

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 23rd February 2010

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.20 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor J. Tuck

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

Apologies: Councillors Orgee and Yeulett

Also Present: Councillors B Brooks-Gordon, P Downes, C Hutton, K Wilkins

124. MINUTES 26th JANUARY 2010

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 26th January 2010 were approved as a correct record.

125. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor J Reynolds declared a non-prejudicial interest as the chairman of the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) and Renewables East, with regard to any issues relating to those bodies that might appear in reports on the agenda.

Councillor J Tuck declared a non-prejudicial interest as a member of the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) with regard to any issues relating to EERA that might appear in reports on the agenda, and as a member of the Leaders' Board in relation to item 15.

The Corporate Director: People, Policy and Law declared a personal and potentially prejudicial interest in Item 5, and would withdraw from the table for this item.

126. PETITIONS IN RESPECT OF CYCLING TOWN INFRASTRUCTURE PROPOSALS FOR GILBERT ROAD, CAMBRIDGE

Cabinet received a petition with 196 signatures reading "We urge members of Cabinet to support the proposals from the County Council's Cycle Cambridge team (Item 12 of the agenda) for improvements to Gilbert Road. If implemented in full, the proposals would, we believe, make the road much safer and less intimidating than it is at present for cyclists and pedestrians, especially the many children and young people who attend schools in the Gilbert Road area. The proposed speed reduction measures and good-quality cycle lanes unobstructed for 24 hours a day deserve Cabinet support".

The spokesperson to the petition was Dr James Woodburn of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign (transcript attached at Appendix A).

Cabinet received a 330 signature petition reading "We the undersigned call upon Cambridgeshire County Council Cabinet and the Transport Delivery Team of

Cambridgeshire County Council to note the opposition with regard to the “Cycle Cambridge” Team’s proposals Option 1 and 2, to improve the cycle lanes along Gilbert Road, Cambridge. This is due to a lack of alternative proposals, one of which would be to leave things as they are”.

Dr Henry Tribe presented the petition on behalf of Gilbert Road residents (Transcript attached at Appendix A).

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

In order to allow the above petition representatives to hear the decisions as early as possible on the report which they had made representations, it was agreed to take the report at item 12 titled “Cycling Town Infrastructure” next in the agenda running order.

127. CYCLING TOWN INFRASTRUCTURE

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning introduced the report. He advised that Local Councillors Sadiq and Moss-Eccardt had provided written submissions, indicating broad support for the report (attached at Appendix A). Local Member County Councillor Wilkins spoke, indicating his broad support for the report, especially given that cyclist safety on Gilbert Road had been an issue of concern for many years. Whilst acknowledging the concerns of the residents of that road, especially the removal of on-street parking, he felt that it was important that the views of a slightly wider area, including parents with children at the schools in and around Gilbert Road should also be taken into consideration, and the majority of these residents supported the proposed improvements on safety grounds. It was noted that parking was currently unrestricted on both sides of the road.

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning thanked the petitioners, Local Members and members of the public who had attended the consultation and responded to the consultation. He explained that the County Council, in partnership with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council was successful in its bid to become one of the new Cycle England (CE) ‘Cycling Towns’. The provisional programme to spend this money was approved by Cabinet on 04/11/08, and was discussed by Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire’s Area Joint Committees (AJCs) and various other forums. It was submitted to CE early in 2009 and subsequently received approval. Works had commenced, or were due to start shortly on a number of schemes in and around Cambridge, which aim to improve cyclist safety and attract new cyclists.

Specific schemes had been developed for Cherry Hinton Road, Gilbert Road, Madingley Road and The Tins, and consultation took place in January on the proposals for these locations. These schemes have been generally well supported, with the exception of Gilbert Road, where opinion was divided. Although broadly supported by cyclists and others, including Local Members and the Headteacher of Chesterton Community College, the residents of Gilbert Road had concerns, as outlined in their representations to Cabinet. However, most Gilbert Road residents had off-road parking for at least two vehicles on their properties. The package of measures for Gilbert Road not only aimed to improved safety for cyclists but also that of pedestrians.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access commented that as the Highways Authority, the Council often faced difficult decisions in balancing the needs of different parts of the

community, and whilst the Council was keen to encourage cycling, this was not “at any cost”. Because of the differences of opinion in views expressed, he suggested that the scheme for Gilbert Road be referred back to the Growth & Environment Policy Development Group (PDG) for further consideration, and then reported back to Cabinet.

Cabinet Members:

- commented that whilst the Council sought to encourage safer driving, it also encouraged safer cycling, and a small number of cyclists did not cycle safely;
- asked for more information on the schools that had been consulted and their responses. It was confirmed that the Headteacher of Chesterton Community College had indicated his support for the scheme, but there had been no response from the Governing Body. Mayfield School was against the scheme as it was concerned that it would lead to more parking nearer the School. The other two primary schools had not commented;
- supported the proposal to explore the issues around Gilbert Road further, with a view to finding a solution which was acceptable to both sides. Officers advised that the timescale, in terms of developing, approving and implementing an alternative scheme, was tight, but may be feasible;
- noted that off-road cycleways would not be supported, and would in any event require the removal of many trees along the road.

It was resolved to:

- i) Note the results of the consultation
- ii) Approve the Cambridge City schemes shown in section 3 of the report to be developed further and implemented in respect of:
 - Cherry Hinton Road
 - Madingley Road
 - The Tins
- iii) Defer the Gilbert Road scheme, pending further review of options at the Growth & Environment Policy Development Group, and to consider the findings of the PDG and views of Local Members at a future Cabinet meeting.

128. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY

Subsequent to the Cabinet meeting held on 26th January, the Children and Young People’s Services Scrutiny Committee called-in the Cabinet decisions on the Future of St Neots Secondary school report and reviewed them at a meeting held on 18th February 2010. Having reviewed the Cabinet decision and the reason for call-in, the Committee decided not to object to the implementation, but to comment upon it.

Councillor Catherine Hutton presented the Committee’s comments. The Committee members were of the view that the initial report received by Cabinet on 26/01/10 was insufficient in terms of content, and there should been greater emphasis on an outcome focussed appraisal, rather than just the structural options available for the two schools. The Committee recommended that future Cabinet reports should address this imbalance, and also debate more fully officer recommendations and wider options. Concern was also expressed regarding the way in which the Department for Children, Schools and Families changes its stance with regard to the eligibility of Longsands College as a National Challenge partner.

The Cabinet Member for Learning thanked Councillor Hutton and the Committee for their comments and support through this process. He remarked that he felt that the original decision to call-in was unhelpful, and had caused further uncertainty for those involved, and that the issues raised could have been satisfactorily resolved through Member and officer meetings, without resorting to call-in. However, it was acknowledged that this had been a learning experience on both sides in relation to both the call-in process and more generally the presentation of reports.

It was resolved to note:

- i) the decision of the CYPS Scrutiny Committee to not object to the implementation of the Cabinet's decision, but to comment upon it; and
- ii) the comments made by the CYPS Scrutiny Committee in relation to Cabinet's decision.

129. LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES

This report was received as part of a fourth despatch with the chairman agreeing to take the report on the following grounds:

Reason for lateness

In order to ensure consistency of approach between the County Council and our partners, amendments to the original report were necessary following the receipt of further information that had a bearing upon the proposed recommendations.

Reason for urgency

The Integrated Plan is reliant on the savings generated by this project over time, with there being a critical path of lead in activities between now and the final Council decision in July that requires action to be taken now, starting with agreement to the proposals in the current report.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance explained that since Cabinet had approved that options be explored for the creation of a Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) joint venture company with Partner Authorities, the LGSS concept and wider operating environment had evolved considerably, requiring a new business case to be developed. Key changes included:

- recent legal precedents and advice from the Partner Authorities' legal counsel mean the original public-private joint venture company needed to be reconsidered, with a 100% public sector owned model being the preferred option;
- the creation of LGSS will be in perpetuity, i.e. with no end date, but the Partner Authorities will enter into an agreement setting out rights and responsibilities including appropriate exit clauses should one of the Partner Authorities wish to withdraw from the arrangement;
- more challenging financial conditions for local government and the wider public sector, putting greater pressure on the need for LGSS to demonstrate an even more effective return on investment against other potential projects, in order to justify the management effort and wider resources the programme is using.

Cabinet Members:

- noted that Slough Borough Council, one of the original partners, was no longer in a position to pursue the LGSS at the present time;
- noted the financial implications included in Appendix 2 to the report;
- noted the plans for a very robust consultation with staff;
- noted that the opportunities presented by shared services went further than financial benefits, as outlined in section 3.8 of the report;
- discussed the relative performance and perception of the partnership authorities.

Cabinet Members commented that this was a very complex area but one clearly worth pursuing given the potential financial benefits for the Council and Council Tax payers, and whilst keen for this to be progressed as quickly possible, acknowledged the need to develop a detailed business case, and for there to be a rigorous consultation with staff.

Cabinet noted the five options available in respect of shared services, and the recommended option of collaborative working, with the longer term aspiration of the creation of a joint venture organisation with public sector partners.

In terms of timescales and political process, it was noted that the detailed business case would be considered by Cabinet in June 2010, and full Council in July 2010.

It was resolved:

- a) That Cabinet endorses the principle of shared services and approves the County Council's, (CCC), participation in and the creation of a Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) partnering arrangement, (the LGSS Partnership), jointly with Northamptonshire County Council (NCC), (the Partner Authorities). It is envisaged that the LGSS Partnership will provide all front line, transactional, professional and strategic support and advice, (the LGSS Services), both to the Partner Authorities and other interested public sector bodies in the following functional areas:

- Finance;
- Organisational Development and Learning;
- Human Resources;
- Procurement;
- Internal Audit;
- Legal Services.

The LGSS Partnership will, initially, be established under the auspices of a Joint Committee, formed by the Partner Authorities.

Cabinet recommends that Full Council approve the establishment of a Joint Committee for the purpose of overseeing the LGSS Partnership.

In order to develop this arrangement and to take preparatory steps for the creation of a separate corporate entity it is further recommended that Cabinet approve the following:

b) That Cabinet:

1. endorses the design principles under which the LGSS Partnership will operate as described in Appendix 1 and by which it is intended the LGSS Services will be

provided to the Partner Authorities, their impact on the provision of those services within the Partner Authorities, including the principle of manager and employee self service, and any associated restructuring of staff and service provision within CCC.

2. authorises the commencement of the procurement and subsequent award of a contract to a private sector supplier, or suitable alternative, to provide the hosting of key LGSS Partnership systems, including the Oracle E-business Suite (EBS), also known as ERP, by the Council and the other Partner Authorities, and the procurement of such supplier by NCC on behalf of the Partner Authorities. The results of the contract award will be reported back to Cabinet.
3. endorses the principles regarding the costs and benefits of LGSS described in the Business Case, (management summary attached at Appendix 2), and the investments and transactions required to establish the LGSS Partnership and deliver the LGSS services.

c) That Cabinet:

1. resolves that CCC shall enter into an agreement or agreements with the Partner Authorities to establish a Joint Committee Partnership Arrangement or similar arrangement, that will deliver support services back to the Partner Authorities. Such arrangements shall include appropriate legal agreements regarding the following:
 - a. the distribution of risk amongst the partner authorities through indemnities etc;
 - b. the Governance framework for the Joint Committee Including delegations to the LGSS Partnership and between the Partner Authorities,
 - c. sharing of the costs, resources and benefits of LGSS; and
 - d. the manner in which the LGSS Services will be delivered,
1. delegates authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, to take such steps as may be necessary, in connection with item c)1 above, to:
 - a. negotiate and agree the terms upon which such arrangements are established and
 - b. to instruct the Head of Legal Services to prepare and complete the necessary documentation.
2. authorises such steps as may be necessary in order to facilitate or enable the transactions described in this Report, including for example, the transfer of staff and assets or leases, (subject to any Full Council approval should that be deemed necessary).
3. resolves that CCC shall enter into service level and other required agreements as between the Partner Authorities and between them and the LGSS Partnership, in regard to the LGSS Services. Cabinet further agrees to delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, to:
 - a. take such steps as are necessary and to agree the terms of any agreements as may be required in connection with the above, and

b. instruct the Head of Legal Services to prepare and complete the necessary documentation.

4. authorises the expenditure of the approved investment in LGSS, as set out in the Business Case, required to establish LGSS arrangements. This shall include authority to enter into any associated contracts and agreements, and delegates authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, to:

- a. authorise the expenditure described above and
- b. agree the terms of any such associated contracts and agreements and
- c. instruct the Head of Legal Services to prepare and complete the necessary documentation;

N.B. The above is subject to Council approval where it would alter the budget or policy framework.

5. agrees to extend the scope of LGSS Services to include additional support services, such as Strategic Asset Management or other functions, and delegates authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, to:

- a. take such steps and agree the terms of any contracts and agreements as may be required in connection with the above and
- b. instruct the Head of Legal Services to prepare and complete the necessary documentation.

6. authorises the amendment, if necessary, of the existing partnership agreement between the Partner Authorities and delegates authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, to:

- a. agree the terms of such amendment and
- b. instruct the Head of Legal Services to prepare and complete the necessary documentation.

d) That Cabinet instructs the Chief Executive and the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, to prepare and agree a detailed revision of the business case which confirms the assumptions in terms of the investment requirements and the rate of return for the Council, with a view to demonstrating whether the LGSS Partnership would represent value for money for each of the founding authorities.

e) Cabinet instructs the Chief Executive to return the detailed business case to Cabinet in June 2010, or as soon as it is available, and to draw to their attention any material issues that arise from the production of the detailed business case, e.g. a reduction in the return on investment, a change in the timing of benefits, extension of scope or new partners joining. Any such change may constitute a key decision.

f) That Cabinet confirms that any proposed change in the legal structure of the LGSS Partnership would be subject to cabinet approval.

g) That Cabinet delegates authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, acting in their capacity as members of the LGSS Strategic Stakeholder Board as described in the partnership agreements with the Partner Authorities:

i) To appoint the Managing Director of the LGSS Partnership, whose role is to oversee the establishment and operation of the LGSS.

ii) To agree the terms of reference for the Joint Committee and the County Council's nominated officer and councillor membership of the Joint Committee.

h) Cabinet reiterates the aspiration for the LGSS Partnership to become a separate corporate entity providing services for local government and the wider public sector. In furtherance of this vision, Cabinet instructs the Chief Executive to undertake further exploration of this model and preparatory work in readiness for the implementation of such a model if and when that becomes possible.

i) That Cabinet notes that all the above recommendations equally require approval by the Cabinet of our partner, Northamptonshire County Council at its meeting on the 9th March 2010.

130. LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT REFRESH 2010

This report was received as part of a third despatch with the chairman agreeing to take the report on the following grounds:

Reason for lateness

Feedback from GO East on the refresh of the LAA was only received following the initial agenda despatch. As Cabinet is being asked to sign off the LAA refresh, it was necessary for these discussions to be completed before a final set of targets could be presented to Cabinet for approval.

Reason for urgency

As the County Council is the lead authority for the LAA in Cambridgeshire it has the statutory responsibility for agreeing targets with Government and these targets need to be agreed with GO East by 12/03/10 after which point the refreshed LAA will be approved by Government ministers.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance introduced the report by reminding Members of the history of the Local Area Agreement (LAA) targets since their introduction. A number of new and changed targets were required for 2010, as outlined in Section 3 of the report, with the most important changes being to those targets related to employment and growth. Other changes are either purely technical or can be finalised now that sufficient baseline data has been collected during 2009.

Cabinet noted a number of minor changes made since the despatch of the report, relating to target NI154 (net additional homes provided) and NI155 (number of affordable homes delivered).

Members discussed the benefits of meeting targets, especially the potential reward grant available to the Council and its partners, and that current performance suggested that 11 targets out of the possible 35 were likely to be missed by the end of March 2011. However, GO East remained pleased with the progress against the LAA to date.

Cabinet were reassured that despite the removal of the indicator NI112 (reducing the under 18 conception rate), this remained a priority for the Council and its partners.

There was a discussion on housing development and how realistic the targets for affordable homes were. It was agreed that care needed to be taken when developments were rolled out, to ensure that there was no imbalance in provision.

It was resolved to agree:

- (a) the changes made to the LAA as part of the refresh, including changes to National Indicators (Nis) 152, 154, 155, 171, 1, 4, 17, 54 and 125.
- (b) to remove NI 112 from the reward grant calculation.

[Note: following the meeting, it was confirmed that there was an error in the amended figures for NI 155 [number of affordable homes delivered (gross)] that were tabled at the meeting. The correct figures are those set out in Appendix One to the report circulated with the agenda, namely:

Priority Area	Indicator(s), including those from national indicator set	Target re-negotiated /revisited?	Lead Officer & Thematic Strategic Partnership	Baseline	Target 08/09	Target 09/10	Target 10/11	Comments
Managing Growth	NI 155 – Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)	Yes	Alex Plant Managing Growth Partnership	759 (22%) 3 yr average over previous 3 years	924	960	1,146	Target for 9/10 was 1,105. Target for 10/11 was 1,344. NB

The Leader of the Council was consulted on this matter and confirmed that the targets be amended to reflect the correct figures and that the submission to Government, as agreed by Cabinet should be amended accordingly.]

131. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Cabinet Member for Communities presented the Council's Community Engagement Strategy and Action Plan. He gave special thanks to the Service Director: Community Engagement (Fenland) and the Community Engagement Programme Manager for their hard work in developing the Strategy.

The Community Engagement Strategy and Action Plan have been developed in response to a number of national government policy requirements, including:

- duty to promote democracy;
- requirement to establish schemes to accept and respond to petitions;
- duty to involve local citizens in decision-making processes.

The Council's approach to community engagement has also been developed to respond to the areas of weakness highlighted in the CPA inspection in 2007. The approach developed

is based upon an acknowledgement that community engagement should be an integral part of the way all services deliver their objectives and therefore delivered within mainstream budgets.

The actions in the plan focus on changes that can be made to improve the way services engage communities within existing resources. The strategy recognises the key role that Councillors play in enabling communities to feel engaged in local decision-making.

The outcomes from embedding this approach to community engagement will be:

- services that better respond to the needs of our communities, and
- communities which have been strengthened by having more involvement in and responsibility for local decision-making.

Cabinet discussed the role that Parish Plans played in Community Engagement and the importance of plain English in communications and documents, to ensure maximum engagement. The importance of genuinely meeting people's needs through real communication and consultation, and not just making assumptions as to what is required, was stressed by the Leader. The importance of managing community expectations was also stressed.

It was resolved to approve the Council's Community Engagement Strategy and Action Plan.

132. DEMOGRAPHIC PRESSURES ON PRIMARY PROVISION IN CAMBRIDGE CITY

This report presented the outcome of detailed work that had taken place to meet the pressures on primary school places in Cambridge as a whole, and the south of Cambridge in particular, where there is the greatest demand. This had included:

- in-depth examination of the demographic data to ensure that, as far as possible, the right level of provision is made in the areas where demand is the greatest;
- close consultation with all headteachers and chairs of governors of primary schools in Cambridge;
- consultation with Cambridge city Council officers and Members;
- a review of the CYP capital programme;
- an exploration of alternative building approaches.

As a result of this work, specific proposals had been developed, and a consultation was held in December 2009 with the parents, staff and governors of the schools concerned. The proposed changes to Cherry Hinton Infant and Junior School has prompted considerable debate, with support both for the current separate arrangements and the proposed all-through approach.

The other recommendations proposed:

- the expansion of two existing primary schools – Abbey Meadows and Colville – on a permanent basis from September 2010;
- the expansion of Queen Edith Primary School, on a temporary basis, for the 2010/11 academic year;
- the establishment of a new primary school, by competition, in Gunhild Way, Cambridge, from September 2011.

Cabinet Members commented that there would be considerable challenges in terms of delivering these new schools and extensions on time, and areas such as procurement and Planning Approval would be key. Officers reassured Members that they were working closely with schools and partners to overcome these challenges.

The significance of the increased birth rate and its impact on schools and service provision was discussed. It was noted that the Council was now receiving more frequent demographic data from the National Health Service, and this data was regularly reviewed to ensure that provision meets the emerging needs of the county's residents.

It was resolved that:

- i) Abbey Meadows Community Primary School should be extended, on its existing site, from 2 forms of entry (FE) to 3FE, from September 2010;
- ii) Cherry Hinton Church of England Voluntary Controlled Infant School should be extended on its existing site, and its intake and age range changed from a 2FE Infant School to a 1FE all-through primary school, from September 2011;
- iii) Cherry Hinton Community Junior School should be extended on its existing site, and its age range changed from a 2FE Junior School to a 2FE all-through primary school, from September 2011;
- iv) Colville Community Primary School should be extended on its existing site from 1FE to 2FE, from September 2010;
- v) Queen Edith Community Primary School should be extended on its existing site from 2FE to 3FE, on a temporary basis for one year only, from September 2010, and that further discussions should take place with the governing body in relation to future years;
- vi) The current Netherhall Lower School site, in Gunhild Way, Cambridge, which was previously declared surplus to requirements, should be retained;
- vii) A new primary school should be established in 2011, by competition, on the Gunhild Way site, in line with the requirements of the Education and Inspections Act 2006;
- viii) The specification for the new primary school should be agreed;
- ix) The Cabinet Member for Learning should be asked to review the position at the third-month checkpoint of the four-month bid period, and advise the Executive Director: CYPS whether or not a County Council-sponsored bid for the new school should be submitted.

133. BETTER UTILISATION OF PROPERTY ASSETS – FIRST PHASE PROJECTS – BUSINESS CASES

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance presented a report on project Business Cases have been produced for two Better Utilisation of Property Assets (BUPA) projects (three having been approved by Cabinet in November 2009). The Business Cases were driven by the Authority's priorities and service principles as well as reflecting the cost/benefits of options as well as an assessment of a number of non-financial criteria, including sustainability, regeneration and partnership working, and of risk.

Over the long term, it is required that the considerable benefits of BUPA will be realised by the Council. Sequencing of projects will be key to ensuring that the balance of investment and returns on investment is optimal. BUPA continues to represent value for money to the organisation despite the lower values that will be realised on properties compared to the high point of the market.

The two Business Cases considered were:

- Learning and Development Facilities Project, which covers three Professional Development Centres (PDCs), a number of rooms in corporate offices, libraries and other County Council buildings, plus the external hire of facilities to deliver training to employees and partners;
- Outdoor Education Centres, which covers Grafham Water Centre, Burwell House and Cambridgeshire Environmental Education Service (CEES), the latter being delivered from facilities in Stibbington and Upware.

The recommended option (0B) for the Learning and Development Facilities Project was to continue the operation of the PDCs while reducing external expenditure on hire of facilities for training through a more concerted use of other Council training rooms, and negotiated contracts with external suppliers.

The recommended option (1a) for Outdoor Education Centres was to carry out the list of works detailed in the Business Case, which included the provision of sprinkler systems.

Members welcomed the proposals to (i) reduce, where possible, the use of outside venues, and increased utilisation of own venues and facilities; and (ii) the installation of sprinkler systems. It was noted that increasing the utilisation of the Council's facilities would require a culture change in some services, and this would need to be carefully monitored. Whilst Schools were subject to separate grants, Governing Bodies could similarly be encouraged to promote the use of School and Council facilities for training purposes.

It was resolved to approve the continuation to design and implementation stages of the suggested options, (at which time formal consultation will take place with any service users /employees impacted by the proposed changes):

a. Learning and Development Facilities

Business case 0B, i.e. To continue the operation of the Professional Development Centres while reducing external expenditure on hire of facilities for training through a more concerted use of other council training rooms and negotiated contracts with external suppliers.

b. Outdoor Education Centres

Business case 1a, i.e. to fund the installation of sprinklers and a number of other safety and energy use improvements for Burwell House and Stibbington.

134. EARLY YEARS SINGLE FUNDING FORMULA

This Cabinet Members for Learning presented a report on the early years single funding formula. He explained that in 2008, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) announced a requirement on all local authorities to develop a funding formula for the early years free entitlement for three and four year olds by April 2010. The free entitlement is 12.5 hours per week for 28 weeks, rising to 15 hours per week for 38 weeks for all children from September 2010. The entitlement commences after the child's third birthday, until the child enters school.

Currently, maintained providers are paid through their annual budget, with 80% of funding derived from the places offered, and 29% of funding based on the actual take-up of places. Private, voluntary and independent providers are paid on a single County rate of £3.38 per hour, each term, and entirely on the basis of actual take-up of places.

Consultation on the proposed new formula took place with all early years providers over the period July-October 2009. 90 written responses were received (around 25% of providers) and 80 people attended the briefing sessions. However, in December 2009, the Minister for Families and Children announced a one-year delay in the statutory deadline, along with an extended pathfinder scheme for *“all local authorities that are confident they are ready to implement their new formulae in April 2010”*.

The application to join the Pathfinder has been considered and supported by the County Early Years Reference Group of providers and Cambridgeshire Forum. Confirmation from the DCSF of acceptance into the extended pathfinder came on 15/02/10. The formula proposals enable the County Council to meet the requirements of a funding formula within available resources. The base rates incorporate essential elements of cost for all types of early years education provider, at a level which promotes sustainability, and supports parental choice and access to a wide range of provision.

It was resolved to:

- i) note the requirement placed on all local authorities by the DCSF to develop a funding formula for early years provision for three and four year olds, and the change in implementation date;
- ii) note the consultation undertaken as part of the process of developing a single funding formula for Cambridgeshire; and
- iii) approve the adoption and implementation of the single funding formula and the associated hourly provider rates with effect from 1 April 2010 subject to acceptance of Cambridgeshire's application to Government to join the Extended Pathfinder programme.

135. DEVELOPER SECTION 106 DEFERRAL REQUESTS – LONDON ROAD, GODMANCHESTER, AND ST IVES GOLF COURSE

This Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning reminded Members that in July 2009, Cabinet had agreed a process for dealing with requests from developers who are seeking to defer Section 106 payments that have already been negotiated, due to the economic slowdown.

Requests relating to the following two developments had been received:

- a residential development of 152 dwellings in Godmanchester;
- a residential development of 93 dwellings in St Ives.

Both requests have been assessed carefully by officers using the criteria laid down by Cabinet. The justification for the decisions was given in section 2 of the report. It was confirmed that there would be no impact on these communities, and that there was no cost to the Council. Local County, District and Town Councillors had been advised of these proposed deferments.

In response to a question on the diversion of bus routes and the bus service contribution, Members were reassured that before the new roads were up to an appropriate standard, buses would stop at the nearest suitable point.

In response to a query on what happens if a developer goes bankrupt, officers advised that larger sites were usually bonded, whilst for smaller sites, the S106 agreements were tied in to the planning applications, therefore the S106 obligations would transfer to the new developer.

It was resolved to note the seven Section 106 deferral requests contained in the report and approve the following:

1. London Rd (Huntington & Godmanchester Market Town Transport Strategy Contribution) – Accept with conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the report;
2. London Rd (Education Contribution) – Accept with conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the report;
3. St Ives Golf Course (Bus Service Contribution) – Reject;
4. St Ives Golf Course (Education Contribution) – Accept in instalments as set out in Appendix 1 of the report;
5. St Ives Golf Course (Traffic Management Contribution) – Reject;
6. St Ives Golf Course (Footpath Improvements Contribution) – Reject;
7. St Ives Golf Course (St Ives Market Town Transport Strategy Contribution) – Accept.

136. ZERO CARBON FOR NEW NON DOMESTIC BUILDINGS – CONSULTATION ON POLICY OPTIONS

This report presented a proposed response to a Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) consultation which sought views on evidence base, policy options and proposals for further work towards the Government's zero carbon ambition for new non-domestic buildings. It was noted that the Government's proposals for Eco-towns was the subject of an earlier government consultation.

Cabinet Members were especially supportive of the emphasis in the response to (i) the challenge of funding the upfront capital costs associated with these higher standards; (ii) the differentiation between residential, non-residential, and the various types of non-residential buildings and (iii) the need for officers to have the appropriate skills to design or commission new buildings to meet zero carbon standards, which would have additional resource issues.

It was resolved to agree the draft Council response set out in Appendix 1 of the report and delegate to the Portfolio Holder for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services and the Corporate Director: Finance, Property & Performance, the authority to amend the response in line with comments made by Cabinet prior to submission to the Department of Communities and Local Government.

137. GLEBE FARM FULL PLANNING APPLICATION – COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning presented a report on the proposed consultation response to the Glebe Farm planning application.

Glebe Farm is one of the Cambridge Southern Fringe development sites and will provide 286 residential units if planning permission for this full application is granted. A Planning Appeal was lodged and the subsequent Public Inquiry was held in October 2009 on the outline application for this site. The Secretary of State will make a decision on the appeal by 10/03/10, and it was observed that this could be a landmark decision and have a significant effect nationally. However, the Cabinet Member commented that the repercussions of that decision would be dealt with in due course, and it would be unwise to speculate on the outcome at this stage.

The recommendation is that the County Council should object to the application until such time as a suitable Section 106 package to provide funding for the new services and infrastructure that the new residents will need is secured.

The draft consultation response also highlighted that more could be done by the applicant to secure environmental sustainability and to address detailed design issues regarding highways. The report also draws attention to the areas of sustainable drainage and biodiversity, where further work and commitment on the part of the developer is required. The County Council has a statutory duty to provide facilities and services to this developing community, failure to secure appropriate Section 106 funding will have a direct and adverse impact upon the Council's ability to provide these essential services.

In response to a question on parking, officers reassured Members that appropriate action was being taken to resolve the parking issues. Cabinet Members supported the areas of objection outlined, observing that the current proposals could impact on the LAA targets for 2010/11.

It was resolved:

- i) endorse the draft consultation response.
- ii) agree with the recommendations for objecting to the application.
- iii) delegate to the Lead Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to make any minor textual changes to the consultation response prior to submission.

138. CONSULTATION BY EAST OF ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY ON THE SCHEME FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LEADERS' BOARD FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND

The Leader presented a report on a consultation by EERA on proposals for the establishment of a Leaders' Board for the East of England. The consultation covered membership, meetings, and joint arrangements with the Regional Development Agency (the Regional Strategy Board).

The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 brought about changes to governance at a regional level. Functions of the Regional Assemblies, such as

the preparation of Regional Strategies, will be transferred to Regional Development Agencies, with work being overseen by local authority Leaders' Boards.

A consultation by Communities and Local Government (CLG) was considered by Cabinet in October 2009, which covered both draft planning guidance setting out how the new Regional Strategies should be prepared, and guidance on establishing regional governance structures, through the establishment of Leaders' Boards. Following this, the final guidance on the establishment of Leaders' Boards was published in December 2009.

Paragraphs (3) and (4) of the proposed response outlined in the report were no longer relevant, and would be excluded from the response.

It was resolved to agree the draft response set out in Section 4 of this report, with the exclusion of points (3) and (4), and delegate to the Leader in consultation with the Executive Director, Environment Services the authority to amend the response in line with comments made by Cabinet and to consider a joint submission to the East of England Regional Assembly by the closing date of 26 February 2010.

139. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / OFFICERS

Cabinet received a report on the progress of the actions delegated to individual Cabinet Members and / or to officers to make decisions on behalf of the Cabinet at previous Cabinet meetings up to the 26th January 2010 Cabinet meeting.

It was resolved 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.

140. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA 16th MARCH 2010

The draft agenda for the 16th March was noted with the following amendments since the agenda was published:

- Add a report on the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway;
- Change the date of the next meeting from 20th April to 27th April.

Chairman
16th March 2010

ITEM 126/127: Representation by Cambridge Cycling Campaign:

Our petition seeks to encourage you to favour the measures for Gilbert Road proposed by the County Council officers who make up the Cycle Cambridge team which is working to promote Cambridge as a Cycling Demonstration Town.

Cambridge Cycling Campaign is a local organisation with more than a thousand paid-up members which is run wholly by volunteers. We seek to represent ordinary cyclists – young and old, experienced and inexperienced, who cycle to work, to the shops, to visit friends. Most of our members are also drivers. Our aim is to encourage cycling and to work cooperatively with the local authorities and other bodies to improve conditions for cycling in Cambridge and nearby. At all times we seek to foster legal, responsible cycling and legal, responsible behaviour by motor vehicle drivers.

Cambridge Cycling Campaign gets more complaints from those who cycle about Gilbert Road than about almost any other road in Cambridge. The main difficulty is that cyclists have to pull out around parked cars into relatively fast traffic. This is intimidating and potentially dangerous, particularly for inexperienced cyclists who need encouragement to cycle on-road. Those wishing to cycle will increase as the NIAB and other developments are built. We are particularly concerned about the many children and young people in the Gilbert Road area where there is a striking concentration of schools. From my personal experience of both driving and cycling along this road for over fifty years, I can testify to the real difficulties and the need for the remedial measures now proposed.

To be specific, we believe that a prohibition of on-road car parking is essential and that this must, as proposed, be a 24-hour prohibition. Activities at Chesterton Community College continue well into the evening. We do understand how many local residents are not happy about the loss of on-road parking but would point out that almost every house along the road has provision for off-road parking and that there is unregulated parking available for visitors in nearby side streets. If the proposals are implemented the parking situation for residents will still be much easier than it is for most Cambridge residents living a similar distance from the city centre.

We support Option One of the cycle lane proposals which is for 1.7m wide lanes with double yellow lines. We think that clear, continuous lanes without parked cars will encourage less confident cyclists to use the road and reduce illegal pavement cycling.

Speed reduction is essential. The proposed measures – speed cushions with raised tables at the junctions – have on the whole worked well elsewhere in Cambridge and have majority support in this particular context among those of our members who have concerned themselves with this issue. We have actively considered alternative arrangements for speed reduction put forward by our members but on balance the proposed measures are favoured here. Speed cushions have the advantage that ambulance and bus passengers are not jolted and noise levels are low.

Please accept your officers' recommendations.

ITEM 126/127: Representation by Gilbert Road residents:

We understood from your official figures that 54% of our residents were opposed to widening of cycle lanes which included parking and loading restrictions. We believed that these figures were far too low. We therefore visited every house in Gilbert Road to ask residents directly.

Our petition asked whether residents supported a cycleway package or preferred no action. We found that 70% of the 200 houses in the road voted for no action. Residents in 21% supported the cycleway package; 9% were unavailable.

Unavailables should be discounted. The petition shows 77% of residents voting for no action. The will of the residents of Gilbert Road is clearly that we retain the cycleway as it is. We like our grass verges, with trees, which give good separation of children and pedestrians from traffic.

Gilbert Road has to be shared with motorists and cyclists. Your recent survey showed that it is used by some 6000 motor vehicles every day, compared with 850 cycles. That is seven times more motors than cycles. But by contrast with the cycling lobby, which comprises most 'Other Respondents' favouring the cycleway package, the views of motor vehicle users have been ignored. Speed of motor traffic is often too high. It would be worse without the natural control of parking.

Present thinking in Cambridge is to reduce the speed limit to 20mph. This is planned to begin in March for the whole of central Cambridge, plus Mill Road, and Wulfstan Way. This is therefore considered as the way forward.

This does not mean that no vehicle may exceed 20. Promotion of careful driving is the main aim of the 20 limit.

Road humps and cushions seriously reduce the efficiency of a road. Gilbert Road is a dedicated route for the emergency services.

We very seriously advise the Council not to rush into decisions for the sake of immediacy but to look into a well-considered future for Gilbert Road.

ITEM 126/127: Written submission from Councillor Tariq Sadiq, Local Member:

I welcome the plans to upgrade the shared use path on Cherry Hinton Road between Perne Road and Cherry Hinton and also the advisory on-road city-bound cycle lane. However, I am concerned about the potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists because the improvements will inevitably lead to faster cycle speeds. This poses a particular danger to the disabled and the elderly, particularly the residents of flats and the nursing home on the stretch between Kelvin Close and Adkins Corner. There is also a concern about the Kelvin Close junction which has blind corners.

One possible solution to this would be to segregate pedestrians and cyclists on the path but enforcement will still be an issue.

Also a 3m wide shared-use lane is proposed. How will this space be found because the existing path does not appear to be 3m wide all the way along this stretch?

Are there any plans for the rest of Cherry Hinton Road? The surface on the shared-use path needs improving and the junctions need levelling. When it rains it's like being on a water ride at the amusement park.

ITEM 126/127: Written submission from Councillor Rupert Moss-Eccardt, Local Member:

I have received a significant amount of correspondence from my residents in respect of the proposals and a number of concerns have been raised. However, with some effort, I think these can be dealt with.

As you know the Gilbert Road cycle lanes have been an issue for many, many years, even before my election. When the officers came to me with the current round of proposals I was pleased to encourage them; the single most spontaneous issue that arose when canvassing last year was a wish that the cycle facilities be improved. As a regular user of Gilbert Road on foot, cycle and as a driver, I think that the current setup cannot persist. Indeed, even ignoring the cycle lanes for a moment, I wince on occasion as it isn't really wide enough for four vehicles and the number of times there are vehicles parked on both sides on the 'Arbury' stretch is more frequent than some would believe.

If we can ameliorate the main concerns that have been expressed, I have no hesitation in supporting the proposal to have double yellows and traffic calming. But the following will need to be addressed: (I continue to receive correspondence so wasn't able to put this all together until now)

Enforcement of parking restrictions - It must be clear that the new scheme has to be policed properly so there should be an extra effort within a few weeks of completion to enforce the double yellow lines, including verge parking

Enforcement against pavement abuse - Many residents see that the scheme will be of little use if the footpath is still used as a cycle route as well. I have had a number of reports of collisions with cars as they come out of driveways. We therefore need to actively discourage cycle on the footpath at least in the early period after completion.

Safety of Children at Mayfield School - The governing body of Mayfield has written to say they are against the scheme as it will displace parking to around the school, making it much more dangerous for children and parents coming and going. So there should be a simultaneous introduction of parking controls around the entrances to Mayfield. I have spoken with Belinda Brooks-Gordon and she generally supports this idea. Indeed, it is a good thing to do anyway.

Reconstruction of Verges - Once the work is complete, the verges should be reinstated. Some consideration should be given to widening the splays where driveways will be in use where they weren't before and it is obvious that the verge will be eroded again.

20mph Zone - Could Cabinet please give consideration now, or soon, to making Gilbert Road a 20mph zone? If we could do this without as much traffic calming that would be really helpful.

Cycle-friendly Calming - Quite some concern has been expressed by cyclists about the traffic calming, in particular the raised tables as many have experienced problems with the surface and the ramps, especially when wet. Can anything be done to make this less of a problem?

Bus Stops - The bus stops do intrude into the lanes and somewhat reduce the benefits of the scheme. Would it not be possible to have the bus stop alongside the lane with a small island? I understand that this concept has been tried elsewhere in the UK. The stop outside No 109 seems rather close to the cushion and the avoiding lane which could lead to conflict.