

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> October 2007

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. – 14.15 p.m.

**Present:** S Johnstone (Chairman)

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

### **Also in Attendance**

Councillors: M Ballard, P Downes, D Jenkins J Huppert, G Kenney A Kent, S King and J West

Nigel Smith and Pat Johnson from the Audit Commission  
Alan Brett Atkins

**Apologies:** None

## **417. MINUTES 11<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2007**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2007 were approved as a correct record.

## **418. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Cllr Curtis declared a personal interest in item 6 “Youth Offending Service” as a member of the Cambridgeshire Probation Board and item “15 County Park Milton and Bassenhally Farm, Whittlesey” as Chairman of Planning, Fenland District Council and local Member for Whittlesey North.

Cllr Johnstone declared a personal interest in item 19 “Quarterly Report on Key Partnerships” as a non Executive Director of Addenbrooke’s Hospital as their representative on the Children and Young People Steering Group and as a Cambridgeshire Horizons Board Member.

Cllr Melton declared a personal in item 19 “Quarterly Report on Key Partnerships” as a Cambridgeshire Horizons Board Member.

## **419. PETITIONS SPEED LIMIT 30 MPH COMBERTON ROAD (B1046) BARTON PETITION**

A petition was received with approximately 200 signatures from Barton residents regarding Comberton Road (B1046) Barton and concerns at the speed at which cars and other vehicles drove through village along that road. It was pointed out that 200

signatures was a significant proportion in respect of the population of the village. At the meeting Rachel Howland Jackson and Dr Margaret Penston (Vice Chair of Barton Parish Council) spoke in support of the appeal to make the whole road through Barton safer by urgently introducing traffic calming measures to force people to slow down.

Attention was drawn to the fact that even with signs indicating a 30 mph limit as well as flashing lights, very few drivers took notice of these warnings and vehicles were seen to travel at between 50 to 60 mph at night. They also highlighted that one particularly dangerous stretch of the Comberton Road was at the Triangle. Traffic coming from Comberton and turning into the High Street often did so without slowing down and as there were bus stops on either side of the road where the very young and elderly crossed the road, they were increasingly concerned/alarmed by the unacceptable dangers of accessing local amenities such as the school, shops, post office, the village hall and the church on foot or by bicycle. The dangers were exacerbated when there were delays on the A14, with the village being used as a cut through for drivers trying to access the M11 and A428. A coloured map was tabled for Cabinet Members to illustrate the points being made. Reference was also made to another petition submitted in September 2004 in respect of Lord's Bridge residents regarding the 60 mph speed limit along the A603 which had yet to be resolved.

Questions of clarification raised by Cabinet Members included:

- Had the parish council made a submission to the AJC for joint funding? In reply it was indicated that they had not made a specific request in relation to the issue highlighted in the petition, but had made general requests to slow down traffic on main roads passing through villages in the area.
- Whether the problem of speeding traffic was just relation to cars? In reply, it was indicated that the problem was with all types of vehicles including lorries and buses.
- Had the police been approached with regard to undertaking any enforcement action? In answer Cabinet noted that the police had been informed on a regular basis of local residents concerns and that on one occasion a panda car was seen to be monitoring the speed of traffic. This however was only a deterrent on the rare occasion such action was taken. A copy of the petition had also been sent to the Chief of Police.

As no report was included on the agenda, the Chairman informed the spokespersons that a response would be provided to them outside of the meeting from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in consultation with officers.

#### **420. COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (CPA)**

Nigel Smith and Pat Johnson from the Audit Commission were welcomed to the meeting. They provided a presentation on the County Council's Comprehensive Performance Assessment of which the slides referred to in the presentation are included as appendix 1 to these minutes. The purpose of the Corporate Assessment was to assess how well the Council engaged and led its communities, delivered community priorities in partnership with others, and ensured continuous improvement across the range of Council activities.

In terms of the new harder test the County Council's score was an overall 2 "Meeting Minimum standards". It was indicated that the Council was performing well in terms of

achievement and capacity to improve. The Audit Commission were encouraged that the County Council had responded so positively which was reflected in terms of the prepared Council Improvement Plan. The presentation made reference to the changed requirements as a result of the move from CPA to the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA).

The executive summary of the CPA acknowledged that the County Council was ambitious for the area and had shown appropriate strong leadership in aspects of partnership working. The report also complimented the County Council on how well it had worked with the five district Local Strategic Partnerships and its contribution to the development and delivery of the Local Area Agreement.

The County Council was complimented on the way that it had maintained its good performance against national performance indicators during the streamlining of the management structure as part “Reshaping for Excellence Programme” programme, which could have led to an adverse affect on performance, and had often been the case initially when other councils have undertaken similar exercises. The Council was seen as having strong political and managerial leadership, based around strong financial management. The Council's style of leadership was seen as appropriate. Councillor training and development was also seen as being good and had led to enhanced political activity.

However to move beyond the rating of adequate, the areas for improvement that the CPA had highlighted as being required were in terms of:

- The need to develop an overarching strategic shared vision for the future of Cambridgeshire and all its communities to improve the response to cross cutting issues such as community cohesion.
- The Council's performance management framework had lacked consistent application and therefore there was a need to secure better quality performance management across the Council.
- There was also a need to ensuring good quality baseline information was obtained in respect to community engagement and cohesion.
- The need to secure delivery of ambitions in terms of healthier communities in partnership with the single Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust. (PCT)
- The need to identify and agree challenging targets to support delivery of priorities

In response, the Leader of the Council while not being comfortable with the present assessment score accepted the findings of the CPA and while not necessarily agreeing with the assessment as a whole, set out the determination of the Administration to make the necessary improvements in the coming months and for all Cabinet Members to be accountable for ensuring the required improvements in the service areas they were responsible for. The point was also made that the Council had not awaited for the report to become public before undertaking action and that many of the recommendations were already being actioned as set out in the next report on the agenda. These also included changes made by the Leader to the composition of the Cabinet to recognise the need for stronger action on community cohesion and partnership working, reflected with the establishment of a Cabinet Lead Member for Communities. In addition she had appointed a Member to be the special adviser on Performance Management who was not part of the

Cabinet who would be able to positively manage issues without having any loyalties to any particular services.

Cabinet Members made the following points:

- They were pleased that the Audit Commission was looking at the future and was not dwelling on the past.
- Highlighting that the Comprehensive Spending Review had again not given any favours to Cambridgeshire regarding the level of grant awarded.
- That the recent announcement by the Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire on the insufficient resources provided by the Government for her force was also relevant to the position the County Council found itself in and that the Government should be held accountable if it did not provide sufficient resources to meet the tasks it required public bodies to carry out and whether its polices were effective.
- The point was made that it was also difficult to sometimes achieve required targets when partners such as the PCT had reduced funding to services (a figure of £2m from children's and adult health mental health services). Nigel Smith made reference to work being undertaken by the Audit Commission at sub county level on health and inequality issues identify best practice and to suggest where barriers to effective service delivery could be removed.
- That despite the good practice in place there was still a need for further Member training and development that needed to be picked up as an action point.
- That in terms of increased community cohesion there was a need to engage school governors effectively.
- The need to receive regular update reports on progress being achieved.

In answer to a question on whether the CPA could comment on the adequacy of the grant awarded by central government, it was confirmed that the Audit Commission was able to comment generally on the Government's national policy, but was required to measure the effectiveness of how the Council used the resources it has been allocated.

Cabinet was pleased to note that the Council was seen as delivering services that were value for money and high quality, whilst it was still levying a low Council Tax. The point was made that the latest Government grant settlement was again insufficient to meet the demand for services.

The Executive Summary to the report highlighted that the Council was seen as having:

- A strong approach to procurement.
- Strong human resource plans and strategies to contribute effectively to the delivery of priorities.
- Clear decision making procedures within a sound framework of corporate governance.
- Sufficient capacity to deliver priorities and that effective and mostly strong partnership will increase capacity further.
- Good achievement over most the its shared priorities with its partners.

Also highlighted were the Council's achievements regarding providing safer communities including a safer environment for young children to live in.

#### **421. COUNCIL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Cabinet received details of the revised Council Improvement Plan updated in response to the Corporate Assessment. The Improvement Plan had been designed to:

- improve outcomes for citizens and raise public satisfaction levels;
- address local improvement priorities and those identified by inspectors and auditors;
- ensure the Council is meeting government agendas as expressed through the Local Area Agreement (LAA);
- be delivered within existing budgets, including use of Office Carry Forwards and Invest to Transform funding.

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

- i) To adopt the revised Improvement Plan.
- ii) To receive regular monitoring reports to Cabinet on progress made against the outcomes of the Improvement Plan.

#### **422. JOINT AREA REVIEW (JAR) – CAMBRIDGESHIRE CHILDREN'S SERVICES AUTHORITY AREA AND CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet received a report of the outcome of the Joint Area Review (JAR) of services to children and young people in Cambridgeshire, as well as the improvement plan produced by the Cambridgeshire Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership in response to the recommendations for improvement set out in the JAR.

The review considered the outcomes of children and young people in Cambridgeshire and the way that local services contributed to their well-being. The JAR had been organised around the five Every Child Matters outcome areas for children and young people of Be Healthy, Stay Safe, Enjoy and Achieve, Positive Contribution and Economic Well Being and also looked at overall Service Management.

The inspection report was generally positive concerning the contribution that services make to outcomes of children and young people and the improvements that had been made. The report stated "Outcomes for most children and young people in Cambridgeshire are good."

The following grades had been awarded:

- |                                  |              |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| • Being Healthy                  | 2 – Adequate |
| • Stay Safe                      | 2 – Adequate |
| • Enjoy and Achieve              | 3 – Good     |
| • Making a Positive Contribution | 3 – Good     |
| • Achieving Economic Well Being  | 3 – Good     |
| • Service Management             | 3 – Good     |

- Capacity to Improve 3 – Good

In addition, County Council services were assessed as “Good” overall with Social Care services assessed as “Adequate” and Education services assessed as “Good”. The Council’s capacity to improve had also been graded as “Good”.

The JAR report contained 8 recommendations, 3 for immediate action, 3 for action within the next six months and 2 for action in the longer term.

It was agreed that progress against the Improvement plan prepared in June to address the recommendations should be the subject of regular update reports to Cabinet.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To agree the Children and Young People’s Strategic Partnership Improvement Plan developed in response to the Joint Area Review.
- ii) To receive regular update reports to Cabinet on progress against the outcomes set out in the Children and Young People’s Strategic Partnership Improvement Plan.

**423. COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL CARE INSPECTION (CSCI) INSPECTION OF SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE MAY 2007 AND THE ACTION PLAN**

Cabinet received a report informing it of:

- The outcome of the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) fieldwork inspection of the Older People’s Services which took place in May 2007.
- Work planned as part of the Action Plan following the inspection, in order to implement the recommendations made by the Commission for Social Care Inspection.

Cabinet noted that the scored judgements of the County Council service by CSCI were that the Older People’s Service was:

- Serving some older people well
- The Council’s capacity for improvement was promising.

The Cambridgeshire Care Partnership Meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> September had received a presentation from CSCI and was informed that the service category judgement of “some” had been very strong for the County Council. Out of the four possible service scoring categories (ranging from the lowest “serving none well” to the highest “serving all well”), the category “serving some well” which the County Council had received was at the highest end of the range and had only just been missed the next category “serving most well”. This had therefore contributed to the associated judgment that the service had promising capacity for further improvement. It was also highlighted that the Inspectors had praised the strong working partnership developed between the County Council and the PCT.

The County Council, working with the Primary Care Trust, had subsequently developed an Action Plan to implement the recommendations set out in the inspection report, which was attached as an appendix to the officer's report.

**Members commented as follows:**

- Whether in respect of the carers who had responded to the questionnaire, any of them had been young carers under the age of 18? In reply it was reported that the survey had been in respect of adult carers but that officers in Adult Support Services were working closely with OCYPS officers to ensure appropriate support services were provided to this particular carer group and highlighting that additional funding had been received for grant carers including young carers.
- Reference was made to the inadequate Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) settlement announced the previous week for County Councils, representing only a 1% uplift compared to the 4% provided by the Government to the NHS. The Leader commented that while she had no problem with the amount granted to the NHS, it had to be said that if the same level of resources had been provided with a requirement to ring-fence 3% for adult social care, many more people could be helped to continue to live in their own homes. In addition, such funding would also have helped save the NHS money by avoiding unnecessary stays in hospital, as more home care packages could be financed. As a result of the settlement, there was a real danger that the County Council would not be able to meet the continued growing demand for adult social care services as a result of an ever-expanding elderly population.
- Reference was also made to the better use that could be made in resource management if the fines imposed for delayed discharges (£100 per day per patient for delayed discharges from hospital as a result of care packages not being in place) were instead used to enhance community-based services.
- Whether all the leads based on job titles identified in the Action Plan had people in place as there would be a concern if areas requiring action had no specific officer lead? In reply it was confirmed that all posts identified were currently filled.
- There was concern expressed that some of the outcomes/objectives were not specific enough in respect service delivery with reference being made to the outcome in relation to the establishment of an Older People's Partnership Board. In response it was stated that the establishment of this Partnership Board was vital in terms of establishing a critical decision making role for older people and having links to the Local Area Agreement (LAA) and the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership.
- Assurances were requested that the necessary plans were in place to achieve the improvements identified as being required in terms of the Single Assessment Process and to support the new commissioning role of the PCT. In terms of the Single Assessment Process (SAP) it was confirmed that as a first stage it had been introduced at the Contact Centre and that some services were already live with older people expected to go live in November. SAP was also to be rolled out in community teams and would initially be a paper based format to be rolled out during the current financial year. In terms of supporting the PCT under new joint commissioning arrangements, Council officers already possessed good expertise as a result of the commissioning and monitoring role undertaken with independent

service providers. It was noted that officers were working closely with the PCT in order to establish strong commissioning arrangements.

- On what the risks would be regarding recruitment and retention as a result of the development of the joint workforce strategy. It was explained that the Strategy was being developed in order to help retain existing staff in the Older People's Services by ensuring all staff were trained and or obtained the necessary professional qualifications required to deliver services to older people.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To note the findings of the CSCI fieldwork inspection.
- ii) To approve the Action Plan developed to implement the recommendations made in the inspection report.
- iii) That in addition to confirming that updates on progress against the Action Plan would be received by the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership and Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee at a minimum of six monthly intervals, Cabinet also agreed to receive regular update reports, the frequency to be determined by the Cabinet member for Environment and Community Services (ECS), the Cabinet Portfolio holder for Enhanced Services and the Deputy Chief Executive, ECS.

**424. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES (CYPS) SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT – MEMBER LED REVIEW OF OUTCOMES FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS**

It was agreed to change the order of the agenda in order to take the report from Scrutiny before the report setting out the details on the action plan resulting from the Youth Offending Action Plan.

Cabinet received a presentation from Councillor Kenney the chairman of the sub-group who had prepared the report for the scrutiny committee. Cabinet noted that the sub group of the Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) Scrutiny Committee had conducted a review of outcomes for young offenders from May to November 2006. The review had focussed on investigating support for young offenders and those at risk of offending in two areas:

- Education, Employment and Training
- Suitable Accommodation

It was the sub-group's aspiration that every young person who left detention should leave with an appropriate package in place that included housing, training, and social support agreed with the young person. While numerical and literacy skills were considered important, vocational and work based training were also highlighted as being important to ensure that young people were re-engaged in the community in a positive way. In speaking to young people they had confirmed that a lack of qualifications combined with a criminal record made it difficult for them to re-engage. In addition, the provision of secure housing was seen as a major factor in reducing deterrent the likelihood of re-offending.

As a result of the research, analysis, and interviews undertaken as set out in the report to Cabinet, the CYPs Scrutiny sub-group requested that Cabinet should consider the endorsement of the 8 recommendations alongside the YOS Inspection Report and Action Plan. The recommendations from the scrutiny committee and a suggested response provided by the officers to each recommendation were reported orally (included as appendix 1 to the minutes).

The Cabinet Member for Communities recommended that recommendations 2-7 should be accepted or were already in the process of being implemented. In respect of recommendation 1, there were resource implications regarding funding vocational training. These would be further investigated with locality teams and would be raised with the local strategic partnerships in order to aim to ensure some priority of funding in this area. In respect of the final recommendation asking Cabinet to consider writing to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government outlining the sub-group's concerns about national policy in relation to housing and benefit support for young offenders, this request would require further investigation to ensure the concerns were fully understood and well-evidenced and that all funding opportunities had been investigated before making a decision on whether to write to the Minister.

Cabinet thanked Councillor Kenney on behalf of the Sub-Group for the very thorough review. She in turn thanked Bob Sproson the manager of Education Other Than At School, Tom Jefford, Head of Youth and Participation and, Katherine Pelly the Scrutiny Development Co-ordinator for their invaluable help in the preparation of the report.

**It was resolved:**

To agree the responses to the scrutiny committee recommendations as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.

#### **425. YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE INSPECTION REPORT AND ACTION PLAN**

Further to the above presentation, Cabinet received the above titled report noting that the Youth Offending Service (YOS) had been inspected by the joint inspection team of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation in December 2006 as part of a 4-year cycle of inspections. The Inspection Report was published on the 9<sup>th</sup> May 2007 and following on from it, the Youth Offending Service was then required to submit a post inspection action plan to the Inspectorate.

Cabinet noted that the service was scored in 5 thematic areas across a four-point scale of 1 Inadequate, 2 Adequate, 3 Good, and 4 Excellent. The scores given were as follows:

Management 2  
Work in Courts 2  
Work with children and young people in the community 3  
Work with children and young people in custody 3  
Victims and restorative justice 2

Cabinet noted that while some aspects of practice needed improvement, overall the inspectors had found an innovative team willing to try out new interventions and saw

some good examples of work with children and young people both at risk of offending and those who had offended, and their parents/carers. The subsequent action plan had been prepared according to a template and had been designed to address the detail of the issues raised in the full inspection report. Cabinet noted that the action plan has been confirmed by the YOS Executive and was to be updated quarterly.

Members commented as follows;

- the need for securing accommodation and long-term employment were seen as vital, positive measures to help prevent re-offending. The choice based lettings scheme was highlighted as being something that could assist with accommodation issues, especially when it was advisable to place young people away from their previous immediate environment, in order to remove some of the negative influences around them. Officers confirmed that since the scrutiny report had been prepared, a full time accommodation officer had been appointed.
- There was some concern regarding ensuring there was effective mental health provision in place. In response, officers were able to confirm that the part time psychologist was now in post and was providing appropriate training for staff and carrying out assessments based on need. Another member confirmed that there was more co-ordinated work in this area with district councils with the 'Supporting People' initiative having helped in the process.
- Participation in expressive arts was seen as a very worthwhile activity, along with other activities to help young people focus their energies in a positive manner.

**It was resolved:**

To agree to the implementation of the Action Plan as set out in the appendix to the officer's report.

#### **426. DIRECTION OF TRAVEL STATEMENT: DRAFT SUBMISSION**

Cabinet received a report presenting the emerging Direction of Travel Statement, which was submitted each year to the Audit Commission. The submission provided context for the Performance Indicators and Use of Resources assessments that were submitted separately to the Audit Commission and also highlighted successes over the past year, as well as identifying areas where the County Council needed to improve further. It was noted that the target for 2007 would be to achieve a rating of 'improving well'.

The submission, which was usually restricted to 10 pages in length, contributed to the Direction of Travel assessment. In response to a concern raised, assurance was given that the slightly longer submission had been agreed as being acceptable to the Audit Commission and would not penalise the County Council in terms of any final judgement.

Members commented:

- On being pleased that there was reference to supporting migrant workers as the County Council needed to ensure that they received access to all appropriate services.
- Officers were congratulated on producing such a well written report.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To agree the proposed Direction of Travel Submission as printed, with no amendments.
- ii) To delegate responsibility to the Leader of the Council in consultation with the Director of People and Policy to agree any final changes to the County Council's statement before final submission to the Audit Commission.

## **427. PETITIONS**

A petition had been received from the Learning Disability Parliament "Speaking Up" with over 70 signatures to speak at the meeting in respect of item 17 "Learning Disability Day Service – Modernisation Programme" which was introduced by Gill Lewis and Kirsten Green from the Learning Disability Parliament which requested that the County Council should ensure:

- "that a full consultation was completed with service users before any changes were made to their service and that no money should be taken out of the day centre service without first speaking to the users.
- all service users should be kept informed of what was being planned for their service through face to face meetings
- adequate time should be given to this process and that everyone should be provided with a service that suits them
- that all decision makers were informed of service users views prior to making decisions regarding services.
- that any decisions about services were made with service users

Reference was made to their satisfaction that citizen panels were now being established at each day centre.

Quotes read out from service users included:

- Listen to the users of the service as they know what they want
- Day centre users needed more service options not reductions in services

In answer to a question raised with the spokespersons they were able to confirm that the level of communication with users had improved since the original consultation and there had been productive meetings between their organisation's members and Council elected members and officers.

Having received the petition it was agreed that item 17 "Learning Disability Services Day Services – Modernisation Programme" should be taken next on the agenda.

## **428. LEARNING DISABILITY SERVICES DAY SERVICES – MODERNISATION PROGRAMME**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for the continuing modernisation of day services for people with a learning disability in Cambridgeshire in order to improve

opportunities for service users in line with local strategies and Government guidelines. It was orally reported that a further petition had been received since publication of the report. This petition requested that County Councillors should visit the Horizon Centre to meet users in order to hear their concerns regarding its possible closure.

Cabinet noted that changes proposed in Cambridgeshire were part of the Government's stated aim to improve services. Early work had focussed on planning with partners an Opportunities Trust to deliver services in the future. As a non-statutory body it had the advantage of potentially attracting additional funds. Partners were to include the Council's current social enterprise providers, as well as additional partners such as other large local voluntary sector organisations (Mencap, Papworth, Speaking up) and possible Independent Providers.

Cabinet Members made the following comments:

- That there was no reference to the Transitions work that had been undertaken by scrutiny regarding young people with learning disabilities moving to adult care services. In reply, officers reported that most young people did not wish to receive services at existing day centres and that work opportunities were being developed for them in partnership with the voluntary sector. The aim would be to ensure that all service users were provided with the same opportunities/access. The point was also made that the County Council Network Task Group was seeking additional Government funding for Transitions arrangements which was currently available, although there were the usual fears that the majority of funding would be allocated to urban areas.
- Expressing the view that the funding of learning disabilities should be mainstream funding provided by Government and should not be subject to having to apply for external funding such as lotteries monies.

The local Member for Wisbech South speaking as a local member with a day centre in his area raised concerns that the original consultation had sent out conflicting messages to carers and service users and stressed the importance of ensuring greater consistency in future communications to vulnerable service users. His view was that it would have been better to have set up the citizens panels before the consultation exercise. He also stated that in his view people with profound needs would not be able to make the same progress as other service users in being able to move away from day centre service provision and that their needs had not been sufficiently recognised. In addition he made the point that for some users having access to workshops was very therapeutic and gave them a real purpose to their lives. He also was concerned that there was no reference made in the report to the impact of the proposed changes on carers. Regarding the proposals for an Opportunities Trust Partnership, he saw this as an unnecessarily bureaucratic structure when in his view it would be better to consider a more fluid approach, with perhaps an overall trust for people with more profound needs and the creation of smaller trusts to help those more able to develop and achieve their full potential. He volunteered his services with regard to being involved with future service arrangements.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Enhanced Services acknowledged the failings in the original exercise that sought users views on the possibilities before presentation to Cabinet, while with reference to the needs of profound users, stated that the review needed to consider the needs of all service users when assessing future service

provision. In terms of the proposed partnership, this was still in the early stages of development and would need to be further developed with partners. The offer of help from the Councillor was noted.

The local Member for March North made reference to the invaluable support provided by staff at day centres and concerns raised by some parents on the treatment of staff as a result of the review. He made reference to the work of Fenland Association Community and Enterprise Trust (FACET) and the financial support that they required in order to help them move to new premises. The Cabinet Member for Enhanced Services responded, acknowledging the good services provided by FACET and confirming that there was ongoing dialogue with the organisation in order to establish a future working relationship which would need to be on the basis of meeting the identified needs of the County Council, its partners and service users.

Cabinet agreed that the points made by the Learning Disability Parliament would be taken on board by officers in respect of the subsequent review and this had been reflected in the wording of the report recommendations.

**It was resolved:**

- i) to approve the continuation of work to improve opportunities for people with learning disabilities by:
  - Officers continuing work with voluntary sector partners to ensure the development of services to commission, deliver, and quality assure a wide range of opportunities tailored to the needs and wishes of each individual service user as a result of feedback received.
  - Officers continuing, with partners, to explore other options where current buildings were unfit for purpose.
  - Establishing an Opportunities Trust Partnership with partners, with the intention of seeking financial and other support to improve service provision for users of day services in the learning disability service.
- ii) To require officers to continue the involvement and engagement of service users and carers in the planning for day opportunities and future plans at all stages of the process.
- iii) To require officers to provide regular briefings for all members on progress.
- iv) to approve the delegation of authority to agree actions to progress the incremental modernisation of day opportunities being given to the Deputy Chief Executive Environment and Community Services (ECS) and the Cabinet Lead Member for Enhanced Services supported by the relevant ECS Spokesmen, where the changes did not require a key decision.
- v) That subject to diary commitments Cabinet Members would aim to take up the offer to visit day centres to hear the views of users.

## **COMFORT BREAK**

As it was midday, Cabinet agreed to take a comfort break for 15 minutes until 12.15 p.m. before considering the remainder of the items on the agenda.

### **429. HEALTH AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - REPORT ON THE SWIFT CONTRACT**

This report had been deferred to the November Cabinet meeting.

### **430. SECTION 29 CAMBRIDGE FRINGES JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE – PROPOSALS**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for taking the next steps towards the creation of a joint planning policy committee for the fringe areas of Cambridge.

It was reported that at the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee (JSGIC) on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2007, the draft terms of reference for the creation of a new joint plan making committee had been considered and it had been agreed that the report would form the basis for detailed discussions with Go-East, subject to the approval of the three relevant authorities: the County Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council.

It was noted that in considering draft terms of reference for the Joint Policy Committee, JSGIC had raised two specific queries in respect of scrutiny arrangements and Mineral and Waste Plan making powers. With regard to Scrutiny, it had been clarified that individual parent authorities would be able to challenge the proposals of the joint committee if necessary, by making representations as part of the planning process. In respect of Mineral and Waste Plan making powers, it had been clarified that overarching policies would remain with the County Council and all planning applications would be referred to the relevant Development Control Committees, with specific proposals for minerals and waste facilities to be included within development plan documents for the Joint Policy Committee.

It was noted that JSCIG had also agreed to establish a member sub-group to advise on details of proposals as they were progressed by officers. The sub-group had put forward the following recommendations for consideration by the three authorities:

- Transport and other planning matters: the authorities which would constitute the Joint Plan Making Committee would need to improve arrangements for integrated planning across the Cambridge area.
- Membership of the Joint Committee: the sub-group to be composed of 3 Members from each of the constituent authorities;
- Quorum: proposed that quorum should be a minimum of two Members from each of the constituent authorities;
- Other Policy guidance: suggested that this element should be excluded, and any additional matters could be determined after it had been established.

The above action followed on from the Department of Communities and Local Government confirmation that the authorities and Cambridgeshire Horizons would

receive additional revenue funding of £700,000 per annum upon establishment of joint development control arrangements, with additional funding anticipated in future years.

Cabinet members commented on/noted:

- the need to consider how young people could influence the process. In response it was indicated that consultation, including young people, would take place at the later planning stage.
- What the arrangements were for agreeing the powers of the committee/ disbanding the committee? In reply it was indicated that all such issues would require the agreement of the three councils making up the committee.
- That the committee would not be taking on the Highways responsibilities of the County Council.
- Receiving confirmation that Cambridgeshire Horizons (CH) did not make policy, as this would be the role of the new committee, as CH 's role was to ensure the driving forward of the growth agenda through ensuring the provision of adequate infrastructure etc.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To agree the draft terms of reference for a joint plan making committee for specified growth sites (attached as appendix A to the officer's report) which had been amended following further member discussion as the basis of joint negotiation with the Department of Communities and Local Government, together with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- ii) To note that final proposals would be referred back to Cabinet for further consideration and then to Council for decision in January.

**431. COMPETITION PROGRAMME FOR NEW SCHOOLS TO SERVE NORTHSTOWE THE CAMBRIDGE FRINGE DEVELOPMENT AND IN RESPECT OF THE AMALGAMATION OF HUNTINGDON INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS**

Cabinet received a report advising that:

- based on the submission of planning applications, available housing trajectories and demographic analysis, new primary schools would be required for September 2009 to serve Northstowe, the Trumpington Meadows (Southern Fringe) and NIAB (North West Fringe) development sites. In the case of Northstowe and the Southern Fringe, secondary schools would be required for September 2012.
- as reported at the previous meeting in early September, the Secretary of State for Education and Skills had turned down Cambridgeshire's application for an exemption from competition for the third primary school to serve Cambourne. As a result, there was now the need to proceed with competition arrangements to secure the establishment of the new school from September 2008. The public notice launching the competition had been published on 25 September and the Department for Children, Schools and Families had now appointed advisors to

work with Cambridgeshire to further publicise the competition and generate interest from potential promoters.

- There was a need to publish proposals for a significant enlargement of Fawcett Primary School in response to planned growth.
- There were still ongoing discussions regarding a proposal to amalgamate Huntingdon Infant and Junior schools to create a 420 place community primary school. An in principle decision was made at a meeting of the governing bodies on 9<sup>th</sup> October to pursue amalgamation with affect from September 2008, but any final decision had been deferred until the New Year to await the results of a further feasibility study.
- As a result of the abolition of the Schools Organisation Committee, Cabinet was now required to approve the publication of statutory notices for changes to existing school provision adding to the lead-in time for the decision making process and to Cabinet's workload. It was therefore suggested that the publication of statutory notices for changes to existing school provision if uncontroversial (where consultation responses indicated clear support for proposed changes) could be dealt with in consultation with Lead members outside of the formal Cabinet decision making process.

Members commented:

- On whether the appendices on the specifications could be tailored more to the specific school in question. In reply it was explained that the format used was the standard template required by central Government.
- On when the Cabinet was likely to receive the report on recommendations regarding the environmental standards to be specified when building new schools. In reply it was reported that a report on the vision and principles on building new schools would be going to the November Cabinet meeting subject to the still awaited announcement on appropriate guidelines from central Government.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Note the need to proceed with competition arrangements for the third primary school to serve Cambourne.
- ii) Note the proposal to amalgamate Huntingdon Infant and Junior schools to create a 420 place community primary school.
- iii) Approve proceeding with the plans to enlarge Fawcett Primary School in consultation with the school's governing body and headteacher, and the publication of a statutory public notice in due course.
- iv) Approve the proposal to proceed with formal consultations on the specifications for the:  
  
Trumpington Meadows Primary School;  
NIAB Primary School;  
Northstowe Secondary School;

First primary school to serve Northstowe;  
Southern Fringe Secondary School.

as detailed below in preparation for the launch of competitions for these schools.

- Consultation should be undertaken on the proposal to establish the primary school to serve Trumpington Meadows with effect from September 2009 in line with the outline specification attached as Appendix 1 to the report, in preparation for the launch of the competition to establish this school.
- Consultation should be undertaken on the proposal to establish a 750 place 11-16 Village College to serve the Southern Fringe with effect from September 2012 in line with the outline specification attached as Appendix 2 to the report, in preparation for the launch of the competition to establish this school.
- The Service Infrastructure Portfolio Holder and CYPS Spokes be asked to review the responses to the competitions for the proposed new schools at the third month checkpoint of the four month bid period, and advise the Deputy Chief Executive CYPS whether a County Council sponsored bid for one or both schools should be submitted.
- Consultation should be undertaken on the proposal to establish the primary school to serve the NIAB development with effect from September 2009 in line with the outline specification attached as Appendix 3 of the report, in preparation for the launch of the competition to establish this school and the Service Infrastructure Portfolio Holder and CYPS Spokes be asked to review the responses to the competitions for the proposed new schools at the third month checkpoint of the four month bid period, and advise the Deputy Chief Executive CYPS whether a County Council sponsored bid for one or both schools should be submitted.
- The Lead Member for Service Infrastructure and the CYPS Spokes be asked to review the responses to the competition for the proposed new schools at the third month checkpoint of the four month bid period, and advise the Deputy Chief Executive CYPS whether a County Council sponsored bid for one or both schools should be submitted.
- Consultation should be undertaken on the proposal to establish the first primary school to serve the Northstowe development with effect from September 2009 in line with the outline specification attached as Appendix 4 to the report, in preparation for the launch of the competition to establish this school.

- Consultation should be undertaken on the proposal to establish a 11FE (1650 place) 11-16 Village College to serve Northstowe with effect from September 2012 in line with the outline specification attached as Appendix 5 to the report, in preparation for the launch of the competition to establish this school
  - The Lead Member for Service Infrastructure and the CYPS Spokes be asked to review the responses to the competitions for the proposed new schools at the third month checkpoint of the four month bid period, and advise the Deputy Chief Executive CYPS whether a County Council sponsored bid for one or both schools should be submitted.
- v) Approve the proposal that the Scheme of Delegations be amended to grant delegated powers to the Deputy Chief Executive, CYPS, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for CYPS and Young People's and Infrastructure Services, Opposition Spokes and local Members, to approve the publication of statutory notices for changes to existing school provision, where these were required, in cases where consultation responses indicated clear support for these changes.

#### **432. CAMBRIDGESHIRE DESIGN GUIDE FOR STREETS AND THE PUBLIC REALM**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to the Cambridgeshire Design Guide for streets and the Public Realm. It was noted that the guide had been:

- prepared in order to respond to the challenge of building successful and attractive new neighbourhoods, and ensure that the quality of all new developments, large and small, met the highest possible standards.
- developed with support from Cambridgeshire Horizons and the City and District Councils and was intended to help guide the County Council in the use of its powers as Highways Authority. The suggestion was that an officer group should be established from the above mentioned partners, to regularly review and update the document.
- prepared as guidance and was not prescriptive but allowed for local needs to be developed.

Cabinet noted the changes proposed to the guide resulting from the consultation exercise and the suggested amendments set out in the appendix to the report. Highlighted issues included the need for on street parking to be considered at the planning stage in respect of new developments. It was reported that an officer group had been established

Questions were raised regarding:

- The measures needed to ensure developers took on board the need for sustained development including sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs)? It was explained that the issue of ongoing liability was still an issue to be clarified with Government as it represented a potential long term liability for the County Council.

- When the likely results of the DEFRA consultation on the maintenance of SUDs was expected to be announced? Officers were not able to orally answer the query but would write to Members outside of the meeting.

**It was resolved:**

- i) to note the feedback from consultation and the Policy Development Group as detailed in the report;
- ii) to agree to adopt the design guide;
- iii) to support an officer group as detailed in section 2 of the report to regularly review the design guide; and
- iv) to delegate approval to the Deputy Chief Executive, Environment and Community Services (ECS) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services and Lead Member for Highways and Transport to agree further changes to the design guide.

#### **433. LONG TERM TRANSPORT STRATEGY (LTTS) TRANSPORT INNOVATION FUND (TIF)**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to the draft Outline Proposal for Funding for submission to the Government's Transport Innovation Fund. An errata sheet was tabled at the meeting and is enclosed as an appendix to the minutes. (Appendix 2)

Cabinet noted that the Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) had been set up by Government to support the introduction of innovative packages of measures to tackle congestion. The TIF would provide some £1.4 billion nationally over the period 2008 to 2014 with local authorities able to bid for this funding. The TIF process provided a unique opportunity for the Council to secure funding for substantial transport improvements at a time when other funding sources, including the Local Transport Plan were declining nationally. To qualify for TIF monies, any package of measures needed to be made up of two main elements; large-scale improvements to public transport, highways and walking and cycling facilities, and demand management measures, notably the requirement for congestion charging.

The point was made that with the continued growth agenda and the large scale house-building programme in and around Cambridge, congestion was already a serious problem at peak travel times and would only get worse. It was made clear that the bid was as implied by the title, to see what the Government had to offer and did not commit the County Council to agreeing a congestion charge policy. Any consideration of a congestion charge policy would be the subject of detailed consultation with stakeholders and the public (including consultation beyond the County boundaries to take account of people travelling in from Suffolk, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire etc) before any final decision was taken on whether it was right for Cambridge and would be dependant on Government financing the scheme. Any final decision would be the subject of a report to Cabinet. It was also explained that even if the necessary funding was approved, no scheme would be contemplated until all necessary transport infrastructure was in place and in terms of timescale, this was not possible before 2011-12 at the earliest. In reality it was acknowledged that any scheme even if approved, would not be implemented until after

this date. It was also confirmed that the requirement would be that both capital and revenue costs would be funded by the Government so there would be no cost to Council taxpayers.

A statement received from the City Council was read out which requested that the County Council should defer the submission of a formal bid to Government until the following steps had taken place:

- a Publication of a draft comprehensive transport plan for the Cambridge area with detailed analysis of its implications for Cambridge residents as well as adjacent residents, visitors and commuters.
- b City Council and South Cambridgeshire DC engagement in developing and evaluating a range of Options for congestion charging or road pricing and Cambridge area transport investment proposals.
- c A public inquiry into the Option(s) and investment proposals the County Council is minded to take forward, with the opportunity for the public and organisations to give, receive and review evidence.
- d That a Joint Forum of the County, City and SCDC should be established to review the development of a Cambridge sub-region transport plan as well as to consider the Options and Cambridge area transport investment. These options should include, amongst other items, financial alternatives for city residents and low emission vehicles.

As eligibility for funding in 2008/09 required that the Council must make a bid to Government by no later than October 2007, in the form of an Outline Proposal for Funding, the request to defer it as suggested by the City Council was not supported. Instead the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services indicated that he would liaise with the City Council and give further consideration to their concerns. Reference was made to the fact that initial guidance from Government had set a deadline of July 2007, but this had been extended following discussions with DfT, reflecting the scale of the Cambridgeshire bid, compared to other, larger authorities. The Government had stated that there was no further possibility of an extension to this deadline if the County wished to be considered for funding starting next year.

It was also reported that the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee had considered the report at their meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2007 and had unanimously supported the bid on the basis that it was an outline bid and was not the final decision. They had also been reassured by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services that there would be full consultation on the proposals.

The following recommendations from that meeting were tabled for Cabinet consideration and were as follows:

- splitting parishes with the Cordon should be avoided;
- full consideration should be given to those who use bus services to come into Cambridge;
- there needed to be absolute clarity in the consultation process, including

- what is being offered, the benefits and the costs;
- the need for equity, especially in terms of accessibility for those on low incomes;
- to take into account the impact of businesses, and in particular, to take the lead with major employers on possibly adapting business practices (e.g. shift patterns) to minimise disruption to employees;
- the need to have all options and alternatives in place before any congestion charging scheme was imposed, and to have evaluated the effectiveness of those other measures in reducing congestion;
- the possibility of achieving equity in which areas of the county receive the benefits through the income generated by a Congestion Charging scheme, possibly by some form of hypothecation;
- that any costs of the scheme not met by TIF funding must be funded entirely from Section 106 money or other government funding, and not the Council tax.

The above suggestions were welcomed and would be fully considered in drawing up any scheme should Government funding be subsequently approved. The last bullet point had already been covered in discussion.

Other issues raised by Members:

- Seeking clarification regarding table 5.4 “Funding requirement from Central Government” on page 64 of the main outline proposal document (due to its size the document had only been circulated in hard copy form to Cabinet Members and Group Leaders) which could be seen as being misleading in terms of the dates as the first column date read 2008. It was explained that the table was for illustrative purposes only and was in respect of the package of transport improvement measures required to be progressed each year as opposed to a start date for congestion charging. It was agreed that the title should be amended to make clear it was for illustrative purposes only and was required by the Government in terms of dates for possible programme planning.
- Seeking clarification on which schemes would not be included in the first phase of any scheme with the response that these would principally be in relation to Cambridge East. It was however recognised that other highways measures would be required to ease congestion on Newmarket Road before this date.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the draft outline proposal for submission to the Government's Transport Innovation Fund.

#### **434. PARKING POLICY REVIEW**

Cabinet received a report in order to consider a revised parking policy for Cambridgeshire.

Cabinet was reminded that on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2006, it had considered a report on the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2006-11 and associated transport strategy

issues which had described the work to develop a long-term transport strategy for the County and highlighted the need to review parking policy. As a result, Cabinet had agreed to both a parking policy review, as well as putting on hold further residents parking schemes, pending the outcome of the review.

It was noted that there had been a deliberate attempt to keep the new policies as brief as possible and that they were intended to balance the need for flexibility to allow for a local emphasis and to address local priorities, whilst achieving a consistent approach across the County. The proposed revised policy had been prepared following consultation events with officers and Members in attendance from the County Council and all the District Councils. In addition, the area joint committees (AJCs) had considered reports on the key issues under consideration as part of the review of the draft policy.

The views expressed at the Cambridge Area Joint Committee, (AJC), who considered the report in July, were orally reported by its chairman, Cllr Huppert. One of the main issues highlighted was the request that the recommendation on introducing a one-off charge for the recovery of residents' parking scheme implementation costs should be deferred by the Cabinet, as they considered it to be an unfair charge. The suggested deferral was not supported. Cabinet took the view that it was appropriate for residents to pay a cost for having personal access to a section of the highway, particularly in the light of the problems of parking in Cambridge and as it was generally accepted that resident parking provision could substantially add to the value of individual properties.

Councillor Huppert made reference to detailed issues regarding the policy he had raised in correspondence to the Cabinet member for Highways and Transport the previous week for which he had not yet received an answer. In reply the Cabinet Member noted that a holding reply had been sent and undertook to respond fully to the issues raised outside of the meeting.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Note the feedback received from the consultation and the Policy Development Group and the views expressed at the meeting by the chairman of the Cambridge AJC;
- ii) Approve the revised parking policy subject to the amendments set out in Appendix A to the Officer's report;
- iii) Delegate approval of parking plan areas to the Deputy Chief Executive (ECS) in consultation with the Cabinet member for Highways and Access; and
- iv) Approve a one-off charge for the recovery of residents' parking scheme implementation costs, capped at £30 per application.

#### **435. THE STRATEGY FOR COMPLYING WITH THE NETWORK MANAGEMENT DUTY AS DEFINED IN THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT**

Cabinet received a report updating progress in relation to the Traffic Manager's Strategy and in order to gain approval to proceed with implementation of the Strategy and associated delivery mechanisms.

Cabinet noted that:

- as part of duties imposed by the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) to augment existing powers of local authorities to maintain, improve and manage the highway network was a Network Management Duty (NMD) requiring all traffic on the road network to be kept moving. One of the key ways of acquiring and managing information was by the use of Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) and that the County Council already used a number of demand management techniques in order to achieve this.
- A ten-year strategy for delivering the requirements of the Traffic Management Act in Cambridgeshire had been developed (the Traffic Management Plan (TMP)). The TMP detailed the key objectives, priorities, inter- relationships and timescales.
- A key objective would be to integrate the existing Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) and provide a facility for the integration of future ITS components. A key element of the (ITS), was for the development of an Integrated Highways Management Centre to deliver a co-located management of all the systems that affected the way traffic moved around the network.
- While the preferred, lowest cost option in terms of establishing a base for the IHMC would be to locate it in Castle Court on the Shire Hall site, accommodation pressures in Castle Court had effectively ruled out the full development of this option, but interim provision in Castle Court remained an option. The next most favoured option was to co-locate with the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus way control room at Northstowe. The initial cost of the proposal was expected to be significant in terms of capital investment, and therefore further work by the officers required to be undertaken.

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

- i) to note the progress made in relation to compliance with the Traffic Management Act.
- ii) to note progress in the development and implementation of the Traffic Manager's Plan.
- iii) to approve development and implementation of the preferred option for the Integrated Highway Management Centre.
- iv) To endorse the framework for the Traffic Managers Plan.

#### **436. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY – HISTON STATION CAR PARK**

Cabinet received a report stating that the demolition of the station building in Histon had been originally proposed to provide space for the Guided Busway. However, it had now been established that the Guided Busway could be constructed by removing the platform and platform canopy, but without requiring demolition of the building. As a result if the car park was not provided, there would be no engineering requirement to demolish the building.

It was noted that in July 2006 the car park had been identified as a potential change area to assist in managing the outturn cost of the scheme.

**It was resolved;**

- i) To agree to delete the planned car park at Histon from the scheme, and
- ii) To agree not to demolish the former station building but to return it and the site to its owner, subject to a suitable agreement being reached;
- iii) That if an agreement could not be reached under ii) then the building and site should to be sold on the open market with no restrictions on demolition by a future owner.

#### **437. COUNTRY PARK MILTON, AND BASSENHALLY FARM, WHITTLESEY**

A report was received requesting approval to dispose of a long term interest in property forming part of the Milton Country Park and also to an option on land at Bassenhally Farm, Whittlesey for a lease at less than best consideration to be granted to Coates Crusaders.

Cabinet noted that the County Council owned approximately 4 hectares (ha 9.8 acres) of land in the centre of the Milton Country Park. South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) currently had a licence to manage the land as a Country Park facility and had approached the County Council to consider leasing the land to them on a 99-year lease at a peppercorn rent. The granting of a long leasehold interest to SCDC would enable SCDC to sub-let the County Council's property to the sub-tenant and for the whole block to be managed as a single entity for the benefit of "park" users, the community and its wildlife.

In respect of land on the eastern edge of Whittlesey, Cabinet noted that:

- the County Council owned approximately 24ha (60 acres). The majority of the land was part of the County farms estate and was shown as 'hold pending long term development potential' on the reviewed April 2006 Farm Management Plan.
- Within the site, 3.7ha of pitches had been used by the Coates Crusaders Football Club under an arrangement with Sir Harry Smith Community College. The Football Club was seeking replacement new playing fields of some 4.38ha and had expressed

a desire for close collaboration with the College. A formal tenancy agreement for 25 years will give the Club the opportunity to secure funding for permanent changing facilities and to cater for the ever increasing demand.

- The granting of an Option to a developer, which was still the subject of negotiations, would generate an initial non-refundable capital receipt with the prospect of a further and significant receipt based on residential development value (less costs and developers profit) should the land be allocated and planning consent granted.

**It was resolved:**

- i) To declare property at Milton forming part of the Country Park as surplus to Council requirements and to authorise the Director of Finance, Property and Performance to dispose of the property at a peppercorn rent on a long term lease with the detailed terms to be agreed with South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- ii) To declare property at Bassenhally, Whittlesey as surplus to Council requirements and to authorise the Director of Finance, Property and Performance to grant a 25 year lease to Coates Crusaders at less than best consideration and dispose of the property on terms to be agreed.

**438. COUNTY COUNCIL'S ANNUAL REPORT 2006/07**

Cabinet received a report seeking authority to publish a County Council annual report.

Cabinet was informed that many organisations, both public and private sector, published an annual report outlining their performance, at the end of each year and it was considered that it would be a helpful communication tool for the Council to also produce such a report. The Annual Report was intended to be a simple summary of the Council's finance and performance achievements for 2006-07 and would supplement existing publications such as the budget book and the Best Value Performance Plan.

**It was resolved:**

To approve the release of the 2006-07 Annual Report.

**439. PLAY POLICY – TIME TO PLAY**

Cabinet received a report in respect of Cambridgeshire County Council's draft Play

Policy 'Time to Play' and the proposal to develop a County Play Partnership and County Play Strategy. 'Space to Play'.

The Time to Play policy had the aim of securing commitment to the policy from district councils and to establish a County Play Partnership and County Play Strategy. The policy aimed to:

- raise awareness about what play was and the benefits

- set a standard for an ethos that supported good quality play
- provided a framework for agreed values and principles
- encourage all relevant parties to take account of the Cambridgeshire Play Policy when planning services.

Members commented:

- That it was sad that there was a need to have to set out how children should play in a policy but that it was in response to the Government's Report "Getting Serious about Play" which had been commissioned to develop a countywide multi agency strategy for play which also aimed to benefit the most disadvantaged children.
- That it was important to imbed The "Every Child Matters" outcomes particularly relating to "enjoy and achieve" as if children were not able to enjoy themselves, they would not be happy and would not be able to fulfil their potential.
- Supporting encouraging play activities for young people as being extremely important in the context of reducing anti-social behaviour and that it was important that the type of play should be appropriate to the particular age group.
- Supporting the recognition of the importance of parish council plans and that where there was no direct support from district councils or where capacity was limited, there was the need for appropriate guidance.

As the report author Lynda Parsons the Head of Service Early Years and Childcare was choosing to retire early from the County Council, Cabinet paid tribute to her achievements over the years.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) approve the Play Policy 'Time to Play' (as set out in Appendix A of the officer's report)
- ii) approve the proposal to develop a County Play Partnership and Strategy (paragraph 1.7 of the report) and
- iii) advocate and champion the importance of quality play opportunities for all of Cambridgeshire's children and young people.

#### **440. QUARTERLY UPDATE REPORT ON KEY PARTNERSHIPS**

Cabinet received a report setting out the main issues/activities of four of the key strategic partnerships that the Council was involved with. It was intended to produce the reports on a quarterly basis in order to both update Cabinet Members on progress and to help enhance accountability. The paper provided the first quarterly report on the following four partnerships introduced by the responsible Office Cabinet Lead:

- (A) The Children and Young People Steering Group (pages 2-3 of the report)
- (B) Cambridgeshire Together (pages 3-6 of the report)
- (C) Cambridgeshire care Partnership (pages 6-7 of the report)

(D) Cambridgeshire Horizons (pages 8-10 of the report)

Members raised the following points:

- Reference was made to the Cambridgeshire Horizons sections not having a crime and disorder implications paragraph, which had been a feature of the other three summary reports. There was a request that such a paragraph should be considered for inclusion for consistency in future updates.
- In respect of the Government's Post Office Review referred to under the section on "Cambridgeshire Together" and the reference to writing to the Minister expressing concerns about the impact of the review on local rural communities, an oral update reported that no response had yet been received to the letter which had been sent on 29<sup>th</sup> August. Cabinet was informed that Councillor Lucas the Cabinet Lead Member for Communities had been appointed as the chairman of the recently convened Post Office Network Change Group, which had been charged with looking at potential local solutions.

**It was resolved:**

To note the content of the report

**441. DELEGATIONS FROM CABINET TO CABINET MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

Cabinet received a report detailing the progress on delegations.

**It was resolved:**

To note the progress on delegations to individual Cabinet Members and/or to officers previously authorised by Cabinet to make decisions/take actions on its behalf.

**442. CABINET DRAFT AGENDA PLAN 14<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2007**

The Cabinet Agenda Plan was noted with the following changes:

Issues Arising from scrutiny committees - Addition: Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee – Report into SWIFT

Item 4 b) ECS Scrutiny Committee - Member led Review of Rural Passenger Transport had been rescheduled to 18<sup>th</sup> December.

Item 5 Final report on the Section 29 Committee Terms of Reference had been re-scheduled to 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2008 meeting

Additions:

A new key decision report titled “Progress on Transport Integration within the Fringe areas and beyond”.

Chairman  
14<sup>th</sup> November 2007