

COUNCILLORS' BULLETIN

18TH AUGUST 2004

CONTENTS



South
Cambridgeshire
District Council

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Committee Meetings
2. Lunch Time Seminar
3. Tenants Open Day
4. Call in

DECISIONS MADE BY THE HOUSING PORTFOLIO HOLDER

1. Application for vehicular right of way over the Council Land to 10 Hall Close, **Bourn**
2. Release of restrictive covenant on land rear of 30 Church End, **Rampton**
3. Sale of Council Land rear of 28/30 Newton Road, **Whittlesford** and consideration of the future of all Council Land to the rear of 22-36 Newton Road
4. Sale of Council Land rear of 6 Horseshoes Lane, **Weston Green**
5. Application for vehicular right of way over Council Land to proposed development off Lacey's Way, **Duxford**

MINUTES

1. County Council Minutes from the 27th July 2004
2. County Council/Cambridge City/South Cambs Strategic Forum Minutes from the 19 July 2004

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FROM:
23rd – 27th August 2004**

Monday 23rd August 2004	9 am	Speed Reading Training	Council Chamber
Tuesday 24th August 2004	12 pm	South Cambs Magazine – telling the story. *Lunchtime seminar*	Council Chamber
Wednesday 25th August 2004			
Thursday 26th August 2004	2 pm	Council	Council Chamber
Friday 27th August 2004			

INFORMATION ITEMS

***South Cambs Magazine and Key Issues: telling the story*
Lunch Seminar - Tuesday 24 August, 12pm, Council Chamber**

Councillors (and staff) are invited to attend a half hour presentation on how our community publication, South Cambs Magazine is produced and also a look at the tenant's newsletter Key Issues. The presentation will include reader survey feedback for South Cambs Magazine and how the two publications are edited, designed and distributed.

The presentation will be followed by a chance to ask questions and then lunch.

If you would like to attend please reserve your seat with Reception on (01954) 713001 or email reception@scambs.gov.uk

**Tenants Open Day – Saturday 4th September 2004
10am - 3pm at Sawston Free Church, High Street, Sawston**

Dear Councillors,

I am writing to invite you all to the above event. This year we have two halls, one for the exhibition and the other for refreshments and the tombola stall. The exhibition will include housing, environmental health, rents and housing benefits. Tenant representatives and the independent tenant advisor will also be present to answer any queries from tenants concerning the housing options appraisal.

Sandwiches and cakes will be served by the WI between 12 and 2pm and tea and coffee will be available all day. A tombola stall will be running again this year, with proceeds going to the East Anglian Air Ambulance (any donations for prizes would be appreciated). Tenants have been advised that they can contact me for transport if they have difficulties getting to the event. Following on from last year we will be having a prize draw for tenants, by way of completing and handing in a questionnaire on the day.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me on 01954 713271 or via my email tracey.cassidy@scambs.gov.uk.

IT Queries

Following the recent IT training for councillors, several queries were raised. Please find the answers below:

I would like a mouse for my laptop rather than using the keypad, can I request one?

This is fine, please contact Eileen Diver on 01954 713284 or email eileen.diver@scamb.gov.uk

If I delete my emails, are they retrievable?

You can retrieve email if it is in the deleted items folder before you shut down each time. Retrieval of email after this will depend on where the item was deleted from and when. South Cambridgeshire District Council cannot retrieve these items for you as it is the responsibility of your Internet Service Provider (ISP). Please contact your ISP helpdesk directly for more information and assistance.

My email cuts out and stops/hangs when I am downloading large files, why does this happen?

When you are using the internet to retrieve files (large or small) South Cambridgeshire District Council has no control over the speed or connection provided by your ISP. Please contact your ISP helpdesk directly for more information and assistance.

Do we have appropriate virus checking/email filtering facilities installed on our SCDC computers?

All SCDC machines have SOPHOS anti-virus software installed which is configured to do automatic updates whenever you are connected to the internet without you having to do anything.

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 Democratic Services Manager must be notified of any call in by **Wednesday 25th August 2004 at 5pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Thursday 26th August July 2004**.

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 Committee Procedure Rules', paragraph 12.

DECISIONS MADE BY HOUSING PORTFOLIO HOLDER

Applicant	Decision
Application for vehicular right of way over the Council Land to 10 Hall Close, Bourn	Agree to grant vehicular access over Council land to 10 Hall Close for a temporary period whereby the drive is removed and the grassed section of open space reinstated after the specific personal circumstances of the applicant's family no longer apply. Include the condition that "reinforced grass" is used for the crossover, that the access is maintained by the grantee and that no vehicles are parked on the grassway.
Release of restrictive covenant on land rear of 30 Church End, Rampton	Agreed not to allow the release of the restrictive covenant on this land
Sale of Council Land rear of 28/30 Newton Road, Whittlesford and consideration of the future of all Council Land to the rear of 22-36 Newton Road	Agree to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Retain the land rear of 28/30 Newton Rd in Council ownership ii) Amend the current Licence to allow the Parish Council, if required, to extend the play area into some or all of the allotment land and the strip of land adjacent.
Sale of Council Land rear of 6 Horseshoes Lane, Weston Green	Agree to retain the land in Council ownership but allow the owner of 6 Horseshoes Lane to construct a hard-surfaced driveway over the land to their garage, at their own expense and with the condition that they will maintain it and will accept liability in the event of any claim.
Application for vehicular right of way over Council Land to proposed development off Lacey's Way, Duxford	Agree to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Grant to the applicant the right of vehicular access over Council land from Lacey's Way, Duxford to the proposed new development, on condition that the applicant is responsible for all works and alterations required, that the existing car parking areas are retained and that the applicant contributes to the future maintenance of the existing unadopted roadway. ii) Grant an easement to the applicant to connect the new development to the existing Council-owned foul water drainage network on condition that the applicant contributes to future maintenance of the network; iii) Grant permission for temporary works to install underground services across Council land, subject to sufficient notice being given in order to inform local residents.
Proposed fence fronting 71 Hereward Close, Impington	Agree to allow as an exception in the circumstances, bushes to be planted on the side boundary of 71 Hereward Close adjacent the footpath of a size which would minimise the effect on the appearance of the area.

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 27th July 2004

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 4.00 p.m.

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor: R Driver (Chairman)

Councillors: P D Bailey, C M Ballard, C C Barker,
R S G Barnwell, I C Bates, T J Bear, B S Bhalla, A J Bowen,
S V Brinton, J Broadway, C Carter, R L Clarke, J E Coston,
P J Downes, J A P Eddy, M Farrar, S A Giles, J L Gluza,
P D Gooden, A Hansard, B Hardy, G F Harper, V A Hearne-Casapieri,
G J Heathcock, W G M Hensley, J L Huppert,
S F Johnstone, A C Kent, I C Kidman, S J E King, M L Leeke,
V H Lucas, A R Mair, R B Martlew, L W McGuire, A K Melton,
A S Milton, S B Normington, M K Ogden, L J Oliver, A G Orgee, D R
Pegram, J A Powley, P A E Read, J E Reynolds, C E Shaw,
P W Silby, R C Speechley, A B Stenner, P L Stroude, J M Tuck,
J K Walters, R Wilkinson, L J Wilson and F H Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors H J Fitch and A A Reid

222. MINUTES: 25th MAY 2004

The minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 25th May 2004 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

223. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

New Councillor

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Colin Barker, the new member for Fulbourn, to his first meeting of the Council.

Assistant Director (Planning)

The Chairman congratulated John Onslow, the Assistant Director (Planning), on his appointment as Director for Development with the Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Partnership.

Awards

The Chairman led members in offering congratulations to:

- Matthew Lugg, on his award as Municipal Engineer of the Year by the Institute of Civil Engineers
- Environment and Transport staff on being awarded the Carmen Environmental Award for the Cambridge Core Traffic Scheme
- Trading Standards staff for winning the Brindley Medal, the Trading Standards Institute's award for excellence, for the Ask CEdRIC website
- Staff involved with the Council's Library Learning Vehicle, which had received a Certificate of Merit from the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals

- The Countryside Services Team, which was responsible for the Council and its partners receiving five Riders' Charter Awards from the British Horse Society for the creation of new bridleways
- The Education, Libraries and Heritage Directorate on its achieving Investors in People status.

224. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared personal interests under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in relation to item 6(b) on the Cabinet report of 15th June 2004 under Minute 226, North Cambridge Primary Education Provision:

- Councillor A J Bowen as a Governor of Park Street Primary School
- Councillor S V Brinton as a Governor of Mayfield Primary School
- Councillor J L Huppert as a Governor of St Andrew's Junior School
- Councillor I C Kidman as a Governor of Arbury Primary School
- Councillor M L Leeke as a member of the temporary governing body of Milton Road School
- Councillor L J Wilson as a Governor of Histon Nursery School.

Councillor S V Brinton declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in relation to item 4 on the Cabinet report of 13th July 2004 under Minute 226, Statement of Accounts 2003/04, as a member of the Learning and Skills Council.

Councillor J L Gluza declared a personal interest under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct in relation to item 6 on the Cabinet report of 13th July 2004 under Minute 226, Adult Services Strategic Plan, because a relative of his was in receipt of care from Social Services and Cambridge City Primary Care Trust.

225. PETITIONS

The Chairman reported that four petitions had been received.

The first contained 816 signatures and read, 'Petition against decision to axe Citi 5 Fen Estate to Trumpington and Citi 4 Kings Hedges (Meadows) to Cherry Hinton – we the undersigned declare our opposition to the axeing of the above buses'. Mrs Dawn Mabbutt attended the meeting, spoke in support of the petition and answered members' questions.

The second contained 122 signatures and read, 'Save our buses – Stagecoach are removing buses numbers 4 and 5, leaving Chesterton with one minibus per hour. Please sign this petition to save our buses'. Mrs Lilian Speed and Mr William McCann attended the meeting. Mr McCann spoke in support of the petition and answered members' questions.

The third contained 479 signatures and opposed the proposed replacement of Stagecoach services C4 and C5 with a minibus service from 25th July. Dr Judith Pinnington attended the meeting, spoke in support of the petition and answered members' questions.

The fourth contained 70 signatures and 13 letters of support and called for a noise reduction barrier to be installed on the A14 at Impington by the Highways Agency. Mr Brian Williams attended the meeting, spoke in support of the petition and answered members' questions.

The Chairman confirmed that written responses would be sent to all four petitioners.

226. REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, moved receipt of the reports of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 15th June 2004 and 13th July 2004.

Report of the meeting on 15th June 2004

Key decisions for determination

- 1) Premature Retirement in the Interests of the Efficient Exercise of the Authority's Functions (PRIEEAF)

The Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, moved the following, which was seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor J E Reynolds:

That the new PRIEEAF scheme, incorporating the proposed changes agreed by the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive, be approved.

Councillor J L Huppert asked in what circumstances the discretion given under the new scheme to the Leader of the Council, the Chief Executive and the Monitoring Officer to allow compensatory added years in exceptional circumstances might be exercised. Councillor S J E King suggested that the scheme should be more explicit about the nature of these exceptional circumstances. He also suggested that the discretion should be exercised by another body, rather than by the three post-holders currently proposed.

Councillor J L Huppert emphasised the need to relate the scheme to long-term retirement planning, to allow for different times and styles of retirement.

Councillor R L Clarke sought assurance that changes to the requirements of jobs and below par performance would whenever possible be managed through the staff development and appraisal processes, rather than by having recourse to the PRIEEAF scheme.

Councillor M Farrar noted that one of the criteria for use of the scheme was to improve the balance in the age structure of the workforce as a whole or of a particular section. He sought assurance that no individual would be compulsorily retired for this reason.

Councillor I C Kidman suggested that employees should be allowed to express an interest in being considered under the scheme.

Councillor P D Gooden commented that the penultimate paragraph on the first page of the scheme should refer to 'unfair dismissal' and not to 'constructive dismissal'.

Responding to the speakers, the Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, accepted a number of the points raised. However, he stated his view that employees should not be allowed to apply for consideration under the scheme and that the exceptional circumstances under which compensatory added years might be given should not be specified, to enable the scheme to be administered flexibly.

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

[Voting pattern: All members in favour except Councillor P D Gooden who voted against.]

2) 'Prospects for Learning' – Single Education Plan

The Cabinet Member for Education, Libraries and Heritage, Councillor R Wilkinson, moved the following, which was seconded by the Lead Member for Education Resources, Councillor F H Yeulett:

That the draft Single Education Plan, 'Prospects for Learning', be formally approved.

Councillor R Wilkinson noted that the preparation of a Single Education Plan was no longer a statutory requirement, because new legislation currently going through Parliament would require the preparation of a Children's Plan, to include Education alongside other services. However, given the work that Cambridgeshire had done in piloting the Single Education Plan, it was proposed that it should still be used as the Education framework as the Council moved towards integrated children's services.

Councillors A C Kent and I C Kidman both reported their Groups' support for the Plan as a coherent statement of principles. However, Councillor Kent expressed concern, given that the Plan was no longer statutory, at the amount of time that officers had spent addressing Government's requirements, and suggested that this be raised through the Local Government Association.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was approved unanimously.

Items for information

3) OfSTED Inspection of the County Council as a Local Education Authority

Comments on this item were made under item 8 of the Cabinet report of 13th July 2004.

4) Trading Standards Advice and Enquiries Policy

Councillor J L Gluza noted that under the new policy, complaints that amounted to alleged breaches of criminal law would be formally investigated only in the most serious cases. He expressed concern that minor cases of fraud could be of great significance for vulnerable members of the community and should be given equal importance.

Responding, the Lead Member for Community and Economic Development, Councillor A K Melton, agreed that minor frauds were a serious issue needing to be tackled.

Councillors P W Silby and R L Clarke commended Trading Standards on their recent handling of business enquiries and management of overweight vehicles.

5) Cambridge Information Signing System

Councillor J L Huppert asked for clarification on whether the middle signing ring would be pursued, given that the papers to the Cambridge City Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee and Cabinet had suggested that it would not. He also suggested that full consultation should be carried out on the

additional signs now proposed, as had been done for those included in the original proposals.

Councillor J Broadway suggested that there should be a systematic review of signage in the historic core of Cambridge.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Councillor S F Johnstone, reported that there had been a recent review of signage and that a number of redundant signs had been removed. She confirmed that the middle signing ring would proceed and noted that there had been local consultation on the additional signs.

6) Other Matters of Interest

a) Social Services Budgetary Control

Councillors J L Huppert and M Farrar expressed concern that weaknesses in financial management skills and training had been known about for some time and sought assurance that these were being addressed as quickly as possible.

Councillor A C Kent expressed concern that financial difficulties within Social Services could affect the integrations of services such as those for people with learning disabilities, older people and children, and emphasised the need for a robust approach to be taken to these.

Councillor J Broadway commented that monitoring reports should be submitted to Social Services Spokes monthly, not quarterly, and to Cabinet more frequently than annually. Councillor S V Brinton endorsed this comment and asked whether the monitoring reports to Spokes had identified during the course of the year the financial difficulties of the Learning Disability Partnership.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Social Services, Councillor J A Powley, confirmed that the Learning Disability Partnership was covered by the budgetary control reports presented to Social Services Spokes. He agreed that effective budgetary control was essential to partnership working and noted that both the Council and its partners would also be making regular monitoring reports to the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership. He also noted that significant progress was being made in delivering staff training on financial control.

b) North Cambridge Primary Education Provision

Councillor P D Gooden welcomed the decision to proceed with a new primary school at Arbury Camps. He noted that the initial proposal was for a 120-place school and asked whether the design would allow subsequent expansion to 240 places, if this were appropriate.

Councillors P J Downes and A C Kent noted that the School Organisation Service Development Group and some Heads had expressed concern about the need to manage surplus school places north of the river.

Councillor L J Wilson welcomed the decision to build the new school and suggested that, given the development's location as a gateway to Cambridge, the school should be of a flagship design. Referring to the earlier petition about the impact of traffic noise on properties in Impington, he expressed concern that the development at Arbury Camps could intensify the problem by reflecting noise back across the A14.

Councillor I C Kidman welcomed the new school but emphasised the need to address the condition of the buildings at Arbury Primary School, some of which were fifty years old.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Education, Libraries and Heritage, Councillor R Wilkinson, noted that the decision to proceed with the new school had been taken after extensive consultation. He confirmed that the footprint of the building would allow for a 240-place school, but, recognising the need to review the issue of surplus places north of the river, initially only a 120-place school would be built. He agreed that there were likely to be a number of opportunities for innovative design on the Arbury Camps site.

Report of the meeting on 13th July 2004

Key decisions for determination

1) Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report 2003/04

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Councillor S F Johnstone, moved the following, which was seconded by the Lead Member for Community and Economic Development, Councillor A K Melton:

That Council approves the Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report 2003/04 Prospects (Corporate Plan) and Policy Framework for 2004-08.

In moving the recommendation, Councillor Johnstone offered her congratulations to Matthew Lugg on his nomination as Municipal Engineer of the Year. She thanked him and all staff in Environment and Transport for the achievements reflected in the Annual Progress Report.

Councillor C E Shaw commented that the levels of growth envisaged for the Cambridge sub-region would lead to significantly increased volumes of traffic. He suggested that the Council should give serious consideration to road-pricing, in tandem with improvements to public transport, to help address problems of congestion.

Councillor J A Powley highlighted the need to improve the A412 between the new Fordham bypass and the junction with the A14. He asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to write to Suffolk County Council, which was responsible for this road.

Councillor T J Bear commended the Directorate on the achievements of the past year, but noted that a number of future initiatives relating to bus and rail travel would be dependent on partners' collaboration. In particular, the deregulation of bus services and companies' focussing on the most profitable routes would make it increasingly difficult for the Council to meet its target on the percentage of rural households within a 13-minute walk of an hourly or more frequent service. Councillor J Broadway noted that the Council was proposing to develop a number of community transport schemes, but commented that these were not an effective alternative to public bus services.

Councillor G J Heathcock emphasised the need for bus operators to consult effectively with the Council and the public when proposing changes to services, because people might have constructive suggestions to make. Councillor L J Oliver emphasised the need for the Council to liaise effectively with operators, particularly with Stagecoach over the changes referred to in the petitions earlier in the meeting.

With regard to the new bus lane scheme for Hills Road, Councillor Heathcock asked for local members to be briefed on this sensitive scheme before the details were made public. He also asked for updates on the introduction of real-time bus information and on proposals to replace street lighting columns. Councillor C M Ballard emphasised the need for real-time bus information to include a robust telephone information line, as well as signs at bus-stops.

Councillor A R Mair congratulated the Directorate on its achievements but expressed concern that Parish Councils did not always receive replies to their correspondence, suggesting that additional administrative support might be appropriate. Councillor P J Downes also expressed concern about the divisional Highways offices' workloads, noting that delay between consultation on a scheme and its implementation could lead to local dissatisfaction.

Councillor I C Bates asked that the A1123 between Houghton Hill and the Wyton junction be included in the Council's noise-reducing road surfacing scheme.

Councillor A K Melton emphasised the need to complete the Ely southern route as soon as possible, especially as traffic in this part of the County would increase once the Fordham bypass was open. He also emphasised the need to dual the A47 as soon as possible, to relieve traffic congestion and help regenerate the Fenland economy.

Councillor J M Tuck welcomed the new Pedestrian Strategy and emphasised the importance of maintaining footways, particularly so that they were safe for vulnerable and elderly people to use. Councillor A J Bowen also emphasised the importance of maintaining cycleways to a high standard, to encourage cyclists to use them in preference to on-road routes.

Councillor S J E King thanked those officers involved in the successful Wisbech Market Town Strategy. He suggested that it would be appropriate to pilot real-time bus information in a market town such as Wisbech, where buses were less frequent than in Cambridge. He also noted that a local group was campaigning to re-open the Wisbech to March railway line as a tourist line and hoped that the Council would support this.

Councillor J E Coston highlighted the need for improvements to junctions on the A10, as well as traffic-calming for villages adjacent to the A14 to discourage 'rat-running'.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Councillor S F Johnstone, acknowledged the importance of effective consultation by bus operators before changes were made to bus services. She noted that the drought damage caused to roads in the summer of 2003 had necessitated some re-prioritising of the highways maintenance programme, as the full cost had not been met by Government. She recognised the importance of maintaining footways and cycleways, but emphasised that the Council continued to be capital-rich and revenue-poor. She agreed that the Council should support the A47 Alliance, which was campaigning for the dualling of the A47, but at the same time emphasised the need to develop effective public transport issues throughout the County to further social inclusion. She also reported that tenders had been issued for the development of real-time bus information and that further work was being done on the funding of street-lighting column replacement.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was approved unanimously.

2) Section 31 Partnership Agreement – Integrated Community Equipment Services

The Cabinet Member for Social Services, Councillor J A Powley, moved the following, which was seconded by the Lead Member for Vulnerable Adults, Councillor D R Pegram:

- i) That the Council agrees to the establishment of a Section 31 agreement for integrated community equipment services;
- ii) To delegate authority to approve and sign the final Section 31 agreement to the Cabinet Member for Social Services in consultation with the Director of Social Services.

Councillor C M Ballard welcomed the integration of community equipment services as the next step following the integration of occupational therapy services. He welcomed the progress made in providing occupational therapy services and expressed the hope that this integration would lead to improved delivery times for equipment. He also emphasised the need to work closely with the District Councils on the delivery of major aids and adaptations. Councillor I C Bates expressed concern that the capping by Government of District Councils' Disabled Facilities Grants would limit collaboration in this area.

Councillors S V Brinton and J L Huppert welcomed the principle of integration, but expressed a number of concerns about the detailed wording of the Section 31 agreement. Issues included the detail of the financial monitoring and reporting arrangements, including the provision of information by the Anglia Support Partnership and reporting to members; local members' access to information as part of their ward casework; and the provision of information to the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee. They sought assurance that these concerns would be taken into account.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Social Services, Councillor J A Powley, noted that he and the Director of Social Services had listened to members' concerns and would take these into account before finalising the Section 31 agreement. He shared members' concerns about the need for effective financial reporting by both the Council and its partners and noted that a report on this was scheduled for the meeting of the Cambridgeshire Care Partnership on 14th September 2004.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was approved unanimously.

3) Financial Outturn for 2003/04

The Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, moved the following, which was seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor J E Reynolds:

- i) That the Council approves £50,000 of debt charges underspend being rolled forward to fund the Supplementary Credit Approval (SCA) contribution to the repair of drought-damaged roads;
- ii) That the Council approves the virement of £400,000 from Social Services to Policy to finance the capitalisation of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) expenditure, which will release funding to cover the Financial Services Income and Payments deficit.

Councillor J L Huppert questioned the way in which the Council's carry-forwards had been presented, noting that the figure of £7.9 million included £9.3 million of schools' carry-forwards, without which the figure would be - £1.4 million. Councillor P J Downes emphasised that the schools' carry-forwards were distinct and not available for use by the Council.

Councillor M Farrar asked whether the target to reduce debts by 15%, which had been met and exceeded by 10%, related to debts owed to or by the Council, and how this related to the figures reported figures for debtors and creditors.

Responding, the Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, emphasised that the Council's general reserves were £5.6 million, which equated to 1.2% of net revenue expenditure, as compared with the Shire County average of 1.4%. No suggestion had been made that the Council was able to use the schools' carry-forwards funds. He agreed to send a written response to Councillor Farrar's query.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was approved unanimously.

4) Statement of Accounts 2003/04

The Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, moved the following, which was seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor J E Reynolds:

That the Council approves the 2003/04 Statement of Accounts, including the Statement of Internal Control.

Councillor S V Brinton welcomed the recognition by the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive of weaknesses in some of the Council's financial systems and the need to address these. She expressed concern that the trading account for Financial Services was overspent by £111,000 and that a number of other trading accounts such as Catering and Cleaning were also in deficit, when these had been set up in the expectation that they would remain in surplus. She suggested that there should be a detailed inquiry into the reasons for the overspends on these accounts. She noted that the long-term debt owed by the former Further Education Funding Council had now been transferred to the Learning and Skills Council. She expressed concern that the Statement showed that a significant proportion of the Council's revenue from Government continued to be in the form of specific grants, limiting local flexibility.

Councillor J L Huppert expressed concern that the £229,000 balance in the Capital Financing Fund would be of limited use in financing capital projects. He also noted that the balance of the Good Housekeeping Fund had reduced to £1,254,000 and asked how many loans from the Fund were outstanding, whether they had been used successfully and what were the future plans for the use of the fund. He also highlighted some minor corrections that he would send to the Director of Resources.

Responding, the Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, emphasised that the Cabinet had commissioned the Pegram report to assess weaknesses in financial systems and take steps to address them. He accepted the correction with regard to the Further Education Funding Council and endorsed Councillor Brinton's comments on Government grants. With regard to the Good Housekeeping Fund, he noted that Resources Spokes had already requested greater transparency of information about the use of this Fund.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was approved unanimously.

Key decisions for information

5) Reshaping the Organisation – Initial Proposals

Councillors A C Kent and S V Brinton accepted the principle of reorganisation. However, they expressed concern that the wider reshaping of the organisation, with the need to define senior management structures, was accelerating the integration of children's services, when time was needed to involve all staff and change cultures. They emphasised the need for proper consultation on the integration of children's services and expressed concern that much of the consultation would be taking place over the summer break, although the decision to defer Cabinet's discussion to 12th October 2004 was welcome. They also expressed concern that no business plan had yet been prepared for the reshaping and that associated risks had not been assessed. Councillor Brinton urged the Leader of the Council to be flexible in taking forward the proposals and to slow down if necessary, especially to avoid the potential need for further changes with the advent of the new Council in 2005.

Councillor P J Downes thanked the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive for their useful contributions to the Policy Scrutiny and Audit Committee's scrutiny of the proposals. He shared the previous speakers' concern that, even with the extension of time, the proposed consultation period would prevent many school governing bodies from responding, which would not help allay their concerns about the proposed changes. He also highlighted the need for a business plan, particularly given the link being made in the Council's publicity between the reshaping and cost reductions.

Councillor J L Huppert welcomed the greater prominence given to Environment in the revised proposals and suggested that this be taken a step further, separating Environment from Economic Development. He queried the proposed link between Finance and Performance Review.

Councillor I C Kidman reported that the Labour Group supported the reorganisation in principle, but wished to emphasise the need to move forward flexibly and to continue to consult and liaise with partners even after the October Cabinet meeting. He expressed support for a structure based on three Assistant Chief Executives, but suggested that the Assistant Chief Executive responsible for children's services should be an educationalist, reflecting the fact that the Council had responsibilities towards all children in this area, but towards a smaller proportion of children for children's social services. He also noted that the reorganisation should be used to address the issues of corporate overheads and effective corporate use of IT.

Councillor C E Shaw emphasised the need to ensure that the proposed changes to Environment and Transport did not compromise the success of the services covered by this Directorate. Councillor C M Ballard made similar comments relating to Children's Social Services, recognising the need for integration but highlighting the need to maintain current strengths. He expressed some reservations about the proposed six Directors for Children's Services, suggesting instead that there should be three service Directors, with the three area Directors immediately below them acting as drivers for integration and collaboration.

Councillor S J E King welcomed the postponement of the Cabinet decision until

12th October 2004, but emphasised the need to maintain sufficient momentum in introducing the changes, especially given the effect of the uncertainty on staff morale.

Responding, the Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, recognised the need to consult and to respond to the representations received, but endorsed Councillor King's comments on the need to take decisions and make progress. He confirmed that a full business case would be presented to members before they were asked formally to approve the restructuring. He emphasised that the main motivation for making changes was not to make savings but to improve service delivery. Nonetheless, it was expected that some savings would ensue.

6) Adult Services Strategic Plan

Councillor J L Gluza expressed concern that integrated health and social care services, including services for older people and people with mental health problems, were still operating very separately from each other. This meant that clients were having long waits for assessment and from assessment to the delivery of services. He emphasised the importance of the Council exercising its accountability for these services, not least because poor performance could adversely affect its forthcoming Comprehensive Performance Assessment score.

7) Proposed Improvements to the A10 Off and On Slip Roads to A14 at Milton
– Compulsory Purchase Order

Councillor J E Coston welcomed the proposed improvements to this interchange and highlighted the need for short-term improvements to signing to prevent people from entering it from the wrong direction.

Other decisions for information

8) OfSTED Inspection of the County Council as a Local Education Authority

The Cabinet Member for Education, Libraries and Heritage, Councillor R Wilkinson, thanked all those officers who had contributed to the inspection process. He noted that the excellent outcome was a particular achievement given that Cambridgeshire had been one of the first authorities to be inspected under OfSTED's new methodology. He also highlighted comments in the report on the positive role played by members.

9) The Youth Service: Post-OfSTED Action Plan

Councillor A C Kent drew attention to the detrimental effect of continued low funding on the Youth Service and noted that the post-OfSTED action plan would be effective only if adequately funded. Councillor P J Downes highlighted the particular importance of the Youth Service to young people in rural areas and asked what would happen if the action plan were not adequately funded.

Councillor I C Kidman expressed disappointment that the OfSTED report had highlighted shortcomings about the use of existing resources. He noted that to fund the Youth Service at the level recommended through the Formula Spending Share (FSS) would require a near-doubling of resources, and emphasised that this service should be one of the first to benefit if there were any relaxation of the ceiling to Cambridgeshire's grant.

Responding, the Lead Member for Lifelong Learning, Councillor V H Lucas,

emphasised that steps had already been taken to establish more effective management of the service and that Cabinet had been advised that the implementation of other elements of the action plan should be an MTSP priority.

Other matters for information

- 10) Performance on Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) and Key Performance Indicators for 2003/04
- 11) Monitoring of the Recommendations of the Joint Review of Social Services
- 12) Improving Financial Management: Progress Report
- 13) Cambridgeshire Direct Phase Two: Building Acquisition
- 14) Registration Services: Wisbech/March Premises

227. COUNCIL CONSTITUTION: SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee, Councillor L W McGuire, moved the report of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Committee held on 27th January 2004 and the recommendations it contained. The recommendations were seconded by Councillor S V Brinton.

Councillor J L Gluza expressed concern that the requirement for call-in requests to state the reason for the call-in would limit the role of the Scrutiny Committee Chairmen. He also felt that the requirement to put call-in requests in writing was unnecessarily restrictive.

Councillors L W McGuire, J K Walters and S V Brinton emphasised that there was no intention to restrict the Scrutiny Chairmen. Rather, the intention was to make the call-in process clearer by ensuring that the reasons for the call-in were known from the outset. Scrutiny Management Committee had agreed that 'writing' should include fax and e-mail.

Council resolved to agree:

- i) To insert the following sentence at the end of Scrutiny Procedure Rule 12(a):

'The Cabinet shall provide a written response to each of the Scrutiny Committee recommendations, including reasons where scrutiny recommendations are not accepted.'

- ii) To insert the following sentence after the end of the first sentence of Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16(c):

'The request for the call-in of a decision shall be conveyed in writing and shall specify the reason(s) why the decision is being called in.'

[Voting pattern: All members in favour except Councillors R L Clarke and J L Gluza against.]

228. COUNCIL CONSTITUTION: REVIEW OF POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY

The Chairman, Councillor R Driver, moved the following, which was seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor S B Normington, and agreed unanimously:

To approve a change in the allocation of seats on the Staff Appeals Committee, so that it comprises two Conservative members and one Liberal Democrat member, drawn from a pool of trained members.

229. COUNCIL CONSTITUTION: APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

The Chairman agreed that this additional item of urgent business be included on the agenda to enable the Appointments Committee to take decisions on local pay and reward in advance of the next Council meeting and to avoid the need for a special meeting of Council which might otherwise be necessary to agree the change.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, followed the following, which was seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor J E Reynolds:

To authorise the Appointments Committee to determine arrangements for local pay and reward and that Table 2, 'Responsibility for Council functions', in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution be amended accordingly.

Councillor M L Leeke asked whether the Appointments Committee would meet in private session when considering arrangements for local pay and reward. Councillor J K Walters responded that this had not yet been determined.

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

[Voting pattern: unanimous.]

230. WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Members noted that one written question had been submitted under Rule 9 of the Council Procedure Rules:

- Councillor J D Jones had asked the Cabinet Member for Social Services, Councillor J A Powley, about the numbers of disabled adults awaiting assessment and waiting times. The response set out the requested figures, where these were available.

Copies of the question and response are available from Democratic Services.

231. ORAL QUESTIONS

Four oral questions were asked under Rule 9 of the Council Procedure Rules:

- Councillor I C Bates asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Councillor S F Johnstone, about possible delays to the improvement of the A14 and the significance of these given the planned growth in the Cambridge sub-region. Councillor Johnstone reported that officers were investigating media reports of possible delays. It appeared that, given the complexity of the scheme, its completion date might slip to 2011.
- Councillor J L Huppert asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport what steps the Council might take to respond to the petitions on bus services presented earlier in the meeting, and to encourage Stagecoach to consult more effectively. Councillor Johnstone reminded members that the bus services referred to were commercial services and that the Council's resources to subsidise bus services were very limited. She agreed to raise the matters referred to in the petition with Stagecoach. As a supplementary question, Councillor Huppert asked about the suitability of Union Lane in Chesterton as a route for buses and coaches. Councillor Johnstone agreed to send a written response on this point.

- Councillor C M Ballard asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport about the delay to improvements to Carter Bridge in Cambridge, the cycle bridge over the railway linking Petersfield and Coleridge. Councillor Johnstone explained that the improvements had had to be deferred to the following year, in view of the urgent need to replace the unsafe Cutter Ferry Bridge.
- Councillor G J Heathcock asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport about the scope offered by the recent White Paper for local authorities to pilot new bus schemes using revenue funding from Government. Councillor Johnstone agreed that a successful bid to the proposed Transport Innovation Fund could enable the Council to explore radically enhanced bus services to tackle congestion.

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

232. MOTIONS

The following motion was proposed by Councillor G F Harper under Rule 10 of the Council Procedure Rules and seconded by Councillor J L Huppert:

‘This Council views with concern the proposed extension of compulsory postal voting at elections, believing that a secret ballot is the heart of the democratic process and that all-postal elections seriously compromise the security and confidentiality of the vote.’

A number of members spoke in support of the motion, emphasising that they did not oppose voluntary postal voting, but were concerned that all-postal voting would undermine the privacy, security and effectiveness of the ballot, and that there was no evidence that it led to sustained increases in turnout.

Speaking against the motion, Councillor P D Gooden argued that postal voting did encourage turnout, particularly as it made it easier for people working long hours to vote.

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

[Voting pattern: Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups in favour; Labour Group against.]

233. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

The following Committee membership changes were proposed by the Chairman, Councillor R Driver, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor S B Normington, and agreed unanimously:

- 1) Councillors J Broadway, M Farrar, and H J Fitch to replace Councillors B S Bhalla, C M Carter, J L Gluza, P D Gooden and J D Jones on the pool of members from which the Staff Appeals Committee is drawn;
- 2) Councillor J L Gluza to be appointed as Labour substitute member on the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee;
- 3) Councillor I C Kidman to replace Councillor J D Jones as one of the Council's representatives on the Local Government Association and on the County Councils' Network.

Chairman

CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY/CAMBRIDGE CITY/SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT JOINT STRATEGIC FORUM: NOTES

Date: Monday, 19th July 2004

Time: 10.00 a.m. – 12.31 p.m.

Place: Committee Room 1 Guildhall, Cambridge

Present: County Council
Councillors T J Bear, S F Johnstone C Shaw and A Kent
Officers: K Baldwin, H. Belchamber, C. Brown, A. Browning,
M Lugg and R Sanderson (Secretary)
Cambridge City Council
Councillors J Bailie, K. Blencowe
Officers: P Studdert
South Cambridgeshire District Council
Councillors D Bard (Chairman) P. Orme
Officers: K Miles

Also Present: Sir D Trippier Chairman Infrastructure Partnership
J. Onslow Infrastructure Partnership

* Attendance for part of the meeting only

Members of the press and public were also in attendance.

Apologies: Councillors J Batchelor, R Smith and D Spink South Cambridgeshire District Council and
Councillor M J Mason CALC.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor D Bard was elected Chairman for 2004/2005.

2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor S. Johnstone was elected Vice Chairman for 2004/2005.

3. NOTES – 28TH APRIL 2004

The notes of the meeting held on 28th April 2004 were agreed as a correct record.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Johnstone declared a personal interest in The Cambridge Southern Fringe Update report as a Non Executive Director of Addenbrooke's Hospital and as her partner worked at Cambridge University.

Councillor Bard declared a personal interest in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Update report as his wife worked for Addenbrooke's hospital.

5. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28TH January 2004

The Minutes were agreed as a correct record.

6. OPERATING CONVENTIONS

The operating conventions were noted with the agreement that they would need to be kept under review in terms of considering widening them in due course to take account of the growth in the importance of monitoring infrastructure delivery.

7. INFRASTRUCTURE PARTNERSHIP – ORAL UPDATE FROM THE CHAIRMAN

Following the invite at the Joint Forum's previous meeting the Chairman was delighted to welcome Sir David Trippier to present an oral update of the work of the Infrastructure Partnership.

Sir David reported that he had been impressed with the level of joint working that was being achieved in the sub region and it was a credit that as far as he was aware, this was the only region delivering its own growth strategy through this type of partnership working.

He outlined the current members of the Infrastructure Partnership, detailing the stakeholders who had been invited to sit on the board to represent independently, without pecuniary interest, various other public and business sector interests. He also reported in the recent director appointments of John Onslow and Peter Studdert to the Partnership.

As the growth agenda was substantial with tough targets to be met (47,500 houses and £2 billion of infrastructure up to 2016) he asked that in the interests of local accountability that the Joint Forum supported the Partnership. Attention was drawn to the requirement to build 2,800 houses per annum in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Currently completion rates had fallen far short of this figure, with a typical build rate of only 2,000 houses per annum. Additionally, there was the requirement to achieve a target figure of 40% affordable housing, a three-fold increase on current provision. This would require a step increase in future years, which Sir David believed was achievable, as some of the larger developments, would come on stream from 2007 onwards. (e.g. Northstowe/Cambridge East)

The Partnership's current focus/concerns were to ensure:

- Bringing forward high quality public transport and transport access schemes to ensure government funding was secure – he was pleased with the progress on the Guided Bus Scheme
- An adequate electricity supply to North Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire – the Partnership Team was in talks to provide the necessary electricity grid transfer station and options testing was currently underway,
- Adequate school provision and community learning – The County Council had the key role
- Government should continue to be pressed for additional infrastructure funding
- Crime prevention reduction – the LSPs had a key role
- Increased funding from a revised Section 106 planning obligation strategy – a strategy was currently being drawn up
- The benefits of the Cambridge economy wealth creation were more widely spread to surrounding rural areas.
- Other government departments did not hinder progress. An example was provided of concerns that the Ministry of Defence was currently seeking full development value prices for their land that would make it very difficult to then provide the required level of affordable housing. A meeting had been arranged to discuss the issue later in the week.

Sir David concluded by looking forward to a long and fruitful partnership with the members of the joint forum and the other partners involved in the infrastructure delivery process.

Joint Forum Member comments

- There was a call for the Infrastructure Partnership to develop good communication channels with local people to help improve engagement. In response, Sir David indicated that he was committed to such a course and recognised the importance of consulting and receiving feedback from the local community. He believed that the new director appointments, with their wealth of local knowledge, would be help in this area and be a great asset.
- Linked to this was a request that now that the Infrastructure Partnership had its own publicity agents, publicity should be co-ordinated with local councils.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the accountability of the partnership and whether there was any accountability to local authorities. In response Sir David Trippier indicated that the majority of Councils had their Leader included on the board and both himself and his directors were responsible to and reported to the board. While currently there was to be an annual stakeholder conference, which would include an invite to the wider community, Sir David was happy to consider any proposals put forward to increase accountability.
- Concerns were raised on Government agencies that were not accountable locally and the phasing of delivery in the new developments that were dependent on infrastructure being in place. Attention was drawn to an article in the previous Friday's Cambridge Evening News that raised the possibility of slippage to 2015 for the completion of the long awaited improvements to the A14.
- The Vice Chairman requested that the Partnership Team work closely with the County Council to clarify the situation on the reported delays on the timetable for improvements to the A14.

It was resolved:

To add Sir David Trippier to the Joint Forum Agenda and Minute distribution list.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROVISION IN CAMBOURNE

This report provided an update for the Joint Strategic Forum on the preparation for consultation in Cambourne for the provision of a second primary school. It was agreed that the experience of Cambourne could be widened and lessons learnt for the future provision of additional schools in the area.

It was noted that although previously annual rates of completion of dwellings had increased gradually, as a result of accelerated releases an oral update on the report indicated that the figure of 1400, the trigger point under the section 106 Agreement for the release of the land to build the second primary school, had now been reached.

It was anticipated that primary rolls could exceed two forms of entry during the school year 2004/05 and therefore officers were putting into place contingency measures should there be more demand than the number of primary school places that were available before the new second school opened.

Joint Forum Member comments

- Concern was expressed regarding the contingency measures that included pupils having to be educated in mobile classrooms on the Monkfield Park site during the 2004/05 school year. There were important lessons to be learnt in future phasing as this did not look like joined up planning for education provision. It was clarified that this was a pragmatic response to the significantly increased demand for school places which had occurred over the last 2-3 weeks, and the fact that the infrastructure would not be in place to allow access to the second primary school site until January 2005 at the earliest.
- Local concerns had been raised about overcrowding at the existing school which had led to calls for the school to be opened earlier.

- Questions were raised about whether the County Council had underestimated the number of reception children coming forward.
- With respect to the estimates of total pupil numbers given in Section 6, attention was drawn to the potential implications of meeting PPG3 requirements for minimum development density which were set at 30 dwellings per hectare. If these standards were to be met there could be at least an additional 600 extra dwellings, however, this would require an amendment to the planning consent which currently limits the development to 3,300 dwellings.
- The proposal for a joint bid for a voluntary aided ecumenical church school for the second primary school was supported.
- Questions were raised that if there was further need for an additional third primary school, as there were already sites for two schools to be built in Great and Upper Cambourne, this third school should be located in Lower Cambourne. In response, it was reported that there were no suitable sites in Lower Cambourne and therefore the third primary school if required would have to be provided in one of the two other areas.
- There was a call to involve County Council Education members much earlier in the process when selecting the sites of schools.
- A question was raised about how the money would be reclaimed for extra school provision on an already agreed section 106 agreement. The Planning Officer for South Cambridgeshire explained that the original Section 106 agreement was for a settlement of 3,300 dwellings. Any further consents for housing would require new planning applications and at this stage it would be possible to negotiate a new section 106 agreement to provide for the additional provision.
- It was noted that school rolls in Cambourne were currently bucking the trend, as most school rolls were falling. The question was raised about whether any flexibility would be allowed in the provision of the new schools to allow some of the buildings to be used for other purposes should the rolls fall. This was another point that the officers agreed would need further consideration.

The Council's Education Officers were now actively considering whether there should be an earlier start on the second school and, would be seeking views at consultation meetings scheduled to take place later that evening on a proposal that the school be opened in September 2005. In terms of future policy, officers would also need to review whether the trigger point of 1400 had been too high.

It was resolved:

- (i) To agree to receive a further general report at the next Joint Forum meeting on issues around how school planning policy could be better synchronised with land use planning policy and
- (ii) To expand on the lessons to be learnt from the current experience of school provision issues at Cambourne.

9. WASTE MANAGEMENT PFI CONTRACT

This report briefed the Forum on progress with the bid for Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Credits for a long term municipal waste management contract in response to the forthcoming stringent requirements to reduce landfill and require local authorities to buy additional landfill allowance where they had not met the reduced targets. In addition it was noted that the landfill tax (currently £15 / tonne) would rise at a rate of £3 per year to reach £35 by 2011.

Current waste disposal contracts for most of the county would run until mid 2007. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) was currently bidding for PFI credits to support the investment in new waste management processes through a long-term contract in order to meet the Landfill Directive targets and achieve the objectives of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) agreed in 2002. It was also intended that the

provision of new Household Waste Recycling (HWRC) facilities would be through the PFI contract.

The report set out the details of the bid submitted on 1st June. The Waste Forum meeting in April had agreed a revised bid reflecting the up to date position of District Councils. This was on the basis that the two waste disposal authorities, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough would be the contracting authorities with the District Councils entering into 'Partnering Agreements' with the County Council, but not being part of the PFI procurement consortium. The bid remained one for £40M PFI credits and it was expected that the results would be known after 10th August.

It was noted that the Waste Forum had recommended an alternative relationship between the collection and disposal authorities in which Collection Services would continue to be delivered by each District with the Partnering Agreement giving some certainty to the PFI contractor as to the continuing levels of separation of materials into three streams through the District services. Endorsement of this arrangement was to be sought from each Council in July/ September.

The PFI bid would be based on the continuation of high recycling and composting, the provision of two Material Recycling Facilities, up to 6 new HWRCs, and two waste processing plants. It was noted that both the technology and the location of plants would not be known until the procurement process was complete. Details of the procurement process were set out in the report.

It was noted that it was intended to provide two HWRCs to serve Cambridge City and one new facility to serve the northern part of South Cambridgeshire in response to the growing population of the sub-region and the requirement that the life of Milton HWRC should not extend beyond that of the landfill (2010). It was assumed that they would be provided in urban areas as the new sites would be covered and designed to criteria which minimised impacts on neighbouring uses.

Waste Disposal Authority officers wished to see sites for HWRC considered in each of the major development sites around Cambridge, in order that the required number could be built in locations most convenient to users. Some progress in this respect had been made in discussions concerning the Southern Fringe and at Northstowe. It was stressed that procurement could not be delayed without risking an exceptionally costly failure to meet the landfill reduction targets embodied in the WET Act. Companies bidding for the PFI contract might therefore have to look to other sites identified in the WLP and the County Council had agreed the principle of using compulsory purchase if necessary to acquire sites for waste facilities.

It was noted that the Waste Local Plan (WLP) identified all of the major development sites as Areas of Search for major waste facilities. Advice from the ODPM had suggested that the key stage to draw together the land uses for any major development area would be at the master planning stage. However, for master planning to be successful in delivering truly sustainable development all parties needed to understand and aid the delivery of the requisite waste management facilities, and a clear and consistent steer given to developers. District Councils were urged by the lead officer to ensure that Waste management was planned at an early stage.

Joint Forum Member Comments:

- Questions were raised on whether the necessary HWRCs could be provided on the same site as the required additional electricity Grid Transfer station or on any alternative site being suggested for the sewage works in order to limit the number of unpopular facilities being suggested in the region. In reply it was indicated that the Electricity station would need to be located in the Northern Fringe with a half a dozen sites having been identified but which had to work in the context of electricity infrastructure and therefore were likely to have limited potential for including other uses.
- A question was raised regarding joint power/waste facilities – in response the officers indicated that nothing had been ruled out it would need to await what bidder solutions were put forward.

- It had been noted that the new style indoor HWRC would be more environmentally friendly, odourless looking more like a superstore than previous facilities such as the one at Milton. This being the case, the officers were asked to ensure that the new type of facilities were given wider publicity in order to sell the benefits to local people.
- Support was offered on the need to develop sites local to the new developments to avoid long journeys to recycling centres.
- A Member asked whether a facility could be sited outside an area of search. It was clarified that the area of search would be the whole area defined and the facility needed to be sited within that area.

There was discussion following a question raised on how the sites would be formally identified and designated. In response, the lead County Council officer admitted that this was the most difficult issue as waste management operated in a commercial world and there were often tensions between the best bid commercially and what would be considered best in planning terms. The importance was to ensure that the necessary numbers of sites were identified, and that they were not overlooked in preparing local plans. Currently there was a need for an additional site in the south of the County that was not currently included on the Waste Local Plan. District officers responded that they were not able to designate sites through local planning processes and therefore what was needed was joint working to map out a clear path. An issue was also raised of developers asking for full development cost value for land to be designated for recycling centres. This could result in very expensive waste facilities unless they could be persuaded to sell the land for a lower cost consideration.

It was resolved:

- i) To note the report including the context provided by the Landfill Directive.
- ii) To request a report back to the next meeting setting out the critical path analysis for providing each of the sites.
- iii) To consider in due course the detailed assessment of waste management requirements that will be produced for the Cambridge Sub Area

10. TOURIST COACH MANAGEMENT IN CAMBRIDGE

The Strategic Forum had previously considered reports on tourist coach management in Cambridge exploring a strategy for improving coach management in Cambridge and the drop off and pick up arrangements, parking facilities and operational matters associated with coach management.

Officers were recommending the extension of the existing coach parking facility at the Madingley Road Park & Ride site from 8 parking spaces to 16. The cost was estimated at £75,000, which would need to be funded from the Local Transport Plan budgets and would have to compete with other transport improvement initiatives, some of which might be considered to have a higher priority. The extension would also be the subject of a planning application.

It was noted that Local Authority Parking Enforcement (LAPE) would commence in Cambridge towards the end of October whereby the County Council had agreed that the City Council would employ contractors to enforce on-street parking controls along with the enforcement of the City Council's off-street car parks.

LAPE would provide the opportunity to explore in greater detail, the implications of more active management of the coach drop off points during the main tourist season. One idea being considered was the introduction of a permit system to book a time slot at one of the drop off points with coach operators being levied a charge to cover operational costs. Officers were looking at the experience elsewhere of managing such a scheme. An important consideration would be the cost of managing the facility against the enforcement costs. If considered

financially viable, the Cambridge Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee would be asked to consider the necessary changes to Traffic Regulation Orders to allow charges to be levied.

There were issues of whether the scheme would be viable at other drop off and pick up points in Trumpington Road, Victoria Avenue and Chesterton Road. The site in Queen's Road was the focal point for most coach drivers and a booking system was considered more appropriate there.

Joint Forum Member Comments

- As the increase in coach parking provision was only small, officers were asked to also consider if temporary requisition of car parking spaces was practicable, as the peak coach requirement coincided with less car parking demand.
- A question was raised regarding enforcement to ensure the coaches used the designated spaces.
- It was pointed out that the main issue of coach parking congestion involved picking up passengers rather than dropping them off. Delays were caused when not all passengers had returned to the coach at the designated pick up time.

It as resolved:

- (i) To support extending the coach parking facility at Madingley Road Park and Ride site.
- (ii) That the Joint Forum should receive a further report on any proposals for a permit scheme as part of the future management of on-street coach drop off and pick up points.

11. CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE PART 1 DEVELOPMENT AREAS

It was noted that good progress had been made in drafting a framework for development of this complex site. The Joint Forum noted the revised timetable.

In reviewing the draft Development Framework, the Steering Group considered that further work/review was needed on a number of key issues before stakeholder consultation could be carried out. These issues included:

- Relocation of the site for the proposed Northern Fringe rail station and associated parking within the phase 1 area of the site.
- Assessment of the traffic capacity on Milton Road and A10/A14 junction in relation to the scale of development on the site that could be served off Milton Road.
- Redesign of the interchange between Guided Bus system and rail station.
- Reassessment of the relationship between any housing proposed on phase 1 area of the site and existing industrial uses.

The following two studies were in progress and would feed into the Development Framework Plan process:

- Traffic modelling work on Milton Road traffic capacity and feasibility work on the possible relocation of the Cowley Road Park & Ride facility. This work was to be completed by mid-summer.
- Investigation of the feasibility of relocating the Anglian Water sewage treatment works. This work would be completed by the end of the year, with Anglian Water Board then to make a decision to either remain in situ or relocate.

The Joint Forum was reminded that the Anglian Water study would not involve selecting a relocation site. Everyone was made aware of the seriousness of the situation for delivering the Structure Plan growth if Anglian Water (AW) did not move from the present site. However, an oral update seemed to indicate that AW had come to terms with the fact that the move

would happen. In terms of a possible location site, South Cambridgeshire had asked AW to widen their search area, although it was recognised that there were potential technical difficulties in moving water and sewage any distance.

During discussion on this item, Councillor Bear declared a personal interest on the basis that he sometimes undertook consultancy work for Anglian Water.

Joint Forum Comments

- Attention was drawn again to the need to consider an alternative link road to the site from Fen Road. It was reported that officers were still looking at the possibility of providing access from Cowley Road.
- A comment was made that the Infrastructure Partnership should consider holding talks with OFWAT in terms of making them aware that some potential sewage relocation sites would result in higher costs.
- In terms of the assessment of traffic capacity on Milton Road and the A10/A14, there needed to be co-ordinated work with the Highways Agency to ensure that any road improvements they were proposing would not increase traffic congestion. In response, it was reported that the Highways Agency were included on the Northern Fringe Working Group and were giving advice on junction proposals.

The report was noted.

12. CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE 2 CHESTERTON INTERCHANGE

The Chesterton Interchange project was expected to play an important role in reducing traffic entering and leaving Cambridge, helping to tackle congestion in the city and also helping to promote sustainability in the growth area.

The project was originally planned for delivery by 2009 as part of the development of the Cambridge northern fringe. The Joint Forum noted that due to technical problems the proposed location was now undeliverable. As a result of this, in July Network Rail had halted development work and had withdrawn project funding. Further to this, work had now been undertaken with Network Rail and the SRA to continue the feasibility studies with the County as the client.

The Joint Forum noted that there was now an agreed way forward to complete the early stages of the work and to then bid for the scheme as a Major Project through the LTP process. This approach has been discussed with government, who endorsed it provided the project had the approval of the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA). The SRA had indicated they were happy to consider working towards 'approval', provided that the County carried out the work and underwrote all of the associated risk.

Given the delays, it was reported that the earliest that the scheme could now be delivered was a year later (2010) and would still involve time risks mostly beyond local authority control as a result of the Government's White Paper, 'Review of the Railway' (to be published in July). This Paper was likely to have a significant effect on the organisational structures, timescales and consequent legal agreements required between whatever parties become involved in the future. It was noted that as there was no money in the Railway Industry the necessary investment would either be Government monies or through a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) or even via Venture Capital.

The Joint Forum noted that the next steps involved:

- Continuing discussions with Network Rail to recommence the feasibility study.
- Continuing discussions with the SRA or their successor body to gain their approval for the scheme.
- Commissioning consultants to start work on the 'major scheme' bid.

It was resolved

To note the report and to ask the officers to provide regular updates.

13. CAMBRIDGE SOUTHERN FRINGE (CSF) UPDATE REPORT

One of the critical aspects of the whole Southern Fringe development is the proposed Southern Access Road that would link Hauxton Road to the Addenbrooke's site. This report updated the current position.

It was noted that it was vitally important to reach agreement on the line of the Southern Access Road which would require the resolution of a wide range of transport, landscape and urban design issues. The current studies were intended to achieve this by the end of the year.

The JSF Southern Fringe Member Reference Group had considered a report on the Shelford Road – Addenbrooke's link on 21st May 2004. The officers' report reviewed the issues for this stretch of the road and had recommended that the Group support the southerly alignment as set out in blue on the map attached to the report. The Group however had failed to reach a consensus and identified a wide range of matters that required further study. These were as summarised under the headings Transport and Environmental issues.

Following the meeting, a brief was drawn up for further work that included three possible alignments as set out in the map attached to the report. Traffic data required for the study had been delayed for two weeks and this had affected the timetable for the work.

Progress with the Southern Fringe Study and the issues around the alignment of the road were discussed at a successful residents meeting on 15th July. The Southern Fringe Reference Group discussed progress at a meeting on 16th July. There would be a further report back to the Group in the early Autumn.

Joint Forum comments

- A view was expressed that although the line of the road from Hauxton Road and Shelford Road had been agreed it would still be better coming from the Motorway roundabout as opposed to another junction having to be created. It was noted that the Highways Agency did not favour 5 exit roundabouts.
- One Member asked why the middle route on the Addenbrooke's Road options had been brought forward.

The Joint Forum noted the timetable as follows:

- (a) July – September: Atkins to conclude studies;
- (b) September - October: results of studies to be the subject of public consultation with other aspects of the Southern Fringe Study; and
- (c) October 2004-January 2005 – formal decision on the line of the road.

14. EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE MEMBER REFERENCE GROUP

The meeting of the Joint Strategic Forum on 28th April agreed the principle that a member reference group should be set up to guide the work at Cambridge East.

Each of the three local authorities would be asked within their internal constitution rules to nominate 4 representatives to sit on the group. There would be advantage if the appointments were a combination of local members and key members with responsibility for planning and sustainable communities e.g. portfolio holders.

It was proposed that this group once set up would consider progress on the relocation of existing uses in the area and as they become available, the development options. This would enable member input between the quarterly meetings of the Joint Strategic Forum. A member reference group already existed for the Southern Fringe of Cambridge and it was suggested that the Cambridge East Reference Group should follow this model. South Cambridgeshire District Council had agreed to administer the group.

It was resolved:

To endorse the proposed arrangements and that the local authorities should be asked to nominate 4 members to the reference group

15. NORTHSTOWE PLANNING UPDATE

During the last 15 months a great deal of preparatory work had been undertaken in the planning of Northstowe in advance of the formal introduction of the new system of plan-making proposed in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. With enactment in May and the coming into force of the Act in September, the whole of the plan-making in South Cambridgeshire was now in a position to begin its progress through the new statutory plan-making procedures. The programme for taking Northstowe (and all other Development Plan Documents in the first tranche of plans) was set out in the table contained in the officers' report.

The first stage of consulting with the public would be the publication of a Preferred Options paper in September and the report set out the proposed public participation programme. The paper would provide a basis for exploring the principle options for the policy content of the Area Action Plan for Northstowe and would cover the topic areas listed in the officers' report.

Northstowe Member Steering Group having debated the two Options Papers was recommending that South Cambridgeshire's meeting of Council on 22nd July agree to publishing the papers for six weeks public participation beginning on 6th September along with the Preferred Options Papers for the:

- Core Strategy
- Cambridge East Area Action Plan
- Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan

The Joint Forum noted the very challenging programme of work necessary, if the Area Action Plan was to be adopted early in 2006, in order to meet the Structure Plan objective of development starting in that year. Sir David Trippier offered the support of the Infrastructure Partnership in any way possible.

Joint Forum Comments

- There was continued concern that the County Council was only represented by one Member on the Northstowe Steering Group which continued to be an anomaly bearing in mind the representation agreed for other Member Reference Groups (see the previous minute). It was argued that those areas most affected, Over and Swavesey, were not currently represented. A response provided was that unlike the other reference groups, Northstowe was not a cross boundary issue.
- There was support from the City Council that there should be greater representation by the County Council on the Steering Group. The majority of Members present supported this view. The Chairman was happy to take back the issue to his Council's Cabinet.

It was resolved:

- (i) To note the progress being made on preparing the Area Action Plan for Northstowe.
- (ii) To ask that South Cambridgeshire District Council's Cabinet reconsider increasing the representation of the County Council on the Steering Group and to receive a report back at the next meeting.

16. DATES AND VENUE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Dates 2004/05	Venue
---------------	-------

Wednesday 2.30 pm 20th October
Wednesday 2.30 pm 15th December
Wednesday 2.30 pm 30th March 2005

Shire Hall Cambridge
South Cambs Cambourne
Shire Hall Cambridge