

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2014

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. to 12.35 p.m.

**Present:** Chairman: Councillor M Curtis

Councillors D Brown, D Harty, L W McGuire, T Orgee and M Shuter

**Apologies:** Councillors I Bates, S Count and F Yeulett

**Also present:** Councillors K Bourke, P Brown, P Downes, J Hipkin, N Kavanagh, M Leeke, M Mason, L Nethsingha, J Reynolds, P Sales, J Scutt, M Smith and A Taylor

### **148. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **149. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Shuter declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in line with paragraph 10.1 of the Members' Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 162, Wing Development: Response to Outline Planning Application – Draft Consultation Response and Section 106 Update, as a Governor of Bottisham Village College.

### **150. PETITIONS**

Cabinet received one petition.

#### **Calling for Improvements to Footpaths in Eynesbury**

The petition had been submitted by Mr C Ray. It had 175 signatures on paper and read:

This is a petition from the people who use the paths from the bridge in Brook Street [Eynesbury] to the Eynesbury School as these are unusable in the bad weather and very uneven. Also the road from Mary's Street to the grass area at the side of the marina, as the Council use this road to bring their mower down. This gravel road belongs to the Priory House up to the gate at the side of the bowls club.

It was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, would send a written response within ten working days of the meeting.

## 151. MATTERS ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

### Called-In Decision: Provision of Housing Primarily for Rent on the County Council's Portfolio

The meeting of Cabinet held on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2014 had considered a report on the provision of housing primarily for rent on the County Council's portfolio. In summary, Cabinet had resolved to declare as surplus two parcels of land, one at Newmarket Road, Burwell and one at Worts Causeway, Cambridge. Cabinet had agreed that planning applications for housing should be taken forward for both sites, with full business cases to be brought for member approval in due course.

Cabinet's decision had subsequently been called in by three members/substitutes of the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Committee had considered the call-in at its meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2014 and had agreed to refer the decision back to Cabinet for reconsideration.

Councillor Leeke, who had been Vice-Chairman at the Committee meeting, presented the Committee's report on the call-in. He emphasised that the call-in did not relate to the principle of providing housing for rent on County Council land or to the site at Burwell. Members' concerns related only to the site at Worts Causeway. Members had been concerned that the decisions relating to this site had been premature, given that its Green Belt designation remained in place. Members had suggested that it would be more appropriate to wait until Cambridge City Council's Local Plan process was complete and the status of the land determined.

Responding to the call-in, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, noted that Cambridge City Council's Local Plan process was well advanced and that the Council was acting responsibly and as any other potential developer would by starting to prepare for possible development on this site.

It was resolved:

- 1) To thank the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee for its recommendations
- 2) To agree to confirm Cabinet's original decision.

### Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure (EGCI) Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Disability Access Member-Led Review

The Chairman of the review group, Councillor Bourke, presented findings and recommendations from the EGCI Overview and Scrutiny Committee's member-led review of disability access. He clarified that the second recommendation, to prepare a more detailed action plan for improving disability access through the Council's provision of public services, should focus specifically on services delivered by Economy, Transport and Environment. Councillor Bourke also commented on the Cabinet's proposed response to the recommendations, noting that it was not intended to commit the Council to expenditure or to increase the burden on staff, but rather to bring forward proposals for realistically deliverable actions.

Comments on the review sent by the Chairman of the EGCI Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Wilson, to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, were noted.

Cabinet members commended the work carried out by the review group but felt that an individual action plan relating to disability access was not appropriate. It was suggested that a flexible approach was preferable, ensuring that disability access was addressed as an integral part of the Council's work.

It was resolved:

To agree the responses to the recommendations as set out in section 2 of the report.

## **152. STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) set out the County Council's policy on how it would involve local communities in its land use planning work. The current SCI was limited in its coverage and out of date. Cabinet had therefore agreed on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2012 that a full review of the SCI should be undertaken. This work had included public consultation on a new SCI, as a result of which a number of amendments to the new SCI were now proposed.

It was resolved:

To recommend that Council adopts the Statement of Community Involvement as proposed to be amended.

## **153. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31<sup>st</sup> JANUARY 2014**

Cabinet received the Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the period ending 31<sup>st</sup> January 2014. Members noted that a year-end overspend of £0.8 million was forecast. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, emphasised that this needed to be viewed in the context of the Council's overall budget and the scale of savings being made. The greatest pressures related to known issues in adults' services, which were being addressed robustly.

It was resolved:

- 1) To analyse resources and performance information and note the remedial action currently being taken
- 2) To approve the use of prudential borrowing to bridge the funding gap where Section 106 triggers have not yet been met within Children, Families and Adults (CFA) (section 6.5 of the report)
- 3) To approve the realignment of CFA's Section 106 funding to reflect the scheme's new phasing, which has been delayed from 2013/14 to 2014/15 (section 6.5 of the report).

## **154. HIGHWAY ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

Cabinet considered the County Council's Highway Asset Management Strategy, which set out how the Council would manage its highway network, taking into account customer needs, local priorities, asset condition and best use of available resources. Members noted that in adopting this Strategy, the Council would be moving from a reactive to a preventative approach to highway maintenance. Moving to the new approach would not be without its challenges but would be more cost-effective and sustainable in the longer term.

Members welcomed the proposed Strategy and in particular the recognition that the use of roads could change over time as a result of agricultural or industrial changes or major planning applications. This Strategy would help to ensure that roads were maintained to a standard appropriate to their actual use.

It was resolved:

To approve the Highway Asset Management Strategy, attached as Appendix A to the report, and Policy, attached as Appendix B to the report.

## **155. PARKING CHARGES REVIEW**

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, presented proposed revisions to on-street parking charges in Cambridge City and Huntingdonshire, the two Cambridgeshire Districts in which such charges were levied. The changes included amendments to Monday to Saturday charges in Cambridge City; the introduction of a Sunday charge in Cambridge City; and the introduction of a 20p per 15 minutes charge in Huntingdonshire. The Cabinet Member explained that parking charges were levied to help meet the Council's objectives of promoting the local economy and keeping traffic moving.

Three non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor P Brown spoke as one of the local members for Huntingdon. He drew attention to the considerable changes taking place within the town including new retail, work on the link road and a new multi-storey car park. He asked for the next two years, whilst this development was underway, to be used for a more fundamental review of parking in Huntingdon, to ensure that it operated as efficiently as possible.
- Councillor Scutt spoke as the local member for West Chesterton. She expressed concern that new and higher charges for on-street parking in the centre of Cambridge would mean that more parking was displaced to residential areas. She also expressed concern that increased charges would make it harder for business owners and customers to park close to local businesses. She noted the planned introduction of parking charges at the Cambridge Park and Ride sites and called for a holistic approach to parking across the City, with issues being addressed jointly by the County and City Councils.

- Councillor Nethsingha spoke on the introduction of a Sunday charge in Cambridge. She noted that although it was proposed to start charging from 9.00 a.m., many of the shops did not open until 11.00 a.m. She suggested that starting to charge from 11.00 a.m. would allow people to come into the City early to attend church and to leave again before the charge applied. She also noted that public transport into the City was less frequent on a Sunday than on other days of the week and suggested that in order not to discourage people from coming into the City, the Sunday charge should be £1 per hour, not £2 per hour.

Cabinet members made the following comments:

- Noted that charges in Huntingdonshire had not been reviewed since 1998 and asked for all parking charges to be reviewed on a more regular basis.
- Accepted that public transport into the City was currently less frequent on Sundays, but noted that if demand increased, services were likely to improve.
- Emphasised the need for improved enforcement of parking charges.

Responding to the speakers, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure agreed that the County Council should work with the District and City Councils on parking issues and that charges should be reviewed more regularly. However, he did not agree with the comments on Sunday parking, noting that church attendance times varied.

For the purpose of moving to statutory consultation, it was resolved to approve:

- 1) The proposals for changes to Monday to Saturday on-street parking in Cambridge City as set out in Appendix C to the report
- 2) The introduction of Sunday charging in Cambridge City for a limited number of areas of on-street parking as set out in Appendix D to the report
- 3) The introduction of a 20p per 15 minutes charge in Huntingdonshire with no changes to current maximum length of stay and operational hours.

## **156. TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR CAMBRIDGE CITY AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

Cabinet considered the proposed Transport Strategy for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, noting that this was a long-term action plan aiming to manage and improve the local transport network and to promote the prosperity of the local area. The preparation of the Transport Strategy and of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council's Local Plans had been closely aligned. This was essential given that the Local Plans envisaged the creation of 35,000 homes and 44,000 jobs in the area by 2031. Members noted that there had been extensive consultation on the Transport Strategy and over 1,000 responses received.

Three non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor Kavanagh welcomed the holistic approach to the preparation of the Strategy and asked officers to ensure that this approach was maintained as it was delivered. He suggested that it would be useful to publish a timetable for reviews of the Strategy, making it possible to assess how successfully it was being implemented. He also suggested that a joint County and City Council cycling strategy would facilitate bids for funding as this became available.
- Councillor Hipkin called for restricted parking to be applied across the whole of Cambridge City, lessening the impact of projected higher traffic flows. He suggested that this would encourage cycling and the use of public transport; that it would prevent commuter parking in residential areas; and that it would remove disputes between neighbouring parts of the City over the impact of localised residents' parking schemes. He also suggested that the Strategy should take into account the impact on the County of improving access from Cambridgeshire rail stations into London.
- Councillor Mason drew attention to the Cambridgeshire Transport Plan 2001-2006, which, like the Transport Strategy now being considered, had proposed new rail stations at Chesterton and at Addenbrooke's. He expressed concern that the Council's focus on rail had reduced since the dedicated officer had been made redundant and urged for plans and strategies to be regularly reviewed and reprioritised to ensure that proposals were realistically deliverable.

Cabinet members made the following comments:

- Welcomed the Strategy and urged the Council to use it to engage innovatively with businesses and with schools, particularly since journeys to school contributed so significantly to peak traffic flows.
- Called for greater focus on existing rail corridors, not only for journeys to London but also for journeys from South Cambridgeshire into Cambridge.
- Noted proposals to remove the level crossing from the A10 at Foxton, which would improve the attractiveness of the A10 to motorists. Concern was expressed at the impact that increased traffic along the A10 would have on residents of Harston and Hauxton. Similar concern was expressed about the impact of traffic travelling from Haverhill to Cambridge on residents of Linton.

Responding to the speakers, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, noted that work on the Cambridge Science Park Station was now well advanced and that discussions about a station at Addenbrooke's were also gaining momentum. He explained that the inclusion of aspirational projects in Council plans and strategies strengthened the Council's ability to bid for funding for such projects as this became available; it also supported the Council's current work on the City Deal. The Cabinet Member did not support Councillor Hipkin's suggestion of City-wide restricted parking.

It was resolved:

- 1) To note the progress with developing the Transport Strategy and consultation results
- 2) To approve the adoption of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire as part of the Third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.

#### **157. REVISED DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT TOP-UP POLICY**

Cabinet was asked to consider a revised Disabled Facilities Grant Top-Up Policy. Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) were offered by District and City Councils for work required to enable disabled adults and children to remain living in their own homes. The County Council considered requests for top-ups when the DFG given by the District or City Council did not cover the full cost of the work. The County Council had had a Top-Up Policy in place since 2006 but it was complex and difficult to understand. In addition, in many cases the Council was awarding grants that added value to the applicant's property, with no contribution from the homeowner. A revised DFG Top-Up Policy was therefore proposed.

An earlier version of the revised Policy had been considered by the Adults, Wellbeing and Health (AWH) Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2014 and the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2014. Both Committees had expressed a number of concerns about the proposals, as set out in their report to Cabinet. These had been taken into account in the version of the Policy now presented to Cabinet, as detailed in Appendix B to the main report. The Chairman of the AWH Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Bourke, presented the report from the two Overview and Scrutiny Committees and welcomed the subsequent amendments to the Policy as a good example of effective cross-party working.

It was resolved:

- 1) To note the report from the Adults, Wellbeing and Health and Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committees
- 2) To approve the implementation of the revised Disabled Facilities Grant Top-Up Policy with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014.

#### **158. FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL CAREERS CONTRACT 2014-17**

The meeting of Cabinet held on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2013 had agreed that the County Council's Adult Learning and Skills team should bid for the Skills Funding Agency contract to manage the whole of the National Careers Service for the Central Eastern area. The contract was due to start in October 2014 with a potential annual value of up to £7 million.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, reported that the outcome of the bid was not yet known. However, the timing of any contract offer and

the date required for acceptance of the contract were not expected to fit with the Cabinet timetable.

It was therefore resolved:

- 1) To accept the National Careers Contract for the Eastern Region if offered
- 2) To delegate the power to negotiate the final terms of the contract to the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning.

#### **159. BETTER CARE FUND 'FIRST CUT' SUBMISSION: UPDATE FOR CABINET**

The Cabinet meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2013 had given delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Adult Services and the Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults to further develop the detail of plans for the use of the Better Care Fund, in discussion with the Clinical Commissioning Group and other stakeholders, and to develop proposals for approval through the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Cabinet now received a report on progress, which included as an appendix the 'first cut' plan that had been submitted to Government by the deadline of 14<sup>th</sup> February 2014. The report also contained details of the engagement activity undertaken as part of the development of the plan. Members noted that the final plan would be approved by the Health and Wellbeing Board and submitted by the deadline of 4<sup>th</sup> April 2014.

Cabinet commended officers for their good work on this project to a demanding timescale.

It was resolved:

To note progress on the development and submission of a 'first cut' plan for the Better Care Fund for Cambridgeshire.

#### **160. SMOKE FREE ENVIRONMENT POLICY**

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Orgee, introduced a proposed Smoke Free Environment Policy for the Council. He explained that the Council already had a no smoking policy for its offices and operational properties. The Smoke Free Environment Policy would extend this to cover all County Council sites. The Cabinet Member reminded members that the County Council was now responsible for public health functions and he suggested that it was therefore appropriate for the County Council to take a lead on this issue.

It was resolved:

To refer the policy to full Council for cross-party debate and decision, subject to any minor textual alterations agreed by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing.



## **161. BETTER BUS AREA FUND: HISTON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE PARKING CONTROLS**

Cabinet considered a report on proposed parking controls on Histon Road, Cambridge. Unpredictable delays on Histon Road had been identified as an issue as part of the Council's successful bid for funding to the Department for Transport's Better Bus Area Fund, which aimed to increase bus patronage in busy urban areas. The proposed parking controls would increase the width of the road available to buses, improving journey times, and would also improve conditions for cyclists.

However, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, reported that there was considerable local opposition to the scheme. He therefore asked members not to approve the scheme at this meeting, as proposed in the report, but rather to refer it back to the project team for further consideration.

Two non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor Sales, the local member for Arbury, reported that local residents had a number of concerns about the proposals. They were concerned that the consultation process had been flawed, because a single consultation had covered both the parking controls on Histon Road and proposed improvements to the Histon Road/Gilbert Road junction. Many people supported the latter but not the former but it had been difficult to make this distinction in a consultation response, obscuring the results. In addition, the proposal to remove Pay and Display and daytime residents' parking was causing considerable distress to local businesses, who feared loss of trade, and local residents, especially the elderly and families with young children, who would have to walk further to their cars. Councillor Sales suggested that unpredictable delays on Histon Road were caused by varying traffic volumes, not on-street parking; he welcomed further review of the proposals.
- Councillor Hipkin, the local member for Castle, urged caution in the justification to be used for any scheme brought in. He suggested that whilst the proposed scheme would improve conditions for cyclists, the removal of on-street parking would not necessarily facilitate bus movements along Histon Road, since these were most influenced by the operation of the road's terminal junctions. In addition, the parking bays proposed for removal were not all on the side of the road used by incoming buses. Councillor Hipkin also welcomed further review of the proposals.

Cabinet members discussed the following points:

- Shared the speakers' concerns that the proposals would not necessarily improve bus journey times, although it was accepted that they would improve conditions for cyclists.
- Suggested that a more strategic review of all radial routes into the City through the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy might be more appropriate.
- Noted that one option might be to introduce an experimental Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), which could implement the arrangements for up to 18 months, enabling first-hand experience of the effects of the changes. This period would

include further consultation and at the end of the experimental TRO, the changes could either be made permanent or reversed to restore current conditions.

It was resolved:

To refer the proposal back to the project team and ask them to consider the possible benefits of an experimental scheme, the matter to be brought back to members in due course.

#### **162. WING DEVELOPMENT: RESPONSE TO OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION – DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE AND SECTION 106 UPDATE**

Cabinet considered the County Council's response to the outline planning application for Wing, a development of 1,300 homes and associated infrastructure to the north of Newmarket Road in Cambridge. Members also considered the County Council's proposed infrastructure requirements for the development, which would be secured through the Section 106 negotiations.

Cabinet members made the following comments:

- Noted officers' concerns regarding the proposed sustainability and BREEAM requirements and agreed that these should be resolved before the application was determined.
- Suggested that there should be good access from the Wing development to the Newmarket Road Park and Ride site, to make it easy for residents to use the bus services to travel into the city centre.
- Noted that adequate provision for secondary education would be essential, especially since the nearby Bottisham Village College was already oversubscribed.

It was resolved:

- 1) To approve the County Council's draft consultation response to South Cambridgeshire District Council to the Wing outline planning application
- 2) To endorse the County Council's proposed infrastructure requirements to be secured through the Section 106 negotiations
- 3) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment the authority to make minor revisions to the planning application response
- 4) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment the authority to make changes to the County Council Section 106 requirements prior to the signing of the document.

## **163. NORTHSTOWE PHASE 1 SECTION 106 FUNDING PROVISION**

Cabinet was reminded that the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee (NJDCC) had approved the planning application for Phase 1 of Northstowe on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2013, subject to the successful negotiation of a Section 106 agreement to secure required infrastructure and community facilities, and the transfer of land for a secondary school. To ensure the viability of Phase 1, the NJDCC had also agreed to limit the developer's contribution to community infrastructure to £30 million. The estimated cost of community infrastructure was £33.36 million, leaving an unfunded gap of £3.36 million. The County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council would work hard to achieve any possible savings in the delivery of this infrastructure. However, the two Councils also needed to agree how to meet the cost of any shortfall.

Members were now advised that the proposal was to split the cost in proportion to the element of community infrastructure to be provided, 78% by the County Council and 22% by the District Council. This would be funded through a shared notional 'pot', with savings in one area benefiting both Councils. Members received confirmation that South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet had already agreed to the proposed approach.

One non-Cabinet member spoke on this item:

- Councillor Mason expressed concern that Cambridgeshire tax payers were having to help meet the costs of infrastructure at Northstowe. He noted that the Homes and Communities Agency were joint developers of Northstowe, together with Gallaghers, and suggested that they should be asked to contribute to infrastructure costs. He also expressed concern that contributions from the Northstowe developers to the costs of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway should not be missed.

Responding to the speaker, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, confirmed that contributions from Northstowe to the Guided Busway would be met and were proportionate. The Head of Growth and Economy noted that the contribution in Phase 1 would be £2.38 million.

It was resolved:

- 1) To approve the principles for the joint management of the delivery of Section 106 infrastructure with South Cambridgeshire District Council
- 2) To agree that any funding shortfall will be split between the District and County Councils in proportion to the total value of the community infrastructure provided (Option 2 in paragraph 2.6 of the report).

## **164. PROPOSED ELY NORTH DEVELOPMENTS AND SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS**

Cabinet considered the County Council's response to two outline planning applications for Ely North, one from the Church Commissioners for Highflyer Farm and one from Endurance Estates for land west of Lynn Road. The two sites were being jointly masterplanned and together would bring forward up to 3,000 houses and associated infrastructure.

Members also considered the County Council's proposed infrastructure requirements for the developments, which would be secured through the Section 106 negotiations. Members noted that initial viability discussions had indicated that the Church Commissioners development was unviable with the full range of Section 106 requirements. Negotiations were continuing and the prioritisation of developer contributions was likely to be necessary. The viability assessment for the Endurance Estates development had not yet been received.

Cabinet members made the following comments:

- Noted that the development would include two new primary schools, funded through Section 106 contributions, but that a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution would be required to provide new secondary school places that could not be met through existing provision. The new secondary school at Littleport was expected to provide sufficient places, but there would be some cost to the County Council.

It was resolved:

- 1) To endorse the County Council's response to East Cambridgeshire District Council on the Church Commissioners and Endurance Estates planning applications
- 2) To endorse the County Council's proposed infrastructure requirements to be secured through the Section 106 negotiations
- 3) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment the authority to make minor revisions to the planning application response and/or Section 106 Heads of Terms.

## **165. CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN**

Members were advised that Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council were starting to prepare a Cambridge North Eastern Fringe Area Action Plan. The approval of the planning application for the Cambridge Science Park Station was likely to be a catalyst for development in this area and the two Councils were keen to ensure an integrated approach. It was proposed that the County Council should contribute to the preparation of the Action Plan as a key stakeholder, given its responsibilities for mineral and waste developments and for transport strategy.

It was resolved:

To support the preparation of the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan and the Council's contribution to this process as a key stakeholder.

## **166. TREASURY MANAGEMENT QUARTER 3 REPORT**

Cabinet received the third quarterly update on the Treasury Management Strategy 2013/14, which had been approved by Council in February 2013.

Members asked for future reports to include an update on discussions with the Local Government Association and others about a possible municipal bonds agency.

It was resolved:

To note the Treasury Management Report for Quarter Three 2013-14.

#### **167. LEARNING DISABILITY JOINT COMMISSIONING STRATEGY**

Cabinet considered the proposed Learning Disability Joint Commissioning Strategy. The Strategy had been prepared in partnership with all major stakeholders, including the Clinical Commissioning Group, and in consultation with service users and carers. It sought to analyse current provision in Cambridgeshire and to define the way forward in order to provide the best possible services for people with learning disabilities and their families. Members noted that the Strategy also addressed the implications for the Council of the Winterbourne View concordat.

It was resolved:

To approve the Learning Disability Joint Commissioning Strategy.

#### **168. EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT REGULATIONS FOR SUPPORT FOR SINGLE HOMELESS PEOPLE IN WISBECH**

Cabinet considered a request for an exemption from Contract Regulations relating to the Ferry Project in Wisbech, which provided support for single homeless people. Members noted that the Ferry Project provided both an assessment centre and move-on accommodation, with the aim of supporting clients to become independent in the longer term. The Council's current contract with the Ferry Project was due to end on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 and a two-year extension was sought. Retendering was not recommended at this stage because of the complexity of cross-subsidy of other services and because of changes to benefit rules, which could threaten the viability of the service since residents might not be able to claim the same benefits under another provider.

Members noted that the two-year extension would be used to consider with LGSS Procurement colleagues how best to continue to procure this service in future.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, noted that he had visited the Ferry Project recently; he commended its work and also its positive connections with Luminus and Anglian Water.

It was resolved:

To approve exemption from Contract Regulations for a contract providing supported accommodation for single people in Wisbech for a period of two years.

## **169. CORPORATE PEER REVIEW**

The County Council had invited the Local Government Association to conduct a Peer Review Challenge in October 2013. Cabinet received the Peer Review Team's full report and the action plan prepared by the Council to respond to the report's recommendations.

It was resolved:

- 1) To receive the report compiled by the Local Government Association Peer Review Team
- 2) To note its content
- 3) To approve the action plan.

## **170. CAMBRIDGE PARK AND RIDE SYSTEM – CHANGES TO THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE (OFF STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2012**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, agreed to exercise his discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow this report to be considered, even though it had not been dispatched to members five working days before the meeting, for the following reasons:

**Reason for lateness:** The consultation on the Park and Ride Traffic Regulation Order amendments closed on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2014. As a significant number of objections were received, it was considered inappropriate to determine these through the delegated process, and it was therefore decided in consultation with the portfolio holder to bring the issue to Cabinet.

**Reason for urgency:** The matter needs to be determined in order to implement the parking charges at the Park and Ride site in accordance with the Business Plan.

Cabinet had agreed at its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2013 to introduce parking charges at the five Cambridge Park and Ride sites. Work was proceeding to implement the charges with effect from May 2014. As part of this, it was necessary to amend the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) governing the site to set the level and periods of operation of the charges.

Members were advised that the proposed changes to the TRO had been advertised from 24<sup>th</sup> January 2014 to 14<sup>th</sup> February 2014. 191 objections had been received and these were summarised in the report, together with the officer responses. Members noted that in response to the objections, it was proposed to extend the period covered by the £1 charge from 12 hours to 18 hours, assisting shift workers and people who wished to remain in Cambridge at the end of the working day. In addition, parking controls were proposed on the roads next to the two sites where these did not already exist, Milton and Babraham Road.

Two non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor Taylor expressed concern that the introduction of charges at Park and Ride sites was contrary to the Council's stated objective of promoting sustainable travel. She expressed concern at the possibility of displacement parking to residential areas near Park and Ride sites, particularly from the Babraham Road site to Queen Edith's, which was already affected by people parking for Addenbrooke's. She suggested that setting the four-week season ticket charge at £20 offered little benefit to a daily commuter, given that this was the same as the daily charge over four five-day weeks. She also noted that she had received no response to her suggestion that employers should be able to buy corporate season tickets for their employees' use.
- Councillor Leeke spoke as the local member for Milton and drew attention to local residents' concerns about displacement of parking from the Milton Park and Ride site, especially to Butt Lane which was one of the access roads for Milton Primary School. He welcomed the proposal to keep the situation under close review, with the possibility of ameliorative action at a later date. He suggested this could be a controlled parking zone with residents' charges waived. He noted that displaced parking would not necessarily be close to the Park and Ride sites, but might for example be close to an alternative normal bus route into Cambridge.

Cabinet members welcomed the amendments made to respond to the objections received, especially the increase in the period covered by the charge from 12 to 18 hours. They emphasised that a workable solution was being sought and suggested that Park and Ride would remain an attractive option.

It was resolved:

- 1) To note the objections and representations
- 2) To consider the amendments suggested as a result of the representations made
- 3) To approve the proposed amended scheme as attached as Appendix 2 to the report.

## **171. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA PLAN**

Members noted the draft agenda for the meeting to be held on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2014 and the following updates reported orally at the meeting:

- Items added – Property Disposals: Fitzwilliam Road Hostel, Cambridge and LTBC Extra Care, Whittlesey; Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) New Agreement and Exit Arrangements for One Member; Revised Governance for Connecting Cambridgeshire
- Item deleted – Clay Farm Community Centre
- Item amended – Littleport Secondary and Special School Sponsorship Approval Recommendation.

## 173. CHILDREN'S CENTRE RECONFIGURATION

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, noted that this item had been shown on the agenda front page as a confidential report. However, he had asked officers to make as much of the report as possible public. Only Appendix 2 remained confidential, because of the timing of staff briefings on the detailed proposals. Cabinet therefore agreed to take this item in open session, not referring to the detail in Appendix 2.

The Leader of the Council agreed to exercise his discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow this report to be considered, even though it had not been dispatched to members five working days before the meeting, for the following reasons:

**Reason for lateness:** The content of the paper needed to be informed by the discussions and final approval of the Council's 2014-19 Business Plan by Full Council on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2014.

**Reason for urgency:** Any delay in presenting the paper to Cabinet will extend the period of uncertainty for nearly 200 Children's Centre staff.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, Councillor D Brown, reminded members that Council on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2014 had agreed to make savings of 22% to the budget for children's centres over the next two years, equating to £1.5 million, but with £200,000 to be reinvested to enable services to be targeted effectively and to help develop a volunteer workforce. The Cabinet Member now presented final proposals for the implementation of the savings, covering four main areas: management capacity, cluster resourcing, the Play and Crèche Worker role and arrangements for mixed model clusters.

Two non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor Nethsingha accepted that grouping children's centres would help to reduce both bureaucracy and the burden of the Ofsted inspection regime. However, she expressed disappointment that the cuts would be leading to staff reductions, given all the evidence about the importance and cost-effectiveness of early years support and intervention. She asked officers to ensure that arrangements for the south of Cambridge were able to respond effectively to the rapid growth in this part of the City, including significant levels of affordable housing. She also called for the work of Romsey Mill across the whole of the City to be recognised.
- Councillor Downes also commented that failure to invest adequately in very young children would result in long-term costs to individuals and to the Council. He asked officers to consider how the effects of the budget cuts could be mitigated, in particular by involving Town and Parish Councils. These Councils had access to funds and buildings and were the democratically elected representatives of local communities. If they were kept informed of specific changes in their local areas, they might be able to help, for example by subsidising sessions to enable them to continue.



Responding to Councillor Downes, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, agreed to take a related but wider action, to write to locality managers and reinforce the need for them to work closely with Town and Parish Councils across a wide range of issues.

It was resolved:

- 1) To consider the proposed amendments and approve the final proposals as set out in the confidential Appendix 2 to the report
- 2) To give permission to release the response to the formal consultation to reduce the Children's Centres budget by £1.5m (excluding re-investments) and reconfigure the service delivery model accordingly during 2014/15 and 2015/16.

#### **174. CORPORATE DIRECTOR: CUSTOMER SERVICE AND TRANSFORMATION**

As this was the last meeting to be attended by the Corporate Director: Customer Service and Transformation, Pat Harding, the Chairman led members in thanking her for her work for the Council and in wishing her well for the future.

Chairman  
15<sup>th</sup> April 2014