

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on
Thursday, 8 June 2006

PRESENT: Councillor Dr DR Bard (Leader of Council)
Councillor Mrs DSK Spink MBE (Planning and Economic Development Portfolio
Holder and Deputy Leader of Council)

Councillors:	SM Edwards	Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	Mrs VG Ford	Community Development Portfolio Holder
	JA Hockney	Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	RMA Manning	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder

Councillors RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, RF Bryant, EW Bullman, NN Cathcart, R Hall, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs EM Heazell, SGM Kindersley, Mrs CAED Murfitt, CR Nightingale, Mrs HM Smith, RT Summerfield, Dr SEK van de Ven and TJ Wotherspoon were in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs DP Roberts.

1. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader began his first meeting by thanking the previous members of the Cabinet for their good service to the Council, and their contributions and input over the past five years. He also thanked the Chief Executive and Development Services Director, for both of whom it was the final Cabinet meeting before their retirements, and expressed gratitude on behalf of the Cabinet for their support and contributions.

Procedural Items

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Leader was authorised to sign as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held on 13 April and 25 May 2006, subject to the following amendments to the meeting of 13 April:

Minerals and Waste Development Plan – Consultation (Minute 6)

To note that Councillor Mrs CA Hunt's full statement had been appended to the electronic version of the minutes.

Travellers Issues – Update on Spending (Minute 16)

To include the following paragraph: "The Leader drew Cabinet's attention to the spending on Traveller Issues in 2005/06, a provisional total of £123,266. In response to concerns expressed that members of the public were frustrated by what they saw as a lack of progress on enforcement, he acknowledged that this was a legitimate concern, and explained that the Council had to ensure that it did not skip any stages of the legal process. He expressed his frustration at the slowness of the legal system, but highlighted the Council's recent successes in court as proof that progress was being made. He emphasised the Council's intention to commit to direct action, if necessary,

against any illegal development, whether in the settled or travelling community, at the first available opportunity only once all other legal options had been exhausted. Members remarked upon the amount of positive work being undertaken by officers, as detailed in the report, and regretted that much of this was getting overlooked in the press.”

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations were made:

Councillor Dr DR Bard	As a member of Sawston Parish Council
Councillor JD Batchelor	As an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor
Councillor Mrs SA Hatton	As a member of Sawston Parish Council
Councillor JA Hockney	One of the clients of the company he works for is Mouchel Parkman Highways
Councillor SGM Kindersley	As an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor
Councillor Mrs HM Smith	As a member of Milton Parish Council
Councillor RT Summerfield	As a member of Milton Parish Council

Recommendations to Council

4. PERFORMANCE PLAN

The Leader introduced the draft 2006 Performance Plan, which set out the Council's achievements in the previous year and its aims, ambitions and targets for the next three years, and proposed that authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, Finance and Resources Director and Leader of Council to finalise the plan for publication before the 30 June 2006 deadline. All members would have the opportunity to discuss the detail of the plan at the 22 June Council meeting.

A request was made to emphasise the steep challenges the Council faced as it worked towards a sound financial position. It was clarified that the Plan did not pre-empt guidance on Travellers, but indicated that appropriate sites would emerge through consultation and the Gypsy and Travellers Development Plan Document.

Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL**

- (a) that the 2006/07 Performance Plan be adopted; and
- (b) to authorise the Chief Executive and Finance and Resources Director, in conjunction with the Leader, to finalise the 2006/07 Performance Plan, in accordance with official requirement and publication deadline of 30 June 2006.

5. HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICE PLAN

The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder commended the plan to Cabinet and noted that it brought into one place a list of all Health and Safety statutory duties with which the Environmental Health Section was involved.

Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the Health and Safety Service Plan 2006/07 be approved.

6. FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT ON LOCAL AUTHORITY FOOD LAW ENFORCEMENT FOOD SAFETY SERVICE PLAN

The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder explained that the plan was a statutory obligation. It had been delayed slightly due to recent emergencies but the Council should be able to meet the fieldwork targets with its present staff. Food safety issues had been classed as being of "medium relevance" to the Council's Race Equality Scheme, rather than of medium relevance to health issues.

Cabinet **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the Food Service Plan 2006/07 be approved.

Decisions made by Cabinet

7. DISPOSAL OF LAND TO PAPWORTH TRUST

On behalf of the Housing Portfolio Holder, the Leader introduced the report and explained that the sites being considered were mainly disused garage sites. Sawston Parish Council welcomed the redevelopment proposed for Evans Way. The planning application for the Longstanton site likely would be referred to the July Development and Conservation Control Committee meeting.

The Housing Corporation was due to announce the outcome of the 'mini-bid' funding round by September or October 2006. Papworth Trust had indicated to the Council that it was happy to proceed without a confirmed grant allocation, and was keen to start redevelopment of the sites.

Cabinet **AGREED** that approval, in principle, be given to the disposal of sites at:

- Magna Close, Great Abington;
- Evans Way, Sawston; and
- Rivey Close, Linton

to the Papworth Trust subject to the requisite planning consents and a financially viable scheme being confirmed, the terms of the disposal being:

- (a) that the Papworth Trust meet any legal costs incurred by the Council;
- (b) that the Council be entitled to receive nomination rights of 100% of initial lets and subsequent lettings; and
- (c) that the sites be used for affordable housing purposes only.

Cabinet **DEFERRED** a decision on disposal of sites at Nether Grove, Longstanton and Queens Close, Over, pending further consultation.

8. COTTENHAM: DISPOSAL OF LAND AT OAKINGTON ROAD

Approval was sought for the disposal of Council land at Oakington Road, Cottenham, to Nene Housing Society in order to provide six affordable homes to meet identified local housing needs. Two different schemes had been referred to in the report and it was clarified that the original scheme as submitted to the Housing Corporation, of four rented and two shared ownership units, had assumed a land value of £0. If the Council wished to achieve land value, then the latter scheme of three rented and three shared ownership units must be used. Achieving land value was in the best financial interests of the Council and the Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder advised that the funds be ring-fenced to prevent them being pooled nationally.

The Leader read a letter received from a Cottenham resident relating to development issues rather than the disposal of land, and which would be taken into account during

the planning process as part of consultation on the planning application. Councillor TJ Wotherspoon, Local Member, explained that he had not responded to consultation because he did not wish to be seen in a position of pre-determination on a future planning application.

Cabinet **AGREED**

- (a) to dispose for affordable housing purposes to Nene Housing Society land in the Council's ownership at Oakington Road, Cottenham for £100,000 to facilitate the provision of six new affordable homes to meet identified local needs, the terms of the disposal to be:
 - (i) that Nene Housing Society meet any legal costs incurred by the Council;
 - (ii) that the Council be entitled to receive nomination rights of 100% of initial lets and 75% of subsequent lettings of all the social rented units;
 - (iii) that the Council receive 100% nomination rights in perpetuity to any shared ownership and / or other intermediate tenures provided; and
 - (iv) that the site be used for affordable housing purposes only.
- (b) that, if necessary, an application be made to the Secretary of State for consent to dispose of the site at less than best consideration to Nene Housing Society as our preferred partner Registered Social Landlord partner on the above terms.

9. LOCAL AREA AGREEMENTS

The Cambridgeshire Local Area Agreement (LAA) was an agreement between Cambridgeshire County Council, its partners and the government, setting out a framework for partnership working and the achievement of targets to improve quality of life across the county. Some of the targets in the Agreement were "stretch targets", performance against which could generate financial rewards paid to the South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). The "reward money" would be paid for a minimum of 60% achievement against the stretch targets and would be divided across Cambridgeshire District authorities, as directed by the LSP. It was important for the Council to use its LSP membership to influence the distribution of reward money, but the Council could not dictate its division through the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

One of the stretch targets was the number of bus journeys into, out of and within Cambridge, and the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder confirmed that she would be meeting with the Leader and Cambridgeshire County Council on 22 June. The Council was open to discussions with other Cambridgeshire authorities via the County Council to bring pressure on the government to fix the problems it had caused with the concessionary fares scheme. Discussion of the scheme was the major agenda item for the 15 June Scrutiny and Overview Committee meeting.

Cabinet **AGREED** to:

- (a) sign up to the agreed Local Area Agreement (LAA), subject to further clarification of the Council's contribution to LAA targets and resources availability;
- (b) advise the South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) to appoint the Leader of Council as the South Cambs representative on the LAA Board, the outcome of which would be reported to Cabinet by the Head of Community Services; and
- (c) request the Leader and officers to continue to represent the interests of the Council and the LSP in the development of the LAA, to improve the awareness of the LAA within the Council, and to report progress back to Cabinet on a quarterly basis.

10. MILTON: BAITS BITE LOCK CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL

Two responses had been received to the consultation, neither raising any objections, and the Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder commended the Design Guidance to Cabinet.

Cabinet **AGREED** the adoption of the Design Guidance set out in the Baits Bite Lock Conservation Area Appraisal as Council Policy, subject to incorporation of the changes outlined in the appendix.

11. **SWAVESEY CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL**

No objections had been received during the consultation and the Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder commended the Design Guidance to Cabinet.

Cabinet **AGREED** to adopt the Design Guidance set out in the Swavesey Conservation Area Appraisal as Council Policy, subject to incorporation of the changes outlined in the appendix.

12. **TEVERSHAM CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL**

The Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder explained that two objections to the boundary changes had been received and the boundaries revised accordingly. He commended the Design Guidance to Cabinet.

Cabinet **AGREED** to adopt the Design Guidance set out in the Teversham Conservation Area Appraisal as Council Policy, subject to incorporation of the changes outlined in the appendix.

13. **APPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY GROUPS**

Cabinet considered the current number of advisory groups and their size, and whether it was appropriate for a portfolio holder to sit as an ordinary member on an advisory group not related to their portfolio. Scrutiny and Overview Committee members who served on advisory groups were required to declare an interest and take no part in discussions if the Scrutiny and Overview Committee considered an issue previously discussed by the advisory group. The same legal position would apply to any portfolio holders who served on another portfolio holder's advisory group should that group make a recommendation to Cabinet. Meetings of advisory groups were open to all members, and portfolio holders, with permission of the advisory group's Chairman, could speak at meetings but were not entitled to vote.

Any members who felt that there could be a conflict of interests between their work on an advisory group and voting on the same issue at full Council should seek the advice of the Head of Legal Services.

Advisory groups were subject to political proportionality; however, the portfolio holder receiving recommendations from the advisory group was not a voting member of the advisory group, and his / her party did not affect political proportionality.

Cabinet **AGREED** that it was not appropriate for portfolio holders other than the portfolio holder to whom the group was making recommendations to sit as ordinary members of an advisory group.

13 (a) **Conservation Advisory Group**

The Constitution stated that advisory groups “did not *normally* exceed nine members”, so allowance could be made for the Conservation Advisory Group to retain its existing size of seventeen without a Constitutional amendment. Councillor NN Cathcart asked that it be noted that, although he served as an elected Labour member of the Council, he had received the agreement of the Independent group convenor to join the Independent group for the purposes of allocation of seats to political groups.

The Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder welcomed the large size of the advisory group as an expression of the amount of interest and importance of conservation issues. Members seeking appointment were reminded that there could be conflicts of interest between the work of the group and decisions of the Development and Conservation Control Committee.

Cabinet

- AGREED**
- (a) that the Conservation Advisory Group be renamed the Conservation and Design Advisory Group to reflect the importance of new growth as well as existing areas; and
 - (b) that the Conservation and Design Advisory Group have seventeen members, including the Development and Conservation Control Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, chosen proportionally from amongst political parties as follows:
 - Conservatives: 7 seats
 - Independents / Labour: 4 seats
 - Liberal Democrats: 6 seats

Group leaders were requested to provide Democratic Services with names as soon as possible for preparation of the July agenda.

13 (b) Housing for Older People Advisory Group

It was considered sensible to reappoint where possible within the requirements of political proportionality previous members of this group and Cabinet

- AGREED**
- that the Housing for Older People Advisory Group have nine members, including as many previous members as possible, chosen proportionally from amongst political parties as follows:
- Conservatives: 4 seats
 - Independents / Labour: 2 seats
 - Liberal Democrats: 3 seats

Group leaders were requested to provide Democratic Services with names as soon as possible.

13 (c) Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Advisory Group

The Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder invited all members to attend his portfolio holder meetings if they wished to have input on ICT issues and Cabinet

- AGREED**
- to disband the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Advisory Group.

13 (d) Land Drainage Advisory Group

The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder felt that it was sensible to retain the group at

its current size and Cabinet

AGREED that the Land Drainage Advisory Group have nine members, chosen proportionally from amongst political parties as follows:

- Conservatives: 4 seats
- Independents / Labour: 2 seats
- Liberal Democrats: 3 seats

Group leaders were requested to provide Democratic Services with names as soon as possible.

13 (e) Member Training Advisory Group

It was hoped that this advisory group could meet as soon as possible and items for consideration included training for Development and Conservation Control Committee members and planning topics to be considered, whether or not training should be mandatory for this and all other regulatory committees, and preparation of an efficient and effective training programme without incurring extra cost to the Council.

Management Team were thanked for their briefing sessions with new members within days of the election, and the Chief Executive commented that internal training sessions were regarded as a good investment of officer time. The Scrutiny and Overview Committee Vice-Chairman invited all members to attend that Committee's sub-group meeting on 13 June at which training would be discussed.

Cabinet

AGREED that the Member Training Advisory Group have six members, chosen proportionally from amongst political parties as follows:

- Conservatives: 3 seats
- Independents / Labour: 1 seat
- Liberal Democrats: 2 seats

Group leaders were requested to provide Democratic Services with names as soon as possible.

13 (f) Milton Country Park Advisory Group

The Community Development Portfolio Holder was interested in speaking to people most affected by Milton Country Park. Although the Country Park was operated on behalf of the entire district and the advisory group therefore could be subject to political proportionality, the advisory group instead could be considered area-specific to Milton and the surrounding villages. It was noted that the group also included, in a non-voting capacity, representatives from Milton Parish Council and the Friends of Milton Country Park.

Cabinet

AGREED that the Milton Country Park Advisory Group have seven members, to be appointed as an area committee with representation from Milton and the surrounding villages or, if this failed to fill all vacancies, that appointments be made proportionally from amongst political parties as follows:

- Conservatives: 3 seats
- Independents / Labour: 2 seats
- Liberal Democrats: 2 seats

Group leaders were requested to provide Democratic Services with names as soon as possible.

13 (g) Northstowe Member Steering Group

This group had been set up to consider the implementation of the planning decision. As a decision was not expected during the coming year, Cabinet

AGREED not to make any appointments to the Northstowe Member Steering Group during 2006/07.

13 (h) Planning Policy Advisory Group

The group membership included the Development and Conservation Control Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, whose appointments formed part of the total number of seats allocated to their parties. Cabinet

AGREED that the Planning Policy Advisory Group have twelve members, chosen proportionally from amongst political parties as follows:

- Conservatives: 4 seats and Councillor NIC Wright, Development and Conservation Control Committee Chairman
- Independents / Labour: 3 seats
- Liberal Democrats: 3 seats and Councillor SGM Kindersley, Development and Conservation Control Committee Vice-Chairman

Group leaders were requested to provide Democratic Services with names as soon as possible.

13 (i) Waste Management Advisory Group

Cabinet

AGREED that the Waste Management Advisory Group have fourteen members, chosen proportionally from amongst political parties as follows:

- Conservatives: 6 seats
- Independents / Labour: 3 seats
- Liberal Democrats: 5 seats

Group leaders were requested to provide Democratic Services with names as soon as possible.

13 (j) Climate Change Group

The Climate Change Group had met informally in the past and the Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder expressed concern that it had not been minuted, preferring that it be abolished and replaced with a standing item on his portfolio holder monthly meeting agendas. He intended that his portfolio holder meetings would be open to all members and invited interested members to attend to have input into climate change discussions. He felt that members would have more power through a formal, minuted meeting with a clear remit and reporting structure. The Portfolio Holder spoke of his proposal to set up a green think tank involving members, officers and public through on-line consultation using the Council's website, but asserted that he did not want to generate extra pollution by establishing a formal group without achieving anything.

Existing members of the group asked that Cabinet establish it as a formal body as climate change affected everyone, and explained that the group had produced the Climate Change Plan adopted by Council and had met more frequently than any formal advisory group. Not having minutes of meetings saved officer time and money. The Council should be a community leader on climate change and had already demonstrated its commitment through actions like rainwater harvesting at its offices.

The Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder, noting that Planning Policy Guidance 25 (PPG25) required authorities to look at climate change issues, proposed the establishment of a formal Climate Change Advisory Group, but with no seconder the motion fell.

Cabinet

- AGREED** (a) not to establish a Climate Change Advisory Group; and
(b) that the informal Climate Change Group be disbanded.

14. APPOINTMENTS TO JOINT AND OUTSIDE BODIES

Cabinet considered the list of joint and outside bodies to which appointments were the responsibility of the executive, and confirmed that substitutes could be sent to the Local Government Association (LGA) meetings if the LGA were informed in advance.

Cabinet

- AGREED** to make the following appointments to joint and outside bodies for 2006/07:

Cambridgeshire Councils' Association	Conservatives (1): Dr DR Bard Independent / Labour (1): Liberal Democrats (1):
County Council / Cambridge City / South Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Forum	Conservatives (2): Leader of Council, Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder Independent / Labour (1): Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder Liberal Democrats (1): RT Summerfield Substitute members required from each group
South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee	Conservatives (2): Leader of Council, Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder Independent / Labour (1): Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder Liberal Democrats (2): JD Batchelor, SGM Kindersley Substitute members required from each group
Home Improvement Agency Advisory Group	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
Windmill Estate Project Steering Group	Leader of Council Housing Portfolio Holder Fulbourn Local Members
Camb Sport	Community Development Portfolio Holder
Cambridge City Centre Consultative	Planning and Economic Development

Forum	Portfolio Holder
Cambridge Marriage Guidance Council (Relate)	Community Development Portfolio Holder
Cambridgeshire Councils' Association Waste Forum	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
Cambridgeshire Horizons	Leader of Council
East of England Regional Assembly	Leader of Council
East of England Tourist Board	Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder
Local Government Association General Assembly	Leader of Council
Local Government Association Rural Commission	Leader of Council or appropriate Portfolio Holder depending on agenda

15. DEPUTISATION OF PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

Noting that the deputisation of portfolio holders had not been reviewed since 2001, Cabinet **AGREED** that the Leader, and in his / her absence, the Deputy Leader, deputise for all Portfolio Holders in their absence.

16. GYPSY AND TRAVELLER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Cabinet received an update on the details, progress and timetable for completion of the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (GTDPD) and the Strategic Officer Group on Traveller Issues undertook to ensure that all members had access to the GTDPD Member Reference Group agendas and minutes. Cabinet had approved the budget on 12 January 2006 and the Leader and the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder had approved the appointment of consultants on 10 April 2006.

The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the Council had met all its previous DPD targets and hoped that this demonstrated that the proposed GTDPD timetable was reasonable, but added that the Local Development Scheme timetable was reviewed annually and could be adjusted if required. The Council had officer representation on the regional board steering the forthcoming Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), through which representation the Council would try to ensure that the RSS had regard to documents prepared by the Council's consultants, achieving consistency between the RSS and GTDPD from the outset.

Cabinet **AGREED** the proposed timetable and that it should be included in the next review of the Local Development Scheme.

Cabinet **NOTED** the details and stages of the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document and the project plan, and the Regional Spatial Strategy revision (single-issue review).

17. TRAVELLERS' NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Cabinet received the survey results and the Leader commented that there were more caravans on authorised plots in South Cambs than anywhere else in the country. The shortage of approved sites was a national problem as much as it was a local one. The Development Services Director cautioned against amendments to the recommendation, explaining that the Council would be weakly-placed tactically if it recommended to the Regional Housing Board that allocations should not be made: a better argument would be to demonstrate the existing disproportionate provision. The revised figure of 110-130

allocations already was lower than had been suggested previously, and there could be room to argue further reductions.

It was noted that the Council's definition of Gypsy / Traveller included travelling showpeople, and therefore was wider than the government's definition.

Cabinet

- AGREED**
- (a) to instruct officers to make the Travellers' Needs Assessment survey findings available to the Regional Housing Board and, at the same time, to make the case as to why not all of the need currently found in the district should be met long-term within South Cambridgeshire; and
 - (b) to use the results of the survey to support any future bids for capital or revenue funding for site provision; and
- NOTED** the findings of the Travellers' Needs Assessment, as they relate to South Cambridgeshire.

Cabinet thanked Trevor Banks for his efforts in successfully managing this project.

Information Items

18. THE NATIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME

Cabinet **NOTED** the outcomes of the Housing Corporation bidding round for the National Affordable Housing Programme (NAHP) 2006-2008 and the ongoing issues for delivery of increasing numbers of affordable housing in South Cambridgeshire to meet identified local housing needs and those of the wider Cambridge Sub-Region.

19. HISTON: FUTURE OF PUBLIC CAR PARK, HIGH STREET

Cabinet **NOTED** the on-going discussions with Histon Parish Council regarding the future of this site.

20. MILTON COUNTRY PARK - FUTURE MANAGEMENT

Cabinet on 9 February 2006 asked that an information pack be sent to organisations that had been interested in possible management of the park as part of a 'market testing exercise'. Three of the seven respondents had proposed options.

The Community Development Portfolio Holder described the investigation into future management options for Milton Country Park as a classic example of the need to control costs versus the need to protect and maintain local services in the best possible way. She was keen that any decision about the future of the park set out a straightforward management process and proposed interim solutions to help alleviate financial pressures on the budget in the short-term while further investigation of long-term options was undertaken:

- (a) Cambridgeshire County Council could promote the park as a rest location for drivers on the A14, reducing driver fatigue and the potential for accidents, and there existed the potential to offer more refreshment and rest facilities; and
- (b) although Milton residents were concerned that car park charging would lead to congested village streets, the budget assumed that revenue would be raised through the introduction of car park charges and the situation had to be

monitored. She asked that the Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder assist with financial negotiations.

The Head of Community Services confirmed that the visitors' centre had been upgraded for disabled access, including a lift and external ramp.

Members expressed concern about the £300,000 annual costs of the park, paid for by taxpayers across the district but of benefit primarily to residents of Milton and surrounding villages, and the city of Cambridge and urged Cabinet to come to a decision as soon as possible. The Community Development Portfolio Holder explained that further investigation was required and it was premature to make a decision without firm business proposals from the interested parties.

Cabinet **NOTED** the responses received to the 'market testing exercise' and **REQUESTED** that the Community Development Portfolio Holder and officers, with negotiation assistance from the Resources, Staffing, Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder, investigate the options further, with the aim of securing the future management of the park at a greatly reduced cost to the Council, a report to be brought to Cabinet on 14 September 2006.

Standing Items

21. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

None.

22. UPDATES FROM CABINET MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES

None.

23. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) (exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act).

Confidential Item

24. SAWSTON: LEASE OF CAR PARK OFF HIGH STREET

The Leader declared a prejudicial interest as a member of Sawston Parish Council, through which he had been involved in discussion of this item, withdrew from the Council Chamber during its consideration and did not vote. Councillor Mrs SA Hatton, also a member of Sawston Parish Council, declared the same, but, noting that she was not a voting member of Cabinet, felt that it would be best if she remained during the consideration of the item in case local representation were needed.

The Housing Portfolio Holder, on 19 May 2006, had agreed to offer a long-term lease of the Council's car park site to Sawston Parish Council at a nominal rent, subject to

conditions, including allowance for the Parish Council to sub-lease to a third party. The Housing and Environmental Services Director confirmed that negotiations continued on points of detail and confirmed that he would include Cabinet's previous request that the provision of recycling facilities continue either at that location or on another suitable, accessible location elsewhere in the village.

The site was often used as an informal Park and Ride site and it was hoped that putting up notices restricting parking to two hours would eliminate this. Car parking charges would not be introduced to deter all-day parking as it was essential to the viability of local businesses to have free parking near the village shops.

Cabinet

AGREED

to endorse the decision of the Housing Portfolio Holder:

- (a) that a long-term lease of the car park site off High Street, Sawston, be offered to Sawston Parish Council at nominal rent, subject to the leaseholder being responsible for ongoing maintenance and payment of National Non-Domestic Rates and that the site remain a free public car park; and
- (b) that Sawston Parish Council may sub-lease to a third party, terms to be agreed by all parties including the District Council.

**The Meeting ended at 1.36
p.m.**
