

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 28th September 2010

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.25 p.m.

Present: Chairman: Councillor J. Tuck

Councillors: Sir P Brown, M Curtis, D Harty, L W McGuire T Orgee, R Pegram, and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors S. Criswell and J Reynolds

Also Present by invitation: Councillor: S King

Also present for at least part of the meeting : Councillors: K Bourke, P Downes, N Harrison, D Jenkins, V Lucas, L Nethsingha, T Stone, J West, F Whelan and K Wilkins.

233. MINUTES 7TH SEPTEMBER 2010

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 7TH September 2010 were approved as a correct record.

234. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Cllr Curtis – Declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in paragraph 2.8 of agenda item 8 “Capital programme adjustments(2010/11) Minor Highway Policy Changes” with reference to Civil Parking Enforcement as he was a member of a Fenland District Committee looking at the issue of Civil Parking Enforcement.

Also declared a personal interest in agenda item 10 “Building schools for the Future” as a LEA Governor of Sir Harry Smith Community College

Cllr Yeulett – same as above regarding report 8.

Cllr Orgee – Declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as a Governor Addenbrooke’s NHS Trust in agenda item 7 “Establishment of a New Maintained Primary School through Competition in Gunhild Way”.

235. PETITIONS

a) Establishment of a new Primary School in Cambridge (Gunhild Way) – Petition of over 400 signatures to support the Roman Catholic Diocese of East Anglia’s Bid

The spokesperson Pauline Blake spoke in support of the above petition for which key issues / information highlighted and tabled at the meeting has been included at appendix A to these minutes.

b) Establishment of a new Primary School in Cambridge (Gunhild Way) – Petition of over 300 signatures to support the proposal by the Queen Edith Community Federation Group

The Spokesperson was the headteacher of Queen Edith Community Primary School, Caroline Peet.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF AGENDA

Two more petitions were received following the publication of the agenda as set out further below. However, as there were a number of teaching staff present from Queen Edith Community Primary School, the chairman agreed to change the order of the agenda and to take item 7. "Establishment of a New Maintained Primary School through Competition in Gunhild Way" as the next item of business in order to allow the teaching staff to exit the meeting once the item had been determined.

236. ESTABLISHING A NEW MAINTAINED SCHOOL THROUGH COMPETITION IN GUNHILD WAY, CAMBRIDGE

Cabinet received a detailed report in respect of the outcome of the competition process for the establishment of a new maintained primary school in Gunhild Way, Cambridge due in September 2011 and for which two very credible competing bids had been received: one from Queen Edith Community Federation and one from the Roman Catholic Diocese of East Anglia.

Cabinet noted that a series of reports to consultative group meetings had previously provided detailed information about the projected increased demand for primary school places across Cambridgeshire due to rising birth rates and increased fertility rates evidenced through analysis of National Health Service (NHS) data. Available data had made it possible to identify pressures at individual school and local area level up to and including the 2013/14 academic year. The most significant level of growth was in Cambridge, particularly in the south of the City. One of the key recommendations previously agreed by Cabinet was the need to establish a new two-form entry primary school on the former Netherhall Lower School site, in Gunhild Way, Cambridge, from September 2011 and that the new school should be established by means of an open competition process.

Questions / issues raised / discussed at the meeting included:

- asking officers to respond to point 7 of the Petition supporting the Roman Catholic Diocese bid. This stated that "Cambridge City Headteachers have so far failed to reach agreement on redrawing catchment areas to suit the Queen Edith bid. In contrast, the Head of St Alban's Catholic School has spoken to Heads in Cambridge, all of whom have agreed to support a new Catholic school." Officers provided Cabinet with clarification on the process that had been followed in consulting on the catchment area for the new primary school. This had started with discussion with the Cambridge Primary Pressures Steering Group, which included representatives from Cambridge headteachers and the Church of England Diocese. Then a meeting had been held with the headteachers and Chairs of Governors of the schools most affected (Morley Memorial, Queen Edith and Ridgefield Primary) to explore the available options, and finally a meeting was held with the headteachers and Chairs of Governors of all schools in Cambridge. No consensus on the way forward was achieved at these meetings, and

it was therefore not considered appropriate to propose changes to existing school catchment area boundaries in advance of the competition process. Both bids proposed different admissions criteria and catchment area boundaries. Officers felt unable to comment on personal conversations that the headteacher of St Alban's may have had with individual headteachers.

- In reply to a question on whether any pupils would be excluded from applying for a place in the proposed new school, it was indicated that the school proposed by the Queen Edith Federation Group would admit children of all faiths, and those of no faith; and the school proposed by the Roman Catholic Diocese, while giving priority to baptised Roman Catholic children, would allow other applications and, therefore, no pupil would be excluded on faith grounds. However, officers considered that the Roman Catholic proposal would not meet the basic need for school places, resulting from the democratic pressures in the south of the City, as effectively as that of the Queen Edith Federation Group.
- It was confirmed that the most up-to-date NHS birth data (September 2010) still showed the requirement to plan for a new school.

Cabinet took into account various supporting evidence which had been provided when considering the assessment of the two competing proposals. This included the decision making framework set out in section 5 of the report, considering the views of two petitions referred to above, and the results of the extensive consultation exercise set out in detail in appendices to the report, as well as the views of the local county councillor for Queen Edith electoral division (supporting the Federation bid) and also views submitted by the local member for Bourn (supporting the Roman Catholic diocese bid).

Cabinet found it a very difficult decision to make, but having considered both proposals in detail, Cabinet supported the bid from Queen Edith Community Federation based on the following:

- Their proposal was much more substantial than that of the Diocese of East Anglia, with strong supporting evidence of how the school would be run;
- There was a clear federation and partnership structure, which outlined in detail who would be involved in the running of the school and how this would be implemented;
- Most importantly, it was considered that the admission arrangements proposed by the Queen Edith Community Federation Group would better meet the demographic pressures in the south of the City - the main purpose of establishing the school - without adversely affecting the other measures that the Council has put in place in that area to meet demand, particularly in Cherry Hinton.
- The wider catchment area proposed by the Diocese of East Anglia was considered likely to result in far more cross-City travel.

An important issue brought to the attention of Cabinet was that since May 2007, the local authority had a specific duty to respond formally to parental representation, under the Education Act 1996, (as amended by the Education and Inspections Act 2006) in furtherance of its duty to promote choice for parents and secure diversity in the provision of schools. The competition process for the primary school had shown strong parental demand and support for the provision of additional Roman Catholic primary school provision in Cambridge. Therefore it was proposed that the letters of support and the petition presented should be judged to be a formal parental representation under the new duty.

It was resolved that:

- i) the Queen Edith Community Federation Group should be awarded the competition to run the new school in Gunhild Way, Cambridge;
- ii) the parental letters of support and the petition presented by Catholic parents to Cabinet should be judged to be a formal parental representation under section 14 of the Education Act 1996 (as amended by the Education and Inspections Act 2006); and that
- iii) the County Council should, therefore, produce a timetabled plan for future action on the establishment of additional Roman Catholic primary school provision in Cambridge, in consultation with the Diocese of East Anglia, within four weeks of the date of the Cabinet meeting and present this to the next informal policy development consultation meeting in November 2010 with a view to a report back to Cabinet in December

237. FURTHER PETITIONS RECEIVED

C) 1,355 Signature Petition Titled "Save Arbury Library"

The text for the petition read: "We the undersigned call upon Cambridgeshire County Council to firmly reject any plan to close Arbury Library or that the existing professional service is replaced with a reduced library service run by volunteers, we believe the social cost to the community would far outweigh the financial gain to be made."

The spokesperson was John Marais. The petition from residents of the Arbury and Chesterton electoral divisions supported the continued provision of the Arbury local branch library in Cambridge in advance of any future report which might consider possible closures. Their presentation highlighted that it was a very well supported local library since it was opened in 1966 supporting a catchment area of 25,000 people and had over 40,000 visitors in 2010. It was stated that the Library's facilities were used by a wide age range from the elderly to young children, including children involved in special reading schemes and was supported by the award winning children's author, Paul Shipton. In opposing any future closure or having a reduced service run by volunteers, it was indicated that its supporters believed that the social cost to the community would far outweigh any financial savings and that a volunteer run library was not a no cost option and that the library should be encouraged to continue to be a hub facility for the local community.

One Member asked where was the nearest alternative local library to Arbury library? In response it was indicated that it was 1 mile away in Milton Road.

In response to the petition, the Cabinet Member for Communities thanked the spokesperson for the presentation indicating that he would take account of their views as part of the feedback being received from meetings being held around the county during the consultation period. It was indicated that the Council did not wish to close any library, but had to look at all options, including voluntary sector participation, as a result of the severe reduction in resources, currently 25% over three years but possibly rising to 40%, and which could not yet be quantified until the Comprehensive Spending Review announcement was made in October.

As there was a relevant report on the agenda Councillor Brown invited the petition spokesperson to hear the debate on the Libraries report included later on the agenda.

D) Petition of 66 signatures requesting abolishing the Busfare for Yaxley Children to go to Sawtry College.

The spokesperson was Cllr Maddie Banerjee (Hunts District Council) supported by Cllr John Watt (Yaxley & Farcet Ward), and Cllr Dick Tuplin (Sawtry ward and Governor of Sawtry College). The points she made in presenting her petition included that:

- Stanground College Peterborough the designated catchment area school for Yaxley was considered to have a poor reputation with many local parents.
- She had been previously been assured that when Hampton College, the Secondary school of South Peterborough, was opened the problem of limited school choice would be solved. She indicated that this had not proved to be the case and that like Stanground it was also full and had only received a very limited number of children outside of the catchment area in the previous year. Therefore parents were not being given any choice in where they were able to send their children. She indicated that she was now being told that when Great Haddon was built, the problem would be solved which she indicated did not help current pupils and was always a future solution, rather than one which dealt with the current perceived problem.
- Parents were having to pay £750 per annum for a bus (provided by the school cost based on the distance) which many parents could not afford. 255 children from Yaxley were currently using the bus service from Yaxley to Sawtry with 50 more being involved in parental car shares.

Her solution was:

- a) to name Sawtry College as the named school for Yaxley
- b) or for the County to provide a free bus pass to Yaxley children attending Sawtry.

As there was no relevant report on the agenda it was agreed that officers in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Learning would write back to the petitioners with a formal response within 10 working days.

**238. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY - SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: LIBRARY SERVICE REVIEW**

A report was tabled following consideration of the Libraries Services Review Update report at the above scrutiny committee which had met three days before the Cabinet meeting. A brief presentation was made in respect of the five recommendations tabled from the scrutiny committee. These included asking Cabinet to explore further the opportunities for revenue generation within libraries (e.g. sponsorship, third sector partnership and good practice gleaned from the private sector) and asking it to consider delaying making irreversible decisions, such as library closures, before there had been time for a thorough review of all of the options beyond January Cabinet. The scrutiny committee was thanked for its helpful comments that would be taken into account as part of the ongoing review. In

response to the point regarding delaying consideration of the outcome of the review, it was indicated that the risk involved in delaying decisions beyond January 2011 was that the Library Service Review and its outcomes would then be out of step with the Council's Integrated Planning cycle.

Officers presented a proposed response which was tabled at the Cabinet meeting.

It was resolved:

To approve the responses which are set out in appendix C of these minutes.

239. LIBRARY SERVICE REVIEW UPDATE REPORT

Cabinet was reminded that the current report to Cabinet followed the report to the 5th July which had resolved to:

- endorse the work underway on alternative options for governance, management and support
- agree to officers urgently pursuing an alternative approach to service delivery based on self service technology and greater community involvement
- agree to officers undertaking an urgent review of library provision in Cambridge City and the surrounding area
- agree to the approach suggested for identifying libraries for closure, should this be required
- agree to the implementation of proposals for savings on support for Library Access Points, especially in relation to stock provision
- agree to the implementation of proposals for savings on the Mobile Service, based on a move to monthly stops
- authorise officers to proceed with full public engagement about library services and consultation on the proposals above.

The current report took into account the recent announcements from the Coalition Government on 'Localism' and 'The Big Society' with Cabinet confirming its support of the Government view that libraries could and should be encouraged to become hubs of community activity and not just to be lenders of books and that officers should seek to develop that approach throughout the County. In respect of this, Cabinet Members made clear that this concept was also relevant to the Cambridge Central Library with Members wishing to see its services widened and not restricted to providing specialist services. Members asked that officers should review the role of Cambridge Central Library in relation to the rest of the library service in Cambridge City, especially in the context of potential closures or conversion to Library Access Points.

Reference was made to a number of suggestions already received, including one from the local member for Warboys and Upwood, suggesting the "Wisbech model" as being one that should be looked at further in terms of possible future rural libraries provision.

There was concern expressed by a number of Cabinet Members that the current Library Assessment Methodology which dated from 2002 required urgent review as it appeared to be inconsistent and disadvantaged rural libraries in its overall scoring mechanism, by not taking into account rural areas with poor public transport access. Scoring rural libraries to

the next nearest library received the same weighting as for an urban library for double the distance. Officers indicated that this reflected the population density in a city being much greater. The current methodology was only seen as a starting point and officers would consider a whole range of factors in further analysis, as well as how best to mitigate any possible potential closures. Officers agreed to re-examine the methodology to ensure such factors raised as a concern by the Members were taken into account.

Cabinet noted an update on the implementation of the savings in the Library Service to date as set out in section 2 of the report.

Cabinet was also provided with an update on the progress on pursuing alternative options for governance, management and support as detailed in section three of the report, including the development of a partnership with other public library services in the East of England to explore areas of joint and shared library and information provision. Details were also provided of the results of the soft market testing exercise which had taken place at the end of July with the feedback and initial conclusions as set out in paragraph 3.5 of the report. All externalisation options required consideration of the size and scope of services which were potentially part of the externalisation process. This included both the scope of the operational services to be included and also consideration of the issues around corporate support with potential savings in Information Technology, human resources and finance support.

A working group was also investigating the feasibility and financial viability of an alternative model of service delivery. This was based on transforming frontline service delivery by putting self service technology into all libraries, reducing the numbers of paid staff, and seeking voluntary and community support to help plan and deliver library services (through volunteering and the establishment of Library Management Boards and fund raising Friends Groups). The intention was not to replace staff with volunteers or to create fully volunteer run libraries but to establish a core offer of minimally staffed opening hours for each library with volunteers sought to carry out specific services (such as assisting people to use self service terminals or helping run children's story times) in order to provide additional capacity.

It was resolved that:

- i) Cabinet notes the implementation of savings in the Library Service to date.
- ii) Officers will take the following actions which will include:
 - the production of detailed business cases on:
 - externalisation options
 - alternative service delivery approach
 - assessment of libraries for either possible closure or a library access point model.
 - A full appraisal and analysis of the outcomes of the user / community engagement process which ends on 30th September 2010.
 - A review of the Cambridge Central Library's role with a view to integration of Library services within Cambridge City.
 - To a review of the Library Assessment Methodology to ensure it fairly reflected service accessibility in both rural and urban settings.

- the presentation - based on this further analysis - of an overall strategy for the future of the Library Service:
 - for adoption by Cabinet at its 25th January 2011 meeting,
 - confirmation by full Council in February 2011.
 - Implementation from April 2011 onwards, following further detailed public consultation.

iii) In order to inform the next phase of the Library Service Review it was agreed to:

- support Cambridgeshire's participation in the shared services agreement with partner authorities in the East of England, as outlined in section 3.2 of the report.
- To continue to pursue all externalisation options
- To look at the potential to include essential critical elements of the cost of corporate overheads in any externalisation package.
- The Library Service fitting in with the Coalition's drive for Localism and The Big Society with an emphasis on libraries being community hubs providing wider services.

240. CAPITAL PROGRAMME ADJUSTMENTS (2010/11) AND MINOR HIGHWAY POLICY CHANGES

As a result of the Department for Transport (DfT) announcing an emergency budget to cut the national deficit, Cabinet was informed that the amount of money available through Cambridgeshire's Integrated Transport Block allocation would be reduced by £2,035,000 for the current year – 2010/11. It was noted that the (The Maintenance Block of the LTP was unaffected by this grant cut). Cabinet therefore received a report seeking agreement to significant changes regarding a proposed revised reduced Capital Programme and approval to virements within the Maintenance Block element of the Network Services Plan 2010 and a further approval to a minor Highway Policy change to increase rates for bond sums under s38 agreements. In addition, specific grant cuts had also been applied which were reflected in a revised Network Services Plan (NSP) document and to works the Council would undertake in the current year. These were:

- A10 Maintenance grant reduced by £133,000 to £532,000.
- A505, East of Coach & Horses (Bridge Strengthening) grant reduced by £25,000 to £100,000.
- A505, Whittlesford Bridge (Bridge Strengthening) grant reduced by £25,000 to £100,000.
- Road Safety Grant reduced by £248,000 to £0.

The report requested that it should approve the following virements with a reduction in the footway maintenance and cycle paths budget by £1,261,000 to £814,000 to be re-allocated to three sub-programmes, as follows:

(i) Carriageway Maintenance – Principal Roads to be increased by £660,000 to £1,665,000.

(ii) Carriageway Maintenance – Non-principal/Unclassified Roads to be increased by £401,000 to £4,706,000.

(iii) Strengthening of Bridges to carry 40 tonne loading to be increased by £200,000 to £1,980,000.

In the case of (i) and (ii) above, it was explained that the changes had become necessary following the harsh winter period and the impact on road conditions. In the case of (iii), this was to return surplus funding from the 2009/10 bridges budget that was temporarily applied to other maintenance budgets, allowing work to be brought forward in that year.

Following changes to the Council's standard construction specifications, it had also been necessary to consider increasing the rates used to calculate the bond sums for section 38 road adoption agreements. These were set out as follows:

Table of Bond sum unit rates (existing and proposed)

	Existing rate (lin. metre)	Proposed rate (lin. metre)
Footways	£70	£100
Cycleways	£105	£175
Carriageway	£800	£800

As the main proposal to Cabinet sought approval to a reduction to the agreed Capital Programme by £2.035m, the Head of Legal Services had ruled that this would require full Council approval.

Following the announcement of the reduced grant allocations, officers had assessed the 2010/11 Integrated Transport Block capital programme and had identified, with the relevant Cabinet Members, a series of schemes and programmes that could be reduced to meet the lower levels of funding that was to be received and the impact that such reductions would have as detailed in section 2 (paragraphs 2.5 to 2.17) of the Cabinet report. It was highlighted and noted that at the current stage, schemes were not being cancelled but were being recommended for deferral (or in some cases, technical studies reduced in scope) as the funding to be made available in the next financial year was not yet known and therefore it was proposed that those schemes alongside the others that would have been delivered next year should be assessed as a whole when the 2011/12 capital programme was being formed and would be the subject of future Cabinet reports.

Cabinet received representations from the local member for Wisbech South seeking to remove the deferral proposal for Wisbech Market Place. His views were supported by a number of other Members when discussing the deferral of the particular scheme at a non-decision making policy development group held the previous day. Such a deferral was not however supported by the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning for the reason set out in the preceding paragraph above.

It was resolved:

- i) To recommend to Council the revised Capital Programme, reduced by £2,035,000 due to grant cut, and the reduced works programme contained within the Revised Network Service Plan 2010;

- ii) To approve the virements, within the Maintenance Block, from Footway and Cycle Paths Maintenance budget to Carriageway Maintenance and Bridge Strengthening budgets set out above;
- iii) To approve the minor Highway Policy change to increase rates for bond sums under s38 agreements set out in the table above.

241. THIRD CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP) PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON FUNDING FORMULA

Cabinet received a report providing details of the consultation on the objectives and priorities for LTP3 that had taken place between January and July 2010 as well as details of the Government announcements of relevance to the Local Transport Plan process. The report sought Cabinet's view on:

- i) whether LTP objectives should be prioritised.
- ii) The forward programme for LTP3 development to April 2011.
- iii) A first draft of a proposed response to the Department for Transport's (DfT's) 24 August consultation on the funding formula for Integrated Transport and Maintenance Block capital funding allocations.

Cabinet was reminded that the County Council was required by the Transport Act 2000 and the Local Transport Act 2008 to produce a third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) for the period from April 2011 to be in place by 31st March 2011. Recent announcements by the Coalition Government had confirmed that the requirements remained in place, but had clarified that in light of the change of Government:

- How local authorities review LTPs once in place would be a matter for local determination;
- As the Government was currently considering its stance on local government performance management, it would be for local authorities to decide what performance indicators they included in LTPs;
- There was a need to include key overarching policies, namely ones which helped grow the economy and helped tackle carbon emissions, while not neglecting other important priorities, including road safety, affordability, accessibility, and people's health and wellbeing - for example, through more cycling and walking.

To inform the development of LTP3, public and stakeholder consultation was undertaken. Overall, stakeholders who responded identified improvements to public transport infrastructure and improving roads as the most important transport improvements for LTP3.

It was resolved to:

- i) note the results of the public and stakeholder consultation on LTP3 objectives and priorities.
- ii) approve the proposal for the County Council's Strategic Objectives to form the overarching objectives of LTP3, instead of the previous Government's Delivering a Sustainable Transport System (DaSTS) objectives.

- iii) In the context of the consultation results and the emerging policy objectives of the new Government, approve the prioritisation of objectives.
- iv) Endorse the proposed draft response to Government's 24 August consultation on the formulae that are used to calculate Integrated Transport Block and Maintenance Block capital allocations to transport authorities and delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to make any minor changes prior to submission to Government.

242. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE

Cabinet received an update report in respect of developments in the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme in Cambridgeshire seeking Cabinet's endorsement for the timetable, resourcing and affordability implications set out in the report.

Cabinet noted that on 5th July 2010 the Secretary of State for Education had announced an end to the national BSF programme under which all 3,500 secondary schools in England were due to be rebuilt or refurbished over a 15 year programme, and as a result, many projects across the country had been stopped. However, a number of projects which had passed financial close, including the six BSF schools in Fenland, would continue to be funded.

Cabinet noted that construction work had begun at the Phase 1 Schools in July 2010 and was due to be completed at both schools (Thomas Clarkson Community College, Wisbech and Neal-Wade Community College, March) by early 2013. Construction work at the Phase 2 Schools (Sir Harry Smith Community College, Whittlesey; Cromwell Community College, Chatteris; Meadowgate Special School, Wisbech; Fenland Junction Pupil Referral Unit, March) was programmed to start in spring 2012. A timetable for the Fenland BSF programme, together with summary details of the scope of each scheme was set out in the Annexe of the report.

Whilst there were inevitably pressures, the Phase 2 schools were considered to be affordable on the basis of:

- the expected capital grant available from Partnership for Schools (PfS);
- school contributions to Facilities Management (FM) and Information Communication Technology (ICT) costs were secure via signed Governing Body Agreements with the respective governing bodies;
- an appropriately experienced and resourced client side team was in place, with a confirmed net budget of £774k in 2010/11 and an estimated net budget of £700k and £650k in 2011/12 and 2012/13 respectively;
- planning risk at Cromwell Community College, Sir Harry Smith Community College and Meadowgate Special School was considered to be low and is being further mitigated by the preparation of planning briefs for each development.

The effect of indexation since the Outline Business Case (OBC) (March 2008) had been to reduce significantly the headline capital figures available for each of the Phase 2 schools in

the Funding Allocation Model (FAM). The location factor had also declined (the location factor reflected regional variations in construction costs). It was noted that in theory, the construction deflation seen over the previous two years which the reduction in funding reflected, should mean that the same project scope was deliverable at less cost. However, officers highlighted that in order to maintain project affordability the following mitigation measures might need to be considered as part of the design development process:

- i adjusting the proportions of new build to refurbished accommodation
- ii forgoing some aspects of schools' Strategies for Change;
- iii securing additional savings and efficiencies through the Local Education Partnership (LEP);
- iv additional capital contributions from the Local Authority.

(i), (ii) and (iii) in some combination was considered to be the best way forward.

Cabinet noted that officers would seek to deliver each scheme within the funding available from PfS by prioritising design development decisions accordingly and also look to the LEP to maximise the value for money of its design solutions to ensure that the available funding purchased the maximum amount of school in the prevailing market conditions. Whilst a reduction in the FAM as a result of indexation was likely to pose schools and the LEP some challenges, officers believed that the fundamental ingredients of each school's Strategy for Change could still be delivered by the available funding.

In reply to a question that was raised in respect to paragraph 3.10 (which indicated that when the costs exceeded the balance of school contributions available in the sinking fund the authority would provide capital resources up to the value of £11.5m as required to restore the balance) it was confirmed this would be by way of a first call on the Schools Capital Programme and was a capped sum over 25 years as agreed at a previous Cabinet and Schools Forum.

Alan Kippax the BSF Programme Director and his team were thanked for their efforts that had enabled an early start to the project and for the work undertaken during the summer which had enabled affected schools to open again in September.

It was resolved to:

- i) Note recent developments with the BSF programme nationally and in Cambridgeshire;
- ii) Note the implications and principal risks set out in sections 2 and 3 and Annex 3 of this report; and
- iii) Confirm the Authority's commitment to proceed with the Fenland Phase 2 schools by endorsing the timetable, resourcing and affordability implications set out in this report.

243. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Cabinet received the latest version of the Corporate Risk Register to enable members to receive an update on the status of the main risks to the achievement of the Council's objectives. The Register provided an important assurance on how the risks were already

managed, and, where necessary, on further action that required to be taken. This was the first time the newly revised Corporate Risk Register had been reported to Cabinet following a review of risk management processes within the Council.

It was resolved:

To confirm that Cabinet was content with the risks as described, the controls which already existed to manage the risks and any mitigating actions planned.

244. HEALTH WHITE PAPER REFORMS OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE (NHS) AND ASSOCIATED CONSULTATION

Cabinet received a report setting out the details of the Government White Paper on reforms of the National Health Service (NHS) and associated consultations.

Cabinet noted that on 12th July 2010 the Secretary of State for Health (Andrew Lansley) had published the White Paper *Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS*. Subsequently a range of consultations had been issued by the Department of Health (DH), listed at section 5 of the Cabinet report. Most of the proposals in the White Paper required primary legislation to be introduced and a Public Health White Paper was expected later in the year and another on social care reform was due in 2011. The majority of the reforms were expected (subject to legislation) to come into effect in April 2012 with significant development of the detail to be carried out beforehand. A joint response from Cambridgeshire Together was therefore being prepared (which the Cabinet Member for Children was pleased to note had taken account of the role of Children's Services) with the joint Adult Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Committee was developing a separate reply. It was also understood that Health colleagues were also considering an additional, separate response.

Cabinet noted that the overall intentions of the White Paper were strongly in line with the Coalition Government's approach to localism, including moves for local people to have a much greater say in the services they needed and wanted. There were seen to be some inherent dangers in the proposals which, if the implementation was not planned carefully, could replace current bureaucratic arrangements rather than just remove them. The Paper represented a major restructuring, not just of health services but also of councils' responsibilities in relation to health improvement, and coordination of health and social care.

Cabinet noted that the proposals in the White Paper cover four broad themes:

- Putting patients and public first
- Improving healthcare outcomes
- Autonomy, accountability and democratic legitimacy
- Cutting bureaucracy and improving efficiency

Within the above themes were a range of more specific proposals as detailed in section 1.6 of the Cabinet report. It was highlighted that Local authorities' new functions as stated in the White Paper had been summarised as follows:

"Each local authority will take on the function of joining up the commissioning of local NHS services, social care and health improvement. Local authorities will therefore be responsible for:

- *Promoting integration and partnership working between the NHS, social care, public health and other local services and strategies;*
- *Leading joint strategic needs assessments, and promoting collaboration on local commissioning plans, including by supporting joint commissioning arrangements where each party so wishes; and,*
- *Building partnership for service changes and priorities. There will be an escalation process to the NHS Commissioning Board and the Secretary of State, which retain accountability for NHS commissioning decisions.*

These functions would replace the current statutory functions of Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees. As well as elected members of the local authority, all relevant NHS commissioners will be involved in carrying out these functions, as will the Directors of Public Health, adult social services, and children's services. They will all be under duties of partnership. Local HealthWatch representatives will also play a formal role to ensure that feedback from patients and service users is reflected in commissioning plans."

In reply to a question raised, it was confirmed that at the time the report had been written there was no detail on the cost implications to the County Council should the resource transfer for the new responsibilities following the abolition of the PCT not prove to be adequate.

In terms of a discussion on the proposal to move to GP consortia as there were already consortiums in place in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough the challenge would be in the co-ordination of partnership / joint working at County, District and local levels.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the contents of the White Paper and associated consultations and the potential responses from the County Council.
- ii) To devolve responsibility for finalising the Council's response to the White Paper and accompanying consultation to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing in consultation with the Executive Director: Community And Adult Services.

245. NEIGHBOURHOOD PANELS – REVIEW OF ARRANGEMENTS

Cabinet received a report on the findings and conclusions of the recent review of the County Council's participation in neighbourhood panels (or district equivalents) in the light of more than one year's experience of the process.

Cabinet noted that since the Parliamentary Election, there had been renewed focus upon the need to engage communities as a means to achieve the Government's aspirations around Localism and the Big Society. Although Neighbourhood Panels/Forums were only part of the programme of work to enable this agenda to be taken forward, as proposals regarding the promotion of the Big Society were developed, it was considered important to ensure that the opportunities presented by Neighbourhood Panels/Forums to involve local people in the agenda were maximised.

It was reported that over the last year or so, Neighbourhood Panels had developed an

increasingly significant role in County, Districts' and the Constabulary's public and local engagement processes. The panels/forums provided the main local platform for local communities to meet with local authorities and were highly visible. The Council had a stated commitment to, and invested much effort in, supporting Neighbourhood Panel (NP) (or district area equivalent) arrangements. However it was identified that as well as panels operating in very different ways in some districts in the County, they still required some improvements with regard to their support arrangements to increase the effectiveness of the County Council's contribution to these forums. These included the need to:

- Increase Councillor attendance and participation for which County Council Members attendance was currently only 52%
- Increase engagement with the public – at meetings and through associated activities
- Expand the remit to make panels/forums about more than fault reporting
- Publicise the outcomes from panels/forums much more widely
- Focus on areas of insufficient progress in meeting Council goals for panels/forums, e.g. in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire; even in the other three districts, where a level of consistency of approach has been achieved, further development work was seen as desirable.

It was reported that meetings had already been undertaken with Action with Communities in Rural England (ACRE) in order to ensure more efficient partnership working.

Questions raised / issues discussed included:

- Querying section 2.11 of the report which suggested “that it would be appropriate to divert officer resources away from supporting the NP structures to supporting other community engagement initiatives given the aspirations within the Community Engagement Strategy and the need to address the Localism agenda in the context of reduced financial resources” and whether officers were still therefore seeing neighbourhood panels as the appropriate fora to devolve the ambition to devolve local decision making and whether they should also be looking to merging functions currently carried out by the area joint committees(AJCs) . In reply, the Cabinet Member for Communities indicated that there was still a great deal of work to be undertaken regarding the future arrangements on how NPs and AJCs might operate in future. In terms of the current pilot project this would be looked at in terms of assessing the feasibility for possible merger. The Service Director: Community Engagement (Fenland) made the point that NPs were only part of the localism agenda and in terms of the two current Neighbourhood Panel Liaison Officer (NPLO) posts, the text related to how the existing resource could be used most effectively.
- An issue was raised regarding the appropriateness of the feedback from the current appointed lead officers attending NP meetings, and that it was often considered more appropriate if the relevant service officer reported on their particular area where issues had arisen. There was also an issue of seeking to ensure that the appropriate services were present at meetings and able to answer service specific queries.
- The need to engage and encourage greater involvement from the voluntary sector was raised as an issue.
- In terms of the appendices provided there was a request with reference to appendix 2 that they should be updated for accuracy as two of the Fenland officers were moving on and a check was needed in terms of correctly spelling all district areas (highlighting the wrong spelling of Gamlingay)

- The Cabinet Member for Communities also highlighted the need to recognise the role that parish councillors could play in helping deliver services.

It was resolved to:

- i) note the achievement made in terms of the development of the Neighbourhood Panels process to date and the contribution that the County Council has made in that regard;
- ii) agree that the County Council should continue to play a positive role in the Neighbourhood Panels process;
- iii) agree that the County Council should work collaboratively with other local authorities and key partner agencies to achieve effective community engagement through using the panels process as one of a number of methods to take forward the Localism agenda;
- iv) accept that Neighbourhood Panels (or district area equivalent) were likely to operate differently in each district, to reflect local practice, but requested that officers continue their efforts to achieve operational consistency, as far as possible, across the County;
- v) reaffirm the aims and operating principles for Neighbourhood Panels adopted in December 2008 (as detailed in sections 1.1 and 1.2 of Appendix 1 of the report);
- vi) agree to review the current pilot being undertaken in terms of the future potential to merge Neighbourhood Panels and Area Joint Committees.
- vii) Endorse the revision of the two current Neighbourhood Panel Liaison Officer (NPLO) posts to release capacity to undertake other work to support delivery of the Community Engagement Strategy and the wider Localism agenda;
- viii) Re-affirm expectations that County Councillors would attend and participate in Neighbourhood Panels (or district equivalent) as well as continuing to encourage the involvement of parish councillors;
- ix) Agreed that the roles of the County Councillors and the Lead Officers in relation to participation in Neighbourhood Panels be developed and for them to be more “self reliant”, requiring less support from the NPLOs;
- x) Agreed that further training / learning should be provided for all elected members in relation to their role as a community leader and that the importance of their engagement in the Neighbourhood Panels process be reinforced;
- xi) Agreed that any role descriptions being developed for County Councillors should include the role that they are expected to perform in relation to Neighbourhood Panels (or district equivalent).

246. GRANT FORMULA CONSULTATION : PROPOSED RESPONSE

Cabinet noted that the Department for Communities and Local Government had recently launched a consultation on minor changes to the Grant Formula with a more fundamental review of Local Government finances planned to be undertaken in 2011/12. As a result, Cabinet received a report setting out a proposed response to the very technical consultation, separately highlighting Cabinet's oft mentioned views on the Four-Block Model that underpinned the current Grant Formula and that taking into account the likelihood of reduced resources, it was more important than ever that funding allocations were made using a robust distribution methodology. Cabinet, along with almost all of local government, had consistently opposed the continued use of the Formula Grant distribution mechanism, the Four Block Model, as it is not considered fit for purpose.

Highlighted in the report was:

- the fact that the 2010 review coincided with further significant changes to the administration of concessionary travel, with the responsibility for it being transferred from lower to upper-tier authorities, with insufficient funding being provided to meet the estimated costs. Members highlighted the need for the Local Government Association to make representations to Government to try to help alleviate the expected significant additional burden.
- That in respect of floor damping levels the formula should be made simpler so there were not top tier winners and losers and that if possible, a single figure should be used across the country for grant uplift/reduction until the grant formula was reviewed.

The point was made at the meeting that the County Council as part of a fast growing area should not be penalised under any new grant distribution system and that this should be highlighted as part of the response.

It was resolved:

To approve the consultation response contained within this report.

247. OBJECTION TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER: BYWAYS OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC No3 WENTWORTH, No4 WENTWORTH, No5 WENTWORTH, No6 WENTWORTH, No8 WITCHFORD, No9 WITCHFORD, No19 COVENEY AND No13 HADDENHAM

Cabinet noted that the above named routes had been the subject of Temporary Closure Orders since February 2010 in order to allow for restoration works to the surface and (at Witchford and Wentworth) for biodiversity improvements. Cabinet was informed that the network of byways in the area was extensive and as a result, the Council did not have sufficient funds to improve the standard of the surface sufficiently to withstand vehicular traffic all year round. Now that the restoration work had been completed, the proposal was to protect the byway in the interest of all users by closing them to motor vehicles with more than 2 wheels between 1st October and 30th April, with the possibility of closure outside those periods should weather conditions make it likely that significant damage to the surface of the highway would occur.

Cabinet was informed that reports of surface damage by vehicles and injury to pedestrians dated back to 1998 and that there had been repeated complaints that very deep rutting of the surface had made the routes difficult to use by pedestrians and horse riders. The report

proposed that the Order would be enforced by means of statutory signage, with gates erected where affected byways met the adopted highway or other byways not covered by the Order. It was highlighted that the County Council as the Highway Authority had no discretion over the form, design and placing of the statutory signage as this was clearly set out in the Traffic Signs Regulations. Gates were considered necessary to ensure illegal access did not take place, as previous attempts at voluntary restrictions agreed with organised user groups had failed.

Letters of support for the proposed Order had been received on behalf of land occupiers in North Fen Haddenham and from Witchford Parish Council. Haddenham Parish Council had no objections while Coveney Parish Council, who had no objection, had asked that the Council should ensure that any signing was provided in a sensitive manner. The Wildlife Trust, the District Council Tree Officer and the Internal Drainage Board also supported the proposals.

Two objections had been received to the proposal one from a resident in Witcham and one from a resident in Coveney. The resident in Witcham had stated that the routes had become more difficult to use with a cycle since being closed, and that the signage was inappropriate for the rural location. The resident from Coveney objected to the signage and gates, stating that they were 'horribly obtrusive and out of place in open countryside'. He also indicated that the surfaces of the routes were less usable to walkers and cyclists because vehicular use of the routes used to roll down the surface and smooth out pock marks made by horses and objected to 'the proposition that the lanes are some sort of recreational/nature corridor [which] is completely at odds with their historic use as access routes to fields'.

The local Member for Sutton had provided written comments orally reported indicating that "while I have no real objection to the proposals but do not like the signage which has raised a lot of adverse comment locally. While I appreciate what is being said about it being a national requirement it is another example of Big Government knows best and it is about time something was done to enable more appropriate signs to be installed in the countryside. I would request that officers write to whoever is responsible at the Ministry of Transport for a dispensation to use more fitting signage".

As the statutory signage was one of the main concerns expressed, officers were asked to make representations through appropriate bodies to the Department of Transport to review unnecessarily obtrusive sign clutter, especially as the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Eric Pickles MP, had recently picked up as an issue, street clutter, including unnecessary signage.

The report author and Acting Executive Director: Environment Services was also asked to ensure that in future such reports to Cabinet should not include individual names or addresses.

It was resolved to:

- (i) determine the objections without holding a Public Inquiry;
- (ii) introduce the Order as advertised
- (iii) inform the objectors accordingly.

- (iv) to submit representations to the Department of Transport through a relevant review body regarding consideration of future flexibility on signage requirements in environmentally sensitive areas, including those in a rural location.

248. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY

As the report was not available / finalised / authorised for despatch 5 clear days in advance of the meeting, the chairman agreed to exercise her discretion under Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow the report to be considered as a late report for the following reasons:

Reason for lateness - In order to provide the most up to date position for Cabinet and to allow for any progress from continued negotiations, this report is finalised as close as possible to the Cabinet meeting.

Reason for urgency - There is a commitment to report to the 28th September Cabinet on the latest position regarding the outstanding identified defects / continued discussions with the developer.

Cabinet was reminded that as a result of the continued lack of significant progress towards rectifying the defects which would allow the Council to accept sectional completion of the busway between Cambridge and St Ives, it had agreed since the April meeting to receive progress reports at each subsequent Cabinet meeting.

The latest update report indicated little progress had been made on the outstanding defects on the northern section of the route as reported to earlier meetings, with Bam Nutall Limited (BNL) increasingly ignoring the commitments made to address those defects given in April. As a result, officers were drawing up contingency plans to rectify defects post completion.

It was reported that there had been some progress from BNL to undertake further work on the southern section of the busway. However, as reported to the 7th September Cabinet meeting, the completion date for the southern section had now been moved by the contractor from December 2010 to January 2011 as a result of the Contractor failing to programme the Shelford Road Bridge Assessment. In addition, a new potential delay was highlighted in respect of construction certificates which were required to allow inspection of the works carried out to ensure they are of the agreed standard. As a result, the County Council was currently carrying out its own inspection to avoid further delay.

Cabinet was provided with details of plans being developed to install an additional junction to serve the Clay Farm Development, which it had not been possible to incorporate into the main Busway contract as the developers had been unable to commit to funding the junction. Subsequently, Cambridgeshire Horizons have agreed to meet the cost of providing the junction using Housing Growth Funds. With the likelihood of the whole Busway being completed as one and the probability that defect correction work would be needed on the north section of the busway, Cabinet was informed that there was now a window to construct the Clay Farm junction during the same period. It was noted that the contractor for the junction considered that they could install the junction sufficiently for buses to run over it in less than eight weeks, which would fit within this time frame. Cabinet was therefore asked to agree to proceed on this basis, if, as anticipated, BAM Nuttall failed to rectify the defects prior to completion.

An additional recommendation was also agreed to formalise plans for an independent review of the operation of the contract when legal proceedings with the contractor were complete which would require formal decisions at a later stage prior to commissioning.

Cabinet wished to place on record their thanks to the relevant officers for their continued efforts to resolve the outstanding issues.

It was resolved to:

- i) Note that the Contractor continued to make slow progress towards rectifying the defects which would allow the Council to accept sectional completion of the busway between Cambridge and St Ives and was increasingly ignoring the commitments to address those defects given in April.
- ii) Note that contingency plans were being made to rectify defects post completion.
- iii) Note the delay to the southern section of the Busway (reported orally to the last Cabinet meeting) as a result of the Contractor failing to programme the Shelford Road Bridge Assessment.
- iv) Agree to the construction of the Clay Farm Spine Road junction immediately post completion provided that it could be carried out during the defect correction period.
- v) Agree to commission an independent review of the operation of the Guided Busway contract when legal proceedings with the contractor were complete, with the terms of the review to be formally agreed by Cabinet prior to commissioning.

249. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA FOR 26th OCTOBER 2010

Cabinet noted the draft Cabinet agenda with the following changes since the agenda was published:

Additional reports

Key decisions: Integrated Resources & Performance Report - Monitoring reports: Local Government Shared Services Update report.

To be rescheduled to a later meeting

Item 13. Countywide Civil Parking Enforcement – moved to 16th November

Item 5. Section 75 Agreement report now moved to 14th December

250. DELEGATION FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS / OFFICERS

Cabinet received the latest update report.

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.

Chairman
26th October 2010

CAMBRIDGE NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL COMPETITION PETITION TO SUPPORT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF EAST ANGLIA'S PROPOSAL FOR A CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL ON THE SITE AT GUNHILD WAY.

The petitioners believed the above bid to be stronger based on the following grounds:

1. The Catholic Church will make a substantial financial contribution, thus creating significant savings for the County Council in this time of economic stringency. The money will come directly from the local Catholic community; there can be no better demonstration of local support.
2. Both bids were well-presented and both exceeded the criteria for the sound running of the school. The Queen Edith bid contained more graphics and letters of goodwill, but I will focus on the substantive matter of running a successful school. The Catholic Church has an established record of providing popular, over- subscribed, and "outstanding" (as endorsed by Ofsted) education. We will replicate this enviable record in the new school. Through federation with St Alban's School, our new school will benefit from the expertise and resources of an established, successful school.
3. Catholic schools are noted for their high standards of learning, and for equally high standards in enrichment, support, guidance, inclusion, special needs provision, and spiritual, moral, social, and personal development.
4. The Education & Inspections Act 2006 requires Authorities to provide choice, diversity, and fair access in their schools. Many Cambridge parents who want their children to have a Catholic education are denied that choice - even if they are prepared to travel several miles. **11** % of the UK population is Catholic, but in Cambridge it is 2% higher. 10% of UK school places are Catholic, whereas Cambridge is under-represented with only 7%.
5. The Council must maintain its good record in meeting demand for primary school places and, wherever possible, allow parents to send their children to the school of their choice. Our bid demonstrates that there is overwhelming demand for a new Catholic primary school; the existing Catholic schools are over- subscribed, and there are large numbers of parents wanting to exercise their choice in our favour.
6. Our research on postcodes of the likely school roll shows that there is very little difference between the bids in terms of catchment areas and travel to school. The officers' report seeks to make this a crucial issue, but there is little or no substance to this line of reasoning. Whoever runs the new school, children are just as likely to be driven to school, and across similar distances.
7. Cambridge city Head-teachers have so far failed to reach agreement on re-drawing catchment areas to suit the Queen Edith bid. In contrast, the Head of St. Albans Catholic School has spoken to Heads in Cambridge, all of who have agreed to support a new Catholic School.
8. David Cameron has said: "...faith schools are a really important part of our education system [...I would like to see faith schools grow."

In summary, madam Chairman and Cabinet members, I present an ambitious, guaranteed, and well- grounded bid from a group of committed and highly-qualified people from the Catholic community. We offer:

- A significant financial contribution
- Real choice for everyone
- The very highest standards in Primary Education
- A real opportunity for you to implement the new vision for community involvement in running a school
- Considerable savings for Cambridgeshire County Council's budget and its taxpayers

I strongly urge you to choose in favour of the Catholic bid

CAMBRIDGE NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL COMPETITION PETITION TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL BY THE QUEEN EDITH COMMUNITY FEDERATION GROUP FOR A PRIMARY SCHOOL ON THE SITE AT GUNHILD WAY.

My name is Caroline Peet, I am the Headteacher at Queen Edith Community Primary School and a member of the Queen Edith Community Federation.

The petition we have gathered reflects the range of support we received and is made up of:

- ◆ 400 local parents and residents;
- ◆ 63 Netherhall staff of whom 50 are local;
- ◆ Most importantly we received unanimous support from all 62 Queen Edith staff and also the Governing Body, many of whom are part of the Federation Group.

In addition we had the support of our three partnership groups.

An Education Group – to offer the best possible education for the 21st Century including University of Cambridge; Faculty of Education; The Netherhall School; The Parkside Federation.

A Well-Being and Inclusion Group – to protect & support the most vulnerable: including Cambridge Family Mediation Service; Romsey Mill; Lunchtime UK; Cambridge Childcare; Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (Addenbrooke's and the Rosie Hospitals).

A Faith and Community Group – to encourage Community Cohesion: including St James' Church of England; Queen Edith Chapel; parent representatives of the Hindu and Muslim faiths.

Queen Edith already has close working relationship with many of these groups and they are prepared to help us serve the socially and culturally diverse community of the new school.

The catchment area we propose will ensure local choice for all local children.

New school built is being built in the Queen Edith catchment area, which is the obvious solution to the huge demand for places in the Morley, Queen Edith & Ridgefield areas.

At present the 150 places each year provided by the 3 school's could need as many as 230 by 2013. Therefore we propose that each of the aforementioned schools keep their own catchment, but the new school shares the catchment area of all 3.

The Federation Group, staff and partners want to serve the community they know and love.

They want to create a new and complimentary school which values diversity, promotes community cohesion and provides first class education for all.

We would deem it a privilege to be chosen to run the new school.

Thank you for considering our bid.

**SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE : LIBRARY SERVICE
REVIEW - RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES AGREED BY CABINET**

Recommendation 1: *Cabinet task officers with the further exploration of opportunities for revenue generation within libraries, e.g.:*

- sponsorship
- third sector partnership
- consideration of lessons from the private sector

Response: Accepted. This will form a key part of the business case produced for the externalisation options strand of the Library Service Review

Recommendation 2: *Cabinet identify with officers a means to increase the capacity within the Libraries, Archives and Information service for as long as is necessary to deliver successfully the proposed development of the libraries service*

Response:

- It was acknowledged by all involved in the Scrutiny Committee meeting that the Library Service Review represents a complex and difficult set of problems and that a multi-faceted approach is rightly being taken to solving them.
- The workload involved in the next stage of the Review – producing detailed business cases and final recommendations on the overall future strategy for the Service by January 2011 - is significant and officers are at the same time committed to implementing this year's agreed savings.
- Specialist legal, financial and human resources expertise will be required in order to ensure that robust business cases produced to inform the final recommendations and strategy produced as the outcome of the Review.
- Some funding has been made available within the current Integrated Plan to enable this support to be resourced. However, the amount set allocated was an early estimate at the outset of the process and may not prove to be sufficient.

Recommendation 3: *Officers make full use of the research, advice and support offered by the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council offering advice on the future of library services in the long term.*

Response:

- Cambridgeshire is already at the forefront or well advanced in relation to a number of developments which feature in the latest thinking – library access points, implementation of self-service technology, online / remote access to services
- MLA is represented on the Library Service Review Project Board by the Regional Manager, East of England who will continue to ensure that County Council officers are able to make full use of MLA research, advice and support.
- Cambridgeshire's participation in the South Fens Project within the national MLA Future Libraries Support Programme will also enable the Library Service Review in the County to be informed by the latest thinking, research and development work and best practice.

Recommendation 4: *Cabinet delay making irreversible decisions, such as library closure, before there has been time for a through review of all of the options. (i.e. the timescales may need to be extended beyond January Cabinet)*

Response:

- The risk involved in delaying decisions beyond January 2011 is that the Library Service Review and its outcomes will then be out of step with the Council's Integrated Planning cycle

Recommendation 5: *Local good practice – such as that emerging at Rock Road Library – should be identified and shared with other county libraries*

Response:

- Local good practice in Cambridgeshire be disseminated via Cambridgeshire's participation in the MLA Future Libraries Support Programme
- Similarly, the same avenue will enable Cambridgeshire to take into account good practice elsewhere.