

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 11<sup>th</sup> July 2006

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 12 noon

**Present:** Councillor J K Walters

Councillors: S F Johnstone, V H Lucas, L W McGuire, L J Oliver, D R Pegram, J A Powley, J E Reynolds, J M Tuck and F H Yeulett.

### **Also in Attendance**

Councillors: M Ballard\*, G Kenney, A Kent, P Sales\* and J West

\* for part of the meeting only

**Apologies:** None

## **191. MINUTES 13<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2006**

The minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 13<sup>th</sup> June were approved as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

## **192. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

None.

## **193. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY**

Cabinet was delighted by the announcement that the Department for Transport (DfT) had announced that the County Council Cambridgeshire Guided Busway was to receive full funding approval with the DfT providing £92.5 million towards the scheme cost of £116.2 million. Local funding would provide up to £23.7 million towards the project. Confirmation of this approval was obtained on 6<sup>th</sup> July following the despatch of the original Cabinet agenda.

Cabinet noted that the Secretary of State for Transport had originally announced in December 2005 his decision to make the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway (CGB) Order. The Order conferred on the County Council the powers to construct and operate a guided busway between St Ives and Cambridge and between Cambridge Railway Station and Trumpington, with a spur to Addenbrooke's Hospital. The Order included compulsory purchase powers with

deemed planning consent, subject to detailed conditions having also been granted.

Cabinet expressed their thanks and gratitude for the dedicated work undertaken by the officer team and members closely involved in progressing the scheme culminating in this successful conclusion. The following were specifically mentioned:

Bob Menzies Head of Delivery, Guided Busway and his team  
Nick Dawe, the Director of Finance and Performance  
Graham Hughes, Director of Sustainable Infrastructure  
Councillor Johnstone in her previous lead Cabinet role responsible for Environment and Transport.

Cabinet Members wished to stress the importance that all the Council should now support this exciting, innovative project which was expected to provide substantial benefits to many residents in the County in ensuring a high quality public transport system was available by the time the first houses in the Northstowe and the Southern Fringe developments were completed. The scheme not only had full Government backing following the lengthy public inquiry, but was also being provided with 100% Government grant as opposed to the 50% grant 50% supported borrowing that they had proposed in their original provisional approval.

Cabinet Members made the following points:

- The need to ensure that the public were kept fully informed in respect of disruption to their travelling arrangements when works were scheduled. In reply to this point Cabinet noted that there was a long-term plan to ensure the public were made fully aware of when and where disruptions would take place.
- The importance of providing sufficient and appropriately targeted publicity to encourage increased patronage on the proposed routes. The point was made that the Inspector's report considered that the County Council's passenger projection figures were likely to be on the low side. Officers would be liaising with other guided bus operators to establish good practice to ensure the widest possible patronage was obtained.
- The point was reiterated that Cambridgeshire County Council had an excellent record in persuading people to switch from cars to buses for their journeys and in the recent past, had been one of the very few councils able to show an increase in bus passenger numbers. The cornerstone for attracting large numbers of passengers would be the quality and reliability of the new service, and would include assessing measures to make travel more comfortable and therefore increasing the attractiveness of the

scheme. Officers were asked to also look further at the benefits/costs in respect of providing air-conditioning.

- In respect of local funding for the north section of the bus guideway from Northstowe, assurances were requested that there would be sufficient monies to carry out this part of the scheme. In reply, officers responded that the DfT considered the County Council's business case to be sound and that Cambridgeshire Horizons Limited, who were negotiating with local developers, were confident that sufficient monies would be secured from the relevant Section 106 agreements.
- A request for details of the timescale for proposed complementary bus priority measures for the Huntingdon to St Ives Section of the route. Officers expect that at least 50% of the measures detailed under section 8 of the report would be completed and in place by 2008.

Cabinet fully supported the proposed changes to the scheme set out in the report which were either no longer considered essential or provided improvements to aspects of the scheme.

**It was resolved:**

To recommend that the Council:

- i) accepts the funding arrangements proposed by the Department for Transport (DfT) now that full approval has been confirmed by the DfT;
- ii) exercises the powers contained in the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Order 2005 to implement the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway; and
- iii) awards the contract for the construction of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway to Edmund Nuttall Limited;
- iv) makes the following changes to the scheme:
  - a) deletes the refuelling facility at St Ives Park and Ride;
  - b) replaces the bridge at Second Drove with an at grade crossing;
  - c) provides a vehicular crossing at Middle Fen Drove Swavesey and delete the proposed access track;

- d) provides an asphalt surface to the bridleway and cycleway from Histon to Cambridge and from Cambridge to Trumpington; and
- e) provides a pedestrian gap in the guideway at St Audrey's Close, Histon.

**194. MEDIUM TERM CORPORATE PLAN (MTCP) APPROVAL OF 2007/08 - 2009/10 PROCESS**

This report set out the consultation process undertaken and the five main drivers to the review and areas requiring improvement. The key changes to the MTCP process from a governance and impact perspective were attached as Appendix 1 to the Cabinet report.

The proposals in the report had been designed to make the MTCP process a true three-year rolling integrated plan that:

- Provided direction and certainty and attempted to balance: corporate objectives, service aspirations, stakeholder requirements to available resources and the capacity and capability to deliver.
- Took into account; the ambition for excellence, Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) and other mandatory or advisory requirements and the aim to deliver 3 star improving strongly performance in 2007/08, over arching strategies such as the delivery of the growth agenda, resource opportunities and constraints that are of a financial and non-financial nature.
- Should result in; continuous improvement in and satisfaction with the Authority's services, attainment of desired CPA and other local performance targets, proven value for money and sound financial management.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the restructuring of the MTCP process as outlined in the officer's report and in particular Cabinet agreed to confirm the following changes:

- That the MTCP becomes a true integrated planning process with the; Corporate Plan, Service Plan, Performance Plan, Capital Plan, Workforce Plan and Budget becoming true component parts of a single process.
- That the MTCP process is re-structured to have six distinct phases (in line with standard industry practice) to promote discussion, debate, and open decision making. These phases were; Review, Strategy, Option Generation, Evaluation, Approval and Implementation.

- That the presentation of information throughout the MTCP process was more structured, evidence based and extensive in order to promote improved decision-making.
- That the phases of the MTCP process should be launched and closed with revised member challenge, decision making and scrutiny arrangements.
- That the MTCP process should be more actively supported by Officers to encourage innovation, testing and the active contribution of staff and stakeholders to the process.
- That the public consultation process should be expanded to again include specific communication and dialogue with the business community and “Third Sector”.
- That the process should evolve over the next three years in the light of experience and the availability of additional information and in particular for the 2007/08 MTCP round due to take places takes account of commitments made in last year’s MTCP.

#### **195. INVEST TO TRANSFORM PROPOSALS**

Cabinet could not agree the report in its present form as some Cabinet members lacked the necessary background knowledge in respect of some of the schemes being proposed, and therefore felt unable to make informed decisions in respect of the detail available in the published report.

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

To defer agreement on the recommendations and to receive an updated report to the 5<sup>th</sup> September Cabinet meeting in order to allow time for all Cabinet Members to be fully briefed regarding the details of the projects proposed to be funded.

#### **196. POLICY FOR OFFERING FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR HOUSING ADAPTATIONS FOLLOWING DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT (DFG) MEANS TEST**

Cabinet noted that given the strategic shift from residential to community-based services and the emphasis on supporting more people in their own homes, it was likely that the number of requests for top-up funding for housing adaptations would increase. In addition, a recent announcement from the Government stated that families needing to adapt their homes to care for a disabled child would no longer be subject to DFG means testing. While more families would be eligible to apply for a DFG from their District Council, this might also

result in more requests for assistance from the County Council for adaptations over the £25k mandatory grant limit. In addition, District Councils might now reduce the amount of discretionary grant funding that they made available to take account of an increasing number of children's cases.

In adopting the suggested policy, the County Council would be complying with its statutory responsibilities, would assist front line staff in the provision of services and would more importantly assist service users who wished to remain living independently at home.

**It was resolved:**

To agree the policy attached to the officer's report in respect of offering financial support when appropriate to people requiring to make a contribution towards the cost of their housing adaptation following a Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) Means Test.

**197. FOOD PLAN 2006/07**

As the authority responsible for enforcement of Food Standards legislation in Cambridgeshire, the County Council was required to develop a Food Plan. This responsibility came as part of a package of measures introduced to address increasing public concern at a number of high profile food standards and quality issues. The Food Plan provided the reference against which performance could be monitored and evaluated.

The code of practice governing the development of the Food Plan originally required that an appropriate Member forum should approve the Plan. In the past this had been Cabinet, as the National Performance Framework, which required Cabinet approval, was produced at the same time and the reports were reported together. Officers advised that there was now no longer a requirement for the Council to produce a National Performance Framework and therefore an opportunity had been taken to recommend simplify the reporting arrangements.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the Food Plan 2006/07
- ii) That following a change to the reporting requirements, to agree to delegate the power to approve the Food Plan in future years to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services.

## **198. COWLEY ROAD PARK AND RIDE RELOCATION**

Cowley Road Park and Ride site had been the subject of temporary planning approval that required renewal in 2007. As the site had also been identified as a suitable brown field site for housing redevelopment, options had been investigated in respect of possible relocation to an alternative site.

An Initial Options report had looked at 10 possible sites and had provided assessments on suitability in respect of engineering, traffic and environmental considerations. Taking into account the three different assessments, the report concluded that only Option 4 (land to the south of Butt Lane) and Option 6 (land to the north of Butt Lane) were suitable to be taken forward for public consultation as detailed in the appendix to the Cabinet report. The report set out the result of the public consultation exercise of which the largest number of responses, including those from other District Councils expressed a preference for Option 4.

The relocation additionally had the support of the Highways Agency and from Landbeach Parish Council and South Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committee (AJC). Cabinet noted that Impington and Milton Parish Councils objected to any relocation in the green belt, but preferred Option 4 if any had to be chosen. Histon Parish Council preferred Option 3, which has been discounted as a suitable site, as the land is part of a landfill site and presents particular engineering difficulties. Local members concerns were raised at the meeting and these will be addressed where practicable within the detail of the scheme.

Views received from two local members received were orally reported. The local member for Waterbeach whilst supporting the relocation and the preferred site in principle, had concerns in relation to the consequent changes in priority of the traffic lights at Butt Lane and that they should not create a problem whereby vehicles used it as a convenient route to Impington. Similarly, he had concerns that the changes in the traffic lights should not create additional hold-ups on the A10 thus encouraging drivers to avoid the area by using either Waterbeach or Milton as a short cut. In addition, he also wished to ensure that the construction works did not create a similar problem. His view was that the design of the site should include an entrance from the south that did not involve going as far as the Butt Lane lights. He highlighted that at the consultation evening this possibility was regarded as a point in favour of option 4.

Cllr Jenkins one of the local members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington was also supportive of moving the site to the Butts Lane location but wished to see a clear and unambiguous statement about how the site was to be managed so that it did not generate additional through traffic from Impington along Butts Lane. He stated that at the village end, this was very much a village road and was totally unsuited

to high volumes of traffic. He also wished to know what the plans were with respect to the bridge over the A10 and whether or not this would be upgraded as a part of the scheme. He stated that this was a potential 'park and bike' site but the bridge at present was unsuitable for cyclist use and believed it would make sense to have an easy route from the car park to the A14 cycle bridge.

Officers undertook to investigate and respond to the concerns raised when working up the detail of the site following approval by Cabinet.

It was noted that funding of £3 million had been secured from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in February 2006 under the Growth Areas Fund (GAF) programme and had enabled work to progress on the relocation of the Cowley Road Park and Ride site, but that this current funding allocation did not extend beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008. The funding would allow the relocation of the Park and Ride in the normal high quality Cambridge style as opposed to the existing basic facilities provided on the existing site. The report set out the key dates to ensure site completion by March 2008.

Preliminary design and planning considerations suggested a site of approximately 25 acres would be required for construction, including landscaping. Land acquisition was an essential part of the scheme in order to ensure timely delivery and therefore recommendations had been brought forward to authorise negotiations for the purchase of the land and to trigger the Compulsory Purchase Order process if required. Cabinet noted that if a Public Inquiry was required the opening date was likely to slip and funding arrangements would require review, as this would take it out of the timescale of the GAF funding.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Approve the site option 4 (to the south of Butt Lane) and the outline scheme details.
- ii) Note the consultation results and forward scheme programme.
- iii) Approve the land acquisition and if necessary, the associated Compulsory Purchase Order.

**199. SCHOOL INTERIM EXECUTIVE BOARDS – DELEGATION TO DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

Cabinet received a report recommending approval to the delegation of powers to the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet lead member in order that he/she could take



prompt action in exceptional circumstances where a school was giving cause for concern.

Local authorities, with the approval of the Secretary of State, had the power to replace the governing body of a school causing concern with an Interim Executive Board (IEB) in circumstances where the governing body is proving an obstacle to progress. Section 57 of the Education Act 2002 inserted section 16A into the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, providing local authorities with an additional power to appoint a specially constituted governing body of interim executive members to replace a normally constituted governing body for a temporary period. The power to replace the governing body with an IEB was available when a school:

- a) Required special measures
- b) had been judged to require significant improvement; or
- c) had failed to comply with a formal warning from its local authority.

In the case of a) and b), Her Majesty's Chief Inspector required to have given the local authority a notice under the Education Act 2005 that the school required special measures or significant improvement.

Section 15 of the School Standards and Framework Act of 1998 provided for a local authority to issue a formal warning notice to the governing body of a school where there were serious concerns about the standard of pupils' performance, school management or governance, or the safety of pupils or staff. Formal Warning notices were meant to remedy situations comparable in seriousness to concerns, which would result in the school being placed in special measures, or judged to require significant improvement, on inspection by Office for Standards In Education (Ofsted). If the governing body did not comply with a formal warning notice, or was placed in special measures or judged to require significant improvement by Ofsted, sections, 16, 16A and 17 of the School Standards and Framework Act allowed the local authority to:

- Appoint additional governors to the school's governing body: and/or
- Suspend the school's delegated budget; or
- Replace the governing body with an interim executive board.

It was noted that where such delegated action was likely to be required, officers would, in addition to consulting relevant administration members, also brief opposition spokesmen and the relevant scrutiny chairman on the imminent action to be taken.

**It was resolved:**

- i) That, solely in exceptional circumstances, the Deputy Chief Executive Children and Young People's Services be given delegated power in consultation with the Lead

Member for Children's Services and relevant Portfolio Holder to appoint additional governors to a school's governing body, and/or suspend the school's delegated budget; or create an Interim Executive Board.

- ii) That with regard to the establishment of any Interim Executive Board, the delegated authority will only be exercised as a last resort after consultation with the Leader and the Office portfolio holders and the reasons reported to the next scheduled Cabinet meeting.

## **200. PEOPLE STRATEGY**

The County Council has previously adopted a People Strategy to provide the strategic direction and framework for the effective recruitment, leadership, development, performance and reward of its most valuable asset: its people. The current People Strategy had existed in an unchanged format since 2001 and given that the first People Strategy was time limited to expire in 2005, it was appropriate for the Council to review and develop an updated People Strategy for 2006-2010. Cambridgeshire County Council as a provider of public services was required to continuously improve its performance. The need to possess a current People Strategy was incorporated into the Audit Commission Comprehensive Performance Assessment process and was further reflected in the Local Government Pay and Workforce Strategy.

The People Strategy for 2006-2010 set out the County Council's approach to the resourcing, leadership, management, development, deployment, performance, culture and reward of the workforce.

### **It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the People Strategy 2006-2010.
- ii) To agree to the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive jointly signing the foreword of the Strategy.

## **201. A RURAL STRATEGY FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

A report was presented seeking Cabinet's endorsement to the Rural Strategy for Cambridgeshire produced by the Cambridgeshire Rural Forum.

The strategy document had a five year outlook and set out:

- A rural agenda for the County over the next five years (Rural Cambridgeshire has been defined in the document as all of Cambridgeshire except the City)
- The role of the Rural Forum will play in taking forward the rural agenda working alongside the partnerships and organisations that deliver to rural communities
- A framework of activity for the Rural Forum over the next two years.

**It was resolved:**

- To endorse Rural Strategy for Cambridgeshire produced by the Cambridgeshire Rural Forum.
- To note that Councillor Melton had been nominated to serve as the County Council lead for Rural Affairs

## **202. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP) 2001- 2006 DELIVERY REPORT**

Cabinet noted that The Transport Act 2000 required all local transport authorities to produce Local Transport Plans (LTPs) at least once every five years. The plans set out the authorities' transport strategies and detailed the programme of transport schemes and targets that the authority intended to achieve in the period. For the past five years the County Council had produced Annual Progress Reports (APRs) detailing how it had delivered transport schemes and met local and national transport targets, and how the LTP had benefited wider corporate policy objectives. The information provided in the APRs had resulted in additional government funding being secured for Integrated Transport, as shown in Table 1 of the report to Cabinet.

In 2006 the Government required to produce a LTP Delivery Report, summarising the Council's achievements over the entire first LTP period (2001-06).

It was noted that the last five years had seen increased investment by Cambridgeshire County Council in transport. The County Council had consistently spent more than its allocated funding from Government, reflecting the commitment to ensuring that the transport network catered for the demands of Cambridgeshire residents, the economy and the Growth Agenda in a sustainable manner. The excellent progress in meeting national and local transport targets were set out in the Delivery Report Executive Summary, included as an Appendix 2 to the officer's report.

It was noted that the next step in the process would be for the District Councils to consider and support the draft Delivery Report during July.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the Local Transport Plan 2001-06 Delivery Report for submission to Government.
- ii) To authorise the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive Environment and Community Services, to make any detailed changes necessary to the above document prior to its submission to Government.

**203. NETWORK SERVICE PLAN 2006**

It was reported that the Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2 Guidelines required all highway authorities to develop Transport Asset Management Plans to be informed by LTPs and other services and corporate plans. The compilation of a Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP) would provide an authority with a tool to: -

- Support the corporate provision of detailed information on the assets held by the whole authority.
- Establish and communicate a clear relationship between the programme set out by the TAMP and the authority's LTP targets and objectives and ensure existing assets are in a condition compatible with the delivery of the LTP.
- Obtain and organise information to support the forthcoming requirement for Whole Government Accounting (WGA).
- Enable the value for money of local road maintenance to be considered more effectively against other local transport spending, and eventually assist local transport strategy and plan production.

The Plan provided details of all the transport schemes that were programmed for delivery over the financial year including budgets, and key indicators and replaced parts of the old Network Management Plan and Road Safety Plan. The NSP set out: Objectives; Budgets for capital and revenue; Programmes for next year; Budgets for capital and revenue Programmes for next year; Performance monitoring of Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and key indicators.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the Network Service Plan.

**204. REFRESH OF CORPORATE ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Cabinet noted that the current Corporate Asset Management Plan 2002-2007 had been assessed as "Good" (the highest rating) by the Government Office for the East of England (GO-East) as part of the

Single Capital Pot assessment process. The Plan was a tool to help optimise the deployment and utilisation of land and buildings to support service delivery.

As the Council had been through a major reorganisation, parts of the Plan required updating and the report set out the key areas updated for change/investment. It was noted that the new Plan would assist the County keep its focus and ensure the effective use of its property assets. The Council had put in place an action plan with the aim of achieving a future score of 4 for Use of Resources in the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) inspection. To contribute to the action plan, it was necessary to have in place a refreshed Corporate Asset Management Plan prior to the next round of CPA inspections (due in the Autumn/Winter 2006/7). Furthermore, several emerging issues such as the challenging targets set as part of the new "Office Accommodation Strategy", the ongoing sustainability agenda and the continued accelerated growth in the County, made it important to continue to develop and promote asset management thinking and practice within the Council.

**It was resolved to:**

Formally adopt the Corporate Asset Management Plan  
2006-2011

**205. LONG TERM CAPITAL STRATEGY TO 2016 – ACTION PLAN**

Cabinet was asked to agree to formally adopt the Action Plan for the Long Term Capital Strategy to 2016 as set out in the appendix to the Cabinet report.

The strategy had been designed to provide a framework for the capital investment necessary to meet projected growth levels and to identify major risks in funding and delivery. The strategy identified a current infrastructure requirement of £1.3 billion and a funding gap of £316 million. The plan contained a range of work items that are already underway, or were programmed as part of the business plan goals within the various Offices.

**It was resolved:**

To formally adopt the Action Plan for the Long Term  
Capital Strategy to 2016

**206. REVISED OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES FOR THE COUNTY FARMS ESTATE**

A review of the County Farms Estate had been undertaken as a result

of the evolving European Union's reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), which had led to farming businesses facing a time of unprecedented change as the CAP was reformed to accommodate an enlarged European Union and the challenges of global food markets. In addition, account had been taken of the unprecedented growth in the region, putting pressure on all of the County's resources.

In 2005 it was agreed to establish a joint member officer group, which also included representatives from the National Farmers Union and senior partners from Bidwells Property consultants.

It was reported that the review group had been unanimous in agreeing all the recommendations set out in the report attached as an appendix to the Cabinet report, with the exception of (h) and (i) within the recommendation section on Sales and Purchases. These two additional recommendations were submitted for Cabinet's consideration.

Cabinet welcomed the report, paying tribute to the contribution made by the members involved on the group and also to the excellent management arrangements in place for running the estate. It was considered that the recommendations and revised objectives agreed would stand the Estate in good stead to face the challenges ahead and would ensure that Cambridgeshire continued to benefit financially and environmentally from its effective management.

A supporting statement in favour of the recommendations was read out on behalf of Councillors Reid who was unable to make the meeting. He indicated that in the course of the numerous meetings he was involved in he had been greatly impressed by the County team responsible for the County Farms Estate, believing it was managed in a way which was financially efficient and environmentally responsible, and which reflected great credit on the whole management team. Secondly he recognised that the proposed additional recommendation 3(i) seeking to maintain the size of the County Farms Estate was controversial. He hoped however that Cabinet would agree to adopt the modest additional recommendation 3(h) which provided for consideration to be given to the purchase of land for environmental reasons, if and when sales receipts exceeded annual targets. He believed this recommendation would not bind the Council in making any such purchases, but would simply permit their consideration.

Councillor Sales was present at the meeting and also spoke in favour of recommendation 3(h) for the same reasons. After a discussion of the issues, Cabinet were minded not to support the additional recommendations as proposals to give consideration to use part of any excess receipts from sales over agreed targets for the purchase of more land for the County Farms Estate would be a breach of the Corporate Council policy on the use of capital receipts. In addition, the proposal to hold the County Farms estate at its present size had

implications for the generation of capital receipts required to fund the growth agenda. In coming to their decision, Cabinet took into consideration the fact that the current size of the Farms Estate was considerably larger than those held by some other County Councils.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To receive and note the Report produced by the Joint Member/Officer Review Group.
- ii) To approve the revised set of objectives for the Estate and the recommendations set out in the report with the exception of the additional recommendations set out as (h) and (i) in the Sales and Purchases recommendation section on page 8 of the Review Group's Report. (See the attached appendix for the final agreed recommendations)

## **207. BUDGET MONITORING 2006/07**

Cabinet received and noted a report summarising the financial results for revenue, capital and trading units to the end of May 2006 as well as the forecast outturn for the end of the financial year 2006/07.

Cabinet noted that:

- There was a total forecast outturn overspend at year-end of £0.3m (excluding Self Managing Institutions (SMIs)).
- Spending was less than budget profile, at the end of May 2006 by £1.9m on Services (excluding SMIs), caused primarily by end of year adjustments for reserve creditors where invoices have yet to be received in the new financial year.
- The Office of Children and Young People's Services was forecast to breakeven by the year-end, although early analysis of the 2006-07 budget has indicated significant pressures. In response to the pressures the management team had implemented a number of budgetary control measures to control spending, which include recruitment and procurement 'freezes' with any such expenditure requiring approval by Directors, and Directors with their budget holders were reviewing spending areas to find savings or reductions in non-critical spending plans.
- The Office of Environment and Community Services was forecasting a year-end overspend of £270k, as a result of pressures in the Adult Support Services budgets.
- The Learning Disability Partnership (LDP) was facing significant pressure from clients in transition. The LDP had a total carry forward deficit of £750k from previous financial years. A new Recovery Plan was being finalised to address the deficit balance and ongoing cost pressures being faced by the service.
- There was the potential that the City and South Cambridgeshire's PCTs Turnaround Plan to address their own budget deficit could impact negatively on the social care responsibilities of the County

Council. This would need to be closely monitored as the detail of their Turnaround Plan became clearer and its impact of its implementation was better understood.

- It was expected that all Older People and Occupational Therapy Pooled budgets would face significant pressures this financial year, through increased demand and inflationary pressures. Detailed analysis of this pressure is being undertaken by the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) in order to find options to address this overspend.
- The Office of Corporate Services was predicting to breakeven by year-end.

It was reiterated that due to the severe Government grant settlements expected in the next two years, that all budget overspends required to be managed and eliminated by the end of the current financial year.

**It was resolved:**

To note the forecast outturn for the end of the year 2006-07 and the actions proposed by officers and in hand to deliver financial balance.

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

Cabinet received a report on progress on issues that had been delegated to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers to make decisions on behalf of the Cabinet.

**It was resolved:**

To note the progress on delegations/actions to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet.

**209. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA PLAN 5<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2006**

Cabinet noted the agenda plan with the following amendment that the three reports listed below should move to the 26<sup>th</sup> September meeting:

Green Infrastructure Strategy  
Major Sports Facilities Strategy  
Arts and Culture Strategy

Chairman  
5<sup>th</sup> September 2006