

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 24th May 2011

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.25 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor N Clarke

Councillors: I Bates, D Brown, S Criswell, M Curtis, D Harty, C Hutton, L W McGuire, L Oliver, and M Shuter

Apologies: None

Present by invitation: Councillors: L Nethsinga, B Brooks-Gordon, N Harrison, T Orgee, T. Stone and F Whelan.

As it was the first meeting of the new Cabinet since Councillor Clarke's election as Leader of the Council, he welcomed his new Cabinet colleagues, other elected Members and the public present and reminded the meeting that currently the proceedings could not be filmed or recorded without seeking his prior permission.

373. MINUTES 5th APRIL 2011

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 5th April 2011 were approved as a correct record.

.

374. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Bates declared a Personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in Item 3a Petition from the Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth Women's Institute on saving the 127 Bus Service as his wife was the president of the Women's Institute.

Councillor McGuire declared:

- A Personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct regarding Item 6 Flexible Retirement Policy as a recipient of the County Council's Pensions Scheme
- A Personal interest regarding Draft Council Responses to proposed Development (item 13 on the agenda) as chairman of Norman Cross Action Group on the Great Haddon
- A Prejudicial Interest under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct in agenda Item 9 Proposed Amendments Special Educational Needs Home to School Transport Policy as his granddaughter was a recipient of SEN Transport. (Left the room during the item and took no part in the discussion or the decision taken)

375. PETITIONS

a) Save the Number 127 Bus Service to and from Royston

Cabinet noted a petition received with 26 signatures (25 from County residents) from Members of the Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Women's Institute seeking to "save *their village bus service (Royston - Bassingbourn Littleton - The Mordens) which was their only public transport link to Cambridge and Royston or London (via rail or the no 26 bus) and the intermediate towns along the way*".

As there was not a relevant report on the agenda / there were not enough signatures to allow a public speaker at Cabinet (although it was further noted that the spokesperson had indicated that she did not wish to make an oral submission at the meeting), the petition details were presented for Cabinet's information and the petition was passed to officers, who in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, would arrange for a written response to be provided to the organiser within 10 working days of the Cabinet meeting.

b) Villagers of Barton and Grantchester - Petition to reduce speed on the A603

Cabinet received a petition of 65 signatures seeking to renew their plea, already submitted to the South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee, to reduce limits for the safety of our pedestrians and cyclists, both young and old at the following:

- a) Link 18 New road / Roman Hill and 19 (Leaving the roundabout from the M11) – to implement a lower 40 mph speed limit from the current 60 mph limit
- b) Link 17 (Village Core Walis garage to Haslingford) - to reduce the speed limit to 30 mph through Barton from current 40 mph limit
- c) Link 15-16 out on the Wimpole Road - to reduce the speed limit to 50 mph from current 60 mph limit.

As there were over 50 signatures and the petition was received before the 9 a.m. 17th May deadline, spokesperson speaking rights had been secured. (More details are provided in [Appendix 1](#) of these minutes). As there was a report on the agenda to which the petition related (item 7 Speed Limits) the Leader invited the spokesperson to stay to hear the discussion and the decisions to be made.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Due to not wishing the petitioner's present to have to stay any longer than necessary and mindful that a number of local Members had requested to speak, with Cabinet's agreement the Leader changed the order of the agenda to receive the key decision report "Speed Management Issues" as the next item of business

376. SPEED MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The Cabinet Member with the portfolio for Highways and Access introduced a report whose purpose was to;

- review decisions taken in January by the South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee (SCAJC) on speed limit changes on various routes as part of

the A and B Road Speed Limit Review (which had been imposed on the County Council by the previous Government) and which were against the then current County Council Speed Limits Policy.

- Agree the future funding allocation for the A and B Road Speed Limit Review which would then draw a line under the review.

In his introduction the Cabinet portfolio holder for Community Infrastructure thanked petitioners, members of the public for the representations made, drawing attention to a letter received from the Chairman of Barton District Council who supported the views of the petition and suggested that South Cambs AJC had made the correct decision regarding their recommendations on links 15, 16 17,18, 19, and expressing his dismay to now learn that the County Council was being advised to rescind the recommendations. More details of the representation are provided in [Appendix 1](#) to the minutes.

The Portfolio holder expressed his concerns that the decisions taken by the AJC in contravention of the County Council Speed Limits Policy had unnecessarily raised public expectations on what could be delivered, and was satisfied that the officer's recommendations were reasonable.

Reference was made to the decision taken at the April Cabinet meeting which introduced a new speed limit policy and included more flexibility in the setting of speed limits in settlements, but which reaffirmed the existing policy in relation to setting speed limits on rural roads outside of settlements. The revised policy made it clear that the speed limits between settlements should be set by the Highway Authority in accordance with the framework included in the policy, recognising that it removed the risk of inconsistent speed limits across the boundaries of neighbouring communities and that there were fewer frontages and accesses affected by speed. The policy targeted the limited Council budget at schemes that would reduce speed in the worst accident hotspots based on guidance and research. He highlighted that the new policy recognised the desire of some communities to reduce speed limits in certain locations outside of the guidance and which provided a mechanism for communities to promote and fund reduced speed limits within settlements.

Three local members had given notice to speak with key issues being as set out in [appendix 1](#).

In relation to the opposing views that had been expressed by Councillors Orgee and Councillor Stone regarding the dual carriageway section covering Mill Lane junction, the portfolio holder indicated that he would wish to look at this further outside of the meeting and suggested that any final decision regarding this particular recommendation from the AJC should be deferred.

Cabinet Members raised a number of issues during the subsequent debate including:

- The costs involved of changing speed limits. The officers indicated that they were relatively small and involved the cost of changing / providing any additional signs. Cabinet did however request that estimates needed to be worked up by the officers so that parishes had some ball park estimate figures to work with. There were difficulties in establishing generic costs as it depended on the number of signs required and was governed by the length of road being proposed for a lower limit. It was highlighted that the costs of advertising was currently a fixed expensive cost due to the need to advertise Traffic Regulation orders in the local Press. However as

indicated at the April Cabinet meeting, officers were working with national Government officials on alternative, cheaper media / electronic advertising options.

- Requesting clarification of whether Safer Routes to Schools officers had been involved in the current speed limit review exercise. It was explained that while such officers were part of the wider team, there they were not involved in the current study as their work tended to be in relation to minor routes. Cabinet still felt that in future stronger working between the two teams would be appropriate when considering speed limits near schools. The Cabinet portfolio holder agreed to take this up.
- A number of Cabinet Members expressed similar reservations to that made by the Member for Gamlingay regarding the ability of smaller parishes such as Tadlow to be able to finance the cost of locally supported lower speed limits.
- The Deputy Leader who had only recently in the previous Cabinet had responsibility for Highways, while expressing sympathy for the aspirations of local communities to establish lower speed limits, also highlighted that there was a tendency to ignore the professional advice provided by officers and highlighted that lowering speed limits were often not effective without other expensive physical measures being put in place to slow traffic beyond signage as well as ensuring appropriate enforcement deterrents were available.

The Leader of the Council while noting that each case would involve a different cost directed that officers needed to be able to establish a standard cost for a particular length of road that could be used as an indicative cost that was easy to understand to give parishes a better understanding of the potential costs and that this was urgently required. He supported the recent change of policy which he believed provided a fantastic opportunity for local communities to become more involved in setting their own speed limits in settlements, while taking responsibility for financing them / ensuring appropriate enforcement was put in place to ensure their success. He also proposed that officers should look to establishing a fund to provide loans to smaller parishes repayable over a number of years in order to help spread the costs involved. This was supported by Cabinet and the portfolio holder who would investigate the proposal with officers on the basis that it would only be used in special circumstances and establishing strict criteria to ensure only parishes with small precepts levels would be eligible as the intention was not to make a general fund that all parishes regardless of size and population could use.

Cabinet did support the South Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committee (SCAJC) decision to extend the 50mph limit on B1042 on Link 4 to include the Larkin Road junction, on accident grounds for the reasons set out in the report.

It was resolved:

- a) to support the South Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committee (SCAJC) decision to extend the 50mph limit on B1042 on Link 4 to include the Larkin Road junction, on accident grounds and re-advertise the proposal.
- b) To rescind other decisions taken by the SCAJC in relation to the changes set out in Appendix A to the report and approve the original advertised proposals for implementation with the exception of the proposal for a speed limit of 50 mph on the Mill Lane Junction section of the A1301 with Cabinet delegating authority to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure in consultation with the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services to review the research undertaken on this link and determine whether to confirm the officer recommendation or re-advertise based on the SCAJC proposal.

- c) To invite Barton, Longstowe, Stapleford/Sawston and Tadlow Parish Councils to consider funding a reduction in the speed limit in or on the approaches to their settlements, in light of recent policy changes relating to speed limits in villages and settlements;
- d) To support the implementation of further reviews as set out in paragraph 3.7 in the report, up to the limit of the available funding in 2011/12;
- e) To suspend further implementation of the speed limit review project thereafter, for the reasons set out in paragraph 3.8. of the report.
- f) To delegate to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure in consultation with the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services the authority to look to create a deferred payment scheme for parishes with small precepts wishing to fund a reduction in speed limits where it is a local priority, but falls outside the Council's implementation criteria and to report back to Cabinet on progress as soon as practicable.

377. SCRUTINY ISSUES – REPORT FROM THE CORPORATE ISSUES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – COUNTY FARMS MEMBER LED REVIEW AND CABINET RESPONSE

The chairman of the Review Group Councillor Farrer presented the findings and recommendations of the Member Led Review of the County Farms Estate (CFE). The purpose of the review had been to examine the:

- Performance of the Estate in achieving its objectives
- Prospects for the Estate in the long term
- Suitability of the CFE objectives and whether they should be amended to reflect changes since the last review in 2006
- the fundamental question of whether the Council should retain or sell the CFE.

The review had concluded that the CFE was a well managed asset which had consistently achieved its objectives and had strong prospects for the future. It was found that the CFE offered excellent value for money and supplied a regular and significant income stream for the Council. In introducing the report Councillor Farrer thanked the other two members of the review group while indicating that he had been asked to carry out the review at short notice and would have appreciated more time to enable an even more detailed study to be made. **Action point it was suggested that Scrutiny Management Group should be made aware of this feedback.**

Issues raised in the subsequent discussion of the report included reference to paragraph 2.2 of the response and the statement that the rates of return were comparable to private estates. One member asked whether consideration had been given to whether a greater rate of return could have been achieved from having invested the money elsewhere. In response it was indicated that the rate of return was greater than if the money had been invested in money markets and in addition, there was the added benefit of the future opportunity of land sales which would not be available with a different type of investment.

Cabinet Members were in favour of utilising CFE as an asset that could provide an increased economic rate of return.

It was resolved:

- a) to thank Scrutiny for producing a valuable and detailed report; and
- b) to approve the response to the Member Led Review on the County Farms Estate, as set out in Section 2 of the report and included as [appendix 2](#) to these minutes.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Being mindful that a number of local Members had requested to speak, with Cabinet's agreement the Leader changed the order of the agenda to receive the key decision report on Special Educational Needs (SEN) Transport as the next item of business.

377. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (SEN) HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT POLICY

Cabinet received a report proposing an amended policy for Special Educational Needs Home to School Transport. The intention was to make the best use of the resources available for the County Council to meet its legal obligations as well as taking into account individual circumstances, and to deliver financial savings to address budget pressures. As well as the paper and associated revised policy, Cabinet's attention was drawn to the Community Impact Assessment report which had been provided to Cabinet members separately, with hard copies being made available for the public at the meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Children highlighted that the current report had only been prepared following extensive consultation with families, special schools, vehicle operators and council officers. He thanked Councillor Curtis the previous Cabinet Member for Children, Judith Davies, Hannah Woodhouse and their colleagues for the work so far undertaken. He highlighted that he had also spoken with a number of involved families, and found them to be overwhelmingly supportive and understanding of the Council's proposed approach and intended to ensure that close collaboration continued with all those involved / affected.

It was noted that historically Cambridgeshire had, had a very flexible approach to delivering the duty to provide free transport where a child had been placed or had to attend schools to access some speciality provision that were not their local catchment school. The Cabinet Member for Children highlighted that all children with special needs were individuals and had differing needs, and that in the past there had been a reliance on taxis as a means of transporting children, without questioning whether this was always the right option. Under the amended policy officers would discuss with the families involved the best solution for them and would involve looking at options in place of individual taxis including whether:

- the child would be able to walk to and from school with appropriate support
- Whether with a financial contribution the family would be able to transport the child themselves
- better use could be made of mini-buses to transport a number of children
- Only after the above had been considered and found not to be appropriate or practicable, would an individual taxi be considered.

It was stressed that under no circumstances was the Council proposing to withdraw necessary support from those individuals with special educational needs as reported elsewhere and which had only served to cause unnecessary concern to the families involved. It was also highlighted that for those individual families who were dissatisfied with the approach being taken, the authority would be instituting a new appeals procedure to address their concerns.

Attention was drawn to the fact that over the past ten years the numbers of children receiving free home to school transport had grown from approximately 900 to approximately 1300. With 3,000 children and young people in the county having SEN statements the authority needed to ensure it was providing appropriate support to each and every one of them, whilst also recognising that the whole Country was having to adapt to a time of finite resources. Attention was also drawn to the significant growth in recent years of the numbers of children with complex needs and as medical science improved, these numbers were likely to increase.

Two local members had given prior notice of their wish to speak on the report. The Local Member for Castle spoke highlighting a case of a child from a family of five children with special educational needs, where both parents worked and who due to balance problems, was unable to ride a bike. She indicated that this family would be seriously economically disadvantaged if the current Council transport provision was withdrawn, as this would result in one parent having to give up work to transport the child to school each day. She noted that the wording of the policy provided welcome flexibility and urged if the Council must apply the new policy (which she still opposed) it should be applied with discretion, intelligence and humanity.

The local Member for Newnham also speaking as the Liberal Democrat spokesperson for Children and Young People sought assurances that working parents full circumstances would be taken in to account in any assessment / appeals process, including the additional time taken out of their working day should it be proposed that they drove their children to school. If these factors were not to be considered, she urged Cabinet to delay implementing the measures proposed.

In response to the issues raised, it was confirmed that officers would be assessing families on a case by case basis.

Issues / Questions raised by Cabinet Members included:

- Seeking and receiving assurance that the proposal that the local authority would not continue transport to parental preferred schools placements where parents moved house further away would not apply to foster parents who were considered to be a special case for exemption.
- Questioning in relation to [appendix 1](#) whether the word “residential” required to be added in the title under paragraph 8.10 of the extract from the Home to College Transport Policy. Officers confirmed that this was an omission that would be rectified.

Having carefully considered the Community Impact Assessment document and the submission made and the reasons proposed for the changes to the policy and having been reassured that each case would be looked at on an individual basis in a sensitive way

It was resolved:

To approve the proposed changes to the Special Educational Needs (SEN) Home to School Transport Policy as set out in section 2.4 of the officers' report.

[REPORTS FOR DECISION FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING]

379. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY AND PROPOSALS MAP C: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREAS & SUPPORTING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPD)

Cabinet was asked to consider the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Proposals Map Mineral Safeguarding Areas and three supporting Supplementary Planning Documents before referring those which could be adopted to full Council for a final decision.

It was noted that the County Council and Peterborough City Council had over a six year period, jointly prepared a new Minerals and Waste Plan and undertaken extensive consultation as set out in the report under the statutory process prescribed in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which when adopted would replace the existing Cambridgeshire Aggregates Local Plan and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan. Cabinet congratulated the officers involved on the excellent work undertaken.

It was noted that the Minerals and Waste Plan was comprised of:

- Core Strategy: a document setting out the strategic vision and objectives, including strategic allocations, and a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development. It was highlighted that the Core Strategy had been found to be sound by the Independent Government Inspector.
- Site Specific Proposals (SSP): a document setting out site specific proposals for mineral and waste development and supporting site specific policies.
- Proposals Map: Three maps showing the Plans proposals, Map A Mineral and Transport Zones, and Map B Waste (which cannot be adopted until the SSP is adopted), and Map C Mineral Safeguarding Areas (which relate to the Core Strategy)

The Minerals and Waste Plan was supported by Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD), which would supplement the policies of the Plan by providing more detailed advice on particular aspects of the Plan.

Three SPD have been prepared alongside the Core Strategy in relation to:

- The Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan
- The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities
- The RECAP Waste Management Design Guide

The first two of these SPD had completed the process of public consultation, and could be considered for adoption alongside the 'parent' Core Strategy and proposals Map C Mineral Safeguarding areas. The third had been subject to one round of consultation, but a further round was required prior to adoption for the reasons set out in the report. It was noted that once adopted an SPD became a material planning consideration which required must be taken into account when determining planning applications.

Cabinet questions included:

- One Member made reference to Paragraph 2.12 and the Inspectors comments regarding local concerns about the impact of Heavy Commercial vehicle (HCV) traffic which he concluded was unlikely to have a material impact asking whether haulage routes had been included. In response it was explained that the Council had prepared and adopted an Advisory Freight Map within the Local Transport Plan which would direct HCVs onto the primary roads and that this was supported by new HCV signage. Officers had been in discussions with Minerals Operators regarding restricting their hours of operation.
- The same Member when referring to paragraph 3.5 of the report stressed the importance of including reference to local guidance which might be available from District / City Councils and to add key principles on sustainable construction. The same Member also requested clarification of paragraph 4.4 on concerns relating to Household Recycling Centres and how the financial contribution to be sought from developers would be calculated. In reply it was confirmed that the methodology for calculating contributions was set out in [Appendix 1](#) of the report and that further consultation was proposed to give all interested parties an opportunity to respond to changes to the document.
- One Cabinet Member highlighted and recommended the excellent recycling centre at St Neots as a model to be followed.

It was resolved:

- a) to request that the Council agree to adopt the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (as amended by Planning Inspector J G King); and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Proposals Map C: Mineral Safeguarding Areas.
- b) To note the Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan and the Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPDs; and request that the Council adopt these SPDs.
- c) To delegate powers to the portfolio holder for Growth and Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director Environment Services, to approve the final amendments to the Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD, prior to the SPD being considered for adoption by the Council.
- d) To endorse the proposed amendments to the RECAP (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership) Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and agree that it will be subject to a further round of public consultation in autumn 2011.
- e) To delegate powers to the portfolio holder for Growth and Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director Environment Services, to approve the final amendments to the RECAP SPD, prior to the second round of public consultation in autumn 2011.

380. FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT

Cabinet received a report highlighting issues in relation to the Council's Flexible Retirement Policy implemented in April 2009 and sought endorsement of proposed revisions before recommending them for Full Council approval.

The current Flexible Retirement Scheme which was useful to both employees and the employer was based on the key principles that employees should have the option to request:

- a 20% reduction in hours or more; AND/OR
- a move to an associated role, with a substantial downgrading of duties of responsibility and grade (must be at least 2 grades lower).

It was highlighted that when an employee was granted early payment of pension benefits, there were costs to the pension fund, which must be recovered. Depending on the employee's age and length of scheme membership these costs were met by either (or both) of the following:

- a) By the employer in the form of capital costs
AND/OR
- b) By the employee by way of reduction for early payment to his/her benefits – This reduction was not waived.

It was highlighted that a number of issues had arisen since the Scheme's introduction as set out in section 2 of the report under the headings "Cost" and "Re-Employment Earnings" and as a result the following revisions were recommended:

Revision 1

To amend the current policy to state that cost would be used as a factor for turning down flexible retirement requests. Managers would need to justify that the capital costs of flexible retirement were disproportionately high.

Revision 2

To amend the current policy by introducing 're-employment earnings' into the criteria. The policy should be updated to state that where the new salary + pension will exceed former salary, employees are required to take a bigger reduction, i.e. employees would have to reduce their hours by more than 20% or move to an associated role that is more than 2 grades below his /her substantive role.

The Leader of the Council's main issue was that the explanation under 1.4 detailing the capital costs was far too technical and a simplified explanation was therefore sought. Officers explained that the figures set out in the report were gross salary savings, e.g. savings made from the vacant hours /reduced salary (assuming that the vacant hours/higher graded post had not been backfilled, where the employee took a reduction in hours or moved to a lower graded post).

It was resolved:

- a) to endorse the proposed policy revisions for onward submission to full Council.

- b) To recommend that Council approves the Revised Flexible Retirement Policy.

KEY DECISION REPORTS

381. PRESCRIBED ALTERATIONS TO PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to proceed with plans to increase the size of the following two primary schools in Cambridge in response to demographic increases leading to an increased demand for school places in Cambridge:

- St Matthew's Community Primary School, in order to provide a total of 630 places, through the addition of twelve permanent classrooms, from September 2011 ; and
- St Laurence's Voluntary Aided Roman Catholic Primary School, in order to provide a total of 315 places, through the addition of two permanent classrooms, with effect from 1 September 2012.

Cabinet noted that the required statutory notice to make the prescribed alteration at St Matthew's Community Primary School had resulted in one written response during the representation period, which was in support of the proposal. In respect of the prescribed alteration at St Laurence's Voluntary Aided Roman Catholic Primary School no representations had been made during the consultation period.

The Local Member for Petersfield spoke in support of the proposal for St Matthews highlighting that the multi storey school expansion on East Road, Cambridge would improve the urban environment and was supported locally. She also made reference that it would be essential to ensure that the second phase of development of St Matthew's, not currently funded, should still go ahead.

Cabinet Members made the following comments:

- One Member stated that it was often the view that 630 places for schools was too large a number and yet, there were real advantages to having larger schools and sharing resources.
- Cabinet requested that their thanks be passed on by the Executive Director to the governing bodies and chairmen of both schools for the extra work undertaken in relation to the proposed expansions.
- The Leader made the point that officers when recommending the expansions of certain schools needed to be sensitive to ensuring capacity was not lost in neighbouring schools.

It was resolved:

- a) to note the fact that the only response received to the statutory notices published on 11 March 2011, was in support of the proposal to expand St Matthew's; and
- b) to approve the prescribed alterations to increase the size of :

- St Matthew's Community Primary School, with effect from 1 September 2011; and
- St Laurence's Voluntary Aided Roman Catholic Primary School, with effect from 1 September 2012.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Due to the need to agree the draft response in time for the special meeting of Peterborough City Council that afternoon, with Cabinet's agreement, the Leader changed the order of the agenda to receive the "Other decisions" report agenda Item 13, "Great Haddon Employment Land Planning Application - County Council Response" as the next item of business. The Leader indicated he had already contacted his counterpart in Peterborough to express his concern that both the local communities in the vicinity of the proposed development and County Officers had not been given enough time to make their representations. He highlighted that the Chief Executives of both PCC and CCC were meeting on Friday and would cover this point as part of their discussions.

As the report had not been circulated five working days before the meeting, the chairman also agreed to exercise his discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the report to be considered for the reasons indicated below:

Reason for lateness – it was necessary to undertake further consultation with Cabinet Members and local Members to informally finalise a response in order to meet the deadline for the recently convened special Planning Meeting by Peterborough City Council which was being held on the same day as the Cabinet meeting. Reason for urgency - in order to seek formal approval to the response from Cabinet. (Peterborough City Council's Planning Committee was meeting at 1.30 p.m. and therefore if any changes needed to be made following discussion at Cabinet these could still be passed on orally)

382. GREAT HADDON EMPLOYMENT LAND PLANNING APPLICATION – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE

Cabinet noted that the residential and employment land planning applications were submitted to Peterborough City Council in December 2009. A draft consultation response to both applications was considered by Cabinet on 16th November 2010 which was agreed containing holding objections to both applications on the basis of deficiencies in the transport assessment for the sites. The County Council had also made objections to the residential application with regards to countryside access/rights of way and libraries/lifelong learning. A response to the employment land application was considered by Cabinet on 5th April 2011 and maintained the County Council's holding objection on transport grounds. Peterborough City Council had intended to determine the Employment land application on the 26th April 2011. However, in the light of the Highway Agency retaining its holding direction to the application, the date for determination of the application was revised.

Cabinet was informed that during April, further information was received in relation to transport measures for the employment land and this led to the Highways Agency withdrawing its holding direction to the employment application. County Council officers had also considered this additional information and were now satisfied that the key points on which the original objection was made had now been addressed. Officers now advised that the proposed employment development would not have a significant detrimental impact on its highway network provided mitigation measures secured by condition or included in

the Section 106 agreement were provided as part of the development scheme. It was highlighted that the holding objection remained until the mitigation described in the report was secured through planning conditions or Section 106 obligations as appropriate.

In terms of drainage the County Council had concerns regarding the possibility of flooding should an inadequate drainage system be provided for the development. To overcome this, it was suggested that there should be sufficient measures proposed to demonstrate the mitigation of this risk to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency, Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. Despite the concerns in discussion Cabinet agreed that there was a positive opportunity to incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) within the development and Cabinet requested as an additional paragraph that this should be secured and implemented through an appropriate planning condition or through the S106 agreement.

Other Issues discussed included the need to continue to raise with Peterborough's counterpart lead member and officers the issues of local concern to Yaxley residents in relation to access to secondary schools and community facilities and that such discussions should involve the relevant local members in order to help forge relationships and suggest guidance to improve future consultation arrangements.

It was resolved:

That despite the short notice given to prepare a response, it was agreed to approve the draft consultation response, as set out in [Appendix 1](#) of the report, for the Employment Land Planning application at Great Haddon and that it should be sent to Peterborough City Council to be considered at their special planning meeting that afternoon.

383. CAMBRIDGESHIRE SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN AND CAMBRIDGESHIRE PRELIMINARY FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT (PFRA)

Cabinet noted a report which had its origins in the wide scale flooding experienced during 2007 which had resulted in the Pitt Review. The key recommendation from the report being that "the development of local 'Surface Water Management Plans' should be coordinated by local authorities, to provide the basis for managing all local flood risk. As a result, the 'Flood and Water Management Act (2010) required Cambridgeshire County Council as a designated 'Lead Local Flood Authority' (LLFA) to develop 'Surface Water Management Plans' (SWMPs). In addition the LLFA had responsibility to develop a 'Local Flood Risk Management Strategy' under the Flood and Water Management Act (2010) with consultation from key stakeholders, such as the public and other risk management authorities. It was highlighted that the outputs of the SWMP would contribute toward the content of Cambridgeshire's 'Local Flood Risk Management Strategy' and define how flood risk management activities would be carried out in the County.

It was explained that the primary use of a SWMP would be for emergency management activities, and the content of the Cambridgeshire SWMP would seek to inform the work of the 'Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Local Resilience Forum' and associated emergency management activities in the County. The objectives of the Cambridgeshire SWMP were set out in paragraph 3.8 of the report. It was highlighted that the next steps for the Cambridgeshire SWMP included:

:

- Undertaking detailed modelling and options appraisals for St Neots, and the other nine identified priority 'wetspot' areas as set out in paragraph 3.21 of the report;
- Identification of quick wins – to identify where smaller 'wetspots' could be progressed to the intermediate stage, in order to assess the viability of inexpensive solutions to remediate flood risk (there were 250 throughout the County);
- assisting in the preparation of a 'Local Flood Risk Management Strategy';

Cabinet was also advised that the Flood Risk Regulations (2009) had sought to provide a consistent approach to managing flood risk across Europe, through a six year planning cycle with the first stage being to undertake a 'Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA)'. It was noted that the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) was a high level screening exercise that brought together information from a number of sources to assess local flood risk. The Cambridgeshire PFRA sought to provide detail on the information used, methodology adopted and level of local flood risk in Cambridgeshire that was principally associated with surface runoff, groundwater and ordinary watercourses.

Cabinet's attention was drawn to recommendations provided by the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee who had considered the SWMP the day before Cabinet which were tabled at the meeting. While comments from Scrutiny had been anticipated, they had come forward in the form of "Informal Recommendations" (attached as [appendix 3](#) to these minutes). It was agreed that due to the timing, resulting in their being no opportunity to prepare a full considered response to the recommendations calling for future action, they could only be noted and it was agreed the Cabinet portfolio member should be given a delegation in consultation with the officers to look at the recommendations in more detail outside of the meeting and prepare a response to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Cabinet Members made the following points during the discussion:

- In terms of the St Neots wetspot and whether it included Little Paxton, there was a request for officers to engage with St Neots Town Council. This would be taken up by the Director of Environment and Regulation and would involve Huntingdonshire District Council.
- While noting that scrutiny also wished to receive further presentations there was a request to include in the invites to engage with districts and local members, as they had direct experience of local flooding issues, often as a result of additional housing being built and being added to existing older drainage systems which had not been upgraded and were no longer adequate to deal with the increased run off during very wet periods.
- Assurance was requested regarding the engagement of the Environment Agency. Officers indicated that they were working very closely with the Environment Agency and other partners. The Council was also able to raise concerns directly via the County Council representatives that sat on the Environment Agency's Regional Flood and Coastal Committees. One member asked what action was being taken to remove blockages during the leaf falling season in vulnerable areas. The Service Director Environment and Regulation was not able to give assurances that all drains would be unblocked and there would not be future incidences of flooding as not all drains were County Council maintained and the Council was not able to instruct other agencies on how often they should jet their drains. However collaborative working was being undertaken with partners to ensure quick wins were undertaken. Cabinet sought a proactive approach from County Council officers to ensure it was seen to be leading

a joined up approach with partners, in line with the Council's statutory responsibilities to investigate and help reduce the incidence of flooding.

- In terms of the risk of insurance blight as a result of repeat flooding this was taken seriously but was sometimes hampered by people not wishing to disclose their insurance details. One Member in response made the point that if people did not disclose incidences of flooding to a new insurer this would invalidate a future claim.
- The valuable role town and parish councils could play as they developed local neighbourhood plans was highlighted.
- Cabinet highlighted this report and a previous one on Flexible Retirement as being too technical and requested that in future report authors be advised that reports should be presented in a simplified, non technical manner in order that they could be more easily understood by people who were not experts and that technical issues should be confined to appendices.

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the Cambridgeshire Surface Water Management Plan Strategic Assessment Report (SWMP) as set out in [Appendix 1](#) (included as part of the separate Cabinet Information pack);
- b) to approve the Cambridgeshire Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment as set out in [Appendix 2](#). (included as part of the separate Cabinet Information pack);
- c) to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning to make final amendments to the PFRA ahead of submission to the Environment Agency; and
- d) to note the tabled recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services the authority to look at the recommendations in more detail outside of the meeting and prepare a response.

384. TRUMPINGTON MEADOWS SECTION 106 DEFERRAL REQUEST

It was noted that as a result of the economic slowdown, the County Council had received a number of requests from developers seeking to defer Section 106 payments already negotiated. As a result of this, a process to deal with these deferral requests was agreed by Cabinet in July 2009.

This report explained that the Council had received a request from Grosvenor, developers of the Trumpington Meadows site in Cambridge, seeking a minor variation to their s106 agreement. While this would need to be agreed by the Joint Development Control Committee who had originally granted the planning permission, as the request would impact mostly on the County Council, an approach to the deferral request from Cabinet needed to be agreed.

Cabinet noted the details was based on the developers' view that an item of preparatory work that should have been included in the list of works that would not trigger the s106 agreement had been inadvertently missed when the agreement was being prepared and therefore taking a strict reading of the agreement, the work as detailed in the report would trigger the start of s106 payments. Officers accepted that the specific work was something that would not normally be seen as triggering development and as the developer was

indicating that without the requested amendment, any works would not commence until all planning matters were resolved, officers accepted that the proposed amendment was likely to give the Council the best financial outcome.

The Leader of the Council expressed extreme concern that one of the local members had not been identified on the front of the report (Gamlingay electoral division) and reminded report authors that they must identify all relevant local members and ensure that they had been given the opportunity to express their views.

It was resolved:

- a) to note the request for a section 106 deferral from developers of the Trumpington Meadows site, Grosvenor; and
- b) to approve the s106 deferral request and with Cambridge City Council, present the proposals to the Joint Development Control Committee for final approval of an amendment to the s106 agreement.

OTHER DECISIONS

385. OUTCOMES OF OFFICE FOR STANDARDS IN EDUCATION CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND SKILLS (OFSTED) ANNUAL UNANNOUNCED INSPECTION OF CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE (REPORT AND ACTION PLAN)

Cabinet received a report on the outcome of the Unannounced Inspection of Cambridgeshire's Children's Social Care Referral and Assessment Teams by Ofsted on 16th and 17th February 2011

The inspection had identified an area of strength which was defined as an area where the Local Authority has evidenced that it had gone over and above statutory guidance and this was detailed in paragraph 2.2 (of the report). The Inspection had also identified a number of areas of practice that met (statutory) guidance as summarised in paragraph 2.3 and some areas for improvement as listed in the action plan in [appendix 2](#) of the report. All of the areas were ones which had previously been identified and the proposals for the new model for delivery of Social Work -Working for Families (currently out to formal consultation) addressed them all. Each of the areas for development was detailed within the Action Plan and the Children's Social Care Performance Board would monitor the implementation and progress. In addition the inspectors concluded that the areas for priority action identified by the 2009 inspection had all been addressed.

The report demonstrated that:

- there had been significant improvement since the previous inspections
- Staff morale and management supervision was a key strength
- Managers and staff were self aware and were actively engaged in working on the areas for improvement.

Cabinet took the opportunity to thank all the officers involved in the service for achieving such an improved rating since the last inspection and to also thank Councillor Curtis as the previous Cabinet Member for Children at the time of the inspection.

It was agreed:

To note the outcome of the Inspection and agree the action plan arising.

MONITORING REPORTS

386. QUARTERLY UPDATE REPORT ON PARTNERSHIPS

In order to update Cabinet and enhance accountability of the activities of key strategic partnerships it had previously been agreed that a quarterly report should be produced. The report provided the latest quarterly update report on the following six partnerships:

- A) Cambridge Children's Trust (pages 1-3)
- B) Cambridgeshire Care Partnership (pages 4-5)
- C) Cambridgeshire Horizons (pages 5-6)
- D) Safer and Stronger Thematic Partnership (pages 6-7)
- E) Greater Cambridge Partnership (pages 7-10)
- F) Community Well Being Partnership (pages 10-11)

Cabinet was also invited to consider whether it wished to continue to receive the report at future quarterly cycles.

The Leader of the Council while wishing to receive future updates considered that the present format required to be amended to provide more information on outcomes achieved etc and tasked the Chief Executive to progress the revamp. In response he indicated that he had already spoken to his Strategic Management Team colleagues the previous day on the need for more focussed reports.

It was agreed:

- a) To note the content of the report.
- b) To receive future reports on the basis that the Chief Executive should ensure that they were more focused on reporting objectives, providing details of measurable outcomes / identifying issues.

387. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / OFFICERS

Cabinet received the latest update report covering the period from November 2010 up to April 2011.

The Leader made reference to item 10 in respect of the Investment in the College of West Anglia and Item 21 Building Schools for the Future (BSF) with reference to securing the site for the Fenland Junction Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and requested that they needed to be linked together and progressed. The Executive Director CYPS reported that the next BSF Programme Board would be looking into the issues around the future site of the PRU.

Councillor McGuire made reference to Item 25 Great Haddon Land Planning Application - Council Response regarding the meeting to be arranged as soon as possible by the then

Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning and the Acting Executive Director Environment Services with Peterborough City Lead Members and Officers which was to involve local Members but which was yet to happen. **The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning undertook to organise the meeting.**

It was agreed:

- a) To note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and / or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions / take actions on its behalf.
- b) With reference to delegations 10 and 21 to ask officers to progress the PRU on the COWA site.

388. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA

It was resolved:

To note the agenda plan.

Chairman
14th June 2011

Appendix 1

Villagers of Barton and Grantchester - Petition to reduce speed on the A603

The spokesperson Patrick De Backer clerk to Barton Parish Council presented the petition. In terms of:

- Link 19 he indicated that they were recommending a 40mhp limit along the stretch of road due to the multiple hazards including the entrance to a rifle range, Haggis Farm and St Marks cemetery.
- Link 18 he believed the New road junction with the B1046 was an accident waiting to happen and was concerned regarding parents and cyclists try to cross the road to get to a primary school and playgroup. There was also an exit from Roan Hill serving a residential housing area where it was difficult to join the road due to the speed of traffic.
- Link 17 he argued there was every reason to decrease the limit in the village due to poor visibility and bends and hazards involving much used junctions in the High Sreet and Haslingfield Road and important entrances to public amenities such as a garage and pub with no crossing points / refuges provided .
- Link 16 and 15 the speed limit should be reduced to allow residents to leave their driveways on both sides safely.

In summing up the parish's view was that the 10 mph requested reductions in the speed limits would prevent death and serious injury reminding cabinet that their views had previously been supported by the AJC meeting in January including many county councillors (some of whom were members of the previous Cabinet).

Letter from Barton Parish Council key points

The letter highlighted that in their opinion:

Link 18 and 19 a badly designed junction of the 603 and B1046 and enclosed a photograph of children and parents attempting to cross the road at Roman Hill to the B10469 to illustrate their point.

Link 17 this included the junction with the High Street, the White Horse pub and the busy (wallis's garage. The lay-by had a food stall and was used by lorries parked at night. The stretch also included the junction with Haslingfield Road.

Link 16 – Haslingfield to the Lords Bridge end of the village. This was a wide stretch of road with fast moving traffic. For much of its length there were houses on both sides of the road. Residents had campaigned for a long time to have the (national) speed limit reduced.

Local Members Views expressed regarding agenda item 7 Speed Management issues Minute 376

- The County Councillor for Hardwick (which included Barton and Granchester) supported the reduced speed limit suggested at links 18 and 19 making reference to the photograph provided by the chairman of Barton Parish Council which highlighted that a small traffic island in the middle of the A 603 was surrounded by barriers which made it difficult to access when escorting a number of children across the road. She

highlighted the dangers of the speed of traffic coming off the M11 who often exceed the 60 mph current speed limit and the added danger of drivers who were unaware of some of the hazards. The support for the reduction in the speed limit was to reduce the risk of future deaths and injuries and to avoid the road becoming an accident hotspot. In terms of the AJC supporting localism in their recommendations, she asked that Cabinet should listen to the views of the local population. Officers made the point that the approach to Barton was an area of low accidents and the crossing routes compared favourably to other crossings in the county. In terms of the alternative speed limits being suggested from the AJC meeting, the Cabinet portfolio holder indicated that he had driven several of the routes the day before to ascertain for himself the issues raised including the A603.

- One of the local members for Sawston, Councillor Orgee reiterated his support for the revised AJC speed limit proposals for the A1307, highlighting in his view the inconsistency of the County Council's officers proposals which would in effect lower one stretch to 50mph while leaving unchanged a section on link 5 at 70mph both stretches of which had recorded almost identical mean speeds. He supported extending the proposed 50 mph limit over the brow of the hill to just past Wandlebury entrance / exit and imposing a 50 mph limit at the Babraham crossroads. He also highlighted the apparent inconsistencies with the County Council policy of encouraging more cycling and upgrading the footway / cycleway from Whittlesford to Sawston for more students to cycle between Whittlesford and Sawston Village college and yet proposing to keep the 70mph stretch of the A1301 at a point where there was a cycle crossing point and where mean speeds were lower than 50mph. In relation to the different speeds proposed along different sections of the A1301 originally put before the AJC by officers, he supported the revised recommendation for a 40mph speed limit for link 3 and a small extensions southwards, and a 50mph limit for the remainder of the A1301 southwards to the county boundary. He strongly supported a 50mph speed limit at the section of the road covering the Mill Lane Junction (link 5) as he believed it met all policy requirements to change it to 50mph.
- The County Councillor for Duxford Spoke supporting the AJC proposal to reduce the speed at link 5 on the A1307 to 50mph having consulted local residents and Babraham Parish Council. He highlighted a problem exiting from Babraham in relation to restricted sight lines resulting in the difficulty of seeing traffic from the Haverhill side as a result of a sharp dip in the road. This was likely to be exacerbated in the future as more development in Babraham increased the potential accident risk as more cars sought to use the exit while from the Haverhill side the Haverhill Vision for further expansion was likely to result in more traffic using the section of the road. In terms of the AJC proposal to reduce the speed limit at link 5 for the dual carriageway section covering Mill Lane junction he highlighted that people living in Sawston tended not to use the bypass but that his own consultation undertaken with residents off the villages around Sawston took the view that the speed limit should remain unchanged in line with the officer recommendations. While the road carried a 70 mph limit it was extremely straight for a mile long section and had excellent sight lines with the accident rate being very low.

In addition comments from the local member for Gamlingay were read out as he was unable to attend supporting the extension of the reduced speed limit to include the Larkin Road Junction. While he was sympathetic to the calls of Longstowe Parish Council and other parishes for further reductions and sorry that they were not included, he was encouraged by the emphasis the officers had placed on "self help" options as detailed in the

Speed Limit Policy. He however raised the issue which concerned parishes who had spoken to him regarding being given some estimate of the likely costs involved. In relation to this latter point the officers were in the process of providing information to parishes in the form of leaflets etc in order that they consider their fund options.

CABINET RESPONSE TO: MEMBER LED REVIEW – COUNTY FARMS ESTATE**Recommendation 1: Retain the Estate**

Members believe that the Estate is a valuable strategic asset that the Council should make a long term commitment to retain.

Agreed response

Cabinet agrees with this recommendation and notes that the Council has signalled its commitment to the County Farms Estate by major investments through the Better Use of Property Assets (BUPA) programme and since 1988 regular reviews of policies, objectives and Farm Management Plans. The latter have given both the Council and its tenants a long term strategic framework to operate and develop viable businesses and has generated excellent financial and non financial returns.

Internal Rate of Return calculations produced by Bidwells show returns of 4.95% and 6.74% for the period 2010 to 2050 which are comparable with privately held estates.

In addition land on the Estate may form part of the Northstowe development, be used for the proposed Recycling Centre at Trumpington and also a rowing lake at Waterbeach.

Furthermore the Estate provides opportunities for people to start farming businesses supporting 64 new entrants since 1998 as well as encouraging existing tenants to diversify their income streams and become more innovative.

Many new woods and permissive paths have been created on the Estate making the County a better place to live in. The latest community woodland planted at Oakington has well received new public access links.

Recommendation 2 : Financial returns must be the top priority during the current economic situation

The County Farms Estate (CFE) has several social, economic and environmental objectives. These are not mutually exclusive as land can often meet several objectives at once. Nonetheless, given the financial difficulties facing the Council, Members believe that the top priority at the moment should be to generate financial returns to supply funds for mainstream services.

Agreed response

Cabinet agree the objectives are not mutually exclusive and that the financial contribution made by the Estate to the Council is most important whilst also recognising the important non financial benefits such as providing opportunities for local communities to enjoy the countryside. Capital receipts have averaged £3m pa for the last decade while rents have increased by approximately £400,000 in the last 3 years and further rental increases are expected as farming profitability improves as a result of global demand for food.

Recommendation 3: Encourage Purchase of Land

The current Estate policies do not explicitly allow or encourage officers to purchase land where this is deemed advantageous, and there is little evidence of land purchases in recent years. Members believe that CFE policy should be amended so that officers actively seek sites for purchase, to partially mitigate the reduction in the Estate. This will help strengthen the Estate's role as a long term strategic asset.

Agreed response

The Better Use of Property Assets (BUPA) project currently provides funding for capital investment on the Estate including land purchases where a sound business case can be made.

In the current economic climate a good business case would be required to justify land purchases. Land might be bought where there is marriage value e.g. to unlock areas with potentially greater value in the long term or to expand existing holdings. Several blocks of land have been considered for purchase in recent years.

However an active campaign by the Council to purchase land could be counter productive as prospective vendors are likely to set enhanced prices.

Local agents currently provide officers with details of land for sale but supply has for several years been limited and prices as a result too high to justify acquisition based on purely agricultural returns.

Officers will continue to monitor the market for sites where a suitable business case can be made to justify a purchase.

Recommendation 4: Ensure proceeds from the Estate continue to support Council services

The Pensions Committee has given some consideration to the possibilities of acquiring some of the CFE. As stated in recommendation 1, Members believe that the Council should retain the Estate as a strategic asset and recommend that Cabinet should ensure that proceeds from the Estate continue to support Council services.

Agreed Response

Cabinet notes the Scrutiny Committee's recommendation. The Pensions Committee's investigations into its overarching investment strategy are ongoing and no conclusions have been reached. If that strategy included direct investment in property incorporating all or part of the County Farms Estate, detailed Member discussion would be required together with the agreement of both the Pension Committee and Cabinet, before any transfer took place.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON AGENDA ITEM 10 CAMBRIDGESHIRE SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN AND CAMBS PRELIMINARY FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT FROM ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 23RD MAY 2011

Surface Water Management Plans and preliminary Flood Risk Assessment

Recommendations to Cabinet

- 1) The Committee believes that water management is a serious, strategic issue that requires long term planning and funding commitments from all statutory bodies and third parties. Sources of funding need to be identified as a priority, for example through:
 - Responsible management of developers through bonds and developer contributions through the Community Infrastructure Levy
 - Tax Increment Financing
 - Match funding from Government
- 2) Officers should review the validity of the top 10 'wetspots' as there are concerns about the data sources used.
- 3) Cabinet should review the capacity of the County to perform its statutory role as a planning consultee as there are concerns about lack of capacity. In particular, this resource is required in order to enable the County Council to provide comments regarding sustainable development requirements (e.g. so that water is recycled effectively).
- 4) Cabinet should task the responsible partnership to develop a programme showing timescales for evidence gathering, action planning, funding allocation, etc, in order to inform plans being developed by key stakeholders (e.g. Anglian Water)
- 5) The Committee highlighted that there remain concerns about communication and partnership working with some bodies. E.g. Anglian Water, and would like to highlight this for Cabinets' attention