

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 24th February 2009

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 11.45 a.m.

Present: Councillor J M Tuck Chairman

Councillors: M Bradney, Sir P Brown, S. Criswell, M Curtis, D Harty, L W McGuire, R Pegram, and F H Yeulett

Apologies: Councillor J E Reynolds

Also in Attendance

Councillors: R Butcher, G Griffiths, S King, M Smith, T Orgee, T Stone and J West.

713. MINUTES 15th AND 26TH JANUARY 2009

The minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on the 15th and 26th January 2009 were approved as a correct record:

714. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None

715. PETITIONS.

None received at the appropriate deadline.

716. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

A) Cambridge Central Area Bus Stop Capacity Strategy – Comments Regarding The Adequacy Of The Decision Making Process, following The Environment And Community Services Scrutiny Committee’s Call-In Of The Cabinet’s Decision of the 15th January 2009

Cabinet was reminded that on the 15th January 2009 it had considered a report on the ‘Cambridge Central Area Bus Stop Capacity Strategy’ and following consideration of views expressed by the local Area Joint Committee (AJC), local members, local residents and local residents groups, it had agreed to approve the recommendations as set out in the report.

Following this meeting, two elements of the decision had been called in for further consideration by the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee. The report from the scrutiny committee provided detail about the outcome of the second call in, which focussed on the decision-making process. Councillor Butcher the chairman of the scrutiny

committee was invited to present the report. In reporting back to Cabinet it was highlighted that Scrutiny Committees had, had four options when asked to scrutinise a called-in decision. These were to:

- (i) decide that having considered the decision and the reasons for it, that no further action was warranted, in which case the decision would proceed.
- (ii) decide not to object to the implementation of the decision but to comment upon it. The Cabinet may take account of the observations when implementing the decision, but was under no obligation to do so.
- (iii) having unresolved concerns about the decision it may refer it back to the Cabinet for reconsideration, setting out the nature of its concerns.
- (iv) refer the matter to full Council if it considered that the decision was not in accordance with the agreed budget or policy framework. (Note: in this case, in determining detailed Highways policy, Cabinet was operating within the framework set for it by Council. Officers' advice therefore was that this option did not apply).

Cabinet noted that the scrutiny committee had agreed to pursue option (ii) that it did not object to the implementation of the decision but had comments upon it, as set out in section 5 of the scrutiny report. Having considered the points raised and the responses received at their meeting, the scrutiny committee did not have any objection about the legality of the decision-making process but were mindful that whilst Cabinet had the power as set out in the County Council Constitution to override decision-making powers devolved to AJCs, they considered that this should not be undertaken lightly, or simply for convenience.

Members further commented that the Area Joint Committee (AJC) provided a valuable means of ensuring that local representatives were involved in local decision-making. The Committee therefore felt that there should have been better communication between the Cabinet and AJC and that the report to Cabinet on the 15th January 2009 should have explicitly noted the AJC's suggestions. The Committee therefore concluded that in its view in this particular case, the essence of partnership working and local democracy had not been observed. Moreover, they believed better communication was required in future so that there was absolute clarity relating to the decision-making process for both Members and the public, i.e. whether a body had consultative or decision-making role, and how the comments provided from consultations would be followed up.

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Highways in response thanked the scrutiny committee for undertaking a very fair hearing and highlighted that the present decision making process being reserved for final Cabinet approval was only undertaken in rare circumstances. In the present case this had been as the result of it being a major countywide strategic capital project and also due to the tight timescale involved and had therefore views received had not been taken lightly. The point was made that the report to the AJC was to enable them to express their views and for Cabinet to consider them within the framework that the final decision was reserved for Cabinet. It was also indicated that in their report back, the AJC had not clearly expressed their views on the issue. One of the local Members present, who had presented evidence at the scrutiny committee asked to make a point of clarification, which at the Chairman's discretion was granted. The local member highlighted that the AJC had requested that the report should be brought back to the Council for reconsideration and that in her view, due consideration had not been given to this request as the report presented to Cabinet was

very much the same report that had been presented to the AJC. In response the point was again made that the views of the AJC had been included in the report to Cabinet and had been discussed and taken into account when considering the report recommendations as set out in the minutes to the Cabinet meeting.

Cabinet in noting the comments, agreed to take the above into account when in future considering, similar type reports.

It was resolved:

To note the Committee's comments as set out in the report back, taking into account for future reference comments made regarding ensuring clearer communication between Cabinet and the Area Joint Committees when undertaking future decisions on areas that might normally be seen as being for AJC consideration, but which for strategic reasons / time limitation factors required for them to be taken by the parent committee.

B) Cambridge Central Area Bus Stop Capacity Strategy – Comments Regarding The Maid's Causeway Bus Stop Proposal, Following The Environment And Community Services Scrutiny Committee's Call-In Of The Cabinet's Decision Of The 15th January 2009

This separate call in of the decision was in relation to the Cambridge Environment and Traffic Management Area Joint Committee meeting on 13th October 2008 agreeing that the proposed list of additional bus stops did not represent a holistic strategy. As a result, an amendment to refer the proposals back to the county council had been agreed by a majority vote. For the purpose of the call-in, the request did not accept that bringing this proposal before Cabinet to determine, was in the spirit of the AJC recommendations, with the detail as set out in the scrutiny report.

In response, it was again highlighted that the report to Cabinet on 8th July 2008 had made clear that with regard to this particular strategy, the AJC was to be given a consultative rather than a decision making role, and that Cabinet would ultimately take the decision on the detail of the strategy. It was noted that the legal officer present at the scrutiny committee had also explained that it was not unlawful for Cabinet to take the decision.

As in the previous report at 4i), Scrutiny Committees had four options when they were asked to scrutinise a called-in decision. Having considered all the evidence presented the scrutiny committee had agreed again to pursue option (ii) e.g. that it did not object to the implementation of the decision but had comments upon it to be relayed back to Cabinet.

Cabinet's attention was drawn to the fact that specifically in terms of the Maid's Causeway bus stop (which was to replace a bus stop displaced by a CGB stop in another location) Members of the scrutiny committee had been informed that whilst the Maid's Causeway site was not ideal, it was the best option available, and alternatives had been explored, but there was no workable alternative site which would be used by bus operators.

It was reported to Cabinet that the Scrutiny Committee had heard from a local member and from two local residents that the bus stop was currently very poorly used and noted that in their view the proposed changes to railings at the site would have a negative impact on the architectural symmetry and special character of Maid's Causeway. The Committee were

sympathetic to the concerns and suggested that Cabinet should take them fully into account before further work was undertaken. In response it was indicated that officers would be looking carefully into what could be practicably achieved in order to minimise the impact above.

It was resolved:

To note the views of the scrutiny committee.

717. COUNCIL DECISIONS

None

718. CAMBRIDGESHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME AND THE RECYCLING IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH (RECAP) WASTE DESIGN GUIDE

Cabinet received a report in order to consider proposed changes to the County Council's Minerals and Waste Development Scheme to enable the Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (RECAP) partnership to review the informal Waste Design Guide, and to take it forward as a formal Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in order to give the Guide a formal status, as part of the Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. It was explained that this would enable the document to have greater weight as a material consideration when determining planning applications.

Cabinet noted the following main stages that had to be completed when preparing an SPD together with the proposed timeline:

Stage	Timeline
Preparation of the draft SPD and supporting documents i.e. Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulation Assessment	January – July 2009
Member consideration of the Draft SPD for the purposes of public consultation	Autumn 2009
Public consultation on the draft SPD (a statutory 6 week period)	February / March 2010
Preparation of a Statement of Consultation (summarising responses received and subsequent changes to the SPD)	By Mid 2010
<i>Examination of the 'parent' Minerals and Waste Plan Core Strategy and receipt of the Inspectors Report late 2010 – early 2011</i>	
Formal adoption of the SPD	June 2011

In response to a question on whether there were any significant implications, it was explained that should there be a delay in the above timetable, this would impact on the advice that would be available to major developments.

The proposals were supported.

It was resolved:

- i) To amend the Cambridge Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, incorporating the provision for the preparation of the RECAP Waste Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document.
- ii) To delegate to the portfolio holder for Economy, Environment and Climate Change, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive of Environment and Community Services, the authority to approve the amendments to the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme for submission to the Government Office.
- iii) To approve the implementation of the revised Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (to come into effect when the Council receives notification under Regulation 11 (3a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004, that the Secretary of State does not intend to serve a direction to amend the Scheme, under Section 15 (4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004)

719. EXTENSION OF SCHOOL AGE RANGE - COMBERTON VILLAGE COLLEGE

Cabinet was reminded that in May 2008 it had considered a report detailing the consultation undertaken by Comberton Village College in respect of the proposal to extend the school's age range to provide post-16 provision. At that time Cabinet had been satisfied that all relevant statutory processes had been completed and had approved the implementation of the extension of the age range of Comberton Village College from 11-16 to 11-19 to take effect on 1 September 2010 to provide for a total of 350 post-16 students. (Ref 2008/029.)

The report on the current agenda explained that the extension of the school age range at Comberton Village College was reliant on additional funding from the Learning Skills Council (LSC) for the substantial building work required. Currently there was a degree of uncertainty regarding LSC funding, although it was explained that it was believed that this was in relation to further education funding, rather than sixth form provision. The funding situation would need to be monitored closely. It was noted that the existing timeline of opening the new facilities in September 2010 no longer provided sufficient time for completion of all aspects of the building project and in the light of this, revisions to the original timeline were sought to delay opening of the new facilities from 2010 to 2011.

It was resolved:

To approve the modification to implementation of the extension of the age range of Comberton Village College from 11-16 to 11-19 to take effect on 1 September 2011 to provide for a total of 350 post-16 students.

720. CAMBRIDGE AREA 14-19 PARTNERSHIP REVIEW OF POST 16 TRANSPORT ARRANGEMENTS

This report informed Cabinet of the need to revise the entitlement for post-16 transport assistance for young people living in the area served by the Cambridge Area 14-19 Partnership (CAP) and sought approval to publish and implement the proposed revised entitlement criteria.

Cabinet noted that under the current Authority's Home to School/College Transport Policy, post-16 students were entitled to subsidised transport (free, if low-income criteria are met) if they:

- (a) lived within the area where Cambridgeshire was the Local Authority; and
- (b) were enrolled on a full-time course (i.e. a minimum 15 taught hours per week) at their nearest appropriate post-16 centre (see paragraph 1.2 below) either in a school, sixth-form college or college of further education as a direct continuation of their 11-16 education; and
- (c) were over compulsory school age but under 19 or are on a course of further education which started before they reached the age of 19; and
- (d) were resident at an address which is 3 miles or more from the nearest appropriate post-16 centre (nac) measured by the *shortest available walking route*.

It was noted that entitlement to subsidised or free transport for students who lived within Cambridge City and the necklace of surrounding villages was different from the above. The Cambridge Area Partnership (CAP) currently comprised the following six post-16 centres: Cambridge Regional College (CRC), Hills Road Sixth Form College, Impington Village College, Long Road Sixth Form College, Netherhall School and City of Ely Community College.

Under the terms of the Authority's Home to School/College Transport policy:

- i) City of Ely Community College was defined as the nearest appropriate centre for students living its catchment area which includes Little Downham and Littleport, and the catchment areas of Witchford Village College and Soham Village College.
- ii) Students living within the City of Cambridge and the catchment areas of the following village colleges are entitled to support with transport to whichever of the other five post-16 centres within CAP they attend:
Bassingbourn, Bottisham (including the parish of Burwell), Comberton, Cottenham, Impington, Linton, Melbourn, Sawston and Swavesey.

Including the decision referred to in the previous report, Cabinet was reminded that the following three 11-16 secondary schools in CAP had been granted presumptions for sixth form provision with effect from September 2011 and would therefore become part of CAP:

The Federation comprising Parkside and Coleridge Community College
Comberton Village College

Cottenham Village College

It was explained that the expansion of post 16 provision had presented a number of logistical problems as set out in paragraph 3.4 of the report. If the existing transport criteria was continued, students would be entitled to transport support to one of eight institutions, which would not be practicable to implement.

The changes sought (to come into effect from September 2011) proposed that students living within the CAP area would be entitled to support with transport to the three nearest CAP post-16 establishments for 'A' level studies. Given the geographical proximity of Long Road and Hills Road Sixth Form Colleges, students would be entitled to transport support to either of these institutions, if they were one of their three nearest CAP post-16 establishments. For vocational courses it was proposed that students living within the CAP area would be entitled to transport support to their nearest vocational centre. Where a Cambridgeshire CAP student lived on the boundaries of the County i.e. where the nearest appropriate centre was an institution in a neighbouring Local Authority, the student would be entitled to transport support there and also to the two designated CAP establishments. Where practicable in terms of access routes, a similar approach would also apply in four other areas of the county where a student's 'nac' was an institution in a neighbouring Authority with the details as set out in the table in paragraph 4.6 of the report. In response to a question raised regarding this latter provision, it was explained that this would not be possible for students living in Farcet and Elton as there was no direct transport route for them to a Cambridgeshire post-16 provider. For these students it was noted that Stanground College, Peterborough would continue to be the nearest appropriate centre.

It was resolved:

To approve the adoption of the revised entitlement criteria for young people living in the area served by CAP for eligibility for support with post-16 transport costs, to be effective from September 2011.

721. LEASE TO FENLAND AREA COMMUNITY ENTERPRISE TRUST (FACET) OF MARWICK CENTRE MARCH

This report sought approval to a proposal to grant a 25-year lease to FACET (Fenland Area Community Enterprise Trust) of the Marwick Centre, March at less than best consideration.

Cabinet was informed that the County Council had declared the old day centre site on Marwick Road, March surplus to requirements and that the previous short-term lease arrangement between FACET and the Council having expired in June 2008.

Cabinet noted that Adult Support Services were requesting that a 25-year lease of the Marwick Centre should be granted to FACET at "less than best" consideration, supporting the FACET request to secure the use of the old Marwick building to ensure development and sustainability of services into the future.

The local member for March North spoke in support of the recommendations, as it provided the opportunity to move FACET forward. He also raised a question of whether it would be possible for the County Council to provide financial support for helping with the repair the roof of the building. The Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Well-being explained that no additional funding had formally been requested previously and therefore as there was no

such budget provision identified within the recently agreed Integrated Plan / County Council Budget for 2009-10 it was not appropriate to allocate funds for such a purpose. The aim of agreeing a peppercorn rent and a long term leasehold would enable FACET to secure charitable capital investment to continue with their wish to secure a commercial loan, in order to commence a planned programme of improvements / necessary refurbishments to the building to an acceptable standard.

The Cabinet Member For Learning made reference to the proposal for a biomass boiler as part of the refurbishment proposals and indicated he would pass to the Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Well-being details of funding opportunities that were available for such equipment.

It was resolved to:

- i) Support the proposal set out in paragraph 2.1 of the officer's report to grant a 5-year lease for Marwick Building to FACET at a peppercorn rent with the County Council having no repair liabilities.
- ii) Confirm that FACET could be offered a 25-year lease at a peppercorn rent with no repairing liabilities on the County Council to allow FACET to seek funding to improve the building and with the lease to be issued once FACET had secured an offer of funding.

722. STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

Cabinet received a report seeking its approval of the Council's Strategic Risk Register 2009/10 which had been prepared on the basis of the Council's strategic objectives and improvement priorities, cross referencing these to the 2008/09 Strategic Risk Register to ensure that no risks from the existing register had been missed.

It was noted that the proposed draft contained 20 risks (including three new risks in respect of the Economy, the increase in needs of Children and young people and the capacity to respond and invest in changed economic circumstances).

One member questioned in the light of the recent Conservative Party press release following the Baby P case, whether Risk 8 titled 'Recruitment Retention and Development' currently listed as C3 (descriptor Significant / scale Moderate) was at the appropriate level. In response, it was explained that it had been agreed after consultation that it could be downgraded from a previous C2 score (descriptor moderate / scale critical) as C3 covered the workforce as a whole. It was however clarified that within Children's Services, Recruitment Retention and Development had a higher profile and the current recruitment and retention initiative for social workers etc was proving successful. Therefore as a whole, the C3 score was considered appropriate.

Other comments made included:

- That any failures regarding Risk 8 'Building Schools for the Future Programme' (score D2) would be as a result of failure by Central Government with regard to the current uncertainty regarding future funding streams. It was acknowledged that any additional revenue risk as set out in the descriptor text would always be present. It

was clarified that funding was guaranteed for the current Fenland wave of schools refurbishment, but the uncertainty surrounded funding for the next waves.

- Attention being drawn to risk 6 'Financial Strategy' (score C2) highlighting that reductions in Government funding and further restrictions on Council Tax increases could lead to a failure to deliver statutory and moral care duties within a climate of demographic and cost pressures.
- Attention being drawn to Item 9 'Delivery of Growth Agenda' (currently risk score B3) which it was agreed would need to be closely monitored to ensure the risk was recorded at a high enough level. In response to a further question regarding what actions were being taken to mitigate this risk, it was explained that this was being dealt with as part of the Outturn. In addition, the Chief Executive reported on the work being undertaken with Cambridgeshire Horizons to explore models to ensure a continued level of building activity, despite the prevailing market conditions, and that if the models proposed stood up to testing, this would be the subject of a report back to Cabinet in the near future.

It was resolved to:

- i) Approve the register of key strategic risks for 2009/10 (as set out in Appendix 1 of the report).
- ii) Agree the risk definitions (as set out in Appendix 2, page 9 attached to the Cabinet report) and proposed new risks (set out in paragraph 2.10).
- iii) Confirm the proposed duration of individual risks as either short term or ongoing as set out in the report.
- iv) Confirm the proposed accountability for individual risks to respective Cabinet Members as set out in Appendix 1 to the Cabinet report.

723. INTEGRATED FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT - DECEMBER 2008

Cabinet received a report presenting the financial and performance information up to the end of December in order for Cabinet to be able to assess progress in delivering the Council's Integrated Plan.

In terms of performance, Cabinet noted that there were no new performance exceptions to report for that month. The following four performance indicators (PI's) / measures were reported as being in a worse position than at the end of the previous financial year / calendar year or same period as last year:

- National Indicator (NI) 117 NEET 16 - 18 year olds (marginal difference).
- NI060 % of Core Assessments carried out within 35 days.
- Local Indicator (LI) 032 Recruitment Lead Times.
- LI 001b Achievement at L4+ in Key Stage 2 Maths (target set by Government).

Cabinet was pleased to note that the following 5 performance indicators (PIs) were making particular progress:

- NI 130 Social Care clients receiving Self Directed Support.
- LI 068 Overall satisfaction of website customers.

- LI 069 Contact Centre – Telephone Contact Handling Accuracy. The comment was again made on the excellent service provided by the Contact Centre.
- LI 136a CCC - % of Contact Centre calls answered within 20 seconds.
- Sickness, although amber in all areas of the Council, it was noted that this was ahead of the same position in the previous year and was making good progress.

Attention was also drawn to the:

- continued improvement in terms of the reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents
- corporately funded item Winter maintenance which although for December was currently forecasting savings of £-149k this would clearly change in terms of the January figures following the recent extreme cold spell.

In terms of the financial issues update, it was highlighted that:

- the overall budget position was showing a forecast year-end underspend of £3.6m, an increase in the predicted underspend from the November position primarily as a result of additional savings being forecast within Debt Charges.
- The release of funds from the Pressures and Developments reserve would need Cabinet approval at year-end, in order to offset the pressure within the Integrated Community Equipment Store (ICES). Based on current forecasts, the level of funding required was estimated at £370k. The position was to be finalised in the outturn report to Cabinet at year-end.
- Spending on the Council's capital programme, especially on generally funded schemes, had proceeded sooner than estimated and that the timing difference of £17.4m would need to be bridged using Prudential Borrowing, which would require Cabinet approval at the end of the financial year.

It was resolved to:

- i) Note the analysis of performance and financial information provided and that in relation to the timing difference of £17.4m to be bridged using Prudential Borrowing, this would require a decision to be taken at the end of the financial year.
- ii) Note that approval for the release of funds from the Pressures and Developments Reserve would be required at year-end to offset the pressure within the Integrated Community Equipment Store (ICES). The position was to be finalised in the outturn report to Cabinet at year-end.

724. ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (ECS) SCRUTINY MEMBER LED REVIEW OF SERVICES THAT PROMOTE THE WELL-BEING OF PEOPLE AGED OVER 50

Councillor Mandy Smith introduced the scrutiny report explaining that the ECS scrutiny committee had undertaken the review to help contribute to the development of the older people strategy, and focussed on three key areas that were considered as fundamental pre-requisites to the effectiveness of the strategy:

- The business case for investing in prevention and well-being services
- Governance arrangements for involving older people in the development and implementation of the strategy
- The accessibility of information about services.

It was noted that the report had drawn on evidence gathered from visiting high performing authorities and from obtaining the views of older people and community groups that worked with older people. Particularly highlighted was the recommendation for there to be a non-executive councillor designated as an Older People's Champion to lead on the "Well Being" agenda.

725. RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS THAT PROMOTE THE WELL-BEING OF PEOPLE AGED OVER 50

In response to the previous report, the scrutiny committee was congratulated on the excellent review undertaken. It was noted that the Scrutiny Committee review had focussed on services that promoted the wellbeing of people aged over 50 and was carried out whilst the Cambridgeshire Together Older People's Strategy was being developed.

Cabinet noted that in developing the strategy, strong representations had been made from older people's groups and as a result, an action plan and monitoring arrangements was to be developed jointly with them, with the actions prioritised according to the views of older people. It was considered that, whilst the recommendations of the County Council Scrutiny Committee sought to improve older people's wellbeing, it was not appropriate to include them in the strategy. Instead, they were to be considered as part of the action plan development when partner organisations and older people could determine whether to include them and with what degree of priority. A full response was provided against each of the scrutiny recommendations as set out in the officer's report.

It was resolved:

- i) To welcome the Environment and Community Services (ECS) Scrutiny Committee's report on services that promote the wellbeing of people aged over 50.
- ii) To thank the Scrutiny Committee for the work done in the review and note and agree the response detailed in the appendix to these minutes to the recommendations of the Environment and Services Scrutiny Committee contained in the report "Review of Services that promote the wellbeing of people aged over 50".

726. OLDER PEOPLE'S STRATEGY

Cabinet received a report providing details of the proposed Cambridgeshire Together Older People's Strategy and for proposals for a supporting action plan.

Cabinet noted and welcomed that the Cambridgeshire Together Board had commissioned an Older People's Strategy to address the needs of people aged 50+, recognising that this

group was growing fast, with people living longer and that therefore there was scope for greater and improved partnership working.

It was noted that the strategy was not intended to replace or subsume other strategies that met the needs of older people with regard to services such as specialist housing, social care or health, but was intended to recognise that older people made a significant contribution to their families, communities and in the workplace and that their overall health and wellbeing were critical in making such positive contributions. They were also an important resource for local action to help tackle social isolation and to help support independent living.

It was resolved:

- i) To receive and endorse the Cambridgeshire Together Older People's strategy.
- ii) To agree that County Council Officers working with partners and the voluntary and community sector, should develop an action plan with defined outcomes and targets and arrangements for monitoring those actions.

727. SINGLE EQUALITY STRATEGY (2009-2012)

Cabinet received a report providing a refresh of the Council's Single Equality Strategy (2009 – 12) and which articulated the Council's commitment as a service provider and employer to supporting a diverse Cambridgeshire and maintaining a diverse workforce.

Cabinet was reminded that it had approved the Council's first Single Equality Strategy in February 2008 and brought together the Council's commitments to the six strands of Equality and Diversity - gender; race; disability; sexual orientation; religion and belief; and age. The Strategy also developed the Council's approach in advance of the anticipated Single Equality Bill, due to be published in the Spring or Summer 2009. The Strategy included a commitment for its annual review and refresh and the refreshed Strategy presented went further in combining the six strands of diversity, containing objectives that applied across all strands. The revised version reduced the overall number of objectives; ensuring all objectives were strategic and ensured a closer link with the Council's Strategic Objectives and Service Delivery Principles.

Cabinet noted that the proposed Action Plan (included as an appendix to the report) was composed of actions contained in the Integrated Plan, other Council strategic plans and service strategies across the organisation and would serve to pull together and join up actions being carried out across the Council, providing an overview of the Council's work on Equality and Diversity without creating large numbers of new actions. For areas not adequately covered in existing plans, actions would be created in the relevant plans and then subsequently added to the Strategy's action plan. It was noted that as the action plan required actions to be inserted from other plans not all of which had yet been completed, a delegation had been sought for approval of the final document following the meeting.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve the refreshed Single Equality Strategy; and

- ii) Agree the process outlined for developing the Strategy's action plan as set out in the detail of the report and to delegate responsibility for finalising the action plan to the Cabinet Member for Communities, in consultation with the Director of People and Policy.

728. INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW NATIONAL FRAMEWORK CONTRACTS FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Cabinet received a report to request agreement to a change in the type of contract the County Council used for children and young people's services, and in respect of the use of legal services to formally seal contract documents.

Cabinet noted that the County Council currently purchased 171 fostering placements and 31 residential care placements from independent providers for 'Looked After Children' and young people for whom there was no appropriate placement provided by the Council. The current Council contracts had been developed with other Eastern Region local authorities in 2001 in line with the National Minimum Standards for children's homes and fostering services. Since agreeing the original contracts, the expectations and the ability to monitor quality had changed, as had the nature of the independent sector market. As a result, proposed new contracts had been developed in partnership with the Department of Children, Schools and Families, Local Authorities and independent providers which required the provider to evidence that the standard of care provided was above minimum standards.

Also highlighted was with the current system contracts held with an individual provider were sealed by the Council's legal services and recorded on the Council's Contracts Register. In contrast, individual contracts for each child/young person placed with the provider were not sealed by legal services, but signed by senior officers as they contained personal and confidential information and related specifically to the child/young person as otherwise this would place the information in the public domain. As there was a safeguarding issue, the proposal was to continue to use this system to help protect the child/young person's identity whilst ensuring that there were correct documents in place to formalise the agreement between the Council and the provider. Additionally, as there were in excess of 150 individual contracts per year issued, requiring all of these to be sealed would be impractical, require additional resources and could result in unnecessary delay for the placement to start.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree to use of nationally developed framework contracts for fostering and residential services for children and young people.
- ii) To agree that current practice was continued and that individual contracts for the placements of children and young people should not be sealed by legal services.
- iii) That officers prepare any necessary changes required to be made to contract standing orders / regulations.

729. CONSULTATION ON PRIMARY AUTHORITY GUIDANCE

Before presenting the report, Trading Standards officers were offered Cabinet's congratulations on the progress with their nomination for beacon status, the result of which would be known by the following week. The report provided Cabinet with an update on the new Primary Authority scheme and Cambridgeshire's proposed response to the Local Better Regulation Office (LBRO) consultation on the Scheme guidance. Cabinet noted that the Primary Authority scheme was to commence on 6 April 2009 and would ensure that any company trading across council boundaries would be guaranteed access to robust and reliable advice through the creation of a legal 'Primary Authority' partnership with a local regulator.

It was noted that one of the regular challenges that the business community required from regulators was the need to provide consistent interpretation of legal requirements. The voluntary Home Authority scheme that was currently in place for Trading Standards Services across the UK had sought to address this requirement and had brought some benefits to regulators, businesses and consumers. It was highlighted that the main problem with the existing scheme had been that, as it was not a statutory requirement, no local authority was under a legal obligation to provide assistance. As a result, Part 2 of the Regulatory Enforcement and Sanctions Act 2008 (RESA) proposed the establishment of a statutory Primary Authority scheme, which was specifically designed to build on the previous successes and to address the perceived shortcomings of the voluntary schemes.

An oral update indicated that the recent meeting between Council And LBRO officers had been very positive within the restrictions placed on them by the Government guidance.

It was confirmed that regarding any uncertainty regarding the financial implications these would not become a financial liability as the fall back position would be for Trading Standards to operate a charging system as set out in the second bullet point of 3.1. of the Officer's report.

It was resolved:

To note the details of the new Primary Authority Scheme and to also agree Cambridgeshire's response to the consultation on the guidance for the Scheme as set out in the report.

730. CITY CENTRE MANAGEMENT LOVE CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP

Cabinet received a report to consider the County Council's membership of the Love Cambridge Partnership.

Cabinet noted that since its inception in 1995, the County Council had been a member of the City Centre Management informal partnership, established by Cambridge City Council. A review had focussed on how the role and structure of City Centre Management could be enhanced as a formal public/private sector partnership. Discussions had been based on the recognition that there was a need to reshape and build on the existing partnership to make it genuinely effective and to ensure that it has the organisational capability and capacity to meet the emerging challenges for Cambridge city centre. Research into best practice in other similar historic locations had helped inform the review process.

The outcome of the consultation process had been to develop a new independent limited company City Centre Management Partnership for Cambridge to be named 'Love Cambridgeshire' which was expected would play a key role in ensuring that Cambridge fulfilled its potential as a great place to live, work and visit, and would contribute strongly to the management of growth in the Cambridge sub-region. The name had been agreed with partners and was an already recognised brand name that had originated with one of the leading developers. In terms of the contribution to the partnership, it was noted that this would be the same as contributed to the City Centre Management (£20,000) and in the event of the Company being wound up or dissolved, any liability to the County Council would be limited to a sum not exceeding £1.

In answer to a question raised on the partnership structures on page 7 of the report, it was explained that the Christmas Sub Group was responsible for bringing retailers together over the festive period to help co-ordinate joint promotion activities and to agree opening / closing times in order to be able to work effectively with transport operators.

Cllr Harrison had requested that the following statement was brought to the attention of Cabinet. "I am happy to see that the Cabinet Member for Growth and Infrastructure will be representing the Council on the Love Cambridge board and thank him for taking on this role. I am sure Cambridge will benefit significantly from having Cabinet level participation in the new Partnership."

It was resolved to:

- i) Note the Articles and Memorandum of membership as set out in the detail of the report.
- ii) Support membership of the Love Cambridge Partnership and To agree to appoint the portfolio holder for Growth and Infrastructure as the Council's representative on the Love Cambridge Partnership Board.

731. CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT ON ECO-TOWNS (AND ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS)

Cabinet received a report outlining the main issues and considerations that would be relevant to the authority's proposed consultation response to the Draft Planning Policy Statement (PPS) on Eco-towns, and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the PPS and the Eco-towns Programme.

Cabinet was reminded that the Eco-Towns Prospectus published in June 2007. which had invited bids from the private and public sectors had, by the Spring of 2008, shortlisted 15 locations with only one of the shortlisted bids (Hanley Grange near Sawston) being in Cambridgeshire. The promoters of Hanley Grange had subsequently withdrawn the scheme from the Eco-Town programme, following unanimous objections from all the Cambridgeshire Local Authorities and other local stakeholders. However at the time of the preparation of the report, Hanley Grange was still a live proposal, having been put forward by the developers for consideration in the current review of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Details were provided in the document in respect of the key elements of the PPS and associated documents as well as the locational principles to be used in identifying locations

for eco-towns. Suggested comments against each section were provided in terms of a proposed consultation response to the PPS. Cabinet noted that the appendix to the PPS identified eleven “locations that were being considered for inclusion in the Eco-towns Programme” and additionally, five locations “not being taken forward as a result of promoters withdrawing schemes from the programme.” Hanley Grange was listed as one of the locations not being taken forward. Cabinet noted that officers understood from conversations with Government Office officials that Hanley Grange would not now be listed in the final PPS, and therefore there would be no eco-town locations in Cambridgeshire.

One of the local members for Sawston spoke generally to support the proposed response, providing comments for consideration, which included:

- suggesting that comment one of the response might be strengthened to say that “under no circumstances should Hanley Grange be included in the list of Eco-Town locations in the final PPS”. (note the current wording of the proposed response read “*The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) should be asked to confirm that Hanley Grange will not be included in the list of Eco-Town locations in the final PPS*”.) The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Highways Environment agreed that the response should not assume that Hanley Grange had definitely been dropped.
- Suggesting that reference should be made on the current lack of agreement on the projected growth in both housing and jobs between consultants employed by the County Council and those by the Government as set out in their current consultation which still required resolution.
- That some commentary was required regarding the mishandling of the request for Northstowe to be classed as an eco-town.
- Highlighting the fact that the exercise had been developer led and that there had been unacceptable detailed changes / additions after the initial consultation period had ended.

Having noted that with the current economic downturn, there might be a further opportunity to champion the new settlement at Northstowe being included as an eco-town, Cabinet supported further representations being made regarding this issue. There was discussion regarding whether the eco-town definition could be broadened to be a zone within the region, officers commented that there was no reference in the current document to eco-extensions, and it was agreed that this was not an area that should be further pursued in the response.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree the comments set out in the report as the basis of a detailed response to questions posed in the Consultation Document for the Draft Planning Policy Statement’.
- ii) To delegate authority to the lead Member for Growth and Infrastructure in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive Environment and Community Services to finalise the consultation response ahead of the 6 March 2009 closing date, including consideration of some of the comments made by Members at the meeting.

732. THE REGIONAL FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR TRANSPORT

Cabinet received a report informing it of the results of the latest round of Regional Funding allocations for transport.

Cabinet noted that the Government had recently asked the Cambridgeshire region to determine its transport priorities for major schemes for the period up to 2018/19 and that excluding schemes which had already been agreed by the region (such as the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway), £80 million had been made available. The region had been asked to make recommendations as to how this money should be allocated and therefore based upon the criteria set by government for schemes, the County Council, in consultation with the District Councils, had put forward the following schemes for consideration.

- Ely Southern bypass;
- Chesterton Station;
- Cambridge Eastern Corridor Rapid Transit links;
- Access to Cambridge East development from the A14;
- King's Dyke Level Crossing Bridge Replacement;
- St Neots to Cambridge bus priorities;
- Huntingdon to St Ives bus priorities;
- A10 improvements north of Cambridge.

In total it was reported that 117 schemes across the region had been considered at a total cost approaching £1 billion and of these, seven new schemes had been agreed, to be taken forward. Cabinet was pleased to note that this included a new station at Chesterton, coupled with a continuation of the Guided Busway from Milton Road to the new station at a cost of £22 million. This was extremely good news, as the scheme would provide significant benefits to Cambridge and the wider area as detailed in the report.

Following a request for clarification, it was reported that of the other schemes submitted by the County, all but the Ely Southern bypass had been referred for future consideration by the region for funding for the period from 2017 onwards. In the case of the Ely scheme, this had been singled out as an example of a smaller scheme that addressed more localised transport issues and fitted very well with some, but not all regional policy aspirations. To this end, the region proposed to set up a Challenge Fund which schemes such as a bypass of Ely could be considered for and it was noted that officers would be working in partnership with district colleagues to seek funding from this for the Ely scheme. Although it was not possible to provide an exact timescale, it could possibly be between 4-5 years in the future. In terms of the financing of the Chesterton scheme and the requirement for 10% to be funded locally, it was expected that this could be met out of the County Integrated Transport Block or through developer contributions. Assurances were provided in answer to a supplementary question, that it would not be at the expense of other road improvements.

It was resolved:

To note the report and particularly the success in securing funding for the proposed new Chesterton Rail Station.

733. SERIOUS CASE REVIEW EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND ACTION PLAN – CHILD A

In introducing the report, the Cabinet Member for children expressed his deepest sympathy on behalf of the Cabinet and Council towards the friends and family of the child.

The report received by Cabinet provided details of the outcome of the Serious Case Review Undertaken by the Cambridgeshire Local safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) following the death of Child A as a result of the previous professional involvement of a number of agencies with the family of Child A, who had died in early 2008 from unknown causes. The report also detailed the multi agency action plan drawn up to address issues highlighted in the Review, which had only been freed from a publication embargo the previous Friday and had therefore been the subject of an unavoidable third agenda despatch.

It was noted that the Review and Action Plan had identified and focused on elements of agencies' practice, which it was considered had fallen short of expectations. The Action Plan included recommendations and actions relevant to social care and education to address the issues that had been raised as part of the review and particular note was taken that many of the actions were already being progressed.

Measures to increase children's social care capacity, particularly in relation to improving the recruitment and retention of qualified social workers were included within the Integrated Plan. It was highlighted that additional resources had been agreed in the setting of the 2009/10 Integrated Plan / budget setting process with additional resources totalling £1.66m (a 16% increase) having been provided to meet inflationary and demand pressures facing the Area Social Care Teams with a further £450k for recruitment and retention action being held corporately. The funding will be used in part to fund the establishment of a Team Manager and Expert Call Handlers, within the Council's Contact Centre. A further £1.3M (or 7.5%) increase has been allocated to central social care functions to deal with inflation and demand pressures.

It was noted that the County Council's social worker vacancy rate was 5%, considerably better than the national average of one in seven posts and reflected the considerable efforts already undertaken to recruit to vacancies in the County.

In response to questions raised, it was confirmed that the LSCB would be monitoring progress on the implementation of the action plan on a monthly basis. Any issues in respect of progress would be escalated to the LSCB Executive Committee and to individual agencies for immediate action.

It was resolved:

To note the Serious Case Review report and to agree the action plan attached as an appendix to the Cabinet report.

734. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / OFFICERS

Cabinet received a report setting out the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and / or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions/take actions on its behalf. Clarification was given following a query from the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and the Environment regarding item 2 "Parking Policy Review" (in respect of area parking plans) that the delegation was still appropriate.

It was resolved:

To note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions/take further actions on its behalf.

735. DRAFT AGENDA 24TH MARCH 2009

Noted with the following change:

that Item 7 Secondary Education Provision to Serve Yaxley and Farcet had been taken off the agenda and would be reassigned to a later Cabinet meeting.

Chairman
24th March 2009

RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE AGREED RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (ECS) SCRUTINY MEMBER LED REVIEW OF SERVICES THAT PROMOTE THE WELL-BEING OF PEOPLE AGED OVER 50

1. BUSINESS CASE FOR INVESTING IN WELLBEING

Recommendation 1

There is a strong business case for investing in prevention and wellbeing. Cambridgeshire Together should develop an action plan for the Older People Strategy, which considers:

- Pooling and targeting funding to create a shift in the balance of care in favour of a wellbeing focused approach
- The results of the Partnerships of Older People Projects (POPPS)

WHO: Director of Adult Support Services / Director of Customer Service / Director of Finance, Property and Performance

Response. It is acknowledged that there is a business case in promoting wellbeing, bringing financial benefits to statutory bodies and older people, but also supporting fulfilled and independent living. It is agreed that in developing the action plan, the Council should work with Cambridgeshire Together partners to examine and implement a new approach that shifts the balance of care in favour of a wellbeing focussed approach. It is suggested that Cabinet endorse this approach for further consideration by the Care, Health and Wellbeing Partnership Board.

Work is about to start which will provide much deeper and richer information about our residents so that services can be better targeted (the Fire and Rescue service has already adopted this approach with success). Using that data and working with public and voluntary sector partners will identify where attention should be focussed and where funding can be applied jointly. Pooled budget arrangements are already in place in relation to integrated social care and health services for people aged 65 and over; the introduction of self-directed support may encourage service users to choose services that address their wider needs. The POPPS projects will be examined and their results considered.

Recommendation 2

It has been proven that the four following factors are key to quality of life and longevity:

- Taking exercise
- Not drinking too much alcohol
- Eating enough fruit and vegetables
- Not smoking

Cambridgeshire Together should publicise as widely as possible, and on an ongoing basis, the advantages of a balanced lifestyle with respect to these factors after consultation with the proposed District Forums on the best ways of promoting healthier lifestyles.

WHO: Director of People and Policy

Response. The strategy acknowledges that there is a range of existing activity within Cambridgeshire which focus specifically on the first, second and fourth factors and suggests for future action that there should be a programme of advice and promotion for all four. This will be taken forward with partners.

2. STRONG GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Recommendation 3

The '50+ wellbeing' agenda should be championed by an Elected Member . This Member should:

- Be a non executive, providing a 'critical friend' challenge to the Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing
- Have a special responsibility allowance and possibly a small budget
- Be elected from a shortlist of 3 Members (1 nominee per political group) by the proposed Countywide Older People's Forum
- Have a clear role description, with a focus on ensuring that the older people strategy is continuously developed and informed with reference to the views of older people
- Present an annual report to the Council

WHO: County Council

Response. Local authorities are required to have a champion for Older People and the Council has designated the Cabinet member for Adults, Health and wellbeing as that champion. However, it is recognised that the role of a non executive older people's champion has worked well in those authorities visited during the review, and could provide a focal point for consultation with older people, and also provide older people with a stronger voice.

Wider consultation with older people will determine whether they would value a non-executive champion. There are budgetary implications to be considered. There may be confusion as partner organisations would not have such a role and the value of the partnership approach might be lost. A consultation exercise will be undertaken, with the findings reported back to Cabinet.

Recommendation 4

The current arrangements for engaging older people and older people groups are fragmentary and confused. There should be a coherent, rationalised structure including:

- District Forums comprised of older people from local community groups. There should be clear linkages with these community groups
- The District Forums should incorporate social activities to attract as wide a range of older people as possible, including making use of events such as Fenland's Golden Age Fairs
- The new arrangements could be facilitated by Age Concern, or other organisations with the relevant expertise and supported by officers from each District area. The forums could be facilitated by different organisations in different areas of the county

- The District Forums should elect representatives to a countywide group, chaired by the Older People Champion. This countywide forum should include organisations such as COPE and COPRG
- The Older People Champion should be member of (and possibly chair) the proposed separate forum of representatives from older people organisations
- The Older People Champion should also sit on the Cambridgeshire Together Board

WHO: Director of Adult Support Services / Director of Customer Service

Response. There are various organisations working across the County or in geographical areas, which are operating well. Age Concern and others have informal networks to reach out to people who would not come to meetings, etc. County and District officers already service and/or support many of these forums. There remains a concern that organisations do not lead to a representative view. The Cambridgeshire Together board recognised that it is difficult to engage some groups, such as the very old and frail. It is proposed that this issue be further considered during the development of the action plan, exploring how current consultation frameworks could be rationalised and how to ensure better engagement with older people. In particular, it is proposed that further work is undertaken to establish whether there is an appetite to establish District forums, as per the review recommendation. In carrying out this review, links should be made to the Council’s emerging Community Engagement Strategy.

Recommendation 5

The voluntary sector provides a valuable range of cost effective, community orientated services that require ongoing, consistent support from Cambridgeshire Together. Service Level Agreements should be:

- Established with voluntary organisations where they do not exist already
- Be proportionate to the amount of money involved
- Aligned with relevant National and Local performance measures; for both new agreements and expired agreements that are renewed

WHO: Director of Adult Support Services

Response. Service level agreements are in place with voluntary organisations where the funding is substantial and agreements cover more than one year. The agreements specify services to be delivered. Each agreement is reviewed during its lifetime and when set up or renewed to ensure it meets the outcomes required. However, it is agreed that Service level agreements should be aligned with National indicators and Council and Cambridgeshire Together priorities, so this will be taken forward in future Service level agreements

3. ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION

Recommendation 6

A strategy should be developed to address how Cambridgeshire Together will provide information that is accessible and publicised effectively. This should include:

- A review of all printed material targeted at older people, with a view to amalgamating it into one newsletter
- Identification of appropriate channels of distribution
- Consideration of how to maximise the use of local radio stations

- Appropriate branding

WHO: Director of People and Policy

Response. There is a communications resource attached to Cambridgeshire Together, whose focus is the promotion of the partnership, and a newsletter has been set up. Each partner has its own communications approach, with newsletters, leaflets and branding and it is unlikely that they will cease to promote services for older people through those channels. The Older People's strategy suggests using focus groups to develop information "banks" targeted to older people's needs and this is likely to be included in the action plan. Branding issues can be considered at that point.

However, it is acknowledged that further work could be undertaken to review how the Council and partners communicate with older people to ensure that there is a rational and accessible approach that is tailored to the needs of all older people. It is agreed that the Council should work with the Care, Health and Wellbeing Partnership to develop a strategy that addresses these issues.

Recommendation 7

Older people advise that they would like a free, individual point of contact for queries about services. Consideration should be given to the creation of a freephone number for queries about wellbeing services, possibly hosted by Age Concern, or the Contact Centre, and allowing callers to access free offers using a reference number. The emphasis should be on 'Free Call, Free Advice, Free Offers'.

WHO: Director of Customer Service

Response. The Contact Centre is migrating to 0345 numbers which will be free to callers on particular tariffs and which are being implemented at no additional cost to the Council. Freephone numbers do suffer from abuse by callers who want other services and are charged at premium rates to mobile phone callers (evidence shows low income households will have "pay as you go" phones instead of landlines). The key issue is the location of information and keeping it up-to-date with so many partners, but the information banks mentioned above would assist.

However, it is acknowledged that there is scope to simplify the range of guidance that is provided to support the wellbeing agenda. Work will be undertaken with partners to review existing communication arrangements in order to establish whether there should be a dedicated freephone number, if so, who should host this and what benefits it could bring. Proposals will be brought back to Cabinet following this review.

Recommendation 8

A formal protocol should be developed whereby agencies that work with older people can make referrals to other agencies where this is in the interest of improving the wellbeing of the older person.

WHO: Director of Adult Support Services

Response. The single assessment process has already brought together arrangements for health and social care referrals, whereby one contact can lead to multiple referrals. Field workers (central and local government) dealing with finance and benefits also make links on behalf of older people to other agencies. The Police and Fire and Rescues Services also refer and sign post people to other services. However, the strategy proposes that more can be done to create a “one door” approach and it is anticipated that this will be included in the action plan. The Scrutiny Review notes that there are instances where existing referral mechanisms could be formalised to ensure there is greater consistency, and this is supported.