

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 15th April 2008

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 12.13 p.m.

**Present:** R Pegram (Vice Chairman) Chairman in the absence of Councillor Walters

Councillors: M Bradney, Sir P Brown, M Curtis, D Harty, J E Reynolds J M Tuck and F H Yeulett

**Apologies:** L W McGuire and K Walters (Chairman)

### **Also in Attendance**

Councillors: P Downes, S Johnstone, A Kent, A Melton, R Turner, and J West

The chairman in opening the meeting welcomed Mark Lloyd, the new Chief Executive to his first Cabinet meeting.

## **533. MINUTES 26th FEBRUARY 2008**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2008 were approved as a correct record subject to the following amendment being agreed in order to aid clarity.

Minute 520 Cambridge Southern Fringe Section 106 Agreements

To change the wording of the delegation resolution currently reading ‘appropriate officers included in the Council’s Constitution’ and replace them with the words “the Director of Sustainable Infrastructure in consultation with the Head of Legal Services” as this reflects the specific delegation in the Constitution.

*Note: in addition there was a need to renumber the minute titled ‘Single Equality Strategy’ from 514 to 515 and all subsequent minutes accordingly.*

## **534. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor J. Reynolds declared a personal interest in item 5 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan - Preferred Options 2 and Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme – as chairman of Renewables East

Councillor Curtis declared a personal interest in item 11 – Integration of Older People’s Occupational Therapy and Social Care Services Best Value Review - as he could might

require the services provided, and also due to his position as a trustee of Age Concern.

Councillor Tuck declared a personal interest in item 12 Community Cohesion and Integration Strategy as the Chairman of Fenland Links.

#### **535. PETITIONS**

None received.

#### **536. REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

None received.

#### **537. CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN - PREFERRED OPTIONS 2 AND CAMBRIDGESHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME**

Cabinet considered a report on the draft Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan – Preferred Options 2, which would set the framework for all minerals and waste developments over the next 15 to 20 years, as well as amendments to the Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme.

Cabinet were reminded that the County Council and Peterborough City Council had consulted on the first round of preferred options for the Minerals and Waste Development Documents at the end of 2006. The report detailed the proposals that had proved to be contentious. Subsequently, an extended timetable for the completion of the Plan had been agreed with the Government Office through a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS). This would now allow time for a range of more detailed studies to be completed and would now enable a second preferred options consultation to take place in September/October 2008.

Cabinet considered the following documents (which due to their size they had not been included on the agenda but were included as an electronic link and had also been made available for viewing in the Members Lounge) which comprised the draft Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan:

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document - Preferred Options 2 Draft: a document setting out the strategic vision and objectives, including a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development
- Draft Earith / Mepal Area Action Plan: setting out a comprehensive strategy for minerals and waste activities in this area, and other strategic objectives which could be delivered through those activities
- Site Specific Policies for Preferred Option 2 (Development Plan Document March / April 2008: Document setting out site specific proposals for mineral and waste development
- Location for a local recycling centre for Cambridge South

- Location for a replacement local recycling centre for Grunty Fen, Wilburton.

Oral updates provided at the meeting on information in the published report were noted in relation to the following:

- Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) - Although the feasibility study was not formally available, it was reported that the housing led redevelopment concept was not viable in the foreseeable future and that as a result, the WWTW would be retained on the current site. Cabinet therefore supported the proposal that an alternative site for the WWTW, including Honey Hill, should not form part of the Preferred Options 2 consultation. Cabinet recognised that if the WWTW remained at the present site it would need to be extended and developed to meet the needs of the growing city, while at the same time reducing its impact on the local environment. Further to this, it was proposed that the existing WWTW should be subject to a Consultation Area some 400 metres wide around the site in order to allow the Council to review the environmental impact of the existing works on any new development proposals in the near vicinity.
- Local Recycling Centre - There remained a need to identify a site for a replacement permanent local recycling centre in north Cambridge to replace Milton. Officers confirmed that Cambridge North Fringe East was the preferred option.

The local member for Willingham speaking orally at the meeting highlighted local concerns regarding the impact of increased traffic on the B1050 as a result of the Northstowe development and the increased heavy lorry traffic that would be generated by the Earith/Mepal Area Action Plan. As a result, she put forward the case for consideration of a bypass to avoid Willingham, and possibly also Earith.

The local member for Trumpington speaking orally at the meeting opposed the proposed revised site identified in the Southern Fringe for the provision of a local recycling centre. She highlighted that even with a change of location, it was still on a greenfield site and also made reference to the lack of prior consultation with local members. She also expressed concerns that the type of building would be out of character with the surroundings. In response to the latter point, it was reported that modern indoor recycling facilities could be constructed in a number of different visual guises to help blend into the local environment, reference being made to recent rural locations having centres that were made to resemble farm barns.

Other Members e-mailed comments had been assembled and included in a tabled public document which Cabinet Members had also received in advance of the meeting. They included the following:

- One of the local Members for Sawston supported the siting of a Household Waste Recycling Centre in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area as currently proposed. He also he supported the reasons for the rejection of the Bayer Crop Science (East) site as the location for such a facility.
- The local Member for Haddenham indicated that he could not support the construction for the Witchford Local Recycling centre if it was located near the main road. He urged that officers look at other sites nearer the source of the waste.

- The local member for Fulbourn supported the retention of Milton Waste Water Treatment Works at the current site and the proposal not to include Honey Hill as an alternative site option.
- The Local Member for Gamlingay supported the proposal at Barrington.
- Both local Members for Godmanchester expressed concerns regarding the Godmanchester recycling centre, and in relation to the amount of new build concerns that Godmanchester residents would not be able to access the A1198 if an exit/entrance was made to the new A14 from the A1198. In addition, Councillor Dutton reminded Cabinet members that there had previously been a recycling centre at Godmanchester, which had been closed. The issues raised by the Godmanchester councillors were to be the subject of discussions with the Cabinet member for Planning and Regional Matters outside of the meeting.

In terms of the Member representations received, officers stated that they would be looked at and considered, along with all other representations received, following the end of the forthcoming consultation exercise referred to above. It was emphasised that although the consultation document was required to highlight preferred options, comments on all the sites evaluated would be taken into account.

Reference was made to the Government's recent announcement of Hanley Grange being short listed for development as an eco-town and the serious consequences this would have for the growth agenda and for partners already stretched resources. It was indicated that there was to be a co-ordinated response from Cambridgeshire Horizons, the County Council and District Councils expressing their strong concerns/opposition regarding the Government announcement. In addition, it was intended to make the views of partners widely known through the media, to raise ensure local residents awareness of the serious concerns and also to highlight that there was cross council/cross party opposition to the announcement. In response to a question on the position on mitigating action to be undertaken, as the Government announcement had only recently been made, consideration of appropriate remedial measures would need to be considered in later reports.

Other issues, some raised as questions, included:

- Concerns that the transport infrastructure system would not be able to cope with the added burden placed on it in respect of the Government Regional Spatial Strategy requirement that Cambridgeshire (as a result of its geological suitability compared to other areas) should be required to import additional waste for landfill from London.
- Confirmation that there was the expectation that any waste imported from London would be pre-treated with all recyclable material retrieved before the residue was received for landfill purposes. There was some concern on how this could be enforced. In response, it was indicated that pre-treatment would be in the interest of the commercial operators and that enforcement would need to be coordinated by the appropriate bodies in the region.
- Confirmation that the Kings Cliffe site used by both Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to dispose of hazardous waste did have sufficient capacity to meet projected needs and that its capacity had recently been expanded.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) approve the draft Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (Preferred Options) for the purposes of public consultation.
- ii) Delegate to the portfolio holder for Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services, the authority to approve the final draft Plan for public consultation, including any amendments required (that do not materially affect the content of the Plan)
- iii) Approve the proposed amendments to the draft Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (to come into effect when the Council receives notification under Regulation 11 (3a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004, that the Secretary of State does not intend to serve a direction to amend the Scheme, under Section 15 (4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) namely:
  - to amend the Scheme in respect to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan to reflect the revised plan period of 2006 to 2026 (no changes to the timetable required).
  - to amend the Scheme to make provision for the review / updating of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities', and to link it to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (rather than the adopted Waste Local Plan)
  - to amend the Scheme to make provision for the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document 'The Earith / Mepal Master Plan', which will also be linked to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan.

**538. NETWORK SERVICE PLAN 2008 AND REVISED HIGHWAYS POLICIES**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for the Network Service Plan 2008, which included street lighting and a new highways policy document. Due to their size, hard copies of the Network Service Plan 2008 and the revised Highway Policy document with shaded changes had been made available to Cabinet Members and Group Leaders separately as part of an information pack and had not been included on the agenda. They were however available for viewing on the County Council internet site.

Cabinet noted that:

- the Network Services Plan (NSP) set out what would be delivered by Highways Services in the next 12 months and provided details of objectives including: capital and revenue budgets, programmes and key Performance monitoring indicators.

- The work programme had been developed using transport asset condition data to give an economic prioritised programme to help deliver the following Council's strategic objectives as set out in the Integrated Planning Process for 2008:
  - Improved transport infrastructure
  - Developing capacity to tackle climate change issues that impact on people's ability to travel in the County
  - Increasing opportunities for community participation and involvement with district and parish councils and resident groups
  - Ensuring that the County Council worked as effectively and efficiently as possible with partners, especially those involved in the delivery of the Highways and related services.

In addition to the Network Services Plan, there had been a review of highway policies and standards which had been the subject of a report to the relevant Policy Development Group to ensure that they were fit for purpose, viable in the context of the budget forecasts for the highways service in the foreseeable future and consistent with any changes in legislation and guidance.

Issues raised by Cabinet members included:

- Requesting confirmation that was given that the Street Lighting Policy would not have an adverse affect on the Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative (PFI) and would not set a single standard for street lighting illumination, but did allow for local variations/graduation of lighting levels. The Street Lighting PFI would reflect the policy agreed in consultation with the appropriate scrutiny committee.
- Confirmation that in paragraph 3.9 the wording in the first line of the second bullet point should read "... to contribute to the **reduction** of crime and disorder in urban areas" (and not its **promotion** as currently worded).
- Concerns were raised regarding the loss of appropriate overnight lorry parking provision and the subsequent damage caused to footways and highways through unauthorised parking. Officers were therefore asked to facilitate early resolution by progressing the concerns through all appropriate forums / working with all relevant partners and through raising the issue with local MPs in order to highlight the concerns at the highest level.
- The need for some schools to be more involved in helping establish safe routes to their schools

Cabinet noted comments that the local Members for Sawston strongly supported the inclusion of the Babraham to Sawston cycleway in the South Division Works programme and were pleased to see the inclusion of a number of roads in the Sawston division in the Surface Dressing and Micro Asphalt programme. In respect of the inclusion of Bury Road, Stapleford there was a request that if possible, this should be extended to include the associated Greenfield Close cul-de-sac.

A request was made to circulate for information to Cabinet Members outside of the meeting the list of schools involved in the school travel plan initiative and also those schools with identified safe routes.

The chairman indicated that he would respond outside of the meeting to a letter he had received from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the Network Service Plan 2008; and
- ii) The new highways policy document, including the new street lighting policy.

*Note: The decision to approve the new highways policy document was subsequently called-in to the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee who will be reviewing the relevant section in respect of the mean vehicle speed test for the introduction of 20mph speed limits contained in the draft Highway Network Management Policies and Standards document at their meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> May.*

## **539. STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval of the Council's strategic risk register for 2008/09 attached as an appendix to the report and to note and endorse the progress made to date on embedding risk management within the Council.

Cabinet noted that the Register has been prepared having regard to the Strategic Risk Register for 2007/08 and also by taking into account suggestions made by Members at the Audit & Accounts Committee meetings and from comments received from relevant Council officers. The Register for 2008/09 included 5 new risks as set out in the report.

It was agreed to amend the draft Register regarding the identification of the lead for Risk 14 "Shared Services" from the Chief Executive to the Director of People and Policy as being the more appropriate placement of responsibility.

Cabinet Members made reference/discussed:

- whether the risk register provided sufficient focus in terms of monitoring the agreed key Local Area Agreement (LAA) performance targets. Assurances were provided that the targets would continue to be the subject of rigorous monitoring. In addition, the Risk Register was reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that the categories of risk identified were still appropriate and if necessary, changes would be made to ensure management focus was targeted to the appropriate areas if increased risk was identified.
- The need to ensure joined up working with partners and between offices to progress risk reference 3 (Safeguarding Children procedures) and risk reference 4 (Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults procedures) including strengthening appropriate transitions arrangements, with the aim of reducing both from a low to a very low risk.

- Expanding the description of the key risk in respect of congestion and growth (key risk B2) to include other towns than Cambridge. After discussion there was general agreement that while there was congestion in other towns in the County, the main risk was identified as being to Cambridge as an economic centre.

The Cabinet Member for Communities referring to Risk 17 “Community Resilience and Business Continuity” had concerns that it had been classed as a low risk (D2) and queried whether it should have received a higher rating. While the explanation received confirmed its current status, the request was made for officers to keep it under close review.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the register of key strategic risks for 2008/09 subject to the following changes:
  - amending the identified risk owner for Risk 14 “Shared Services” from the Chief Executive to the Director of People and Policy.
  - On risk 24 “Congestion and Growth” adding the word ‘especially’ before the words ‘in and around Cambridge’ in the second sentence.
- ii) Note the progress made to date on the embedding of Risk Management process within the Council.

**540. ACCOUNTABLE BODY ROLE FOR EAST OF ENGLAND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (EEDA) INVESTING IN COMMUNITIES PROGRAMME**

Cabinet received a report seeking agreement to a proposal from EEDA that the County Council should act as the accountable body (on behalf of the Local Area Agreement LAA) for the EEDA Investing in Communities Programme from 2008/09 onwards. This would involve approximately £1.5m in 2008/09 and indicative funding of nearly £2m in both 2009/10 and 2010/11.

Cabinet noted that in accordance with the proposals in the Government’s Review of Sub-National Economic Development and Regeneration (SNR), the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) had proposed to devolve more of their programme funding to local authorities and sub regions and to align it better to Local Area Agreement (LAA) local priorities. The first phase of the devolution was to seek the agreement of LAA accountable bodies – county and unitary authorities in the region – to transfer the Investing in Communities (IiC) programme funding to them, either at the beginning, during or at the end of the 2008/09 financial year.

Reference was also made to the recently published Sub National Review proposals, and the opportunity the County Council would have in shaping the Government’s proposals for the East of England which would be the subject of a consultation response report to the June Cabinet meeting.



Agreement was recommended subject to confirmation from EEDA on payment terms and frequency, audit details and reporting requirements. It was also proposed and agreed that the entire 2008/09 Investing in communities funding was transferred to Greater Cambridge Partnership to honour commitments to 10 projects in the Investing in the Communities Annual Delivery Plan.

**It was resolved:**

- i) That Cambridgeshire County Council act as the accountable body, on behalf of the Local Area Agreement (LAA), for the EEDA devolved Investing in Communities Programme from 2008/09 onwards.
- ii) That the transfer of any further EEDA funding programmes to the LAA are agreed by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Service and the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance, Policy and Performance.

**541. ESTABLISHMENT OF CAMBOURNE THIRD PRIMARY SCHOOL - DETERMINATION OF PROMOTER**

Cabinet received a report advising it of the bids submitted by Big Wide Talk and Comberton Village College to establish the proposed third primary school in Cambourne and sought a decision between the two on who the promoter should be. These had been received following the requirement introduced as part the Education & Inspections Act 2006 requiring a competition process to operate for the opening of a new school. Due to their size, appendices 2-3 were made available to Cabinet Members and Group Leaders separately as part of an information pack and were not included on the agenda.

The report also sought approval for specified modifications to the proposals for the opening of the school as a result of:

- taking account of the delay in opening as a result of land access issues,
- the continuing availability of places in Years 5 and 6 at The Vine Inter-Church Primary School and the advice from headteachers of other new schools in Cambridgeshire.
- discussions with the existing schools and from feedback received from parents expressing their concerns on the proposed catchment area for the new school.

In coming to their decision Cabinet took into account the detailed analysis of the two proposals as set out in the report, which included:

- Views of interested parties - noting that the majority of those who responded during consultation were in support of the proposal by Comberton Village College.
- That in terms of the effect on standards and school improvement, the proposal from Comberton Village College was considered to be the stronger of the two demonstrating a clear track record of academic success and of enabling learners to attain high standards and make good progress, and showing how the approaches used would be applied to the new school.

Cabinet members highlighted their concerns that the Government requirement for a competition process and the subsequent resulting delay could have a detrimental impact on necessary provision with the real risk that unless there was continued close partnership working with developers, new schools would not be ready to open when required, leading to a need for temporary school buildings which was not ideal. In addition, until the competition process had been operating for a period of time there was no way to gauge whether there were any additional educational benefits from the process.

**It was resolved:**

- i) that conditional approval be granted to the Comberton Education Trust to establish the proposed third primary school in Cambourne;
- ii) That the proposed opening date for the school be modified to September 2009;
- iii) That the proposed initial intake numbers for the school should be modified to 30 for Reception & Year 1, 20 for Year 2 and 5 for Years 3 & 4; and
- iv) That the proposed new school and The Vine Inter-church Primary School should operate a combined catchment area for a minimum of three years.

**542. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE NORTHSTOWE PLANNING APPLICATION**

Councillor Bradney declared a personal interest as a member of the Joint Development Control Committee.

Cabinet noted that the joint promoters of the proposed new settlement, Gallagher Estates and English Partnerships, had submitted an outline planning application to South Cambridgeshire District Council in late December 2007. The County Council as a statutory consultee on planning applications would be making representations on the proposals to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC). Cabinet therefore received a report outlining the officers suggested consultation response to the Northstowe planning application which recommended that the County Council should object to the planning application in respect of 70 specific objections as detailed in the report.

It was orally reported that Gallagher and English Partnerships had contacted the County Council the previous day to make a number of comments on the published Cabinet report and while officers had concluded that the report should remain largely unchanged, the following corrections were required:

- At paragraph 5.2.3 the final sentence should be corrected to read  
"The County Council requests that **a greater proportion** of informal open space is situated adjacent to eco-corridors in order to provide buffering functions"

- The comment at Paragraph 5.4.3 was incorrect. Information on the impact of lighting on the landscape had been submitted and County Officers who would consider it and pass their comments on to South Cambridgeshire District Council.

As a result of a detailed submission from the local Member for Willingham and also from one of the Members representing Cottenham, Histon and Impington which Cabinet had received in hard copy form before the meeting, it was recognised that some of the sections might require further amendment. It was therefore agreed that a co-ordinated response taking on board the points made by the members above and including further consultation with Cabinet and the local members, should be undertaken before the submission of the County Council response.

Specific issues raised by Cabinet Members (most of which were already included in the proposed response or from the submissions of the local members),

included:

- concerns on the link road,
- the need for traffic mitigation measures to reduce the impact of traffic from Northstowe travelling through surrounding villages,
- The need for adequate green separation between Northstowe and the surrounding villages
- clarification of the multi use of the busway and that consideration should be given in the response it is not acceptable even in the short term.
- Phasing of the development and the timely delivery of necessary infrastructure and the phasing of the civic hub
- minimising the impact of construction workers/traffic, including making changes in paragraphs 7.5.1 and 7.5.2.
- reference being made to Chesterton station via the Cambridge Guided Bus-way
- the possible need for a bypass around Willingham and concerns at the lack of detail in the application regarding the impact of the proposed development on the B1050 and Willingham, and
- the need for six primary schools.

It was agreed that the delegation should be amended to include the Chief Executive being involved in co-ordinating the final response. It was clarified that to take account of all the changes raised might require a further 7 days before the agreed further round of consultation could be undertaken.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the draft consultation response
- ii) To Delegate to the Lead Member, Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services and the Chief Executive (the latter being designated as the appropriate co-ordinating officer) the authority to make both minor textual changes to the consultation response prior to submission and to also add, if required, substantial further objections arising from Members comments, submitted after the meeting.

#### **543. INTEGRATION OF OLDER PEOPLE'S OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY AND SOCIAL CARE SERVICES: BEST VALUE REVIEW – REPORT AND ACTION PLAN**

Cabinet was reminded that Cambridgeshire's Older People's health and social care services became fully integrated in April 2004 under Section 31 powers set out in the 1999 Health Act arrangements. As a result, over 700 staff had been transferred to the employment of the Primary Care Trusts (PCT) in order to enable the provision of integrated services for older people. It had been agreed that it would be appropriate to undertake a review at the point when the Section 31 Agreements were being revised, and this had influenced the timing of the current Best Value review. The report set out the conclusions obtained from stages 1 and 2 of the Best Value Review of Integrated Older People's Services and requested that Cabinet should confirm the recommendations identified to further enhance the integrated service. (As set out in paragraph 5.6.2 of the report).

Cabinet noted that the purpose of the Best Value Review had been to undertake a strategic and detailed review of the quality and effectiveness of integrated health and social care services for older people across Cambridgeshire. Cabinet further noted that the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee, who had initially received the report, had felt unable to endorse the Best Value Review recommendations. They had considered that it had been far from clear whether best value had been obtained from the information provided. As a result, Cabinet Members robustly challenged the methodology of the Best Value Review and sought explanations:

- regarding whether greater use could have been made of other comparator authorities to assess the effectiveness of service provision following integration. In response the point was made that of 150 authorities, only eleven had so far integrated their services and of these they were either unitary or borough councils and therefore not appropriate for comparison purposes.
- on the independent challenge sought regarding the assumptions that had been made. In response, Cabinet noted that as well as other research colleagues having been consulted, Birmingham University had provided the necessary independent challenge as the research data had been used as part of a successful masters degree which they had overseen.

Cabinet also requested details on:

- how young carers were being supported and whether there was recognition of their specific needs. In reply it was reported that their specific issues had been discussed at the relevant PDG, which had helped highlight the areas that needed to be taken forward. It was noted that young carers specific needs had also been identified in some of the case studies.
- the support and training made available to help those people who struggled with the bureaucracy in respect of form filling and also the information being provided to self-funders. In response it was reported that professional advice was provided to ensure that appropriate information was given in order for clients to be able to make informed

choices. Measures taken included expanding the range of information available and signposting to relevant services at the Contact Centre. It was highlighted that under the “Putting People First” Concordat there was a duty to provide appropriate advice to those seeking social care support.

- the steps being taken to improve regular billing in order to not only improve the economic well being of service users, but to also help protect the County Council from increasing debt. In reply, it was indicated that some of the issues highlighted were historical and that the current CRIP invoicing system provided timely invoices. It was also confirmed that direct debit arrangements were progressed where practicable as part of the assessment of new care packages.

Other issues referred to in discussions was the importance of non-accredited learning for people with learning difficulties and that the Government should ensure that it was providing sufficient funding for adult evening classes etc.

Cabinet Members having satisfied themselves that the best value review had been undertaken in a robust manner and that progress was being made, agreed the following recommendations.

**It was resolved:**

- i) to note and endorse the content of the report, including the recommendations which were as follows:
  1. Reviewing cross agency training for Care Workers to ensure staff deliver person centred care, and demonstrate courtesy and respect at all times.
  2. Ensuring all eligible self-funders had access to a comprehensive list of care providers.
  3. Ensuring all eligible self-funders had access to support to enable them to seek appropriate care services.
  4. Developing the local care market to encourage a wider range of services to specifically include preventative services.
  5. One joint record being held for health and social care involvement, to prevent duplication of information held / asked for from service users.
  6. A Coordinator to be identified for each service user.
  7. Continuation of the systematic collation of service user and family carer views following assessment and care planning.
  8. Reinforcement through the care management processes to ensure that family carers are offered a Carers Assessment.
  9. Working with General Practitioner (GP) practices to promote knowledge and dissemination of community services and activities
  10. Establishing a voluntary sector liaison group for Older People's Services

11. Information was needed for self-funders to assist them to make decisions about their care.
- ii) To approve the action plan arising from the Best Value Review. (Set out in appendix 3)
- iii) To review progress on the implementation of the recommendations as part of the review of progress on the Annual Performance Assessment Action Plan, into which the necessary actions will be incorporated.

#### **544. COMMUNITY COHESION AND INTEGRATION STRATEGY**

Cabinet received a report providing details of the proposed Strategy for Community Cohesion & Integration developed from the findings of the Council's Corporate Assessment in 2007 and the subsequent action plan.

It was reported that the drivers for a Community Cohesion & Integration Strategy had included a significant report commissioned by the Department of Communities & Local Government (DCLG), the developing framework for the Comprehensive Area Assessment and appropriate focus through the Local Area Agreement (LAA).

It was confirmed that the proposed action plan would be prepared following the publication of the Government's Cohesion Delivery Framework, which was expected shortly. (June was currently the Government's proposed date). As this timescale could slip, Cabinet Members requested to be updated on progress.

There was a discussion on the future funding of Fenland Links and it was noted this would be the subject of a future report to the Communities PDG. It was noted that Fenland District Council had confirmed their continued funding of Fenland Links through the current local strategic partnership arrangements.

##### **It was resolved to:**

- i) Agree the proposed Council Strategy for Community Cohesion & Integration.
- ii) Agree that an action plan to support the Strategy should now be developed and that officers should confirm in due course when it would be available.

#### **545. QUARTERLY UPDATE REPORT ON KEY PARTNERSHIPS**

Cabinet received an update on the work of the four partnerships since the previous report in January. It had been agreed they would be produced on a quarterly basis in order to enhance accountability of the activities of key strategic partnerships and to keep the Members of Cabinet informed of the current key issues/activities undertaken.

On section 4.3 a) relating to Cambridgeshire Horizons, it was confirmed that the first meeting of the Joint Transport Forum between the County Council, the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council had now taken place and had been extremely productive with terms of reference and a work programme being agreed.

Cabinet agreed that as the report was such a useful summary, all Members should have the opportunity to receive the update.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the update reports on the following four partnerships:
  - To Cambridgeshire Together
  - the Children and Young People Partnership
  - Cambridgeshire Care Partnership
  - Cambridgeshire Horizons
- ii) To request that as the report provided very useful summaries of partnership activity they should be made widely available to all County Councillors by way of a detailed summary being included as part of the Cabinet Council report.

**546. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

Cabinet noted the progress on matters delegated to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers to make decisions on behalf of the Cabinet up to those approvals given at the 26<sup>TH</sup> February Cabinet 2008.

**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.

**547. DRAFT AGENDA FOR 20<sup>th</sup> MAY CABINET MEETING**

The draft agenda was noted with the following changes notified since publication of the agenda:

Item 13 Property John Falkner School rescheduled for July Cabinet

Item 15 NIAB - rescheduled for July Cabinet with reference to NIAB (National Institute Agricultural Botany) there was a request to ensure that in future, all acronyms on Cabinet forward plans provided in a public setting (including those published on the internet) should be spelt out first.

Item 16 will be two performance reports:

- a) Local Area Agreement (LAA) Performance indicators)
- b) National Performance Targets 2008/11

Item 17 Cambridge North West Section 106 Agreement - rescheduled for July Cabinet

Chairman  
20<sup>th</sup> May 2008