

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 20th October 2009

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor L W McGuire (in the absence of Councillor J. Tuck)

Councillors: M Curtis, S. Criswell, D Harty, T Orgee, R Pegram, J Reynolds and F H Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors: Sir P Brown and J M Tuck

Also Present: Councillors K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, N Harrison, D Jenkins, C. Shepherd, F Whelan and K Wilkins
Councillor I Nimmo-Smith Leader of Cambridge City Council

55. MINUTES 29th SEPTEMBER 2009

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 29th September 2009 were approved as a correct record.

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The following Members declared interests as follows:

Councillor J. Reynolds and T Orgee declared a personal and prejudicial interest under Paragraph 8 and 10 of the Code of Conduct in respect of report 9 titled 'Development at Cambridge North West: National Institute of Agricultural Botany frontage Site – Section 106 Agreement Update' on the agenda as a member of the Joint Planning Committee for Cambridge City Fringes who might at a later stage be required to make decisions on subsequent planning applications. The two members left the room during the discussion of the report.

57. PETITIONS

A) PETITION TO SUPPORT A RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME IN PRETORIA ROAD / AYLESTONE ROAD AND KIMBERLEY ROAD

A petition had been received with approximately 110 signatures reading: "We, the undersigned, petition Cambridgeshire County Council to introduce a residents' parking scheme on Kimberley Road and Pretoria Road and the western section of Aylestone Road. We consider the parking situation in our area to be unacceptably difficult. We are prepared to pay a similar amount to what is charged in the other residents' parking zones in Cambridge (around £50 per year)."

The spokesperson for the petition was Anil Malhotra and a summary of his speech based on a transcript provided, is included at Appendix A.

The chairman in responding invited those present supporting this petition to hear the outcome of item 6 which would be the first item following presentation of all the petitions received.

B) PETITION REGARDING BLINCO GROVE PARKING CONTROLS.

A petition was received with approximately 141 signatures which had text reading "In two recent surveys the majority voted against a resident's parking scheme but councillors are seeking to overthrow Council policy and allow a partial scheme in our area. The Area Traffic Joint Committee has since voted to introduce a partial scheme only for Rathmore Road and Hartington Grove. This is against Council Policy which insists that schemes must be large enough not simply to displace problems onto adjacent streets. The petition requests that the County Council policy that 'residents' parking controls shall be introduced on an area basis taking in clearly defined blocks of streets to deter as far as reasonably practicable the migration of parking into surrounding streets', remains unchanged".

The spokesperson was Wendy Pickford who in presenting the petition highlighted that the area in question was geographically defined, being Victorian terraced housing which did not have off-street parking and was different from housing in surrounding streets. Despite pressures regarding parking in the area, local residents had been surveyed twice and the majority (61% for the second survey) had voted against resident parking controls. She considered that any piece-meal changes would have a negative effect, forcing cars to migrate to other streets which might then require a parking policy which was against the majority wishes.

Following her presentation, the Chairman also invited this petition's supporters to stay and hear the outcome of item 6 which would be the first item following presentation of all the petitions received.

C) PETITION TITLED HISTON AND IMPINGTON PARISH COUNCILS (OPPOSING CHANGES TO CITI 7 ROUTE)

A petition was received with over 50 signatures reading "We the undersigned oppose the changes to the Citi7 route as proposed by Stagecoach for introduction on the 29th November, in that it will miss out part of the current route along Station Road and Cambridge Road through Histon and Impington thereby missing the Doctor's surgery a chemist, local sheltered accommodation, two residential homes, the local industrial estate and the Station and force residents to walk from five to fifteen minutes longer to get to a bus stop, including crossing a very busy road (B1049). It will particularly hit hardest the elderly and infirm.

At a time when the Government is trying to improve the public transport option, especially for travel into and out of cities such as Cambridge, the changes to this very well used route seem only to be justified on the basis of increased profits not service. We are unhappy at the change to the Citi 7 Sunday service as a result of the withdrawal of the service run by Myalls for a number of years, which included an evening service, brought about by Stagecoach introducing a competing service on the route but stopping at five p.m."

The spokesperson was Max Parish, Chairman of Histon Parish Council who made reference to the grant of £400,000 made two years ago to improve Cambridge City bus services and also that as recently as March, the County Council' Passenger Services section and the then relevant Cabinet portfolio holder was still supporting the notion of buses running every 10 minutes. The current change from Stagecoach had taken place with very little notice and had been justified as a purely commercial decision due to falling passenger numbers. He also refuted the suggestion made by Stagecoach that parish councillors and residents had contacted Stagecoach requesting a shorter journey time for the service. He indicated that the change to this flagship service would do nothing to dissuade people from using their cars instead of public transport and would not help the related performance indicator.

Following the presentation it was agreed that as there was no report on the agenda on this subject, the officers would take the petition away and undertake for the Executive Director: Environment Services in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio member for Highways and Access to respond to the lead petitioner within 10 working days.

58. ISSUES FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES – None received

59. COUNCIL DECISIONS – None

60. CAMBRIDGE AREA JOINT COMMITTEE (AJC) ISSUES

Cabinet noted that at its meeting on 26th January the Cambridge Area Joint Committee (AJC) had passed four resolutions that were in direct conflict with County Council policy. The terms of reference for the AJC required it to comply with both County and Cambridge City policy, where relevant and on each occasion the AJC had been made aware that its proposed decision was not consistent with the County policy. The resolutions agreed were as follows:

- i. Area Parking Controls: the AJC resolved to support the advertisement of draft traffic regulation orders for a residents' parking scheme in some selected streets within the Rock Road area of Queen Edith's. Cabinet was reminded that the current policy required an area wide approach to avoid simply transferring the parking problem into neighbouring streets.
- ii. Gonville Place-Gresham Road crossing: the AJC resolved to revoke the banned turns at the crossing despite clear advice that this would create an unacceptable hazard to pedestrians that, in the event of an accident, the County Council would not be able to offer a defence.

- iii. Addenbrooke's Access Road: the AJC supported a 30mph speed limit on the rural section of the road, rather than the advertised 40mph limit, again in the knowledge that this was contrary to county speed limit policy and that at the current time County Council and police advice had been that this was not appropriate to the current road conditions.

A further matter relating to a resolution to advertise a 20 mph speed limit in Luard Road and Sedley Taylor Road, while potentially at the time in conflict with policy, had been overtaken by a change in policy approved by Cabinet on 21st April 2009 and was therefore no longer being challenged.

- iv. In addition to the above, at the AJC meeting on 21st April a resolution agreed again in the knowledge that it was contrary to policy had supported the advertisement of draft traffic regulations for residents parking scheme in some selected streets within the De Freville Area,.

Councillor Shepherd a local member spoke in support of the AJC decision regarding iii) above, believing that the decision on what speed limit to apply to a road should be a local decision and stating that the AJC did not contravene County Council policies lightly, the decision being based on the fact that surrounding roads in the area had a thirty mile an hour limit and that in her opinion it was therefore not sensible to encourage motorists to speed up on this one stretch of road. Her views were that the risks set out in the risk implications paragraph were not responsive to local needs / the local position. In reply to this, both Members of Cabinet and the relevant officer presenting the report took the opposing view that the current speed limit was appropriate to this stretch of road as a lower limit taking into account its immediate surroundings was likely to result in many contraventions. Cabinet was reminded that speed limit reviews were not just about lowering speed limits and that in this particular case the police had expressed the view opposing at the present time any increase in the speed limit as it would criminalise road users breaching speeds above 30 mph. It was clarified that there would be a further speed limit review for the road once development took place which was considered to be the appropriate time and would be undertaken in consultation with local residents and Cambridge City Council.

In terms of i) ii) and iii) above, for the reasons set out in the report the decisions of the AJC were not supported for implementation. In respect of the Gonville Place-Gresham Road crossing, Cabinet could not endorse any proposal which would create a greater hazard to pedestrians.

In addition to the petitions received earlier in the meeting both in favour and against parking controls in areas of Cambridge City, as well as numerous e-mails sent directly to the Leader and Deputy Leader, the Leader of Cambridge City Council, Councillor Ian Nimmo-Smith and Councillor Wilkins spoke in support of localised parking controls. Their support was in order to recognise both local opinion and local needs and following on from this, they also expressed their support for the views set out in the petition at 3A) above. Councillor Wilkins speaking as the current chairman of the AJC and a member at the time the decisions were taken, explained that the real problem of parking was to the west of De Freville Avenue and lessened the further east you went. The AJC was in a difficult position as if it just took the majority view it would be ignoring the moral need of residents west of De Freville Avenue. Any decision in his view should be based on the AJC committee members' local knowledge of the City, which was not at the disposal of the County Council Cabinet.

The Local Member for Queen Edith's had submitted a letter to Cabinet Members before the meeting which was also tabled, setting out the current problems of parking in Queen Edith's.

The Leader of Cambridge City Council also expressed his support of the continued value and important role undertaken by Cambridge AJC which in its decision making role informed by local knowledge sought to balance the sometimes conflicting local issues / requirements with the County Council's strategic interest. In answer to a question on whether he accepted that the terms of reference for the AJC required it to comply with both County and Cambridge City policy, his view was that the AJC required a more explicit delegation to allow it to change policy to meet the specific needs of a local situation. This view was supported by Councillor Wilkins.

In recognising that the current Parking Policy could not satisfy all competing demands and that there were sometimes opposing needs in different locations within an area due to factors such as off street parking / garages being available in some locations but not in others, Cabinet agreed to delete the existing recommendation iii) set out in the report. This had proposed to review responsibilities for area parking policy implementation in the context of a wider review of Area Joint Committee remits. It was agreed that what was required before making any final decisions regarding local area parking controls, was a further review of whether the Area Wide Parking Policy operated across the County was still fit for purpose with regard to the issues in Cambridge City.

Officers highlighted that an area wide parking policy had been created in order to avoid spending a great deal of officer / Member time and money on investigating conflicting local issues and would be even more pertinent in the future in view of the considerable constraints on both monetary resources and the likely further pressure on staff. The overriding consideration in any further review would be the need to ensure that the delivery of services was undertaken in the most cost effective manner. It was suggested and agreed that the above review of the Area Wide Parking Policy in Cambridge City would be undertaken as part of the annual review of highway policies that Cabinet considered each April.

It was resolved:

- i) Not to implement the Area Joint Committee decisions set out in the report;
- ii) To note that the speed limit on Addenbrooke's Access Road would be reviewed as and when development took place; and
- iii) To review the Area Wide Parking Policy in Cambridge City.

61. END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT 2008/08 AND REVIEW OF INTEGRATED PLAN 2008-11 NATIONAL INDICATOR TARGETS

Cabinet received a report whose purpose was to present the end of year performance for the 2008/09 National Indicator set and to make final amendments to targets for 2009/10 and 2010/11. The first part of the Cabinet report presented an analysis of the end of year performance results for 2008/09 with the second, setting out the amendments to national indicator targets for 2009/10 and 2010/11.

Cabinet noted that the Council's Performance against key PIs remained strong, particularly against statutory National indicators with 73.9% of targets having been met along and that there was an ongoing improvement trend over the past 4 years. It was further noted that National Indicator (NI) 117 (NEET) end of year figure which had been reported as 'red' (target not met) in the printed report had been further revised as suggested performance was now better, and had moved to scoring 'Amber'. (acceptable performance) Performance against Section 2 of the Integrated Plan while more mixed in achievement, showed that against all Nis, performance was good (64% on target). Paragraph 6 of the report highlighted areas of exceptional performance and summarised areas where targets had not been met (i.e. those identified as being 'red') although it was noted that some of these were also the responsibility of the County Council's partners. Assurance was provided that Performance against 'red' NIs was being carefully managed through Cambridgeshire Together and service management teams.

Revised targets for 2009/10 were set out in paragraph 8.2 of the report and new targets for either 09/10 and /or 2010/11 were set out in paragraph 8.3. An oral update indicated that there were 3 errors in the original printed report that needed correcting in paragraph 8.2. The revised table with the changes is as set out overleaf.

Clarification to NI Targets (Para 8.2 of the report)

PI Ref	Short Indicator Description	Target		
		08-09	09-10	10-11
NI 130	Social Care clients receiving Self Directed Support per 100,000 population SO4(KPI&AP)	14.3% (210)	35% -	40% -
Comment: Significant definition change has required that the target for 09/10 and 10/11 should now be expressed as a percentage rather than a number. Also this means NI130 is now calculated in a different way hence the large difference in the target between 08-09 and 09-10.				
NI 175	Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling SO1(AP)	89.7% (89.7%)	96% (89.7%)	96% (89.7%)
NI 176	Working age people with access to employment by public transport (and other specified modes) SO1(AP)	85.9% (85.9%)	79% (86.3%)	79.07% (86.7%)
Comment: New targets based on revised baseline published by Department of Transport (DfT)				

Comments by Cabinet Members included:

- The expectation that the performance against NI130 'Self Directed Support' would improve as a result of the continued roll out of the programme.
- In terms of NI177 'Local Bus Journeys' the Cabinet Member for Children asked if it was practicable for a breakdown district by district. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance undertook to ascertain whether it was possible and also practicable in terms of time / resource implications, to provide this information outside of the meeting.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree the revision and introduction of targets as set out in paragraph 8.2 (as amended at the meeting) and paragraph 8.3. of the report.
- ii) To agree the end of year performance results.

62. SHIRLEY COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Cabinet considered a report recommending extending the terms of the current lease between the County Council and the Old Schools of Cambridge Trust for use of the Shirley Primary School upper school site in Nuffield Road, Cambridge, in order to defer the Council's current obligation to purchase the site in 2011.

Cabinet were reminded that throughout the negotiation and re-negotiation of the lease, the County Council had always recognised that under charitable law, the Trustees were obliged to obtain best consideration for the site and, as a consequence, could not transfer the site to the County Council at either no cost or a reduced cost. The preferred option had always been to replace the Trust's interest in the Nuffield Road site (the former St Andrew's Church of England Aided Junior School site) with a similar interest in another school in Cambridge on the basis that it had the advantages of representing best consideration while maintaining the Trust's role in education in Cambridge.

The current leases and ancillary agreements provided for the County Council, in exchange for the St Andrew's / Nuffield Road site, to replace the Trust's interest in the site with an interest in a new primary school within 5 years, i.e. by 31st August 2011. However the current agreement was that should it not be possible to provide a new school site within this period, then the Council would be obliged to pay to the Trust a fixed sum of £2m for the freehold of the original part of the brownfield land area of the school and pay the Trust £3m to acquire the whole of the brownfield area of the site, whilst continuing to pay rent on the playing fields.

At the time of entering this agreement, it was considered that the need to provide new primary schools in the Cambridge area to meet the demands of new housing developments meant it was highly probable that the Trust's interest could be replaced through a new school within five years. However, the economic downturn had subsequently slowed the pace at which major new housing areas were coming forward and there was now no prospect of providing a replacement school for the Trust by 2011, particularly in the North West fringe of Cambridge, which was an area in which the Trust had previously indicated an interest.

Cabinet noted that officers had been in discussion with representatives of the Trustees for some months regarding the implications of the delay for both parties and that an in principle agreement to the extension of the current lease was expected to be approved by the Trustees at their next meeting in November. Such a change would allow the Council, working closely with the Trust's education officer, more time to support them in acquiring a replacement interest in a new school / site or, if that eventually proved not to be possible, would provide the County Council with more time to fund the purchase of the current site from its capital programme.

It was resolved:

- i) To grant officers the authority to:
 - conclude negotiations with the Old Schools of Cambridge Trust to extend the current lease on the Shirley Primary School upper school site in Nuffield Road and thereby defer the need to purchase the site from the Trust in 2011,
 - work with the Old Schools of Cambridge Trust to provide an alternative school site that replaced its present interest in the Shirley Community Primary School site in Nuffield Road, Cambridge.
- ii) To note the conclusion of earlier negotiations with the Trust that had enabled building work to commence on the Nuffield Road Site.

63. DEVELOPMENT AT CAMBRIDGE NORTH WEST: NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL BOTANY FRONTAGE SITE (NIAB1) - SECTION 106 AGREEMENT UPDATE

Cabinet received a report informing it of the current position that had been reached on the Section 106 negotiations for the proposed NIAB1 development at Cambridge North West in advance of the expected determination of the amended outline planning application by the Fringes Joint Development Control Committee on 3rd November 2009.

Cabinet was reminded that in May 2009 it had endorsed a response to the amended outline planning application which had raised several objections to the development proposal and which affected the Section (S) 106 package. The objections related to the need for better provision of transport and education infrastructure which were considered necessary for the development to mitigate its own impacts, but which had not yet been secured with the developer. In August 2009, a revised viability appraisal from the developer was shared with the local authorities and showed an expected rise in sales revenues. As a result, the viability gap had reduced but was still considered to be greater than what was likely to be required to enable development to proceed. Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report set out the requirements being sought by the County Council as part of the Section 106 agreement.

Cabinet Members however expressed concerns regarding the reference in the report to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway contribution (which was currently not accepted by the developer) which questioned whether, on the evidence base currently provided (referred to in paragraph 2.16), the contribution should be removed from the Section 106 Agreement. Cabinet was of the view that the report provided little evidence to support this proposed change, and while there might be a view that there was not a clear relationship showing that the development was dependent on the Guided Busway, there was the issue of residents using the Guided Busway to enhance their ability to travel in and out of the city and improve their quality of life, as well as attracting them to buy properties in the development area. In answer to a question put to the Corporate Director: Finance, Property and Performance on the possible financial consequences of the County Council not receiving the £2.3m contribution to the Guided Busway, it was indicated that this would be in the region of £200k per annum to finance debt servicing and capital repayments.

For the reasons set out above, Cabinet did not support the suggestion that the contribution should be removed, but requested that officers should undertake a further assessment in order to establish the basis for further discussions regarding the contribution.

It was resolved:

- i) To endorse the proposed s106 heads of terms for the development at NIAB1 taking into account the resolution at iii) below.
- ii) To delegate to the Lead Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services, the authority to make any minor changes to the heads of terms prior to finalising the S106 agreement.
- iii) Continue negotiations with a view to securing a developer contribution to relevant transport infrastructure.

64. INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES REPORT – AUGUST 2009

Cabinet received a report presenting it with financial and performance information to assess progress in delivering the Council's Integrated Plan.

The following performance issues were brought to Cabinet's attention:-

- As previously reported, sickness was still being reported along the old office lines while the Oracle HR Hierarchy had been adjusted to reflect the new structure. This work was part of a formal project, which was due to be completed by the 31st March 2010.
- The Strategic risk basket had been changed to reflect the risk register approved by Cabinet in February 2009.
- Performance exceptions for August included:
 - NI192 Household waste recycled and composted (AMBER ↓) – a dry first quarter combined with an expectation of improved composting, which had not emerged, makes the year-end demanding target highly unlikely. Recycling rate is still increasing, however.
 - NI148 Care leavers in Employment, Education and Training (EET) (RED ↓) - the difficult economic environment is curtailing EET opportunities particularly for young people.

The following resource issues were brought to Cabinet's attention:-

- Overall the budget position was showing a forecast year-end overspend of £3.2m (1%). This was an increase of £3.1m from last month. The position needed to be rectified as there was little reserve flexibility to support such an overspend in year and no possibility of supporting such an overspend in future years (due to the overall financial position).
- In Environment Services (ES) an underspend of £76k was being predicted, which was due to a saving on the Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Contract.
- In Community and Adult Services (CAS) an overspend of £3.8m was being predicted, which was mainly due to pressures within Adult Social Services (Older People's Services overspend was forecast at £4.9m of which the County Council's pooled

contribution from the shared agreement with the national Health Service (NHS) would be £3.3m).

- In Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) an overspend of £757k was being predicted, which was due to pressures within Learning, Strategy and Commissioning and Children's Social Care.
- In Corporate Directorates (CD) an overspend of £423k was being predicted, which was due to pressures within the Customer Services and Transformation Directorate and the People, Policy and Law Directorate.
- In Corporate Directorates – Financing, an underspend of £1.7m was being predicted due to savings on Debt Charges.
- Cabinet being asked to approve the permanent virement of £485k from Corporate Reserves to CYPS to fund recruitment and retention work with social workers.
- Cabinet being asked to approve the transfer of £230k from CYPS reserves to Groomfields (CYPS) to offset the pressure being experienced.
- Cabinet being asked to approve the budget virement of £500k demography funding from Fostering (CYPS) to Placements – Social Care (CYPS).
- Spending on the Council's capital programme was currently proceeding slower than estimated.
- There were no significant debt problems to report and there were no noticeable effects arising from the economic downturn.
- Cabinet being asked to consider and approve the S106 deferral requests as set out in appendix 6 of the report. In discussion of this recommendation Cabinet supported it on the basis that there should be regular monitoring to ensure payments on deferrals agreed should be secured at the appropriate time. There was also discussion regarding the need to ensure people purchasing properties were made aware of their potential liability if works on infrastructure carried out by developers were not brought up to an adoptable standard.

Cabinet noted that the general economic forecast for the UK remained poor and it was probable that growth would not be evident until 2010. The most significant implication for the Authority was that in order to restore the nation's finances and service borrowing and benefit requirements there would be significant pressures on public funding for at least five years and probably for a decade. The implications of the funding constraints were to be considered in the 2010/11 Integrated Plan.

An oral update was provided regarding the measures (including recovery action plan details) being undertaken to address the overspends in relation to the £3.8m confirmed pressure predicted in Adult and Community Services (including reviewing staffing and rigorously ensuring care packages continued to be suitable for clients needs while still ensuring services were provided and maintained to those eligible) and the £757K predicted in Children and Young People's Services. A large part of the latter deficit was within Trading Services for which a medium term plan was already in place, with it being noted that Catering Services were making significant progress in improving their trading position with a 5% increase in uptake in school meals. For Social Care it was noted that a recruitment freeze was in operation but this did not apply to front line social workers. It was stressed that the £485k transfer was not to deal with the overspend, but was part of the agreed Integrated Planning Process measures to fund the recruitment and retention of social workers.

In response to a question raised, Cabinet noted that the overspend in Adult and Community Services was being monitored regularly by the Chief Executive / Executive

Director: Environment Services and the Leader and Cabinet portfolio holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Well Being and was also to be monitored at each subsequent meeting of the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership.

Following a response which indicated that no looked after children had been included in the Cambridgeshire Apprenticeship Scheme, there was a discussion in which Cabinet recognised the need in the current difficult employment climate to encourage partners and the wider business community to increase the number of apprenticeships to help school leavers / children looked after to train for practical jobs. This would also help address the recognised skills shortages in the building industry etc. and increase the pools skill which would be required when the economy began to revive. The transfer of 16-19 funding and the creation of the Children Trust were expected to help. It was agreed that consideration of the practical measures that could be taken should be included as an item for discussion on the next agenda of the Greater Cambridge Partnership to ensure appropriate action and subsequent monitoring by the Cambridgeshire Together Board.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the performance and resources information as set out in the report.
- ii) To approve the permanent virement of £485k from Corporate Reserves to Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) to fund recruitment and retention work with social workers (as set out in section 3.2 of the Cabinet report).
- iii) To approve the transfer of £230k from CYPS reserves to Groomfields (CYPS) to offset the pressure being experienced (as set out in section 3.2 of the Cabinet report).
- iv) To approve the budget virement of £500k demography funding from Fostering (CYPS) to Placements – Social Care (CYPS) (as set out in section 3.2 of the Cabinet report).
- v) To approve the recommendations on Section 106 deferral requests as set out in section 3.2 and appendix 6 of the report with the need to ensure regular monitoring to ensure timely repayments were made when required as part of terms of the deferral agreement.
- vi) To agree that the Greater Cambridge Partnership should be asked to include on their agenda consideration of how partners could encourage the increase in the number of training apprenticeships being created within the County.

65. JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT STRANDS FOR MIGRANT WORKERS AND HOMELESS PEOPLE

Cabinet noted that The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act (2007) had placed a duty on upper tier local authorities and Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) to undertake a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). The JSNA was a process to identify the current

and future health and well being needs of a local population, informing the priorities and targets set by Local Area Agreements leading to agreed commissioning priorities that will improve outcomes and reduce health inequalities.

Cabinet was reminded that the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Cambridgeshire: Phase 2 was published in November 2008 providing an analysis of data to show the health and well-being of local communities and to define where inequalities existed. At the time when JSNA phase 2 was completed, further population groups were identified which would benefit from a specific information collection and assessment of health and wellbeing needs in the Cambridgeshire context. These included:

- Migrant workers
- Homeless people

with a commitment made to cover these groups in the JSNA work carried out in 2009. The current report set out the findings in relation to these specific groups.

It was noted that national guidance also required that JSNAs should include recommendations as well as the provision of information and therefore the JSNA strands in Annexes A and B of the Cabinet report included recommendations for further action to address the health and wellbeing needs of the population groups as set out above, which it was recognised would need to be considered within current resource constraints with the key to good progress being close partnership working.

In terms of a reference in the appendix to homeless people and forty four years being the average age of death over the last five years among patients registered at the Cambridge Access Surgery (CAS) (a dedicated GP practice largely for single homeless and rough sleepers) it was clarified that this had been misrepresented in the media and was not the same as life expectancy, which was a different measure, as the former included a greater number of people dying at a young age.

In answer to a query regarding providing a definition for the term “sofa surfers” it was explained that this referred to a hidden part of the overall homelessness group representing those with no fixed abode who stayed with friends and often moved on, which made them very difficult to contact.

It was resolved:

- To welcome the executive summaries of the JSNA strands for migrant workers and homeless people as attached to the Cabinet report and to approve their presentation to Cambridgeshire Together and/or its relevant Thematic Partnerships in order to agree joint action plans.
- To thank Doctor Liz Robin and her team for the excellent work undertaken to produce such useful documents.

66. AMENDMENTS TO POLICY FOR OFFERING FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR HOUSING ADAPTATIONS (DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT (DFG) TOP-UP)

Cabinet received a report seeking its endorsement to proposed amendments to the Policy for Offering Financial Support for Housing Adaptations (Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG)

Top-up) with the key changes as set out in paragraph 2.2 of the report, with the detail of the changes being highlighted in bold italics in *Annex A* attached to the report.

Cabinet noted that the policy had been in operation since being endorsed by Cabinet in 2006 and since its implementation, had been successfully applied to eighty-two cases (across both adults and children's services) and, as a result, had meant that essential housing adaptations had been able to go ahead without delay. Through this action, more people had been supported to remain living in their own homes.

Cabinet was informed that the policy had been reviewed and updated to take account of some changes, both nationally and locally, and to offer more flexibility, particularly in relation to meeting the needs of families with disabled children. As a result of feedback from front-line teams, the update included a number of minor amendments to offer clarification of wording.

It was resolved:

To endorse the amendments to the Policy for Offering Financial Support for Housing Adaptations (Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) Top-up) with the key changes agreed as set out in paragraph 2.2 of the report with the detail of the changes in bold italics set out in the appendix to the report.

67. DEFERRAL OF PLANNED OPENING DATES FOR THE CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE SECONDARY SCHOOL AND TRUMPINGTON MEADOWS PRIMARY SCHOOL

Cabinet received a report advising it of the implications of the changing pattern and pace of development on the previously agreed opening dates for new schools to be established in the Cambridge Southern Fringe. As a result the report sought approval for the deferral of the agreed opening date for the new Trumpington Meadows Primary School from September 2010 to September 2012 and permission to also seek approval from the Office of the Schools Adjudicator to defer the opening date for the new Cambridge Southern Fringe Secondary School from September 2012 to September 2015.

Cabinet was informed that the new opening date of September 2012 for the primary school was considered the earliest practicable completion date for the school buildings. It was noted that the pace of development in relation to the new school would continue to be monitored by officers, and in reply to a question raised, officers would seek to mitigate the impact and consequence of rapid housing development should it materialise. While there remained many unknowns in relation to the development of the school on the site within the design and planning process, Cabinet were assured that officers were working closely with design partners, the Temporary Governing Body and other partners to ensure that the school would open on schedule to meet the needs of the new community. It was stressed that whilst the new proposed date was a delay in terms of the opening date, the school would still be available at the same point within the context of the phasing of the housing development; e.g. the aim to be having the school, and associated community facilities open for the occupation of the 100th dwelling. In answer to questions raised, based on the current information available officers considered the new dates to be robust. While there was always the risk of a time lag in respect of a new school being built and the ability for a developer to build houses quickly which might have include more children than was forecast, a short term response could always involve the use of temporary classrooms in the unlikely event of this happening.

It was noted that within the agreements reached with the developer, officers had included a stipulation when the school site had to be made available to the Council to enable construction of the school to begin. In advance of the hand over of the site, the developer would undertake necessary works such as, archaeological surveys and the remediation of the site from its previous use. The timescales for these activities had been made as short as possible in order to enable construction work to commence at the earliest opportunity.

It was agreed that answers to queries which the local member for Trumpington had wished to raise but had unable to do so, as she had to leave early in order to attend another meeting, would be actioned by officers outside of the meeting.

It was resolved:

- i) to approve the deferral of the Trumpington Meadows Primary School's opening date from September 2010 until September 2012.
- ii) To approve the proposal that the Office of the Schools Adjudicator be asked to agree to defer the opening date of the new Cambridge Southern Fringe Secondary School from 2012 until 2015.

68. POLICY STATEMENT ON REGIONAL STRATEGIES AND GUIDANCE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LEADER'S BOARDS – CONSULTATION

Cabinet was asked to consider and comment on the proposed consultation response to the 'Policy Statement on Regional Strategies and Guidance on the establishment of Leaders' Boards' being conducted by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS).

Cabinet noted that the current consultation sought comments by 30 October in order to add more detail to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Bill, particularly regarding the preparation and review of the new Regional Strategies and schemes for the establishment of Leaders' Boards. Additional questions were also being asked about guidance on the sustainability appraisal of Regional Strategies.

It was noted that while the proposals for producing Regional Strategies had advanced since last year's "Prosperous Places" consultation and many of the comments that the County Council made at that stage had now been addressed, it was considered that there was still a lack of understanding and appreciation of the expertise and resources that organisations at the sub-regional and local level – particularly the strategic authorities – brought to the regional planning process including implementation and monitoring. It was therefore agreed that it was important that this should be addressed, both to ensure that the new process worked efficiently and also that the responsible regional authority should be properly accountable to the local authorities and other organisations that would need to implement the strategy.

Also highlighted was the fact that the guidance so far produced on how new regional strategies should be prepared referred to broad principles and did not specifically address how local authorities and other organisations would contribute to the new regional strategies. Another important area considered deficient was in relation to the need for

effective scrutiny of decisions made. It was considered essential that the scrutiny process should be clearly distinguished from the local authority role in agreeing and implementing the Regional Strategy if Leaders Boards were to be truly accountable.

It was highlighted that Cambridgeshire District Councils had been contacted regarding drawing up a joint response to the consultation and provided with a copy of the draft response. An oral update at the meeting indicated that the feedback so far received from district councils supported the suggested response.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report as the basis of the County Council's response to CLG / BIS.
- ii) That approving the final joint response should be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning and the Executive Director: Environment Services in order to take account comments from District Councils in order to formulate a joint response from all the Cambridgeshire authorities.

69. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 15 – PLANNING & THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Cabinet received a prepared draft response to comment on in respect of the Department for Communities & Local Government new draft 'Planning Policy Statement 15 – Planning for the Historic Environment' which when finalised, would result in a single policy covering both archaeology and the historic built environment, replacing both PPG15 and PPG16.

Cabinet noted that in 1990 the Department of the Environment had published Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG)16 which had established archaeology as a material consideration in the planning process. It was explained that PPG15, published in 1994, provided comparable guidance for the management of the historic built environment in the planning process. Both documents were allocated for updating and incorporation into the more recent Planning Policy Statement system. It was highlighted that PPG16 had been the primary tool used for the protection of Cambridgeshire's unique archaeological record and underpinned the advice that the County Council provided to the District Councils through service level agreements as well as on strategic and County Council planning issues. PPG15 was the planning policy guidance on the Historic Environment, with a principal emphasis on the built heritage and its setting.

Cabinet noted that as currently presented, the imprecise language used in the PPS was seen as being a major weakness, allowing for differing interpretations, which in turn would lead to confusion for those who would have to both use and implement it. The County Council officers' experience with PPG16 had shown that where developers, planners and their advisers were operating within a clearly defined procedure, the system flowed smoothly. PPS15 as presented did not offer such a process, and it was agreed that clear guidance on implementation required to be introduced once the final version of the policy statement was known.

It was resolved:

- i) To note and approve the response to the consultation as outlined in Appendix 1 to the Cabinet report.
- ii) To approve that the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment in consultation with the Director of Environment Services agree any minor changes to the wording of the response if any issues further arose following the meeting before submission of the final response.

70. CONSULTATION ON DRAFT NOISE ACTION PLANS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS (DEFRA)

Cabinet received a report drawing its attention to a consultation on draft Noise Action Plans currently being undertaken by The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), which had potential implications for the County Council as a “noise generating authority” and consequently for finance and staffing resources and the policy approach of the County Council.

Cabinet noted that the Secretary of State for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs had devised draft Noise Action Plans which described the process for what, if any, noise mitigation measures might be carried out in specified areas in the context of sustainable development. The noise maps identified locations on some major County roads in Cambridgeshire, i.e. A10, A1123, A141, A1307, A505 and a length of the former A142 bypassed by the Fordham bypass. It was understood that roads carrying more than six million vehicles per year and where traffic noise was in excess of 76 decibels for 18% of the 18 hour working day were to be considered as major roads for the purposes of the plans and would be extended in 2012 to such roads within Cambridge City, as an agglomeration with more than 100,000 population.

Cabinet noted with concern that highway authorities, classed as “noise making authorities” would be required to examine the various locations identified on the maps and to form a view about what measures, if any, might be taken in order to assist the management of environmental noise in the context of sustainable development at those locations. The consultation documentation suggested action to mitigate noise might include:

- Erecting noise barriers
- Installing low noise road surfaces,
- Local traffic management measures; or
- Improving sound insulation.

The Action Plans also aimed to protect yet to be identified Quiet Areas with the intention being that the identified government department would liaise with local authorities (it was not clear in the consultation document which authority this would be in two tier authorities) to obtain information on open spaces and then form a view, with them, as to which of these should be designated. Local authorities would be expected to adopt policies to manage the local noise environment so as to protect designated “Quiet Areas” and to avoid increases in noise, which would include reviewing the approach to the management of open spaces.

Highway Authorities would need to consider whether any of their proposed measures might cause conflict with these areas.

In reply to a question raised on whether the County Council would in future be responsible for acoustic barriers being erected for example in relation to the M11 near Little Shelford / Hauxton) it was explained that measures to curb noise from motorways would continue to be the responsibility of the Highways Agency.

For the reasons listed in the bullet points overleaf, Cabinet asked that a more robust response should be sent which made clear the County Council's objections in the opening paragraph, including challenging the use of the offensive phrase "noise making authority" to the proposals being put forward:

- Concerns regarding the manner of the current consultation exercise which had bypassed normal channels in terms of the consultation document not being sent to the Chief Executive or designated lead officer thereby causing undue delay,
- That it raised undue public expectations at a time of severe resource restraint,
- If the County Council were identified as a noise agency there could be substantial additional financial implications in respect of undertaking noise alleviation measures which had not currently been quantified or included in the Local Transport Plan or the Integrated Planning Process,
- The Rolling Programme was due to begin in 2010 with Cambridge likely to be included by 2012.
- Concerns regarding legal liability for traffic noise at new developments being built near major roads.
- Concerns that the proposals appeared to be moving away from the concept of the polluter should pay by classing the local authority as the polluter in terms of having to finance noise reduction measures.
- Concerns that there were roads in some Market Towns that carried similar volumes of traffic to those in Cambridge, yet residential situations there would not be eligible under these regulations for ameliorative measures.
- The plans could have undesirable routing implications for Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCVs) and Buses.

Cabinet noted that as there had not been time to take the report to the Growth and Environment Policy Development Group for their comments before being included on the Cabinet agenda, these had been sought separately via email correspondence. At the time of the Cabinet meeting one comment had been received from the local Member for Fulbourn who had raised the issue of noise intrusion in rural villages like Bottisham where night time noise from the A14 was a particular problem. It was also understood that the local Member for Willingham had on the basis of the Cabinet report, already raised associated issues with Members of the European Parliament in Brussels.

It was resolved:

- (i) to note the draft response offer on DEFRA's consultation proposals; and
- (ii) to delegate to the Cabinet Members for Highways and Access; Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning; and Economy and the Environment in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services the authority

to finalise the Council's response submission taking on board the comments made at the Cabinet meeting.

71. GREEN PAPER SHAPING THE FUTURE TOGETHER

Cabinet received a report updating it with regard to the activities undertaken to help the County Council respond to the national consultation (running until 13th November 2009) on the shape and funding of adult care and support services, launched through the Green Paper, "Shaping the Future Together" as set out in the report to the last Cabinet meeting. Cabinet noted details of the helpful Member's comments already received following the original Member's Seminar held on 9th October.

Additional views from elected members were being sought following the withdrawal of the item for consideration at the Council meeting on 13th October 2009, entailing the requirement for additional events in order to obtain as many elected member's views as possible before the Government's 13th November consultation deadline. In addition, a delegation authority was sought in order to allow the final wording of the response to be amended following the Cabinet meeting to reflect further comments received from the proposed additional events, which included the report's consideration at a further Member's Seminar. In addition, Members were invited to submit comments directly to the Executive Director: Community and Adult Services or to the portfolio holder for Adult Social Care, Health and Well Being.

It was resolved:

- (i) To note the detail of the Green Paper and that the process of gathering further views from members which would now include:
 - Discussion at the Community and Adults Spokes meeting in November.
 - A second Members' Seminar on 6th November.
- (ii) To delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Care in consultation with the Executive Director Community and Adult Services to agree the final written response to the national consultation by 13th November 2009.

72. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA 24 NOVEMBER 2009

The draft agenda for the 24th November was noted with the following amendments:

Additional report following the 13th October Council meeting on "Carbon reduction commitments, including the 10:10 pledge"

Item 16 Joint Municipal Waste Strategies and Item 17 Controlled Waste Regulations Responses moved to February as officers were still awaiting Government consultation.

Item 18 Review of Neighbourhood Panels – moved to a meeting later in the New Year to be confirmed.

Item 23 The Hive Programme moved to December.

73. QUARTERLY UPDATE REPORT ON KEY PARTNERSHIPS

In order to update Cabinet and enhance accountability of the activities of key strategic partnerships it received the latest quarterly report on the activities on the following six partnerships:

- A) Cambridgeshire Together
- B) The Children and Young People Partnership
- C) Cambridgeshire Care Partnership
- D) Cambridgeshire Horizons
- E) Community Safety Strategic Partnership
- F) Greater Cambridge Partnership

It was resolved:

To note the contents of the report.

Chairman
24th November 2009

Appendix A

PETITION SUMMARIES FROM TRANSCRIPTIONS PROVIDED

The petition of those in favour of Residents' Parking first conducted on Pretoria and Aylestone Road has been extended to Kimberley Road due to demand from residents. Therefore the wording on some petition sheets includes Kimberley Road.

The overwhelming majority of residents in the Pretoria Road, Kimberley Road and Aylestone Road west in Cambridge agree that there is a real problem with parking during the daytime in the immediate neighbourhood. Many residents have also written to Cabinet Members to describe their daily problems. The Area Joint Committee has also acknowledged these problems and the Local County Councillor has taken the view they are serious enough to require a parking scheme.

There have also been too many near-accidents recently, some involving children and older residents. A wall in one street was demolished last week by a driver trying to back-up due to incoming traffic. There are growing reports of aggressive behaviour from incoming drivers and increasing use of the streets to dump vehicles, for free. Ask anyone who knows the area and you'll hear the phrase "it's a nightmare parking round there during daytime".

A parking scheme will work in this area. Our parking problems are caused by growing numbers of people using these residential streets as the nearest main area of free parking to access both Cambridge city centre and the Grafton Centre. A survey early this summer on three weekday mornings showed over 100 single-occupant vehicles each morning entering the neighbourhood between 6.30am and 9am.

At your last Cabinet meeting you heard a resident claiming that a parking scheme wouldn't work because of insufficient parking space for residents cars. This analysis is our opinion wrong and conflicts with the survey conducted by Council officers earlier this year and our own more recent door-to-door survey. The Council survey in fact showed ample space for the cars parked by residents, approximately 40 excess spaces. Councillors can confirm with your colleague Graham Lowe.

So a scheme will be successful in practical terms, but what about the displacement issue?

While needing to walk further to access the city will deter some, the important factor is that the impact of any transfer of parking will not be felt in the same way. Unlike our neighbourhood, many residents in De Freville Avenue and beyond have the benefit of either their own off-street parking or garages. Little wonder that this different neighbourhood didn't feel the need for parking controls in their distinctive area, as reflected in the Council survey earlier this year. Cabinet should not permit those in less affected streets with the benefit of off-street parking options to veto the resolution of this serious problem in those streets that experience real problems every day.

The scheme for our neighbourhood that we petition you for today is, we argue, consistent with current Council policy. Specifically, Policy 3 guidance states:

"It may not always be possible to achieve majority support in every street within areas but it is not reasonable to delay measures to address parking problems in some streets within the area where there is support for parking controls because of the lack of support in other streets in the area where the parking problems may not be as severe at that time."

This is an accurate description of the current situation in the De Freville area of Cambridge. Cabinet should not permit those in less affected streets with the benefit of off-street options to veto resolution of this serious problem in those streets that experience real difficulties each day.

Finally, Policy 3 guidance also says: *"Parking control areas will be developedthrough consultation with local councillors to identify suitable sized zones for area wide controls"*. We have consulted and we have our local councillor's support.

In our area there a clear need and a clear desire for rapid resolution. The problem will not go away on its own, but your endorsement today will make an immediate positive difference to this neighbourhood and support efforts to reduce congestion in the city.