

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 5th July 2011

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.noon

Present: Chairman: Councillor N Clarke

Councillors: I Bates, D Brown, S Criswell, M Curtis, D Harty, L W McGuire, L Oliver and M Shuter.

Apologies: C Hutton.

Present by invitation: Councillors: P Downes, S Johnstone, L Nethsingha, T Stone and F Whelan.

In his introduction the Chairman welcomed Alex Plant, the New Executive Director: Environment Services to his first Cabinet meeting and also thanked John Onslow for acting up into the same position for fifteen months and whose efforts had been greatly appreciated. He also reminded those present that no permission had been granted to record or film the meeting.

403. MINUTES 14th JUNE 2011

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 14^h June 2011 were approved as a correct record.

404. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Curtis declared a Personal Interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in item 12 “Building Schools for the Future” as a School Governor, Harry Smith Community College.

405. PETITIONS - FIX OUR PAVEMENTS - PETITION OF 62 SIGNATURES URGING THE COUNTY COUNCIL TO START COMPREHENSIVE PAVEMENT REPAIRS IN COMBERTON AND INDICATE WHEN THIS WORK WOULD BEGIN

The chairman invited the spokesperson Cllr Stephen Harangozo to speak in support of the petition. (The text of the petition and a summary of the presentation is included as appendix 1 to the minutes).

Resolved:

That the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure to provide a response to the spokesperson within 10 working days.

406. SHIRLEY COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL

This report was presented in order for Cabinet to consider whether:

- to continue to lease parts of the site occupied by the Shirley Community Primary School in Nuffield Road, East Chesterton, Cambridge (known as the Shirley Upper School site). This was on the former St Andrew's Church of England (Aided) Junior School site owned by a local charity, the Church Schools of Cambridge (The Trust), or to purchase those parts where the Council had an option to do so.
- to reconsider its earlier decision to declare the County Council-owned school site in Green End Road (known as the Shirley Lower School site) surplus to education requirements, once it was vacated by Shirley Community Primary School.

An addendum updating paragraphs 2.1, 2.3, 2.8 and 2.10 was tabled at the meeting following comments received from the Church Schools of Cambridge.

In terms of the Nuffield Road site, Cabinet noted that the Trust, under the provisions of the Charities Act, would have to demonstrate in disposing of an asset that it was seeking to obtain best value, and this had, had a bearing on the negotiations undertaken. To help keep the Council's costs to a minimum, the Trust had previously agreed to defer the sale of the school site through leasing arrangements, which included the playing fields and three leasing arrangements were currently in place as shown on the plan attached as Appendix 1 to the report. This outlined colour coded areas as follows:

- red showing the area formerly occupied by St Andrew's (Aided) Junior School, which had been rebuilt/refurbished (current rental £113,000 per annum with 5 year lease ending August 2011) - the option now available was to pay £2m for the freehold or agree new lease terms.
- blue showing the new extension, which was part of the playing field at the time of the 2006 agreement (current rental £49,500 per annum - lease ending August 2056) – the option was to keep paying the current annual rent or to purchase the freehold at a price of £943,750.
- green showing the remaining playing field (current rental £31,000 lease ending August 2056) – no change was proposed to this agreement.

The financial decision required was the need to consider the ongoing cost of the lease agreement, (which would increase in line with inflation) compared to the cost of purchasing the red and entering into a 999 year lease for blue land at a total cost of £2,943,750. The purchase option would give certainty of price and would gain the County Council full control of the red and blue parts of the site. The options for purchase were detailed in 4.1.1 of the report and in summary were either: full funding by Prudential Borrowing or part funding by Prudential Borrowing and a part contribution from capital programme slippage.

In relation to the recommendation for the Green End Road, former Shirley Infant School Site, it was reported that since the original Cabinet decision to declare it surplus to requirements, continued house building in and around Cambridge coupled with a significant rise in birth rates had put pressure on the availability of primary places in the City. Cabinet noted that the latest demographic forecasts suggested additional primary school places would be required in the Shirley Primary catchment area specifically, and in the north of the City in general.

The officer's report suggested that the site could accommodate a primary school of 210 places (1 form of entry or 30 reception places) with co-located early years and childcare provision. The original expectation was that the sale would have offset the capital costs of

the Shirley Nursery and Primary school scheme. It was noted that in addition to the capital cost of creating a new school on the site, some additional capital funding would be required to pay for maintenance / site security once the school was vacated in August 2011. As there was no provision in the Children and Young People's Services five year Capital Programme to meet the costs if the site was not sold, a review of the programme would need to be undertaken in the Autumn as part of the Integrated Planning Process.

The Liberal Democrat Education Spokesperson highlighted local concerns regarding the physical capacity of the Green End road site, specifically whether this was large enough to provide a suitably sized school due to its restricted location, parking issues and the lack of playing field and green space. He asked whether consideration had been given to extending the Nuffield school site from a two to three form entry school. The Cabinet Member thanked Councillor Downes indicating that as he was not familiar with the school, he would investigate the points raised outside of the meeting.

The officers were thanked for producing a very detailed, comprehensive report.

It was resolved to agree to:

- a) The purchase of those areas of the Shirley Primary School site in Nuffield Road, Cambridge where the Council has an option to do so at a cost of £2,943,750;
- b) The purchase of the land outlined in Red and the Blue on the plan attached as Appendix 1, to be funded through one of the two options identified in section 4.1.1 of the report, with the decision on which option to be pursued to be delegated to the Local Government Shared Services: Director Finance and Executive Director: Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) in consultation with the Cabinet members for Learning and Resources and Performance; and
- c) To agree to the retention of the County Council-owned school site in Green End Road, Cambridge for future education/school use.

407. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT

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

- Revenue Budget; overall the budget position was showing a forecast year-end overspend of £2.3m (0.6%). The majority of this related to the forecast pressure within Adult Social Care – Operations and section 3.2 provided details of key exceptions in relation to projected overspends in Environment Services (£410k) Community and Adult Services and the impacts and proposed actions that were suggested to address the overspends and ensure the budget was back on target).
- Key Performance Indicators; the performance information that would be provided in this report was currently under review and was the subject of a separate report.

- Capital Programme; 137 out of 168 current projects were forecast to be on time and budget. Those that were not were mainly as a result of slippage and cuts to the programme. (section 4.2 set out the details and suggested actions).
- Details were provided in respect of changes to grant allocations for 2011/12 to what had been budgeted for in the Integrated Plan as a result of recent confirmation announcements from Central Government and for which the usual treatment was to take amounts to general / corporate reserves with the detail set out in Section 6 of the report.
- The collection fund deficit as at 31st March was higher than forecast to January 2011 Tax setting purposes with Cambridgeshire's share of the overall Collection Fund deficit being an additional £262,548 to that budgeted for in the Integrated Plan. This would impact on the Council's position in 2012/13, as it would be dealt with when 2012/13's Council Tax requirement was calculated as part of the Integrated Planning Process (IPP).
- During 2011/12's IPP £507k (£421k Environment Services Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Reserve Balance and £86k 10/11 corporate underspend - both forecasts) was expected to be transferred to the Pressures and Developments Reserve to help fund the Waste PFI pressure in 11/12. However, Waste PFI overspent by £79k in 10/11, resulting in only £286k of ES Waste PFI Reserve being transferred to the Pressures and Developments Reserve. As a result there would be an adverse impact on this reserve balance of £221k.
- A new capital grant of £388k had been allocated to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) for Short Breaks for Disabled Children. This resource was for a specific earmarked purpose and was planned to deliver capital adaptations to carers' homes and Children's Centres to enable a wider range of short break opportunities for families.

The Liberal Democrat Deputy Leader whose portfolio included Resources having requested and been granted the right to speak, made the suggestion that the report should have been considered at the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their comments before coming forward to Cabinet. In response it was indicated that while it was still early days in terms of the overview function and forward programmes for the scrutiny committees were still being drawn up, it would be for each scrutiny committee to determine what they would wish to receive and was not in the gift of Cabinet.

It was resolved:

- a) To note the resources and performance information set out and the remedial action currently being taken.

Virements:

- b) To note that it was established practice to support all significant virements where the value was over the Executive Director's or Corporate Director's limit and therefore Cabinet agreed to:
 1. Approve the virements of £250k from the area social care teams to 16+ and Leaving Care, and £140k to residential units (section 3.2).
 2. Approve the further virement of £160k from the area teams to Strategic Management Social Care (section 3.2).
 3. Approve a virement to transfer the £460k one-off saving from the CCN

budget to the Corporate Director budget (section 3.2).

Funding taken to/from Reserves:

c) To note that In line with agreed practice, the default position was to account for all income as a general resource, with any additional pressures in grants taken to the Pressures & Developments Reserve. On occasions, funding that had been earmarked by Cabinet for specific use, or funding expected as per the Integrated Plan, was transferred to the appropriate Service. As a result Cabinet agreed the following:

4. New Homes Bonus (£789,300) – to approve the treatment of this funding as a general resource in the first instance and take it to corporate reserves (detailed in section 6.2 of the report).
5. Community Transport Funding (£258,208) – to approve the allocation of this funding in full to Environment Services (detailed in section 6.2 of the report).
6. Pothole Funding (£2,681,869) – approves the allocation of this funding in full to Environment Services (detailed in section 6.2 of the report).
7. Local Services Support Grant (£215,704) – to approve the treatment of this funding as a general resource in the first instance and take it to corporate reserves (detailed in section 6.2 of the report).
8. Music Grant (£305,941) – approves the allocation of this funding to be split between CYPs (£125,441), with the remaining £180,500 being treated as a general resource and being put into corporate reserves (detailed in section 6.2 of the report).
9. Local Public Sector Agreement (LPSA) Reward Grant (£4.5m) – To approve that this money is taken to corporate reserves pending agreement between Cambridgeshire partners as to how this resource can be most usefully deployed (detailed in section 6.2 of the report).

408. PROHIBITION OF DRIVING - HURST LANE BYWAYS OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC NOS 45 AND 46 ELY NOS 47 AND 48 LITTLE DOWNHAM

Cabinet received a report to enable it to determine objections to the Cambridgeshire County Council Byway Open to All Traffic No 45 and No 46 Ely and No 47 and No 48 Little Downham Prohibition of Driving Order 2011. This report had come forward as part of the externally funded Fens Green Way Project and enabled the County Council to address some long standing problems of misuse of the drove by recreational vehicles.

Cabinet noted that The Rights of Way and Access Team had requested that a Prohibition of Driving Order (PDO) under Section 1 of the Road Traffic Act 1984 was placed on byways open to all traffic between Ely & Little Downham. The routes in question consisted of un-surfaced 'green lanes' and there were records of regular and repeated complaints about rutting and damage to the surface going back to 1998. The proposed closure was originally requested by Little Downham Parish Council, primarily through the village's Conservation Group. Letters of support for the proposed Traffic Regulation Order had been received from the City of Ely Council, the British Horse Society (users of the land) and 2 adjacent landowners. The local Member for Sutton had e-mailed to Cabinet Members his support to the proposed order.

It was reported that 49 letters of objection to the proposed PDO had been received with 18% of the objectors living within the village, a further 61% from the wider Parish and 21% living outside the area e.g. Isleham, Chatteris, Littleport. The main issues of concern were set out in the detail of the report and in an appendix which provided an officer response to each objection point.

The benefits of the scheme were;

- Responding directly to request from Little Downham Parish Council for action
- Working with and responding to local landowners requests to manage public access
- Responding to the needs of local users and was an example of localism in action
- Enabling effective local land management for the future

It was highlighted that the majority of objections came from beyond the area affected and concerned matters of principle rather than the specific route. In addition, officers had suggested that many of the objections were misguided in terms of the understanding of current law and responsibilities.

It was resolved:

- a) to determine the objection without holding a Public Inquiry;
- b) to introduce the Order as advertised; and
- c) to inform the objectors accordingly.

409. LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

In introducing the report Cabinet was reminded that Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) was facing unprecedented financial challenges due to the current deficit reduction plan resulting in core funding being reduced by 14 per cent, with growing demand for high cost services required by an increasing and ageing population. In this context, the authority had to look for innovative ways to reduce costs and find a sustainable budgetary position.

Cabinet received a report outlining the opportunity to increase the scope of the Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) arrangement between Cambridgeshire County Council and Northamptonshire County Council in October 2010, to include Cambridgeshire County Council's Information Technology (IT) and Facilities Management (FM) services.

It was highlighted that IT Service faced significant budgetary pressures and had been reducing spend considerably through new service models and efficiency savings over recent years. The actual and target budget represented a 47% reduction in cash limit funding over a six year period from 2009/10 through to 2014/15 from £4.3m to £2.3m. In addition the cash limit funding for the CCN (Cambridgeshire Community Network) Contract budget (excluding schools contribution) was to be reduced by an overall 76% from £3.8 million to £0.9 million p/a over five financial years as it moved to the new CPSN (Cambridgeshire Public Sector Network) Contract). In addition, there was an unidentified saving of approximately £229k in 2015/16 for IT services and CSPN.

It was further highlighted that Facilities Management (FM) and County Offices functions also had aggressive savings targets with overall budgets reducing by over £2m from £6.2m

in 2010/11 to £4.1m by 2014/15. Certain functions within FM involved a small number of staff with specialist skills with single points of failure which represented a business continuity risk. In addition, there was an unidentified saving of approximately £419k required to be made in 2015/16 for Facilities Management, County Offices and Business Support.

The proposed levels of savings were such that there was a risk of the identified services not being sustainable over the planning period. As a result, it was proposed that this could be mitigated by the improved critical mass gained by incorporating the services into LGSS. Given this context together with CCC's stated vision for the future provision of Corporate Services to be within the LGSS arrangement, the transfer of IT and FM services to LGSS was considered to be the next logical next step.

It was therefore recommended that the following CCC services transferred to LGSS:

- Information Technology (IT)
- Web Functions (currently within Service Transformation)
- Business Support Helpdesk
- Facilities Management - contract and operational management for cleaning, grounds maintenance and waste management.
- Property services, including engineering and client premises services (including associated support staff)
- County Offices Team

Table 3 of the report set out the total annual budget savings and cumulative cash saved for those areas proposed to transfer to LGSS (excluding 2011/12 savings already achieved) (in total 46% of the corporate retained total for 2011-16);

One Member raised concerns regarding the reference on the seventh line in paragraph 2.1.2 on the top of page five reading "As a result, service levels and response times will be redefined and there will inevitably be some loss of specialist skills and organisational knowledge" and sought reassurance that such losses would not be in both organisations. The Head of Service Transformation Corporate Directorates gave reassurance that the transfer would strengthen the combined expertise.

Due to the increased scope of services being proposed to be transferred and following legal advice, the final decision to endorse the proposal would need to be made by the full Council meeting on 19th July and revised recommendations were tabled at the meeting. The Leader proposed a further change to the first recommendation regarding the timescale to change and delete the words reading "from 1st October 2011, or earlier, if feasible" and to replace them with wording "as soon as possible, but not later than 1st October 2011" to reflect the Administration's wish to move quickly and achieve the savings as soon as possible.

Attention was also drawn to the following services remaining out of scope at the present time:

- Reception, security, parking review and site facilities
- Pool cars and residual lease car scheme
- Reprographic services
- Education ICT services
- Service specific IT related staff (e.g. One Vision team in CYPS)

In discussion Cabinet Members made the point that they wished to be flexible regarding the possibility of further services being shared from amongst the list. One Cabinet Member queried why reception and pool cars and the residual lease car scheme had not been considered for inclusion under Facilities Management. The Leader requested that officers should progress work to ensure there was a plan for each of the services currently out of scope, so that at a later date they could be reviewed to see if any others were appropriate to be included in scope. The officer present responded that negotiations were currently ongoing.

It was resolved:

- a) to confirm its agreement for the inclusion, within the ambit of the Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) partnership arrangement, of the Information Technology (IT) and Facilities Management (FM) Service teams' functions and responsibilities as soon as possible, but not later than 1st October 2011.
- b) In so far as the functions and responsibilities exercised under the auspices of the IT and FM Service, are Executive Functions, to delegate these functions to the LGSS Joint Committee, LGSS Managing Director and LGSS Director of Operations, as appropriate.
- c) Authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive, to agree and implement any necessary amendment of the LGSS Delegation and Joint Committee Agreement.
- d) Recommend to Full Council that it:-
 - 1) endorse this proposal, approve the consequent changes in the Officer structure within Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and insofar as the functions and responsibilities exercised under the auspices of the IT and FM Services are Non-Executive Functions, delegate these functions to the LGSS Joint Committee, LGSS Managing Director and LGSS Director of Operations, as appropriate.
 - 2) Agree to the amendment of the Council's Scheme of Delegation to reflect these changes and authorise the Monitoring officer, in consultation with the Group Leaders, to finalise the precise wording of the amendments and date of implementation.

410. SOCIAL AND EDUCATION TRANSPORT EXEMPTIONS FROM CONTRACT REGULATIONS FOR THE DELIVERY OF TRANSPORT TO LEARNING DISABILITIES SERVICES

Cabinet received a report setting out requests for a range of Learning Disabilities Transport Contract Exemptions, the recommendations having been made in the context of the ongoing reviews on the future day service provision within Learning Disability Partnership (LDP) services and the Social and Education Transport Team's (SETT) network review, a wider review of transport services within the County investigating how community needs

could be better met through improved collaboration within the County Council and with other public sector partners.

Cabinet noted that the current contracted routes were tendered in 2006 on a 3 year contract, with options to extend by a further 2 years. The Council had since agreed 2 year extension options on a year by year basis whilst awaiting the LDP Day Services review which was now expected in April 2012. The current contracts were due to expire in Oct 2011.

Cabinet agreed that transport service provision should be maintained while the Day Services review progressed to its conclusion and that the contracts with operators listed in paragraph 1.4 of the report should be extended under the provision of CCC Contract Regulations Section 3 paragraph 3.4.2 until 30th September 2012. This would then provide an opportunity to assess the outcome of the Day Services review and build the most appropriate network of routes to serve both the service users, parent/carers and centres themselves to deliver a quality cost effective transport service. The timing would also fit well with the forecast outcomes of the current Cambridgeshire Future Transport work where more locally-led transport solutions were being sought.

In answer to a question raised, it was expected that implementation of the review would help towards partly alleviating the Learning Disability projected overspend.

It was resolved:

To approve a range of contract exemptions with respect to a number of transport contracts, to ensure safe delivery of transport services both within the budget available and effectively as follows:

- a) Collins Coaches: extension from 1 Oct 2011 to 30 Sept 2012
- b) JKL Services: extension from 1 Oct 2011 to 30 Sept 2012
- c) A J Rippingale: extension from 1 Oct 2011 to 30 Sept 2012
- d) Ely Soham and District Community Transport Ltd (ESDAR) extension from 1 Oct 2011 to 30 Sept 2012
- e) Fenland Association for Community Transport Ltd (FACT) extension from 1 Oct 2011 to 30 Sept 2012;
- f) That subject to the Local Transport Consortia pathfinders being approved as part of the Cambridgeshire Future Transport initiative as set out in item 9 on the agenda, to agree that contracts should not be renewed to cover the relevant routes, but transport would be spot-purchased for these routes pending the start of the pathfinders.

411. CAMBRIDGESHIRE FUTURE TRANSPORT INITIATIVE

Cabinet received a report reviewing progress with the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Project and sought Cabinet approval to agree recommendations to take the review forward.

Cabinet was reminded that as part of the 2011 Integrated Plan process, it was decided to investigate more efficient methods of using tightly constrained public funding to provide public transport options which would allow for the withdrawal of existing bus subsidies over the next 4 years. This been initiated with the Transport Summit held at March Town Hall in February 2011, where broad agreement was reached amongst those with an interest in

passenger transport including, but not limited to, operators, district councils and the National Health Service (NHS) to work collaboratively to see what could be achieved working across organisational boundaries.

Following the Summit, the partners agreed an ambition for a new way of working to join up resources, priorities, people and journeys, and transport operators to achieve wider community benefits through a more efficient, effective and co-ordinated approach to passenger transport. The aim would be to create a “light touch” joint commissioning body, inviting partners to pool budgets with the intention that private enterprise, local public support would also step in and work together in partnership.

A cross-authority member led Governance Group, which includes NHS Cambridgeshire and Cambridgeshire ACRE (Action with Communities in Rural England), was overseeing the work, supported by a Solutions Group of representatives from across all sectors, including transport operators.

In terms of progress the report detailed the key design principles as set out under section 3.1 of the report. It was reported that work on the local transport consortia was currently ongoing and a small number of pathfinder projects were being developed to test different approaches. It was highlighted that the three work-streams being pursued were:

1. Testing the local transport consortium approach through:
 - a) a roots-up review of all transport services in parts of the north of Cambridgeshire (Fenland) , including linkages to neighbouring counties, and
 - b) an external review of transport in the west of Cambridgeshire (Huntingdonshire) to determine potential benefits of moving to a social enterprise model
2. Testing of private enterprise micro-franchises for services to provide additional capacity in locations of greatest need and to complement existing provision in South Cambridgeshire and the Cambridge City Area
3. Testing how a joint strategic commissioning body, Transport for Cambridgeshire, could provide the focus for a new governance model and county-wide support functions.

It was anticipated that one or more of the pathfinders would go live by the end of the year and that roll out of local transport consortia would take place over the next few years. Work was also ongoing to develop the strategic business case for the new approach to determine the potential benefits of the model and the pathfinders.

The local member for Duxford spoke, seeking a clear explanation of paragraph 6.2 which he did not understand. He also highlighted that the key design principles set out in paragraph 3.1 had not been explained and as statements, were meaningless and therefore made it difficult as a local member to explain to constituents what the County was planning. He highlighted that “the Duxford Division used nearly 15% of the total bus subsidy, and although it contained less than 1.5% of the total electorate, residents had a right to be consulted, which he stated had not yet happened. He highlighted that if nothing changed, six villages would lose all access to public road transport. He had so far tried to play his part, calling a meeting on 9th March at which parish councils, the bus companies, district and county officers were present. A follow-up meeting had been arranged for 8th June but had to be cancelled as the County Council officers had no progress to report. He highlighted that as there was currently still no progress, and with no one from the villages in

his electoral division being included on the Core Delivery group, local residents were becoming restless. His view was that the Administration had failed to listen to the Liberal Democrat group who had lobbied for a route and branch review of school and other transport. He also stated that the second round of cuts had not been communicated to parishes.

The Liberal Democrat Spokesman for Sustainable Transport was next to speak, making reference to the £34m spent annually on Passenger Transport in Cambridgeshire and the Administrations' proposals to give responsibility back to the community which she indicated had so far involved a project conceived without public involvement. She highlighted that the initial host summit had not involved opposition councillors and that the Core Solutions Group which had been working up proposals only involved Members of the Administration, with no notes made available from the meetings for outside people to view. She also made reference to having to make a Freedom of Information request to receive papers for the Governance Group. As the result, she requested that the process should be made transparent.

In response it was highlighted that while opposition county councillors had not been invited to the Summit, all district councils had been invited to attend meetings held with the NHS and this would have included Liberal Democrat councillors, as well as invites being sent to parishes who had signalled an active interest in participating. The Leader clarified that initially the County Council had been seeking with limited resources to look into the options of providing effective transport as a locally based solution. As there were consequences from budget reductions resulting from less Government grant, he did not apologise for moving very quickly with partners to explore innovative solutions. He confirmed that the next stage in moving forward the process would be transparent.

In discussion, the developing plans were supported by Cabinet as being exciting and innovative and would with partners, local businesses and local support seek to move forward to radically revitalise rural and other communities transport options. It was confirmed in answer to a question, that small cost operators would be involved in the debate.

It was resolved to agree:

- a) The principle of establishing a Transport for Cambridgeshire Partnership to oversee the Cambridgeshire Future Transport project and enter into discussions with partners to develop the concept further.
- b) To invite the passenger transport funding partners in Cambridgeshire to enter into discussions regarding the sharing of their passenger transport budgets to deliver more effective transport services.
- c) To develop pathfinder projects for local passenger transport consortia as set out in this report.
- d) To invite expressions of interest from businesses and organisations wishing to contribute to the provision of local passenger transport.

412. WITHDRAWAL OF BUS SUBSIDIES AND THE JUDICIAL REVIEW

It was highlighted that a Cambridge resident was seeking a Judicial Review of the decision to phase out subsidised bus funding, and that the County Council intended to vigorously defend any application made.

The Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure expressed disappointment that the resident had taken the action, as the intention to provide a joined up transport solution, which included pooling partner budgets, was one that many residents would welcome. It was stated that the Judicial Review would not deflect the County Council's plans to provide effective transport for the residents of Cambridgeshire, but there was real concern that the cost of the Judicial Review (estimated to be in the region of £250K) was money that would now have to be found from existing budgets and could result in even more cuts to services to the detriment of County residents.

The report sought approval to review the decision taken as part of the 2011-2012 Integrated Plan to withdraw all subsidised bus funding over four years. Cabinet noted that the original decision had been based on the prevailing financial circumstances, a comprehensive consultation and Community Impact Assessment and the Council's determination to seek alternative and innovative ways to deliver transport in the future. It was highlighted that in February 2011 prior to the full Council decision, the Cambridgeshire Future Transport project had been launched which had progressed rapidly and as indicated in the previous report, innovative transport pathfinders were due to be launched later in the year.

A review of the decision was considered appropriate, in order to reaffirm confidence that the progress with, and potential of, Cambridgeshire Future Transport was such that the County Council's duties to provide transport under Section 63 of the Transport Act 1985 would be met. Cabinet noted that in carrying out the review it was fully intended to comply fully with the requirements of the Equalities Act 2010 and the general duty to consult, and the further review would allow the opportunity to consult even wider over the whole county. To allow this, it was considered appropriate to delay any further subsidy withdrawals. The intention was for the review to take all relevant factors into account, with its timing to coincide with the annual integrated Planning Process, to enable Members to consider the matter in relation to the Council's overall financial priorities.

The Liberal Democrat spokesman for Sustainable Transport Councillor van de Ven in speaking to the report, suggested that it was a good time to pause to look at the social impact of reducing bus subsidies and sought clarification of whether the whole package of bus subsidies was to be withdrawn and whether the Cambridge City Centre Shuttle, which had been included in the first tranche of cuts was to be reinstated. As Cabinet was not a Member question forum, officers would respond to the questions raised outside of the meeting.

It was resolved:

- a) To authorise the Executive Director: Environment Services:
 - i. In consultation with the Director of Legal Services, to continue to pursue the Council's defence against the claim for Judicial Review of the decision to remove subsidies.

- ii. To undertake a review of the decision to withdraw subsidised bus service funding over four years, including consultation of relevant groups and the in depth assessment of the impact of the proposals in the context of the Council's public sector equality duty, linking this to progress on the Cambridgeshire Future Transport project. The output from this review to inform the Integrated Planning process for the financial year 2011-12.
- b) That no further bus subsidy reductions were to be implemented before the adoption of the 2012-2013 Integrated Plan.

413. HEAVY COMMERCIAL VEHICLE (HCV) MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Cabinet received a report in order to consider a draft strategy for the management of heavy commercial vehicles which had built on earlier work to develop an advisory route map for freight movements and also in recognition that the current policy was too rigid and with the imposition of weight limits to be seen as a last resort if other management methods failed. It was recognised that there was no easy way to determine the exact triggers for formal restrictions, but the report set out an initial way forward which could be reviewed through experience. The strategy had been developed through a consultation workshop with parish councils and with further engagement proposed.

Cabinet recognised that the movement of HCVs around the county's highway network was a matter of significant concern for many residents of Cambridgeshire and the growth in traffic volumes and vehicle size had contributed to this concern. Whilst many of the larger vehicles were passing through the County using the Highways Agency motorway and trunk road network, many were undertaking journeys with destinations or origin points within the County.

The new strategy advocated collaboration between the County Council, local communities and the road haulage industry. The strategy recognised the limited resources that the County Council had available for HCV management and the potential need for cross community working in some areas to avoid simply transferring lorry issues between settlements. The strategy also recognised that HCV access controls should only be applied to routes which were intended to provide local access only and that HCV access controls would not be appropriate on those routes identified as strategic routes.

It was noted that officers had been working with local communities and the industry to undertake the assessment process and would now to be tested through trials to allow for fine tuning. The outcome of the process might result in various interventions, including the option of formal HCV restrictions. In terms of enforcement, again there were considered to be no easy solutions, but future success would need support from the local community. It was highlighted that officers were currently evaluating the role of camera technology for enforcement purposes.

The proposal in the report was for the process to be trialled at a limited number of selected sites where problems were known to exist and there was an appetite for community involvement. Reference was made to the Wilbrahams, Earith and Sutton as having been put forward as pilot trials as set out in paragraph 5.2 of the original report and also as highlighted orally at the meeting to a very active group in Hilton who had longstanding community concerns and as a result, were offering resources to be part of a fourth trial, which was supported by the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure.

The Liberal Democrat Spokesman on Sustainable Transport made reference to the fact that the term “local communities” was a phrase being used a great deal in Cabinet reports and suggested there needed to be a definition of exactly what was meant by it and who it included. She expressed her concern that neighbourhood panels were not part of the current discussion process, and was also surprised that her parish council which had a good record of involvement with Speedwatch initiatives had not been involved at an earlier stage. Councillor McGuire made reference to an e-mail invite sent to parishes to attend a workshop on 2nd March when he was the portfolio holder for Highways and Access (referred to in paragraph 4.1 of the report) and asked if she had attended. In response, the Liberal Democrat member indicated that she had to give her apologies to the meeting but had reminded parish councils in her electoral division of the date of the HCV meeting.

Cabinet was reminded that the workshop had been the forum for presenting the proposed approach to HCV management, and as a result of the feedback received at that event, modifications had been made to the assessment process and exposure index. The latest versions appeared as appendices b and c to the report, along with a summary of the workshop feedback included at Appendix d of the report.

The Local Member for Sutton had provided comments for Cabinet’s attention which were read out at the meeting as follows: “I support the idea and would welcome trials to see if there is a way forward. I do not know how successful local monitoring will be, as it has been difficult to get members of the public to support the Speedwatch campaign, despite their vociferous complaints about speeding”.

The local member for Willingham expressed concern regarding the differentiation being made between local and strategic routes, highlighting local issues on the main B road to Willingham with traffic coming mainly from Earith and Sutton, who were two of the areas that had been selected for the pilot and stressed the need to take into account villages affected in any transition proposals. The Leader of the Council made the point that that the local examples given at the meeting could apply equally to many other parts of the County.

A further theme taken up by the local member for Willingham and one other Cabinet Member was the need to restrict HCV vehicles from roads not designed to carry their weight / size and which caused undue damage to the road surface and kerbs. Cabinet supported the contention that it was important to ensure HCVS were mainly routed along those roads that were designed to take them and that there was a role for partner planning committees in ensuring future business parks were located near appropriate main routes. The issue of roads not being wide enough to take the new generation of freight vehicles was currently the subject of on-going discussions between the industry and the Department for Transport. In response, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure recognised the capability of roads was an issue and that restricting HCV movements had the potential to transfer movements onto local roads which was why it was necessary for groups of parishes (sometimes in cross border areas) to work together to develop control measures that did not move lorry problems from one settlement to another. It was intended that the pilot trial area results would be shared with all communities.

In terms of the haulage industry and whether it was in support of the proposals, officers confirmed there had been extensive discussion with the main haulage operators and the Freight Quality Partnership and that while they were on board, there was also the practical issues of the number of non British-National HCV drivers in some areas. Such drivers were

not answerable to national freight organisations, which made realistic enforcement in some areas more difficult.

Another Cabinet member highlighted the continued need to lobby the Government and Highways Agency to ensure there were sufficient rest places for long distance lorry drivers along major routes and to help discourage them from parking in unsuitable areas.

It was resolved:

- a) To endorse the draft strategy set out in Appendix A of the report for the purposes of undertaking trials: and
- b) To confirm the sites for community trials as set out in both paragraph 5.2 in the report and as supported at the meeting, subject to Parish Council commitment.

414. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE

Cabinet received an update regarding the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) accelerated programme in Fenland, summarised the Final Business Case (FBC) for the Phase 2a schools and sought Cabinet's consent to enter into contracts to build the Phase 2a schools once confirmation of the funding had been received from Partnerships for Schools and outstanding commercial and contractual matters had been satisfactorily resolved.

In terms of Phase 1 progress, the projects continued to make good progress on site and the contracted handovers remained on target to be achieved as set out in Paragraph 2.1 of the report.

Detailed design work at the Phase 2a schools (Sir Harry Smith Community College, Whittlesey, Cromwell Community College, Chatteris and Meadowgate Special School, Wisbech) began in January 2011 with updates as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the report with the works programmes being approximately two years in duration, leading to completion by September 2013. It was noted that the programme was currently on target to be achieved. Attention was drawn to a number of risks and dependencies associated with this, which could delay the planned start on site in August and which included:

- Securing planning consent and discharging any pre-commencement planning conditions;
- Finalising the contracts with the Local Education Partnership (LEP), sub-contracts with the builders, interface agreements with Information and Communication technology (ICT) provider etc;
- Approval of contract derogations and the Final Business Case by Partnerships for Schools.

Cabinet noted that the following Contingency plans were being prepared in the event that contracts are not signed by late July, including:

- Delaying the start on site date until contracts are signed; or

- Maintaining the current programme by starting the works under an Early Works Agreement.

As there were risks and costs associated with both of these options the focus continued to be on achieving contract close by July. Cabinet supported undertaking an early works agreement which had worked well previously, highlighting that undertaking site set up activities in August to avoid causing disruption during term time should be achieved, if at all possible.

It was reported that the Draft Final Business Case for the Phase 2a schools was submitted to Partnerships for Schools on 3rd June, with a final version to be submitted following the Cabinet meeting. (Final Business Case approval was a pre-requisite for contract and financial close and would provide the promissory note for the capital grant draw-down for the three schools over the next three financial years). Paragraph 2.9 of the report detailed what the Final Business Case would confirm and which required Cabinet to confirm that it was content to proceed to enter into contracts for the development of the Phase 2 schools.

Attention was drawn to section 4.1 of the report which set out the Funding Strategy to meet the costs associated with the Phase 2 Projects under the headings: Building Costs, Financial Management Costs, Lifecycle Costs, Information and Communication technology Costs, as well details of the transfer of staff. It was highlighted that the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Facilities Management (FM) Services contracts for the Phase 2a schools were entered into at the same time as the contracts for the LEP and the Sample Schools in May 2010 and that the FM and ICT services for the Phase 2a schools would be delivered in accordance with the scope and revised specification and/or fee adjustment arrangements contained within the existing contracts.

In terms of the Phase 2b single school project - Fenland Junction Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) which was currently located in March for which the BSF project proposed should be re-located to a new, purpose built facility in Wisbech or March, an update indicated that written confirmation had been received from Partnerships for Schools in February that 100% of the original funding (£2.5m) had been agreed for this project, but remained subject to 'Stage 0' and Final Business Case approval in due course. Cabinet noted that three potential sites in Wisbech had been identified with surveys and other site appraisal work ongoing to establish what constraints existed with the sites and the speed with which a planning application could be brought forward. Options in March were also being reviewed and the exercise was to be concluded with a view to identifying a preferred site by the end of July.

Paragraph 2.15 -2.20 set out the progress on developing a Community Leisure Suite at Cromwell Community College. Cabinet noted that Fenland District Council and Chatteris Town Council were providing funding to build the Leisure Suite (gym, dance studio and associated reception and changing facilities) on the Cromwell Community College site and the County Council would build the facility as a sub-project of the BSF project at the college. A long-term leasehold interest of the Leisure Suite would then be granted to Fenland District Council who would operate the facility in association with community partners on a not for profit basis. Cabinet noted that the site area subject to the lease was approximately 0.12 hectares together with rights of shared access and parking. An independent consultant had determined the current market value of the freehold interest in this land and the report included a recommendation to dispose of this land at less than best consideration.

It was reported that the County Council had recently completed the purchase of 3.3 hectares of land to the south of the college for the provision of additional playing fields to address a shortfall in the amount of playing field at the school. The timing of when this land would be brought into use as the playing field would have a bearing on when the disposal (lease) of the Leisure Suite to Fenland District Council could take place under legislation designed to prevent school playing fields from being built on or sold off.

It was resolved:

- a) to confirm that the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Contract Documents listed at Annex 1 of the report and any other related contracts, agreements and instruments required to give effect to the Projects (including, but not limited to, collateral warranties and direct agreements) may be entered into once (a) final and formal confirmation of BSF funding for the Project has been received from Partnerships for Schools; and (b) any final outstanding issues have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Executive Director: Children & Young People's Services and the Corporate Director of Finance, Property and Performance in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Learning and Resources;
- b) to note the summary of the Final Business Case at paragraph 2.9 and endorse the strategy for funding the projects set out at paragraph 4.1 of the report;
- c) to declare property forming part of Cromwell Community College Playing Fields as surplus to Council requirements and to authorise the Corporate Director of Finance, Property and Performance to dispose of an eighty year leasehold interest in the property at less than best consideration on terms to be agreed with Fenland District Council.

415. MODIFICATION TO THE OPENING DATE FOR THE FIRST PRIMARY SCHOOL AT NORTHSTOWE

Cabinet received a report setting out the implications of the changing pattern and pace of development on the previously agreed opening date for the first primary school to be established in Northstowe.

It was reported that as a result of delays to the planned Northstowe development, it was necessary to seek Cabinet approval to defer the opening date for the first primary school to serve Northstowe from September 2011 (previously agreed by Cabinet) to a new proposed date of September 2016. Cabinet noted the delays included the absence of a revised planning application; the Government's decision not to upgrade the A14; the possible inclusion of County Council-owned land West of Station Road and the overall change in economic conditions.

Cabinet noted that the dates assigned to the opening of the school were intended to ensure that no matter how quickly development commenced, the Council would be able to fulfil its statutory obligation to provide school places for the early residents of Northstowe. Recent discussions between the County Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and the developers indicated progress was now being made towards the submission of a revised planning application which could be submitted before the end of the year. If this were the

case, construction could begin in 2013. Based on the anticipated pace of development and given that a new primary school facility should be in place for the 100th occupation (the current agreed trigger), officers estimated that the earliest likely opening date for the new school would be September 2016. The Cabinet Member for Learning orally indicated that more flexibility could be built in for an earlier date, if required.

The local member for Willingham while welcoming the suggestion on flexibility for the possibility of an earlier opening, expressed her disappointment that no reference had been made in the current report to the member led review undertaken by the Children and Young People's (CYPS) Scrutiny Committee titled "Children and Young People in New Communities" which had been received at the 26th October 2010 Cabinet meeting. A reference to this report was also made in a statement provided in advance of the meeting to Cabinet Members from Councillor Gymer one of the local members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington whose comments were as follows:

"As a local member I am deeply concerned about the set date of 2016 for opening the first primary school in Northstowe after a predicted commencement of building in 2013. Can I on behalf of my residents ask for a more flexible approach that fundamentally addresses the need of the new town and reduces the impact on the surrounding villages?

I would also ask that officers be tasked with actively promoting this concept with the planning authority and developers so that the necessary funding is made available. I am sure Gallagher would be pleased to repeat the success of the school in Orchard Park.

If the report to Cabinet regarding primary school provision in Northstowe had referred to the member led review into Children and Young People in New Communities - it would have noted the importance of a school being in place early on in the build as this improves the well being of the children and gives an important social focus to the settlement, building a strong community that is more self reliant in the future.

I am sure we do not want to repeat the mistakes seen in previous large developments. The whole purpose of the report was to identify the best practice for the future children of the County. I am disappointed that this local work was not used as a basis for the report to Cabinet and therefore I cannot support the recommendation".

Reference was also made to an e-mail from Cllr Jenkins the other local member for Cottenham, Histon and Impington who had asked Cabinet to note his support for the report stating that "it was imperative that we plan to make the primary schools available very early on in a development".

Councillor Johnstone highlighted that the scrutiny report had reviewed education provision in previously created new communities and as a result, had challenged the current historically used trigger point of opening a primary school based on the 100th occupation. This was supported by rough and ready calculations which suggested that 100 households would produce 25 children, almost sufficient to make one form of entry. She also pointed to previous precedents to opening schools when there were as few as five children of suitable age. By also making reference to the results of a South Cambridgeshire Scrutiny Review of Arbury, and on the basis that it was crucial to have community facilities provided in new communities as early as possible, she believed there was a case to suggest that for Northstowe to be successful, a primary school should be available from day one.

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning welcomed her input and requested copies of the two reports referred to. Councillor Johnstone agreed she would send them on to him.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Learning believed that lessons had been learnt from the earlier experiences of providing education provision in new settlements and that a flexible approach could be used to ensure that provision was provided at the appropriate time. The Cabinet Member for Community and Planning gave reassurance that the County Council would be working very closely with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Longstanton and Oakington parish councils to build on already established relationships and ensure a cohesive approach to making the new settlement a success. Reference was also made to the need to include the NHS Health Sector at the outset.

The Executive Director: Environment Services made reference to another useful document the “Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth” on the subject of new developments produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons that he indicated he would circulate to all Cabinet Members.

It was resolved:

To approve the deferral of the opening date of the first primary school to serve Northstowe from September 2011 to either September 2016 or to coincide with the occupation of the hundredth dwelling, but to also provide the flexibility for an earlier opening, if the case could be made that a primary school was required before either of the above trigger points.

416. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER UPDATE

Cabinet received an update on the status of the main risks to the achievement of Council objectives. It was reported that three risks had been deleted from the current quarter’s version of the Risk Register for the reasons set out in the table included in the report in relation to:

- Risk 6 -Transformation
- Risk 7 - Performance
- Risk 17 - Demographic Change

The following two new strategic risks had been included:

- Risk 20, ‘non compliance with legislative and regulatory requirements’ to reflect concerns in respect of equality issues in respect of 2011/12 budget proposals.
- Risk 21, ‘business disruption’ to reflect the difficult environment in which the Council is currently operating.

In addition it was reported that Strategic Management Team had recommended that Risk 16 should be widened to include the risk of an unanticipated increase in the demand for Adult Services.

It was noted that the nature and scoring of the following Risk Number 10 Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Trigger had been changed as follows:

From: 'Failure by contractor to repay its risk share at the end of the contract'
To: 'Settlement of the Busway dispute exceeds contingency allowances already made'
Change: Probability 1: Impact 4

The changed score reflected the expectation that a satisfactory settlement with the contractor would be achieved.

The Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group suggested that this was a report that would usefully have been received first at the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee so officers could have been questioned in relation to the changes in more detail, and expressed the opinion that the Guided Busway was still a big risk. She suggested that Risk 1 IPP Delivery could have been split into two separate risks, e.g. the Council being unable to achieve required savings and failing to meet statutory responsibilities or budget targets to be one risk and then a separate new risk to address the detrimental effect of savings made on communities. *(Note: Audit and Accounts Committee would normally be the appropriate body to scrutinise and support recommendations for change to the Risk Register with final approval being for Cabinet)*

It was resolved:

To note the proposed updates to the Corporate Risk Register and to confirm that Cabinet was content with the risks as described, the controls which already existed to manage the risks and any mitigating actions planned.

417. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The performance management regime under the previous Government was widely regarded as overly bureaucratic and now that Central Government no longer conducted an overall authority inspection and assessment, the Council needed to consider what performance measures it required in order to know how well it was doing in delivering the services set out in the Integrated Plan, as well as how it would communicate this information to the public. Cabinet therefore received a report seeking its views on what should be reported to Cabinet in terms of performance in key areas and the best way of making this understandable and relevant to the public.

As an introduction, details were provided of some of the views which had been expressed at the overview and scrutiny committee who had met the previous week and discussed the same report. Comments made by overview and scrutiny included:

- expressing concerns regarding the traffic light system, suggesting red should only be used to reflect real problems and be consistently applied.
- Performance reporting should not be an end in itself.
- Top level strategic indicators should be developed as part of the Integrated Plan.
- Performance measures should have two main audiences internal and external.
- They should be simple and easy to understand
- External Performance indicators should focus on outcomes and issues the public had an interest in, and should be an opportunity to improve communications with residents.
- Benchmarking – Cambridgeshire should focus primarily on its own performance rather than comparison with neighbours.

The Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group cited this report and the comments from scrutiny as an example of the good collaborative approach being developed to take reports first to Overview and Scrutiny and then on to Cabinet. She highlighted the need to obtain the right mix of performance indicators, reflecting all sides of the Council.

In terms of the current timetable for reporting back to Cabinet in September, the Leader suggested that if possible, the report should first go back to scrutiny.

Cabinet comments included:

- The need to ensure that there were only a small number of indicators that were drafted in Plain English (to get away from the complex definitions from the Local Area Agreement) with an emphasis on clear phrasing / non ambiguous language which was understandable to all.
- The majority of Indicators to be tailored to the County Council's own services.
- Consideration to be given to a small number of indicators which might be common to partnerships.
- Indicators needed to be beneficial to local taxpayers and should reflect those areas of most interest to residents. There should be measures of how people perceived the services provided, how they had been treated and the outcomes they expected the Council to achieve.
- Ensuring that performance indicators did not become the be all and end all, which focused undue resources at the expense of other priorities.
- Emphasis on quantative rather than qualitative measures.

It was agreed that more work needed to be undertaken outside of the meeting and that each portfolio holder (in consultation with their Executive / Service Directors) should prepare indicators relevant to their areas and pass them on to the lead officer.

It was resolved:

- a) That each Cabinet Member should follow up and provide comments in relation to their particular portfolio to the lead officer outside of the meeting.
- b) That the concepts should be passed to all the overview and scrutiny committees to consider further responses in relation to their remits.

418. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA

It was resolved:

To note the agenda plan with no changes since publication as part of a late, despatch.

419. LATE REPORTS

The chairman announced that the late confidential report on the Guided Busway that was to have been considered as an urgent item had been withdrawn.

Chairman 6th September 2011

Fix Our Pavements Petition

Cabinet noted that a petition had been received with 62 signatures which read: “Cambridgeshire County Council has gradually reduced its funding for the routine refurbishment of pavements. As a result of the reduced maintenance programme many pavements in Comberton have been steadily deteriorating over the last few years, a situation made worse by repeated severe winter weather conditions. The consequence is that many village pavements are breaking up, have large cracks or are slumping, causing large frozen puddles that are a particular hazard in winter.

Because of this situation pedestrian safety is deteriorating which especially affects children, the frail and users of mobility scooters. Despite repeated requests over several years, the County Council is unable to state whether the pavements in Comberton will receive a general refurbishment or when.

We the undersigned urge the County Council to start comprehensive pavement repairs in Comberton soon and indicate when the work will begin”.

The spokesperson in his presentation indicated that the deterioration of the pavements in Comberton was at an all time high. The County’s ‘patch and mend’ approach was no longer able to keep up with the scale of the problems. What had particularly sparked the petition was the level of pavement damage in the two streets mentioned and, directly related to this, the fact that two avoidable accidents had taken place, both involving young children falling over. The spokesperson stressed that the accidents involving broken pavements in Comberton were avoidable and made reference to the broken pavements shown in the photos (provided to Cabinet in advance of the meeting) were ones that he believed had not had any work carried out to them since the later 1990s when large-scale skimming was done. Some breakups had been there for two years steadily getting worse, particularly in Bush Close where a child fell off its bike and he understood into the road. The second reason highlighted for breakups occurring on many skimmed paths was during SCDC pavement sweeping, giving the example of Hillfield Rd in May and indicating that some pavements with break ups had been fine to walk on immediately beforehand. He again highlighted that the second accident in Hillfield was avoidable as the skimmed pavements were at the end of their useful life.

He made two further general points that a lot of money was spent maintaining road surfaces and preventing vehicle accidents and while as far as he knew there had not been any personal injuries from numerous potholes in Comberton, two children had been injured during the year on pavements. Secondly, residents were painfully aware of cuts to their bus service and possibly to the local library and were expecting the County Council to at least maintain streets properly.

The spokesperson also wished to raise specific questions which it was agreed would be passed to the officers for a response following the meeting.