

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 15<sup>th</sup> January 2009

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 11.47 a.m.

**Present:** Councillor J M Tuck Chairman

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

**Apologies:** Councillors

Also in Attendance

Councillors: n Harrison G Kenney, P Downes, D Jenkins and T Orgee.

### **691. MINUTES 16<sup>nd</sup> DECEMBER 2008**

That subject to the following amendment the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2008 were approved as a correct record:

Deletion of Councillor Harty being recorded as being present and insertion of him recorded as having given his apologies.

### **692. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

The following members declared personal interests under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct.

Councillor J. Reynolds declared a personal interest as the chairman of Renewables East and of the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) with regard to any issues on recycling and to EERA that might appear in reports on the agenda.

Councillor Bradney declared a personal interest in agenda item 7 'Extension of School Age Range - Cottenham Village College' as a school governor at the college.

### **693. PETITIONS.**

None received at the appropriate deadline.

### **694. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

None

## **695. SUPPORT FOR THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR DURING THE ECONOMIC OUTTURN**

Following the request via a motion agreed by the Council on the 9<sup>th</sup> December to make available an extra £500,000 to the third sector in the short term to complement existing funding, a report was now presented to Cabinet, as agreeing such expenditure came within its remit.

The report followed on from consultation meetings that had taken place with the third sector and partners in order to action the Council resolution. Cabinet were asked to approve additional funding and support across the following three distinct areas:

- 1) A sum of £200,000 spread over the next two years to provide additional capacity and coverage to help support people in staying in their employment and homes through additional advice and information services. It was reported that discussions had taken place with representatives of Advice for Life and Citizens Advice Bureau who had undertaken a mapping exercise identifying gaps in service provision. They had been asked to submit a proposal that utilised the proposed additional funding in order to address the gaps via a service level agreement.
- 2) A sum of £100,000 to help provide rent free space and technical support for 2009/10. Work had begun on developing criteria for allocating this support.
- 3) A sum of £200,000 to provide extra support in poorly served areas.

An oral update at the Cabinet meeting provided details of the draft service level agreement to be spread over 14 months, which had been agreed verbally with providers that morning. This included that:

- The employment advice would be provided by a full time worker employed by Advice for Life for 12 months from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 to be part funded by the County and match funded by the City Council at a total cost of £60,000. It was estimated that there could be in the region of 286 clients.
- The remaining £170,000 was still the subject of negotiations in order that the cost could be shared between the five local authority areas to fund CAB debt and benefits advice at a cost of £34k each, in order to be able to start work from February 2009. It was estimated that the debt advisor would have in the region of 420 clients. Currently only South Cambridgeshire District Council had not been in a position made a firm commitment.

Cabinet Members asked to be provided with details of the SLA when finally agreed.

It was noted that the agreed monitoring of the contract would be via a quarterly update report. Measures to be taken into account in order to assess the impact of the advice provided would include how many homes were saved from repossession and how many jobs were saved. These outputs would be measured in consultation with partners. Cabinet requested to also be updated on progress on a regular basis with a first report back within two to three months. A report was also to be presented to the March Adults and Communities PDG.

It was reported that Cambridgeshire Together were monitoring the impact of the credit crunch on the voluntary sector and now included a standing item on their agenda on the state of the economy, to ensure actions agreed were being taken forward and also to be ready to consider any further actions that might be required.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To approve making extra funding to the value of £500,000 in cash or kind available to the third sector as proposed by the Council.
- ii) To delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities to agree the distribution of the £200,000 aimed at preventing residents losing their jobs or homes (with up to £100,000 being committed before 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009).
- iii) To delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities to agree the distribution of funds for voluntary sector rental holidays, rent free space and technical support to the value of £100,000.
- iv) To delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities to agree the distribution of funds to develop the voluntary sector in areas of need to the value of £200,000.
- v) To endorse the approach being taken by officers in ensuring that the proposal is taken forward under the Cambridgeshire Together umbrella, as outlined in bullet 2.3. of the report.
- vi) To note from the delegation to the Deputy Chief Executive Environment and Community Services and the Cabinet Member for Communities the intention to enter into a service level agreement (SLA) with Advice for Life and the County's Citizen's Advice Bureaus.
- vii) To receive an update monitoring report on progress to the March or April Cabinet meeting.
- viii) That officers provide outside of the meeting final agreed details of the partner funding proposals to be included in the proposed SLA.

## **696. ALIGNMENT OF COUNTYWIDE AND COUNCIL GOALS**

Cabinet received a report proposing revisions to the wording of the County Council's Strategic Objectives to ensure a robust link between the Cambridgeshire Vision objectives and the Strategic Objectives of the County Council. The revised Strategic Objectives, (and therefore the Improvement Priorities), had been developed to make the alignment with the Countywide Vision clearer. In addition, the link from the overarching vision, through the Council's top level planning and through to team and individual plans would now be clearer as the Integrated Plan developed.

**It was resolved;**

To agree that the re-worded Improvement Priorities and Strategic Objectives (as set out in section 2.3 of the Cabinet report) should be incorporated within the Council's Integrated Plan.

**697. EXTENSION OF SCHOOL AGE RANGE - COTTENHAM VILLAGE COLLEGE**

Cabinet noted that 'The Learning and Skills Act 2000' provided an entitlement to further education and training for young people aged 16-19. The Five Year Strategy for Children and Learners made clear the Government's commitment that every young person should be well equipped for adulthood, undertaking skilled work and further learning. As part of its strategy, the Government had introduced a measure to create more high quality 16-18 places in schools. High performing 11-16 specialist schools that applied for, and were granted a second specialism, were now automatically offered the opportunity to develop proposals to extend their age ranges and open sixth forms.

It was reported that Cottenham Village College had been granted a post-16 presumption because of its proven success in providing high quality education for 11-16 year olds. Approval of proposals for new sixth forms resulting from presumptions would trigger the release of capital funding from Government. Cottenham Village College was expected to receive in the order of £4m to fund its planned 250-place sixth form. The addition of a sixth form at Cottenham Village College would enable the school to provide its students, and those living in the wider area, with a greater choice of post-16 provider.

Attention was drawn to paragraph 3.1 bullet 5 regarding issues on overcapacity which could have an adverse affect impact on existing providers.

One of the Local members for Cottenham, Histon and Impington Councillor Jenkins spoke in support of the recommendations, drawing attention to the fact that Cottenham was a high performing college, achieving 60% passes for 5 GCSE's including Maths and English and had received a good Ofsted report. With regard to the issue of overcapacity, he indicated had asked to see a copy of the review. He made the point that as the intended 6<sup>th</sup> form was to be vocational in its provision, it would therefore complement and not compete with other sixth form colleges. His view was that anything that encouraged borderline students should be supported and applauded. The Cabinet Member for Learning made the point that a presumption of overcapacity which was beneficial to providing flexibility if planned, was not a reason to reject such provision. It was intended to look carefully at the issues and enter into dialogue with various other colleges as their proposals came forward.

The local Member for Willingham while supporting the overall proposals, raised questions which were brought to the attention of Cabinet orally, with the Acting Deputy Chief Executive CYPS providing an oral response which would be followed up by a written response to the local member on the points she had raised. A summary of the question and answers are set out in appendix 1 to these Minutes.

**It was resolved to approve:**

- i) The implementation of the extension of the age range of Cottenham Village College from 11-16 to 11-19 to provide for a total of 250 post-16 students.
- ii) That the proposed extension of the school's age range be effective from September 2011.

**698. INTEGRATED FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – NOVEMBER**

This report provided financial and performance information to assess progress in delivering the Council's Integrated Plan and to agree supplementary actions where required e.g. recommendation ii) above. An addendum to the report had been included in the second despatch papers.

Cabinet was especially please to note particular progress had been made on:

NI 47 (i) People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents

NI 192 Household Waste recycled and composted.

NI 193 Municipal Wasteland filled

NI 130 Social Care clients receiving self directed support.

Reference was made to the need to release £350K from reserves to cover the inflation rise in the cost of street lighting as a result of the steep increase in energy pricing, which could not have been predicted when the budget was originally agreed last February.

The Director of Finance, Property and Performance was asked if he could provide an update in advance of the December update report in respect of financial performance / debt performance as the economic climate continued to rapidly change, as well as any update on the position of any significant trends in Adult Social Care budgets. While the December update would be provided to the next ordinary meeting of Cabinet, the Director was able to confirm that debt expenses were lower than originally predicted with the forecast underspend at the end of the year being in the region of £3m (the treasury management activities of the last two quarters had sustained the benefits of the first two quarters) In response to a query in relation to the Integrated Community Equipment Services budget and the action being taken, it was noted that this was showing a volume and demand overspend, the detail of which would be provided in the December report. The point was made that the Adult Social Care budgets received close scrutiny as a result of regular monitoring reports received at the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the analysis of performance and financial information as set out in the report.
- ii) To agree the release of £350k from the Future Development and Pressures reserve to the Office of Environment and Community Services (OECS), in order to offset the pressure forecast from the

higher than anticipated inflationary rise in energy costs for Street Lighting.

#### **699. SAWSTON TO ABINGTON CYCLEWAY**

Cabinet noted that in 2003 a sum of £100,000 was secured to provide a foot/cycleway from Sawston to Babraham. In 2006 a further £350,000 was secured to contribute to one, or a combination, of the following schemes:

- The remodelling of Hildersham Crossroads;
- The construction of a foot/cycleway along the A1307 between the Gog Magog Roundabout and Fourwentways Roundabout;
- The construction of a foot/cycleway from Sawston to Babraham.

The local member for Linton opposed the report recommendations on the basis that he did not believe there was any business case to support the cycleway and that in his view there was no evidence to show that it would be well used. He contended that cycleway projects did not enjoy the same level of rigour / challenge as was the case with other Council financed projects. He provided background knowledge regarding the long standing local dispute regarding the use to which the section 106 monies should be used, and supported a more substantial remodelling of Hildersham cross roads / improvement to the right hand turn to Hildersham as being the more appropriate priority. If however the Cabinet did wish to approve the report recommendations that the Sawston to Abington foot/cycleway via Babraham should be the first priority for use of the section (s) 106 funding from the Granta Park development then he requested that any residual monies should be used to improve the right hand turn at the crossroads.

The two local councillors for Sawston expressed their support orally at the meeting in favour of the recommendations citing the original intention for the monies secured in 2003 and that it made sense to add the 2006 monies to secure the original project and to complete the link up with existing cycle routes (national cycle network route 11). They also supported that any residual monies should be used to improve the crossroads to help improve safety on the notoriously dangerous A1307. The point was also made that scientists based on Granta Park fully supported the proposals and would make good use of the cycleway.

In coming to a final decision Cabinet noted the views expressed by all the local members and that the proposals in the recommendations had the support of Great Abingdon, Little Abington and Babraham parish councils. Given that £100,000 of the overall funding had to be spent on Sawston to Babraham and that this route was well supported locally, Cabinet agreed with the proposal to add the monies to commence construction of this section of foot/cycleway once the land had been obtained. Completing a route to Abington from Babraham would link Abington to the National Cycle Network and would facilitate more cycle commuting to Granta Park. The point was made that by removing cyclists from busy main roads itself contributed to overall road safety.

On completion of the routes, Cabinet supported that the remaining Section 106 money could be targeted at improvements at Hildersham crossroads, working closely with the Road Safety Engineering Team. Thanks were expressed to the team in respect of the continuing safety improvement works being undertaken on the A1307 between Horseheath and Linton.

In answer to questions raised, officers confirmed that the new cycleway would be built to national standards and that the works would lead to minimum delays to traffic along the route and would not involve road closures, rather there might be the use of temporary traffic lights. It was also confirmed that the works would be carried out only after undertaking a full environmental assessment and that no hedges would be lost.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Confirm the Sawston to Abington foot/cycleway via Babraham as the first priority for use of the section (s) 106 funding from the Granta Park development, and to progress this option to design and construction, including land purchase.
- ii) Support a suitable low cost improvement at Hildersham crossroads, in consultation with the County Council's Road Safety Engineering Team with residual funding from the Granta Park s106 agreement.

## **700. CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL PARKING SERVICES AGREEMENT**

Following a review by officers, Cabinet received a report the current agreement with the City Council in order to assess whether the current arrangement in Cambridge could be operated more efficiently with the potential for Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) to be extended outside Cambridge also having been taken into account.

It was noted that Paragraph 2.5 required an amendment to the words in the fourth line "...first £43,000 (equivalent to 3% of the on street account income at a 2004 base..." should read "the first £100,000".

The local member for Petersfield in speaking against the report recommendations, especially serving notice of termination of the parking services agreement with Cambridge City, urged that Cabinet should defer the report, as she believed that the report did not specify in enough detail how the new contract would operate in Cambridge and was concerned that the quality of enforcement could be compromised. She believed that a thorough business case and risk identification analysis had not been proved from the information included in the report and that no clear reasons had been provided in support of the termination proposal. In terms of her concerns regarding enforcement she made reference to the possibility of any reduction in enforcement having a potentially dangerous consequence in relation to parked vehicles obstructing the free-flow of traffic and the objective of keeping people moving safely.

It was reported that the City Council's unit costs from enforcement and notice processing had been reviewed and compared with those that would result should the County Council undertake the functions in-house. The analysis carried out indicated that a significant annual saving could be made, largely due to the different ways in which each authority accounted for its overheads (up to £200k less any additional costs from relocation from Mill Road depot - although these were not expected to be significant compared to savings that were expected to be made). It was also anticipated that savings could be made under a new enforcement contract with no subsequent reduction in quality or coverage by changing the way in which the IT system for notice processing was procured. There was also the potential for further savings if other districts also joined the scheme.

It was noted that to be cost effective, any extension of CPE to other parts of the county would need to be on the basis of a single notice processing operation based on the current set up. Moving this element of service to the County Council would pave the way for any future expansion of CPE.

It was confirmed that extensive consultations had been undertaken with Cambridge City officers since the previous summer and the relevant Lead Member at the City Council had been made aware of the review process and of the possibility that the County Council could terminate the agreement.

For the reasons set out above, the request to defer by one local member was rejected and the original officer recommendations supported.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Note the informal discussions on extending Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) to outside Cambridge;
- ii) Approve serving notice of termination of the parking services agreement with Cambridge City and to transfer the staff involved to the County Council under the Transfer of Undertaking and Personal Employment rights regulations (TUPE);
- iii) Support negotiations with the City Council on arrangements to provide civil parking enforcement for its off-street car parks; and
- iv) Support preparatory work for the procurement of a new civil enforcement contract for Cambridge, to include options for the inclusion of other districts under any extended CPE scheme.

## **701. CAMBRIDGE CENTRAL AREA BUS STOP CAPACITY STRATEGY**

Cabinet was reminded that on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2008, Cabinet had considered and agreed a report on the strategy to ensure adequate bus stop capacity in central Cambridge in order to cater for the expected growth in bus services and patronage over the coming years, as a result of the anticipated growth in the Cambridge sub-region. The report identified areas within the centre of the city where additional bus stop capacity would be required. The report also highlighted the need to ensure that adequate bus stop provision was in place for the start of Cambridgeshire Guided Busway (CGB) services in 2009. In response to the July report Cabinet had resolved:

- i) To endorse the bus stop capacity strategy for Cambridge;
- ii) To support work with Cambridge City Council to explore the potential for off-street bus stop capacity; and
- iii) To support the provision of bus stop capacity for CGB services in time for the start of operations in 2009, with the Area Joint Committee (AJC) being consulted to ensure that the AJC's views were represented.

Cabinet noted that determining suitable routing and stop locations to serve the key central area destinations (the Grafton area and the historic centre) was especially difficult. The bus



operators were concerned that the journey times for GCB services would be adversely affected and unpredictable if they stopped in both the Grafton and the Drummer Street/Emmanuel Street area. To avoid this, it had therefore been proposed that New Square would become the principal city centre stop location for CGB services. As a result, some existing bus services were to be relocated to other stops with the agreement of the bus operators, which it was accepted would not be popular with those in the immediate vicinity. This approach satisfied one of the key objectives of the bus stop strategy, which was to disperse bus stop capacity away from the Drummer Street-Emmanuel Street-St. Andrew's Street area.

Representations had also been received in relation to deferring the proposals at Maids Causeway. A submission from Cambridge City Councillor Mike Dixon (attached as appendix 2 to these minutes) was circulated to Cabinet members several days before the meeting) drawing attention to the need for planning permission to alter the railings as they were listed and therefore believing it inappropriate at the present time to make a decision on making the bus stop permanent. His view was that inward bound guided buses should more appropriately stop at the same stop as other buses in New Square / Emmanuel Road.

Professor Elliott who lived in Maids Causeway had also made representations in respect of the proposed changes to the grade 2 listed railings, which he highlighted had considerable historical interest as set out in his letter which Cabinet Members had, had sight of. He also stated his concerns regarding a possible increased accident risk from conflict between the proposed site of the new bus stop and the western end of the residents parking bay at the four lamps end of Maids Causeway.

Oral representations were also made by the local member for Market who supported Professor Elliot's proposed alternative provision of using the existing bus layby in Short Street, by modifying railings along the whole east side of New Square. She also made the point that she understood that all Traffic Regulation Orders should be approved by the Area Joint Committee as set out in their terms of reference.

Cabinet was also informed that the Brunswick and North Kite Residents Association (BRUNK) also opposed to the proposed new bus-stop outside No. 14 Maids Causeway on the grounds that:

1. The Doll's Close properties (Nos. 2-20 Maids Causeway) and their frontages were an important part of the architectural heritage of the City, hence their Grade II listing.
2. The railings and the even spaces between them (each measuring 48cm and in direct alignment with the front door of each property) were a distinctive feature of the aspect of this unique row of properties.
3. To make the gap in the railings in front of No. 14 much wider (by up to 80cm) than the rest would spoil the symmetry of this part of the street scene in the Conservation Area.

They suggested as an alternative to either widening the gap in the listed railings or widening the pathway in front of them was that the bus-stop on Maids Causeway should not be located at all in Maids Causeway at all and that officers should look at other options such as in Jesus Lane or New Square.

It was noted that the Cambridge City Area Joint Committee (AJC) did not support consultation on the measures set out in Appendix B (the CGB bus stop proposals) and

asked that the County Council should reconsider its approach, particularly with regard to air quality management, management of bus movements and the impact on the public realm. It was regretted that as a result of the AJC meeting largely discussing points of principle in relation to delegation issues, more detailed feedback could not be obtained from those members present. It was confirmed as a point of clarification, that Cabinet was not obliged to go along with AJC recommendations when being consulted on a major capital project of which the current proposals were part (The Cambridgeshire Guided Busway), and that the decision on the proposals had not been delegated to the AJC. The Bus Stop Strategy paper approved previously by Cabinet had identified that the AJC would be consulted rather than being asked to determine the proposals and this had been made clear in the report to the AJC when requesting their views. It was standard practice for Cabinet to make decisions on large strategic capital projects.

All the points made in the representations had been considered previously and were again the subject of careful consideration by Cabinet. However, it was noted that at the current time the detailed proposals developed to cater for CGB services had been informed by discussions with those bus operators who had been granted access to the Guideway and the alternative bus stop provision proposals in the representations received, did not relate to the operators current routes and were therefore not considered viable. The proposals had taken into account the bus stop strategy approved previously by Cabinet. Officers did however indicate that at a later date, when looking at future bus stop capacity options, they would investigate whether any alternative practicable provision to that at Maids Causeway could be established. Tabled at the meeting were enhanced computer generated photographs showing the gap before and after the proposed railings widening opposite 14, Maids Causeway.

It was confirmed that proposed changes to the railings at Maids Causeway would be undertaken via working with the City Council conservation officers to ensure a minimum impact.

Minor changes of accuracy were made to the wording of the recommendations that had been set out in the hard copy of the agenda to reflect accurately the number of plans provided to Cabinet (9) and that the consultations were as set out in appendix C (the version on the web had been changed accordingly).

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Note the replies to consultation and the Traffic Regulation Order objections received;
- ii) Determine the Traffic Regulation Order objections detailed in Appendix C without a public inquiry;
- iii) Approve the Traffic Regulation Orders as advertised and notify the objectors accordingly; and
- iv) Approve the bus stop proposals shown in plans 1-9. (provided separately to Cabinet Members only)

## **702. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CARE SERVICES FOR ADULTS SERVICES FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND ACTION PLAN**

Cabinet was reminded that the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) makes an annual assessment and judgement on Adult Social Care Services, drawing from the following information collected throughout the year:

- Regular meetings with the Business Relationship Manager
- The annual Self Assessment Survey, which contains the formal PIs and text, submitted in May
- Any fieldwork inspections
- Annual Review Meeting, held in August 2008.

The current findings reflected the hard work undertaken and sustained effort by all staff countywide involved in the management and delivery of social work and Cabinet congratulated their achievement as set out in the final judgement for Adult Social Care across Cambridgeshire. The final judgement recognised the improvement in service delivery resulting in an increase in the overall star rating from 1 to 2 stars, out of a possible maximum of 3 stars, with the “promising capacity to improve” judgement in respect of delivering improved services for the people of Cambridgeshire.

It was noted that extremely positive feedback had been received to the inspection team from service users and carers, not only in relation to the improvements in service delivery but also in terms of them being listened to and being able to contribute to the improvements.

The areas for development had been arranged under each of the 7 outcome areas in the Performance Summary Report of 2007/08 Annual Performance Assessment and were as set out in the action plan at Appendix 2 of the Cabinet report. Cabinet noted that in many of the areas for development, work on their implementation was progressing well, with one areas having been successfully completed.

During discussions on the increased participation of client groups, mention was made of the valuable work being undertaken at meetings of the Learning Disability Parliament. Reference was also made to work undertaken at performance clinics, the latter being a valuable source of best practice information exchange with other authorities.

### **It was resolved to:**

- i) Note and congratulate all staff on the content of the Performance Summary Report of 2007/08 Annual Performance Assessment of Social Care Services for Adult Services For Cambridgeshire, including the improved judgements and the star rating.
- ii) Approve the action plan set out in Appendix 2 to address the areas for development identified by CSCI.
- iii) To confirm that updates on progress against the Action Plan would be received by Cabinet, Cambridgeshire Care Partnership and Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny at a minimum of six monthly intervals.

## 703. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Cabinet received details of the results of The 'Annual Performance Assessment' (APA) which was the overarching inspection process for children's services. The inspection assessed both the specific contributions that services make to improving outcomes for children and young people and the capacity to be able to further improve the services.

Staff were congratulated on the latest judgement with the APA letter stating that the Council provided services for children and young people that were consistently above minimum requirements and continued to make a good contribution to improving outcomes for children and young people on a day to day basis. There was a request that Cabinet's congratulations should be passed on to the staff involved.

The Council had been assessed on a 1-4 scale (1 being inadequate, 4 being excellent) against each of the Every Child Matters outcome areas, capacity and service management and overall effectiveness. For 2007/08, the following grades had been given:

Overall effectiveness of children's services	3 (Good)
Being Healthy	3 (Good)
Staying Safe	2 (Adequate)
Enjoying and Achieving	3 (Good)
Positive Contribution	3 (Good)
Economic Well Being	3 (Good)

While this represented an improvement on the grades received in the Joint Area Review, (with Being Healthy improving from a 2 to a 3), all other grades had stayed the same and Cabinet was therefore keen to continue to pursue the ongoing improvements, especially in relation to staying safe.

It was noted that where previously 4 out of 7 children's homes had been assessed as being inadequate, at least 3 had been inspected subsequently and all assessed at being at least adequate, with one classed as being outstanding. It was expected that the recent inspection of the remaining home would also result in an adequate judgement or better.

Reference was made to the area of improvement relating to the proportion of looked after children without an allocated qualified social worker which presently was recorded as being 37%, which was considerably higher than similar councils and nationally. The response indicated that all looked after children had a named worker who in some instances was a child and family worker supervised by a qualified social worker. Improvement in this area was a County Council priority alongside the priority to ensure that all cases were assessed thoroughly with the emphasis on keeping children safe. The Lead Member was currently liaising with authorities who had received an excellent APA rating to see what best practice could be adopted.

Attention was also drawn to the major change programme being taken in respect of the area of improvement in relation to the proportion of permanently excluded pupils who were receiving 20 or more hours tuition with tribute being paid to the co-operation being received from schools.

**It was resolved:**

To welcome the current report, congratulating staff on the progress made and noting the action being taken in response to those areas identified for improvement.

**704. EQUALITY STANDARD DIVERSITY PEER CHALLENGE: SELF ASSESSMENT**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for the Council's self-assessment in respect of level 3 of the Local Government Equality Standard.

In order to demonstrate achievement in equality and diversity, the Government introduced the Equality Standard for Local Government (ESLG) in 2001, which was revised in 2006 and again in May 2007 by the Improvement and Development Agency for Local Government (IDeA). The Equality Standard has 5 levels and the Council claimed Level 2 in March 2006 and is now aiming to achieve Level 3 by the end of March 2009.

Cabinet noted that in February 2008, the IDeA launched a peer challenge framework for assessment of level 3 of the Equality Standard for Local Government. The self-assessment document has been structured to demonstrate achievement against the IDeA's requirements for level 3, which focus around four main areas: Leadership and Corporate Commitment; Community Engagement and Accountability; Service Delivery and Customer Care; and Employment and Training.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the final draft as set out in the report and to authorise the Director of People and Policy, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities, to make final adjustments to the self-assessment prior to submission.

**705. KEY PARTNERSHIPS QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT**

Cabinet received the quarterly update report of the main issues / actions being undertaken by the key partnerships in the County. For the first time this had also included reporting on the activities of the Greater Cambridge Partnership

**It was resolved:**

To note the content of the update report.

**706. DELEGATIONS FROM MEMBERS / OFFICERS**

Cabinet received details of progress against previously agreed 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.

**707. DRAFT AGENDA FOR 26<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY**

Noted on the basis of an update provided orally at the meeting that the Annual Strategic Risk Register report listed on the original agenda for the 26<sup>th</sup> January meeting had now moved to the February meeting.

**708. DRAFT AGENDA FOR 24<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY CABINET MEETING**

The draft agenda was noted with the following changes notified since the publication of the Agenda:

An additional report on: 'Third Sector Emergency Funding'.

Chairman  
24<sup>TH</sup> February 2009

## QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLOR JOHNSTONE AND SUBSEQUENT RESPONSES - EXTENSION OF SCHOOL AGE RANGE - COTTENHAM VILLAGE COLLEGE

In the context that I support the overall proposal to extend the age range at Cottenham Village College (CVC), I have the following points/questions that I believe need to be addressed:

- 3.5 - engagement - with whom did CVC consult last autumn - in particular, were any local members consulted on the proposal, since this paper is the first I have heard?

**Response:** The school followed the Department of Children, Families and Schools (DCSF) guidance on consultation and therefore consulted extensively, including with parents, families, governors, District Councillors, Parish Councillors and the local MP. Unfortunately the DCSF guidance does not list County Councillors. This will be raised with DCSF and schools will be alerted to the omission.

- 3.4 -4th bullet - who was the consultation paper on Post-16 transport arrangements issued to - did it include all local members in the Cambridge Area Partnership (CAP) area? Please may I have a copy of the paper?

**Response** The paper went to secondary schools, colleges and Pupil Referral Units (PRUs), OCYPS Spokes and members of the 14-19 strategy group. It should also have gone to local members and this will be addressed.

- 3.3 climate change - the paper rightly points out that there will be a reduction in the number of students having to travel to access post-16 learning, but says nothing about any additional transport requirements to enable students to get to Cottenham, There is no bus service between Willingham and Cottenham and so students would be required to use the school bus. Is there sufficient space on the bus to take the additional students? Furthermore, post-15 students do not necessarily travel at the same time as the 11-16 age group; what arrangements would be in place to enable them to travel in a sustainable manner?

**Response:** Existing bus arrangements can largely be used although a larger bus may be required on two routes. The County Council do not reflect potential late starts or early finishes in any of the post-16 transport that we provide at the moment and there would be no change in this instance.

- 3.1 3rd bullet - what will be the additional cost of post-16 transport to CVC and where will this be funded?

The cost of transport isn't a factor that can be taken account of when considering a presumption. However, officers do not believe that the net cost will be significant. The maximum cost is in the region of £22k however students will make a contribution of £360 each depending on personal circumstances. In addition, the provision of sixth form courses will reduce existing travel out of the catchment area, for example to CRC and there may be travel savings from this. Much will depend on the choices of students.

- 3.1 2nd bullet - I do have major concerns about the physical capacity of the college - in particular, access arrangements. An additional 250 students will create additional demands, both in terms of students and additional staff. Parking is already a problem; how do the college plan to address this?

**Response:** The school is currently in the process of investigating a purchase of land which would enable expansion of car parking space and a smoother process for the post 16 new build

- 1.6 whilst the population of the sub-region will expand, there is no major growth in the Cottenham Village Catchment (CVC) catchment. Therefore, how will extending the age range at CVC address this need - it won't, although it will provide more choice. But it conflicts with the sentiments set out in section 3.3 in addressing climate change, since the places will not be located where the need is greatest.

**Response:** The presumption system allows high performing schools to provide post 16 education, regardless of more strategic demand or future growth, the expectation is that market forces will deal with over capacity. This does represent a risk to the local authority.



**COUNCILLOR MIKE DIXON CAMBRIDGE CITY MARKET WARD - COMMENTS ON PROPOSALS IN AGENDA ITEM 11 CABINET 15<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY CAMBRIDGE CENTRAL AREA BUS STOP CAPACITY STRATEGY**

I am writing as City Councillor for Market Ward to ask you to rethink some of the proposals on the agenda papers.

My main cause for concern is the proposed new stop on Maid's Causeway which will replace the current temporary stop for incoming buses. It seems clear that this is an inappropriate place for a bus stop. Passengers alight on to a narrow stretch of pavement with no obvious exit to the main pavement. There is one very narrow gap in the railings. If that is not used passengers have to walk to the point where the railings stop, or, if fit, vault over the railings. I do not believe that this situation is either safe or sensible.

It has been suggested informally that part of the length of railings can be removed. If this is so, there would have to be a planning application since the railings are listed. You cannot be sure that planning permission will be granted. Thus the decision before you is to determine that the bus stop be made permanent without the knowledge that the railings can be removed; or else to assume that they cannot, so continuing a practice that is unsafe and unsatisfactory.

The papers suggest that all the decisions before you are caused by the desire to disperse the stops - to prevent overuse. There is no suggestion that the guided bus could not, if necessary, be accommodated at the same stop as other buses. If this is so, I suggest that there is no reason why all inward buses should not revert to the stop in New Square/Emmanuel Road. As they are inbound there will be very little boarding at that stop; and in any case off-bus ticketing is soon to be introduced for those who do wish to board there. I have often used that stop, and it was manageable in the past.

This is not as much a problem for the inbound stop on Jesus Lane, but this "temporary" stop has some disadvantages. Since the majority of passengers leave the buses there and aim for the Grafton Centre, they have to cross Jesus Lane at a busy point, close to the roundabout, with no pedestrian crossing point available. Passengers currently believe that their buses will revert to the New Square stop when the lay-by has been rebuilt. I suspect that there will be an outcry when it is made permanent.

Continuing the theme of dual use, I also request that the Citi 2 stop on Parkside be retained. There is no suggestion in your papers that it will not be, but I believe that its removal was suggested in the consultation papers. This stop is well used by disembarking passengers for the Grafton Centre, and it is important that they should continue to be able to use it. The distances from the two next nearest stops are too great. Again assuming that dual use is possible, only the guided bus and Citi 2 would require this stop, almost entirely to drop off passengers.

Members must visit the proposed stops and see how unsatisfactory the proposals are. I ask you not to determine the proposals at this point without further consultation and discussion.