

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 5th April 2011

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.10 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor J. Tuck

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

Apologies: None

Present by invitation: Councillors: K Bourke and N Guyatt.

354. MINUTES 15th MARCH 2011

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 15th March 2011 were approved as a correct record subject to amending the dates in minute 337 from 25th January to 22nd February 2011.

355. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

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

Councillor Orgee declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct regarding a road to be resurfaced referred to in the Network Services Plan (item 4)

Councillor Tuck declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as a board member of FACT (Fenland Association of Community Transport) when discussing the Sustainable Transport Fund (Item 11 on the agenda)

Councillor McGuire declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as chairman of Norman Cross Action Group referred to in the report on the Great Haddon Planning Application – Draft County Council Response to proposed employment area (item 12 on the agenda)

356. PETITIONS

None received.

[REPORTS FOR DECISION FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING]

357. CAMBRIDGE CITY FRINGES JOINT COMMITTEE ORDER 2008

The chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local

Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below.

Reason for lateness – The information for inclusion in the report had only become available following the original agenda despatch.

Reason for urgency – The decision on cancellation of the committee needed to be made as soon as possible in order to allow the commencement of plan making through joint working.

Cabinet received a report seeking endorsement to recommend to Council that the Cambridge City Fringes Joint Committee should be cancelled. The report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/ccc-cab110405-3>

Cabinet was reminded that at the request of the department for Communities and Local Government (CLG), South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council agreed in 2008 to the establishment of the Cambridge City Fringes Joint Committee which was to be the Local Planning Authority for plan-making for three cross boundary locations on the edge of Cambridge, as detailed in the report. The joint plan-making committee was established by an Order of Parliament on 1st July 2009 under the provisions of Section 29 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Cabinet was informed that although some of the procedural work of the Committee had been undertaken, the main task of preparing the plans for the specified areas had progressed little. The Committee had to date only met three times (one of which was inquorate) and there was now no ongoing funding from Government to support it. For this reason, the Members of the s29 Committee resolved on 23rd March that the Committee should be cancelled agreeing that the required planning documents could be produced more effectively and less bureaucratically through joint working rather than the process of a specific Committee.

The authority for the County Council to participate in the Committee was originally endorsed by Cabinet and agreed by Full Council and therefore to cancel the Committee, a similar process needed to be followed. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council were also following similar procedures. The process would be that when all three Councils had agreed that the Committee should be cancelled, Cambridge City Council would formally write to the Secretary of State on behalf of the three Councils requesting that the Committee be cancelled, which would then require a revocation of the Parliamentary Order.

It was resolved:

- a) To endorse the cancellation of the Cambridge City Fringes Joint Committee.
- b) To recommend that Full Council endorse the cancellation of the Cambridge City Fringes Joint Committee and ask the Secretary of State to request revocation of the Cambridge City Fringes Joint Committee Order 2008.

[REPORTS FOR INFORMATION FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING]

[KEY DECISIONS]

358. NETWORK SERVICE PLAN 2011

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for the Network Services Plan (NSP) 2011. Due to its size, the plan itself had only been made available before the Cabinet meeting to Cabinet Members and Group Leaders. The report and plan can be viewed at the following link: <http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-4>

Cabinet was reminded that in broad terms the NSP set out the:

- Objectives
- Budgets for capital and revenue expenditure
- Programmes for the next 12 months, and
- Performance monitoring of key indicators

The works programme had been developed for the available budget using transport asset condition data, to provide an economically prioritised programme. This data included:

- The structural condition of the carriageway and footway to enable the most cost effective treatment at the optimum time to be used
- Bridge inspection and assessment data to prioritise those bridges in greatest need
- Accident data and other performance measures

In addition, the works programme recognised a number of approved transport strategies, including the Market Town Strategies which had strong links with third party funding to enable the greatest transport benefits to be realised. Other projects included had been evaluated through their respective processes such as:

- A continuation of the Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement programmes in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland.
- A small improvement works programme in other district areas to replace previous jointly funded works.

Cabinet was reminded that at its meeting on 16th December 2010 it had considered a list of bids for funding in 2011/12 from the medium sized traffic management and safety budget (commonly referred to as the October list). The capital budget for the 2011/12 programme had significantly reduced; £250,000 for 2011/12 compared with £800,000 in 2010/11. As a result, it was highlighted that if the rankling list approved in December were to be implemented, it would be only be possible to commit to a single scheme. In light of the reduced funding available, the methodology for allocating the available funding had been reviewed with the aim of placing more emphasis on achieving the greatest casualty reduction in the most cost effective way. The funding available for the financial year appeared in the Network Service Plan as a single allocation rather than being allocated to individual schemes. It was highlighted that an additional £2.8 million had been provided by the Council as part of the Integrated Plan and was being targeted at structural maintenance projects across the county in order to meet the County Council's statutory duties.

It was orally reported that since the preparation of the report, an additional £2.6 -2.7 million had been received from Central Government to cover winter damage to the highways network which had to be spend within six months and the details of the spend published by the end of September.

Questions / issues raised included:

- Whether an assurance could be given regarding ensuring improved partnership working with District Council colleagues. In response it was indicated that the position was changing, especially in relation to joint funding arrangements, as some district councils were no longer contributing to such funding arrangements. There was currently £200k in the budget for jointly funded projects and in terms of winter maintenance works, the County Council continued to have a good relationship with the districts. The delivery of the works programme required that the County Council worked with partners such as City, District, Town and Parish Councils. The key at a time of shrinking resources was flexibility and for local communities to help contribute on schemes which were a priority to them but which might no longer be possible for the County Council to fund e.g. putting in place physical features on highways to help with speed reduction proposals and the provision of drop kerbs.
- In terms of flexibility there was a need to also look beyond the County's boundaries, with the Cabinet member for Sawston expressing his gratitude to the officers who had helped influence the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy Development Plan Document which had resulted in Suffolk County Council now agreeing to contribute to maintaining a section of the A1307 as recognition of the growth of Haverhill and its impact on increased traffic along the route into and out of Cambridge.
- Highlighting an error on scheme 1 on page 32 which incorrectly referred to the road for resurfacing being the A605 when it should read A1307 and needed to be corrected on the final version of the report.

It was resolved:

To approve the Network Service Plan 2011.

359. HIGHWAYS POLICIES AND CHARGES

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to changes to the County Council's highways policies and charges. Cabinet was reminded that last year, the annual review of highway policies had been deferred in order to allow for a wider ranging review of policy setting.

In the light of the Localism agenda and the Council's focus on local priorities, Cabinet supported a need for a more flexible approach to policy setting. The budget situation in forthcoming years would also result in less funds being available for local highways schemes and was likely to require closer, more flexible working with local communities to encourage them and third parties to invest in highway works. Against this background, the current highway policies and standards had been reviewed to streamline policy requirements, minimise constraints and help create the greater flexibility required.

It was highlighted that the current policy and standards document contained a considerable level of detail much of which was procedural or operational, rather than pure policy. A new

policy document had therefore been drafted (Appendix A to the Cabinet report) to only contain policies that were necessary to:

- ensure safety
- manage budgets
- manage the risk of litigation or claim
- protect the council's reputation
- encourage investment by third parties
- set minimum standards.

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-5>

To allow a more flexible approach to be adopted, the draft policy document did not include any requirements set by legislation to avoid duplication, as legal requirements would be applied by virtue of the legislation, rather than through policy setting. The remaining parts of the existing policy document would be included as guidance in a highways Operation and Procedure Manual.

The policy changes were detailed in section 4 of the report and are summarised below, some of them reflecting changes as part of the budget reductions agreed in the Integrated Plan:

1. **Highways defects** - The most significant change related to the time period for category 2(H) defects changing the response standard from 7 days to 14 days.
2. **Religious symbols** - For the purposes of the policy on religious symbols on the highway, Christmas trees had previously been considered as a religious symbol. However, it was agreed that they no longer fell within this policy, given the largely secular associations with Christmas trees and that they should be treated alongside any other request to place an item on the highway.
3. **Tree planting** - The requirements for planting trees on the highway were further qualified by the inclusion of a zonal standard for planting near public utility apparatus or highway structures.
4. **Heavy commercial vehicle (HCV) restrictions** - The policy on the application of any environmental heavy commercial vehicle restrictions made reference to the Council's HCV Management Strategy, which was being prepared to be considered by Cabinet at its meeting in May.
5. **Gullies** – changing the standard of intervention for gully cleaning from the current policy of cleaning once a year to cleaning them only when sufficient waste warranted attention.
6. **Grass Cutting**: to be reduced so that grass in urban areas was only cut a maximum of 3 times a year rather than four. In rural areas outside towns and villages, visibility areas and a single swathe would be cut three times each year.
7. **Speed Limits in Settlements**: Speeding continued to be one of the key road safety concerns raised by local communities and there was the potential for increased demand for speed limit changes arising from expectations of the Localism agenda. Feedback from some communities suggested a level of frustration over what was considered to be an inflexible approach adopted by the Council to speed limits. It was agreed that while for any County Council investment, the current policy should be retained, for any investment by local communities a more flexible approach would be adopted. Appendix B of the report set out a revised policy for speed limits incorporating a dual approach for

speed limits in settlements that could be applied to i) council investment and ii) where local communities wanted to fund a change in a speed limit in their settlement. The 'Localism' element of the policy proposed would give greater local determination but in a way that required local communities to consider the likely outcomes in terms of compliance and speed reduction. The 'Localism' element of the policy would remove the need for physical measures to be provided as part of any speed limit change. A key requirement would be consultation between the local community and the police, as the enforcement agency. Those funding the changes would be accountable for the outcomes rather than the County Council, with the County Council acting as a facilitator rather than a decision maker. Officers would support and advise the local community as and when required and undertake the statutory processes required, with the local community being responsible for the outcomes and responding to any issues that arose. Local ownership of the outcomes was considered key to the success of this more flexible approach.

8. **Speed Limits on Rural roads outside settlements** - it was agreed that the current policy and approach should be retained utilising the Department for Transport assessment framework to maintain a disciplined, intelligence led and rational approach to speed management on higher speed roads and to avoid speed limits being set on a purely perception basis.
9. **Street Lighting** - The existing policy was revised to reflect the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) initiative for street lighting and reductions in lighting provision. Appendix C of the report to Cabinet reproduce only those sections that included additions / deletions, which had caused some confusion, as the numbering of the sections related to the original document.

The following charges were highlighted with the detail of the agreed revised highways related fees and charges 2010/11 set out in Appendix D of the report.

1. **Highway Charges** - these had been increased in line with the mechanisms previously approved by Cabinet and 1% inflation had been applied to cover the forthcoming increase in national insurance costs.
2. **Accident Data Charges** had been reviewed in light of further investment to upgrade the accident data system and as a result, an above inflation increase of 3.8% was agreed to support the recovery of the investment over time.
3. **Dropped Kerb Access Charges** - had been reviewed last year and the new cost now reflected the full cost implications.
4. **Existing commuted sum for soakaways** - no increase is proposed as the charge was still considered to be adequate.
5. **Detailed Public Rights of Way enquiries and searches** - A new charge had been included.
6. **Switching off and on of traffic signals** Charges had been levied in the past to facilitate work on the highway. These charges were now included in the charges schedule.

The Local member for Duxford who was unable to attend the meeting provided some comments in advance for Cabinet's attention which were noted with hard copies made available at the meeting. As they included a number of questions for different officers, it was agreed that the officers would respond to them outside of the meeting.

Amendments to Appendix D of the report setting out the proposed highways related fees and charges 2010/11 were orally reported as follows:

Page 33 6th Line with title "Diversion or extinguishment of public footpaths and bridleways" in the second column titled "Charges" add the words "plus expenses" after the words "administrative fee" the rest of the wording to stay as set out. (This addition reflected the need to make provision for additional mileage expenses where it was necessary to visit a site on a number of occasions and which was not appropriate to include in the standard charge).

On page 34 a new 7th line to be added after the current item line 6 titled "Traffic Signals Technical Vetting" to be titled:

"Traffic Signals Switch off/on"

Charge column to read: "During working hours: £191 (internal) £205 (external) Out of working hours: £239 (internal) £253 (External)"

Comment column to read: "Internal refers to council based works external relates to external organisation works"

All other lines to remain as printed. The amended page 34 was tabled at the meeting for reference purposes.

Cabinet welcomed the document as a more flexible approach to policy setting, providing flexibility for Members to agree exceptions in certain stated cases, while noting the need to satisfy statutory requirements. It was agreed that the added flexibility would be important when implementing the Localism agenda.

Questions raised / issues highlighted included:

- noting that with regard to paragraph 4.10 of the report - the policy on speed limits on rural roads - there was the need to recognise that some roads in the county were covered by more than one parish council and that account needed to be taken of county / parish boundaries.
- Whether in relation to dropped kerb access there would be any opportunities for joint funding with other departments / outside agencies such as the NHS involved with providing Older People's services. Officers agreed that where it involved providing access for a person to remain in the community this would be pursued with local health services.
- The need to be braver in decision making with regard to potential risks, when considering future speed limit changes proposed by parishes/ district councils.
- A request by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance for officers to continue to pursue with Central Government the need for an agreed minimum timescale for developers to be required bring up to adoptable standard, roads included as part of new developments. He also provided details within his electoral division of two problem areas in terms of the need to reduce accidents, but which currently did not meet the accident criteria for remedial works to be carried out, but which could involve locally funded solutions. The officers agreed to discuss the issues with him outside of the meeting.
- Asking officers to investigate ways of reducing the cost of expensive formal public notices such as traffic regulation orders. In response It was highlighted that while currently there were laid down rules on which publications such as advertisements had to appear in (and which tended to be expensive), the Department for Transport (DfT)

were looking at this area as a priority to seek more appropriate / potentially cheaper ways of advertising.

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the new policy document shown in Appendix A of the report;
- b) Support the development of a separate Highways Operation and Procedure Manual and delegate responsibility for any changes to the document to the Service Director for Highways and Access in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access;
- c) Approve the changes in speed limit and street lighting policy set out in Appendices B and C of the report; and
- d) Approve the revised highway charges set out in Appendix D, subject to the amendments to pages 33 and 34 orally reported at the meeting.

360. EARLY YEARS FUNDING FORMULA REVIEW

In response to the Department for Education (DfE) requirement that all local authorities should develop a funding formula for early years provision (EYSFF) by April 2011, Cabinet received a report in order to consider proposed changes to funding rates for early years education provision in Cambridgeshire.

It was noted that Cambridgeshire was part of an extended pathfinder programme of 71 local authorities operating a formula from April 2010, following the Council's request to join the programme (endorsed by Cabinet on 23 February 2010). The Code of Practice set out the legal framework for the delivery of free early years places, and included guidance on Flexibility, Quality, Funding and Working in Partnership. It described those things which local authorities must do, such as ensuring sufficient places were available, and what they should do, including ensuring that places were available free at the point of delivery, and supporting providers to ensure billing arrangements were clear to parents.

The Government's formal response to the House of Commons Children, Schools and Families Committee report on the EYSFF set out its commitment to the principles of the funding formula - "consistency and transparency in allocating funding". The response underlined the role of the funding formula in promoting quality, incentivising flexibility, addressing market failure and maximising the impact of the free entitlement on those families at greatest risk of inequality. It also stated that "fundamentally ... the EYSFF is for local agreement between local authorities and childcare providers", and encouraging the development of written agreements between authorities and their providers.

The main elements of the formula and current rates were set out in Appendix 1 to the Cabinet report. The EYSFF budget for 2010 / 11 was £13.4m. The areas of focus for the review were detailed in the report informed by a DfE briefing note and were in relation to Base rates, Deprivation, Quality, Flexibility, Protection and Affordability. The review found:

Base rates: were in line with the original cost analysis, assuming occupancy rates between 50% and 80%.

Deprivation: the early years formula allocated a smaller proportion of funding on the basis

of deprivation than schools' and other formulas.

Quality: it was not possible to develop an appropriate element to recognise quality during the review period. Work was continuing on how to establish appropriate measures of quality, in order to ensure any supplement is properly targeted.

Flexibility: current flexibility bands were complex and not well understood by many providers. The level of the premium encouraged some providers to adopt or declare levels of flexibility they could not easily manage.

Protection: some scaling down of the protection for maintained nursery provision was proposed where occupancy levels were low. It was not proposed to reduce the protection for pre-schools in light of the very tight margins in the sector and reliance on fund raising and other voluntary effort.

Affordability: high rates for full day care providers could not be sustained and should be more in line with the upper quartile level (highest 25% of local authorities in the national Pathfinder).

The proposed rates and flexibility bandings for 2011-12 were set out in Appendix 2 of the report. As a result of the proposals, the changes agreed by Cabinet were as follows:

	Current rate/s	Proposed rate/s
Full Day Care / Childminder base rates	£4.23 / hour	£3.85 / hour
Deprivation funding	None* £0.00 Low* £0.15 / hr High* £0.29 / hr	None* £0.00 Low * £0.19 / hr Medium * £0.39 / hr High * £0.58 / hr
Flexibility funding	Various (£0 - £0.51 / hr)	None* £0.00 Low * £0.10 / hr Medium * £0.19 / hr High * £0.29 / hr

Rates shown are for full day care (maximum payable)

The report detailed the consultation exercise undertaken with providers of whom (39%) responded to the consultation. Around half of those made further comments or expressed concerns as detailed in the report. The review of responses identified that most providers were able to accommodate the changes from April 2011. The report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-6>

Whilst funding levels were reducing for some providers, those most affected were still on average 20% better off than before the formula was introduced. Pressure on all local authority budgets and increasing take-up of places due to demographic change, had required reductions on base rates. Despite the proposed reductions, nearly all providers would be better off in real terms than prior to the introduction of the formula as a result of changes in 2010/11.

It was reported that two providers (King's School Ely, Pelican Perse) had announced their intention to withdraw from the scheme due to their inability to offer a free stand-alone place in line with the Code of Practice. This would reduce funded places in Cambridge and Ely, and require parents to decide whether to move their children or pay additional childcare costs. Other providers were adjusting their pricing arrangements to remain within the scheme.

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the new funding rates for early years education provision;
- b) note the implications of adopting the National Code of Practice on the delivery of the free early years entitlement from the start of the Summer Term 2011.

361. SECTION 106 FUNDING

The chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below.

Reason for lateness – There had been the need to obtain further information that had only become available following the despatch of the original agenda.

Reason for urgency – The contract for the surfacing of the Busway Maintenance Track required to be let as soon as possible and so a decision at the current Cabinet meeting was needed otherwise the window to include the works in that contract would be lost.

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to spending section 106 contributions secured through the Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan, the Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan and the Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan. The report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-7>

It was noted that some years ago, the County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council agreed a process for securing contributions towards transport infrastructure from major developments in both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. A process between the County Council, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire officers has recently been established to make recommendations on the allocation of the Area Transport Plan developer contributions.

Four schemes were proposed for approval which had received the support of the portfolio holders at Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire district councils, covering improvements to the Guided Busway cycle/maintenance track and three Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) systems in relation to:

- Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn (via Coldham's Lane) - Eastern Corridor Area Transport Plan
- Science Park, Histon and Milton – Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan
- South East of the City including Mill Road, Cherry Hinton Road – Southern Corridor Area Transport Plan.

It was highlighted that RTPI installation at the above sites had received strong local support. It would help increase bus patronage, providing up to date information helping passengers know more accurately how long they would need to wait for buses. The proposed scheme for Coldhams Lane was supported by the local Member for Romsey who spoke in support at the meeting. The point was made that the funding could not be used to

support Community Transport as it was ringfenced for capital infrastructure and therefore could not be used towards funding bus route subsidies.

Reference was also made to comments submitted to Cabinet in advance of the meeting from one of the Members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington welcoming the section 106 money investment in improving the bus service, stating that if it could encourage more people to use buses it would contribute positively to reducing the County's carbon footprint, reduce congestion, improve the local economy and enable older people to travel. A question he had raised would be dealt with by officers outside of the meeting.

In relation to the proposal to improve the Guided Busway cycle /maintenance track by providing a quality blacktop surface instead of the current unbound maintenance track surface, this was also seen as a positive move to encourage more cycling, as such a surface greatly reduced the instance of tyre punctures and be an all weather surface. It was confirmed that any work undertaken in relation to this proposal was completely independent of the current Guided busway contract and had no impact on it.

It was resolved:

To approve the s106 funding allocations to enable the following schemes to be delivered:

- a) a Real Time Passenger Information scheme from Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn to Coldham's Lane;
- b) a Real Time Passenger Information scheme at the Science Park, Histon and Milton
- c) a Real Time Passenger Information scheme for the south east of the City including Mill Road and Cherry Hinton Road;
- d) tarmac surfacing to the guided busway maintenance track between Cambridge station and Addenbrooke's Hospital/Trumpington Park and Ride

[OTHER DECISIONS]

362. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – FEBRUARY 2011

Cabinet received the latest financial and performance information to assess progress in helping deliver the Council's Integrated Plan which was in the new style format. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-8>

The key exceptions included in the summary analysis were:

- Revenue Budget; overall the budget position was showing a forecast year-end underspend of -£1.2m (-0.4%). This was an increase in the forecast outturn underspend of -£230k since the previous month.

- Key Performance Indicators; overall 25 out of the Council's basket of 42 key performance indicators were currently on target. Of those, 26 indicators had year-end forecasts of which 18 were on target. (section 4.2 of the report provided details and proposed actions).
- Capital Programme; 128 out of 201 current projects were forecast to be on time and budget, mainly as a result of slippage and cuts to the programme. In addition, based on current market conditions, there is currently a potential shortfall of £6m in capital receipts that will need to be managed through additional prudential borrowing or a further reduction in the capital spend programme (section 5.2 of the report provided details and proposed actions).
- Balance Sheet Health; end of quarter (December) figure showed the variance of actual net borrowing (a positive figure representing additional borrowing than what was planned). There were investments of £11m at the end of the previous quarter (December) resulting in a projected borrowing requirement of £19m. However, a balanced budget was currently being forecast (section 6.2 of the report provided further details and actions).

Issues raised on the detail of the report included;

- Requesting that Cabinet's congratulations be recorded for the efforts of senior managers and their staff in taking the actions necessary to achieve an overall balanced budget in what had been extremely difficult times.
- Noting that the overspend for Children and Young People's Services currently standing at £173k was expected to reduce at year end.
- Noting that Community and Adult Services were now forecasting a balanced budget at year end.

It was resolved:

To note the analysis of resources and performance information provided and the remedial action currently being taken to address identified overspends.

363. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY CONSULTATION

Cabinet received a report in order to consider the County Council's response to the latest Green Infrastructure Consultation. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://cab110405-9>

Cabinet was reminded that the first Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region was produced in 2006 by Cambridgeshire Horizons and partners, including the County Council, and had been endorsed by Cabinet on 26th September 2006. The Strategy had been particularly beneficial in helping to secure Growth Area Funding, and focusing funding into the delivery of its projects and initiatives. In addition, it had raised the profile of Green Infrastructure and its role in contributing to the delivery of successful sustainable communities.

The draft revised Strategy built on the success of the 2006 document and strengthened the supporting evidence base to ensure it could play a greater role in the planning process. It now covered the entire county including those areas with a greater deficit of Green Infrastructure and socio-economic issues.

Details were provided in relation to the Strategic Network, which provided a county-wide framework upon which to provide or enhance Green Infrastructure in Cambridgeshire up to and beyond 2031 and which was separated into the following six distinct geographical areas:

- River Nene
- Huntingdon Fens and Woods,
- Great Ouse
- Eastern Fens and Towns
- Chippenham Fen
- Cambridge and Surrounding Areas.

These had been based around landscapes and the connections within them. Within each Strategic Area, smaller target areas had been identified. The consultation document provided information e.g. background, context and analysis, for each Strategic Area and Target Area, highlighting their key aspects and the opportunities that existed. The methodology adopted ensured that each area had the potential to contribute towards delivering the Strategy's objectives. In addition to the geographic descriptions of each area, the local planning authorities had also identified the key issues and Green Infrastructure priorities for their administrative areas.

It was resolved:

To approve the draft response set out in section 4 of the Cabinet report and to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment in consultation with the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services the authority to amend the response for submission to Cambridgeshire Horizons.

364. SOCIAL WORK – WORKING WITH FAMILIES

Cabinet received a report providing details of the formal consultation for the Social Work - working with Families Consultation. The report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://cab110405-10>

Due to the number of documents included in the consultation the background papers were provided as a limited print run Information Pack produced at the same time as the second despatch agenda. They can be viewed at the following link:

<http://camweb.ccc.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/cyps/csoccare/workingforfamilies/>

Cabinet supported the desire in Cambridgeshire to do the best for the children and families and noted that while significant progress had been made to improve practice, changes made had not fully addressed some of the fundamental issues and common messages received from young people, staff, Serious Case Reviews and OfSTED Inspections as set out in section 2.1 of the report.

In response, the Directorate Management Team had looked at a range of possible options and in the discussions that followed, the 'Reclaiming Social Work' Unit Model which had been developed by Hackney Borough Council was chosen as the preferred option for achieving significant change using a multi-disciplinary approach.

Cabinet noted the following principles and priorities that underpinned the model and which provided the basis for developing Social Work – Working for Families in Cambridgeshire with more detail provided in each heading in the Cabinet report:

- Children & Families - An environment which enabled children and families to change and flourish with children's needs being considered systematically and support provided for families to look after their children safely with fewer transitions. The intention being for social workers to have far more contact with families
- Social Work Practice - Social Workers feeling empowered and supported to carry out the complex Social Work task, including a single clear and transparent methodology to promote consistent practice not being tied to one function and reducing processes, procedures and systems.
- Organisation & structure - The structure supporting the flexibility required to meet the needs of children and families in Cambridgeshire to manage risk and ensure early intervention when appropriate. Allocation of units across the county to reflect level of need in a geographical area, units paired to offer peer support and collaboration.
- Operational - Decisions that involved accommodating children and initiating legal proceedings were so life changing that these would continue to be taken by Children's Allocation Meetings, whose role and function required to be enhanced. It was accepted that a small number of families would require ongoing and long term support.

It was acknowledged that while Hackney and Cambridgeshire were very different places, common to both authorities were the critical needs of the children and families and therefore heavy focus had been given to the location of the units to ensure that the model could successfully be applied in Cambridgeshire.

As a large scale Directorate review there were implications for staff working across the Children's Social Care Service which were set out in the report. .

The principles underpinning the proposals included:

- Establishing a qualified Social Care Service workforce
Heads of Service, Group Managers, Consultant Social Workers and Social Workers would all be social work degree qualified. Child Practitioners/Newly Qualified Social Workers (NQSWs) would be qualified.
- Protecting the existing workforce and mitigate the impact of proposals on staff wherever possible. Appointments would be restricted to internal candidates in the first instance before advertising jobs externally.
- The implementation process would take up to 18 months in order to create further opportunities for individuals whose posts were considered 'at risk'.

The "Social Work – Working for Families" informal consultation had provided an overview of the plans to develop a Social Work Unit Model in Cambridgeshire having been launched on Friday 21st January 2011 running until Monday 21st February 2011. Informal consultation workshops were also held for staff and were attended by 83% of staff invited to attend the sessions. Stakeholder workshops were also held for Children's Trust representatives, County Council Members Unions and Senior Managers from across the authority. The feedback both from staff and stakeholders had generally been extremely positive about the plans, although understandably those unqualified staff who were in danger of redundancy clearly had mixed feelings and concerns regarding their own personal position, while

recognising the value of having fully qualified staff as a benefit to children and families in the long term.

Questions / issues raised included:

- Whether the proposals would raise the threshold in relation for children meeting the criteria to be admitted to care? Assurance was given that as the measures were to improve practice and support families wherever possible, it would still ensure those children who needed care would receive it, as the restructure was not driven by cost savings.
- One member sought clarification on how progress on achieving objectives would be reported back to Cabinet. In response it was indicated that as well as internal monitoring an independent review was to be carried out By Professor Ian Goodyear from the University of Cambridge which would provide different ways of measuring outcomes. It was suggested that the earliest a report should come back to Cabinet would be in a year's time taking into account that the implementation process, as explained above, was to be over 18 months.

It was resolved:

- a) to note the content of the Social Work – Working for Families Formal Consultation as set out in the information pack provided to Cabinet Members.
- b) to support the proposals outlined in the Social Work – Working for Families Formal Consultation.
- c) to receive a progress report in a year's time (April 2012)

365. SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND

The chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below.

Reason for lateness – It was not possible to finalise the financial information at the time of the original agenda despatch

Reason for urgency – Bids for the first small packages were required to be made by 18th April 2011.

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for the Council's bid to the Sustainable Transport Fund providing details of the two types of packages for which bids could be made. The report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-11>

Cabinet was advised that the Government had announced the creation of a Local Sustainable Transport Fund as part of the Local Transport White Paper titled 'Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon' published on 19th January 2011. £560 million was to be made available to the fund for the 4-year period to 2014-15 and would comprise both revenue and capital resources as detailed in table 1 of the report. The purpose of the fund was to enable the delivery by local transport authorities of sustainable transport solutions that supported

economic growth, while reducing carbon emissions / footprints. It was also an opportunity to deliver additional wider social, environmental, health and safety benefits for local communities.

Cabinet was advised that Guidance on the Sustainable Transport Fund indicated that all bids must include a local financial contribution with those bids providing a greater contribution from the private sector and other external organisations likely to be better received. It was also noted that the government guidance suggested that packages of measures that were able to deliver greater benefits, rather than individual measures in isolation, would also be favoured. The fund had not been designed to support major infrastructure or service enhancements in relation to inter-urban journeys, or support major rail, passenger transport or road infrastructure enhancements.

To prepare the bid, an officer group was formed consisting of officers from the County, all five districts and Cambridgeshire Horizons, to identify projects for inclusion in the bid that met the wider objectives of the Councils, of the Government through the Sustainable Transport Fund Guidance and which also had community support. The conclusion was that it would be most beneficial to make a bid for the first stage of the Fund and this should be in the under £5m category. (This did not rule out a follow on large bid at a later stage).

The resulting bid contained a mix of schemes that provided benefit across the county and which focussed on the key need for improved accessibility in rural parts of Cambridgeshire, particularly through the promotion and development of Community Transport schemes linked to the emerging Cambridgeshire future transport work, which was investigating options for local transport solutions and on cycling and walking measures, especially within Cambridge City. Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report contained the draft bid for the Sustainable Transport Fund for Cambridgeshire.

The total sought from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund was £4,981.5 million with match funding to be provided totalling £7,968.5m.

Questions / issues raised included:

- Where was the match funding to come from? The majority of this funding would be from funding already available in the system from appropriate section 106 funding monies for sustainable transport and for Local Transport Plan packages, and was therefore not committing the County Council to additional funding.
- What was the likelihood of the bid being successful? While nothing could be guaranteed, officers confirmed that had been in regular contact with Department of Transport officers during the preparation of the Bid. In addition, Cycling England were to be part of the assessment team, and were an organisation that the County Council had good relations with. Officers believed that from the discussions undertaken, the bid was in the right areas for appropriate consideration.

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the bid to the Sustainable Transport Fund contained in Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report;
- b) to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director for Environment

Services, to make any minor changes to the bid before submission to the Department for Transport;

- c) to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director for Environment Services the completion and signing of the application form for the Sustainable Transport Fund.

366. GREAT HADDON EMPLOYMENT LAND PLANNING APPLICATION – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE START

The chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below.

Reason for lateness – Information had only just been received from the developer which had contributed to the detail included in the report.

Reason for urgency - Peterborough City Council had intended to determine the employment land applications on the 26th April and therefore at the time of the late second despatch it was seen as being the last opportunity for Cabinet to consider the County Council's response before Peterborough City Council determine the employment land application on 26th April.

Cabinet received a report providing an update regarding the above application and a draft proposed response to Peterborough City Council for comments. Cabinet was reminded that Great Haddon was a proposed development for up to 5,350 new homes and 65 hectares of employment land to the south west of Peterborough with the site lying immediately to the north of the border with Cambridgeshire, near the village of Yaxley. Two outline planning applications had been submitted for Great Haddon: one a residential application and the other an employment land application the details of which can be found in the Cabinet report at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-12>

The residential and employment land planning applications were submitted to Peterborough City Council in December 2009 with a response agreed by Cabinet at its meeting on 16th November 2010 which contained holding objections to both applications on the basis of deficiencies in the transport assessment for the sites. The County Council had also made objections to the residential application with regard to countryside access/rights of way and libraries/lifelong learning issues. It was reported that Peterborough City Council had now received amendments and additional information in support of both the residential application and the employment land application and had invited the County Council to provide a further response as part of a wider consultation exercise.

Cabinet was informed that in the officer's view, the new Transport Assessment and Travel Plan submitted in support of the employment application did not contain sufficient information to enable officers to establish whether the employment site proposals were acceptable in transport terms to the County Council. For that reason, it was recommended that Cabinet supported the continuation of the County Council's holding objection to the employment proposals as set out in Appendix A to the report. It was also highlighted as an

oral update that the Highways Agency at the time of the meeting, (who currently had an Article 14 Holding Direction in place for both applications which meant that the Planning Authority could not determine the applications until it was lifted) had still not received requested further information and therefore Peterborough would not be able to consider the application at their 26th April planning committee as originally planned. As a result, the application would now need to be rescheduled for their June meeting (at the earliest).

The non-cabinet Member for Norman Cross who had requested to speak as a local member in the adjoining electoral division directly affected by the proposals spoke, expressing his gratitude to officers for the time they had spent on the application and for the consultation undertaken with local members. He was also pleased that comments provided, had been taken on board. He highlighted that in his opinion the jobs to be created (mainly warehouse related) do not fit the profile of residents of Huntingdonshire, or to the aspirations of Cambridgeshire or Peterborough for creating high quality employment. (the report referred to the proposals for warehousing / light industry being unlikely to attract the high proportion of clerical and managerial workers who live in Huntingdonshire and currently choose to commute longer distances)

He also highlighted that the application contravened Peterborough's Site Allocation Document and that as the development site proposed would be a very large area of concrete (about the size of the Alconbury development and twice the size of Cambourne) it had the potential for serious flooding, as in his opinion, the proposed drainage was likely to be inadequate and would in times of heavy rain cause the resulting run offs to flood areas such as the old Great North Road / bridge under the A1 (M).

The Cabinet Member for Norman Cross also made reference to the two areas of serious concern for local Cambridgeshire residents, one being the highways and transport issues already referred to and the second, the current lack of a local secondary school in the area. The current proposals for a new secondary school (which would be across the road from Yaxley) was that it would only serve the residents on the new development. While Members understood the growth aspirations of Peterborough, it was suggested that this should not be to the detriment of the neighbouring local community. Continued concerns regarding the lack of consultation with the residents outside of Peterborough were also noted. There was a request for a high level joint officer / portfolio member / local member meeting with Peterborough to further discuss the issues.

It was resolved:

- a) To agree the draft consultation response as set out in Appendix A for the employment land planning application at Great Haddon subject to including concerns raised at the meeting in respect of potential increased flood risk;
- b) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to make changes to the draft consultation response prior to submission, including making reference to the possibility of flooding should an inadequate drainage system be provided for this development.
- c) To request that the Acting Executive Director : Environment Services should arrange a meeting as soon as possible with Peterborough City

Council involving the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, a local Member and senior officers with a request for similar representation from the city council in order to discuss the issues of concern.

367. INVEST TO TRANSFORM (ITT) BID FOR RADIO FREQUENCY IDENTIFICATION (RFID) EQUIPMENT FOR LIBRARY SERVICE TRANSFORMATION

The chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below.

Reason for lateness – the bid was only finalised after the first despatch of the agenda.

Reason for urgency - A delay until the May Cabinet would delay the orders for the self service installation in all libraries, jeopardising the Service's ability to meet the savings targets set by the Integrated Planning / budget process.

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to a bid for Invest to Transform funding required in order to carry out the major Library Service redesign (Alternative Service Delivery) as agreed by Cabinet on 25th January 2011. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-13>

The bid for funding was to:

- purchase the required hardware and software
- make necessary property and layout changes to facilitate installation at 23 libraries over the next year in order to enable library users to issue and return books and other materials via self-service rather than, as is presently the case, via a staff mediated transaction.

Cabinet was informed that the benefits included:

- enabling the Alternative Service Delivery approach to go ahead in order to make staff savings of £100k in 2011/12 and a further £100k in 2012/13, as set out in the Council's Integrated Plan
- significantly increasing the self-service use of these libraries, recognising that many people increasingly wanted the ease, speed and privacy of serving themselves
- enabling libraries to be operated with fewer paid staff, which in turn (together with input from volunteers in the local community) meant that they could potentially be opened for longer hours without increasing the staffing costs
- enabling staff to devote time to those who needed help and to promoting and presenting the stock and resource collections for customers and their needs
- ensuring a single system of dealing with customers would be in place across the county resulting in more flexible cross-location transfer of stock and staff to suit the needs of the service
- providing a single system of processing new stock acquisitions rather than the inefficiencies inherent in the current system of preparing stock for both Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) and non-RFID libraries.

In addition at the same time as the rollout of the self-service technology there was to be a service restructure into a Hub and Cluster arrangement accompanied by staffing reductions across each group. This restructure was dependent upon the introduction of RFID and the flexibility for staff to work across a range of service points would be enhanced if RFID self service was in place at all libraries.

It was resolved:

To agree a one-off capital investment of £360,000 from the ITT Fund repayable over three years to purchase the necessary radio frequency identification (RFID) equipment hardware / software required in order to carry out the major Library Service redesign (Alternative Service Delivery).

368. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY

The chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the following report to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below.

Reason for Lateness - In order to have a more up to date version than would have been available at the time of the first despatch

Reason for Urgency - To comply with the request to have an update report presented to each Cabinet meeting.

Cabinet received the latest update report on the progress towards completion of the Guided busway as at 29th March. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-14>

Cabinet in previous reports had been repeatedly advised that the Busway Contractor, BAM Nuttall had failed to achieve dates in their own programmes to complete remaining works and the necessary documentation for the Busway. At the Cabinet meeting on 15th March officers had advised that although progress had been made, BAM Nuttall still had documentation to produce to demonstrate that their works had been properly designed and constructed.

It was reported that nearly all the mandatory certificates had now been submitted. It was indicated that a pragmatic approach was now being sought in relation to outstanding minor works / issues which could have been completed months / years ago (e.g. certificates relating to assurances on quality of works, maintenance manuals, fencing etc) which were not defects. The aim was to seek their completion by the end of May 2011 in order that they should not hold up the final handover, while ensuring such an approach did not financially penalise the County Council. The proposal was to lift them into a separate contract, but currently officers reported that there was no agreement with the contractor as to which items would be included in the proposed Memorandum of Agreement.

An oral update provided at the meeting indicated that there were still two safety critical items outstanding relating to electrical safety certificates that had not been submitted and the submission and sign off of the design certification to the stability of the Trumpington

Cutting Retaining Wall. Both of the items were essential to enable the handover to be completed.

Members of Cabinet expressed their concerns at the continued delays in agreeing / finishing the outstanding works / issues by the contractor which was not the actions expected from a company with an international reputation.

It was resolved:

- a) To note that BAM Nuttall had not achieved completion at the time of the preparation of the report and
- b) To note the items that were considered critical for BAM Nuttall to achieve completion but which were still outstanding at the time of the meeting.

369. LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES (LGSS) UPDATE,

Cabinet had requested monthly progress reports in order to be able to reports to review the progress and success of the Local Government Shared Services arrangement with Northamptonshire County Council. The latest update included details on the following with full report viewable at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab110405-15>

Operation of LGSS: Feedback and comments on the consultation on restructure within LGSS closed on 24th March 2011 and responses to the consultation were published on that day for further feedback. The consultation sub-group re-convened on the 1st April 2011 to consider additional feedback received up to that date. The review was still ongoing and would continue to consider further changes to service delivery.

Financial Performance of LGSS. Overall the LGSS partnership was reporting outturn underspend of £1.1 million to the end of the financial year. The joint finance and procurement directorate outturn was reporting a -£358k underspent. The joint Human Resources and Organisation Development directorate outturn was showing a -£527k underspent. The Joint Operations directorate outturn was a -£660k underspent. The joint Legal directorate outturn was a +£414k overspent. There was the result of a forecast overspend of £446k in Northamptonshire legal services following a forecast under-recovery of income as a result of higher than predicted levels of non-chargeable hours. The reduced productivity in the first half of the financial year was due in part to activity being undertaken to achieve Lexcel accreditation. It was hoped that this shortfall would be redressed by increased productivity in the second half of the year but, to date, this has not been sufficient to offset the earlier shortfall.

Operational Performance of LGSS. Prompt payment, aged debtor, system availability and other metrics remained at or above target save for the asset sale target. The asset sale target was behind plan as a result of the Authority decision to retain certain school sites in Cambridgeshire to meet current and future need, these sites having previously been identified for disposal. Both Authorities had led the way in early publication of £500 plus spending. New performance measures were being designed by the directorates in LGSS for reporting from April 2011, in line with the LGSS strategic plan.

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

It was resolved:

- a) To note the contents of the Cabinet report (as detailed in Appendix 1) covering the period to the end of February 2011 of the Local Government Shared Service (LGSS) operation; and
- b) To note that key performance measures were still being formalised and would be reported to a future meeting.

370. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA

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

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

Reason for urgency – to ensure Cabinet receives details of the reports to be presented to its next meeting.

Cabinet noted the following change since the draft agenda for 24th May was published as part of the second despatch: Under “Other Decisions” - further report provisionally titled: 'Great Haddon Planning Application - Draft County Council Response to proposed residential development'

It was resolved:

To note the agenda plan with the amendment referred to at the meeting.

371. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

It was resolved:

To exclude the press and public from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it contains exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, and that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))

372. CAMBRIDGESHIRE PUBLIC SECTOR NETWORK (CPSN) FRAMEWORK CONTRACT AWARD

Cabinet received a business confidential report seeking approval for the award of the above

contract for the provision of Telecommunications and associated services to Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridgeshire Schools with the length of the contract being for a period up to seven years with annual price benchmarking provision.

The existing Cambridgeshire Community Network (CCN) Contract currently provided broadband network connectivity to all County Council offices and libraries as well as to most Cambridgeshire schools was due to expire in April 2012 and it was crucial to have continuity of provision. Furthermore with the current financial constraints, it was essential that the new broadband network contract delivered better value for money than the CCN contract which had been partially funded by Government Private Finance Initiative (PFI) credits and which would not be available in the future.

Cabinet was informed of the details of the project undertaken to commission a replacement to CCN, known as CPSN (Cambridgeshire Public Sector Network) in collaboration with other Cambridgeshire Public Sector organisations. There has been a robust and rigorous process with the aim of ensuring that supplier costs were driven down in a manner compliant with European Public Sector Procurement regulations in order to minimise the risk of challenge in a competitive market. The contract award marked the final phase in the procurement process.

The framework contract for network connectivity and associated services would be available for all Cambridgeshire Schools, County Council offices and libraries as well as a wide number of Cambridgeshire and other Public Sector organisations as listed in the OJEU (Official Journal of the European Union) notice. The proposed network included a fibre based “core” with access circuits from each location to which it would be connected. The procurement process elicited comprehensive and competitive bids from all three companies in the final stage; however the most competitive offer was from Virgin Media Business (VMB), the current CCN incumbent.

The pricing represented excellent value for money for the authority and for schools and would provide indicative savings of around 50% to the Council as well as significant savings for other participating organisations. This aggressive pricing had been achieved in part through economies of scale and was only effective as long as at least 400 access circuits were purchased, as falling below this figure, would result in the County Council incurring penalties. The combined total of existing County Council and schools circuits was expected to be 347, so wider participation in the framework was needed from other public sector organisations in order to maintain lowest pricing. It was important that schools continue to participate with Cabinet noting that the Schools Forum supported schools participation.

Although the requirement for commercial confidentiality had meant that only limited information about the proposed contract could be given to schools and other partners prior to the award of contract, the response received had been enthusiastic and it was considered that the 400 sites minimum was an achievable target. Cabinet’s attention was drawn to the element of financial risk associated with the contract if participation fell significantly, noting that an ongoing focus on ensuring widespread take-up would be required, with some marketing effort to ensure that lowest pricing continued to be achieved.

In addition to providing connectivity for the Council, schools and partners, the CPSN contract provided options for Cambridgeshire communities to benefit from the Council’s investment. It was also hoped that the Council’s investment as part of CPSN could be used to help leverage better broadband provision for Cambridgeshire homes and businesses. Cabinet was reminded that the Government currently had an initiative to promote the rollout

of super fast broadband across the whole country and there was an option within the contract to continue to provide scaled down support for “Community Access Points” (CAPS) in village halls and community buildings around the County.

It was highlighted that as the forecast capital costs (funded by an allocation from the County Council's Capital Programme) for the implementation of the CPSN was lower than originally estimated, there was an option to reallocate surplus funding to address the currently unfunded Information Technology (IT) resilience risk by allocating the remaining allocation of CPSN capital to Phase Three of the IT Resilience project and the intention was to start this work during the second half of the financial year.

In reply to a question, it was noted that the name of the winning bidder would remain confidential until 15th April to allow for any call in by Scrutiny but that on this date the name would become public property. There was a request to officers to ensure non-commercially sensitive details were passed to all Members on this date.

It was resolved:

- a) To confirm the award of the CPSN framework agreement to Virgin Media Business (VMB) in accordance with the Competitive Dialogue Procedure as set out in Regulation 18 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006, subject to statutory standstill requirements.
- b) To confirm that CPSN contract documents may be entered into, in line with confidential Contract and Financial details set out in Appendix One of the report, on completion of final due diligence checks to the satisfaction of the Corporate Director: Customer Services and Transformation in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Customer Services and Transformation.
- c) To note the principal business risks associated with the CPSN contract and endorse the risk mitigation approach set out in Section 2.2 and summarised in Appendix Two of the confidential report.
- d) To note and endorse the approach to community benefit and public access via Community Access Points as set out in Section 2.3 with detailed background in Appendix Three of the confidential report.
- e) To approve the reallocation of any surplus in the CPSN capital budget, as described in Section 2.4 of the confidential report to address the currently unfunded IT Resilience risks faced by the County Council, subject to final approval by the Corporate Director: Customer Services and Transformation in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Customer Services and Transformation.
- f) To request that officers make all members aware of the successful bidder on the date agreed as being appropriate for public disclosure.

Chairman
24th May 2011