

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 19<sup>th</sup> July 2016

**Time:** 1.30 p.m. – 3.45 p.m.

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillor S Kindersley (Chairman)  
Councillors: P Ashcroft, A Bailey, D Brown, P Brown, P Bullen, R Butcher, S Bywater, B Chapman, P Clapp, J Clark, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, D Divine, P Downes, L Dupre, D Giles, G Gillick, L Harford, D Harty, R Henson, R Hickford, J Hipkin, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, G Kenney, M Leeke, M Loynes, R Mandley, I Manning, M Mason, M McGuire, Z Moghadas, L Nethsingha, F Onasanya, T Orgee, J Palmer, P Reeve, M Rouse, P Sales, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Smith (Vice-Chairwoman), A Taylor, S Taylor, M Tew, P Topping, A Walsh, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and F Yeulett

Apologies: B Ashwood, E Cearns, C Boden, D Connor, I Bates, A Dent, A Lay, K Reynolds, M Shuter and S van de Ven.

### 237. MINUTES – 10<sup>th</sup> MAY AND 28<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2016

The minutes of the Council meetings held on 10<sup>th</sup> May and 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

### 238. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made a number of announcements as set out in **Appendix A**.

### 239. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest under the Code of Conduct.

### 240. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Council noted one question received from a member of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

### 241. PETITIONS

One petition was presented by a member of the public. As the petition contained over 3,000 signatures, the organiser had asked, as set out in the Council's Petitions Scheme, for the petition to be debated at the meeting. **Appendix C** sets out the text of the petition and debate

Councillor Hunt declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct, as he had been born in Milton Road.

**Proposal by Councillor Scutt:**

“That this petition is referred to the City Deal Executive Board and Assembly with the views expressed in the Chamber”.

Following discussion, the proposal on being put to the vote was carried.

*[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Liberal Democrats, UKIP, Labour and three Independents in favour; two Independent members against]*

**Statement proposed by Councillor Manning:**

“This council wishes to express its opposition to any plan that would result in the removal of the majority of trees from Milton Road.

Further, Council believes the measures contained in the City Deal do not represent efficient or desirable ways of cutting congestion and asks that more options be considered in the public consultation”.

On being put to the vote the statement was lost.

*[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats, nearly all UKIP, two Independents in favour; Conservatives, Labour, two Independents against; one Independent abstained]*

**242. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

**Treasury Management Quarter Four and Outturn Report**

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hickford, that the recommendation as set out on the Council agenda be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

Approve the Treasury Management Outturn Report 2015-16.

**243. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10**

One motion had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

**Motion from Councillor Nethsingha**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Nethsingha and seconded by Councillor Jenkins:

“This council

- a) expresses its support for all residents of Cambridgeshire, whether UK nationals, European Union (EU) nationals or citizens of other countries. This country must remain a tolerant multi-cultural society, where many different cultural traditions add to our rich national life.
- b) asks the Chief Executive to work with business and the universities to lobby central government to ensure that our future relationship with the European

Union (EU) allows as much access to the single market as possible, as homes and jobs in the Cambridgeshire area depend on our ability to trade with Europe.”

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Bullen and seconded by Councillor Count:

Deletions shown in strikethrough

“This council

- a) expresses its support for all residents of Cambridgeshire, whether UK nationals, European Union (EU) nationals or citizens of other countries. This country must remain a tolerant multi-cultural society, where many different cultural traditions add to our rich national life.
- b) ~~asks the Chief Executive to work with business and the universities to lobby central government to ensure that our future relationship with the European Union (EU) allows as much access to the single market as possible, as homes and jobs in the Cambridgeshire area depend on our ability to trade with Europe.”~~

Following discussion, it was proposed by Councillor Count and seconded by Councillor Bullen that the question be put. On being put to the vote, this proposal was carried.

*[Voting pattern: Conservatives, UKIP, five Labour and five Independents in favour; nearly all Liberal Democrats, three Labour against; one Liberal Democrat abstained]*

Following further discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was carried.

*[Voting pattern: 22 Conservatives, seven UKIP and five Independents in favour; Liberal Democrats, Labour, one Conservative and one UKIP against; one Conservative abstained]*

After further discussion the substantive motion on being put to the vote was carried.

*[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Liberal Democrats, UKIP, Labour and four Independents in favour; one Independent abstained]*

## **244. QUESTIONS**

### **a) Oral Questions**

Eleven questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix D**. In response to these questions, the following items were agreed for further action:

- In response to a question from Councillor Sales, a written answer would be provided by Councillor Bates, Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, on whether consideration would be given to reducing the charge for Park & Ride Sites to £1.00 for a limited period, to incorporate the cost of parking and the bus journey, to demonstrate that it was an effective means of getting people to leave their car behind.
- In response to a question from Councillor Jenkins, a written answer would be

provided by Councillor Bates, the Council's representative on the City Deal Executive Board, on whether consultation on Phase 1 initiatives within the City Deal such as Milton Road, the presentation of statistics to the Economy and Environment Committee showing a reduction in bus patronage, and the approval by the City Deal Executive Board of a study into how people make their transport decisions, had been done in the wrong order and that they should be looking at the results of its study before it decided what to do.

- In response to a question from Councillor Chapman, a written answer would be provided by Councillor Count, the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, about the Boundary Commission Review setting out where the figures for the current electorate and proposed electorate in his Division had come from and what they were based on.
- In response to a question from Councillor S Taylor, a written response would be provided by Councillor Bates, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, setting out what the Council was doing to ensure sustainability through the provision of additional employment in St Neots and when St Neots would have an Enterprise Zone.
- In response to a question from Councillor Wisson, a written answer would be provided by Councillor McGuire, the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, as soon as possible about when the first and subsequent grass cuts could be expected for the footpaths in Abbotsley and Great Paxton.
- In response to a question from Councillor Manning, a written answer would be provided by Councillor Bates, the Council's Representative on the City Deal Board, confirming the arrangements for making decisions about the Milton Road trees and specifically whether the decision would be taken by officers.
- In response to a question from Councillor Sir Peter Brown, a written answer would be provided by Councillor Count, Chairman of the General Purposes Committee / Leader of the Council, setting out the arrangements by which any business case submitted by the Police and Crime Commissioner regarding the Fire Authority would be considered by the Council.
- In response to a question from Councillor Mason, Councillor Count, the Leader of the Council, agreed to take up with officers the question of the timing and scheduling of meetings about reports into defects in the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway

## **b) Written Questions**

No written questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2.

## **URGENT ITEMS**

*In line with the urgency criteria set out in the Council's Constitution, the Chairman, as set out in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Part 4.4(a) Urgent Decisions, agreed to authorise the inclusion of the next two items on the grounds that failure to do so would not be in the public interest and failure to take the decision quickly would, or would likely to, harm the interests of the Council and the public.*

## **245. COMMITTEES – ALLOCATION OF SEATS AND SUBSTITUTES TO POLITICAL GROUPS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLITICAL BALANCE RULES**

It was moved by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by the Vice Chairwoman, Councillor Smith, and resolved unanimously:

To approve the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees in accordance with the political balance rules, as set out in **Appendix E**.

## **246. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS**

It was moved by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Smith, that the recommendations as set out in the tabled report on white paper be approved.

Councillor McGuire also proposed, seconded by Councillor Hickford, that Councillor Bywater replace Councillor Loynes on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority.

It was resolved unanimously:

To approve the following changes to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority:

Appoint Councillor Roger Henson to replace Councillor Simon Bywater  
Appoint Councillor Simon Bywater to replace Councillor Mervyn Loynes.

Chairman

**Appendix A**

## **COUNTY COUNCIL – 19TH JULY 2016 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **PEOPLE**

Rosie Edwards, Head of Cambridgeshire Environmental Education Services

The Chairman reports with enormous sadness the death of Rosie Edwards, Head of Cambridgeshire Environmental Education Service. Rosie was a passionate advocate of environmental education and outdoor learning and, during nearly 40 years of service in the County Council, she has touched the lives of thousands and thousands of children, teachers and colleagues. The Council's thoughts are with her family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

### **AWARDS**

Former Director of Children's Social Care receives OBE in Queen's Birthday Honours

Niki Clemo, the Council's former Director of Children's Social Care, has been awarded an OBE for her services to children in the Queen's Birthday Honours list.

Niki, together with colleagues, was instrumental in turning around the fortunes of Cambridgeshire's safeguarding arrangements from inadequate to good in less than two years. Niki said: "On behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council's social workers and staff, elected members, partners and stakeholders, I am delighted to accept this OBE. Working in Cambridgeshire gave me the opportunity to promote the social work profession as one that should be celebrated and valued – and it's this recognition of our profession that makes this OBE so special.

### **Municipal Journal Award for Community Engagement**

Cambridgeshire County Council working with Spice has won a Municipal Journal Award for Community Engagement for their Time Credits programme. Led by the Council's Strategic Marketing, Communications and Engagement team, Social Enterprise Spice, colleagues throughout Cambridgeshire County Council and partners, they beat a host other councils to scoop the top prize for Excellence in Community Engagement.

This award is a real celebration of the volunteers taking part in the initiative who have given thousands of hours of their time throughout the County to make it a success. For each hour a volunteer gives to participating organisations or services, they receive one time credit. These can be exchanged for a range of activities, from a swim to bowling, an afternoon club or even a visit to the Tower of London. This project would not be possible without a variety of our services working together to embed Time Credits in the work that they do.

## **SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Transformation Programme**

Although Cambridgeshire has always been an innovative Council, members have been keen that it increases the pace around transforming the authority to meet the financial challenges. That is why it is pleased to announce that the transformation programme has kicked off including informal workshops with Members on bringing forward ideas that could potentially save millions of pounds, protect frontline services and deliver services in a way that benefit our communities. Staff are also playing a vital role as part of this transformation programme and an internal ICAN campaign has been launched by the Chief Executive and Strategic Management to engage with them, encourage ideas to come forward and empower them to help improve the Council.

### **Adult Learning and Skills Team**

The Council's Adult Learning and Skills Team have been graded as good after a recent Ofsted Inspection. Very few organisations have maintained their good status through the changes to the inspection model and through restructure of a service. Lynsi Hayward-Smith, Head of Adult Learning and Skills is very proud of what the team has achieved and would like to thank everyone who helped with it.

### **Summer Reading Challenge 2016**

The theme of this year's Summer Reading Challenge is 'The Big Friendly Read' which is being launched on 16 July. Children are asked to read any six library books through the

summer holidays and can collect a Roald Dahl Character postcard each week. A certificate and gold medal will be awarded to all children who finish the Challenge. Last year 3,500 children took part in the Challenge. This year, given the yearlong global Roald Dahl 100 celebration of the world's favourite storyteller and considerable interest already shown by schools, a record number of participants are anticipated.

### **The Big Friendly Read Summer Challenge**

### **St Ives Library: Open+ self-service to be available soon**

Open+ will soon be available for public use at St Ives Library. The Council is trialling this innovative self-service library system that allows access to library resources, including borrowing or returning books, use of free Wi-Fi, PCs and pre-booked meeting rooms, outside of staffed hours. Open+ will allow for the reinstatement of Sunday opening hours (12noon to 4pm), and additional hours on a Thursday afternoon, 1:30 to 5:30pm. If the system is successful at St Ives, Open+ could be installed at other libraries to enhance current opening hours, offering a more flexible, efficient, community-driven service.

## **MESSAGES**

### **Royal Visits to Cambridgeshire**

The Chairman was honoured to welcome four Royal guests to Cambridgeshire recently, on behalf of the County Council.

On Thursday 23 June 2016, Her Royal Highness The Princess Royal visited St John Ambulance to open the Goodman Centre, the charity's new Headquarters in Cherry Hinton. The Centre, which is used for training by the Cambridge City, Cambridge Eastern and Cherry Hinton units, along with the cycle response unit, is named after the late Anne Goodman, who was instrumental in setting up St John Ambulance in Cherry Hinton.

On Sunday 3 July, His Royal Highness The Duke of Gloucester attended a service and parade in Ely Cathedral, as Colonel in Chief of the Royal Anglian Regiment, for the annual reunion of the Royal Anglian Regiment, which this year also marked the centenary of the Battle of the Somme.

On Wednesday 13 July, Her Majesty The Queen, accompanied by His Royal Highness The Duke of Edinburgh, officially opened the East Anglian Air Ambulance's new operational base, The Egerton-Smith Building, at Cambridge Airport, which is named after the charity's founder and president, Andrew Egerton-Smith MBE.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 19TH JULY 2016****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question</b>
1.	Antony Carpen	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	"What assessment has the council made of the risks associated with the devolution deal it has signed with Whitehall for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough?"
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	Antony Carpen	"Thank you Chairman .... Yeah I think it's a fair question and challenge what risks are there about the devolution deal that has been signed and I think the first thing to note that what we've signed is a proposal. It's going through a process at the moment: it's not finalised. It is at this moment in time, a work in progress. There are various stages of it, so the first stage was to have discussions with ourselves, with our partners, with Government about what a proposal might look like and that came to Council a few months ago and that original proposal, one of the risks was "it won't be accepted" and that indeed was the case. It wasn't accepted. And so we went off and worked with Government and our partners and drew up an entirely new proposal which was acceptable. So that was a risk that we dealt with at that time. The second part of the stage is where we are now. So we've agreed in principle a proposal to put to the public to consult on, to see what they feel about it, to see exactly the great amount of detail and consultation and feedback on it to see if it's something that we still want to progress with when it comes back to our meeting later on in the year and indeed to demonstrate whether the governance is sufficient to operate this devolution deal in a better way than Whitehall makes those decisions at the moment and that will come back to us and so that's another risk nicely out the way - can we do a better job than central government? And then the third stage will be actually if we do go ahead, to draw up detailed work plans on how to achieve everything. Now I think it's at that stage that you will look at every single work-stream and you will develop a risk profile for moving forward and analyse how you're



			<p>going to mitigate the risks there. So a large proportion of the work is still in the future but I'd just like to highlight some of the risks that have been identified so far and some of the things that have been done. So the first one I mentioned already is that the Deal will not command support from all the organisations involved. Indeed it didn't; we went off got a better deal and now it has. . . . So very quickly the other ones were that the Deal would not be supported by or understood by the public which is why we've gone to consultation to explain it, that the Deal will not have the support of government, we've negotiated this every step of the way and we believe that when we get to the final thing there'll be a "yes" and that the Deal will not be deliverable – that is a matter of fact that we've got to get all those work-streams ready - and that the proposed new Governance arrangements will not be sufficiently transparent and accountable which I've already mentioned. But I think all of us or most of us, realise that the biggest risk of all would be if we don't land this. Just what kind of a County can we then deliver to the people of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough without the kind of input that we're going to get in terms of the infrastructure, housing, capital investment and skills? So thank you very much for indulging me Chair.</p>
	<b>Supplementary question from:</b>	<b>To:</b>	<b>Question</b>
	Antony Carpen	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	<p>Thank you very much Councillor Count and actually, I pay tribute to the Councillor for being so explicit on the risks. I'm going to pick up on two. The first one he said on transparency. I've thrown some freedom of information requests at the Treasury and at the Department for Communities and Local Government. The Treasury have got over 2000 mentions of Andrew Lansley on their systems post the 2015 election and the Department for Communities and Local Government have got none in the context of Devolution East. Transparency issues bigtime. Second, with the consultation. Because it's happening in the school holidays there is a huge risk that young people will just be completely bypassed in this whole process. Also similar with the City Deal and Devolution East; there are some similar themes. Hardly any public events and I can't see anything that actually brings together communities from disparate parts of the county such as, let's say, Wisbech and Cambridge together. To see if we can solve these problems, I would love to see the Council really addressing those issues because you've shown you can do this with the Spice time banking thing, so please, learn from that. Thank you.</p>
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>

	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	Antony Carpen	<p>Yes thank you. I can't answer for government and if 4000 mentions aren't enough, you know I can't really answer on that. But in terms of transparency for the organisation: one of the things that we were keen on here when we actually passed the mandate lasting thing was overview and scrutiny and when we come back in October we'll have that a lot more fleshed out so that we can seek ontransparency going ahead. Everything's published online, everything that we have to come to a decision to will be and there's regular releases and consultations out there. And in terms of the consultation and the timing, that was a problem that was recognised, there has been a fair amount of consultation going out there. It is agreed with all of our partners, there's a MORI poll, online poll. So we are trying to do as much as possible, but the timeline was pre-defined, so therefore it wasn't possible to adjust it as much as you would have liked. But I'm sure because the consultation is being carried out by each and every one of us forming one massive thing, I think that'll be quite useful, it will help answers we get back. And in terms of working together, I think we've already experienced a greater bonding between, certainly the County Council and District Councils from going through this process. Us being in the same room together sometimes identified other areas that we can work together. So I think it's a positive process that we've been seeing here.</p>
--	--	---------------	---

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 19TH JULY 2016**

**ITEM 5 – PETITIONS**

**Text of a petition containing 3,356 signatures presented by Mr Charles Nisbet**

**“Save our Trees and Verges**

The Greater Cambridge City Deal plan to widen Milton Road to four lanes of traffic. To do this they want to remove 83% of our lovely flowering trees. There are alternatives.”

**Petition Organiser Mr Charles Nisbet**

Thank you Chairman . . . This petition was drafted in the middle of winter when the first proposals became known for the destruction of Milton Road as we know it. It's acquired 3356 signatures, half of which are online and half of which are in hard copy obtained by a lot of hard work by your voters throughout the town.

The meaning, the wording rather, of the petition is 'the Greater Cambridge City Deal are proposing to widen Milton Road, chopping down the beautiful cherry trees, removing the grass verges and replacing them with acres of tarmac. As many as 83% of the trees on Milton Road are destined to be removed if these proposals go ahead. The local residents are horrified that their avenue will be turned into a treeless corridor, closing key routes into side streets and splitting the community in two. Recent research has encouraged towns and cities to plant trees and shrubs along roads, citing the environmental advantages not only for air quality, but also for the wellbeing of citizens by reducing stress. Grass verges, in addition to tree roots, help with drainage problems. Some cities in the UK have actually changed their road layouts to incorporate trees. Cambridge should be at the forefront of such developments. There are many alternatives to widening the road.'

Now as you heard that was addressed to the City Deal. So why am I bringing it to you the County Council? Well the reason is that when you delegated to the City Deal, you delegated authority for the exercise of their functions. You actually said "to delegate exercise of their functions to the Executive Board to the extent necessary to pursue and achieve the objectives of Greater Cambridge City Deal." You didn't delegate responsibility; indeed I don't believe you can. So the ultimate responsibility for those functions, including highways, remains with you.

The second reason is that when City Deal comes to an end, either in its natural course or if it hurries, because they run out of money or because the changed attitude of the new prime minister suggests that we no longer give to those who have but they move money elsewhere; if that happens you will be left picking up – dealing with the outcome. If that includes the wreck of Milton Road, there'll be a lot of very angry voters whose ire will be directed against you of course, not against the non-existent City Deal.

And the third reason relates to funding. The latest version of the do something plans for Milton Road appear to show not that 83% of the trees will be removed, but that every tree will be removed. Some will be replanted though only on one side of the road. But it's completely unclear whether or not the Greater Cambridge City Deal's funding will allow it to pay for tree planting. Is that transport infrastructure? It might well be argued that it isn't. So, if they cut down all the trees and then say "but we're not allowed to replant them", you will be presented

with a very short term decision as to whether or not you're going to fund a lot of planting of new trees to replace the ones that could have been left there. So that's why I think it's your business.

What do the residents want their County Council to do?

Well we think you ought to exercise a measure of oversight of the City Deal by requiring regular reports from them about issues that affect you. Secondly and this is an odd one, we think you ought to remind your officers who it is that takes the decisions at Shire Hall. I would have thought that was an extraordinary and unnecessary remark, but one quite senior officer of the Council was recently heard telling a local pressure group that they didn't have to bother about the fact that they weren't on local liaison forums and so forth, because ultimately the decisions would be taken by the officers. I don't think that's right and I don't think you think that's right either. When you receive advice, I think you need to challenge deeply the officers' advice and insist on proper replies. Supported by real evidence, not waffle and generalities which justify the officers' prejudices.

Above all, we think you ought to delay any irreversible destruction of the existing trees and verges until all other methods of resolving the congestion problem have been properly tried and tested. The avenue of trees on Milton Road were recently described to me by a resident in another part of the City as one of the glories of Cambridge. They're an asset created by your farsighted predecessors and now, they're in your custody. Please ensure that they're not wantonly destroyed.

(Chairman. Thank you very much Mr Nisbet for your petition. Right. Members. The petition can now be discussed for a maximum of 15 minutes if you desire. You will need to decide how to respond to the petition at this meeting. . . .)

## **Councillors speaking to the petition**

### **Councillor Jocelynn Scutt**

Thank you. Labour has always been for trees and verges and I stand here for trees and verges now, thanking Charles Nisbet for bringing the petition to the County Council and Maureen Mays, Clare Hughes and the many who assisted in ensuring that more than 3000 signatures were received.

I note Labour's support for trees and verges because I want the City Deal Board and the Assembly and us here to remember this history affirming this country's past commitment for trees and verges, a commitment that must be present and future for the City Deal, Milton Road and the wards and divisions surrounding.

The garden city movement led into the new city movement and it wanted everyone to have the free gifts of nature, fresh air, sunlight, breathing room and playing room in all needed abundance. Renowned Labour and Fabian member H G Wells wanted for everyone all the beauty that is here and more also and none of the distresses. Even one of our Fabians died in support of trees. George Bernard Shaw was trimming an apple or cherry blossom in his garden and fell and consequently he died of pneumonia which often follows the hip-breaking that affected him. He ended his life in that way. The Atlee government introduced a new town movement complementing garden cities. The New Towns Act of 1946 and Town and Country Planning Act 1947 created a revolutionary machinery for positive town construction. Twenty eight new towns were constructed over the next half century, with Labour ministers determined to bring the project to fruition. Hugh Dalton, Richard Crossman, Anthony Greenwood.

Trees at roadside, along verges and pedestrian and cycle segregation are major new town features, together with well treed extensive parks and green wedges lined by trees and verges coming into the centre of town. We have an assurance that trees, verges and public realm will be included in every workshop for Milton Road local liaison forum and this is the message coming from us here at the County Council to the City Deal Board and Assembly.

Trees matter, verges matter; trees count, verges count. They count for Cambridge; they count for Milton Road. We want and I will be asking a commitment from the City Deal Assembly and Board that if in the end construction requires removal of any single one of the trees in Milton Road, then the City Deal monies return to Milton Road mature trees lining Milton Road's verges, making Milton Road the impressive vista it should be – a lead into Cambridge of which us, all of us, can be proud – and I commend the petition to the County and I ask that the County send it to the City Deal Board and Assembly as coming from the County because of our having delegated the matter to the City Deal Board. Thank you.

### **Councillor Bill Hunt**

Thank you Chair. I think I'd have to declare an interest in this matter as I was actually born in Milton Road and therefore it's always been a very special entrance to Cambridge for me.

I think Cambridge is special. Cambridge is unique and it isn't Harlow or Milton Keynes and I think the City centre is approached by roads and vistas, not by transport corridors. And I think we should be aware, and in this case I'm urging balance and reasonable thought, because Cambridge is not just a place to do business. It's a place where people have homes and they want to have communities that thrive and they are not just houses along a route into a trading centre.

I think there is potential huge damage being done to our environment if these trees are needlessly attacked and I recognise the need to move people around for the benefit of business and private lives. I do however have experience with this mini-Holland experience in the London Borough of Waltham Forest and it's a nightmare. It's an Orwellian nightmare. Only the main roads work. All the back roads are blocked up, so when there's a traffic accident the emergency services can't get there, they can't get the people into hospital. Please be very cautious about this mini-Holland. Add to it, PCCPs, which really sound lovely and workplace parking levies and you end up with a place that people are not going to say "let's go to Cambridge", they're going to say "let's avoid Cambridge, it's a nightmare".

So, I'm actually urging that a really considered view is taken by the City Deal and that they do recognise that support for this vista and these trees comes not just from one side of this chamber but across the chamber and it comes from me.

### **Councillor Fiona Onasanya**

Thank you Chair. I just wanted to say thank you for bringing the petition but also just to note that we had delegated powers for making the decision to the City Board at City Deal, that I just wanted to make that comment because I know there were questions raised in the petition about why we as the County are not doing something, and also to say that there have been no final decisions made as yet and it is still going through consultation. So please do keep your feedback coming to us and we will put forward what you have said but we have to go to the City Deal Board. Thank you.

### **Councillor Paul Bullen**

Thank you Chairman and thank you Mr Nisbet and the residents of the vicinity for bringing this to this chamber. I think we all remember that in a meeting not that long ago we voted on

whether we give this authority to the City Deal Board. My party voted unanimous against doing so and as much as I hate to say "I told you so", I think this is the first instance where that decision is going to come back and bite us. And I do feel for you and the residents because this chamber cannot do anything. We've given away that authority, and if we also vote through the devolution deal we're going to give even more authority from our highways to that assembly. So I think we as a chamber need to really seriously think about what we've done, learn from this and consider whether we wish to take those powers back again from the City Deal Board and I'm not sure that we can even do it. But I agree, I think it is an Orwellian scheme. It's outdated, it's been proven not to work elsewhere and there are other schemes for easing congestion and I give Liverpool as a prime example, where actually they've taken bus lanes away and taken traffic lights away and it's actually eased congestion.

So I firmly believe that the City Deal Board do need to look again at this idea and to have a look at all the other ideas before they decide to put it back to public consultation. I personally think it was a bad decision we made in the first place and that this scheme is bad for the City and for the residents.

### **Councillor Anna Bailey**

Thank you Chairman. I welcome the petition. It's the view of the local people about their area and they clearly care about it passionately. I would welcome some clarity about the legal situation, about the issue that has been raised by the petitioner on the delegation. Ultimately I believe this authority retains overall responsibility for highways, so I think perhaps away from this meeting I would welcome some clarification on that.

I've got great sympathy with the plight of these trees and the residents who care about them. You know, it's not easy if you're the one asked to cut it down with the chainsaw and it's in your area, it's unbelievably difficult and trees are really important. These particular trees have been under threat many times over the years and I should think the residents are fairly fed up of having to mount this challenge over and over again. Officers of this Council will be aware of my concern about overall loss of trees across the whole county. It's something which I am trying to address and I do see this as the potential thin end of a wedge which might ultimately take into its ultimate end, you know, we could start looking at what to do with Jesus Green and Parker's Piece and Midsummer Common.

These are special and important features of our landscape. However there is a governance structure in place as other people have said and the City Deal, whether you agree with the plans or not, have carefully put out some very considered plans and the place to talk about those is during this consultation. They are only plans and I for one have heard that 3300 odd residents are deeply unhappy about one element of those plans and I think the City Deal needs to take very careful note about that, because it is their area. But we shouldn't undermine the governance of the City Deal and our partners who share responsibility in the City Deal and therefore I would urge the City Deal to look at this petition very, very carefully and see whether there are more creative solutions and ways around it.

Thank you Chairman.

### **Councillor Roger Henson**

Yes Mr Chairman .my home Norman Cross, is miles away from Milton Road, and I've had four phone calls to me . . . and I look at it from this point of view. It's got 3300 residents in this paperwork; they're 3300 voters and we keep doing useless things and wasting money in my opinion in various places and when you drive through these avenue of trees they are part of our history. And also remember that the 3300 voters will be the ones you won't get next year if you go against them. Thank you very much.

## **Councillor Ian Manning**

Thank you Chair. To say I welcome the words from Councillor Scutt. . . . thanks so much for (*inaudible*) the history lesson. I didn't quite follow all of it but I think history's quite important here and Councillor Bullen mentioned the history of our delegations earlier, where his party and my party voted against the removal of powers from Cambridge Joint Area Committee which would of course have put us in a decision - with the City Council – put us in a position of being able to stop this scheme. Having said all that I do welcome her words and I welcome the implication that her fellow Labour party member Councillor Lewis Herbert will be working hard as a voting decision maker on the City Deal Executive Board to make sure this doesn't go through. That said, you'll have a White Paper in front of you with what I would like to propose as a response to this petition. Do you want me to read it out Chair?

## **Chairman**

Yes, and if you could make it clear perhaps that this is a statement rather than a motion. Councillor Count are you raising a point of order?

## **Councillor Steve Count**

Yes I am, a point of order on the handling of petitions. It's very clear that the petition should have called for an action in order to be heard. It's not up to this Council to supply one. To supply one 13 minutes into a 15 minute debate, it's not appropriate because now we have to debate something and we've got about two minutes left on. It's entirely inappropriate.

## **Chairman**

Having taken legal advice on this matter, the reality is that anything put forward by any member simply will be a straight yes or no vote, so if you don't support what Councillor Manning is going to propose then vote against it. There were also suggestions I think from Councillor Scutt and indeed from Councillor Bailey of ways that Council might move forward which we will come to. Councillor Manning.

## **Councillor Ian Manning**

So just to read out the wording. 'This Council wishes to express its opposition to any plan that would result in the removal of the majority of trees from Milton Road. Further, Council believes the measures contained in the City Deal do not represent efficient or desirable ways of cutting congestion and ask that more options be considered in the public consultation.'

## **Chairman**

Thank you. We have no other speakers, so we have a series of – Councillor Count.

## **Councillor Steve Count**

Yeah. Very simple response. It's not possible for us to digest that simple motion. For example it talks about majority of trees, so we don't know what schemes would or would not happen if the majority of trees are there. Etc etc. It's simply not possible to come to a rational decision. I therefore will be voting against.

## **Councillor Maurice Leeke**

I indicated that I wished to speak Chairman. Is it that you ran out of time. . . ?

## **Chairman**

Very sorry Councillor Leeke. You did and I did not write your name down. I do apologise. If you can keep it brief then I shall, as form of apology, allow you to rise.

## **Councillor Maurice Leeke**

That's very kind Chairman. I should just like to make some very quick points. As Councillor Bailey mentioned, it's not the first time it's come to this chamber. I remember with colleagues opposing a similar move when I was Councillor at West Chesterton and I'm glad that we were successful then, and all of the Liberal Democrats opposed the proposal for the changes on Milton Road at the City Deal Assembly. It is as Mr Nisbet suggested I think a case of spending money, rather than spending money wisely and in this case it really is the wrong way round, because so much that the City Deal is and should be doing is about reducing traffic and therefore reducing the need for schemes such as the one on Milton Road and I think it's inappropriate that this is coming before the effects of those changes are introduced.

## **Councillor Ashley Walsh**

I'm no constitutional lawyer Mr Chair but, is there any power you have Mr Chair to extend the debate because this motion does not actually relate just to the trees. It relates to the measures contained in the City Deal, all of them. We can't debate that in 30 seconds. This holds the process of (*inaudible*) in contempt.

## **Chairman**

So Members, the constitutional position is that we accept the petition, you are entitled to debate the petition for 15 minutes. Council then will decide what action to take and it has been left fairly open and I read from the notes. 'It may decide to take the action the petitioner requests, not to take the action requested, to commission further investigation for example by the relevant committee.' So on that basis it is fairly fluid but what is very clear is that there should be no debate of any of the proposals. So it's a clear vote yes or no. Councillor Count.

## **Councillor Steve Count**

I'm sorry Chairman, I must challenge the advice that you've received in that quote in accepting the petition. Petition guidelines, types of petitions, format of petitions, 'the petition submitted to the Council must include the following. A clear statement of your concerns and what you want the Council to do.'. It did not include the second. On a subsequent page it states clearly, 'petitions will not be accepted unless they're in the correct format.'. It's missing that. I was perfectly content for us all to have this debate because I think it's an important subject but to be dragged into a two minute discussion on actually a motion put forward which we are answering on the basis of an ordinary debate where the time is unlimited compressed into two minutes is wholly unreasonable. The petition actually should not have been accepted under those rules.

## **Chairman**

Thank you Councillor Count. I did seem to recall that Mr Nisbet did make a series of



proposals about how we might proceed.

### **Councillor Steve Count**

Chairman we have a written petition in front of us. That is the petition we've heard. Speaking to the petition is not the petition.

### **Chairman**

Well, I think Councillor Count on that note I shall take further legal advice. (*Pause for legal advice*). Right. Councillor Count. I think the first point I would make is that this would have been a more useful point to raise before the meeting began or indeed, at the beginning of the debate. But anyway given that it wasn't, the way I intend to treat this is as follows. Councillor Manning has put forward a statement that he wishes the Council to vote on. Councillor Bailey has put forward a proposal I understand in that you wanted to refer this for further investigation . . . and Councillor Scutt put forward initially the fact that you wanted to put the City Deal Board to take our views into account.

### **Councillor Jocelynn Scutt**

It was that we refer the petition to the City Deal Board with an imprimatur that we want them to take it into account. Yes.

### **Chairman**

In which case, we will now take votes and we will take three and we will take them in chronological order. We will start with Councillor Scutt's proposal, we will then move on to yours Councillor Bailey and then we will move to Councillor Manning's. . . . do you wish to drop yours? (*Councillor Bailey confirms she does*). OK. We will then have two votes. The first will be on Councillor Scutt's proposal . . . we will take a vote firstly on Councillor Scutt's proposal, or suggestion rather, that this is referred to the City Deal Executive with the views as expressed in the chamber and the second vote will be on the statement, it is not a motion but a statement, as submitted by Councillor Manning and it is up to you to vote yes or no in support of either of those two positions. Is everybody clear?

**(Agreement. Proceed to vote). (See main Minute)**

**County Council**

**Tuesday 19th July 2016**

**Oral Questions**

**1) Question from Councillor Paul Sales**

I'd like to ask whoever is responsible for transport . . . it's about Park & Rides in Britain . . . I'd just like to ask whether or not consideration would be given to reducing the charge for Park & Rides to £1.00 to incorporate not only the parking, but also the journey into town . . . for a limited period, so that it would demonstrate the fact that it's an effective means of getting people to leave their car behind. That's the question.

**Response from Councillor Roger Hickford, Deputy Leader**

It's not my remit obviously, but I'll just say that as part of the City Deal there is an aspiration to reduce Park & Ride charges overall. I'm sure there'll be a written answer coming back to you from Councillor Bates in due course.

**2) Question from Councillor David Jenkins**

This would be for Ian Bates as our man on the City Deal Executive, but he's not here. Does he have a deputy or should I just make the question and leave it?

**Response from the Chairman**

I think what we will do is if you put your question, it'll be in the Minutes and he will supply you with a written answer.

**Councillor Jenkins**

Right. Three things happening. One, we have a consultation on what you might refer to as the City Deal phase one initiatives, which of course includes the Milton Road thing. Lots of stuff in there about making it easy for people to ride buses. Item two is the stats which we saw at the Economy & Environment Committee last week which showed bus patronage is going down. And item three, the City Deal Executive Board last week approved a study to understand how people make their transport decisions. I would suggest those are being done in the wrong order and if we were to start again we might get some better answers, so may I have a response on that? . . . Does Councillor Bates agree with me that this has been done in the wrong order and that they should be looking at the results of their study before they decide what to do?

**3) Question from Councillor Derek Giles**

Chairman, I refer to the sighting of wildebeest in St Neots, as somebody said to me the other day. But on a serious note, the grass cutting of some amenity grass in St Neots has been abysmal this year. Huntingdonshire District Council are the contractors for cutting Cambridgeshire County Council grass and verges three times a year. I understand that these three cuts have already been carried out and we are only part way through the growing season. My question is, what financial arrangements are in place to pay for additional cuts that will inevitably be needed before the wildebeest finally take over? Seriously. Ignore the last bit.

## **Response from Councillor Mac McGuire, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

Chairman, I am aware of the particular issue that Councillor Giles is referring to. It is right: Huntingdonshire District Council have done their three cuts a year and therefore effectively switched off on 1 July. Together with the Executive Director, I met with their Portfolio Holder and the Managing Director HDC last week to discuss this. At the moment there are no actual proposals to increase the number of cuts, but we are in discussions, Chairman. It is at a broader issue than just simply the three cuts, but I will take on board what Councillor Giles says. We are aware of it. It is an issue particularly in Huntingdonshire as a result of the, effectively, unilateral decision by HDC, but I can assure him we are dealing with the matter.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Giles**

Yes. Thank you for the confirmation of what we already know. My question really was, what financial arrangements are in place to pay for additional cuts?

### **Response from Councillor McGuire**

Chairman, I thought I had actually addressed that by saying that at this particular moment there are no additional arrangements. We are in discussion with HDC as to how we can proceed.

### **4) Question from Councillor Barry Chapman**

I have a question; I'm not sure who to direct it to. It's about the boundary commission review.

### **Response from the Chairman**

Well let's hear the question and then maybe I'll answer it.

### **Councillor Chapman**

Well, for quite a few weeks since I discovered the base information that was being used for my area I've been asking questions of both Cambridgeshire Insight and of the LGBC as to where the numbers that they had for current electorate/ proposed electorate come from. And those haven't been – they haven't been able to answer those questions at the moment. There are . . . differences of thousands of electors and thousands of houses in the county divisions between their reports, the declared electorate at elections and now most recently the District Council have published their boundary review recommendations, which again have different figures which cannot be reconciled. Now I understand that LGBC are going ahead with their recommendations for the commission within the next few days and I'm still waiting after many weeks for an explanation as to where these figures came from.

### **Response from Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council**

Yes thank you. I'll try the best I can, but I will come back to what we're going to do. So my understanding is that the figures are not just based on the existing electorate but also encompass the local plans moving forward, so the expected increase. There are factors that they take into account for that and that is what drives the ultimate figures. The figures have been about for an awful long while now because we actually reopened (or not we but Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC)) reopened the consultation. So it's quite late to be challenging the figures that were based at the very outset. However, it's a valid question.

Where did the figures come from? What are they based on? So I think if that's the question you're asking you deserve an answer, so if you put that question into an email to me I will get the answer for you.

### **Supplementary from Councillor Chapman**

Well I'm not (*happy with that*) because I have been challenging these figures and presumptions for quite some time, many months. I have been seeking this information from officers and the last response I had from an officer on this was about 6 June. So I'm not happy, no. I just think there's no explanation. Where we have - for example, in Little Paxton we've got 262 new homes in the forecast period. Somehow there are only 200 electors in those 262 new homes. There doesn't appear to be any adjustment for those that are 15, that are going to become 15 in 2014 that will be coming onto the electoral register and there are gross differences between the county and district figures, as well as the declared electorate.

### **Response from the Chairman**

Thank you Councillor Chapman. I think that Councillor Count has undertaken to respond to you by email and that's probably the best we can do.

### **5) Question from Councillor Simone Taylor**

I think this is to the Chairman of ETE. Who am I talking to?

#### **Chairman**

Put it anyway. It will go in the Minutes and he'll respond in writing.

### **Councillor Simone Taylor**

As the largest town in Cambridgeshire with the fastest rate of percentage population growth, I would like to ask the Chairman of the ETE Committee what is the Council doing to ensure sustainability through provision of additional employment? When will St Neots, like Cambourne, Alconbury and Ely, have an enterprise zone? Thank you.

### **6) Question from Councillor Julie Wisson**

My question is to the Chairman of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee and it's also on grass cutting. Different grass cutting although my concern is also the same concern as Councillor Giles' in St Neots, but my grass cutting question is to do with the Rights of Way in the countryside. Two villages in my division, Abbotsley and Great Paxton, still have not had their footpaths cut for the first time and the grass is now three feet tall, making access to anybody very difficult. Can the Chairman tell me when the grass is likely to be cut please?

### **Response from Councillor Mac McGuire, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

Councillor Wisson did give me notice of the fact she was going to ask me this question. I can't give her a direct answer as to when it will be cut, but I am in discussions with again the Executive Director to talk about this aim. As Councillor Wisson knows, it is to some way connected with the previous answer given to Councillor Giles. Although we, County Councils do remain responsible for cutting the grass on the Rights of Way, although we make arrangements with parishes, there is no one simple straightforward answer because there are different arrangements Chairman, in different parishes. But I will endeavour to get

Councillor Wisson an answer as soon as possible as to when they will achieve that first cut, and subsequent cuts, hopefully.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Wisson**

One of the replies by email, on a report that was put in by a resident on the highways reporting to do with grass cutting, the reply she got was that the contractors had a mechanical failure. Which I don't think is good enough to be honest. And what assurance can the Chairman give me for next year when the grass grows? The grass grows every year; can we try and prepare for it a little earlier please?

### **Response from Councillor McGuire**

I wasn't aware of the email or reference to the mechanical breakdown so I can't answer that part of the question directly, but what Councillor Wisson has done is given me the opportunity to talk about is that, this apparently has been an exceptional year for grass growth; I guess it's something to do with the weather. We also face exceptional years when we talk about winter. Maybe it's time this Council actually starts thinking not just about winter maintenance, on how we deal with the peaks and troughs. Maybe we have to start looking at summer maintenance as well to deal with some of these peaks and troughs and recognise there's going to be a higher cost in some years than there is in other years. So Chairman, it's something I want to address both through the committee and with colleagues in this Council.

### **7) Question from Councillor Ian Manning**

I think this is a question for Councillor Bates . . .

### **Chairman**

Let's hear it – briefly – and it'll go in the Minutes.

### **Councillor Manning**

It's just that there is a rumour going round on Twitter (it was perpetuated by a certain Mr Taylor) that the Greater Cambridge City Deal has said that the decisions on the Milton Road trees whatever they are, will be taken by officers. I don't believe that is the case. I believe it will be taken effectively when the overall scheme comes back to the Executive Board to be voted on. Could we please get clarification on that please?

### **8) Question from Councillor Sir Peter Brown to Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council**

My question is to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Count, and it relates to matters regarding the fire authority and the police and crime commissioner and the police and crime bill that is now going through Parliament. I think by the end of the year the police and crime commissioner will be making a case, a business case, for what he wants to do to get involved with the local fire service. At some point that case has to come before this Council as the primary authority. I just wonder what he can tell me as to what the arrangements might be when that business case comes forward and how we're going to consider it.

### **Response from Councillor Count, Leader of the Council**

Thank you Sir Peter. I'm unaware of the exact process to be fair. However, we have a constitution that lays down our relationship with all bodies. It stresses the limits for delegation and it will follow that. All I can say is that whatever involvement this Council has in looking at that business case will be given the full and due diligence that all of our other business is given.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Brown**

Chairman, could I just ask that, that case actually comes before a meeting of this Council and is not delegated?

### **Response from Councillor Count**

Thank you. What I'll do Sir Peter is I'll have a look at where we are in the delegations regarding that and then I shall circulate to everybody a written reply and on the basis of that, we can come to a view as to what's the best way to proceed.

### **9) Question from Councillor Mike Mason to Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council**

The question is, can the Leader please say if the reports into the Cambridgeshire guided busway defects, currently in dispute with BAM Nuttall, have been received by the Council and indicate the date of publication to members and the public? The background to the question Chairman, and I did give written notice of this yesterday, is that a discussion which we had at E & E Spokes some months ago when Bob Menzies indicated that publication of the report to members would be in early summer. Now it is of vital importance to this Council in the business planning process that any financial implications emerging from those defect reports be taken into account during the discussion for next year's budget. Can I just briefly refer to the risk register – the corporate risk register number 26 – where the result of a failure of busway bearings or movement of foundations, the significant and on-going costs to maintain the busway to the extent that it will no longer be attractive to the operators or to passengers. In other words, the longer this report is delayed and the longer we delay decisions on how we're going to deal with it, the huge financial risk accrues to the Council. So I do want to ask, when is this report going to be made public?

### **Response from Councillor Count, Leader of the Council**

Yes. Thank you for advance notice of the first part of the question, but the second part I'm going to address first. In the risk register as you've quite correctly identified, there is a risk of what may happen as it goes through the entire risk register. Alongside that there are mitigating factors, so for example where the busway has any defects at the moment, regular maintenance is carried out so that it doesn't get into that trap of actually becoming so uncomfortable that people don't use it. So I hope you'll take some reassurance on that. With regards to the report on the busway defects, the report is currently being drafted by our expert advisers and I know that you were told it would be with us by early summer, or be with all of us by early summer. However, the reason for delay (there is now a delay) is that, that report has identified some further investigation and analysis that is required. So the latest update is we expect it to be shared with us – to the members and the public – in the autumn.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Mason**

I do find that very unsatisfactory Chairman, because this report was initiated last September. We were promised a six month investigation and meanwhile we have the jeopardy to the

Council's cash flow position which we have to deal with on a day to day basis. And the other point and just extending that a little bit to what Councillor Count was saying, the funds that have been set aside from liquidated damages to deal with these legal costs etc have now diminished from £10 million to £2.8 million, so I'm really a little bit wary of taking the assurance from Councillor Count. Can he now please give me an assurance that this report will be debated and that meeting dates will be set to deal with this report: rather than just say the autumn, can he please now schedule some dates when these reports will in fact be discussed by this Council?

### **Response from Councillor Count**

Yes thank you. Thank you for those comments on the actual figures involved. The difficulty is this is an extremely complex piece of work and we've employed some very competent outside people to look at it from our point of view. There are opposing viewpoints; there are legal aspects of the contract being looked at and we could rush along the report I suppose, but actually it's better to get a job well done and finalised than it is to rush it along. So at the moment our advice is that we need to give this some extra time to be a full and competent report. Having said that, I take on board what you're asking for is to actually say what does autumn mean and let's have some meetings scheduled in, so I will take that up with officers and see what we can do about that.

### **10) Question from Councillor Peter Downes to Councillor Joan Whitehead, Chair of the Children & Young People Committee**

This question is directed to the Chair of the CYP Committee, Councillor Whitehead. I have given her advance notice.

Is Councillor Whitehead aware of the report published a few days ago by the Education Policy Institute which has been looking in great detail at school performance in multi-academy trusts and local authorities and which comes to this conclusion. Just a very short extract: 'It is inevitable that people will want to draw comparisons between the performance of academies and that of schools that remain with the local authority. What this analysis shows is that the variation between local authorities is just as great as that seen between multi-academy trusts. Just as with the multi-academy trusts, there are some authorities where schools are continuing to thrive and others where results remain consistently low.' And this is the important sentence: 'Taken in aggregate, there is no substantial or consistent evidence for multi-academy trusts being more effective than local authorities or vice versa.' Now that is a very important piece of information for us to have in mind at this critical time, facing the future of our remaining local authority primary schools, because the process of transferring from local authority to being a multi-academy trust is in itself a very time consuming operation, in terms of human time and in costs and is very divisive. And I think this shows that we must warn our primary schools that are considering this move that it will almost certainly make no difference to the performance of the children. And I hope that the Chairman of the CYP is aware of this and will join me in passing that message on to the schools for which we retain responsibility.

### **Response from Councillor Whitehead**

Thank you Chair. I wasn't aware of the report: I was out of the country last week and haven't read it. I am however slightly surprised by its findings, although of course it is taking a national average, because of course theirs do not reflect what happens in Cambridgeshire. Where it's difficult: we can't make any comparison with secondary school because they're all academies, but we are unhappy about many of them. But at primary level, although there are not many primary academies, they do do less well than the majority of primary schools that have remained under local authority control in the maintained sector. So we would

certainly not wish to encourage any of the maintained sector primary schools to move to an academy for any reason at all. And indeed, given that Keith Grimwade and his team have maintained an excellent programme of support for maintained primary schools, which means that they are doing better than the academies, one would hope that one might be able to lobby the new Education (*Secretary*) Justine Greening to ask whether in fact the reverse process can go ahead as academies can in fact vote to return into the maintained sector. Thank you Chair.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Downes**

May I just say that that is reassuring. Of course the point I'm referring was that it was not just based upon Cambridgeshire but it is a national picture . . . (*My supplementary question*) is to welcome (*Councillor Whitehead's*) comments and to hope that we can work together constructively to put the interests of our pupils first rather than our systems.

### **Response from Councillor Whitehead**

We do indeed do that Chair and we will hope to continue to do so and to improve our relationship with the Cabinet, to try to get them to improve the service they provide to pupils.

### **11) Question from Councillor Samantha Hoy to Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council**

My question is for the Leader of the Council. Will Councillor Count join me in condemning the remarks made by some Cambridge City Councillors at the last meeting. I must stress I'm not talking about Labour members on this Council. I've never heard such vulgar remarks from them and I also must stress this is not about Councillor Hipkin because he was the only Councillor that came to Fenland's defence at that meeting. Will the Leader condemn the remarks made by some Councillors, who referred to Fenland people as badly educated racists. This smug superiority does not help work towards a cohesive County and we must not take these remarks and we must distance ourselves from them.

### **Response from Councillor Count**

Thank you. Councillor Hoy advised me of this question earlier, but in the subsequent time I haven't had a chance to actually look at the footage of this. But I was aware of it. I was aware that it had created a bit of a storm on YouTube and it literally was labelled as 'What Cambridge City think of us'. So I have to say that if the words "badly educated racists" was used about the people of Fenland, then I absolutely support that this is an abhorrent thing and people really need to understand what goes on in our communities a lot better than they are jumping to conclusions. I know that a lot of people have a lot of things to say about the residents of Cambridge you know, but I'm not going to repeat whether they're elitist, or superior or very smug . . . because whatever words are used you know, I think Councillor Reeve summed it up very nicely and so did Councillor Hipkin. We're all people rubbing along together; we're just people. We're not here, there, everywhere, colours or everything. We're just people and that's the best way we can treat each other.



## COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2016/17

### POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEES

#### **GENERAL PURPOSES (17)**

CLLR	A BAILEY	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	I BATES	C	CLLR	D HARTY	C
CLLR	D BROWN	C	CLLR	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	S COUNT	C	CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	CLLR	M SHUTER	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	T ORGEE	C	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	A WALSH	L	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	E CEARNS	LD	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR		L
CLLR	M LEEKE	LD	CLLR		L
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	CLLR	P DOWNES	LD
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP	CLLR		LD
CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP	CLLR	M SHELLENS	LD
CLLR	M TEW	UKIP	CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD
			CLLR		UKIP
			CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP
			CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP
			CLLR	A LAY	UKIP

#### **ADULTS (13)**

CLLR	A BAILEY	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	C BODEN	C	CLLR	P BROWN	C
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	CLLR	M LOYNES	C
CLLR	S HOY	C	CLLR	T ORGEE	C
CLLR	G KENNEY	C	CLLR	M SMITH	C
CLLR	F YEULETT	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	D GILES	IND	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	Z MOGHADAS	L	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	L DUPRE	LD	CLLR		L
CLLR	G WILSON	LD	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	R MANDLEY	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
CLLR	M TEW	UKIP	CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
			CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD
			CLLR	P DOWNES	LD
			CLLR	I MANNING	LD
			CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD
			CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP
			CLLR	P CLAPP	UKIP
			CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP
			CLLR	A LAY	UKIP

### CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE (13)

CLLR	D BROWN	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	P BROWN	C	CLLR	S HOY	C
CLLR	S FROST	C	CLLR	G KENNEY	C
CLLR	D HARTY	C	CLLR	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	M LOYNES	C	CLLR	F YEULETT	C
CLLR	J WISSON	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	Z MOGHADAS	L	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	M LEEKE	LD	CLLR	F ONASANYA	L
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
			CLLR	I MANNING	LD
			CLLR		LD
			CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD
			CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD
			CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP
			CLLR	P CLAPP	UKIP
			CLLR	G GILICK	UKIP

### ECONOMY & ENVIRONMENT (13)

CLLR	I BATES	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	J CLARK	C	CLLR	R BUTCHER	C
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	CLLR	D CONNOR	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	CLLR	D HARTY	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	CLLR	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	M SHUTER	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	M MASON	IND.	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	E CEARNS	LD	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	A LAY	UKIP	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP	CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
			CLLR	S KINDERSLEY	LD
			CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD
			CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD
			CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP
			CLLR	G GILICK	UKIP
			CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP

## HEALTH (13)

CLLR	L HARFORD	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	CLLR	P BROWN	C
CLLR	M LOYNES	C	CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C
CLLR	T ORGEE	C	CLLR	J WISSON	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	CLLR		C
CLLR	P TOPPING	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	P SALES	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD			
CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L
CLLR	P CLAPP	UKIP	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	A DENT	UKIP	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
			CLLR	A WALSH	L
			CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD
			CLLR	M LEEKE	LD
			CLLR		LD
			CLLR		LD
			CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			CLLR		UKIP
			CLLR	R MANDLEY	UKIP
			CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP

## HIGHWAYS & COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE (13)

CLLR	R BUTCHER	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	D CONNOR	C	CLLR	I BATES	C
CLLR	S CRISWELL	C	CLLR	S FROST	C
CLLR	B HUNT	C	CLLR	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	CLLR	J PALMER	C
CLLR	M ROUSE	C	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	G GILLICK	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP	CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
			CLLR	L DUPRE	LD
			CLLR	D JENKINS	LD
			CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD
			CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP
			CLLR		UKIP
			CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP
			CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP

## **REGULATORY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE (11)**

CLLR	D CONNOR	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	C BODEN	C
CLLR	B HUNT	C	K REYNOLDS	C
CLLR	M LOYNES	C	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	M SHUTER	C
CLLR	M MASON	IND	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	D GILES	IND
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	S KINDERSLEY	LD	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP	P SALES	L
CLLR	A LAY	UKIP		L
				L
				L
			E CEARNS	LD
			L DUPRE	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
			J WILLIAMS	LD
			P BULLEN	UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP
			R HENSON	UKIP
			M TEW	UKIP

## **OTHER COMMITTEES**

### **ASSETS & INVESTMENT COMMITTEE (7)**

CLLR	C BODEN	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	A BAILEY	C
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	I BATES	C
CLLR	P SALES	L	S COUNT	C
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD		C
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP		L
CLLR	A DENT	UKIP		L
				L
				L
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
				LD
				LD
				LD
				UKIP
			D DIVINE	UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP
			M TEW	UKIP

### AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (7)

CLLR		C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	I BATES	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	J CLARK	C
CLLR	P TOPPING	C		C
CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND	S FROST	C
CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L	D GILES	IND
CLLR	M SHELLENS	LD	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP	M MASON	IND
			S TAYLOR	IND
			N KAVANAGH	L
			F ONASANYA	L
			A WALSH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L
			P DOWNES	LD
			D JENKINS	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
			G WILSON	LD
			P BULLEN	UKIP
				UKIP
			A DENT	UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP

### CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE (11)

CLLR		C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	D BROWN	C	A BAILEY	C
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C		C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	S FROST	C
CLLR	K REYNOLDS	C	J WISSON	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	D GILES	IND
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	M MASON	IND
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	E CEARNES	LD	S CRAWFORD	L
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP	A WALSH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L
			P DOWNES	LD
			M LEEKE	LD
			S VAN DE VEN	LD
			J WILLIAMS	LD
			P ASHCROFT	UKIP
				UKIP
			P CLAPP	UKIP
			A DENT	UKIP

### CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (6)

		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
E CEARNES	LD	B ASHWOOD	LD
I MANNING	LD	L NETHSINGHA	LD
A TAYLOR	LD		LD
N KAVANAGH	L		LD
J SCUTT	L		LD
A WALSH	L	Z MOGHADAS	L
		F ONASANYA	L
		P SALES	L
		J WHITEHEAD	L

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD (5)**

T ORGEE	C	<b>Substitutes (one per position):</b>	
P TOPPING	C	M LOYNES	C
J WHITEHEAD	L	F YEULETT	C
D JENKINS	LD	P SALES	L
P CLAPP	UKIP	L NETHSINGHA	LD
		P REEVE	UKIP

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES (4)**

CLLR	G KENNEY	C	<b>Substitutes (two per group)</b>	
CLLR	T ORGEE	C	L HARFORD	C
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	M LOYNES	C
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			J WILLIAMS	LD
				IND
				IND

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICESJOINT COMMITTEE (3)**

R HICKFORD	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
I MANNING	LD	I BATES	C
P BULLEN	UKIP	S COUNT	C
		R HICKFORD	C
		M SHUTER	C
		D JENKINS	LD
		L NETHSINGHA	LD
		M LEEKE	LD
		M SHELLENS	LD
			UKIP
		P CLAPP	UKIP
		P REEVE	UKIP
		M TEW	UKIP

**NORTHSTOWE JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (4)**

CLLR		C	<b>Substitutes (two per group)</b>	
CLLR	E CEARNES	LD		C
CLLR	P SALES	L		C
CLLR	A WALSH	L		L
				L
			M LEEKE	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD

### PENSION FUND COMMITTEE (6)

CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	G KENNEY	C	J CLARK	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	K REYNOLDS	C
CLLR	M LEEKE	LD	F YEULETT	C
CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L		C
CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP	S CRAWFORD	L
			P SALES	L
			A WALSH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L
			P DOWNES	LD
			M SHELLENS	LD
				LD
				LD
			P BULLEN	UKIP
				UKIP
				UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP

### PENSION FUND COMMITTEE INVESTMENT SUB-COMMITTEE (4)

CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	G KENNEY	C
CLLR	M LEEKE	LD		C
CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP		LD
				UKIP

[Note: Membership drawn from Pension Fund Committee membership]

### PENSION FUND BOARD (2 Employer Representatives)

CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C		
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD		

### STAFFING & APPEALS COMMITTEE (11)

CLLR	P BROWN	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	D BROWN	C
CLLR	G KENNEY	C	S COUNT	C
CLLR	W HUNT	C	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	J PALMER	C
CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	D GILES	IND
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	M MASON	IND
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP		L
CLLR	A DENT	UKIP	N KAVANAGH	L
			P SALES	L
			A WALSH	L
			E CEARNIS	LD
			M LEEKE	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
			S VAN DE VEN	LD
			P ASHCROFT	UKIP
				UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP
			M TEW	UKIP

### SERVICE APPEALS SUB-COMMITTEE (3)

APPOINTED FROM STAFFING & APPEALS COMMITTEE AS AND WHEN NEEDED