

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

**Date:** 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

**Time:** 10.00 – 11.50am

**Present:** Chairman: Councillor N Clarke

Councillors I Bates, D Brown, S Count, D Harty, L W McGuire, T Orgee,  
M Shuter and S Tierney

**Apologies:** Councillor M Curtis

**Present by invitation:** Councillors J Batchelor, K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, K Reynolds, P  
Sales and T Sadiq

### **582. MINUTES: 22<sup>ND</sup> MAY 2012**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **583. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor D Brown declared a personal interest under paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 592, as a member of East Cambridgeshire District Council.

Councillor T Orgee declared a prejudicial interest under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct in item 5, Draft Consultation Response on University of Cambridge Outline Planning Application and Draft S106 Heads of Terms for Development at North West Cambridge, as a member of the Cambridge Fringes Joint Development Control Committee. He left the meeting whilst this item was discussed.

### **584. PETITIONS**

None.

### **585. MATTERS ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

None.

### **586. ADULT SOCIAL CARE – STRENGTHENING PROVISION**

Cabinet received a report proposing the strengthening of the strategic framework for prevention in Cambridgeshire, based on the introduction of an initial three year

Community Navigator project, to help bridge the gap between local communities, statutory and voluntary organisations.

The Chairman of the Adults, Wellbeing & Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Kevin Reynolds, was invited to speak, and he raised the following points:

- the Adults, Wellbeing & Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee would have welcomed the opportunity to consider this proposal;
- whether the Strategic Framework was a Strategy or an Action Plan, as he did not feel this was clear from the report: whilst acceptable as a Strategy, if the intention was to provide an Action Plan, the proposals lacked detail. It was confirmed that it was a Strategy;
- the importance of prevention was not being emphasised strongly enough;
- it was unclear whether additional resources were being made available, and if so, whether these resources were financial or staff time, whether these resources would be sufficient to achieve the ambitious objectives set out, and what would happen when the three year project came to an end;
- “community” did not necessarily refer to a geographical area as many communities could not be defined in that way e.g. travellers;
- It was unclear what the role of the Countywide Community Navigator Co-ordinator was.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke, welcomed Councillor Reynolds’ comments. He pointed out that it was the role of the Overview & Scrutiny Committees to determine their own work programme, and the items to be considered at Cabinet were publicised well in advance through the Cabinet forward agenda plan.

Councillor John Batchelor, speaking as Opposition Adult Social Care Spokesman, said that he was very keen to support preventative policies, and felt there was a need pull together the various strategies currently in place. However, he was concerned that the only new element being proposed was to appoint six new officers to co-ordinate existing activity. He expressed concern that this would lead to more pressure on already stretched resources, and additional pressure on the voluntary sector.

Cabinet welcomed the positive report, which demonstrated the Council’s desire to work with third sector in a strong way. It was acknowledged that this was one piece of a broader preventative agenda, and it had particular value in tackling the issues of isolation and loneliness.

It was resolved to endorse the principles of the Cambridgeshire Adult Social Care prevention framework through the development of a Community Navigator function.

## **587. PROPOSED CONTRACT FOR DESIGN AND BUILD SERVICES**

Cabinet was asked to agree the proposed re-procurement for Design and Build services. The proposal was to establish a framework agreement so that at least 15% of the capital programme was allocated outside of the framework contracts. This would have a number of benefits, including providing opportunities for new entrants, specifically small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

Cabinet Members raised the following points:

- queried the position of Academies in terms of Capital Maintenance and Minor Improvements. It was confirmed that Academies had the flexibility to employ local companies;
- noted that although some people held the view that all work should be tendered, the costs of such an approach would outweigh the benefits;
- highlighted the importance of modern methods of construction, and their impact on design.

It was resolved

- a) to note the current contracting arrangements and the measure that have been taken to manage performance and deliver efficiencies both in respect of cost and project control;
- b) to note the steps that are being taken to address the few negative aspects of framework contracts, whilst recognising the wider benefits of their use in specific contracting situations;
- c) to agree to the proposed re-procurement for Design and Build services should be through the establishment of a framework agreement and that at least 15% of the capital programme should be allocated outside of the framework.

## **588. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT OUTTURN REPORT**

Cabinet received the Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the 2011/12 financial year. This report preceded the production of the Council's formal Statement of Accounts, on which the audit opinion was formed.

Cabinet noted that the forecast year-end revenue underspend was £2.1M, which was particularly pleasing given the £50M savings that had to be made in 2011/12. However, a further £40M worth of savings had to be made in the coming year.

Two non-Cabinet members spoke on this item:

- The Labour Group Leader, Councillor Sadiq, commented the underspend at a time of challenging cuts imposed nationally was not a cause for celebration, as it meant that the people of Cambridgeshire were losing out. He drew attention to the indicator on the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on the county's road, commenting that the reduction in casualties was starting to plateau, and the number of cyclists injured had increased. He expressed concerns that the big transformations in Economy, Transport & Environment Services resulted in there

being insufficient capacity in the Road Safety team to address this issue, and suggested that a root and branch review of every junction in Cambridge city was required.

- The Liberal Democrat Group Leader, Councillor Bourke, noted that the underspend was primarily due to the mechanical-biological treatment (MBT) plant not being commissioned on time, despite this project having previously been referred to as a “risk free project”. He expressed concern about the shortfall predicted for Adult Social Care budget in 2012/13, particularly as margins became tighter and there being insufficient reserves to call upon.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, commented that the outturn was a fantastic result, given that very significant savings had been made whilst maintaining the quality of services provided, and paid tribute to staff for achieving this. Whilst sharing Cllr Sadiq’s concerns on road safety, especially the safety of cyclists, he felt that every highway user had a duty of care to both themselves and other road users, and the flagrant abuse of traffic regulations by a small number of cyclists had a negative impact on road safety.

The Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Orgee, commented that over the last five years, performance figures demonstrated that the number of people killed or seriously injured on county roads had reduced by 20%, and he outlined the measures being taken to further reduce these figures. It was confirmed that accident hotspots across the county, not just in Cambridge, would continue to be evaluated.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count, commented that the need to find savings had been embraced across the Council, and much had been achieved through efficiency savings in many areas, whilst maintaining funding and continuing to invest in areas such as libraries and community transport.

Councillor Clarke acknowledged that the Adult Social Care budget was an area of concern and would continue to be the focus of attention. He stressed that the Cabinet continued to take a long term business planning approach to managing the County Council’s resources.

It was resolved

- a) to note the revenue expenditure of Services in 2011/12, and in particular the delivery of a better than break-even position (section 3.1 of the report);
- b) to approve the budget virement of £2.1M to transfer the 11/12 Waste PFI underspend to Corporate Reserves (which is in line with existing policy and is as reported in February’s Integrated Resources and Performance report – see section 3.2 of the report);
- c) to approve the use of the Council’s -£2.1M underspend position in 2011/12 to partly offset the £2.3M Adult Social Care pressure in 2011/12 (see section 2.1 and 3.2 of the report);
- d) to approve the budget virement of £1.2M from CS Financing to Corporate Services to establish a provision for liabilities in the new financial year (see section 3.2);
- e) Cabinet portfolio holders discuss the issues identified within the Performance section with their Directs to establish if action to improve performance or set

appropriate targets can be identified during the next business planning round (see Section 9)

**589. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE – COUNTY SCHOOL (FENLAND LEARNING BASE) FINAL BUSINESS CASE**

Cabinet was asked to endorse the Final Business Case for the County School (Fenland Learning Base), and approval to enter into contracts with the Local Education Partnership to build the County School.

Cabinet noted the report and passed on particular thanks to the Programme Director for Building Schools for the Future, Alan Kippax, and his team for their work in this matter and the Building Schools for the Future programme generally.

It was resolved

- a) to confirm that the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Contract Documents listed at Annex 1 of the report and any other related contracts, agreements and instruments required to give effect to the County School project (including, but not limited to, collateral warranties and direct agreements) may be entered into once (a) final and formal confirmation of BSF funding for the project has been received from the Education Funding Agency; and (b) any final outstanding issues have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Executive Director: Children & Young People's Services and Adult Social Care and the Section 151 Officer for Cambridgeshire County Council in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Learning and Resources;
- b) to note the summary of the Final Business Case at paragraph 2.2 and endorse the strategy for funding this project at paragraph 4.1 of the report.

**590. DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S PROPOSED APPROACH TO SEEKING DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Cabinet received a report on the proposed consultation response to the Draft Charging Schedule for the East Cambridgeshire Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It was noted that County officers had assisted their East Cambridgeshire District Council colleagues in drawing up the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) proposals, particularly the key infrastructure requirements. It was also noted that the CIL alone would be insufficient to meet the infrastructure costs, particularly transport infrastructure/ requirements, and this viability gap would be the subject of further detailed discussions with ECDC.

In response to questions from Cabinet Members, it was clarified that:

- the exemption for affordable housing was a regulation set down by central government;
- funding would still come in through Section 106 for Education and Transport projects;

- the viability gap was not new to CIL, and that the funding gap has been identified as a challenge for most authorities;
- the proposed response included a recommendation to review the CIL rate on an annual basis;
- “equine development” was currently zero rated, which indicated that a rate could be introduced in future;
- the distribution of CIL between County and District authorities was still under discussion, and there was a need to agree priorities early.

It was resolved

- a) to endorse the draft consultation response as set out in Appendix A of the report;
- b) to delegate to the Lead Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment and Local Members, the authority to make any minor changes to the draft consultation response prior to its submission.

#### **591. DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION AND DRAFT SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS FOR DEVELOPMENT AT NORTH WEST CAMBRIDGE**

Cabinet considered the Council’s draft consultation response to the outline planning application from the University of Cambridge for development at Cambridge North West, an urban extension to the city to include living and research accommodation, public amenities and open space. The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning highlighted the importance of the development to Cambridgeshire, and the key concerns from the County Council’s perspective, particularly around education and transport. He tabled an amendment of Appendix B to the report (Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms) and also copies of a representation submitted by Bidwells on 11<sup>th</sup> June, along with an outline response from officers to Bidwells’ representation.

Councillor Brooks-Gordon spoke as the local member for Castle, highlighting concerns about the size of the supermarket, which should be limited to 2000m<sup>2</sup> net floorspace; access to green spaces owned by the University; the adequacy of the bus strategy; traffic mitigation (especially on Lady Margaret Road) and access on to the Huntingdon Road. She welcomed the proposals to support community facilities.

In discussion, Cabinet members raised the following points:

- asked for clarification as to whether a library would be included in the facilities. Officers clarified that a library/health care facility was incorporated in the plans for NIAB1, and the University had been asked to contribute to the costs for that centre.
- queried the “separation of time” referred to in the officers’ outline response, in relation to the NIAB planning applications. Officers explained that the NIAB1 and NIAB2 applications were made at different points in time, and whilst there were similarities in the applications, there were also some real differences, and the

applications were considered under the particular set of policies that were applicable at that time.

- noted the letter from Bidwells and that officers were developing a response, but agreed that due to the late receipt of this letter and the technical nature of its contents, it would not be a material consideration in their deliberations.
- urged Local Members to continue to liaise with officers on this issue.

It was resolved

- a) to consider and endorse the draft response to the consultation as set out in Appendix A of the report including agreeing to removing holding objections as described;
- b) to consider and endorse County S106 Heads of Terms as set out in Appendix B of the report;
- c) to delegate to the Lead Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment and Local Members, the authority to make any minor changes to the draft consultation response prior to its submission;
- d) to delegate to the Lead Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment and Local Members, the authority to finally approve the Adoption and Public Access Strategies.

## **592. ADULT SOCIAL CARE: EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT REGULATIONS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THREE HOMELESSNESS HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES**

Cabinet considered a contract exemption for a housing related support (Supporting People) contract, relating to three homeless projects in Cambridge city. Capital funding for the development of the largest scheme, at 222 Victoria Road, had been secured by Riverside ECHG (English Churches Housing Group) from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), which Riverside ECHG would be matchfunding.

Speaking in support of the proposal, Local Member Councillor Sales outlined the varied backgrounds of the residents of 222 Victoria Road, many of whom were people with families and work or Armed Forces experience. He explained the issues they faced which resulted in them needing housing support, and advised that the average life expectancy of residents was 42. He stressed that whilst the scheme was based in Cambridge it served the whole of the county. He urged Cabinet to approve the contract exemption, which would benefit everyone.

Opposition Spokesman for Adult Social Care, Councillor John Batchelor, spoke in support of the proposal, but questioned the different costs of the various schemes. The Supporting People Strategic Planning Manager, Joseph Keegan, outlined how the different costs reflect the different levels of need of the service users, and the services provided.

It was resolved

To approve a contract exemption with respect to the following adult social care contract:

THREE SERVICES FOR SINGLE HOMELESS PEOPLE – supplied by Riverside ECHG (a charitable registered provider of social housing) currently as part of one contract to allow:

- (i) The issue two new contracts of 3 years, plus up to 2 years' extension, from 1 April 2013 for one of the services ( a large hostel for single homeless people in Victoria Road, Cambridge) to enable significant remodelling into two separate services
- (ii) The extension of the existing contract for up to 2 years from 1 April 2013 for one of the services (smaller hostel for single homeless people in Willow Walk Cambridge) to enable market testing
- (iii) The extension of the existing contract for up to 2 years from 1 April 2013 for the third service (move-on accommodation for single people previously in hostel accommodation in seven houses in Cambridge) to enable alternative options to be explored prior to tendering

#### **593. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA – 10<sup>th</sup> JULY 2012**

Members noted the draft agenda for the Cabinet meeting to be held on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2012, including the following updates made since the publication of the agenda for this meeting:

##### Deferred to September meeting

- Consultation Response on Alconbury Airfield Application

##### Removed from the agenda

- Treasury Management Quarter 4

Chairman 10<sup>th</sup> July 2012