

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 19th February 2008

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 5.50 p.m.

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor: A G Orgee (Chairman)

Councillors C M Ballard, J D Batchelor, I C Bates, B Bean, N Bell, B Boddington, M Bradney, J Broadway, P Brown, T Butcher, C Carter, K Churchill, S Criswell, M Curtis, A Douglas, P J Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, G F Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, G J Heathcock, W G M Hensley, S Higginson, P E Hughes, P Humphrey, W Hunt, J L Huppert, C Hyams, J D Jenkins, S F Johnstone, E Kadić, G Kenney, A C Kent, S J E King, V H Lucas, D McCraith, L W McGuire, A K Melton, R Moss-Eccardt, S B Normington, M K Ogden, L J Oliver, D R Pegram, J A Powley, P Read, A A Reid, J E Reynolds, K Reynolds, P Sales, M Shuter, L Sims, M Smith, T Stone, J M Tuck, R Turner, J K Walters, J West, K Wilkins, H Williams, M Williamson, L J Wilson and F H Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors S A Giles, G Griffiths, S G M Kindersley and D White

203. MINUTES: 11th DECEMBER 2007 AND 10th JANUARY 2008

The minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 11th December 2007 and 10th January 2008 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

204. REPORT OF THE COUNTY RETURNING OFFICER

Members noted Peter Humphrey, a Conservative, had been elected as the member for the Roman Bank and Peckover electoral division in the by-election held on 3rd January 2008.

205. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

New Member for Roman Bank and Peckover

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Humphrey to his first meeting of the Council.

Royal Town Planning Institute Award

The Chairman led members in congratulating the Council's planners on winning a Royal Town Planning Institute award for their work with Donarbon to reduce climate change through effective planning of a large waste management park.

Register of Interests forms

The Chairman reminded members of the need to review their Register of Interests forms and give notice of any changes.

206. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared personal interests under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct. The items to which the interests relate are shown in brackets.

- Councillors Ballard, Heathcock, Hughes, Read and Wilson as members of Cambridge Older People's Enterprise (COPE) (Minute 210, Report of the meeting of Cabinet held on 1st February 2008, Item 1, Council's Integrated Plan)
- Councillors Bates, Melton and Walters as Board Members of Cambridgeshire Horizons and Councillor Melton as a member of Fenland District Council (general declarations)
- Councillor Bean as a Trustee of Age Concern (general declaration)
- Councillor Kent as a governor of Cambridge Regional College (Minute 210, Report of the Cabinet meeting held on 18th December 2007, Item 4, Amended Home to School/College Transport Policy)
- Councillor J Reynolds as a Director of Renewables East (general declaration).

Councillor Lucas declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct as the Chairman of Cambridgeshire Community Services (Minute 210, Report of the meeting of Cabinet held on 1st February 2008, Item 1, Council's Integrated Plan). He noted that if there was any discussion of the Council's relationship with Cambridgeshire Community Services, his interest would become prejudicial and he would leave the Chamber. Councillor Jenkins declared a similar interest as a lay member of Cambridgeshire Community Services.

207. PETITION

Mr Burbridge presented a petition calling on the Council to install a roundabout at the Goosetree/Hobbs Lot junction in March. He noted that this petition had 600 signatures and reminded members that an earlier petition on the same issue had attracted 3,500 signatures. He explained that his daughter had been killed at this junction five years previously and that in his view, the traffic lights now proposed by the Council would be an insufficient safety measure.

Members noted that the Goosetree/Hobbs Lot junction improvements were included on the agenda for this meeting as item 4 of the report of the meeting of Cabinet held on 1st February 2008 [Minute 210].

208. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Two members of the public attended the meeting to ask questions:

- Mr Shellens asked whether the Council carried out meaningful consultation with the public and listened to the responses it received, and whether it took account of petitions submitted. He drew attention to two petitions recently

submitted to the Council which in his view had received short shrift, one relating to Buckden Recycling Centre and one to a crossing on the A141 in Huntingdon. He reminded members that the new Comprehensive Area Assessment would place increasing emphasis on the Council's responsiveness to the public and on public perception.

Responding, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, noted that the Council had listened carefully to the issues raised in the petition on Buckden Recycling Centre previously submitted by Mr Shellens. The Council also conducted extensive public consultation via questionnaires, focus groups and roadshows. However, as had been the case with Buckden Recycling Centre, it was possible to listen and still to maintain a valid difference of opinion.

As a supplementary question, Mr Shellens asked whether the Council would consider introducing mystery shopping of its services to test how well the Council listened to its public. The Leader of the Council commented that the Council already conducted annual surveys of public perception, the questions of which were designed by professional researchers to ensure that they were neutrally expressed.

- Mr Willingham asked the Council to consider adopting a Fairtrade policy and to seek to acquire Fairtrade status. This would mean achieving five goals, one of which would be for the Council to express its support for Fairtrade and to serve Fairtrade products at its meetings and in its canteens.

Responding, the Leader of the Council reported that the Council's catering service had piloted the use of Fairtrade products, but had found limited support for them, given that they were more expensive than other alternatives. However, the Leader agreed to investigate further the adoption of a Fairtrade policy. He also noted that the Council would be selling Fairtrade products during Fairtrade fortnight, with the catering service absorbing the difference in cost.

As a supplementary question, Mr Willingham asked if the Council would consider adopting a Fairtrade policy as soon as possible, since the purchase of Fairtrade products contributed to the health and well-being of people in the Third World. The Leader of the Council agreed to give further consideration to what would be involved.

A transcript of the questions and responses is available from Democratic Services.

209. COUNTY COUNCIL CONSTITUTION

It was proposed by the Chairman, Councillor Orgee, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Oliver, and agreed unanimously

To approve revisions to the Council Constitution as set out in the appendices to the report to Council, subject to:

- 1) The additional deletion of the following words from section (d) of paragraph 7.04 of Part 2, Article 7, The Cabinet:

'Changes by the Leader to the Cabinet membership will only take effect following a formal report from the Leader of his/her intended change being presented to a meeting of the Council';

- 2) Deferral of the proposed amendment of the delegation to the Director of Learning relating to the appointment and dismissal of local authority school governors, to allow further discussion with members about the process.

210. REPORTS OF CABINET MEETINGS

Meeting held on 18th December 2007

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, moved receipt of the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 18th December 2007.

The Chairman advised members that any discussion of the following items in this report should take place under the relevant items in the report of the Cabinet meeting on 1st February 2008:

- 1) County Council Priorities
- 2) Integrated Planning: Financial Settlement
- 5) Transport Integration Proposals: Section 29 Joint Policy Committee (Cambridge Fringes) and Joint Transport Forum.

Key decisions for information

- 1) County Council Priorities
- 2) Integrated Planning: Financial Settlement
- 3) Accident Remedies and Traffic Management Programme: Medium-Sized Schemes

Councillor Downes requested an update from the Lead Member for Highways and Transport, Councillor McGuire, on discussions with Huntingdonshire District Council and Huntingdon Town Council relating to the Kings Ripton Road junction.

Councillor Harrison reminded members that Mill Road in Cambridge ran through Petersfield as well as Romsey. She thanked Cabinet for giving high priority to this scheme.

Responding to Councillor Downes, the Lead Member for Highways and Transport explained that discussions with the District and Town Councils were continuing concerning a possible scheme based on traffic lights, which would make it possible not to ban vehicular right turns and could include a pedestrian phase. Members would be kept informed of progress.

- 4) Amended Home to School/College Transport Policy
- 5) Transport Integration Proposals: Section 29 Joint Policy Committee (Cambridge Fringes) and Joint Transport Forum

6) Estates Strategy to 2017

Councillor Moss-Eccardt expressed concern that the Office Accommodation Strategy did not appear to be well linked to the Estates Strategy, despite sharing common aims relating to efficiency.

Councillor Harrison asked how resources to pump-prime the Estates Strategy had been considered through the final stages of the budget-setting process. She also expressed concern that savings from the Office Accommodation Strategy should not be used as a cushion to avoid efficiency savings elsewhere.

Councillor Sales welcomed the development of a coherent Estates Strategy but expressed disappointment that it did not refer to the County Farms Estate.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Councillor J Reynolds, assured members that implementation of the Office Accommodation Strategy was progressing well, with several major initiatives to be completed in coming months. He agreed that savings from this initiative should be clearly identified and accounted for. Councillor J Reynolds reminded members that the Council was currently investing in Farms Estate initiatives to help improve its profitability. Later in the meeting, he provided a response to Councillor Harrison's question about pump-priming, noting that provision for the first two years had already been included in the capital programme, with the third year to be considered in the context of efficiencies for future years.

7) Northstowe Trust

Councillors Read and Williamson expressed concern that the creation of a Trust for Northstowe should not inhibit the establishment of a Parish Council at an early stage in the life of the new community, since this would be key to ensuring democratic representation.

Responding, the Lead Member for Communities, Councillor Lucas, explained that the Trust would help to set up democratic arrangements in Northstowe and would help to establish contact with neighbouring Parish Councils. The new local council would actually be a Town Council, not a Parish Council. He reported that the Shadow Board had met twice and was negotiating to ensure that all partners contributed to the Trust for the first two years of development, after which time it was expected to be self-sufficient.

8) Waste Disposal Policies

Councillor Stone highlighted the need for flexibility in the Council's waste disposal policies, drawing attention to the recent experience of a farmer who had not been allowed to dispose of rubbish flytipped on his land at a Council facility free of charge. Councillor Read shared this concern, commenting that if the Council did not help people to dispose of flytipped rubbish, it would end up being moved around rather than being dealt with properly.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor Pegram, confirmed that the County Council worked with the District Councils to ensure flexibility in such cases, and the site operators were also able to exercise their own discretion.

Other decisions for information

- 9) Ely Ouse Lodes Strategy: Preferred Option Consultations
- 10) Extension of School Age Range: Thomas Clarkson Community College and Cromwell Community College

Councillor Melton welcomed the proposal to increase the age ranges of these schools to enable them to offer sixth form provision. He noted that many young people living in Fenland were currently travelling to Cambridge for sixth form education. The population and hence the level of demand were set to increase in future. Increasing the age range of these schools would help to ensure equitable provision for young people throughout the County.

Councillor Read welcomed investment in Fenland schools through the Building Schools for the Future programme. He sought assurance that schools elsewhere in the County would not be disadvantaged by this initiative.

Councillor King sought assurance that adult education and vocational training would continue to be provided in Wisbech if the age range of Thomas Clarkson were expanded.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor Tuck, confirmed that the Council was working with the College of West Anglia to ensure that adult education and vocational training would continue in Wisbech. She also confirmed that all Cambridgeshire schools would be included over time in the Building Schools for the Future programme.

- 11) Issues Arising from Scrutiny Committees
 - a) Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee Member-Led Review of Rural Passenger Transport and Cabinet Response

Councillor Broadway welcomed the findings of this review but noted that funding to pilot enhanced community transport would be available only from 2009/10. She asked what progress would be made in this area during 2008/09.

The Chairman of the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee, Councillor King, explained that some of the recommendations would be funded by redirecting existing resources, meaning that it would be possible to implement these in 2008/09.

The Lead Member for Highways and Transport, Councillor McGuire, noted that business cases for the remaining recommendations were being prepared and would be considered by Cabinet in due course.

b) Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee Member-Led Review of Education and Information on Drug and Alcohol Issues for Young People Aged 11-18 and Cabinet Response

Councillor Batchelor welcome the Cabinet's acceptance of the recommendations arising from this review, particularly in relation to the preventative role of youth services. However, he commented that in order to fulfil this role properly, youth services would need to be adequately funded.

Councillor Hughes highlighted the importance to young people of having places to meet and emphasised that this should be taken into account when planning new developments.

Councillor Wilson also emphasised the importance of preventative services, particularly for vulnerable children and young people. He noted that the substance misuse budget was currently funded from Government grant, which made forward planning difficult, and urged that this key service be placed on a more stable financial footing.

Councillor Read emphasised the need for effective control of drugs to limit young people's access to them.

Councillor Sales welcomed the findings of this review but expressed concern that the review had been diverted from its original aim of considering drug and alcohol treatment services for adults. Councillor Ballard commented that alcohol misuse was a serious problem amongst older as well as younger people.

Councillor Heathcock commented that this had been an appropriate review for the Committee to carry out, given the long-term health implications for children and young people of substance misuse. Given the gravity of the situation, he suggested that progress against the Committee's recommendations should be revisited in less than a year's time. He also suggested that the Committee could establish a standing sub-group to keep this issue under close review.

Councillor Curtis, who had chaired the review, agreed that it was appropriate for the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee to consider health issues across all age ranges. He commented on the need to recognise good practice and particularly commended the preventative contribution of the Personal, Social and Health Education service.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor Tuck, agreed that it would be helpful for the budget for the substance misuse service to be placed on a more sustainable footing. However, she commented that although the dedicated budget was small, a wide range of other services within the Office also contributed to the preventative agenda.

Meeting held on 22nd January 2008

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, moved receipt of the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 22nd January 2008.

Key decision for determination

1) Cambridgeshire's Long-Term Vision and Local Area Agreement 2008

It was proposed by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, and seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Pegram, that

The County Council approve Cambridgeshire's Vision Statement, as circulated with the agenda.

Councillor Batchelor reported that the Local Area Agreement (LAA) Joint Accountability Committee (JAC) had expressed significant concerns about the governance arrangements for the LAA, particularly in relation to democratic accountability, and had yet to receive a response. It would be essential for Cambridgeshire Together to recognise the importance of the JAC's role.

Councillor King commented that Cambridgeshire Together should be allowed sufficient time to develop robust governance arrangements, but expressed confidence that these would be discussed with the JAC shortly.

Councillor Hughes welcomed the Vision Statement and emphasised the need to focus on the positive benefits of joint working to deliver effective services to the community.

Councillor Broadway drew attention to the need for accurate and up-to-date statistics about population size and forecast growth. She expressed concern that Census figures should not be used as the basis for allocating funding to Cambridgeshire, since the 2001 figures were by now substantially out of date and in addition there would be a time lag before the figures from the next Census in 2011 filtered through.

Councillor Jenkins commented that whilst the County Council had four strategic priorities, the Vision Statement set out five for the LAA; it would be important to be clear about how these were interrelated.

Councillor Ballard expressed serious concern that City and District Councillors were not as aware as County Councillors of the increasing importance of the LAA. He urged for this to be addressed.

Councillor Lucas welcomed the contribution of the JAC to the development of the LAA and the Vision Statement, which would help to establish consensus between partners about how best to develop services for the community. He suggested that JAC members could be invited to Cambridgeshire Together workshops on taking the vision forwards.

Councillor Bates reminded members that Cambridgeshire had already received £9 million of Local Public Service Agreement reward grant as a result of effective partnership working.

Responding, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, commended the success of Cambridgeshire's LAA and paid tribute to the officers involved, particularly the Policy and Partnerships Manager. He acknowledged the JAC's concerns about democratic accountability, but emphasised the importance of the LAA in bringing all partners together. The JAC as it became established would help to ensure the involvement of democratically elected members.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was agreed.

[Voting pattern: unanimous]

Key decisions for information

- 2) Cambridge Southern Fringe: Proposed Developments at Clay Farm, Trumpington Meadows and Bell School – Final Consultation Response on Planning Applications

Councillor Kent commended the County Council's objections to these planning applications to the Cambridge Fringes Joint Development Control Committee, who would be considering the applications shortly. She expressed disappointment that it had not been possible to resolve the outstanding issues, given the lengthy dialogue that had taken place between the Council and the developers. She expressed particular concern about the proposals relating to affordable housing on the Trumpington Meadows site, to the location of an underground recycling facility within the grounds of the primary school, and to library and lifelong learning provision. Councillor Kent highlighted the aspiration in the Sustainable Community Strategy to develop 'flagship communities' and suggested that all new communities should have an individual community development plan.

Councillor Jenkins drew attention to the concerns of residents of the new development at Arbury Park about the timing of provision of infrastructure and facilities. Councillor Hughes expressed similar concerns about the earlier development at Kings Hedges. Both members expressed concern that this appeared to be a recurring theme in Cambridgeshire's new developments. They urged the Council to learn from previous experiences when developing the Southern Fringe and other major new developments in and around Cambridge.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor Pegram, accepted that there had been issues at Arbury Park and agreed that the timely provision of infrastructure was essential to the development of new communities. He confirmed that the Council would be working closely with developers to ensure that this was achieved in forthcoming developments.

3) Huntingdon Bus Priority Measures: Hinchingsbrooke Junction Bus Lane Improvement

Councillor Downes agreed that bus usage should be encouraged, but expressed concern at the cost of these bus lane improvements and questioned whether they would be effective in saving time and reducing carbon emissions. He also asked whether Hinchingsbrooke School had yet confirmed where it thought the toucan crossing should be located.

Responding, the Lead Member for Highways and Transport, Councillor McGuire, noted that the proposals had been discussed several times at the Huntingdonshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee and had been supported by most local residents. He agreed to advise in writing whether Hinchingsbrooke School had yet responded about the location of the toucan crossing.

4) Highway Operational Measures

Councillor Higginson welcomed the revision of charges for Section 38 road adoption agreements to include administrative costs. He suggested that Development Control Committees should make adoption of highways to a specified timescale a planning condition for new developments.

5) Huntingdon Town Centre Project: Financial Update

6) Kingswood Park, March

7) Property in the Southern Fringe

Councillor Stone requested more information about the Council's disposal of an interest in and acquisition of an option on land on the Cambridge Southern Fringe.

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Councillor J Reynolds, agreed to send a written response.

Other decisions for information

8) Issues Arising from Scrutiny Committees: Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee's Call-In of Cabinet's Decision on the Annual Performance Assessment of Social Care Services for Adults in Cambridgeshire and Associated Action Plans

A number of members spoke on this item, highlighting concerns about Adult Support Services and about the way in which the call-in process had worked.

Members speaking about Adult Support Services:

- Noted that adult social care was the Council's foremost priority. The Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) had been very critical of the Council's service, rating it as one star on a scale from no to

three stars for six years running, despite efforts by members, officers and consultants to improve performance.

- Shared the Scrutiny Committee's concern at the Council's continuing failure to improve in key areas, such as the number of older people helped to live at home.
- Expressed concern that the action plans agreed by Cabinet did not address a number of issues raised by CSCI, such as consultation with hard to reach groups, improvements to respite care, greater provision for people with dementia and improved support for carers of people with learning disability.
- Asked to be advised when the consultation paper on senior management of adult social care would be published.

Members speaking about the call-in process:

- Expressed concern that pre-Cabinet discussion in private forums should not be used to justify brief discussions at Cabinet meetings, since these were the only opportunity that the public had to hear issues discussed. Scrutiny Committees could also not operate effectively if the only documented discussion of an issue prior to Cabinet was in confidential minutes.
- Discussed the Cabinet's comment that in referring decisions back for reconsideration, Scrutiny Committees should put forward specific recommendations for improvements, based on robust challenge and evidence. It was suggested that the Constitution and guidance on call-in should be reviewed, since some members felt that the Committee had not been clear at its meeting about procedural options and expectations.
- Drew attention to a comment that had appeared in the Cabinet decision summary, but did not appear in the Council report, that Scrutiny should not be used for political purposes. It was noted that it was the role of both the Opposition groups and the Scrutiny Committees to hold the Administration to account.

Responding, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, noted the concerns expressed about procedure and reported that these would be discussed at a joint meeting of Cabinet, Scrutiny Management Group and Strategic Management Team on 26th February 2008.

The Lead Member for Enhanced Services, Councillor Yeulett, advised Council that the Opposition groups had been invited to nominate members to the Adult Social Care Improvement Board, to help drive improvements. The action plans had been agreed with CSCI and were robust. Progress against them would be reported regularly to members.

9) Quarterly Update Report on Key Partnerships

Councillor Wilson emphasised the importance of regular monitoring of the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership, since the County Council was no longer solely responsible for adult social care, but delivered this in partnership with the Primary Care Trust, using significant pooled resources.

Councillor Harrison asked whether the Cabinet had reviewed progress against the recommendations made by the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee relating to Cambridgeshire Horizons, in particular its transparency, business planning and performance management. She welcomed the appointment of the new Chief Executive and commented that a core task for Cambridgeshire Horizons now should be to address the funding gap for vital infrastructure.

The Chairman of the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee, Councillor King, reported that the Scrutiny Committee had discussed Cambridgeshire Horizons again recently and would continue to keep progress under close review.

10) Proposed Transfer of the Archaeological Field Unit to Oxford
Archaeology

Meeting held on 1st February 2008

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, moved receipt of the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 1st February 2008.

Key decisions for determination

1) Council's Integrated Plan

The Leader of the Council drew attention to the following papers informing the debate on the Integrated Plan:

- The report of the meeting of Cabinet held on 1st February 2008
- The Integrated Plan documents, comprising Sections 1 to 3 on white paper and Section 4, the Financial Report, on various colours of paper
- The reports of the Council's four Scrutiny Committees on the Administration's proposals
- The report of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee on the Liberal Democrat amendment.

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Councillor J Reynolds, that the recommendations on the Integrated Plan as set out on pages 4 and 5 of the Cabinet report be adopted.

Councillors Williamson, Batchelor, King and Wilson respectively moved the receipt of the reports of the two meetings of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee; the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny

Committee; the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee; and the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Downes presented a petition with 4,697 signatures which called on the County Council and the Waste Recycling Group to negotiate a new agreement which would allow the Buckden Recycling Centre to stay open for domestic use beyond October 2008.

Councillor Walters opened the debate on the Integrated Plan on behalf of the Cabinet. Councillors Jenkins and Ballard responded on behalf of the Liberal Democrat and Labour groups respectively.

Councillors Williamson, Batchelor, King and Wilson spoke to the reports of the four Scrutiny Committees in their capacity as Committee Chairmen.

Members then debated Sections 1 to 3 of the Integrated Plan and the Office-specific proposals.

Sections 1 to 3 of the Integrated Plan

Councillor Jenkins queried the relationship between the Council's four strategic objectives, three service delivery priorities and six improvement priorities, since this was not explained in the text of the Plan. He also expressed concern that there were no clear links between any of the improvement priorities and the actions in Section 2 of the Plan.

Councillor Harrison emphasised the need to match priorities with spending and actions. Given the stated aim of promoting a low carbon economy, she expressed disappointment at the Council's decision not to work with a Cambridge academic and the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs on a pilot of more energy-efficient street lighting.

Councillor Reid welcomed the inclusion of tackling climate change as one of the Council's four strategic objectives. He asked for clarification of the target relating to per capita carbon dioxide emissions, in particular, if it was a reduction target, over what time period it was intended to achieve this, and whether it was consistent with the reduction targets in the Climate Change Bill.

[The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor Pegram, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Reid's questions.](#)

With regard to the strategic objective of managing and delivering the growth and development of Cambridgeshire's communities, Councillor Hughes welcomed the aim to provide good access to open space, but commented that much more than this was needed to develop communities, including places to meet and activities for people to do together. With regard to the service delivery principles, Councillor Hughes suggested that equity in relation to cultural practice and beliefs should also be included.

Children and Young People's Services

Councillor Kent highlighted the essential role of youth services in delivering preventative support across a range of issues including substance misuse, sexual health, mental health, anti-social behaviour and youth offending. She expressed concern that the increase to the youth services budget was purely to fund demography, meaning that there would be no wider expansion of services. Councillor Kent also expressed similar concerns in relation to the area and locality budgets, where cuts would mean that there was limited scope to provide early support to children and their families. She also highlighted the significant risks inherent in the proposals, in relation to specific services such as home to school transport and across all services in year 3, when an additional £1 million of savings yet to be identified would be required.

Councillor Ballard questioned whether the proposed savings in this part of the budget were realistically achievable, particularly those relating to home to school transport and agency placements. He also expressed serious concern about the accumulating deficits of the Children and Young People's Services traded services, noting that up to £1.3 million was still unmatched by earmarked reserves. He welcomed the proposal to bring the services in-house but noted that the two main ones, Catering and the Cambridgeshire Instrumental Music Agency, were seeing their customer bases reduce, making it even harder for them to consolidate their positions.

Summing up, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor Tuck, noted that the Integrated Plan and budget proposals were closely linked to each other and to other key documents such as the Joint Area Review inspection report, the Children and Young People's Plan and the Local Area Agreement priorities. The Office would continue to work with partners to deliver efficient services and to minimise risk.

Environment and Community Services

Adult Support Services

Councillors Heathcock and Jenkins expressed serious concern at the possible raising of the eligibility threshold for adult social care from 'substantial' to 'critical'. They urged that this be considered very carefully, since services were already provided only to people with high levels of need.

Councillors Heathcock and Sales expressed concern at the continuing pressure on independent sector care providers to make efficiency savings. They questioned whether the savings were achievable and suggested that if they were achieved, over time this could impact on the quality of the providers' care and even on the viability of their operations.

Councillor Ballard highlighted concerns about the rising costs of services for people with learning disabilities. Nationally costs were rising by 8%, but in Cambridgeshire the budget had increased by 17% in 2007/08 and had been overspent, and was set to increase by 13% in 2008/09. He

asked officers to investigate why Cambridgeshire's costs were rising more steeply than other local authorities'.

The Lead Member for Enhanced Services, Councillor Yeulett, explained that the aim in identifying required savings had been to minimise the effect on front-line services. Budgets would be managed tightly but it could be difficult to forecast demand, making the provision in reserves prudent. Councillor Yeulett agreed to send a written response to Councillor Ballard's question about rising learning disability costs.

Environment and Regulation

[Councillor Harrison expressed concern at the proposed use of £1 million from the general reserve to support the Waste Private Finance Initiative \(PFI\). £475,000 of this would be paid back after 28 years, in her view an unacceptably long timescale, and £625,000 would be transferred to the Future Developments and Pressures reserve pending the outcome of discussions about ground leases.](#)

Councillor Broadway suggested that the proposal to add £30,000 to the budget for a Climate Change Technical Support Officer was very modest, given that tackling climate change was one of the Council's four strategic objectives. She expressed concern that other savings measures such as cuts to rural bus services and to the Council's contribution to the Biodiversity Partnership were also contrary to the Council's stated objectives. Councillor Broadway also expressed serious concern at the significant savings that would be needed from year 3 onwards, the nature of which had not yet been identified.

Summing up, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor Pegram, noted that it would be preferable to keep the eligibility threshold for adult social care unaltered; any change would be considered very carefully. With regard to the 1% uplift for independent sector providers, he noted that there was some capacity in the system at present. He agreed to send a written explanation to Councillor Harrison of how the £475,000 relating to the Waste PFI would be repaid.

Corporate Services and Chief Executive's Department

Councillor Harrison expressed disappointment that the savings expected to result from the shared services project had been reduced from the previous year's forecast, which would affect overall spending capacity.

Councillors Harrison, Huppert and Downes all expressed serious reservations about the proposal to introduce individual Councillor budgets from 2009/10, at a total cost of £690,000 a year. They suggested that this approach would be too top-down to foster community engagement, and that it would be preferable to work within existing structures such as Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Panels and Area Joint Committees. They expressed concern that Councillors would use their budgets to support "pet" projects, rather than addressing issues of wider local interest. They also expressed concern that the proposed timing for launching the individual budgets, April 2009, would be

inappropriate, given that County Council elections would be held in the following month.

Councillor Jenkins welcomed the new residents' magazine as a high-quality publication, but expressed disappointment that there was no plan for it to be self-funding through advertising. He also expressed concern about the reduction to resources for Traveller liaison, commenting that the former Traveller Liaison Manager had done invaluable work jointly with the Travelling community and the District and Parish Councils.

Summing up, the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Councillor J Reynolds, reported that the shared services project was on track and that the Council was receiving payment from Northamptonshire County Council for the use of its intellectual property. With regard to the residents' magazine and communications, he reported that a wider review was currently being carried out on the future of the Communications Directorate. He commented that it was difficult to attract advertising for the magazine, given that its circulation covered the whole County. With regard to Traveller liaison, he agreed that it would be essential to ensure that effective communications and joint working continued.

General Debate

Two amendments were proposed under this heading:

Liberal Democrat Group Amendment

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Jenkins and seconded by Councillor Harrison:

The Liberal Democrat group rejects the Integrated Plan 2008-11 being recommended by the Cabinet and commends to the Council the alternative proposals developed by the Liberal Democrat group [set out in Appendix 1 to the signed copy of the minutes].

Specifically the Liberal Democrat group proposes that the Integrated Plan be amended to:

- (a) Identify £6.2 million of under-utilised resources as set out in Section 2 of the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals;
- (b) Identify £5 million of investment in services as set out in Section 3; and
- (c) Increase the level of Council Tax by 4.8% in both 2008/09 and 2009/10

and that consequential amendments be made to the Cabinet's recommendations set out on pages 4 and 5 of the Cabinet report.

Introducing the amendment, Councillor Jenkins explained that its purpose was to make use of significant funds in reserves; invest £5 million in improving and reshaping services; set a Council Tax increase of 4.8%; and act now to prevent more serious problems occurring for Council services in the future.

Members speaking in support of the amendment:

- Commented that it would better align spending with the Cabinet's stated priorities, especially on climate change, which would benefit the whole of the County. It would also increase funds for community transport in 2008/09 and reverse cuts to rural bus subsidies. In addition, it would restore the discretionary highways budget, enabling officers and members to work with their Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Panels to address local concerns.
- Noted that the proposals were in line with the Administration's own guidelines on general reserves as set out in the budget papers; these stated that general reserves should be no less than 2% of the non-school spend. It was suggested it was preferable to resource and manage services effectively from the outset to avoid over-spending in-year, rather than to plan in advance for when over-spending might occur.
- Noted that the lower Council Tax levy would result in a saving for Cambridgeshire residents of £1.2 million over two years.

Members speaking against the amendment:

- Suggested that it was not appropriate to reduce reserves to the level proposed, because of the risk and uncertainties faced by the Council. Particular attention was drawn to the deficits on the trading units, up to £1.3 million of which was not matched by earmarked reserves.
- Noted also that the Administration's proposal to keep some contingency in reserves could help to avoid painful in-year cuts in the case of unforeseen overspending, as had been required in 2007/08. The amendment would leave no contingency in reserves.
- Suggested that setting a Council Tax increase of 4.8%, below the likely cap, would be irresponsible given that Cambridgeshire's Council Tax was already one of the lowest and that, due to the capping mechanism, the gap between it and other local authorities' was widening each year.
- Suggested that setting a Council Tax increase below the likely cap would also send an inappropriate message to Government that Cambridgeshire was content with its 2.1% increase on the Revenue Support Grant, well below the Shire average.
- Expressed concern that the proposed cuts to the Public Relations and publications budgets would leave almost no funding for these services.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was defeated. [Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats in favour, Conservative and Labour Groups against.]

Amendment from Councillor Downes

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Downes and seconded by Councillor Broadway:

That recommendation 4 (a) be amended to read:

- (a) (i) That, with the exception of the Office of Environment and Community Services, approval be given to the Office cash limits as set out in table 4.3.1 (Page 10) of Section 4 (Finance Report) of the Integrated Plan (yellow pages);
- (a) (ii) That the decision to close Buckden Household Waste Recycling Centre be put on hold, pending the outcome of negotiations with WRG on the possible extension of the contract on revised terms until the new St. Neots facility is functioning, and the possibility of weekend opening thereafter and that, consequentially, the Environment and Community Services Cash Limit for 2008/09 set out in table 4.3.1 be increased by £200,000 to be funded from the Council's balances.

Introducing the amendment, Councillor Downes explained that the Council had invested between £320,000 and £730,000 in the purpose-built facility at Buckden, which received 100,000 visits a year. Closing the site would mean longer journeys to alternative facilities. For many users the alternative would be the site at Alconbury, which had not been purpose-built and which would need additional staff. The longer journeys would result in increased carbon dioxide emissions, contrary to one of the Council's stated objectives to reduce such emissions. Councillor Downes also reminded members that the Council would increasingly be assessed in terms of public perception, and how well it listened to local people; closure of this facility was strongly opposed by many local residents.

Seconding the amendment, Councillor Broadway expressed concern that the Council had never discussed with WRG how much it would cost to keep the site open, meaning that it had not properly explored whether this was a viable option.

Councillor Jenkins spoke in support of the amendment, emphasising that at this stage the Council was being asked only to reconsider its earlier decision to close the site, not to reverse it.

Speaking as the local member for Buckden, Councillor Boddington urged members to oppose the amendment and have regard to the equitable and cost-effective provision of services across the County.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor Pegram, reported that to keep the Buckden site open until October 2009 would cost £510,000, £250,000 in 2008/09 and £260,000 in 2009/10. Under the terms of the Waste Private Finance Initiative, Donarbon had exclusive rights to all waste generated at County sites, meaning that WRG would have to transport the waste they collected to Alconbury. Councillor Pegram noted that no provision had been made in

the budget for this expense and urged members not to support the amendment.

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was defeated.

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats in favour, Conservatives against, Labour Group various. A recorded vote was requested by 14 members of the Liberal Democrat Group and is attached as Appendix 2 to the minutes.]

Council then voted on the substantive motion and it was resolved:

1. To transfer the additional £500,000 identified in the revised Council Tax base to the Development and Contingency Reserve with the aim of issuing it in-year to agreed priorities, or using it to reduce financial pressures in future years.
2. To delegate responsibility for agreeing performance targets for publication on 1st April 2008 to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the Director of Finance, Property and Performance.
3. To delegate responsibility for agreeing any minor amendments to the Integrated Plan to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the Director of People and Policy.
4. To agree the following budget recommendations:
 - a) To approve the Office cash limits as set out in Table 4.3.1 (page 10 of Section 4 (Financial Report) of the Integrated Plan;
 - b) To approve a County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £315,699,334;
 - c) To approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £209,002,681 (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the 'fall-back' provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995);
 - d) To approve 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 Council (213,461.9):

Band	Council Tax	Band	Council Tax
A	£625.74	E	£1,196.69
B	£761.53	F	£1,414.27
C	£870.32	G	£1,631.85
D	£979.11	H	£1,958.22

- e) To approve the Prudential Indicators and Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 4.6 (pages 20-24 of Section 4 (Financial Report) of the Integrated Plan;

- f) To note the report of the Director of Finance, Property and Performance on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out in Section 4.6 (pages 25-28 of Section 4 (Financial Report) of the Integrated Plan;
- g) To approve Capital Payments in 2008/09 up to £129.4 million net of slippage arising from:
 - i) Commitments from schemes already approved; and
 - ii) The consequences of new starts (for the five years 2008/09 to 2012/13) listed within the Office reports in Section 4 of the Integrated Plan, subject to the receipt of appropriate capital resources and confirmation of individual detailed business cases.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives in favour, Liberal Democrats against, Labour Group abstained.]

2) Formal Request for the Establishment of a Cambridge Fringes Joint Policy Committee

It was proposed by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor Pegram, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, and agreed unanimously that the Council:

- i) Enters into a Local Agreement with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to establish a Section 29 Committee for relevant fringe areas of Cambridge, the Local Agreement as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report to Council;
- ii) In consequence makes a formal request to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to publish an Order for the establishment of a Joint Policy Committee for the Cambridge Fringes under Section 29 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;
- iii) Notes that the final proposals will be referred back to the Council when the Secretary of State consults on the draft Order, although consideration will be restricted by the terms of the Local Agreement to which the Council will be a signatory.

Councillor Harrison asked whether the new Transport Forum would meet in public. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services confirmed that this was already set out in its terms of reference.

3) Addenbrooke's Access Road Prudential Borrowing

It was proposed by the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Councillor J Reynolds, seconded by the Lead Member for Highways and Transport, Councillor McGuire, and agreed unanimously that the Council:

- i) Approves prudential borrowing for Phase 2 of the Addenbrooke's access road to a maximum of £10 million;

- ii) Notes that this sum together with interest charges incurred will be repayable from additional Government Growth Funds and/or by developers.

Councillor Melton commented that the new road would be essential in improving access to Addenbrooke's, one of the key hospitals in the region. He expressed regret that the Government had only made an initial grant of £8 million available for this scheme, necessitating the prudential borrowing. He asked the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services to do all he could to ensure that this shortfall did not jeopardise future infrastructure projects. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services confirmed that he would.

Key decision for information

4) Goosetree (Hobbs Lot): Major Safety Scheme

Recalling the petition submitted by Mr Burbridge earlier in the meeting, a number of Fenland members spoke on this item.

Councillors West and Ogden expressed their disappointment at the Cabinet's decision to install traffic lights at this junction. Councillor West sought assurance that the effectiveness of the traffic lights would be monitored closely and would be reported to members.

Councillors Butcher, Melton, Curtis and Tuck spoke in support of traffic lights at this junction, noting that traffic light technology had improved since the original discussions about a roundabout. Councillor Melton commented that significant housing growth was anticipated in March and Chatteris and noted that problems with the Forty Foot Bank could also increase traffic at this junction. He sought assurance that the capacity of the traffic lights would be kept under close review. Councillor Curtis noted that statistically, traffic lights were likely to be marginally safer at this junction than a roundabout; and the cost of £0.5 million as compared with £2.2 million would mean that the Council would also be able to take forward other safety schemes at other locations. He also noted that when initially installed, the traffic lights were expected to operate at 40% of capacity, leaving significant margin for future growth.

Responding, the Lead Member for Highways and Transport, Councillor McGuire, emphasised that in his view, traffic lights were the most appropriate safety solution for Goosetree. He explained that it was normal practice for new junctions to be monitored closely. Information would be reported to members via the annual network monitoring report, with more detailed and interim information on request.

Other decisions for information

5) Comprehensive Area Assessment: Joint Inspectorate Consultation

Councillor Downes reminded members that the CAA would take significant account of the views of local people. Drawing attention to the amendment submitted under the Integrated Plan item relating to the

Buckden Recycling Centre, he asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor Pegram, to provide a written copy of his statement, since to Councillor Downes's knowledge the Council had not contacted the Waste Recycling Group by the close of the previous day.

6) Use of Resources 2007 Score and 2009 Consultation

Councillors Ballard, Jenkins and Read all congratulated officers on achieving the highest possible score of 4 for the Council's 2007 Use of Resources assessment. They noted that consultation was currently being carried out on a new Use of Resources assessment to be introduced from 2009, which would take into account natural, human, property and IT resources as well as financial resources. The new assessment would be challenging for the Council but all three members commented that it was a sensible development and that the Council should strive to continue to perform well.

7) Place Survey Consultation

8) Statutory Guidance: Creating Strong, Safe and Prosperous Communities

9) Children and Young People's Services Trading Units: Actions to Address Cumulative Deficits

Commenting on the proposal to bring the CYPS trading units back in house, Councillor Jenkins highlighted the need to clarify whether these units were to be run as freestanding businesses or as Council operations. If the former, they should be freed from the constraints placed on internal services. He also noted that Councillors Pegram and Johnstone had previously carried out reviews of the trading units and suggested that these should be made publicly available to inform the current debate. Councillor Jenkins also reminded members that there were other trading units elsewhere in the Council, including the School Libraries service in Environment and Community Services.

Councillor Williamson emphasised the need to consider all possible options for the future of the CYPS trading units, especially given that it had just been agreed to externalise the Council's Archaeological Field Unit.

Councillor Moss-Eccardt suggested that lessons should be drawn from the Council's trading units to inform the shared services project currently being set up.

Councillor Hyams drew attention to the Legal Services trading account and suggested that this should be brought back in house.

Responding, the Lead Member for Universal Services, Councillor Curtis, explained that the CYPS trading units were very different from the Archaeological Field Unit, most of whose work was done out of County. The two main units under review were the Catering Service and the Cambridgeshire Instrumental Music Agency (CIMA). Considerable efforts were being made by the Catering Service to re-establish the

profile of school meals. Steps were also being taken to ensure that CIMA could continue to provide an important cultural resource. The deficits of both of these units were also subject to detailed discussion.

211. WRITTEN QUESTIONS

No written questions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.

212. ORAL QUESTIONS

Three oral questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9:

- Councillor Jenkins asked the Lead Member for Highways and Transport, Councillor McGuire, about layover places for long-distance truck drivers sleeping the night in their vehicles. He noted that the number of lay-bys on the A14 available for this use was reducing and expressed concern that truck drivers were increasingly using residential areas, causing distress to local residents. He asked to be advised how many overnight stopping places were now available to truck drivers in the County, and how inappropriate use of residential areas could be controlled. The Lead Member agreed to send a written response to these questions.
- Councillor Broadway asked the Lead Member for Highways and Transport how many schools in East Cambridgeshire were directly situated on a road with a speed limit higher than 30 mph. She drew attention to the primary school in Kennett, which was situated on a road with a 40 mph limit with increasingly heavy traffic flows. The Lead Member agreed to send a written response to Councillor Broadway, noting that lowered speed limits would require both physical measures and the support of the Police to ensure that they were enforced.
- Councillor Sales asked the Lead Member for Highways and Transport whether he was aware that residents of Keynes Road in Cambridge were so concerned about rat-running that they were considering taking direct action. He also asked the Lead Member to review traffic calming arrangements on this road. Responding, the Lead Member for Highways and Transport agreed to discuss this with officers and send a written response. He suggested that it could be an appropriate matter for the Cambridge Traffic Management Area Joint Committee to consider in due course.

A transcript of the questions and responses is available from Democratic Services.

213. MOTIONS

No motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

214. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

The Leader of the Council announced that Councillor Lucas was standing down from the Cabinet, to enable him to take on a new role as the Chairman of Cambridgeshire Community Services. Councillor Brown would replace him as the Cabinet's Lead Member for Communities.

The following changes to Committee memberships were proposed by the Chairman, Councillor Orgee, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Oliver, and agreed unanimously:

- Councillor Johnstone to be appointed to the vacancy on the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee
- Councillor Humphrey to be appointed as a substitute on the Fenland Traffic Management Area Joint Committee
- Councillor Jenkins to replace Councillor Higginson as a substitute on the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee
- Councillor Humphrey to replace Councillor Brown on the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee
- Councillor Humphrey to be appointed as a substitute on the Fenland Traffic Management Area Joint Committee
- Councillor Johnstone to replace Councillor Brown in the pool of members from which the Staff Appeals Committee is drawn
- Councillor Orgee to be appointed to the pool of members from which the Service Appeals Committee is drawn.

Chairman:

Appendix 1

Liberal Democrat alternative proposals – to be attached to the signed copy of the minutes

Minute 210, Reports of Cabinet Meetings

Report of the meeting of Cabinet held on 1st February 2008

1) Integrated Plan – Recorded vote on amendment from Councillor Downes

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/ No vote
BALDWIN D	Con				/
BALLARD C M	Lab			/	
BATCHELOR J D	LibD	/			
BATES I C	Con		/		
BEAN B	LibD	/			
BELL N	LibD	/			
BODDINGTON B	Con		/		
BRADNEY M	Con		/		
BROADWAY J	LibD	/			
BROWN P	Con		/		
BUTCHER R	Con		/		
CARTER C M	Lab			/	
CHURCHILL K	Con		/		
CRISWELL S	Con		/		
CURTIS M	Con		/		
DOUGLAS A	LibD	/			
DOWNES P J	LibD	/			
DUTTON J J	Con		/		
FARRER R	Con		/		
GILES S A	LibD				/
GRIFFITHS G V	LibD				/
HARPER G F	Con		/		
HARRISON N	LibD	/			
HARTY D	Con		/		
HEATHCOCK G J	LibD	/			
HENSLEY W G M	Con				/
HIGGINSON S	LibD				/
HUGHES E	Lab		/		
HUMPHREY P	Con		/		
HUNT W T I	Con		/		
HUPPERT J L	LibD	/			
HYAMS C R	Con		/		
JENKINS D	LibD	/			
JOHNSTONE S F	Con				/
KADIĆ E	Con		/		
KENNEY G	Con		/		

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/ No vote
KENT A C	LibD				/
KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD				/
KING S J E	Con		/		
LUCAS V H	Con		/		
McCRAITH D	Con		/		
MCGUIRE L W	Con		/		
MELTON A K	Con		/		
MOSS-ECCARDT R	LibD	/			
NORMINGTON S B	Con		/		
OGDEN M K	Con		/		
OLIVER L J	Con		/		
ORGE E A G	Con			/	
PEGRAM D R	Con		/		
POWLEY J A	Con		/		
READ P A E	Con		/		
REID A A	LibD	/			
REYNOLDS J E	Con		/		
REYNOLDS K A	Con		/		
SALES P	Lab	/			
SHUTER M G	Con		/		
SIMS L	Con		/		
SMITH M	Con		/		
STONE T J	LibD	/			
TUCK J M	Con		/		
TURNER R J	Con		/		
WALTERS J K	Con		/		
WEST J	Con		/		
WHITE D	LibD				/
WILKINS K	LibD	/			
WILLIAMS H	LibD	/			
WILLIAMSON M	LibD	/			
WILSON L J	Con		/		
YEULETT F H	Con		/		
TOTAL		17	40	3	9