

## **CABINET: MINUTES**

<b>Date:</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> July 2005
<b>Time:</b>	10.00 a.m. – 11.38 a.m.
<b>Present:</b>	Councillor J K Walters (Chairman)
<b>Councillors:</b>	S F Johnstone V H Lucas, M W McGuire, L J Oliver, D R Pegram, J A Powley J E Reynolds, J M Tuck and F H Yeulett
<b>Apologies:</b>	None
<b>Also in Attendance:</b>	Councillors I C Bates, M Ballard and S J E King

### **20. MINUTES 14<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2005**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **21. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

None made.

### **22. ISSUES ARISING FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

No issues.

## **DECISIONS FOR COUNCIL**

### **23. PROVISIONAL CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 2006-11**

Cabinet received a report setting out the new requirements of the Local Transport Act 2000 for local transport authorities to produce Local Transport Plans (LTPs) at least once every five years. An update to the web link to the report was orally reported correcting the version in paragraph 1 of the printed report so that the last three letters read ltp and not itp. Paper copies of the full plan had been made available in the Members Lounge, Members Group Room and were also available at the meeting.

Although the County Council was not required to produce a new plan at the current time, if the opportunity was not taken, the County Council would miss the opportunity to obtain additional funding of up to 25% if the submitted Plan was considered a higher quality than the average. The new LTP produced by the County Council would run from 2006-2011 and set out the authority's transport strategies, a programme of transport schemes and the targets to be achieved in the period.

A member made the point regarding the urgent continued need for the A 142 Ely Southern bypass when making reference to the list of schemes set out in the appendix. This was supported, in addition to the continued need to press for the necessary improvements required as soon as possible along the A14.

The revised LTP was based on new government guidance (as set out in Paragraph 2.1 of the officers' report). This new guidance specified that LTPs should only contain schemes based upon identified funding. As there would be a need in Cambridgeshire for substantial improvements to the transport network arising from the growth agenda, it was likely that considerable amounts of additional funding for transport would need to be obtained from sources not yet precisely identified. To address this shortcoming, a Long Term Transport Strategy was also being developed to bridge the gap between the LTP and the very significant additional funding required to be provided. The Long Term Transport Strategy would ensure the continued integration of transport and planning policy in Cambridgeshire.

In addition, under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 all transport authorities were now required to produce a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) to cover a ten year plan period from 2007 which would cover all aspects of Right of Way and access management (including use for transport health and recreation).

Part of the LTP addressed traffic management in Cambridge. The current key objectives of the Cambridge Core Traffic Scheme were to:

- remove through traffic
- improve conditions for public transport
- provide safer / convenient routes for cyclists
- create better / safer environments for pedestrians
- achieve an overall improvement in air quality
- provide opportunities for streetscape improvements
- maintain essential vehicle access
- achieve an overall benefit

Cabinet also agreed the addition of a further objective in recognition of the need to minimise street clutter and excessive signage, which also has the support of the Cambridge Area Joint Committee. This read as follows:

- minimise visual intrusion on the highway.

This was seen as necessary not only in the City but also in rural areas and should include working with farmers to minimise signs being set up in fields next to the highway.

Having agreed the principles involved, **It was resolved to recommend that the Council:**

- (i) Approves the revised Local Transport Plan;

- (ii) Authorises the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive for Environment and Community Services, to make any detailed changes necessary to the above documents prior to their submission to Government;
- (iii) Approves the Rights of Way Improvement Plan;
- (iv) Approves the revised objectives of the Cambridge Core Traffic Scheme.

## **24. YOUTH JUSTICE STRATEGY AND YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN**

A Youth Justice Plan had been prepared in accordance with the Youth Justice Board template for the purposes of planning delivery and resource allocation. Paper copies of the Youth Justice Plan and the Youth Justice Strategy had been placed in the Members Lounge, group rooms and an electronic link provided. Copies were also available at the meeting.

The Youth Justice Strategy set out how the Youth Offending Service (YOS) would deliver the aim of preventing offending by young people and addressed the 13 national measures of performance, as detailed in the officers' report. The YOS concentrated on performance improvement in three key areas namely, Attainment of Education Training and Employment, Assessing using Asset, and the rate of contact and Enforcement of Court Orders under national standards.

Attention was drawn to the fact that when compared with other regions, while reconvictions data was broadly similar, the prevention of re-offending for those receiving final warning programmes was better than the regional average. This was to be commended. It was also considered appropriate that the Youth Offending Service should now be placed within the Office for Children and Young People's Services, as 15 years of age was the recognised peak age for offending.

**It was resolved to recommend that the Council:**

Approves the Youth Justice Strategy and the Youth Justice Plan.

## **KEY DECISIONS**

## **25. FINANCIAL OUTTURN FOR 2004/05**

Cabinet received and noted a report outlining the 2004/05 draft financial results for revenue, capital and the trading units. The report also provided information in relation to the final position on balances, carry forwards, reserves and treasury management and the prudential regime. The portfolio holder for Corporate Services explained that the report indicated the difficulty in operating

under tight financial constraints as one of the lowest funded County Councils in the Country.

The approved Council Budget for the year was £466.425m. The Budget had been increased with transfers from carry forwards of £407k, making a total budget of £466.832m (see Appendix 1). A further £9.749m of schools carry-forwards had also been made available.

Cabinet noted that the overall position for Services (excluding Education Self-Managing Institutions) had been actual spending of £264.7m against a budget of £262.6m, which represented an overspend of £1.7m (only 0.6% of the overall budget). The position for each Service was summarised in Appendix 1. £1.3m of the overspend had been charged against Carry-Forwards Reserves in accordance with the Council's Constitution, whilst £408k had been chargeable to County Council balances. The main area of overspend had been for Children's social services. This overspend had been as a result of more children requiring support than had been expected in 2004/05. Cabinet had continued to monitor the position during the year, and continued to ensure that budget planning for future years would recover the deficit.

Cabinet, in line with the County Council's Constitution requirements, was recommending to the Audit and Accounts Committee the use of £148k of the debt charges underspend in order to fund the Warboys Inquiry overspend.

Cabinet also agreed that in line with the Section 31 Agreement, that up to 2% of the underspend on Older People's pooled budgets in 2005/06 would be returned to the pooled budgets and that underspends over 2% should be reinvested in priority areas within Older People's Social Care Services, to be identified by the Adult Task Group.

Cabinet noted the report on capital spending (actual expenditure of £89m) and its financing in 2004-05. It was previously reported to Cabinet that required capital receipts might not become available until the 2005-06 financial year, and that it would possibly be necessary for the capital programme to be temporarily financed through Prudential Borrowing. However, the final pattern of spend indicated that more grant funding had been utilised, and therefore the arrangement was not required. Part of this had been due to Education Libraries and Heritage (ELH) being able to secure £1m Standards Fund Grant for Nursery provision, where previously they had made arrangements in their overall capital programme. In view of this, Cabinet supported approval to a virement of £1m from Nursery provision to support Schools condition work and mobile replacement.

Cabinet noted the position in respect of the Council reserves, which at £5.1m was lower than would be preferred, but recognised the tight constraints placed on the Council Budget.

Cabinet noted that total quantified efficiency savings of £3.404m and £1.653m Gershon savings had been achieved.

Cabinet was informed that the Council had reduced its debts of older than 6 months by 11%, which was 3% above the target and included long standing debt of £254,000.

In respect of prompt payments, the final position for 2004/05 was that 93.8% of undisputed invoices had been paid within thirty days. This represented a continuous improvement in prompt payment results in the past three years.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Note the revenue expenditure of Services in 2004-05 (sections 2 and 3 and Appendices 1 & 2), and to recommend to Audit and Accounts Committee the use of £148k of the debt charges underspend to fund the Warboys Inquiry overspend (3.10);
- ii) Approve that up to 2% of the underspend on Older People's pooled budgets in 2005/06 was returned to the pooled budgets in line with the Section 31 Agreement and that underspends over 2% be reinvested in priority areas identified within Older People's Social Care Services;
- iii) Note the report on capital spending and financing in 2004-05 (Section 4 of the officers report), and to approve the Virement of £1m from Nursery provision to support Schools condition work and mobile replacement (paragraph 4.5 of the officers' report)
- iv) Note the report on trading units' performance (Section 5 of the officers' report and Appendix 3),
- v) Approve the reserves and carry forwards (Sections 6,7,8 of the officers' report and Appendix 4),
- vi) Note the report on treasury management activities and prudential indicators (Section 9 of the officers' report); and
- vii) Note the reports on efficiency savings (Section 10 of the officers' report), debt management (Section 11 of the officers' report), prompt payment (Section 12 of the officers' report).

## **26. SCHOOLS DEFICIT STRATEGY**

Cabinet received a report recommending measures to help strengthen the authority's ability to aid school recovery planning and deficit monitoring by addressing school deficits caused by a financial anomaly with the County Council's four smallest Secondary schools. The deficits were the direct result of structural defects within the school funding system, exacerbated by the

decreasing numbers of pupils on roll at the schools. The proposed intervention would enable the schools to provide a level and standard of Education to their respective pupils as defined in the National Curriculum.

It was noted that the Coleridge Community College (CC) deficit required to be funded in full, in order to facilitate the proposed Federation between the school and Parkside CC, which was based on the write-off of the historic deficit for Coleridge CC. In terms of the Manor CC, it was reported that on current planning and funding assumptions, the school would be unable to submit a recovery plan acceptable to OfSTED that addressed the historic deficit within 5 years, despite the improvements in financial management that had been achieved over the last two years at the school.

Cabinet agreed that the sum of up to £1.1m from Education Libraries and Heritage (ELH) reserves would be distributed to the schools. Funding would be allocated to Coleridge Community College during the 2005/06 and to the three others in 2006/07. The costs of the proposal were to be limited to the £1,149k available, and therefore funding for the other three schools might require proportional adjustment, depending upon the confirmed outturn figure for Coleridge.

The initial proposals for funding the deficits were:

Manor	£401,000
Melbourn	£148,814
Bassingbourn	£60,389
Coleridge	£538,986

It was noted that the shortcomings in the current funding formula had been recognised and revised formula arrangements were being developed for implementation by the 2006/07 financial year.

Cabinet wished to make clear that the funding of these deficits was a one-off response to unique circumstances, and did not represent any weakening of the general principle that schools in deficit were responsible for recovering the situation from their own funding base.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) Agree that the deficit budgets for Manor Community College, Coleridge Community College, Melbourn Village College and Bassingbourn Village College were considered, in whole or in part, structural in nature and thus eligible for one-off targeted funding for their reduction, as the deficits are considered beyond management control.
- ii) Agree that the Coleridge Community College deficit would be funded in full, in the light of the Federation with Parkside Community College.

- iii) Agree that that the sum of up to £1.1m from Education Libraries and Heritage (ELH) reserves is distributed to schools meeting the above "beyond management control" criterion. Funding to be provided to Coleridge Community College during the 2005/06 financial year and to Manor Community College, Melbourn Village College and Bassingbourn College in 2006/07.
- iv) The final sum to be distributed to each school to be agreed by the Cabinet member for Children and Young People's Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive CYPS following confirmation of the outturn position of the four schools.

## **27. GOOD HOUSEKEEPING LOANS**

Cabinet received a report requesting approval to fund loans from the Good Housekeeping Fund.

The Good Housekeeping Fund (GHF) had been established to provide essential flexibility through pump priming loan sums to revenue projects on a 'spend to save' basis with loans repayable over the lifetime of a project. Advances from the fund of up to £140,000 were normally approved by the Director of Finance and Performance, following certification by the relevant Assistant Director (Resources) / Deputy Chief Executive. The current requests exceeded the delegation ceiling.

### **It was resolved:**

To approve the following Good Housekeeping loan applications on the basis of them being repaid over the lifetime of the project:

- i) Information Technology - £329k for the urgent update of the corporate NT servers.
- ii) Policy and Scrutiny - £166k - over two years commencing in 2005/06, to fund the appointment of two scrutiny support officers.
- iii) Children and Young People – a total loan amounting to £823 for the following projects:
  - a) Expansion and Relocation of Residential Provision - £50k - to be used to support the set up costs involved with the relocation of the existing home to a new site and expanding it to be registered for three children.
  - b) Residential Accommodation for Children and Young People with a Learning Disability - £88k – similar to the above but setting up completely new residential provision for children with a learning disability.

- c) Fostering and Kinship Support Service - £289k in order to establish and develop a comprehensive and effective service for children and young people.
- d) Recruitment and Training of Social Work Qualified Staff - £396k to be paid in instalments over three consecutive years commencing in 2005/06 (£169k, £166k, £61k)

## **28. CAMBRIDGESHIRE'S SECOND LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICE AGREEMENT (LPSA)**

Cabinet received a report on the progress being made towards the County Council's second Local Public Service Agreement, which had involved protracted negotiations between partners and the Government, through no fault of the County Council. The agreement was to be based on the requirements set out by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) for second LPSA agreements as detailed in the Cabinet report and as updated in the later report to the Council.

Cabinet expressed concern that the start date of the agreement was to be backdated to October 2004 and the end date of the agreement would be March 2007, which would again make it very difficult to achieve agreed targets, especially as no pump prime money had so far been provided. Negotiations on the outstanding topics would continue, with a view to them being submitted for ministerial approval in September.

Cabinet welcomed the government announcement that Cambridgeshire has been successful in its bid to be a second phase Local Area Agreement (LAA) pilot area. This will provide the County and local partners with the opportunity to build upon the principles and partnership working developed as part of the LPSA.

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

- i) Note the progress being made towards the agreement of Cambridgeshire's second LPSA and that Cabinet would receive a further report on the details of the final agreement.
- ii) Delegate authority to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the Chief Executive to approve the submission of the first part of Cambridgeshire's draft second Local Public Service Agreement to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) for ministerial sign off.



## OTHER DECISIONS

### 29. SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CONSULTATION ON PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS

Cabinet received a report in respect of the key corporate responses being recommended by officers with regard to the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Pre-submission Consultation Document.

The Local Development Framework (LDF) was a vital component for creating sustainable developments in the Cambridge Sub-Region, in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan. The LDF would provide the spatial framework for investment in key services such as schools, libraries, transport and recreation. While the current document was broadly in accordance with the Structure Plan, it was considered too prescriptive in excluding playing fields from the green separation areas, while the Area Action Plan for Northstowe also appeared to be unnecessarily restrictive in limiting the New Town to an area with capacity for around 8,000 dwellings. This latter restriction did not take account of the potential for long-term development needs to be accommodated on land West of Station Road.

In supporting the County Council position for a proper strategy for green separation areas, one member made the point that consideration should also be given to including burial grounds, with a need to avoid areas becoming waste land/dumping grounds.

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

That the following key points be incorporated in the Council's response to the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Pre-submission Consultation, (which was to be considered in more detail by the Service Development Groups for Transport and Delivery and Environment, Waste and Business prior to a full response being prepared on behalf of the Council):

- i) That while South Cambridgeshire's Local Development Framework (June 2005) was broadly in accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan the following amendments were considered necessary by the County Council:

#### Green Separation

Extend uses permitted in green separation areas to allow appropriately managed and landscaped playing fields.

## Reason

The Council does not support that playing fields, including school playing fields, are inappropriate in the green separation between existing communities and new development at Northstowe. South Cambridgeshire has maintained this policy approach and has extended to all green separation areas. This imposes additional pressures on vital land needed for housing and facilities, which will have less capacity if all playing fields have to be included in the development areas. Green separation areas should be used for the benefit of new and existing communities and needs active use and management if it is not to become neglected.

## Northstowe

Provide more long-term flexibility for the use of land west of Station Road (North of Longstanton), to meet the future needs of Northstowe, by appropriate amendments to the Green Belt in this area and by further investigation of an alternative Country Park policy. Objecting to this land not being used for the future potential expansion space for Northstowe, being designated a Country Park and as green belt.

## Reason

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, adopted by the Council in 2003, indicates that Northstowe should be in the size range of 8,000 to 10,000 dwellings. Currently the proposed capacity is for 8,000 dwellings. The County Council has previously indicated that the area West of Station Road may be needed to accommodate the long-term needs of Northstowe. The District Council proposes to extend the Green Belt across this area and to designate it as a Country Park which disregards the Structure Plan policies and Government planning policies. While the County Council has supported the provision of a Country Park in the vicinity of Northstowe, there is no convincing evidence suggesting this area is the best location for a Country Park. Additionally, if the developer can demonstrate that the area of land for the country park is in excess of what is required for Northstowe, alternative funding would have to be sourced. As a County facility, this would be a potential additional cost for the County Council.

- ii). That delegated powers be given to the Cabinet portfolio holder for Environment and Community Services and the Deputy Chief Executive to submit LDF representations to

South Cambridgeshire District Council following consideration by the Environment Waste and Business and the Transport and Delivery SDG's.

### **30. RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS AND STRATEGIC REGISTER**

Cabinet received a report seeking approval to the process for strategic risk management as set in Appendix C to the officers report, tabled at the Cabinet meeting, and also to the agreement of the Council's Strategic Key Risk Register for 2005/06. It was intended that an annual review of the strategic risks should be reported to Cabinet for approval and a further half yearly report should be produced on progress on reducing risk exposure.

In agreeing the list of key strategic risks, Cabinet deleted the word "Significant" from key strategic risk 19 as set out in paragraph 2.4 of the officers' report, so that it read "failure of Child Protection procedures". It was considered that any failure of child protection procedures was a concern/threat to parents and families and therefore represented a key risk. It was also agreed that recommendation (d) of the officers' report should be deleted, as the Cabinet member nominated to be the Council's member champion for risk management should also oversee the Action Planning process in respect of each key strategic risk.

Cabinet supported the introduction of a standard format section on "Risk Management Implications" for all future Cabinet reports on proposed policies and projects. Cabinet did not agree a recommendation that there should be a dedicated risk management champion for each service area: as it was considered that this could encourage impressions that risk management was compartmentalised, rather than being integral to all planning processes.

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

- i) To approve the draft process for strategic risk management as set out in appendix C to the officers report and the register of prioritised key strategic risks for 2005/06 as follows;

Failure to maintain CPA status  
Financial arrangements  
Management of Growth Agenda  
Projects, Partnerships and Contracts  
Recruitment and Retention  
Loss of focus on service delivery as a result of Reshaping for Excellence  
Civil Protection  
Waste PFI  
Resource Management  
Budget Gap  
Primary Care Trusts

Failure of Child Protection Procedures.

- ii) That the standard format of reports presented to Cabinet be modified so that all future reports on proposed policies and projects contain a section headed “Risk Management Implications”;
- iii) That Councillor Powley, the Cabinet Portfolio holder for Corporate Services should be appointed as the Council’s member champion for risk management to oversee the Action Planning Process in respect of each of the identified key strategic risks.

### **31. CORPORATE PROCUREMENT STRATEGY**

Cabinet received a report seeking comments on the draft updated Corporate Procurement Strategy and requesting approval to delegating the signing off of the final strategy to the appropriate portfolio holder.

The County Councils vision for procurement was set out as:

- To deliver Best Value procurement to support innovative and high quality services to the people of Cambridgeshire, thereby achieving our community plan objectives.
- To demonstrate value for money from contracts, thereby improving the cost effectiveness of the Council, and;
- To support the fulfilment of the County Council’s corporate aims and objectives including the delivery of the efficiency agenda.

The purpose of the strategy was to communicate clearly to all stakeholders, operational managers, Directors, procurement specialists, suppliers in the private and voluntary sector, the Council’s vision for its procurement of goods, services and works. This was in order that all stakeholders understood and contributed to the implementation of the vision. The strategy provided a framework by which the Council will make procurement decisions.

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

That the portfolio holder for Corporate Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive (Corporate Services) be authorised to agree the final procurement strategy.

### **32. BEACON COUNCIL APPLICATION**

Following The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) announcement on the themes for round 7 of the Beacon Councils scheme, Cabinet received a report providing details of the intention to apply for Beacon Council Status following officer discussions on the themes most likely to succeed.

**It was resolved:**

to endorse the intention to apply for Beacon Council Status under the themes of:

- Delivery of Quality Services through better procurement;
- Road safety;
- Waste and recycling.

**33. COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (CPA) VALUE FOR MONEY (VFM) SELF ASSESSMENT**

Cabinet received a report on the requirement to submit a Value for Money (VFM) Self-Assessment to the Audit Commission by 31<sup>st</sup> July as part of the new Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) methodology and sought agreement on the process for approving the Council's self-assessment.

The Audit Commission had revised the framework for the CPA for the period 2005 to 2008 to provide:

- A 'harder test' for authorities;
- Stronger focus on service users and VFM;
- Fewer service inspections and more reliance on performance information; and
- A balanced approach to regulation.

It was noted that The Use of Resources judgement was to be one of the key elements of the CPA framework. As a result, the Council's external auditors would undertake an annual assessment of the Council's use of resources to cover the following five areas:

- Financial reporting;
- Financial management;
- Financial standing;
- Internal control; and
- Value for money (VFM).

**It was resolved:**

To delegate the responsibility for the approval of the VFM self-assessment to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the cross-party CPA Member Working Group, to enable the Council to meet the deadline set by the Audit Commission.

**34. IMPLEMENTING ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT STRATEGY – INTERIM STATEMENT**

Cabinet received a report to consider the Council's progress towards meeting the requirement of ensuring appropriate services were electronically enabled by March 2006 and seeking comments on a draft up-dated statement on the above strategy. Authority was also sought to delegate signing off the final

strategy in order to meet the Government's submission deadline of 18<sup>th</sup> July 2005.

The statement provided an update on the Council's progress towards meeting the requirement of ensuring appropriate services were electronically enabled by March 2006.

Cabinet noted that all "required targets" were on schedule to be met by the 31<sup>st</sup> December stated deadline, with all "good targets" expected to be met by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006. Details were provided on the progress against those targets that had slipped, setting out the action being undertaken and also detailing the position against each of the other sections.

**It was resolved:**

To authorise the portfolio holder for Corporate Services, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive (Corporate Services) could agree and submit the final statement.

**35. WASTE PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE (PFI) PROCUREMENT - PROCESS FOR APPROVAL OF LAND ACQUISITIONS**

Cabinet received a report requesting that authority be given to the Waste Procurement Board to take decisions to approve the purchase of land for the provision of new or replacement waste handling facilities, as required in the Waste PFI project. The approval would be within the overall limit of expenditure of £6.4 million, specified in the agreed Business Case for the project. This approval was in order to avoid returning to Cabinet to obtain the necessary approval for every individual site.

Cabinet on 18 May 2004 had endorsed the need for estimated expenditure of £6.4 million to acquire land for such purposes. Cabinet were informed that "Invitations to Negotiate" were to be issued imminently to short-listed bidders and during the period in which bids were being prepared, the Council would need to specify the sites available. As a result, it was likely that prompt decisions would be needed in order to proceed with specific land acquisitions during the next few months.

**It was resolved:**

To authorise the Waste Procurement Board to take decisions to approve the purchase of land for the provision of new or replacement waste handling facilities, as required in the Waste PFI project, within the overall limit of expenditure specified in the agreed Business Case for the project.

***[OTHER MATTERS]***

**36. INSPECTION OF SOCIAL CARE SERVICES FOR DISABLED PEOPLE  
SEPTEMBER 2004 COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL CARE INSPECTION  
REPORT**

Cabinet received a report on the above titled inspection carried out by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) In September 2004. The report set out their conclusions and the subsequent action plan to address the issues identified. The judgement made by the Inspection Team had been that people with physical and sensory disabilities had not been served well and that the service's capacity for improvement was uncertain. Appended to the officers' report was an appendix providing the full action plan and the progress made against it up to June 2005.

Cabinet were pleased to note that there has been significant progress achieved on a number of the recommendations and that work was continuing on the other recommendations in the Inspection Report, focussing on continuing to improve the quality of services for disabled people.

**It was resolved:**

To note the outcome of the Inspection carried out in September 2004 and the subsequent action plan, and progress to June 2005.

**37. MONITORING OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF JOINT REVIEW ACTION PLAN**

Cabinet received and noted the seventh report on progress on delivering the recommendations of the Joint Review, as agreed in the Joint Review Action Plan. The impact of this work provided improvements to services to vulnerable adults and children across Cambridgeshire.

Cabinet was pleased to note the continued good progress in delivering the action plan, with the report detailing the progress made in specific areas.

**It was resolved:**

To note the progress being made to implement the recommendations of the Joint Review.

**38. CABINET DRAFT AGENDA 6<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2005**

It was resolved to note the Cabinet Draft Agenda Plan for 6<sup>th</sup> September 2005 with the following amendments:

- Deferring to a later meeting the Secretary of State's decision on the Guided Bus
- Noting that unless there was a reference back from Audit and Accounts Committee the report on the Outturn was likely to be deleted.

## **[PART 2 EXEMPT REPORTS]**

### **39. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

To exclude the press and public from the meeting under Section 100 (A) 4 Of The Local Government Act 1972 during the consideration of the following reports on the grounds that it was likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 8 and 9 of schedule 12a of the Local Government act 1972 by virtue of the report referring to any expenditure proposed by the authority or any terms proposed or to be proposed by or in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property, or the supply of goods and services.

### **40.A HUNTINGDON TOWN CENTRE PROJECT – LIBRARY AND ARCHIVE CENTRE**

Cabinet received a report advising on the progress on the Town Centre Redevelopment Project and seeking approval of the preferred option to rebuild the existing Library premises in Phase II of the development.

The confidential report to Cabinet indicated successful progress against the conditions required to be satisfied in relation to the conditional contract for D.E Clegg to purchase the Council's town centre assets.

While discussions were still continuing with HDC regarding shared facilities/joint use of the site, the new proposed Library/Records facility had been costed on a stand-alone basis and could be provided within the overall funding available.

Cabinet received detailed financial information on the improved financing position, which now makes the scheme financially viable including:

- The increase in MTCP Capital Programme funding
- A guaranteed payment for the Council as part of a share in profits
- Significantly improved capital receipts prospects from the sale of other surplus assets
- That as part of the partnership agreement with D E Clegg, the County Council has the opportunity to examine and challenge all finance and costs to ensure value for money
- The building contract for Phase 1 offices is based on "gross maximum Price" which requires the builder to absorb any cost increases while providing for a shared agreement for any cost savings.

It was orally reported that Local member Councillor Kadić was in agreement with the building of a new library that was user friendly, especially for disabled people. She also stressed the need for ample parking to be provided.



In answer to a question raised on whether the building would be in accordance with environmental policies on the efficient use of resources, including recycling waste water, it was confirmed that the building would meet the highest standard green excellent rating. Making the building sustainable had been factored in the overall costings as part of stage 2.

**It was resolved to:**

- i) approve the proposal to rebuild the Library in Phase II of the project.
- ii) To declare the Records Office, Grammar School Walk to be surplus to requirements following completion of facilities in the new Library.

#### **40.B FORMER HOWARD MALLET CENTRE**

Cabinet received a report on proposals submitted for the former Howard Mallet Centre in Sturton Street, Cambridge.

In agreeing reports recommendations account has been taken of local views and concerns set out by the local member whose observations were orally reported to the meeting. While supporting the proposed project the local member wished to ensure the project benefited the wider community and wished to see greater clarity about community/youth facilities to be provided. She also saw the need for the County Council to be involved in public consultation, and that there should be member involvement in the disposal, to ensure that the widest community interests were being served effectively.

The proposals submitted from Citylife were to develop the site by building a new centre that would contribute to the education and training of young people and adults in the theory and practice of enterprise and entrepreneurship. The new centre would provide opportunities for the positive engagement of young people by creating a building to accommodate:

- subsidised small business development spaces for individuals, co-operatives and social enterprises;
- community facilities including an advice centre;
- youth facilities;
- training and development activities particularly for young people; and
- arts activities.

The proposed Cambridge Community Innovation Centre was also expected to deliver significant educational benefits for 14-19 years olds, which supported the County Councils objectives in respect of this age group, as well as meeting the proposals set out in the Government White Paper requiring schools to develop the provision they make in respect of vocational education.

In terms of what the position would be should Citylife fail to obtain the necessary planning consent/funding to undertake the proposed scheme, it was reported that Citylife would dispose of their interest in the site.

**It was resolved that:**

- i) The former Howard Mallet Centre building be declared surplus to the County Council's needs;
- ii) The Director of Property and Asset Management in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio holder for Corporate Services be authorised to agree terms for the disposal of a long lease in the former Howard Mallet Centre to the charity Citylife at its full market value provided that, as part of the terms, detailed arrangements are made that will deliver the educational and community benefits which contribute to the requirements of the County Council; and
- iii) The Director of Property and Asset Management be authorised to agree the best terms possible for the grant of a short lease to Dawe Media the County Council's needs.

Chairman  
6<sup>th</sup> September 2005