

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 29 October 2002

Time: 10.00 – 10.50

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor J K Walters (Chairman)

Councillors S F Johnstone, V Lucas, A K Melton,
S B Normington, L Oliver, D R Pegram and R Wilkinson

Also in attendance:

Councillors S V Brinton and A C Kent

Apologies: Councillors J A Powley and J E Reynolds

218. OPENING REMARKS (POWER SHORTAGES IN CAMBS.)

The Chief Executive reported that, following the recent high winds experienced across the country, approximately 4,000 homes were still with out electricity in Cambridgeshire. Action was being taken by the County Council to ensure that the needs of Social Services clients were being met. In view of the protracted length of time being taken to restore power, normal emergency duty arrangements were being supplemented and the Council had opened a telephone helpline to provide advice to residents. Information about the facility was being sent to the press, local radio stations and local Parish, District and County Councillors. Officers would continue to liaise with the utility company to ensure that up to date information was available to the public and, where there was sufficient demand, the Council would work with District Councils to set up community rest centres.

Cabinet welcomed action being taken. Reference was made to:

- The good work being done by the local media, commenting on the need to ensure that information regarding action that is being taken to remedy the situation is provided to the public, as well as identifying which areas are affected.
- The need to ensure that regular information up-dates are provided to the local media for dissemination to residents.

219. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24 September 2002 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

220. REFERRALS FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

There were no referrals from Scrutiny Committees to report.

221. SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS – REVISED POLICY

Cabinet noted the current range of policy related documents that were in place to meet the County Council's statutory obligations, as set out in the Special Educational Needs (SEN) Code of Practice 2001 and accompanying regulations.

The Council's SEN Strategy documents, published in April 2002, had addressed the majority of the Code of Conduct's policy requirements. However, the Strategy focussed on key areas for change and did not, therefore, cover all aspects of SEN policy or explain all of the Council's policies in detail. It was proposed that other Directorate documents, such as the Education Development Plan, guidance to schools on the identification and assessment of SEN and booklets produced for parents, be compiled to meet the policy related information requirements and be made available for any future inspections. A summary table signposting how the statutory duties had been met and providing information about the development work being undertaken in each area would be included for ease of reference.

Members noted that performance against the targets set for SEN would be measured in two ways. Firstly, progress in meeting the policy requirements of the Code of Conduct would be addressed within the relevant policy documents and secondly, measurement of educational attainment for children with SEN would be monitored through the Education Development Plan.

Cabinet decided:

- (i) To approve the range of policy documents in place to meet the Council's statutory obligations set out in the SEN Code of Practice and accompanying regulations; and
- (ii) To note the intention to review the policy documents and amend them for 2003/04 in order to meet all policy related requirements of the Code of Practice and the Council's new Special Education Needs funding arrangements.

222. AGREEMENT TO SECURE PARK AND RIDE FACILITIES FOR JOHN LEWIS PARTNERSHIP

Prior to the commencement of the discussion on this item, Cabinet was advised that this item had not previously been included on the agenda for this meeting or on the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions. The item had originally been expected to be dealt with under the delegated powers of the Director of Environment and Transport. However, it had become apparent from recent negotiations with developers that this would need to be a key decision requiring Cabinet approval. Officers were of the view that the matter could not await inclusion in the next revision to the forward plan, as this would delay a decision by a further month. Further delay might have jeopardised a development of significant importance to Cambridge and to the Council's strategic planning and transportation policies. The matter had, therefore, been brought forward as a matter requiring decision at this next meeting.

Cabinet considered the report, which outlined proposals for the future arrangements of the Council's Park and Ride Facility at Trumpington. In view of the facility being an integral part of the viability of the Grand Arcade development in Cambridge, the John Lewis Partnership (JLP) wished to secure its continuation for a minimum of 30 years. JLP had indicated that they must either have:

- The use of the Council's site restricted to a Park and Ride site for no less than 30 years; or
- A lease granted to them (at no cost or the absolute minimum legally permitted) for the whole site if the Council does not continue to use the site for Park and Ride for the same period of 30 years.

In considering the request from JLP, Members were advised that they would need to consider, on the one hand, the preservation of the potential latent value in the Park and Ride site and, on the other hand, giving long term security in the practical application of the Council's planning and transportation policies. The site was essential to the viability of the Grand Arcade redevelopment and associated improvements to the Trumpington Road corridor provided under the S106 agreement with the developer. It was noted that, if JLP's requirement were considered acceptable, there was the potential for the Council to impair the value of its asset or obstruct the use of the site for other purposes for the next thirty years. The loss in value could be very significant to the Council in the future.

Cabinet Members commented on the need to provide long term security for the use of the Park and Ride facility, in the light of its importance to the Council's planning and transportation policies and to the viability of the Grand Arcade redevelopment and associated improvements.

Cabinet decided:

- (i) To agree to restrict the use of land at the Trumpington Park and Ride site, as outlined in paragraphs a) to d) below, subject to any necessary consents being obtained from the Secretary of State.
 - a) The County Council enters into an agreement with JLP to secure the continuation of the site as a Park and Ride for 30 years by granting an obligation to lease the whole site to JLP at nil consideration for them to operate entirely at their own cost;
 - b) This lease would run from the point that the Council ceased to operate the site as a Park and Ride itself at any time during the 30 years from the establishment of the JLP facility at Trumpington;

- c) If JLP did not want to take up the option and run a Park and Ride service, or at a later date ceased to operate such, or after 30 years anyway, then the obligation to lease would terminate; and
 - d) If JLP exercise their right to a lease there is no revenue cost to the County Council once the County Council decides to cease its Park and Ride service at Trumpington, i.e. the continuation of the Park and Ride at Trumpington is entirely at JLP's cost.
- (ii) To instruct the Head of Property and Procurement to open discussions with the District Auditor and to take soundings with the Secretary of State to establish whether approval is required and that this Cabinet decision would be "subject to any decision by the Secretary of State if his consent is required under legislation or regulation".
 - (iii) To delegate to the Head of Property and Procurement the authority to finalise the detailed lease conditions, consistent with Cabinet's decision, but as modified by any direction from the Secretary of State.

[Note: Councillor V Lucas declared a personal interest in this item under paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct by reason of his being related to an employee of the developer of the Grand Arcade scheme in Cambridge, and accordingly withdrew from the meeting during consideration thereof.]

222. INTEGRATED DISCHARGE PLANNING AT ADDENBROOKES HOSPITAL

Cabinet considered proposals to establish an integrated health and social care team working on discharge planning at Addenbrookes Hospital.

Considerable progress had been made through focussed hard work by all parties to address the problem of delayed transfers at the Hospital. This had been accompanied by a significant cultural shift across organisations, recognising delayed transfer as a shared "whole system" problem. However, in order to sustain progress, it was recognised by all stakeholders that a more radical look at the way we work together is needed to sustain progress.

There were three main groups of staff involved in discharge planning at Addenbrookes:

- The Hospital Social Work Team employed by the County Council;
- A Team of Discharge Planning Nurses (mostly employed by Addenbrookes); and
- 2 Home Finders (employed by Cambridge City Primary Care Trust (PCT)) who work with Self Funders.

It was proposed that the three groups, which were currently separately managed and each worked to their own procedures and priorities, be integrated under a single manager to work more effectively together. This approach had been agreed by all stakeholders and was at the leading edge nationally, as integrated discharge teams had recently been recommended by the House of Commons Health Select Committee.

Members noted that:

- Social Services Spokes and Vulnerable Adults SDG had indicated support for the proposals.
- County Council staff would continue to be subject to all County Council working practices and procedures under the new arrangements.
- It was likely that an integrated team would reduce delayed discharges and therefore prevent future penalties being incurred. However, it was recognised that it would still be the Council's responsibility to pay any penalties levied by Central Government if delayed discharge targets were not being met.

Cabinet decided:

To agree, in principle, to the secondment of Council staff into the NHS in order to establish an integrated discharge team at Addenbrookes Hospital.

223. IEG2 – IMPLEMENTING ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT

Cabinet discussed and welcomed the final draft version of the County Council's Implementing Electronic Government (IEG) Statement, which outlined the progress made by the Council since the submission of the IEG first statement in July 2001 and would need to be submitted by 31 October 2002, as required by the Office of the Department Prime Minister (ODPM).

The requirements for the IEG statement were far more proscriptive than in 2001 and linked with the key elements outlined in the draft national strategy for local e-government, including vision, local and national priorities, resources and risks. The document highlighted, in particular, the positive work being undertaken with partner authorities in developing e-government initiatives and, in addition to being a submission to Central Government, it represented a useful tool for internal communications. A programme of internal events would be planned once the IEG was completed in order to ensure that the messages about progress and issues contained in the IEG were disseminated as widely as possible.

Members noted that:

- Providing that the Statement was judged to be 'satisfactory' by the ODPM, the Council would receive additional funding of £200k in 2003/04 to match funding provided in 2002/03.
- Following the receipt of funding in the 2002/03 financial year, those Councils that had demonstrated that they were working in partnership with neighbouring authorities were invited to bid for additional funding for the partnership; the Cambridgeshire Direct and Community Network partnership was allocated £650,000 capital funding over two years under this scheme. Of this funding, £50k had been earmarked to undertake a business case and funding model to enable future bids for funding to be submitted to Government, with the purpose of addressing the issues outlined in the IEG Statement. The business case would need to be submitted in February 2003 and would be used as the basis for Central Government deciding the allocation of funding to partnerships in 2003/04.
- There was a need to focus on improving staff expertise and understanding of IT equipment in order to ensure that the Council was making full use of the available technology.

Cabinet decided:

To approve the Implementing Electronic Government Statement for Year 2, as attached to the report, and authorised its submission to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

224. BUDGET MONITORING 2002/03

The Cabinet considered a report summarising the financial results for revenue, capital and trading units to the end of September 2002, including forecast outturn results for the current year.

Members noted that:

- Trends were broadly similar to the report submitted to Cabinet on 3 September 2002, with forecast variations for the year (at outturn) showing a £2.9m overspend, principally on Social Services and Debt Charges. It was too early to quantify the full effects of the management action agreed by Cabinet on 3 September 2002 to address the Social Services overspending and further action might be required later in the financial year.
- Education, Libraries and Heritage trading units were showing an overall projected deficit of £85k at year end, some of which would be met from accumulated surpluses. Policy trading units were also showing an overspend of £155k at year end; officers were devising a strategy to address the situation.

- Overall, the latest forecasts for capital spending and financing were similar to those estimated at the beginning of the year.

Cabinet agreed:

To note the trends in spending to date in 2002/03.

225. CABINET OUTLINE AGENDA – 19 NOVEMBER 2002

During discussion of the outline agenda for the 19 November 2002 meeting, Cabinet noted that:

- An item on Developments in Community Education had been programmed to be submitted to the 29 October 2002 meeting. However, officers were of the opinion that this item would need to be classified as a key decision and, in order to ensure that the Council had met its statutory obligations relating to access to information, it should be deferred to 19 November 2002 to enable the appropriate notices to be made available to the public.
- It appeared likely that the Revenue Settlement Grant (RSG) would not be announced by Central Government until 5 December 2002. It would not, therefore, be possible for officers to submit a report on Budget Cash Limits for 2003/04 to the Cabinet meeting on 10 December 2002. It was proposed to defer consideration of this item to the 7 January 2003 to give officers sufficient time to consider the full implications of the RSG and report back to Cabinet.

The Cabinet agreed:

- (i) To note the outline agenda for the meeting scheduled to take place on 19 November 2002 and the following proposed amendments:
 - Developments in Community Education – deferred to 19 November 2002.
 - Cambridge Special Schools Review – deferred to 28 January 2003.
- (ii) To defer consideration of the item on 2003/04 Budget Cash Limits, which was scheduled for 10 December 2002, to the 7 January 2003 meeting.