



**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN – ISSUE DATE 23RD
JULY 2003**

CONTENTS

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS

1. Forthcoming Committee Meetings

INFORMATION AND CUSTOMER SERVICES PORTFOLIO HOLDERS MEETING

• **Minutes**

CABINET 17TH JULY 2003

Decisions Made by Cabinet

3. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan: Proposed Modifications
4. Cambridge To Huntingdon Rapid Transit: Consultation By Cambridgeshire County Council
5. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan Review: Proposed Further Changes To The Explanatory Memorandum of The Deposit Draft Local Plan
6. Housing Benefit Changes
7. Housing Benefit Sanctions – Anti-Social Behaviour
8. Cambridge City Local Plan Review: Deposit Draft Local Plan
9. Extension To Fixed Term Post of Special Projects Officer (Cambourne Office Re-Location)
10. Rainwater Harvesting
16. Little Wilbraham – Disabled Facilities Grant
17. Regrading of Planning Post

DECISION MADE BY HOUSING PORTFOLIO HOLDER

1. The Awarding of Five Management Transfers

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Call-in Arrangements

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLORS



COMMITTEE MEETINGS

FROM 28TH JULY – 1ST AUGUST 2003



MONDAY 28TH JULY 2003	AT 10:00 AM	CRIME & DISORDER PARTNERSHIP	COMMITTEE ROOM 1
TUESDAY 29TH JULY 2003	AT 10:00 AM	JOINT MEETING: DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL COMMITTEE AND PLANNING POLICY (<i>TO DISCUSS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN</i>)	COUNCIL CHAMBER
THURSDAY 31ST JULY 2003	AT 10:00 AM	CABINET	COUNCIL CHAMBER
	AT 2PM	WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY GROUP	COMMITTEE ROOM 1

INFORMATION AND CUSTOMER SERVICES PFH

Meeting held on the 11th July 2003 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillors JD Batchelor and Mrs DSK Spink

GJ Harlock S Carroll (for item 3)
SC May M Wylie

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

JS Ballantyne

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Members' Allowances Regulations

Noted that a report had been presented to Council. JB stated that he should have seen the report prior to its circulation. Arising from the discussion at Council, it was suggested that:

- allowances were not an issue at elections
- pensions should be for all or none
- the panel should be provided with information on the benefits to councillors and the cost to the Council (16% contribution rate) **SM**

SM to advise JB of the matters the panel is required to review. **SM**

It was still not certain that all parishes knew about the new regulations.

Park and Ride Charges

A response had now been received; SC to email it to JB. **SC**

Bar Hill

A copy of Cllr Hall's book was with the authority.

BVPP

Reference to the Council's bid for broadband funding had been included.

ITNET

Noted Cllr Mrs Spink was unable to access the server for the Intranet.

CASCADE Project

Visit to the Contact Centre still to be arranged for some members of Cabinet. Cllr Mrs Spink to invite anyone interested to contact MW.

3. COMMUNICATIONS ISSUES

SC circulated a progress report on communications issues and commented:

- South Cambs magazines were being delivered; about 200 had been returned from the Post Office, address unknown
- negotiations were proceeding with a door to door delivery firm for future issues – they could use the Council's delivery team although delivery rates would not be so high
- 3 deliverers had complained about not being used for this issue
- a souvenir guide to Milton Country Park was to be distributed with the CEN next week – the guide was within budget, largely paid for by advertisements
- an advertising campaign about wheeled bins was to be launched at the end of the month

- South Cambs Magazine had been entered into a competition, the results of which would be known in July
- the communications team had been asked to look for sponsorship for the Real Nappy Campaign, which had been so successful it had run out of money
- a new logo for the Council would probably be in the form of the crest in a modern setting
- the CEN Citizens' Guide had out of date councillor information, but the Council's own guide went out at the same time

4. CASCADE PROJECT

Wheeled Bin Hotline

This project appeared to be going well, the service starting on the agreed day, although delayed to 11.00 am because of a problem with phone lines, losing about 35 calls. Approximately 130 calls had been received on each of the first 2 days and the number of staff appeared to be about right. About one third of calls had been handed off to expert staff. A further peak in calls was expected around 4th August, when collection dates changed.

MW paid tribute to Rachel Woodcock, who had been diverted to this project. Rachel would need the press advertisement dates. **SC**

Progress

It was noted that Sx3 was saying that going live in December would be difficult to achieve, but had been advised that a later date was not acceptable. A letter of intent to proceed to the County Council was therefore required as soon as possible.

The roll out of Cambridgeshire Community Network (CCN), which would provide fast links between Council buildings, schools and other access points, was behind by about 2 months. MW's requirement that South Cambridgeshire must be at the head of the queue for the links had been agreed by the Head of IT at County and was endorsed by JB.

Budget

A paper was circulated reviewing the costs and budget of the project.

The County Council's staff costs predictions included a Team Leader and a Business Support Analyst, neither of whom had originally been allowed for: the County Council's projections were being challenged and it was believed there was scope for reductions. Nevertheless, there would be a requirement for an additional £120,000 (approximately) revenue funding for these and other costs of the service. This was cause for concern given the expectation that the ongoing costs of the Contact Centre service would be cost neutral, but circumstances had changed. It was noted that the current scope of the project did not include handling the South Cambridgeshire switchboard function at the Contact Centre; it was not thought that this should affect the costs, but the possibility should be flagged up.

It was noted that a business case would have to be prepared as the Contact Centre took on more services, to assess whether there would be further additional costs.

The Sx3 cost summary indicated a capital requirement within the £1m originally estimated in October 2002 and which was provided for in Cabinet's earlier approval of the ICT budget. However, the capital plan for the project over 2002/03 and 2003/04 had not fully reflected this figure. The main missing figure was for integration work to be done by third party suppliers. It was confirmed that the quoted cost of £340,000 was a not-to-be exceeded figure and that the contingency figure of £60,000 included

bid costs. JB queried the latter and MW agreed to check how much the bid costs were. **MW**

It was noted that some of the capital costs might be recoverable from other Districts as they joined the Contact Centre, but that reliance should not be placed on this.

The project had been approved on the basis of the £1m provided in the estimates, and approval to increase the capital programme must be sought to rectify the error and reconcile the various parts of the budget.

AGREED

- (1) that the capital budget for the County and Sx3 elements of the CASCADE project should be confirmed at £1m, Council requested to approve corrections to the capital programme, and appropriate adjustments made to the cost centre budgets during the forthcoming budget revision exercise;
- (2) that a report be presented to Cabinet on 24th July 2003 giving a project progress report and requesting approval for the revised revenue budget;
- (3) that the Finance and Resources Director issue a letter of intent at this stage to the County Council to proceed with the project subject to Cabinet/Council approval of the revenue costs.

A meeting was arranged for Tuesday, 15th July to explain the issues to Cllr Summerfield as the Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder.

5. BROADBAND – UPDATE

MW reported that, if the Council's bid were on the shortlist for grant, advance warning would be received on the following Friday. The final announcement would be made on 23rd July.

The Council's bid was technology neutral and, if successful, the project would be rolled out by a voucher system. JB asked for details: MW to provide JB with a copy of the bid document. **MW**

News reports that BT was cutting its thresholds for the provision of broadband were noted.

6. CORPORATE GIS ORDER

A report was circulated seeking approval to place orders with Graphical Data Capture (GDC) to complete a corporate Geographic Information System (GIS) solution. The total cost (which was within budget) would be £154,666 to the 31st March 2004, spread over a number of orders. Normally, competitive bids would be sought for a contract of this size, however GDC were the only known supplier of an open spatial data warehouse designed for local government use, which was what was desired, and were also contracted to supply related systems. The request was, therefore, for Contract Standing Orders 6.2 and 6.1.3 to be invoked.

It was decided to deal with this report on Tuesday with the Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder.

7. FORWARD PROGRAMME

It was noted that the final meeting for the Access to Services review was due to take place on 8th August, so a report would not be going to Scrutiny Committee in July.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Elections Chris Taylor was to give JB a briefing on elections, both staffing and options for encouraging more voters, by next Tuesday. JB was happy with briefings outside PFH meetings; he would call CJT to the next meeting if necessary.

New Financial Management System It was noted that the report to Cabinet on 17th July contained incorrect figures: the original total estimates were £530,000 and the revised budgets £637,000.

Budgets A new budget breakdown was to be provided for JB **MW**

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Friday 5th September at 10.00 a.m.

The meeting closed at 12.15 p.m.

CABINET

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on
17th July 2003 at 10.00 am.

PRESENT:	Mrs DSK Spink	Leader and Conservation Portfolio Holder
	RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader and Finance and Resources Portfolio Holder
Councillors:	CC Barker	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
	JD Batchelor	Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	RF Collinson	Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder

Councillors RF Bryant, R Hall, Mrs SA Hatton, SGM Kindersley, RJ Turner and Mrs BE Waters were also in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dr DR Bard, Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder, and from Councillor Mrs JM Healey.

Procedural Items

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Leader was authorised to sign as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 27th June 2003, subject to the addition of Councillor Mrs MP Course to the membership of the Conservation Advisory Group (Minute 12 – Appointments to Advisory Groups and Outside Bodies).

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following personal interests were declared:

Councillor RT Summerfield Item 8 (Cambridge City Local Plan Review: Deposit Draft Local Plan), as a director of Cambridge United Football Club, whose pitch was mentioned in the Local Plan as desirable open space.

Councillor CC Barker Item 14 (Little Wilbraham – Disabled Facilities Grant), as he would be attending the village fundraising event for this family.

Decisions made by the Cabinet and reported for information

3. THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH WASTE LOCAL PLAN: PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

This item had been deferred from the Cabinet meeting of 27th June so further details could be brought to members. Mrs Ann Barnes, an officer of the Planning Division of Environment and Transport at the Cambridgeshire County Council, was in attendance to answer questions.

Mrs Barnes explained that the Waste Local Plan (WLP) looked at all waste streams to 2011, including household, commercial and industrial waste. Household waste

accounted for about 40% of the total waste stream. A new waste management facility site, treating all waste within one building, could house both a Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) and Materials Reclamation Facility (MRF). The current plan referred to an HWRC only, but Mrs Barnes confirmed that more than an HWRC was required to accommodate the amount of waste being generated in Cambridgeshire. The Environment Agency would regulate the use of this site and prevent outside waste storage, but a large building would be required. A further building could be proposed through a planning application at a later date if one were deemed necessary. Similar facilities had 30-50 lorries per day entering and exiting the site and the Highways Authority, taking into consideration the widening of the A14, had advised that the junction at Milton was adequate for this traffic.

Waste management technology was evolving and the WLP sought to remain as flexible as possible and specific issues would be subject to planning applications. An area of search of 2 hectares had been identified in the Cambridge Northern Fringe East site near Milton, within which the building would accommodate approximately ½ hectare and the remaining land used for the manoeuvring of lorries and a weighbridge. There would be space for members of the public to drive into the building and bays for parking while waste was offloaded onto conveyor belts for sorting. Design and siting of the building would be considered through a planning application.

Cabinet members, while appreciating the need for new waste management facilities, expressed concern about the impact on Milton village of noise and traffic, which would be addressed through the Masterplan for the Cambridge Northern Fringe.

The Planning Director explained that the County Council was trying to address a changing situation with the growing amount of waste and the advances in recycling and reclamation technologies, and was trying to reserve options about use of the site. If Cabinet could approve the WLP even with reservations, the County Council would still require planning permission, through which this Council could have further involvement. Cabinet

AGREED to submit a representation to the County Council generally supporting the proposed modifications to the Waste Local Plan but expressing the misgivings this authority has about the lack of specific information and the impact on Milton village, details to be agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health and Councillor RT Summerfield, local member for Milton.

4. CAMBRIDGE TO HUNTINGDON RAPID TRANSIT: CONSULTATION BY CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Cabinet was invited to respond to the public consultation on the Cambridge to Huntingdon Rapid Transit (CHRT) scheme. The District Council had supported the scheme in principle for some years and the District Local Plan included a policy safeguarding the route for a rapid transit system and noting that the guided bus was the preferred option in the CHUMMS Study because of its flexibility. An officer working group was considering a number of issues which still needed to be resolved. Planning Policy Officers had attended public consultation events in the villages directly affected to explain the wider planning issues.

An e-mail had been received from Councillor NS Davies, one of the local members for Histon and Impington, outlining key concerns of residents and noting that there was no comment on the environmental impact on communities along the route. A letter had also been received from a resident of Swavesey expressing concerns including the crossing near the Swavesey Village College and asking instead for a

large Park and Ride site at Swavesey with the busway diverted to run alongside the A14 to Bar Hill.

Cabinet raised the following issues:

- Traffic congestion could result from frequent closing of roads at guideway crossings. There would be traffic signals at the crossings, with no greater congestion nor danger than at ordinary motor crossings;
- Passengers could be reluctant to transfer more than once between modes of public transportation on a single journey. There could be bus services originating in the villages, taking passengers to busway connection points and limiting the number of transfers;
- The buses may not be able to get into the City effectively without using the railway route through the Chesterton Sidings to the main station. Negotiations between the County Council and the Strategic Rail Authority and Network Rail about an additional line adjacent to the railway were continuing and it was hoped this could be added as a third route in the longer term;
- Commuters would need to drive through a residential area to access the Histon stop and, as there was no parking at the stop, cars would spill into residential streets. The County Council had noted residents' request for an additional Histon stop northwest of the village and would be meeting with the Histon and Impington Parish Councils for further discussion on a number of matters of local concern;
- It was unclear how maintenance vehicles could access the guideway to reach a bus which had broken down, and what impact a broken down bus would have on the movement of other vehicles in the guideway. The understanding was that maintenance vehicles could enter the guideway at any crossing point and tow a broken down bus out;
- Members and residents were concerned about the environmental impact. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) explained that a very detailed environmental assessment had already been undertaken and that the County Council had since hired external consultants to further develop the study;
- The need for well designed shelters to keep passengers warm, dry and comfortable. A specialist design team would be looking into this matter;
- The cost of a journey would need to be low enough to encourage passengers to use the service rather than private vehicles; and
- The safety of the track for use as a cycle- and bridleway. The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) advised that current cycle paths alongside ordinary roads were subject to higher traffic levels and the motor traffic was not separated from cyclists by a kerb as the guided buses would be, with the advantage that the guided bus could not deviate from the guideway.

Cabinet, with one objection, **AGREED** to support in general the CHRT proposals but make the following comments:

- (a) Urge the County Council to revisit the modelling behind the number of parking spaces to be provided at the two Park and Ride sites and increase the St Ives Park and Ride site to 1,000 spaces to better reflect Local Transport Plan objectives;
- (b) Review the proposed location of the Longstanton Park and Ride site as part of the master planning for the new settlement development;
- (c) Object to the "kiss and ride" operation of the stops in the villages along the route as this is of limited value. Proper provision needs to be made for parking at the stops to avoid spill-over into adjoining residential areas;
- (d) Express concern to the County Council that the conflicting needs of pedestrian access and safety needs further consideration;
- (e) Support bus priority measures and improved facilities in the city centre to improve on-street bus movements through the City;

- (f) Support the spur into Addenbrooke's Hospital as this will provide an attractive alternative to the car for employees and visitors to this major trip generator in the city;
- (g) Remind the County Council that South Cambridgeshire District Council has supported the Local Transport Plan and will work in partnership with the County Council to ensure that the Government provides adequate funds for this scheme. Require the County Council to continue to work closely in partnership with the District Council and Parish Councils along the route to address local issues;
- (h) Support the provision of a maintenance track and the creation of a cycleway / bridleway along the length of the guided section in whatever form it is provided. This will provide important high quality cycle infrastructure between the villages and Cambridge;
- (i) Note that these issues may need further consideration at later stages in the process;
- (j) Advise the County Council that there will be a need to consider restricting the hours of operation for the Park and Ride sites to avoid undue intrusion on nearby residential properties;
- (k) Advise the County Council that the preferred approach would be Option 1 (Histon) because on balance it has the least impact on local residents;
- (l) Require that the environmental impact assessment be completed and the District Council advised of its findings.

5. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW: PROPOSED FURTHER CHANGES TO THE EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM OF THE DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

Cabinet had debated the proposed further changes informally on 27th June, but had deferred a decision until this meeting to allow time for them to be considered. Members at the earlier meeting had indicated that strong representations should be made to the Cambridgeshire County Council including concern about the County Council's approach to consultation.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) confirmed that the issue of extra housing and the need for additional schools at Cambourne was one which should be considered under the Local Development Framework. The District Council was objecting to the inclusion of references to Cambourne in the Structure Plan as it was a Local Development Framework issue.

Cabinet

AGREED to object to the additional suggested supporting text changes to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan for the reasons outlined in the report of the Planning Director.

6. HOUSING BENEFIT CHANGES

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder explained that the Government proposed to replace Housing Benefits to private tenants with a standard housing allowance, but was also proposing withdrawing direct payment of benefit to landlords. If both these proposals were successful in the private sector, the Government intended to introduce them in the public sector. The Housing Portfolio Holder advised that the introduction of these proposals would incur extra work and expenditure for the District Council through the collection of rents and the non-payment of rents. The Leader felt that it could be mentioned in the Comprehensive Performance Assessment that these proposals would create a non-efficient use of Council staff.

Cabinet

AGREED to write to the Department for Works and Pensions welcoming the move to simplify the benefits system but raising their concerns over the issues outlined in the report of the Finance and Resources Director.

7. HOUSING BENEFIT SANCTIONS – ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

The Housing Portfolio Holder reported proposals by the Department for Works and Pensions to introduce Housing Benefit sanctions for tenants guilty of anti-social behaviour and explained that there was a relatively small anti-social behaviour problem in the District. She was concerned that the legislation would cause division between private residents and public tenants, and require additional expense and staffing for District Council. She felt that, if required to choose one of the two options outlined in the proposal, Option 1 would be preferable as the “least bad idea”, provided that a warning system were established and used prior to taking a person to court.

There was strong opposition to the proposed sanctions. The Community Development Portfolio Holder noted that the types of behaviour cited by the Government were issues already covered by laws and should be dealt with by the police, not the local authority. Councillor RF Collinson queried whether it was legal to cut off benefits to a family, possibly making them homeless. Cabinet

AGREED that the Director of Finance and Resources respond to the Government that the proposals are divisive and discriminatory against people on benefits.

8. CAMBRIDGE CITY LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

The Principal Planning Policy Officer (Transport) explained that a number of issues for South Cambridgeshire in the Cambridge City Deposit Draft Local Plan had been identified in the report. Since the closing date for formal representations was before the date of Cabinet, representations, which had been endorsed by the Leader of Council and the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder, had already been submitted to the County Council.

Cabinet

AGREED to support the objections to the Deposit Draft Cambridge City Local Plan as detailed in the report of the Planning Director.

9. EXTENSION TO FIXED TERM POST OF SPECIAL PROJECTS OFFICER (CAMBOURNE OFFICE RE-LOCATION)

The post of Special Projects Officer (Cambourne Office Re-location) was due to expire on 31st March 2004. It was felt desirable to extend the post to 31st May 2004 now that Cabinet had set a move date of the May Day Bank Holiday (1st, 2nd and 3rd May) 2004.

AGREED that post F.3.18 (Special Projects Officer – Cambourne Re-location) have its duration extended to 31st May 2004.

10. RAINWATER HARVESTING

The New Offices Working (NOW) Group had considered rainwater harvesting at the new offices the previous week and expressed sympathy for the project, noting that costs would be recovered within six years, following which savings would be made on annual water bills for the new building. There was an opportunity to add the system during construction, saving money on having it retrofitted in the future. The Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder commended the system to Cabinet as a way the District Council could demonstrate its commitment to sustainability through leading by example.

The Strategic Development Officer reported that revised costings had been received, bringing the installation cost of a 35,000L tank to £15,000, a cost recoverable within 5-6 years. Two quotations had been received from suppliers and a third was awaited. Other companies in similarly sized buildings with this system retrofitted had spent approximately £3-4,000 for digging the hole and £20,000 on installation. Water was becoming an increasingly expensive commodity and should be conserved as much as possible. Using harvested rainwater in toilets, backed up by mains water as necessary, reduced demand for treated water.

The NOW Group had asked if there were any non-essential building plans which could be removed to allow funds for this project, such as the feature wall. The Special Projects Officer (Cambourne Office Re-location), having spoken to the developer, informed members that removal of the feature wall would be a savings of £2,350 only. As the installation of this system would exceed the budget for the new offices, Cabinet would have to make a recommendation to full Council.

A vote was held and with four votes to three, Cabinet **AGREED** to defer this item to the next meeting, asking the officers to provide further details, the NOW Group to identify any further savings, and that a visit be arranged to a site where a similar system was being used.

Information Item

11. IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW FINANCIAL SYSTEMS

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder updated members on the current status of the implementation and noted the revised figures in the appendix, which reduced the difference in the original and revised budgets to £107,000. The system would streamline the ordering process and bring budget holders in more direct control of their budgets. There had been some transition difficulties but officers were now working to catch up.

Cabinet **NOTED** the report.

Standing Items

12. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Following the non-publication of a negative decision, the Scrutiny Committee had asked Cabinet to consider the minuting and publication thereof of Portfolio Holder meetings. It was noted that some Portfolio Holder meetings were already minuted.

Councillor SGM Kindersley, Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, clarified that the Scrutiny Committee resolution was to ask Cabinet to consider the publication of Portfolio Holder Meeting minutes if minutes were already being taken, thus there was no additional work being requested other than the inclusion of the minutes in the Weekly Bulletin. Although it was unclear which member had requested consideration of this item, a vote had been taken and the Scrutiny Committee had been in favour of referring it to Cabinet.

The following issues were discussed:

- The additional work for the Committee Section if all Portfolio Holder meetings were minuted;
- Those Portfolio Holders who already had their meetings minuted were happy with the system and felt minutes were essential to open government and part of an audit trail to show how decisions were made;
- Whether there was anything to be gained which was not already addressed in decision notices published in the Weekly Bulletin;
- Negative decisions should be published in the Weekly Bulletin;
- Cabinet members were available and willing to answer questions from all members regarding reports and decisions both before and after Portfolio Holder meetings and decisions could be called in;
- Some issues being considered had a direct personal impact on individuals and could not be published;
- Many items from Portfolio Holder Meetings were also discussed at Advisory Groups, which were open to all members;
- Local members were consulted on issues before decisions were taken by Portfolio Holders; and
- There was a danger of making the Weekly Bulletin too long.

Cabinet asked that it be made clear to the Scrutiny Committee that Portfolio Holders were available for discussion of any decisions.

It was concluded that it should be a matter for individual portfolio holders to determine whether their meetings should be minuted and, if so, whether the minutes should be published on the Weekly Bulletin.

13. RE-LOCATION OF OFFICES TO CAMBOURNE

See Minute 10.

14. REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL BY CONSULTANTS

The new pay scales had been implemented and staff would receive their new salaries on their July paycheques. Work was continuing on the backdating of pay.

15. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 5 and 11 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Confidential Items

16. LITTLE WILBRAHAM – DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT

The Housing Portfolio Holder explained that, although a large grant was requested, it was in the best interests of the family to remain in Little Wilbraham, as they had a high level of support within the village. The works total was amended to £73,442.39, lowering the grant total to £64,115.41. Councillor CC Barker, as local member, supported the grant and commended it to Cabinet.

The Home Improvement Agency Project Co-ordinator explained that a move to a bungalow had been considered but nowhere suitable could be found within the village. It was queried whether this was a viable long-term solution and the Home Improvement Agency Project Co-ordinator noted that, in a similar case, only the lift needed adjusting to accommodate a larger electric wheelchair as the child grew. It was not known if the current case made provision for an adjustable lift.

Cabinet

AGREED that a Disabled Facilities Grant of £64,115.41 be approved and gave delegated approval to the Director of Housing and Community Services to spend above that figure if it was necessary to include an adjustable lift.

17. REGRADING OF POST

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder explained that the regrading of this post would bring the structure of the Cambourne/New Town/Special Projects Team in line with the other Planning Area Teams.

Cabinet

AGREED that post P.2.27 be re-graded from that of Planning Assistant to that of Senior Planning Officer at scp 27/34.

The meeting closed at 13.25pm

DECISIONS MADE BY PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

Decision Made By Housing Portfolio Holder

Subject	Decision	Reason
Housing Allocation Appeals and Management Transfers	To award Miss J a Management Transfer (ref W/03/007)	Miss J requires a transfer to more suitable accommodation
	To award Mrs B and family a Management Transfer (ref E/03/012)	A transfer would enable this family to remain in their decant property
	To award Mr and Mrs B a Management Transfer (ref S/03/010)	A transfer would enable this family to remain in their decant property
	To award Mrs S a Management Transfer (ref E/03/011)	Mrs S's home is due for redevelopment and re-housing will reduce the stress of her situation
	To award a Management Transfer to Mrs C and family (ref S/03/009)	Mrs C requires a transfer due to the special need of her son

GENERAL INFORMATION ITEMS

Call-In Arrangements

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee or any five other Councillors may call in any executive decision recorded in this bulletin for review. The Committee Manager must be notified of any call in by **Wednesday 30th July 2003 at 5pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 1st July 2003**.

Any member considering calling in a decision made by Cabinet is requested to contact the Committee 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 Committee Procedure Rules', paragraph 12.