

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 26<sup>th</sup> September 2006

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 1.05 p.m.

**Present:** Councillor J K Walters

Councillors: S F Johnstone, L W McGuire, V H Lucas, 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, J Huppert, A Kent, \*S King, \*T Orgee, M Smith and J West.

\* for part of the meeting only

**Apologies:** None

## **222. MINUTES 5<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2006**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5<sup>th</sup> September were approved as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendments:

a) Deletion of Cllr Kent as being present at the meeting.

b) Minute 217 Top 30 Performance Indicators 2006/07 and Performance Quarter 1”

Page 7 in the paragraph on Best Value 54/LPSA number of people per 1000 aged 65+

Deletion of the word in the 10<sup>th</sup> line “dispute” and replacement with the word “discussion”.

## **223. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Tuck declared a personal interest under paragraph 9 of the Members Code of Conduct in respect of agenda Items 10 “Building Schools for the Future” and 14 “The Queen’s Secondary School Wisbech” due to her position as the chairman of the Interim Executive Board for the Queen’s School, Wisbech.

Councillor Reynolds declared the following personal interests under paragraph 9 of the Members Code of Conduct regarding agenda item 6

“The Cambridgeshire And Peterborough Minerals And Waste Plan – Preferred Options”:

- i) As the Chairman and Director of “Renewables East”
- ii) In relation to a site located at Cowley Road owned by Coulson Building Group, Cambridge.

**224. PETITIONS REGARDING AGENDA ITEM 6 “THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN – PREFERRED OPTIONS” (SEE MINUTE 225)**

Four petitions were received (the summaries of the main points are set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes) objecting to the proposed re-siting of Cambridge Sewage Works from its present location in Milton, to the preferred site identified in the consultation paper at Honey Hill, Fen Ditton. They were as follows:

- Petition from Horningsea Village (54 signatures) Speaker Mike Hellowell
- Petition from Teversham Parish Council (55 signatures) Speaker Simon Martin
- Petition from Fen Ditton (127 signatures) Speaker John Drake
- Petition from Stow-cum-Quy (202 signatures) Speaker Geoff Barker.

Also summarised in Appendix 1 were the following comments from:

- James Paice, Member of Parliament for Cambridgeshire South East who was invited to sum up the key issues raised in the previous four petitions.
- A submission from the local member for Fulbourn tabled at the meeting which had been circulated in advance for Cabinet members.
- A separate Petition organised by Hauxton Parish Council (229 signatures) Speaker Councillor Janet Lockwood. This petition was opposed to the proposed siting by Cambridgeshire County Council of a waste transfer/recycling facility on the former waster water treatment plant of Bayer Crop Science Limited now owned by Harrow Estates plc. Their opposition to the preferred site was also supported by one of the local members for Sawston.

The local member for Trumpington spoke in favour of the Hauxton site being the preferred option for going forward for the purposes of the consultation exercise. An e-mail submission against the proposal for the Hauxton site was also received and tabled on the day of the meeting from Councillor Mrs Liz Heazell South Cambridgeshire District Council Member for Haslingfields and Eversdens. The chairman ruled that it had been received too late for Cabinet Members to be able to

give it proper consideration. The officers would include a reply to her points as part of their schedule of responses to petitioners (identifying it as a late representation).

## **CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

With the agreement of the meeting due to the number of petitions and members/petition representatives present in relation to agenda item 6 , the Chairman agreed to move the next report up the agenda and for it to be taken as the next item of business.

### **225. THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN – PREFERRED OPTIONS**

Cabinet considered a report explaining that a key element of the work to be undertaken in the next 3 years in respect of the Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme was the preparation of the new Minerals and Waste Development Plan. The Plan would be vital in ensuring that construction materials were available to support the growth agenda in this area, and that sustainable waste management was provided for new and existing communities. The Plan period was from 2003 to 2021 and comprised 3 elements:

- **Core Strategy:** a document setting out the strategic vision and objectives, and including a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development
- **Earith / Mepal Area Action Plan:** this was an area where there were interrelated minerals and waste issues, and other issues such as transport, flood protection, and opportunities to make sustainable use of land and water resources together with a significant contribution to the achievement of bio-diversity targets through quarry restoration.
- **Site Specific Policies:** a document setting out site specific proposals for mineral and waste development and supporting site specific policies

The now completed informal Issues and Options consultations stage had sought views on the direction of future mineral and waste policy, and valuable feedback was received on matters that related to the Core Strategy. The aspirations of stakeholders, including the minerals and waste industry, were also shared in the Issues and Options consultations, and some suggestions provoked a strong response (opposing the suggestions) at certain sites. In particular:

- The relocation of the Milton Waste Water treatment Work To Honey Hill, Horningsea

- The location of a Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) at Glebe Farm, Trumpington.
- Large scale mineral extraction and a new kiln at Barrington Cement Works, Barrington (It was noted that the these aspirations for Barrington had now been withdrawn).

Cabinet was informed that over 1,600 representations had been received. Following consultation at the Issues and Options stage, work had progressed, with all of the sites proposed evaluated against pre-determined criteria in a process overseen by a cross party Member Group. The results were presented as the Council's Preferred Options Plan. It was noted that a Members Seminar had been held on 1st September, with the Development Control Committee considering the Plan on 4 September, and the Environment, Waste and Business Service Development Group (SDG) considering it on 8 September. An appendix to the Cabinet report provided details of their views.

Cabinet noted that the proposals in the Preferred Options plan were expected to meet all anticipated needs for minerals and waste management facilities up to 2021. The proposals sought to achieve the best balance of environmental, social and economic factors in the interests of sustainable development. To facilitate sustainable transport, the plan suggested that wider use should be made of existing freight transport infrastructure (railheads and port) for the movement of minerals and waste in the future. The Cabinet report set out the proposals in relation to:

Mineral Extraction Proposals

Block Fen, Mepal

Minerals – Barrington

Minerals – Other specialist requirements

Minerals – Phasing out of extraction in Earith/Somersham area

Waste Management Proposals

Apportionment of London's Waste

Household Waste Recycling Centres

Waste Management in Cambridge Southern Fringe/ Glebe Farm and other major developments

Hazardous Waste

Inert Waste.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services spoke of the important part that new waste recycling centres would play in the County Council's future waste management strategy to reduce landfill waste and recycle an even greater proportion of household and other refuse. The County was already extremely successful with its recycling policies but required greater recycling capacity, in order to comply with Government reduced landfill targets and to avoid substantial fines being imposed.

Attention was drawn to new targets imposed for the County Council and other surrounding Councils to have to take a greater proportion of

London's waste, which would make it more difficult to achieve the original Government landfill reduction targets. If the County Council did have to accept higher quotas then it would prefer it to be as treated inert waste. The Environment, Waste and Business Service Development Group (EWB SDG) view was not to accept any increased quotas. Concern was expressed that the County Council was being asked to agree higher quotas on the basis of the success of previous recycling initiatives, which had helped contribute to some landfill capacity being available.

Cabinet noted that the views expressed in the officer's report were still to confirm Hauxton as the preferred new site option for a Household Waste Recycling Centre, as opposed the original choice of at Glebe Farm. This was also supported by Cabinet who agreed with the views of the EWB SDG as opposed to the Development Control Committee view that there should not be a preferred site put forward. Officers would respond directly to the petitioners and local members in respect of the points made regarding this site (summarised in Appendix 1 to these minutes).

Cabinet noted that in respect of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Works, the approval of the Cambridge City Local Plan required that a new location should be provided for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Works if the planned redevelopment of the Cambridge Northern Fringe was to proceed. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group spoke in support of the essential need to move the existing works to another best site. The specific benefit highlighted being the provision of much needed additional housing, and with other related transport improvements planned, should help encourage greater local employment.

In drawing up their proposals, officers had taken into account the very high level of local concern (as expressed in the petitions summarised in Appendix 1) However in their view it was still not possible to find a more favourable Area of Search than Honey Hill. The detailed location identified within the Area of Search had now proposed a site at the eastern edge, the most distant from either Fen Ditton or Horningsea villages.

It was explained that having seen the problems encountered by other authorities who had not specified preferred sites, for procedural reasons, it was believed that it was necessary that the County Council should identify a preferred site. (This also applied in respect of the suggestion being made for the Household Waste Recycling Centre for the Southern Fringe – preferred option now being the Hauxton Water Treatment Works).

Cabinet noted that in respect of any new waste water treatment works proposed at Honey Hill, the requirement would be for a modern, high quality facility, integrated into the landscape and with full environmental

mitigation, including substantially improved odour control, which would be far superior to the current works, which had been on the present site for a hundred years. One major difference would be that any new site would include a closed, rather than an open to the air, water treatment facility, which in itself would provide substantially improved odour control.

Cabinet agreed that the preferred option as set out in the report should proceed to consultation, with a recognition that further work was required in respect of illustrative material on potential proposals for a new works and to answer the detailed objections set out in the various petitions received. The expectation would be that any final solution would be affordable within an agreed funding package and would also be compatible in respect of environmental concerns. The point was made that the current site was required for housing in order to help provide much needed affordable housing to enable people to live close to their place of work and also to provide the opportunity for local people to be able to purchase their own homes. Officers were asked to reply after the meeting to the detailed issues raised by the various petitions and by local members.

Other issues raised by Cabinet included:

- Receiving confirmation that the extension of the Kings Cliff waste Site in Northamptonshire, which was accepting a wide range of hazardous waste, would be the subject of consultation between adjoining authorities such as Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It was confirmed that discussions had taken place in order for the site to be able to take Cambridgeshire's future hazardous waste requirements.
- The urgent need for a national policy for the disposal of hazardous waste.

In coming to its decision on the whole report, Cabinet was reminded that the current Preferred Options stage (to be undertaken between November – December 2006) was only the first formal stage of the process of the Plan and that there was a need to ensure that the whole community and other interested groups were provided with the opportunity to submit their views on the proposals set out in the consultation document and on the alternative options. Following the consultation on the Preferred Options Plan, there would be another opportunity for both Peterborough City Council and the County Council to reconsider the Plan before submitting it to the Secretary of State for his consideration in Autumn 2007; and undertaking a second formal stage of public consultation. After that point, there would also be a public examination of the Plan, to be held by an independent Planning Inspector. The Plan process would not be completed until February 2009. (i.e. when the Plan would be adopted)

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan (Preferred Options) as set out in the Cabinet report for the purposes of public consultation; and
- ii) Delegate to the portfolio holder for Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive of Environment and Community Services, the authority to approve the final Plan for public consultation, including any amendments required that did not materially affect the content of the Plan.

**226. ADOPTION OF THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FOR THE PREPARATION AND REVISION OF FORTHCOMING MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT DOCUMENTS AND THE CONSIDERATION OF COUNTY PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Cabinet considered a report providing details of the County Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). It was noted that a key objective of the new planning system was to strengthen community involvement in the land use planning decisions that affected their areas. The aim of the SCI was to develop a consensus about what were the best methods and techniques of community involvement to apply to in respect of:

- The preparation and revision of Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents (M&WDPDs), and
- County Planning Applications (i.e. minerals and waste, County Council service developments).

The statement set out the methods and techniques of community involvement associated with the preparation and revision of forthcoming Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents and the consideration of County Planning Applications. Following the completion of the earlier stages, the "submission" SCI was submitted to the Government for formal examination on 31 March 2006. Cabinet noted that concurrent with the submission of the SCI for examination, a further round of formal public consultation was undertaken that ended in May 2006. Details were provided of the representations received. It was reported that none of the responses received had raised fundamental points that were incapable of being satisfactorily resolved through modest changes to the text of the SCI.

Examination of the "submission" SCI, including consideration of the written representations and the Council's suggested changes, had

been completed at the end of August. The Planning Inspector's Report had not been formally published at the time of the Cabinet meeting and it was therefore agreed that minor changes should be via a delegation to the Cabinet member for Environment and Community Services and the Deputy Chief Executive. However Cabinet noted that the Inspector's draft report had concluded that the County Council's SCI was "sound", based on the various tests set out in planning guidance, subject to a few minor changes to the text.

It was reported that Environment, Waste & Business Service Development Group had considered the "submission" SCI at their September meeting and agreed to recommend that Cabinet and Council approve the document as amended in line with the Inspector's binding recommendations.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the comments of the Environment, Waste & Business Service Development Group (SDG) made in respect of the proposal to adopt the Statement of Community Involvement SCI; and
- ii) Recommend that Council at its meeting on 17 October 2006 approves the "submission" SCI, as amended, following consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive and Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services to take into account the final Inspector's recommendations.

## **227. WASTE PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE (PFI) PROJECT**

Cabinet was reminded that the process of procuring a long-term PFI contract for new facilities to treat household waste in Cambridgeshire began in January 2005. A key objective of the Waste PFI Project would be to help achieve greater financial certainty in waste management over the medium to long term. The Waste PFI Project was expected to deliver the means to meet the Council's Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS) obligations by 2010.

Cabinet at its meeting in April 2006 had authorised an additional delegation to the Waste PFI Procurement Board to agree a period of exclusive negotiation with a single bidder prior to the appointment of a Preferred Bidder or to invite Best and Final Offers as appropriate. Cabinet noted that following a detailed evaluation of the bids received from Donarbon Ltd (Donarbon), Shanks Group plc (Shanks) and the Waste Recycling Group Ltd (WRG), the Waste PFI Procurement Board (26 April 2006) decided to enter into a period of exclusive negotiation with Donarbon, the highest scoring bidder for price and quality after the Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) phase. Cabinet received details of the



outcome of the exclusive negotiations with Donarbon Ltd. The principal conclusions were that:

- i. That the Base Unitary Charge of Donarbon's bid had increased by approximately 2.7%.
- ii. Despite this increase, it remained cheaper than both of the other bids.
- iii. The original evaluation conclusion that Donarbon's bid was the highest scoring for price and quality remained valid and there was now a greater degree of confidence in Donarbon and the robustness of their technical solution and price.

Cabinet were informed that the Waste PFI Procurement Board were of the opinion that the positive progress made during the exclusive negotiations with Donarbon justified their appointment as Preferred Bidder as Donarbon's bid offered:

- A value-for-money solution
- A deliverable solution
- -A timely solution
- A flexible solution
- A sustainable solution

The remainder of the timetable for the procurement process would be as follows:

Preferred Bidder Letter approved by Cabinet	31 October 06
Final negotiations	Oct-06 to Feb-07
Contract Award considered by Cabinet	27 February 07
Contract Award approved by Council	27 March 07
Contract start	April 07
Existing contracts expire and interim services begin	July 07
New MBT facility operational	Late 2009

Cabinet members raised the following issues:

- Concerns were raised regarding the location of Donarbon's headquarters and waste site, which was adjacent to the A10, and the likely increase in lorry traffic as a result of winning the contract. A member asked whether traffic considerations had been taken into consideration. In reply it was stated that as most landfill already went to this site, the PFI produced additional waste would only be a relatively small part of the total waste

processed there, and was not expected to make any appreciable difference to traffic congestion.

- Issues around the financial standing and guarantees surrounding the company. Members were content in the assurances provided, noting the company would be backed by a major bank.
- Requesting and receiving confirmation that an Environment Agency permit would be required for the site.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the outcome of the exclusive negotiations with Donarbon Ltd.
- ii) To appoint Donarbon Ltd as the Preferred Bidder for the Waste PFI Project subject to the condition that a Preferred Bidder Letter can be agreed. In order to reach agreement on the letter, the outstanding issues from the exclusive negotiations phase required to be first resolved.
- iii) To consider a further report on progress on concluding the Preferred Bidder Letter at the next Cabinet meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> October.
- iv) Note the programme for the remaining phase of the procurement process.

**228. VOICE AND DATA CONVERGENCE (VOIP) PROJECT –  
ALTERATION TO CAPITAL PROPOSAL APPROVED IN THE  
2006/07 BUDGET**

Cabinet noted a report explaining that Cambridgeshire's telephony was currently provided as a managed service from NTL, based on the Centrex system, relying on obsolete technology which was due to be decommissioned from 2007 onwards and therefore the County Council now required alternative provision to be provided. Recent technological advances now made it possible to run telephony and data services across a single network (CCN - Cambridgeshire Community Network) instead of the current two, which would realise significant efficiency gains through the reduction of telephony costs for the authority. The resultant savings would lead to full payback over seven years.

It was expected that the convergence of voice and data services would also bring opportunities for new functionality, which supported the authority's aim of a 20% reduction in office accommodation costs, as set out in the Office Accommodation Strategy. Specifically it allowed for:

- (a) Moves, adds and changes that could be done at the click of a button.
- (b) Integrated messaging, telephony, videoconferencing and web-based collaboration.
- (c) Breaking the link between the telephone extension and the physical device, which would facilitate genuine flexible working.

There were some concerns from Cabinet members regarding the fact that:

- As all telephone calls would now be channelled through the computer network, whether there was sufficient capacity, and also in relation to reliability/durability as there were concerns that in the past when e-mails were unavailable, phone calls could still be made, which would not be the same on a shared system. In response, it was indicated that the core network was currently below capacity, having been designed with this in mind, but that due diligence and design work would be carried out with the system suppliers and NTL to verify the predicted performance of a combined network particularly to local sites. It was indicated that the type of system being pursued had a resilient design, very good recoverability functions and had measures included to combat viruses etc.
- The capital borrowing requirement appeared to have nearly doubled from the original estimate. In response, the Cabinet member for Corporate Services explained that an initial notional sum had been included in the capital programme. The business case was a mixture of capital and revenue expenditure and the identified investment required, would reduce revenue expenditure on telephony by £621,000 per annum from year 4 onwards. The Director of Information Technology (IT) explained that actual tenders from the market met the full needs of flexible working and the office accommodation approach, offered fuller functionality than a simple Centrex replacement. The existing obsolete system would need to be replaced at current market costs to meet both current and projected needs. It was explained that there was still a solid cash business case, with revenue being neutral over the life of the project.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the increase in overall funding for the project and the advance of spend In particular for:

- i) An increase in the total capital costs of the project from £750,000 to £1,569,000.
- ii) An advance of spend of £650,000 into this financial year from 2007/08.

- iii) An advance of spend of £100,000 from the 2008/09 financial year to 2007/08.
- iv) An additional call on capital of £819,000 in 2008/09.

## **229. ST IVES MARKET TOWN TRANSPORT STRATEGY**

Cabinet received a report requesting approval of a St Ives Market Town Transport Strategy which was to form an important part of the Local Transport Plan (LTP). Cabinet welcomed the contents of the strategy, which had as its key objective the identification of an integrated package of measures that when combined, would address the six LTP objectives and contribute towards improving the environment of the town.

The strategy was the result of a significant amount of work that had identified both the key transport problems facing St. Ives and the most appropriate transport schemes to address the problems. These had been prioritised to give an indication of the likely timescale for delivery of individual measures.

Issues raised by Cabinet members included whether consideration could be given to the use of hoppla buses in outlying villages, looking into concerns regarding the need to improve the pavements in North Road to help improve the safety for pedestrians and wheelchair users, and to also look into issues of light pollution.

### **It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the St Ives Market Town Transport Strategy.
- ii) To ask the officers to look into issues raised regarding the use of hoppla buses in outlying villages, concerns regarding the pavements in North Road and issues of light pollution.

## **230. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE**

Cabinet considered a report recommending that the Council should enter Wave 4 of the Government's "Building Schools for the Future" as an exciting opportunity to help pay, through Government funding, for improvements to the fabric of school buildings.

Cabinet noted that the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) was a national programme for the refurbishment or rebuild of all secondary schools over the next 10-15 years, featuring significant levels of capital investment in the school infrastructure. For Fenland, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) had supplied the Funding Allocation

Model for BSF and in respect of the five fenland schools put forward for participation, this could potentially provide £94.75m of resources, based on 50% new build, 35% refurbishment and remodelling of a school and 15% minor refurbishment.

At the heart of BSF was a new approach to the delivery of the capital investment in the school estate, the Local Education Partnership (LEP). The LEP was designed to be a vehicle that allowed the local authority to meet all the requirements of the delivery of the local BSF programme, through a single long-term partnership with a private sector partner. BSF was to be funded primarily through Private Finance Initiative (PFI) funding. The contracts would be on a design, build, finance, operate and maintain basis for a 25-30 year period and would be between the local authority and the LEP.

Local authorities were participating in BSF through 15 waves of projects, based on a DfES assessment of the physical condition of school buildings and local deprivation. Local authorities in waves 1-3 had started work on BSF and the DfES had recently invited authorities in waves 4-6 to begin their preparations. There were concerns that City and South Cambridgeshire were in later waves and that their timing did not contribute to joined up working in respect of the growth agenda in these areas.

It was noted that authorities identified for inclusion in waves 4-6 had, had to register by the 15<sup>th</sup> September whether they wished to be included in wave 4 of BSF. In order to support an application, authorities would be required to prepare a Readiness to Deliver Statement by 13<sup>th</sup> October. Those authorities allocated to Wave 4 would be announced in December 2006 and projects would begin in January 2007.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To agree that arrangements should be established to enter wave 4 of Building Schools for the Future;
- ii) To accept:
  - the appropriateness of the Building Schools for the Future funding arrangements, particularly the use of Private Finance Initiative (PFI) funding in schools;
  - the default model of procurement for Building Schools for the Future being the Local Education Partnership;
  - the procurement of an integrated schools' Information Communication Technology (ICT) service through Building Schools for the Future.

## **231. SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROVISION TO SERVE THE NORTH WEST FRINGE OF CAMBRIDGE CITY**

Cabinet considered a report explaining that the Structure Plan had set a demanding challenge of around 60,000 new homes being created over the next 15 years, of which 47,500 were planned for the Cambridge Sub-region. In the north of the City, developments were planned on sites on Huntingdon Road/Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road/Histon Road (known collectively as the North West Fringe development area), Arbury Park and Chesterton (Northern Fringe East).

Cabinet noted that after 2015, secondary rolls would start rising beyond the current 11-15 capacity in the City. There was therefore a requirement for additional secondary school places to serve the urban fringe developments planned for the City. Chesterton and Manor Community Colleges, which served the secondary-aged pupil population living north of the river, were only 0.87 of a mile apart and therefore neither school was ideally placed to serve the developments planned in the North West Fringe. The officers' assessment was therefore to propose a replacement secondary school sited to the west of the existing schools.

### **It was resolved:**

- i) To endorse the proposal that a secondary school be located in the North West Fringe development area.
- ii) That a detailed report should be provided to the Planning and Development SDG on the phasing of the developments.

## **232. PRIMARY EDUCATIONAL PROVISION IN SAWSTON**

Cabinet received a report indicating that a fall in pupil numbers since 2000 had affected all three primary age-range schools, serving Sawston. The proposals in the report were to amalgamate John Falkner Infant School and John Paxton Junior School, Sawston and to create a purpose-built primary school on the present John Paxton School site.

Councillor Orgee after declaring a personal interest as a Sawston Parish Councillor who owned land adjacent to the site, spoke as one of the local members, highlighting the main issues, including some of the local concerns that had been raised regarding the educational benefits of an all through primary education, the financing of the proposal etc as set in paragraph 3.6 of the report. He also highlighted the benefits of the suggested proposals as set out in paragraph 4.2, namely the creation of a 270 place primary school in place of the existing schools

which would provide sufficient places to cater for the current and forecast need for the foreseeable future.

As a result of concerns, a further public consultation meeting had taken place on 12<sup>th</sup> September and it was orally reported that from this and from written statements received since the meeting, there had been nearly a 100 responses in support of the proposals.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the publication of a Public Notice proposing the closure of John Falkner Infant School and John Paxton Junior School on 31 August 2007, and the establishment of a new 270-place, 4-11 community primary school with effect from 1 September 2007, to serve the catchment served by the current schools;
- ii) To note the intention to provide a purpose-built primary school on the present John Paxton School site, to accommodate the new community primary school; and
- iii) To approve the proposal that the site of the John Falkner Infant School, and part of the John Paxton Junior School be declared surplus to educational requirements and that the resulting capital receipts be used towards the building costs associated with establishing the proposed new primary school.

**233. PRIMARY EDUCATIONAL PROVISION IN BRAMPTON**

Cabinet received a report indicating that both primary pupil numbers and Infant rolls had fallen at the two Brampton schools since a peak in 2000/01 and were expected to fall further to the period up to January 2011.

In January 2006, the Authority was notified of the two schools' governing bodies' interest in considering the potential for amalgamation following the Junior School's Headteacher's appointment to a new post, with effect from September 2006. Cabinet was informed that following a consultation exercise, the overwhelming majority of those who had expressed views were in favour of the amalgamation. The governing bodies of both Brampton Infants and Brampton Junior Schools voted on 14 September to recommend to the Local Authority that the two schools should be amalgamated.

It was reported that the local member for Brampton and Kimbolton fully supported the proposals.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the publication of a Public Notice proposing the closure of Brampton Infant and Junior Schools on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2007, and the establishment of a new 420-place, 4-11 Community Primary School with effect from 1 September 2007, to serve primarily residents of the village of Brampton.

**234. THE QUEEN'S SECONDARY SCHOOL WISBECH**

Cabinet noted that as the Queen's School was the only secondary school in Wisbech and the Executive Headteacher arrangement was for one year only, urgent action was needed to be taken to ensure that suitable administrative and management arrangements were in place by September 2007 at the latest, to secure strong secondary educational provision in Wisbech. In addition, Section 19 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998, as amended by Section 56(2) of the Education Act 2002, gave the Secretary of State the power to direct a Local Authority to close a school requiring special measures or with serious weaknesses.

Cabinet noted that Fresh Start proposals were designed to replace an existing school in special measures or with serious weaknesses with a new school. Where it was proposed to establish a Fresh Start School there was required to be:

- a clear commitment from the Local Authority and senior management to taking the necessary steps to provide all pupils with the right learning environment to enable them to achieve their full educational potential;
- a substantial review of staffing and governance to ensure that the school had the right people in post to put in place and maintain that learning environment;
- clear, well-planned and financially secure strategies in place for tackling the weaknesses and building on the strengths of the closing school, especially in relation to teaching and learning, curriculum and staff development, behaviour and attendance, leadership and management, staff appointments, and responsiveness to the needs of the local community and other schools; and
- a Raising Achievement Plan in place for implementing the strategies, agreed with the Local Authority, The Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) and Department of Education and Skills (DfES), including an explicit commitment that both the school and the Local Authority will work closely with OfSTED and DfES in doing so.



All of the actions required of Fresh Start as set out above were considered essential to improving secondary education in Wisbech. It was noted that originally the Planning and Development SDG had concerns on whether the application should be for either Fresh Start or an application for Academy status. However it was reported that the concerns had been addressed and members were happy to support the Fresh Start proposal.

Cabinet was also been provided with details of a new statutory framework that applied with effect from 1 September 2006, for the establishment of new secondary schools – whether they were brand new schools or to replace existing schools. Under the new regulations, authorities were required to proceed with a competition for the establishment of any proposed new secondary school and this would currently apply with regard to the proposals for the Queen's School. As the resultant delay would make it impossible to appoint a headteacher in time for a September 2007 opening date, it was agreed to seek exemption from the Secretary of State from the new competition requirements.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the interim management and governance arrangements currently in place for the Queen's School, Wisbech;
- ii) To approve that an application was made to join the national Fresh Start programme;
- iii) To endorse the recommendation that an application was made to the Secretary of State for consent to publish proposals for a new school without running a competition.
- iv) To approve the start of a consultation process on the future nature of secondary school provision in Wisbech.

**235. LONGSTANTON BYPASS SIDE ROADS ORDER**

Cabinet considered a report explaining that the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (February 2004) provided for 21 hectares of land north of Over Road in Longstanton being allocated for residential development for up to 500 dwellings, and 6.3 hectares of land north of Hatton's Road for employment and development use. To facilitate these developments, the existing B1050 road through Longstanton required to be re-routed to bypass the village and an Interim Access Road constructed to provide access to the developments.

A local member raised the issue of officers ensuring that contractors removed debris on a regular basis from the temporary bypass to avoid damage to windscreens from stones thrown up by other vehicles.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the making of the Side Roads Order for the Longstanton Bypass as detailed in the officer's report.

**236. A605/B671 ELTON SAFETY SCHEME**

Cabinet was reminded of the history to this proposal whereby an original decision to construct a roundabout following a number of serious accidents could not be complied with when the landowner had refused to sell the necessary land. A later report submitted to the February 2006 Cabinet meeting set out legal advice that had been given indicating that a contested Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) was unlikely to be successful and that meeting had therefore agreed to officers investigating and reporting back on alternative safety solutions for the junction.

Cabinet received a report setting out the results of the findings of an independent investigation into providing additional safety measures at the A605/B671 junction. The main conclusion of the consultants report was to confirm that due to the reduction in the number of accidents in recent years following the introduction of safety cameras, improvements to increase the safety at the junction would not qualify for County Council Major Road Safety Scheme funding.

A letter had been received following the despatch of the Cabinet agenda and prior to the meeting from Elton Parish Council, urging that the Cabinet should still maintain the position as understood by the Parish Council, that funding would be made available for a major scheme in the near future. In their view it still remained a dangerous junction and was still as poor a design as when the County Council had originally decided upon the roundabout scheme. The Parish Council however were still certain that to avoid future serious injuries or possible fatalities required significant engineered improvements to achieve this.

The letter also highlighted concerns regarding the delay from the time of the publication of the final consultants report in June, to them being provided with its details, which they had only been received the previous week to the Cabinet meeting.

Cabinet was informed that the consultant's report had concluded that:

- whilst a roundabout would address the key safety issues at the junction, it was not cost effective and could not be justified under existing County Council policy for the appropriate funding stream;
- a range of other substantial safety schemes at the site would also partially address the safety issues, but again could not be justified on the basis of existing County Council policy;
- a range of low cost measures would have an impact on the safety of the junction and could be justified under the County Council's policies.

It was orally reported that a letter from Councillor Hensley had also been received. While he recognised that the junction no longer met the criteria for major scheme funding, he suggested that other measures could be taken to improve safety such as the erection of interactive speed signs, laying down double white lines and rumble strips, providing improved approaching a dangerous junction signage and also indicating that the junction was an accident black-spot and providing details of the accident record. He also suggested a reduction in the speed limit to 50mph.

Whilst Cabinet were in agreement that a roundabout was not now an option as a result of the consultants findings, it was agreed that officers should still aim to work with the Parish Council to see whether other small-scale safety improvements could be taken in the short term to help alleviate further the risk of accidents.

**It was resolved:**

- To note the findings of an independent investigation into additional measures at the A605/B671 junction.
- That as a result of the above, to confirm that any improvements necessary to improve safety at the junction did not qualify for any major road safety scheme e.g. a roundabout.
- To ask the Officers to provide an explanation to Elton Parish Council regarding the reasons for the delay in providing them with details of the final consultants report which had been highlighted as a particular concern in their letter of representation.
- To investigate with the Parish Council the potential to introduce a ban of right turns from Elton to the A605.
- Agree to consider with the Parish Council the provision of road side "casualty number" information signs in the area and any immediate other small scale measures that could be taken to help road safety e.g. rumble strips etc; and

- vi) Consider the introduction of a small scale scheme through the Jointly Funded Minor Improvement Schemes budget (JFMI) process should such a scheme come forward.

## **237. HIGHWAYS OPERATIONAL MATTERS**

Cabinet received a report setting out details of the current County Council practice regarding the provision of privately funded highway features, whereby such measures had only be provided in situations where their provision was considered to be beneficial in road safety terms.

It was noted that where such features have been provided in the past, their cost had been funded from the County's "Good Housekeeping Budget" and the actual cost of the scheme re-paid, over a period of up to 5 years, by a local Parish Council. However County Council budgets were at the present time insufficient to fund their construction.

With the recent growth in the provision of physical traffic calming and speed reduction measures, as part of the annual number of accident remedial schemes and the recent A14 Village Traffic Calming Project, there had been increasing interest expressed in such measures being provided by private funding. Cabinet was therefore recommended to approve policies for:

- the provision of privately funded highway features,
- gates on the public highway
- and interactive signs on the public highway.

Other requests for approval where in respect of tidying up other highways issues including:

- a request to delegate the decision to revoke or vary any highway development lines
- approving the revocation of part of the development line in Chesterton Road, Cambridge, as shown in Plan 1 of the report to Cabinet.
- the clarification of the policy for temporary signs
- seeking to delegate responsibility for overseeing the allocation of any surplus from the Local Authority Parking Enforcement (LAPE) account.

One member raised concerns on equity in relation to the ability of smaller parishes to be able to pay for some of the proposals being suggested.

### **It was resolved:**

- i) To Approve the policy for the provision of:

- a) privately funded highway features as set out in section 3 of the officer's report;
  - b) gates on the public highway as set out in section 9 of the officer's report
  - c) interactive signs on the public highway as set out in section 12 of the officer's report;
- ii) To delegate the decision to revoke or vary any highway development line to Area Joint Committees (AJCs);
  - iii) To approve the revocation of part of the development line in Chesterton Road, Cambridge as shown in Plan 1 of the officer's report.
  - iv) To note the clarification of the policy for temporary signs set out in section 17 of the Cabinet report; and that the proposed changes should be communicated to all parish councils and any organisations known to erect temporary signs.
  - v) To delegate responsibility for overseeing the allocation of any surplus from the LAPE account to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive Environment and Community Services.

## **238. HORIZONS QUALITY OF LIFE STRATEGIES**

Cabinet considered a report requesting endorsement to three Cambridgeshire Horizons strategies presented in relation to arts and culture, green infrastructure and sports facilities. The strategies had been created in response to the increase in population arising from development in the Cambridge Sub-region, which required the enhancement of existing infrastructure.

One member asked that the identified need for an arts/cultural centre outside Cambridge to cover the Cambridge Sub Region should be actively pursued by the County Council with relevant partners.

### **It was resolved:**

- i) To endorse the three Cambridgeshire Horizons strategies on arts and culture, green infrastructure and sports facilities.
- ii) To delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and the appropriate Portfolio Holder to continue to progress the idea of a cultural centre in Northstowe to serve the Cambridgeshire sub-region.

## **239. CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON TRUMPINGTON MEADOWS PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Cabinet considered a report informing it that on the 4th July, the Trumpington Meadows Land Company (TMLC) had submitted two outline planning applications for the development of land west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington to both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council with the details as set out in the report to Cabinet.

Although broadly in support of the principle of the proposals, officers had provided a proposed response proposing that the County Council should object to the planning application for reasons highlighted in Appendix A of the report to Cabinet.

The Transport And Delivery SDG had indicated their support to the proposed response. The local member for Trumpington also fully supported the objection and wished Cabinet to consider the need to view the application in conjunction with the other 3 planning applications expected shortly, so that no precedents were set. In her view there was the need to take a consistent view on community facilities, the management of open space and the level of affordable housing.

### **It was resolved:**

- i) To approve the County Council's consultation response to the Trumpington Meadows Planning Applications.
- ii) To delegate to the Lead Member in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services to make any minor textual changes to the consultation response prior to submission.

## **240. POST COMPULSORY EDUCATION DISCRETIONARY AWARDS**

Cabinet noted that the Department for Education and Skills had reminded local authorities of the requirement to make an annual determination, regardless of whether a Local Authority had made previous determinations that it would not exercise its power to offer Post Compulsory Education Discretionary Awards. This was in accordance with the Local Education Authority (Post Compulsory Education Awards) Regulations 1999 (S.I. 1999/229).

While the recommendation was to continue the County Council's policy of not exercising the power to make discretionary awards, The Portfolio holder for Learning requested that officers seek to provide, if practicable, any known details of the likely demand that there would have been for discretionary awards, had they been available.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To continue the County Council's policy of not exercising the power to make discretionary awards for post compulsory education due to the continued adverse financial climate.
- ii) That the portfolio holder for Community Learning and Development investigate whether it was possible to establish likely demand had the decision been to reinstate a discretionary awards scheme for post compulsory education.

**241. COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (CPA)  
DIRECTION OF TRAVEL STATEMENT**

Cabinet received details of the annual Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) Direction of Travel (DofT) document, normally submitted to the Audit Commission by 30<sup>th</sup> September of each year. The document considered the degree to which an authority was complying with its responsibilities to continuously improve. The submission would:

- Assess the track record of achievement of outcomes during the last year and the robustness and delivery of its improvement plans.
- Inform audit and assessment programmes to ensure that they are targeted on the right areas.
- Provide learning about good and poor practice to inform improvement planning.

Cabinet noted that further updates to the draft of the 2006 Direction of Travel Statement had been inserted since the publication of the version included on the Cabinet agenda.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the 2006 Direction of Travel Statement and that further updates had been included since publication of the Cabinet agenda to take account of suggestions made in other forums.
- ii) To authorise for the Statement to be finalised by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

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

Cabinet received details of the latest Budget Monitoring report for the period to the end of July 2006, which also included the forecast outturn results for the current year. The report summarised the financial results for revenue, capital and trading units to the end of July 2006, as well as the performance undertaken in respect of Payment and Debt performance.

It was reported that spending on services was ahead of budget profile at the end of July by £1.47m primarily caused by pressures within Adult Support Services in the Office for Environment and Community Services. Appendix 2 of the report to Cabinet detailed the main variations on each service. On current estimates an overspend at year-end of £2.45m was being forecast (excluding Self Managing Institutions).

The key issues were in relation to the following:

- Children and Young People Services were currently forecasting an overspend at year-end of £918K (1.5% of turnover) primarily as a result of pressures of Infrastructure and Social Care budgets. The Office Management Team was currently reviewing each of the spending problem areas (Home to School Transport Budget, The Assessment and Care Management Budget, The Children Disability Services Budget) in detail, and would produce an action plan by the end of September to address the issues.
- Environment and Community Services were currently predicting a year-end overspend of £1.8m as a result of pressure in Adult Support Services Budgets. The relevant budgets (The Learning Disability Partnership, The Older People and Occupational Therapy Pooled budget, The Physical and Sensory Impairment Budget, The Adult Client Side Budget) where overspends were predicted, were also being reviewed by the relevant management team in conjunction with health partners, in order to produce an action plan to address the issues by the end of September.
- The following Trading Units were predicting a deficit: the Schools Library Service, Cambridgeshire Instrumental Music Agency, Environmental Education Service, Grafham Water Centre, Handyman Services, Groomfields, Grounds Maintenance, Catering, Cleaning and Property and Asset Management. Business plans were currently being examined with the anticipated outturn forecasts to be updated in the light of these. The Member Led Review of the Catering and Cleaning



Services (CCS) was still in progress with the findings due to be published shortly.

In relation to debt recovery, concern was expressed by the Cabinet Member responsible for Corporate Services of cases where clients refused to contribute to services they received and who had been assessed as being able to afford to pay for them.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Note the forecast outturn for the end of the year 2006-07 and the actions proposed and in hand to deliver financial balance.
- ii) Provide Cabinet with details of the legal processes available to recover monies from people assessed as able to pay for chargeable services they received, but who continued to avoid making payments.

**243. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA PLAN 31<sup>st</sup> OCTOBER 2006**

**It was resolved:**

To note the agenda plan as set out on the agenda.

Chairman  
31<sup>st</sup> October 2006