

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 1st February 2008

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.33 p.m.

Present: K Walters (Chairman)

Councillors: M Bradney, M Curtis, D Harty, V H Lucas, L W McGuire, R Pegram (Vice Chairman), J E Reynolds J M Tuck and F H Yeulett

Also in Attendance

Councillors: P Downes, N Harrison, D Jenkins and J West

Apologies: none

496. MINUTES 22nd JANUARY 2008

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 22nd January 2008 were approved as a correct record, subject to amending minute 483 page 2 'Petitions' on the second paragraph second line by inserting the word 'Police' before 'Cambridge Road Safety Unit'.

497. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Lucas declared a personal interest in item 7 'The Integrated Plan' following his appointment as the chairman of the Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust's (PCT) Provider Services Board on the basis that if during the discussion on the report any proposals were moved that would have an effect on the budget of the PCT, he would declare a prejudicial interest and leave the meeting. (In the event this did not happen and he was therefore not required to leave the meeting)

498. PETITIONS

None received.

499. GOOSETREE (HOBBS LOT) MAJOR SAFETY SCHEME

Cabinet was reminded that following a fatal accident at the above site in 2003 and a high profile public campaign for improvements, a scheme had been prepared for inclusion in the list of major safety scheme improvements. Further to this and as a result of the A605 Elton Major Safety Scheme being unable to proceed, Cabinet in February 2006 agreed to bring forward improvements at the Goosetree / Hobbs Lot (A141/A605) junction as part of the Major Safety Scheme programme (MSS).

Cabinet noted that earlier safety assessments at the site had originally identified a roundabout as the most appropriate scheme to reduce accidents. Consideration at the time was also given to a traffic signal solution for the junction, but the latter option was

rejected on technical and safety grounds. However as an update, Cabinet was informed that as a result of recent improvements in traffic signal technology relating to vehicle speed detection and capacity, officers advised that it was possible to reconsider the option for a new technology traffic signal scheme at the junction.

At the invitation of the chairman, the Member for March North, whose electoral division bordered on the relevant section of road was allowed to address the Cabinet meeting. The Member spoke of local residents concerns regarding the junction and requested that Cabinet should give consideration to a further option he was proposing, that officers should investigate making the junction into a cross roads with traffic lights, linking the Twenty Foot Road with the A141/A605. His view was that the other options would just shift the potential for accidents to the Twenty Foot Road. He believed the financing of the cross roads could be achieved from not allocating expenditure of £1m to Huntingdon Leisure Centre and through the sale of two major plots in Gordon Avenue and through selling to Fenland District Council a proportion of the 14 ½ acre site in Estover Road, acquired by the County Council when the grammar school closed. He stated that the land was currently leased to Estover Road Playing Association for the provision of football fields at a peppercorn rent of £1 per annum.

In response Cabinet Members raised the following issues:

- Asking whether the local Member was aware of the accident record at the junction since 2004. He indicated he was not aware of the exact statistics but knew that near misses were not recorded. Attention was drawn to a section in the report setting out that as a result of remedial measures put in place following the original fatality, these had effectively led to a reduction in accidents at the junction. In addition, there had been no further fatalities at the junction since 2003.
- Asking whether the local Member had consulted any Cabinet Members in respect of his new proposal. He indicated he had not. In terms of the solution being recommended by the officers asking whether the Member had spoken to officers. He confirmed he had, but had agreed to disagree with the option the officers had put forward.
- It was clarified that the £1m referred to in respect of the leisure centre was the County Council's contribution to schools use of leisure facilities and was not a saving that should be considered to fund such a scheme.

Cabinet noted that £1.5m had originally been allocated for this scheme over the 2007/08 and 2008/09 period. However detailed scheme estimates for a roundabout showed a total scheme cost of £2.2m, with the traffic light option estimated at £500k. Cabinet noted that given the budget shortfall and improvements in traffic signal technology, an evaluation of the two alternative junction improvement solutions had been undertaken with the traffic signals option utilising 'Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation' (MOVA) technology. It was explained that this new technology was extremely flexible, altering green times to minimise disruption as the traffic conditions changed. Cabinet members orally indicated that some of them had experience as road users of the traffic signals using MOVA technology installed on the A10 at the Denny End junction, Waterbeach and at several major intersections on the A14 including the A1 Brampton Hut, A141 Spittals and A10 Milton Interchanges. They were therefore able to confirm the report findings that the above junctions had shown a significant reduction in accidents and congestion as a result of the installation of this type of new traffic signal system.

Cabinet noted that in line with the MSS, both alternatives had been assessed against estimated reduction in accident numbers, traffic flow and scheme cost using the latest industry standard design and modelling tools. Based on the findings, officers' views were that the installation of traffic signals would address the safety issues to the same level as a roundabout and additionally, present benefits in terms of cost and rapid delivery. Cabinet therefore fully supported the proposal, noting that the construction of the traffic signals solution could start in March 2008 and would take approximately 4 months to complete. Cabinet noted that should the roundabout scheme option be pursued, it was not likely to open to traffic until between February and August 2009, subject to the funding gap being solved. In addition at the cost estimated a roundabout scheme would have to be at the expense of other potentially life saving safety schemes in other areas. As a result, Cabinet Members considered that any further delays to improving safety at the junction would be unacceptable.

In coming to their decision, Cabinet also took into account the fact that the nearby junction of the A141 with the Twenty Foot Road, had been looked at when improvements were first considered, but had been rejected on costs grounds. Cabinet was informed that the roundabout option would offer little benefit to this junction and although difficult to quantify, the signals solution being suggested should cause gaps in the traffic on the A141, which could assist vehicles turning right in and out of this junction, thus improving safety at this nearby junction.

The Cabinet local Member from Waldersey expressed concerns that the College of West Anglia Travel to Work Plan, which had recently been published, had not been the subject of specific analysis in terms of any likely increased traffic movements. Although it was explained that there was considerable spare capacity available for increased vehicle numbers in the model being suggested (60% reserve capacity) which would also apply for any alternative roundabout scheme, it was agreed that in order to reassure Members that the agreed solution would not be compromised, an analysis exercise should be carried out in a timescale that would not effect the implementation date.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve the construction of traffic signals at the junction of the A141 / A605 junction (Goosetree / Hobbs Lot), March.
- ii) That Cabinet and the Local member from March North should receive from officers an analysis within the next 14 days of the College of West Anglia Travel to Work Plan in order that Cabinet Members could be reassured that it would not increase traffic movements to such an extent as to compromise the proposal agreed.

500. BUDGET CONSULTATION FEEDBACK FROM FORMAL INTEGRATED PLANNING CONSULTATION MEETINGS

Cabinet received two reports setting out the feedback and comments received from both meetings with representatives from the voluntary sector, Staffside, the Local Council

Liaison Committee and from the Members seminars held in January. The programme of consultations was to obtain early views on the details provided in the initial draft version of the Integrated Plan. The Integrated Plan set out the Council's priorities, key actions, the budget proposals and the details of savings being considered as required in order to meet resource limitations imposed as a result of the low Central Government grant settlement.

Cabinet noted that the meeting with the voluntary sector had again raised concerns that grant claimants were unaware of their funding position for the following year. Concerns had also been highlighted regarding not having had the benefit of being able to competitively bid for certain projects. One Member made the point that for many voluntary organisations the struggle was to obtain the funds necessary to finance the running costs and overheads and therefore relied heavily on county and District Councils grants.

Staffside had raised concerns regarding the financing of the congestion charge work which had been clarified as set out in the report that expenditure would be solely from Government provided funding.

The three confidential member seminars held in mid January had provided the opportunity for Members to make suggestions for changes, some of which were already being actioned for incorporation into the final version of the documentation to be presented to the Full Council meeting on 19th February. In terms of the reference to migrant children, it was reported that a strategy was being developed, as the numbers for the County were substantial.

It was resolved:

- i) to note the feedback and comments received.
- ii) To request that Cabinet receives a report in due course on the operation of the Compact with the voluntary sector and that the same report should also address issues of communicating grants decisions.

501. COUNCIL'S INTEGRATED PLAN

Cabinet received a report setting out the details of the Council's Integrated Plan for Cabinet consideration and recommendation on to the full Council meeting on 19th February for their final approval. It was noted that the performance indicators were still in draft form and would be the subject of further consideration by the Local Area Agreement Board. The aim was to ensure that resources were now linked to priorities, but Cabinet noted that more work was still required in respect of linking in performance monitoring. Cabinet expressed gratitude to all the staff involved in budget preparation and noted that despite the County Council receiving an extremely poor national grant settlement, the overall integrated planning and budget process had worked well.

In relation to the proposed performance indicators/targets it was noted that the reduction in the number of performance targets would provide the opportunity for some local choice targets to be set. It was confirmed that services to Older People remained the County Council's highest priority and this was reflected in the budget proposals in terms of

increased investment for Adult Social Care and for the recruitment of social workers to aid the transitions process.

Cabinet was advised that since the publication of the Cabinet report, the County Council had received the final notification of the taxbase figures from District Councils. The figures were higher than the original estimates and therefore updated information and proposals for amending the recommendations (section 5) were tabled at the Cabinet meeting. Cabinet noted that the final taxbase figures provided the Council with an additional £0.5m of resource. Taking into account the decisions already made on priorities, and the uncertainty for future years, it was agreed to propose to the Council budget making meeting on 19th February that the extra resource should be transferred to the Development and Contingency Reserve. An alternative proposal of using £200k of the resource in order to reduce the Council Tax increase to 4.9% was discussed and rejected by Cabinet, given the very small impact it would actually have on Council Tax levels.

In making the additional recommendation, Cabinet took the view that due to the uncertainties around the demand for children's and older peoples services that could place additional resource demands on limited budgets during the year, it would be more prudent to allocate the additional £500k wholly into the Development and Contingency reserve. The balance to this decision was that in real terms, a reduction in the Council Tax from 5% to 4.9% only equated to 99 pence less per week for an average D band dwelling.

As a result recommendation 5 of the original Cabinet report needed to be updated. All other recommendations remained as set out in the original report. Recommendation 5(a) referred to table 4.3.1 from the Integrated Plan. An updated version of this table was tabled as set out below. All other references remained valid.

Office	2008-09 £'000	2009-10 £'000	2010-11 £'000	2011-12 £'000	2012-13 £'000
OCYPS	76,313	79,329	81,752	84,511	86,835
OECS	182,167	187,927	196,789	205,521	213,078
OCS	32,078	32,360	32,503	32,617	31,433
Financing	28,308	31,585	33,549	35,581	34,959
Levy	310	325	341	352	361
DSG contribution	-1,798	-1,870	-1,931	-1,989	-2,043
Net Movement on Reserves	-1,708	837	1,158	1,129	631
Headroom		467	3,116	4,467	12,788
Budget Requirement	315,669	330,960	347,277	362,189	378,042

It was resolved:

1. To recommend to Council that the additional 500k identified in the revised Council Tax base is transferred to the Development and Contingency Reserve with the aim of issuing it in year to agreed priorities, or using it to reduce financial pressures in future years.
2. To approve the proposed changes in detailed budget allocations shown in Section 6 of the Officers report.

3. To delegate responsibility for agreeing performance targets for publication on the 1st April to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the Director of Finance, Property and Performance
4. To delegate responsibility for agreeing any minor alterations to the Single Integrated Plan to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the Director of People and Policy
5. Recommend to Council the following budget recommendations:
 - a) That approval be given to the Office cash limits as set out in Table 4.3.1 (page 10 of section 4 (Finance Report) of the Integrated Plan (yellow pages)).
 - b) That approval is given to a County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £315,699,334.
 - c) That approval is given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £209,002,681. (To be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the “fall-back” provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995)
 - d) That approval be given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of “Band D” equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (213,461.9):

Band	Council Tax	Band	Council Tax
A	£652.74	E	£1,196.69
B	£761.53	F	£1,414.27
C	£870.32	G	£1,631.85
D	£979.11	H	£1,958.22

- e) That approval is given to the Prudential Indicators and Treasury Management Strategy as set out in section 4.6 (pages 20-24 of section 4 (Finance Report) of the Integrated Plan (yellow pages)).
- f) That the report of the Director of Finance, Property and Performance on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out in section 4.6 (pages 25-28 of section 4 (Finance Report) of the Integrated Plan (yellow pages) be noted.
- g) **Capital Budget:** That approval be given to Capital Payments in 2008-09 up to £129.4m net of slippage arising from:
 - i) Commitments from schemes already approved; and
 - ii. The consequences of new starts (for the five years 2008-09 to 2012-13) listed within the Office reports that follow, subject to

the receipt of appropriate capital resources and confirmation of individual detailed business cases.

502. FORMAL REQUEST FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CAMBRIDGE FRINGES JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE

Cabinet had agreed draft terms of reference in 16th October 2007 for the joint plan making committee as the basis of joint negotiation with the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG), together with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. Following on from this decision, officers from the three authorities had drafted more detailed proposals which had been the subject of initial discussions with Go East and CLG.

Cabinet now received a report in order to consider the next steps required to set up a joint policy committee for the future planning of Cambridge Fringe Areas, with membership to include Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. Cabinet noted that Government officials had now clarified their views on the process and time-table, which envisaged setting up of the Committee at the earliest opportunity. A draft Local Agreement between the three authorities was therefore being taken formally for Council resolution on the following dates:

- Cambridge City Council	24 th January 2008
- South Cambridgeshire District Council	31 st January 2008
- Cambridgeshire County Council	19 th February 2008

The Agreement would include a formal request to the Secretary of State to place an Order before Parliament to establish the Joint Section 29 Committee. It was envisaged that following the necessary approvals, the joint committee would be established in the summer.

Cabinet noted the importance that the process for the agreement followed the timetable above, in order to release essential delivery funding in the near future. The failure to agree the formation of a joint plan making would result in the Government not providing additional funding of £700,000 per annum to the three authorities and Cambridgeshire Horizons, and would therefore limit the Council's ability to recruit additional staff and specialist assistance in managing the growth agenda. The establishment of a rolling fund for early infrastructure investments was also conditional upon the agreement of joint plan making arrangements.

One Member queried what the arrangements would be for extending the site areas set out in the plan attached as an appendix to the report. In response it was reported that all changes to the terms of reference would require a report back to Cabinet and agreement between the three parties.

It was resolved to:

- i) Recommend that the Council enters a Local Agreement with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to

establish a Section 29 Committee for relevant fringe areas of Cambridge;

- ii) Recommend in consequence that the Council makes a formal request to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to publish an Order for the establishment of a Joint Policy Committee for the Cambridge Fringes under Section 29 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;
- iii) Note that the final proposals would be referred back to the Council when the Secretary of State consulted upon the draft Order, although consideration would be restricted by the terms of the Local Agreement to which the Council would be a signatory.

503. ADDENBROOKE'S ACCESS ROAD – PRUDENTIAL BORROWING

This report sought Cabinet's support for the use of prudential borrowing as a temporary source of finance for the Addenbrooke's Access Road Phase 2 (pending the securing of additional finance from Government and/or Developers).

Cabinet noted that the Authority was currently constructing phase 1 of the Addenbrooke's Access Road (AAR) using phase two Growth Area Funding (GAF2) funding. The works were due to be completed in April 2008. Design of phase 2 of the AAR had already been completed and construction was intended to start in April 2008 to gain efficiency through back-to-back contracts and more importantly, to take advantage of rail possessions booked for September 2008. In order to achieve this target date, Cabinet noted that the contractor needed to be notified and orders placed by early February 2008. If the dates were not met, the project could be delayed by at least 18 months whilst further possessions were agreed with Network Rail. It was highlighted that this would introduce a very significant delay to the plans of Addenbrooke's Hospital and other developments in the Southern Fringe, and on house building targets in Cambridgeshire.

The costs of AAR phase 2 were currently estimated to be up to £18m. Cabinet noted that the costs of AAR phase 2 had originally been intended to be met by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) through a rolling fund for Cambridgeshire, specifically designed to provide up-front funding of essential infrastructure with the expenditure eventually to be recouped from the Cambridge Southern Fringe Developers through Section 106 agreements. It was reported that currently the CLG had only offered £8m from Growth Area Funds 2 (GAF2) thereby leaving a funding gap of £10m. As a result, Cabinet noted the options available to bridge the funding gap as set out in the Officer's report and supported the approach to financing being recommended to go forward to the full Council meeting for final approval.

Cabinet noted that the repayment of any loan drawn down together with interest charges incurred would become a call against either any specific CLG funding secured at a later date and/or Section 106 contributions from Developers. In terms of the fixed rate loan referred to in paragraph 3.2, it was confirmed that the figure of 4.45% was just an illustration and that the actual rate would be fixed at the time the loan was taken out.

It was resolved:

- i) To recommend to Council approval to prudential borrowing for the Addenbrooke's Access Road Phase 2 to a maximum of £10m.
- ii) To note that this sum together with interest charges incurred would be repayable by additional Government Growth Funds and/or from Developers.
- iii) To note that the Prudential Loan would be a loan of last resort and following the signing of the Section 29 joint committee agreement it was hoped that early additional funding would be made available by DCLG.

504. COMPREHENSIVE AREA ASSESSMENT – JOINT INSPECTORATE CONSULTATION

Cabinet received a report in order to consider both the local implications of proposed arrangements for the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA), and a prepared draft response from the County Council to the national consultation.

Cabinet noted that the Audit Commission had previously consulted on the proposed local government inspection framework changes from Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) to Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) and that a second national consultation on the CAA had now been issued jointly by the Audit Commission, Commission for Social Care Inspection, Healthcare Commission, Her Majesty's (HM) Inspectorate of Constabulary, HM Inspectorate of Prisons, HM Inspectorate of Probation and the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted).

In terms of the draft response set out in the officer's report, the Leader of the Council requested that the final version should be re-written in order that it was far more robust in terms of setting out the County Council's concerns regarding the cost burden associated with inspections, which the Government had originally intended should be reduced.

It was resolved:

To delegate agreement of the detail of the final response to the Leader of the Council in consultation with the Director of People & Policy taking into account the comments made at the Cabinet meeting.

505. USE OF RESOURCES 2007 SCORE AND 2009 CONSULTATION

Cabinet received a report which:

- advised it that the Authority had gained the top score of 4 for Use of Resources following the recent audit inspection undertaken in 2007 and was a score that only 10% of all Councils had achieved.
- indicated to Cabinet the actions planned for the 2008 inspection.

- outlined the proposed changes to the Use of Resources assessment, and provided a suggested response to the consultation.

Cabinet noted that unlike other elements of the proposed CAA framework, the Government was proposing to have a Use of Resources judgement for each individual Council, PCT and Police authority. The Use of Resources element was to be scored against new key lines of enquiry which emphasised the importance of ensuring value for money in using all resources, not just financial ones. This shifted the focus from probity towards value maximisation in natural, human, property and IT resources. The proposed new test was therefore much broader and the criteria harder to achieve.

The agreed Cabinet response contained the following general themes:

- Expressing concern at the significantly increased requirements for Use of Resources judgment under the proposed CAA framework, in the context of the Government's expressed policy intention of reducing the burden of inspection. In particular, the intention of the Audit Commission to increase audit fees to reflect the expanded work – at a time when the Government was expecting councils to make real efficiency savings.
- Recognising the important challenge of stretching assessment processes in support of councils' continuous improvement.
- Raising concerns over the step change being made.
- Raises some concerns regarding the lack of definition over what was required for level 4.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the 2007 Use of Resources score of 4 out of 4 and to pass on the congratulations of Cabinet to all the staff involved for the excellent achievement.
- ii) To approve the Action Plan for 2008 as set out in the officer's report.
- iii) To approve the response to the consultation for 2009 Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) Use of Resources (UoR) assessment as set out in the report, subject to adding comments around reducing the cost and intrusiveness of the audit and having a scoring system that measured progress from one year to another.

506. THE NEW PLACE SURVEY CONSULTATION

This report to Cabinet set out details of a consultation document from the Department of Communities and Local Government relating to a 'Place Survey' which would replace the former Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPI) Public Satisfaction Survey, and to consider the Council's suggested response included as part of the report.

Cabinet noted that as part of the new performance framework for local government, the Government had announced proposals for a set of performance indicators reflecting

national priorities. Of the 198 proposed national performance indicators, the Government was proposing that 25 of them should relate to perception and overall satisfaction levels. Of these, 20 were to be collected from a single survey to be undertaken by local authorities based on selected postal codes to be provided by the Audit Commission. The closing date for responses on the consultation had been set for 8 February 2008.

Issues raised included:

- Questioning the collection method and its relevance to young people. In reply to this it was confirmed that using postal codes was a statistically proven method to accurately reflect representation across the County.
- Receiving confirmation that no new money would be provided by Government to undertake the survey.
- Concerns of Members that the exact wording of questions would be laid down by the Government following the consultation.

In agreeing the response, it was highlighted that further details should be provided in the final response of the benefits of partnership working and to also argue the case that local priorities should be set through the LAA. It was considered appropriate for the LAA to have the opportunity to set local questions for their own area, rather than having them imposed by Central Government.

It was resolved:

To support the Council's draft response to the consultation as outlined in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.5. subject to sections 3.1 and 3.4 being expanded to highlight the opportunities for joint working to obtain local views through activities undertaken by LAA partners and also in helping eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort.

507. STATUTORY GUIDANCE – CREATING STRONG SAFE AND PROSPEROUS COMMUNITIES

Cabinet received a report setting out the details of draft statutory guidance that had been issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) for councils and partners regarding creating strong safe and prosperous communities, specifically relating to the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health (LGPIH) Act.

Cabinet noted that in December 2007 the Government had published a concordat agreed between DCLG and the Local Government Association (LGA). The concordat reinforced the LGPIH Act and the draft guidance in committing local government to providing leadership, working with partners and collaborating in delivering services against specific targets.

The DCLG had requested responses to seven specific questions (set out in Appendix A of the Cabinet report) as well as any other comments councils or other agencies might wish to make with responses required to be made by 12th February 2008.

The officer's report had suggested that a response was not considered necessary and this had been supported by the Policy, Resources and Performance Policy Development

Group on the basis that the proposed guidance related to an act already in place, and its minimum requirements for a set of countywide priorities in a county wide sustainable community strategy was already being met through the Cambridgeshire LAA. (The latter had already agreed the Sustainable Community Strategy)

However as a result of discussions, Cabinet agreed that it would be helpful to provide a response which set out the steps Cambridgeshire was already undertaking and to also highlight important issues around the allocation of reward monies.

It was resolved:

To agree to delegate the authority to make a formal response on behalf of the County Council to the Director of People and Policy in consultation with the Cabinet member for Corporate Services and the portfolio holder for Communities on the statutory guidance on place shaping and the operational guidance on Local Area Agreements.

508. ACTION TO ADDRESS THE DEFICIT POSITION OF TRADING UNITS

Cabinet received a report summarising the current financial position of the Office of Children and Young People's Services (OCYPS) trading units and providing details of the proposed scope and direction of a strategic review of traded activity.

Cabinet was concerned that the financial position of a number of the traded services was still serious and whilst individual services were taking action to seek to address the current deficit on traded activity, Cabinet supported a strategic review on the provision, organisation and support arrangements for trading units. Cabinet noted that a project to review, develop and implement new arrangements had been established. Cabinet endorsed the following principles:

- That the existing range of traded services would continue to be provided by the Council.
- That traded services needed to be better integrated within the OCYPS organisational structure and corporate financial management, reporting and business processes, including reducing wherever possible the distinction between traded and non traded services and that the financial position of traded services should be reported within the main budgetary control report.
- That economies of scale should be sought to increase access to more specialist business support and marketing capacity
- That there should be greater clarity and recognition of those services that the Trading Units provided that supported the Council in the discharge of its statutory and other responsibilities.
- In addition, the review should include services within OCYPS that generated a large part of their funding externally but were not formally classified as traded services. If appropriate, in terms of financial reporting and related business issues, Cabinet agreed that the report should also identify any changes that might need to be made to any other non OCYPS County Council trading units for consistency purposes.

Due to the need to agree revised arrangements by 1st April, it was agreed that a report was required to be presented to the next Cabinet meeting.

It was resolved:

- i) To receive a report back to the 26th February Cabinet meeting providing details of the business plans and options to address cumulative deficits and improve the financial viability of all traded activity within OCYPS and,
- ii) If appropriate, in terms of financial reporting and related business issues, changes required to be made to any other County Council trading units.

Chairman
26th February 2008