

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 5th May 2009

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 11.49 a.m.

Present: Chairman Councillor J M Tuck

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

Apologies: Councillors M Curtis

Also in Attendance

Councillors: S Higginson, W Hunt, D Jenkins, G Kenney, S King, T Orgee and M Williamson.

Councillors P. Bucknell Huntingdonshire District Council and I. Nimmo-Smith Cambridge City Council.

772. MINUTES 21ST APRIL 2009

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 21st April 2009 were approved as a correct record.

773. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The following Members declared interests as follows:

Councillor J. Reynolds declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as the chairman of Renewables East and declared a prejudicial interest as the chairman of the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) with regard to reports 9 'Cambridgeshire Strategic Policy Advice to the East of England Regional Assembly – Review of Regional Spatial Strategy' and 10 'Response to the East of England Regional Assembly Consultation Document – The End of an EERA' and left the KV Room before the debate commenced on both the reports and was only invited back in when the debate had ended and the resolutions agreed.

Councillor Tuck declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in agenda items 9 and 10 (as titled above) as a member of EERA serving on their executive committee.

774. PETITIONS.

None received.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

With the agreement of Cabinet, the chairman approved a change in the order of the

agenda agreeing to take agenda Item 9 'Cambridgeshire Strategic Policy Advice to the East of England Regional Assembly – Review of Regional Spatial Strategy' as the first substantive item of business to enable invited representatives from the district councils and local members to speak early and not have to sit through the majority of the meeting.

775. CAMBRIDGESHIRE STRATEGIC POLICY ADVICE TO THE EAST OF ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY (EERA) – REVIEW OF REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY

Cabinet received a report in order to consider a suggested response to be provided to the East of England Regional Assembly following their request for advice on the 'Review of the East of England Plan' and the rolling forward of the Regional Spatial Strategy from 2021 to 2031.

In introducing the report, the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Highways indicated that the conclusions in the response could have a significant impact on the long term future of the County. He reminded Cabinet that EERA had been notified previously that the County Council would not be rushed into meeting their original deadline of 7th January. As a result, EERA had provided a revised, more measured timetable which it was hoped would enable an agreed position to be submitted within the next week or so following the Cabinet meeting, having taken on board all the consultation responses received. Cabinet noted that EERA would be shaping their options in the summer for formal consultation in September to November and that studies on their options had been progressing since the Autumn. As part of the technical work a special consultants study had been commissioned into the impact of the development scenarios provided by EERA, with the findings as summarised in the Cabinet report.

It was noted that the study work had been managed through a joint officer group, which included District Councils and Horizons representatives. To ensure partners were fully involved in an open and transparent manner, the following had been undertaken:

- Meetings of the Joint Cambridgeshire Regional Spatial Strategy Review Panel (CReSSP) which were held in public and included in its membership lead planning members from all the Cambridgeshire District Councils (Councillor Bradney thanked Councillor Orgee who had taken over the chairmanship of the last CRESSP meeting due to the former having to leave before the end for another meeting)
- Informative Web Pages and an online survey
- Stakeholder workshops.

Included in Appendix 2 of the report were the views submitted from Huntingdonshire, Cambridge City and Fenland District Councils in response to them receiving a draft of the proposed response. East Cambridgeshire District Council's views had been received following the publication of the report and had therefore been e-mailed to Cabinet Members the previous Friday with copies tabled at the meeting. (East Cambs response is set out as appendix 1 to these minutes along with comments received from Councillor Orgee). It was understood that South Cambridgeshire District Council's views would be input later. The Leaders of the District Councils or their representatives had also been invited to attend the Cabinet meeting if they wished to present their councils views in person, as it was recognised that they had important concerns that needed to be listened to and considered before Cabinet agreed a response. The Cabinet Member stated that it would be helped if all the authorities could work together with a single voice for Cambridgeshire and that although the proposed response was an important step, it was still the early stages of the Regional

Review process which was still unfolding over the next two years. It was therefore considered vital that the County Council and its partners continued to work closely together.

Cabinet was informed that the main elements of the advice being proposed were as set out in Section 6 (Conclusions) of the report and had been prepared with input from all the district councils at joint discussion meetings and also took account the findings of the commissioned Cambridgeshire Development Study, feedback received from workshops and the input from local residents / local members and included:

- A strong vision for the County with the interests of existing communities at its heart
- A realistic assessment of future economic prospects in Cambridgeshire (accepting that no-one really knew when and how fast the economy would recover)
- A much more deliverable rate of housing growth - between 3,000 and 3,600 homes per annum rather than the 3,900 to 5,200 proposed by EERA's Government led projections.
- Priority to be given to the delivery of the first 75,000 homes in the current strategy [Northstowe, Cambridge Fringes, Market Towns]
- Beyond that a mixed strategic approach was being advocated, but with a total of no more than 90,000 new homes by 2031
- The potential for more regeneration, job growth and sustainable expansion of the market towns and related to this, there was a need to address the economic prospects of Cambridgeshire in areas away from Cambridge. (i.e. Fenland and the northern parts of Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire)
- Utilising opportunities on existing transport corridors
- Reviewing the further potential in the Cambridge Green Belt given the continuing strength of the Cambridge economy
- Stating that no potential could be seen at the present time for any further new settlements given the prohibitive costs of infrastructure and the lack of sustainability that had been indicated in the study work already undertaken
- It recognised that Cambridge and its environs would remain the main focus for economic growth and employment, including research and knowledge based industry.
- In terms of EERA's Call for Development Proposals - on the basis of the evidence provided in the initial study, this enabled the proposals to be grouped by the nature of the planning difficulties associated with them as follows:

a) With potential, subject to resolution of some major issues:

- North Ely CP36
- Wintringham Park (St Neots East) CP80

b) Serious difficulties identified and, pending further consideration of the evidence base, may not be appropriate in this review period:

- Alconbury Airfield CP71
- Waterbeach (Denny St Francis) CP88
- Cambourne East (Bourne Airfield) CP27
- Cambourne West (Swansley Farm) CP76
- Cambourne North CP51
- Northstowe Extension CP17
- Hanley Grange, Hinxton CP23
- South East Cambridge CP8
- West of Shelford Road, Cambridge CP64

c) No longer worthy of consideration

➤ Mereham CP111

With the agreement of the chairman in exercising her discretion on speakers at the Cabinet meeting, Councillor Hunt was invited to address the meeting having in advance requested to speak as a concerned local member in respect of the further developer application for Mereham. He spoke strongly in support of the conclusions in the report regarding the unsuitability of the said site and the conclusion that EERA should give it no further consideration. He also highlighted the disruption that had been caused as a result of the previous developer proposals for the site which had no support from residents in his electoral division. He also expressed his deep concern at the continued cost to the District and County Council in having to oppose such proposals, which had already been rejected at an earlier public inquiry.

At the invitation of the chairman, Councillor Peter Bucknell the Executive Councillor for Planning Strategy and Transport at Huntingdonshire District Council spoke on behalf of their Cabinet who had considered the RSS Review proposals at its meeting on 23rd April 2009 and had asked that its views should be taken into account including that:

- the emerging strategy for the future growth of Cambridgeshire needed to be based upon six key strategic policy principles which would deliver;
 - a highly sustainable approach which has regard to the applicable evidence base and
 - result in the development of a sound strategy for the direction and delivery of growth within the county up to 2031.

The six principles that Huntingdonshire would want to see shaping and guiding the advice to EERA were that the emerging 'Cambridgeshire growth strategy';

1. was based upon a sustainable approach - that would both direct policy and influence the proposed spatial pattern of development.
2. built upon the established sequential approach – towards directing further growth within Cambridgeshire.
3. acknowledged that there was limited capacity for additional growth - therefore that any targets for growth up to 2031 must reflect the lower rather than the higher National Housing Policy Analysis Unit (NHPAU) options.
4. recognised the need to utilise the capacity of, and the opportunities created by, existing and committed transport and other infrastructure provision.
5. acknowledged the essential need to co-locate homes with jobs. simply put building homes near where jobs were likely to increase – e.g. in and around Cambridge.
6. recognising that the market towns could accommodate some further growth, and indeed such growth could aid their regeneration and make them more sustainable, and that the market towns did have environmental capacities that needed to be respected.

He confirmed that Huntingdonshire District Council was committed to considering the issues on a county-wide basis, and that, at this relatively early stage of the process - all the potential options should be appropriately tested (e.g. assessing all the possible sites for extra growth throughout the County, before deciding where that future growth should appropriately be located).

The Leader of Cambridge City Council, Councillor Ian Nimmo-Smith, spoke in support of the majority of the representations included in the proposed paper (as highlighted in their response points 1-8 included in appendix 2 of the Cabinet report) but specifically highlighted the areas where the City Council's views differed, stating that:

- His Council could not take a final view until the carbon modelling of the different growth scenarios and spatial options had been undertaken and that the latest findings on climate change and flood risk had been fully taken into account.
- His Council did not support the Single Vision for Cambridge as currently drafted, as they wished to see a geographically differentiated approach to further housing growth in the County. From the response provided in Appendix 2 Councillor Nimmo-Smith highlighted that the Development Study had not shown that there were solutions to the critical shortage of space for public transport and cycling movements in the City Centre and elsewhere in the City identified by the Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) work which itself only sought to address the current growth strategy. The City Council considered that further peripheral development at Cambridge would make these issues worse. This was not acceptable to the City Council and risked a repeat of the 2003 Structure Plan approach where growth allocations were not accompanied by a transport strategy.
- His Council could not support the proposed strategic review of the Cambridge Green Belt on the basis that it believed such a review was not needed to support the 75,000 dwelling option, as the land for this growth had already been allocated. As it also appeared that there was sufficient scope to reach the 90,000 dwelling option, the City Council's view was that exceptional pressures had not been substantiated, and there was therefore no justification for a further review. Furthermore it was highlighted that all the land in the City that might be looked at in such a review had been examined closely over recent years and found worthy of protection as detailed in the response and where necessary had been the subject of successful High Court challenge.

In summing up he requested that as Cambridge City's views were different, they should be highlighted. In response to a question raised, he indicated that Cambridge City Council would also be making a separate response. It was clarified that all councils would be undertaking their own individual response, in addition to providing commentary for the County Council response.

To aid clarification regarding the issue raised in the third bullet point above, officers from the County Council clarified that the proposal for a further review of the Green Belt was seen as being in the much longer term and would only be contemplated after current developments in the existing RSS had been taken forward.

Councillor Yeulett representing Fenland District Council summarised the conclusions of Fenland District Council whose Cabinet met on the 23rd April as follows:

- Supporting modest additions to current strategy on growth rate based on existing and planned transport investment with regeneration improvement of the market towns, with a focus on March and Wisbech as sustainable growth areas and with appropriate growth in Chatteris and Whittlesey. The expansion of market towns should be subject to significant infrastructure investment and an increase of quality jobs.
- Supporting raising the quality of life for Fenland residents and a commitment to improve community facilities, environment, affordable homes and regeneration.

- Needing to convert real economic development efforts into job growth. Housing releases should be linked with infrastructure investment and job growth.
- Ensuring the latest findings on climate change and flood risk were fully taken into account.
- That there should be a sustainable form of corridor growth linked to public transport availability, further job growth and appropriate infrastructure investment. Investigating potential improvements and expansion to public road and rail transport corridor links, such as the A47 and A10 together with rail links between Cambridge, Ely, March, Whittlesey, Peterborough with a link to Wisbech.

Arising from the considerations set out above, Cabinet agreed that the favoured approach to spatial strategy in Cambridgeshire should be based on delivering the current strategy, augmented where justifiable and deliverable with further balanced expansion, linked to an overall strong agreed vision and strategic objectives for Cambridgeshire, as follows:

- **market towns** - regeneration in selected locations;
- **transport links** - making best use of existing infrastructure;
- **consideration of a longer term strategic review of the Green Belt.** The exact wording for this to be the subject of further consultation with Cambridge City Council before a final response was sent.

It was highlighted that if growth was dispersed around the County, this would lead to greater infrastructure costs not only in respect of transport, but also in the appropriate provision of additional primary and secondary school places. There was discussion regarding the adequacy of the future provision for primary and secondary school places in the County, following recent articles published in a national newspaper and the knowledge that national miscalculations had been replicated at a local level. Reassurance was provided to Cabinet that officers undertook regular reviews regarding projected pupil numbers and as a result, were able to address issues in a proactive manner.

Attention was drawn to the results of an online survey carried out as set out in Appendix 3 of the report which suggested that there was likely to be wider support for the kind of approach being suggested, whilst also recognising the need to ensure that the public continued to be engaged in the run up to EERA's autumn consultation. Measures already in place included the appointment of consultants 'Corporate Culture' to ensure a greater engagement of local people in the continuing RSS review process. Cabinet was also informed that officers would be continuing with the joint technical work over the summer period, in order to improve the evidence base on delivery, on new settlement proposals and on quantifying carbon impacts.

Other points where there was general agreement to be included in the response included:

- That there were considerable doubts expressed about the viability of any further new settlements for reasons including the prohibitive costs of infrastructure and the lack of sustainability indicated in the study results so far undertaken.
- The planning authorities did not regard the Arup Study of Regional Scale Settlement options as an adequate basis for drawing up spatial strategy for Cambridgeshire or for the Region as a whole.
- That other key issues of vital importance in the development of the future strategy included:

- Recognising external links between areas, such as development being undertaken in Peterborough, King's Lynn and towns to the south of Cambridge and further links to London.
ensuring that the latest findings on climate change and flood risk were fully taken into account.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve the draft submission in Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report as the basis of the County Council's advice to EERA.
- ii) To agree that agreement on the final form of the advice should be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Infrastructure in consultation with the Executive Director, Environment Services, to take into account the responses from local planning authorities, other stakeholders and third parties including further consultation being undertaken with Cambridge City Council regarding the final wording around any further review of the Green Belt and the other issues they had raised at the meeting.

776. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

A) Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee Report – Member Led Review Community Cohesion and response

Councillor Gail Kenney the chairman of the review group was invited to provide a brief introduction to the scrutiny report thanking Rob Jakeman, the scrutiny development coordinator for all his work in helping prepare the report. She indicated that the review had been undertaken as there was the belief that not all parts of the County had the same degree of community cohesion and that while there were examples of good practice around, there was no overarching policy to help co-ordinate appropriate activity.

Cabinet noted that the primary objectives of the scrutiny committee review had been to:

- Define what community cohesion meant in the Cambridgeshire context. This was defined as being for the purposes of the review:
“Community Engagement is about what the Council is doing to involve the public in the development of its services; whilst cohesion is the net result of this and related activities”
- Assess the Council's current arrangements and capacity to effectively promote community cohesion.
- Identify good practice in the Council's current approach.
- Consider national guidance and learn from high performing authorities.
- Make recommendations that would place the Council on a sound footing to exercise a stronger role in promoting cohesive communities.

A question raised in response to the second paragraph of the introduction to the scrutiny report which read "This was started because it was seen by the Audit Commission that some areas of Cambridgeshire were struggling more than others to take in the large numbers of new residents and help them to feel part of their community so that the whole county feels at "at ease with itself" " asking whether it was possible for this to be achieved. In reply, the scrutiny chairman indicated this would depend on how successful the County

was at reaching out to both old and young people and the progress that could be made against the recommendations set out. She could not guarantee that it would ever be fully achieved.

Cabinet welcomed the scrutiny report recommendations and the subsequent officer responses with the Cabinet member for Communities indicating community engagement needed to be pursued as this would lead to greater community cohesion so that the County became a place where people lived and played in harmony. This would only be possible if people were listened to and their requirements delivered, taking into account the resources available.

It was resolved:

- i) To welcome the report of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee and support its recommendations and the responses as set out in appendix 2 to these minutes.
- ii) To undertake the proposals set out in recommendations 2, 3, 5 and 6.
- iii) To explore as a priority options for resourcing the proposals in recommendations 1 and 4.

B) Environment and Community Services (ECS) Scrutiny Committee Member led Review – Carbon and Energy Management and response

In the absence of the chairman of the scrutiny review panel who had sent his apologies, Councillor King another member of the scrutiny review panel, was invited to provide a brief introduction to the scrutiny report.

As background, it was explained that a follow up report regarding a previous energy management review had been presented to the ECS Committee in October 2008 which had noted the progress in developing energy management arrangements within the County Council's central services, focussing on the potential opportunities for taking a broader role through expanding partnership working with Schools, District, Town and Parish Councils.

Following scrutiny of this report, the Scrutiny Committee decided to undertake a Member Led Review 'looking at the scope for sharing energy management services with schools, Districts and Town and Parish councils, given the apparent significant benefits to both the Councils and partners'. The external drivers included:

- increasing prices for utilities,
- Government imposed charges relating to carbon emissions,
- the revised aspiration for the County Council to reduce carbon emissions by 30% by 2014
- meeting applicable National indicator targets (NI 185 – percentage CO2 reduction from Local Authority Operations and NI 186 – Per Capita CO2 emissions in the local area),

The review in recognising the external drivers, looked at the current preparedness of the authority to meet the challenges and looked at the steps that would need to be taken in

order to be at the forefront of the energy management agenda. The focus was on four main themes:

- Governance arrangements
- Resources
- Partnership working in schools
- Promoting community awareness.

Recommendations included that the Council should establish Member and Director Carbon Management Champions, setting up a substantial dedicated fund and seeking to secure as much Salix match-funding as possible, in order to help achieve the proposed reduction in the County Council footprint. Councillor King noted that whilst the Council had been successful in securing £500,000 of Salix Finance match funding, Salix Finance had indicated that up to £1.2m could be available and the scrutiny committee recommended that proposals were developed to attract as much of this as possible.

Cabinet welcomed the scrutiny report recommendations and the subsequent officer responses, including with reference to the reply on funding issues (Recommendation 4), the County Council's participation in Phase 6 of the Carbon Trust Local Authority Carbon Management Programme (LACMP) for which more information was included in the report later on the agenda titled "Cambridgeshire County Council Carbon Management Plan." It was confirmed that the County Council would be pursuing all opportunities for additional match funding, while recognising the finite resources available.

The Cabinet Member for Finance, Property, Performance, People, Policy and Law highlighted that the response, along with the above mentioned plan, would help towards achieving the Energy and Carbon Management reductions required. This would require the County Council working in close co-operation with all relevant partners (including District Councils, schools, the Primary Care Trust and those who provided services such as transport and waste disposal operators)

Rob Jakeman, the scrutiny development coordinator was again thanked for all his work in helping prepare the report.

It was resolved:

- i) To welcome the report of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee and to agree the response as set out in Appendix 3 to these minutes.
- ii) To note the progress being made in respect of the recommendations arising from the Scrutiny Review.

C) Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee Report –Review of Access to Health Services for People with Learning Disabilities and Response

Councillor Simon Higginson the chairman of the review group was invited to provide a brief introduction to the scrutiny report. He explained that in response to national and local evidence that people with learning difficulties were encountering issues accessing healthcare services, the Health and Adult Social Care (HASC) Scrutiny Committee had agreed to conduct a review to examine what steps were being taken by the health service

to ensure that people with learning difficulties received equitable and appropriate health care. The review was conducted in conjunction with a self-assessment undertaken by NHS organisations for the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) East of England, which used the SHA's learning disabilities "Performance and Self Assessment Framework" and it was hoped that most of the recommendations would be adopted in their resulting action plan to be submitted to the SHA by 31st May 2009.

The purpose of the review had been to respond to information and recommendations made to the HASC Scrutiny Committee by the Speaking Up Parliament of people with learning difficulties, and the Learning Disability Carers Network by:

- Assessing the challenges faced by people with learning difficulties when accessing health services
- Identifying where improvements could be made to better the care of people with learning difficulties in relation to health services
- Making recommendations for improvements

Highlighted as being an area of particular concern for service delivery and needing swift action was to address front line staff shortages and unfreeze those posts currently frozen in the Learning Disability Partnership (LDP) nursing team and also ensuring adequate support for dysphagia sufferers was provided.

It was resolved:

- i) To thank the Scrutiny Committee for the report.
- ii) To approve the proposed actions to be taken by the Learning Disability Partnership in response to the recommendations from the report of the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee as set out in appendix 4 to these minutes.

D) Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee Report – Review of the Development of Self Directed Support in Adult Social Care

Councillor Simon Higginson, the chairman of the review group, was invited to provide a brief introduction to the scrutiny report. He explained that a review group of the Health and Adult Social Care (HASC) Scrutiny Committee had been set up to examine the way in which Self-Directed Support (SDS) in Adult Social Care was being developed in Cambridgeshire. Members had decided to review the implementation of SDS as it was a fundamental transformation / shift in service delivery and might have a major impact on the quality of life of users of Adult Support Services.

The review had aimed to assess the extent to which the development of SDS was being undertaken in a way which would:

- a) Improve the quality of life of service users
- b) Provide value for money
- c) Ensure that there were robust monitoring processes and safety nets in place to support and safeguard service users.

In conducting the review, consideration was given to the extent to which SDS would be accessible and would improve the quality of life of service users across all localities and care groupings.

Highlighted in the introduction was:

- Recommendation 4 regarding providing advice and support to users and carers and building the knowledge of staff on the availability of community resources to be extended to all teams and care groupings. This followed the experience obtained from the Learning Disability (LD) pilot scheme on the value of the family support worker role.
- Recommendation 15 in terms of identifying baseline data to enable comparisons to be made and stressing that this should also include back office / administration costs as well as front line costs, as any expected savings needed to be easily identified.

One Cabinet member commented that as there were a great many complex issues / recommendations, that any further review by the scrutiny committee should not wait a further 12 months, but with recognition that the implementation timetable was very ambitious and that some flexibility around implementation would be required.

The relevant officers were commended for both the contents of the scrutiny report and the responses provided.

It was resolved:

- i) To thank the Scrutiny Committee for the report.
- ii) To approve the proposed actions to be taken by the Learning Disability Partnership in response to the recommendations from the report of the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee as set out in appendix 5 to these minutes.

777. DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON AMENDED OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION AT LAND BETWEEN HUNTINGDON ROAD AND HISTON ROAD, CAMBRIDGE

As the County Council was a statutory consultee on planning applications a report was received setting out a proposed County Council consultation response to the amended outline planning application for the proposed development between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road for 1,593 dwellings and the associated infrastructure (known as the NIAB - National Institute of Agricultural Botany site). Cabinet was asked to consider the key issues arising as set out in respect of the individual recommendations in respect of:

- The lack of a Section 106 Strategy
- Proposed Education provision
- Transport
- Waste Management
- Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS)
- Archaeological Mitigation.

As the map provided to Cabinet Members showed an outline of both the NIAB and the NIAB extra sites, the local member for Bar Hill made reference to Girton residents concerns regarding any proposals for the NIAB extra site, including improving access for pedestrians and cyclists from Girton to the new development as well as concerns about the loss of the Green Belt. Assurances were provided that the current report only related to the existing NIAB site application as detailed in the text of the Cabinet report. Reference was made to the problems of the developer failing to adopt the roads around the Quills / Wellbrooke Road site with a request for information on what enforcement measures could be undertaken to avoid a recurrence of such problems on future sites. In response, it was indicated that officers from the County Council were working with their district council colleagues in terms of the latter's planning powers, on what was a recognised national problem. This included looking at planning conditions providing time limits and officers were investigating whether such conditions could be guaranteed by bonds, and whether they were affordable.

Another member made reference to:

- the substantial transport congestion issues already apparent in the area and concerns that an additional 1600 houses would only add to this pressure and therefore there need to look at infrastructure very carefully. In response, details were given of a Transport study which had been undertaken at an early stage in the process assessing the impact of the NIAB development together with the other development anticipated for the entire north west quadrant. The study had been drawn up to inform negotiations with the applicants and a number of measures have been agreed including an Area Wide Travel Plan which was expected to help minimise any increased traffic movements by cars, particularly those using the A14 to reach destinations in the south of the City.
- whether there were any timing issues with development of the site and the A14 upgrade. In response it was reported that most of the development was expected to be completed before the A14 works commenced and that the Highways Agency had not expressed any concerns. The Construction Traffic Plan would need to be drawn up through working closely with the Highways Agency to help minimise disruption.

In terms of issues around primary education provision as referred to in the report, it was noted that this was currently being progressed and that a report would come back to the July Cabinet meeting.

One member made reference to forthcoming Government legislation which he believed would require the automatic adoption of sewers once a site was completed. As this could not be confirmed at the meeting, it was agreed that written clarification would be provided outside of the meeting.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve the County Council's consultation response to both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils to the amended outline planning application for development between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road which objected to the planning application on the following grounds:

- Until a section 106 Agreement was submitted and agreed.
 - On the grounds that insufficient primary school provision had been made on the NIAB site.
 - That no secondary provision was made by the applicant.
 - Until the resolution of the detailed response regarding transport issues set out in Appendix A of the report.
 - Subject to satisfactory revision of the Archaeology proposals.
- ii) To delegate to the Lead Member, Growth, Infrastructure and Highways in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services, the authority to make any minor textual changes to the consultation response prior to submission.
- iii) That a further report would be presented to the July Cabinet meeting in respect of clarifying the County Council's Primary Education provision requirements.

778. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL CARBON MANAGEMENT PLAN

Cabinet received a report on the Cambridgeshire County Council Carbon Management Plan (CMP) setting out the Council's approach for reducing Carbon Dioxide production over a five year period. The CMP comprehensively set out the County Council's strategy for delivering the reduction in terms of approach, governance, accountability, resources and communication.

Cabinet noted that the County Council had been selected to participate in Phase 6 of the Carbon Trust's Local Authority Carbon Management Programme (LACM) which had through the LACM, provided the Council with technical and change management support and guidance to help realise carbon emissions savings. The primary focus of the work was to reduce emissions under the control of the local authority such as buildings, vehicle fleets, street lighting and landfill sites with the culmination of the work being the production of the Cambridgeshire County Council Carbon Management Plan (CMP). Cabinet noted that the Carbon Trust had encouraged participants in Phase 6 of the programme to take an aspirational target of a 30% reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) by 2014, which was higher than the committed 10% within the Council's Climate Change and Environment Strategy.

The report was welcomed with Cabinet commenting that in order to achieve the proposed targets every service would need to closely monitor its own performance in helping reducing car usage etc recognising that the biggest challenge would be in relation to growth and how this was considered in determining if targets had been met. The Cabinet Member for Finance, Property, Performance, People, Policy and Law called for robust, regular overview monitoring to track progress against the set down targets.

It was resolved:

- i) To endorse the Council's ambition and approach for reducing Carbon Dioxide production by the authority in the course of its activities and
- ii) To delegate authority to the Corporate Director (Finance, Property and Performance) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance,

Property, Performance, People, Policy and Law to finalise and submit the Plan to the Carbon Trust.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

It was agreed to change the order of the agenda to take report 8 'Adult Social Care Transformation Strategy' before agenda item 7 'Adult Social Workforce Strategy 2009-2012' as this allowed reference back to the Transformation Strategy when discussing issues in the Workforce Strategy.

779. ADULT SOCIAL CARE TRANSFORMATION STRATEGY

Cabinet received a report setting out proposals for a 12 week consultation commencing in June on the draft Strategy for the Transformation of Adult Social Care titled 'Transforming Adult Social Care in Cambridgeshire through Personalisation A Frame work for Action'.

The approach to the consultation was to follow that used when consulting on the self-directed support policy including:

- Notification of the consultation through existing networks,
- Face to face discussion through existing partnership and user consultation meetings
- Specific focus groups
- A short consultation questionnaire available on-line and in hard copy
- Ensuring feedback on the results of the consultation were distributed widely.

The consultation was to provide a vehicle for engaging partner organisations, service users, carers and other interest groups in the development of the final document, which would be presented to Cabinet for approval in the Autumn.

Cabinet noted that the purpose of the strategy was to provide an overarching framework that outlined the vision, direction, priorities and long-term plan of action (strategy) for transforming adult social care services. It encompassed the work on Self-directed support being rolled out following the successful launch on 20 April 2009 and the strategy was set within the context of personalisation linked to the individual, the neighbourhood and the wider community.

In answer to a question raised regarding whether officers were satisfied that the workforce and IT systems were sufficiently prepared to cope with the changes required, it was indicated that a great deal of work had already been undertaken with NHS partners, but that more work was being / to be undertaken through presentations etc to bring on board the District Councils and the Voluntary Sector.

It was resolved:

To approve a 12 week consultation on the draft Strategy for Transformation of Adult Social Care, beginning in June 2009.

780. ADULT SOCIAL WORKFORCE STRATEGY 2009-2012

Cabinet received the Adult Social Care Workforce Strategy 2009-2010 and the associated action plan for Adult Social Care 2009-2012 to support the development of an appropriately skilled and experienced workforce to deliver the adult social care agenda.

Cabinet noted that as a result of the need to change, Adult Support Services and partners from NHS Cambridgeshire and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust had been working together to modernise the way that adult social care was delivered. A key part of the work would be implementing the national programme of transformation, including the introduction of the new Self-Directed Support system referred to in the above report. The changes represented a significant cultural shift in the way that services were provided and it was therefore vital that staff possessed the appropriate values, skills and knowledge to deliver the new ways of working and enable them to supply a complete and flexible approach to clients expectations. New Information and Communications Technology skills would need to be adopted to support the roll out of new systems and would need to be ongoing as system change was introduced.

The Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Well Being highlighted that the County Council's partners (as identified in paragraph 3.8 of the report) would need to be aware of the changes that the County Council were implementing as a direct result of the Workforce Strategy to facilitate the Transformation Agenda, and where appropriate, good practice should be shared with them.

It was resolved:

To approve the Adult Social Care Workforce Strategy 2009-2010 and the associated action plan.

781. RESPONSE TO THE EAST OF ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY (EERA) CONSULTATION DOCUMENT 'THE END OF AN EERA'

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to draft of the formal advice proposed to be sent on behalf of the Council to EERA in respect of options for the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) in Cambridgeshire.

Cabinet noted that In July 2007 the Government had produced its review of Sub National Economic Development and Regeneration (SNR) confirming that with the abolition of Regional Assemblies, their planning, transport and housing responsibilities would be transferred to the Regional Development Agencies (RDA), who would be responsible for producing a new Single Regional Strategy (SRS), combining the current Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Regional Economic Strategy (RES). The review had also promoted the notion of greater delegation from the RDA and that upper tier local authorities would have greater responsibility for local economic development delivery, through the production of economic assessments for their areas.

The proposed legislation would mean:

- the reform of regional governance structures and, in particular the establishment of a new Local Authorities Leaders' Board with joint responsibility (with the East of England Development Agency (EEDA)) for preparing a new SRS;
- the abolition of the Regional Assembly, EERA;
- the new and soon to be established Regional Select Committee and Regional Grand Committee will undertake the scrutiny role of EEDA.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree the draft County Council response to EERA's consultation document as set out in the appendix to the report.
- ii) To agree to delegate to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services, the authority to make any minor amendments to the draft response to enable a final response to be submitted by the closing date of 8th May 2009.

782. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA FOR 7th JULY 2009

The agenda was noted with the following additional reports:

Recruitment and Retention of Social Workers
Size of Primary School on NIAB Site

783. VOTE OF THANKS

As it was the last meeting of Cabinet before the County Council local government elections, the Chairman thanked her Cabinet colleagues and all the officers present for their support and contributions during her time as chairman and praised the good work that had been achieved by the meeting.

In response, Cabinet colleagues thanked her for performing extremely well in her first year as the Leader of the Council and additionally, recognising that both herself as a new Leader and the still relatively new Chief Executive had worked very well in partnership in helping to improve the performance of the Council.

Chairman
7th July 2009

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S RESPONSE ON THE PROPOSED COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE AS SET OUT IN THE REPORT 'CAMBRIDGESHIRE STRATEGIC POLICY ADVICE TO THE EAST OF ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY (EERA) – REVIEW OF REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY' (MINUTE 775)

- The Council supports the emerging vision and strategy delivering a county towns strategy with high quality public transport linkages
- The Council supports continuing commitments based strategy for up to 90,000 homes following the sequential policy approach established by the 2003 structure plan and the 2009 East of England plan
- We need to articulate a better deal for market towns in a re-written sequential policy
- The Council considers that key rural service centres can also make a contribution
- The spatial planning strategy and an integrated transport strategy should be delivered together
- Infrastructure provision – the implementation plan published by East of England Development Agency (EEDA) / EERA currently out for consultation is a positive way forward but there is one significant question not answered – where is the money coming from?
- Another strategic review of the Cambridge Green Belt will be a distraction from the need to focus on delivering the current strategy.
- No to new settlement proposals especially Mereham which are not needed in the context of the emerging vision and strategy for the county
- ARUP regional settlement study is rejected by all the districts
- Climate Change/sustainability e.g. effect of climate change on market towns and rural areas

Councillor Orgee's comments

Councillor Orgee who had chaired part of the previous CReSSP meeting also wished to place on record his thanks to all the officers involved in the work of CReSSP to date. In particular he commended the work that had been undertaken in preparing the response which he believed contained many important comments and observations. He regarded paragraph 1.1 (c) as being particularly important with regard to future housing numbers and welcomed the request in paragraph 6.5 that the boundaries of the existing Cambridge Sub-Region should be changed to include the whole of Cambridgeshire. He also considered that Paragraph 6.7 regarding mutual planning across authority boundaries was important and was pleased that paragraph 6.3 refers to there being no support for new settlements. In addition, he made the point that great care needed to be taken to ensure that developments on the inner edges of Cambridge do not lead to coalescence of the city and surrounding villages. He also indicated that the proposed response justifiably criticised the Arup Report for a number of shortcomings, in particular its lack of clarity.

APPENDIX 2

RESPONSE TO MEMBER LED REVIEW OF COMMUNITY COHESION (MINUTE 776A)

Recommendation 1 – Mapping Community Cohesion

Recommendation: The Council should seek to map the key community cohesion issues facing Cambridgeshire. Evidence should be gathered from a range of sources including:

- Input from Councillors from the ward perspective
- Local Surveys
- Community engagement activities
- National Guidance
- Tension monitoring arrangements

Response: Cabinet acknowledge that further work is required to develop a community cohesion strategy which truly reflects the specific community cohesion issues within Cambridgeshire, and that in order to do so, a mapping exercise is required. The Director of Community Engagement (Fenland) will work with the Head of Research and Financial Strategy and the Head of Communications to explore potential methods of mapping. It should be noted however that this work is not within existing resources and there is therefore a risk that it may not be achievable in the short-term.

WHO: Service Director, Community Engagement (Fenland)
WHEN BY: May 2010

Recommendation 2 - Leadership

Recommendation: A lead officer role should be identified to be responsible for coordinating community cohesion activity. The role should be held at Service Director level or higher, with clearly identified responsibilities.

Response: Cabinet is fully committed to clarifying lines of accountability at Officer and Member level to ensure that community cohesion activity is regulated, coordinated, promoted and reviewed. As Scrutiny is aware, the Cabinet Member for Communities has a clear role in promoting community cohesion. In support of the recommendation above, Cabinet confirms that the new Service Director, Community Engagement (Fenland) post will be responsible for leading and promoting community cohesion across the Council.

WHO: Chief Executive and Service Director, Community Engagement (Fenland)
WHEN BY: July 2009

Recommendation 3 - Strategy

Recommendation: The Council has several strategies that have a bearing on the approach to promoting community cohesion. These strategies should be informed by public consultation and be aligned and rationalised to provide greater clarity and a coordinated response. In particular, this should include:

- Alignment or amalgamation of the community engagement and community strategies and action plans
- Explicit linkages with the People strategy, Single Equality strategy and other relevant Council strategies
- Explicit linkages with community cohesion strategies developed by Cambridgeshire Together partners, particularly District Councils

Response: Cabinet supports the recommendation to streamline and align the number of strategies focused on working with the community. The Community Engagement Strategy currently being drafted will become part of a broader Community Cohesion Strategy in the longer

term, with the aim of this wider strategy being informed by a mapping exercise and by formal public consultation. Linkages with other relevant strategies will be made.

WHO: Executive Director, Community and Adult Services

WHEN BY: May 2010

Recommendation 4 - Mainstreaming

Recommendation: The Council should seek to embed a culture throughout the organisation so that each service is mindful of its role in supporting community cohesion. This should include an ongoing 'mainstreaming' exercise through:

- Awareness raising initiatives
- Accessible guidance and good practice information provided for the benefit of all services
- Amendments to service planning arrangements

Response: Cabinet supports this proposal and believes that the process of refreshing the community cohesion strategy will in itself assist in embedding a culture of community cohesion across the organisation. However, to ensure that such mainstreaming of community cohesion across all council services is fully achieved, resources will need to be identified to implement initiatives such as the delivery of awareness raising initiatives and development of appropriate guidance and good practice information. There is therefore a risk that this recommendation may not be implemented in the short term.

WHO: Executive Director, Community and Adult Services

WHEN BY: May 2010

Recommendation 5 – Member Training And Development

Recommendation: Community Cohesion awareness raising and training sessions should form part of the ongoing Member Development Programme.

Response: Cabinet is committed to supporting Members to act as community leaders in championing community cohesion activity and will ensure that community cohesion awareness raising and training sessions form part of the ongoing Member Development Programme.

WHO: Corporate Director (People, Policy and Law)

WHEN BY: Ongoing

Recommendation 6 – Further Scrutiny

Recommendation: Progress in implementing the recommendations should be reviewed by the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee (or equivalent) in a year's time.

Response: Cabinet will be pleased to update Scrutiny as to progress on implementing the above recommendations in a year's time.

WHO: Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee

WHEN: May 2010

APPENDIX 3

RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEMBER LED REVIEW – ENERGY AND CARBON MANAGEMENT (MINUTE 776B)

Recommendation 1 - The allocation of officer resources to carbon and energy management initiatives should be reviewed in the light of the recommendations below, and again at key project milestones, to ensure that work to achieve carbon and energy reduction targets stays on track.

WHO: Chief Executive
WHEN BY: Ongoing

Response – Agreed and being delivered via current operational management arrangements: The integrated planning process (IPP) has resulted in the preservation of the three full time equivalent posts within the Energy Management Team, furthermore this same process has allocated up to £2 Million towards Environmental improvement initiatives. This resource has been used to fund specialist technical consultancy to develop discreet business cases that have the potential to deliver 20% reductions to our Carbon Footprint through £1M of investment, £500,000 of which is through Salix match funding. Incremental projects identified through our Local Authority Carbon Management Programme will present discreet business cases against this allocated resource.

Recommendation 2 - The Council should establish Member and Director Carbon Management Champions

WHO: Leader of the Council / Chief Executive
WHEN BY: July 2009

Response – Agreed, but will be finalised following the County elections and once the specific portfolio holder has been identified. Director engagement through the Tackling Climate Change Quality Improvement Area (QIA) ensures that officer champions have been identified.

Recommendation 3 - The Council should seek to ensure that Building Schools for the Future (BSF), Better Utilisation of Property Assets (BUPA), Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative (PFI) and other relevant capital programmes are coordinated with, and support the delivery of, the Council's carbon management objectives.

WHO: Member and Officer Carbon Champions
WHEN BY: Ongoing

Response – Agreed and being progressed by a variety of mechanisms. Cabinet Reports for example have climate change implications as an element to be considered as a requirement in each report. Representation by officers in significant capital programmes, such as street lighting, BUPA and the Tackling Climate Change QIA ensures that any particular programme is supportive of the carbon management objectives. Examples can be seen in setting standards for construction in Building Schools for the Future (BSF) to ensure minimal carbon impacts.

Recommendation 4 - A substantial, dedicated fund should be urgently established to enable the Council to meet its aspiration to reduce its carbon footprint by 30% within 5 years, as stated in the Local Authority Carbon Management Plan.

- A clear roadmap should be developed to enable the Council to identify the amount of funding required, and to enable programme implementation
- The fund will need to be a mix of reinvestment and one off payments/loans to enable an annual rolling programme to be established and implemented
- The Council should seek to secure as much Salix Finance match funding as possible to form part of the fund (i.e. up to £1.2 million)
- The initial focus should be on those initiatives that can generate the greatest carbon efficiencies in the short term. This will primarily involve working with schools.

WHO: Cabinet

WHEN BY: December 2009

Response – Agreed. The approach outlined above is exactly the approach being followed through participation in phase 6 of the Carbon Trust Local Authority Carbon Management programme (LACMP). Through this we have developed a comprehensive understating of our carbon footprint and discreet business cases are being developed based upon a prioritisation to secure maximum effect. The LACMP is being presented separately to Cabinet on the 5th May 2009. In respect of funding we are working a manageable load of improvements to our buildings estate, many of which are in respect of schools. We have up to £2M available, through IPP (£500,000 of which is already ring-fenced to the improvements identified through LACMP). £500,000 Salix match funding has been allocated, subject to Council approval (Salix is an independent, publicly funded company set up to accelerate public sector investment in energy efficiency technologies through invest to save schemes.). As we develop business cases for further demands we can look to exploit further these two sources of funding as well as resources within the Better Utilisation of Property Assets (a tenet of which is to improve building environmental performance), Invest to Transform and future Integrated Planning Process (IPP) cycles. It should also be noted that we have financial resources allocated in 10/11 in readiness for the Carbon Reduction Commitment – there may be opportunities to use this in advance where the business case permits.

Recommendation 5 - The Council should initiate a project to install monitoring equipment in all state Cambridgeshire schools willing to participate in the project. As this is rolled out, community groups should be involved in order that the initiative engages the whole community as much as possible.

WHO: Corporate Director Finance, Property and Performance / Service Director Strategy and Commissioning

WHEN BY: March 2010

Response – Agreed. As part of the Council's statutory participation in the Department of Energy and Climate Change's Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) the implementation of SMART meters are being considered across a significant proportion of our building estate, including schools. £60,000 has been allocated in 2009-10 for resource "Delivering environmental education at a local community level, focusing on working through schools".

Recommendation 6 - The Council should provide advice and guidance to schools on how to promote energy efficiency to students

WHO: Service Director Learning

WHEN BY: Ongoing

Response – Agreed. Environmental education services offered by Cambridgeshire Environmental Education Service (CEES) include a termly schools newsletter, professional development courses for teachers, a school grounds advisory service, workshops for pupils in schools and the production of environmental education resource materials. All CEES centres offer courses led by qualified, experienced teachers for Foundation stage to A level. Courses support curriculum requirements in subjects including Science, Geography and History, and education for sustainable futures. CEES' newest centre at Coldham specialises in education about energy and renewable energy technologies.

Recommendation 7 - The Council should support schools in working with a range of community organisations, such as Friends of the Earth, in promoting environmental issues

WHO: Service Director Learning

WHEN BY: Ongoing

Response – Agreed. CEES has been strengthened with funding from the most recent IPP round. CEES already works with a broad range of external organisations to further awareness of environmental issues. CEES coordinates a network of organizations that contribute to environmental education in Cambridgeshire schools. Organisations involved include Wildlife Trusts, National Energy Foundation, EDF Energy, BBC Breathing Places, The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), Country Parks, GO East and others. CEES' termly newsletter shares information from these organizations with all schools and promotes their events, resources and grants; however, this engagement will be reviewed to ensure that it is sufficiently comprehensive.

Recommendation 8 - The Council should seek to promote the Energy Management related resources at the County Council to appropriate partner organisations

WHO: Corporate Director, Customer Service and Transformation

WHEN BY: Ongoing

Response – Agreed. The priority is firstly to implement improvements and establish an effective energy management discipline within Cambridgeshire County Council, and then expand the work with partner organisations. Regular knowledge sharing takes place through forums such as the Cambridgeshire Procurement Group in respect of utilities procurement, schools through free utility health checks – to which a response rate exceeding expectations was received – almost 50% of all schools. Promoting energy management resources to schools has been successful; in 2008 5 schools shared £20,000 of funding from NPower towards energy improvement, a further 5 schools in the Little Barford area are participating in 2009. Other schools have benefited from investment from Cooperative Society Environmental Grants.

Recommendation 9 - The Council should ensure there is a forum to promote carbon reduction initiatives and to share best practice with partners and appropriate community organisations in Cambridgeshire

WHO: Member and Officer Carbon Champions

WHEN BY: October 2009

Response – Agreed. This is already being progressed through the Environmental Sustainability Partnership, reporting to the Cambridgeshire Together Board, by the Climate Change Partnership in particular.

RESPONSE TO HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEMBER LED REVIEW - ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES (MINUTE 776 C)

1. **Recommendation:** Each team should provide a named contact for each GP practice, and that named contact should make periodic links with GP practices in allocated area.
Response: Completed – Teams have made links with all GP practices in their area. Incorporated into the Learning Disability Partnership (LDP) commissioning plan and will be monitored.
2. **Recommendation:** Carers should be provided with a named contact for LDP teams.
Response: Commenced – will be completed this year.
3. **Recommendation:** A standard county-wide approach is needed to designing Health Action Plans (HAPs), although it should be noted that documents can – and should – be individualised by service users. Re-issued national guidance from the Department of Health should be consulted.
Response: Incorporated into multi-agency action plan – will be completed this year.
4. **Recommendation:** A process for regular reviews/re-assessment of patient's needs to be put in place. This must be more than a 'box-ticking' exercise.
N.B. this recommendation needs to be passed to General Practitioners (GPs), and has also been included on the NHS Cambridgeshire Commissioner for GP documentation
Response: Incorporated into multi-agency action plan – is an national Health Service (NHS) responsibility. Will be monitored by LDP board and the Strategic Health Authority (SHA).
5. **Recommendation:** LDP Teams to provide or pass on information about how to access easy-to-read information to GP Practices and Hospitals.
Response: Completed. Lists of web based materials provided. LDP will continue to support and review information needs annually.
6. **Recommendation:** Assist hospitals to review the format options for their appointment letters, especially when being sent to patients with learning difficulties, to ensure it is clear to read.
Response: Incorporated into multi-agency action plan – is an NHS responsibility but LDP will support. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.
7. **Recommendation:** LDP teams to be encouraged to work together, and with partner organisations, to produce literature.
Response: Incorporated in to multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.
8. **Recommendation:** LDP team to review Service Plan to see how training campaigns are planned.
Response: Incorporated into multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

9. **Recommendation:** LDP Partnership Board to request a report on the set up of preventative work, for example 'Health Groups', such as men's health, women's health to ascertain whether they are equitable across the County, and to address any issues that arise.
Response: Incorporated to LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.
10. **Recommendation:** LDP teams to share information through national networking of professionals; as it was felt that the teams are very inward focussed, more strategic work or management might help reduce duplication and share best practice across Britain.
Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.
11. **Recommendation:** Involve people with learning difficulties in the delivery of training events, where relevant.
Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.
12. **Recommendation:** Raise awareness of 'reasonable adjustments' that the General Practitioner (GP) should do to make it more accessible for people with learning difficulties ie longer appointment / minimising wait in waiting area by fast tracking or first or last appointment etc
Response: Partially completed – covered in training by LDP to GP practices. LDP will continue to reinforce annually.
13. **Recommendation:** Alert and provide support to GPs to ensure that when they are completing 'Choose & Book' for hospital appointments or writing to the hospital, information is included about the person with learning difficulties such as:
- their communication needs
 - if they need easy-to-read or large print appointment letter
 - if they need special considerations such as quiet waiting area, first on operating list to minimise nil by mouth wait etc
 - if family carer or care staff needs to accompany
- Response:** Partially completed – covered in training by LDP to GP practices. LDP will continue to reinforce annually.
14. **Recommendation:** LDP teams to provide information and advice to carers in order for them to ask for reasonable adjustments to be made.
Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.
15. **Recommendation;** A consistent county-wide approach to the treatment of dysphagia is required to ensure equity of access to appropriate care.
Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.
16. **Recommendation:** Liaise with Traveller Liaison Service to identify ways that will better ensure that the health issues of traveller communities are better addressed.
Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

17. **Recommendation:** Ensure training at GP Surgeries signing up to the Direct Enhanced Service includes information about how to book people with learning disabilities onto patient transport, i.e. inform patient transport that:
- the person has learning difficulties
 - their communication needs
 - if they need easy-to-read or large print appointment letter
 - if the person needs the family carer or care staff to also be with them
 - if the person needs to be taken to the clinic area

Response: Partially completed – covered in training by LDP to GP practices. LDP will continue to reinforce annually.

18. **Recommendation:** LDP teams to work with hospitals and the transitions team to ensure a joined-up service is offered to adult patients (as currently happens for children).

Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

19. **Recommendation:** A multi-disciplinary approach to be followed to ensure that the holistic needs of people are met, and that they are not put into silos, based on a 'primary diagnosis'.

Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

20. **Recommendation:** Staffing levels need to be reviewed to ensure equity of service across the county, support for dysphagia is provided, and to take account of the functions that are currently under-resourced, for example extra training requests as a result of the GP enhanced service.

Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

21. **Recommendation:** Access to and the provision of Physiotherapy needs to be reviewed.

Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

22. **Recommendation:** Discuss with Peterborough City Council to put agreement into place with regard to payment for carer staff.

Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

23. **Recommendation:** Put a protocol into place to ensure that there is prior agreement between the Primary Care Trust (PCT), Hospital and Council about who pays for extra support if required.

Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

24. **Recommendation:** The LDP to explore opportunities for the new Health Facilitator to run or source relevant training for the Community Dental Service team around working with people with learning disabilities.

Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

25. Recommendation: The Learning Disability Partnership and the Community Dental Service Oral Health training programme includes the need to include an alert to attendees so they are aware of the Community Dental service.

Response: Incorporated into LDP service plan and multi-agency action plan. Will be monitored by LDP board and SHA.

APPENDIX 5

FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE MEMBER LED REVIEW INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-DIRECTED SUPPORT (SDS) IN ADULT SOCIAL CARE (MINUTE 776D)

Recommendation 1: Employment Support Service

A comprehensive support service must be provided for service users and carers who use a DP to employ staff, and users should be made aware of the range of support available. The resourcing of this should be regularly reviewed, and increased over time to keep pace with the growth in the number of people receiving a Direct Payment (DP) as SDS is rolled out. There should be sufficient capacity for all users and carers to be able to access this service, though they should also be informed of what alternative support services are available.

Response

Cambridgeshire Direct Payment support services are contracted through an external organisation, Essex Coalition of Disable People (ECDP). Their primary role is to provide advice and guidance to people using DP to employ their own staff. Care Managers encourage people to use this service. The contract with ECDP is monitored regularly, and there is sufficient capacity currently and some room for additional activity in the contract to allow for the early roll out of SDS. Contract monitoring meetings will be used to monitor capacity issues, and adjust the contract as necessary.

Recommendation 2: Recruitment

The County Council should work with the support service to develop ways of assisting recruitment, such as co-ordinating advertising, initiatives to expand the pool of care workers, or maintaining lists of available care workers.

Response

Cambridgeshire County Council is aware that some other areas have a personal Assistant Register which can help people receiving a DP to recruit staff particularly in crisis situations. Other areas also have newsletters with job vacancies. The Transformation Team will explore these options and provide a report on the options to the Director and the project board.

Recommendation 3: Information

The SDS implementation plan should include a strategy and action plan for provision of information to service users and carers, both in web-based and paper formats, such as an information pack. The information should include: what support and services are available, such as transport, home

adaptations; clear information on what users can expect and what is expected of them; how SDS will work; what a DP can be used for, and how it will be monitored.

Users and carers should be made clear about their right to request a review if circumstances change, and how they should go about asking for one. This should be given to them in writing.

Response

There are plans in place to have information fully available to service users, carers and people who fund their own care in web-based and paper-based format. Information packs were available at the launch of SDS that took place on 20 April. Future information will include an explanation of the process for requesting a review if circumstances change.

Recommendation 4: Advice and Support to Users and Carers

There needs to be sufficient capacity built in to enable the roles of providing advice and support to users and of building the knowledge of staff about available community resources, to be extended to all teams and care groupings, building on the experience of the family support worker role in the LD pilot scheme. Sufficient resources should be allocated for this. This could be funded through the Transformation Fund, at least until the implementation is complete. Urgent consideration should be given as to the best approach to achieving this.

Response

Our initial intention is for care managers/carers co-ordinators to be the main vehicle for advice and support for users/carers as SDS is rolled out. We have refocused the care manager role in order to allow for this to happen, initial training began late March in line with the implementation plan. The Transformation Fund has been used to provide increased capacity for the operational teams during the roll out. The use of easily accessible web based databases of community resources e.g. Cambridgeshire.net, are being explored, and how this might link with our other IT systems to provide an easily accessible information database for care managers and individuals themselves. Information will also be made available in hard copy for those people who do not have access to the internet.

Recommendation 5: Rural Costs

Evidence should be obtained through monitoring of the support plan and review outcomes of the extent to which staff costs, and other costs such as travel to services and to social and recreational activities are higher in rural areas, so that any necessary adjustments can be made to the RAS.

Response

See Response to Recommendation 15.

Recommendation 6: Support for Carers

The implementation plans should include a strategy and action plan for ensuring that carers receive the information and support that they need. This should include ensuring that the support planning process takes account of their needs, that regular carers' assessments are made, and carers' breaks, including respite care provided. Account should be taken of the fact that carers may over commit themselves and need to reduce the level of support they provide in the light of experience. Outcomes for carers, and indicators such as the breakdown of arrangements, should

be specifically monitored, so that any changes required to the SDS process in the light of experience can be identified and made.

Response

The revised assessment and care management process for SDS does emphasise carers' needs and indicates the need for a separate carers' assessment, if appropriate. There is positive feedback from both local and national research that SDS has provided benefits to carers. In addition, support plans are done as a matter of course and detail areas such as respite care.

Recommendation 7: Communication and Administration Issues

An action plan should be drawn up to reduce problems in communication between social services and users and carers, and to ensure that financial administration is timely and works smoothly.

Response

The revised business processes indicate clear points at which specific communications should happen between Cambridgeshire County Council, or partners, and service users and carers. The review point after each phase of implementation will ensure that any issue with the business process can be dealt with.

In addition to this, the County Council is currently working on a project that will make the manual processing of Direct Payments electronic. The CRIP (Commitment Record Implementation Project) financial Information Technology (IT) System is being developed to manage Direct Payments and will ensure financial administration is less resource intensive, streamlined and timely. This will be implemented from July 2009, ahead of the implementation of SDS for Older People.

Recommendation 8: Occupational Therapy (OT) Services

The County Council should continue to work with NHS Cambridgeshire and Cambridgeshire Community Services (CCS) to improve the timeliness of OT services. Consideration should be given to ensuring that users and OT staff have access to up to date information on the equipment available.

Response

Cambridgeshire County Council has used the Transformation Fund to support a project with NHS Cambridgeshire and CCS looking at the role of OT in respect of SDS. This project, which will run for 1 year, will explore and make recommendations about how SDS can be applied to the work of OTs and the provision of equipment.

The Integrated Community Equipment Services provides an online catalogue of available equipment for use by OTs. Currently 80% of requisitions for equipment by OTs are made online, using this catalogue. A leaflet giving advice on where to view and purchase equipment is already available for service users. Further information will be considered as part of the project work over the next year.

Recommendation 9: Outstanding Issues

The Council ensure that the following key elements are in place as soon as possible, with resources identified to enable their implementation:

- Financial and outcome monitoring arrangements
- Arrangements for initial and ongoing staff training and support
- Safeguarding arrangements for users and carers
- Communication of the changes to current and future users and carers
- Agreed arrangements with other agencies to ensure they are informed and have ownership of the changes, and that there is co-ordination between services.
- There is a strategy for identifying resources in the community that will support users and carers, and making this information available to individuals and staff working with them.

Response

Financial and outcome monitoring arrangements, arrangements for initial and ongoing staff training and support and safeguarding arrangements for users and carers are all in place.

Communication of the changes to current and future users and carers is in hand and will continue throughout the roll out period. Communications with relevant groups have been well received to date.

Planning for the process and implementation of SDS has been undertaken with colleagues from NHS Cambridgeshire, CCS and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, to ensure ownership across the statutory services. There are networks with service providers and partnership boards to ensure ownership of the changes and work on a shared accredited provider database.

Work is currently underway with a software design company to explore the potential of developing an online catalogue of providers. This work is also considering how Cambridgeshire.net could be used to provide information on over 4,000 local activities and clubs. The information will need to be available in hard copy for those people without internet access.

Recommendation 10: Timescales

Given the complexity of the changes involved, the Council should be open to allowing the rollout timescale to slip if necessary.

Response

The timescale for the rollout is ambitious, but is designed to minimise the time running two systems. However, the support from the Scrutiny Committee to slip the timetable if necessary to ensure that the roll out is as smooth as possible, is welcomed.

Recommendation 11: Responsiveness

The implementation plan timetable should provide opportunities for learning from each stage to be identified and acted on for the subsequent stages.

Response

The implementation plan has review stages built in, that will ensure that we learn from the experience of each group as implementation progresses.

Recommendation 12: Managing Risk

The implementation plan should include clear and explicit arrangements for managing risk, and for identifying potential problems through monitoring data such as requests for emergency support.

Response

The implementation plan is part of the In Control Total project and has clear and explicit arrangement for identifying and managing risks and issues especially when they many impact on the user experience.

Recommendation 13: Choice and Control for All

Approaches should be developed that will enable people who do not have a DP, or those who pay for an agency to employ staff, can experience the same degree of choice and control and quality of life as people who have a DP and who employ staff directly. This should be reflected in staff training, and in the quality control of the support planning process. The implementation plan should specifically review how well SDS works for people who are not on a DP, in comparison with those who are, and whether there are any differences in the nature and range of services provided.

Response

We will ensure reviews will identify any comparison between those who are/are not in receipt of DP. An approach is being developed that should enable people to come as close as possible to being in direct control through DP given the framework of people being supported by staff from Cambridgeshire County Council and partners. For example, our starting position will be care managers/care coordinators support individuals to spend a personal budget will be to use our list of accredited providers and community groups through Cambridgeshire.net. We are working hard to rapidly expand the list of providers and businesses within the current safeguarding expectations.

Recommendation 14: Review of Outcomes

A review of outcomes for users and carers in each care grouping, which includes obtaining the views of a representative sample, is undertaken a year after SDS has been implemented for the first cohort of older people.

Response

A methodology will be put together to define such a review in line with the current implementation plan, approximately August 2010, through use of survey/focus groups.

Recommendation 15: Monitoring

The implementation of SDS is monitored and changes made where required.
Baseline data to enable comparisons over time should be identified and collected now.

Specific issues that should be monitored include:

- Whether the indicative budget calculated by the Resource Allocation System (RAS) is a fair reflection of people's needs, as evidenced by under or over-spends of the allocation; appeals;

or changes on review.

- Whether the RAS is consistent between individuals
- Whether the RAS is equitable between client groups
- Whether the changes deliver adequate support for carers

Whether there are additional costs for people living in rural areas to obtain care and to access to services and leisure facilities, and if so, whether these are being adequately addressed (see recommendation 5).

Response to Recommendations 5, 15 and 17

Mechanisms are being put in place to ensure that a range of information is tracked through the implementation of self-directed support over the next two years. These mechanisms will draw on existing information about the following aspects of service delivery (including annual returns to the Care Quality Commission [CQC]), and compare this with information available as the implementation progresses:

- Costs
 - Services
 - Frontline staff
 - Infrastructure
- Alignment between the Resource Allocation System and individual needs
- Any differential in the cost of services in rural areas.

It should be noted that during the two year roll out of self-directed support there will be structural changes in the configuration of teams within Adult Services, which will have to be carefully tracked to ensure that meaningful comparisons can still be made. In addition, it is anticipated that there will be further changes to the annual returns required by CQC, that may make direct comparison, from one year to the next, more difficult.

Recommendation 16: Service Development

A strategy and action plan is developed, revised in the light of experience, to promote the development of a wider range of services, including transport, and to support existing services to adapt to changes in the pattern of demand arising from SDS.

Response

Officers are working with provider champion groups including in-house service groups and external, i.e. voluntary, not for profit and private, to inform the changes required of providers and of contracts to support SDS. A regular newsletter is distributed to 500+ providers.

Recommendation 17: Value for Money

The impact of the changes on the Councils administrative and management costs, and on service costs, should be kept under review, so that any efficiency savings or additional costs can be identified. The Council should urgently obtain baseline data on current costs to enable comparison.

The reviews of outcomes for service users should be used to evidence where the changes are leading to value for money for individuals.

Response

See Recommendation 15, above.

Recommendation 18: To the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee

It is recommended that the Committee:

- Agree the report and recommendations, and submit them to Cabinet
- Suggest to the incoming Committee responsible for scrutiny of social care that it review progress in the implementation of SDS in relation to the issues and recommendations in the report. It is suggested that this review takes place shortly after the implementation of the first phase of SDS for older people, and that the Committee give particular consideration to:
 - Whether any additional costs of care and access to services for people living in rural areas are being identified and taken into account in how the indicative budget is calculated
 - How the County Council is working in partnership with District Councils, housing providers and OT services to ensure effective and co-ordinated support.
 - How effectively the financial and outcome monitoring arrangements are working in terms of
 - Managing risk
 - Ensuring that service users and carers in all care groupings are supported, including those who do not have a DP.
 - Administrative efficiency.

Response

This recommendation is the responsibility of the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee.