

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 17th April 2007

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.40 p.m.

Present: J E Reynolds (Chairman)

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

Also in Attendance

Councillors: M Ballard, I Bates, P Downes, A Kent, S King, and M Smith

Apologies: Councillors: L J Oliver and J K Walters

344. MINUTES 30TH MARCH

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 30TH March were approved as a correct record.

345. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Johnstone declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 11 – Hinchingsbrooke Hospital Consultation - as a non-executive director of Addenbrooke's Hospital.

Councillor Lucas declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 11 – Hinchingsbrooke Hospital Consultation as a non-executive director of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital and left the meeting during the discussion of this item.

346. PETITIONS

a) Petition from Papworth Everard Parish Council

A petition was received from Papworth Everard Parish Council with 225 local resident signatures and 28 e-mail signatures supporting Papworth Everard Parish Council's request for a 20mph speed limit zone in Papworth Everard along Ermine Street between Church Lane and Varrier-Jones Drive and along Varrier-Jones Drive past the village primary school.

In addition, the Parish Council had prepared their own counter report to that of the officers' report included on the Cabinet agenda. Paul Hicks spoke on their behalf highlighting the main points of the counter report, which had been sent to

members of the Cabinet on 12th April via e-mail and also as a hard copy. Hard copies of the Parish Council's report were made available at the meeting.

The counter report from the Parish Council requested that Cabinet should support the Parish Council's call for a 20 mile per hour (mph) zone in the central area of Papworth Everard, in line with the additional traffic calming measures proposed. The local member for Papworth and Swavesey speaking at the meeting also supported the request and in addition, attention was drawn to a statement provided by Andrew Lansley CBE, Member of Parliament for South Cambridgeshire expressing his continued support for a 20 mph speed limit, commenting that "we must not allow the Caxton situation to recur". Also highlighted was a letter attached to the report from Papworth Hospital's Chief Executive confirming the Hospital's support.

It was reported that following a meeting of the Parish Council held on 22nd March they were now prepared to make available the full £50,000 which was the current cost estimate required to fund the additional calming measures and as such, would have no budget implications for the County Council.

Main issues in the report from Papworth Everard Parish Council included:

- noting that the County Council policy for 20 mph speed limits required that they should be self-enforcing, to conform with Department for Transport (DfT) guidance (newly issued DfT Circular 01/2006 and DfT Traffic Advisory leaflet (TAL) 09/99), and as the Police were not able to undertake enforcement of such speed limits due to the resource implications.
- highlighting that two of the objectives of DfT Circular 01/2006 were for:
 - local speed limits that better reflected the needs of all road users, not just motorised vehicles; and
 - improved quality of life for local communities and a better balance between road safety, accessibility and environmental objectives, especially in rural communities
- highlighting that they considered that the new DfT Circular 01/2006 in conjunction with DfT TAL 09/99 was highly relevant to the unique set of circumstances present in Papworth Everard (and therefore could not be used to open the floodgates for other requests for 20 mph speed restrictions) for the following reasons:
 - a) the former main road was now entirely bypassed by the new purpose built A1198;
 - b) the former main road split the village in half, with one half of the village having to cross from the east side to access the new village primary school along Varrier-Jones Drive on the west side (the primary school being part of the County Council's safer routes to school programme (SRTS));

- c) the old school still existed in this central area in the form of the Cambridgeshire Instrumental Music Academy and fronted on to and was accessed from the former main road;
 - d) Pendragon pre-school (2-4 year-olds) was located adjacent to the Music Academy and also fronted on to and could only be accessed from the former main road; and
 - e) there was an exceptionally high use by special needs people, many in wheelchairs, living in the village crossing from accommodation on the west side of the former main road to the shops, doctor's surgery, library, coffee shop etc. on the east side.
- Reference to the County Council's January 2003 Environmental Statement listing five main objectives for the proposed bypass, highlighting two of them namely; enhancement to the environment of Papworth, Everard and improved safety for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians; and improved accessibility within the village, particularly for the elderly and disabled residents.
 - Setting out details of the additional measures that would be required for 20 mph compliance, with the Parish Council emphasising that they failed to see how the extra provision, designed to slow traffic, could cause 'gridlock' which remained a concern of the Police should traffic have to be diverted through the village in the event of the bypass being closed.. In addition, reference was made to the Transport Minister stating that improved safety was a reason for increasing the Government's funding of the bypass. The 20 mph zone was therefore seen as a key tool in achieving these aims of the bypass
 - Arguments set out in the report that the Parish Council could see no policy reasons for the County Council objecting to the implementation of a 20 mph zone, which was seen as:
 1. being entirely consistent with County Council policy,
 2. being cost neutral to the County Council
 3. was in line with the new central Government policy (DfT Circular 01/2006 and DfT TAL 09/99) which positively promoted the implementation of 20 mph zones, particularly in bypass schemes and where there were vulnerable road users.
 4. Not having a detrimental affect on County Council-Police relations, which had been alluded to in the report.

With the agreement of the Cabinet, the Chairman altered the order of the agenda in order to take agenda item 10 "A1198 Papworth: Traffic Calming Measures" as the next item in the running order.

347. A1198 PAPWORTH: TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

Cabinet noted that the officer's published report on the agenda had originally suggested that consideration should be given to a 20 mph speed limit as part of the post monitoring work for the traffic calming scheme and that the proposal should thereafter be assessed through the normal budget prioritisation process.

However, as a result of the new funding proposals brought forward by the Parish Council, a new recommendation was proposed at the meeting to agree to allow Papworth Everard Parish Council to pursue the introduction of the 20 mph speed limit using the Council's Third Party Funding Policy. This additional recommendation also required minor changes of wording to the other two report recommendations.

Advice was provided that the Traffic Order would need to be advertised, and that if objections were received to the revised proposals, a final decision to be made would need to be taken by the South Cambridgeshire Area Joint Committee (AJC). In addition, it was highlighted orally at the meeting to those present representing the Parish Council that the agreement would require the Parish Council to be liable for the full cost of implementing the works, whether it was greater or less than the current estimate, and that they would also be responsible for the maintenance liabilities associated with any features introduced as part of the scheme. (Reference was made to electronic signs)

Officers were asked to ensure the process could be completed so that any objections could be provided in a report to the Area Joint Committee at their June meeting.

It was resolved:

- i) Not to support a 20 mph speed limit on Ermine Street, Papworth Everard using County Council funds;
- ii) To agree to allow Papworth Everard Parish Council to pursue the introduction of the 20 mph Speed limit in i) above using the Council's Third Party Funding Policy, subject to the normal Traffic Regulation Order process should they wish to do so. Officers were asked to ensure the process could be completed so that any objections could be provided in a report to the Area Joint Committee at their June meeting.
- iii) To request that the officers continue to monitor the situation in Ermine Street following the completion of the bypass and traffic calming measures and to review the need for a 20 mph limit with the Parish Council after 12 months, should they choose not to pursue the third Party Funding Route.

348. WASTE PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE (PFI)

Cabinet received a report setting out the reasons for selecting Donarbon Ltd as the Preferred Bidder for the Waste PFI Contract. The report detailed the financial and risk management implications of awarding the Waste PFI Contract, the environmental benefits of reducing the amount of municipal waste sent to landfill, and the other drivers for change, such as the Government's Landfill Allowances Trading Scheme (LATS), the Landfill Tax escalator, national targets for the recovery of value from municipal waste, national targets

for recycling and composting and the growth agenda in Cambridgeshire. All these together made an overwhelming case for a step change in how the County Council deals with the County's rubbish in the future.

Issues raised by Cabinet Members included:

- whether any lessons could be learnt from the PFI Project in Gloucestershire which was referred to in paragraph 3.13 of the report as being in abeyance. It was explained that this particular scheme's solution had proved to be unaffordable within the original financial estimate and was currently being reassessed. The County Council's proposed partnership agreement was seen as financially robust.
- Concerns of the impact of changes in future Government policy regarding taxation of waste streams – in reply it was indicated that this had been taken into account in the assumptions about future risks and opportunities.
- The need to ensure the proposed education centre was progressed early in order to provide the facilities to inform people regarding the advantages of recycling over the unsustainable alternative of continuing to dump waste in landfill and that the doing nothing and carrying on as present was not an option.
- Concern by one member regarding safeguards that the proposals would not result in the County having to take more waste from other regions. In response reassurance was provided that the proposed Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) facility would be subject to a planning catchment restriction and that it had been sized to meet the expected needs of Cambridgeshire rather than being a regional or national facility.
- Assurances were requested regarding Donarbon's track record in being able to deliver the contract and in respect of their financial stability. In response it was clarified that as a project financial solution involving the investment of substantial funds by the Bank of Ireland, the Bank would have undertaken their own risk assessment before agreeing to support the bid. An extensive amount of officer time had also been undertaken in verifying the business case and the Audit Commission would also look at the robustness of it before signing it off. Members were therefore reassured by the high level of financial diligence that had been undertaken.

Cabinet was reassured by the detailed analysis of the bid as set out in the report and as a result:

It was resolved to recommend to Council that:

- i) the contract negotiated with Donarbon represents:
 - a) an acceptable solution for meeting the Council's landfill diversion objectives
 - b) acceptable value-for-money
 - c) an affordable proposition
 - d) an acceptable level of risk transfer.

- ii) the 28 year Waste PFI Contract is awarded to Donarbon Waste Management Ltd subject to the final contract documents being prepared to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal Services, the Director of Finance, Property & Performance and the Deputy Chief Executive (OECS)

349. JOINT PLANNING ARRANGEMENTS MAJOR GROWTH SITES

Further to a report received at the 27th February 2007 Cabinet meeting, Cabinet now received a report outlining the updated arrangements for joint working and decision making on the major growth sites between the County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, as accepted by the Minister for Communities and Local Government.

Cabinet were reminded that following a review of Cambridgeshire Horizons, the Minister for Housing and Planning had expressed concern about the current capacity and mechanisms for delivering growth given the “...*major increase in the complexity and size of the task*” and had requested a review of structures, capacity and a need for a shared leadership agenda, linking this to a willingness on the part of the Government to provide greater certainty of support on investment for the future. Following the review, officers from the County, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils and Horizons wrote back in December 2006 setting out proposals for joint working to address the concerns raised by the Minister. These included the creation of cross authority groups to drive the growth agenda forward through more efficient working practices and an increase in resource levels to support them.

Cabinet noted that the Minister had provided an initial reply to the proposals in January, welcoming the very substantial strengthening of the delivery arrangements for sustainable growth in and around Cambridge contained within them and offering, that subject to resolving a range of issues, the Government would be willing to consider a significant increase in revenue support for strengthening delivery mechanisms and to help develop a rolling fund to ensure the early provision of the infrastructure needed. Further responses received on 20th March 2007 addressed the issue of funding to support the proposed changes as set out in the officers’ report.

It was reported that there was still an outstanding issue regarding the Minister’s requirement for a policy making committee which required further work to finalise the detailed arrangements. As there remained an urgent need to establish the joint Development Control Committees, it was agreed that the suggested revised arrangements should be recommended for approval and that further discussions would take place as soon as possible to resolve the issues on the planning policy committee.

Members raised issues in respect of:

- the certainty regarding Government funding becoming available. It was indicated that Department of Communities and Local Government had given assurances that the proposals would be looked at favourably for

future years financing arrangements although no confirmation could be given at the current time beyond 2007/08.

- assurances being given that whatever structure was adopted that it would deliver the very demanding growth agenda, a member citing the previous shortcomings of the Northstowe Board and the need to ensure there were no further delays. In reply, members were assured that a great deal of joint working/joined up thinking by officers from the various Councils and Horizons had taken place to ensure the appropriate structures would now be in place.

It was resolved to:

- i) Endorse the proposed new arrangements for planning of the major development sites; in particular, the creation of:
 - A member level Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee;
 - Two officer level Growth Area Delivery Boards;
 - Two joint Development Control Committees;
- ii) Recommend the above proposals for consideration and approval by Full Council on 15th May 2007.
- iii) Delegate to the Lead Member for Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive Environment and Community Services to continue to work with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to develop a structure and scheme of delegation to officers of the three authorities to provide development control advice to the joint committee with the scheme to be approved by the relevant Joint Development Control Committee at its first meeting.
- iv) Delegate to the Lead Member for Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services the authority to seek to resolve issues in relation to the proposed joint policy making committee for consideration and decision by Cabinet and Full Council at a later date.

350. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN (BVPP)

Cabinet received a report outlining the proposed content of the BVPP for 2007/08, the projected timetable and work programme leading to its completion, and reports on progress made so far.

Cabinet noted that the Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP) would be prepared in line with statutory guidance and that the Council was required to make the BVPP available to the public by 30th June 2007. For the timetable to

be achieved this first required Council approval of the Plan, for which the next appropriate meeting was on 15th May.

Cabinet members expressed concern that for the second year running it had not been provided with a draft plan at the Cabinet meeting prior to the relevant full Council meeting and were uncomfortable that the proposals appeared to suggest that they would only see the draft plan a week before the Council meeting. There was also the issue of the timescale not allowing scrutiny of the plan.

There was also a request to include information in respect of where the Council had received Beacon status and also those areas where applications would be made in the future. Officers acknowledged the validity of including high performance and recent achievements as part of the text in the final document.

As a result of the concerns expressed, as well as requiring a draft to be sent to Cabinet Members as soon as possible and before the despatch of the County Council agenda, officers were also asked to investigate whether there was any flexibility regarding the current publication timetable and whether the Government would consider publication after the next Council meeting in July.

It was resolved:

- i) to agree the production of the BVPP, as well as the proposed content of the document subject to it also including details of achievements as well as performance.
- ii) That Cabinet Members are circulated by e-mail with the draft BVPP for comments before the despatch of the Council agenda.
- iii) To agree that the Full Council will approve the draft BVPP at their 15th May meeting, unless through officer discussions with the Government, the timetable for publication could be altered to allow for a later submission.

351. NETWORK SERVICE PLAN 2007

Cabinet received a report presenting details of the Network Service Plan and setting out the detail on what the County Council's Highways and Access Directorate would be delivering in the next 12 months in terms of a programme of projects to help maintain an efficient, safe, and cost effective road network. Approval of Cabinet was requested due the value of the work incorporated within it. Copies of the full Plan had been provided separately for Cabinet members with copies being made available at the meeting.

Officers were asked to check some of the detail in the document as it was pointed out that March was being referred to as a parish rather than a Town Council.

It was resolved to:

Approve the Network Service Plan 2007/2008

352. THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE COMPACT

Cabinet received a report advising it on the development of the Cambridgeshire COMPACT, an agreement between the statutory and voluntary sectors in Cambridgeshire to help support good working relationships and facilitate the successful implementation of the Local Area Agreement. The report also requested the identification of a 'lead' / Champion for the Cambridgeshire COMPACT.

It was resolved to:

- i) endorse the Cambridgeshire COMPACT
- ii) agree the lead member for Community Learning and Adult Social Care as the member 'lead' / Champion for the Cambridgeshire COMPACT
- iii) agree to ask officers to amend 'risk management' guidance in Council reports to specifically identify risks to the voluntary sector based on the COMPACT undertakings.

353. HINCHINGBROOKE HOSPITAL CONSULTATION

Cabinet received a report outlining the factors that had prompted the current review of services at Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, providing the consultation timetable, reporting on the progress of the consultation and presenting the suggested County Council response to the consultation.

Four options had been provided designed to achieve financial balance for the Hospital Trust, each requiring the reconfiguration of the services provided to ensure a more sustainable means of delivering health services to the people of Huntingdonshire. These were:

Option 1 - Minimum change - provision of broadly the same level of services on the site but at lower volumes with potential recurrent savings of £10.37m - this option was considered high risk.

Option 2 - Remodelled Services - provision of broadly the same range of services at lower volumes through a major redesign of how services were provided across the hospital and community setting. This was the NHS preferred option to realise potential savings of £14.50m.

Option 3 - Transferring significant elements of patient services to other hospitals and significantly reducing the activity on the hospital site - £10.33m potential recurrent savings.

Option 4 - closing all services on the hospital site with the exception of inpatient surgery and outpatient services in the Treatment Centre - £4m cost reductions /recurrent annual savings.

Representatives from the Hinchingsbrooke Healthcare Trust and the Cambridgeshire PCT had attended a meeting of the Corporate Services Service Development Group (SDG) on 21st March to present the options. Based upon the comments received from SDG Members and other invited County Council members, a draft response had been prepared for Cabinet's views before final approval was sought from full Council on 15th May.

Comments were received in writing from local Members and had been sent to Cabinet members in advance of the meeting. The written comments from Councillors Sir Peter Brown, Elaine Kadić, and Steve Criswell were tabled at the meeting. Comments from the relevant scrutiny chairman, Councillor Geoffrey Heathcock were also orally reported. (see the appendix to these minutes for a summary of all the above views)

Huntingdonshire Members for Brampton and Kimbolton and The Hemingfords and Fenstanton also provided comments at the meeting. Issues raised orally during discussion included:

- That the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) should confirm that following consultation and the implementation of an agreed option that the Hinchingsbrooke Health Care Trust should not suffer a second round of cuts from a further Regional Review of acute service provision to take place at a later date.
- That the views of Hinchingsbrooke Trust and the people of Huntingdonshire should be fully represented at both executive and non-executive levels of the new governance arrangements.
- Concerns regarding the long-term future of the Hospital. There were concerns of a merger with Peterborough Hospital at some future date despite current denials, and these were not supported.
- The future status of the Trust – one member expressed a preference for a hospital and community trust as an option to be pursued.
- More detail was required regarding the accuracy around the figure proposed under Option 2 of providing an investment of £2.5m in community based services. There were concerns that if the figure proved insufficient, particularly in year 1, there could be a lack of service provision in some areas.
- Requiring more details on how the above sum would be spent and what it would buy.
- General concerns regarding the fact that the financial figures from the PCT had still not been finalised.
- The need for both doctors and GPs to change behaviours in respect of minimising unnecessary referrals to hospitals.
- Questioning what would be the knock on effect year on year of the costs agreed under Section 31 Agreements, and what the expectations/implications would be for the County Council when cuts were made.

- Issues of concern around Doddington Hospital and the need to ensure decisions on Hinchingsbrooke Hospital were not taken in isolation.
- Concerns regarding future adult services provision/social care budgets and Health Service partners' commitment to the County Council's Social Care Improvement Plan.
- That there was a need to ensure clinical standards were maintained.
- Concerns regarding the transfer of outpatient services to General Practitioner (GP) practices or community settings without adequate access for patients via supporting transport infrastructure/car parking at GP surgeries.
- The issues of whether it was appropriate to transfer specialist services to GP practices.
- Issues in respect of the need to change behaviours by both GPs and the public regarding helping reduce the number of unnecessary referrals to hospitals.
- Availability of sufficient staff in the community across the patch being available to take up the transferred work which would otherwise be going to Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, especially as there had been historical shortages in many specialities.
- One member highlighted the need to address future provision of respite care to ensure its adequacy, otherwise she considered that the proposals set out in Option 2 would fail.

As a result of the views received a number of issues were raised which required to be looked at further in terms of the final response. In addition, due to the wide-ranging impact for County residents and potential impact on Council budgets of any future change option to the Hospital, it was considered appropriate that the updated response should be agreed at the next Council meeting.

Councillor Tuck did not feel able to support the current response without first seeing the details of the final plan, amidst her continued concerns on the current unknown affect on Adult Services budgets, the position on the future provision of respite care and not having received full reassurance of the long terms implications of other impacts e.g. Doddington Hospital.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree to note the draft response recommending support for Option 2 but that the response should be further revised to allow officers to take into account comments made at the meeting by Cabinet Members and from Huntingdonshire Members received both in writing or orally presented at the meeting.
- ii) That a final version of the response should be considered and agreed at the full Council meeting in May.

354. ROAD SAFETY SPECIFIC GRANT

Cabinet has received a report advising it of the changes to Safety Cameras Funding and Governance arrangements.

Cabinet noted that in December 2005 the Department for Transport (DfT) had announced that the system of funding Safety Cameras through penalty charges was to be end in April 2007 and would be replaced by a new national central fund for road safety of £110m a year. For Cambridgeshire this amounted to a Specific Road Safety Grant Allocation of £1,109,464 in revenue monies and £246,849 in capital for 2007/08, which would be in addition to road safety funding allocated through the Local Transport Plan settlement. In line with the associated DfT recommendations that local authorities participate in wider Road Safety Partnerships, Cabinet was provided with the details of the proposed arrangements that had been prepared to transform and strengthen the existing Partnership following a series of partner conferences held over the past ten months.

Due to the financial involvement, all partners would be represented on a Strategic Management Board and this would include an elected Member from both Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council. Cabinet was asked to approve appropriate members to serve on the Strategic Management Board.

It was Resolved:

- i) To agree that the Authority should enter into a wider Road Safety Partnership and to approve the proposed use of the Road Safety Specific Grant Allocation as set out in the Officer's report.
- ii) To approve the proposed arrangements for managing and supporting the new wider Road Safety Partnership, as outlined in the report.
- iii) To approve that both the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services or the lead member for Transport and Delivery should be appropriate members in terms of serving as the County Council elected member on the Strategic Management Board.

355. REVIEW OF SECONDARY EDUCATION PROVISION IN CAMBRIDGE

Cabinet received a report providing a summary of the responses received to the recent consultation on secondary education provision in Cambridge and highlighting the key issues and concerns raised. Cabinet was informed of the emerging response to meeting the secondary education needs of the planned development areas in and around Cambridge and the report outlined the further work required to inform a decision by Cabinet on the strategic provision of secondary education in Cambridge at its meeting on 22nd May 2007.

The local member for Coleridge who had requested to speak made the following points;

- While appreciating the flexibility in the approaches set out in 4.1 of the

current report he believed that the principles set out to inform the response to growing secondary school capacity issues including ensuring minimal turbulence for young people and communities did not appear to have been applied to Morley Memorial primary school parents in terms of the new proposed catchment area and instead supported retaining the existing catchment area for Coleridge Community College which was also supported by Cambridge City Council local Members. A smaller school on the federation school appeared to be a better option

- He believed that increasing the catchment area would result in some pupils having to undertake long journeys, some of which would be over the 3 mile catchment area limit, resulting in increased travelling costs to be borne by the County Council. In response to this point, officers indicated that measurements taken had shown that no pupils in the proposed new catchment area would be more than three miles away.
- Emphasising the strong links that had developed between Coleridge Community College, the local community around Morley Memorial and the commitment made by parents to the Parkside Federation arrangements.
- It was considered that there was the lack of a natural community link to the North of Newmarket Road development.
- That the one community that could not express any views via a consultation were the future residents of the new development, north of Newmarket Road.
- Support for a smaller secondary school within a federation model.

Members of Cabinet raised the following issues:

- A request for clarification of the existing County Council policy around fire suppression measures in new schools as a debate on the current Council Policy had resulted in officers being unable to confirm current Council policy. This would be further investigated by the officers and included in the further report.
- Support by the Cabinet member for CYPS to the concept of smaller schools centred around a community.
- Recognition of the need to reduce home to school transport costs as part of the consideration of the siting of new schools.
- The need to ensure cohesion in post 16 provision.

It was confirmed in response to various questions that the further report would include:

- Information from the Learning and Skills Council on post-16 provision.
- Information on the “Building Schools for the Future” (BSF) timetable linked to issues raised during consultation in respect of investment in existing schools.
- Consideration of the alternative proposals received in respect of the original proposal to change the catchment area of Morley Memorial Primary School, and the implications of these for the planned Southern Fringe secondary school in particular, the options of establishing two smaller secondary schools to serve Cambridge East and expanding Bottisham Village College.

- Consideration of options for secondary provision to serve North West Cambridge
- Consideration of issues raised around size and design of new schools, diversity of provision and parental preference

It was resolved:

To note the outcome of consultation and that a further report would be presented to the May Cabinet meeting setting out recommendations on the future provision of secondary education in Cambridge following further analysis of the consultation responses.

356. STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

Cabinet received a report seeking approval of the Council's Strategic Key Risk Register for 2007/08

It was highlighted that the Strategic Risk Register for 2007/08 included 3 new risks;

- i) Building Schools for the Future
- ii) Streetlighting Private Finance Initiative (PFI)
- iii) Partnership working with the Primary Care Trust (PCT)

The following points/issues were made:

- The Cabinet member for Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) requested that officers should review the numbering system in Appendix A to consider changing it so that it reflected the actual risk and officers should also review whether setting out the previous years risk number was confusing. It was explained that the purpose of showing the previous years number was for audit trail purposes. Officers agreed to look to see if a clearer numbering system could be developed for future registers.
- The Cabinet Lead Member for Inclusion highlighted the risks to the community as a result of potential hospital closures (by way of example citing the discussion held earlier in respect of Hinchingbrooke Hospital/Doddington Hospital) and that in her view they should be considered at a higher risk level when the Management Action Plans for Strategic Risks were prepared. In response the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services reminded Cabinet of the processes that had been used to identify the major risks and that the Risk Register was a live document with the order of items changed if identified risks increased in priority during the year, or if new previously unforeseen risks developed which warranted inclusion.

It was resolved:

- i) to approve the register of prioritised key strategic risks for 2007/08.

- ii) To note the progress made to date on the embedding of Risk Management process within the Council.

357. WASTE PARTNERING AGREEMENT

Cabinet received a report requesting that the Council should agree to enter into a Waste Partnering Agreement with the Cambridgeshire District Councils.

Cabinet noted that prior to the issue of the Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Invitation To Negotiate (ITN) documentation in August 2005, the five Cambridgeshire Waste Collection Authorities and Cambridgeshire County Council agreed Heads of Terms for a Partnering Agreement and had signed a Statement of Intent to enter into a formal Agreement. As the Waste PFI Project was now at an advanced stage of negotiation, it was important that the County and its District Council partners in RECAP (Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough) sought the authority to formally enter into this agreement. The objective of the Partnering Agreement was to set out clearly the responsibilities of the District Councils as the Waste Collection Authorities (WCA) and the County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA).

It was resolved:

to agree that the Council enter into the Partnering Agreement with the Cambridgeshire District Councils.

358. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEALTH ROLE

Cabinet received a report setting out how Cambridgeshire County Council contributed to public health with recommendations being proposed to define future public health governance arrangements following the appointment of the Director of Public Health and requested identification of a Cabinet lead member for Public Health.

The report outlined management arrangements for Public Health within the County Council, including proposed processes for member involvement and scrutiny and the suggested arrangements for producing the 2007 Annual Public Health Report for Cambridgeshire.

The amendment to recommendation ii) and iii) of the published report reflected that changes to the Inclusion Service Development Group (SDG) terms of reference and Scrutiny Committee functions required Council approval.

It was resolved to approve:

- i) The appointment of the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services as the Cabinet Lead Member for Public Health.

- ii) The Inclusion Service Development Group (SDG) taking the lead role in advising on Public Health development within the County Council and that the Council at their next meeting be asked to approve the amendment to the Constitution by adding the following words to the reference for the SDG (Part 2 Article 11 Advisory Process) "Public Health development within the County Council".
- iii) That Council be asked to agreed that the Scrutiny of Public Health should be led by the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee.
- iv) That occasional seminars should be held for Members on Public Health Issues.
- v) That an analysis of existing County Council policies and activity which impact upon Public Health should be carried out.
- vi) That discussions of the draft Annual Public Health Report 2007 should commence in September with appropriate SDG(s).
- vii) That the recommendations of the Annual Public Health Report should be used to develop an implementation plan with appropriate performance indicators.

359. DISTRIBUTION CENTRE

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to taking decisions in order to rationalise the storage needs of the Community Learning and Development Directorate from five sites to a single site in Huntingdon, and to agree to dispose of two surplus sites and to re-investment in a new facility.

One member was concerned of whether the proposals, which were expected to be cost neutral, would be achieved by centralising the distribution network as in some cases stock would be travelling further than previously. It was explained that currently stock was located and distributed from a number of centres and therefore there would be offset cost savings resulting from reduced handling costs.

It was resolved:

- i) To agree to declare the properties at Worts Farm, Landbeach and Gordon Avenue, March as surplus, dispose of the sites and re-invest part of the capital receipts into a new facility.
- ii) To agree to taking a lease of premises in Huntingdon on terms to be agreed by the Director of Finance, Property and Performance.

360. VIREMENT CONTROLS

Cabinet received a report highlighting that previously the Council's Constitution had allowed officers to make virements (transfers) of revenue funds between budget headings up to a maximum £150k value per transaction. During the current financial year concerns had been raised by the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee that the existing process of proposing and approving virements was at best unclear and at worst did not promote earlier disclosure and consideration of the issues surrounding such resource movements.

The current report therefore suggested improvements to clarify the virements policy, which was in addition to recent uplifts in the virements limits to officers (£160k for revenue and reserves and £250k for capital) and clarified that virements beyond the new limits including where a number in aggregate exceeded the limits would in future require Cabinet approval.

In a response to the current report, the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee in a statement orally reported at the meeting welcomed the tighter controls proposed. She also drew attention to the scrutiny report presented to Cabinet on 5th December 2006 which had highlighted that there appeared to be no limit on the number of transactions that the authorisation provided, which was why an early review of the adequacy of the current virement procedures had been requested.

She believed that the scrutiny committee would also wish to see a response from officers that addressed other points raised in that report, especially Section 3.4 of the scrutiny report regarding the processes for release of information within the Council and to the public, and Section 3.6 regarding the implementation status of Budget recovery plans. Officers considered the latter points to be more in respect of timing issues and that increasing Budget Control Reports (BCR) from a quarterly to monthly basis to Cabinet was not practicable, as it would devalue their impact and would unnecessarily further congest an already busy agenda. Monthly BCR reports were however now available to all Council Members.

It was resolved:

To approve the clarification of the virements policy set out in section 3 of the officer's report and that these clarifications should be reflected in updated procedures and as part of financial training.

361. WELFARE BENEFITS TAKE-UP INITIATIVE - EXTENSION OF FUNDING

Cabinet received a report advising it of the current situation regarding the continuation of funding for the Citizen's Advice Bureau (CAB) Welfare Benefits take-up initiative.

This report requested approval to a non-repayable loan from the Invest to Transfer Fund to cover a six month extension to the County's Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). Cabinet was reminded that during 2002/03 a Member led review of welfare benefits had concluded that there was a strong case for investing in the funding of welfare benefits advice for both social and business reasons. As a result, in July 2004 an advance of £150,000 was agreed from the Good Housekeeping Fund. Following a competitive tender exercise, the contract for promoting welfare benefits take-up had been won by the CAB and in October 2005 Cabinet had agreed to award the CAB an extension of funding for a further period of twelve months, subject to no further extensions to the scheme being considered until there had been a more detailed analysis of the Formula Spending Share (FSS) gain, following the grant settlement.

In line with the Cabinet decision, and based on benefit take-up information provided by the CAB, work had been progressing within the Corporate Finance Office to establish the level of grant gain for the Council, but this still required further work as it had proved difficult to quantify the amount of benefit uptake attributable to work undertaken by CAB, as opposed to other initiatives from the Department of Works and Pensions and the Council's own benefits advice initiatives. In addition, there had been changes to the way that the Council's Grant was allocated that meant that a direct link between the previous investment and grant allocation was not possible. While this work was being finalised, a discussion between the Leader, Chief Executive and the Chief Executive of the CAB had led to the current proposal that the contract should be extended for a further six months to allow full consideration of the issues and to enable CAB to be able to give adequate notice of the termination of the contract and if necessary to make arrangements with any affected staff.

Cabinet in agreeing this current additional extension was concerned that there should be no further extensions to the contract beyond the 6 month extension without the necessary analysis being provided and therefore requested that the work on identifying any quantifiable benefits should be concluded within a three month period and there should be a report back to Cabinet to enable a final decision to be made.

It was resolved:

- i) To approve a non-repayable loan from the Invest to Transfer Fund to cover a six month extension of the contract to allow a fuller consideration of the issues.
- ii) To request a report back to the June or July Cabinet meeting, whichever was the more practicable.

362. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Cabinet received a report detailing the progress on delegations. Oral updates were provided in relation to the discharge of the following delegations:

- the authority to the Portfolio holder for Equality and Diversity, (Cllr Victor Lucas) to approve the final Gender Equality Scheme prior to publication on 6th April 2007 as agreed at the 27th February Cabinet meeting.
- The authority to the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People's Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive for Children and Young People's Services to agree final consideration and approval of Part 1 of the Strategy for Change, prior to its submission to the DfES.

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 as updated orally at the meeting.

363. CABINET DRAFT AGENDA PLAN 22ND MAY 2007

It was resolved:

To note the agenda plan with the following changes:

Withdrawal of Agenda Item 8 "Review of Educational Provision in St Neots (determination of notice)

Chairman
22nd May 2007