

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 22nd January 2008

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 11.58 a.m.

Present: K Walters (Chairman)

Councillors: M Bradney, M Curtis, D Harty, V H Lucas, L W McGuire, R Pegram (Vice Chairman), J E Reynolds J M Tuck and F H Yeulett

Also in Attendance

Councillors: J Heathcock, S King, A Kent, M Smith, L Wilson and J West

Apologies: none

481. MINUTES 18th DECEMBER 2007

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18th December 2007 were approved as a correct record.

482. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Cllr Lucas declared a prejudicial interest in agenda item 4) Issues Arising from Scrutiny Committee – “006/07 Annual Performance Assessment of Social Care Services of Adult Services in Cambridgeshire and Associated Plan – reconsideration following the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee’s call-in of the Cabinet Decision on 4th December” following his appointment as the chairman of the Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust’s Provider Services Board on the basis that officers from the provider arm of Cambridgeshire PCT had been called as witnesses. During the consideration of the report he had left the room and had therefore not taken part in any discussions/subsequent decision.

Councillor Curtis declared a personal interest in item 10 Kingswood Park, March as the Chairman of Fenland District Council Planning Committee on the basis that a planning application may go to the committee in the future.

483. PETITIONS

Dr Silverston spoke as the chairman of the Babraham Road Action Group (BRAG) who had submitted a petition containing 63 signatures opposing the construction of a road junction on Babraham Road as the access to a proposed housing estate on land owned by the Bell Educational Trust, adjacent to Addenbrooke’s Hospital.

He reported that when the plans for the junction had been drawn up in 2003, BRAG had engaged its own highways planning consultant to examine the proposals and who had considered them to be substandard and dangerous in a number of key areas. These

conclusions had been passed to the Highways department at the time. Dr Silverston drew attention to the issue which he felt had not been addressed in the report, namely that half a mile along the road from the junction was the park and ride terminus used by most hospital employees and that surveys carried out by BRAG suggested that 250-300 cyclists and pedestrians travelled between it and Addenbrooke's Hospital every day. On the basis that the working population on site would increase from 6,500 to over 17,000 they had extrapolated that 850-1000 hospital employees would cross at the junction to access the estate. He read extracts from a CCC safety Audit report indicating that "the audit team had severe concerns that the proposed junction would need to compromise either safety or capacity". He then read a statement from Peter Brett Associates who had designed the junction replying to their planning consultant's letter, quoting "the problematic nature of the junction has always been acknowledged. We have raised a number of similar comments/observations to those in Mr Rutherford's letter. Mr Rutherford has highlighted one of our concerns - the access to 6 and 6B. It is not ideal".

Doctor Silverston made reference to other reports sent to Cabinet members before the meeting from David Rutherford and Rod Kirby of the Cambridgeshire Road Safety Advisory Council who stated that in their opinion the junction was sub-standard and dangerous. He also highlighted that the Cambridge Police Road Safety Unit and the Cambridge Cycling Campaign had submitted letters to the City Council's planners expressing their grave concerns on its safety.

In response to the petition, Cabinet Members asked the following questions:

- Whether Dr Silverston resided at one of the property addresses on Babraham Road that he had referred to earlier? He confirmed that this was the case.
- If he was aware that the Cabinet was not empowered to make any decisions regarding the planning applications but were statutory consultees to the application as the highways authority, and that the decision on the planning application would be taken by the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) where there would be a further opportunity to make objections. He indicated that he now understood the process having held discussions with officers the previous day. He was however still of the view that the Council's Cabinet should change its proposed response and put forward representations to the JDCC recommending that the application should be permanently refused on the grounds of safety.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Cabinet agreed that as the petitioners were lobbying with regard to information included in the report on the Southern Fringe planning applications, the report should be moved up the agenda and taken as the next item of business.

484. CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS AT CLAY FARM, TRUMPINGTON MEADOWS AND BELL SCHOOL – FINAL CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Cabinet received a report inviting it to consider the final consultation responses on the planning applications for Clay Farm, Trumpington Meadows, and Bell School which were three of the developments making up the Cambridge Southern Fringe urban extension as

defined in the former Structure Plan and the adopted Cambridge City Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework. A further report on Section 106 agreements for the developments, originally intended to be part of the current report (hence why it had originally been designated a key decision report) would be coming forward to a later Cabinet meeting for a decision.

All three of the planning applications were now due to be considered by the Joint Development Control Committee in February or March. The report updated Cabinet on the only outstanding issues identified by the previous consultation responses with the County Council's suggested responses being set out in appendices A1, B1 and C1 attached to the report. [Note In respect of the Appendix C1 Bell School Response Cabinet Members had been notified before the meeting that Paragraph 10.12 The first sentence "A new road on-roadincrease safety for cyclists" required to be deleted and the second sentence should be amended to read " There will be a new cycle link to Greenlands and the northwest corner of the site to link to a proposed cycle route forming part of the proposed cycle network for the Southern Fringe". The reason for the amendment was to more clearly state the facts relating to the mitigation measures being proposed for the Bell School in relation to cycling facilities and routes].

The local Member for Queen Edith's, spoke in support of the safety concerns that had been expressed by the petitioners regarding the new access onto Babraham Road. He was critical of the trip generation analysis included in the report which he believed were extremely optimistic, bearing in mind the amount of development due to take in place in respect of not only new dwellings, but also the move of Papworth Hospital to the Addenbrooke's site as well as Addenbrooke's own expansion plans and the resultant increase in staff movements.

The local member for Trumpington spoke in support of the objections to be made on the Trumpington Meadows application and the Clay Farm application on the basis of insufficient Affordable Housing being provided, the requirement for the provision of a Library and Lifelong Learning Centre. The latter was on the basis that community facilities should be in place at the time residents moved in, and that in her opinion, a recycling centre should not be sited within the boundary of the primary school, as this was not something she had ever heard of and did not consider it appropriate.

Cabinet Members raised the following issues:

- spoke supporting the archaeology concerns in respect of Clay Farm, which if not protected, could be lost forever.
- the final response should be extremely robust in terms of ensuring sufficient measures were in place to mitigate construction traffic and in respect of addressing waste management issues.
- The need to ensure that the section 106 agreements to be the subject of a further report were extremely robust in order to ensure early delivery of appropriate community infrastructure and that the County Council was not left with the liability to provide necessary infrastructure at a later date.
- Overwhelming support regarding the need for the early provision of a Library and Lifelong Learning Centre and also that a recycling centre was not appropriate within the footprint of the primary school.

Members in agreeing the objection to the Bell School site as set out in the report (rather than the request from the earlier petition asking Cabinet to recommend complete rejection of the proposal for an entrance to Babraham Road to provide vehicular and cycle and pedestrian access to the new development) were reassured by the officers that a second toucan crossing to the south of the junction on Babraham Road would help ease the pressure regarding pedestrian flow from the crossing to be sited at the junction. This measure, along with the improvement of the cycle path (along the permissive path and through the development site and onto to the Addenbrooke's campus via existing streets) would help ease pedestrian flow from the Babraham Park and Ride site and would help allay some of the safety concerns being expressed. Members therefore agreed to the objection as set out in paragraph 2.11 of the report. In addition, the point was made that there was also the need to ensure that the lighting sequences allowed local residents to access the road.

Cabinet Members also requested that the final responses should be extremely robust in terms of ensuring sufficient measures were in place to mitigate construction traffic and for waste management issues.

In respect to the Clay Farm planning application, the County Council as the Highways authority was recommended to

The Chairman made reference to a submission he had received from Hauxton Parish Council late the previous evening via an e-mail regarding the financial arrangements for improvements on the M11 at Junction 11. They had requested that any Article 14 funding arrangements were proportional to the size of proposed developments on both sides of the M11 and that the larger development should fund the majority of any junction improvements. This was to be looked at further by the officers.

It was resolved:

- 1) that the County Council should make representations on the proposals to the Joint Development Control Committee on the following applications

Clay Farm

To object on the following reasons:

- Confirming the County Council's previous objection with regard to the lack of information on affordable housing.
- Maintaining the objection in terms of the requirement for a contribution from Section 106 monies for the provision of a Library and Lifelong Learning Centre.
- Suggesting that until the transportation issues were resolved in terms of the quantum of development that could be delivered on site prior to the full opening of phase 2 of the Addenbrooke's Access road, including the connection through to Robinson Way, no development should take place until phase 2 of the Addenbrooke's Access Road had been opened and that a condition should be attached to the planning decision to reflect this.
- The issues in respect of cycling requiring to be addressed at the detailed design stage.

- That the proposed underground recycling facility should be provided adjacent to the primary school as opposed to within its footprint.
- The need for the area of landscaping between Hobson's Brook and the railway line to be accounted for in the Mitigation Strategy in terms of preservation by record or in situ, according to the significance of the archaeological remains identified.

To approve the transport planning conditions as set out in paragraph 4.23 of the report.

Trumpington Meadows

- That the County Council should maintain its previous objection to the lack of affordable housing, as the proposed 30% was inconsistent with the stated policies.

Transport

- Given the importance of this matter, Members noted that the technical work required for Trumpington Meadows had been submitted and assessed. The transport impact was noted as set out in Appendix B1 of the Cabinet report.

Bell School

- The County Council, as Highways Authority, to recommend that the application should be refused on the basis that a satisfactory design for the Toucan Crossing has still not been agreed.
- 2) to endorse the delegation to the Lead Member, Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services the authority to make any minor textual changes to the consultation responses prior to submission.

485. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CARE SERVICES FOR ADULT SERVICES IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND ASSOCIATED ACTION PLANS – RECONSIDERATION FOLLOWING THE HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE'S (HASC) CALL- IN OF THE CABINET'S DECISION OF 4TH DECEMBER

The meeting of Cabinet held on 4th December 2007 had considered the Annual Performance Assessment of Social Care Services for Adult Services for Cambridgeshire and associated action plan. Cabinet had agreed to:

- i) note the content of the Summary Report of the 2006/07 Annual Performance Assessment of Social Care Services for Adult Services for Cambridgeshire, including the judgements and the star rating given, and the action plan set out in Appendix 2 of the Cabinet report to address the areas for improvement identified by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI)

- ii) To confirm that updates on progress against the combined Action Plan (older people's service and additional areas of improvement) would be received by Cabinet, Cambridgeshire Care Partnership and Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny at a minimum of six monthly intervals.

Councillor Wilson the chairman of the scrutiny committee presented the report back from HASC explaining that the decision of Cabinet had been called in by fifteen Liberal Democrat Members of the Council on the basis that there had been insufficient debate at the Cabinet meeting on the adequacy of the proposed action plan, and as a result, they had called for a further review. Having considered the Annual Performance Assessment (APA) and action plan and the responses from Cabinet members and officers, the Scrutiny Committee had concluded that it did not have full confidence in the Action Plan to deliver the improvements that were identified in the APA and also highlighting that the service had received a low rating for the last six years. Members of Scrutiny were particularly concerned at the Cabinet's lack of insistence on the detail in the Action Plan when it had decided to accept the plan at its meeting on 4th December 2007. The scrutiny committee had therefore agreed to refer the matter back to the Cabinet for its reconsideration.

In reply, it was recognised that Scrutiny had made an important contribution to analysing and considering the issues in Adult Services including their most recent discussion. Cabinet however suggested that this particular call in should not set a precedent, as many reports considered briefly by Cabinet had been the subject of numerous detailed discussions and extensive monitoring in other forums, including the Adult Services Improvement Board and the strategic Cambridgeshire Care Partnership. In Cabinet's view the level of activity/scrutiny already undertaken and the commitment of the Council and its key partners to improve Adult Social Care Services had not been taken into account in terms of the reason given for the call-in. It also did not help that the six action points arising from the annual assessment were looked at in isolation when it was one part of a wide range of activity.

However, Scrutiny's request that the Cabinet should consider further the issues had been timely as it provided the opportunity to update all members on current developments. Cllr Bradney who had special responsibility for performance improvement stated that while there was a great deal of improvement activity being undertaken, there was a need for it to be co-ordinated into a single work stream and reported in a way which made clear how each part related to the whole. There had been an improvement in Adult Services but this had been insufficient and there was a need to increase its pace. Following discussions with the Interim Chief Executive he had asked that all improvement activity was considered by a single improvement board and captured in a single action plan. This would cover:-

- action from the 2007 inspection;
- the action being considered here from the annual assessment
- the action necessary to produce the older people strategy;
- issues arising from care partnership consideration of joint commissioning strategy;
- other improvement activity reporting to the improvement board;
- the improvement leadership initiative supported by east of England centre of excellence.

It was noted that the revised improvement board covering the full range of quality services for adults would be chaired by the Interim Chief Executive with Member involvement.

With regard to the issues raised by Scrutiny regarding workforce development, it was reported that there had been liaison with partners in the NHS to ensure a single coherent workforce development strategy. In addition, there was to be a consultation paper regarding the reporting arrangements for the Director of Adult Services to emphasise the strategic importance of the services for this Council. As any proposals might have implications for the Council structure, the Interim Chief Executive would first discuss this consultation paper with the incoming Chief Executive and as a result, the proposals would be timetabled for consideration in a few weeks time. In addition, it was reported that the budget to be considered by the Council on 19th February included proposals to invest in the modernisation of Adult Social Care management capacity focusing on:-

- commissioning;
- partnership building;
- quality assurance.

In summing up, the Chairman responded that he would expect that if Scrutiny Committee were uncertain of the deliverability of the action plan, or indeed of any decision taken by Cabinet, they should put forward specific recommendations for improvements based on robust challenge and evidence, in order to justify Cabinet reconsidering a decision previously made. There was also a need to have confidence that the Council's scrutiny process was not being manipulated for political purposes.

It was resolved:

To re-confirm Cabinet's decision of 4th December and to approve the action plan (set out in Appendix 2 of the Cabinet report) as a robust document to address the areas for improvement identified by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI).

486. CAMBRIDGESHIRE'S LONG TERM VISION AND LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT (LAA) 2008

Cabinet received a report presenting the final draft of Cambridgeshire's Vision (Countywide Sustainable Community Strategy) developed by Cambridgeshire Together (LAA Board), and to highlight the key stages in the process to develop and negotiate the new LAA for 2008.

The report summarised the main outcomes resulting from a November consultation event, and further input that had been received from Members and partner organisations, which has facilitated the development of the final draft appended to the Cabinet report.

An update confirmed that The LAA Board had endorsed the final draft of the vision at its January meeting. An oral update was also provided of the changes /outstanding issues regarding:

- the financial basis of the LAA, which was now different from the original understanding which had been that the LAA Board would make decisions regarding resource distribution. It was confirmed that this was not now to be the case and that the lead budget holder of an area base grant for a specific service would for 2008/09 (and possibly beyond) have the first say on how resources were spent for their particular service responsibility.
- The figures and methodology used in the vision for forecasting population growth. It had been reported that there were differences between the figures for growth projection provided by the Office of National Statistics (based on past growth) and the figures provided by the County's Research Team (based on the projected increase in the number of houses). As a result the LAA Board had agreed that the Research Team's figures may be more appropriate in some cases and that further work would need to be carried to see what pressure could be undertaken by Government to change the methodology being used.
- the 35 key priorities which the Government was now asking should be indicated (and which could attract reward monies) by January, having originally had a target date of June.
- That the Government had not yet finalised the technical information on the new national indicators at the time of the report, which was key to the development and negotiating process of the new LAA.

Reference was made to the Vision addressing Climate Change within its priorities and the importance of this, in light of the increased flooding experienced in parts of the County in the previous few days, which was now becoming a regular phenomenon.

It was noted that The Local Government and Public Health Involvement Bill placed a duty on all local authorities to develop a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) with partners. In two-tier areas, there would be district-area based Sustainable Community Strategies developed by Local Strategic Partnerships, and an overarching Countywide Sustainable Community Strategy developed by the LAA Board under the leadership of the County Council. To fulfil this statutory responsibility, the final draft of the Cambridgeshire Vision (countywide SCS) was recommended for full Council approval on 19 February 2008. This proposal was supported.

The report author was thanked for her excellent report with the Interim Chief Executive and the report author also for the work undertaken on the vision and in supporting the work of the LAA.

It was resolved to:

- i) Agree the final draft of Cambridgeshire's Vision while recognising that small editorial changes were still being made in the light of comments from partners.
- ii) Endorse that the most up to date Cambridgeshire Vision should be taken to full Council on 19 February for approval.
- iii) Note the steps to develop and negotiate a new Local Area Agreement for 2008/2011.

- iv) Agree to receive regular progress reports.

487. HUNTINGDON BUS PRIORITY: HINCHINGBROOKE JUNCTION BUS LANE IMPROVEMENT

Cabinet received a report setting out the details of the results of the public consultation on the Hinchingsbrooke bus lane proposals, the comments that had been made from Huntingdonshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee (AJC) and as a result recommending reaffirmation that the Hinchingsbrooke Junction Bus Lane scheme should now be constructed. A package of bus priority measures between Huntingdon and St Ives had been developed as part of the Huntingdon & Godmanchester Transport Strategy designed to minimise the impact of congestion on bus journey times and improve reliability and extend the benefits of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway from St Ives to Huntingdon contributing to the delivery of the Transport Strategy by enhancing the quality of bus services to and through Huntingdon.

Since Cabinet last considered the Hinchingsbrooke scheme, a Toucan crossing on Brampton Road and a realignment of the Hinchingsbrooke Park Road exit had been added. A cost estimate including these safety features found the scheme to cost in the region of £1million which was in excess of the original budget of £600,000 due to increases in the costs of statutory undertakers diversions and an underestimate for construction inflation. As a result it was explained that a scope analysis had been undertaken to identify if and how the scheme could be delivered at an acceptable cost and consultation undertaken on the reduced scheme.

Comments received by Cabinet from local Huntingdon councillors in support of the recommendation in the report recognised the need for an improved and integrated bus/public transport service following regular concerns raised regarding the traffic and other infrastructure issues within the area. The local members commented that since the plans were put in place there had been a substantial amount of growth in the area resulting in a higher density of housing and further demands on the educational establishments at Hinchingsbrooke School and Cromwell Park Primary School. They also made reference to further vehicle parking problems being generated by Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, the Fire Authority and Cambridgeshire Constabulary. Added to this were issues regarding uncontrolled parking as a result of the expansion of the Hinchingsbrooke Industrial estate, adjacent to the Marriott Hotel. They explained that the current situation was becoming more chaotic and with only one access to the Estate from the Brampton Road, this was becoming extremely congested even beyond peak times. Following enquiries, they now understood that there would not now be any access to the estate from the A141/A14, but that at sometime in the future a second access would be available as a result of the implementation of the Huntingdon Town Plan. They recognised that the timing of this would not be in the foreseeable future. They therefore called for the Huntingdon Town Centre improvements to be interlinked with the upgrading of the A14 and that the County, District and Town Councils should consider this as a priority, since the Town continued to suffer chronic congestion whilst a number of projects were being progressed.

It was explained to Cabinet that Huntingdon Town Council had originally objected to the scheme wishing to await the Highways Agency making a firm decision on the removal of the A14 viaduct. However as the onsite works on this were not likely to take place before 2015, this had been rejected by the AJC. The recommendations from the AJC were to support approval to the scheme with elements removed as set out in the report, with the exception being to recommend the retention of the uncontrolled pedestrian island in Brampton Road. This change was recommended following the results of the public survey, where its removal had been opposed by the majority of those who had responded.

Cabinet noted that the engineers had made assurances that any approval to the current scheme would not negate any later proposals.

Other issues raised included:

- One Member requesting that once the works had been undertaken, the erection of signs should be considered for an initial period to warn motorists of the changes to layout etc.
- Commenting that the biggest challenge would be the college moving and the need to consider officers liaising with the hospital, college and school to consider staggering arrival and departure times in order to help ease congestion.
- Receiving confirmation that the Bus Priority Budget would pay the £200k gap identified between the cost of the scheme at £800k and the identified funding of £600k.

It was resolved to:

- i) Note the results of the public consultation and comments from Huntingdonshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee on the detailed design of the scheme shown in Appendix A; and
- ii) Reaffirm the scheme for construction as outlined in paragraph 2.2 of the officer's report, with the addition of including the retention of the uncontrolled traffic island in Brampton Road.

488. HIGHWAY OPERATIONAL MATTERS

Cabinet received a report requesting consideration to:

- i) Setting new penalty charges for Civil Parking Enforcement in response to new regulations made under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004;
- ii) Setting revised reasonable charges for Section 38 road adoption agreements - as currently the base linear figure used in the calculation of the bond sum was £575 and given the significant increase in construction costs over the last few years it was considered appropriate to review and agree a charge which also covered administration costs. The recommended charge was based on the mid range of charges made by a number of similar authorities obtained from a benchmarking exercise.

The report also updated information on the speed limit review programme agreed on 22nd October 2007 Cabinet in respect of a review of all speed limits over 30 mph on the A & B road network, broken down into 85 road lengths and prioritised on the basis of the injury accident history for each length. The current report explained that the two lengths of road in Cambridge currently with 40 mph speed limits had been omitted in error from the priorities review. Cabinet noted that the two lengths of road, Long Road and Barnwell Road (south), had now been assessed and the programme had been adjusted accordingly.

Cabinet were informed that in line with the Secretary of State's requirement that the level of penalty charge should be consistent with securing a high level of compliance and should be self financing. As a result, Cabinet agreed to the proposal that the penalty charges should be set at the higher rate (identified as Band 2 in the table). This recommendation for the higher charging band took into account the relationship between off-street parking charges and the level of penalty charge. Historically, off-street parking charges in the city had been set high for long stays to encourage modal shift towards more sustainable forms of transport.

One member requested that appropriate leaflets and publicity should highlight the high level and low level contraventions set out in the appendix to the report as she was unaware that some were finable offences (08 - 'parking at an out of order meter during controlled hours' – on the basis that it was expected that a motorist would go and park at a meter that was working and 24 'not parking correctly within the markings of a bay or space' – both were particularly highlighted in the table on page 8 listing lower level contraventions) and was sure that many of the public were in the same position. Officers agreed to look to update appropriate leaflets and publicity material for greater clarity.

With regard to the higher level contraventions on page 7 of the report 62 "parked with one or more wheels on any part of an urban road other than a carriageway (footway parking)" Members were concerned when informed that this applied more to London and that it was not enforceable outside London by local authorities unless a specific traffic order had been made. Currently enforcement was by the police. In that it was known that Norfolk had made such an order and such parking was a particular hazard to wheelchair users, guide dogs and mothers with pushchairs, officers were requested to take the issue back to the local constabulary to look at them undertaking greater enforcement or for the local authority to consider obtaining the necessary enforcement powers. Officers did advise that it would not be practicable to enforce such measures countywide and would need to be further investigated. This would be undertaken as part of the work to consider extending civil parking enforcement to all parts of the county.

It was resolved to:

- i) Support the advertisement of Band 2 penalty charge levels set out in Table 1 in the Cabinet report;
- ii) Delegate the determination of any objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order, including penalty charge levels to the Deputy Chief Executive (OECS) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport;

- iii) Approve a new base linear charge of £800 for Section 38 road adoption agreements and the arrangement for its annual revision as set out in paragraph. 6.3 of the report; and
- iv) Note the update on the A & B road speed limit review.
- v) Ask officers to investigate the future viability/practicalities of local authority enforcement to prevent footway parking by vehicles as part of the consideration of countywide civil parking enforcement.

489. HUNTINGDON TOWN CENTRE PROJECT, FINANCIAL UPDATE

Cabinet received a report requesting approval to virements to enable the financing of the Huntingdon Town Centre Project, prior to moving forward with the second and final stage of the project.

Cabinet noted that at the time it had approved the proposal to rebuild the Library in Phase 2 of the project, a budget was set for both Phases 1 and 2 at £13.2 m with a further £2.2m being set aside for replacement training facilities giving an overall budget of £15.4m.

The present report indicated that following a review of the costs of Phase 1 and in confirming the costs of Phase 2 together with the requirements of the replacement training centre, the total cost of the scheme had risen to £15.940m, therefore requiring virements to allow the project to continue in full. Cabinet agreed to the proposed virements on the basis of assurances given that the new budget would be sufficient to finance the project and that it would be delivered to the agreed timescale.

It was resolved:

To agree a revised overall budget for the project and approve the following virements to enable the project to be funded in full:

- The transfer of £2m from the training centre sub project to the town centre sub project with an alteration to the spend profile (by moving the bulk of spend from 2007/08 to 2008/09).
- The transfer £0.540m (of the £1.7m net Workwise asset saving not otherwise accounted for in the capital programme) to the town centre project.

490. KINGSWOOD PARK, MARCH

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to dispose of land of 12 hectares (30 acres) to the east of the A141 and south of Burrowmoor Road in March on terms to be agreed. It was noted that the land might be allocated for residential development in the emerging Fenland District Council Local Development Framework (LDF) and as the County Council was not the principal landowner, a residential development would be promoted whether the Council participated or not.

The intention would be to explore the disposal by way of an Option as this usually generated a (small) upfront capital payment that was non-refundable. Cabinet was advised that if any part of the Council's land was then subsequently allocated for development, the Council would gain a very substantial capital receipt that could be invested in other capital projects or used to reduce debt charges. It was also agreed that should it be more advantageous to sell the land on an alternative basis, this should also be explored.

It was resolved:

To declare the land at Kingswood Park, March surplus to the Council's requirements and authorise the Director of Finance, Property and Performance to agree terms for its disposal.

491. PROPERTY IN THE SOUTHERN FRINGE

Cabinet received a report requesting consideration of proposals to dispose of a legal interest in the Trumpington Park & Ride site and acquire an option on land west of the M11 Motorway.

Cabinet was advised that as part of the planning permission being sought for residential development and a new school on land to the south and west of the Trumpington Park and Ride site known as Trumpington Meadows, the Trumpington Meadows Land Company (TMLC) wished to formalise their access rights to construct two new accesses into their new development. One to be constructed opposite the new Addenbrooke's Shelford Road/Hauxton Road link road now being built, and one further north. Both crossed the north and south entrance/exit to the Council's Park and Ride site.

Cabinet were advised that a proposal for a second park and ride site around the junction of the M11/A10 had been put forward as part of the Transport Innovation Funding (TIF) bid. TMLC owned a site to the north of the A10 and west of the M11 and terms had been agreed to acquire a 15 year option over a 12 hectare (30 acre) parcel within the larger block of land. The option to be granted would also give the Council the right to develop the land for other County purposes and non-County uses.

It was resolved:

To agree to dispose of an interest in the Trumpington Park and Ride site and acquire an option on land adjacent to the M11/A10 junction on terms to be agreed by Director of Finance, Property and Performance.

492. QUARTERLY UPDATE REPORT ON KEY PARTNERSHIPS

In order to update Cabinet Members and enhance the accountability of the activities of key strategic partnerships, Cabinet received the second quarterly report on the following four partnerships:

- A) Cambridgeshire Together
- B) The Children and Young People Partnership
- C) Cambridgeshire Care Partnership
- D) Cambridgeshire Horizons

An update was requested regarding the current position under the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership section of the report on the status of the outstanding Section 75 agreements between the County Council, Primary Care Trust (PCT) and the Mental Health Trust which were still awaiting the PCT Board to sign off. It was reported that there was now only one outstanding issue and that final sign off was expected shortly.

In respect of the Section 29 Committee referred to in the Cambridgeshire Horizons section of the report, it was noted that a report would be coming forward to the Cabinet meeting on 1st February.

It was resolved;

To note the report.

493. CABINET DRAFT AGENDA PLANS – 1ST AND 26TH FEBRUARY 2008

The agenda plans were noted with the following amendments:

Changes on 1st February

Shared Services Commercial Tender partner report to move to 26th Feb

Additional report under Council heading titled “Prudential Borrowing for Addenbrooke’s Access Road Phase 2”

Additions to 26th February

Key Decisions

1) Proposed Extension of the lantern Ely - Approval to Publish Notices
Other Decisions

2) Amendment of Policy for Property Disposals

Other Decisions

3) Passenger Transport Review

Moved from 26th Feb to the April Cabinet meeting

4c) Best Value Review of Integrated Older People’s Services

494. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Cabinet agreed a resolution to exclude the press and public during the consideration of the following report on the grounds that it was likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 2 (disclosure of the identity of an individual), and 3 (Disclosure Of Commercially Sensitive Information) 4 (impact on labour relations) and 5 (reveals information that could prejudice future decisions) of Part 1 schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and that it would not be in the public interest for the information to be disclosed.

495. PROPOSED TRANSFER OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD UNIT TO OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGY

Cabinet received a report informing it of the results of the tendering exercise in respect of the proposal to transfer the County Council's Archaeological Field Unit (CAMARC) following a tendering exercise. Following the tendering process officers reported that Oxford Archaeology (OA) was the preferred bidder for the proposed transfer and was therefore being recommended for approval.

Cabinet were reassured to note that as set out in the report, that the staff employed in the unit had indicated a very clear preference for OA, recognising a close cultural fit between the two organisations, and also recognising that the move offered greater long-term job security and enhanced career prospects. It was also confirmed that Unison has been closely involved through the Joint Consultation and Negotiating Group, the Project Team and Staff Group. Unison Branch officers had expressed their satisfaction at the exemplary openness and inclusiveness of the consultation process and therefore also supported the proposals.

The management and staff of CAMARC were congratulated for their work undertaken for the Council over the years and Cabinet was reassured that the excellent open days/exhibitions would continue under any new arrangements via a service level agreement in respect of Education and Outreach Work.

An issue was raised regarding the Office budget responsible for any liability resulting should it be necessary to write off the loan detailed in the report. It was clarified that this would fall to the Environment and Community Services Office.

It was resolved to:

- i) Approve the proposed transfer of the archaeological field unit to Oxford Archaeology
- ii) Delegate to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services (ECS) and the Deputy Chief Executive (ECS) the authority to

- Negotiate with Oxford Archaeology a mutually acceptable agreement for the proposed transfer, including if necessary writing off the loan as detailed in 3.6 of the confidential report.
 - Reconsider other bidders should negotiations with Oxford Archaeology prove unsuccessful.
- iii) That should it be necessary for the loan referred to in ii) above to be written off, this should be via a report back to Cabinet.

Chairman
1st February 2008