

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 16th November 2010

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.28 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor J. Tuck

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

Apologies: Councillors: None

Present by invitation: Councillors: N Guyatt and L Nethsingha

264. MINUTES 26TH OCTOBER 2010

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

265. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None

266. PETITION REQUESTING THAT THE COUNTY COUNCIL TAKE MEASURES TO REDUCE SPEEDING ON BELL ROAD, BOTTISHAM

As there was not currently an appropriately constituted East Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committee (AJC) Cabinet received a petition with 113 signatures in respect of seeking County Council action on reducing the speed of traffic travelling along Bell Road, Bottisham (which was currently a 60 mile per hour road except for a short stretch before a turnoff to Saint Peter's Field estate). The spokesperson Julie Bristow made a brief presentation to the meeting indicating that the 30 mph speed restriction sign on Bell Road was only about 50 yards from the entrance to the estate, and with cars travelling at 60 mph along the road if a car wished to turn into the estate, this involved having to slow down quickly, with its own inherent dangers and vice versa, if coming onto the main road from the estate.

She illustrated the dangers of speeding cars along the Bell Road having personally witnessed the death of one of at least three cats and believed it was only a matter of time before a child was seriously injured / killed. Speed Watch checks and Police speed checks undertaken indicated that 57% of cars monitored on the 30 mph stretch were found to have been over the speed limit. Her view on behalf of the petitioners was that the whole of Bell Road should have a 30 mph speed limit as well as traffic calming measures introduced near the entrance to Saint Peter's Field. The local Member for Woodditton had indicated in writing to Cabinet that he was aware of the problem and supported the petitioners' aims.

One Cabinet Member asked whether the parish had made a submission to the AJC. In reply the petition spokesperson indicated that she believed this was the case and that

measures being looked at, included the possibility of a roundabout at Saint Peter's Field and other measures to slow down traffic. As there was no relevant report on the agenda the spokesperson was informed that she would receive a written response from the relevant officers in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highway and Access by no later than ten working days following the date of the Cabinet meeting

267. [COUNCIL DECISIONS]

None for determination at the full Council meeting.

268. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY

None.

[REPORTS FOR INFORMATION FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING]

Copies of reports considered by Cabinet are on the County Council's website via the links shown in this report. Alternatively they can be found by navigating from the Home page (www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk) to **Council and Democracy** then **Democracy Decision Making** and then **Agenda and Minutes** and then using the drop down menu for Agenda minutes and reports to seek the correct meeting and then clicking on the report title on the agenda page and then clicking on the report attachment title.

[KEY DECISIONS]

269. INTEGRATED YOUTH SUPPORT SERVICE

As the report was not available / finalised / authorised for despatch 5 clear days in advance of the meeting the chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below.

Reason for lateness - In order to provide the most up to date report for Cabinet, as a number of informal discussion meetings had been held after the original despatch deadline and officers wished to have the opportunity to revise the report from any feedback received, if considered appropriate. This included discussions with trade unions and Human Resources specialists to ensure the correct process has been followed.

Reason for urgency - There is a commitment to report to the 16th November Cabinet and to agree proposals in order to meet the target date of 1st April 2011 for the new staff structure to be in place.

Cabinet was reminded in receiving the latest report that through the Integrated Planning Process approved by Full Council in February 2010, it had been agreed that the Youth Work and Connexions services needed to save a total of £1 million which was approximately one third of the budget allocated for Youth Work and Connexions services. The significance of the saving meant that unfortunately a reduction in staff and service provision to young people was unavoidable and in order to achieve the savings, it had been

necessary to review and look to restructuring Connexions and Youth Work functions into a single Integrated Youth Support Service (IYSS). It was stressed that this was not a decision that Cabinet had wished to make, but was one which had been forced on it as a result of the financial pressures and the severe financial restraints that were now being imposed on all councils. Cabinet recognised and valued the work undertaken by the current, skilled workforce.

As a result of the above budget reductions, the County Council was having to end 'universal service' provision across Cambridgeshire and would seek to preserve services in order to target provision. Implementing the proposals would lead to a service which no longer worked with all young people, but would focus more explicitly on the more vulnerable and those least likely to make a good transition to adulthood. The report proposed that the full savings of £1million should be found from April 2011, as in consultation with staff, it was felt that staggering the process over two years would be more disruptive for staff and service delivery and increase uncertainty. The savings would reduce full time equivalent (fte) posts which could be afforded from the core budget from 110.02 to 72.37, amounting to a drop in approximately 37.65 fte posts across the County. The numbers of staff who would be made redundant would not be finalised until a recruitment process had been completed. To further protect services at the front line, central services had been reduced and integrated.

The local Member for Newnham speaking as the Liberal Democrat Group Children Social Care spokesman was concerned at the speed and timing of the decision, believing that it was too early for Cabinet to make their final decision, as the current mapping exercise being undertaken had not been completed. (The mapping exercise is being undertaken by locality managers to identify youth work and connexions services / activities in each locality which will continue through core local authority funding or external funding and those which are at risk of having to cease unless external funding is identified) She was concerned that Cabinet was rushing into a decision before knowing the full extent of what voluntary support / partner support might be available to help run local open access youth clubs and that there was currently insufficient time for them to make alternative preparations. She highlighted the concerns that shutting down youth clubs as a result of the current proposed timetable would leave serious gaps in provision and lead to a loss of skilled staff with important contacts. She was extremely concerned that young people who needed help and support would fall through the safety net as a result of the proposed cuts and that more young people would end up in the care / probation / legal system as a result of a likely increase in anti-social behaviour, which she believed could have huge indirect financial consequences and negate any savings made by the review. She highlighted that flexibility was required in terms of how locality teams managed youth club reductions and wished to receive an assurance that the transformation fund would be preserved to help support the changes.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Children thanked her for her concerns which he understood, but highlighted that the process to rationalise youth service provision had in fact commenced following the decisions made after the Council meeting in February. This had been a long running process involving a very substantial consultation process with it being recognised that it would not be possible to make savings in the current year as time would be needed to make the substantial changes that would be necessary. This had included an informal consultation period on the initial proposals undertaken with stakeholders, including the Children's Trust, Area Partnerships and through a series of local stakeholder meetings, between March 2010 and 23rd July 2010. Following the results of this, Cabinet at its meeting on 7th September 2010 had authorised the formal consultation stage which had then run from 9th September 2010 to the 29th October 2010. The

consultation document, issued to all affected staff set out the proposed offer to children and young people in Cambridgeshire, the model of delivery and proposed staff structures. It had also been made available to Members, other council staff and external stakeholders on request.

It was highlighted that it was crucial to keep to the timetable proposed in the report as if there was further delay, then the savings required would not be achieved and this would then require savings from other parts of the Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) budget. As a comparison with how the pressures sat with other parts of the CYPS service, it was indicated that as a result of the substantial increases in the number of Looked After Children in the current year, cuts were having to be considered in areas such as education services for Looked After Children, the Cambridgeshire Race Equality & Diversity Service (CREDS) and Travellers' children.

As a reassurance, it was indicated that transformation monies would be made available for a two year period to help support parish councils, voluntary organisations, parents and residents who might wish to set up and run the services and the funding would be used flexibly to develop capacity within the community. This was in addition to fund raising efforts / seeking local sponsorship by businesses / securing external funding sources which was already part of staff youth service activity.

Discussions were currently being undertaken at the locality level with parishes, town councils, local businesses the voluntary sector and other partners but due to the budgetary pressures, the timetable unfortunately did not allow the time to wait and see what provision might be offered. In addition, the process of securing external funding was an ongoing one and could not form the basis for a permanent staffing structure.

The Service Director: Children's Enhanced and Preventative Services and her team were thanked for their efforts to preserve as much of the service as was practicable.

The Cabinet Member for Communities indicated that he was already working along with his other Huntingdon electoral division county councillor colleague to support services locally.

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101116-6>

Having undertaken a very full debate

It was resolved to agree:

- (a) To note the progress made to date.
- (b) To proceed to implement the new structure and the selection stage as follows:

Date	Meeting / Event
17 th November 2010	Affected staff issued with 'at risk notices' and invited to apply for roles
1 st – 8 th December 2010	Interviews for initial roles undertaken
From 17 th December 2010	Notice letters issued to unsuccessful candidates

5 th -14 th January 2011	Interviews for remaining roles undertaken
27 th January 2011	Notice letters issued to unsuccessful candidates
1 st April 2011	New staff structures in place

- (c) To note that funding would be available for a 2 year period from the CYPS budget that had been set aside for transformation costs, as part of the Integrated Planning Process. This would be available on a time limited basis to help support communities in providing youth support services following the reduction in universal support.

270. CAMBOURNE SECTION 106 AGREEMENT

As the report was not available / finalised / authorised for despatch 5 clear days in advance of the meeting the chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the to be considered. It was not possible to provide the report earlier for the reasons indicated below.

Reason for lateness - Negotiations on the contents of the s106 agreement with the developer have taken longer than expected and were only finally completed on 10th November.

Reason for urgency - This paper cannot be considered at a later Cabinet meeting as South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee are scheduled to determine the application at a meeting on 1st December and the County Council Cabinet therefore need to consider the s106 package prior to then.

Cabinet received a report on the current position reached on the Section 106 negotiations for the proposed development of 950 additional new homes at Cambourne submitted as part of a planning application to South Cambridgeshire District Council in August 2007.

The Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment declared a personal interest as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council but indicated he would not be taking part in any discussion of the planning application at the district council.

In terms of affordable housing, the District Council had commissioned an independent consultant to advise on the viability of the development who confirmed that the original District and County s106 requirements, along with the District Council policy requirement of 40% affordable housing would make the Cambourne 950 proposal unviable and therefore for this particular development, the District Council was only seeking 30% affordable housing. As a result it had been necessary to reconsider the overall package with discussions over the past few months resulting in a refinement and reduction of the County Council's s106 requirements. Although the total contributions had been reduced, officers were firmly of the view that the reduced amount, if secured, would not have any negative impacts on the County Council's ability to deliver its statutory duties at Cambourne.

For the development the section 106 Contributions being sought included:

- To ensure sufficient primary and secondary school places were provided for children

living in the proposed dwellings.

- To extend the library within the community facilities hub at Sackville House.
- To contribute to the Capital cost of the extension for the new household waste recycling centre at St Neots.

In response to questions on any revenue consequences as a result of the library extension officers confirmed they were not aware of any.

It was highlighted that Primary education was to be provided at 3 permanent schools (to serve the community living in Cambourne for the development of 3300 dwellings which already had planning permission) at Monkfield Park, The Vine and Jeavons Wood, which was due to commence construction shortly. The additional 950 dwellings would require additional primary school accommodation. On questioning why the County Council was not seeking a public transport contribution, this had been removed from the original list of Section 106 requirements in order to assist viability issues and in order to protect the more significant primary / secondary school contributions required. It was confirmed that the contribution for the additional primary school was adequate on the basis that its design and construction build costs were kept to a minimum. The secondary school contribution covered only a proportion of the overall cost of the school based on the expected proportion of the students that would be generated by the new development, and the remainder of the funding would need to be found elsewhere. Work was being undertaken on basic needs allocations, and home to school transport issues as away of delivering this additional funding.

The current set of County Council s106 requirements were detailed in Appendix 1 along with any changes which have occurred since the November 2008 Cabinet paper with the detail of the full report viewable at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/35o22n8>

To provide security for the County Council's s106 contributions, it was recommended that a Parent Company Guarantee on the developers of the site should be obtained. In answer to questions raised, it was confirmed that this was considered to be a reasonable approach on the balance of risks and the LGSS Director of Finance having undertaken a financial appraisal of the two development companies overall assets and who had concluded that they were large enough to provide sufficient guarantees to cover the County Council's s106 contributions. Officers confirmed that they were not aware of any previous instances when such guarantees had failed.

It was resolved to agree to:

- (a) Approve the list of s106 requirements as contained in Appendix 1 as the County Council's formal response to South Cambridgeshire District Council;
- (b) Delegate to the lead Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director for Environment Services the authority to make any necessary minor alterations to the Section s106 requirements as contained in Appendix 1;
- (c) Approve the use of a Parent Company Guarantee to provide security for the s106 payments due to the County Council.

[OTHER DECISIONS]

271. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – SEPTEMBER 2010

Cabinet received the latest financial and performance information to assess progress in delivering the Council's Integrated Plan. It was highlighted as a correction that the report did not include items that required a key decision of Cabinet.

Cabinet noted that there were 7 new exceptions in respect of performance issues reported which were detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report and can be viewed along with the full report at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101116-8>

The report also listed those previously reported exceptions where there was nothing further to report, and detailed changes to the indicators reported as a result of the changes to the National Indicator Set and were highlighted in appendix six of the report. The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government announced in October that Local Area Agreements and the statutory requirement to report performance of indicators in the National Indicator Set were to be abolished. The National Indicator Set would be replaced with a single list of all the data that local government was expected to provide to Central Government from April 2011. The Corporate Performance Team had been tasked to review the council's performance management arrangements in response to this and other changes.

The following resources were highlighted for Cabinet to note:

- Overall the budget position was showing a forecast year-end overspend of £4m (1.2%). This was an increase in the forecast overspend of £169k from the previous month) and was mainly due to a newly reported pressure identified within the Mental Health service Community and Adult Services (CAS).
- Although the report showed a further deterioration in the position, work was in hand to produce a balanced financial outturn by the end of the financial year. Indications orally reported were that Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) overspending might be contained to circa £1.3m by October, CAS was currently showing overspending to £0.5m, a balanced position was probably achievable in Debt Charges and further underspends were probable in Environment Services (ES) and the Corporate Directorates (CD). Measures being undertaken, together with an issue of contingency funding from reserves to cover the unexpected increase in the number of looked after children, was expected to ensure financial balance at the year-end although the Executive Director: CYPS could not guarantee a nil overspend due to the pressures of a record number of children looked after (LAC) having appeared during the year who were required by statute to be a spending priority. Further work was being undertaken to look for savings on children in care profiles, vacancy savings, a placement strategy review to see whether some children could be returned to live at home with support. There would be an update / uplift for the LAC demography for next year's base budget which would help for future years. The Executive Director: CAS set out the details of the robust action plans being pursued in respect of Adult Social Care and Older People's Services detailing progress on the Reablement Programme, The Resource Allocation System and the revised Charging System which had come into operation on 1st September and

which were expected to show significant savings in future months. In Learning Disabilities, work was being undertaken to see if complex placements could be reduced in cost. Work was also being undertaken to see whether savings could be found in non staff / non service budgets.

- In Environment Services (ES) Cabinet congratulated the relevant officers who were currently predicting an underspend of -£114k, which was due to savings within Growth and Infrastructure.
- In Community and Adult Services (CAS) an overspend of £2m was currently being predicted, which was due to pressures identified within Adult Support Services and Libraries, Learning and Culture.
- In Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) an overspend of £2.1m was currently being predicted, which was due to pressures within Strategy and Commissioning and Children's Social Care.
- In Corporate Directorates (CD) an underspend of -£214k was currently being predicted, which was mainly due to savings identified within Customer Services and Transformation.
- In Corporate Directorates – Financing, an overspend of £250k was currently being predicted due to higher borrowing than budgeted for in the Integrated Plan and a write-off of a debt.
- Spending on the council's overall capital programme was currently proceeding slower than estimated.
- Cabinet was asked to approve the progression of a number of capital schemes, within the overall Carbon Reduction Scheme, to a value of £125k.
- There were no significant debt problems to report and there was no noticeable effects arising from the economic downturn.
- This month's report included a half yearly update on the Corporate Invest to Transform (ITT) Fund.

The following general economic issues were noted:

- On 20 October, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had announced the Coalition Government's Comprehensive Spending Review to eliminate the structural deficit by 2015. The review was introduced as being underpinned by "a far-reaching programme of public sector reform", and premised on three principles: reform, fairness and growth. It was announced that spending on health, education, security and infrastructure would be prioritised, whilst savings would be achieved largely through cutting waste and reforming welfare.
- For Councils, funding from central government would be cut on average by 7.1% per year over the next four years (excluding schools, fire and rescue and police), although early years cuts would be proportionally greater.
- For Cambridgeshire, it was likely that the announced figures will translate into savings of around 35% over the next five years, equating to around £135 million. The current round of Integrated Planning Process (IPP) had anticipated this higher level of savings, building on existing plans for £16million savings in the current year.
- Critical decisions would therefore need to be made over the next few months in terms of which services were transformed which would cease, and which would be looked at in terms of enabling communities to co-produce.

As a result of the above, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance stressed the importance of ensuring an end of year balanced budget was achieved that it might be

necessary to identify further in year savings in some areas to counter balance any overspends in others.

Issues discussed included:

- On Local Indicator 303 Response to Freedom of Information Requests (FOI) within specified timescales (one of the indicators for which an exception was being reported as only 80% of requests were being answered on time against a target of 85%) there was a question of how many had been received and whether there was a breakdown of the time / costs involved in answering them. In response, the Corporate Director: Customer Services and Transformation indicated she would provide a response in writing outside of the meeting, but highlighted that the numbers were increasing and might require a review of operational procedures, as often information requested was available on the website and services were being encouraged to publish more information for transparency purposes. It was clarified that there was a cost cut off point where if exceeded, the request was refused.
- In terms of the update on the Corporate Invest to Transform Fund there was a query regarding the delays in achieving the savings on the Office Accommodation - Workwise Project and the progress in recovering the overspend and whether it had been exacerbated by the leases for Park House and Babbage House not ending until 2012 and 2020 respectively. In response it was indicated that accommodation requests had substantially fallen and there was therefore more properties to dispose of, which was difficult as a result of the downturn in the commercial property market. In the case of the two properties referred to, the intention had been for a partner to sub-lease one and possibly both properties, but they had subsequently decided against.
- Receiving reassurance that the NHS debts set out on page 9 would be resolved as previous debts had been paid promptly and there was no reason to expect that the identified current debt would be any different, and confirming that finance officers of both authorities were currently in relevant discussions.

It was agreed to:

- (a) Note the resources and performance information and the remedial action currently being taken; and
- (b) Approve the progression of a number of capital schemes, within the overall Carbon Reduction Scheme, to a value of £125k as set out in paragraph 4.6 of the report.

272. JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT (JSNA) PHASE 4 SUMMARY REPORT

Cabinet were reminded that in Cambridgeshire, officers had so far carried out four phases of Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), working in partnership across the National Health Service (NHS) and Local Authorities to gather the relevant information and were provided with details of what had been included in previous phases as follows:

Phase 1 a public health and health inequalities dataset was produced, which included the data recommended in national JSNA guidance. Six JSNAs were produced which focussed on the following different groups within the population:

- Children and Young People.

- Adults of Working Age.
 - Adults with mental health problems.
 - Adults with learning disabilities.
 - Adults with sensory or physical impairment and long term conditions.
- Older People.

Phase 2, undertook a review of existing surveys and consultation with service users, carers and the public, to provide qualitative information on local health needs. Phase 3 produced two further JSNAs, which looked at the needs of groups at particular risk of social exclusion within Cambridgeshire – people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness; and migrant workers.

Phase 4 included the following new work

Refresh of:

- Children and Young People's JSNA
- Older People's JSNA
- Adult mental health JSNA

New JSNAs for:

- Travellers
- New communities

It was highlighted that a new common theme in the current JSNA summary was the importance of social networks and social inclusion – and the role that communities could play in supporting people's health and wellbeing which was relevant to the Localism agenda. Housing and accommodation also emerged as an issue for several population groups. There was a strong section in the new Older People's JSNA on the evidence base for preventive interventions for older people - which highlighted the need to evaluate what work was undertaken.

Cabinet noted that good progress had been made against the recommendations in last year's JSNA which related to migrant workers and to homeless people and those at risk of homelessness. The new JSNA contained a small number of recommendations which had been developed on the basis of the information and evidence in the JSNA, and had been discussed through the multi-agency steering group and aimed to be pragmatic recognising current resource constraints on the public sector.

Cabinet congratulated Dr Robin and her team for an excellent document. While it was noted that officers had recognised the need to communicate the findings of the JSNA more widely (which included launching a new website later in the year), Cabinet requested that to ensure that those partners who would find the information most useful (for future financial and resource allocation planning including the Fire and Rescue and Police Authorities as well as general practitioners commissioners) knew where to find the document, the website address should be given extensive publicity. The document was not currently available electronically to the County Council.

It was agreed:

- (a) To the use of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Phase 4 as an information source for strategy development and service planning on

health, care and wellbeing issues.

- (b) for the need to publicise as widely as possible the new website (on which the final document would be located) to ensure that it could be easily accessed by partner organisations and by any other individuals / organisations who could make use of the important information contained within it.

273. GREAT HADDON PLANNING APPLICATION – DRAFT COUNCIL RESPONSE

Cabinet received a report informing it of the detail of the two Great Haddon planning applications in Peterborough, one for residential and one for the employment land and which set out their potential impacts on villages within Cambridgeshire. The report provided an initial draft consultation response for comment and further consideration.

It was highlighted that Great Haddon was a proposed development for up to 5,350 new homes and 65 hectares of employment land to the south west of Peterborough on the border with Cambridgeshire near the village of Yaxley. The housing proposed for the south of the development adjoined the A15 which was a highway the County Council had responsibility for. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access set out his concerns orally at the meeting in terms of the effect the development would have on the A15 and its impact on Yaxley.

Cabinet noted that County Council officers had been liaising with colleagues in Peterborough City Council, particularly on the matter of the possible future disruption of the current catchment of Stanground College that served children resident in Cambridgeshire and to discuss agreeing to a wider study of demographic projections and to consider education provision across Peterborough. Discussions between Members from both authorities had also taken place, which were continuing and in response to a request from local County Council Members, County Officers had begun work on an options appraisal for securing provision for those children for the medium and long-term. Pending the outcome of this work, it was reported that Stanground College would remain the designated catchment school for Yaxley and Farcet.

The report and draft consultation response highlighted concerns officers had with the current applications and recommended objections in relation to transport, countryside access and Libraries and Lifelong Learning. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101116-10>

Councillor Guyatt one of the local Members spoke at the meeting, having already provided in writing to Cabinet his concerns regarding the proximity of Yaxley and Farcet and the need for Peterborough and / or the County to provide spaces at secondary schools for the children from these villages. He highlighted that Stanground College could not accommodate all the pupils from Yaxley (only half currently attended) and in his view Peterborough had an obligation to make up the shortfall, which logically he believed should be at Great Haddon. He also drew attention to new developments at Stanground which would result in a shortfall of spaces for local children. He also circulated an extract from Peterborough's Core Strategy which highlighted that even in the boom housing period the

net gain in housing growth had never matched the Regional Spatial Strategy target (892 per annum compared to a target of 1,250 per annum) with Peterborough's Strategic Land Availability Study 18 only able to identify land for 4,011 dwellings in addition to those already built or committed since 2001, leaving a shortfall of 5,750 dwellings against the RSS target. He questioned whether, if infrastructure was also lagging 10 -15 years behind, the time-span of the initial stage of the development was realistic and had concerns in respect of the timespan for providing the agreed community centre. His main contention was that the officer response required strengthening with regard to education concerns expressed in the report.

In terms of Archaeology, he highlighted that the development ignored the potential spread of the war grave element of the site. This was presently designated as informal play space which he did not regard as a sensitive nor sensible use of the land, and asked Cabinet to consider how people in this Country would react if a British war cemetery in France was treated in the same manner. He believed the whole buffer area needed to be extended and a very robust plan for the site produced (with appropriate funding). This was supported by Cabinet.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access also supported the concerns regarding future education provision and the need to strengthen the response on education grounds citing the concerns of local Cambridgeshire residents with respect to the lack of any formal consultation from Peterborough having been extended to them. He highlighted that the current planning application provided the opportunity to make a requirement for the provision of a larger school which if not vigorously pursued through all possible channels would compound the existing problems for Cambridgeshire children whose geographical proximity meant they were far nearer Peterborough schools than those within their own County. He indicated that in his view paragraph 5.1 of the response should be changed to read as follows (with his additional wording in bold)

5.1 "The County Council accepts that the developers cannot be **required but should be** expected to provide a larger secondary school site in order to accommodate school children from Cambridgeshire"

He also for clarification highlighted that Paragraph 2.11 of the report stating that children from Farcet were entitled to free transport was misleading as the position was that only Farcet Fen children were entitled to free school transport to Stanground College (ten of whom attended Stanground) while Farcet village children were not, and that when reading the reference to Farcet, it was naturally assumed to be a reference to the village rather than the outlying homes in Farcet.

Cabinet noted that the officer's report suggested that the letter enclosing the formal consultation response should set out in the strongest terms the County Council's frustration that the secondary school at Great Haddon could not be developed in a more flexible manner and that as a result, children might not be able to attend the most appropriate secondary school. Officers highlighted that, under planning legislation, the Great Haddon developers were required only to provide a school which would be large enough to serve their development and not the wider local need. County Education Officers had requested that the new secondary site was made large enough to accommodate children living in Yaxley, but given the current legal position, this was not a formal objection, although Peterborough City Council Officers were aware of the request. As part of the draft proposed consultation response, officers had suggested that the Council should formally request that the site (land parcel) for a new secondary school at Great Haddon should be made large

enough to allow it to provide accommodation to cater for children living in Yaxley, who would otherwise attend Stanground College should provision be possible. However, due to the strength of feeling expressed by the local Members and subject to further appropriate legal advice being sought, Cabinet agreed that if at all legally possible, the County Council should additionally make an objection to the application on education grounds.

It was resolved to:

- (a) agree that the draft consultation response as set out in Appendix A to the report required further strengthening in relation to Education concerns highlighted in the report and that subject to legal advice, that the County Council should additionally object on education grounds on the basis that the proposed education provision in the planning application was insufficient and required further negotiation; and
- (b) agree to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to make changes to the draft consultation response as a result of the issues raised by Cabinet Members, which included strengthening the archaeological response regarding recognition of the French war grave and sensitivities regarding the use of the land around it.

274. CAMBRIDGE LOCAL INVESTMENT PLAN – CONSULTATION DRAFT

Cabinet received a report providing details of the Cambridgeshire Local Investment Plan (CLIP) and its importance for the possible funding of future County Council infrastructure and services to facilitate growth in the county, and sought approval to endorsing the consultation draft, subject to agreeing for inclusion several additional pro-formas, for submission to Cambridgeshire Horizons Board for final approval at their meeting on 8th December. The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101116-11>

Cabinet was advised that the CLIP was composed of a series of pro-formas for projects and infrastructure which the Cambridgeshire local authorities were seeking funding for. The document contained background information on the vision, challenges and opportunities in the County, which set out the context for the overall bid. In total, the CLIP was seeking funding in the region of £685m, of which the County Council were bidding for approximately £93m. All Councils had prioritised the pro-formas in terms of the importance of the proposed investment. The CLIP was to provide the evidence base and context for the Single Conversation negotiations between Local Authorities and the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). The Single Conversation was the means by which the HCA wished to engage with local areas to match their ambitions for growth, regeneration and housing with funding support available from the HCA and other sources. Although a separate Local Investment Plan could have been produced for each district area, the County and district councils had concluded that it would be more efficient to produce a single joint plan for Cambridgeshire and had been co-ordinated by Cambridgeshire Horizons and supported by the Cambridge Sub Regional Housing Board.

County Council pro-formas had already been included in the CLIP for Chesterton Station and the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. In order to ensure all County Council services and infrastructure were covered a number of additional pro-formas had been prepared in respect of the following for which support was requested:

- Waste Management Infrastructure;
- Cambridgeshire Archaeological Archive Store;
- Cambridgeshire Archaeology Planning Advisory Service;
- Education Capital; and
- Libraries, Learning and Culture.

There was concern that as all seven County Council sponsored projects had been given the highest priority (Priority 1 out of a possible 5), whether this would be prejudicial in terms of the likely success in the bidding process. It was indicated orally by one Member that the PDG at their earlier meeting had expressed particular concern that the Guided Busway had been given the same priority as Chesterton Station and Members had not understood the reasons for this equality of priority and were concerned that it could prejudice Chesterton Station's scheme's chances. The PDG had requested that officers should further reprioritise the pro-formas to reflect the schemes considered to be the highest priority. It was explained in reply that only a quarter of all pro-formas submitted were priority as part of the overall bid and not all other pro-formas had been prioritised as 1.

Other Cabinet Members expressed concern that having recognised Fenland as a priority area due to its high deprivation rating, it was a surprise to one Member that not one of the schemes being put forward by the County related to Fenland. Reference had been made at the PDG suggesting that the CLIP should contain a stronger context for Fenland, particularly in respect to transport links. There was also concern by Members that in the report presented it appeared that there was no reference to the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), College of West Anglia, the Ely Southern Relief Road and other prominent capital schemes which were important in terms of economic viability and which made some Members question how inclusive the consultation process had been. *(Note added following the meeting for clarification purposes: the CLIP full document does make significant reference to the LEP. The Ely Southern Bypass is in the pro-formas that East Cambridgeshire District Council CDC had submitted).*

Officers explained that further responses from consultees were expected, including the NHS and Fenland District Council which would be added, hence the proposed delegation to the Cabinet Member and officers to agree minor changes outside of the meeting. In reply to a further question it was explained that at the time of the meeting the full detail of the pro-formas to be submitted from East Cambridgeshire District Council and Fenland District Council had not been known.

One Member highlighted that he did not understand the reasoning on page 22 of the report on the different priorities given to the different schools.

Cabinet did not agree the recommendations as printed in the report but

it was resolved to agree:

That due to issues raised by Cabinet Members regarding the options presented including those detailed in this minute, and in order to give further

consideration to them, the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director: Environment Services was delegated the authority to make changes to the response to the CLIP and amended County pro-formas prior to submission to Cambridgeshire Horizons, following further discussion with Cabinet colleagues.

275. SHARING BUILDINGS AND POOLING ASSETS IN SUPPORT OF LOCALISM, GROWTH PARTNERSHIP WORKING AND EFFICIENCY

Cabinet received an update on the progress of the Making Assets Count Project which sought continued commitment to the project and asked Cabinet to comment on the additional benefits the authority would wish to gain through formally sharing and pooling assets within the county and to comment on how the project might further affective partnership in other areas of activity.

It was highlighted that since the economic downturn began in 2008, all sectors had been required to re-think income expectations and expenditure commitments with the Comprehensive Spending Review confirming that the public sector would take a significant cut in revenue and capital funding over the next four years. Careful asset management including disposals, using lease break clauses, maximisation of facilities in use, minimisation of expenditure on facilities in use, etc was seen as helping form part of the solution to minimise the impact of reduced income. Sharing facilities with other public sector partners was also highlighted as a potential way to lessen the impact of the cuts for both Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and the wider Cambridgeshire public sector and critically for the residents of Cambridgeshire. The Making Assets Count Project (MAC) project was seen as providing the opportunities for saving money and generating returns from public assets which would allow the County Council and its partners to protect public services in a period of austerity.

The report to Cabinet which can be viewed at the following link

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101116-12>

received details of the options being explored by the MAC project to deliver a partnership environment for the management and use of property asset with the two headline options being:

- a) The creation of a more formal vehicle which manages assets on behalf of the collective and is charged with achieving the best possible outcomes from the partners' combined portfolios, or;
- b) A less formal option where assets remain with partners but can be drawn into specific projects where they formed part of the solution.

The report detailed the benefits and issues with both approaches. The potential for change through either of the proposed pooling approaches was considered to be great, with the pace at which the change was realised being limited by the decision-making responsibilities of any Strategic Group established. Each partner would need to consider the advantages of devolving decision making (e.g. projects and therefore benefits delivered more quickly) against the potential disadvantages (e.g. less direct control).

It was highlighted that in the formation of any partnership, CCC was likely initially provide the majority of resources to put into the venture (including the assets themselves) and also support from the technical specialists from LGSS.

If option a) was pursued It was highlighted that the value of assets provided by each partner could be used to determine the level of influence (i.e. shareholding) in the venture at the Strategic level, but could discourage partners with smaller interests which could impact on the ability to generate the optimum level of benefits for remaining partners. As a result at some stage consideration would need to be given whether at the strategic level a one member one vote approach should be adopted and then whether at an operational level the investment made by each partner i.e. value of assets and potentially capital investment would determine their stake and therefore their share. It was expected that at the Operational level, individual propositions would in this model have to meet the objectives and requirements set by the Strategic level and have business cases that successfully balance individual partners' corporate aims with desired cost/returns. Other issues that would need to be considered was whether the authority wished to pool all or some of its assets with the report detailing the various ways asset pooling could be achieved.

Cabinet considered that it was too early to make any decisions at the current stage on issues such as governance arrangements but supported sharing assets in principle as an approach that could take forward the localism agenda and which was in the best interest for the residents of Cambridgeshire. What was required in a future report was further detail, including a timetable for potential implementation. In response the LGSS Director of Finance indicated that the intention was to bring forward a further report to Cabinet before 31st March 2011 which would provide details on such issues as capital yields, revenue savings and identified collaborative projects.

It was agreed to:

- (a) Reconfirm Cabinet's support to the local Making Assets Count Project which was now a national Total Capital and Asset Pathfinder and as a means of supporting the localism agenda;
- (b) Support in principle sharing and pooling public assets within Cambridgeshire on the basis that it benefitted people living in the County.
- (c) Confirm that Cabinet remained open minded about any future governance arrangements subject to receiving the proposed further report at a later meeting which would provide more detail regarding any additional benefits the authority might gain through formally sharing and pooling public assets within the County of Cambridgeshire.

[MONITORING REPORTS]

276. LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES UPDATE

The Local Government Shared Service (LGSS) initiative between Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire County Councils came into operation as planned on the 1st October 2010 and Cabinet received the first of what would be regular monitoring update reports reviewing

the progress of the Local Government Shared Services arrangement. The report which can be viewed at the following link provided a summary of finance, performance and operational issues:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101116-13>

Cabinet noted that:

- there were no significant financial performance issues in either the Northamptonshire or Cambridgeshire "office". For Cambridgeshire a balanced financial out-turn position was currently forecast, although ideally an under spend in the order of £250,000 to £300,000 should ideally be delivered (to help off-set financial pressures in other services).
- No operational issue or problems had arisen from 1st October with prompt payment, aged debtor, system availability and other metrics remaining at or above target save for the asset sale target. The asset sale target was behind plan as a result of the Authority decision to retain certain school sites in Cambridgeshire to meet current and future need. Both Authorities had led the way in early publication of £500 plus spending.
- In terms of LGSS Management Team appointments and associated secretarial support, the target saving of £231,000 in a full year would be delivered with the probability that a further £60,000 saving would result from associated administrative changes. It was highlighted that for each year that the Managing Director appointment was not made a further £189,000 of savings would accrue. The other major area of saving achieved to date had been in respect of the Business System hosting and support contract. The savings that would accrue from the recently completed tendering exercise were in the order of £1m a year across both Authorities. The net saving target included in the Business Case was £410,000 per annum (target saving of £560,000 less contingency of £150,000).
- The key actions until the end of March were built around delivering the other expected improvements and efficiencies required by the business case and planning for the additional savings that would be required as a result of the recent Comprehensive Spending Review statement.

It was agreed to:

- (a) note the progress made; and
- (b) to note the key actions planned until the end of the financial year.

277. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY

Cabinet was reminded that as a result of the continued lack of significant progress towards rectifying the defects which would allow the Council to accept sectional completion of the Busway between Cambridge and St Ives, it had been agreed since the April meeting to receive progress reports at each subsequent Cabinet meeting. The issues requiring completion and the progress to date were set out in detail to Cabinet on 16th March 2010 and at each subsequent Cabinet meeting including the latest update with the detail available for viewing in the full report at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101116-14>

At the meeting on 26th October members were advised that through BAM Nuttall's inaction the point had been passed where sectional completion was possible and the whole Busway was likely to be handed over by BAM Nuttall in or around January 2011 with the defects remaining. Contingency plans were being made to address the defects and it was proposed to seek Cabinet approval for the plans at the 14th December meeting with a view to their implementation as early as possible after handover.

It was highlighted at the meeting that Bam Nuttall's Chief Executive had recently been interviewed by the BBC which was the first time BAM Nuttall had chosen to speak publically about the project since they made a public statement in April stating that they would rectify six defects on the St Ives to Cambridge stretch of the route. In the interview the Chief Executive had made the statement to the effect that they were not aware of what the defects were, which contradicted the previous statement in April on what required to be undertaken, with the contractor having been notified at that time of both the nature of the defects and the appropriate means of rectifying them.

On the assumption that BAM Nuttall would not rectify the defects, plans were already in place to carry out work once the route had been handed over. Before the Council could step in however, there would still be a period of 28 days following formal completion of the scheme in which BAM Nuttall could rectify the problems. It was reiterated that tax payers should not have to pay for the contractor's mistakes and that the cost of fixing the defects would be charged to BAM Nuttall.

On a more positive note the Cabinet Member for Growth Infrastructure and Strategic Planning was able to report that the first buses had trialled the final section of the track through Trumpington Cutting. Although buses had now run on every section of the track, there was still a number of weeks work for Bam Nuttall to carry out before the contractor completed the southern link.

Clarification sought at the meeting included:

- The process for agreeing the defects, as Bam Nuttall were indicating they would be providing a significant number of certificates by 17th December, which was their last working day before the Christmas break. As set out in previous reports to Cabinet officers had raised concerns regarding BAM Nuttall not providing construction certificates until their proposed completion date. Despite earlier statements to the contrary, this still appeared to be the case. It was explained that following issue of the construction certificates by BAM Nuttall, there was a 21 day period for the project manager to respond. Final completion of the busway would not be certified until the certificates had been properly checked and found to be acceptable. The inherent risks in BAM Nuttall's approach were being mitigated by Atkins carrying out inspections on the Council's behalf. The results of the inspections were being passed back to BAM Nuttall so that they were in no doubt about any 'snagging' work that needed to be undertaken before their certificates would be accepted. This, however, still meant that when the certificates were submitted by BAM Nuttall, final checking would be needed and it was no guarantee that they could be accepted immediately, hence the Council's view that completion was not likely until mid- January. Once the works were physically complete BAM Nuttall were required, in addition to the certification referred to above, to carry out some testing and commissioning work. It was therefore reiterated to Cabinet that BAM Nuttall's programmed completion on 17th December was unrealistic and that the most

likely date remained around mid-January. The completion date would be determined by the progress made by BAM Nuttall in resolving the issues detailed in the report.

- Seeking to rectify incorrect information currently being purported as fact on a public blog that the intention had only ever been that stagecoach double-decker buses would be used on the Huntingdon to Cambridge section of the busway (where only one bridge had been required to be lifted) while the southern section of the busway would only operate single deck buses as the cost of having to raise four bridges along this section of the route would have been prohibitive.

It was agreed to:

- (a) note that contrary to public statements made by the Contractor, they had been notified of both the nature of the defects and of appropriate means of rectifying them; and
- (b) To note that the Contractor's programmed completion date was considered unrealistic given the number of outstanding issues that they had yet to resolve.

278. DELEGATION FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / OFFICERS

The full report can be viewed at the following link:

<http://tinyurl.com/cab101116-15>

Following the recent statement by the Secretary of State for Transport that the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement Scheme was to be dropped from the Highways Programme as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review, it was understood that the Scheme draft Orders were to have been withdrawn and as a result on item 3 titled "A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement Scheme Draft Orders" the report set out recommendations seeking agreement to changing previously agreed delegations.

However the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access in an oral update notified Cabinet that in the event this did not happen and there was the prospect that the draft Orders would fortuitously remain, whilst work was undertaken on alternative solutions to the problems of the A14 route. This would in effect preserve for the short term corridors of land which could become essential for a revised strategy. As a result the proposed amendments to the earlier delegations were premature and he therefore sought agreement to revising the recommendations so that the existing delegations remained in force until the draft Scheme Orders were withdrawn or amended, when the delegations would be reconsidered. Given the importance and urgency to Cambridgeshire of addressing the problems of the A14 route, he also expected that the County Council would be directly involved in any re-examination by the Department for Transport of the issues and therefore proposed that the part 3 delegation should be retained and any updated information on proposals for addressing the problems in the corridor would be reported to Cabinet Members as soon as possible.

It was agreed:

- (a) to note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and / or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions / take actions on its behalf; and
- (b) after the receipt of updated information, not to approve the proposed changes 1 and 2 under item 3 'A14 Ellington To Fen Ditton Improvement Scheme Draft Orders' on page 4 of the report seeking to withdraw existing delegations and draft Traffic Regulation Orders published by the County Council, but to agree to approve a further delegation to the lead Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning and the Acting Executive Director : Environment Services the authority to make the necessary arrangements for the County Council to participate in the Department of Transport A14 Corridor Multi Modal Study with any financial implications to be reported back to Cabinet.

279. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA FOR 14th DECEMBER 2010

Cabinet noted the draft Cabinet agenda with no changes as at the time of the meeting.

Chairman
14TH December 2010