

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 24th November 2009

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 11.50 a.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor J. Tuck

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

Apologies: None

Also Present: Councillors, S. Johnstone, D Jenkins, C. Shepherd, M Smith, J West and F Whelan

74. MINUTES 20th OCTOBER 2009

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 20th October 2009 were approved as a correct record.

75. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The following Members declared interests as follows:

Councillor J. Reynolds declared a personal interest and prejudicial interest in item 7 titled 'Consultation On "East Of England Plan > 2031" And Consideration Of Joint Cambridgeshire Authorities' Response' under Paragraph 8 and 10 of the Code of Conduct as the chairman of East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) and left the room during the discussion of the report.

Councillor J. Tuck declared a personal interest and prejudicial interest in item 7 titled 'Consultation On "East Of England Plan > 2031" And Consideration Of Joint Cambridgeshire Authorities' Response' under Paragraph 8 and 10 of the Code of Conduct as a member of the EERA board, A member of Fenland District Council and as a builder partner and left the room during the discussion of the report.

Councillor Tuck declared a personal interest in item 10 titled 'Cambridgeshire Integrated Development Programme' under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as a member of Cambridgeshire Horizons Board.

Councillors Curtis and Yeulett declared a personal interest in item 7 titled 'Consultation On "East Of England Plan > 2031" And Consideration Of Joint Cambridgeshire Authorities' Response' under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct titled as members of Fenland District Council.

Councillor T Orgee declared a personal interest in report 7 titled 'Consultation On "East Of England Plan > 2031" And Consideration Of Joint Cambridgeshire Authorities' Response'

under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council and having attended the last CRESSP meeting as a substitute Member.

Councillor J. Reynolds declared a personal interest in agenda item 15 titled 'County Council's Carbon Reduction Commitment ; Including the 10 ;10 Pledge' under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as the chairman of Renewables East.

76. PETITIONS

None received.

77. ISSUES FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES – None received

78. COUNCIL DECISIONS

SHAPING OUR FUTURE - DRAFT STRATEGY FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF ADULT SOCIAL CARE

Cabinet received a report on the outcome of the consultation "Shaping *our* Future" (overarching draft strategy for the Transformation of Adult Social Care), and related work to date, seeking initial approval to the final draft of the strategy before being forwarded to full Council for final approval as a policy framework document.

Cabinet noted that the consultation had run from 2 July to 25 September 2009 and while overall the response to the consultation has been fairly low, there was a good response from statutory partners. 76 groups and organisations were contacted as listed in the report. In addition, over 500 "hits" have been recorded on the relevant webpage. Of the responses received, the majority have been positive about the '2020 Vision', with people believing that it was realistic and achievable. The feedback confirmed local support for the Vision and the Direction of Travel set out in "Shaping *our* Future" and therefore no material changes had been made to the draft strategy which had been received at the earlier Cabinet meeting in May.

Cabinet supported the need for there to be close partnership / local community joint working in order to deliver the Strategy and for there to be multi-agency commitment to the Vision and the Direction of Travel. The new multi-agency officer group looking at health inequalities (Through the merger of the wellbeing officers group and those working on transformation) reporting to the Community Wellbeing Partnership, was considered to be best placed to take this work forward.

Questions raised included:

- the position regarding the guarantees around the three year Social Care Reform Grant and the longer term funding implications. In response, it was explained that the named grant provided in years 2008 / 09, 2009 / 10 and 2010 / 11 (with the detail as set out in the report) was to help finance necessary transition work and was not expected to continue beyond the dates provided.
- Whether the new strategy took into account the likely future public funding scenario. In response it was indicated that the strategy would be one of the key measures to managing future prevention service funding for adult social care.

- In terms of clients accessing relevant contracting and commissioning services information officers were asked how this was to be achieved and what publicity / promotion would be undertaken. In response, it was indicated that officers would be producing an e-catalogue which was currently being developed and would published in due course on Cambridgeshire.net (the directory for voluntary organisations, clubs societies etc). In terms of those not IT literate, care managers and social workers would continue to provide support and advice. Universal Access points and an on-line accessible booklet would continue to be part of the intended Action Plan, with access to activities to promote living healthier lifestyles.

It was resolved:

- i) To acknowledge the outcome of the consultation.
- ii) Approve the proposal that the new multi-agency officer group takes forward the work on developing the action plan for implementation.
- iii) To give in-principle approval to the draft Strategy for the Transformation of Adult Social Care, and to agree to the document being forwarded to full Council for its final approval as a policy framework document.

79. BETTER UTILISATION OF PROPERTY ASSETS (BUPA) - PHASE 1 PROJECT BUSINESS CASES

Cabinet received a report asking it to consider the BUPA phase 1 projects Business Cases and supporting information (provided separately for Cabinet) and to agree to approve the suggested options continuing to design and implementation stages.

Cabinet acknowledged that the considerable benefits of BUPA required to be realised in order to achieve savings required by the Council and that the development of the business cases was the first step in this process. The business cases had been driven by the Authority's priorities and service principles and reflected the cost/benefits of options, as well as an assessment of a number of non-financial criteria, (Including sustainability, regeneration and partnership working).

In terms of c) Corporate Storage and Distribution Project Business case 3b, in agreeing the recommendation, assurances were sought and given that there would be further full consultation with all relevant directorate officers in order that they should input their professional expertise on what they believed would represent minimal stock being kept to meet legal, statutory and risk management principles, especially in relation to sensitive collections (e.g. Archaeology human remains) before any final decisions were made and that this would be undertaken at the design stage.

Cabinet noted that as the County Council currently had no single current strategy clearly setting out the Council's approach to the acquisition of property the opportunity had been taken to develop such a strategy under the governance of the BUPA programme. The Property Acquisition Strategy had been prepared to ensure a consistent approach to the acquisition of property as part of the BUPA Programme underpinning BUPA and other Estate requirements.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve the continuation to design and implementation stages of the suggested options, (at which time formal consultation would take place with any service users / staff impacted by the proposed changes).

- a) Shire Hall Project

- Business case OA, i.e. to carry out sufficient maintenance and upkeep to give the campus ten year's further life whilst continuing to maximise the use of the site through Workwise.

- b) Fenland Project

- Business case 1, i.e. to provide appropriate and extended facilities in Wisbech in combination with continued use of Authority facilities in March and Fenland District facilities in Whittlesey and Chatteris.

- c) Corporate Storage and Distribution Project

- Business case 3b, i.e. to review all stock holding policies to ensure only minimal stock is kept and use existing spare accommodation in a consistent and co-ordinated way to meet stock holding needs.

- ii) To approve the Property Acquisitions Strategy in advance of subsequent phases of delivery.

80. CONSULTATION ON “EAST OF ENGLAND PLAN > 2031” AND CONSIDERATION OF JOINT CAMBRIDGESHIRE AUTHORITIES’ RESPONSE

As set in the declarations of interest at the beginning of the meeting Councillors Tuck and Reynolds left the room before the discussion and subsequent consideration of the recommendations to this report with Councillor McGuire taking the chair for this item only.

Cabinet received a report in order to be able to agree the joint response from Cambridgeshire County Council, including the views of the Cambridgeshire District Councils, to be provided to the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) on the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) “East of England Plan > 2031”.

Cabinet noted that the current stage of the East of England Plan review had included public consultation running from 2 September to 24 November on four growth scenarios for the Region as summarised in Section 4 of the report. The consultation set out eight questions (included in Appendix 1 of the report along with proposed responses (in italics)). The intention was to provide draft comments by EERA’s deadline of the 24th, to be followed by a final response with any additional minor amendments following discussion at a further meeting of the Joint Cambridgeshire Regional Spatial Strategy Review Panel (CReSSP) due to be held on 4 December.

The joint response view reached with the district councils was that the priority must be to complete the current RSS with a strong vision for economic recovery, improved

infrastructure, provision of affordable homes in a safe environment and for meeting the challenge of climate change. The proposed response rejected the Government imposed projections for high level targets that appeared unachievable with the higher rates of growth put forward in scenarios 2, 3 and 4. These were considered to be unsustainable and undeliverable and if attempted, would stretch transport and community provision to breaking point. The need for the provision of adequate infrastructure was stressed and the Regional Assembly's projection for job growth was strongly questioned.

Cabinet noted that the response highlighted that it was considered that:

- Cambridge and its environs would be the focus for economic recovery both for Cambridgeshire and for the Region, as it was strongly represented in growth sectors such as biotechnology, medical and clean technologies of the future. The response supported the currently planned expansion of Cambridge as a compact and attractive city with enhanced and sustainable transport facilities which will provide in the order of 20,000 additional homes over 20 years.
- There would be no need for a further Green Belt Review for many years to come and there would need to be a further study of the longer term growth potential of the City, to be undertaken by the local authorities. At the same time the County's market towns were also key to the prosperity of much of the County, having strong linkages into Cambridge and to Peterborough in the north. The market towns would also provide a sustainable focus for surrounding rural areas and therefore there was support for the regeneration and deliverable expansion of market towns, subject to the achievement of job growth and infrastructure improvements.
- The response rejected the need to create expensive, unsustainable and resource hungry new towns such as those suggested in the consultation for Alconbury, or those privately proposed at Hanley Grange, Six Mile Bottom, Waterbeach and Mereham.

Cabinet was advised that the proposed response to the consultation recommended that a lower rate of growth than EERA's scenario 1 was appropriate for Cambridgeshire with some flexibility to provide further development provided that the strategy was deliverable in the current climate of recession in the development industry and severe constraints on public spending which would also result in the provision of infrastructure to support growth being increasingly constrained. The foundation of the approach for Cambridgeshire was based on the delivery of the current strategy of 75,000 new homes (equivalent to 3,000 new homes a year over the period 2006 to 2031 (25 years) as opposed to the 3,600 per year suggested by EERA who were using a different timescale starting at 2011). In relation to the above, it was agreed that a clarification was required to be made to sections of the text on the draft response to reflect the correct start date. Within the figures proposed in the joint response, it was agreed that there might be potential to deliver up to an additional 15,000 new homes overall (equivalent to 3,600 new homes a year overall during the Plan period).

Cabinet noted that work had been undertaken to establish a preferred distribution of growth by District and it was generally agreed that this should be put forward to EERA with the initial response given in Appendix 1 with the proposal that the figure for Fenland in Appendix 6 should be increased to 550 new homes a year, with potential for up to 650, dependent on the qualifications given in paragraph 5.7 of the report.

At the meeting Fenland Cabinet Members indicated that they still wished to see 650 as a minimum figure and possibly up to 800 per year on the basis that this would be sustainable as a result of projected job growth in Peterborough and Kings Lynn and if further transport infrastructure improvements were carried out. In response the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning indicated that this would need to be further reviewed in terms of the level of infrastructure available to support such housing growth in terms of growth in Market towns / the job market / transport links and would require further studies to be undertaken. Discussion on this suggestion would be discussed at CReSSP on Friday 4th December.

Suggestions were made regarding the key points of the response that needed to be highlighted including:

- The justifications for the lower growth scenario set out in paragraph 1.6 of appendix 1
- Infrastructure constraints set out in paragraph 2.14
- The circumstances which might allow for an additional 15,000 homes as set out in paragraph 3.5
- The comments on sub-area profiles set out in paragraph 7.2 on pages 25 and 26 of the response.

In addition, and requiring a separate response was in relation to advice sought by the Regional Assembly on what changes, if any, were needed to the East of England Plan's Cambridge Sub-Region policies (CSR 1 to 4) which had been received following the public consultation on growth scenarios. The request for advice followed a different timescale to the public consultation and comments had been requested by the 9th of December 2009. A suggested approach to a review of the CSR policies was set out in italics in Appendix 2, with the text of the existing policies was summarised for information in Appendix 3. This draft response was also to be taken to the CReSSP meeting on the 4th December for further consultation / consideration.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve Appendices 1 and 2 of this report as the basis of Cambridgeshire County Council's response to EERA subject to a necessary amendment relating to the appropriate timescale and for further discussion to be undertaken with partners on the draft responses at the CReSSP meeting on 4th December.
- ii) To approve the results of the consultation work undertaken by the Cambridgeshire authorities, as summarised in Appendix 5 of the Cabinet report, for submission to EERA as evidence to inform the review of the East of England Plan.
- iii) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services to agree the final form of the responses, to take account of comments from local authorities, other stakeholders and third parties and from the Joint Cambridgeshire Regional Spatial Strategy Review Panel (CReSSP) meeting to be held on 4th December.

81. ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION INVESTMENT PLAN 2010/11

Cabinet received a report in order to be able to consider the contents of the Economic Participation (EP) Investment Plan for Cambridgeshire for 2010/11 for approval.

Cabinet was informed that The EP Programme was a programme from the East of England Development Agency (EEDA). Which it had delegated the management and accountability to Cambridgeshire County Council as the Accountable Body. The Council had since April 2008 sub-contracted the delivery of this programme to the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) reflecting the fact that GCP had been delivering it directly for EEDA for 4 years previously, and had achieved excellent performance from projects in terms of spend and outputs. The GCP's Partnership Board on behalf of Cambridgeshire Together, had approved the EP Investment Template for 2010/11 at its meeting on 15 October 2009.

Cabinet noted that the EP programme supported disadvantaged people and communities across the county to improve their confidence and skills, to assist them to get a job or work for themselves. At a time of economic recession, the Investing in Communities (IiC) funding was offering the extra help they often required to gain the right skills or to enter employment. It was confirmed in response to a question raised that there was scope within the programme to allow flexibility in delivery e.g. in terms of targeting other deprived wards e.g. in East Cambridgeshire.

In terms of an update regarding the disbandment of the Learning and Skills Council and future funding arrangements associated with it, this would be included as part of the Budget report to the December Cabinet meeting. In terms of 2010-11 likely to be the last year of EEDA funding, it was confirmed that a key focus of 2010/11 activity would be on working towards the sustainability of the projects currently supported with contracts only signed for a year and with there being no ongoing commitment.

It was resolved:

To approve the Economic Participation Investment Plan for Cambridgeshire for 2010/11 and submit it to the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) for approval in January 2010.

82. DEVELOPER SECTION 106 DEFERRAL REQUESTS

As a result of the economic slowdown, the County Council was receiving a number of requests from developers seeking to defer Section 106 payments that had already been negotiated. A process to deal with such requests was agreed by Cabinet on 7 July 2009 and the recommendations in the current report were based on that process which required that deferral requests in excess of £250,000 should be considered individually.

Cabinet has considered the following four Section 106 Deferral Requests received from developers in relation to the following two separate developments (Tim Brinton Site and land adjoining Fitzwilliam Road and Clarendon Road, Cambridge):

Tim Brinton Site: Land at the junction of Cherry Hinton Road and Hills Road - 92 dwellings.

- Request to remove 100% the Southern Area Corridor Area Transport Plan Contribution.

- Request to reduce by 50% the Education Contribution.

**Land adjoining Fitzwilliam Road and Clarendon Road, Cambridge
- 408 dwellings.**

- Request to link payments, pro rata, at the point of legal completion of each plot to be payable at the end of each quarter based on housing sales and
 - to defer the education contribution
 - to defer the Life Long Learning contribution

The local member for Trumpington provided the following written comments which were brought to Cabinet's attention: "Support the recommendation not to accept the deferral request for the Clarendon / Fitzwilliam S106 which is earmarked for pre- school education. This is a priority we cannot let it slip. If we can help developers out with the non-priority concerns as with the 2nd request then that seems sensible".

The local Member for Coleridge provided the following written comments for Cabinet's attention: "I strongly support the refusal of the Tim Brinton site deferral request. This development will add 133 flats and will have significant transport impacts which will need to be mitigated particularly for the increased numbers of people trying to access the railway station. The Southern Area Corridor Transport Fund should be used to improve access from Cambridge Leisure to the station".

It was resolved:

To note the S106 deferral requests and to approve the following decisions for the reasons detailed in the Cabinet report:

- 1) Tim Brinton Site (Southern Area Corridor Area Transport Plan) – Reject request
- 2) Tim Brinton Site (Education Contribution) – Reject request
- 3) Land adjoining Fitzwilliam Road and Clarendon Road (Education) – Reject request
- 4) Land adjoining Fitzwilliam Road and Clarendon Road (Life Long Learning) – Accept request.

83. CAMBRIDGESHIRE INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Cabinet received a report informing it of the details of the Cambridgeshire Integrated Development Programme (IDP) and its importance for the future funding of County Council infrastructure.

Cabinet noted that the IDP brought together existing spatial and economic strategies to show the overall strategic picture of infrastructure and investment needed to support housing and economic growth in Cambridgeshire to 2021. It identified the strategic interventions and infrastructure that would be required to achieve the housing and economic targets as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Regional Economic Strategy (RES).

Cabinet noted that the purpose of the Cambridgeshire IDP included:

- acting as the strategic evidence base for the Variable Rate Tariff or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (It was confirmed orally in answer to a question that the intention from the Government was that the latter would be established from April 2010) to be used to secure future developer funding for key public services and facilities to support growth by updating and widening the scope of estimates for infrastructure need indicated in the Long Term delivery Plan.
- helping forge a stronger connection between economic ambitions and spatial development processes (as set out in the RSS, Cambridgeshire Horizons Business Plan and District Councils' Local Development Frameworks), and ensure they were developed in a co-ordinated, sustainable and efficient manner;
- offering a coordinated and prioritised programme of project delivery to support new development in the County;
- providing a shared and robust evidence base for investment in the key infrastructure priorities up to 2021, including climate change mitigation and adaptation, and to influence East of England Development Agency (EEDA) spending decisions in relation to the Single Programme, any future rounds of Housing Growth Fund, and other National funding bids;
- informing the Cambridgeshire elements of the East of England Implementation Plan (EEIP), the Joint Implementation Plan for the RSS and RES.
- informing funding bids at regional and national level as it will contain information on capital-led investment for strategic infrastructure in the County. This includes EEDA's spending decisions in relation to the Single Programme, future rounds of Housing Growth Fund and other National funding bids. Its existence would therefore enable those involved to attract future funding as it would demonstrate a cohesive strategy for delivering and meeting the targets for growth set by Government.

In agreeing the recommendations the second recommendation was altered so that the delegation was not only to the Cabinet Member and for further clarity also deleting from the original recommendation the word "document" in fourth line and replacing it with the words "Integrated Development Plan".

It was resolved:

- i) To endorse the draft final version of the Cambridgeshire Integrated Development Programme;
- ii) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services the authority to make any minor textual changes to the Cambridgeshire Integrated Development Programme prior to it being considered formally by the Horizons Board.

84. CAMBRIDGE CYCLE TOWN: COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDERS

Cabinet received a report in order to consider the proposals for the Cambridge Cycle Town schemes and the associated need in some cases for Compulsory Purchase (CP) Orders.

Cabinet was reminded that the County Council, in partnership with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, had been successful in its bid to Government to become a Cycling Town, which had provided an additional £3.6m of funding over three years. The provisional programme of infrastructure schemes to be funded was approved by Cabinet on 4 November 2008. Public Consultation on seven of the schemes was carried out in August/September 2009 and reported to Cabinet on 29 September with the detail of the schemes as set out in the current report.

Following further design work on all of the schemes, it had been identified that, in order to fully implement them, four of them could not be fully constructed within the existing highway and would require the purchase of additional land as set out below:

1. Cottenham to Histon requires 9 plots of land (see Plan 1 on the agenda)
2. Horningsea to Fen Ditton requires 1 plot of land (see Plan 2 on the agenda)
3. Milton to Impington will require 8 plots of land (see Plan 3 on the agenda)
4. Swavesey to the A14 requires 3 plots of land (see Plan 4 on the agenda)

A question raised requested details on the minimum width of a pathway used for joint use cycling - in response it was indicated that this varied and was usually between 2.5 to 3 metres depending whether it was in a rural area.

Councillor Jenkins one of the local Members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington supported the recommendations in principle and praised the good work undertaken. He made the comment that cycleway should be continuous to their point of destinations with sensible ends e.g. for the Milton to Impington project there were problems at each end with the cycleway not reaching the villages. In response, the officer clarified that on this project at the Milton end, cyclists would have to dismount to use the Butt Lane footbridge over the A10 to access Milton village and at the Impington cycleway end.

The Local Member for Councillor for Papworth and Swavesey supported the recommendations and the urgent need to move on the schemes as being the justification for seeking to commence CPO proceedings and welcomed the further stakeholder consultation to take place in the future as referred to in paragraph 3.5 of the report. .

The local member for Fulbourn provided the following statement submitted to Cabinet: "Compulsory purchase orders should always be used as a last resort and have the least impact on individuals as possible. I support the need to CPO the strip of land required for the Fen Ditton to Horningsea cycle way. This piece of land does not affect any individuals and will provide significant benefit to the people of both villages."

Cabinet noted that initial negotiations with landowners were still continuing, but as a result of them, it was now clear to officers that some of the landowners were not willing to sell by agreement. In order to make progress and to allow delivery of the schemes set within the Cycling England funding timeframe, it was therefore necessary to agree to Compulsory Purchase the land to allow delivery of the schemes within the tight timescales set. Cabinet agreed to approve the CP orders only on the basis of them being a last resort, where agreement could not be reached through negotiation. The Compulsory Purchase Orders

(CPO) would be made under the 1980 Highways Act. The Orders could be published in early 2010 with an earliest start for construction in late 2010.

It was resolved:

To make the Compulsory Purchase Orders for the Cambridge Cycle Town schemes as detailed in the report.

85. DEVELOPMENT AT CAMBRIDGE NORTH WEST : NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL BOTANY FRONTAGE SITE (NIAB) 1 SITE – SECTION 106 CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUS CONTRIBUTION

Cabinet was reminded that the NIAB proposal was for 1,593 new dwellings and associated infrastructure on the land to the north of Huntingdon Road in northwest Cambridge. On 20th October 2009, Cabinet had considered and endorsed the proposed Section (S) S106 heads of terms for the NIAB development in the northwest of Cambridge. The package negotiated was extensive and covered all of the County Council services including transport. However at the same meeting Members had expressed concerned regarding the officers recommendation not to seek a contribution from the NIAB development towards the capital cost of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway (CGB) scheme. This report responded to Members concerns and detailed the further assessment that Cabinet required as follows:

- (a) more detailed information on the NIAB development and the transport mitigation package that supported the development proposals and the role of Cambridgeshire Guided Busway within this mitigation package.
- (b) more detailed information on the planning policy context within which a possible capital contribution to the CGB scheme was evaluated; and to
- (c) provided as a result of the above a final view on whether a contribution to the capital cost of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway scheme should be sought from this development.

Having further reviewed the Transport Assessment for the NIAB proposals officers were clear that there was no reliance on the CGB built into the transport strategy for the site and concluded that continuing to seek the capital contribution for CGB from this development was not sustainable or defensible.

Cllr Gymer had made the following comments which were brought to Cabinet's attention: "I oppose using NIAB 106 money for the CGB, as this "service" does not run through the site or even serve much of the development. There are no plans to build a stop within its area and how many homes will be within the 0.6km distance of the Orchard Park stop? I did not see a time commitment to 106 money for buses/stops serving the new development - perhaps that's what should be concentrated on at this stage. With the slow down in building at Orchard Park - the extra support is needed to allow a transport system to develop - they are only just about to put up shelters and I would be grateful if officers gave some clearer information on the time scales. I think the officers are right to expect a challenge as it is not evident what local people will be getting from the CGB. It has been made clear that this is a rapid transit system to help ease congestion on the A14, as clearly demonstrated in our other villages/communities (CHI area).

Councillor Jenkins one of the local Members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington supported the officer recommendations congratulating the officers on the proposals and also indicating that Section 106 Contributions should not be seen as “a bottomless pit”. He made a point which cross referenced with discussion on the previous report asking whether some of the A14 junction monies could be used to help mitigate the A14 cycle crossing. In response the Executive Director: Environment Services indicated that solving the A14 barrier to Histon remained technically challenging and could not be resolved in the immediate future within current financial restrictions. However those using the Eastern Side would be able to use the cycleway alongside the Guided Busway.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the officer’s assessment of the policy and other considerations contained within this report and
- ii) To approve not seeking a capital contribution for the CGB from this development.

86. SUPPORTING PEOPLE: EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT REGULATIONS FOR CONTRACTS BEING LET UNDER NEW FRAMEWORK AGREEMENTS

Cabinet received a report to seek a decision to enable the contracts affected by the delivery of the Cambridgeshire Supporting People Modernisation Programme to be exempt from Contract Regulations

Cabinet was informed that The Supporting People Programme had embarked on a commissioning process that would enable the changes to the existing models of provision to be achieved through the use of Framework Agreements (similar to a preferred provider list). This included a tendering process against specified standards and value for money.

The Framework Agreement with identified providers, chosen through a formal tendering process, was expected to be in place by April 2010. This would allow the review of existing floating support and accommodation services, in accordance with the modernisation programme. In order to allow the continuation of services while this work was taking place, the Supporting People Programme had sought to extend existing contracts arrangements ending March 2010, for a period of up to three years.

Questions were raised in relation to the legality of the extension in terms of EC Procurement thresholds and therefore while consultation had taken place with the Council’s Procurement Unit, as Legal Services had not been consulted in advance regarding the contents of the report, the final action to exempt the Supporting People contracts would be subject to Legal Services confirmation that it was permissible, and this would be pursued following the meeting.

It was resolved:

- i) That the Supporting People Programme seek legal advice regarding the potential for challenge.

- ii) To endorse the need to exempt the Supporting People contracts summarised in Appendix 1 and 2 by invoking the following clause of Cambridgeshire County Council Contract Regulations:

Paragraph 3.7: In exceptional circumstances, the County Council and its *Cabinet* have power to dispense with any provision of these Contract Regulations.

- iii) To note that the ending of these contracts and services will cause significant disruption and jeopardise the successful completion of the Modernisation Programme for the Supporting People Programme

87. OFFICE FOR STANDARDS IN EDUCATION, CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND SKILLS INSPECTION OF SAFEGUARDING AND SERVICES FOR LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN 2009

Cabinet received a report informing it of the results of the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) Inspection of Safeguarding and Looked After Children and providing details of actions being undertaken to respond to the areas for improvement identified within the inspection report.

Cabinet noted that under the new Comprehensive Area Assessment Framework Ofsted had introduced two new inspection processes for Children's Services:

- An annual, unannounced inspection of local authority contact, assessment and referral centres for Children's Social Care
- A full inspection of safeguarding and services for looked after children at least once every three years.

It was reported that Cambridgeshire had now been subject to both inspection processes with an Unannounced Inspection taking place on 7th and 8th of July and the inspection of Safeguarding and Looked After Children taking place between 15th September and 26th September.

It was noted that following the death of Baby P and the subsequent Laming Report, Ofsted had raised their standards and focussed on safeguarding and vulnerable groups. The expectation on local authorities in safeguarding was understandably high and had resulted in processes and grade criteria that were significantly more challenging than previous inspection frameworks.

It was highlighted that overall, Cambridgeshire was considered both adequate for safeguarding and adequate for Looked After Children, with good capacity to improve and good features in its current arrangements. In the context of a more challenging inspection regime, this result was considered an acceptable point from which to continue improvement.

Members in commenting on the report expressed their dissatisfaction with the judgement area title for Grade 3 described as being "adequate" as this often had negative connotations while in the context of the inspection regime, the standard met would more accurately be described as "fully meeting requirements". It was highlighted that in terms of

safeguarding, not a single school had been classed as inadequate, while two had been classed as outstanding.

Reference was made by the Cabinet Member for Children to a letter published in a local newspaper from an opposition group member commenting negatively on the review results which was seen as being detrimental to staff morale. At the same time the Cabinet Member paid tribute to all staff involved for their hard work and continued dedication during what had been a very difficult and anxious period. Cabinet recognised that staff working in these services continued to be under pressure and that comments made to the press needed to be constructive as maintaining good morale was very important.

It was resolved:

To note the contents of the report and the responses to the areas identified for improvement.

88. COUNTY COUNCIL'S CARBON REDUCTION COMMITMENT, INCLUDING THE 10:10 PLEDGE

This report to Cabinet followed on from the amended motion agreed at Council on 13th October 2009 requesting that Cabinet "reports to the next meeting of the Council in December on the full implications of the Council participating in the 10:10 scheme".

Cabinet in receiving the report (attached to this Cabinet Council report as Appendix 3) noted that the greatest proportion of carbon dioxide emissions emanated from schools buildings (46%), followed by contracted services (36%), of which the majority are transport emissions from the Education Transport service. 7.5% of total carbon emissions are from non-schools buildings, 6.4% from streetlights and 4.8% from business mileage and fleet vehicles.

Energy consumption in buildings was by far the most significant source of emissions for Cambridgeshire County Council at 53%. Of this, the majority came from energy use in schools with emissions from school transport accounting for another 29.3% of the total, meaning that schools accounted for 75% of emissions and that the County Council was accountable for schools emissions, even though it has little direct control in reducing them.

Cabinet noted that a major step forward for the County Council in its commitment to reducing carbon emissions had been taking part in the Local Authority Carbon Management scheme during 2008/09 resulting in the development of the Local Authority Carbon Management Plan (LACMP), adopted by Cabinet in May 2009. It set out an aspirational target of 30% reduction in CO₂ over 5 years (which at 6% a year would be double the rate needed to be considered as a successful participant under the 10:10 commitment – see more details below) and the potential ways of achieving this significant cut covered all operational activity, including schools and school transport, and had resources aligned accordingly to delivering it. This included support for schools through the Energy Management Unit, as well as dedicated posts within Children and Young People's Services.

It was highlighted to Cabinet that the emissions included in the 10:10 commitment did not include schools and while there was some flexibility in the 10:10 target and the Council would be listed as a successful participant if we reached 3% this was only a one-off commitment for a year. While a number of local authorities had signed up to it, they were in

the main unitary and metropolitan boroughs, while County Councils had indicated that the short term nature of the commitment does not fit with their strategic position on carbon reduction.

To be a successful participant in the 10:10 scheme, the County Council would need to reduce CO₂ emissions by 470 tonnes, whereas the Council's own LACMP required a reduction of 5,109 tonnes over a five year period. It was reported that the County Council's current plans were focused on delivering not only long term sustainable reductions in emissions of CO₂, but also in terms of activity not covered by the 10:10 agreement such as reducing methane emissions by cutting down on landfill, as well as ensuring sustainable locations for additional housing under the Regional Spatial Strategy. The focus on the highest emitting areas such as schools, would help deliver the highest overall reduction in emissions. Cabinet therefore supported that it would be appropriate to continue to support the delivery of the longer term Local Authority Carbon Management Plan to ensure that the significant reduction of emissions was a continuous process, which would mean not reprioritising activities to divert resources to the 10:10 commitment.

Reference was made to the National Conservative Party's environmental proposals which were to be published that day including plans for a 10% Whitehall emission target.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the performance data contained within the report.
- ii) To note the implications of the 10:10 commitment.
- iii) To continue to support the delivery of the Local Authority Carbon Management Plan and not reprioritise the activity and resources aligned to it.
- iv) To report the outcome of its discussions to Council in response to the recent motion on the 10:10 Commitment and to attach the current report as background to the Cabinet Council report

89. TAX INCREMENT FUNDING : EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

Cabinet received a report detailing the opportunities benefits and risks associated with the proposed Tax Increment Funding scheme and seeking Cabinet approval to the expression of interest.

Cabinet was informed that in many European economies and the United States of America, public bodies benefited directly from business and sales taxes and could by a variety of means "borrow" against future tax receipts" to invest in the infrastructure to facilitate and nurture regeneration and economic growth. This borrowing against the future approach was commonly referred to as "Tax Increment Funding" (TIF).

It was noted that in the 2009 Budget the Chancellor announced that the Government was willing to pilot a TIF approach in England (following significant lobbying from those charged with City regeneration projects (e.g. Birmingham) and those delivering economic growth (e.g. Cambridgeshire).

The County Council and Cambridge City Council together with Cambridgeshire Horizons had expressed an interest in being a TIF pilot with officers seeing it as a way of delivering further investment in public infrastructure, during a period when developer contributions would be under pressure, Government funding was likely to be scarce, and the current grant mechanism failing to reward growth. Officers from the County and City Councils had prepared an outline bid, with an expression of interest having already been submitted in relation to the Cambridge Station Area Project.

It was resolved:

To approve the expression of interest and outline bid in the Tax Increment Funding Scheme.

90. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA 15th DECEMBER 2009

The draft agenda for the 15TH December was noted with the following amendments:

- A new key decision report: Exemption from contract standing orders for the personal support service (home based) contract
- Removal of item 13. "Evaluation of Delivery of Climate Change and Environment Strategy Action Plan" which will be rescheduled to a later meeting.

Chairman
15th December 2009