

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 22nd February 2011

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 1.50 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor J. Tuck

Councillors: Sir P Brown, S. Criswell, M Curtis, D Harty, L W McGuire, T Orgee, R Pegram, J Reynolds and

Apologies: Councillors: F Yeulett

Present by invitation: Councillors: K Wilkins and S. Tierney.

313. MINUTES 25th JANUARY 2011

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 25TH January 2011 were approved as a correct record.

314. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Reynolds declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as chairman and director of Renewables East in relation to any associated issues on the agenda.

[REPORTS FOR INFORMATION FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING]

Copies of reports considered by Cabinet are on the County Council's website via the links shown in this report. Alternatively they can be found by navigating from the Home page (www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk) to Council and Democracy then Democracy Decision Making and then Agenda and Minutes and then using the drop down menu for Agenda minutes and reports to seek the correct meeting and then clicking on the report title on the agenda page and then clicking on the report attachment title.
--

315. SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT (IOM)

At the invitation of the chairman Councillor K Wilkins from the review group made a brief presentation as an introduction to the above report. He highlighted that unlike most reviews the review had been less about looking at what was already in place and seeing whether it worked, and more about observing a process in the early stages of change. The grandiose talk of the previous government about how Integrated Management would ensure offenders had a single point of contact with the interventionist agencies had been replaced by the welcome language and practice of pragmatic change. While not welcoming the slow progress of IOM development in Cambridgeshire, the review considered that it was now being developed in the right direction. IOM was seen as important as a way of reducing

crime levels and the associated cost of crime. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-3ai>

Specific attention was drawn to a number of fundamental areas that needed to be tackled to ensure success including:

- Addressing issues concerning the number of offenders with significant mental health needs which was upwards of 50%. It was considered unacceptable that mental health care was provided so rarely and that existing systems were becoming so poor.
- Housing – this was not an easy issue to solve as the chronic shortage of housing enabled landlords to cherry pick tenants to the detriment of ex-offenders and was particularly acute in Cambridge, distorting the market and forcing many local ex offenders to be re-housed outside of Cambridge in cheaper accommodation.
- Co-location of services was considered to be very important by the review group as highlighted in recommendation 9, stating that partnership without co-location would not bring the same benefits.
- Interventions shortly after release from prison were considered vital to an offenders chances of success (the report made reference to £46 release money not being considered much to live on until the first benefit cheque, particularly if prisoners were released on a Friday where the temptation would be to re-offend to obtain more money or returning to old associates for accommodation needs).

Councillor Wilkins and those involved in the review were thanked for an excellent report with the Cabinet Member for Communities particularly highlighting recommendations 20, 28 and 31 as those that the Council should particularly act on as a matter of urgency. Issues considered vital were to ensure that the various partners were on board, as some of the recommendations were targeted to other agencies.

In answer to questions on who would ensure appropriate partnership working this was seen as being appropriate for the IOM Board as well as ensuring appropriate reference was made to the Criminal Justice Board.

Reference was made to the proposed response to recommendation 9 which as it currently stood only partially agreed that co-location was vital, while highlighting that the Probation Service did not appear keen to co-locate staff. The Service Director for Community Engagement believed that it was vital to ensure closer collaborative working with the Probation Service, but that progress in this area would require dialogue between the Criminal Justice Board and the Probation Board. Cabinet support for the strategy would allow officers to go back to partners with proposals for change. Cabinet indicated their support for initiatives to encourage closer working between partners, particularly the Probation Service. The Cabinet Member for Children who had experience from a previous role with the Probation Service for Cambridgeshire highlighted that one of the issues for the Service in the past had been too much central control, including not having control of where they were located, as well as stressing that the Cambridgeshire Probation Service had been one of the worst funded in the past.

The Cabinet Member for Children also queried the proposed timescale set out in paragraph r. on page 2 of the review report which urged the Council "to chase progress on the

recommendations and to return to the subject in two years when practices and outcomes could be assessed”, suggesting that there should be report back sooner. It was indicated in response that the intention was that scrutiny would receive an initial update within a period probably nearer 12 months. Cabinet supported this shorter timescale.

In supporting the recommendations of the response to the scrutiny committee review recommendations, the Chairman of Cabinet paid tribute to the scrutiny function in Cambridgeshire and the strength of its non-party political reviews.

It was resolved:

- to thank Scrutiny for producing a valuable and detailed report; and
- to approve the proposed response to the Member Led Review on Integrated Offender Management (IOM) as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.
- To ask officers to progress through all possible channels co-location issues with the Probation Service.

316. SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – IMPROVING THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF PROFESSIONALS TO HELP ALCOHOL MISUSERS AND THE CABINET REPONSE

Councillor Tierney was invited to present the scrutiny review of education and training of professionals to help address alcohol miss-use, thanking the officers listed in the report and particularly drawing attention to the exemplary work carried out by graduate trainee Hannah Barrett. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-3bi>

In highlighting key recommendations and commenting on the proposed responses Councillor Tierney stated that:

- in respect of recommendation 2 none of the officers involved had heard of the clinical evaluation of “Identification and Brief Training” (IBA Training) carried out by the John Moores University and the Councillor asked that in respect of the further evaluation to be carried out, which he welcomed, he should be kept informed on progress.
- In terms of recommendation 4 he urged that officers should have another look at what was an innovative idea and which had been glossed over in the current response. The Director of Community Engagement agreed to speak to the Member outside of the meeting on how to progress the recommendation.
- Recommendation 5 was to address a perceived major gap in current service provision.
- Recommendation 6 had called for a hard copy of contact information for alcohol services to be provided to all practitioners so that services could be contacted immediately as no central contact point currently existed and therefore a directory was seen as a way forward. In discussion one Cabinet Member did not see the proposed response to this recommendation as being contradictory to what was being suggested in the original recommendation. However following further discussion it was suggested that

the contact information requested could be provided electronically and the Director of Community Engagement would look into this in terms of providing information on the website and on Cambridgeshire.Net.

- The recommendation in 9 asking Addaction to share more information with statutory professions on client progress, was to recognise that while client confidentiality was valued, it should not be an overriding principle when withholding information that could put other members of families at risk, particularly children and that agencies should be encouraged to share information holistically. It was considered that the proposed response currently did not recognise this vital point. The Cabinet Member for Children indicated that there had been similar discussions at the Children's Trust and supported the view that he would rather have a data protection issue than an injured child. Cabinet supported that officers should look again at the response on recommendation 9 which reflected health colleagues views and that there should be further discussions / negotiations with them on the issues highlighted in order to consider changing their approach.
- On recommendation 11 the councillor wished to be kept informed on the progress on the training and alcohol co-ordination functions delegations highlighted in the response.

Issues raised in discussion by Members included:

- how the recommendations would be progressed. In reply the Director of Community Engagement indicated that he would now prepare an action plan in order to monitor progress identifying an accountable person against laid down timescales, as part of a management framework.
- Suggesting that a similar approach to the successful initiative undertaken on smoking using peers should be looked at for discouraging alcohol misuse. The Director of Community Engagement agreed to take this up with the appropriate Education Service who had already undertaken alcohol awareness lessons in schools which could be used as the basis for future presentations.

The Cabinet Member for Communities thanked both Councillors Tierney and Brooks-Gordon for an excellent report whose recommendations could be taken forward as part of the Localism agenda.

It was resolved:

- (a) To thank Scrutiny for producing a valuable report and to support the majority of recommendations in the report as amended in discussion and as set out in Appendix 2 of these minutes.
- (b) That the lead officer would contact Councillor Tierney outside of the meeting regarding providing a strengthened response to recommendation 4.
- (c) That officers be asked to additionally amend the response to 6 to also provide a web based copy of alcohol services contact details and in relation to response 9 to seek a holistic approach with other agencies including the Health Service in terms of ensuring children's safety was paramount which should supersede issues of client confidentiality when needing to share information so that appropriate risk assessments could be made.

- (d) The need to produce an action plan in order that scrutiny could monitor progress in future.

[REPORTS FOR DECISION FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING] (an updated version of the report will be included on the Council agenda)

317. THIRD CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

Cabinet was reminded that the Council had a statutory duty under the relevant Transport Acts to produce a Local Transport Plan (LTP) with the Coalition Government confirming the continued role of LTP's as a key tool for delivering transport investment and services at the local level.

Cabinet noted that The LTP 3 guidance allowed more flexibility to develop plans that focused on local circumstances and priorities than in the past. The LTP 3 had been developed to contribute towards the County Council Vision and priorities and would support the creation of communities where people would want to live and work. The Plan document had been formulated by consultation with both the public and stakeholders. Appendix A of the report recognised 8 specific challenges to be addressed and the solutions at a time of serious fiscal constraint. In order to deliver the plan a robust monitoring framework would be employed to ensure that value for money would be pursued. Appendix B of the Plan set out details of the Local Transport Plan Implementation Strategy while Appendix C provided the Integrated Transport Block Programme areas and the Maintenance Block Programme areas and their funding proposals. Both the programme and the anticipated level of expenditure would be monitored and updated regularly.

It was orally stated that there was an aspiration to support rail infrastructure improvements but current resource restrictions did not allow the County Council to provide financial support.

Discussion of the detail included the following issues being raised / suggestions being made:

- In terms of supporting rail infrastructure there was a request to update the text to reflect the response to a written question provided at the last Council meeting for the final version of the report due to go forward to the Council meeting in March.
- The need to work with relevant partners to help secure improvements to rail infrastructure / other travel infrastructure in the county to facilitate improved travel both in and for traffic passing through the county.
- A question was raised by one member on whether the elements of the capital and revenue programmes set out in appendix B could be prioritised suggesting that major road maintenance and structural maintenance schemes should have a higher priority than traffic calming schemes. In response the point was made that some traffic calming measures could be seen as having a high priority by local communities and therefore a general prioritisation of spend against such schemes should not be included, while acknowledging the general point being made.
- One member was concerned that the text did not reflect enough ambition about the economy, while appearing to concentrate on climate change issues. It was highlighted

that in Fenland unless there was improved access for cars then the local economy could not improve and more consideration needed to be given to the development of cleaner car engines etc to make travel more environmentally friendly in outlying areas of the county. It was agreed that the text on the economy would be strengthened with the point being made that the policy had been developed over a period of 12-18 months at a time when climate change was a Council priority.

- Reference needing to be made to the new Tax Increment Finance (TIF) programme as a way of leveraging in additional funding. Officers agreed to make reference while highlighting that there was only limited circumstances when such monies could be used.
- Including comments made at the recent non-decision making PDG in the final report to Council.
- More detail was required on how the plans would be implemented and how they would help achieve the County Council's agreed priorities.

It was resolved:

(a) to endorse the draft Local Transport Plan prior to consideration

by Council on 29 March 2011 subject to including issues raised at the Cabinet meeting ; and

- (b) to delegate to the Cabinet member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director for Environment Services, the authority to make textual changes to the document prior to submission including:
- taking account of a written question and answer discussed at the Council meeting in respect of rail infrastructure,
 - to strengthen the wording in respect of ambitions relating to the economy,
 - making reference to Tax Increment Finance (TIF) where appropriate,
 - flagging up issues in relation to achieving the County Council's agreed priorities,
 - highlighting progress already made,
 - making reference to the importance of improving transport infrastructure outside of the county and its role in helping to facilitating travel through the county.

REQUEST TO MOVE ITEM ON THE AGENDA

With the agreement of Cabinet, the Chairman changed the order of the agenda in order to receive the Public Health Report as the lead officer was required to attend another meeting.

[FURTHER REPORTS FOR INFORMATION FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING]

318. ANNUAL PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT (APHR) FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE 2010

The Director of Public Health introduced the Annual Public Health Report describing the statistics relating to the health of the local population and making recommendations for

action to be taken to improve and maintain its health. The report provided a brief summary of some key health statistics for Cambridgeshire, key points and recommendations from the JSNA work carried out in 2010 and reviewed progress against the recommendations of the APHR 2009 (pages 26-30) and made a number of new recommendations.

The APHR made reference to the new national Atlas of variations in Healthcare which included a range of useful information about how healthcare compared with other parts of the country and provided recent statistic on infectious diseases in Cambridgeshire.

The document which can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/030222-13>

The Director of Public Health explained that since her first Annual Public Health Report for Cambridgeshire in 2006 the estimated population of the county has increased from about 570,000 people to over 600,000. Close to a third of this estimated increase was amongst people aged 65 or over. Life expectancy had improved overall in Cambridgeshire as had premature death rates for circulatory disease and cancer, but inequalities in life expectancy between different communities had persisted. Surveys of adult health and lifestyles in Cambridgeshire carried out in both 2008 and 2009 showed no significant change in the main lifestyle behaviours which impacted on health (smoking, alcohol, diet and physical activity) over this relatively short period. In Cambridgeshire the well known trend of rising childhood obesity appeared to have levelled out over the past two years but had not reversed.

It was highlighted that since 2007, Local Authorities and Primary Care Trusts had a statutory duty to co-operate and to prepare a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), looking at the health and wellbeing needs of local communities, including needs for preventive, health and social care. Cabinet noted that as a result of the increasing focus on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment there was now a reduced need for a detailed Annual Public Health report as there was considerable cross over between the two documents.

A wealth of new information about local people's health and wellbeing, and the factors which affected health, were now available on www.cambridgeshirejsna.org.uk and this information had been used by several local organisations to plan services to meet local needs. Highlighted was that health inequalities in areas of Cambridge City and Fenland had increased.

At the time of preparing the report changes were proposed to both NHS and Public Health structures, as laid out in the draft Health and Social Care Bill. This included a welcome focus on the role and involvement of local communities, and an increased role for local authorities. Although the new statutory roles for health improvement would sit with Cambridgeshire County Council, it would be essential to have close involvement from District and City councils in order to achieve the intended outcomes.

Cabinet noted that there had been good progress against some of the previous recommendations, including an improvement in the uptake of Measles, Mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccinations. Recommendations coming forward were as a result of looking at variations in healthcare, clinical variations and comparing Cambridgeshire to other areas and the need to target limited resources to those areas where the greatest difference could be made. The recommendations for 2010 highlighted were:

- The ongoing need to ensure the Healthy Child Programme is delivered effectively to all children and young people through the NHS, Children's Centres and supported by schools and colleges (Children and Young People's JSNA)
- The importance of local planning and housing services being fully engaged with a range of health and wellbeing issues – including the housing needs of an ageing population, and wider community issues for people moving into new housing developments (Older People's JSNA, New Communities JSNA).
- Opportunities to pilot and use a new Mental Health Impact Assessment toolkit when considering a range of decisions made within the local public sector (Mental Health JSNA)
- The recognition of Gypsies and Travellers as a significant community within Cambridgeshire which is at risk of discrimination and poor health and educational outcomes (Travellers JSNA).

A recommendation which was outside the scope of the current year's JSNA, and was specifically aimed at NHS commissioners, was to make careful use of information on variations in clinical care, either at a national level or at a much more local level such as variations between different General Practitioner (GP) practices, to support clinically led decision making on the best use of local NHS resources.

In relation to the changes outlined in the draft Health and Social Care Bill 2011 and the Public Health White Paper the following recommendations were put forward:

- That the opportunities to improve health and care outcomes for local people, both through an increased public health role for local authorities, and through the strategic potential of Health and Wellbeing Boards, should be welcomed and developed to their full potential by local partner agencies.
- That attention was paid over the next two years to ensuring a robust and safe transition of the emergency planning and health protection functions currently held by NHS Cambridgeshire.

Comments made by Members included:

- The Vice chairman at a Public Health conference the previous week was made aware when making reference to the local JSNA of how well regarded it was in other areas of the country with it being used as an exemplar. He therefore took the opportunity to congratulate Doctor Liz Robin for the continued excellence of the work she was carrying out which was endorsed by the whole Cabinet.
- One Member asked with regard to recommendation 3 of the APHR for 2209 whether GPS were engaging in the work to jointly plan services which were relevant to the health of their patients. In response it was indicated that there were two pathfinder groups of GP commissioners and GP practices clusters in the county who were taking significant responsibility for purchasing decisions leading up to them taking over Primary care Trust (PCT) commissioning responsibilities through the GP Senate would have 8 GP representatives elected representing the various parts of the county. The Cambridgeshire Community Wellbeing Partnership, with representation from a range of local public sector organisations, had agreed that the county should become an early implementer of a Health and Wellbeing Board. Statutory Health and Wellbeing Boards have been proposed in the draft Health and Social Care Bill, in order to lead the strategic coordination of joined up commissioning of services across the NHS, social

care, and related children's and public health services. To achieve effective integration and joint action, core members of the board were required to include at least one local elected representative, GP commissioners, the director of adult social services, the director of children's services, the director of public health and a representative from local HealthWatch.

- One member highlighted that while noting that life expectancy was improving, expressed caution in terms of the information provided in terms of both child obesity nationally and the small number of the population shown to be living healthy lifestyles. He also highlighted the need to take account of the quality of life in the final years and the quality of care received when required, as well as the need to improve the support needed for those who wanted to live at home as long as possible. In terms of healthy lifestyle expectancy Dr Robin indicated that this was a measure that required to be taken over a longer time frame and could not be judged on a year by year basis. She also highlighted that the information currently provided in the report on a locality basis would not be repeated in future years and therefore it might be difficult to judge healthy living trends in the future.

It was resolved:

- (a) to note the Annual Public Health Report 2010, and its relevance to the work of Cambridgeshire County Council.
- (b) to approve its joint publication by Cambridgeshire County Council and NHS Cambridgeshire.

319. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – DECEMBER 2010

Cabinet received the latest financial and performance information to assess progress in delivering the Council's Integrated Plan.

Cabinet noted that there were no indicators that were reported in the previous month (November) as exceptions that had reached targeted levels in December. Seven exceptions were reported in respect of performance issues as detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report and can be viewed along with the full report at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-5>

In terms of business mileage and the lack of progress against the local indicator 10% target reduction there was concern expressed by Cabinet members regarding recognising that staff needed to travel when meeting clients and that in some key areas of the organisation, travel to other places was essential (an example being the new national agenda for social workers to spend more time with families and less time in the office as well as the needs associated with an increasing over 85 population) The Cabinet member for Resources and Performance reminded Cabinet that it was the responsibility for every directorate to reduce non-essential business mileage and that there had still been significant growth in business mileage in some directorates. The Chief Executive in response highlighted that Environment Services had performed well in terms of reducing business mileage with Corporate Services also making reductions. Measures to help reduce mileage in other areas included a cap being introduced in Community and Adult Services and a significant reduction target proposed for Children and Young People's Services mileage.

The following resource issues were noted:-

- Overall the budget position was showing a forecast year-end underspend of £604k (-0.2%) which was a further improvement in the previous month's forecast outturn position of £433k, where an underspend of £171k had been reported.
- In Environment Services (ES) an underspend of £979k was being predicted, which was due to savings identified across the whole Service (see paragraph 4.2 of the report).
- In Community and Adult Services (CAS) an overspend of £738k was being predicted, due to pressures identified within Adult Social Care - Operations (see para 4.3 of the report).
- In Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) an overspend of £263k was predicted, due to pressures within Strategy and Commissioning and Children's Social Care (see para 4.4 of the report).
- In Corporate Directorates (CD) an underspend of £626k was being predicted, due to savings identified within both Corporate Services and LGSS Cambridge Office (see para 4.5 of the report).
- In Corporate Directorates – Financing a balanced budget was predicted.
- Spending on the council's overall capital programme was proceeding slower than estimated (see para 4.6 of the report).
- There were no significant debt problems to report and there were no noticeable effects arising from the economic downturn (see para 4.7 of the report).
- Cambridge Community Network PFI Credits - the profiling of these credits had been amended and an additional £5.3m was to be received in 2010-11, brought forward from future years. It was therefore proposed and agreed that this balance was carried forward within reserves and would therefore have no impact on the 2010-11 accounts.

It was noted that while there was no detail behind the recommendation included in the current Cabinet report, that as the Local Government Shared Services initiative was going well and as there was a continued need to reduce costs and improve back office services, it was proposed to give early consideration to integrating the County Council's Corporate IT service into LGSS and that a report should be submitted in the first quarter of 2011/12. Cabinet was also asked to note Northamptonshire County Council's intention to place its property and estates functions into LGSS.

Having analysed resources and performance information noting the remedial action currently being taken **it was resolved:**

- (a) To approve a transfer of £5.3m to reserves as a result of an amendment to the funding profile of Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Credits for the Cambridge Community Network project (as set out in paragraph 4.5.1 of the report); and
- [b] In acknowledging the need to reduce costs and improve back office services through working in partnership:
 - To approve in principle integrating the County Council's Corporate IT service into LGSS; and to acknowledge the proposal for a report to be submitted to Cabinet in the first quarter of 2011/12 incorporating a business case and recommendations on this integration.

- To note Northamptonshire County Council's intention to place its property and estates functions into LGSS, subject to similar business case review and recommendations.

320. PRESCRIBED ALTERATION TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF PECKOVER COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL, WISBECH

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to proceed with plans to increase the size of Peckover Community College to 420 places (its current operational capacity being 315 places). The proposals had the support of the local member and no objections had been received following the required statutory consultation exercise. The proposal would continue to contribute to meeting the demand for places from the surrounding area. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-6>

It was resolved:

- (a) to note the demographic forecast for Reception places for September 2011 and beyond;
- (b) to note the fact that no responses were received to the statutory notice published on 5 January 2011; and
- (c) to approve the prescribed alteration to increase the size of Peckover Community Primary School to provide a total of 420 places, through the addition of four permanent classrooms, with effect from 1 September 2011.

321. ON STREET PARKING CHARGES REVIEW, CAMBRIDGE

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for increasing charges to on-street parking in Cambridge for the purposes of formal advertisement and consultation.

Cabinet noted that historically, the on-street parking account had generated a healthy annual surplus that had been used to fund the following transport related operations and schemes:

- the deficit from civil enforcement operations
- a contribution towards Park & Ride site operations
- rising bollard operations and transponders
- car park information system operation
- a contribution towards the cost of the City Council's shop mobility scheme.

Cabinet was advised that the gradual reduction in the number of pay and display spaces as road space was used for other uses had impacted on income and the annual surplus had been reducing over the last few years while residents' and visitor permit charges had not been reviewed since 2001. Also highlighted was the need for urgent investment in pay and display ticket machines in Cambridge as many were well past their intended lifespan

In response to the diminishing annual surplus and the risk of a deficit next year the costs of the operations supported through the on-street account had been reviewed to assess the

budget needs over the coming years and based on the expected costs to be met in the coming years, parking charges had been reviewed with recommendations to be set at levels expected to generate the required income and to generate a surplus for reinvestment in highway services. A small change was orally reported as being required to the charges in Appendix A proposed for Ref 4 (page 7) which were shown as 25p for 15 minutes. This should have read 50p for 30 minutes and required amendment.

Reference was made to representations received from Councillor Harrison who highlighted concerns raised by permit holders in her division regarding the system of issuing permits, including visitors permits, being open to abuse and that permits were being issued to people who were not entitled to them. She had therefore requested that Cabinet should additionally consider asking officers to initiate a review of the criteria and processes for permit applications, and that local members and residents' representatives were included in the conduct of the review. This proposal was not taken forward. Cabinet had also received representation from a local resident Anil Malhotra who had requested that the increase in her area for visitor permits from £1 to £1.60 should be revisited, suggesting a 20% increase only, which she considered would be more in line with the increase in residents permits. The proposal was not supported.

While the report suggested charges should be held for three years Cabinet considered that in the present financial climate and to recognise the rising costs of operations, it would be more appropriate to review the charges on an annual basis.

It was resolved:

To approve the changes to on-street charges set out in Appendices A and B of the report (as set out in Appendix 3 to these Minutes) for the purposes of formal advertisement and consultation subject to the change to Appendix A page 7 ref 4 which should read 50p for 30 minutes.

322. FINAL DETAILS ON ENGLISH NATIONAL CONCESSIONARY FARES TRAVEL SCHEME (ENCTS) FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE

As the report listed below was not available / finalised / authorised for despatch 5 clear days in advance of the meeting the chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below:

Reason for lateness - In order to provide the most up to date report for Cabinet, it was essential to gather some last minute specialist advice which, together with further Portfolio Holder advice, led to a substantial redrafting.

Reason for urgency - There is an urgent need to gain approval to adopt the recommended methodology for calculating reimbursement for the scheme. The reimbursement rates and the scope of the scheme must be published to the 19 operators by 3rd March 2011 in order to be compliant to the relevant legislation.

Cabinet received a report on the anticipated costs associated with the revised arrangements for the above ENCTS for which the Council was required to take on responsibility from the districts from 1st April. (By 3 March the Council was required to have negotiated and set a reimbursement rate with each of the 19 operators in Cambridgeshire).

Cabinet was advised that the Government grant to cover the ENCTS was £3.995m while £5.7m was estimated to be the actual cost of the scheme if it were to be based on last year's scope, figures and reimbursement rate. Of the costs associated with ENCTS in Cambridgeshire, the most significant element was the statutory reimbursement cost which represented about 95% of the total.

The approach adopted to calculate the rate of reimbursement for each bus operator was in keeping with the recently published DfT guidance and Calculator Tool which had produced reimbursement rates in the order of 50% as opposed to the current rate of 66%. The cost of reimbursing the operators for the statutory scheme was estimated at £4.5m resulting in a reduction in reimbursement to operators over the current system to on average 20% (although for some operators the reimbursement would drop by as much as 60%). Having given due consideration to the "no better, no worse off" principle and the likely risk of challenge should a reimbursement rate below that of the DfT calculator tool be set, no further work had been undertaken to model reimbursement rates lower than 50%.

Operators had been asked to provide an indication of the effect of the proposed reimbursement rates on the county's bus network and officers would continue to work with them to seek to minimise the impacts and to explore alternative models for provision of services as part of the public transport review.

Cabinet was advised that there were three additional discretionary elements to the current ENCTS scheme in Cambridgeshire which, if continued post April, would cost approximately £150K per year (approximately 3% of the budget). In some areas of the county, Community Transport schemes were fully reimbursed to provide free travel on their Dial-a-Ride services being dependent on the decision of District/City Councils where the scheme was based, and was detailed in Table 1 of the report the full details of which can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/CAB110222-8>

Cabinet noted that to provide a consistent full concession across all county schemes would cost approximately £130K. It was noted that Dial-a-Ride services often operated where there was no alternative public transport available, enabling passengers to maintain a level of independence in accessing socially necessary services. Due to the nature of the service, Dial-a-Ride fares could be considerably higher than a comparable bus fare and their cost could restrict their use by those in the greatest need. As the County Council had invested considerably in the County's Community Transport schemes, it was agreed that if a discretionary concession was to be applied to Community Transport schemes, it should be provided across the whole of the County equitably for the sake of fairness. Given current financial pressures, Cabinet supported that a 50% or half fare discretionary concession should be provided. This option offered a reduced outlay for the Council whilst providing a significant level of assistance to those eligible concessionaires using Community Transport schemes. Under Wellbeing powers, the district councils could choose to top up this concession to provide a full concession to their residents. It was noted that no formal indications had yet been received from districts but that if districts wished to top up the

scheme to 100% then the County Council would administer the scheme but was not in a position to finance a 100% scheme themselves.

Free travel for those registered as blind or partially sighted has been funded for a number of years by the County Council. Since the introduction of the national scheme the County Council had funded pre 0930 travel for this group and also for bus services in isolated areas with very limited services. As these only applied to a relatively small group of concessionaires its continuation was supported.

It was highlighted that a review of the Park and Ride service was being undertaken, which would consider the wide range of options available for delivering Park and Ride services. It was therefore agreed that the Park and Ride service should remain eligible under the ENCTS for this year to avoid jeopardising any future business models emanating from the review. However steps would be taken to reduce in future the Council's financial liability in operating the Park and Ride service.

Discussion included:

- In terms of alternative provision it was indicated that the Transport Summit would look holistically at the future provision of community transport and the willingness demonstrated for local communities to help support such schemes.
- Concern was expressed by one Member in respect of the publication of costs around concessionary passes as well as concerns of whether it was over specified. In response it was indicated that the European Regulations required details to be provided of the indicative costs over the course of a contract and in terms of the electronic smart card its functions made it compatible with all other operators around the country and would help reduce its costs of production.
- Confirming in answer to a question that on subsidised bus routes if contractors added extra buses this would result in additional costs being incurred by the County Council.
- With regard to details being provided on the number of services that operators intended to discontinue / reduce 52 deregistration notices had been received the previous Friday from Stagecoach with officers looking at the detail and confirming 17th April as the date changes would commence. There was a request that officers should provide to all members details of the changes once established.
- It was confirmed that the Traffic Commission could not intervene where commercial service routes run by commercial operators were withdrawn.

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the approach being taken with bus operators to minimise reimbursement costs using the Department of Transport (DfT) calculator;
- b) to approve providing a 50% discretionary concession on community transport Dial-a-Ride services and to provide an equitable level of concession across the county at a cost not to exceed £65K; and
- c) to retain the continuation of the pre-0930 discretionary concession for those registered as blind or partially sighted and on bus services in isolated areas at a cost of approximately £15K.

- d To request that officers provide all members with details of bus operator de-registration proposals once clarified.

323. COUNTY FARMS ESTATE: WIND FARM DEVELOPMENT

Cabinet noted that the Council's objectives, approved by Cabinet in July 2006, included encouragement of wider farm diversification and maintaining or increasing rental income which was used to support other Council services. The construction of nine of the twelve turbines on the Red Tile Wind Farm at Warboys on Council property was currently helping to meet those objectives. In addition Cabinet now received a report advising it of the details of the outcome of an exhaustive 18 month market testing exercise to find suitable developers for potential windfarm sites on the Council's Farms Estate which had narrowed the number of potential sites to 4 at Crowtree Farm, Farcet, Whitehall Farm, Littleport, Wolvey Farm, Coveney and Morleys Farm, Warboys. The detail of the market testing exercise is set out in the report which can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-9>

The background was that windpower being a clean renewable source of energy should play a fundamental part of the energy mix required for the low carbon future of Cambridgeshire. Renewable energy was part of Cambridgeshire County Council's vision for a low carbon economy as set out in policy CC3 and that further development of wind energy on County Council land would ensure that the Council contributed to national renewable energy targets. It was however recognised that any proposal for a windfarm would be contentious.

On the basis that the 4 sites would be taken forward, the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance and the Local Government Shared Services Director of Finance would agree terms and enter into a 2 year Exclusivity Agreement with developers for each site with the aim to progress to an Option and Lease agreement. The Option would cover the period up to obtaining planning approval and will be for 5 years. Once an Exclusivity Agreement was agreed the timeline of the project would be as follows:

- Consultation and site investigation – April – June 2011
- Environmental statement preparation – July 2011 – June 2012
- Wind monitoring – July 2011 – March 2013
- Submit planning application – October 2012
- Possible construction 2014-16

It was highlighted that the Council's involvement in the project was limited to leasing the site of the wind turbines to the developer and was low risk with the developer taking the responsibility for consultation and officers ensuring that this included the local community and relevant district councils. The cost of removing turbines should the project fail would be covered by a sum of money held as a bond as part of the initial planning consent. It was noted that there were substantial financial benefits should all the four sites proceed as based on the current values and that the Council's income could peak at an annual rent of more than £700,000, while the corresponding agricultural land lost would be less than £1,000. The contracts if agreed following a planning application would be for 25 years at the end of which, the contractor would reinstate the land if required.

Local Members had been consulted and the responses received along with other Members views were reported as follows:

- The local Member for Littleport was fully supportive believing it demonstrated the County Council's willingness to participate in alternative energy.
- The Local Member for Sutton had highlighted that anything that detracted from the open views of the Cathedral would probably attract vociferous objections once any planning application was submitted.
- The local Member for Whittlesey South had expressed his concern about the proposed amount of windfarms being proposed in Fenland.
- The local Member for Warboys and Upwood (who was also keeping the Member for Ramsey updated on issues he was raising) had already been in correspondence with the Cabinet Member and officers on a number of issues before the meeting but as follow up also asked questions in relation to the following:
 1. Clarification of the location of the Warboys site and which electoral division it was included within. In response it was indicated that the farmhouses were on either side of the constituency boundary but the postcodes suggested that they were in the Forty Foot division. The land known as Morleys was also on either side. It was likely that most if not all of the turbines would be located to the north of the boundary (Forty Foot electoral division).
 2. Why an extension to Red Tile Farm was not being considered? In reply it was indicated that this was because of the close proximity to dwellings. Developers aimed to locate turbines 750m from dwellings.
 3. Seeking clarity on the size of the community financial benefit. In response it was indicated that community benefits both financial and non financial were incorporated into the tender bid. The details would be worked on at the next stage of the process. The likely developer on this site had proposed the largest financial community benefit of any site but the exact amount would depend on the eventual number of turbines consented and would be for the developer to discuss with the local community. This will become clearer after detailed site investigations have been carried out and the number of turbines possible is clearer. The existing scheme at Red Tile gave an indication of what developers were offering.
 4. Why wasn't consultation taking place before the Exclusivity Agreement and Option agreement was signed? In response it was indicated that the next step for the Council would be to sign an Exclusivity Agreement and Option agreement subject to Cabinet delegating decision making. Extensive consultation formed part of the planning application process. The pre planning process was very expensive and would not be considered by developers without the benefit of an exclusivity agreement. Regarding timing developers were generally working on approximately 2 years to submit the planning application. During this period there would be detailed site investigation and extensive consultation which might take another year to determine and another year to construct. (Total approximately 4 years).
 5. What were the other planning projects being proposed that affected Warboys? It was indicated that three windfarm developments in the Fenland District area in the vicinity of the Morleys site had made unsuccessful planning applications. Two had been taken to appeal and the third was being dealt with by written representations. The Inspector visited the sites earlier in the month but they had all now been called in by the Secretary of State. The first two were not supported by Fenland District Council officers but the third which was an extension of an existing wind farm was supported. Cumulative impact was considered to be the key issue.

Other issues raised in discussion included:

1. The Deputy Leader in his capacity as the local member for Norman Cross (Yaxley and Farcet) highlighted that while the map provided at the meeting showed that Crowtree Farm (buildings and much of its land) were physically closer to Pondersbridge than they were to the village of Farcet, the farm and its land were within the parish of Farcet. Farcet Parish Council (PC) and Yaxley PC were currently both negotiating the purchase of land from County Farms and his concern was in relation to the reputation of the County Council which was currently not prepared to sell the land to the PC but only to lease it to them, while seen to be initiating proposals for windfarms which were opposed by many local residents. His view was that this went against the Localism agenda in trying to help meet needs identified by local communities.
2. Whether the windfarms would attract Section 106 contributions. In reply it was indicated that they would (but this would be between the developer and district council as part of any planning consent granted)
3. The Cabinet Member for Children speaking as a local Fenland Member was of the view that Fenland had already agreed its fair share of windfarms and that in the past neighbouring authorities had given consent to such schemes when their impact was greater on the neighbouring district.
4. A number of Cabinet members agreed that developers should not only comply with pre-application protocols but with windfarm policies not just in the consenting district, but in any neighbouring district likely to be affected as a result of the proposed site being close to a shared boundary.
5. It was suggested that there was more support for solar power initiatives than with windfarm proposals and the need for officers to continue to pursue other technologies.
6. The need to ensure appropriate public consultation was undertaken and to receive further progress reports in due course.

In respect to the point 5 above it was noted that other forms of renewable energy generation on the Council Rural Estate were also under investigation including changing buildings to utilise both grey water recycling and solar power and that solar photo voltaic panels on farm buildings would benefit from the Government's Feed in Tariff scheme with benefits for both the Council and its farm tenants. An initial desktop survey was to be completed by March and more detailed proposals for the sites with most potential would follow in April and it was therefore suggested that an additional recommendation to those included in the report should be agreed to reflect this.

It was resolved:

- a) to grant leasehold interests of Cambridgeshire County Council land in four parishes for the development of windfarms on terms to be agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance and the Local Government Shared Services Director of Finance to include ensuring the developers engaged in pre-application protocols and also took into account appropriate wind turbine policies in the area and surrounding areas around windfarm locations;
- b) to reserve the ability for the Council to invest in the wind farm developments and seek a further approval from Cabinet before investment;
- c) To continue to investigate opportunities for other forms of renewable energy such as using solar photovoltaic technology.

324. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CARE SERVICES FOR ADULT SERVICES FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND ACTION PLAN

Cabinet was pleased to receive details of the most recent report from the Care Quality Commission (CQC) who had judged that overall Cambridgeshire County Council was performing well in its delivery of outcomes for people using Adult Social Care Services. The judgement had been made at the end of November 2010 and looked back for the period 2009/10 and represented good progress from the previous judgement. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/ab110222-10>

In two categories, Outcome 2 “Improved Quality of Life” and Outcome 3 “Making a Positive Contribution” the County Council and its partners scored an excellent rating, the highest level achievable. The other areas highlighted in which the County Council was performing well were Leadership, Commissioning and Use of Resources, Increased Choice and Control, and Maintaining Personal Dignity and Respect. The Care Quality Commission had also noted a number of areas for improvement under each of the 7 outcome areas. An Action Plan, attached as appendix 2, to the report had been developed to progress them, and it was noted that work on implementing them was already well underway.

A question raised was whether the Mental Health Trust would be able to deliver on the recommendations set out in the action plan. In response it was indicated that Melanie Brooks, the Interim Head of Commissioning Mental Health and Supporting People was working up proposals, including monitoring arrangements and agreeing timescales with the Mental Health Trust and these would be included in a revised Section 75 agreement due to be submitted to a future Cabinet meeting.

Cabinet wished to place on record their thanks to the teams and staff in the relevant partnerships who had contributed to the improved rating.

It was resolved:

- (a) to note the content of the Assessment of Performance Report 2009 /10 for Adult Social Care Services for Cambridgeshire;
- (b) to approve the action plan set out in Appendix 2 (circulated separately in the Cabinet Members Pack) to address the areas for improvement identified by the Care Quality Commission; and
- [c] to confirm that updates on progress against the Action Plan would be received by Cabinet and the Adults Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Committee at a minimum of six monthly intervals.

325. TRANSFER OF UNDERTAKINGS (PROTECTION OF EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS) REGULATIONS) (TUPE) TRANSFER OF MENTAL HEALTH SOCIAL WORK STAFF

Cabinet received a report outlining the main issues and case for the approval of the TUPE Transfer of Mental Health Social Work staff to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT). The full report can be viewed at the following link:

Cabinet was advised that:

1. The Council currently employed 41 Social Workers seconded to work in the mental health service delivered by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation NHS Trust (CPFT) formed eight years ago to integrate health and social care which was also the period of the current secondments
2. For both legal and Human Resources (HR) best practice considerations secondments should be on a short-term basis. It was advised that should the TUPE transfer not go ahead, the Council would be at risk of legal challenge by employees with Unison stating that they expected the transfer to proceed.
3. The current arrangement created operational problems in terms of the performance management of staff
4. There was the need to review the terms and conditions of employment of social work staff in order to deliver a modern mental health service.
5. Through the consultation and transfer, the aim would be to review the roles, terms and conditions of staff delivering a workforce that was fit for purpose.

Issues raised included:

- Some Cabinet Members expressed concern that the report did not provide full details of the financial costs connected with a harmonisation process which the report stated were currently still being costed. Also highlighted was the statement that it was not clear if CCC employees would support the proposal to harmonise terms and conditions if a TUPE was to go ahead, however, it was considered likely that they would be supportive, given that in most cases there would be a financial benefit in terms of the payscales they would transfer to.
- An oral follow up question was raised regarding the future cost implications / liability to the Council. In response it was indicated that the costs of the transfer would be planned to be cost neutral, making use of a number of long term vacant posts to manage any cost pressure.
- Members in noting that a final report would come back in April confirmed that this needed to include full financial costs / future liability that might impact on the Council including any pension liability. It was agreed that the transfer could only be in principle at this stage, subject to the further detailed report.

It was resolved:

- (a) to approve the TUPE Transfer of Mental Health Social Work staff to CPFT NHS Trust, in principle, to allow the next steps in the process to progress, including consultation with the staff affected; and
- (b) to report back to Cabinet in April for a final decision following the consultation with staff affected and with confirmation details of the financial impact to the County Council.

326. SECTION 75 PARTNER AGREEMENTS

Cabinet received details of revisions to the section 75 agreements between Cambridgeshire County Council and NHS Cambridgeshire for the integrated delivery of:

- older people's (OP) and occupational therapy (OT) services
- learning disability (LD) services, and
- the Integrated Community Equipment Service (ICES).

Cabinet noted that since 2002, the Council had entered into a number of partnership agreements with the National Health Service (NHS), initially using Section 31 of the Health Act 1999. Section 31 was subsequently repealed and replaced by Section 75 of the National Health Service Act 2006. As a consequence of the 2006 review, a major update of the partnership agreements for Older People's Services, Occupational Therapy Services, Adult Mental Health (AMH) services and Learning Disability services was undertaken and approved by Cabinet in July 2007. Two types of agreement were developed, one for Pooled Budgets and Lead Commissioning and one for Integrated Management. The proposed agreements between Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and NHS Cambridgeshire (NHSC) were as detailed in the report to be found at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-12>

The report set out the functions of the existing section 75 agreements and the main changes made following the most recent review with the main revised agreements attached as part of a Cabinet Information pack. The review had concluded that the existing agreements were robust and did not require fundamental changes, but needed updating to reflect current governance arrangements and to be more explicit about the overarching rationale for having such agreements. The review had been undertaken in three parts as set out below:

- A review of the four agreements included in the current report between CCC and NHSC.
- A review of social care functions undertaken by CPFT including the proposal to TUPE transfer staff from CCC to CPFT, which would require changes to the Section 75 agreements and had been the subject of the proceeding report.
- A review of the agreement with CCS that was to be informed by the current contract negotiations between NHSC and CCS, to which CCC was an Associate Commissioner.

Revised Section 75 agreements for the arrangements between CCC and CPFT and between CCC and Cambridgeshire Community Services (CCS) would be presented to future Cabinet meetings for approval.

It was highlighted that to finalise the agreements it was necessary to agree the financial contributions and the performance targets. An additional meeting of the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership was being arranged in March 2011 to agree the financial contributions, following the confirmation of the CCC budget by Full Council on 15 February 2011. The pre-existing performance framework was being revised as part of the Government's work following the consultation on the Health White Paper with the expectation that a number of performance targets would be able to be set by 1 April 2011.

Cabinet was advised that if new indicators were introduced by the Department of Health, it might be necessary to baseline them before setting targets for the end of March 2012 and therefore a delegation was sought for the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing to sign the revised agreements once the financial contributions and performance targets (including agreements to establish baselines) were agreed for 2011/12.

Questions included

- Whether in relation to learning disabilities for which governance arrangements were still being finalised, officers were confident that the transition to becoming an older person would not result in a gap in service provision and affect the smooth provision of services. In response it was indicated that the changes currently being made should not impact on the clients already receiving a service they received and that work was being undertaken with CCS on staff protocols to ensure a smooth transfer from the Learning Disability Teams to the Older People's Team, with the Learning Disability Teams being available to provide specialist advice, if required as part of the assessment process.
- In relation to the risk agreements in respect of overspends / underspends the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning asked officers to confirm that the proposals set out in the agreements were considered fair and equitable in relation to the contributions made by the two parties. Officers confirmed that given that the purpose of the pooled budget arrangements was to deliver benefits to local people receiving adult social care services, the arrangements in place reflected the benefits / risks across the Partner organisations. The Service Director of Strategy and Commissioning (Adult Support Services) was happy to provide further details to the Member outside of the meeting.

It was resolved:

- (a) to agree the revised section 75 agreements for:
 - Older Peoples and Occupational Therapy Services
 - Learning Disability Services
 - Integrated Community Equipment Services
- (b) to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing in consultation with the Executive Director: Community and Adult Services to approve and sign the proposed Section 75 Agreements.

[OTHER DECISIONS]

327. PLACEMENTS STRATEGY FOR LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN 2011-15

Cabinet authority was sought to approve a new Children and Young People's Services Placements Strategy for Looked After Children. (Circulated separately as part of a Members Pack due to its size).

The Placements Strategy provided the framework for projects across Children and Young People's Services to deliver a high-quality and sustainable placements model meeting the needs of Looked After Children while delivering the planned £8.3m savings target for placements purchased from independent providers. The Strategy had a specific focus on minimising the need for children to become looked after by supporting families to stay together as well as setting out plans to commission and provide placements for children in care. The Strategy can be found in the report at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-14>

Cabinet was advised that since 2007 the number of Looked After Children in Cambridgeshire had increased by over 25% (by more than 100 children) to around 500 in 2010/11. Although Cambridgeshire's rate of children in care was still a little below the average for similar authorities, the sharp rise in the number of children in care meant it was necessary to more fundamentally consider the services provided and commissioned to meet their needs. In 2010, Cambridgeshire's average spend on placements for Looked After Children per child per week (£1,074) which was significantly higher than the average for other comparable authorities (£861). The high overall cost per child was largely attributed to the mix of placements bought and provided with Cambridgeshire having more residential placements than most authorities, a higher proportion of which were with external providers as opposed to in-house carers. This combination of an increasing number of Looked After Children and a higher level of spend on placements occurs at a time when Children's Services is seeking to deliver over £40m of savings between 2011 and 2015.

In response Children and Young People's Services had developed a 'whole-system' approach to reducing spend based on tackling the 5 themes identified below involving social workers / schools:

1. **To support families to stay together** and reduce the need for children to be looked after by ensuring a focus on early intervention and preventative action across Children's Services
2. **To manage risk confidently and provide support at the edge of care** to make sure the right children come into care at the right time.
3. **To provide and commission a flexible and affordable mix of high quality placements** to support all children having positive experiences, in care whatever their needs.
4. **To ensure all children in care get a good education**, whether this is in mainstream schools or in alternative arrangements.
5. **To give children clearly planned journeys through care** which enable them to be reunited with family and friends where possible, have stable placements and exit the care system positively.

The Placements Strategy and associated workplan aimed to deliver savings of £8.3m from the projected budget for Looked After Children with independent and private providers over the next 4 financial years, delivered primarily by;

- Reducing the number of children coming into care through a combination of successful and well-targeted preventative services; high quality, family-centred social work and other support at the edge of care; and good care planning that avoided drift and supported children and young people to return home where this was in their interests.

- Altering the mix of placements so that a greater proportion of children and young people were supported by in-house carers rather than private providers and fewer received high-cost residential or residential school placements.

Alongside the savings, Children and Young People's Services was planning additional investment from demography funding in anticipation of a continuation of the increase in the level of need that has been seen since 2007 with the detail of the investments set out in the report.

It was reported that the revised approach while still in its early days had already resulted in looked after children numbers falling from 510 to 471.

Questions / issues raised included:

- One Member highlighted that the challenge for the strategy would be significant bearing in mind that many actions had to take place in a short period of time and that the service had struggled in the past to reduce expenditure during a time of less financial constraint.
- The need to link the strategy to locality / community strategies being developed. In response it was indicated that a second, linked community strategy was being developed over the next two months.

It was resolved:

To formally approve the strategy set out as an appendix included as part of the Cabinet Information pack.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 12.30 P.M. FOR A PERIOD OF HALF AN HOUR

Due to the number of items on the agenda the meeting was adjourned for thirty minutes for a lunch and comfort break.

328. ENDORSEMENT OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Cabinet noted that following the passing of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act in 2009, all upper tier local authorities were required to undertake an economic assessment of their local area, in partnership with district councils. It was highlighted that clarification had recently been received that the LEA duty would remain but that the guidance had been scrapped, leaving councils to determine how they take forward their assessments "without interference from government." It was suggested however, that the assessments would play a key role in determining the functions and strategies of the new Local Enterprise Partnerships.

The primary purpose of the local economic assessment (LEA) was to provide the economic background, data and analysis to inform a range of county and district council plans and strategies. These included sustainable community strategies, local development frameworks, local transport plans, economic development strategies and skills strategies and as such, the assessment provided an evidence base to help inform

economic interventions and investments in the county. The assessment along with those completed by other upper tier authorities in the Local Enterprise Partnership area would support the ongoing development of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and accompanying Economic Strategy and it was suggested that this should be enshrined by agreeing a further additional recommendation taking the wording set out in Paragraph 7.2.

The core challenge for the Cambridgeshire Economic Assessment was to better understand the key drivers of the economy and the support required to improve local economic prosperity. A number of questions underpin this challenge which the assessment categorised under the three themes of:

- Business (including levels of productivity and sectoral strengths);
- People (including skills levels and patterns of deprivation and prosperity) and;
- Place (including employment land provision and the impact of climate change and the environment).

A brief summary of the assessments findings was set out in section 5 of the report under the key conclusion headings: Strengths, Weaknesses, Threats, Opportunities and priorities for action, with detail provided under appendix 2 of the report in the executive summary. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/economicandcommunitydev/ecodevelopment/economicassessment

Cabinet noted that a wide consultation exercise was undertaken with stakeholders invited to comment and provide feedback and the draft assessment was considered by the non-decision making Growth and Environment PDG in September 2010 and the district profiles at 'In your Patch' meetings with district and county members during the autumn. District authorities also presented the draft assessment to Members through their various cabinet and committee processes. County Council Members had also received a presentation at a members seminar. Appendix 1 of the report provided details of the consultation responses received.

It was intended that the Cambridgeshire Economic Assessment would be reviewed annually each autumn and refreshed when the review highlighted that it needed substantial updating e.g. following publication of the 2011 census, with the refreshed Assessment to be approved by Cabinet.

Questions /issues raised included:

- On page 14 bullet 5 referring to higher skilled workers commuting into Fenland to worketc, it was suggested that to sustain this required additional higher skilled businesses being encouraged to move into the area and should be added as a new opportunity.
- What the structure of the LEP was to be and what influence the County Council might have over it? The Acting Executive Director: Environment Services in response indicated that recruitment had already taken place to appoint an independent chairman with a Board of 14 members being established, mainly drawn from businesses but with places for 5 local authority members from across the LEP area.

It was resolved:

- (a) to approve the Cambridgeshire Economic Assessment;
- (b) to agree that the Assessment would be reviewed annually by the Service Director Environment and Regulation in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy and Environment;
- (c) to agree that the Assessment would be refreshed when the review highlighted that it needed substantial updating with the refreshed Assessment to be approved by Cabinet;
- (d) That Cabinet notes that as suggested in the Government's letter to councils, the assessment along with those completed by other upper tier authorities in the Local Enterprise Partnership area, will support the ongoing development of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and accompanying Economic Strategy.

329. CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL INVESTMENT PLAN (CLIP) – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Local Investment Plans (LIPs) are bidding documents that provide local authorities with the opportunity to seek funding from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). Cabinet received an update report on the Cambridgeshire Local Investment Plan (CLIP), in terms of:

- Recent work;
- Changes that had been made to previous County pro-formas and the CLIP itself following consideration and suggestions made by Cabinet in November 2010. The changes made addressed presentational issues such as maps, and particularly focused around the limited geographical spread and scope of projects proposed for inclusion.
- The programme of work required to finalise the document.

Cabinet was reminded that local authorities in Cambridgeshire had developed a joint Cambridgeshire Local Investment Plan (CLIP) with the final document including a series of projects which the Local Authorities were seeking funding for, in order to facilitate growth in the county, and services and infrastructure to support the growth (such as new schools and transport infrastructure). Work had been ongoing by all Local Authorities since summer 2010 in order for them to be in a position to submit projects that they wished to include within the CLIP. The projects were identified on a series of pro-formas having been ranked in priority from 1 to 5 (with 1 being the highest).

In December 2010 the District Council pro-formas were approved at the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board. Details of the total funding that the District Councils were seeking from the CLIP and how many of their pro-formas are for priority 1 schemes were as follows (appendix 1 of the Cabinet contained further details of District Council infrastructure bids which due to its size was included in the Cabinet Information pack)

Local Authority	Total number of pro-formas submitted	Total funding required	Number of Priority 1 schemes
Cambridge City Council	57	£224,205,150	9
East Cambridgeshire District Council	26	£48,957,000	6
Fenland District Council	56	£26,541,770	18
Huntingdonshire District Council	59	£179,852,000	15

South Cambridgeshire District Council	44	£112,178,000	9
TOTAL	242	£591,733,920	57

To address the issues raised previously by Cabinet, work had been undertaken by officers throughout the County Council to ensure that all relevant county projects were now included covering the whole geography of the county. The following significant changes have now been made to the County pro-formas to provide a comprehensive range of County schemes, covering a wider geographical area, as requested by Cabinet Members:

- The education Capital pro-forma had been expanded to include post-16 education facilities (including reference being made to the College of West Anglia) and stronger reference to education requirements throughout the county;
- Market Town Transport Schemes for Chatteris, March, Wisbech, Whittlesey, St Neots, St Ives, Huntingdon and Godmanchester, and Ramsey were now included;
- Cambridgeshire Broadband Together (countywide project with links into Fenland) was now included;
- The Cambridgeshire History Centre was now included.

There were 9 County pro-formas (provided for information as appendices, 2-10) for which gap funding of £100.274m was being sought, an increase of approximately £7m from those initially submitted in November 2010 as follows:

1. Cambridgeshire Guided Busway
2. Chesterton Station
3. Waste Management Infrastructure;
4. Education Capital;
5. Libraries, Learning and Culture;
6. Cambridgeshire History Centre;
7. Cambridgeshire Broadband Together;
8. Market Town Transport Schemes for St Neots, St Ives, Huntingdon and Godmanchester, and Ramsey;
9. Market Town Transport Schemes for Chatteris, March, Wisbech and Whittlesey.

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-16>

Following consideration by Cabinet the County Council input to the CLIP would need to be sent to Cambridgeshire Horizons in advance of their next Board meeting on 23rd March, where the final version of the CLIP was to be approved. Once agreed at the Horizons Board in March, the CLIP would be submitted to the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and would be used by them to inform investment decisions across Cambridgeshire. While it was currently uncertain how the funding would be allocated, it was important that a CLIP was submitted in order to maintain the profile nationally of the significant growth agenda for Cambridgeshire. In addition the document and the processes used to develop it could be used for other future funding bids.

A question was raised regarding how the HCA would be able to identify which of the bids was critical to the County Council and whether any cost-benefit analysis had been undertaken. It was indicated in response that this had not been required as part of the

bidding process. It was agreed in discussion that it would be practicable and possibly advantageous to prepare brief cost –benefit analysis data to help support as background information for each of the County’s bids.

It was resolved:

- (a) to endorse the final draft of the Cambridgeshire Local Investment Plan (CLIP) for approval by the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board in March 2011;
- (b) to approve the additional and amended County Council pro-formas, which have been included in the CLIP; and
- (c) to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services, to make any minor changes to the CLIP response prior to submission to Cambridgeshire Horizons
- (d) To prepare and submit with the CLIP a brief cost-benefit analysis for each County Council bid.

330. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

Cabinet received a report on a new proposed Procurement Strategy for its approval which was intended to significantly improve how the Council procured goods, services and works. The report also provided details on the actions proposed to deliver the outcomes in the strategy.

Cabinet noted that the Council had historically spent in the region of £350m annually on procuring goods, works and services and there was an urgent need to obtain improved value for money from this expenditure to help protect front line services. Cabinet was reminded that the Member led review in April 2010 into ‘Getting Maximum Value for Money in Procuring Goods, Services and Works’ had identified a number of weaknesses in how procurement was being undertaken across the Council, including the lack of a Council Procurement Strategy. As a result the findings from the Member led review had been built upon to develop a Procurement Strategy attached as Appendix 1 to the report which can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-17>

The strategy set out the purchasing direction for the next three years and was to be reviewed annually. The strategy would form an integral part of the procurement strategy covering the Local Government Shared Service (LGSS) partnership between Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) that provides business support services to both partners. The strategy mapped out the actions necessary to put firm foundations in place to maximise the contribution from procurement for the Council both from its own spend and by leveraging economies of scale from the

combined LGSS spend. Individual strategies would be developed jointly with service owners to cover the approach towards each key category of spend across both LGSS partners.

Reference was made to the importance of encouraging apprenticeships and that there would be the opportunity in future to engage early with contractors around the possibility of providing apprenticeship places.

One member highlighted that page 5 of the strategy under the title “Where are we now” made reference to past practice. In respect of section 5 “Where we want to be” he also suggested that there needed to be a statement in relation to eliminating over-specification which often added unnecessary expense.

It was resolved:

- (a) to approve the proposed Procurement Strategy with the addition in section 5 page 7 of a category: “Eliminating over specification through challenging contract documentation through the procurement process”; and
- (b) to note the key performance measures and how these will be reported upon.

331. LITTLEPORT MASTERPLAN DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

Cabinet received a report in order to consider the County Council’s response to a consultation from East Cambridgeshire District Council on the Draft Littleport Masterplan for the future development of Littleport to 2032. When finalised, the document will be adopted by the District Council as its long term vision for Littleport’s future. The report summarised the consultation process undertaken by the District Council, outlined the key findings of the consultation and the constraints and issues arising. The report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-18>

The consultation period was from 10 January to 21 February and although this Cabinet meeting was after the deadline, the District Council had indicated that comments would be accepted from the County Council after the closing date.

The Masterplan set out ambitious proposals for the growth and regeneration of the town, including an additional 1,700 homes, new employment development and proposals for a range of community facilities including a new secondary school, a third primary school, preschool and childcare provision. It identified seven development principles as follows:

- Embracing Littleport’s rural character
- Supporting business and employment
- Boosting the town centre
- Promoting healthy and enjoyable lifestyles
- Achieving sustainable growth
- Serving the wider hinterland

- Creating better movement and linkages.

The vision of the Masterplan was set out as:

To ensure Littleport develops in a way that is sustainable and enables it to thrive and provide for all whilst embracing the surrounding rural fen landscape.

The County Council response strongly supported the vision and aims of the Littleport Masterplan, subject to the more detailed comments on certain sites. The response also sought the opportunity to work closely with East Cambridgeshire District Council and Littleport residents to help deliver the Masterplan's objectives and detailed development proposals.

The response raised concerns:

1. about the proposed site for the new secondary school, to the North of Wisbech Road which was an area of high flood risk and therefore raised the potential of increased development costs for flood investigation and mitigation.
2. with access to some of the proposed sites to the west of the town, including the proposed new primary school and the creation of a new access onto the A10.

Comments / issues raised included:

- The need to ensure communities were sustainable to be able to thrive.
- That it was important to note that the Masterplan document was not a rigid blueprint but indicated a direction of travel and would be a material consideration when considering future planning applications.
- That while it was easy to build homes, infrastructure requirements, such as secondary schools were expensive, and therefore the education requirements and the appropriate siting of schools needed to be planned well in advance.
- The section 106 agreement would need to reflect the costs that would be incurred to provide necessary infrastructure, such as flood mitigation.

It was resolved:

- (a) to agree the draft response set out in the report and to delegate to the Portfolio Holder for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director, Environment Services the authority to amend the response for submission to East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC); and
- (b) to endorse ongoing liaison with ECDC on developing the Masterplan and working collaboratively on its implementation, subject to available resources.

332. CONSULTATION BY EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL REGARDING A MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A DISTRICT WIDE LEISURE CENTRE AND ASSOCIATED TRANSPORT WORKS (LAND ADJACENT TO ELY, RUGBY CLUB, DOWNHAM ROAD, ELY)

Cabinet received a report in order to consider and agree the County Council's response to the consultation by East Cambridgeshire District Council who were seeking the County Council views as a statutory consultee on a planning application for a district leisure centre and associated transport works on the edge of Ely. The centre would cover 6,000 square metres and include a six lane 25metre swimming pool, a six court sports hall, a children's pool a fitness area and car park. Cabinet noted that East Cambridgeshire District Council had submitted a planning application to be considered at their Planning Committee meeting on 2nd March.

The report summarised the outcomes of officer discussions between both authorities undertaken since mid January, with the report confirming in-principle support for the proposal subject to agreement that the pre-commencement conditions would be included if approved to address issues raised. The non-decision making PDG which considered the draft report on 18th January confirmed their support for the principle of the development, but noted that should the outstanding issues not be resolved, the County Council should consider submitting a holding objection on highway grounds, whilst joint working continued to address the issues.

It was highlighted that vehicular access to the centre would be from Downham Road. As the site was severed by the A10 it had been agreed that an underpass would be constructed to provide pedestrian and cycle access and the District Council recently confirmed their intention to adopt and maintain the underpass. On this basis a number of 'Pre-commencement conditions' were put forward as part of the County Council response set out in section 2.2 of the officers report, and which provided they were applied, enabled Cabinet to confirm support to the principle of the development. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-19>

In discussion on who owned the land in terms of the underpass maintenance responsibilities, it was confirmed that East Cambridgeshire owned the land and that they would build the underpass as a private structure, and they would be expected to adopt and maintain this to relevant standards given its key function. Maintenance liabilities for the underpass would not fall to the County Council. As part of the Conditions, a Maintenance regime would need to be agreed which includes the underpass as well as treatment of the highway verge.

It was resolved:

- (a) to note the issues raised by the planning application for provision of District wide leisure centre and associated transport works, land adjacent Ely Rugby Club, Downham Road, Ely (Ref: 10/01020/FUM);
- (b) to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to respond to the consultation on the basis of Cabinet's comments.

333. GUIDED BUSWAY

Cabinet received the latest update report on progress regarding the steps needed to be agreed and completed before the Guided Busway could be opened.

Expressing considerable frustration, the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning explained that as had been expected, BAM Nuttall had not managed to achieve the hoped for completion by Mid-February. Cabinet was reminded that all of the documentation should have been produced last year and Bam Nuttall had not provided any reasons why it had not been produced, having undertaken to have had all necessary paperwork submitted by Christmas.

In terms of progress made, Cabinet was advised that the bulk of the work on Addenbrooke's Bridge had been completed by 31st January. BAM Nuttall also had a small number of minor snags and small items arising from the safety audits to complete. BAM Nuttall had continued to submit construction certificates and at the time of preparing the report two were still outstanding. (Addenbrooke's Bridge and the flood warning system) Apart from a small number of minor snags and small items arising from safety audit to complete, no further major site work was planned. Despite reminders, BAM Nuttall had been slow to complete certain critical safety documentation bringing together all the documentation for the various bridges and the larger culverts, without which, completion could not be certified. As no programme for their completion was forthcoming, the County Council's Chief Executive had written to BAM Nuttall's Chief Executive on 10th February asking him to address the issues urgently. The issues of concern were set out in paragraphs 2.6 -2.12 of the Cabinet report which can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-20>

An oral update position to the outstanding issues was provided at the meeting by report paragraph number as follows:

Para 2.3 Addenbrookes Construction Certificate - had arrived the previous day, 3 weeks late

Para 2.7 Shelford Road Bridge Assessment. This was received on 11th February and had now been accepted.

Para 2.8 Geotechnical Report. This previously submitted report required revision to confirm the stability of earthworks, in particular cutting slopes. The revisions were discussed at a meeting in November 2009. BNL advised on 14th February that the revised report would be submitted on 15th February. The report had been received by the agreed date.

Para 2.9 Design certification for Trumpington Cutting Retaining Wall. As BAM Nuttall have proceeded to build the wall without an accepted design they have not been paid for this work. This had been promised for the previous week but had not arrived at the time of the Cabinet meeting.

2.10 National Grid Gas acceptance of the Trumpington Cutting Retaining Wall and of the Method Statement for guideway removal. This had been submitted to NGrid during the previous week.

Para 2.11 Network Rail acceptance of the bridge maintenance manual. As both Addenbrooke's and Hills Road Bridges affect railway lines Network Rail needed to accept

the maintenance manual. This was submitted to Network Rail on 18th January. BNL needed to secure Network Rail confirmation that these were acceptable. Officers had contacted NWR but they were indicating it would be another two weeks.

Para 2.12 Structures Design 'Wrap Up' Certificates. BNL had previously indicated that they would start resubmitting these the previous week but notified officers on the 17th February that they would not all be submitted until at least 4th March. The first resubmission for a retaining wall at Oakington had arrived the morning of the current Cabinet meeting. The revised submission was no longer endorsed, which was a positive sign. In response to a question raised it was confirmed that legal advice was being taken regarding the continued delays and that penalty fines were still in place currently standing at over £10m.

It was resolved:

- (a) to note that BAM Nuttall did not achieve completion by mid February as had been indicated by their programme in January; and
- (b) to note the items that were considered critical for BAM Nuttall to achieve completion but which were still outstanding at the time of the meeting.

334. LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES – UPDATE

As the report listed below was not available / finalised / authorised for despatch 5 clear days in advance of the meeting the chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below:

Reason for lateness – Due to the need to finalise the figures in the report.

Reason for urgency – Cabinet has requested an update at each Cabinet meeting.

The Local Government Shared Service (LGSS) initiative between Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire County Councils came into operation on the 1st October 2010 and to ensure the initiative progressed to plan and delivered the financial and operational benefits required it was agreed that Cabinet would receive monthly progress reports. The report covering December which provided a detailed summary of finance, performance and operational issues was attached as appendix 1 and 2 to the Cabinet report and can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-21>

An update was provided in the report against the following headings:

Operation of LGSS: LGSS was operating as planned.

Financial Performance of LGSS: There were no significant financial performance issues in either the Northamptonshire or Cambridgeshire "office".

Operational Performance of LGSS: No operational issue or problems had arisen.

Savings and Benefits Delivery: LGSS savings came from a multiplicity of sources in the current and future years, as detailed in the Business Case. In terms of LGSS Management

Team appointments and associated secretarial support, the target saving would be delivered (and further savings would accrue as a result of not filling the Managing Director role in the short to medium term). Savings on the IT hosting contract had also exceeded plan.

It was resolved:

- (a) to note the contents of the report (including Appendix 1) covering the period to the end of December 2010 of the Local Government Shared Service (LGSS) operation; and
- (b) to note that key performance measures were still being formalised.

335. QUARTERLY UPDATE REPORT ON KEY PARTNERSHIPS

As the report listed below was not available / finalised / authorised for despatch 5 clear days in advance of the meeting the chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below:

Reason for lateness - due to wishing to include an update from the Care Partnership meeting held on 8th February.

Reason for urgency – to ensure Cabinet received the requested Quarterly Partnership Update report.

In order to update Cabinet and enhance accountability of the activities of key strategic partnerships it had previously been agreed that a quarterly report should be produced. The report provided the latest quarterly update report on the following six partnerships:

- A) Cambridgeshire Together (pages 2-3)
- B) Cambridge Children's Trust (pages 3-4)
- C) Cambridgeshire Care Partnership (pages 4-8)
- D) Cambridgeshire Horizons (pages 8-10)
- E) Safer and Stronger Thematic Partnership (formerly Community Safety Strategic Partnership) (10-11)
- F) Greater Cambridge Partnership (pages 12-14)
- G) Environmental Sustainability Partnership (14)

The detailed information can be viewed in the report at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110222-22>

It was resolved:

- (a) To note the report.

- (b) To request that the front page format was changed in terms of the report author / lead member box being in the same order as the individual partner reports.
- (c) To add the Health and Well Being Partnership to be reported to future meetings.

336. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA FOR 15th MARCH 2011

As the report listed below was not available / finalised / authorised for despatch 5 clear days in advance of the meeting the chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below:

Reason for lateness - due to wishing to include the most up to date version.

Reason for urgency – to ensure Cabinet receives details of the next meeting.

Cabinet noted that the draft Cabinet agenda with the following further additions had been made since the agenda was published:

Additions:

Key decision reports

Amended Home to School Transport Policy

- a) Main Stream
- b) Special Educational Needs

Suggested that the report be moved from March to April Cabinet

Other decision reports

Item 12 Building Schools for the Future Update / Leisure Facilities Chatteris - in terms of this report Cabinet considered that there was a need for an update to the March meeting while accepting that it was too early to provide a full report, which was why officers had originally sought deferral.

Item 18 Confidential report Cambs Public Sector Network Procurement Project - Contract Award

It was resolved:

- (a) To note the agenda plan as updated.
- (b) To request that an update report on Building Schools for the Future was still provided to the March meeting.
- (c) To ask officers to look at the possibility of the Highways Policy Review report (currently scheduled for April) being considered before the Speed Limits

Review report (currently scheduled for March) which was required as a result of decisions made at the January South Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committee meeting (which were contrary to current County Council Policy and required a final decision by Cabinet).

Chairman
15th March 2011

CABINET RESPONSE TO : MEMBER LED REVIEW – INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT (IOM)

Recommendations and responses:

1.i – The cohort for IOM should be wider than the current cohort for PPO.

1.ii – Specifically, it should include the more prolific of those offenders currently receiving no interventions because they served less than 12 months, and those who need lower-intensity interventions following intensive, ‘PPO-style’ work.

Response: agree. The new IOM delivery structure is currently identifying the cohort which will extend beyond PPO to include offenders who have served less than a 12 month sentence. However, it is essential that those selected are managed effectively, so not all those leaving prison before 12 months would be “in scope”.

2.i – Agencies should consider IOM, including non-statutory clients, as part of their core business.

Response: agree. The IOM Project Manager is currently leading work streams which include identifying and supporting additional partners to participate in IOM

2.ii – Agencies should ensure this perception cascades throughout their organisations.

Response: agree. As IOM develops, it is anticipated that this will become more “widespread” as many “IOM” clients will be accessing a range of services and it is important that these services work together to meet the needs of the client, rather than in separate silos. All partners under the new structure will be asked to commit to delivery with an agreement of roles and responsibilities and expectations of organisations’ participation

2.iii – The review group welcomes Probation’s commitment to taking on the cohorts of offenders outlined in Recommendation 1.

2.iv – Probation and other agencies should ensure that resources are aligned to give due priority to these cohorts. They should ensure that this attitude is embedded within their working practices. This should include altering performance management arrangements as necessary to make certain that staff are held to account for their work with non-statutory offenders as they are with statutory offenders.

These ought not to be controversial in Cambridgeshire, given the comments from the various agencies involved.

Response: agree. A performance management framework is currently being developed, led by CCC Research Group, all partners will commit to participate in this. However, it will be important to maintain current performance management at the same time to ensure any differences are noted.

3.i – New IOM clients should not be treated as new cohort of ‘IOMs’ alongside cohorts of ‘PPOs’, ‘DIPs’ and ‘MAPPAs’. Rather, once MAPPA and DIP have been separated out, IOM should treat all its remaining clients (that is, those formerly classed as ‘PPOs’, plus those

new clients IOM expands its cohort to include) as one continuous cohort. There should be a sliding scale of interventions available, to be individually tailored to an offender's needs.

Response: agree. The IOM Project Manager is currently leading a work stream to determine the IOM cohorts and the interventions and processes to be used.

Recommendation 3.ii – Cambridgeshire's IOM should use a single governance structure. This structure, however, should be flexible enough to allow districts to pursue local priorities within IOM.

Response: Partially agree, due to differences in delivery between Peterborough and the rest of Cambridgeshire. It will be necessary to continue to have subsections of "IOM clients", in order to fully understand the cohort. However this needs to be as transparent as possible.

The new delivery model includes a governance structure (see attached). This includes one strategic lead/ group across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. However, given current funding arrangements, this will need to report to the relevant Executive Boards to ensure continuation of funding streams.

Recommendation 3.iii – It is neither likely to be appropriate that a fixed, equivalent number of IOM clients are found in each district, regardless of the severity of that district's problems, nor that exactly the same thresholds for selection are used in each district, even if that leaves some almost entirely unserved by IOM. The review group recommends that a balance be struck between allocating IOM resources to the most prolific offenders in the county and ensuring all districts are served.

Response: agree with this recommendation and that flexibility will be key in the delivery of IOM across Cambridgeshire. The CSPs are part of the strategic and working groups which will inform how and what is delivered and will provide local knowledge, expectations and expertise on this.

4 – Agencies, including but not limited to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) should recognise the potential benefits of an IOM approach.

Response: agree. All 5 Cambridgeshire CSPs have demonstrated commitment to IOM and have also identified reducing reoffending as a priority to deliver upon in 2011/12

5 – IOM should feature regular case management meetings to discuss offenders. These should bring together the agencies involved in providing services for those offenders. Meetings should be organised, as far as possible, to ensure agencies can attend those cases relevant to them without spending unnecessary time in discussions about other cases.

Response: agree. Currently with both DIP and PPO there are regular multi-agency case management meetings and this will continue with IOM.

6 – The governance structure described in Recommendation 3.ii should act as a forum for strategic discussion of offender management services and interaction between agencies. It should be publicised to relevant agencies.

Response: agree. It is anticipated that this will be the case once agreement on governance structure has been agreed.

7 – The review group commends the current creation of a directory of interventions as a priority. The group looks forward to its publication, and urges all agencies to proactively cooperate to ensure they are included.

Response: agree and noted that there is a risk of this becoming out of date as soon as produced. Therefore a web linked directory may be appropriate.

8.i – Recognising the importance of the joint working of statutory bodies too, the review group recommends that the involvement of non-statutory and third sector organisations should be seen as a priority.

Response: agree. The working group is currently developing a structure of extended partners to be involved including voluntary, private and community sector.

8.ii – The review group notes that, in the course of this review, it has come across many third sector organisations with great energy and drive, and with a well-evidenced approach. The group anticipates that, with a small amount of effort and accommodation on the part of offender management services, more bodies like this can be found to valuably complement the options currently available.

Response: Partially agree, dependant on resources in voluntary and community sector.

9 – The review group believes that there are very considerable benefits to be gained by the co-location of services, including, but not limited to, police, probation, mental health and drugs services. Partnership without co-location will not bring the same benefits.

Response: Partially agree that co-location is vital, and there are current DIP/PPO premises that could be used for much of this. However, Probation does not appear to be keen to co-locate staff. The new delivery structure includes co location and also a hub and spokes model of delivery out into local areas. **The officers following Cabinet's comments at the meeting would be taking this up further with the relevant boards.**

10.i – Prisoners should be able to begin the process for claiming Job Seekers' Allowance while they are in prison, so that the first benefit payment arrives at the end of the first week after release.

Response: agree. JCP are being invited to be part of the strategic groups and can work on any way to make changes to this which are possible at delivery level. However, Cambridgeshire IOM scheme is not in a position to be able to change national practice.

10.ii - Prisoners should similarly be able to apply for Employment Support Allowance in advance of their release. They should be able to get medical problems certified by the prison doctor rather than waiting for release.

The Home Office and Ministry of Justice are working closely with Department of work and pensions to improve release support.

11.i – The Prison Service should be centrally involved in IOM

Response: agree. Peterborough Prison will be key for the delivery of IOM and are part of the IOM Strategic Group. The IOM project manager is in contact with other local prisons (Littlehey and

Whitemoor) to gain commitment and participation in developing the new model. Although it should be noted that prisoners do not come directly from Whitemoor to the community. In addition, the IOM project manager is looking at the possibility of funding of a benefits advisor via Citizens Advice Bureau to enable more efficient benefits advice for those on the scheme.

11.ii – IOM should be an opportunity for all agencies, including prisons to receive feedback on their clients and interventions from other agencies.

Response: agree. The IOM Project Manager is currently working to encourage more participation from local prisons into the IOM process

11.iii – Prisons should routinely calculate expected dates of release as early as possible, and communicate them to prisoners' needs assessment meetings. Subsequent changes to this date should be avoided, and, in any event, should be communicated to IOM.

Response: agree. As 11.ii

11.iv – Unexpected release on a Friday should only take place where it is genuinely unavoidable.

Response: Partially agree, although there are issues with the Human Rights Act regarding keeping people in Prison for any longer than their sentence, resulting in their subsequent release on Fridays. The IOM Project Manager is working closely with prison services locally and service providers to identify solutions for this.

12 – Link workers are a valuable tool for all agencies because they give a named individual responsibility for keeping up links with a particular sector. The review group recognises that some bodies which provide services to offenders will not be part of every IOM meeting.

Where this is the case, the group recommends IOM itself give a named IOM worker particular responsibility for liaising with that organisation/group of organisations. For example, if not all education providers attend IOM meetings regularly, there should be an IOM worker with particular responsibility for liaising with education providers.

Response: agree. All partners committing to IOM will be asked to carry out responsibilities including ensuring all of their organisation are aware and can participate fully.

13 – The review group does not presume to determine who should be the case managers in IOM. Rather, it suggests that this should be discussed directly and openly between all interested bodies.

Response: agree

14 – All agencies involved in IOM, while continuing to focus on engagement with other organisations, should remember the importance of engaging internally and getting staff not specifically assigned to IOM on board with its work.

Response: agree and will be addressed through the IOM Communication Strategy being developed by the IOM Co-ordinator

15 – All budget-holding agencies should produce clear frameworks for deciding what services are provided to whom and in what quantity. Such frameworks should be evidence-based and robustly linked to outcomes.

Response: agree

16.i – Agencies providing interventions should regularly and routinely evaluate their programmes, including their value for money. Agencies funding interventions should expect this level of evidence-based evaluation and provide advice necessary to achieve it.

Response: Partially agree as many small providers do not have the capacity to do this, especially for low cost interventions. There is currently work ongoing with the IOM Project Manager and CCC Research team on how best all work can be evaluated without causing additional workload on the smaller providers.

16.ii – While some existing projects might struggle to fulfill R16.i in the short term, it should be considered a medium-term priority, and all new projects should provide the evaluations R16.i describes.

Evaluation will be carried out to demonstrate value for money and clear outcomes.

17.i – The review group commends the evidence-based approach of organisations like the One Service and the Dawn Project.

Noted

17.ii – The review group notes that the Dawn Project's Ministry of Justice (Home Office) funding is set to run out in March 2011; it recommends that commissioners do not allow the county to go without good provision for female offenders.

Response: agree. The CCC Research group have carried out evaluation on a number of projects funded by CSPs to assess their impact on reducing reoffending. They are also involved in developing the performance framework.

18 – De-selection criteria should be a priority interest in the creation of the IOM scheme. They should emphasise passing on resource when it could be better used elsewhere, even where practitioners are not certain that the offender currently receiving that resource would no longer benefit from it at all.

Response: agree. IOM has to make the most of resources and use them to the greatest benefit. Once an individual has stopped committing crime, or is at lower risk, where possible they should be transferred to relevant agencies in the community, in order that the IOM case managers can focus on those posing the greatest risk.

19 – There should be a sliding scale of strengths of intervention available through IOM, based on the likely benefit gained from resources. This is likely to generally correlate with lighter interventions targeted towards less prolific/less serious offenders. The appropriate level of intervention should be regularly re-appraised, and should be expected to change over the course of an offender's time on the scheme.

Response: agree. As part of developing the new delivery model this will be addressed.

20 – The Review Group requests that the County Council writes to the Secretary of State

asking for a review of the Broad Market Rental Area limit as it affects higher market rent areas such as Cambridge.

Response: agree. This can be carried out as and when directed by portfolio holder

21 – The review group does not presume to determine what the ‘right’ sort of housing provision is. It should be ensured, however, that the type of housing intervention used is appropriate to the client in question, and that housing projects are regularly evaluated, including value-for-money assessments which take into account their success rates (coupled, of course, with a recognition that different projects deal with different client groups).

Response: agree. Currently the PPO scheme has a housing support officer funded by Supporting People, and the DIP is funding a housing support officer for those offenders using Class A Drugs. Supporting People are currently engaging to see how offenders’ housing needs can be supported through dedicated link workers for IOM clients.

22.i – Specialised housing provision should be available for those offenders facing the most problems, including mental health problems.

Response: agree. A mental health rep is now part of the strategic group and is providing guidance on how best to meet the needs of clients who suffer with mental health issues. However, any involvement is likely to be subject to additional funding from NHS Cambridgeshire.

22.ii – There should, in general, be greater housing availability.

Response: agree that appropriate accommodation for ex offenders does not meet need.

23 – Districts should form agreements with other districts elsewhere in the country, whereby a number of offenders who wish to leave their current area are ‘swapped’ each year and management responsibilities handed over, to help offenders make a fresh start in a new environment.

Response: Partially agree. Information sharing agreements are being developed for providers and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) lead for IOM is working with all Police forces and Local Authorities in the country to share good practice from the pathfinder IOM pilots and to establish better ways of working.

To work effectively would mean all Local Authorities in the country would need to sign up, however there is scope to trial this with clusters of Local Authorities.

24 – Mental health should be seen as central to the management of offenders; offenders should be seen as a key constituency for mental health care. Mental health representation must be at the heart of IOM just as, for example, the police are. This should extend to co-located workers and representation at IOM meetings.

Response: agree. Cambridgeshire Mental Health Trust now has a representative on the IOM Executive group and is working closely with the Project Manager on addressing all mental health issues within offender management.

25.i – There should be clear pathways for the mental health care of offenders, which do not rely on GP referral.

Response (and for 24 – 29) : agree., however resources are currently inadequate The Bradley forum are addressing mental health issues and report into the IOM Executive Group.

25.ii – The mental health representation on IOM called for in Recommendation 24 above should be used to help with decisions regarding referral.

Response: See response under item 24.i

25.iii – In the absence of this representation, there should be direct referral pathways from IOM workers into mental health.

Response: see above

26 – The link worker model works, and should be extended. The review group welcomes the prospect of funding for a Probation-mental health link worker in Cambridgeshire and in Peterborough.

Response: see above

27 – There should be a thorough review of practices to ensure mental health access and provision at the point of arrest. This should not be considered an optional extra, but a key part of at-arrest procedures.

Response: see above

28 – The commissioning of mental health services for offenders, particularly of forensic mental health teams, should be joined-up. Cambridgeshire County Council & NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Unitary Authority & NHS Peterborough should liaise to ensure social care and health care provision matches up.

Response: see above

29 – There is a lack of forensic mental health cover where it is most needed (Peterborough and Wisbech). This should not be the case.

Response: see above

30.i – Long waits for the start of a Foundation Education programme can lead offenders to give up on the system. Foundation Education providers (such as Cherry Hinton Hall, the YMCA etc) should coordinate with one another to stagger the starts of their programmes to ensure there is always a programme starting soon.

Response: agree. The working group are identifying solutions to providing good education, employment and training opportunities to offenders within IOM

30.ii – Education providers should ensure there is some quick-access ‘drop-in’ education available to buffer before the start of a fixed-term programme.

Response and 31: Partially agree, there is not clear evidence as yet that drop ins lead to further take up, however would be worth piloting locally if resources allow. The IOM Project

Manager is currently working with wider partners, e.g. adult learning services to extend the interventions available.

31 – *Adult learning and learning disability education should coordinate their eligibility criteria to ensure any given offender is eligible for, and suitable for, one programme or another.*

Response: As above

32 – *There is a lack of services to help offenders with financial issues (paying bills, claiming benefits, budgeting etc) which merits further scrutiny.*

Response: agree. The voluntary sector agencies can provide a contribution to this, e.g. CAB and can be negotiated by the project manager. This will require funding to be sought via the CAB in order to provide a benefits advisor for IOM.

CABINET RESPONSE TO : MEMBER LED REVIEW – IMPROVING THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF PROFESSIONALS TO HELP ALCOHOL MISUSERS

Recommendation 1: The IBA training roll out is continued to ensure practitioners feel more confident addressing alcohol issues with clients

Response

Agreed-At present there are monthly IBA training sessions organised throughout the county run by the current treatment provider Addaction. However there is flexibility and if increased need is identified then additional training sessions can be provided.

Recommendation 2: There should be rigorous systematic and scientific evaluation of the IBA training

Response

IBA training has been rolled out by the Department of Health (DOH) after many years of trialling brief intervention tools in the primary care setting. The end product was then clinically evaluated by John Moores University in Liverpool. It can be argued that the IBA model itself has undergone intensive thorough review and we plan to evaluate local IBA training course provided locally to ensure it meets the needs of professionals.

Recommendation 3: Alcohol misuse training should be treated as a priority for Adult and Children's Social Care

Response

Agreed - This should be taken to the relevant directors to ensure that alcohol and drug misuse training is mandatory for social workers and that time is allocated for individual professionals to enable them to do so.

Recommendation 4: Offer IBA training to people in the community as a qualification that can be used on CVs. People who gain the qualification can then spread the message within their own communities. As a pilot scheme this might be something other councils will look to as a future model.

Response

At present the IBA training is a recognised intervention and those who participate in the training will acquire additional skills. However this training does not represent a validated qualification, however certificates of attendance can be issued to participants and as such can be used as part of a training portfolio adding contribution to a CV. The relevant lead officer would speak to the lead Member of the review outside of the meeting regarding how the innovative approach suggested could be taken forward.

Recommendation 5: Train volunteers to accompany alcohol misusers in journeys to detox clinics. This would be part of a “buddy” system.

Response

Currently Addaction workers accompany clients to inpatient detox. However the Addaction volunteer scheme has trained a number of volunteers that can help support this work as well as assisting clients with visits to residential rehab units across the country.

Recommendation 6: It is recommended that a hard copy of alcohol services be provided to all practitioners so that services can be contacted immediately

Response

At present the DAAT produces locality wide leaflets and posters detailing local Alcohol and Drug Treatment services with contact details and opening times and a brief overview of the services provided. National helpline numbers are also provided on these cards/posters. These are updated regularly and distributed to a range of professionals. It was agreed at the Cabinet meeting that contact information would also be provided via a link to the website and on Cambridgeshire.Net.

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that job shadowing opportunities are provided between Addaction and Social Care to increase shared understanding of each other's roles.

Proposed Response

Agreed – Relevant managers would need to commit to releasing staff in order for this work to progress. To be taken to the relevant directors.

Recommendation 8: Hinchingsbrooke Hospital to review its data sharing of Accident & Emergency information with partner agencies.

Response

This is currently in the early stages and in the last month Hinchingsbrooke Hospital have agreed in principle to the sharing of A&E data. If this information is not made available then the Leader of the Council is asked to write to the Chief Executive of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital in order to progress matters further.

Recommendation 9: Addaction to share more information with statutory professionals on clients' progress where appropriate so that appropriate risk assessment can be made (especially re. children).

Response

Addaction offers a confidential service and whilst information sharing is valuable, this is at the discretion of the client. It is accepted that where it is in the best interest of the client, agreement should be sought for some information to be shared. Cabinet did not agree that confidentiality should be an over-riding principle when children and others could be at risk if information was not shared. Cabinet supported that officers should look again at the response on recommendation 9 which reflected health colleagues views and that there should be further discussions / negotiations with them on the issues highlighted in order to consider changing their approach.

Recommendation 10: The Co-chairs of this review strongly recommend that a separate Member Led review be taken into domestic violence in Cambridgeshire.

Response

Agreed – this would be valuable piece of work.

Recommendation 11: Coordination of training, following the departure of the DAAT Alcohol coordinator and DAAT's restructure, needs to be allocated as a role to an individual / individuals in the team.

Proposed Response

The training and some of the alcohol co-ordination functions will be picked up by the team, it is proposed in the restructure that some members of the team will expand their roles and responsibilities to include alcohol as part of their day to day work. Without this specific post clearly coordinating alcohol work for the county will be more challenging. Through the work of the Adult Alcohol Commissioning Group (AACG), key partners recognise that progressing alcohol work in the county is the responsibility of all partners and not the responsibility of just one agency.

ON STREET PAY AND DISPLAY PARKING CHARGES AND TIME LIMITS

REF	STREETS OR PARTS OF STREETS	TARIFF		TIME LIMIT	HOURS OF OPERATION	
		Existing	Proposed		Existing	Proposed
1	Free School Lane, Jesus Lane, King Street, Manor Street, Park Terrace, Trumpington Street (north of Silver Street)	50p for 12 minutes	50p for 10 minutes	1 hour	Monday to Saturday 8.30 am to 6.30 pm	
2	Brookside, Lensfield Road, Regent Street (south of Park Terrace), Tennis Court Road, Trumpington Street (south of Silver Street)	50p for 15 minutes	50p for 10 minutes	2 hours	Monday to Saturday 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	Monday to Saturday 8.30 am to 6.30 pm
3	Newnham Road (west side near Maltings Lane), Queen's Road	50p for 15 minutes	50p for 10 minutes	2 hours	Monday to Friday 9.30 am to 5.00 pm Saturday 9.00 am to 5.00 pm (No Waiting Monday to Friday 8.30 am to 9.30 am)	
4	Abbey Road, Arthur Street, Bateman Street, Beche Road, Canterbury Street, Castle Street, Chesterton Road, Devonshire Road, Emery Street, Fisher Street, Glisson Road, Gwydir Street, Harvey Road, Histon Road, Holland Street, Kingston Street, Mawson Road, Mill Street, , Norfolk Street, Northampton Street, Norwich Street, Panton Street, Pemberton Terrace, Pound Hill, Priory Road, Ravensworth Gardens, Russell Court, Russell Street, St. Barnabas Road, St. Paul's Road, St. Peter's Street, Saxon Road, Shelly Row, Tenison Avenue, Tenison Road (north of George Pateman Court), Mill Road Council Depot Access Road	20p for 15 minutes	50p for 30 minutes	2 hours	Monday to Saturday 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	

REF	STREETS OR PARTS OF STREETS	TARIFF		TIME LIMIT	HOURS OF OPERATION	
		Existing	Proposed		Existing	Proposed
5	Gresham Road, Lady Margaret Road, Mount Pleasant, Newnham Road (adjacent to Lammas Land), Newnham Walk, Ridley Hall Road, Sidgwick Avenue, West Road, Wordsworth Grove	20p for 10minutes	50p for 30 minutes	4 hours	Monday to Saturday 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	
6	Sun Street	50p for 15 minutes	50p for 10 minutes	1 hour	Monday to Saturday 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	Monday to Saturday 8.30 am to 6.30 pm
7	Chesterton Road (outside numbers 34 to 46) Milton Road (Mitcham's Corner) layby adjacent to Springfield Road	20p for 10 minutes	No change	1 hour	Monday to Saturday 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	
8	Clarendon Road, Shaftesbury Road, Station Road, Trumpington Road, Union Road Huntingdon Road, Broad Street, River Lane, Riverside, Walnut Tree Avenue St. Matthew's Street, Sturton Street, Tenison Road (south of George Pateman Court)	20p for 10minutes	50p for 30 minutes	8 hours	Monday to Saturday 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	
9	Bentley Road, Newton Road	5p for 15minutes	No change	30 minutes	Monday to Saturday 7.00 am to 5.00 pm	
10	Parkside (o/s nos. 37-38)	50p for 20minutes	No change	20 minutes	Monday to Saturday 9.00 am to 5.00 pm	

RESIDENTS' PARKING PERMIT CHARGES

Residents' Parking Zone	Hours of Operation	Annual Residents' Permit Fee	
		Existing	Proposed
Riverside Petersfield Newtown Benson West Cambridge Castle Hill	Monday to Saturday 9 am to 5 pm	£41	£52
Tenison Road	Monday to Saturday 9 am to 8 pm	£41	£70
Guest Road	Monday to Saturday 8 am to 8 pm	£41	£76
Brunswick Kite Park Street Regent Terrace	Monday to Sunday 9 am to 8 pm	£50	£81

Business permits are charged at 1.5 times the residents' permit rate

Medical Practitioners' permits are charged at the same rate as residents' permits per bay