of the current County Council's revised Strategic Objectives, agreed by Full Council in February 2011.

Following the publication of the Cabinet agenda, the Local Member for Sutton had provided written representations supporting the current report recommendation to defer the implementation of the February 2011 Cabinet decision. As an alternative viewpoint, the non-Cabinet member for Norman Cross expressed his support for the concept of windfarms as oil was running out and proposed that the operating company should have been County (specifically the Pension Fund) owned, suggesting that relevant communities were engaged and asked to 'bid' for 'their windfarms'.

One Cabinet Member who had just returned from a holiday in the Iberian Peninsular made the point that in that area, as in most of mainland Europe, windfarms were not situated closer than 3-4 kilometres from residential properties.

The Leader as part of his summing up again highlighted that Cabinet was proposing to make a decision after taking into account the views of local people / local elected members, and that these views were considered more appropriate than those of Cambridge residents, who due to their geographic position, were unlikely to be affected by a windfarm proposal sited in close proximity to where they lived.

**It was resolved:**

To defer implementation of the February 2011 Cabinet decision to progress with wind farm development on the Council's Farms Estate.

**437. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / LEAD OFFICERS**

Cabinet received the latest update report covering the period from May 2011 up to August 2011.

**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 its behalf.

**438. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA**

The following changes were orally reported since the publication on the agenda of the draft Cabinet agenda for the 27<sup>th</sup> September meeting with cabinet noting that there still likely to be further changes and that the draft agenda published could; only ever be a position statement on the day it was produced.

Additions:

- Scrutiny Member led Review on Domestic Abuse
- On Libraries Learning and Culture Service Review Update will be an Safer and Stronger Overview and Scrutiny response

- New National Road Safety Strategy and Response
- Future Options - Park and Ride Scheme

#### Deletions

Item 6 Cambs Joint Response Consultation on Sustainable Drainage Consultation etc

Moved to 25<sup>th</sup> October Cabinet meeting

Highways Licences for Tables and Chairs

#### Amendments

Item 10 Integrated Resources and Performance reporting for period ending July and August will be two separate reports.

Item 16 Draft National Planning Policy Framework this would be a consultation response

Item 17 was to be re-titled Fenland Draft Coe Strategy

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

To note the agenda plan with the changes that had been made since publication of the report in the original agenda despatch.

Chairman 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011