

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 2nd October 2012

Time: 10.05am – 12.10pm

Present: Chairman: Councillor N Clarke

Councillors I Bates, D Brown, S Count, M Curtis, D Harty, L W McGuire, T Orgee, M Shuter and S Tierney

Apologies: None

Present by invitation: Councillors K Bourke, P Downes, R Farrer, L Nethsingha, K Wilkins, M Williamson

635. MINUTES: 17th SEPTEMBER 2012

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 17th September 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

636. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Members declared non statutory disclosable interests in line with paragraph 10.1 of the Members Code of Conduct:

Councillor Orgee as a Member of South Cambridgeshire District Council, in relation to Item 11.

Councillor Curtis as a Member of Fenland District Council, in relation to Item 10.

Councillor Bates as the Local Member for Hemingford Grey, in relation to Item 6.

637. PETITIONS

None.

LATE REPORT

The chairman agreed to take the following report under the discretion given to him under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972:

Northstowe Phase 1 Outline Planning Application Draft Consultation Response on Transport issues and Section 106 Heads of Terms

Reason for lateness: officers were awaiting confirmation from South Cambridgeshire District Council to their agreement to the detail of the Section 106 schedule.

Reason for urgency: in order that a decision can be made in advance of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee on 24th October 2012. The current timescale had been initiated by the Northstowe Joint Team in order to progress that application so that discussions can move towards concluding the Section 106 legal agreement.

Whilst allowing the late report, the chairman expressed strong disappointment that this report had been made available to Cabinet at such a late stage, stressing that such lateness should only be permissible in truly exceptional circumstances.

638. NORTHSTOWE PHASE 1 OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON TRANSPORT ISSUES AND SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS

Cabinet received a report on transport issues arising from the Northstowe Phase One Outline Planning Application, and the draft Heads of Terms for a Section 106 Agreement covering County matters for the Phase One development.

Cabinet members noted the particular issues relating to:

- the A14/B1050 Bar Hill Interchange
- Cambridgeshire Guided Busway
- Traffic Monitoring and Management Strategy
- Walking and cycling
- Public and community transport
- Construction traffic

If the Phase One development at Northstowe was granted outline planning permission, then a Section 106 Agreement would be required setting out the financial contributions and works that the developer would be committed to provide, to ensure that the infrastructure investment required for this development were delivered. From a County Council perspective, the infrastructure elements related to education, community facilities such as libraries, waste management and transport.

Cabinet noted that there had been a late change to the proposed recommendations, to reflect the fact that it was not within Cabinet's remit to approve the draft Heads of Terms, as that was a decision for the Joint Development Control Committee for Northstowe. The Cabinet Member, Councillor Bates, outlined the proposed revision to the recommendations, which Cabinet accepted.

The Liberal Democrat Spokesperson for Planning, Enterprise and Environment, Councillor Wilkins, spoke on this item. He advised that the Liberal Democrat Group wanted Northstowe to be a success and an asset to the County, but not a drain on resources. He made the following points on the report:

- it was desirable to have bus services in Northstowe from the outset, rather than "as soon as possible", to encourage a change in people's behaviour as soon as they move in;
- traffic monitoring should be improved, so that the County Council could consider whether any additional work was required;

- construction lorries should be tracked, to address residents' concerns;
- more work should be undertaken to improve cycling facilities for Northstowe.

With regard to the last point, the Leader reminded Councillor Wilkins that a cycleway ran alongside the successful Guided Busway, next to the Northstowe site. Further proposals for high quality walking and cycling routes, including links to Longstanton and Bar Hill, were included in the report.

Councillor Johnstone, one of the Local Members for the Northstowe site, had submitted written comments, which had been circulated to Cabinet Members and were available to the public. Responding to Councillor Johnstone's comments on education, the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, advised that the primary school would accommodate the first secondary provision for Northstowe. There would be no post-16 education provision in Northstowe in Phase One of the development, as there was currently overcapacity in the area. Officers were asked to respond in the form of a letter to Councillor Johnstone's comments.

Responding to the report, Cabinet Members:

- commented that it was good to see progress on this project, which would benefit the people and the economy of Cambridgeshire;
- welcomed the provision of a three form entry (3FE) Primary School (including early years/pre-school provision), which would provide essential community facilities from the first occupation of the Phase One site;
- commented that it was important to recognise that reaching the commencement of Phase One had been a long journey which had taken a lot of work by all involved, and in particular a lot of close collaboration between the County and South Cambridgeshire District Councils;
- suggested that the tracking of all lorries would be almost impossible, given the amount of subcontracting in the construction industry. However, the Construction Management Strategy contained details of the access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel including the location of construction traffic routes, details of their signing, monitoring and enhancement measures. Mitigation measures to minimise the impact on surrounding villages were also to be secured;
- commented that given the size of the development, a developer would be sought who was a member of the Responsible Development Scheme.

It was resolved to:

- a) consider and approve the County Council's consultation response on transport issues to the Northstowe Phase One Outline Planning Application;
- b) consider and recommend to the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee the draft Heads of Terms for items to be considered for inclusion in a Section 106 Agreement should the Phase One development be granted planning permission;
- c) delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment the authority to make any minor textual changes to the consultation response or the recommended draft Section 106 Heads of Terms, prior to submission to the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee

**639. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR PERIOD
ENDING 31st AUGUST 2012**

Cabinet received the Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the period ending 31st August 2012. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, outlined particular issues for both revenue and capital budgets.

Cabinet noted that the current forecast year-end revenue overspend was £3.1M, which represented 0.8% of the total budget, and was travelling in the right direction. With regard to Key Performance Indicators, of the nine indicators within the Council's basket which had targets, three were currently on target, but some of the remaining ones were very near misses. The report provided further details and suggested actions regarding these Performance Indicators. However, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance cautioned that a further £40M worth of savings had to be made in the coming year.

Councillor Nethsingha spoke on the report as the Resources Spokesman for the Liberal Democrat Group. She commented that the report was not very positive at first reading, and the £3.1M overspend was disappointing. She expressed concern that targets for three of the twelve key performance indicators were still not available, four months into the financial year. Whilst acknowledging that some of the key performance indicators were 'near misses', she pointed out that the target for customer complaints was not a near miss, with only 66.1% receiving a response within the minimum response times, compared to a 90% target.

Responding to Councillor Nethsingha's last point, the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Councillor M McGuire, advised that there was a protocol for dealing with complaints, and the main thing was that services should provide a full and appropriate response to complaints, within a reasonable timeframe.

Responding to the report, Cabinet Members made the following points:

- one of the three areas for which there was not a target was *the proportion of repeat incidents of domestic violence in supported cases*. The Cabinet Member for Health & Wellbeing, Councillor Tierney, commented that ideally this target should be zero, but regrettably this was not always achievable;
- reflected on the Adult Social Care budget, given the huge pressures that the Service faced – whilst people were generally living longer, and this was to be welcomed, the financial impact of this was increasing rapidly, and Adult Social Care was the biggest single issue faced by all County authorities;
- one Cabinet Member expressed concern that there was no target for the percentage of Cambridgeshire residents aged 16-64 in employment, and stressed that the County Council could impact positively on employment figures;
- discussed how the need to find savings affected the people of Cambridgeshire, and that Councillors were constantly faced with competing priorities.

It was resolved to:

Analyse resources and performance information, and note the remedial action currently being taken, and consider if any further remedial action was required.

640. THE FUTURE PATTERN OF EDUCATION PROVISION IN ST IVES

Cabinet considered a report on the identified pressures on primary school capacity in the St Ives area, resulting from demographic changes and housing development, and proposals to expand primary school and associated early years and childcare provision in St Ives and Hemingford Grey, following a recent public consultation.

The Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor David Harty, outlined the issues, including the problems with some of the existing school buildings, including their condition and suitability. He reminded Members that the County Council had a statutory duty to provide primary school places and sufficient early years and childcare places for two, three and four year old children, and outlined how it was proposed to provide this in the St Ives area, using the additional basic need capital funding made available by the Department for Education (DfE).

Cabinet noted that there had been a late change to the recommendations made in the report, to reflect the fact that a proportion (£1.4M) of the £12.5M DfE funding allocated to Cambridgeshire had already been allocated for the new primary school planned in Soham, and that ultimately the allocation of the £12.5M capital funding would be a decision for full Council at its budget meeting in February 2013. The Cabinet Member, Councillor Harty, outlined the proposed revision to the recommendations, which Cabinet accepted.

The Liberal Democrat Education Spokesman, Councillor Downes, spoke on the report. He advised that he supported the report proposals and felt the review outcomes were good. He noted that at the heart of the proposals for Thorndown Primary School was the principle of increasing school sizes from two forms of entry (2FE) to three forms of entry (3FE), a proposal that he warmly supported, as slightly larger schools were not only more cost effective, but could be educationally more effective. However, there was a popular view held by some parents, teachers and governors, that larger schools were impersonal and, therefore, undesirable. Additionally, the physical process of extending schools could potentially put pressure on schools. He felt that both of these issues needed to be appropriately addressed in the future as the Council would require other schools to expand in response to the need for more places.

Both the Leader and the Cabinet Member, Councillor Harty, welcomed Councillor Downes' comments, and asked him if he would be willing to work with Cabinet Members and officers in the further work on supporting the Council's current policies on the sizes of its schools. Councillor Downes confirmed that he would be happy to do so.

Speaking as the Local Member for Hemingford Grey, Cabinet Member Councillor Bates thanked Councillor Harty and officers for their hard work on this issue. He advised that there had been very good, constructive engagement with the community, and that Hemingford Grey Primary School warmly welcomed the major investment in that school, which was urgently required.

Councillor Curtis, speaking as the Chair of Governors for a 3FE primary school in Whittlesey, supported Councillor Downes' point that large primary schools were

effective, and there were significant benefits of being a larger school. With regard to the pressures in the construction phase, he outlined ways in which this could be turned into a positive experience for schools and their pupils.

It was resolved to:

- a) note the views expressed during the recent consultation on the proposals to expand primary school and early years and childcare provision in the St Ives area;
- b) approve:
 - i) to proceed with proposals to increase the capacity of the following schools:
 - i. Thorndown Primary School to provide an additional 210 places and additional early years and childcare provision;
 - ii. Eastfield Infant School to provide an additional 30 places and additional early years and childcare provision;
 - iii. Westfield Junior School to provide an additional 40 places;
 - iv. Hemingford Grey Primary School to provide an additional 105 places and additional early years and childcare provision;

with priority being given to the expansion of Thorndown and Hemingford Grey Primary Schools;

ii) to Thorndown Primary School's catchment area being expanded to include housing development area C1 and the balance of land in area 5 on the plan attached as Appendix 1 of the report; and

iii) to the remaining £11.1M of £12.5M of exceptional Basic Need funding awarded to the Council in April 2012 be used to support the implementation of the proposals detailed above, subject to the approval of Full Council in its consideration of the Council's budget at its meeting in February 2013.

641. RAISING THE PARTICIPATION AGE STRATEGY

Members received a report on the Raising the Participation Age (RPA) Strategy. The Strategy outlined the implications of increasing the minimum age at which young people in England can leave learning, from 16 to 18. It was noted that learning in this broad context included full-time education, Apprenticeships and part-time education or training if employed, self-employed or volunteering.

Introducing the report, the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, summarised the six objectives to raise participation and support young people to progress and achieve, which are: (i) accurate data; (ii) improving support for young people at risk of not participating; (iii) linking employers with schools and colleges; (iv) ensuring sufficient suitable provision; (v) guaranteeing targeted high quality information, advice and guidance for all young people; (vi) ensuring everyone knows what RPA means for them.

The Liberal Democrat Education Spokesman, Councillor Downes, spoke on the report. He advised that he supported the report, which was essentially the local interpretation of a national requirement. However, he expressed concern about post-

16 education transport for those who cannot afford it, especially as the Educational Maintenance Allowance (EMA) had been withdrawn. Councillor Bates advised that he was happy to meet with Councillor Downes, Councillor Harty and appropriate officers to investigate this issue further.

It was resolved to:

Agree the adoption of the Raising the Participation Age Strategy.

642. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER AND RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY UPDATE

Cabinet considered a report on the updated Risk Management Policy, and the current status of corporate risk for the County Council. The creation of Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) had provided the opportunity for Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire County Councils to align risk management approaches.

The key changes were:

- Cambridgeshire was to split the existing policy between the two distinct elements of policy and process;
- the ownership of risks within the Corporate Risk Register would be assigned to officers of the Council, rather than the current practice of joint ownership of risks between officers and Cabinet members;
- the relevant legislation identifies responsibility for approving risk management policy as an executive function for Cabinet, not the Audit and Accounts Committee, although the Audit and Account Committee would retain its valuable role in reviewing any update to the Council's Risk Management Policy and providing advice to Cabinet;
- simplifying the expression of the Council's risk appetite, whereby the maximum acceptable risk score was set at 15, above which actions would be taken to reduce the risk score.

Cabinet noted that there had been no significant changes to the Corporate Risk Register from that previously reported to Cabinet in June 2012.

Councillor Nethsingha, speaking as the Liberal Democrat Resources spokesman, felt that it was important that Cabinet Members retained oversight of risk gradings, and questioned how accurate and realistic some of the risk gradings were. She felt this was increasingly important as the Council was required to make more and more savings, potentially exposing it to increased risks.

Responding, Cabinet Member Cllr Count advised that the gradings were reviewed very closely by a range of Members and officers, including Cabinet, the Audit & Accounts Committee, and both Internal and External Auditors. All were happy with the current grading, and there were a variety of routes for them to raise concerns if they felt that a risk was inaccurately or inappropriately graded.

It was resolved to:

- a) approve the updated Risk Management Policy;
- b) note the position in respect of corporate risk.

643. CAMBRIDGESHIRE SURFACE WATER MANAGMENT PLANS FOR ST NEOTS, GIRTON, ELY AND MARCH

Cabinet received a report on the outputs of the St Neots, Ely, Girton and March Surface Water Management Plans. The requirement for local authorities to coordinate Surface Water Management Plans (SWMPs) was set out in The Pitt Review, which became the Flood and Waste Management Act (2010). Once the SWMPs were approved, the County Council would be able to apply for funding to pay for the flood reduction measure detailed within them. Preliminary grant applications had been made on the basis of the SWMPs presented.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor Bob Farrer expressed concern that the St Neots SWMP had not gone far enough in addressing flooding issues. He had particular concerns that the report focused on storm water, not river water, and he felt that separating out different types and causes of flooding was ultimately not helpful in addressing the issues. He also queried the inclusion of Meadowsweet as one of the wetspots. He felt that many of the issues were due to the relevant agencies, including the Environment Agency and Water Authorities, not communicating appropriately.

It was noted that the March SWMP had not yet been approved by Fenland District Council.

Commenting on the report, Cabinet Members:

- commented that one of the Pitt Review recommendations was for the County Council to become the lead authority, to stop “buck passing” between partner agencies;
- Councillor Bates advised that he would report back to Cabinet Members on grant timescales, following meetings of the Environment Agency Central and Northern Flood Defence Committees later in the month;
- welcomed the report and the excellent and extensive nature of the consultation;
- commented that insufficient maintenance of culverted waterways had a significant impact on flooding;
- commented that the resilience of schools to flooding needed to be addressed;
- welcomed the support of Local Members like Cllr Farrer and agreed to follow up on the Meadowsweet issue directly with Councillor Farrer.

It was resolved to:

- a) approve the individual Surface Water Management Plans for St Neots, Girton and Ely;
- b) delegate the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning in consultation with both the local County Councillors for March and the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment, the approval of the Surface Waste Management Plan for March once completed.

644. CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO FENLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL ON BOTH THE FENLAND COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN – CORE STRATEGY – FURTHER CONSULTATION DRAFT AND POLICIES MAP (JULY 2012) AND

FENLAND DRAFT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2012-2031 CONSULTATION DRAFT (JULY 2012)

Cabinet considered a report on the County Council's proposed response to the Fenland Communities Development Plan – Core Strategy – Further Consultation Draft and Policies Map (July 2012) and the Fenland Economic Development Strategy 2012-2031 Consultation Draft (July 2012)

Commenting on the report, Cabinet Members:

- observed that good strategic planning and framework documents helped to take the controversy out of the planning process;
- stressed that it was important to consider lifetime homes, e.g. walls in people's homes were having to be strengthened so that equipment could be fitted – this should be done upfront, to prevent the need for remedial work in future;
- with regard to supporting and managing the impact of a Growing District (CS11) suggested that relevant ducting for super fast broadband should be included *within* new homes, not just externally;
- discussed car parking spaces, noting that the Police had made recommendations that the strategy should include car spaces, not just garages, which were often not used to park cars. A Member suggested that rows of terraced properties with rows of separate garages should be discouraged;
- noted with concern that the amount of land allocated for employment had fallen from 125 hectares to 85 hectares, following a review of land availability, and supported the proposed response that additional land to support jobs needed to be found.

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, advised that he would take up the points raised by Cabinet Members and incorporate them into the final response, which would be circulated to Cabinet Members and Members with Fenland Divisions prior to submission to Fenland District Council.

It was resolved to:

- a) agree the consultation response to Fenland District Council on both their Core Strategy (Appendix 1 to the report) and the Draft Economic Development Strategy (Appendix 2 to the report);
- b) delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Economy in consultation with the Executive Director, Economy, Transport and Environment the authority to make minor amendments to the responses before submission.

645. CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL ON THE SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PKLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT CONSULTATION (JULY 2012)

Cabinet considered a report on the proposed response to the South Cambridgeshire District Council Issues and Options report (July 2012).

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, advised that the County Council continued to have a good, close working relationship with both South

Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council on a wide range of issues through a variety of cross-party forums. The Issues and Options Report raised a number of challenging questions, particularly relating to potential housing growth sites on the South Cambridgeshire/Cambridge City fringes, which would involve further Green Belt release, if progressed.

Councillor Michael Williamson spoke as a Member with a division in South Cambridgeshire, and as Local Member for Waterbeach specifically. He declared a non-statutory interest as a Trustee of the Farm Museum at Denny Abbey. In relation to Issue 16 (Development Options), he reminded Cabinet that Waterbeach was rejected as a site for the new settlement in Cambridgeshire, and that the County Council's Joint Statement on the Strategic Planning made provision for development *"within Cambridge or as sustainable extensions to the urban area, subject to environmental capacity and compatibility with Green Belt objectives"*. He stressed the problems of the already congested A10 corridor and the need to avoid any options which exacerbated congestion on that side of Cambridge.

Commenting, Cabinet Members highlighted that in the unsuccessful Mereham development application, transport had been regarded as the weak link. It was noted that the Ely to Cambridge railway line and Waterbeach station were already very busy. It was further noted that there was no reference to Surface Water drainage in the Issues and Options consultation.

The following issues were raised by Cabinet Members:

- suggested that relevant ducting for super fast broadband should be included *within* new homes, not just externally;
- noted that adoption of roads was always a challenge in new housing developments. Councillor Count outlined the legal avenues that were open to the Council when a developer went into administration without completing roads to an adoptable standard;
- noting the proposed amendment in relation to Renewables that *"no more than 10% of a building's energy requirements should be provided from micro technologies"*, suggested that this statement assumed that technology would stay the same, and needed to be reworded to reflect technology moving forward;
- discussed green spaces (Issue 87) and the need for these to take into consideration the needs of all members of the community. The attractiveness of green spaces and value to the economy were stressed.

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, advised that he would take up the points raised by Cabinet Members and Councillor Williamson, and incorporate them into the final response, which would be circulated to Cabinet Members and Members with South Cambridgeshire Divisions prior to submission to South Cambridgeshire District Council.

It was resolved to:

- (a) agree the consultation response attached as Appendix 1 to the report, and send it to South Cambridgeshire District Council in response to their Local Plan Issues and Options report (July 2012);

(b) delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Economy in consultation with the Executive Director, Economy, Transport and Environment the authority to make minor amendments as necessary prior to submission.

646. PROPOSED RESPONSE TO THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE GREATER PETERBOROUGH ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (LEP) GROWTH PROSPECTUS FOR GREATER CAMBRIDGE GREATER PETERBOROUGH

Cabinet considered a report on the proposed response to Growth Prospectus recently published by the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The proposed response suggested a prioritisation of the 37 strategic priorities put forward.

Speaking as Democrat Spokesperson for Planning, Enterprise and Environment, Councillor Wilkins was disappointed that Quality of Life was omitted from the priorities, especially as this was so important for recruitment and retention in the county. He welcomed the focus on the Alconbury Enterprise Zone.

There was a discussion on the difficulty of accurately measuring and quantifying Quality of Life. Cllr Wilkins acknowledged that it was difficult, but felt that it was a broad objective and it was important to have the aspiration in there, so that the LEP was mindful of quality of life issues in its work. Cllr Clarke agreed to reflect these comments back to the LEP Board.

It was resolved to:

endorse and submit to the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (LEP) the proposed comments made in relation to the strategic priorities (and related actions and programmes) in the Local Enterprise Partnership's Growth Prospectus.

647. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA – 23rd OCTOBER 2012

Members noted the draft agenda for the Cabinet meeting to be held on 23rd October 2012, including the following changes:

- additional item: Ofsted inspection of arrangements for the protection of children;
- item removed: Northstowe Strategic Transport.

Chairman 23rd October 2012