

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 25th May 2010

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 11.35 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor J. Tuck

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

Apologies: Councillors: Sir P Brown and J Reynolds

Also Present: Councillors: D Jenkins, F Whelan and L Nethsingha.

174. MINUTES 27th April 2010

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 27th April 2010 were approved as a correct record.

175. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Orgee declared a potential prejudicial interest under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct in item 7 titled "Development at Cambridge North West: National Institute of Agricultural Botany (NIAB) 1 Site - Section 106 Heads of Term" as a member of the Joint Development Control Committee for Cambridge Fringes and also in any of the discussion to take place on the Clay Farm proposals in item 8. "Integrated Resources and Performance Report (Abbreviated) March 2010" and as a result left the meeting for the duration of the discussions on item 7 and during the discussion on Clay Farm on item 8.

176. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY

None required for the current meeting.

177. COUNCIL DECISIONS

No decisions for the current meeting.

178. PARKING POLICY REVIEW

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for changes to parking policy. This followed on from a request from the 20th October 2009 meeting which had received a report on various operational decisions taken earlier in the year by the Cambridge Environment and Traffic Management Area Joint Committee (AJC) including the application of area wide parking controls, as set out in the parking policies adopted by Cabinet.

Cabinet had received 3 petitions (two in opposition to the earlier decision taken by the AJC and one in support) and as a result, recognised that there were sometimes opposing needs in different locations within an area due to factors such as off street parking / garages being available in some locations but not in others. Cabinet therefore requested a further review of whether the area wide parking policy operated across the County was still fit for purpose with regard to the issues in Cambridge City, before making any final decisions regarding local area parking controls.

The changes set out in Appendix B of the report were designed to place greater onus on local Members to determine the extent of area wide controls. It was highlighted that the Service Director of Highways and Access would still retain a right as a last resort to refer an area wide parking control scheme to Cabinet if it was considered that the area selected by local Members was wholly inappropriate.

To address staff resource issues highlighted in the report, the amendments to policy advocated the local community taking control of the consultation process, once officers had set a template for any required parking restrictions. It was proposed that the consultation should be led by a community group under the direction of local members using the consultation document attached as Appendix C to the report to be used as a template and which could be amended to suit local circumstances.

In terms of parking charges the account was under considerable pressure as income had dropped, following the removal of various parking bays as part of traffic management schemes undertaken in the city centre, and with expenditure continuing to rise. There was therefore a need to ensure, as much as possible, that income meets requirements and therefore it was agreed that it was appropriate that decisions on pay and display charges were made by Cabinet rather than by the AJC, which was not accountable for the on-street account. All decisions on final parking charges would be following the recommended review.

In terms of Residents and visitor parking permit charges Cabinet noted that currently, residents permit charges had been set to cover operational costs, (although parking policy does allow AJCs to set higher levels to generate a surplus). Given the pressures on the on-street parking account and the likelihood of further reductions in parking bay numbers in Cambridge in the coming years, it was recommended and agreed that additional income should be raised via increased residents' parking permits charges with the detail as set out in the report. Cabinet also supported the proposal that it was more appropriate for Cabinet rather than the AJC to set resident and visitor permit charges, although the AJC would still be consulted.

Cabinet was also asked to agree changes to Appendix B to modify the policy to avoid any arbitrary allocation of permit rights to a dwelling following any redevelopment that increased the number of dwellings. Changes were also proposed to clarify that if new development were undertaken within the curtilage of a property in a way that did not alter the existing dwelling unit, that the permit rights enjoyed by the existing dwelling would be retained.

Cabinet also supported the proposal that as the parking problems experienced in Cambridge tended to be replicated in time in other areas of the county for consistency and equity, any new policy adopted for Cambridge should also be applied cross other areas of the county.

In terms of resolution iv) the intention by officers was to bring together local members who had been through the proposed process for residents parking scheme development with the portfolio holder to take stock of the process of developing schemes and assess how well it

went. Depending on the feedback from this informal review, the portfolio holder might then consider whether there was a need to bring any issues to Cabinet for further consideration.

Questions raised by Cabinet members included:

- Whether collaborative / comparison work on charging policy had been undertaken with other similar local authorities and whether charges were linked to bus fares. e.g. Peterborough. In reply, while no direct comparisons had been made (as Cambridge's parking issues were considered somewhat unique), all the County Council's travel policies were to encourage people to travel using public transport / Park and Ride buses when visiting Cambridge (including City residents)
- With reference to paragraph 3.1 and the text relating to needing to increase funding to ensure the On-Street account did not run the risk of having to be underwritten by taxpayers, one member asked if the account was currently in surplus or deficit. In response it was indicated that currently it was in surplus by approximately £100k, but historically it had a surplus of between £0.5 to £1m and therefore as costs continued to rise and income dropped off, unless addressed through the proposals in the review, it would not be long before a deficit might be incurred.
- One Member queried on page 15 of the Draft Revised on Street Parking Policy under 'Policy 6 Disabled Parking', the reference on not being able to restrict blue badge designated parking bays to a specific badge holder. He received further clarification that in designated blue badge bays the County Council could apply enforceable time restrictions but was not able to restrict the time period for the blue badge parking exemption on yellow lines which were covered by separate, national policy.

It was resolved to approve:

- i) The changes to parking policy and guidance set out in Appendix B of the report for application Countywide;
- ii) Cabinet taking responsibility for setting on-street parking and permit charges with Cabinet to receive a follow up report with recommendations following a review;
- iii) The consultation document shown in Appendix C, as a template document for adaptation by officers through consultation with local members; and
- iv) Agreeing to an informal review of parking policy in Cambridge led by the portfolio holder for Highways and Access, following the introduction of a further residents' parking scheme.

179. DEVELOPMENT AT CAMBRIDGE NORTH WEST: NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL BOTANY (NIAB) 1 SITE - SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS

Cabinet received a report updating it on the detail of the section 106 negotiations for the proposed NIAB1 development at Cambridge North West in advance of the expected determination of the amended outline planning application and section(s) 106 Heads of Terms by the Fringes Joint Development Control Committee on 16th June 2010.

An amended version of Appendix A to the report was tabled at the meeting setting out the County Council requirements for the s106 Heads of Terms which had changed the figure

for the Secondary School requirement (which was incorrect in the original version of the report) and was now corrected to read £10,292,785.

One of the local Members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington while generally supporting the proposals reminded Cabinet of the Council's responsibilities in respect of the creation of new communities (ensuring early community facilities were provided) and in terms of strategic transport policies ensuring the impact on the environment and climate change was minimal. In particular there was a need to make new roads of an appropriate size for the local community while not being of a size that encouraged unnecessary commercial activity or use by other road users.

The report set out the changes required to the s106 Heads of Terms that were previously agreed by Cabinet in October 2009 directly resulting from the Secretary of State Public Inquiry decision on Clay Farm. As a result it was:

- No longer appropriate to seek a library revenue contribution for a library at Cambridge north west.
- That a catchment based approach to determining the library capital contribution is appropriate. However, it was not accepted that a two mile radius was the appropriate catchment area and for the reasons set out in the report, Cabinet agreed that a 1 mile distance was appropriate for this site.
- Agreed the revised triggers in Appendix A to secure a position that allowed for making the decision on whether to provide for two smaller or one larger primary school at the appropriate time.
- That the objective of 40% affordable housing on the site was still being pursued.

Cabinet was keen to support the idea of delivering community hub facilities in partnership with other partner providers.

It was resolved:

- i) to agree the s106 Heads of Terms, as set out in Appendix A to the report for the development at NIAB1; and
- ii) to delegate to the Lead Member for Growth and Infrastructure in consultation with the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services, the authority to make any minor changes to the Heads of Terms prior to finalising the s106 agreement.

180. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT (ABBREVIATED) – MARCH 2010

Cabinet received a report presenting the financial and performance information to the end of March in order to enable it to assess progress in delivering the Council's Integrated Plan and to seek approval to the investment of up to £8m Growth Funding.

Cabinet noted that Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) has been asked to invest up to £8m (corrected at the meeting to be in pounds sterling rather than euros - the currency denomination incorrectly used in the report) of growth funding on behalf of Cambridgeshire Horizons to stimulate development at Clay Farm. The main reason for CCC making this

investment, rather than Horizons, was to prevent adverse implications on Horizons' trading position. Assurances were provided that any costs and charges incurred by the County Council would be recovered as part of the overall agreement

Paragraph 2.1 of the report set out the five new or changed performance issues that had arisen since the previous report, as well as details of the current position and action being taken in respect of previously reported exceptions.

Cabinet noted the following headline resource issues:-

- Overall the budget position was showing a forecast year-end underspend of -£2m (-0.6%). The increase in the forecast underspend in the current month of -£1.5m, followed the issue of £300k from corporate reserves to fund pressures within the Older People Services (CAS) along with an increase in predicted savings that have been identified across CAS.
- In Environment Services (ES) an underspend of -£409k was being predicted, which was mainly due to savings in Environment & Regulation.
- In Community and Adult Services (CAS) an overspend of £524k had been predicted, which was mainly due to pressures within Adult Social Services. Further examination of the factors behind this overspend with the Primary Care Trust (PCT) had taken place and as a result, management actions have been taken and a call against the Pressures and Developments Reserve of £1.3m made. An oral update indicated that the PCT had now closed their accounts and that the final overspend for the whole Older Person's Pooled Budget was in the region of £5m (which was a lot less than the predicted mid-year position) and having taken into account the above adjustment and efficiency savings found during the year of over £600k on top of the £500k savings in Adult Social Care to help reduce the overspend was now likely to result in a figure in the region of £300k still to be resolved in terms of the current risk share agreement with the PCT. The relevant staff were congratulated for all their efforts to help reduce the overspend.
- In Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) an overspend of £130k was being predicted, which was mainly due to pressures within Strategy and Commissioning.
- In Corporate Directorates (CD) an underspend of -£428k is being predicted, which is due to specific actions to hold costs and reclaim rebates. Much of this additional benefit was to be applied to the Workwise and Shared Service's target savings.
- In Corporate Directorates – Financing, an underspend of -£1.8m was being predicted due to savings on Debt Charges, resulting from further improvements to Treasury Management and the net impact of increases in costs on certain capital projects and revised phasing of other capital projects.

Some of the specific points made by Members or where answers to questions were received included:

- In terms of Local Indicator 9LI) 206 Young People Aged 13-19 Participating in Youth Service Activities - the Cabinet Member for Children questioned the value of the indicator as it was currently configured and officers supported the view that it should be replaced by one which better reflected the Youth Services future activities.
- Highlighting the achievement of the milestone for Self Directed Support a year early;
- In Terms of LI 136a CCC – '% of Contact Centre Calls Answered within 20 seconds' - the percentage had reduced but the year to date figure was still within service level with the contact centre still receiving a high number of calls related to pot holes in the County. To help reduce the impact, 4 temporary staff were to be recruited on six

month contracts within existing budget (as the cost was offset by the section already carrying a number of vacancies).

- Noting that while NI 171 'New Business Registration - % of Regional average (LAA)' - showed poor performance from recently released figures, as the figures were two years old they did reflect the full picture and needed to be taken into context with respect to the current economic climate and the other measures that the County Council had taken to help alleviate local people from the worst effects of the recession.
- Again with NI192 'Household Waste Recycled and Composted' – currently showing red - this did not take into account that this was an area that the County Council performed very well in and was still one of the best in the country.
- The Cabinet Member for Customer Service and Transformation raised a question regarding NI 152a 'Working Age People on Out of Work Benefits in Fenland' – and what measures were being taken to target the area. **Action: The Acting Executive Director: Environment Services undertook to write to all Cabinet Members with details following the meeting.**
- The point was made that the overspends in both CYPS and ES budgets were very small when compared to the pressures and the overall budgets involved.

An oral update at the meeting provided details of the Coalition Government announcement on the immediate level of reductions it proposed to take to initially tackle the massive deficit in the Country's finances. While no specific details were available, the Chief Executive set out figures provided by the Local Government Association on their predictions on where the cuts would fall which were severe in terms of local government grants and local government related expenditure. The Chief Executive undertook through his management team to establish at the earliest possible opportunity the effect the wide ranging local government related cuts would have on the County Council and to bring forward for further consideration the mitigation proposals that would be necessary.

It was resolved:

- i) to note the analysis of the resources and performance information set out in the report.
- ii) To agree in principle the investment of up to £8m of growth funding, on behalf of Cambridgeshire Horizons, to stimulate development at Clay Farm. Authority to negotiate the details and complete the investment agreement being delegated to the Corporate Director: Finance, Property and Performance), Councillor Reynolds (Resources and Performance) and Alex Plant (Chief Executive: Cambridgeshire Horizons) (see section 3.1 of the report for detail).
- iii) To note the previous days announcements from the Coalition Government in relation to the £1.5 billion cuts being made immediately and to instruct Strategic Management Team to establish as soon as possible the implications for the County Council's own budgets and the mitigation measures that would be necessary and to inform Cabinet as soon practicable.

181. RESIDENTIAL SHORT TERM BREAK REVIEW

Cabinet received a report to inform it of developments in providing a short break service to children and young people with disabilities and their families.

Cabinet noted that in October and November 2009, Children and Young People's Services (CYPS), had undertaken a review of the residential short break service in order to consider whether improvements could be made to the short break services to better meet the needs of children, young people, their families and carers.

Having considered the Review findings, a model was put forward for Cabinet's consideration for an integrated short break service that was to be jointly commissioned with NHS Cambridgeshire and would aim to ensure best value as well as and quality of provision was secured. Cabinet noted that while the number of centres was to be reduced, the new model proposals would increase overall capacity and the ability to deal with emergencies.

In reply to a question raised it was confirmed that any surplus of existing buildings would be considered as part of the BUPA Programme subject to consideration of the requirements of other related service developments.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree that Children and Young People's Services and NHS Cambridgeshire should proceed with a formal competitive tendering exercise for affordable and integrated residential short break service.
- ii) That a specification for this service should be developed and to be consulted upon with children / young people, their families and carers as well as staff from all three units. (The Laurels does not currently have staff in post.)
- iii) To agree to jointly commission an integrated service that utilises the skills and knowledge of both health and social care staff in order to meet a wide spectrum of need.

182. ACCIDENT REMEDIES AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME - MEDIUM SIZED SCHEMES

Cabinet received a report setting out the results of a review of the current cost benefit weighting system applied to the assessment scores for medium sized traffic and safety schemes bids.

Cabinet was reminded that at its meeting of Cabinet on 15th December 2009, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Highways and Access had proposed a review of the current weighting system, and for officers to investigate the effects of potential alternatives following some concerns expressed that the system might no longer be fit for purpose and that some sites with high accident rates might not be receiving sufficient weighting.

Having received an analysis of several different options it was agreed to support the current process but with the addition to also highlight sites with notable accident scores as this would allow members to see clearly which schemes had merit in accident terms and where they could demonstrate added value in terms of traffic management or community benefit, or where there were external third party funding sources, these schemes would be cited for special consideration.

Responding to a question on whether the wider cost implications of accidents were currently considered, it was confirmed this was the case being as they were taken into account in the benefit element of the cost benefit analysis (note: using the Department of Transport standard values for accident costs. These take into account emotional loss, loss of earnings, loss of production, medical, and emergency services and all manner of other costs to society). Cabinet confirmed that officers should continue to consider the wider cost of accidents to other partner services such as Police, Fire and Rescue and the NHS.

It was agreed that any scheme with an accident score of 7 or more should be brought to Cabinet under this category to ensure that any site that had had 2 or more fatal accidents in a 3 year period was considered. This would provide a process which took into account a range of issues that were important to the Council and would enable Cabinet to demonstrate value for money. Adding the option for Cabinet to consider those schemes with an unweighted accident score at or above 7 would ensure that problems that might have a high public interest would also be duly considered.

It was resolved:

To agree the following as the weighting system to be applied to the assessment scores for medium sized traffic and safety schemes bids:

Maintaining the current cost benefit based process but with the addition that schemes with an unweighted accident score of 7 or above are also brought to Cabinet for consideration as part of the process.

183. PROPOSED RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON PROPOSALS TO SET UP AN URBAN TRANSPORT CHALLENGE FUND

Cabinet received a report in order to consider the proposed response to the Department for Transport's (DfT) request for comments on proposals to establish an Urban Challenge Fund.

Cabinet noted that in October 2009 the County Council agreed to submit a Package and Funding Proposition (the Proposition) to Government setting out a three stage process for continued work on Cambridgeshire's Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) proposals. This work had been expected to culminate in December 2010 with the submission of a full Business Case for the TIF package. However on Tuesday 2 March 2010, the DfT announced the end of the Congestion TIF programme, and its replacement with an 'Urban Challenge Fund' (UCF), with Cambridgeshire and Reading (the other contender for TIF funding) receiving letters relating to their TIF bids. Stemming from this, the Department for Transport had requested consultation comments on the proposals for UCF by 6 June 2010. At this stage the details of how the UCF could work lacked detail and therefore the consultation response drafted had as a consequence to also be general in nature.

While with the recent change of Government future funding issues were currently unknown, a joint response was seen as being a preferable response in terms of being favourably considered in terms of the views expressed rather than individual councils making their own response.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve the response set out in Appendix A of the report for submission to the Department for Transport following their request for comments on proposals to establish an Urban Challenge Fund.
- ii) Delegate to the Lead Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services, the authority to agree any minor textual changes to the joint responses to the consultation following consideration by Cabinet.

184. PUBLIC PATH ORDER APPLICATIONS TO DIVERT OR EXTINGUISH PUBLIC FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS

Cabinet received a report setting out criteria the Council officers would wish to apply in considering the extinguishment and diversion of public paths under sections 118 and 119 of the Highways Act 1980 respectively, in order to ensure equitable consideration of proposed path diversions.

Cabinet noted that as Highway Authority the County Council has the power under sections ss118-119 to respectively extinguish or divert public footpaths, bridleways or restricted byways, which landowners and others may apply for. The Policy was first introduced as Appendix B of the 'Policy Guidelines on the upkeep of the Definitive Map and Statement for Cambridgeshire, and the management of the path network to which these documents refer' approved by Cabinet on 4th March 2003. It was last amended in September 2004 and the criteria now required to be updated to reflect changes in legislation, policies and experience. The agreed revised criteria would also help evaluate the relative merits of each application in terms of sustainability, user satisfaction, and benefits to the public e.g. health that the path(s) in question and the proposed changes afford.

The proposals were to:

- amend the criterion such that, whilst still consulted, a parish council would not in future, and where no grounds were provided for the objection, be able to unreasonably veto an application any more than any other consultee
- amend the requirement that the width of a diverted path must be 2metres (m). In certain situations, notably cross-field paths, it is not always reasonable to require a 2m width. This has led to some eventual diversions not being the optimum solution, or even failing.

A Member did request that where they were being consulted on changes, that they received an executive summary as well as the substantial proposals document to help with their understanding.

There was also a request to the Acting Executive Director to ensure significant implications had been fully considered.

It was resolved to approve:

The County Council's standard criteria for public path extinguishment orders to reflect the aims and objectives of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan as identified in Appendix 1, which includes:

- the removal of specific references to Parish Council objections.
- allowing the County Council to agree variable widths for the new routes of diverted paths in exceptional cases as appears to it to be reasonable.

185. GUIDED BUSWAY UPDATE

Cabinet received a report setting out the progress being made on the outstanding key areas of work required to be rectified before the County Council could agree to the opening of the Cambridge to St Ives section of the busway. It was indicated that although some progress had been made with dealing with the issues identified and accepted by all parties, progress was slow and several deadlines had been missed which continued to be a source of frustration as Bam Nuttall had set out and established the proposed timetable. Current progress including oral updates at the meeting was reported including the following:

River Great Ouse

BNL had submitted a design for the expansion joint by 30th April in accordance with their timetable. The County Council's designers had made a number of comments on the design which were responded to by Bam Nuttall on Wednesday 12th May. As the County Council officers were still not satisfied that all issues had been addressed, the comments were being reviewed and Bam Nuttall had been asked to organise a meeting with their bridge designers in the following week, with a view to resolving the outstanding issues. Subject to resolution of the comments, Bam Nuttall (BNL) would then proceed to order and place the joint.

St Ives Park and Ride

BNL had committed to complete the design work on the car park by 19th May and had confirmed that when the design work was complete, they would implement the solution to address the ponding on the site as soon as possible. Given the likely nature of the solution, this work will take a number of weeks to complete. BNL's designers submitted proposals for resurfacing the car park on Monday 10th May which included extensive replacement of almost all of the existing drainage system, which in the view of both the County Council and Atkins was unnecessary. A simpler, less expensive and quicker to implement solution has been suggested should be possible within the constraints,. At the time of the meeting it was reported that a useful meeting had been held with BNL the previous week and a report was due back with revised proposals by the end of the week.

Maintenance Track

Initial design work to identify the volume of material needed to raise the maintenance track to the level indicated at the public inquiry and to determine the volume of flood storage

available was completed for 23rd April and discussed at a meeting on 27th April. The available flood storage was around half the volume required, however it was not evenly distributed between the different areas or flood cells, as they are known. The Environment Agency would need to agree to a transfer of storage between cells.

Bam Nuttall had calculated the approximate height of track that could be provided with the available flood storage with both a 4m wide maintenance track and a reduced width of 3m and were assessing how frequently, based on the historical record, a track at different heights would be flooded in order to understand the optimal solution. BNL's designers had held a meeting with the Environment Agency (EA) on 18th May at which the EA had indicated that they were willing to consider raising the maintenance track on a section by section basis. It had been agreed with the EA that BNL's designers would identify options for discussion on site with the EA. The programme for these actions had been promised for Friday 21st May but was still awaited.

Foundations

The respective designers had met on site on 30th April and agreed the positions of boreholes and methodology for testing. Bam Nuttall submitted details on 6th May and the designers met again on 7th May. Bam Nuttall had indicated that the borehole sub-contractor would start work on Monday 24th May which was several weeks later than indicated by BNL in their initial programme. It was confirmed at the meeting that works had commenced the previous day and the boreholes were programmed to take one week and the testing of the resulting samples a further three weeks.

On the basis of this programme the results of the soil investigation and testing should be available in the week commencing 21st June. The implications of the soil test results would then need to be assessed by the respective experts, before conclusions could be drawn about the foundations. It was therefore likely to be into July before there was clarity on the foundations issue.

The boreholes would assess the possible impact of trees near the track on the foundations. Some of these trees were currently small and close to the 5 metre limit beyond which they were unlikely to have an influence but there was a need to plan ahead for future growth. It was possible that a tree management programme might be required following the soil test results.

Beam expansion gaps

BNL has completed calculations which confirmed that a number of gaps were not sufficiently wide to allow for the full effect of thermal expansion of the guideway beams. Discussions had been taking place on how the Guideway structure would react to the stresses created. While those gaps which were too narrow were not likely to cause the beams to move so as to affect ride quality, there were potentially costly maintenance issues should the concrete crack and the metal brackets and bolts holding the rail, become damaged. It was considered that the most likely consequence would be horizontal movement of the foundations, which would not be a significant maintenance issue, but BNL needed to prove this through calculations. BNL's designers had provided further calculations on 21st May but BNL were at the current time declining to provide the analysis of the worst case scenario which they had previously indicated they would provide.

Rubber Tyres

The Fire Safety Report had now been accepted. The Designers Risk Assessment had been revised and re-submitted. The outstanding issue had been the risk of damage to the communication cables, which runs in ducts between the tracks and the need for BNL to quantify the risk of a fire in this area. The risk assessment had been received the previous week but there was still a need for the County Council's experts to confirm whether it covered everything required.

From the above, while Cabinet could see that some progress had been made, there were still a number of iterations necessary as part of the design process before a design could be formally accepted. Greater certainty of the programme for implementation of the solutions or otherwise resolving the outstanding issues could not be achieved until the design processes are concluded. Given the above, it was considered premature to commit to an opening date for the northern section of the route and based on the progress to date not be until July at the very earliest before any commitment to a future opening date might be possible. A specific question was asked on whether there was currently evidence that the contractor was preparing to undertake any of the physical works required (on the viaduct, on the St Ives park and Ride site and raising the maintenance track) with the Head of Busway Delivery in response stating that at the time of the current meeting there was no evidence that the contractor was preparing to carry out the works.

In terms of the wording of the Climate Change (paragraph 4.3) in the third sub paragraph it was agreed the wording should more accurately read "The busway **should** have a high quality track alongside As opposed to currently reading "The Busway has a high quality track..... "etc.

Cabinet wished to place on record their particular concerns / dissatisfaction with progress on some of the outstanding issues involving missed deadlines / continuing disputes with specifications which had been agreed as part of the original contract.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the slow progress that was being made towards sectional completion and the opening of the busway between Cambridge and St Ives and in particular, the current timescale from the contractor for addressing the notified defects.
- ii) To record Cabinet's ongoing dissatisfaction with the contractor's performance.

186. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / OFFICERS UPDATE

Cabinet received and noted the current progress, including where the actions delegated had now been completed, on specific delegations given to individual Cabinet Members and / or to officers at earlier Cabinet meetings.

An oral update at the meeting in respect of item 8 'Building Schools for the Future – Contract Award' confirmed the contract had been signed since the report had been written

and Cabinet took the opportunity to congratulate Alan Kippax and his team for all the hard work and dedication to duty that they had shown in seeing the project through to completion.

It was resolved:

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

187. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA FOR 15TH JUNE 2010

Cabinet noted the draft Cabinet agenda with the following changes since the publication on the current agenda:

Additions

Key decisions

Longstanton Park and Ride Demonstrator Building

'Northstowe Eco Town Demonstrator Projects & Study Work

(Note confirmed after the meeting that the two above will be drafted as one report).

Other decision reports

Shared Services report for June Cabinet meeting will not be the Council recommendation report but will be an update. Main report will now be considered at July Cabinet

moved to July Cabinet:

Item 10 Great Ouse Catchment Flood Management Plan as a result of Environment Agency extending their deadline.

Other Changes

Item 14 'Constitutional Changes to the Local Access Forum' proposed change of name to : 'Highways Operational Issues : Local Access Forum and Development Control Agreement Charges'

Chairman
15TH June 2010