

**ACTIONS ARISING FROM DECISIONS MADE AND MOTIONS AGREED AT FULL COUNCIL COVERING DECEMBER 2015,  
MARCH, AND MAY, 2016**

**COUNCIL MEETING 15<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2015**

**2) SECTION 85 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – RECOMMENDATION TO EXTEND SIX MONTH RULE**

**Action**

Following a proposal from Councillor Count that the Council should consider introducing a policy to allow only one extension in to the six month Member absence rule any four year municipal period, Councillor Hickford undertook to raise this issue at Constitution and Ethics Committee.

**Response**

The Constitution and Ethics Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2016 received a report inviting it to consider a proposal that Council should consider introducing a policy to allow only one extension to the six month rule for a councillor in any four year municipal period but agreed to defer the report to their meeting in April pending clarification of the legal position. At the 19<sup>th</sup> April 2016 Constitution and Ethics Committee received a review of the legal position in relation to section 85 of the local government act 1972 and the six month rule and whether it would be legally feasible to impose a restriction on the number of times that Cambridgeshire County Council could grant an extension to the six-month rule. Members noted that, while there was in theory no legal authority preventing the Council from adopting such a restriction, the right of Full Council to approve an extension was embedded in UK legislation, and could not be overridden locally. The Committee noted the contents of the report.

**22<sup>ND</sup> MARCH 2016 COUNCIL MEETING**

**1. ARRANGEMENTS FOR MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL TO JOIN LGSS JOINT COMMITTEE SHARE SERVICES PARTNERSHIP .**

**Action**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the proposed changes to the existing Delegation and Joint Committee Agreement to reflect the addition of Milton Keynes Council as a full partner of the LGSS Joint Committee and the consequent updates to the constitutions of the Councils required to enable this, as reflected in Schedule 2 of the agreement; and

- b) Delegate to the LGSS Managing Director the power to make these and any other necessary or incidental amendments in order to finalise and implement the arrangements.

**Response**

The final sign off of the document to make Milton Keynes Council a full partner of the LGSS Committee was undertaken on 4<sup>th</sup> April.

**2. AGREED MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10**

**A) MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LUCY NETHSINGHA AS AMENDED BY COUNCILLOR HIPKIN**

**Directorate: Chief Executive**

**Lead Officer: Gillian Beasley**

**Lead Member Councillor Steve Count Leader of the Council**

**Action**

This council notes the announcement by the Chancellor of a devolution deal for the East in his budget on 16th March but regrets that the deal, in its current form, is not acceptable to this council.

This council resolves to:-

Request that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Local Government to bring this resolution to his attention.

**Response**

A letter dated 13<sup>th</sup> April from the Chief Executive was sent to the Right Honourable Greg Clark MP, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

**B) MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR HIPKIN**

**Action**

It was resolved:

This Council notes the contents of the recent Cambridgeshire Research Group (CRG) IMD Summary of IMD (Index of Multiple Deprivation) data for Cambridgeshire comparing the differences in national and local ranks and deciles from IMD 2010 to IMD 2015.

This Council further notes the main findings of the CRG Summary as follows:

- Compared to 2010, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire now rank as more deprived in national terms than previously - Cambridge City ranks as less deprived.
- Cambridgeshire now has 16 LSOAs (Lower-layer Super Output Areas) in the 20% most deprived nationally – this is compared to 9 in 2010. Two are in Cambridge City, two are in Huntingdonshire and 12 are in Fenland.
- Four of the LSOAs in Fenland are in the 10% most deprived nationally, all of which are in Wisbech. Eight of the top 10 most deprived LSOAs in Cambridgeshire are in Fenland. Two are in Cambridge City.

This Council notes the ongoing work of the Wisbech 2020 project and the continued benefits it expects to bring.

However this Council regards this latest data as disappointing and deeply concerning and calls upon the County Council to:

- embrace and promote policies for the regeneration of the most deprived parts of Cambridgeshire on an equal footing to those designed to stimulate the growth of the more prosperous parts of the county
- expedite capital projects, such as the Wisbech to Cambridge rail link, which will do much to connect comparatively isolated market towns and villages in Cambridgeshire to those areas of the county where employment opportunities are greater
- resolve that as the County's Business Plan gets under way, the Council will be especially mindful and give special weight in their deliberations to the impact proposed measures will have upon the county's most disadvantaged communities.

\* [Lower Layer Super Output Areas](#) are a geographic hierarchy designed to improve the reporting of small area statistics in England and Wales.

## **Response**

The Director of Customer Service and Transformation indicated that she would be co-ordinating action on this motion and would provide regular updates.

### **C) MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR JOAN WHITEHEAD AS AMENDED BY COUNCILLOR DAVID BROWN**

**Directorate: Children Families and Adults**

**Lead Officers: Adrian Loades and Keith Grimwade**

**Lead Member: Councillor Joan Whitehead Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee**

#### **Action**

It was resolved to request the Chief Executive, the Executive Director for Children and Young People, the Director for Learning and the Chair of the Young People's Committee to write jointly to the Chair of the Education Select Committee :-

1. To support the members of the Education Select Committee in their conclusion about academies and urge them to continue to pressure the Government to take seriously not just the issue of accountability and oversight of academies, but the even more pressing issue of the need for intervention to help failing academies.
2. To reinforce the point made to them by the LGA that Councils should be actively involved in the improvement of failing academies; and they should urge the Government to enable this to happen by ensuring there are powers to intervene in academies to improve their performance, just as there are in maintained schools, and that the allocation of schools' budget should contain adequate provision for school improvement.

#### **Response**

A letter dated 21st April was sent from the Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults to the Right Honourable Neil Carmichael MP, the Chair of the Education Select Committee.

### **3) MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10 – AGREED MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR STEVE CRISWELL**

**Directorate: Chief Executive**

**Lead Officer: Gillian Beasley**

**Lead Member Councillor Steve Count Leader of the Council**

This council calls upon the Chief Executive to:

1. Submit a Delivery Plan for 'Stronger Together', our strategy for Building Resilient Communities, to General Purposes Committee as soon as possible. This will identify how we will deliver the outcomes of this strategy. It will demonstrate how costs can be avoided, where community based alternatives could replace and potentially improve on council services, where the impact of cuts that have to be made to front line services can be mitigated and how demand on our services can be reduced.
2. To include as part of the Delivery Plan an Invest to Save bid to the Transformation Reserve to secure appropriate investment in community initiatives to deliver the outcomes of the Strategy that will have a social and financial value that will enhance peoples' lives.

To determine a governance structure to oversee this investment, and the initiatives it supports, that includes partner organisations with a view to sharing the outcomes, costs and benefits of 'invest to save' initiatives across the whole public sector, thereby helping to mitigate the impact on our communities and each other.

#### **Update**

A report was presented to [General Purposes Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2016](#) which agreed:

- a) the Delivery Plan for 'Stronger Together' as a reflection of the Council's ambitions to support community resilience;
- b) as requested by Full Council, to note the development of the Innovation Fund as an "*appropriate investment in community initiatives to deliver the outcomes of the Strategy, that will have a social and financial value that will enhance peoples' lives*";  
and
- c) to note the establishment of a governance structure to oversee this investment.

- d) To receive future updates at six monthly intervals on progress of the Strategy.

## **MAY 2016 COUNCIL MEETING**

### **A) MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR COUNT**

Council calls on the Chief Executive to develop an options appraisal that:

- Considers alternatives to Shire Hall to determine the most effective way to deliver services, currently hosted within Shire Hall
- Considers alternatives to Shire Hall to determine the most effective method for fulfilling the Council's democratic duties and responsibilities
- Evaluates the potential alternative uses of Shire Hall

### **Response**

A project group was established to carry out this work, to assess and take into consideration various aspects such as staffing, IT and property assets. It now reports to the Assets and Investment Committee.

### **B) MOTION FORM COUNCILLOR COUNT – DEVOLUTION**

- Commit to a full and complete review of service delivery across all tiers.
- Commit to designing governance and delivery that is initially a maximum of cost neutral.
- Commit to a final design that aims to deliver a reduction in bureaucracy and cost.
- Commit to determining service delivery at the lowest appropriate level that makes efficient use of resources.
- **Commit to producing recommendations on how best to ensure local democracy in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is enhanced rather than diminished by exploring how best to capitalise on our town and parish councils.**
- Commit to a time scale of a maximum two years for review and maximum two years for implementation. The start to coincide with the formal acknowledgement of joining of a combined authority.

- **Commit to forming a cross-party working group of Councils to assist in undertaking the required exploration.**
- **Commit to public consultation on the resultant proposed changes of governance.**
- Commit to using an evidence base to help shape the final outcome.

To bring this all into one place responses and actions are as follows:

### **Response**

An extraordinary Committee meeting was held in on 28<sup>th</sup> June on a Cambridge and Peterborough Devolution proposal with recommendations including undertaking a public consultation exercise on the proposed devolution proposals. An extraordinary meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2016 agreed the proposals to establish the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and to hold elections in May 2017 for the appointment of a Mayor.

### **(c) MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR ANNA BAILEY**

This Council recognises the need to undertake further scoping and business case work and therefore instructs the Chief Executive to:

- Commission a further high level economic and route options study for the A10 north of Cambridge to complement the existing A10 study for use in future bidding exercises
- Work with Norfolk County Council to develop a case for whole route improvement from Cambridge to Kings Lynn
- Work with the two Local Enterprise Partnerships to develop funding bids for the development and delivery of a scheme of improvement on the A10 north of Cambridge
- Continue to lobby government for improvements to the whole of this vital route.

### **Response**

Jeremy Smith Head of Transport and Infrastructure Policy and Funding provided a response in October 2016 which was passed to Councillor Bailey which stated that: "To address the motion, officers have commissioned technical work to understand the case for investment, as an extension to work already in progress considering the Cambridge to Ely corridor. This work involves:

- Data gathering – collecting evidence to understand the current situation on the A10 between Ely and the border with Norfolk at Brandon Creek.
- Investigation into future traffic flows on this stretch of the A10 and through its junctions, and how the corridor will operate in the future.
- Investigation into route options for an improved A10 including an assessment of constraints.
- Consideration of links with planned rail capacity improvements on the Kings Lynn to Cambridge and London Kings Cross Route.
- Development of high level costings and business case for an improved A10 providing estimates of Benefit to Cost Ratios for options that have been developed, together with an assessment of other impacts and benefits.
- Investigate the high level Wider Economic Benefits and those related to enhanced value that improvements might bring on the A10 corridor north of Ely.
- Recommendations based on consideration of the above.

Given the nature of this work and the interrelationships with the main A10 corridor work, the completion and reporting of this will be on the same timescale as the main study which is planned for Summer 2017 and any further specific actions, particularly with colleagues in Norfolk can follow that. In addition officers will be discussing the route and the Council motion with officers from Norfolk County Council; it should be noted that any decision to undertake complementary work on the A10 between Brandon Creek and Kings Lynn will rest with Norfolk County Council.