

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 28th May 2013

Time: 10.00am – 11.55am

Present: Chairman: Councillor M Curtis

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

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 16th April 2013 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

The following Members declared a non statutory disclosable interests in line with paragraph 10.1 of the Members Code of Conduct:

- Councillor Orgee as a Member of the Addenbrooke's Board of Governors, in relation to item 4;
- Councillor Count as the Chairman of the Member Steering Group which helped develop the March Market Town Transport Strategy, in relation to item 6;
- Councillor Count as a Member of Fenland District Council involved in the development of the Fenland Core Strategy in relation to item 7;
- Councillor Shuter as a governor of Bottisham Village College Academy, in relation to item 7;
- Councillor Bates as a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council, in relation to item 10.

3. PETITIONS

It was noted that the petition on "reversing bus cuts" was being deferred until a future Cabinet meeting.

Cabinet received a petition which had been received by the deadline of five working days before the meeting. As the petition had more than 50 signatures, a spokesperson was permitted to speak on the petitioner's behalf, for a maximum of three minutes.

Pavement improvements on Mill Road, Cambridge

The petition had 157 signatures and read: *"We, the Mill Road Traders' Association, wish to petition Cambridgeshire County Council to carry out pavement improvements on Mill Road"*.

Piero D'Angelico addressed Cabinet on behalf of the petitioners. The petition had been instigated by traders on Mill Road, which had many businesses which served Petersfield, a substantial community of around 25,000 residents, and those from further afield. The petitioners were asking for improvements to the pavements on Mill Road: due to emergency works carried out by various utility services over the years, the pavements were in a very poor state and presented a real safety hazard. Traders and residents were keen to work with Cambridgeshire County Council to address these issues, and whilst recognizing that the County Council faced resources constraints, urged the Council to address the worst areas and have a strategic approach to the maintenance of pavements in that area. It was noted that Mr D'Angelico had recently met with one of the County Council's traffic engineers, and he was also aware that there had been bids for funding previously, supported by Local Members, to address the issue.

Councillor McGuire, the Cabinet Member for Highways, thanked the petitioners and commented that whilst he could make no promises at this stage to undertake the work, he would discuss this issue with the Service Director and Local Member, Cllr Bourke, and visit Mill Road with Mr D'Angelico so that he could see the issues himself.

The petitioner was advised that he would receive a written response within ten working days.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES:

(a) ADULTS, WELLBEING AND HEALTH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: REVIEW OF DELAYED DISCHARGE AND DISCHARGE PLANNING

Cabinet received a report from the Adults, Wellbeing & Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee, on the findings and recommendations from a Member review of delayed discharge and discharge planning. In the absence of the Committee Chairman, Councillor Sales presented the Committee's report to Cabinet as a Member of the Review Group. He briefly outlined the reasons for undertaking the review and its objectives. He outlined main issues and key findings, which included working relationships between the various agencies involved, client data and effective information sharing, and the importance of preventing readmission.

Councillor Sales was disappointed with the Cabinet response with regard to a new IT system, which was identified by front line staff as essential. He stressed that there were still problems with capacity in the residential care system. Concluding, he urged Cabinet to focus on, and receive regular updates on this issue.

In response to a question on how Addenbrookes compared to hospitals of a similar size, Councillor Sales that Addenbrookes role as a regional hospital serving a number of authorities in the East of England brought particular problems in terms of discharge planning. Addenbrookes was full and often ambulances were forced to queue outside.

It was agreed to:

- a) Note the report;
- b) refer the report to the Health & Wellbeing Board.

(b) CABINET RESPONSE

Cllr Curtis, the Leader of the Council, introduced the Cabinet response to the report from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee. Whilst welcoming the Committee's report, he felt there was insufficient emphasis on avoidance, i.e. stopping people presenting at Accident & Emergency in the first place. He also felt that it was important to share the Committee's report with partners through the Health & Wellbeing Board.

Other Cabinet Members made the following comments:

- that the full Scrutiny report ("Final report and recommendations" – Appendix 1 to item 4(a)) put greater emphasis on the great cost and impact of delayed discharge and this was not made clear in the covering report. Similarly, the full report made clear that whilst about one-third of delayed discharge were the responsibility of the relevant local authority, about two-thirds were due to the NHS;
- suggested that there should have been greater focus on best practice nationally, and what could be learnt from that;
- noted that around 85% of delayed discharges were related to emergency admissions.

Councillor Orgee, the new Cabinet Member for Health & Wellbeing, welcomed the report

Officers outlined the current structure of partner meetings with the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group and acute hospitals, which included the Urgent Care Networks, and the operational arrangements of the Discharge Planning Teams, and how these link with neighbouring authorities. Members commented that the links to neighbouring authorities may be a particular issue the Health & Wellbeing Board would like to consider.

It was resolved to:

- a) consider and comment upon the findings and recommendations contained within the report;
- b) respond to the recommendations contained within the report; and
- c) refer the report to the Health & Wellbeing Board.

5. INCORPORATION OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (CCC) DEMOCRATIC SERVICES FUNCTION WITHIN THE SCOPE OF LGSS SHARED SERVICES

Cabinet received a report on the proposed incorporation into LGSS of Cambridgeshire County Council's Democratic Services function, under the auspices of the Directorate of Law, Property and Governance.

Introducing the report, the Cabinet Member for Resources & Performance, Councillor Count reminded Members of the success of LGSS since its inception, in delivering improved back office services.

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the change in scope of LGSS Shared Services to include the Cambridgeshire County Council democratic services team
- b) to recommend to Full Council that they:-
 - i) approve the incorporation of the Cambridgeshire County Council democratic services team within the scope of LGSS
 - ii) approve the necessary amendments to the Cambridgeshire County Council constitution to bring this about
 - iii) authorise the LGSS Director of Law, Property & Governance, in consultation with the Chairman of the LGSS Joint Committee and Chairman of the Cambridgeshire County Council Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any amendments to the Cambridgeshire County Council Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

6. MARCH MARKET TOWN TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Cabinet received a report on the second March Market Town Transport Strategy. Introducing the report, Councillor Bates, the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, drew attention to the detailed Action Plan within the Strategy. He also thanked officers for their hard work in bringing the strategy together.

Councillor Count spoke as the Chairman of the Member Steering Group that helped to develop the strategy. He paid tribute to the hard work of Members and officers from all authorities which were involved in developing the Strategy, and the wide consultation that had taken place. He drew attention to the following points:

- he had supported the “shared use” proposal for Broad Street, but this proposal proved to be controversial, probably because of concerns about the relocation of the fountain and war memorial, and had been abandoned. However, this demonstrated how there had been a genuine consultation, and how the Strategy had changed in response;
- he had particular concerns about (i) safety implications resulting from parking in the area around the Elm Road railway crossing and (ii) the footpath on the Norwood Road bridge, and these sites were addressed in the Action Plan.

Cabinet welcomed the Strategy.

It was resolved:

- a) to note the progress made in developing the March Market Town Transport Strategy; and
- b) to approve the adoption of the March Market Town Transport Strategy (attached at Appendix 1 to the report) as part of the Third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.

7. PROPOSED RESPONSES TO THE EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN AND THE FENLAND CORE STRATEGY PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION CONSULTATIONS

Cabinet received a report on the proposed responses to the East Cambridgeshire Draft Local Plan and the Fenland Core Strategy Proposed Submission Version consultations.

Outlining the key issues in the East Cambridgeshire response, Councillor Bates, Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, drew attention to particular concerns about the lack of commitment to “Lifetime Home” standards, whereby new homes were built so that they were wheelchair accessible or readily adaptable. There were also strong concerns regarding the omission of any reference to both a secondary school for Littleport and Special Education Needs (SEN) requirements. In terms of transport, the response highlighted the lack of strong focus on the A10 north of Cambridge, one of the county’s most congested routes.

Local Member Councillor Palmer spoke on the East Cambridgeshire Draft Local Plan. He outlined the extensive nature of the consultation for the Draft Local Plan, which included liaison with all Parishes in the District, and balancing the differing aspirations of those communities. The aim of the Plan was to facilitate growth in the District’s major settlements, rather than plan for growth by developing a new town. In conjunction with this, residents had expectations in terms of infrastructure, which included a new railway station at Soham, and a secondary school in Littleport.

Liberal Democrat Planning, Environment & Enterprise Spokesman, Councillor Jenkins, supported Councillor Bates’ point about the importance of the A10 in East Cambridgeshire. Turning to the Fenland Core Strategy, he noted that there was no mention of reconnecting Wisbech to the railway network.

Councillor Brown highlighted two key transport problems for East Cambridgeshire: (i) the A14/A142 junction – whilst situated over the border in Suffolk, the County Council needed to be working with that authority to address the problems with the A14/A142 junction; (ii) increasing congestion on the Quy/Newmarket Road route into Cambridge. He also highlighted that there was very little post-16 education provision in East Cambridgeshire.

Other Cabinet Members raised the following concerns:

- supporting Councillor Bates’ point about the need for Lifetime Home standards;

- “future proofing” new homes by providing ducting for cabling/future technologies, and saving individuals and authorities considerable sums in future;
- strongly supporting the points made about the need for Lifetime Homes.

(Councillor Count withdrew from the meeting)

Turning to the Fenland Core Strategy, Councillor Bates explained that one of the main concerns was that the 11,000 new homes for the District were at undefined, broad locations, which meant it was very difficult for the County Council to plan for any infrastructure requirements associated with these developments.

Councillor Orgee commented that a big issue was ensuring balance between the growth in homes and the growth in jobs, as without this, there was a danger that the new developments become homes for commuters to other areas, exacerbating transport problems.

It was resolved:

- a) to approve the proposed response to the East Cambridgeshire Draft Local Plan consultation (attached as Appendix 1 to the report);
- b) to approve the proposed response to the Fenland Core Strategy Proposed Submission Version consultation (attached as Appendix 2 to the report); and
- c) to delegate to the Cabinet member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director, Economy, Transport and Environment authority to make minor changes to the responses before submission and to conditionally withdraw or withdraw objections where negotiations with the District Councils overcome objections raised.

(Councillor Count rejoined the meeting)

8. ALLOCATION OF SECTION 106 (S106) DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS TO TRANSPORT SCHEMES IN CAMBRIDGE CITY AND HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL AREAS

Cabinet considered a report which proposed the allocation of Section 106 developer contributions to schemes in south Cambridge and Huntingdonshire. Councillor Bates, Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, outlined the processes in Cambridge and Huntingdonshire by which these potential schemes were selected. Cabinet Members requested that future reports include maps illustrating the exact sites for the schemes.

In response to a Member question, it was clarified that the proposed allocation from Section 106 contributions to the St Neots Railway Bridge project was £200,000, with the shortfall being met by Huntingdonshire District Council.

It was resolved:

To approve the allocation of Section 106 contributions to the following schemes:

- a) new pedestrian/ cycleway linking Trumpington Park and Ride, Clay Farm/Trumpington Meadows New School and Guided Busway - £160,000;
- b) St Neots Railway Bridge - £200,000; and
- c) West of Town Centre Link Road - £94,484

9. GREATER CAMBRIDGE AND GREATER PETERBOROUGH SHADOW LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY

Cabinet received a report on progress made with establishing the Local Transport Body (LTB). The report also sought agreement on resources and Terms of Reference for the LTB.

Introducing the report, Councillor Bates, Cabinet Member for Planning & Growth, explained how the Department for Transport (DfT) would be devolving funding for major transport schemes to LTBs. For Cambridgeshire, the LTB encompassed Cambridgeshire, Peterborough and Rutland, as its geography reflects that of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Funding of £21 million for 2015-19 was anticipated, but it was acknowledged that this was a relatively small amount spread across a large geographical area. It was noted that the Shadow Local Transport Body had already met several times and developed the draft Terms of Reference.

Liberal Democrat Planning, Environment & Enterprise Spokesman, Councillor Jenkins, spoke on the report. He noted that the LTB was not yet a democratically accountable body. It was confirmed that the County Council's three Members on the LTB would be politically balanced/representative. He suggested that some attention should be given to ensuring that existing roads were maintained to a satisfactory standard. In response, Councillor Bates advised that the LTB's remit was to look at major highways projects which were currently under the auspices of the DfT, and the LTB had no responsibility for the maintenance of roads. It was also noted that the County Council had committed £90M to highway maintenance.

In response to a Member question as to the LTB's status, officers confirmed that this is currently in Shadow Form and that its' constitution is subject to DfT signing off the Draft Assurance Framework which has been submitted for their approval. Officers confirmed that the LTB is an informal Partnership, but that Cambridgeshire County Council acts as Accountable Body and as such Cabinet ratify the LTB decisions. Officers also confirmed that meetings of the Shadow LTB are being held in public with papers available on the County's website. It was noted that there would be a further report on the LTB at the July Cabinet meeting.

As Cambridgeshire County Council was the Accountable Body for the shadow Local Transport Body, Cabinet agreed:

- a) the resources for the Local Transport Body for 2013/14;
- b) the Terms of Reference for the Local Transport Body;

- c) to delegate to the Cabinet member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director, Economy, Transport and Environment authority to make minor changes.

10. WINTRINGHAM PARK: OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION – DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Cabinet considered a report on the key issues arising from the consultation on the Wintringham Park Outline Planning Application. Councillor Bates, Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, outlined these issues, which broadly covered education, transport and health. Specific issues included the undesirable proposed location of primary schools next to the East Coast Main Line, the shortfall in secondary provision, and lack of provision of Children's Centres.

Addressing Cabinet, Local Member Councillor Smith highlighted her particular concerns regarding the proposed response. She felt that the scheme had particular implications for the A428, which was already congested, especially between Caxton Gibbett and St Neots, and this part of the response should be strengthened considerably, especially given the proposals for continued development in the Cambourne/Bourn area. Her other concern was the lack of public transport between St Neots and Cambridge given the importance of this route, there was no rail link, and very few bus services.

Comments from Cabinet Members included concerns that the County Council was being exposed to risks, particularly the financial risks associated with increasing secondary school provision. It was noted that a decision had previously been taken that any extension in secondary school provision in St Neots should be based on the two existing schools, rather than establishing a third, new school, which would be problematic as there was no appropriate site available, and there were also potential demand issues.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the following would be put forward as objections:

- the shortfall of funding of £5M for the required secondary school expansion;
- the inappropriate location of the proposed two primary schools, next to the East Coast Main Line;
- lack of special school provision;
- lack of early years provision;
- lack of post-16 provision.

These objections would be on top of the holding objection on transport.

With regard to the desirability of Lifetime Homes, raised under a previous report, it was noted that the Huntingdonshire Plan, which would be published shortly, included a policy provision on Lifetime Homes.

It was resolved to:

- a) approve the County Council's consultation response to Huntingdonshire District Council on the Wintringham Park Outline Planning Application (planning reference: 1300178OUT); and
- b) delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment, authority to make changes to the consultation response to reflect the Cabinet discussion.

11. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY – CONSULTATIONS

Cabinet received a report on the proposed response to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) consultations from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) and Cambridge City Council.

Introducing the report, Councillor Bates, Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, commented that the CIL arrangements would significantly change the amount of funding the Council has access to in the future, and how infrastructure schemes were prioritised. He also stressed that CIL would not pay for all infrastructure schemes – there would be a greater shortfall of funding in future. A particular concern was that some proposed changes would allow more exemptions e.g. Cambridge City Council was proposing a nil rate on commercial/business premises in Cambridge. The proposed response suggested that some level of charge would be viable, whilst still enabling growth and the provision of infrastructure.

It was resolved to:

- a) approve:
 - the DCLG Consultation response on Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Further Reforms;
 - the response to the Huntingdonshire District Council Draft CIL Regulation 123 Infrastructure;
 - the response to the Cambridge City Consultation CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule;
- b) delegate to the Executive Director, Economy, Transport and Environment, the authority to make minor amendments as necessary to these responses prior to submission.

12. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA 18th JUNE 2013

Members noted the draft agenda for the Cabinet meeting to be held on 18th June orally updated at the meeting with the following changes since the publication of the current agenda:

The following items had been moved from the May to the June Cabinet meeting:
Petition on reversing bus cuts

13. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

It was resolved that:

The press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following report on the grounds that it is likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 3 and 5 of Part 1 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and that it would not be in the public interest for the information to be disclosed (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information) and information in respect of which claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

14. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GUIDED BUSWAY MEDIATION DELEGATION ARRANGEMENTS

Cabinet received a report in relation to proposed delegation arrangements for the forthcoming mediation in the dispute with BAM Nuttall. Having considered advice received from legal and senior officers,

It was resolved:

To agree the recommendations in relation to the representation at the mediation and other related issues, as set out in the confidential report.

Chairman
18th June 2013