

**COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN  
20 APRIL 2005**

**CONTENTS**



**South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council**

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

1. Committee Meetings
2. E-mail protocol
3. 2004/05 Expense Claim Deadline One Week Away
4. Call-in Arrangements

**DECISIONS MADE BY THE HOUSING PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

1. Housing Allocation Appeals and Management Transfers

**DECISIONS MADE BY THE PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

1. Public Consultation on the M11 Route Management Strategy  
SCDC Response to Highways Agency (Letter and Schedule of Comments) attached.

**MINUTES**

1. Cabinet – Minutes of 14 April 2005  
Decisions Taken:
  - Swavesey Dual Use Sports Facility Grant
  - Police Community Support Officers
  - Market Supplement Policy and Procedure
  - Local Development Scheme 2005
  - Capping of Council Tax 2005/06
  - Lettings Policy Review
  - Growth Area Project Manager – new post
  - Urban Design Capacity – new post
  - Abington Institute – Community Facility Grant
  - Appointments to Smoke-free South Cambridgeshire Advisory Group
  - Service Plans
  - Travellers Costs Quarterly Update
  - Direct Labour Organisation Review
2. Cambridgeshire County Council - Minutes of 29 March 2005 (Internet link)
3. County Council/Cambridge City/South Cambs Strategic Forum – Minutes of 30 March 2005 (Internet link)

<b>COMMITTEE MEETINGS FROM: 25 April to 29 April 2005</b>				<b>Contact</b>
<b>Mon 25 Apr</b>				
<b>Tue 26 Apr</b>	9 am	Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder	Finance Office	Maggie Jennings
<b>Wed 27 Apr</b>	10 am	Conservation Advisory Group	Swansley Room	Ian Senior
	2 pm	Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder	Swansley Room	Patrick Adams
<b>Thu 28 Apr</b>	10 a.m.	Special Cabinet on Travellers Issues	Monkfield Room	Susan May
	12.30 am	Group Briefings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservatives</li> <li>• Independents</li> <li>• Liberal Democrats</li> </ul>	Swansley Room Monkfield Room Mezzanine	Group Leaders
	2 pm	Council	Council Chamber	Susan May
<b>Fri 29 Apr</b>				

### **E-MAIL PROTOCOL**

When sending e-mails, please remember that not all recipients will be using Broadband. It is therefore **very important** to limit the size of attachments to no more than, say, 200 KB or thereabouts.

As a guide, avoid sending photographs and diagrams via e-mail, unless they have been compressed using a program such as WinZip. Images are extremely memory hungry! Remove all logos, including the South Cambridgeshire District Council crest, from attached letters.

Those using 56kbps modems have difficulty downloading large files, and often find that their computers crash, or otherwise disconnect from the Internet.

To determine the size of a document, click on File > Properties and select the General tab.

Thank you for your co-operation!

### **2004/05 EXPENSE CLAIM DEADLINE ONE WEEK AWAY**

The deadline for all 2004/05 expense claims is one week away. Under the current Members' Allowance Scheme, expenses will be paid for the current Council year only and all expense claims for that time must be received within one month of the year-end: by **30 April 2005 (a Saturday, so please submit all claims by Friday 29 April 2005)**. Any expense claims for the 2004/05 municipal year received after 30 April 2005 will not be paid. Expense claims received by 29 April 2005 will be paid at the end of May.

Expense claim forms are available in the Members' Lounge or can be downloaded from the Members' Information section of the Intranet. Please remember to sign and date your expense claim and to print clearly your name and address at the top.

### **CALL IN ARRANGEMENTS**

The Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee or any five other Councillors may call in any executive decision recorded in this bulletin for review. The Democratic Services Manager must be notified of any call in by **Wednesday 27 April 2005 at 5 pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 28 April 2005**.

Any member considering calling in a decision made by Cabinet is requested to contact the Democratic Services Section to determine whether any relevant amendments have been incorporated.

The call in procedure is set out in full in Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, 'Scrutiny and Overview Committee Procedure Rules', paragraph 12.

**DECISION MADE BY THE HOUSING PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Mr & Mrs C (Reference E/05/023)	Agreed a transfer to smaller accommodation

**DECISION MADE BY THE PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Public Consultation on the M11 Route Management Strategy	To submit the attached letter and schedule of comments to the Highways Agency as the Council's response to the M11 Route Management Strategy

Our ref: C/6/4  
Your ref:  
Date April 2005

Contact: Claire Spencer  
Direct dial: 01954 713418  
E-Mail: claire.spencer@scambs.gov.uk

Mr S DAVY  
M11 RMS Project Sponsor  
Highways Agency  
Heron House  
49-53 Goldington Road  
Bedford  
MK40 3BR

Dear Mr Davy

## **PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON M11 ROUTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

Thank you for your letter of 21 January 2005 regarding the above strategy and for the opportunity to comment.

The District Council previously made comments at the start of the process, in June 2002. These comments related to Junction 14 and the congestion and road traffic accidents caused by traffic merging from the A14, M11 and Cambridge City, problems exacerbated by weaving traffic. In the current Highways Agency Public Consultation on the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton proposals, it is noted that Junction 14 will be remodelled and should address many of these concerns.

The District Council has a number of concerns regarding the M11 Route Management Strategy (RMS); these are detailed below. In addition, a number of technical comments relating to specific to parts of the RMS and its Appendices have been set out in the attached schedule.

- 1. Timescales.** There are numerous references to the RMS covering a ten-year period, but it is not clear when this ten years starts. For example, will the RMS cover ten years from the date it is adopted? Or has the ten years already begun, as the study has already been ongoing for three years? For the study to be meaningful, given the future development pressures facing the route, it will need to cover a long enough period from the date of adoption. Will the final RMS include a timetable for implementing the various management measures?
- 2. Relationship with Development Strategies.** The RMS only partially recognises the extent of future development pressures, particularly in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Even where development pressures have been identified in the RMS, there appears to be a lack of understanding of the implications for the M11. For example, where the RMS reports on the expansion of Stansted it focuses on managing the local area, but fails to consider the knock-on impact on the wider route.

There is considerable development pressure in and around Cambridge, which the RMS fails to identify. The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan clearly sets out future development requirements; substantial development (of 10,000-12,000 dwellings) at Cambridge East; Cambridge Southern Fringe and Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) (2,900 dwellings). The references included in the RMS to the new town of Northstowe, which will be 8,000 dwellings, and development on the west of Cambridge are inaccurate (see attached schedule for details). It is also noted there are no references to the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy 14, covering the period to 2021.

The District Council is currently in the process of preparing a Local Development Framework (LDF) to replace the adopted Local Plan 2004. The first tranche of documents will include Area Action Plans for Cambridge East, Cambridge Southern Fringe and Northstowe. The

Council undertook public participation on Preferred Options in October / November 2004 and is in the process of preparing the draft LDF in light of responses received. It is intended the draft LDF will be published in June 2005.

The RMS does not appear to consider the impact of the increased levels of traffic which will result from the substantial amount of development. For example, traffic forecasts appear to be on the basis of a *central estimate* from the National Road Traffic Forecasts and not related in any way to the level of future development in the Growth Area. It is essential that the RMS has a more accurate assessment of future traffic levels in the M11 corridor to develop a holistic strategy on how best to manage it. See also comments in the schedule.

It is very difficult to ascertain how the various sections contained within the RMS have been drawn together into a comprehensive strategy. Whilst various sections of the report deal with quite specific aspects there does not appear to be much correlation between them. In fact, it is not clear from the RMS what the strategy actually is. At Section 9.1 the RMS refers to the strategy being devised to overcome the Route Issues, which are addressed in the Route Outcomes. However, the Route Outcomes do not address issues arising from Sections 2 (Route Description – which includes traffic and congestion, accidents analysis, integration and accessibility, multi-modal studies etc.) and 6 (Development Control Statement - which includes development proposals) of the report. These sections contain considerable information which is pertinent to the development of a RMS, therefore the strategy cannot be considered comprehensive.

3. **National and Regional functions of the M11.** The RMS confuses the national and regional functions (see comments in the schedule). Without a clear understanding of how the route functions, the RMS cannot begin to devise a strategy to manage the use of the route effectively.
4. **Relationship with Multi Modal Studies.** The London to South Midlands Multi Modal Study (LSMMMS) and Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi Modal Study (CHUMMS) recommended road improvements to the A428 and A14 respectively. The A428 is to be dualled in autumn 2005, whilst the A14 is programmed to be completed in the period 2011-15. Improvements to these two major routes will have a significant impact on the M11 and needs to be carefully managed.

One associated issue relating to these road improvements, is the function of Junctions 13 and 14, neither of which are all-movement. The RMS assumes that these junctions will be addressed as part of implementing the CHUMMS recommendations. However, from the recent public consultation on the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton scheme it is clear that neither junction will be upgraded to all-movement. Upgrades to the A428 and A14, along with the substantial development pressure in the Cambridge area, will place considerable pressure on an already congested section of the route and accesses into Cambridge. The RMS needs to address the serious implications for a lack of a full movement junction (Junction 14) at the confluence of three major routes, a situation exacerbated by the lack of north facing slips at Junction 13 and the resultant conflict between local and strategic traffic.

5. **Movements around Cambridge.** Not only does the RMS fail to address the serious implications of a lack of all-movement junctions at Junctions 13 and 14 on M11, it also fails to consider the movement needs of people in and around Cambridge. The junction of the A11 and A14 (on the east of the City) also has restricted movements. As a result traffic heading northbound on the A11 cannot head west on A14 to access the north of Cambridge, an area facing considerable additional development. Therefore, traffic accessing the northern parts of Cambridge to / from the south has to route via M11 northbound and A14 eastbound, and vice versa, placing greater demand on the M11. This issue does not appear to have been identified or addressed in the RMS.

- 6. Widening of the M11 between J8-14.** One recommendation from the LSMMMS is for the widening of the M11 between Junctions 8-9 and 9-14. The Secretary of State has requested the Highways Agency undertake further work for widening between junctions 8-9 to bring forward proposals to enter into the Targeted Programme of Improvements in due course, but the situation with J9-14 is less certain. The Secretary of State has requested the Highways Agency undertake further work for widening 9-14, which, if taken forward could be implemented around the middle of the next decade. What would happen if these schemes were not successful? The RMS clearly identifies that there is insufficient capacity in the dual two-carriageway stretch. However, there are few measures proposed in the RMS which would help address the problems already identified, notably the congestion and accidents, let alone cope with the additional traffic resulting from considerable further development. These problems will be exacerbated by the continuation of restricted movement Junctions 13 and 14.
- 7. Relationship with Local Transport Plans.** Given that the RMS is meant to be a management plan and given the Highways Agency's commitment to encouraging travel by sustainable modes, there is a lack of coordination with local authorities' Local Transport Plans. The Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan contains a clear strategy to improve access into Cambridge along the main radial routes by public transport. The District Council has yet to consider its response to the A14 proposals, but it would appear that there is an opportunity to improve public transport access into west Cambridge and provide access to Madingley Park and Ride if north facing slips were provided at Junction 13. In addition, an all-movement Junction 14 could remove the conflict between local and strategic traffic at Junction 13 and improve the A1303 corridor for bus movements into the city.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require clarification of any issues.

Yours sincerely

DAVID HUSSELL  
Development Services Director

## M11 RMS Schedule of Comments

### Volume 1

<i>Document Reference</i>	<i>Comment</i>
2.3 etc.	There are several sections without full data on J10-11 and J12-13, which prevents proper analysis of AADT, CRF etc. along these sections.
2.3.3	Traffic growth takes account of <i>central estimate</i> of growth from the National Road Traffic Forecasts but what about the substantial development growth, particularly in the Cambridge Sub-Region? (some of which is identified in section 6.3). Given that it is in a Growth Area, it would be more appropriate for a higher estimate of growth to be used to better reflect future traffic conditions.
2.7	<p>The section on Integration and Accessibility is very focussed on Stansted Airport, particularly the sub-sections on Local Buses and Cycle Provision. What about provision along other parts of the route?</p> <p>This section doesn't address integration with other roads and / or the desire lines for travel, such as the A14, A428 and A11. For example, M11 Junctions 13 and 14 are restricted movement. In addition, traffic wanting to access the north of Cambridge from the south would be required to use the M11 northbound and A14 eastbound given that there is no westbound movement permitted from the A11 northbound onto the A14. As such this would place additional pressure on the M11.</p>
2.7.5	Incorrect reference to Cambridge Park and Ride only having 3,000 spaces. There are currently at least 4,700 spaces at the five sites, and the Trumpington site is expanding.
2.7.6	<p>The rapid transit project is being promoted by Cambridgeshire County Council and not Supercam.</p> <p>Is it realistic to expect commuters to use the Guided Bus between Cambridge and Huntingdon, thereby relieving some congestion on the M11 between Junctions 11 to 14? Such an assumption could lead to an underestimation of traffic. This could create a capacity issue at Trumpington Park and Ride site.</p>
2.11	<p>LSMMS - There is no reference to the A428 being dualled, although this was a recommendation from the LSMMMS. However, Cambourne, sited adjacent to the A428, is recognised as a Key Site for development in section 6.3.9. Section 6.3.9 recognises that with a lack of major public transport infrastructure there is likely to be a high level of private car use, which may impact on the operation of Junctions 13 and 14. This impact is likely to be worsened with the dualling of the A428 and should be recognised in the RMS.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the district council has recently opposed proposals by the developers to increase significantly the size of Cambourne, which has gone to appeal and the outcome is awaited. The council is proposing a smaller increase in the number of dwellings to be provided on the remainder of the development, through the Local Development Framework, in order to comply with the latest Government housing density requirements.</p>
2.13	CHUMMS – The RMS should recognise that the CHUMMS study does not take into account all the current development proposals in the Cambridge Sub-Region (new town, and development on ALL sides of Cambridge) and the resultant traffic generation, which will impact on M11. The CHUMMS study was completed prior to the development proposals in the

Document Reference	Comment
	<p>Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and does not accommodate the resultant increase in traffic. It would be remiss of the RMS not to identify these pressures.</p> <p>Whilst the CHUMMS study recommended improvements to Junctions 13 and 14, the recent Highways Agency's Public Consultation on the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton scheme does not include either. Although Junction 14 is to be remodelled, it will not become all-movement. However, it needs to be all-movement to accommodate strategic routes in ALL directions to prevent unacceptable rat-running traffic through villages. This is a particular concern given the location of the new town of Northstowe close to the A14, given that traffic cannot exit Northstowe and head west along the A428 and vice versa, a major traffic movement not accommodated for.</p>
4.2	<p>Whilst it is correct that the white paper "A new deal for Transport: Better for Everyone" is a starting point for the RMS, given that the majority of the study has been conducted during its lifetime, it is important that regard is had to the more recent White Paper "The Future of Transport – a network for 2030". It is important that the RMS is forward-looking.</p>
5.1.1 & 5.1.2	<p>The National and Regional functions appear to be confused. Some functions listed as Regional appear to be National. For example, <i>RF1 Provides a link from the eastern part of Thames Gateway to the <u>national</u> road network, &amp; RF2 Forms one of three motorways (M1, A1(M) and M11) from the M25 to the north</i> (the north being well outside the region).</p>
5.3	<p>Para 5.3 states that the M11 currently operates within its design limits. However, this appears to contradict Figure 2.3. Figure 2.3 shows that in 2002 Junction 13-14 is already operating above the CRF and Junction 11-12 is very close to it. (The data is also incomplete to allow comparison of other parts of the dual two-lane carriageway.)</p>
5.4	<p>There could be a potential capacity issue at Trumpington Park and Ride if it is promoted for access onto Guided Bus.</p>
6.1	<p>Incorrect reference to "Local Development Plan" in 6<sup>th</sup> para – should refer to "Local Development Scheme".</p>
6.2	<p>Incorrect reference to "Local Development Schemes" in 4<sup>th</sup> para – should refer to "Local Development Frameworks".</p>
6.3.6	<p>The Aviation White Paper refers to provision of surface infrastructure to support a new runway at Stansted being developed in conjunction with emerging proposals for the Growth Areas to serve London and the north and east midlands. However, the RMS appears to focus on addressing the issues in the area immediately surrounding Stansted and not the wider route implications, despite section 2.3.3. identifying the pressures on the dual two-lane section. What will happen if the M11 is not widened to three lanes between Junctions 8 and 14? There do not appear to be any measures in the RMS to address the future capacity issues. There is no reference or integration with the Stansted Surface Access Strategy.</p>
6.3.9	<p>Incorrect reference to the "<i>draft</i> Structure Plan for Cambridge" in 6<sup>th</sup> para – it was adopted in 2003 and is the <u>Cambridgeshire</u> Structure Plan.</p> <p>Please note, the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan clearly stated a new town of between 8,000 and 10,000 homes, therefore the last sentence should be amended to refer to "<i>...<u>up to</u> 10,000 homes...</i>"</p> <p>It should be noted that the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan proposes significant development on ALL sides of Cambridge and a new town of 8,000 near Longstanton and Oakington (Northstowe), which will have a</p>



<i>Document Reference</i>	<i>Comment</i>
	<p>significant impact on the M11 in future.</p> <p>Also note, the proposed development on the East of Cambridge is actually significantly larger than the new town and will impact on M11, especially as the A11 / A14 junction is not an all-movement junction.</p> <p>Annotation on Figure 6.7 incorrectly refers to Possible New College Site – the proposals include a wide range of uses.</p> <p>The RMS recognises Cambridge University’s plans to expand on the west of Cambridge and that “<i>due to the size and location of this site and the potential effect on the M11, the RMS should be updated to include the proposals of the expansion.</i>” This is missing the point given that this site is only a relatively small part of the proposed future development. There will be considerably more development proposed elsewhere around Cambridge, particularly Cambridge East, (and at Northstowe). Therefore, if the RMS has not considered west of Cambridge, it does not even begin to address the issue of major development around Cambridge, and must be updated immediately.</p> <p>The timescale of the RMS is also an issue here (as referred to in the covering letter). It is important that the RMS covers a long enough timescale to address these development pressures.</p>
Table 6.1	Strategy Element 2 does not read properly.
Table 7.2	<p>The issue of slow moving HGVs and Congestion are proposed to be addressed by widening the M11 between Junctions 8-9 and Junctions 9-14. What if the widening does not happen?</p> <p>Junctions 13 and 14 are proposed to be addressed by the A14 improvements, but recent public consultation on the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton schemes shows this is not the case. Junction 14 is at the confluence of 3 major routes and needs to be addressed. Junction 13 improvements could assist with modal shift onto buses from Huntingdon serving the west of Cambridge, or using the Park and Ride at Madingley and reduce traffic accessing Trumpington Park and Ride.</p>
Table 7.3	<p>Junctions 13 and 14 are proposed to be addressed by the A14 improvements, but recent public consultation on the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton schemes shows this is not the case. Junction 14 is at the confluence of 3 major routes and needs to be addressed. Junction 13 improvements could assist with modal shift onto buses from Huntingdon serving the west of Cambridge, or using the Park and Ride at Madingley and reduce traffic accessing Trumpington Park and Ride.</p>
Table 7.4	As Table 7.3.
RO1 Summary	<p><i>Policy Objectives IN3 and IN5 (“to make better use of the route...” and “to recognise the two-way interaction with related MMS”)</i> There are no <i>Possible Actions</i> to remedy lack of south slips at J13 as recommended in CHUMMS. Therefore traffic has to travel further to J11 to use Trumpington P&amp;R. The provision of slips could reduce flows in this two-lane section, therefore reducing congestion, and could reduce queues on J11 slips. This issue is not addressed in the A14 improvements.</p> <p>Section 2.4.5 recognises J10-11 and J12-13 as worst banding for severe accident ratios and J11-12 is also a concern, and section 2.4.6 recognises J13-14 is 4<sup>th</sup> highest accident rate. However, these issues have not been addressed here although they could improve journey time reliability given</p>

<i>Document Reference</i>	<i>Comment</i>
	that severe congestion is caused when incidents occur on the two-lane stretch. Although incident management is identified as a <i>Possible Action</i> nothing is proposed to address the accident issue. Is it not better to prevent accidents than deal with the after effects?
RO2 Summary	This does not relate back to the problems identified in the text of the report, for example, at sections 2.4.5 and 2.4.6 (as referred to above). There are no <i>Possible Actions</i> to remedy these problems, only “carry out safety review of M11 junctions”. What about the route between junctions?
RO6 Summary	<i>Possible Action</i> “ <u>consider</u> maximising the use of quieter surfacing.” This should be amended as it should be a requirement for all new surfaces to be quieter.
RO7 Summary	<i>Possible Action</i> – “study pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian movements, facilities and improvements.” If the existing infrastructure is poor / unsafe people will not be using it. Therefore, how will it be possible to identify where desire lines are etc?  <i>Possible Action</i> – “consider the provision of higher parapets...” This wording is not positive enough and should be amended to “ <u>introduce higher parapets if appropriate following studies.</u> ”
RO8 Summary	<i>The Possible Action</i> is Stansted focussed. What about the facilitating multi-modal integration along the rest of the route? For example, improvements to Junction 13 would aid multi-modal integration to Madingley Park and Ride and allow buses from the north to access west Cambridge. This would address two of the <i>Related Issues</i> , “Congestion related to attracting too many vehicles to one interchange facility” and “Park and Ride Cambridge”. Improving public transport along the corridors into Cambridge is also a key objective in the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan.
RO10 Summary	There are no <i>Possible Actions</i> to remedy lack of south slips at J13 or J14 layout, despite recognising the non-standard layout of J14 and limited access in <i>Related Issues</i> .
RO13 Summary	There are no <i>Possible Actions</i> to remedy lack of south slips at J13 as recommended in CHUMMS. If there were slips, it could reduce flows in this 2-lane section, therefore reducing congestion, and could reduce queues on other slips.
RO14 Summary	<i>Possible Action</i> – “study alternative junction configurations and safety issues” This should be done in conjunction with the A14 improvements.  <i>Possible Action</i> – “improve management after incidents, reducing congestion” This should address the issues such as the layout, lighting etc. to try to prevent incidents happening in first place. Prevention is better than cure.  There is no <i>Possible Action</i> to remedy against the lack of an all-movement junction and the knock-on effects through Madingley and rat-running through villages etc. Madingley Road presently has to carry traffic accessing Cambridge and strategic traffic accessing the M11 southbound. These Route Functions should be separated by an all-movement junction.  No account has been made for the dualling of the A428 and the additional traffic it is likely to generate.
RO16 Summary	<i>Possible Action</i> – “continued close liaison with key stakeholders...to ensure traffic related of development along London–Stansted–Cambridge–Peterborough Corridor are minimised” This is very development focussed and does not address the strategic function of the route or the impact on

<i>Document Reference</i>	<i>Comment</i>
	the corridor as a whole. The RMS needs to set out the strategy in light of the known development pressures (which requires updating). It should also consider development pressures in neighbouring areas and the recommendations and outputs of MMS.
Table 9.1 etc	Query these tables – there should be more positive impacts if the issues are addressed.

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on  
Thursday, 14 April 2005

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs DSK Spink MBE (Leader of Council)  
Councillor RT Summerfield (Deputy Leader of Council and Resources & Staffing  
Portfolio Holder)

<b>Councillors:</b>	JD Batchelor	Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability & Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder
	SGM Kindersley	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder

Councillors RF Bryant, BR Burling, Mrs PS Corney, SM Edwards, RMA Manning,  
Mrs CAED Murfitt, Dr JPR Orme, J Shepperson, Mrs GJ Smith, Dr SEK van de Ven and  
NIC Wright were in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dr DR Bard and R Hall

---

### **Procedural Items**

---

#### **1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Leader was authorised to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2005  
as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

**Citizens' Advice Bureau** (Minute 10)

Second paragraph, after "subject", to read "to review if the Council were capped."

In relation to the request that he revisit e-conferencing (Minute 9), the Information and  
Customer Services Portfolio Holder reported on the costs he had been advised, and  
Cabinet concluded that this would not be a good use of Council funds at this time.

#### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following interests were declared:

Councillors NIC Wright and Mrs PS Corney:

Personal interest in item 3, having children at Swavesey Village College

#### **3. SWAVESEY DUAL USE SPORTS FACILITY GRANT**

The Headteacher of Swavesey Village College, Mr Martin Bacon, gave a presentation in  
support of the college receiving a grant from the Council to assist in the improvement of  
its sports facilities. These improvements would allow the college to open its facilities to  
more members of the community for a wider variety of sports.

Mr Bacon emphasised the work already being undertaken to encourage maximum  
community use of the college for sport and exercise through the appointment of a Sports  
Co-ordinator. This person engaged in outreach work and liaised with local primary

schools and sports clubs to promote sport in the area. The Co-ordinator role was part of a collaborative project with Comberton Village College, through which good practice was shared.

Reference was also made to transport arrangements for students from other villages to enable them to take advantage of facilities after school hours. Mr Bacon advised Cabinet that as demand grew for community use of the college outside school hours, further public transport could be researched to facilitate access to and departure from Swavesey. Councillor R Hall's arguments that the facilities should be provided in Bar Hill rather than Swavesey was not accepted by Members because Swavesey was more accessible to the greater part of the college catchment area.

Cabinet and other Members indicated their support for the award of a Dual Use Sports Facility Grant to Swavesey Village College, and Cabinet

**RESOLVED** to award a sports facility dual use grant of £150,000 to Swavesey Village College for the provision of new and the refurbishment of existing sports facilities at the college.

#### 4. **POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS**

Representatives from Cambridgeshire Police gave a presentation on the works of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). Inspector Nick Lidstone gave an outline of their powers and responsibilities, emphasising that PCSOs were not substitute police officers but had the role of contributing to the policing of neighbourhoods by being a visible presence. Sgt David Martin gave a break down of the results of a survey of residents of some of the parishes where PCSOs operated. Inspector Paul Ormerod described some of the effects of PCSOs in South Cambridgeshire and outlined the changes which were taking place to bring police division boundaries into line with local authority boundaries. It was hoped to transfer the Gamlingay/Papworth area to the South Cambridgeshire division before long.

Members with experience of PCSOs gave their full support to the excellent work they were doing, commenting on the difficulties faced when a PCSO was moved. In response to queries arising from the Scrutiny and Overview Committee, Chief Superintendent Rob Needle stated that crime detection figures had improved, although a direct link with the deployment of PCSOs could not be proved.

The District Council currently funded three PCSOs and part funded a fourth with the Police. It was noted that all divisions had broadly equivalent numbers of PCSOs and that at least some other District Councils were known to fund officers in their area. Members expressed concern that the number of PCSOs depended to some extent on the ability of the local authority to fund them and were of the opinion that, if the Government were serious about tackling crime, it should provide funding. Cabinet was happy to explore future funding by the Council, but warned that, in view of the Council's current financial position, no commitment could be made.

The Council could, however, play its part in relaying the message about the work of PCSOs through South Cambs Magazine; parish magazines were another vehicle. It was also suggested that more liaison with parishes explaining the changes would be useful.

Cabinet **AGREED** that

- (a) options for South Cambridgeshire District Council funding of Police

- Community Support Officers (PCSOs) in the future be explored, but with no commitment in view of the Council's present financial situation;
- (b) the work of the PCSOs working in South Cambridgeshire be commended
  - (c) further means to support the PCSOs be considered by the community safety team and police;
  - (d) the community safety team work with the police to increase awareness of PCSOs in the community and raise public awareness of how they can be contacted.
  - (e) the Council use its means of communication to increase public awareness of PCSOs.

## **5. MARKET SUPPLEMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

Cabinet considered the proposed policy governing the payment of market supplements in addition to the established salary for a post where this was necessary to attract or retain specific skills, and

### **RESOLVED**

- (a) to adopt the market supplement policy and procedure attached as Appendix 1 to the report;
- (b) that the policy be reviewed 2 years after implementation.

## **6. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2005**

Cabinet received the final Local Development Scheme setting out the programme for the production of statutory plans and non-statutory planning guidance, as submitted to the Secretary of State. Confirmation had been received that the Scheme had been submitted on time and the Council would consequently receive further Planning Delivery Grant for 2005/06. Cabinet

**RESOLVED** that the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Scheme December 2004 – December 2007 shall come into effect on Thursday, 14 April 2005.

## **7. CAPPING OF COUNCIL TAX 2005/06**

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder introduced the report on the announcement from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) of its intention to "cap" the Council's council tax for 2005/06 and the challenge being mounted to the view that the budget requirement was excessive. He commented that if the additional criterion applied in 2004/05, that only councils with a Band D council tax greater than the shire district average were affected, none of the nine authorities threatened with capping would have been considered.

A copy of the letter of challenge to the ODPM had been emailed to Members. Councillor Summerfield expressed his thanks to the Chief Executive, the Finance and Resources Director and the Leader for producing the excellent case for challenge, and these thanks were echoed by other Members.

Members were agreed about the excellence of the letter and commended the words "manifest absurdity" as summarising the position. It was noted that many parish councils and partner organisations were supportive of the Council and proposed that they might be encouraged to express that support to the ODPM. To assist them, the Council could prepare a list of the salient points – potentially the points highlighted in the

letter.

In answer to queries it was noted that

- It was legal to collect council tax pending determination of capping
- If the Council were capped, its balances would be gone by the end of 2006
- Some local government re-organisation would come sooner or later, but what form it might take could not be judged
- No response had been received to the request for a meeting with the ODPM
- The challenge letter implicitly asked the ODPM to suggest how statutory services could be maintained if the full budget reduction were required
- The meetings with the other authorities under threat of capping had not been very productive from this Council's point of view other than a sharing of tactics
- The challenge letter was published on the Intranet

Members were already being asked what services would be cut if the Council were capped and it was agreed that it was essential for contingency plans to be prepared in advance of the final announcement, especially as this might not be until July. Staff, parishes and grant recipients should be kept informed as far and as soon as possible, but no assumptions should be made at this stage on what cuts might have to be made. Arrangements were made for Cabinet and Management Team to discuss this further.

Cabinet

**APPROVED** the action taken to challenge the capping of the Council Tax for 2005/06 by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and congratulated those involved in the drafting of the letter; and

**AGREED** that letters be sent to the Council's partner organisations and appropriate grant recipients seeking their support in the challenge.

## 8. LETTINGS POLICY REVIEW

The Housing Portfolio Holder advised that government targets for local authorities to operate a Choice Based Lettings Scheme meant that the review had to be carried out and that participation by an Advisory Group was needed. Cabinet

**AGREED**

- (a) the aims of the review of the lettings policy as
- To make best use of both the existing and new affordable housing in terms of meeting the housing needs of the district/sub-region
  - To offer appropriate housing choices to those in housing need
  - To contribute to maintaining sustainable communities within existing villages and the creation of balanced communities in the major new developments
- (b) that the scope of the review should include the areas outlined at paragraph 16 of the report;
- (c) that an Advisory Group be set up to oversee the review project, including the Housing Portfolio Holder and up to 6 other Members, ideally with representation from all political groups.

## 9. GROWTH AREA PROJECT MANAGER - NEW POST

The Development Services Director commended this post to Cabinet, emphasising the

importance of a Growth Area Project Manager in helping to ensure that as South Cambridgeshire grew, consideration was given to all the service requirements of new communities as they began and developed over time. Cabinet

**RESOLVED**

- (a) that a post of Growth Area Project Manager be created at a salary of scp 33-40, the Council accepting the risk of a permanent contract;
- (b) that the post be advertised only following confirmation from Cambridge Horizons that they will be funding the post at least on a short-term basis;
- (c) that authority be given to the Planning and Economic Development and the Community Development Portfolio Holders to re-advertise with a market supplement if the initial advertisement is unsuccessful.

**10. URBAN DESIGN CAPACITY - NEW POST**

The Development Services Director commended this post to Cabinet, emphasising the importance of an Urban Designer (Project Management) in helping to ensure that new urban developments in South Cambridgeshire were designed with quality and sustainability in mind. He advised that the spinal column points should be 29-36. Cabinet

**RESOLVED** that

- (a) the post of Urban Designer (Project Management) be created at a salary of scp 29-36, the Council accepting the risk of a permanent contract;
- (b) that the post be advertised only following confirmation from Cambridgeshire Horizons that they will be funding the post at least on a short-term basis;
- (c) that authority be given to the Planning and Economic Development and the Finance and Resources Portfolio Holders to re-advertise with a market supplement if the initial advertisement is unsuccessful

**11. ABINGTON INSTITUTE - COMMUNITY FACILITY GRANT**

The Community Development Portfolio Holder advised that the Abington Institute Management Committee was now proposing to extend and refurbish the village hall rather than rebuild and was seeking additional funding. She commended this application and it was supported by the local Member.

Cabinet

**APPROVED** An additional community facility grant of £5,000 towards the refurbishment of the Abington Institute, taking the total grant award to £65,000.

**12. CHANGE OF VENUE**

Cabinet **AGREED** that the 14 July 2005 meeting be held in the Swansley Room to accommodate a planning inquiry.

**13. APPOINTMENTS TO SMOKE-FREE SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE ADVISORY GROUP**

The Leader noted that there had been no member interest in joining this Advisory



Group. The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder told Cabinet that there was a requirement to discuss the introduction of non-smoking working environments across South Cambridgeshire and asked for further support from Members. This would be an aspect of partnership working with other bodies including the Local Strategic Partnership, and would not be duplicating effort.

Councillor Kindersley indicated that a questionnaire would be included in the next South Cambs magazine asking for residents' feedback about smoking in the workplace. He agreed that when this consultation was returned and results collated it might negate the need for convening an Advisory Group. Cabinet

**AGREED** to defer further consideration of a Smoke-Free South Cambridgeshire Advisory Group for the results of the questionnaire to be distributed with South Cambs Magazine.

---

### Information Items

---

#### 14. SERVICE PLANS

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder notified Cabinet that in order to save paper, Service Plans were held electronically for Members to refer to via the Intranet.

Cabinet **NOTED** the availability of the 2005/06 service plans on the Intranet.

#### 15. TRAVELLERS COSTS QUARTERLY UPDATE

Cabinet **NOTED** the report on expenditure to date on controlling breaches of planning control by travellers and the Community Development Portfolio Holder asked if more information could be given in future.

It was noted that the special Cabinet meeting on traveller issues was to be held on 28 April.

---

### Standing Items

---

#### 16. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

None.

#### 17. UPDATES FROM CABINET MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES

None.

#### 18. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Cabinet

**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 (exempt

information as defined in paragraphs 8 and 10 of Schedule 12A of the Act)

## **19. DIRECT LABOUR ORGANISATION REVIEW**

The Housing and Environmental Services Director gave a summary of the main issues arising from the review and stated that he had agreed to give a briefing to the press.

The operating deficit for 2004/05 was now calculated to be £435,000, the bulk of which had accumulated under the previous response repairs contract. Serious errors had been made but there was no evidence of fraudulent behaviour on the part of the DLO staff or partner contractors.

The Housing Portfolio Holder thanked Councillors Edwards, Riley and Mason for acting as a sounding board for the report.

It was recognised that the deficit could not continue as the Housing Revenue Account could not withstand it, but the tender for the current contract appeared to have made over-ambitious assumptions. The circumstances of the tendering exercise were discussed and it was noted that this had been on the basis of external legal advice. For the future, the main issue was likely to be over response maintenance: efforts continued to move more repairs demand into planned maintenance work and a pilot was being tried to organise response work more efficiently.

Audit involvement was discussed.

Cabinet **APPROVED** the following courses of action:

### **Short term (to June 2005)**

1. Extend the DLO recovery team's life through to June to build on and deliver productivity improvements, including an extension of additional responsibility payments.
2. Increase the DLO allocated work packages up to £800,000 for 2005/06 in order to sustain the current arrangements while future options are being explored.

### **Medium term (to September 2005)**

3. Commission a full assessment of the operational, legal and financial impacts of the future procurement options listed above, which takes account of the housing options appraisal outcome.
4. Proceed with the Shire Homes Technical Services reorganisation as far as it contributes towards improving DLO efficiency, while retaining the flexibility to adjust managerial arrangements to accommodate the future procurement options.

### **Long term (to March 2006)**

5. Agree a preferred procurement option and an appropriate timetable for implementation.

---

**The Meeting ended at 3.10  
p.m.**

---

## **2. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – MINUTES OF 29 MARCH 2005.**

The minutes for the above meeting have now been published on the Internet. Please copy and paste the link below into your browser to access:

<http://www2.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/db/reprack.nsf/e0c624b01b2e9ade80256b14004eb73b/730a6f25d09b795680256fc7003dbe17?OpenDocument>

If you experience any problems opening the link, the agenda can be found at the following:

<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/>

- \* Council and Democracy
- \* Democracy and Decision Making
- \* Agendas, Minutes & Reports
- \* Agendas & Minutes

## **3. COUNTY COUNCIL/CAMBRIDGE CITY/SOUTH CAMBS STRATEGIC FORUM – MINUTES OF 30 MARCH 2005.**

The minutes for the above meeting have now been published on the Internet. Please copy and paste the link below into your browser to access:

<http://www2.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/db/reprack.nsf/e0c624b01b2e9ade80256b14004eb73b/0aae40240928709a80256fc700577415?OpenDocument>

If you experience any problems opening the link, the agenda can be found at the following:

<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/>

- \* About the Council
- \* Cabinet, Councillors & Council Meetings
- \* Agendas, Minutes & Reports
- \* Agendas & Minutes