

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 10th September 2013

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 1.15 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor M Curtis

Councillors I Bates, S Count, D Harty, L W McGuire, T Orgee, M Shuter and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillor D Brown

Also present: Councillors S Criswell, P Downes, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, M Leeke, M Mason, L Nethsingha, P Sales, A Taylor and S van de Ven

52. MINUTES

The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 9th July 2013 and 9th August 2013 were agreed as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared non-statutory disclosable interests in line with paragraph 10.1 of the Members' Code of Conduct:

- Councillor Jenkins, a speaker on Minute 60, Cambridge Park and Ride: Parking Charges, in relation to his wife's use of the Cambridge Park and Ride
- Councillor McGuire as the grandparent of a child with special educational needs, in relation to Minute 63, Alconbury Weald
- Councillor Orgee as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council, in relation to Minute 64, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plans.

54. PETITIONS

Cabinet received four petitions.

20 mph speed limit on Victoria Road, Cambridge

The first petition had been submitted by Danny Quinn. It had 69 electronic signatures and read:

We the undersigned petition the Council to have the speed limit on Victoria Road reduced from 30 mph to 20 mph. It is a narrow Victorian street with no room for cycle lanes and vehicles cannot pass if there is traffic coming in the opposite direction. The pavements are very narrow, dangerously so in parts. There are no delivery bays for vehicles and pavements are often blocked as a result.

In the absence of the petitioner, Cabinet received the petition. As there was no relevant agenda item, it was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, would send a full written response within ten working days of the meeting.

Traffic lights for the junction at Sandal Bridge, New River Bank, Littleport

The second petition had been submitted by Sarah McLaughlin. It had 52 valid signatures and had also been signed by another 169 people who had not given their full addresses. The petition read:

The petition is for traffic lights for the junction at Sandal Bridge, New River Bank, Littleport. Traffic lights are vital for this spot in Littleport, for the safety of drivers, especially when turning out as it is blind.

In the absence of the petitioner, Cabinet received the petition. As there was no relevant agenda item, it was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, would send a full written response within ten working days of the meeting.

Potholes in Youngman Avenue, Histon

The third petition had over 60 signatures on paper and read:

We are writing to request information on the plans to resurface Youngman Avenue. Despite many phone calls about the dreadful potholes along the Avenue, particularly near the junction leading out of Mill Lane, I have had no replies, but have been assured by various members of staff that someone will get back to me or at least leave a message on the answer phone. This has never happened! Some of the smaller potholes have been mysteriously filled!! We first notified the Cambridgeshire County Council in the spring about the state of the Avenue. Our friends came to take us out for a meal and said, 'I didn't realise you lived in a third world country'!! We were mystified until he indicated he was talking about the dreadful state of the road!!

As we drive over these potholes several times a day, this is obviously causing wear and tear to our cars. Please could you let us know what compensation we are entitled to whilst you decide on when you are going to repair the road? An urgent response is requested.

Mr Lee addressed Cabinet on behalf of the petitioners. He noted that since submitting the petition, he had had a site meeting with a Highway officer and a number of the potholes had been repaired. However, he expressed concern that some of the repairs were already disintegrating, especially at points where heavy vehicles turned repeatedly. Mr Lee called for the road to be fully resurfaced.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, thanked the petitioner. He noted that a bid for resurfacing was being prepared but would need to be prioritised against other schemes. As there was no relevant agenda item, a full written response would be sent within ten working days of the meeting.

A10 Safer Junctions Campaign

The fourth petition had 1,208 signatures on paper and read:

The A10 Safer Junctions Campaign: We the undersigned call for action to make safer the two junctions Landbeach to Milton (Humphries Way to Landbeach Road) and the Slap Up Junction, Landbeach to Waterbeach. This must be done with consultation with the local community to find the best way forward.

South Cambridgeshire District Councillor James Hockney addressed Cabinet on behalf of the petitioners. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, thanked the petitioner and noted that as there was no relevant agenda item, a written response would be sent within ten working days of the meeting.

55. MATTERS ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

A report from the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee was considered later in the meeting, as recorded under Minute 68 below.

56. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR PERIOD ENDING 31st JULY 2013

Cabinet received the Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the period ending 31st July 2013. It was noted that the forecast year-end overspend was £2.3 million. This was due primarily to a forecast overspend of £7.1 million within Children, Families and Adults (CFA) on older people's services, offset by underspends in other services. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, noted that CFA were working to reduce the overspend but did have uncommitted reserves of £2.4 million that could be applied to offset any residual overspend.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance drew attention to further information following the Spending Round 2013 announcement of 26th June 2013. The impact for Cambridgeshire County Council would be a 15% cut in real terms, translating to a 13.1% reduction in cash terms, slightly worse than had initially been thought.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance also highlighted performance against Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Members noted that data for five KPIs were temporarily unavailable, as reporting mechanisms for Adults' Social Care and Children and Young People's Services were being realigned to the new CFA Directorate. Following discussion at previous Cabinet meetings, the single KPI on response times for customer complaints had been split into four, one for each of the Council's Directorates and a fourth for Local Government Shared Services (LGSS). The Head of Corporate Support explained that performance for the three Directorates remained at red; no complaints had been received by LGSS. Steps were being taken to address performance, including a review of whether the target response time of 10 days was too ambitious.

Other Cabinet members:

- Expressed serious concern at the Council's future financial position.
- Noted that the significant increase in the overspend on older people's services from the previous month was due in part to inaccurate forecasting and provision of information by Cambridgeshire Community Services (CCS). The majority of services currently provided by CCS would be returning to the Council on 1st October 2013 and immediate action would be taken to improve financial management.
- Welcomed the Council's success in securing additional grants enabling it to deliver more, for example the £2.175m Cycle City Ambition grant funding.
- Welcomed the revisions to the KPI on response times for customer complaints.
- Noted in relation to the KPI on quitting smoking that there was a time delay between activity and establishing whether it had been effective. The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing drew attention to Stoptober, a national initiative.

It was resolved:

- a) To note the resources and performance information and the remedial action currently being taken
- b) To approve the use of the additional £1.2m of Better Bus Area capital funding in-year on appropriate schemes as allocated by Economy, Transport & Environment (ETE) (section 6.4 of the report)
- c) To approve the use of the additional £1.7m of Growing Places capital funding in-year on appropriate schemes as allocated by ETE (section 6.4 of the report)
- d) To approve the use of the additional £1.1m of Local Sustainable Transport capital funding in-year on appropriate schemes as allocated by ETE (section 6.4 of the report)
- e) To approve the use of £1.3m brought forward Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) funding in 2013/14, in order to remove the prudential borrowing requirement (section 6.4 of the report)
- f) To approve the rephasing of CFA Section 106 funding to reflect the new NIAB and University Primary development triggers (section 6.4 of the report)
- g) To approve the rephasing of CFA's prudential borrowing funding to reflect the new phasing of expenditure for Ely College (section 6.4 of the report)
- h) To approve the use of the £2.175m Cycle City Ambition grant funding in-year on appropriate schemes as allocated by ETE (section 6.4 of the report).

57. TRANSPORT DELIVERY PLAN 2013/14: UPDATE

At its meeting of 16th April 2013, Cabinet had approved the implementation of the Transport Delivery Plan 2013/14, including the first six months of maintenance schemes. Members were now invited to consider schemes for the second six months of the financial year. It was noted that these had been identified using the same scoring mechanism as those in the first tranche. A full review of the scoring mechanism would be carried out in time for the 2014/15 Plan and would factor in local member involvement as well as the current asset management criteria.

Two non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor van de Ven, the Liberal Democrat Transport Spokesman, welcomed the helpful discussion at Spokes' meetings of the schemes for the second half of the year. However, she expressed some concern that the current criteria favoured economic development over pavements in residential areas and asked for this to be addressed.
- Councillor Jenkins, the Liberal Democrat Planning, Environment and Enterprise Spokesman, welcomed the planned involvement of local members in the future assessment of schemes. However, he expressed concern that the schemes currently proposed would not significantly reduce the £300 million deficit in the road maintenance programme. He suggested that progress in addressing this was monitored as a Key Performance Indicator and through the Council's balance sheet.

Comments from Councillor Bourke, the local member for Romsey, were reported: he welcomed the work to improve pavements on Mill Road, Cambridge.

Cabinet members noted:

- That the £90 million to be spent through the Transport Delivery Plan over five years had been reprofiled to bring an additional £5 million to be spent in the current year
- The importance of bridge strengthening works, especially at St Ives and Earith
- The need to consider the usage of roads, for example by heavy vehicles, to ensure appropriate repairs were made

Cabinet members welcomed the planned review of the assessment methodology to involve local members and agreed that this should be taken forward in consultation with Spokes and Overview and Scrutiny.

It was resolved:

To approve amendments to the Transport Delivery Plan, including the list of capital maintenance schemes comprising the second six months of 2013/14 (as detailed within the Transport Delivery Plan 2013/14 Revision A).

58. MAJOR SCHEMES PRIORITY SCHEMES

Cabinet's approval was sought for the recommended priority schemes to be delivered with the devolved Major Schemes Funding for 2015-19, as recommended by the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Shadow Local Transport Body. The three recommended schemes in Cambridgeshire were the A142 Ely Southern Bypass, the A605 Kings Dyke and Soham Station.

Two non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor Jenkins, the Liberal Democrat Planning, Environment and Enterprise Spokesman, noted that as a member of the Shadow Local Transport Body Board, he had been involved in the scheme selection process. He expressed concern that the report now presented to Cabinet did not adequately reflect the decision-making process that had been followed. He also noted that two shortlisted schemes that had not finally been selected, Madingley Rise and the Chisholm Trail, remained priorities for the Council; Cabinet should be clearer about how these would be pursued.
- Councillor Kavanagh, the Labour Economy, Transport and Environment Spokesman, asked whether the most up to date modelling methods had been used, estimating the economic benefits of investing in public transport and cycling, when scoring the schemes.

Responding to Councillor Kavanagh, the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, and the Head of Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding noted that the model used had been mandated by the Department for Transport (DfT) for use nationally and that the Local Transport Body was required to follow the guidance as prescribed in the Draft Assurance Framework. It was noted that the DfT was considering use of a wider model to consider wider economic benefits; it was suggested that Councillor Kavanagh meet with officers and feedback be sent to Government.

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning confirmed that the Council remained committed to the Madingley Rise and Chisholm Trail schemes and would continue to seek funding for these.

It was resolved:

To ratify the priority schemes as recommended by the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Shadow Local Transport Body on 17th July 2013, for submission to the Department for Transport.

59. A14 LOCAL FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION

Cabinet's approval was sought for the County Council to make a financial contribution towards the A14 improvement scheme between Cambridge and the A1(M). Members were reminded that the scheme had re-entered the National Roads Programme in 2012, subject to funding being received from three sources: central Government; local contributions from local authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships; and tolling. The

contribution sought from the County Council was £25 million over 25 years, the exact terms and schedule of payments to be agreed.

One non-Cabinet member spoke on this item:

- Councillor Mason, one of the local members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington, expressed concern at the effects the scheme could have on residents in his division living in close proximity to the A14, including worsening air quality and increased noise. He called for mitigation measures including low-noise surfacing, noise barriers and a 50mph speed limit adjacent to residential areas.

Responding to Councillor Mason, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, suggested that the consultation launched by the Department for Transport (DfT) and Highways Agency the previous day was the most appropriate mechanism for raising these issues.

Cabinet members expressed reluctant support for the County Council contribution and tolling, noting that the scheme was essential to Cambridgeshire's growth and economic development and would not go ahead if either of these elements were missing. It was noted that the DfT and Highways Agency consultation proposed toll charges of £1.00-£1.50. Members suggested that with charges at this relatively low level, it would not make economic sense for road users to find another route. However, assurance should be sought that charges would not in future rise more than in line with inflation.

Members also noted that the Council would become responsible for parts of the road detrunked under the scheme and would need to consider the longer-term effects of this.

It was resolved:

- a) To approve a financial contribution of £25m over 25 years towards the A14 improvement scheme, to be funded through a top slice of the Council's Local Transport Plan funding allocation
- b) To delegate to the Cabinet Members for Growth and Planning and for Resources and Performance, in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment and the Head of Finance, the authority to agree the terms of the payment and the schedule of payments.

60. CAMBRIDGE PARK AND RIDE PARKING CHARGES

Members considered a report outlining proposals for the introduction of parking charges at the five Park and Ride sites around the fringes of Cambridge. It was noted that these sites currently cost the Council in excess of £1 million per year to operate. A parking charge of £1 per user per day could result in a net income of approximately £1 million per year, sufficient to cover fully the Council's costs of operating the Park and Ride system.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, read out revised recommendations at the meeting.

Four non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor van de Ven, the Liberal Democrat Transport Spokesman, expressed disappointment that this proposal had not previously been discussed with Spokes and that there had been no public consultation. She suggested that the proposed charge was potentially game-changing and counterproductive; in particular, it would discourage people who currently drove to the Park and Ride and then cycled into Cambridge, for whom provision had been made when the sites first opened.
- Councillor Jenkins, the Liberal Democrat Planning, Environment and Enterprise Spokesman, also expressed concern that there had been no public consultation or engagement on the proposals. He commented that insufficient information had been provided on other ways of generating income or saving money at the Park and Ride sites, or on risks relating to reduced use of the Park and Ride and increased on-street parking.
- Councillor Taylor, the Liberal Democrat Resources Spokesman and local member for Queen Edith's, expressed particular concern that the proximity of Addenbrooke's and two sixth-form colleges could result in parking being displaced from the Babraham Road Park and Ride site to nearby residential areas if a parking charge were introduced. Similar displacement could occur from other Park and Ride sites in other parts of the city. Such displacement could necessitate new on-street parking controls at an additional cost to the County Council.
- Councillor Kavanagh, the Labour Economy, Transport and Environment Spokesman, reported that the Labour Group opposed the introduction of a parking charge. A charge would affect the low-paid most severely, representing a substantial cost over the course of a year. Introduction of a charge was also likely to lead to increased numbers of cars driving into the city, worsening congestion and air quality problems.

Cabinet members noted that:

- All Council Tax payers were currently paying for the costs of the Park and Ride; given the Council's severe financial position, this proposal would mean that those people who actually used the Park and Ride helped to meet its costs.
- Other options for generating revenue at Park and Ride sites, such as selling coffee, had been tried but had proved unsuccessful.
- An increased departure charge to Stagecoach had been considered, but this was likely to result in increased costs being passed on by the operator to bus passengers through increased ticket prices.
- The likely impact of introducing a charge had been modelled; a short-term dip in use of the Park and Ride was predicted, followed by a return to use at current levels.
- The average car using a Park and Ride site contained two passengers, meaning that a £1 charge would equate to 50p per head.

- The proposal had previously been discussed with Group Leaders.

Cabinet members suggested that:

- Cambridgeshire could learn from the experience of other local authorities who had introduced Park and Ride parking charges.
- Other income-generating options could be considered for the sites, such as green energy generation.
- Further consideration was needed of how the proposals would affect some specialist users of the Park and Ride sites, including mobile health screening clinics, National Express coaches and the Uni4 bus service.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, noted that these proposals were one aspect of a proposed wider review of the Park and Ride system. He invited Spokes and Overview and Scrutiny to participate in the wider review.

It was resolved to agree the revised recommendations:

- a) To consider the need for the introduction of parking charges at the Cambridge Park and Ride sites and agree to proceed with their implementation, subject to no new issues arising from stakeholders
- b) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment, the development of the final proposals and the details of the measures to enforce the charge
- c) To ask the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure to continue existing discussions with stakeholders to ensure the Park and Ride service operates in a cost-effective and efficient manner.

61. TREASURY MANAGEMENT: QUARTER 1 REPORT

Members received the first quarterly update on the Treasury Management Strategy 2013/14, which had been approved by Council on 19th February 2013.

It was resolved:

To note the Treasury Management Report, Quarter 1 2013/14.

62. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER UPDATE

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance presented an update on the Corporate Risk Register, which had been reviewed by the Council's Strategic Management Team (SMT) on 22nd August 2013. SMT had made two changes to the Risk Register:

- Risk 1a), Failure to deliver the 2013/14 stage of the Council's five-year Business Plan 2013/14 to 2017/18 – the probability of this risk had been moved from 'very rare' to 'possible', changing the risk rating from green to amber, to reflect the current financial overspend and financial pressures faced by the Council
- Risk 13, Lack of community influence on local decision-making – this risk had been removed from the Corporate Risk Register, as it was considered that the Council now had sound mechanisms in place to enable the community to influence Council decision-making.

One non-Cabinet member spoke on this item:

- Councillor Jenkins, the Liberal Democrat Planning, Environment and Enterprise Spokesman, expressed concern at the removal of Risk 13 from the Corporate Risk Register, noting that the South Cambridgeshire Shape Your Place website had been running for several months but had resulted in only a small number of issues being raised. He also suggested that the transition from Cabinet- to Committee-based decision-making should be added to the Register as a new risk, to help ensure that a strong and effective model was developed.

Responding to Councillor Jenkins, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, noted that multiple measures enabling the public to influence decision-making were now in place. With regard to Shape Your Place, it could take time for this initiative to become established; the Fenland version was very successful.

It was resolved:

To note the position in respect of corporate risk.

63. ALCONBURY WEALD: AMENDMENT TO THE OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION – DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE AND SECTION 106 UPDATE

Cabinet considered the Council's draft response to the amendments to the Alconbury Weald outline planning application and details of the County Council's infrastructure requirements to be secured through the Section 106 legal agreement. The outline planning application was due to be considered by Huntingdonshire District Council's Planning Committee in October 2013. Members noted that the County Council still had a number of concerns about the application, including issues relating to transport and to early years and primary, secondary and special school provision.

Written comments were received from Councillor Bywater, the local member for Sawtry and Ellington. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, noted that a written response would be sent to Councillor Bywater.

One non-Cabinet member spoke on this item:

- Councillor Downes, the local member for Brampton and Kimbolton, expressed support for the proposed comments on education infrastructure. He emphasised a number of points: that school places should be available when people first moved

into the new settlement; the importance of using the correct demographic methodology to assess the number of school places needed, as there could be more children than had previously been thought; the need to resolve issues on school siting; the risk that the Education Funding Agency would not provide sufficient funding for 'uneconomic' new schools and that this would have an adverse effect on other schools in the county; and the possible impact of a new secondary school on existing neighbouring schools, making it difficult to manage resources effectively.

Speaking as one of the local members for Norman Cross, Councillor McGuire expressed reservations about the proposal to build a special school at Alconbury Weald for up to 50 pupils with complex and severe learning difficulties. He noted that there was already a special school in Huntingdon, Spring Common, to which some pupils travelled from considerable distances. Separately, the County Council had recently announced that agreement had been reached with Peterborough City Council jointly to provide a new secondary school at Hampton Leys, which would serve pupils both from Peterborough and north Cambridgeshire; but the County Council had confirmed that it had no interest in special school provision on this site. Councillor McGuire suggested that this decision be revisited, since a new special school at Hampton Leys could potentially provide for pupils in the north of the County, reducing their need to travel and freeing spaces at Spring Common, removing the need for a new special school at Alconbury Weald.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, thanked Councillors Downes and McGuire for their comments and agreed to keep them in mind.

Other Cabinet members commented as follow:

- Emphasised the need for flexibility to be built into new homes. If all new homes at Alconbury Weald were built to the Lifetime Homes standards, this would reduce the need for costly adaptations in the future.
- Welcomed the links between Alconbury Weald and the Great Fen Project.
- Emphasised that the encroachment of housing into the Enterprise Zone should be resisted, since economic development would be key to the new settlement's success.

Members emphasised that the Cabinet had already made a number of comments similar to those now proposed when it had first reviewed the outline planning application on 5th March 2013. The Council should adopt a firm stance on issues on which the developer had not yet responded.

It was resolved:

- a) To approve the County Council's draft consultation response to Huntingdonshire District Council on the Amendments to the Alconbury Weald Outline Planning Application

- b) To endorse the County Council's proposed infrastructure requirements to be secured through the Section 106 negotiations
- c) 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 consultation response prior to submission
- d) 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.

64. PROPOSED RESPONSES TO CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED SUBMISSION CONSULTATIONS (JULY 2013) AND TO DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON UPDATED PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 10

Cabinet considered the Council's draft responses to the Cambridge City Council Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultations (July 2013) and to the Department for Communities and Local Government's consultation on the updated Planning Policy Statement 10 on waste management. Introducing the draft responses, the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, emphasised the need for the County Council to work constructively with the City and District Council to achieve satisfactory outcomes.

Two non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- Councillor Leeke, the local member for Waterbeach, expressed his opposition to a new town at Waterbeach, citing a number of reasons. The proposed site was on low-lying land, significantly below the 5-metre contour and hence at threat from rising sea levels. No genuine separation was proposed between Waterbeach New Town and the existing village of Waterbeach. There was a lack of clarity from the County Council on transport proposals. Development on this scale would undermine the growth of Northstowe, since given its train connection to London, people were likely to choose Waterbeach over Northstowe. However, Councillor Leeke noted that residents were likely to support an extension to the existing village of 900-1,400 houses, to replace the former dynamic contribution to village life made by Waterbeach Barracks.
- Councillor Nethsingha, the Liberal Democrat Deputy Group Leader, welcomed the preparation of a joint Local Plan by Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils, given the number of issues the two Councils shared and the links to the County Council's Transport Plan. She also welcomed the proposed minimal change to the Green Belt and the two Councils' emphasis on public transport, walking and cycling. She commented that stronger relationships with bus operators were needed to ensure the provision of effective bus services. She also welcomed the proposed comments on funding for education, noting that pressure on school and daycare places was already intense, even without further growth.

Cabinet members made the following comments:

- Emphasised the need for the County Council to take a firm approach with developers to ensure that new communities were well provided with services.
- Noted the important links between these Plans and the City Deal, a key enabler for growth. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, urged the Liberal Democrat Group also to promote the City Deal with their national party.
- Emphasised the need for flexibility and connectivity in new developments and a modern and forward-facing approach to services, based on community hubs, broadband and homes built to Lifetime Homes standards.
- Commented that school sites should be sufficiently large to allow for future expansion; many existing schools struggled to cope with growth because they were landlocked.
- Noted the need to make adequate provision for flooding, especially given new problems emerging nationally with unpredictable flash flooding.

It was resolved:

- a) To agree the consultation responses attached as Appendices 1, 2 and 3 to the report and to send them as required to Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council in response to their Local Plans Proposed Submission Consultations (July 2013); and to the Department for Communities and Local Government in response to their consultation on Updated Planning Policy Statement 10
- b) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment the authority to make amendments as necessary to the appendices prior to submission.

65. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) STRATEGY 2013-2017

Members considered a report setting out the Council's proposed IT Strategy for 2013-17, which had been drawn up in consultation with colleagues within Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) and the retained organisations, incorporating technical and business views.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, emphasised that in a time of substantial financial pressure, innovative use of IT could help the Council to change patterns of service delivery and make substantial savings.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, noted that he had visited two Council offices recently with limited or no access to wi-fi; he called for all staff to have access to wi-fi at their desks as soon as possible. The Client Services Group Manager confirmed that this would be addressed.

It was resolved:

To approve the IT Strategy for 2013-17.

66. SUMMARY OF AUTHORISATIONS MADE UNDER THE REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT (RIPA) POLICY

Members received a report on the Council's use of authorisations under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 for the financial year 2012/13. It was noted that during this period, the Council had made no authorisations for the use of directed covert surveillance or for the use of covert human intelligence sources.

It was resolved:

To note the report on the Council's use of authorisations under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) for the financial year 2012 to 2013.

67. HOUSING-RELATED SUPPORT FOR OLDER PEOPLE

Members considered a request for contract exemptions to be made on a range of contracts providing housing-related support for older people. Extending the contracts by three months to 31st March 2014 would enable further negotiations to take place with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on providing services in co-operation with the County Council; it would also enable work to progress so that the tendering processes for services in East Cambridgeshire, Fenland and Huntingdonshire could run concurrently.

One non-Cabinet member spoke on this item:

- Councillor Nethsingha, the Liberal Democrat Health and Adult Social Care Spokesman, welcomed the proposed provision of services in co-operation with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council.

It was resolved:

- a) To approve extensions for three months until 31st March 2014 to contracts with support providers (as listed in appendix 1 to the report)
- b) To approve the negotiation with one District Council and Cambridge City Council to provide services in co-operation
- c) To delegate the sign-off of the agreements to provide services in co-operation to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and the Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults.

68. ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: CAMBRIDGESHIRE FUTURE TRANSPORT MEMBER-LED REVIEW AND CABINET RESPONSE

The Vice-Chairman of the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure (EGCI) Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Criswell, presented a report and recommendations relating to the Cambridgeshire Future Transport initiative. He explained that the report was the outcome of a single extended Committee meeting, held on 27th March 2013. The Committee had made a number of recommendations relating particularly to the objectives of the initiative, pace of delivery, clarity of member and officer roles and monitoring of outcomes.

Comments from Councillor van de Ven, the Liberal Democrat Transport Spokesman, were read out at the Cabinet meeting. She expressed concern that since the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting, all dedicated Cambridgeshire Future Transport officers had left their posts, further delaying the delivery of the programme.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, presented the Cabinet response to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recommendations. Two of the six recommendations were fully accepted and four partially accepted. He agreed that the Cambridgeshire Future Transport initiative had lost some momentum and explained that he would like to review its purpose, in consultation with Spokes and Overview and Scrutiny. He also commented that it would be essential to ensure that the County Council's own transport users and needs were co-ordinated as effectively as possible.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Orgee, noted that in some places where bus subsidies had been withdrawn, it had been possible to rejig existing services to meet need, meaning that the introduction of new services had not been necessary. On community engagement, he noted that in some villages, every household had been leafleted and that the significance of this should not be underestimated.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, welcomed the proposed review and reinvigoration of the Cambridgeshire Future Transport initiative, commenting that the aim should not be to mitigate against the impact of withdrawn bus subsidies, but to ensure a minimum standard of public transport across the whole County.

It was agreed:

- a) To note the findings and recommendations contained within the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's report
- b) To confirm the responses to the recommendations as set out in section 2 of the Cabinet response.

69. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS AND/OR OFFICERS

Members received an update following on from the last report, presented to Cabinet on 18th June 2013, on progress on matters delegated to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers.

It was resolved:

To note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers.

70. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA PLAN

Members noted the draft agenda for the meeting to be held on 8th October 2013.

Chairman
8th October 2013