

## **COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> February 2007

**Time:** 10.30 a.m. – 5.15 p.m.

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillor: S B Normington (Chairman)

Councillors D Baldwin, C M Ballard, J D Batchelor, I C Bates, N Bell, B Boddington, J Broadway, P Brown, T Butcher, C Carter, S Criswell, M Curtis, A Douglas, P J Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, S A Giles, G Griffiths, B Hardy, G F Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, W G M Hensley, S Higginson, W Hunt, J L Huppert, C Hyams, J D Jenkins, S F Johnstone, E Kadić, G Kenney, A C Kent, S G M Kindersley, S J E King, V H Lucas, D McCraith, L W McGuire, A K Melton, M K Ogden, L J Oliver, A G Orgee, D R Pegram, J A Powley, A A Reid, J E Reynolds, K Reynolds, P Sales, M Shuter, M Smith, T Stone, J M Tuck, R Turner, J K Walters, J West, D White, K Wilkins, H Williams, M Williamson, L J Wilson and F H Yeulett

**Apologies:** Councillors B Bean, M Bradney, G J Heathcock, P E Hughes, R Moss-Eccardt and L Sims

### **124. MINUTES: 12<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2006**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2006 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **125. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **Restructuring of the Office of Corporate Services and the Chief Executive's Department**

The Chairman reported that as a result of restructuring, there would be a number of changes with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007 to staffing at Director level in the Office of Corporate Services and the Chief Executive's Department. She led members in congratulating the following people on their appointments to the new structure:

- Stephen Moir, who would become Director of People and Policy
- Nick Dawe, who would become Director of Finance, Property and Performance.

The Chairman and members paid tribute to the following officers, who would be leaving the Council by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2007:

- John Little, Director of IT
- Kala Nobbs, Director of Policy and Scrutiny
- Andrew Rowson, Director of Property and Asset Management
- Caroline Stanger, Director of Business Support.

## Awards and Achievements

The Chairman led members in congratulating:

- The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Childcare Information Services, managed by Opportunity Links, which had won a national Sure Start Partners in Excellence award in the Better Information to More Parents category.
- All involved in preparing the Local Transport Plan for 2006-11 and the Local Transport Plan Delivery Report for 2001-06, both of which had been classified as 'excellent' by the Government, leading to approximately £6 million of additional funding for integrated transport over the next four years.
- All those who had participated in fitness events on the Council's 'Do Your Ten' day on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2007.
- County Council staff involved in developing a sustainable drainage scheme at the new housing development at Lamb Drove in Cambourne, which had received a commendation in the Climate Change category at the Royal Town Planning Institute National Planning Awards.

## **126. 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.

- Councillor J Reynolds as the Chairman of Renewables East, an organisation engaging with climate change issues (Minute 129, Report of the meetings of Cabinet held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007, Item 1, Corporate Plan 2007/08 and Policy Framework and Item 2, Council Revenue and Capital Budgets 2007/08 and 2008/09)
- Councillor Tuck as the Chairman of the Interim Executive Board at The Queen's School, Wisbech and a member of the shadow governing body for the new school (Minute 129, Report of the meetings of Cabinet held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007, Item 3, Secondary School Provision in Wisbech: The Queen's School and Report of the Cabinet meeting of 6<sup>th</sup> February 2007, Item 1, Queen's Secondary School)
- Councillors Bates, Boddington, Criswell, Downes, Farrer, Harty, Hyams and K Reynolds as members of Huntingdonshire District Council (Minute 129, Report of the meetings of Cabinet held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007, Item 11, Service Level Agreement with Huntingdonshire District Council)
- Councillor Huppert as a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Minute 129, Report of the Cabinet meeting of 6<sup>th</sup> February 2007, Item 3, Historic Centre Pedestrian Zone Cycling Restriction, Cambridge)

- Councillor Batchelor as the Chairman of Linton Action for Youth (Minute 129, Report of the Cabinet Meeting of 6<sup>th</sup> February 2007, Item 4, Allocation of Grant Aid to Voluntary Organisations)
- Councillors Batchelor, Kindersley, McCraith and Orgee as members of South Cambridgeshire District Council (general declaration).

Councillor Giles declared a prejudicial interest under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 129, Report of the meetings of Cabinet held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007, Item 2, Council Revenue and Capital Budgets 2007/08 and 2008/09, as a provider of supported lodgings.

Councillor Johnstone declared prejudicial interests under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 129, Report of the meetings of Cabinet held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007, Item 12, Consultation Response on Addenbrooke's 2020 Planning Application, as a non-executive director of the Cambridge University Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; and in relation to Item 16, Shared Services and the e-Business Suite, as her sister was an employee of Xansa.

## **127. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The Council noted that no questions had been received from members of the public by the deadline.

## **128. COUNTY COUNCIL CONSTITUTION**

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

To approve revisions to the Council Constitution as set out in the appendices to the report to Council, subject to the delegation relating to the approval of candidates nominated to the Local Access Forum being transferred from the Director of Environment and Regulation to the Director of Highways and Access.

Revisions relating to the changes at Director level in the Office of Corporate Services and the Chief Executive's Department would come into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007. All other amendments would take immediate effect.

[Councillor Jenkins noted that the Deputy Chief Executives' delegated powers gave them significant scope to vire funds between departments, without limits on how often this could be done. He sought assurance that virements would be made transparently and with the agreement of members.](#)

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, agreed to address the issues raised by Councillor Jenkins in a written response.

## **129. REPORTS OF CABINET MEETINGS**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, moved receipt of the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007.

## Meetings held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007

### Key decision for determination

#### 1) Corporate Plan 2007/08 and Policy Framework

It was proposed by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, and seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor J Reynolds,

- i) To approve the updated Corporate Plan and agree its subsequent publication;
- ii) To authorise the Leader of the Council in consultation with the Chief Executive to agree further refinements as up-to-date performance information becomes available.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Reid and seconded by Councillor Huppert:

‘That recommendation (i) be amended to read:

- i) Approves the updated Corporate Plan and agrees to its subsequent publication subject to the amendments set out [in Appendix 1 to these minutes] being made to the Corporate Plan and Policy Statements.’

Councillor Reid introduced the amendment, explained that the Council had approved ‘Tackling Climate Change in Cambridgeshire’ in March 2005. The document contained ambitions to reduce both the carbon dioxide emissions resulting from County Council operations and carbon dioxide emissions occurring in the County more generally. However, he expressed concern that although targets had been set, there were no baseline measurements, no action plan to achieve the targets and no arrangements for annual performance monitoring. The purpose of the amendment was therefore to reflect more fully the objectives of the Council’s Climate Change Strategy in the Corporate Plan, and to ensure that they were implemented effectively.

During the debate on the amendment, members supporting it:

- Emphasised the need to address climate change issues urgently. This need was increasingly being recognised by national Government.

Members speaking against the amendment:

- Noted that the Council was already committed to addressing climate change and was working both internally and with partners to do this. Information on carbon dioxide emissions was already available and actions to reduce emissions were in place.
- Commented that it was not appropriate to make policy ‘on the hoof’. The proposed changes and their resource implications should be discussed properly through the Service Development Group process.

The Leader of the Council undertook to arrange this if the amendment was defeated.

Following debate, a vote was taken on the amendment and it was defeated.

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

Members then debated the main recommendation.

A number of members expressed concern that the Corporate Plan had been edited poorly and contained a number of factual and typographical errors. It was suggested that it should be checked for sense by someone external to the organisation.

Several members suggested that the Plan showed a mismatch between the Council's aspirations and the resources allocated to achieve them. Councillor Huppert suggested that the Plan conveyed a lack of ambition and did not tally with the Administration's budget proposals; for example, it expressed support for rural bus services and for improving the standards of Cambridgeshire's roads, but there were likely to be funding cuts in both of these areas. Councillor Batchelor welcomed the commitment in the Plan to work with children and families to prevent problems in the future. However, he expressed concern that this was an aspiration only, as preventative services for children and young people in youth services, social care and the Youth Offending Team were all underfunded.

Councillor Ballard suggested that the Plan should convey a stronger sense of the challenges posed by the Council's difficult financial situation in working to improve services such as adult social care and libraries.

Councillor Kent suggested that the section on building Cambridgeshire communities should be strengthened to place greater emphasis on working with partners, including developers, to deliver high quality communities with good infrastructure.

Councillor Reid suggested that targets for reducing carbon dioxide emissions resulting from County Council operations and more generally across the County should be added to the list of targets.

Responding, other members emphasised that the Council was ambitious. Councillor King highlighted the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway project which was now underway. The Lead Member for Inclusion, Councillor Tuck, noted that in Children and Young People's Services, existing budgets would be used to develop preventative services, for example to support young people at risk of offending, and through joint working between locality teams and schools. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, agreed to consider the suggestions from Councillors Kent and Reid and the content of the Liberal Democrat amendment.

A vote was then taken on the main motion and it was carried.

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

2) Council Revenue and Capital Budgets 2007/08 and 2008/09

The Leader of the Council drew attention to the following papers informing the budget debate:

- The report of the meetings of Cabinet on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007
- The revised Budget recommendations on yellow paper
- Feedback on the Budget consultation including the telephone poll, deliberative opinion poll, leaflet and internet questionnaire
- The Budget summary document circulated with the Council agenda
- The reports on the individual Office budgets circulated with the agenda
- 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 Powley, that the revised Budget recommendations as set out on yellow paper be adopted.

Councillors King, Kenney, Harrison and Wilkins 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.

No petitions relating to the Budget had been received.

Councillor Walters opened the Budget debate on behalf of the Cabinet, setting out the difficulties of Cambridgeshire's funding position and the challenges faced in setting the budget. Councillors Huppert and Ballard responded on behalf of the Liberal Democrat and Labour groups respectively.

In each of the three main service areas, Children and Young People's Services, Environment and Community Services and Corporate Services (including the Chief Executive's Department), a Cabinet Member spoke in support of the Cabinet's budget proposals: Councillor Pegram for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor Oliver for Environment and Community Services and Councillor Walters for Corporate Services. The Chairman of the relevant Scrutiny Committee then introduced the report from the Scrutiny Committee. A general debate on each service area followed. For each service, the lead Cabinet Member then summed up the debate: Councillor Johnstone for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor J Reynolds for Environment and Community Services and Councillor Powley for Corporate Services.

During the debate, members highlighted the following issues relating to specific service areas:

### **Children and Young People's Services**

- Expressed concern that the Office's proposed budget was high-risk and questioned whether it would be adequate. The Office faced financial pressures in a number of areas, including demand-led, statutory children's social care; home to school transport; and the costs of the action plan that would result from the Joint Area Review. It faced uncertainty as the new area and locality structures were established. It would be required to make savings in a number of areas, including central support functions, area budgets, the Access budget and home to school transport. It would face further pressures resulting from reductions to Government grant, for Connexions in 2007/08 and for the Children's Fund in future years. Members therefore emphasised that it would be essential for the Office to take an innovative approach to the development and delivery of services, including preventative services, making full use of the funding available from the Invest to Transform Fund.
- Questioned whether the cut to the Access budget was appropriate. The Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee had been advised that this budget had been underspent in 2006/07. Members suggested that, as the funding had been intended to support preventative services, it could have been spent under this heading or vired for another preventative use. The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services confirmed that the 2006/07 underspend had been vired to support other service areas in which overspending had occurred.
- Expressed concern that youth services continued to be underfunded. Members emphasised that the County Council should not place undue reliance on other partners such as District Councils to help deliver youth services, as these organisations also faced significant financial pressures.

### **Environment and Community Services**

#### Adult Support Services

- Questioned whether the budget for this Directorate was realistic. Members welcomed the decision to keep the eligibility threshold for adult social care at 'substantial', rather than raising it, but commented that the eligibility criteria were likely to be applied increasingly rigorously. The service faced serious performance issues and had recently received a one-star rating from the Commission of Social Care Inspection, with the assessment that it had uncertain capacity to improve; yet it would be required to make £9.8 million of savings. Members expressed concern that achieving these savings would have a severely detrimental effect both on the quality of life of clients and on the morale of the staff delivering services. Members also asked how any overspends emerging mid-year would be addressed.

## Highways and Access

- Expressed concern at the proposal to remove £100,000 from the Discretionary Traffic Management Budget and transfer the remaining £40,000 to pay for the maintenance of interactive signs. Members expressed concern that the discontinuation of this budget diminished their ability to represent their residents and help them to shape their local communities. They noted that even small schemes could make a significant difference and that a backlog of requests was accruing. The Lead Member for Transport and Infrastructure noted that many of the schemes that had previously been funded from this budget would now be funded via alternative routes, such as budgets for market town strategies, the Cambridge access strategy and Local Transport Plan capital funding. Existing commitments under the Discretionary Traffic Management Budget would be honoured.
- Commented that the condition of Cambridgeshire's roads was of concern to many of the County's residents and suggested that failure to invest adequately in road maintenance now would mean that problems were greater in future.

## Environment and Regulation

- Suggested that the budget contained insufficient financial provision to implement the climate change measures set out in the Council's agreed Climate Change Strategy.

## Community Learning and Development

- Reported that local communities opposed proposed reductions to the mobile library service, stating that this was a valuable resource for young families, the elderly and people without cars. The Lead Member for Community Learning and Development and Adult Social Care, Councillor Yeulett, commented that libraries had been found to be a relatively low priority in the recent public consultation on the Council's priorities, but recognised that they provided a valuable service for a wide spectrum of people. The Council would be carrying out public consultation on the future of mobile libraries and this would be discussed at the Service Development Group.

## **Corporate Services and Chief Executive's Department**

- Expressed concern that almost all of the anticipated savings in the Office of Corporate Services would be dependent on the success of two projects, the Office Accommodation Strategy (Workwise) and the delivery of shared services. The Office Accommodation Strategy was proving challenging to deliver and would require major cultural change. The shared services project was also taking time to develop. Members questioned what would happen if the anticipated savings from these projects could not be realised.
- Commented that the stated aim of the Office of Corporate Services to be in the top quartile for performance and the bottom quartile for costs, whilst commendable, would not be achievable all of the time



and would therefore be demoralising for staff. It was suggested that targets should be demanding, but more realistic.

- Expressed concern that the reduction to senior management capacity within the Office of Corporate Services would increase the workload and expectations placed on those managers remaining. Over time, there was a risk that they would become stressed and exhausted and could seek employment elsewhere. The importance of retaining sufficient central capacity to support the delivery of front-line services was emphasised.

### Overall budget proposals

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Councillor Powley, spoke in support of the Cabinet's proposals on the overall budget proposals, including the consultation process. Councillor King spoke to the reports of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee on these matters and on the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative Budget proposals.

One amendment was proposed:

#### Liberal Democrat Group amendment

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Huppert and seconded by Councillor Broadway:

That the revised Budget recommendations [circulated on yellow paper] be amended to delete recommendation 1 and insert the following:

1. To approve the Office cash limits as set out in Table 3-1 [page 11 of the Budget Book white pages] and subsequent detailed Office budgets subject to variations being made to reflect the savings and items of additional expenditure as set out below:

#### SAVINGS

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
Use late notified taxbase	1085	1150	1210
Use half Council Tax headroom	0	490	1555
Reduce Press and PR	125	200	200
Reduce communications	40	75	75
Reduce Corporate Project Office	80	125	125
Reduce minuting of informal meetings	25	35	35
End webcast early	25	0	0
Senior officer income target	25	25	25
Sale of housing (net)	65	130	130
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1470</b>	<b>2230</b>	<b>3355</b>

## EXPENDITURE

Climate change fund	300	800	1500
Learning disability social workers	100	120	150
Adult social care	300	360	450
CYPS – Access	200	240	300
CYPS – Recruitment and retention	100	160	250
Youth services	200	240	300
Reverse bus cuts	50	60	70
Reinstate discretionary highways	100	110	140
Reverse voluntary organisations cut and 5% increase in small grants	20	25	30
Reinstate mobile libraries	40	90	95
Increase Book Fund	60	25	70
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1470</b>	<b>2230</b>	<b>3355</b>

Introducing the amendment, Councillor Huppert explained that its purpose was to increase spending in two priority areas, support for vulnerable people and the environment. Increases would be offset by reductions to central services and the redirection of some funding from the proposed Development and Future Pressures reserve.

Members speaking in support of the amendment:

- Recognised that the Council faced considerable uncertainty and a number of major capital projects, meaning that it was appropriate to strengthen reserves to some extent. However, the late notified Council Tax base reflected growth in the County and should be used to provide services for the expanding population. In addition, too generous provision for future financial pressures would act as a disincentive to managers to control budgets robustly and could also have a detrimental effect on the Council's negotiations with external service providers.
- Noted that the proposals relating to Children and Young People's Services were based on existing Council policies to develop preventative services, including youth services, and aid the recruitment and retention of social workers.
- Noted that the additional learning disability social worker posts would be used to assist more people with learning disabilities to move from out of County placements back into the County and would also support young people with learning disabilities as they transferred to adults' services.
- Suggested that the Council should act urgently and do much more to address climate change, both within its own operations and as a community leader.

- Recognised the value of the services provided by central support functions, but emphasised that the difficulty of the Council's position made it essential to review the level of service provided. As an example, the number of member meetings should be reviewed, since servicing these meetings required time and money.

Members speaking against the amendment:

- Emphasised that the Council faced considerable financial uncertainty and suggested that it was prudent to strengthen reserves to provide adequately against future pressures.
- Suggested that additional investment in Children and Young People's Services to aid the recruitment and retention of social workers was premature, since a strategy was already in place and should be given time to take effect. In addition, the Joint Area Review team had inspected detailed cases for a number of children and had found that they were being served well, even though they did not all have a qualified social worker allocated to their cases. Members were also reminded that the Access budget had been underspent in the current year and that additionally, much of this budget heading was effectively a contribution from the Council's revenue budget into the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), which should be reviewed given that the Office of Children and Young People's Services would receive a 2% uplift in 2007/08 as compared with a 6% uplift to the DSG.
- Noted that the Council already had a robust Climate Change Strategy in place and that its work in this area was considered to be of sufficient standing that it would be applying for Beacon status in 2007.
- Expressed concern that the proposed cuts to central functions such as Press and PR and the Corporate Project Office would affect the ongoing viability of these services. Particular concern was expressed about possible reductions to resources for internal communications.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was defeated. [Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats in favour, Conservatives against, Labour Group abstained.]

During the debate on the general budget and the amendment, members:

- Noted that Cambridgeshire's current financial position was in part due to its history of low Council Tax increases. The Council Tax capping mechanism now imposed by Government meant that it was not possible to bring Cambridgeshire's Council Tax closer to the Shire average.
- Suggested that the Council should lobby Government for fairer grant funding, as had been done previously with the Area Cost Adjustment.
- Suggested that use of the Development and Future Pressures reserve to meet any emerging financial pressures should be subject to approval by full Council.

- Emphasised the need for the Budget reflect the Council's corporate priorities and not only the aims of individual Offices and asked whether this was being achieved. The Leader of the Council suggested that this might be an appropriate issue for the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee to consider.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, then summed up on behalf of the Cabinet. Council voted on the motion and it was resolved:

### Revenue Budget

1. To approve the Office cash limits as set out in Table 3-1 [page 11 of the Budget Book white pages] which now include adjustments to the reserve position following an update on tax base information received from the Districts. (Details of the collection account deficit/surplus would not be known until the end of January);
2. To approve a County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £291,894,188;
3. To approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £195,872,322

(to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the 'fall-back' provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995);

4. 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 (210,053):

<b>Band</b>	<b>Council Tax</b>	<b>Band</b>	<b>Council Tax</b>
A	£621.66	E	£1,139.71
B	£725.27	F	£1,346.93
C	£828.88	G	£1,554.15
D	£932.49	H	£1,864.98

5. To approve the Prudential Indicators as set out on page 22 of the Budget book;
6. To approve the Council's Treasury Management Strategy as set out on page 23 of the Budget book;
7. To note the report of the Director of Finance and Performance on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out on pages 25 to 28 of the Budget book.

### Capital Budget

8. To approve Capital Payments in 2007/08 up to £145.5 million net of slippage arising from:
  - i) Commitments from schemes already approved; and
  - ii) The consequences of new starts (for the three years 2007/08)

to 2009/10) listed in the Service Directors' reports in the Budget Book, subject to the receipt of appropriate capital resources and confirmation of individual detailed business cases.

### Final Adjustments

9. Cabinet had authorised the Director of Finance and Performance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the foregoing budget recommendations to the County Council, so as to take into account the final Revenue Support Grant Settlement, and information on District Council Tax Base and Collection Funds, if this information is received only after the meeting of Cabinet.
10. The only adjustment subsequently required was in relation to a net collection account surplus of £347,874, which was applied to the Uncertainty and Development Reserve.

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

### Key decisions for information

- 3) Secondary School Provision in Wisbech: The Queen's School
- 4) Accident Remedies and Traffic Management Programme: Medium-Sized Safety Schemes

Several members commented on the programme:

- Councillor Harper welcomed the inclusion of the Forty Foot Bank scheme.
- Councillor Sales welcomed the inclusion of the Newmarket Road – Coldhams Lane junction in Cambridge.
- Councillor Williamson expressed disappointment that the accident remedial scheme at the A10 Slap Up junction had not been included in the final shortlist, especially since use of this junction was likely to intensify with the development of the Cambridge Sport Lake.
- Councillor Batchelor expressed disappointment that no schemes in South Cambridgeshire had been included. He also questioned whether it was a good use of resources to work up schemes for which there was not currently funding available.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor J Reynolds, explained that additional schemes were developed in case for any reason those in the final shortlist could not proceed, meaning that others could be brought forward.

- 5) Cambridge Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) Term Maintenance Contract (Traffic Signal Maintenance) 2007-2016

Councillor Broadway sought assurance that this contract would cover the maintenance of interactive signs across the County, not just those in Cambridge.

The Lead Member for Transport and Delivery, Councillor McGuire, confirmed that it would. He explained that as this work was of a specialised nature, it had not been included in the highways maintenance contract. It would be funded using the £40,000 remaining from the discretionary highways budget.

- 6) Registration Service: Modernisation and New Registration Scheme
- 7) Office of Environment and Community Services: Recovery Plan Virement, Debt Write-Off and Invest to Transform Fund
- 8) Enterprise Centre, Haggis Gap, Fulbourn
- 9) Land at Somers Road, Wisbech

#### Other decisions

- 10) A1198 Papworth Traffic Calming Measures
- 11) Service Level Agreement with Huntingdonshire District Council

Councillor Downes questioned why the County Council's agency agreement, which had been cancelled eighteen months previously as it had not represented best value, now appeared to have been reinstated.

The Lead Member for Transport and Delivery, Councillor McGuire, explained that the agency agreement had not been reinstated. This new agreement related to specific services such as horticultural maintenance, relating to which the District Council had specific expertise. The service level agreement was therefore more cost-effective than if the County Council were to employ people directly to deliver these services.

- 12) Consultation Response on Addenbrooke's 2020 Planning Application
- 13) Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE) Review of School Syllabus

The Chairman of SACRE, Councillor Orgee, and Councillor Broadway, another of its members, welcomed the publication of the new syllabus for the teaching of religious education in schools. SACRE members had worked well together to produce this and it was hoped that it would be a useful resource for teachers.

- 14) Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative (PFI)

Councillor Kenney welcomed this planned investment in street lighting and urged for steps to be taken to improve cyclists' and pedestrians'

visibility to drivers. She also suggested that the control systems for new lighting should allow the lights to be turned off in the middle of the night where they were not needed.

Councillor Reid expressed concern that this proposal had not been subjected to rigorous financial scrutiny. It had been suggested that the cost to the Council over the life of the PFI contract would be £60 million. He asked for all costs to be set out clearly for members. He also expressed concern that the proposal appeared to be based on meeting British Standards for street lighting, which would involve installing 9,900 additional lights. This was not a statutory requirement and Councillor Reid therefore suggested that other, less expensive options should also be developed and risk-assessed, better to inform the decision-making process.

Councillor Ballard reported that he shared Councillor Reid's concerns, especially since each time a new stage of PFI was agreed, the project became more embedded as policy. It would be essential to keep members fully informed of the costs involved.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor J Reynolds, explained that the Council had recently submitted the outline business case for this project and was waiting to see if it would be approved by Government for the payment of PFI credits. If it was, a detailed business case and full costings would be prepared, which would be shared with members, including the Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee, who were particularly interested in contributing to this project.

15) Cambridgeshire Local Area Agreement (LAA)

Councillor Huppert expressed concern that there were still no satisfactory arrangements in place to ensure scrutiny of the LAA and accountability to County Councillors.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, reported that the last meeting of Cambridgeshire Together, the LAA Board, had agreed arrangements for scrutiny which would now be implemented.

16) Shared Services and the e-Business Suite

17) Life After School: Transitions to Further Education/Training/Employment/  
Social Care for Young People with Special Needs

Councillor Downes welcomed the Cabinet's positive response to this report from the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee. He sought assurance that the financial implications of the recommendations had been taken fully into account.

The Lead Member for Inclusion, Councillor Tuck, confirmed that she was fully committed to implementing the recommendations. She had already discussed them with the Lead Member for Community Learning and Development and Adult Social Care and the Directors of Inclusion and Adult Support Services. The recommendations would now be

considered at a joint Service Development Group on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2007.

### **Meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2007**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, moved receipt of the report of the meeting of Cabinet held on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2007.

#### Decisions for information

- 1) Queen's Secondary School
- 2) Response to Consultation on Proposals for a Planning Gain Supplement

Members from all three political groups spoke strongly against the Government's proposal to introduce a planning gain supplement, highlighting the following concerns:

- Cambridgeshire was a major growth area and required full funding of infrastructure to support housing development.
- Developers' contributions should be applied locally. Under the Government's proposals, 30% of the charges levied would be received by the Treasury. It was unclear how these charges would be redistributed; it was possible that Cambridgeshire's contributions would be redistributed nationally to support other local authorities that had been less successful in the past in generating income from Section 106 agreements.
- There was a serious risk that the proposals would reduce landowners' willingness to bring forward land for development. This had occurred when similar forms of taxation had been applied previously. The threat to the growth agenda from these proposals should be stated clearly to Government.
- The demand for growth in the Cambridge sub-region was a result of the high quality of life available to people living there. This would be also decline if full funding of essential new infrastructure was not forthcoming.
- The support of local people for new developments in their area was vital and this would be jeopardised if the provision of community facilities were not forthcoming as a consequence of the Government's proposals.
- Local authorities across the region were opposed to the proposals.
- Cambridgeshire's response should state clearly the Council's full opposition to the proposals and should emphasise strongly the full range of new infrastructure required, including schools, children's centres and libraries.
- Concern should also be expressed that whilst the Government was increasing the proposed number of new houses for the Cambridge sub-region, there had been no commitment from Government Office



Eastern Region that additional funding for infrastructure would be available.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor J Reynolds, welcomed speakers' comments and agreed to work with the Director of Communications to further strengthen the Council's response to the consultation before it was submitted to Government.

3) Historic Centre Pedestrian Zone Cycling Restriction, Cambridge

Councillor Huppert thanked the Cabinet for endorsing the recent recommendations of the Cambridge Environment and Traffic Management Area Joint Committee on cycling arrangements in Cambridge's historic centre. He noted that consultation on the experimental implementation of the new arrangements had found that 60% of respondents supported them. He expressed some concern at the decision to review the new arrangements after twelve months, noting that only one accident had been reported during the experimental period; it would take some time for meaningful trends about accidents to emerge. He also emphasised the needs for the police to take a more active role in enforcing legal cycling and for clear signage about restrictions.

4) Allocation of Grant Aid to Voluntary Organisations

Councillor Jenkins welcomed the Cabinet's decision to review the administrative process for allocating grants to voluntary organisations, particularly the joint Service Development Group meeting. He emphasised the importance of even small grants to voluntary organisations in enabling them to carry out vital activities and to attract funding from other sources. He suggested that the Council should be more proactive in identifying organisations that would benefit from grant funding.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor Johnstone, agreed that small grants could have significant beneficial effects. She confirmed that the administrative process for allocating grants would be reviewed; one option included better involvement of the voluntary sector representatives on the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership.

### 130. WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Two written questions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9:

- Councillor Huppert had asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor J Reynolds, to provide the latest budget and quarterly report for the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway programme, covering finances and progress and including a projected completion date and forecast outturn. The response set out the information as requested.
- Councillor Huppert had asked the Leader of the Council about the number of business miles claimed by members and officers of the Council during 2006 and the steps being taken to reduce these figures. The response noted that

the total number of miles claimed for all forms of transport during 2006 had been 7,601,074 and described the Council's initiatives to reduce business mileage, including the Travel for Work and Workwise Strategies.

Copies of the questions and responses are available from Democratic Services.

### 131. ORAL QUESTIONS

Six oral questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9:

- [Councillor Higginson asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor J Reynolds, about the process for adopting a number of new roads in Ely. He expressed concern that the Council had previously been advised that the adoption of new roads was a developer-led process but that in this particular situation, the land on which the roads had been built was owned by a separate asset company, which was now apparently going into liquidation. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services agreed to send a written response.](#)
- [Councillor Downes welcomed the Government's decision to raise the legal age for the purchase of tobacco from 16 to 18 from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2007. He asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor Johnstone, what steps would be taken by Trading Standards to publicise the change in legislation to young people aged 17, who were able to buy tobacco at present but would not be allowed to do so from this date. The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services agreed to send a written response.](#)
- Councillor Williamson reminded members that Milton Country Park, which was run by South Cambridgeshire District Council, was currently under threat of closure. The County Council owned part of the land within the Park. Councillor Williamson noted that it was possible that a community trust could be set up to run the Park in future and asked the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Councillor Powley, whether the County Council would be willing to enter into an agreement with such a trust. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services responded that the Council would consider any proposal for keeping the Park open on its merits, within the context of the Council's asset management policy.

As a supplementary question, Councillor Williamson asked whether the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services would liaise with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services to see if the County Council could help to support the Park in future, as part of its stated objective of improving residents' quality of life. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services agreed to discuss this with his colleague but noted that it was not possible for the County Council to make any definite commitment until the detailed proposals for the future of the Park were known.

- Councillor Jenkins noted that the Council's response to the consultation on the David Wilson planning application for development between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road in Cambridge had been e-mailed to Councillors for comment, but would not be considered by any meeting of a Service Development Group (SDG) before it went to Cabinet. He asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services how many Councillors

had responded to the e-mail, and whether he considered this form of involvement to be sufficiently democratic. He also emphasised the need for the impact of this development on the wider area, for example on drainage systems in villages to the north of the City, to be taken fully into account. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services explained that there would not be enough time to take the application to an SDG; he did not know immediately how many members had responded, but noted that all had been offered the opportunity to discuss the application with officers. He endorsed Councillor Jenkins's view that the impact of development needed to be viewed holistically.

- Councillor Sales commented on the delay to the construction of the new foot and cycle bridge over the River Cam in Cambridge and asked when this would now start. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services reported that construction was due to begin in early summer 2007 and the bridge was expected to be completed by spring 2008.
- [Councillor Griffiths noted that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services had been invited to attend a recent meeting of Cambridge City Council's West/Central Area Committee, but had been unable to do so. A number of questions relevant to his portfolio had been asked; Councillor Griffiths now relayed one, about why it had taken so long to replace a knocked-over lamppost outside Park Street Primary School. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services apologised that he had been unable to attend and noted that an officer had attended in his absence. He agreed to send a written response about the lamppost.](#)

## **132. MOTIONS**

No motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

## **133. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

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

- Councillor Stone to replace Councillor Williamson as a member of the South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee
- Councillor Williamson to be appointed as a substitute member on the South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee
- Councillor Bean to be appointed to the pool of members from which the Service Appeals Committee is drawn.

Chairman:

**Minute 129, Report of the meetings of Cabinet held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006 and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007, Item 1, Corporate Plan 2007/08 and Policy Framework**

**Full text of Liberal Democrat amendment**

‘That recommendation (i) be amended to read:

- ii) Approves the updated Corporate Plan and agrees to its subsequent publication subject to the following amendments being made to the Corporate Plan and Policy Statements:

**CORPORATE PLAN MAIN DOCUMENT**

*Page 4. Add new section after Building Cambridgeshire Communities section as follows:*

“Action on Climate Change

- reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the County Council's operations
- reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Cambridgeshire
- take precautionary measures to prepare for the effects of climate change”

*Page 14. Move paragraph headed 'Take account of climate change in developing policies and in planning County Council services', so it is placed after the text below on Page 17.*

*Page 17. Insert new section as follows:*

“Action on Climate Change

We will work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the County Council's own operations, and in Cambridgeshire as a whole. We will also take precautionary measures to prepare for the effects of climate change.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the County Council's operations

We will estimate the level of greenhouse gas emissions from the County Council's operations in 1997. This will cover all aspects of the County Council's operations, including offices, schools, operational buildings, transport, waste disposal, street lighting, and the County Farms, and will quantify the amounts of greenhouse gas emissions arising from each operations.

We have set, in our Climate Change Strategy published in 2005, targets to reduce emissions from County Council operations by 20% of 1997 levels by 2010, and work towards a 60% reduction target.

We will develop and implement an emissions reduction plan, which allocates specific annual emissions reductions to operations in the most cost effective way. We will ensure that all policies and plans developed within the County Council, for example for building new schools and replacing street lighting, are in accordance with the emissions reduction plan.

We will monitor progress against the emissions reduction plan on an annual basis.

#### Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Cambridgeshire

We will estimate the current level of greenhouse gas emissions in Cambridgeshire, and will quantify the amounts of greenhouse gas emissions arising from different sources, including homes, commercial buildings, industrial operations, transport, and agriculture.

We will develop and implement an emissions reduction plan, with identified reductions to be achieved on an annual basis in each sector. We will ensure that forward plans, including the Local Transport Plan and the Long Term Transport Strategy, are in accordance with the emissions reduction plan.

We will monitor progress against the emissions reduction plan on an annual basis.

#### Precautions

We will develop and implement a programme of precautionary measures that need to be taken, within the County Council's own operations, and within Cambridgeshire as a whole, to prepare for the effects of climate change. “

*Page 21. Add additional Category containing two additional indicators, as follows:*

“Corporate Priority 4 - Action on Climate Change
Amount of greenhouse gas emissions from County Council's operations.
Amount of greenhouse gas emissions in Cambridgeshire.”

#### POLICY FRAMEWORK STATEMENTS

*Page 21. Delete existing paragraph 3.1 (Our objectives), and replace with:*

“3.1 Climate Change.

Our objectives are to:

- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from all County Council operations, including offices, schools, operational buildings, transport, waste disposal, street lighting, and the County Farms, in accordance with annual numeric targets set out in an emissions reduction plan.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Cambridgeshire, in accordance with annual numeric targets set out in an emissions reduction plan.
- Increase energy efficiency.
- Increase the proportion of energy produced and used that comes from renewable resources.
- Ensure buildings, services, and the community are able to adapt to climate change.

- Achieve a shift from single occupancy car to more environmentally sustainable forms of transport and encourage improvements in the environmental performance of means of transport.“