

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 15th June 2010

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.25 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: None

Also Present: Councillors: N Clarke, D Jenkins, A Melton, J Palmer, J Powley, L Nethsingha, F Whelan and K Wilkins

188. MINUTES 25th May 2010

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 25th May 2010 were approved as a correct record.

189. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Orgee declared a personal interest in report 8 titled “Northstowe Eco Town Demonstrator Project under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct as a member of South Cambridgeshire District Council which was undertaking retro-fit energy saving measure and technology to houses in Rampton Drift.

Councillor Reynolds declared a personal and prejudicial interest in report 8 titled “Northstowe Eco Town Demonstrator Project under Paragraph 8 and 10 of the Code of Conduct as the chairman of Renewables East in respect of the work it would be undertaking in respect of Northstowe Eco Town Demonstrator Project.

190. PETITIONS - PETITION RECEIVED FROM RESIDENTS TO THE NORTH OF GILBERT ROAD

Cabinet received a petition from 278 residents in surrounding roads from Gilbert Road including Perse Way, Roseford Road, Hurrell Road, Tedder Way, Harding Way, Thirleby Close with the text reading:

"We the undersigned call on Cambridgeshire County Council and the Transport Delivery Team of Cambs County Council to note the concerns of residents north of Gilbert Road who believe that the Cycle Cambridge Team's proposal to improve the cycle route along Gilbert Road with the proposed traffic calming measures would have potentially an adverse affect on our environment by significantly increasing the traffic movements through our area. We therefore request that no Gilbert Road cycle route improvements with the proposed traffic calming measures are considered until a full traffic modelling analysis of the area north of Gilbert Road has been undertaken".

The Chairman had agreed to accept it on the basis that it was a materially different petition seeking a different outcome to that received from residents from Gilbert Road at the February Cabinet meeting. A summary of the text of the presentation made in support of the petition is included as appendix 1 to these notes.

Due to the complexity of the issues and to allow the opportunity to respond on the new issues raised, the Chairman also agreed under her discretionary powers to allow the James Woodburn on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign to state their case in respect of why Cabinet should not agree to any further delay. The presentation outlined that the main consideration should be the need to safeguard cyclists using Gilbert Road and outlining the Campaign did not believe that providing the proposed cycleways would lead to a significant increase in rat running in the roads highlighted in the above petition. The text to which James Woodburn referred to for his presentation is included as appendix 2 to these minutes.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

The chairman with the approval of Cabinet agreed that the Gilbert Road Report should be moved up the agenda in order to allow all interested parties to hear the debate without undue delay.

191. GILBERT ROAD, CAMBRIDGE – CYCLING SCHEME

In introducing the report the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning drew attention to the fact that both himself and other Cabinet Members had received many items and levels of correspondence in regard to the proposed recommendations with almost equal numbers for (54%) and against (46%) the proposal. Whilst the broad majority favoured all aspects of the safety implications of the scheme some did not support the need for hard traffic calming measures which were currently proposed as integral to the proposals as set out in the report.

Cabinet was reminded that Cycling England (CE) has been tasked by the Government with delivering a national programme to increase cycling levels. Initially Cycling England provided funding of £3.6m up until April 2011, which was to be match funded. In addition a further £210,000 has been secured, with further funding likely to be based on the record of delivery.

A scheme in Gilbert Road was included in the programme because for some time it had been recognised as an important part of the cycle route from villages to the north of Cambridge such as Histon, Impington, Cottenham and Rampton into central Cambridge, as well as being a key route on many school bound cycling journeys. An improvement of the current cycle facilities has been an objective of the Council for many years and has been contained in a number of policy documents such as The Northern Corridor Transport Plan which was adopted in 2003. On 23rd February 2010 Cabinet approved 3 schemes in Cambridge - Madingley Road, Cherry Hinton Road and The Tins. The Gilbert Road scheme which was the fourth of the schemes considered was deferred to allow Members the opportunity at a Policy Development Group (PDG) to discuss the matter further since the scheme proved much more controversial than the other three before a report came back to Cabinet for any decision.

It was highlighted that Gilbert Road was currently used by 900 cyclists per day. With Chesterton Community College, four local primary schools and the new development on the NIAB site to the west, there was potential for marked growth in future trips if a safe environment could be provided for them. It was noted that at the present time there were 1.3m wide advisory cycle lanes along the whole length, and on both sides of Gilbert Road and that currently vehicles could legally park in them. Surveys had revealed that typically 20 vehicles were parked in these cycle lanes at any time, with a concentration at the Milton Road end, and were believed to be commuters rather than residents or their visitors which increased the risk of accidents, particularly for children and also discouraged people from cycling from the wider area. It was also highlighted that the majority of houses on Gilbert Road had at least two off street parking spaces.

It was further highlighted that the cycling scheme was not just about the safety of road users in Gilbert Road, as the road formed part of a wider network of cycling provision as was an important route for motor vehicles including buses. As part of the Cycle Cambridge proposals, the Cottenham-Histon-Cambridge corridor had been identified as a key route for improvement. One of the fundamentals of encouraging modal shift, was to remove the perceived danger of cycling and encourage an increase in cycling is to make routes continuous by improving the safety on the whole route. The Gilbert Road scheme was one section of the above route.

Cabinet's attention was drawn to the fact that there had been 10 reported accidents in the last 5 years, of which 6 involved cyclists with many cyclists perceiving Gilbert Road as a dangerous place to cycle and resulting in many cyclists illegally using the footways, coming into conflict with pedestrians. Having considered a wide range of possible options the options considered feasible and put forward to an extensive consultation exercise were:

Option 1 Increased Width Advisory Cycle Lanes

The existing advisory lanes (bounded by a broken line) could be widened to 1.7m with double yellow lines to prevent cars parking in them. In this case, the enforcement restrictions would need to be undertaken by local authority parking attendants. (If a solid line were used to create a mandatory lane, police enforcement would be necessary and vehicles would not be able to park on the verge).

Option 2 Mandatory Cycle Lanes.

The existing lanes could be widened to 1.5m and converted to mandatory lanes (bounded by a solid line). Vehicles would not be permitted to enter or park in these lanes, and it was the police's responsibility to enforce the restrictions (there have been enforcement problems in mandatory lanes in other parts of the city). Without double yellow lines, motorists would be permitted to park on the grass verges, which has become a common practice in recent years.

The results of the consultation as detailed in the Cabinet report demonstrated that overall, there was a high degree of support for the principles of the scheme. However, in Gilbert Road, although a significant minority of residents did support the proposals, the majority did not, principally due to the loss of on street parking. Further engagement with the petitioners who had presented their views opposing the scheme proposals at the February meeting confirmed that they still believed there was no need to change the status quo, but that if measures were necessary, these should be through speed control and not through raised tables or cushions. Further correspondence received from the Cycling Campaign confirmed

their belief that the current situation was dangerous and that the proposals should be implemented without further delay.

The PDG and Cabinet had been particularly interested in receiving the views of the five local schools and therefore further work had been carried out to ascertain their views. All except one of the schools was very supportive of the proposals for improved cycle provision on Gilbert Road. It was orally reported that the police had expressed a preference for option 1.

The local member for West Chesterton speaking orally in support of the provision of improved cycle lanes believed that they should be accompanied by speed reduction measures to help protect the safety of cyclists, especially children cycling to any of the five local schools, and would also help deal with residents concerns by ensuring cars did not speed along the road.

There was also discussion on whether the width of the road encouraged motor vehicles to speed and while it was confirmed that the road was not overly wide for an urban road there was a view as expressed by the local member that its width with the cycle lanes gave the impression of it being wider than it was.

Cabinet Members expressed concerns regarding whether traffic calming measures were required as these were not found to be necessary in other parts of Cambridge or indeed other parts of the country which operated successful cycle lanes. In addition there was the view that speed humps would not make any difference during the rush hour period as traffic moved very slowly along the road.

Following careful consideration of the report content including the details of:

- the consultation exercise previously undertaken,
- the views expressed at the Members Policy Development Group,
- the views of local County Councillors for the electoral divisions affected as reported orally and attached as an appendix to the report ,
- the views of the local schools and the police,
- the further representations made at the meeting by a petition from residents north of Gilbert Road and from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign

Members of Cabinet agreed that option 1 was their preferred choice as being the option that was more likely to be enforced and should be progressed but that due to their concerns regarding whether additional traffic calming measures were necessary and also taking into account the current extremely unfavourable economic climate, they took the view that such additional expenditure could not be justified. The approval given was on the basis that the speed of traffic along Gilbert Road should continue to be monitored and that if there were concerns regarding the speed of motor vehicles, a report could come back to a future meeting.

It was resolved:

To unanimously approve the Option 1 cycle scheme (Increased Width Advisory Cycle Lanes) proposals for implementation subject to the required funding being available, but not to proceed with the traffic calming elements

contained within that option but to ask the officers to keep the issue of the speed of traffic in Gilbert Road under review.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

The chairman with the approval of Cabinet agreed that item 6 on the agenda “Prescribed Alterations to increase the size of six Primary Schools across Cambridgeshire” should be moved up the agenda in order to allow a number of local Members to express their views on local schools affected by the proposals.

192. PRESCRIBED ALTERATIONS TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF SIX PRIMARY SCHOOLS ACROSS CAMBRIDGESHIRE

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to proceed with plans to increase the size of six primary schools, five schools by the addition of 30 extra Reception places with effect from 1 September 2010, and one school by the addition of 20 extra Reception places with effect from 1 September 2011. The schools which it was proposed to increase in size were:

- Abbey Meadows Community Primary, Cambridge
- Colville Community Primary, Cambridge
- Spring Meadow Community Infant, Ely
- The Weatheralls Community Primary, Soham
- St John’s Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary, Huntingdon
- Pendragon Community Primary, Papworth Everard

In terms of the proposed alteration to enlarge the physical capacity of The Weatheralls Community Primary School to 630 pupils from the current 420 (which was supported by the School Governing Body who had agreed with the Local Authority’s proposal that this should be on a permanent basis), Councillor Powley one of the local members for Soham and Fordham speaking at the meeting expressed his support for the proposals, highlighting that that several other successful schools in the County were of a similar size.

The other local member for Soham and Fordham, Councillor Palmer, also speaking at the meeting, outlined his opposition to the enlargement proposals being on a permanent basis, believing that they were not good for Soham and could undermine the provisions in the master plan and Soham Vision and indicating that in his opinion there had been a lack of consultation with the relevant town and district councils in terms of the proposed changes to the school. For clarification to this latter point, the Cabinet Member for Learning was able to confirm that the leader of the District Council was aware of the proposals and had not indicated specific opposition to them in previous discussions. The proposals were to meet the most up to date National Health Service data in respect of children already born in the Soham primary schools catchment areas and the resulting forecast demand for school places up to the 2013-14 academic year and the statutory requirement for the local authority to meet this demand. Officers confirmed that the expansion of Weatheralls Community Primary School was to meet the current demand and would not affect the identification of a new third primary school which would be required to meet future projected demand as a result of new local housing growth.

As it was recognised that the consultation process had not been as wide ranging as it could have been, the Cabinet Member for Learning undertook to ensure close working / open

dialogue was continued by the County Council officers / lead members with their opposite numbers in the District and Town Councils regarding primary education provision in Soham. Officers were reminded of the need to ensure that they fully took into account existing master plans when bringing forward their own plans for further education expansion.

It was resolved:

- (i) To note the pupil projections for each of the relevant schools for entry in September 2010 onwards;
- (ii) To note the responses to the statutory notices published during the spring term 2010; and
- (iii) To approve the enlargement of the physical capacity of all six primary schools, in order to provide a total of 170 additional places across Cambridgeshire (as listed above).

193. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY - CORPORATE SERVICE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEMBER LED REVIEW – GETTING MAXIMUM VALUE FOR MONEY ON PROCURING GOODS AND SERVICES AND THE RESPONSE

Cabinet received a report presenting the findings and recommendations from a Member Led Review of the Council's procurement arrangements and seeking its support to the recommendations set out in the review.

The chairman of the review Councillor Nick Clarke in orally presenting the report to Cabinet highlighted that the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee had received a report in September 2009, which provided an overview about the ways in which the Council purchased goods, services and works (procurement). The Committee had, had concerns about the following:

- The Council's ability to negotiate best value
- Finding a way through corporate restrictions
- The ownership of the procurement process
- The Council's relationship with small and medium sized businesses.

A sub group was established to review the topic further and their review provided a strategic analysis of the Council's current procurement arrangements making 11 recommendations for improvement in the following key areas:

- Leadership
- Skills Deployment and Development
- Systems and Processes

The review group while recognising that the current procurement arrangements were working well, believed that implementation of the recommendations would enable the Council to achieve even greater value for money from its future procurement activities. During his presentation he thanked the other sub group Members: Councillors Steve

Tierney and Michal Williamson and also paid tribute to the excellent work undertaken by the Scrutiny Development Co-ordinator, Rob Jakeman.

Under the Council's Constitution Cabinet was required to receive and consider the recommendations of a scrutiny review and indicate whether it would action the recommendations put forward and in line with this, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance welcomed the scrutiny report fully supporting the review findings fully supported the proposals to achieve excellence in procurement activities aligned with the need to make significant savings. He drew Cabinet Member's attention to the proposed response to the scrutiny report already included on the original agenda which highlighted dates for the commencement and completion of activities, both taking into account the recommendations of the member led review, necessary lead-in times and where appropriate the prospective timetable for Local Government Shared Services (subject to Cabinet and Council decision). In some cases the proposed timescale suggested was earlier than the original review recommendation if this was seen as achievable.

In terms of establishing a Members Panel, it was agreed that it was important that the discussions to clarify the remit of this group and its constitutional position should be concluded by the 31st July 2010 deadline, as well as ensuring that the Head of Profession for Procurement should be recruited as a priority and that targets established to ensure the post paid for itself.

It was resolved:

- i) To thank Scrutiny for producing a valuable and detailed report and that these should be passed on to all relevant staff involved in the review.
- ii) To approve the response to the Member Led Review on Getting Maximum Value for Money in Procuring Goods, Services and Works as set out in Section 2 of the report and as detailed in appendix 3 of these minutes.

194. COUNCIL DECISIONS

No decisions required for the current meeting.

195. EARLY YEARS AND CHILD CARE – LEASE COSTS AND LICENCE FEES FOR COUNTY COUNCIL PROPERTIES AT LESS THAN BEST CONSIDERATION

This report could not be finalised until after the despatch of the original agenda but was required in order to progress the transactions set out in the report.

Cabinet received a report setting out details of the Council's statutory responsibilities as a strategic leader in facilitating the childcare market. The report highlighted the need to consider the level of lease and licence fees payable by the private, voluntary and independent sector childcare providers on County Council premises as the current requirement to achieve "best consideration" in every case might limit the delivery and availability of childcare places.

The report proposed that private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector early years and childcare providers, and any organisation operating under contract with the local authority

to provide children's centre services, should have the opportunity to apply for a reduction from 'best consideration' in the licence fee or market rent for leased premises. As it was estimated that this applied to 150 potential transactions, rather than all these potentially coming to Cabinet it was proposed that the approvals should be agreed via a general delegation.

It was resolved:

To agree to delegate to the Executive Director: Children and Young People and Corporate Director: Finance, Property and Performance in consultation with the Portfolio holders for Learning and also for Resources and Performance, the ability to grant leases and licences at less than best consideration on transactions to provide childcare places and Children's Centres in Council premises when agreed criteria were met.

196. NORTHSTOWE ECOTOWN DEMONSTRATOR PROJECT

Cabinet received a report informing it of the previously successful bid for funding under the Eco Towns programme and the proposed delivery programme for the County Council element of the programme.

The local member for Willingham who was unable to be present in a written statement which was read out strongly supported the proposals as set out in the Cabinet stating her extreme disappointment that the funding position had not yet been clarified as this put the Council in a difficult position and stating that it was essential that Northstowe, when developed, was built to the highest environmental standards and the early investment would be critical in providing advice and guidance.

Cabinet noted that a total of £1,500,000 had been awarded to Cambridgeshire by the department for Communities and Local Government (CLG), £365,000 less than the bid amount. £1,135,000 million was allocated by CLG for demonstrator projects, with the remaining £365,000 allocated to complete studies. Under CLG's stated funding terms, the building required to be completed and all invoices submitted by April 2011.

However as an oral update it was indicated that in terms of funding matters were now less certain following the recent general election with the new Coalition Government having pledged to review all financial decisions made after 1st January 2010 with the Eco Town funding falling into that category. It was indicated that currently there was no certainty that the funding for the project would continue and that clarity, was unlikely until after the Emergency budget was announced on 22nd June.

Councillor Jenkins one of the local members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington spoke in support of the project, stating that the construction of a highly accessible exhibition and learning facility should be made to be a multi-use facility e.g. a combined working office and exhibition building so that it was also an asset and that if time allowed, officers should also seek a private sector partner to share its facilities and to also be potential future owner e.g. a bus operator.

Cabinet noted that given the uncertainty over funding, there were two options for the way forward. The first was to wait until there was clarity over the availability of funding before

undertaking any further work was undertaken on the project. Officers' views was that given the already extremely tight programme, and assuming there was no clarity until towards the end of June, the project may by that time be undeliverable and even if the funding was subsequently made available, it may not be possible to spend it and deliver the project on time. The second option was to commence a limited amount of preparatory work such that if the funding was to be confirmed, the project would be underway and there would be a much better chance of delivery within timescale. This would, however, mean committing some funding at risk until a clear decision was made by Government.

It was estimated that to move the project forward under option 2 in a meaningful way, the minimum amount of money that needed to be spent was £10,000. This was in addition to £5,000 that had already been spent prior to the current uncertainty over funding. Cabinet expressed their serious concerns regarding spending £10k with no guarantee of success and which if the latter proved to be the case and Government funding was not confirmed would then be lost and which could have been spent on other projects.

It was resolved:

- i) to note the proposal for an exhibition building at the Longstanton Park and Ride site through the Eco Town programme funding and the proposed programme for delivery;
- ii) to note current uncertainties regarding funding;
- iii) to approve the project for delivery subject to funding becoming available and
- iv) to agree that no further advance expenditure should be undertaken until Government funding was confirmed at which time officers in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Growth Infrastructure and Strategic Planning would assess its feasibility as an ongoing project.

197. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT - OUTTURN 2009/10

This report could not be finalised at the time of the first despatch but the chairman agreed to consider it as an urgent report exercising her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 due to the need for Cabinet to agree a proposed capital virement as set out in the report.

Cabinet received the report which detailed the performance of the Council for the 2009/10 financial year. The report followed the broad structure of the Integrated Resources and Performance Report submitted each month, but provided further detail in areas such as Schools, Reserves and Treasury Management Activities. The report was also a management report that preceded the production of the Council's formal Statement of Accounts.

Cabinet noted that the overall position for 2009/10 was a successful out-turn position with actual spending of £325.9m against the revised budget of £327.9m, resulting in an underspend of -£2m (-0.6% of the revised budget). Of this underspend, £0.480m was to be transferred to Carry Forwards and Other Reserves, in accordance with the Council's

Constitution, and £1.5m transferred to the General Reserve. A warning was given that due to the current financial climate there would be an increased need to continue to drive down costs and improve value for money for every pound spent.

Included as an additional request was a recommendations to approve a capital virement of £672k from the Better Utilisation of Property Assets (BUPA) programme to the Workwise scheme within Corporate Directorates, as it was expected to have a final overspend of £672k, with £636k already incurred in 2009/10 and a further £36k due in 2010/11. The Corporate Director: Finance, Property and Performance had agreed in principle that this should be covered by the Better Utilisation of Property Assets (BUPA) programme. In terms of the reason for the overspend it was explained that this was due to a number of the properties identified for disposal as a result of the scheme having to be retained in the short term due to the unfavourable economic conditions, and in order to ensure greater value was achieved by selling them when the property market recovered. The identified sites were now included in the BUPA programme and would be sold in due course to realise the necessary savings.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the revenue expenditure of Services in 2009/10, and in particular the delivery of a better than break-even position (section 3.4).
- ii) To approve the capital virement of £672k from the Better Utilisation of Property Assets (BUPA) programme to the Workwise scheme.

198. LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES – DETAILED BUSINESS CASE AND JOINT COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

This report could not be finalised at the time of the first despatch but the chairman agreed to consider it as an urgent report exercising her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 in order to enable Cabinet to reconfirm its support for the Local Government Shared Services Programme and to confirm that a number of key issues had been dealt with adequately in producing Detailed Business Case and Joint Committee Agreement in advance of the detailed report going forward to Cabinet and Council in July.

In February 2010, Cabinet considered and approved the Outline Business Case for Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) and had requested that a Detailed Business Case was produced with supporting information that would allow a decision to be recommended to Council in July. This further report provided Cabinet with an early opportunity to consider the (near final draft) Detailed Business Case for Local Government Shared Services, together with the (near final draft) governance arrangements by means of a Joint Committee structure that would support the shared service partnership, prior to formal recommendation to Council in July.

A correction was made in terms of providing a replacement paragraph 4.6 in respect of the further benefits savings identified, with the replacement paragraph reading:

“4.6. A prudent approach has been taken to the preparation of the business case and 11% of the relevant baseline (over and above non-LGSS planned savings) is the expected minimum return. Areas of further benefit have been identified that indicate that further direct and indirect savings of up to £2.3 million a year are probable of which £1.4 million will

be within three years of LGSS commencement, and the further £0.9 million once services have stabilised from year four i.e. 2014/15. In addition there are budget changes representing commitments already entered into by the councils result in net savings of £1.5 million per year, which LGSS will be responsible for delivering. These savings will be confirmed as part of the 2011/12 and 2012/13 Integrated Planning cycles”.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance detailed the savings that could be expected to be made in terms of like for like services which could be in the region of 28% over the full period of the scheme including reductions as set out in the table on page 12 of the report. The programme has a pay back period of two and a half years.

The following functions transactional and professional were proposed to be in scope for LGSS for both authorities:

Finance
Human Resources and Payroll
Organisational Development and Learning (including social Care workforce development)
Procurement
Internal Audit
Legal Services

Pensions administration was also proposed to be in scope. In addition to the services identified above and in order to reflect current but different approval to service integration in both authorities, it was proposed that from inception Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) would also include Research, Performance Management, Estates Strategy and Property Commissioning Services whilst Northamptonshire CC would be adding Information Technology Services. It was expected that progress would be made for like for like inclusion over the five year period.

The economic rationale for Sharing Services was noted as set out in section 3 of the report.

The benefits of collaboration were set out in paragraph 4.8 of the report and beyond the financial benefits already quantified, were wider opportunities to support LGSS as set out in paragraph 4.9 of the report. The report also detailed the proposals for consultation and scrutiny, the organisational implications and the options which had been considered in terms of the best vehicle to the LGSS vision and design principles. The detail of the various options which had been considered was as set out in section 8 of the report. This detailed why Option 2, the creation of a formal partnership to extend collaboration through a Joint Committee, was the recommended option.

It was further explained that the legal risk of challenge to the proposed creation of a shared services arrangement was considered small as explained in section 6 of the report and in the more detailed confidential legal advice paper provided for Cabinet members separately.

In answer to questions raised it was confirmed that there would be opportunities for further local authorities in Cambridgeshire/ Northamptonshire to join in due course. Cost sharing and buy in arrangements had been included to allow for this potential interest.

Cabinet reminded officers of the need to keep Members informed and involved at the important milestone stages of the project.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance put on record his thanks to both Nick Dawe and to Dale Squire from Northamptonshire CC and their teams for all their work under difficult circumstances and in keeping staff engaged and focussing them on the way forward to ensure a successful outcome.

It was resolved

- A. That Cabinet reconfirmed its support for the Local Government Shared Services Programme.
- B. confirmed that the following issues had been dealt with adequately in producing the Detailed Business Case and the Joint Committee Agreement:
 1. That the **vision** of the Local Government Shared Services programme is clear and is fully described and that the vision identifies the ambition of both authorities to work in partnership to offer a full range of cost effective and quality corporate services, that will be made available to local public service bodies and other authorities over time.
 2. That the **objectives** of the Local Government Shared Services programme are clear and are fully described and that the objectives indicate an optimum balance between; performance, cost, quality and control.
 3. That the **design principles** of the Local Government Shared Services programme are clear and are fully described and that the design principles will deliver cost effective and quality corporate services to both authorities and subsequent partners and customers.
 4. That the **initial scope** of Local Government Shared Services is clear and is fully described and that the opportunities to extend the scope to other corporate services as and when beneficial to both authorities are understood.
 5. That the **governance model** for Local Government Shared Services programme was clear and was fully described and provided the correct balance between; the singular and joint interests of both authorities, control and performance management, risk management and cost effectiveness.
 6. That the **target operating model** assumed in the Detailed Business Case (but subject to subsequent formal consultation) for Local Government Shared Services programme was clear and was fully described and provided the correct balance between; control, professional leadership and cost.
 7. That the certain and potential further **financial benefits** being delivered by Local Government Shared Services was clear and was fully described and provided the correct balance between; reducing cost, maintaining professional support during a period of major service change, and providing sufficient return on investment, within the context of continued economic uncertainty and funding reductions.
 8. That the **risks and risk management actions** associated with the Local Government Shared Services programme were clear and were fully described and that proposed mitigating actions ensured that the programme was within the risk appetite of the Authority.

That Cabinet noted that any decision made in July will relate to the approval of the Local Government Shared Services arrangements with Northamptonshire County Council, operating within a Joint Committee structure. Any changes to the form of the partnership, e.g. an alternative registered company structure and/or any significant expansion of the partnership beyond the geographical boundaries

of the two counties, will require a further business case and separate Cabinet and/or Council consideration as appropriate.

- D. That Cabinet was content, based on the advice of the Monitoring Officer that the Local Government Shared Services proposals and supporting Joint Committee arrangements are lawful, and the advice of the Section 151 Officer that Local Government Shared Services and supporting Joint Committee arrangements offer value for money, and comply with all relevant tests of probity, integrity and good governance.
- E. That Cabinet noted that on full and formal consideration of the Detailed Business Case and Joint Committee arrangements in July, recommendations as italicised below would need to be made to Council:

That Cabinet recommends to Council the formation of a joint committee between the Council and Northamptonshire County Council, that the Council makes the delegations described in the Delegation and Joint Committee Agreement, and that it delegates power to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Resources and Performance, to enter into the Delegation and Joint Committee Agreement.

199. CHATTERIS MARKET TOWN TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Cabinet received for its approval, the new Chatteris Market Town Transport Strategy which would form part of the Local Transport Plan which identified the key transport issues facing Chatteris and outlined a programme of transport schemes to address the transport needs of the town over the next five years.

Further to this it was agreed that it would be important to recognise the rural aspect of the villages around Chatteris in term of their specific transport requirements.

It was noted that the programmes in the market town strategies took a wider perspective in looking at the existing problems in the towns and the future challenges that they were facing, and sought to identify the interventions that were needed to deal with them and could be used as the basis of bids for funding from other sources or as the policy basis for Section 106 contributions from development.

It was highlighted that the strategies did have a degree of aspiration in them and were dependent on funding sources becoming available and for this reason the programmes were stated in phases rather than having specific timescales attached to individual schemes. Due to the current economic slowdown it was agreed that it was prudent to make clear in subsequent publicity that the schemes within the programme could only be implemented if funding became available.

The local Member for Chatteris spoke in support of the Strategy, congratulating the officers for an excellent report and highlighting that he hoped that measures would be undertaken in the medium term, subject to appropriate funding being secured, in partnership between the County Council, East Cambridgeshire and Fenland District Councils to improve the safety for cyclist and walkers wishing to access the Mepal Outdoor Centre (situated on the west side of the A141 (Ely - March road)) via a linked cycleway away from this main road.

It was resolved:

To approve and adopt the Chatteris Market Town Transport Strategy as part of the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2006-11 and that the schemes contained within it to be implemented subject to the appropriate funding being available.

200. CAMBRIDGE STATION BUS INTERCHANGE

Cabinet received a report updating it on the progress on the CB1 Bus interchange and the proposed programme for delivery of the scheme.

Due to the current economic slowdown and current uncertain economic climate it was highlighted that it was prudent to indicate that the scheme could only be implemented if the necessary funding became available. In answer to a question it was indicated that the risk of this scheme not going ahead was considerably less than for the Northstowe Ecotown demonstrator project, as this was a project that had already been agreed.

One Member expressed his concerns regarding the timescales in relation to assumptions on the outcome of any future planning application. It was indicated that there had been ongoing discussions with partners who had been supportive of the proposals without pre-empting any future decisions by planning committees. Officers highlighted that it was necessary to make assumptions about when the planning permissions would be granted as time limited funding streams such as this project required close programming if the funds were to be spent and received within the specified time from Government.

Members noted the importance of the project for the station area and Cambridge as a whole and agreed that even if Housing Growth Funding did not become available, alternative ways of bringing the project forward, such as through the use of developer s106 contributions or through the developer of the CB1 scheme, should be considered.

It was resolved to:

- i) note the progress on the development of the bus interchange project at the Cambridge rail station;
- ii) approve the scheme (outline contained in Appendix 1 of the report) for submission for planning permission and delivery by the County Council using funding from the Housing Growth Fund, subject to the preferred design receiving planning permission and subject to the appropriate funding being available.

201. HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS OPERATIONAL ISSUES

This report could not be finalised at the time of the first despatch but the chairman agreed to consider it as an urgent report exercising her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 as Members are normally appointed to the Local Access Forum in April and therefore making the necessary changes as proposed in the report had now become a priority.

Cabinet received a report in order to consider proposed changes to operational Highways and Access policies associated with:

- i. the Local Access Forum (LAF)
- ii. prioritisation of Definitive Map investigations;
- iii. charges for highway development control agreements.

Whilst it was normal to bring forward policy charges for Highways and Access on an annual basis the following three specific changes had been brought forward in order to achieve Integrated Plan efficiency savings, and to enable the County Council to complete activity in relation to the Rights of Way network and Development Control during the current financial year. The report covered 3 areas of highway operations where changes to existing policies were required:

- Changes to the membership of the Local Access Forum (LAF),
- Prioritisation of Definitive Map investigations and charges for highway development control agreements. Policies relating to Public Rights of Way were not currently part of the Highway Network Management Policies and Standards document.
- A request to amend the wording relating to Developmental Control charges was proposed by Cabinet on 27th April but needed approval in order to be properly implemented.

An Additional resolution ii) was proposed to reflect the following changes recommended by the Lead Member for Highways and Access:

- in relation to Local Authority membership, agreeing that two County Council Members would be more appropriate than one County Council Member and one District Member. It was confirmed in reply to a question raised that this would not prevent district members from putting forward their points of view.
- that while the PDG when considering the proposals had suggested that in the interest of geographical balance the venues should be extended beyond Cambridge and Ely, in his view even stating 3 locations as currently worded in the report was unnecessarily restrictive.

The point was made that while the report indicated that there were no significant climate change implications, reducing the number of members when calculated over a year would have a positive climate change impact in terms of the reduction in the number of journeys travelling to the forum meetings. Further to this, the general point was made that for meetings generally it was important that only those people who needed to attend were invited and that the meetings should be productive to justify attendance in the first place.

It was resolved:

- i) To reduce the number of members of the Local Access Forum from 22 to 12 and frequency of meetings from 6 to 4 each year (as amended in the detail of Appendix A
- ii) To amend the detail in Appendix A to make clear that the change to the membership should include 2 County Councillors requiring bullet point 6 and 7 in

paragraph 2.6 to be combined to be consistent with paragraph 2.2 and that the detail on locations in Paragraph 2.5 should be amended to delete the number 3 in order to allow greater flexibility regarding the number of venues the meetings could be held at.

- iii) Alter the Statement of Priorities for Definitive Map investigations to better align these to corporate objectives as detailed in Appendix B.
- iv) Amend the wording relating to Highways Developmental Control Charges as detailed in Appendix C.

202. GUIDED BUSWAY UPDATE

This report could not be finalised at the time of the first despatch due to meetings continuing to take place to progress the outstanding issues following the original agenda despatch. The chairman agreed to consider it as an urgent report exercising her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 due to the intense public interest in the delivery of the busway and the need to ensure Cabinet received the latest information to help assist in the Council's attempts to open this key piece of public infrastructure by continuing to apply pressure on the contractor to complete the required works.

Cabinet received the latest update report on the progress being made towards opening of the Cambridge to St Ives section of the busway. The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in introducing the report read out the following statement:

"It is with regret that I have to advise Cabinet that all of the notified defects as reported on the 27th April are still to be addressed and resolved by the contractor Bam Nuttall. Progress if I can call it that is painfully slow, timelines set by the contractor are constantly being ignored, information asked for is not forthcoming, requested programmes for the works to be undertaken once identified have not been received, submissions under the Contractual Design Certification process have not been actioned or received.

Make no mistake these defects may well be showstoppers, we contracted for an asset and we will not be adopting a liability, we require certainty in terms of our ongoing maintenance costs and the long term reliability of the busway.

I have to say I have concerns regarding the ability of Bam Nuttall to deliver as per the specification laid down in the Contract, as they had proved to be unreliable in achieving the timetable for delivery and despite agreements made with them, are demonstrating an attitude to completing the project which I find difficult to understand / comprehend."

As a result of confirmation by officers of the lack of significant progress since the original update report in April and subsequent further update reports and having been assured that Bam Nuttall's technical team project manager and senior managers had been made aware at a number of meetings of the Council's requirements, Cabinet considered that it was necessary to record their continued discontent at the lack of progress by Bam Nuttall Limited (BNL) by agreeing a far more robust resolution than had been set out in the original report, subject to legal advice regarding the final wording to be included.

It was resolved:

- i) to note that while progress was being made towards sectional completion of the busway between Cambridge and St Ives, this progress was slower than had been promised,
- ii) to note that in the absence of a programme from the Contractor for resolving the outstanding issues, no commitment could be made to either a handover date or an opening date and,
- iii) to record Cabinet's ongoing frustration at BNL's management of the project and its failure to address the notified defects within the agreed timescale.

203. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA FOR 5TH JULY 2010

Cabinet noted the draft Cabinet agenda with the following changes since the publication on the current agenda:

The following changes were reported since the agenda was published:

moved to September

Item 10. Cambourne Section 106 Agreement

Item 13. Corporate Risk Register

To be rescheduled to a currently unidentified later meeting

Item 7. Objections to A14 Improvements – Determination of Local Roads Traffic Regulation Orders

Item 15. Great Haddon Planning Consultation taken off agenda

The reason for this moving was that it was unlikely that the submitted planning application would be determined during the current calendar year and that a significant amount of work was needed on the planning application before it could be considered by Peterborough City Council's Planning Committee. The Deputy Leader asked officers to ensure that they kept Members informed on progress.

GORDON JEYES

Although not present at the meeting, as it would have been his last Cabinet meeting before leaving the authority, the Chairman and Cabinet Members wished to place on record their appreciation of the Executive Director: Children and Young People's sterling work for the children and young people in the county during his time with the Council.

Chairman
5TH July 2010

Appendix 1

Statement to the petition presented to the Cambridgeshire County Council Cabinet, 15th June, 2010-06-16

This petition reflects the genuine and legitimate concerns of residents who live in Arbury, Cambridge, to the north of Gilbert Road, an area that includes Roseford Road, Perse Way, and streets of Perse Way.

These residents believe that the proposed traffic calming measures associated with the Gilbert Road cycle lane recommendation could have a very detrimental effect on their environment and residential amenity due to the displacement of traffic through Roseford Road, Perse Way, and then Metcalfe Road and Courtney Way, if the proposed traffic calming measures were agreed. A significant number of motorists using Histon Road as their access to and from Cambridge who wish to get to and from Milton Road, would potentially use this route to avoid much of a traffic-calmed Gilbert Road.

Residents of the Roseford Road/Perse Way area expressed their concerns to me back in January, and I wrote to all County Council Cabinet members on the 10th February, prior to the February Cabinet meeting. A section of that letter outlined the concerns about the potential impact on the wider area regarding the traffic calming proposals. Given that the Cabinet deferred a decision on the Gilbert Road scheme back in February, and given the concerns expressed to Cabinet members over the potential impact of the traffic calming measures back in February, there is genuine surprise that the opportunity was not taken for an impact assessment on the wider area to be undertaken. That is why 278 residents of the area concerned signed this petition.

The traffic calming proposals are substantial – 4 raised table junctions and 10 pairs of speed cushions along the length of Gilbert Road. I have met with surveyors, engineers and planners who live in the Roseford Road/Perse Way area who are amazed at the absence of any impact assessment on the wider area. All this petition asks for is that a traffic modelling analysis or impact assessment is undertaken before the Gilbert Road scheme is agreed. Such an analysis may reveal more sustainable, alternative solutions to the ‘hard’ traffic calming measures proposed.

The County Council is already trialling a 20 mph zone in the area within the Cambridge inner ring road and also has a 20 mph trial in Wulfstan Way where no additional calming features are required and only signage changes are installed. Elsewhere, innovative councils such as Portsmouth have introduced 20 mph sectors. These sectors include cycle routes but no ‘hard’ traffic calming measures are required. According to the report (1), funding from the Cycling Town initiative of £3.6 million is available to April, 2011, a further £210,000 secured, and further funding likely (2). £300,000 of the Gilbert Road scheme budget is from the Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan (3) – as far as I can tell from the report this is not time-limited.

Therefore, rather than make a decision under pressure from time constraints, it seems there is an opportunity to make the right decision based on a proper impact assessment and an analysis of alternatives for Gilbert Road and the wider area.

Mike Todd-Jones

Cambridge Cycling Campaign Response to Petition

Cambridge Cycling Campaign 1100 members are ordinary cyclists using their bicycles mainly for ordinary day to day local journeys. And promote cycling by working co-operatively with local authorities all the major political parties local residential associations and a wide range of other bodies to improve local conditions for cyclists. Our approach is non-confrontational and we believe responsible. We strongly advocate legal, responsible cycling and ask Cabinet not to agree to the postponement of the Gilbert Road proposals requested in this new petition. Our reasons for suggesting that postponement would not be appropriate are as follows:

The proposed traffic-calming on Gilbert Road would not in our opinion displace significant amounts of traffic onto adjacent roads.

The intention of the Gilbert Road measures is to improve conditions for cycling and by doing this to encourage more people to choose to use their bicycles for local journeys and to leave their cars at home. We know from the marked reduction in traffic in the school holidays that local traffic problems are often caused by parents taking their children to school by car. At present many parents are fearful about their children cycling on Gilbert Road and we have reason to believe that more children will go to the many schools along Gilbert Road by bicycle rather than in their parents' cars if the proposals are implemented.

Another factor is that traffic displacement would only be expected where there are easy alternatives for traffic to be displaced to. The roads where the signatories of this petition live do not offer easy alternatives to Gilbert Road (particularly because Carlton Way is already traffic calmed using more severe traffic-calming measures than those proposed for Gilbert Road).

Again modern traffic calming is not so severe that traffic is seriously impeded or penalised. The traffic calming planned for Gilbert Road is likely to be similar to that in Cromwell Road where traffic is slowed down but journey times are not much increased. For all these reasons significant traffic displacement is most unlikely.

The potentially very serious consequences of any further postponement.

In our opinion this issue could and should have been raised at an earlier stage when extensive local consultations were held. It is now too late to agree to further delay. The County Council Officer report to Cabinet sets out very clearly the threat to the Gilbert Road proposals and the probable loss of funding that could result from any further postponement.

The availability of alternative measures to deal with the petitioners' possible future traffic problems.

Our suggestion is that the Gilbert Road proposals be implemented and that, both before and after the road works are carried out to implement the scheme, careful traffic monitoring of adjacent areas (including the area in which the signatories live) be carried out (preferably funded by Cycling England) to assess whether significant traffic displacement or other traffic problems do occur as a result of the Gilbert Road scheme. In the unlikely situation that displacement does occur, even greater efforts could then be made to encourage yet more people, especially schoolchildren, to cycle or walk rather than go by car on local journeys. Other measures focussed on the particular situation in the streets in question could also then be given careful consideration.

James Woodburn on behalf of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

CABINET RESPONSE TO : MEMBER LED REVIEW – GETTING MAXIMUM VALUE FOR MONEY IN PROCURING GOODS SERVICES AND WORKS

LEADERSHIP

RECOMMENDATION 1: SENIOR OFFICER AND MEMBER OWNERSHIP

Strategic contract management arrangements should be bolstered through the establishment of a senior officer contract board and a Member panel.

Who: Chief Executive / Council
When September 2010

Agreed Response

In terms of an officer group involving leads from each Service the recommendation is agreed and the group will be set up to work as the Risk Group does, i.e. membership will be at Director and Head of Service level supported by procurement and other professionals as appropriate. Action by 1st October 2010.

In terms of establishing a Members panel, it is proposed that further discussions are required to clarify the remit of this group and its constitutional position. Currently for major business activities separate groups, including members, are established and decisions are made at Cabinet level (unless specific delegations have been agreed). Issue to be clarified by 31st July 2010.

RECOMMENDATION 2: HEAD OF PROFESSION

A Head of Profession for Procurement should be recruited as a priority. The Head of Profession should be mandated by Cabinet and Strategic Management Team to lead on all procurement activity. This will include:

- Devising and Implementing a Procurement Strategy
- Ensuring the Head of Profession is required to sign off procurement activities exceeding a specified value (to be determined)
- Ensuring the Head of Profession devises and regulates use of all procurement policies and procedures

WHO: Cabinet / SMT / Head of Profession
When: September 2010

Agreed Response

The post was established as part of the 2009/10 corporate restructuring and recruitment has been held pending the results of the member led review. The recommendation is therefore agreed with recruitment taking place within the context of the Local Government Shared Service Initiative. Action, postholder should be in place no later than 1st January 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 3: COLLABORATIVE PROCUREMENT

The Council's Procurement Strategy should ensure that collaborative procurement takes place unless there are compelling reasons not to. This should include reference to opportunities to collaborate with:

- ESPO
- Local partners, particularly through Making Cambridgeshire Count
- Improvement East

WHO: Cabinet / SMT

WHEN: September 2010

Proposed Response

The majority (although not all) of the Council's procurement spend takes place within collaborative arrangements, the most notable partners being Eastern Shire Purchasing Organisation (ESPO), Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust (PCT), and where appropriate Northamptonshire County Council and other local public bodies. The recommendation to extend this approach to be the "default" position is therefore accepted. Action to be undertaken on a rolling basis as contracts come up for renewal from 1st July 2010.

SKILLS DEPLOYMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

RECOMMENDATION 4: CATEGORY MANAGEMENT

The Council should introduce a category management procurement model, funded by rationalising existing procurement resources or through use of the Invest to Transform Fund.

WHO: Corporate Director: Finance, Property and Performance

When: September 2010

Agreed Response

Operationally the Authority has a partial category response to procurement and contracting e.g. buildings and works is led by experts within Property Commissioning, highways maintenance and projects is led by experts in Highways and access, however the central procurement team has and still adopts generic advisory roles. The recommendation to develop category knowledge and expertise in the central procurement is accepted and this is the approach which has been assumed within the Local Government Shared Service Model. Action by 1st October 2010.

RECOMMENDATION 5: SHARED SERVICES

- A. The Council should ensure that the new shared service organisation develops a category management model encompassing procurement across all Council services.
- B. The Shared Service organisation should develop an action plan to address the issues within this report as a matter of priority.

Who: Cabinet

When: Action Plan to be developed within 6 months of the commencement of the operation of the new Shared Services Organisation

Agreed Response

- A. The recommendation aligns with the draft procurement policy that has been produced for Local Government Shared Services.
- B. The Shared Service organisation will be mandated to address the issues and adhere to the timetable set out in this report (through the proposed Joint Committee arrangements).

RECOMMENDATION 6: PROCUREMENT PROFESSIONALISM

The Council should seek to expand the pool of procurement expertise within the organisation through.

- Providing procurement leads with the opportunity to attain professional procurement qualifications
- Ensuring that there is an expectation that new recruits with significant procurement responsibilities hold professional procurement qualifications
- Ensuring that officers exercising regular procurement roles (such as contract management) are required to attend appropriate training and development sessions
- Providing 'commercial awareness training' for officers regularly engaged in managing supplier performance

WHO: Executive and Corporate Directors

WHEN: Ongoing

Agreed Response

The recommendation is agreed. In line with the approach taken in other areas e.g. finance, the requirement to hold a professional procurement qualification will become an essential requirement for new recruits to the central procurement team. Current post holders will be encouraged and supported to gain such a qualification (if they currently do not hold it). For other officers involved in procurement and contracting activity appropriate seminars will be held as part of a general programme of professional development event. Action, rolling from 1st October 2010.

RECOMMENDATION 7 – INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

The performance of officers with significant procurement responsibilities should be systematically reviewed through the appraisal process.

WHO: Executive and Corporate Directors

WHEN: In accordance with Appraisal Corporate Guidance

Agreed Response

The recommendation is agreed. In practice if roles have procurement responsibility and / or significant procurement activities are in train, the suggested review should already be happening as part of the Individual Performance Review process. However appropriate reminders will be sent. Action from 1st July 2010 (as new reviews are carried out).

RECOMMENDATION 8: SHARED LEARNING

The Council should seek to enhance the ability of procurement professionals to share learning and exchange information through.

- The establishment of a procurement group for procurement leads
- The establishment of a centrally held database cataloguing lessons learned from procurement activities

WHO: Head of Profession

WHEN: December 2010

Agreed Response

A Cambridgeshire wide procurement group already exists but can be refreshed in the light of this report. A Cambridgeshire County Council procurement group did exist but ceased to meet approximately a year ago. The group will be relaunched and revitalised. As part of proposed improvements to the Oracle E.Business Suite and as part of the introduction of the “Compete For” tender portal, a database of tenders and contracting activity and learning will be formed. Action on reforming group by 1st October 2010. Action on system and database improvements, rolling from 1st October 2010.

SYSTEMS AND PROCESSES

RECOMMENDATION 9: MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

The Council should adopt processes that enable the collection of data about the overall performance of the Council’s procurement functions so that it can inform decision making.

Who: Head of Profession

When: December 2010

Agreed Response

The recommendation is agreed. Work is in train to ensure that the E.Business suite is used for all requisitioning, ordering, acquittal and payment activity will produce a rich database on customer, supplier activity volumes and values. Action rolling from 1st October 2010.

RECOMMENDATION 10: PROCUREMENT TRANSACTIONS

A clearer policy on the appropriate and most efficient transaction process for staff to use for different purchase categories should be communicated. A two-year target to be established for the increased take up of purchase cards and SSP and a target for a reduction in the use of certification slips.

Who: Cabinet / SMT

When: Target set by September 2010 and achieved by September 2012

Agreed Response

The recommendation is agreed. Work is in train to ensure that the E.Business suite is used as originally intended, i.e. that all purchasing transactions are electronic and completed within the system with an expected target of 100% compliance over time. Targets for this and there issuing of mandatory directions around the use of purchase cards will be issued. Action from 1st October 2010, to be completed no later than 30th September 2012.

RECOMMENDATION 11: COMPLIANCE

New incentives for compliance should be investigated and implemented. For example simpler and quicker processes, charges from budget holder cost centres for consistently not complying to procedures, and charges per certification slip transacted. Procedures for systematic monitoring of non contract spend should be implemented.

Who Cabinet /SMT

When: Measures implemented by April 2011

Agreed Response

The recommendation is agreed. Linked with the response set out for 10 above it is proposed that orders will only be placed and payments will only be made if the E.Business suite has been used and mandated, i.e. no “work arounds” will be tolerated or supported, obviating the need for penalties. During the period of transition, compliance reports will continue to be produced (as it the case now).