

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 19th December 2006

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 11.40 a.m.

Present: J E Reynolds, (Chairman)

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

Also in Attendance

Councillors: *G Griffiths, *G Kenney, A Kent, *T Orgee, *M Smith, and J West.

* for part of the meeting only

Apologies: Councillors V H Lucas and J K Walters

278. MINUTES 5th DECEMBER 2006

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5th December 2006 were approved as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

279. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Cllr Tuck declared a personal interest in item 6 as the Chairman of the Interim Queen's School Governing Body.

Cllr Oliver declared a personal interest in item 10 as an appointed governor to Papworth Hospital.

Cllr Johnstone declared a prejudicial interest in item 10 as a Non Executive Director at Addenbrooke's Hospital - Cllr Johnstone left the meeting during its discussion.

280. PETITIONS - SUPPORT AND FUNDING FOR A GILBERT ROAD SCHEME

Cabinet received details of a petition organised by Cambridgeshire Cycling Campaign with 220 signatures asking it to accept the advice of the Cambridge City Traffic Management Area Joint Committee who at their meeting on 16th October 2006 had unanimously agreed "to urge the County's Cabinet to continue its support and funding for a Gilbert Road scheme and to the retention of agreed funding already allocated which would permit the necessary additional work to achieve a viable and deliverable safety scheme to reduce the high rate of cycle casualties along this road (ten injury accidents over the past three years)". The action requested also had

the support of the Principal of Chesterton College and the Leader of the City Council. A statement was read out in support of the petition by James Woodburn which was also tabled as a hard copy for the Members of Cabinet. (Attached as an appendix to these Minutes)

Following the presentation, a number of questions were raised for which the following replies were received:

- The route distance referred to was approximately half a mile and was very difficult/intimidating for cyclists.
- The four schools referred to as being in the vicinity around Gilbert Road were Chesterton Community College, the Castle Special School and the Milton Road primary school in Ascham Road and the further primary school (Arbury Primary) on Carlton Way off at the north-end of the road.

With the agreement of the Cabinet agenda Item 8 titled "Accident Remedies and Traffic Management Programme Medium Sized Schemes" which made reference to the above scheme was moved up the agenda and taken next.

281 ACCIDENT REMEDIES AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME MEDIUM SIZED SCHEMES

Cabinet received the above report reviewing progress on the medium sized traffic and safety schemes programmed for 2006/07; and which requested the members should determine the relative priority of schemes for the 2007/2008 programme. The schemes had been set out in priority order after having been assessed via a thorough points scoring system as having the highest effectiveness rating.

Reference was made to the highest priority being the proposal for Average Speed Cameras being positioned at Forty Foot, Benwick to address the very dangerous stretch of road where there had been 13 injury accidents in the last three years as well as a number of tragic fatalities.

The local member for West Chesterton who had requested to speak, supported both the proposals for improved lighting measure proposed for Gilbert Road, the requirement for further traffic safety measures due to the close proximity of the road to a number of schools and the need to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. He requested that officers should continue to consult with teachers, parents and local residents in order that an agreed scheme could eventually go forward to the Area Joint Committee for approval. Written representations had also been received from the elected member for Arbury, a neighbouring division, which were orally reported confirming local residents were in favour of the proposed street lighting improvements, and wished to see further safety improvements on Gilbert Road.

One of the local members for Sawston spoke in support of the proposed A1301 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford speed management measures as detailed in the officer's report.

A member raised the issue of whether the Home to School Transport costs in respect of the Melbourn Village College to Shepreth route, which had been declared unsafe at an Education Transport Appeal earlier in the year, had been taken into account when ranking its priority. In reply, it was confirmed that all issues had been looked at, but that unfortunately benefits identified through the joined up approach to the delivery of this scheme were insufficient to enable the scheme to be moved far enough up the priority list to attract funding within the projected financial limits.

Cabinet considered the views expressed for supporting the need for a safety scheme for pedestrian and cyclists in and around Gilbert Road. However as only limited funding was available and there were always many more schemes included for consideration than there was available funding, Cabinet endorsed the recommended traffic management and safety schemes set out in the officer's report. To both those lobbying for a safety scheme for Gilbert Road, and also in response to queries concerning the reinstatement of the Murrow Bank, Murrow improvement (following completion of the Anglian Water Authority mains sewerage works), assurances were given that the schemes would not be lost, but funding would be reallocated in future years, as part of a continuous rolling programme.

It was resolved:

- i) To note progress on programme delivery as set out in the Officer's report
- ii) To approve the priority order of medium sized schemes as set out in Appendix A to the officer's report;
- iii) Approve the commencement of design and consultation on schemes 1 to 3 as follows:
 - Forty Foot Bank
 - Newmarket Road - Coldhams Lane Junction
 - 3) A141 Broughton Turn

Cabinet also agreed to approve initial design and consultation work on the following five schemes:

- A1301 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford
- Pidley Village Traffic calming
- A10 Slap Up Junction - Accident Remedial
- A603, C201 Granchester Road roundabout, Barton
- B1042 Croydon Accident Remedial

- iv) It was confirmed that schemes such as any future agreed safety improvements programme for Gilbert Road and, the deferred Murrow Bank, Murrow Improvement project (following the completion of works by Anglian Water Authority), would not be lost but would come forward at the appropriate time.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

As there were a number of people/councillors who had requested to speak on the 1198 Papworth Traffic Calming Measures report it was agreed that it should be moved up the agenda and considered as the next item of business.

282. A1198 PAPWORTH TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

Cabinet received a report to consider the decision by the South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee (AJC) to:

- Support a 20 mph speed limit in the central core area of Papworth Everard on the existing A1198 (along Ermine Street North, from Varrier Jones Drive to the traffic lights at Church Lane extending from Ermine Street North up Varrier Jones Drive to the primary school); and
- Apply to the Department of Transport (DfT) for authorisation for average speed camera signs on A1198, and failing that, other signs as appropriate.

The decisions by the AJC set out above, had been taken following amendments to the report recommendations tabled at the AJC meeting. The amendment supporting an additional reduction in the speed limit from 30 mph to 20 mph in the central core area, had been agreed by the AJC contrary to County Council officer advice given at the meeting. The officer's advice was that the County Council policy for 20 mph speed limits required them to be self-enforcing, as the Police would not undertake enforcement of such speed limits. Based on previous experience, County Council officers had advised the AJC that the proposed measures were not expected to achieve this level of speed reduction and that any 20 mph speed limit would not be self-enforcing. As a result, the decision of the AJC required final determination by the County Council's Cabinet.

A further amendment to the report recommendations tabled and agreed at the AJC had called for the provision of average speed camera signs on the A1198, without the presence of camera enforcement. County Council officers had advised that any such signs would require Department of Transport authorisation, and this would only be granted at sites where average speed cameras were in operation. The County Council's officers' view was that to apply for enforcement signs without the use of camera enforcement was totally inappropriate and a poor use of officer time and limited Council resources.

Again as the AJC had made a decision that the officers could not support, the decision had been referred to Cabinet for determination.

Representations were received and tabled from Papworth Everard Parish Council, as well as from the local member supporting the proposals agreed at the AJC meeting. They believed that without such measures to reduce the speed of motorists travelling through Papworth, the bypass would be ineffective.

The main issues highlighted by Councillor Paul Hicks speaking as the Papworth Everard Parish Council representative on why a 20 mph policy was relevant to the central area of Papworth Everard included:

- a) That the main road split the village in half, with one half of the village having to cross the main road from the east side to access the new village primary school along Varrier-Jones Drive on the west side (the primary school being part of CCC's safer routes to school programme (SRTS));
- b) the old school still existed in the central area in the form of the Cambridgeshire Instrumental Music Academy and fronted on to and was accessed from the main road;
- c) Pendragon pre-school (2-4 year-olds) was located adjacent to the Music Academy and also fronted on to and could only be accessed from the main road; and
- d) there was an exceptionally high use by special needs people, many in wheelchairs, living in the village crossing from accommodation on the west side of the main road to the shops, doctor's surgery, library, coffee shop etc. on the east side.

It was highlighted that a consultation leaflet produced by the County Council had omitted reference to the option for a 20 mph limit following early police objections. It was reported that following a meeting held with the police the previous Friday, the police position had changed, with them now having a fuller understanding of the reasons (supported in the Parish Council's view by information in DfT circular 01/2006 regarding speed management policies which they said encouraged and supported 20 mph zones and DfT Traffic Advisory Leaflet 09/99 which included a statement that with new road layouts where suitable features could be included in the design, the preference was for 20 mph zones) why residents wished to have the lower speed limit. The Cabinet meeting was informed that the police were no longer objecting to a 20 mph limit on streets either side, but were still not supporting a reduced speed limit in the main street, central core area.

The Parish Council's view was that as a result of 21 traffic calming features the 20 mph zone would be self-enforcing. They also indicated that they had set aside £20,000 for further give way signs and therefore any reduction of the speed limit in this case would be cost neutral to the County Council. The local

member for Papworth and Swavesey spoke at the meeting in support of the proposals.

In order to be able to consider the issues raised by the Parish Council and local members in more detail, officers tabled revised recommendations recommending that a further report be received at a later meeting. It was reported that the officers were reviewing the speed limit policy of the County Council in light of Circular 01/06 to assess the implications and whether any changes were required.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve the advertisement of the original proposed 30mph speed limit.
- ii) To note the decision of the South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee to request a 20mph speed limit for the central core area in Papworth Everard, and to ask officers to report back to Cabinet at its late February meeting on all the implications associated with this request.
- iii) Not to support an application to the Department for Transport (DfT) for authorisation of average speed camera signs on the A1198.

283. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

None.

284. BUDGET REPORT – MEDIUM TERM CORPORATE PRIORITIES (MTCP) 2007/08 –2009/10 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET OPTIONS

Cabinet received a report setting out the options for a balanced revenue and capital budget for the 3 year period 2007/08 – 2009/10 that delivered the Authority's key corporate objectives and that would be considered in detail in January and proposed to Council in February.

In terms of available funding, the report provided details of the recent provisional revenue grant settlement and specific grant notifications (where they had been released) and suggested a prudent view of other income and receipts including asset sales.

In terms of costs, efficiencies and savings, the report took into account the work that had taken place in the last four months and which culminated with the Budget Advisory Panel presentations in November. When considering the options set out, Cabinet noted that the grant settlement for 2007/08 was provisional (though it was considered unlikely that it would change) and a

clearer view on longer-term Government funding would only follow the publication of the findings of the Comprehensive Spending Review.

In particular Cabinet's view was requested to provide a steer in respect of the;

- The rate of Council Tax increase required for the next three years.
- The revenue cash limits to be set for each Office

Cabinet's view was also sought on the emerging Capital and Invest to Transform programs as set out in the report and its support requested for making representations to Government in respect of the provisional settlement.

Cabinet noted that:

- the provisional settlement confirmed the level of grant for 2007/08, originally notified last year i.e. £96.012m.
- There were no changes to the grant formula despite the particular pressures associated with waste for all authorities and the growth agenda for several authorities including Cambridgeshire.
- As the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) was not due to report until the Summer, there was no indication of Government funding levels for 2008/09 and 2009/10, making true medium term planning difficult,
- The result of the in-depth review of demand and costs had confirmed the view that local inflation pressures were running at twice Government expected levels (i.e. 4% plus), whilst demand and demography were running at three times Government expected levels (i.e. also at 4% plus).
- The management of inflation and demand would be more pronounced in future years but even taking account of these actions the cost pressures on the authority are significant.
- As a result of the review of inflation and demography, there were considerable differences in the rate of cash limit increases for the Offices (i.e. in 2007/08 OCYPS plus 8.4%, OECS plus 5.8% and OCS plus 0.4%).
- That as a minimum it was recommended that 2.5% cash releasing efficiencies would be required in each year of the planning period with no impact on services. It was also noted that this target might rise to 3% following the CSR. In addition a further decrease in costs in the order of 1% was required each year to deliver a balanced budget alongside further savings to meet any further Office pressures.
- The detail of the efficiency and savings proposals as presented to the November Budget Advisory Panels remained essentially unaltered.

- That several major developments (waste, street lighting and Building Schools for the Future) were currently being progressed that would impact mainly at the end of the planning period. It was proposed that until the scale and timing of the investments became known, that funding was added to the general reserve at a rate of 0.25% of turnover to provide a measured contingency fund.
- In view of the uncertainties surrounding the CSR and the relatively low council tax level of the Authority, officers proposed a council tax increase 5% increase in each of the three years. In addition, until the outcome of the CSR became known the additional funding in the second and third year arising from the higher levels of council tax increase should be taken to reserve.
- Invest to Transform proposals would be produced for consideration at the January Cabinet meeting reflecting the priorities of improving and modernising services and delivering operational savings. Details were provided of the sums available for investment.
- Capital proposals and priorities would be produced for consideration in January reflecting the priorities of improving and developing services and where possible offering operational savings.
- Due to changes in the grant formula, the costs of supported borrowing were no longer funded pound for pound in the grant settlement. As a result, when calculating the level of available borrowing it was proposed that a discount of 1.6% was applied to the notified limits.
- The public consultation exercise on budget options being undertaken in early January would be reported back to the January Cabinet meeting.

Cabinet members commented/noted:

- That in respect of efficiency savings officers should ensure that those taken at source before the Council received funding e.g. Connexions monies were not then double counted as savings still required to be made.
- Efficiency saving could not be sustained indefinitely and were likely to result in diminishing returns in future years.
- The need to recognise that many of the services provided to children and older people were demand led and therefore their budgets could find it very difficult to make the appropriate efficiency savings. This needed to be drawn to Government's attention.
- A zero based budget for selected high priority budgets within CYPS (and also ECS) would be undertaken from the beginning of 08/09.

- It was announced that the Department of Transport had commended the County Council's delivery of the County Council's existing Transport Plan and also the detail of the future plan to 2011 and this would result in total additional funding for the implementation of the plans equivalent to an increase of 25% resources. The officers were commended for this exceptional effort.

At the current time the approval of Council would be inappropriate and an amendment was agreed to the main recommendation. In addition recommendation v) was amended, as the Leader of the Council would not be back from leave in time to agree the final wording of the representations letter to meet the Government deadline for representations.

It was resolved to agree:

- i) To support the revenue funding assumptions set out in Section 2 of the officer's report and in particular:
 - a) the recommended revised Council Tax Rate exemplification set out in Section 2.4.7 of a Council Tax rate of 5% increase for each of the next three years and that the gains should be transferred to general reserves to protect against Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CSR) uncertainties and protect key developments.
 - b) Until the exact scale of the investments was known that funding of 0.25% of turnover should be added to the general reserve to provide a measured contingency fund.
- ii) The overall cash limits proposed in Section 3 of the officer's report and as set out as an appendix to these minutes taking account of the savings proposals set out in Section 3.8 of the officer's report.
- iii) The overall approach to the use of the Invest to Transform reserve as set out in Section 4 of the officer's report including:
 - a) Sums available to draw on for the planning period were set out as follows:
 - 2007/08 £1290,000
 - 2008/09 £3253,000
 - 2009/10 £4,869,000
 - b) Invest to Transform Office allocations
 - OCYPS £200,000
 - OECS £400,000
 - OCS £75,000
 - c) that the threshold for bids to be considered and prioritised at Office level without the need for Cabinet approval be set at under £100,000 to be funded from the specific Office allocations

- iv) The overall approach to capital resourcing and investment as set out in Sections 5 and 6 of the officer's report and the abatement of 1.6% in capital spend due to the change in last year's grant formula.
- v) That representations should be made to Government on the provisional settlement (in respect of the basic grant not taking into account specific pressures arising from Government policy e.g. issues around the waste block, growth etc and not being robust enough in respect of managed demand and inflation) with agreement to the final wording of the letter being delegated for approval to the Deputy Leader in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Office of Corporate Services.

285. SECONDARY SCHOOL PROVISION IN WISBECH – THE QUEEN'S SCHOOL

Cabinet received a report providing feedback from the wide-ranging consultation undertaken in respect of proposed changes to the organisation of secondary education provision in Wisbech. This followed from the actions agreed at the 26th September Cabinet meeting:

- To endorse the urgent action to be taken in order to ensure suitable arrangements were in place by September 2007 at the latest to secure strong secondary educational provision in Wisbech.
- That consultation be undertaken.
- To endorse proposals for applications be made to join the Government's Fresh Start initiative and for approval not to have to enter into a competition to provide any new school established in place of The Queen's School.

Cabinet noted:

- that whilst some positive support was received in response to the option of establishing a voluntary aided church school, the clear majority of respondents favoured the establishment of a Foundation secondary school with Trust status in Wisbech in place of The Queen's School. This was considered the best option for the future provision of secondary education in Wisbech.
- The excellent news that the Government had accepted Fenland in Wave Four of Building Schools for the Future and as a result, it would be possible to provide a high quality environment for students in Wisbech and Fenland.
- That student and parents perceptions of the school had changed positively since the County Council's intervention in the school and the appointment of an interim head teacher and board of governors.
- That to achieve the change, the Authority was required to publish joint proposals with the primary lead partner in the Trust, the College of West Anglia (COWA) in the form of a public notice setting out the Authority's

intention to close The Queen's School on 31 August 2007, and the Trust's intention to open a new 11-16 Foundation Trust non-denominational, non-selective school on 1 September 2007 on the site of the current school. The proposal included provision of on-site post-16 provision in partnership with COWA.

The Cabinet Member for CYPS paid tribute to all the hard work undertaken by the officers involved in achieving the present improvement in standards.

It was resolved:

To confirm the Council's support for the publication of statutory public notices detailing proposals to:

- i) Close The Queen's School Wisbech on 31 August 2007; and
- ii) Establish an 11-16 Foundation Trust non-denominational, non-selective school with co-located post-16 provision in partnership with the College of West Anglia (COWA) within the Government's Fresh Start Programme on 1 September 2007 on the site currently occupied by The Queen's School.

286. SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT WITH HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Cabinet received a report setting out the benefits of securing agreement to a Service Level Agreement (SLA) being established with Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) to continue to provide specific highway related services to the County Council.

It was resolved:

To agree to the Service Level Agreement being established with Huntingdonshire District Council as detailed in the officer's report.

287. CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON ADDENBROOKE'S 2020 PLANNING APPLICATION

The Cabinet received details of the planning application submitted on the 25th October 2006 by Countryside Properties, Liberty Property Trust and Cambridge University Hospitals Foundation National Health Service (NHS) Trust and the Pemberton Trustees for the development of land south and west of the existing Addenbrooke's Campus, to Cambridge City Council.

The County Council was a statutory consultee and the report of the officers set out the reasons the County Council should object to the planning application, as set out in Appendix A to the report.

The two local members also supported the proposed County Council response. The local member for Trumpington commented that as the site would be better served by public transport than almost any other site in Cambridge, there was no need for the current planned level of parking. She was also of the view that there was no need for the Plan to provide initial spaces with a view to reducing their level over time, as these were in relation to new occupants who did not currently have car based travel patterns.

The Member for Queen Edith's Division provided comments which were tabled at the meeting highlighting that over 15 roads in the division already suffered the consequences of overflow parking from people avoiding using the chargeable car parking provided on the Addenbrooke's site. He was against any increased car parking provision being provided and highlighted the need for enhanced public transport from the Papworth catchment area to avoid people having to travel by car. He also highlighted the need for improved local facilities e.g. shops, to help properly cater for such a large new development.

Cabinet commented/noted:

- That in respect of whether there would be the timely generation of sufficient monies from Section 106 agreements to ensure the appropriate required level of funding for the growth agenda, officers had responded indicating that a report would be coming forward in the new year on integration issues and the release of necessary funding.
- One member urged caution when calling for less parking provision to recognise that not everyone was able to travel on public transport.

It was resolved to:

- i) Approve the County Council's consultation response to the Addenbrooke's 2020 Planning Application as set out in appendix A to the officer's report.
- ii) Agree to delegate to the Lead Member, Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services the authority to make any minor textual changes to the consultation response prior to submission.

288. STANDING ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION (SACRE) REVIEW OF SCHOOL SYLLABUS

Cabinet noted that by law each local authority was required to review its "Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education" every five years. Although the Agreed Syllabus was due to be reviewed by 2007, due to the retirement of the Religious Education (RE) adviser in August 2006 it had been decided to review the syllabus slightly earlier, so that the work did not fall entirely on a new adviser. Cambridgeshire SACRE had therefore instituted a review and in November 2006 had convened a conference to help complete the task.

Cabinet received details of the review undertaken and the recommendations brought forward. The chairman of the review made the point that in addition to the new syllabus, appropriate support materials including INSET activity would be required for schools with one Religious Education (RE) teacher to ensure that quality provision was provided.

It was resolved:

To agree to the adoption of the revised syllabus for religious education, as unanimously recommended by SACRE.

289. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Cabinet received a report detailing the progress on delegations.

It was resolved:

To note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions/take actions on its behalf.

290. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA PLAN 19th DECEMBER 2006

It was resolved:

To note the agenda plan as set out on the agenda and the additions orally reported

Chairman
23rd January 2007