

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 26<sup>th</sup> October 2010

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 11.29 p.m.

**Present:** Chairman: Councillor J. Tuck

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

**Apologies:** Councillor: Sir P Brown

**Present by invitation:** Councillors: S Gymer and S Johnstone

### **251. MINUTES 28TH SEPTEMBER 2010**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 28<sup>TH</sup> September 2010 were approved as a correct record.

### **252. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

None

### **253. PETITIONS**

None

### **254. [COUNCIL DECISIONS]**

None for determination at the full Council meeting.

## **[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 ( <a href="http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk">www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a> ) to <b>Council and Democracy</b> then <b>Democracy Decision Making</b> and then <b>Agenda and Minutes</b> 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.
--

### **255. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY – CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: MEMBER LED REVIEW OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES IN NEW COMMUNITIES**

Cabinet received the above report with a brief presentation from Councillors Sue Gymer (review chairman) and Shona Johnstone which included thanking Reece Bowman the lead scrutiny officer, the other members of the review group and those headteachers and

children who had given evidence to the panel. The review had investigated the extent to which Children and Young People's Services were integrated successfully into the County's newer communities and involved speaking to a range of people from various organisations serving areas such as Cambourne, Loves Farm and Orchard Park, including as a major theme, speaking to children resident in the new communities.

The well-documented needs of new communities became apparent throughout the review, with there generally being higher levels of need, including health and social problems. It was found that often there was a greater prevalence of domestic issues that could impact negatively on children and young people. In summary it was indicated that the challenges faced by public services in new communities were, very frequently, greater than they were elsewhere. In such circumstances, high quality universal services for children and young people were strongly valued and could allow professionals to avert the development of more complicated problems in some of the children and young people that they encountered, which was an especially important role in a vulnerable new community.

The review group used its report to highlight the money that could be saved by intervening early, thus preventing more expensive and damaging problems for a child or young person from emerging. With this in mind, the main purpose of the report was to highlight the need for greater Council-wide financial resources to be invested in the new communities at an early stage to avoid more expensive interventions later. The review group had recognised the financial constraints that the Council and its partners faced, and there was concern expressed by one of the scrutiny members at the tone of some of the proposed responses, which had not acknowledged this. The whole purpose of the review had been to find better ways of providing services within the limited resources available. The review group had also recommended ways in which the voluntary and community sector could be better supported to provide services, in line with the requirements of the 'Big Society'.

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101026-4i>

The report had made an innovative proposal that, given the scale of the development, a Social Impact Bond should be used on an area basis to fund such services in Northstowe and there was again concern expressed from the presenters regarding the perceived negative response to this proposal which indicated that being able to show a clear return on investments could be problematic in new communities. The 'Invest to Transform' fund was also suggested as a possible source of pump priming investment to be considered. The Cabinet Member for Children highlighted it had not been the intention that the proposal was not to be taken seriously and as set out in the first line of the response, it was suggested that this proposal would be explored further, especially in terms of developing a Social Impact Bond for a geographic community.

The review group had also championed the work of schools in new communities, making several recommendations in relation to how they could be helped by the Council and its partners in the vital work they undertook. Other recommendations covered areas such as accountability, leadership and access to higher-tier services.

In terms of the introduction to the response, the Scrutiny Members disagreed with bullet one in paragraph 2.4 which made a distinction between urban extensions and new settlements, pointing out that the same issues were highlighted at Bar Hill, Cambourne and Orchard Park with only the scale being different.

The Cabinet Member for Learning thanked the presenters and highlighted the responses to the recommendations in the late despatch report, most of which Cabinet would be supporting and which would have an immediate impact on those communities being developed. As the response report was not available 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 it to be considered as it had not been possible to prepare and finalise a response in time for the first despatch in order to provide a response to the scrutiny committee report on the agenda as required by the County Council constitution and enable the scrutiny spokesperson to hear the outcome at the same meeting.

Cabinet recognised the need for a comprehensive and holistic view of the way that services to children and families living in new communities were planned and established. It was highlighted that Localities Teams would play a crucial role in delivering and coordinating work to build resilience in communities and in families and identifying opportunities for preventative approaches based on early intervention and therefore avoiding deeper and costly crises later. The approach to be adopted would be to invest in building on what was known to work effectively and what had been learned from the experience of establishing infrastructure and services in other new communities. The priorities would be balanced against the need to fulfil statutory duties and protect the most vulnerable children and young people. The availability of funding, particularly capital funding meant that affordability would also be a driving factor in the design and development of new communities. It was highlighted that funding routes for new communities were currently subject to considerable change with the Government already talking in terms of providing financial incentives for those local authorities that could deliver housing growth. Likewise, there were to be changes to the current arrangements for securing developer contributions towards public infrastructure and services through Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments.

In terms of recommendation 6 proposing that “Cambridgeshire Together partners should commit to allowing free use by approved voluntary and community sector groups of appropriate buildings owned by partners respective organisations”, in agreeing this, a comment was made by one Cabinet Member that this would need to be undertaken by judging each application on a case by case basis.

In response to a question raised regarding how the recommendation actions / responses agreed would be monitored, it was indicated that the relevant scrutiny committee would receive back a formal report in due course.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the responses which are set out in appendix A of these minutes subject to the response to recommendation 4 being more positive in respect of using Social Impact Bonds to secure comprehensive universal services in Northstowe.

## **[KEY DECISIONS]**

### **256. STREET LIGHTING PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE (PFI) - AWARD OF CONTRACT**

Following the award of the preferred bidder status, at Cabinet on 5 July 2010 to Balfour Beatty, the fine-tuning and clarifications as permissible under the Public Contract Regulations 2006 had now been concluded. Cabinet therefore received a report in order to determine the award of the Street Lighting PFI contract to Balfour Beatty in accordance with the Competitive Dialogue Procedure as set out in Regulation 18 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 which the LGSS Director of Legal Services had confirmed was appropriate for Cabinet decision and did not require Full Council approval.

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101026-5>

Cabinet was reminded that the PFI credits were to replace about 80% of the Council's street lighting stock, together with all its illuminated signs and bollards. This much needed investment was necessary because over many years there had been a national under investment in street lighting. As a result, there was a significant backlog and a high percentage of street lighting columns beyond their design life of 25 years. The project would replace approximately 44,000 of the 52,000 street lights with modern and energy efficient lighting with good opportunities to make significant savings in its energy usage, and replace all the illuminated road signs with new or de-illuminated road signs. Additionally all the illuminated bollards would be replaced, the majority with solar powered bollards. The project included the provision of a central management system (CMS) for the larger communities, which would allow greater control over light levels with potential additional savings. The project would deliver up to an additional £57 million of PFI credits spread over the full 25 years of the project.

Cabinet noted that the Project Team had developed an output specification which would provide Cambridgeshire with a high quality street lighting infrastructure, with light levels commensurate with the respective need achievable. Additionally, the output specification included the dimming of light levels for both traffic routes and for residential roads at the touch of a button and would result in a maximum of 40% dimming for both categories. This would result in the light levels being more appropriate for the numbers of vehicles and pedestrians on the network during the quieter parts of the night.

The proposed street lighting lantern types, modern switch gear together with the dimming regime were expected to provide significant savings in energy once the core investment programme (CIP) had been concluded (projected to be in 2016). It was highlighted that the Carbon Reduction Commitments (CRC) had been introduced following the development of the Outline Business Case and as a result, the potential savings in carbon converted into CRC had not been taken into account in any calculations. It was expected that the proposed output specification should realise a saving of potentially £40,000 per annum after 2016.

Cabinet was reminded that the Council had submitted an Interim Final Business Case in January 2010 which was approved in April 2010 which set out the technical, legal and financial position for the project and contained a detailed set of proposed derogations from the 4<sup>th</sup> version of the Government's Standardisation of PFI Contracts Version 4 (SoPC4) requirements for each Bidder. The Final Business Case (FBC) builds on the Interim Final

Business Case (IFBC) and completed the final position for all the technical, legal and financial elements of the project for Cambridgeshire. Cabinet in July approved the FBC and delegated authority to the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services and the LGSS Director of Legal Services, in consultation with the LGSS Director of Finance (Section 151 Officer), to make any necessary amendments following confirmation of the PFI Credits to approve the FBC and to submit to the Department of Transport (DfT) for final funding approval.

It was noted that subject to Cabinet awarding the contract, the Project Team would work with the Service Provider to achieve financial close in early November 2010 and to approve and monitor the Service Providers mobilisation plan, to enable a proposed service commencement date of 1st April 2011.

Cabinet were reminded that at final tender, the predicted contract costs showed a saving from the existing street lighting service. Since final tender, further work had been undertaken on the street lighting inventory to ensure it was up to date. As a consequence, the contract sum was likely to be slightly higher than at final tender. The predicted revised contract figures were set out in a business confidential Appendix B, provided separately for Cabinet Members. Cabinet Members requested assurance that the new contract represented value for money and that the best price was being sought to ensure affordability over the longer term. This was expected to be achieved following further negotiation and required appropriate delegations to be made to lead members and officers to agree the final contract price following the Cabinet meeting. It was reiterated from earlier meetings that a “do nothing option” would be more expensive as the Council, subject to final Government approval, would not have the benefit of PFI credits to replace street lighting which as already stated earlier, was often beyond its original design life. The additional cost of not proceeding with the PFI contract was reported to be in the region of an additional £700k per year.

Mark Kemp, Chris Capps and his team were thanked for the way they had managed the process over the last 4-5 years and helping to keep Members informed of progress.

**It was agreed to confirm:**

- (a) the award of the Street Lighting PFI Contract, in accordance with the Competitive Dialogue Procedure as set out in Regulation 18 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006, to Connect Roads Cambridgeshire Limited the special purpose vehicle established by Balfour Beatty to deliver the Street Lighting PFI project, but noting that such award was subject to statutory standstill requirements and approval of the Final Business Case by the Department for Transport (DfT) and conditional upon receipt of final and formal confirmation of PFI Funding for the Project from DfT and upon satisfactory resolution of all outstanding matters in accordance with recommendation b) below;
- (b) delegated authority to the Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) Director of Finance or in his absence the LGSS Director of Legal Services to enter into the Street Lighting PFI Contract Documents listed at Appendix A of the Cabinet report and any other related contracts, agreements and instruments required to give effect to the Project (including, but not limited to, collateral warranties and direct agreements) once (a) final and formal confirmation of PFI funding for

the Project has been received from the Department of Transport (DfT); and (b) any final outstanding issues had been addressed to the satisfaction of the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services and the LGSS Director of Finance in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Growth Infrastructure and Strategic Planning and the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance ensuring this was the most comprehensive value for money solution.

- (c) i) that the LGSS Director of Finance or in his absence the LGSS Director of Legal Services be authorised to give certificates of vires under the Local Government (Contracts) Act 1997 in respect of the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Project Agreement, Funder's Direct Agreement (and for any other of the Project Contract Documents as may be considered necessary by the LGSS Director of Legal Services); and (ii) that the LGSS Director of Finance or LGSS Director of Legal Services (as the case may be) be indemnified by the Authority in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities (Indemnities for Members and Officers) Order 2004 in respect of any liability arising from his/her signing of such certificates and that the terms and form of such indemnity be finally settled by the LGSS Director of Legal Services;
- (d) Cambridgeshire would work with Northamptonshire to deliver cost effective contract monitoring and to continue the working relationship on street lighting which included the formation of a Members Contract Board.

## 257. WINTER POLICY REVIEW

Following the exceptional winter seasons in 2008/09 and 2009/10 the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Highways and Access instigated a review of the County Council's Winter Service Policy to see whether it was still fit for purpose. A review has been undertaken and further consultation work was undertaken with City, District, Town and Parish Councils. Cabinet therefore now received a report on the progress and outcome of the Winter Service Review and in order to consider its support of a new Winter Service Policy.

The result of the winter review had been assessed into 5 areas highlighted in bold below:-

- **Redefining the precautionary and secondary network with clear justification for each road that was included.**
- **Recognition of the need to find a way to improve the service for pedestrians and cyclists.** (During the next season it was proposed to trial the use of a Quad bike and brine sprayer to treat some longer lengths of the network within Cambridge City and knapsack sprayers in other areas. The quad bike would be used to treat the primary on and off-road network of cycle routes within the ring road as identified on the Cambridge Cycle Map produced by the County Council. Following a review of this trial in the summer of 2011, a report would be brought to Cabinet regarding the possibility of rolling out the treatment of cycleways and footways across the County).
- **Review of the County Council's resilience in relation to salt stock.** (It was confirmed orally that the County Council was fully stocked for the season, and that additional orders were in place for early 2011).

- **Looking at the opportunities to work with partners such as City, District, Town and Parish councils.** (Cabinet noted that plans were being drawn up for each City and Market Town to define the routes which should be treated to link schools and residential care homes, or sheltered housing with local shopping areas or major residential areas. These were being discussed with the District and City Councils to ensure that no site or significant route was missed. Discussions with City and District Councils on how all the Authorities could work closer together when severe weather affected the County had highlighted the potential benefits of closer working with the Parish, Town and City Councils to utilise any resources they may have that could assist including help from local farmers. The issues were covered in the consultation letter and a list of farmers and other possible resources that could be made available was being prepared with the cost implications being reviewed in the summer of 2011).
- **Review of the advice we are able to give to the general public to promote self help.** (As a result of the National Winter Review Central Government were developing some advice for members of the public in relation to clearing paths)

The report explained what work had been carried out in relation to footways and cycleways and the trial work undertaken in the current season. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access was pleased to be able to announce that ways had been found to help Town and Parish councils to assist the County Council in treating the footway network through discussion with the Council's insurers. A protocol was currently being developed and would be shared once completed.

The detail on this can be found in the full report at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab-101026-6>

Cabinet noted that the review built on work undertaken in 2009 which included the following actions:

- i) A change in the interpretation of the policy identifying when a secondary run should take place.
- ii) Treatment of certain cycle bridges as a precautionary measure.
- iii) Increase of stock at the start of the season to full capacity.

It was reported that Actions 1 and 2 above appeared to have been successful in reducing the number of complaints relating to those specific issues. However, the 2009/10 season was more extreme than the 2008/09 season and had resulted in a national shortage of salt and, following a request from central government, the precautionary network in Cambridgeshire (roads that are treated in advance of sub zero temperatures based on a weather forecast provided on a 24 hour basis through the winter season) had to be reduced for the period February-April 2010.

It was clear from early in the review that a more robust policy was required to identify those roads that would be treated as part of the precautionary network and how that network would be reduced should circumstances require. Using national examples and in discussion with other Highway Authorities a hierarchy of roads was developed as detailed in the Cabinet report. The development of the routes for consultation also considered the following operational and practical issues:

- Seeking to optimise each route so that it takes no more than 2 hours to complete. This was the current time for a route and all existing equipment would provide this level of

service. Any increase in this time would increase risk to the public and result in additional expense for the authority.

- Reducing the amount of time when a gritter was travelling on an already treated road to increase efficiency.

Having established the draft criteria of roads to be included in the precautionary routes, a letter was sent to all County Members, District Members, City Council, District Councils, Town Councils and Parish Councils requesting their views on the proposals. Generally, the responses had been supportive and positive, acknowledging the work to rationalise the network, although many of the Parish, Town and City Council's had requested more routes to be included in their areas without suggesting any compensating reductions. These requests had been reviewed and a reply was to be sent following the Cabinet meeting. It was also highlighted that the letter would also clarify that the routes would be reviewed each year between 15<sup>th</sup> April and 1<sup>st</sup> October as to change routes in season presented a communications issue with the public.

The draft proposed replies to the consultations were included within Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report with a recommendation from officers as to whether the requests should or should not be accepted with reasons. These were agreed, subject to officers taking into account and amending the final document for any errors identified. Appendix 2 to the report provided a list of roads to be treated to enable those that fitted with policy to be linked. (It was highlighted that should a route change, the roads would be removed from the precautionary network if no longer required to complete a route).

At the meeting representations were received from several local members including those on Cabinet regarding perceived errors in Appendix 1.

The local member for Melbourn had provided a written statement in advance stating that:

- in respect of the Foxton entry - Foxton - Shepreth Road between A10 and Station Road and the response given that 'The route in from the A10 is Frog End.' she indicated that the response referred to an entirely different village (Shepreth) while the route she had highlighted in her representations - Shepreth Road between A10 and Station Road was a bus route for Stagecoach number 26, and was also a school bus route for buses taking children from Foxton to Melbourn Village College and back.
- Great and Little Chishill - New Road: Response she challenged the response provided reading 'not a bus route.' as it was a school bus route for buses taking children to and from Fowlmere Primary School and Melbourn Village College.

Given that both routes involved the safety of children, she requested that Cabinet should agree that the two routes referred to above should be included on the Winter Arrangements list. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access thanked the Melbourn member for pointing out the minor typing error and confirmed that Shepreth Road between the A10 and Station Road was included in the precautionary network. As a general response to the issue of school bus routes, it was indicated that there had been a number of requests to include school bus routes (which were not generally included) on the precautionary network. Unfortunately these requests could not be achieved within the existing budget, but officers were asked to ensure that bus companies were aware of the routes that were being treated.

The Cabinet Member for Learning made reference to Milton Avenue, St Neots which had previously been on the precautionary list for 30 years but had been removed in 2008/09 and



served as a distributor road to 18 cul de sacs and approximately 350 properties, as well as serving as a school run to reach the rear of Crosshall schools complex, helping reduce congestion at the front of the school. He highlighted that at the start of Milton Avenue there was a short steep bend which was highly dangerous and therefore believed that leaving the route exposed placed children and parents at high risk. He urged officers to review their decision.

The Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment highlighted that on the second page of Appendix 1 he had not made comments attributed to him in respect of Spalding Way Queen Edith's or Mill Lane, Sawston or would the parishes have supported the comments made with regard to the latter. His comments had related to New Road, Sawston which had not been fully reflected in the Sawston heading. He made the point that Bus routes Citi routes 7, 13 and 31 should have been included. The comments on 7 and 13 had been accepted, but asked that officers look again at Bus Route 31.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access thanked all those who responded to the consultation over the summer. The responses had helped refine the service and despite the difficult financial times he was not looking to reduce the winter budget at this time. He also agreed that officers would take a further look at the specific issues that had been raised by Members and at the issue of treating School Bus Routes.

**It was resolved to agree:**

- (a) the new winter policy as identified in section 6 of the report and set out below:

The precautionary salting network will consist of roads that comply with the following criteria:

**Precautionary 1**

- All A and B roads
- Links to A&E hospitals and other emergency services
- Strategic locations as defined by Go East
- Roads adjacent to major fen drains

**Precautionary 2**

- Routes where scheduled buses are timetabled on a frequency of 5 times or more per week
- Distributor Roads to industrial estates

Other roads necessary to complete individual routes

The secondary network, which will be treated when five days or more of sub zero weather is forecast, will consist of roads that comply with the following criteria:

Secondary Routes - Routes where scheduled buses are timetabled on a frequency of less than 5 times per week and links to small hamlets.

Changes to the precautionary or secondary network will only be agreed and implemented out of season, between May and October of each

year, to ensure that a clear network can be published at the start of each season.

- (b) the inclusion of roads identified in Appendix 1 and 2 of the report.
- (c) that any changes to the precautionary or secondary network would be agreed by the portfolio holder for Highways and Access in consultation with the Service Director for Highways and Access.

## **258. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT - AUGUST 2010**

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

Cabinet noted the following 5 new exceptions in respect of performance issues

- National Indicator (NI) 130 Social Care Clients receiving Self Directed Support (RED ↓) – overall there had been a slight drop in performance, although the numbers of service users who have been through the Self-Directed Support (SDS) system continues to rise overall. Cambridgeshire's performance for 2009/10 was 10<sup>th</sup> highest out of 154 Local Authorities. The local target of 80% of service users through the SDS system by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011 is very challenging and 12 months in advance of the national target. The indicator definition allows Councils to count both these who have been through the SDS system and these who were previously using Direct Payments. The proportion using the previous Direct Payments scheme had fallen from 68% in June to 59% in August and was the correct direction of travel.
- NI 148 Care Leavers in Education, Employment or Training (EET) (RED ↓) – Out of the 15 care leavers in the cohort, 10 were in EET. It was noted that at the time young people were in between courses whilst they awaited for exam results, and it was therefore anticipated that this performance would increase in September/October, as it did last year when performance was 58% at August and rose to 65% in October. However, there were also a number of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking young people who are 19+ within the cohort that were considered to have exhausted their rights to appeal who were not able to access EET opportunities due to their immigration status.
- NI 152b Working Age People on Out of Work Benefits in Fenland – difference between Fenland and the regional average – LAA (RED) – LAA target renegotiated for 2010/11 to one of maintaining 3.6% points between Fenland and regional average. Current performance of 3.9% was slightly over this target.
- NI 163 Working Age Population Qualified to at least Level 2 (RED ↑) – the figure for 2009 indicated that the percentage rate for Level 2 skills attainment in Cambridgeshire had increased to 74.7%, an improvement of over 1%, but just short of the 75% target.
- Local Indicator (LI) 136a CCC % of Contact Centre Calls Answered within 20 Seconds (RED ↓) – performance was impacted by the project to review Adult Social Care service model, as part of Quality for Adults Programme, as a remit of which, a number of posts were held open. The Service was planned to stabilise after September.

The report listed those previously reported exceptions where there was nothing further to report, and detailed small changes to the basket of indicators reported. More would follow as a result of the changes to the National Indicator Set brought about by the abolition of

various surveys used to provide data for many National Indicators and a report would come forward in due course on proposed local indicators to take their place.

The following resources were highlighted for Cabinet to note:

- Overall the budget position showed a forecast year-end overspend of £3.9m (an increase in the forecast overspend of £968k from the previous month mainly due to a newly reported pressure identified within the Learning Disability Partnership service (CAS).
- In Environment Services (ES) an underspend of -£74k was being predicted, which was due to savings within Growth and Infrastructure.
- In Community and Adult Services (CAS) an overspend of £1.7m was being predicted, which was due to pressures identified within Adult Support Services and Libraries, Learning and Culture. In terms of Adult Services details were orally reported in respect of savings expected to come forward later in the year from the Re-ablement Initiative which had started in September, a month earlier than originally planned. In reply to questions regarding how confident the adult social care Members / officers were that partners would be able to achieve services at the lowest possible cost, it was indicated that officers were currently working with their PCT counterparts in order to strengthen the current Section 75 agreements / governance arrangements in order and achieve improved service provision at the lowest possible cost. In reply to questioning of whether the risk share agreement was disproportionately a burden on the County Council compared to the PCT, the Service Director Strategy and Commissioning (Adult Social Care) explained that the percentages had changed in recent years and appeared to be a fair split.
- In Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) an overspend of £2.2m was being predicted, due to pressures within Strategy and Commissioning and Children's Social Care. Significant pressures had been forecast across CYPS since the beginning of the financial year and to address them a major review had been undertaken to curtail non essential spend and release savings. Some £4m of savings have been identified largely offsetting the £4.1m of pressures reported in the previous month. Pressures had continued to rise principally as a result of a significant increase during August in numbers of children becoming Looked After, and as a result of announcements by the UK Border Agency (UKBA) in relation to funding for costs related to unaccompanied asylum seeker children (UASCs). A significant level of costs which have previously been funded in respect of UASCs would not now be funded and it was also unlikely that costs claimed in relation to the previous financial year will be reimbursed. As these were costs that were outside the Council's control the Cabinet Member for children would be writing to complain to the relevant government minister. The Executive Director: Children and And Young People indicated that action plans were in place to significantly reduce the £2.2m projected overspend, but he could not guarantee the full reduction could be made, due to the need to ensure the main priority of ensuring children's continued safety.
- In Corporate Directorates (CD) an underspend of -£229k was being predicted, mainly due to savings identified within Customer Services and Transformation.
- In Corporate Directorates – Financing, an overspend of £234k was being predicted due to higher borrowing than budgeted for in the Integrated Plan and as a result of a write-off of a debt.
- Spending on the Council's overall capital programme was currently proceeding slower than estimated.

- There were no significant debt problems to report and there were no noticeable effects arising from the economic downturn. Reference was made needing to ensure that the NHS paid amounts outstanding.

Making reference to the current overspend prediction the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance highlighted the need for services to ensure action plans were in place to ensure there was no budget overspend at year end, as well as the aim to come in under-budget where ever practicable, to help create a special reserve buffer for future years.

The following new general economic issues were noted:

### Hutton

A recent report designed to reform public sector pensions and put a 'cap' on employer costs had been published. Details of the report were awaited next year, but certain issues such as Consumer Prices Index (CPI) measure of inflation, as a substitute for the Retail Prices Index (RPI), and common national retirement might allow some reduction in cost and was being picked up in the triennial actuarial review of pensions currently taking place.

### Green Report

This was a top level report prepared by Sir Philip Green following his efficiency review of Government spending. Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) already makes use of Government framework contracts and aggregate purchasing power via Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) and also currently used its strong cash flows to support small and medium enterprises (SME). A programme was to be launched around further supplier discount and price reductions for prompt payment.

### Treasury

In view of the current Bank of England interest rate stance, undervaluing of pound (£) sterling, further short-term loans were to be used in the next quarter (in preference to medium-term and long-term loans).

The full details of the report can be found at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101026-7>

Cabinet was asked to approve the capital virements totalling £1.47m to help offset the pressure against the Schools Condition Capital budget.

A decision was requested as to whether to levy the charges for extra staff in relation to the Better Utilisation of Property Assets (BUPA) project (for staff employed within services between the baseline year and 2008/09) in 2010/11 or to waive them for a further year and ask the Business Support and Facilities Management and Strategy and Estates to advance disposals with the active support of Services. A pressure had been brought forward into 2010/11 of £811k, as a result of the shortfall in targeted savings for the Workwise project in previous years. This was to be partially offset in 2010/11 by a transfer of revenue funding following reclassification of Building Maintenance expenditure (£250k), the draw-down of the remaining approved Invest To Transform (ITT) funding (£276k) and other minor adjustments, leaving the forecast year-end position at £230k overspent. Work was continuing to recover the overspend by a combination of additional savings from buildings

identified for closure and previously agreed charges for extra staff employed within services between the baseline year and 2008/09. Rapid action was required, as the failure to realise either element, would result in the year-end overspend reported, which would significantly impact on the capacity to repay the ITT loans.

**It was agreed to:**

- (a) note the resources and performance information and any remedial action being taken to address any projected overspends as detailed in the report.
- (b) levy the charges for extra staff in relation to the Better Utilisation of Property Assets (BUPA) project (for staff employed within services between the baseline year 2008/09 and in 2010/11) in principle; subject to officers examining the detailed implications of implementing this approach and reporting these back to Cabinet.
- [c] approve the following capital virements totalling £1.47m to help offset the pressure against the Schools Condition Capital budget within CYPS:
  - £100k from the 14-19 Diploma Funding for Secondary Schools budget;
  - £274k from the Secondary CCN Upgrade 2010/11 budget;
  - £500k from the Schools Condition Capital 2010/11 budget; and
  - £594k from the Schools Access Initiative 2010/11 budget.

**259. JOINT INTERIM STATEMENT ON PLANNING BY THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AUTHORITIES AND FUTURE STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

Cabinet received a report updating it on discussions between the Cambridgeshire authorities relating to a proposed joint planning statement setting out the development strategy for Cambridgeshire (as set out in Appendix A of the report), following the recent abolition of Regional Strategies and also providing details of the future strategic planning work for the County.

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101026-8>

At the same time the Government announced the abolition, it also issued guidance for local planning authorities alongside this announcement. This stated that local planning authorities should:

- Determine planning applications having regard to their Local Development Frameworks (LDFs), saved policies and any old style Local Plans that had not lapsed, as well as national policy and any other material considerations.
- Continue to work on their LDFs, although the revocation of Regional Strategies could be an opportunity to revisit policies in adopted LDFs.

In relation to housing provision the guidance stated that local planning authorities:

- were now responsible for establishing the right level of housing for their areas, and no longer had to meet regionally established targets.
- Needed to justify the housing numbers they arrived at through the use of reliable information.
- Would still be required to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land.

Cabinet was informed that the Government intended that the previous 'top-down', target-driven planning system would be replaced by a new approach, giving local authorities considerable freedom and allowing local people more say in how their communities developed. Regarding regional and sub-regional planning, the guidance stated that: "New ways for local authorities to address strategic planning and infrastructure issues based on cooperation will be introduced." Although the new freedoms were to be welcomed, the changes also raised concerns - particularly that the gap left by the abolition of Regional Strategies would open up the authorities to major speculative development pressures and create a strategy driven by planning decisions granted on appeal. In response to these concerns, the Cambridgeshire authorities have undertaken initial work to:

- Prepare a joint position statement, setting out the development strategy for Cambridgeshire in the absence of the Regional Strategy (Set out in Section 5 and Appendix A of the Cabinet report) which had been endorsed by most authorities as listed in paragraph 5.2 of the Cabinet report.
- Scope out what further work may be required for future strategic planning in Cambridgeshire (Set out in section 6 of the cabinet report.).

Cabinet Members raised the following issues / made comments as follows:

- Drawing attention to the Advisory Policy Development Group comments that any future strategic planning work needed to look at the cross boundary impacts of developments in Peterborough on Cambridgeshire (north west of county - Yaxley) which had been highlighted and required to be challenged, as had the growth of Haverhill and its impact on the A1307, mention was also made of the impact on the southern side of East Cambridgeshire in relation to the latter. It was highlighted that a recent Planning Inspector' report into the St Edmundsbury Borough Council Planning Core Strategy Examination had ruled that Suffolk County Council and the district council would be required to make contributions to the A1307 safety improvements, which would be of benefit to Cambridgeshire residents. It was confirmed by the Cabinet member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning that officers were consulting with both Peterborough and Suffolk colleagues on their growth proposals.

There was a request for the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning to make a statement regarding the current position on Northstowe. In response he indicated that the Council had not had a favourable response from Government to the proposed improvements to the notorious A14. The future of the major development previously envisaged at Northstowe was now subject to review. The County Council was charged with providing additional domestic accommodation within the new community. Without the appropriate investment in infrastructure in this community, the Council would be building a housing estate that would further escalate the problems that were currently being experienced. The infrastructure would prove to be indispensable to not only the new

community, but also the existing villages and parishes in that area, and without improvements to the A14, this would severely restrict the activities, the well being, the quality of life, available to all residents. The County Council were not alone in its concerns, and along with South Cambridgeshire District Council (the planning authority) must not only raise the issues in higher places, but must insist that these issues are addressed.

The Cabinet Member was thanked for the helpful clarification update.

**It was agreed to:**

- (a) endorse the Joint Interim Statement on Planning by the Cambridgeshire Authorities (as set out in Appendix A of the report)
- (b) note the future strategic planning work for Cambridgeshire outlined in the report.

**[OTHER DECISIONS]**

**260. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY**

Cabinet was reminded that as a result of the continued lack of significant progress towards rectifying the defects which would allow the Council to accept sectional completion of the busway between Cambridge and St Ives, it had been agreed since the April meeting to receive progress reports at each subsequent Cabinet meeting.

The latest update report indicated little progress had been made.

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101026-9>

Section 1 of the report identified the existing defects and pointed out that due to Bam Nuttall's failure to address them, the opportunity for sectional completion was now believed to have been lost. Section 2 of the report identified the defects in question and the lack of progress to date. Section 3 focussed on progress on the Southern section and illustrated concerns regarding the Shelford Bridge works as demonstrated by the programme of works undertaken.

Another cause of concern identified was the need for effective lighting at Trumpington where the Guideway changed from single to double track, which was an important and relevant safety matter that could now be held up until January or even later, as there was a need for Cambridge City Council to discharge the relevant planning consent.

Cabinet was reminded that Bam Nuttall were required to submit construction certificates to show that all works required had been built in accordance with approved design and specification. The certificates were still awaited, raising concerns that they would be produce at the last minute. As a result, the County Council was attempting to mitigate the workload by carrying out inspections where possible prior to receipt of the certificates. (the normal practice in the construction industry was to submit certificates as individual items of work were completed) Currently Bam Nuttall had chosen not to comply with this standard requirement. Section 4 and 5 of the report set out the actions proposed to be taken by the

officers once, as was likely, the contractor had completed the project and handed it over with the identified defects unresolved.

The Cabinet member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning reiterated that the Council would not accept an ongoing liability and would only adopt an asset built and completed to the agreed specification and standard as identified in the contract.

Questions raised from Cabinet Members for which answers were provided included:

- That the certificates from the designers in respect of the fire risk assessments for the rubber tyre infill between the guideway beams had still not been received.
- Confirming that in the officers opinion the completion date for the Southern section, which had slipped back to 14<sup>th</sup> January in their previous programme and had now apparently returned to 17<sup>th</sup> December was not realistic, even if the certificates were received on the December date, as they would require sign off for completion by the project manager.
- There were no statutorily required safety certificates for the scheme.

**It was resolved to:**

- (a) note that the Contractor had made no meaningful progress towards rectifying the defects on the busway between Cambridge and St Ives, contrary to commitments given in April, and as a result the opportunity to open this section in advance of completion of the whole project had now passed.
- (b) note that although the Contractor's programme showed that the delay to the southern section of the Busway reported to the last Cabinet meeting had been recovered this was considered unlikely to be achieved in practice
- (c) note that contingency plans were being made to rectify defects post completion should BNL not meet their obligations to do so under the contract.

**[MONITORING REPORTS]**

**261. QUARTERLY UPDATE REPORT ON KEY PARTNERSHIPS**

Cabinet received for information the latest partnerships update report in respect of the following seven partnerships:

- A) Cambridgeshire Together
- B) Cambridge Children's Trust
- C) Cambridgeshire Care Partnership
- D) Cambridgeshire Horizons
- E) Safer and Stronger Thematic Partnership
- F) Greater Cambridge Partnership
- G) Environmental Sustainability Partnership



The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101026-10>

Updates / specific attention was drawn to:

- That the Children Trust and Executive in November would be looking at future arrangements and ways of empowering the Trust on a bottom up basis.
- Lead Members and officers from the County Council and the PCT represented on the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership would be meeting shortly to discuss issues with regard to the NHS White Paper, implications for transformation, the Section 75 risk share ratios and the future of the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership.
- On the report on the Environmental Sustainability Partnership page 18 there was a typo on the 7<sup>th</sup> line down and for accuracy the indicator should have been described NI 192 b).

**It was resolved:**

To note the content of the report.

## **262. DELEGATION FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / OFFICERS**

Cabinet received the latest update report.

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab-101026-11>

**It was resolved:**

To note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and / or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions / take actions on its behalf, subject to the report in future reflecting the new job titles / new posts appointed as a result of the Shared Services Contract.

## **263. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA FOR 16<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2010**

Cabinet noted the draft Cabinet agenda with the following change since the agenda was published:

Change in status of Item 9 titled 'Integrated Youth Support Service' this report had now been re-classified as a key decision.

Chairman  
16<sup>th</sup> November 2010

**AGREED RESPONSE TO THE MEMBER LED REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS (INCLUDED IN BOLD) INTO INTEGRATING CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURAL PROVISION INTO THE COUNTY'S NEW COMMUNITIES**

- 1. The pressure placed on Locality teams by the new communities needs to be recognised and mitigated through the Council-wide Integrated Planning Process by allocating sufficient financial resources to the Teams concerned in coming financial years**

The Integrated Planning Process brings together the different priorities and statutory responsibilities across the Council with the budget available. It is not possible to pre-empt its outcome. The role of Locality Teams will be a part of this process. The budgetary position is clearly worsening, and in this scenario, the Council will need to make policy decisions about where to focus its funds in the future. From the perspective of Children and Young People's Services, working with the more vulnerable as opposed to all children and young people, will become a key feature of locality teams in the future and the needs of new communities will need to be reflected in service delivery and agreed with Members.

The allocation of Locality resource across the County will be the subject of an ongoing and transparent review process that takes account of population of changes, within the confines and complexities of established teams, and terms and conditions of staff contracts.

- 2. The Invest to Transform funds should be used as a method for funding comprehensive universal and preventative services in the County's new communities, particularly Northstowe, on an Invest to Save basis.**

The return on funds within the budget cycle is unlikely to be realised with long term preventative work, which is a premise of the Invest to Transform Funds. The principle of continuing to invest in effective preventative work is one which is informing all aspects of the planning process, but will need to be undertaken within the constraints of a reducing budget and the rising numbers of children coming into Local Authority care. A significant focus is on ensuring that resource allocation decisions are built on a strong evidence base of outcomes.

Work with partners to identify how the universal and community based providers (for example, schools, health, voluntary and community groups) can be strengthened is crucial. The work underway through Making Cambridgeshire Count, and at a local level through the vehicle of Localism, will help us define how the universal and preventative services can be provided.

- 3. The locality funding formula developed as part of the IYSS development process should recognise the extra pressures faced by locality teams servicing new communities and fund them accordingly.**

The funding formula will be kept under review. This will include ensuring that the data used reflects current and future projections of population and need. However, there is more likely to feature a redistribution of resources rather than an increase in the overall resource available.

- 4. The use of Social Impact Bonds as a means to secure comprehensive universal services in Northstowe – fit for the needs of a new community – should be thoroughly examined by the Children’s Trust Executive Group.**

The officers to give further detailed consideration to exploring the option further. To date, Social Impact Bonds have lent themselves to investments where a clear return can be demonstrated in relation to an established and recognised need, and where the impact of the intervention can be clearly seen. This could be more problematic in new communities where assumptions about future need will have to be made in order to secure investment. However, there is a growing research basis as to the nature of the needs of children and families in new communities that might lend itself to developing a Social Impact Bond for a geographic community.

- 5. Social housing providers should inform all partners, including the relevant voluntary sector organisations (possibly via CVSIC) of the release of tranches of social housing in order that the relevant grants and contract can be secured by them to allow services to be in place upon first occupation of the housing**

Agreed. It is essential that the Council receives such information as early as possible in order to ensure that the necessary infrastructure and services are in place for the first occupants. This request will be made to District Councils and other social housing providers.

- 6. Cambridgeshire Together partners should commit to allowing free use by approved voluntary and community sector groups (VCS) of appropriate buildings owned by partners respective organisations**

Agreed. This will be taken up with partners. All possible support should be offered to VCS organisations in order to build local community networks and provision as quickly as possible in new communities. Given the varied range of organisations’ financial circumstances, consideration will be given to a sliding scale of charges so that those who can afford to pay do so. This could be agreed on a time limited basis in order to provide an injection of investment in the community at the outset to ensure that the community is sustainable.

- 7. The small grant allocation process should be streamlined by implementing either of the suggested actions:  
Forego elected member involvement entirely by delegating the final decision entirely to the relevant Council officer or, ideally  
Delegate the final decision entirely to Young Lives**

We will explore this further. Discussions are ongoing with Young Lives, the infrastructure organisation for voluntary and community sector organisations supporting children and young people, about the way in which the County Council could work more closely with them. There is a precedent where Young Lives have been asked to manage contracts on behalf of the County Council, which has included managing the procurement process. There would be a cost to the County Council in delegating this function as part of a formal contract, but the issue will be explored with Young Lives to see what can be achieved to make the process less cumbersome in a way which would be cost neutral.

- 8. Details of the ongoing support to be offered to non-statutory providers should be produced in consultation with them alongside details of how the work of the non-statutory providers will be quality assured on an ongoing basis.**

We will explore this – we continue to work with partners through the Area Partnerships and Children's Trust so that they can engage in the delivery of high quality children's services in the most productive way.

- 9. A procedure for informing local schools and other partners of residential property developments likely to attract higher need families with children and young people, and their predicted date of occupation, should be agreed between the County Council and the relevant district council; and piloted for sufficient time to assess the process and fully adopted and extended throughout the county if found to be useful.**

Agreed. This clearly links to recommendation 5. It is agreed that such a procedure should be developed and piloted in partnership with colleagues in the districts.

- 10. Cambridgeshire County Council should better prepare for the documentary requirements of new schools by establishing a suite of model policies and strategies available to be accessed when required,**

Agreed. A 'new schools' area will be established on the educational portal to act as a repository for all new school related documents and policies to ensure access for all. This will be updated regularly in line with national policy. The Learning Directorate/Strategy and Commissioning will audit the range of policies and procedures that currently exist and identify gaps in policy and guidance. As a result of the policy audit additional guidance will be written for identified gaps and regularly updated and amended to ensure it is responsive to changes in national policy.

- 11. The Department for Education should note the Jeavons Wood example and consider whether the various sources of information for new schools should be collated into a single resource.**

Agreed. We will make this suggestion to the Department for Education.

- 12. Experienced teachers – ideally those with experience of teaching in a new community - should be involved, from the earliest stages, in the development of schools in new communities. The broadest possible professional influence on the process should be encouraged, from master-planning to school layout and classroom design.**

Agreed. There is an established primary headteacher reference group which advises officers on design of new schools. This includes the headteacher of Orchard Park Primary, one of Cambridgeshire's newest schools. The group also includes a representative from the Learning Directorate and a therapist to ensure the resulting accommodation facilitates the inclusion of children with additional needs.

The current direction of travel, supported by members through a series of design critiques, is towards reducing capital costs and the greater standardisation of design and construction (for example, through use of Modern Methods of Construction and modular units).

**13. An 'Enhanced Locality Team', comprising professionals currently working separately within Locality and Social Care Area teams, should be created for Northstowe**

How the Council and other services can work together to more effectively support families with higher needs need is under close scrutiny as part of the IPP process, and is also a focus of pilot work in the Arbury area of Cambridge. This includes looking at the interface between Locality and Social Care teams. The CAF process should ensure, once fully embedded, that services are brought effectively around the family. Proposals for how any new arrangements might work, within financial constraints, will take account of the needs of new as well as some established communities.

**14. Organisational lead over specific aspects of service provision in new communities should be explored as a concept, with a view to identifying the appropriate themes / work / services to which a lead should be established, and the appropriate organisation/s to provide such lead as required.**

Agreed in principle. This will be explored.

**15. Northstowe service planning groups should be reinstated and meet at least biannually as a means to share and retain knowledge, develop linkages, and service plan collaboratively.**

Agreed in principle. The partnership approach to planning for new communities is both right and appropriate. However, there is a danger that without clear terms of reference and accountability structures, these groups will operate in isolation and that service planning will be fragmented, not integrated. There needs to be an over-arching strategic group to whom the service planning groups would report.

A further consideration is that the Northstowe connection has been superseded by a Task and Finish Group set up within the County Council to oversee the proposal to bring forward part of the proposed new town. There is also a review ongoing to develop a single and common approach to evaluation and estimation of the services and facilities needed for new developments. This work should ensure a more integrated approach in the future.

**16. The County Council Youth Offer should be publicised widely, particularly in new communities where there is likely to be less clarity as to what can be expected from service providers. In doing this the Youth Offer should be elaborated in terms of what services can be reasonably expected. This would be to: Enable service providers to be held to account by residents for entitled service delivery and Clarify for new and potential residents the 'end product'**

The consultation in relation to Integrated Youth Support Services places more emphasis on locality partnership arrangements to define and set local priorities for services for young people according to local need. The proposed offer from the County Council to young people needs to be added to at a local level and made available in an accessible format. In the Southern Fringe developments, the City Council, with partners, is proposing to produce a 'welcome pack' for new residents which could include this information and be added to as provision develops alongside the community. This could be used as a trial for other communities as they are established.