

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 16<sup>th</sup> July 2013

**Time:** 10.30 a.m. – 5.05 p.m.

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillors: P Ashcroft, B Ashwood, A Bailey, I Bates, K Bourke, D Brown, P Bullen, S Bywater, E Cearn, B Chapman, P Clapp, J Clark, D Connor, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, M Curtis, A Dent, D Divine, P Downes, S Frost, D Giles, G Gillick, D Harty, R Henson, R Hickford, J Hipkin, B Hunt, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, S Kindersley, P Lagoda, A Lay, M Leeke, M Loynes, I Manning, R Manning, M Mason, M McGuire, L Nethsingha, F Onasanya, T Orgee, P Read, P Reeve, J Reynolds, K Reynolds, M Rouse, S Rylance, P Sales, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, M Smith, A Taylor, M Tew, P Topping, S van de Kerkhove, S van de Ven, A Walsh, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors P Brown, R Butcher and J Palmer

### 15. MINUTES – 21<sup>st</sup> MAY 2013

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2013 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 16. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

### 17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Connor declared a disclosable pecuniary interest under the Code of Conduct in the discussion recorded under Minute 22 c), Motion on pay negotiations, as his partner was employed by Cambridgeshire County Council. He left the room whilst the discussion took place.

The following Members declared non-statutory disclosable interests under the Code of Conduct:

Councillor	Minute	Details
Jenkins	22 b)	Governor at Impington Village College, which taught the International Baccalaureate (IB)
Shuter	22 b)	Governor at Bottisham Village College; child at Burrough Green Church of England Primary School; another child had recently completed the IB at Impington Village College

### 18. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were received from members of the public.

## **19. PETITIONS**

One petition was presented by a member of the public, as set out in **Appendix B**. The Chairman thanked the petitioner and advised that the Leader of the Council would respond in writing.

## **20. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION FROM CABINET**

### **a) Incorporation of Cambridgeshire County Council Democratic Services function within the scope of LGSS Shared Services**

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, that the recommendations as set out in minute 5 of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 28<sup>th</sup> May 2013 be approved.

Following discussion, it was resolved

- i) To approve the incorporation of the Cambridgeshire County Council Democratic Services team within the scope of LGSS
- ii) To approve the necessary amendments to the Cambridgeshire County Council Constitution to bring this about
- iii) To authorise the LGSS Director of Law, Property and Governance, in consultation with the Chairman of the LGSS Joint Committee and Chairman of the Cambridgeshire County Council Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any amendments to the Cambridgeshire County Council Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, most UKIP and 2 Independent members in favour; most Liberal Democrats, 1 UKIP and 2 Independent members against; Labour and some Liberal Democrats abstained.]

### **b) Treasury Management Quarter 4 Report**

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, that the recommendations as set out in minute 19 of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> June 2013 be approved.

Following discussion, it was resolved

To give final approval to the Treasury Management report for Quarter 4 of 2012/13.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Liberal Democrats, Labour, some UKIP and some Independent members in favour; some UKIP members against; 1 UKIP and 1 Independent member abstained.]

## **21. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION**

It was proposed by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, that the

recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

It was resolved unanimously

- i) To note the timetable for working up detailed proposals for the operation of the committee system
- ii) To note that the proposal to change arrangements for the overview and scrutiny of Cabinet decisions had been withdrawn
- iii) To delegate to the Adults, Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee the power of referral of health service proposals to the Secretary of State for Health
- iv) To approve the content of the proposed amendments to the Council's Constitution
- v) To authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to implement the amendments set out in this report with effect from 30<sup>th</sup> July 2013, and to make any other amendment to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

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

Six motions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10, as follow.

### **a) Motion from Councillor I Manning**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor I Manning and seconded by Councillor Taylor.

This Council notes:

- The current procedures for public questions or petitions allow a member of the public to address the chamber but do not require a direct reply from any members, other than to commit to a written response
- A threshold of 15,130 petition signatures is required to trigger a debate of an issue in Council and no petition has reached this threshold since the rules were put in place.

This Council believes:

- These procedures are unsatisfactory for many petitioners or questioners, who have spent a long time collecting signatures, often speak passionately and expect rather more than to be told a response will be given in writing
- Further, it is unsatisfactory given the desire for more open local government as the response is not published
- Given that Government guidance suggests the number of signatures required should encourage rather than discourage petitions, the current system is unsatisfactory.

Therefore this Council will change the current procedure and make the resulting changes to the Constitution and/or Standing Orders such that:

- This Council resolves to change the threshold of signatures on a petition required to trigger a debate to 3,000 signatures
- For public questions, each Group Leader, or nominated member from their party, will make a statement, of no more than 2 minutes, on their party's response to the questioner(s), and all these responses will be published on the Council's website
- Council authorises the Monitoring Officer to make any necessary amendments to the Constitution to implement these changes.

Two amendments to the motion were put forward. The first amendment was proposed by Councillor Curtis and seconded by Councillor Dent (additions in bold and deletions struck through):

This Council notes:

- The current procedures for public questions or petitions allow a member of the public to address the chamber but do not require a direct reply from any members, other than to commit to a written response
- A threshold of 15,130 petition signatures is required to trigger a debate of an issue in Council and no petition has reached this threshold since the rules were put in place.

This Council believes:

- These procedures are unsatisfactory for many petitioners or questioners, who have spent a long time collecting signatures, often speak passionately and expect rather more than to be told a response will be given in writing
- Further, it is unsatisfactory given the desire for more open local government as the response is not published
- Given that Government guidance suggests the number of signatures required should encourage rather than discourage petitions, the current system is unsatisfactory.

Therefore this Council will change the current procedure and make the resulting changes to the Constitution and/or Standing Orders such that:

- This Council resolves to change the threshold of signatures on a petition required to trigger a debate to ~~3~~ **5,000** signatures
- For public questions, each Group Leader, or nominated member from their party, will make a statement, of no more than 2 minutes, on their party's response to the questioner(s), and all these responses will be published on the Council's website
- Council authorises the Monitoring Officer to make any necessary amendments to the Constitution to implement these changes.

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

[Voting pattern: Conservatives and 1 UKIP member in favour; Liberal Democrat, Independent, most Labour and most UKIP members against; 1 Labour member abstained.]

*Councillor Walsh noted after the vote had closed that he had intended to vote against the amendment, not to abstain.*

The second amendment was proposed by Councillor Curtis and seconded by Councillor Count (additions in bold and deletions struck through):

This Council notes:

- The current procedures for public questions or petitions allow a member of the public to address the chamber but do not require a direct reply from any members, other than to commit to a written response
- A threshold of 15,130 petition signatures is required to trigger a debate of an issue in Council and no petition has reached this threshold since the rules were put in place.

This Council believes:

- These procedures are unsatisfactory for many petitioners or questioners, who have spent a long time collecting signatures, often speak passionately and expect rather more than to be told a response will be given in writing
- Further, it is unsatisfactory given the desire for more open local government as the response is not published
- Given that Government guidance suggests the number of signatures required should encourage rather than discourage petitions, the current system is unsatisfactory.

Therefore this Council will change the current procedure and make the resulting changes to the Constitution and/or Standing Orders such that:

- This Council resolves to change the threshold of signatures on a petition required to trigger a debate to 3,000 signatures
- ~~For public questions, each Group Leader, or nominated member from their party, will make a statement, of no more than 2 minutes, on their party's response to the questioner(s), and all these responses will be published on the Council's website;~~
- Council authorises the Monitoring Officer to make any necessary amendments to the Constitution to implement these changes.

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

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Labour, most UKIP and most Independent members in favour; most Liberal Democrats against; 1 Liberal Democrat, 1 UKIP and 1 Independent member abstained.]

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion as amended was carried.

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrat, Labour, UKIP and Independent members in favour; Conservatives abstained.]

As the above resolution necessitated changes to the Council's Constitution, Council then received a written report on the changes from the Chief Executive and the Monitoring Officer, in accordance with Article 16.03 of the Constitution.

**b) Motion from Councillor Downes**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Downes and seconded by Councillor Harty.

This Council welcomes the Government's commitment to introducing a national funding formula for schools, possibly from 2015-16.

This Council notes that:

- Cambridgeshire currently receives the lowest unit of pupil funding in the country
- There is a gap of over £500 per pupil between Cambridgeshire and the median Local Authority
- There is a gap of £3,000 per pupil between Cambridgeshire and the highest funded Local Authority.

This Council considers that:

- There is no justification for disparities on this scale when all schools are judged against national criteria (testing, inspection, and league tables)
- The current distribution methodology replicates to a large extent decisions made by local Councils many years ago when there was less high profile accountability without national criteria and a punitive inspection regime
- It would be unreasonable to expect absolute equality of funding in cash terms, given the variations across the country in employment costs, deprivation and other identifiable pressures.

This Council calls on the Department for Education to produce a distribution formula that:

- Ensures that the basic unit of funding per pupil (i.e. excluding area factors, deprivation, English as an additional language and sparsity) is the same for all pupils across England and is derived from an analysis of what schools are expected to deliver
- Distributes funding to Local Authorities rather than to individual schools so that the local Schools Forum, working with partners and the Local Authority, can devise its own local distribution formula to reflect local needs and circumstances

- Allocates sufficient Education Services Grant to enable Local Authorities to provide challenge and support for local schools
- Provides adequate funding for the commissioning of new schools to meet demographic growth, including not only up-front capital costs but revenue funding for the diseconomies of scale as schools develop
- Allocates the Education Services Grant equitably to academies and maintained schools so as to fulfil its own pledge that 'there will be no financial incentive for schools to convert to academy status'.

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

#### c) **Motion from Councillor Bullen**

With the agreement of Council, Councillor Bullen proposed the following motion, altered from that set out on the agenda (additional text in bold, deletions struck through). The motion was seconded by Councillor Reeve.

Cambridgeshire County Council Employees are currently paid according to the pay scales set by the National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government Services and, therefore, we have no say in how much pay our employees receive.

Cambridgeshire County Council currently has 816 employees who earn less than £13,000 per year and 14 employees who earn in excess of £80,000 per year. Indeed, several employees earn between £90,000 and £190,000. Recent survey results have shown that, on average, public sector employees earn an average of 25% more than those in the private sector and, yet, our Council still has some of the poorest paid employees in the County.

It is understood that staff contracts of employment contain within them a clause linking their pay to NJC scales and that their contracts are governed by the Green Book, the contents of which are incorporated by reference. If Cambridgeshire County Council is to withdraw from the NJC then it may be in breach of its contractual obligations.

It is permissible, however, for an employer to unilaterally vary terms and conditions of employment, but this can only be done after proper consultation. This involves notifying each and every employee, as well as the unions, and going through a proper consultation process. There also have to be pay protection provisions in place to enable any employees who lose out to have time to adjust their finances accordingly and these periods are usually measured in years, not weeks or months. Therefore:

~~It is proposed that Cambridgeshire County Council do~~ **Council calls on the Cabinet to** withdraw from the National Joint Council for Local Government Services pay negotiation process and in lieu thereof enter into separate local collective bargaining agreements with all present and future employees and recognised Trades Unions.

Following discussion, the motion, on being put to the vote, was lost.

[Voting pattern: most UKIP members in favour; Conservatives, Liberal Democrat and Labour and most Independent members against; 1 UKIP and 1 Independent member abstained.]

**d) Motion from Councillor Bullen**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Bullen and seconded by Councillor Reeve.

The Government has announced that it will upgrade the A14 in 2016 on the condition that Cambridgeshire County Council contributes £25m over 25 years. It is also a condition that the new road will be tolled and that the proceeds of that toll will be paid into Central Government funds; no toll income will be returned to Cambridgeshire County Council.

It has already been proven that the majority of motorists, both private and commercial, will avoid toll roads at all costs and that they will either use local roads or avoid the area altogether. Therefore, a tolled A14 could drive business away from Cambridgeshire and cause more congestion on local roads.

It is the responsibility of Government to pay for upgrades to national trunk routes and not local Council Tax payers through City, District and County Councils. If the A14 upgrade is partially funded by local Council Tax payers, it will be the thin end of the wedge, it will divert money away from much needed local services and it will have a detrimental effect on the Council Tax precept for many years to come.

Therefore:

This Council calls on the Cabinet to implement a requirement that Cambridgeshire County Council do seek the views of Council Tax payers, by way of both formal consultation and referendum, before committing funds to any infrastructure projects normally the responsibility of Central Government, including by way of non-exhaustive example major highway projects.

Following discussion, the motion, on being put to the vote, was lost.

[Voting pattern: UKIP and 2 Independent members in favour; Conservative, Liberal Democrat, Labour and 2 Independent members against.]

**e) Motion from Councillor Bullen**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Bullen and seconded by Councillor Reeve.

Cambridgeshire County Council, under a Conservative-led Council, has raised the Council Tax for 15 of the last 16 years. In this time of austerity, Council Tax payers are finding it increasingly more difficult to 'make ends meet' and the burden of ever increasing taxation is causing undue hardship to many local people.

It is acknowledged that some savings have already been made but, by refusing to partially finance national projects, significant extra expenditure can be invested locally without the requirement to increase Council Tax contributions from local residents. Therefore:



It is proposed that Cambridgeshire County Council agrees to freeze any further increases in its Council Tax for the duration of this administration; and that it do encourage other public authorities within the County, by example and exhortation, to similarly limit their claims upon the taxpayers we serve.

Following discussion, the motion, on being put to the vote, was lost.

[Voting pattern: most UKIP members in favour; Conservative, Liberal Democrat, Labour and most Independent members against; 1 UKIP and 1 Independent member abstained.]

**f) Motion from Councillor Jenkins**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Jenkins and seconded by Councillor van de Ven.

This Council notes:

- That the backlog of road repairs in the County is £300 million
- That the gap is growing at £50 million per year and is projected to widen
- That the Council has borrowed £90 million over five years to address it
- That the Council is developing an ambitious new Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and is poised to embark on a number of high profile transport infrastructure projects
- That a decent highway network is not only an important enabler of economic growth but also contributes to the opinion which third parties, including potential investors, form of our county
- That the Council is taking positive steps through the Department for Transport's Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme, but this does not address the fundamental problem.

This Council calls upon the Leader:

- To acknowledge that the highways maintenance deficit is an issue which needs to be fully addressed rather than simply understood
- To establish an officer team to develop an appropriate plan which can form a part of the next budget round.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrat, Labour, most Independent and most UKIP members in favour; Conservatives against; 1 Independent and 3 UKIP members abstained.]

## 23. QUESTIONS

### a) Oral Questions

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

- The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Wilson's question on Huntingdon and Godmanchester primary school places, including a copy of his response to the petitioner to Cabinet on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2013 and observations on how a single parent with children at two primary schools four miles apart might manage.
- The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Nethsingha on the timetable for implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order managing coach parking on Barton Road, Cambridge, and on wider proposals for the management of coach parking in west Cambridge.
- The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, agreed to arrange a visit to Romsey with Councillor Bourke before the next Council meeting to discuss childcare provision.
- The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Scutt on whether the upper age limit for school bus fare subsidies would rise when the school leaving age rose to 17.
- The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Shellens explaining how much of the increase in the value of the Cambridgeshire Pensions Fund during the financial year 2012/13 detailed in Appendix D to these minutes was due to new members joining.
- In response to a question from Councillor Rylance, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, agreed to support lobbying of central Government for a levy to be imposed on foreign lorries entering UK ports, to be ringfenced exclusively for road maintenance.
- In response to a question from Councillor Sales, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, agreed to discuss with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment whether the Council could lobby the Highways Agency for reduced speed limits at accident black spots on the A14 until the new road was built.
- The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Walsh on whether parking schemes would be coming to Cabinet that would allow temporary passes to be issued to people carrying out building renovations.
- The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, agreed to arrange a written response for Councillor Jenkins on why the Council no longer wrote to Blue Badge holders when their Blue Badges were about to expire.

**b) Written Questions**

One written question had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2, as set out in **Appendix D**.

**24. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES AND OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS**

It was proposed by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds, seconded by the Vice-Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, and resolved unanimously:

- (a) To replace Councillor Nethsingha with Councillor I Manning on the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee and to add Councillor Nethsingha as a substitute
- (b) To add Councillor Ashcroft as a substitute on the Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (c) To add Councillor Jenkins as a substitute on the Planning Committee
- (d) To add Councillor van de Ven as a substitute on the Constitution and Ethics Committee
- (e) To add Councillors Ashwood and Cearns to the membership of the Service Appeals Committee
- (f) To add Councillor Ashwood as a substitute on the Health and Wellbeing Board
- (g) To replace Councillor McGuire with Councillor Chapman on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority
- (h) To replace Councillor Clark with Councillor Chapman on the ESPO Management Committee
- (i) To add Councillor Nethsingha as a member of the LGA Urban Commission
- (j) To remove Councillors Giles and van de Kerkhove as substitutes on the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (k) To remove Councillors Hipkin and Mason as substitutes on the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (l) To remove Councillors Hipkin and Mason as substitutes on the Adults, Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (m) To remove Councillors Giles and van de Kerkhove as substitutes on the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (n) To remove Councillors Hipkin and Mason as substitutes on the Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (o) To remove Councillors Giles and Hipkin as substitutes on the Planning Committee

- (p) To remove Councillor Giles and van de Kerkhove as substitutes on the Constitution and Ethics Committee
- (q) To replace Councillor Rylance with Councillor Ashcroft on the Adults, Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (r) To delete Councillor Smith as a substitute on the Joint Development Control Committee for Northstowe
- (s) To replace Councillor Bailey with Councillor Schumann as a substitute on the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013  
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**PEOPLE**

**Former County Councillor Paul Rayment**

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of former County Councillor Paul Rayment. Councillor Rayment served on the County Council from 1989 to 1993, representing the Newnham Division, on behalf of the Labour Party.

**Death of Councillor Tim Bick's Wife**

The Council notes with regret the recent death of the wife of the Cambridge City Council Leader Councillor Tim Bick. The Chairman, on behalf of the Council, will be sending his condolences to Councillor Bick and his family at this very sad time.

**Honorary Aldermen**

At its last meeting on 21 May, the Council resolved unanimously to confer the title of Honorary Alderman on:

- the late Terry Bear
- Geoffrey Heathcock
- Shona Johnstone
- John Powley
- Jill Tuck

Unfortunately, Geoffrey Heathcock and Jill Tuck were unable to make the meeting but have instead been invited to the meeting on 16 July to receive their certificates.

**Councillor Peter Reeve**

On behalf of the Council, the Chairman congratulates Councillor Peter Reeve on being elected Deputy Chairman of the Independent Group on the Local Government Association.

**AWARDS**

**Local Authority of the Year Primary Authority Award**

Cambridgeshire County Council has won the inaugural Local Authority of the Year Primary Authority Award in recognition of the way it is working alongside businesses to help reduce red tape and improve regulation. The council was presented with the award, run by the Better Regulation Delivery Office of the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, at the Local Government Association Annual Conference in Manchester on 3 July 2013. The council was praised for its pragmatic approach to addressing concerns and with businesses now seeking advice from them on commercially sensitive issues in a way that would never have happened before. The Council is working with South Cambridgeshire District Council to create a one stop shop for assured advice – an initiative welcomed by several national fast food companies and is also sharing specialist knowledge in areas of new legislation, helping Primary Authority to become a tool for business development, by providing greater confidence and certainty.

## **SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

### A14 Improvement Scheme

The Government has announced as part of its Spending Review that the £1.5 billion A14 improvement scheme will go ahead. The scheme will be funded by a combination of a £100 million local contribution, tolling revenues and central government funding. The aim is to start the scheme in 2016. The A14 improvement will provide a huge boost for the local and national economy and in the short term will allow the new town of Northstowe to start.

## **MESSAGES**

### Visit by Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh

The Chairman was delighted to meet Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh when they travelled on the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus from Cambridge Station to open the Medical Research Centre's Laboratory of Molecular Biology on 23 May 2013.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013**  
**PETITIONS**

Text of a petition containing 2,907 signatures presented by Mr Peter Wakefield, Chairman  
Railfuture East Anglia

“We, the undersigned, support the re-opening of the Wisbech to March railway line and  
provision of a through train service to Cambridge. [www.wisbechrail.org.uk](http://www.wisbechrail.org.uk)”

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013  
ORAL QUESTIONS**

**1. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, from Councillor Wilson**

This is a question for Councillor Harty about primary school places in Godmanchester. For the second year running, a number of Godmanchester's children starting school this year will have to go to Huntingdon and others have been allocated places to a different school in Godmanchester to their brothers and sisters, who are already at school. My question, Councillor Harty, is what advice do you suggest I give a single parent who has one child in one school, her closest school, and will now have to take the other one past two of the schools in Godmanchester into Huntingdon?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

Thank you for the question. I have actually written today to Godmanchester and they will be receiving the letter from me tomorrow or on Thursday.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Wilson**

Can I clarify that when you have written to Godmanchester? There are 6,000 residents in Godmanchester.

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

I have written to a Mrs Holden who wrote to me and I can give you a copy of that letter if you need it.

**Comment from Councillor Wilson**

That will be helpful, although the lady who contacted me isn't Mrs Holden, but if you could send me a copy of that, that will be helpful. But could you just clarify what advice you have given to this lady and then I will have my supplementary brief. I think other members would be interested too.

**Comment from the Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds**

I think the issue you raise is not just peculiar to Godmanchester, I think most members would have similar issues in their wards. I think it's normal practice, and I stand to be corrected there, if a Portfolio Holder, or Leader or anybody corresponds with a constituent in a member's area, they should copy the letter to the ward member, as a matter of courtesy. So I would think that everything you have asked and the clarification you're seeking should be in the letter. Is that correct?

**Comment from Councillor Wilson**

You've mentioned, Chair, that other members would be interested in this. How do other members understand the principle that the Cabinet Member is taking when we, and it won't just be me, are faced with a similar problem in the future? I don't understand why the Cabinet Member won't explain what's in the letter. I've not mentioned any names, there is no need to mention names, it's the principle of what



advice you give a single mother who has got to take one child to this school over here and take the other child four miles into Huntingdon over there.

**Comment from the Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds**

In addition to a copy of the letter, Councillor Harty will give you a written response to that. When you have a written response in answer to a question at this meeting, it will be circulated to all members of the Council, so they will get that information as well.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Wilson**

My supplementary question is that it's now the second year, as I mentioned; what is the problem going to be next year? Or will you find out please, what forecast officers have and are you more comfortable that there will not be a problem next year that we won't be facing this position and officers will be much more flexible to avoid children being in different schools than their siblings.

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

Yes I am quite confident that will happen and we will get a better response next year.

**2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor J Reynolds**

Can I thank Councillor McGuire for coming and visiting Bar Hill some 5-6 weeks ago to look at the state of some of our internal estate roads? As he will have been able to see for himself, not only the top surface but the second surface below and even the wearing course underneath has been worn away on at least 4 or 5 roads. Despite talking to the relevant officers for the last 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>-4 years, no action has been able to be taken to improve the standard of the road surface. I appreciate that it isn't something that probably can be done for every single road immediately, but we would like to ask the Portfolio Holder to give some indication or at least take some action to try and at least have a plan which will have those roads repaired over a period of time.

**Comment from the Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds**

Councillor, that was very similar, dangerously close to the last motion that we were discussing, Councillor Jenkins's motion. We shouldn't really be asking questions where there is an opportunity otherwise. Councillor McGuire, can you take that on board and deal with it?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

Chairman, if I could just say for the benefit of Councillor Reynolds, yes I did go round there and have a look at some of his roads and I saw the condition they were in. I did understand from Nicola Debnam, I'm sure you will know that some of them had been addressed in the meantime, because I pointed particular ones out to her. Having said that, apart from what we have already discussed earlier on, Chairman, there is a maintenance programme and there is the Transport Delivery Plan. If Councillor Reynolds wants to get in touch with, what is now known as your Local Infrastructure and Streets Officer, if you get in touch with him because you did mention to me and the supervisor earlier on, that person should be able to tell you what is actually planned in any particular area over the next year. It is up to them as local officers to

give you some knowledge as to when particular roads will be repaired, resurfaced, whatever.

**3. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor Nethsingha**

During early 2012, this Council undertook a consultation on changes to parking in Barton Road. The concerns raised by local people were particularly in relation to the number of coaches which park on both sides of Barton Road during the summer tourist season, making the road almost impassable to the normal flow of traffic. Following extensive consultation with residents, a scheme was agreed in the winter and we were hopeful that the issue would have been resolved in time for this summer's season. Unfortunately issues with the County's system for managing TROs (Traffic Regulation Orders) mean the scheme still has not been signed off and the buses are back. I would like to ask the Cabinet Member to ensure that this scheme is pursued with all possible speed and I would also like to ask that there is a review of how coach parking is managed in west Cambridge. The current lack of space for coaches to park is causing significant problems not only for the Barton Road area but also in many other streets where residents are subjected to large numbers of coaches parking throughout the day in residential streets during the summer. They often leave their coaches running all day so that the drivers can keep their air conditioning on and this is an intolerable situation for the people whose houses they park outside.

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

Thank you, Councillor Nethsingha, for bringing this one up. She did mention it to me at lunchtime but that was insufficient time for me to look into this one. It doesn't at the moment ring a bell with me, because clearly I wasn't the Portfolio Holder when that was decided, but I will follow this up. There is a process where if there objections to TROs, then they will come to me and I will make a decision. I don't recall seeing this one so Barton Road and the coaches doesn't mean anything to me but I will follow this up and I'm sure you will get a response.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Nethsingha**

Just very quickly, could you also follow up issues of coaches in other areas and coach parking more generally and the management of coaches in west Cambridge? They also cause huge problems off Queen's Road.

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

That one is noted, Chairman.

**4. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, from Councillor Bourke**

At the last meeting of full Council, I asked if he would be willing to come to Romsey to attend a meeting involving childcare in my division and I was very grateful when he agreed to do that. It's subsequently proving to be very difficult to get a response in terms of organising that meeting. Would he be willing to commit to ensuring that we have this meeting before the next full meeting of Council?

## **Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

Yes I am quite happy to help arrange that meeting for you.

### **5. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, from Councillor Scutt**

I understand that the national Westminster Government is introducing a policy that students should remain at school until they reach the age of 17. As you will know, there is a bus fare subsidy for students; however, that bus fare subsidy cuts out at 16. Therefore my question is, when the age of leaving school is raised to 17, will the bus fare subsidy be raised consistent with that school leaving age?

## **Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

I can't give you a definite answer at the moment but certainly one would expect it to follow suit, I would think. I will try and come back to you.

### **6. Question to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, from Councillor Shellens**

I previously submitted a written question to Councillor Count and I'm extremely grateful for the replies to that; it was on the question of pensions and the cost of pension management. His replies clearly demonstrate the danger of paying too much attention either to me or Hamilton or the Daily Express. Inevitably, however, answers beget questions: the cost of management from the answers he's given and circulated on this paper. The cost of management and dealing come to about £2.5m, which is real money and that's about 1.5% of the funds invested. So a) how does this level of management cost compare with other authorities? And b) what scope is there, does he feel, to reduce the cost? Then going on from that, I note that the fund increased in value over the year by an impressive 15%, but Sainsbury's when they quote growth figures always do so on a like for like basis, excluding new retail space etc. So could Councillor Count, if necessary through a written reply, advise whether the figures are on the funds from those who were there in the scheme at the beginning of the year, or whether it is massaged to include resources from new members?

## **Reply from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count**

Councillor Shellens did advise me of these questions first thing this morning so my responses are pretty much based on my knowledge. I do note that the origin of the question was newspaper articles and was glad to reflect that we are well run when compared to some of the ones that are highlighted. Management fees are agreed by the Pension Board, the Investment Sub-Committee, when we choose investments together, the fund managers are pitching different things and different costs. They are not changed subsequently unless they come back to the Board, the Board which has members from the County Council, District Councils, Union representative members. It is a very cross party large group that agrees these things. They also have independent advisors that advise on the cost that managers are quoting.

I can confirm to you that just recently, in our latest report, we actually had our costs analysed by an outside company that specialises in that. The results of their findings were that as a whole, we were on the favourable end of the local government pension universe. There was one exception to that, I cannot quite recall which fund it was for, but it identified that we were possibly erring on overpaying to the tune of somewhere

in the region of £60,000 a year. Even before we managed to meet and task the officers with renegotiating that package, they had renegotiated it down in excess of that figure. So bearing in mind that this is in the favourable end, our total cost of £2.6m, and they identified a possible reduction for £60,000, I think we were doing a very good job, I think we were doing an honest and professional job.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Shellens**

I did ask a second question which has yet to receive the benefit of an answer, but I hope that will receive a written reply

### **Reply from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count**

Very quickly, the figures that are reported are not like for like, they are of the total fund size which will include the new people that have moved there. I will talk to officers to see what kind of figures we can give you written in reply to your question.

### **7. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor Dent**

I would just like to ask Councillor McGuire for an update on the status of the Bassingbourn Barracks, with particular emphasis on civilian access to the sites for sports and social activities during the training of the Libyan troops.

### **Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

Councillor Dent did give me notice of this question so I do have some answers and I'm responding as the Chairman of the Community Covenant Board. As far as the future of Bassingbourn Barracks, it now has, following the announcement from the Government, a little bit more certainty for the future. If I may I'll quickly go through a list of the key facts in regards to what we intend to do with Bassingbourn Barracks in terms of training Libyan military personnel. Members may be aware that this comes as a result of the G8 conference where a number of nations agreed that they would take on the responsibility for training with the Libyan military personnel. Apparently this is a cross-Whitehall initiative, it's not just MoD, all Libyans will be vetted prior to visas being issued. Visas will be single entry, Libyans will be escorted to and from the airport. 7,000 Libyans have been earmarked for training with the UK to take on 2,000 in groups of 300 as far as the training is concerned. It will be a very intensive 8-10 week training programme. Libyans will be restricted to the camp during the course, a regular army unit will be responsible for training and the Libyan Government will cover the cost of this training.

The future of Bassingbourn Barracks is yet to be decided and that's the rub and really is the point of Councillor Dent's question. What we are now trying to establish with the MoD is that effectively Bassingbourn is now coming out of mothballs and therefore and for those who are not aware of it whilst it's being mothballed effectively the community uses of the Bassingbourn Barracks on that site has been very restricted and almost zero. We are still trying to establish through the MoD will they now allow the community access back again; what we don't know is how long past this particular training Bassingbourn will stay open.

**8. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor Rylance**

The haulage companies based across Great Britain are constantly at a disadvantage compared to those based abroad, who come into our ports with their tanks full of cheap fuel, use our roads for free and then leave again without paying anything towards the infrastructure of this country. This is felt keenly in Fenland. Will the Leader of the Council back me in asking Parliament to introduce and enforce a levy system as early as possible which will be applied to every foreign lorry entering this Country, at any port, and to ringfence the money it raises to be used solely on road maintenance.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis**

The answer is yes and also tolling.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Rylance**

Tolling is not the answer, as can be evidenced by the completely empty motorway that is tolled on the M6.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis**

I was being a bit flippant about the tolling thing, I have to say I wasn't being entirely serious. I will happily write and everything else but I would say stop using the M6 toll as an example, because it's modelled on a completely different cost price and cost basis than what we've got. Let's not forget that there are others models of tolling in this country that do work. I'd prefer not to have it but let's not start hiding from the real facts by selecting the one that is convenient.

**9. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor Bywater**

It's a question for Councillor Curtis. Without flogging a dead horse in relation to the potholes scenario that we talked about earlier, my key issue that I'm going to raise with yourself is about risk and mitigation of insurance claims. We've explored the pothole scenario and I'm aware of Councils up and down the Country being in my line of work, who have probably fallen foul to the reporting system of potholes and the fact that there are criminal elements out there who actually report the holes to Councils now, and they monitor when those potholes are repaired, and if they are not repaired in due process, lo and behold, we are presented with accident claims and they are pursuing us on a point of liability. That's an issue that is spreading across the country. Being a keen cyclist, and I know you are because we've spoken at events, we've got the world's biggest sporting event coming to Cambridge next year and we're talking about people falling over. My estimations are that there is probably going to be about 200-300,000 people coming to Cambridge. What are we planning on a risk mitigation process that we are going to reduce the possible claimants that are coming into the city as a result of repairs?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis**

There is a whole programme going on at the moment about how the Tour de France is going to be administered. It's going to be from a central body and it's all very complex, as the Olympics were. So I don't know the answer and I suspect at this precise moment there isn't an answer, but please be assured that the fact that we are

expecting huge numbers of people in Cambridge, it's obviously a significant part of the planning for the Tour de France next year, and one of the benefits we have, as you know, is if the cycle race is repeated in Fenland again next year and it's as big as we want it to be, actually that gives some of us a good opportunity to do smaller scale planning as well. I think it is too early to say, but we are really well on top of the fact that it is going to be. We thought the Olympic torch relay would beat that last year; this is going to be huge and so we are very aware of those facts.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Bywater**

Just to reiterate the fact that it's about working together, which obviously we are quite keen on doing. I would be quite happy to discuss further issues with you.

**10. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor Sales**

A question to Councillor McGuire about the A14. It's well established that the imposition of speed limits reduces accidents and I wondered whether or not the Administration would support the imposition of a 50mph speed limit on the dual section of the A14 where so many of the accidents occur. This has been put before, but no one seems to be particularly interested and at times there have been roadworks there and the speed limit has been introduced; the accident rate did fall sharply. I would have thought one of the ways of making the roads safer before the new road is built is to impose a 50mph limit.

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

Chairman, as Councillor Sales knows, the A14 is a trunk road and therefore the responsibility of the Highways Agency, not the County Council. However, I think most of us would agree the principle that where roadworks are taking place, the speed limits should if necessary be reduced to accommodate to make sure they stay within safe limits. I will ask the Executive Director to take it on board and advise us as to what influence we have over the Highways Agency on this and on specific parts, but it is ultimately up to the Highways Agency as to speed limits on the A14.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Sales**

Very quickly, I don't want representations made, I would like us to lobby the Highways Agency to get such a speed limit introduced as I think it would be helpful to everybody. Can that be done?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

Chairman, I will raise with Alex and we will see whether it's lobbying or representation. We will make the point, if we believe that failure to introduce speed limits is contributing in any way to accidents.

**11. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor Walsh**

Firstly I would like to thank him for visiting my division in Petersfield and also Romsey to inspect the state of the Highways, but I would like to ask a question related to the question of Petersfield. Phil Hammer, who is the Parking Operations Manager into

which my division falls, has informed me that there were plans to bring forward to Cabinet, plans to reform residents' parking schemes in Cambridge to allow people renovating to be able to take a temporary pass from the parking centre in Cambridge. I contacted Councillor McGuire by email four weeks ago but have received no replies, so I have decided to bring it to oral questions.

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

Thank you, Councillor Walsh, for raising it with me. I certainly have no recollection of such an email. The problems we have with this new system seem to be a bug for me. Please send it to me again and check the spelling because people always get McGuire wrong, but you should have got a bounce back if you did misspell it, but again if you could forward it to me again. It was a worthwhile visit and I hope that as a result of it, although there were a number of issues that came up and that did follow on from other members, a petition that was brought to Cabinet by the Trade Association in Mill Road, but it was an interesting visit and I hope as a result of it something positive comes out of it.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Walsh**

Can I just ask Councillor McGuire if Phil Hammer is correct or incorrect to say that Cabinet plans to reform residents' parking schemes in Cambridge to allow people who are renovating houses access to the scheme?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

From the top of my head I can't remember what's coming to Cabinet in October but again without having advance notice, apart from the email which clearly I didn't see, but I will certainly check this and advise back in writing.

**12. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor Jenkins**

The County Council has changed the policy whereby when blue badges are about to expire they say nothing and expect the holder to know that it's expiring and to take the appropriate steps to get it renewed, instead of warning them in advance. I would just like to know how this policy was arrived at?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

Chairman, I suspect that technically the question is for Councillor Count but having been responsible for the Contact Centre prior to the election, I am aware, because it's the Contact Centre manage the badges, it's now a national scheme in terms of the type of badge. So I would suggest that in fact Mike Davey takes it on board with Pat Harding and gives Councillor Jenkins a written response to that particular question.

**Comment from the Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds**

I think that it's probably a subject that all members will be interested in because we get questions about blue badges, so if you could copy it to all members please.

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

Chair, could I just point out that my question was to the Cabinet Member and at no time was I intent to pass the buck onto officers who are simply observing policy as set by the Cabinet Member.

### **Comment from the Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds**

I understand the point you made but you probably get the best response in the manner Councillor McGuire suggested. Would you like to elaborate?

### **Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire**

If I misrepresented the information I am going get or take on board, whether it's Councillor Count or myself, Chairman, I'll make sure that an answer comes. Fact is I will seek the answer from the officers.



**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013**  
**WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

Question from Councillor Shellens to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count

In the light of concerns expressed in the national press by Neil Hamilton amongst others that the payments to pensions fund managers has been twice as great as the increase in the value of local government pension funds, could the Chairman of Cambs Pension Board please supply the following information for the year 2012-2013:

1. By how much did the value of the fund increase in that 12 month period?
2. What is the total value of payments made to the managers of the various funds within the Cambridgeshire portfolio?
3. What was the cost of trading carried out in the same 12 month period, fees, stamp duty, etc, incurred by the fund?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count

Please find below responses to your three questions, as follows:

1. The value of the Fund increased from £1.645bn (11/12) to £1.902bn (12/13).
2. The amount paid to managers was £1.957m (12/13).
3. Transaction costs were £710,024 in 12/13.