

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 13th October 2015

**Time:** 10.30 a.m. – 2.50 p.m.

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillor S Kindersley (Chairman)  
Councillors: P Ashcroft, B Ashwood, A Bailey, I Bates, C Boden, D Brown, P Brown, P Bullen, R Butcher, S Bywater, E Cearn, B Chapman, J Clark, D Connor, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, D Divine, P Downes, S Frost, D Giles, G Gillick, L Harford, D Harty, R Henson, R Hickford, J Hipkin, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, A Lay, M Leeke, M Loynes, 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 Shuter, M Smith, A Taylor, M Tew, P Topping, S van de Ven, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors: P Clapp, A Dent, G Kenney, K Reynolds, S Van de Kerkhove and A Walsh

### 164. MINUTES – 21ST JULY 2015

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 21st July 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 165. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

### 166. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

### 167. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Council noted two questions received from members of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

### 168. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

### 169. DECISION REVIEW : LESS THAN BEST CONSIDERATION DISPOSAL – CROMWELL MUSEUM BUILDING , HUNTINGDON

As set out in Part 4.5 – Decision Review Rules of the Council's Constitution, Council considered a request from 24 elected members to review the following decision of the General Purposes Committee held on 15th September 2015:

- approve a transfer of a 999 leasehold of the Cromwell Museum building to Huntingdon Town Council at less than best consideration for

continued use as a public museum on detailed terms agreed by the Head of Strategic Assets in consultation with the Chairman of General Purposes Committee.

After discussion, Councillor Wisson proposed the following motion seconded by Councillor Bullen:

“This Council proposes that in view of continued discussions with Huntingdon Town Council, Cambridgeshire County Council rescinds the offer of Leasehold and instead approves a transfer of the freehold of the Cromwell Museum building to Huntingdon Town Council, at less than best consideration, for continued use as a public museum. A covenant to restrict the use to “a public museum dedicated to the life of Oliver Cromwell”, to be contained in the deeds of transfer. Further detailed terms agreed by the Head of Strategic Assets in consultation with the Chairman of General Purposes Committee”.

Following further discussion, on being put the vote the motion was carried unanimously by a show of hands.

#### **170. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

##### **a) Business Planning - Medium Term Financial Strategy**

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendation set out in Minute 130 of the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting of 28th July 2015 be approved.

Following discussion, it was resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

to approve the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

##### **b) Business Planning – Capital Strategy**

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendation set out in Minute 131 of the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting of 28th July 2015 be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

- a) to agree revisions to the Capital Strategy to align it with the Operating Model approach, including that prioritisation of capital proposals would be undertaken using an amended version of the Investment Appraisal process that reflected the new outcome-based focus of Business Planning.
- b) to keep the advisory limit on the level of debt charges (and therefore prudential borrowing) at existing levels, which were higher than the level of debt charges approved in the 2015-20 Business Plan;
- c) to continue to exclude borrowing related to Invest to Save/Earn schemes from the advisory debt charges limit.

## **171. REPORT OF THE STAFFING AND APPEALS COMMITTEE -APPOINTMENT OF A SHARED CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

It was moved by the Chairman of the Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Schumann, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Downes, that the recommendation set out on page 19 of the report on the appointment of a shared Chief Executive be approved. In introducing the report the Chairman thanked the Director of People, Transformation & Transactions, the Head of People, the Head of HR Advisory Services and the Democratic Services Manager for organising the process.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

- a) Approve the proposal to enter into a shared chief executive by way of secondment arrangement with Peterborough City Council with regards to the post of Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service.
- b) To formally appoint Gillian Beasley to the shared Chief Executive role for a period of a year with a review of the arrangements after six months, on terms to be agreed by the LGSS Director of People, Transformation and Transactions in consultation with the Council's Leader and Monitoring Officer.
- c) To designate Gillian Beasley as the Head of Paid Service for Cambridgeshire County Council for the duration of the existence of the secondment arrangement.

## **172. AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE – CENTRAL LIBRARY ENTERPRISE CENTRE REVIEW**

It was moved by the Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee, Councillor Shellens, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Topping, that the recommendation set out on page 27 of the report on the Central Library Centre be approved.

In introducing the report the Chairman thanked members of the public and councillors who had provided contributions. He also thanked the Democratic Services Officer (Rob Sanderson), the Acting Head of Internal Audit and the Principal Auditor for all their support in relation to the review and the preparation of the final report.

Following detailed discussion, it was resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

To approve the action plan as set out in Section Three of the report identifying actions to address improvement areas.

## **173. CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO FULL COUNCIL**

### **a) Contract Procedure Rules**

It was moved by the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

In response to a query from Councillor Manning, the Chairwoman to consider the process for reviewing ongoing contracts.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

- a) To approve the amendments to the Contract Procedure Rules, as set out in Appendix A of the report in order to reflect the requirements of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
- b) Authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

#### **b) Grant of Dispensation under the Members' Code of Conduct**

It was moved by the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Smith, and seconded by Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

- a) to approve the amendment of the Members' Code of Conduct to permit the grant of dispensations to Members as set out in the Appendix to the report;
- b) to delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer to grant dispensations under the Members' Code of Conduct; and
- c) to authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

#### **c) Decision Review Procedure Rules**

It was moved by the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Smith, and seconded by Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

Following discussion, it was resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

- a) to approve the amendment of Rule 3 of the Decision Review Rules (Decisions which may not be reviewed) to cover the position where a decision is rescinded prior to the consideration of a decision review request (paragraph 5.2 – 5.3 refers).
- b) to approve the revision of:
  - (i) Part 4.5 of the Constitution (The Decision Review Rules) as set out in Appendix A; and
  - (ii) Article 6 of the Constitution (The Decision Review Process and

Statutory Scrutiny Function) as set out in Appendix B.

- ci) to authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

#### **174. PENSION FUND BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15**

The Chairman of the Pension Fund Board, Councillor Count, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2014/15. As part of his introduction he thanked all members and external advisors who sat on the Board (now renamed the Committee) and the Investment Sub-Committee and in LGSS Pensions Services.

Councillor Downes declared a disclosable statutory interest under the Code of Conduct as a minor beneficiary of the Pension Fund.

Council noted the report.

#### **175. COMMITTEE - ALLOCATION OF SEATS AND SUBSTITUTES TO POLITICAL GROUPS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLITICAL BALANCE RULES**

The Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Smith, moved the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees to political groups in accordance with the political balance rules as set out on page 231 of the Council agenda, and the delegation to the Monitoring Officer and Chief Executive in consultation with Group Leaders to make any minor adjustments necessary resulting from the Chatteris by-election on 15th October 2015.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Nethsingha and seconded by Councillor Hipkin to swap the Liberal Democrat Group place on the Joint Development Control Committee – Cambridge Fringes with the Independent Group place on the Audit and Accounts Committee. The amendment on being put to the vote was carried unanimously by a show of hands.

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion as detailed below was carried unanimously by a show of hands:

- a) to approve the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees to political groups in accordance with the political balance rules, as set out on page 231 of the Council agenda subject to the inclusion of the above amendment, and
- b) To authorise the Monitoring Officer and Chief Executive in consultation with Group Leaders to make any minor adjustments necessary resulting from the Chatteris by-election on 15th October 2015.

#### **176. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Smith, moved the change in membership proposed for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority as set out on page 239, and the additional change identified at the meeting.

It was resolved unanimously:

To approve the appointment of Councillor Divine to the vacancy and the appointment of Councillor Scutt to replace Councillor Shellens.

## **177. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10**

Two motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

### **(a) Motion from Councillor Ian Manning**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Manning and seconded by Councillor Cearns, the motion included an amendment proposed by Councillor Sales which was accepted as an alteration to his motion by Councillor Manning and agreed by the meeting without discussion:

*Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough*

This Council notes:

- The threat of global climate change and the need to act against it both nationally and locally
- The responsibility of this Council to act to reduce its carbon footprint
- That the Law Commission reviewed the meaning of fiduciary duty as it applies to investments in 2014, concluding that “Where trustees think ethical or environmental, social or governance (ESG) issues are financially material they should take them into account.”
- That there is nonetheless a risk for this Council in any non-financial considerations in investment policy, and therefore before any such change, the implications should be studied and considered carefully.

Further, Council recognises the growing number of commercial, educational and governmental organisations deciding to support low carbon investment:

- Bristol Council’s decision alter its investment policy to exclude companies whose core activities cover fossil fuel extraction
- The Norwegian Government’s decision to divest from fossil fuel investment in its pension fund
- The over 150 companies, including Hewlet-Packard, BT Group & Volvo who have signed up to the “We mean business” coalition’s aims

Council notes that the University of Cambridge have this year launched a wide ranging report into its £2.2bn endowments fund, and endorses this cautious approach.

Therefore Council resolves to:

- direct the Chief Executive (or delegated officer) to write to the University group

asking that Cambridgeshire County Council be part of it the University's work in this regard;

- recommend that ~~the Cambridgeshire County Council continues to support Pension Committee consider whether to include the Cambridgeshire County Council pension fund within the University's analysis, with a view to the Pension Fund~~ **in its efforts to promote ethical investment Board** ~~considering the report in due course; and~~
- form a cross party member group to consider what, if any, aspects of the "We Mean Business" coalition Council could sign up to, with a view to bringing a recommendation back to Full Council in a year.

On being put to the vote, the motion as altered was lost.

*[Voting pattern: thirteen Liberal Democrats and seven Labour in favour; all Conservatives, six UKIP and two Independents against; two Independents and one UKIP abstained]*

**(b) Motion from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha**

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

This council notes

- the need for more electricity generation in coming years as many of our power stations reach the end of their lives. The success of small micro-generation schemes in providing an increasing proportion of our electricity in ways which are not only good for the environment but can provide cheaper electricity and income to organisations like schools.
- the fact that constraints in national grid capacity are preventing development of schemes which could provide many benefits, both environmental and economic.

This council requests that the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State asking her to ensure that the companies responsible for up-grading the national grid have systems in place for

- better monitoring of networks so they can control hot spots and allow more generation capacity
- gradual re-design and up-grade of the grid across Cambridgeshire and the South East in the longer term to increase resilience and allow more capacity
- systems in place for applicants to share the costs of up-upgrades in areas where capacity is particularly constrained and up-grade is urgent.

Following discussion, the motion, on being put to the vote, was carried unanimously by a show of hands.

## 178. QUESTIONS:

### a) Questions on Fire Authority Issues

The Chairman of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority, Councillor P Brown, responded to questions and comments on Fire issues, in accordance with the guidelines agreed by Council. The questions and comments are set out in **Appendix C**.

### b) Oral Questions

Nine 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 Chapman, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates, undertook to arrange a meeting with Councillor Chapman and the appropriate officers to discuss a likely date for a Market Town Transport Strategy for St Neots.
- In response to a request from Councillor Jenkins, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates, undertook to arrange for officers to provide an update on when road works were likely to finish on Huntingdon Road / Madingley Road / cycleways and the Hills Road and the Station Road junction, and he also agreed to arrange a site visit with officers and Councillor Jenkins in relation to the latter.
- In response to a question from Councillor Mason, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates, undertook to provide in writing budget details on funding the ongoing repair and inspection work on the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway.
- In response to a request from Councillor Palmer, the Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, to take up with officers the position on replacement lighting provision to be provided in Soham.
- In response to a question from Councillor Downes, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Count, undertook to liaise with the Chief Executive regarding whether alternative provision could be made to provide councillors with similar briefings to those currently provided free on a trial basis by the Local Government Information Unit.

### c) Written Questions

One written question was submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2. as set out in **Appendix E**.

Chairman



**APPENDIX A****COUNTY COUNCIL – 13TH OCTOBER 2015  
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS****PEOPLE****County Councillor Sandra Rylance**

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of County Councillor Sandra Rylance. Councillor Rylance served on the County Council since 2013, representing the Chatteris Division, on behalf of the UKIP Party. During her short time on the Council, Councillor Rylance was appointed Chairwoman of Adults Committee, a role in which she excelled and in which she was respected by all Members who worked alongside her. The Chairman of the Council, together with many colleagues, attended her funeral service, which took place at Muchwood Burial Ground in Ramsey on 24 August. The Council's thoughts are with her family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

The By-Election for the Chatteris Division will take place on 15th October 2015.

Each of the Group Leaders, with Councillor Kavanagh speaking in the absence of Councillor Walsh, was invited to speak and paid tribute to her contribution to the Council.

**Robert Tuckwell**

It was with great sadness that the Council announces the death of Bob (Robert) Tuckwell who died peacefully aged 69 on 6th August. His funeral was held on 4th September at the Cambridge Crematorium and was attended by many former colleagues and friends.

Bob, often described as a true Gentleman, worked for Cambridgeshire County Council for more than 25 years as our Strategic Transport Adviser and only retired in December due to ill health following a long and distinguished career as one of the Council's most committed and respected officers. He played a key role in progressing some of the County's most notable transport achievements during his time here; including the Busway and Park & Ride. However, the project the Bob is undoubtedly best renowned for, is the A14 improvement scheme, where he worked diligently to make a professional and evidence based case for the scheme. So after more than 25 years of pressing the case, Bob was pleased that on the day he retired last December, the A14 improvement scheme was finally submitted for permission.

The Chairman asked Members to stand for a minutes silence as a mark of respect for Councillor Rylance and Bob Tuckwell.

**Mark Lloyd, Chief Executive**

Mark Lloyd, our Chief Executive for the last seven and a half years, will be leaving the Council at the end of October to become the Chief Executive of the Local Government Association. Prior to joining us in Cambridgeshire Mark was the Chief Executive of Durham County Council.

During his time in Cambridgeshire Mark has worked with five different Council Leaders and very closely with the Leaders of all the political groups to support the Council through the hardest financial years in living memory. He has also elegantly supported the Council with its move to No Overall Control and the introduction of a Committee System of governance. Despite the financial pressures, the Council under his leadership has responded innovatively:

driving up service standards; supporting economic and population growth and driven efficiency through the largest shared service arrangement in the country.

Mark is very well regarded by councillors, staff and our partners and has significant influence nationally. There are very many things he should be proud of as he moves to take on his new role. And we should be proud too that our Chief Executive is considered to be the country's most senior and has been elevated to be the new boss of the LGA. We are hugely grateful to him for his stewardship of the Council since March 2008 and wish him well in his new job and trust that Cambridgeshire's interests will be very well represented through the LGA in the future.

Each of the Group Leaders with Councillor Kavanagh speaking in the absence of Councillor Walsh was invited to speak and express their thanks for his years of service to the Council and participated in a round of applause.

### **Retirement of John Onslow – Service Director (Infrastructure Management and Operations)**

John Onslow, Service Director (Infrastructure Management and Operations) in Economy, Transport and Environment will be retiring at the end of November after 36 years in local government. He joined the County Council in 1989 as a senior transportation planner, became Transportation Team Leader, Capital Programme Manager and then Head of Transport Development, before being appointed as Assistant Director (Planning) in 1999, where he oversaw the development of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and led the first Local Transport Plan.

John left the Council in 2004 to set up Cambridgeshire Horizons, the partnership responsible for overseeing Cambridgeshire's growth plans and infrastructure investment. He returned to the County Council in 2010 as Acting Executive Director in charge of Environment Services, before taking on his present role in 2011. As Service Director, John refocused the highways service, expanded the highways maintenance programme and is currently overseeing transformation across his directorate.

The Chairman would like to thank John on behalf of current and past Councillors for all his years of service and to wish him a long and happy retirement.

## **AWARDS**

### **The ICT Service SIMS Accreditation**

The ICT Service has earned their sixth consecutive accreditation from Capita as a supporter for schools for the implementation and on-going support for the company's SIMS. The two-yearly accreditation means the Service has now been quality assured for 12 years. The accreditation draws on customer feedback with 112 schools responding to the assessment request with the vast majority assessing The ICT Service as very good or excellent. The Chairman would like to congratulate all colleagues in The ICT Service for earning this valuable commercial accreditation for its work.

## **SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

### **New Coroner arrangements**

On 1 August 2015 the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Coronial jurisdictions merged

following a Statutory Instrument in Parliament. The Senior Coroner for the whole new area is David Heming, who was previously Senior Coroner for Peterborough. Cambridgeshire County Council will be the lead authority in delivering the Coroners Support Service.

## **MESSAGES**

### **Royal Visits**

The Chairman has recently attended two Royal visits to Cambridgeshire.

On Tuesday 16 September, Her Royal Highness The Princess Royal visited The Welding Institute, Granta Park, Great Abington, Cambridge, to officially open the TWI Headquarters.

On Thursday 1 October, His Royal Highness The Duke of Gloucester visited Cambridge University Library, where he opened the Royal Library Exhibition there.

### **Councillor Van De Kerkhove**

The Chairman on behalf of the Council paid tribute to the care that Councillor Van De Kerkhove was receiving at Addenbrooke's Hospital and wished him a speedy recovery with the well wishes of the whole Council to be conveyed to him.

**APPENDIX B****Council meeting – 13th October 2015  
Public Questions****Question from Mr Phillip Peacock, Clerk to Huntingdon Town Council**

Chairman, Members of Council and Officers, thank you for allowing me to ask this question. It is a simple, straightforward question – why has the General Purposes Committee declined to transfer the freehold of the Cromwell Museum Huntingdon to Huntingdon Town Council?

**Response from Councillor Steve Count, Chairman of the General Purposes Committee**

Thank you Philip for raising the question. The County Council is of the view that the most important objective of the discussions with the Town Council was to come an arrangement that would secure the future of the Museum dedicated to the life of Oliver Cromwell for the long term for the people of Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire and the country. The General Purposes Committee at this meeting had some reservations regarding the possible interpretations that could be placed on the covenant suggested for a freehold transfer and the ability to enforce them. In an effort to satisfy all interests and notwithstanding the fact that further information has since become available, at that time they believed that the best way forward to achieve that, was by the grant of a 999 year lease. If you may indulge me Chairman, I am aware that this will be an agenda item later on and there is a proposal coming forward, so I was wondering in an effort to help that discussion, if I can ask a question of the Town Clerk 'would you be able to confirm that Huntingdon Town Council would be willing to accept the freehold transfer if the Covenant was restricted to "a public museum dedicated to the life of Oliver Cromwell?"

**Response from Mr Philip Peacock**

Chairman thank you and thank you Councillor Count for the question. As Town Clerk I am used to being asked questions and I can confirm on behalf of Huntingdon Town Council, we are willing to accept that condition, that the Museum be dedicated to Oliver Cromwell if the freehold is transferred to the Town Council.

**Question from Mr Robert Pugh, Friends of the Cromwell Museum**

Thank you Chairman. My name is Bob Pugh and I am a Huntingdon resident and a member of the Friends of the Cromwell Museum Huntingdon. I would like to thank the Council for having procedures that allow questions to be raised.

My question is this, can the Chairman of the County Council's General Purposes Committee (GPC) give any reassurances that the County Council will not abandon the Cromwell Museum until its future and that of any emerging Trust is secured. We recognise the efforts of many, including County Council Councillors and staff over the past 20 months and especially by the sound of it, over the last couple of weeks. We note that the Town Council offered one solution in July 2014 which was supported by several of your Councillors including those on your own Cromwell Museum Management Committee, albeit not supported by the very recent decision of the GPC. Even before the decision we were in great danger of running out of time for the new Trust to be in a position to retain accreditation to be registered as a charity and to unlock appropriate funding for the Museum to be secure and viable before the beginning of the next financial year as desired by this Council. I remind the Council of the importance of the Museum and the 4000 or so of Cambridgeshire residents who signed a petition in February 2014 against the County Council's proposal for

the planned closure until another viable operator took responsibility. Thank you for your attention.

### **Response from Councillor Steve Count**

Thank you Chairman and thank you Robert. The County Council is fully supporting the establishment of a Trust to run the Museum service for the future, which has now appointed five Trustees. Whilst we acknowledge the timescale is challenging, the project plan is on track to hand over the service to the Trust by April 2016. The Project Manager is in place, volunteers have been recruited and the legal work to establish the Trust is underway and staff in close contact with the Arts Council regarding accreditation. Huntingdon Town Council has offered a solution for the maintenance of the building but will not be responsible for the Trust or the Museum Service. The ownership of the building and who maintains and leases it to the Trust is a separate issue and is not expected to have significant bearing on the establishment of the Trust. The County Council recognises the international importance of the Museum's collections and has already taken the decision to continue funding in the current year. However, the severe budget challenge facing the Council is such that it cannot continue to fund this discretionary service any further. I would like to let Robert and Phil know that obviously this is the next agenda item and I do hope you will stay to hear the outcome of that.

**APPENDIX C****County Council – 13th October 2015  
Questions to the Chairman of the Fire Authority****Question from Councillor Ed Cearn**

My question to Sir Peter is will he be requesting that the Leader of this Council contributes to the current consultation on the merits or otherwise of the Fire Authority joining with the Police and Crime Commissioner's powers in the future?

**Response from Councillor Sir Peter Brown, Chairman of the Fire Authority**

Thank you Chairman. As you all know there is a Government consultation that is out at the moment which has been signed off by the Secretary of State for Health, the Fire Minister and the Ambulance Service. So what we have got at the moment is a National Consultation which has gone out to all Fire Authorities. In Peterborough and Cambridgeshire, we have sent that Consultation to every employee and I am presuming that Councillor Count, in his position as Leader, has also seen a copy of that consultation but if he hasn't, I am happy to let him have a copy and happy to look at the question when you have answered Councillor Cearn.

**Question from Councillor Mike Shellens**

Thank you Chairman. My question to Sir Peter is does he share with me the view that given the closer collaboration which is in advanced discussion between the Fire Authority and the Ambulance Service over first responder, that it would make more sense for any collaboration, any cementing of relationships, to be with that Authority or even the Health Authority than with the Police Service, with whom the Fire Authority has fewer direct connections

**Response for Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

Thank you Chairman and thank you Councillor Shellens for your question. I think before I answer the question, I would just like to pay tribute to you again, you are getting all the thanks today, I don't know why, but as your membership of the Fire Authority is coming to an end shortly, we will greatly miss your contributions and everything that you have put forward.

The question is about collaboration with the Ambulance Service and it is something that we discussed at the Joint Consultative Committee with the Trades Unions the other day. For some reason the FBU are not keen, but I think that they recognise that their positions are a bit insecure at the moment and they are going back to look at it. Certainly I take the view that we should collaborate much more with the Ambulance Service than we can with the Police. I think that things are there to look at and to make it work.

My view on the joining up with the Police Service is well known. I am not in favour of it at all. I don't think the skills set is the same. The Fire Brigade is for fire. I don't think the Police should be for fire or anything like it. I don't think they have got the skills. So we will have to wait and see how that goes, but I do feel that because the consultation has been signed off by three Government Ministers in the Cabinet, that it looks as though, unless there is a rear-guard fight, it may be a done deal. But never mind, what we will do is we will go to the Local Government Association (LGA) under its new leadership and try and get some support for our views.

**APPENDIX D****COUNTY COUNCIL – 13th OCTOBER 2015  
ORAL QUESTION TIME****1. Question from Councillor Ian Bates to Councillor David Jenkins, Chairman of the Health Committee**

Thank you Mr Chairman. My question is to the Chairman of the Health Committee, Councillor Jenkins. Following the recent Inspector's report on the Addenbrooke's and Rosie, what plans are proposed for discussion on this serious matter within the Health Committee?

**Response from Councillor Jenkins**

Thank you for the question Ian and thanks for the advanced notice. Yes this is serious, very, very serious so I have prepared a text and I will read from it if I may.

Before I do respond to the question, let me just give a little background. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) conducted a regular inspection of Cambridge University Hospitals Trust (I will refer to that as Addenbrooke's) earlier this year. The inspection resulted in the CQC declaring Addenbrooke's overall as inadequate and so the hospital has been placed in 'Special Measures'. The outcome of the inspection was presented at an NHS Quality Summit in September. During its presentation, the CQC made it clear that although the judgment was clear and appropriate, the compassionate care given by staff was rated as outstanding and there were several examples of clinical excellence at the hospital.

Addenbrooke's is not a Mid Staffordshire and it is only the change in the inspection regime which has resulted in the two hospitals having the same rating. The CQC highlighted staff shortage, the impact of the EPIC computer system implementation, a dis-connect between operations and the Board and poor medicines management. It is also worth noting though that the Hospital was rated good on all services for children and young people.

With respect to this Council's response I am sure you appreciate that it has no executive authority where NHS Trusts are concerned. Although through the NHS scrutiny role of the Health Committee, it can challenge and show leadership. That is what we have done.

Shortly after the announcement, the Director of Public Health and I met to consider it. Our main concern was that the health sector at large in Cambridgeshire, the CCG, other Trusts and ourselves should recognise that the Addenbrooke's problem was our problem, and that we should all be working together to address it, with a view to Addenbrooke's coming out of special measures as soon as possible. We are satisfied that, that is the case. The Local NHS Chief Executives meet regularly and Addenbrooke's is a part of the discussions at their meetings. The common attitude was summed up by the CCG press release after the announcement, in which it noted the strong negatives of the CQC judgment but at the same time highlighted Addenbrooke's strengths. Furthermore, we have been talking to key contacts to ensure that they share this attitude. I have met the Chairs of two of the Trusts, including Addenbrooke's itself and will shortly be meeting with the Chair of the CCG.

And finally as a part of its regular programme of scrutiny, the Health Committee will be scrutinising the CQC judgment and Addenbrooke's response to it in November. This will be attended by the CQC, Addenbrooke's and the CCG. Members of course are welcome to attend the scrutiny meeting and to ask questions, but we have found on the Committee that it

is most productive if we send the questions to them in advance and we will be compiling a list to send off to them on Friday.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Bates**

Can I have the assurance of the Chairman of the Committee that the Committee will constantly monitor this situation as it develops and goes forward. I would be interested to know, and I think other Members will be interested to know the date of when you are meeting next month, as I think it could be of interest to quite a few Members and certainly if I am available, I would wish to come.

### **Response from Councillor Jenkins**

Too rightly we will and Councillor Shuter will no doubt tell us the date of the meeting now. It is November the 5<sup>th</sup> at 2pm in the afternoon, how appropriate. This is not a prepared statement, but Addenbrooke's is a big hospital. It is a world-scale hospital and in many respects it is world class and we talked earlier this morning about the quality of care that Councillor Van de Kerkhove is getting. It is of the highest quality in the treatment of cancer care.

The Rosie has also been subject to some criticism. The Rosie is one of the strongest brands in maternity care in the country. People want to go there to give birth.

The is close to our hearts and is both a world class hospital, a world class teaching centre and the District General Hospital, so we need to support it. Its problems are certainly partly internal - it took its eyes off the ball trying to do too many things, I think that mismatch between governance and operations is pretty darn serious. And they have been evidenced by the CQC and we will be pinning them down on getting those things improved. But they do have external issues. We know about our funding problems, they have funding problems and a demand problem. A hospital starts to run into problems when they run at 85% capacity and above. Addenbrooke's consistently runs at 100% capacity – it is not surprising they need all our support. We do know that the CCG has got a programme of transformation and that programme should look at ways of trying to get people to get treatment in a different way and put less demand on A&E. The preventative agenda is so important, which is why it was so sad to see the Public Health Grant being chopped mid-year. Addenbrooke's is a big problem but it's our problem and they will get out of it and yes, we will stay on top of it Ian.

### **2. Question from Councillor Barry Chapman to Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee**

Thank you Chairman. I was going to put my normal question to Councillor Bates asking for a date, but I wonder if it would be better placed with Councillor Shuter today.

I really do have to raise this major issue again and it's not only about St Neots and Little Paxton. The fact that we haven't got a transport plan in the St Neots area affects Buckden, Papworth, Cambourne, Gamlingay, area of South Cambs, parts of Bedfordshire and the whole of south Huntingdonshire. A few months ago now, we had a response to the Huntingdonshire District Local Plan and the County's' response was that we would be preparing a St Neots Market Town Transport Strategy and we welcomed that being included in the Local Plan. Since that time I have been told "it is next on the list; we are waiting for the District Council; it has got to be done with the Town Plan; and most recently that the Town Council would in some way be expected to do an unlawful derogation of its authority to District and County to get this Plan underway". I was surprised to discover only last week that



officers were told months ago that there was to be no work at all on a Plan for St Neots. I would like to know from Councillor Bates, as Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, when were local Members to be informed of this, when were the Economy and Environment Committee Members to be informed of this, the GPC and Councillors here? And on what authority has the decision been made not to carry out a St Neots Market Town Transport Strategy?

### **Response from Councillor Bates**

Thank you Mr Chairman. Can I perhaps suggest a way forward, that Councillor Chapman and myself meet with the appropriate officers to discuss this matter outside the Chamber.

### **3. Question from Councillor David Jenkins to Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee**

My question is to Councillor Bates. And apologies to those from the north of the County – this is a Cambridge-centred question.

When I was a member of the Economy and Environment Committee, I got an item on the agenda about congestion in Cambridge which is coming up in November. Anecdotal observations by all of us tell us that it is getting worse. Stagecoach confirm that they cannot run their buses on time because it is getting worse. Kids cannot get to school on time because their buses are delayed and that is a serious problem and it is particularly distressing for people in their first year. What is this County Council doing to monitor this situation and do its best to alleviate it at least in the short term and the answer to the question is not the City Deal?

### **Response from Councillor Bates**

It must be my day. Let's start with thank you for the advance notice of the question. As lots of Members will realise, there is a lot of work happening particularly in Hills Road and Huntingdon Road with the cycling project and inevitably that does cause delays and that does cause problems. But remember that the contractor doesn't start work at 8am – they actually start working later in the day to get past the peak times.

I am conscious of things in Madingley Road and Hills Road junction on the NIAB site on both sides of those key routes into the City. They are very strategic and they are important. You cannot actually develop those sites without having some disruption and we are delivering a lot of houses on that site with the University Research that is also going on there, and the Student accommodation. You said don't mention the City Deal, but I'm afraid I have to mention it, because it is actually all wrapped up with the City Deal, and the work coming forward. The Assembly and the Board are totally aware of the issue of congestion and the delays of work. There is some other strategic stuff coming forward as discussed at the Assembly recently, regarding Histon Road and Milton Road and will not be easy to deliver. There are also other suggestions in respect of the A428 and what might happen from Cambourne into Cambridge and that has impact further afield, as well. I think it would be useful perhaps, bearing in mind some of the work which is going on around this area that I ask the officers to give us an update on when that work is liable to finish, but particularly around the Huntingdon Road / Madingley Road and the cycleways. They are due to finish the cycle projects shortly and, yes, in the Autumn. Autumn is hopefully approaching us but I will get an update for all Members because I think it is important for lots of people who come into the City on a frequent basis to answer that. So there are projects happening, we all know about the funding issues through the City Deal and it is not going to happen overnight

and that actually needs detailed planning, detailed consultation with residents, both inside the City and outside the City.

#### **Supplementary question from Councillor Jenkins**

I am far more parochial than to worry about the A428 - that is somebody else's road. I am concerned about Hills Road and the Station Road junction though as there are roadworks there and they are going on forever. Even though the work of the contractor does not start until 9.30 a.m., there is some sort of effect of the existence of these signs on the side of the road on slowing traffic down and this is resulting in children on buses turning up late for their schools and that is bad news for them. Practically speaking we cannot wait for the City Deal for this year. Why don't we send some officers down in the morning and see if the traffic is being slowed down or is it flowing through as it is supposed to do so? Can we do that please?

#### **Response from Councillor Bates**

I will certainly discuss that with Mr Hughes about how we monitor that and how we are progressing those particular works and I will be happy for Councillor Jenkins to join us if he wishes.

#### **4. Question from Councillor Mike Mason to Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee**

This is a question for Councillor Bates or perhaps and /or Councillor Count. In view of the recent public statement concerning the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway defects, and the six month delay to Court action, and bearing in mind the Auditors' comments with regard to asset valuations, will Councillor Bates state what steps are being taken to 1) update the Corporate Risk Register and 2) revalue the Busway asset in terms of asset life and current depreciation?

#### **Response from Councillor Bates**

Kindly Councillor Mason wrote it out for me at lunch so thank you for that. Let me try to address the two questions. Let's start with the Risk Register. The Risk Register does come to the E&E Committee as it goes to all the Committees. It is obviously constantly updated and we take account of all foreseeable eventualities so to reassure Members, we do update, we do look at and that's a constant progress programme and it will get updated at the appropriate time. With regard to the delays, there are no delays ok, because we are discussing jointly with the contractor about the way forward. That has been negotiated, it is not a "them and us" approach, we are actually trying to work much more constructively with the contractor and therefore any revaluation of the busway and the assets will be determined at a later date.

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

Thank you Chairman. My concern as always is in the intermediate period. We are still carrying out repairs as necessary and my supplementary is basically how are we funding the repair work and the inspection work and which budget is being used?

#### **Response from Councillor Bates**

I think that it would be appropriate if I get a written answer. I do not have that

information to hand at this precise moment, so I think I will give that as a written answer about the costings.

**5. Question from Councillor Derek Giles, to Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

Thank you Chairman. My question is to Councillor Hickford. On several occasions throughout the last year I have been informed by Highways that a policy has changed or that the policy is being reviewed. For example the depth of when a pothole is not a pothole seems to be getting deeper. Another example is overhanging foliage on the highway – when can this be trimmed and when can it not be trimmed, who is responsible for the safe passage of cyclists and pedestrians. Yet another example is the request for approved funding for a scheme to help residents of Longsands Estate in St Neots with their traffic problems. A similar scheme has been in place around Huntingdon Railway Station for several years, but now we are told that there has been a change of policy.

So my question is, when a change to a policy is decided who decides these changes, is there any Member consultation and involvement, and if not, do you not think that there should be, so that Members can have views taken into consideration and be aware of the new up to date policies?

**Response from Councillor Hickford**

It is decided with Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee (H&CI) through the Highways Asset Management Plan done annually, but you are right, Spokes should have more input and I have asked officers that, instead of it coming to Committee and the Spokes just before Committee, for it to come as a yearly thing, so that Spokes can look at it a year ahead and consult with Groups. I think that is absolutely right.

No supplementary question from Councillor Derek Giles

**6. Question from Councillor James Palmer to Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

A question for Councillor Hickford and I have notified him of this question earlier. I have been sitting and watching with trepidation as the streetlight saga has gone round the County and it is finally my turn.

Soham Town Council received a letter some years ago, there is some argument over the date, Councillor Hickford believes it might be 2010, I believe it was 2013 but it was certainly a letter from an officer at this County Council on County Council headed paper telling the Town Council in Soham that the heritage lights would be replaced like for like. When it comes to the crunch of course they have been told last night that their heritage lights would not be replaced like for like and they should put up with whatever lights come their way. I would like Councillor Hickford to look into this for me please and I would like the Council to stand by the promise that they made, rather than say, what is currently the word that is coming out of County, that this particular officer was wrong and should not have ever written the letter, which does not seem to be washing particularly with the Town Council who had decided that although the heritage lights, in the Town centre were going to replace like for like, they would invest some more money to put extra heritage lights across the town to improve the town. It has also been noted by the Town Council that their alma mater, or what the Town Council in Soham see as the opposition, which is Ely sadly, have had their heritage lights replaced and woe betide this Council if they do not give Soham what Ely has already been given. So I ask Councillor Hickford, if he would on my behalf, look into this matter for me.

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

I do understand this was an officer mistake when that letter was written to Soham.

When is a heritage column not a heritage column, it's when it's a standard column painted black and that is what the officer misinterpreted on this occasion, is my understanding.

When you talk about Ely, Ely have had heritage columns for heritage columns because that was in the original contract and that is why that has happened. The ones in Soham weren't. I understand in Soham there are four roads totalling 35 lights that will have standard columns painted black instead of the heritage. That is the situation at the moment. I have heard what you have said and I will be taking it up with officers on your behalf.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Palmer**

I appreciate that Councillor Hickford, and would just like to add as well to the Council that there had been issues of course elsewhere within the Town as I am sure everybody has had the same situation in their area, but the Town Council have said where the other issues are, that they would be happy to pay for the lights to remain where necessary, so this isn't a situation where the Town Council, and I am certainly not a spokesman for them, are hiding away from their responsibilities, but they do feel that they should be treated as they have been told that they would be treated.

### **Response from Councillor Roger Hickford**

I do hear you Councillor Palmer and I will take up with officers.

### **7. Question from Councillor Amanda Taylor to Councillor Count, Leader of the Council**

Thank you Chair. My question is to Councillor Count, Leader of the Council and you will be pleased to know that it is not just a local Ward issue today, it is a question which affects the City and also the County as a whole.

Our visitor this morning reminded us of our duty to care, not just for our own children but for everybody and in that regard I would like to ask you if you can give us a brief update on how the County Council is responding to the needs of refugees who may be coming to Cambridgeshire. As we all know, David Cameron has offered to take 20,000 refugees over the next five years. While I, like many, deplore the paucity of that number, I would still like you to assure us that the Council is doing what it can to work with other Local Authorities and Government agencies, and indeed voluntary organisations, to make sure that if and when refugees do come to Cambridgeshire, that they are welcomed and supported according to the services that we can provide, please.

### **Response from Councillor Count**

Thank you Chairman and thank you Councillor Taylor for advising me of the question at lunchtime. I have been able to get an update from officers to give the correct position rather than the usual gobbledegook that comes out of my mouth. So here we go.

Following discussions that have already been held at the Children and Young People Committee on the 8<sup>th</sup> September when this was raised, officers have liaised with the District and City Councils to ensure that the necessary support to Syrian refugees who have settled in Cambridgeshire is available. The national focus has moved somewhat away from an

original intention to prioritise the re-settlement of orphans and other vulnerable children to now focus on the re-settlement of families. Therefore because of that local preparatory work we are getting ready for that situation. In order to achieve that, we have started work, and are reviewing the availability of school places and also ensuring that there is Arabic, as well as other language support available to schools and services. We are also reviewing the availability of appropriate social care and other support to families who have experienced trauma and I think that is an important thing for us to consider, when these people arrive in our communities.

As more details of the circumstances and the needs of the families to be re-settled in Cambridgeshire emerge, then services that the County Council is responsible for or can assist with, will be put in place accordingly. I think it is worth noting that the Council is currently the corporate parent for 37 unaccompanied asylum-seeking children and these include some young people who have travelled all the way from Syria.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Taylor**

Thank you very much for your response. It is welcome news that so much is being done in preparation. I would like to point out that there has been a vast wave of support from the public on this issue, not just in Cambridge and Cambridgeshire, but all over the country and some Councillors on this side of the Chamber have been involved in setting up a group in Cambridge, but it is much wider than just Cambridge – there are people from Histon, Milton, St Neots, Ramsey and March - in fact it is notable that many of the communities that are the neediest themselves, have been keen to help with running convoys, doing collections of clothes and vital supplies etc. for the refugees. So I would just ask if you can keep Councillors and the public via Councillors informed of what is going on and would officers please let us know if there are any ways in which we can help with initiatives and communicate them to the wider public

### **Response from Councillor Count**

Yes, thanks for that. I know it is an issue that is of huge importance to an awful lot of people. It does occur to me that the main impact of this at present will be primarily through the CFA Directorate. Whilst they are the lead on this at the moment, hopefully through their Committee and through the Committee Chair, will keep everybody updated and if that has a wider dispersal effect or, if I am called in, then of course I will be happy to do whatever I can.

### **8. Question from Councillor Jocelyne Scutt to Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

My question is to the Chair of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee and relates to lighting.

The “Keep Cambridge Bright” campaign launched on Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> October and the campaigners in talking with people in the street discovered that 85% of those with whom they spoke had no idea that a switch off was planned and one may anticipate that the same lack of information may well be out there in the rest of Cambridgeshire. The concerns of residents are that, for example, at the South Area Committee last week a note came from a Council officer to say that there had already been a three month consultation and that the public consultation would begin at the end of this month.

So the question is, how will the consultation be conducted, is it simply to be online or will there be a paper consultation, because so many people cannot get access to online consultation and what dates will it run from and to? Secondly; what is the impact expected of

the consultation, because there is misinformation out there as to the people who do know there is a consultation in the thought that this will affect whether the lights go on or go off or stay on. How will they get clear information as to exactly what the consultation will be, from when it will run, till when it will run and what the impact of the consultation will be on the issue of switching off or dimming the lights in particular streets.

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

As far as I am aware you are absolutely right, the three month consultation with our partners has finished now and those results are being analysed. Seven of our partners have taken up paying for street lamps, street lights. Chatteris, Wisbech, Cottenham, Sawston, Granchester, Yaxley and Teversham so far. What will happen is that the consultation for the public will be e-mailed out to Spokes, (because we don't have a Spokes meeting until the 10<sup>th</sup> November) before the end of the month and it is hoped that the consultation will be online (and I haven't heard about it being paper, but online), for the end of the month and it will be four to six weeks. The exact dates have not yet actually come out and as far as what will happen with the results of that consultation is that they will be analysed and fed into the process, just as all other consultations are.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Jocelyne Scutt**

The supplementary question is what will be done by the Council if overwhelmingly there is a negative indication through the consultation to the lights going off at all, or the dimming of the lights as one may anticipate even if it is clear that the consultation is only about which streets. It might be anticipated that there will be an overwhelming negative response to the whole idea in itself and if that is so, what does the Council propose?

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

Sorry what was the beginning of that one?

### **Response from Councillor Jocelyne Scutt**

That even if it is made clear that the consultation, as I understand it, goes not to whether the lights will go on or stay off or be dimmed or not dimmed but it is, as I understand it, to the question of which lights in which streets will go off, or be dimmed. However, one may anticipate that once the consultation goes forward, that people will make it clear that they don't want the lights off at all, or dimmed, so if that is the case, what will the response of the Council be?

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

Thank you for indulging me on that one. Obviously it depends upon how you ask the question. I am sure there are several ways of asking whether you would like street lights turned off or kept on. The default position of this Council at this moment in time is, those designated streetlights to be turned off, will be turned off between 12 at night and 6 in the morning and if there is overwhelming support to keep streetlights on or turn them off, then that will go into the process and we, as County Councillors, will decide – that is what we do.

## **9. Question from Councillor Peter Downes to Councillor Count, Leader of the Council**

This is for Councillor Count. It is not a difficult question so I have not given you any advance

notice.

I think you will agree with me that the expectations on Councillors are increasing almost week by week as the world in which we operate is changing and the demands on us are increasing and our need to know what is happening is greater almost on a daily basis. And I am thinking not just here within this County, but nationally as well. In the last few weeks we have been receiving a briefing on a daily basis from the LGIU, the Local Government Information Unit, and I found these very helpful, not least because they give us extracts from newspapers that I don't normally read. I won't specify which those are, but that it is useful and I find it has been very helpful. That has ceased – it ceased a few days ago - and I find out on enquiry that it isn't because we have stopped paying the subscription, we were never paying a subscription anyway. We had it on a free trial basis and I simply want to put it to you, if some way could be found of either restoring that service or providing an alternative service. For example, the Local Government Association produces I think a 'Key Issues Summary' from time to time, or even daily. If it is possible for that to be circulated to all Members I think we might value it, so could you perhaps give consideration to that in the interest of keeping us all up to speed on not only what is happening in our own County, but across the country.

### **Response from Councillor Count**

Thank you Councillor Downes. I am well aware of the e-mail that comes into our in- boxes every day from the LGIU with a plethora of information on a multitude of subjects from various different sources and as I scan that every day I have found some of the agenda items quite useful, just to affect my knowledge and see what's in there.

I must say I haven't delved into probably any of them in depth either, because I am picking up the information elsewhere or whatever, but as you quite rightly say that wasn't arriving because we bought a service – that was arriving because it was a hook and says when it stops, you will perhaps consider buying it. And I think in these days of austerity we can't go down the route of paying for things if we can find a reasonable alternative. I suppose in the old days a reasonable alternative would be to buy your own newspaper, go to the library and read the others, but I am aware that the LGA, as you suggested, does do something along those lines. They have perhaps a daily briefing that Mark Lloyd perhaps gets, or can get hold of, that we could possibly disseminate more widely. I am aware of another one we get, Conservative Daily Briefing, but I am not sure that you'd be that interested!

I will take that up as a serious note with Mark and see if there is a freely accessible, rather than paid for service that would somehow go some way to replacing that.

**APPENDIX E****COUNTY COUNCIL – 13 OCTOBER 2015****WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2****Question from Councillor Mike Mason**

I refer Councillor Hickford to Freedom of Information response 5359, Appendix 1. Pdf, in which the 5<sup>th</sup> draft version dated Jan. 2015, of a management contract for the Cambridge Library Enterprise Centre, was to have been signed with a company named Regus Cambridge Library Limited No.08667370 registered on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2013, having 4 named directors. Furthermore Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee Reports from March 17<sup>th</sup> 2015 had consistently named the other party as Regus/Kora, represented by their lead negotiator Mr. R. Perrin, who we now know is disqualified from holding office as a director in the UK. I also refer him to paragraph 2 on page 6 of my report to Councillor Shellens and Head of Internal Audit, dated 14<sup>th</sup> August and published on the Council Web Site.

Bearing in mind the published Committee decisions of 17<sup>th</sup> March and 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2015, delegating the final decision on contract matters to Chairman, Vice Chairman and Officers, will Councillor Hickford publish the date/s on which he and the Vice Chairman were made aware of the existence of Regus Cambridge Library Limited, together with that company's trading history and financial status, and will he say why this information, which was available to officers responsible for matters of due diligence, was not properly and accurately reported to committee members to inform the decisions making process.

**Response from Councillor Roger Hickford****Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee**

The company named Regus Cambridge Library Limited No. 08667370, referred to in the draft Management Agreement (published in response to the Freedom of Information request 5359) was a company set up by Regus at the start of negotiations with the Council. It is a dormant company, wholly owned by Regus, with the same registered office address, and has no financial or trading history, which was revealed as part of due diligence processes during the project. There was nothing to prevent anyone registering a company with that name, and permission of the library or the local authority was not required.

None of the four directors associated with this company are Mr Roger Perrin. Officers were aware of the company from the start of negotiations on the draft Management Agreement, and I was made aware of it once I saw the draft Management Agreement. Officers always made clear that there was a draft Management Agreement, and (in the report to General Purposes Committee on 14 April 2015) that each Kora project is established as a separate company in its own right:

- 3.2 Kora is a division of the Regus Group PLC.....
- 3.4 Each individual Kora outlet is established as a separate business within this division....

No final agreement had been reached or any contract signed with Regus Kora ahead of the original report to Committee, and documents were still in draft form.

Your submission to the Scrutiny Review of this project has been reviewed by Councillor Shellens and the Head of Internal Audit, and they have now reported in response to all of the submissions provided.



Since Kora was the name developed by Regus during the course of negotiations with the Council – commonly being used in association with this project from late 2014 – it was therefore appropriate and accurate that this was how it was referred to in relevant documents and reports for Members. The parent company in all cases is Regus and this is the company that was subject to due diligence, and has been identified throughout all Committee and Spokes reports.

You may also wish to note that the published draft of the Management Agreement refers to a Guarantee on page 3 that specifically identified Regus as the company considering such a guarantee. Our Legal team were pursuing this guarantee as part of the negotiations, as Regus Cambridge Library Limited was obviously a newly established company for the purposes of this project.