

CABINET: MINUTES

Date: 29 January 2013

Time: 10.00 am – 12.24 pm

Present: Chairman: Councillor N Clarke

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

Apologies: None

Also present and invited to speak: Councillors K Bourke, P Downes, I Manning, L
Nethsingha and K Wilkins

720. MINUTES – 15 JANUARY 2013

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 15th January 2013 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

721. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None

722. PETITIONS

There were no petitions.

723. MATTERS ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES – NORTHSTOWE SECTION 106 CALLED IN DECISION OF THE CABINET MEETING OF 15TH JANUARY - REPORT OF THE ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON FRIDAY 25TH JANUARY

As this meeting only took place the previous Friday the report had only become available to e-mail to Cabinet Members the previous evening with hard copies tabled at the meeting.

The meeting of the Cabinet held on the 15th January had considered a report regarding "Northstowe Section 106". Cabinet had agreed:

- "a) to endorse the draft requirements including Heads of Terms for a Northstowe Section 106 Agreement for the Northstowe Phase 1 Outline Planning Application, which will be considered by the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee (NJDCC); and*
- b) to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment the authority to make revisions to the draft requirements including Heads of Terms for a*

Section 106 Agreement prior to inclusion in the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee report for the Phase 1 development."

Following this meeting, the decision was called in for further consideration by the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee with the text of the call-in being as follows:

'Cabinet today approved a heads of terms of the Northstowe S106 agreement.

This decision did not go to scrutiny before hand despite it being the forerunner of the biggest s106 agreement CCC has so far had. This decision deserves a public airing.

The sum being 'requested' is £40 million, down from £65 million approved at cabinet in October 2012. There was no explanation of the change and no debate of it. This decision deserves a little more explanation and challenge.

I should like to call this decision in but it needs to be done fast because the JDCC meets 30 Jan 13.'

Councillor Butcher the chairman of the overview and scrutiny committee in presenting the response report indicated that the committee had decided by a majority not to object to the implementation of the decision, but to comment upon it in order that Cabinet might take account of their observations when implementing the decision (But was under no obligation to do so) and to pass a copy of the minutes to the Northstowe Joint Committee.

He explained that the Committee had received a presentation that Members had agreed provided a very helpful explanation about the changes to the sums requested within the Heads of Terms proposals. The Chairman, in particular, felt that this information (or as much as was available at the time of publication) could usefully have been included in the report to Cabinet to inform their decision making, and provide greater clarity to Overview and Scrutiny Members and may have mitigated the need for the call in.

Members and the local councillors had also raised concerns about the process for enabling the Committee to fulfil its overview role in relation to major decisions associated with Northstowe and other key developments. In response, the Chairman noted that the Committee had previously decided not to convene an extra meeting to consider Northstowe proposals prior to the Cabinet meeting on the 15th January. It was clarified that two members had left the meeting before the decision was taken not to overview when agreeing items for the next meeting, while it was also noted that some local members not on the committee had been frustrated in terms of not having been consulted about the proposals in good time. However the Committee had agreed that the general issue of Overview involvement would be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Group for their resolution.

In discussion at the Cabinet meeting it was clarified that the call-in had been legitimate having been signed by eight members (Seven from the Liberal Democrat Group) five of whom were members of the committee. *(Note: at the meeting the figure was given incorrectly as three).* However the Leader of the Council expressed surprise and some concern that currently it appeared that the Council's Constitution

allowed a minimum of three members of the same committee at a later date to be able overturn a decision taken at a full committee meeting and the Cabinet agreed that this needed to be looked at in terms of its democratic implications. (*note: the Constitution currently allows a call-in of a Cabinet decision by a minimum of three members of the relevant committee or 15 members of the Council*)

The Leader reminded those present that Cabinet did not control overview and scrutiny in terms of what they should and should not overview before a report came to Cabinet, but he did consider a call-in unacceptable as a process of backfilling when members in retrospect decided it should have been reviewed in advance and which then had the effect of overturning a decision made at the relevant overview and scrutiny committee meeting.

It was resolved:

- a) To note the comments contained within the report as work associated with the Northstowe development progresses.
- b) To ask the Chief Executive to review the Overview and Scrutiny Call-in Procedures in relation to the fact that currently three members could call-in a decision of Cabinet on the basis that the report had not received overview after the relevant overview and scrutiny committee had already made a decision at an earlier meeting that overview was not required.

724. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY VISIONING GROUP – INITIAL RESPONSE TO THE COUNCIL BUSINESS PLAN 2013/14

Cabinet received the above report, as part of a second dispatch, from the Visioning Group who had met on 23rd January following publication of the Business Plan in order to discuss the Plan contents and to feedback their initial views to Cabinet. Having received a presentation from the Leader of the Council the Group acknowledged the unprecedented pressures facing the Council, while voicing concerns about the potential for demand led care services to absorb increasing amounts of the Council's budget, leaving little for other important services such as Highways.

This had led Members to challenge whether the Council would be able to maintain the organisational capacity to deliver major transformation on an unprecedented scale against a backdrop of reduced staffing levels and the potential affect on morale and productivity, by changes to employee terms and conditions. However, the Leader had assured the Group that whilst the changes being proposed would be challenging, he was confident that they could be delivered.

In addition, the Group questioned whether the Council could further strengthen its partnership arrangements, particularly with local District Councils, in order to maximise Cambridgeshire's capacity to adapt to current and future circumstances.

Members noted that the Business Plan allowed for continued investment in projects that aimed to stimulate economic development and growth, while the Census had confirmed that Cambridgeshire was, in population terms, one of the fastest growing

counties in the country. The Group believed that this growth brought both advantages and challenges to the County, with increased pressure on services to cope with additional demands. The Group felt that Cabinet should undertake a wider assessment of the full implications of population and economic growth, both positive and negative, in order to enable the Council to adapt accordingly over the short and long term, and that this strategic approach should involve other partners across the area.

Cabinet noted the report and would be taking into account the comments made when considering the Council's Business Plan, the next item on the agenda.

725. COUNCIL BUSINESS PLAN 2013/14

Cabinet received the Council's Business Plan covering the period 2013-14 and 2014-15 for its consideration, before making final recommendations to go forward to the Full Council meeting in February.

It was highlighted that the Council's Vision remained "Making Cambridgeshire a great place to call home" and to deliver it, the Council would continue to focus on 3 key priorities:

- Developing the local economy for the benefit of all
- Helping people live healthy and independent lives
- Supporting and protecting vulnerable people.

The Strategic Framework set out the Council's vision and high level priorities for the Business Plan period 2013-14 to 2017-18 detailing how the organisation intended to achieve its strategic aims, as well as the high level performance measures to be used.

The report detailed the budgetary context with the general condition of the UK remaining fragile with prospects for growth in the short term unlikely. Given the continued economic uncertainty and the temporary move back into recession, the Chancellor's 2012 Autumn Statement of 5 December 2012 had confirmed that Central Government would continue its Deficit Reduction Strategy. As well as contending with the spending pressures, 2013-14 would see a radical overhaul of the local government finance framework with a move to a business rates model as detailed in section 5.1.3 of the report.

The headline figures for the Revenue Budget 2013-14 were explained as:

- For 2013-14, Cambridgeshire to receive £490.6m of funding excluding £247.8m grants to be delegated to its schools. The key sources of funding would be Council Tax (which was being recommended in the report to be increased by 1.99%) and Central Government grants (excluding grants to schools) which would see a like for like reduction of 6.4% compared to 2012-13.
- There has been the offer of a freeze grant from Government but this was only at 1% for two years which would leave the Council with a lower Council Tax yield over the longer term and put further pressure on the delivery of services.

- Total expenditure was £490.6m which incorporated a one off transfer from reserves of £0.9m. The costs of the Council had risen primarily through inflationary pressures, demand pressures, especially in respect of adult social care and increasing capital financing costs in response to growth in Cambridgeshire – investment in infrastructure and new schools.
- In order to balance the budget in light of these pressures and reduced Government funding, savings of £32.0m would be required for 2013-14, and a total of £146.5m across the full five years of the Business Plan with the detail set out in subsections 2 and 3 of the Budget Strategy (Section 3) within the overall Business Plan.

In relation to the Capital Programmed, including current commitments, the Council would be spending in excess of £1 billion on capital investment in the County over the period of the Business Plan. For 2013-14, the Council's proposed expenditure on its Capital Programme would total £134.2m to be financed by a combination of the following funding streams:

- Central government and external grants (£36.5m);
- Section 106 and external contributions (£33.3m);
- Prudential borrowing (£59.7m); and
- Capital receipts (£4.7m).

Current prudential borrowing included £64.7m to 31 March 2013 with the detail set in paragraph 5.3.1. subsection 6 of the Budget Strategy (Section 3) within the Business Plan.

In relation to the Treasury Management Strategy an under borrowed position would be maintained throughout 2013-14 with the detail and explanation set out in Section 6 of the report.

Section 7 of the report set out the Council's equality duty set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act with Section 8 detailing the budget consultation exercises which had been undertaken.

In introducing the Report the Leader of the Council explained that the proposed Business Plan had been designed to protect the vulnerable while boosting jobs and prosperity, despite massive pressures from a fast-growing population (12% increase in the last decade) and much-reduced funding. It was designed to continue doing what was best for the communities of Cambridgeshire, while also taking into account residents' feedback. The proposed budget included £1 billion of current and future funding to be spent on boosting education, transport links, Broadband, business and care to ensure Cambridgeshire remained prosperous and a great place to live and work. At the same time it was proposed to reduce management costs, sharing services with partners and looking at further innovative ways to deliver services and make taxpayers' money go further. The administration would be asking employees to do much more with less resources.

The Leader indicated that he would be taking into account public opinion and the recommendation to go forward to Council for approval would be to raise Council Tax by a below inflation level of 1.99 per cent in order to protect vital front line services

and avoid a multi-million funding gap in the future, which would be the case, if the Council accepted a Government Council Tax freeze over the next two years. Accepting the Council Tax Freeze offered by Government and freezing Council Tax over the next two years would reduce the Council's income by £10 million by 2017/18, leaving a £37.7 million funding gap to fill over the same period. This would result in future years having to cut vital front line services to meet the extra £37 million needed.

While a tax freeze was a good option for many Councils, this was not the case for Cambridgeshire, which according to the 2011 Census was the fastest growing county in the country. While growth would bring jobs and prosperity it also meant, that unlike other areas of the UK, Cambridgeshire faced uniquely high and costly demands on all of its services. Despite these pressures, it was highlighted that last year the Council, which was traditionally one of the lowest taxing authorities of its kind in the country, had saved £42.2 million.

The Leader also highlighted that:

- The business plan would also see the integration of public health into the authority as part of the Council's commitment to improving the health and quality of life for Cambridgeshire communities.
- Residents would also be able to do much more online, saving money and making it easier to access Council services. Management and corporate costs were also being looked at, as well as the use of reserves. Employee costs continued to be kept below inflation and would be looked at as the Council sought to drive down every cost and in line with this, the Council would be continuing to budget for a pay freeze as it had in previous years, as one of the Council's most significant costs were its employees.
- The results of the 'You Choose' survey showed that people understood that savings needed to be made, but also indicated that four out of five people were prepared to pay at least 2 per cent more Council Tax to help retain services they valued, such as adult social care, children's services and keeping Cambridgeshire moving. Cabinet therefore supported keeping the rise well below inflation to help those struggling in the current financially tough times.
- Like other authorities countrywide, the Council was also facing the national problem of the growing cost of adult social care funding and had been leading the call for Government to address this issue properly. In this area the Council would be expanding its highly successful reablement programme to help some of the most vulnerable in society keep their independence and dignity, and had been shown to prevent those being helped by the scheme from needing more critical and expensive care and further deterioration of their health. The Council would be making savings in other areas of Adult Social Care to invest in this initiative.
- The Council was also looking at proposals to build a new care home.
- In the face of a like for like 6.4 per cent reduction in Government funding in the new financial year, combined with increased demand and inflation, the Council was required to find £146.5 million of savings over the next five years which amounted to a cumulative reduction of £466 million.

Despite having to find these massive savings the budget proposals included:

- around a £500 million building and improvement programme for schools to make sure the County's children had the right start.
- The Council maintaining its investment in child protection, whilst continuing the rollout of new ways of working to better safeguard children and young people in Cambridgeshire.
- The Council looking into building its own specially built care home to reduce the expense for both those in care and the tax payer.
- The Council continuing its commitment to significant capital funding for major transport projects such as the Ely Crossing and Cambridge Science Park rail station. The Council would also be investing millions of pounds into helping bring better broadband to Cambridgeshire and was continuing to invest an additional £90 million into improving Cambridgeshire's roads over a five year period.

In relation to Service detail some of the main points included for Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) and Learning:

- In the next five years CYPS was reducing its budget from £172m to £155m coupled with Inflation / democracy pressures of £27m. Savings were being required of £43m and cumulatively over the period adding up to £132m. Joint working with Health provided opportunities to make further savings.
- The three strategic objectives for CYPS were:
 - Improving learning and health outcomes for every child and young person
 - Narrowing the gap in learning and health outcomes for vulnerable children and young people strategy
 - Keeping young people safe at home and in their communities.
- In Learning, pressures were not just financial and making savings, but the need to ensure sufficient schools places were provided in schools as a result of the pressures of a growing population. Savings of 11% had been achieved in the area of home to school transport and further savings were being looked into. The Looked After Children (LAC) savings proposed were large, but considered achievable
- The CYPS Capital Programme of over £370 m over five years was a huge budget which was required to take into account the needs of the growth agenda.
- A great deal of work had been undertaken in the last 12 months to respond to the pressures in the Library service with a new management structure in place and the last part of the restructuring due in November. A large saving was expected from the increased use of new technology with community libraries and a new management system going live in the last few months. As a result of the initiatives the saving required to be made in the library service was much smaller in the current year, with opportunities to bed down the new systems and support the Learning agenda.

The Cabinet member for Resources and Performance highlighted three changes required to be made to the Business Plan document as follows overleaf:

Section	Page	Amendment/Addition
3 – Budget Strategy	10	<p>Add following wording within Specific Grants Paragraph:-</p> <p>Details of the Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG), transfer from local government spending control to academies, was released in December 2012. In 2012/13 the County Council spent £66 per pupil on services covered by LACSEG funding. The new Education Services Grant has however assumed a spend level of £126.46 per pupil when transferring funds from council's to academies.</p>
Section 4 Finance Tables 4 Index	6	Refers to F Public Health with Tables 1,2 and 3. There is only a Table 1, the rows in the contents table indicating Tables 2 and 3 should be deleted.
4 – Economy, Transport, and Environment Services Capital Programme	51	<p>The borrowing requirement for the Science Park Station (Reference C/C.4.002) was incorrectly stated. The total borrowing requirement should have been circa £30m following further detailed work, which is still continuing, on the development of the station. The revised borrowing requirement and the profile of spend is as follows:</p> <p>Costs attributed to the Science Park project (ref C/C.4.002) should read as follows: -</p> <p>Indicative Cost £30m</p> <p>Previous Years £2.2m</p> <p>2013/14 £2.5m</p> <p>2014/15 £14.8m</p> <p>2015/16 £10.5m</p>

As part of the introduction for Corporate Services the Cabinet Member referenced the fact that the recent public consultation exercise had indicated that the public had wanted corporate back office services to be cut the most, in order to protect front line services and this had been reflected in the Business Plan. In addition, savings were continuing to be pursued with LGSS through sharing services with Northamptonshire County Council. Other ways of making savings would include the increased use of Digital by Default and from pursuing other technology solutions. He confirmed that having looked at the Community Impact Assessments for Corporate Services he could not find anything that should prevent the proposals from being implemented.

Councillor Count also made reference to Section 5 of the report and the approach to Treasury Management and he took the opportunity of thanking Matt Bowmer who had been the Acting Section 151 Officer and his team for the excellent work undertaken in pursuing the strategies as described. In turn, the Leader of the Council

made reference to Councillor Count having been nominated and shortlisted for a Local Government Financial Councillor of the Year award, which was also recognition of the hard work undertaken by officers and Members in this area.

The Cabinet Member for Enterprise whilst recognising the Council needed to protect the most vulnerable in the community, highlighted the initiatives being undertaken to help develop a resilient economy and drive economic growth during a very tough period. He believed that increasing economic prosperity would in turn help the most vulnerable in the community, but warned of the dangers of taking a vibrant local economy for granted and the need to attract new businesses and to retain those that were already prosperous. This would include focusing growth in and around Cambridge, in the main market towns and along key growth corridors and prioritising those key investments which were critical to helping the economy grow. These included the provision of Superfast broadband, affordable housing, key transport links and infrastructure necessary to support local communities growth and development.

The Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, while indicating that he saw all the Community Impact Assessments in his area as being neutral, highlighted in his area of responsibility:

- The real action taken to improve services including the £90 million invested in roads / footways in the last year.
- The transformation undertaken in the service as a result of the restructuring of the previous Environment Services directorate which had helped create a revised focus, including a more flexible customer focused service to responding to the identified needs of the community. This was reflected in a report recommending changes to the Street Lighting PFI contract included as a later report on the agenda.
- He also highlighted that the County Council was now working more effectively with partners which included work reviewing the Highways Services Contract and helping revitalise the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership.
- He took the opportunity to thank the Winter Maintenance staff for their hard work in keeping the main road network open in the last two weeks of severe winter conditions which was in marked contrast to some of the Council's neighbouring authorities' performance during the bad weather period. It was highlighted that an extra £100k had been earmarked for winter maintenance based on a five year average.

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning highlighted the reduced management in the directorate which would lead to a considerable saving. Reference was made to the:

- benefits that would accrue as a result of the proposed investment in superfast broadband and the increased access to broadband including:
 - Improving children's ability to undertake their homework
 - Accessing more services on line
 - More people being given the opportunity to work from home and thereby reducing the congestion on the road network

- Ensuring the County became a leader in access to superfast broadband.
- The £25m investment being made available to support the development at Northstowe and looking at a longer term combined transport strategy.

The Deputy Leader of the Council highlighted some of the exciting developments being undertaken in Corporate Services as detailed on pages 55-56 of the Business Plan as the customer face of the Council. He pointed out that Libraries and the developing Community Hubs played a key prevention role resulting from the social value of their information services and service activities which helped people live more independent lives, thereby reducing their demand on more expensive targeted services. He also highlighted the ongoing development of community hubs enabling people and groups to access local facilities and services in one venue, as well as being able to play a part in their design and management. He drew the meeting's attention to the success story at Ramsey and the need to roll them out to other parts of the county. He also made reference to the community impact assessments relating to the proposals; in particular the Contact Centre now receiving twenty thousand calls per month, as well as a significant increase in non-phone call contacts e.g. white mail / e-mails which were up to eleven thousand a month (a third of all contacts). To deal with this increase and ensure sufficient support for the Digital by Default agenda, there was to be an increase in customer service advisors. He also highlighted the 'Shape your Place' initiative started in Fenland three years ago promoting community involvement/problem-solving through social media. This had rolled out to East Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire and it was hoped that Cambridge City would follow next. He drew attention to the need to encourage more use of the facility.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke paid tribute to the work of his Cabinet colleagues and the Council's senior officer Strategic Management Team who had begun work on the Plan in the summer, with a series of workshops which had involved going through the Business Plan line by line to ensure the impact of proposals on other services was taken into account. The Chief Executive highlighted that this was now the third year that austerity measures were being required to be made and that the County Council had so far saved £90 million and that the current year's budget was expected to come in with an underspend. A total of £146 million was required to be saved over five years which represented total cumulative savings of £466m. He paid tribute to his senior management colleagues for the work undertaken so far to help achieve the savings required and those which would be required over the next five years and also to the present Cabinet, for its strong leadership and its determination to make the tough decisions required.

The Leader asked and received confirmation that Cabinet members had received and read the Community Impact Assessments which applied to their portfolio responsibilities.

Other Local Members / opposition spokesmen who had requested to speak on the item made comments that included:

- The local Member for Wisbech North welcomed the investment proposed in CYP and for vulnerable adults as areas of the budget that required protection

and welcomed that children's centres were being kept open, as well as the investment of £90m in roads. In terms of the provision of alternative transport services to replace previously subsidised bus services in county border areas, she highlighted the need for Cambridgeshire Future Transport to work with other County Councils for solutions e.g. for Fenland these would include Councils in Norfolk and Lincolnshire.

- The Liberal Democrat Transport spokesman questioned whether two years after its inception and with no services yet running, Cambridgeshire Future Transport (CFT) was a viable project. She challenged the view that bus subsidies in the past had been extortionate and to illustrate the point provided a breakdown of the various per passenger subsidies on the 31 bus routes yet to lose their subsidy as follows:

8 routes £5.51 to over £12.09

4 routes £2.10p – £2.16p

9 routes £1.03p to £1.82p

10 routes 44p to 99p

She suggested that many still offered good value for money as well as being vital transport for many people. She noted the £471k already spent on the project and the £1.2m currently included in the budget and proposed that the Council should use the money to support current bus operators. She also highlighted that Community Transport operators were not being supported in the way that they had expected, as the grant money was only being offered on a loan basis, which was of no use to volunteer transport operators who were operating on a non-profit-making basis and had no means of paying back the grant. The Member also pointed to the link between social isolation and inadequate transport links with detrimental effects on health and mortality. In response, the Leader expressed surprise that the Member did not support CFT and asked whether she was suggesting the project was cut and the money spent elsewhere. In reply she indicated that she was supporting subsidised providers who were being put at risk by the current policy.

- The Liberal Democrat Education spokesman having heard the amendment earlier in relation to the LACSEG reference addition to the Specific Grants paragraph suggested that the amounts quoted were incorrect and that the Government had assumed a level of spend of £116 per pupil and not £126. As the County Council in 2012/13 had spent £66 per pupil on services covered by the central Spend the County Council would lose £50 of grant funding for every pupil attending an Academy with the loss to the County Council in 2013-14 estimated at £1.725m which might rise next year to £2.37m depending on how many schools converted to academy status. (This was on top of the £3.1 million deducted from the 2012-13 grant, making a potential cumulative loss of over £5.4 million by 2014-15). In relation to pages 14-15 of section 4 he expressed concern at the reductions proposed at practitioner support level at early years and also for school intervention primary service funding and the potential implications for narrowing the gap initiatives. He also questioned Bullet 1 and 3 of the Council priorities suggesting there was no link that these would help divert money to those less well off.

His opposition to academies was challenged by the Cabinet Member for Health and Well-being. His response was this was on the basis that schools were choosing to convert for the short term benefit of extra money to their own particular school which was to the detriment of all pupils in the County as it resulted in the County Council receiving reduced funding and thereby a reduction in the services it was able to provide. This he explained was exacerbated by the historic low Council Tax level philosophy adopted by successive Conservative Councils, as well as by the current extremely negative view of how Central Government viewed Local Government.

- The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group spoke recognising that the current budget was very much constrained by the dictates from Central Government thanked the Cabinet and senior officers for the hard work in putting together the budget. He supported the proposals for capital spend on Chesterton Station (Science Park Station) but was concerned regarding lack of investment proposals in the Chisholm Trail. He however highlighted:
 - the current risks still associated with the Guided Busway contractor dispute which at a cost of £2m interest per annum was requiring cuts in front line services.
 - Concern at the lack of environmental proposals in the Business Plan and while not supporting building wind turbines where people did not want them, he believed in a proper dialogue with local people on the benefits rather than being swayed by the vocal minority.
 - His priorities which were likely to be reflected in the Liberal Democrat alternative budget would include supporting opening the Wisbech Line to help improve economic connectivity, reversing cuts to subsidised bus services to help protect old and vulnerable people from increased isolation, selling off the Shire Hall complex and providing a cheaper less grandiose building. In response, the Leader indicated that if he had been in attendance at the earlier 20/20 Wisbech launch he would have heard details of proposals for new rail infrastructure.

In summing up, the Leader while again drawing attention to the savings required to be made, highlighted that the budget had been formulated based on the views of residents to do what was best for Cambridgeshire. He indicated that the County was in the unique position of benefitting from tremendous growth to help create jobs and prosperity, whilst also having to fund the monumental pressures on the Council's services that growth brought. He highlighted that encouraging growth would bring better transport provision, business opportunities and jobs and would build on initiatives such as the '20/20 Vision for Wisbech' (launched that morning prior to the Cabinet meeting) which reflected the pride in the County, and again made the point that Cambridgeshire was one of the few currently contributing to economic growth. His intention was to make Cambridgeshire the best county in the country, while at the same time recognising that the Council had to fund the increased need for the Council's care services in order to protect the most vulnerable.

It was resolved:

- 1) to support the Business Plan (Appendix 1 of the report to Cabinet), including supporting Budget, Community Impact Assessments, Consultation Responses and other material, in the light of all planning activities undertaken to date.
- 2) to agree amendments and changes to the Business Plan reported orally at the meeting subject to any further clarification required as a result of additional information provided at the meeting by a member, prior to submission to Council.
- 3) to delegate responsibility for agreeing any further alterations to the Business Plan and Budget to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the Section 151 Officer.
- 4) to recommend to Council the following:
 - a. that approval is given to the Service/ Directorate cash limits as set out in Section 3, Table 3.2 of the Business Plan.
 - b. that approval is given to a total County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £738,424,000 as set out in Section 3, Table 4.1 of the Business Plan.
 - c. That approval is given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £226,400,292 (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995), as set out in Section 3, Table 4.1 of the Business Plan.
 - d. That approval is given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of "Band D" equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (205,805), as set out in Section 3, Table 4.2 of the Business Plan reflecting a 1.99% increase:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	733.38
B	7/9	855.61
C	8/9	977.84
D	9/9	1,100.07
E	11/9	1,344.53
F	13/9	1,588.99
G	15/9	1,833.45
H	18/9	2,200.14

- e. That approval is given to the Prudential Borrowing, Prudential Indicators as set out in Section 3, Table 7.3 of the Business Plan.

- f. That approval is given to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in brief in Section 3 and comprehensively in Section 5 of the Business Plan.
 - g. That approval is given to the report of the Section 151 Officer on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out in Section 3 of the Business Plan.
 - h. That approval be given to Capital Payments in 2013-14 up to £134.2m arising from:
 - i. Commitments from schemes already approved; and
 - ii. The consequences of new starts (for the five years 2013-14 to 2017-18) shown in summary in Section 3, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan.
- 5) to approve the priorities and aspirations set out in Section 1 and 2 of the Business Plan.
- 6) to authorise the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the Business Plan, including the foregoing recommendations 4a to 4h to the County Council, so as to take into account any changes deemed appropriate, including updated information on District Council Tax Base, Collection Funds and specific grants.

726. INTEGRATED RESOURCES & PERFORMANCE REPORT – FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31st DECEMBER 2012

Cabinet received the Integrated Resources and Performance Report for the period ending 31st December 2012. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count set out the key issues for both revenue and capital budgets including the following.

- The overall revenue budget position was showing a forecast year end underspend of -£4.4m (-1.1%). This was a change in the forecast underspend by -£0.8m from last month and was mainly due to additional savings identified within CYPs and LGSS Cambridge Office.
- Of the 12 Key Performance Indicators 5 were on target but it was highlighted that 11 out of the 12 were very near to being achieved. The Cabinet Member had asked for more resources to be directed to them to try to achieve the target, where practicable and especially in relation to the two areas showing a red rating.
- Capital Programme; 134 out of 205 current projects were forecast to be on time and budget at year end. The majority of the projects not to time and budget were as a result of expenditure rephasing with a number being as a result of changes to total budget, as previously reported.
- Balance Sheet Health; at the end of quarter three (December), net borrowing was less than originally planned and projections showed that the trend would continue as a result of lower than expected capital expenditure and positive cash flows. There were investments of £56.3m at the end of the quarter. Further long-term borrowing was being considered to fund future capital expenditure as long term interest rates are at historic lows.

Councillor Count also drew attention to the deferral requests included on page 18 of the report for Section 106 contributions relating to education and transport at the development sites set out below and wished to clarify the wording in the recommendation to confirm that Cabinet would not be approving the following requests to defer payment for up to one year which totalled £470K for each development for the reasons set out:

Land at St Ives Golf Club for 128 units and associated development - this followed a previous deferral request agreed by Cabinet and this request for education and transport contributions was not recommended as the monies had or shortly would be committed by the Council.

Papworth: Land at Summers Field, Ermine Street, Papworth Everard, Cambs. Residential development for 365 units, including open space, vehicular access, and associated infrastructure – deferral request for the education payment was not recommended since the monies had already been committed and spent on an extension to the local school.

He congratulated all directorates for the efforts regarding finding the savings towards the projected underspend for the end of the financial year and made the point that the savings would help offset the savings required to be made in 2013/14. He did not support criticisms levelled by the opposition party suggesting that budgets not spent at year end was a bad thing.

Members speaking on the report included:

- The Liberal Democrat Deputy Leader and Resources spokesman Councillor Nethsingha who suggested that a 1.1% underspend while appearing good, suggested potential bad management as it suggested that services were failing to be provided. In response the Cabinet Member made the point that it was not that services were not being provided, but that they were being undertaken more efficiently and also, that despite the high level of savings already having been made in the previous two years, the Council had just received its highest satisfaction rating from the public.
- Councillor Nethsingha also criticised the constant restructuring of departments which resulted in staff having to re-apply for their jobs rather than being able to concentrate on providing services. The Leader of the Council in response made the point of supporting the Chief Executive and senior managers for the fantastic job they were undertaking in steering the Council through very difficult times with the level of savings being required to be made. He also made the point that there was a need to re-set the expectations of what councils could provide and that with the resource limitations, they would become organisations of last resort. He further made the point that restructuring at the edges was no longer an option and that all local authorities were experiencing seismic levels of change, requiring radical restructuring.
- The Liberal Democrat Member above also criticised the number of performance indicators that were only at amber, highlighting the performance on the proportion of 16-19 year olds in Education, Employment or Training which she believed by not meeting the target would have greater cost implications for the future. Other members of Cabinet reiterated the point that many of the amber

targets were near to achievement and reflected that the Council had set very stretching targets, rather than ones easily achieved. Councillor Count made the point that the figure of 91% compared to a target of 92.8% for the proportion of 16-19 years olds in Education employment and training could hardly be considered a failure and that not hitting the target would not have the serious cost implications for the future that Councillor Nethsingha was suggesting.

- Councillor Curtis highlighted that the figure for the proportion of people using social care services who had chosen how their support was provided which was showing 72% against an 80% target was far higher than most other comparator local authorities and was an area where the Council was one of the Country's leaders.
- Councillor Nethsingha highlighted her concern that one off the two areas showing red was in relation to 'the number of complaints responded to the month before last responded to within minimum response times'. Councillor McGuire responded accepting that the figures could not be ignored and while noting that there was also a data lag in reporting and that it was often a service area issue as opposed to a contact centre issue, he would be undertaking meetings with the Corporate Director Customer Service and Transformation and other officers to identify the service areas where there was a problem and the further action required.

It was resolved:

- a) to note resources and performance information and the remedial action currently being taken to ensure as many of the performance indicators / capital projects reach their target where at all practicable ; and
- b) Not to agree the deferral requests for developments at Papworth and the St Ives Golf Club to delay payments by up to one year as detailed in section 5.2 of the report.

727. CAMBRIDGE SCIENCE PARK STATION – PLANNING APPLICATION

This update provided progress in developing the Cambridge Science Park Station scheme and seeking necessary approvals to take the next stage forward.

Cabinet was informed that the public had been invited to help shape the scheme through a public consultation during November 2012 which had demonstrated very strong public support for the scheme (90% of those who had responded being in favour) There had been concerns about specific issues related to the scheme, including the possibility of station users parking in the surrounding residential area, the potential impact of increased access on Bramblefields Local Nature Reserve, and connectivity into and through the site. As a result, a number of proposed changes were put forward in relation to the details of the outline design as set out in paragraph 3.3 of the report.

It was explained that for the elements of the scheme falling within the Town and Country Planning Act, the Council would need to submit a planning application, to be considered by the Fringes Joint Development Control Committee. The majority of the

land required for the scheme was in the ownership of the key project partner, Network Rail, who would retain ownership with agreement having already been reached on access over land belonging to the City Council for station users. A number of small parcels of land around the edges of the site had been identified as being required to provide access and connectivity into the site, particularly towards the future delivery of the Chisholm Trail cycle route which the administration supported (and which also responded to a challenge from the Liberal Democrat Leader during consideration of the Business Plan regarding lack of investment in the route, as it was made clear at this point in the meeting that this route could only be progressed in stages when the money became available). It was hoped all the required land could be secured through negotiation, but if not, it was necessary at this stage to approve the use of compulsory purchasing powers.

It was explained that money was being borrowed to finance the project, subject to certainty being obtained around the business case for which only indicative costs could currently be provided. Such a large capital investment was believed to be appropriate in terms of future benefits to not only those in the city itself, but to those wishing to access rail travel from the north of the County. Additionally, it was predicted that the station would take away some congestion from the main station. The innovative approach was supported by the Department of Transport with reference being made to the letter from the Secretary of State, the Right Honourable Theresa Villiers MP included as an appendix to the report.

The local member for East Chesterton who had been working closely with the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in terms of local consultation, supported the proposal, highlighting benefits for local people including the travel convenience as well as the boost for local house prices, while also referring to the concerns of increased traffic in Nuffield Road for which account should be taken of the Cycling Campaign proposals. He welcomed the changes already being proposed in response to the consultation.

The Liberal Democrat spokesman for Transport as an advocate of rail travel supported the proposal, while seeking clarification around whether bus access would include laying down further guided bus tracks (not the case) and whether the station building would be designed to be energy self sustaining from the outset. In response, the Leader indicated such considerations should not delay the project as the overriding need was to have the station buildings fit for purpose and the station up and running as soon as possible.

It was resolved:

- a) to note progress on the scheme;
- b) to approve the submission of a planning application for the scheme; and
- c) to approve the use of Compulsory Purchase powers if required.

728. STREET LIGHTING PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE (PFI) POLICY REVIEW

Cabinet was reminded that in October 2010 the Council had approved a 25 year Private Finance Initiative, (PFI), contract to maintain the Authority's 56,000 streetlights which had commenced in July 2011 and within the first five years was to ensure every street light in Cambridgeshire would be replaced, re-designed, improved or removed. Following the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010, the Authority was required to make significant cost savings across its services and as part of this, it was necessary to provide additional revenue cost savings from the County Council's street lighting assets.

While already bringing considerable benefits in terms of improved lighting, efficiencies and subsequent savings, early experience in the roll out of the programme had identified a number of concerns from some residents and communities. These had identified that the existing criteria used for the removal of streetlights in residential areas, (as part of the aim to achieve savings by reducing the number of columns) was, in practice, too restrictive. In response to the feedback, and as the contract contained a change protocol allowing the Council to make changes to its Street Lighting policy, the opportunity had been taken to review the existing policy. The revised proposals in the report would allow greater flexibility to meet residents requirements when addressing the impact of permanent removals on communities, whilst still achieving the required revenue savings. In addition, it was recognised that in the early stages of the roll out, the quality of consultation carried out with the community on the changes proposed had not been to the standard required.

Councillor Wilkins (also speaking on behalf of Councillor van de Ven who had asked to speak but had to leave early), supported the proposed changes to what had been undesired restrictions.

The local Member for Wisbech North provided an example of the lack of consultation undertaken in her area which had resulted in lights being removed in a well known anti social area, making the area perceived to be less safe and which could have been avoided had local councillors / the Town Council been consulted. She supported proposals for communities to become involved in adopting lights but stressed this could only be effective with prior consultation. She supported the proposed changes set out.

In relation to the points made, the report highlighted that the policy revisions would allow greater local input through devolving more decisions, responsibility and action to local communities and would allow things to be undertaken differently if that was the wish of the local community. Councillor McGuire, as the Cabinet Member with Community Engagement responsibilities, also highlighted the need to engage with local members to ensure their greater knowledge was utilised and requested to be involved in future consultation arrangements. Reference was made to communities being able to obtain details of when their area would be reviewed from a link on the County Council website. *Note this can be viewed at the following link:*

<http://www.lightingcambridgeshire.com/newlighting.aspx>

Other Cabinet Members with specific knowledge of changes already undertaken in their divisions were able to report positively on the quality of the new lighting provided and also that more recent area roll outs had included full consultation with local members / town councillors. Tom Blackburne-Maze was personally congratulated for his positive input in helping to reinvigorate the project.

The point was clearly made for those areas where work had already been undertaken and where the local community felt they had not had an input, there would be the opportunity to revisit the identification of permanent removals. It was highlighted that the change of policy as detailed in section 3 of the report and its practical implications could lead to an increased capital cost estimated to be £264,000 over the next four years which it was agreed should be funded from the existing allocated Local Transport Plan (LTP). However this additional funding but that this was expected to be offset in approximately eleven years by the revenue savings detailed in paragraph 3.4.

It was resolved:

- a) to amend the existing policy such that both non-deemed to comply columns (NDTC) and deemed to comply columns (DTC) could be removed;
- b) to amend the existing policy such that reductions could be selected from any road or footpath.;
- c) to amend the policy to remove the prescribed numbers of columns to be permanently removed from roads or footpaths; and
- d) to allow the new policy to be used to consider any justified issues raised by communities affected by the application of the previous policy.

729. ESTABLISHING A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL IN GREEN END ROAD

This report advised Cabinet of the outcome of the process adopted by the Council to discharge the statutory requirement, under the Education Act 2011, to seek an Academy or Free School sponsor for the new primary school to serve the East Chesterton area of Cambridge City and sought endorsement of the Active Learning Trust as the Council's preferred sponsor for this new primary school.

It was highlighted that the NHS registration data indicated that pressure on Reception places in Cambridge would continue to increase year-on-year from September 2012 with the biggest mismatch between available places and demand being in East Chesterton, the catchment area of Shirley Community Nursery and Primary School. Detailed pupil forecasts for the North of Cambridge and for the Shirley Primary School catchment area were attached as an appendix to the report.

Following consultation with the local community, a proposal to expand the number of primary school places in East Chesterton through the opening of a new 210 place (1FE) primary school in September 2013, was approved by Cabinet on 23 October 2012. Cabinet also gave approval to officers to seek proposals from potential

Academy or Free School sponsors to run the new school in line with legislative requirements. Paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.1.6 set out the funding implications.

The Cabinet Member for Learning in his introduction thanked Councillor Manning, the local member for his collaborative work which had included undertaking separate local meetings and setting up a dedicated website to help obtain residents views.

The report detailed the sponsor process undertaken indicating that five proposals had been received by the deadline, of which one withdrew later in the process (paragraph 2.2 of the report provides details) and also information around a public meeting held at which the potential sponsors presented their proposals. Following the public meeting three written representations were received, two supporting a bid made by the Diocese of Ely and Methodist Church proposal.

It was reported that the joint member/officer Assessment Panel had met on the 10th January 2013 to interview and assess each potential sponsor's application against the criteria detailed in the School Specification document. All the submissions were of a good quality and either met or exceeded the council's expected minimum requirements for an organisation seeking to run a school. However, the Assessment Panel considered that the proposal submitted by the Active Learning Trust was particularly strong as it:

- demonstrated the greatest understanding of the local context in which it would operate and had the most developed plans for engaging all sections of the community in preparing for the opening of the new school and for ongoing parental engagement in the education of their children
- Fully appreciated the diverse nature of the local community and the need to overcome the perceptions around potential levels of achievement in different social and ethnic groups if the school was to be successful in reducing disparities in attainment levels between different groups of children.
- Although the Trust was relatively new it had been selected by the Department for Education (DfE) as the sponsor of existing Academies where improvements were required and it was considered that the Trust, therefore, had capacity within its current structure to be able to resource the opening of a school in the short timescale available (September 2013).

The Panel was therefore unanimous in its conclusions to select the proposal from the Active Learning Trust. *(Note: in relation to a letter dated 18th January received from Ms Tricia Pritchard Interim Director of Education Diocesan Office seeking answers to a number of questions on the process undertaken, a letter from the Chief Executive dated 23rd January was circulated for information by e-mail to Cabinet Members on 24th January which maintained that the process of selecting the a sponsor for the new school was thorough and met the Council's standards in respect of its governance arrangements)*

Councillor Manning spoke as the local member for East Chesterton explaining that ideologically while not in favour of academy / free schools, his role as a local member and on the panel had been to ensure the best results for the local

community. He thanked the Cabinet Member for Learning for helping empower him to enable this to be fulfilled. He also put on record his thanks for the hard work and support received from the lead officers Ian Trafford, Hazel Belchamber and Quentin Baker. He confirmed in answer to a question that the panel process had been vigorous and that his voice had been heard. He also commented on how impressed he had been by the Trust's commitment in having already begun to engage with the local community even before Secretary of State approval had been confirmed.

The Chairman who was always keen to support local member involvement thanked the local member for his valuable contribution and requested that he provided feedback from the meeting to the residents associations.

The Liberal Democrat spokesman for Education also supported the recommendations confirming that the procedures undertaken had been correct and that the decision was sound. He however again brought Cabinet's attention to his concerns regarding the extremely costly process now required by central government in order to select a sponsor. As a result, he would shortly be meeting with the Chairman of the National Audit Office and also the Schools Minister David Laws to voice his opposition to such a costly and time consuming process at a time of austerity, which he believed was a waste of public money. One Cabinet Member replied that he was not so concerned with cost if it ensured the best possible outcome for the education of the children at the school, praising the exemplary process and the excellent local member contribution.

Cabinet having heard the contributions and the detailed process that had been undertaken to identify the best sponsor was very happy to endorse the report recommendations.

It was resolved:

- a) to endorse the Active Learning Trust being named as the Council's preferred sponsor for the new primary school to serve the East Chesterton area of Cambridge City; and
- b) To inform the Secretary of State for Education, as the decision maker in this case, of Cabinet's endorsement of the Active Learning Trust's application with immediate effect.

730. DRAFT CABINET AGENDA - 4th FEBRUARY AND 5th MARCH 2013

Members noted the draft agenda for the Cabinet meeting to be held on 4th February and 5th March 2013, including the following changes to the latter meeting orally reported as follows:

Additions:

- Recommendations for Allocation of Residual Capital
- Review of Planning Fees

Defer until April:

Cambridge Science Park Station Ratification of Agreement with Department of Transport.

Remove from the Agenda:

- On Street Parking and Park and Ride Charge - No new date yet confirmed.
- Serious Case Review - Report by Cambridgeshire Local Safeguarding Children's Board (N Clemo). This needed to move back to June / July as the LSCB had not yet signed off the report.

Chairman
5th March 2013