

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017

**Time:** 10.30 a.m. – 5.15 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, B Chapman, P Clapp, J Clark, D Connor, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, A Dent, D Divine, P Downes, L Dupre, S Frost, D Giles, G Gillick, L Harford, R Henson, R Hickford, J Hipkin, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, G Kenney, A Lay, M Leeke, R Mandley, I Manning, M Mason, M McGuire, L Nethsingha, F Onasanya, T Orgee, J Palmer, P Reeve, M Rouse, P Sales, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, M Smith (Vice-Chairwoman), A Taylor, S Taylor, M Tew, P Topping, S van de Ven, A Walsh, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson and F Yeulett

Apologies: E Cearns, D Harty, M Loynes, Z Moghadas, K Reynolds, and J Wisson.

### 275. MINUTES – 13<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2016

The minutes of the Council meetings held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 276. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

### 277. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman reported that the Monitoring Officer had exercised his discretion to grant a dispensation to all elected members of Cambridgeshire County Council taking part in the debate on the Council's business plan.

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

### 278. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

### 279. PETITIONS

One petition was presented by a member of the public. **Appendix C** sets out the text of the petition and the debate.

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

### **Changes to Arrangements for the Appointment of External Auditors Committees**

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

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Mason and seconded by Councillor Clapp:

Delete paragraph b) from the recommendation.

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

*[Voting pattern: UKIP and one Independent in favour; Conservatives, Labour, Liberal Democrats, and 1 Independent against; 3 independents abstained].*

*[Note: Councillor Topping apologised for accidentally voting as Councillor Loynes who was absent from the meeting instead of as himself].*

It was resolved by a show of hands to agree to:

- a) opt-in to the sector led body (Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA)) for the national procurement of external auditors and ultimately the Council's external auditors from 2018/19; and
- b) ask Officers to write to the PSAA and request to meet with the Chief Officer at PSAA to seek assurance that a single auditor be appointed for the LGSS Partners setting out the clear rationale in terms of the efficiency and value for money that this would achieve.

## **281. COUNCIL'S BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET PROPOSALS 2017-22**

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council, Councillor Smith, and resolved unanimously to suspend any standing orders in connection with the Business Plan debate in order to accommodate a procedure agreed by the Council's Group Leaders.

As the General Purposes Committee had been unable to reach agreement on the 2017/18 budget and associated business plan proposals, the Chairman of Council, seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council, moved the Council's Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2017-22, as set out within Agenda Item 7.

The Chairman invited the Leaders of the Groups to make their opening statements on the Business Plan. In his speech the Leader of the Council and other Group Leaders paid tribute to the hard work undertaken by officers during the Business Plan process.

The Chairman then opened the debate on all sections of the Business Plan and invited amendments to the overall budget proposals.

Councillor Bullen moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Reeve as set out in **Appendix D**.

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix E**.

*[Note: Councillor Topping apologised for accidentally voting as Councillor Loynes who was absent from the meeting instead of as himself].*

Councillor Nethsingha moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Leeke as set out in **Appendix F**.

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix G**.

Councillor Walsh moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Whitehead as set out in **Appendix H**.

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix I**.

Councillor Count moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Hickford as set out in **Appendix J**.

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix K**.

The Chairman agreed to a request to adjourn the meeting at 3.30 p.m. to allow further discussion between Group Leaders in order to agree a balanced budget for 2017-18. The meeting reconvened at 3.45 p.m.

Councillor Walsh moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Nethsingha as set out in **Appendix L**.

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix M**.

Councillor Count proposed a small change to his original amendment for consideration by the Council. To enable consideration of this revised original amendment, it was moved by the Chairman of Council and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council to suspend standing orders in relation Council Procedure Rules, Section 14.2 'Motion Similar to One Previously Rejected'.

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix N**.

Councillor Count moved a small change to his previous amendment, seconded by Councillor Hickford to add the following additional wording:

“This Council ring-fences the 2% Adult Social Care (ASC) precept to ASC”

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix O**.

Following further discussion, the substantive motion on being put to the vote was carried. The substantive motion comprised the original motion as set out within Agenda Item 7 with the following additional aspects of the Conservative amendment as set out below in bold:

It was resolved:

- a) That approval be given to the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan.
- b) That approval be given to a total County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £780,393,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.
- c) That approval be given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £262,235,777.24, as set out in Section 2, Table 6.3 of the Business Plan (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995).
- d) That approval be given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of "Band D" equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (220,287), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% ASC precept increase in the County Council element of the Council Tax:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	£793.62
B	7/9	£925.89
C	8/9	£1,058.16
D	9/9	£1,190.43
E	11/9	£1,454.97
F	13/9	£1,719.51
G	15/9	£1,984.05
H	18/9	£2,380.86

- e) That approval be given to the report of the Chief Finance Officer on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out within the Section 25 statement (given in Appendix B).
- f) That approval be given to the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan.
- g) That approval be given to capital expenditure in 2017-18 up to £264.9m arising from:
  - Commitments from schemes already approved; and
  - The consequences of new starts in 2017-18 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 6.9 of the Business Plan.

- h) That approval is given to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan, including:
- i. The Council's policy on the making of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) for the repayment of debt, as required by the Local Authorities (Capital Finance & Accounting ) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008
  - ii. The Affordable Borrowing Limit for 2017-18 as required by the Local Government Act 2003)
  - iii. The Investment Strategy for 2017-18 as required by the Communities and Local Government (CLG) revised Guidance on Local Government Investments issued in 2010, and the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.
- i) That approval be given to an extra £2.78m beyond the current Committee based cross-party budget and section 151 officer proposals to funding proposals detailed in the Conservative Amendment at Appendix J for the financial year 2017/18 the cost of these investments to be funded from the MRP funding.
- j) That approval be given to the £932k funding gap in the 2017/18 budget, (which it was proposed to balance by using MRP funding which otherwise would have been transferred to the Transformation Fund), should be met by permanent savings in the 2018/19 budget to prevent an ongoing drain on the Transformation Fund and additional one off (non-recurring) savings of £3,712k to reimburse the Fund in 2020-21 for sums drawn on in 2017-18.
- k) This Council notes that the 2% Adult Social Care Precept is ring fenced to adult social care.

The voting record is attached as **Appendix P**.

## **282. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS**

It was moved by the Chairman of Council and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council that Councillors Simon Bywater and Peter Reeve be appointed as the Council's representatives on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

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

*[Voting pattern: 27 Conservatives, 5 Liberal Democrats, 9 UKIP and Labour in favour; 1 Conservative against; 8 Liberal Democrats, 1 UKIP and the Independent Group abstained].*

## **283. REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY PROTOCOL**

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

It was resolved by a show of hands to:

- i) approve the protocol attached at Appendix 1 to the report, for inclusion in the Council's Constitution, to enable the Council's appointee to the Combined Authority, and its appointees to the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to provide a written report to each meeting of full council;
- ii) 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 this proposal.

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

One motion had been submitted under the Council Procedure Rule 10.

### **Motion from Councillor Ian Bates**

Councillor Bates withdrew the following motion:

This Council notes that:

- Park and ride has a key part to play in providing sustainable access to Cambridge and is vital for those living outside and working in the City;
- There is a considerable cost in operating the park and ride system, which is increasing on an annual basis;
- The park and ride £1 a day parking charge was introduced over two years ago in order to cover the full cost of operating the sites, avoiding the need for other service cuts across the County Council's budgets;
- Since the introduction of the £1 charge usage has fallen by around 14% but at present is broadly stable;
- The ticket machines for the park and ride sites have proved more complex and unpopular than originally envisaged, we believe contributing to the drop in patronage;
- Given the financial position of the County Council, any proposals to reduce the income from park and ride parking charges needs to be met by alternative income streams, which will have to cover the costs to Cambridgeshire County Council of park and ride provision in full;
- Changes to one form of parking in and around Cambridge affects other forms of parking and so there are benefits to considering all parking spaces as a whole;
- Use of park and ride sites by commuters and visitors to Cambridge is preferable to parking on and off street in Cambridge;
- A new Combined Authority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is coming into being in March 2017, with the introduction of the Bus Services bill giving the ability to the Mayor to franchise bus services being planned for 2017; and

- This new authority and this new power has the potential to have a significant effect on the operation of bus services in this area.

Therefore, this Council asks officers to:

- Consider how all parking in and around Cambridge City can be planned and operated together so a joined up approach to income and funding for car parking - on street, off street and park and ride can be developed;
- Commence discussions with Cambridge City Council to develop a joined up policy and pricing structure for on street, off street and park and ride car parking;

In this context, to commence discussions with Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, the City Deal Board, the combined authority and Stagecoach to develop a new funding model for park and ride sites that is sustainable, fair and meets the broad objective of discouraging parking in central Cambridge and encourages it in park and ride sites.

## **285. QUESTIONS**

### **a) Oral Questions**

Three questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix Q**. In response to one of the questions, the following item was agreed for further action:

- In response to a question from Councillor Jenkins, Councillor Bates, Chairman of Economy and the Environment Committee, agreed that the issue of maximising public transport and cycling access to the new Cambridge North Station for residents in the north of the County should be added as an item to the next Economy and Environment spokes meeting and for an invitation to be extended to Councillor Jenkins to attend and speak on it.

### **b) Written Questions**

No written questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2.

**Chairman**

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 14TH FEBRUARY 2017  
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**PEOPLE**

**Former County Councillor Michael Farrar**

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of former County Councillor Michael Farrar who represented the Shelford Division on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Party from 1997 to 2005.

Michael was County Archivist from 1961 until his retirement in 1994. He was a very highly respected and dedicated archivist and genealogist with a wide variety of interests, and he maintained his commitment to Cambridgeshire's archives long after retirement.

The Council's thoughts are with his family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

**Tara Spicer**

One of our teachers, Tara Spicer, died on Friday 30th December. Tara was diagnosed with Leukaemia at the end of the Summer Term. She recently got engaged and was talking about returning to work at Eastfield Nursery and Infants next September, as well as planning her wedding for the Autumn Term. Tara's treatment was going well initially but she then developed serious complications in hospital. Tara taught at Yaxley Infants School before moving to Eastfield. She was also an Early Years Lead Practitioner, where she was highly respected.

Representatives from the Early Years' Service attended her funeral on the 23rd January at Cambridgeshire Crematorium.

**Councillor Peter Reeve MBE**

Congratulations go to Councillor Peter Reeve who has been awarded a Member of the British Empire (MBE) in recognition of his services to Local Government and the community in Ramsey, Cambridgeshire, in the Queen's New Year's Honours list.

Congratulations also go to Brian Gale, former County Council employee and now Director of Policy and Campaigns, National Deaf Children's Society who has been awarded an Order of the British Empire (OBE) in recognition of his services to Special Educational Needs, and former Councillors Jane Coston and Geoffrey Heathcock who were awarded British Empire Medals (BEMs) for services to the community in Milton and for services to the Royal National Lifeboat Institution and the community in Cambridgeshire respectively.

**Councillor Cearns**

The Chairman, on behalf of the Council, sent best wishes to Councillor Cearns for his speedy recovery following his recent operation, and for his early return to the Council.

## **MESSAGES**

### **Duke of Gloucester**

The Chairman was honoured to welcome the Duke of Gloucester to Cambridge recently, on behalf of the County Council.

On Thursday 2 February, His Royal Highness The Duke of Gloucester visited Bar Hill Community Primary School, and Bar Hill Church Centre, to mark the village's 50th Anniversary.

During the day, His Royal Highness also visited the Cancer Research UK Cambridge Institute on the occasion of their 10th Anniversary, and Thermoteknix Systems Ltd in Waterbeach, following the presentation of the Company's third Queen's Award for Enterprise: Innovation in 2015.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 14<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2017  
PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

(Note the public recording failed for this item and below is only a summary)

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
1.	Nicky Shepard Local Resident of Abbey Division	Councillor McGuire	<p>My name is Nicky Shepard, I am a mum of two young boys and live in Whitehill Road. I would like to ask a question of Cllr McGuire, Chair of Highways, Communities and Infrastructure Committee.</p> <p>Would the chair of Highways, Communities and Infrastructure committee agree to visit me to see first hand the unsafe roundabout on Newmarket road?</p> <p>By the evidence on the County Council website, the roundabout at the corner of Newmarket Road and Barnwell Road is a known accident cluster, very close to a pedestrian crossing where the crossing patrols have just been made redundant. local residents and parents at the local school all tell me how unsafe they feel this roundabout is, and how they would like changes to be made to increase safety at both the roundabout and crossing. We have had almost weekly collisions in and around the roundabout, as well as one near miss and one accident in the pedestrian crossing since the crossing patrols were made redundant. I understand that Cllr Whitehead has applied for a feasibility study for this roundabout, however, myself and other parents are very worried that something serious will happen before changes are made. We, the residents of Abbey, cannot sit back and wait for a serious or fatal accident, we need action now.</p>

			I ask Cllr Maguire if you will agree to visit me at this roundabout in order to see what can be done to improve safety in the short term, before someone is seriously or fatally hurt?
	Response from Councillor Mac McGuire		<b>Response</b>  I would like to thank you very much for coming along and asking your question. I can inform you that the Road Safety Team are actively looking at measures and options available to reduce accidents and I will of course be very happy to come and meet you at the this location and I believe to facilitate this the Road Safety Team have already contacted you to make the necessary arrangements. Councillor Whitehead as you have said has been actively involved and I will also invite her to attend.
	<b>Supplementary question from:</b>	<b>To:</b>	
	Nicky Shepard	Councillor Mac McGuire	Can funding from the City Deal be used to make the necessary changes to the junction at Newmarket Road?
	<b>Response from:</b>		
	Councillor Mac McGuire		The City Deal will be populated with work including this road at some time in the future but the issue of safety at this junction needs to be looked at before then. We will have to wait and see regarding future City Deal monies.

**TEXT OF A PETITION CONTAINING 928 VALIDATED SIGNATURES PRESENTED BY PROFESSOR NICK GAY**

“To Cambridgeshire County Council

Stop their £325,000 planned cut to library books”

(Note the public recording failed for this item and below is a summary of the discussion)

It is with commitment and determination that I come before you and have over 1000 elector signatures in support of the petition which requests and requires the deep cuts in the budget for the County Library book buying service to be reconsidered.

Literacy is one of the pillars of our civilisation and in this country the free library services has delivered the gift of reading and learning to everyone since 1855. The proposal will tear the heart out of the library provision in Cambridgeshire and deprive the current generation of this most invaluable of resources.

For my own children the weekly trip to the Cambridge Central Library has been an essential and formative part of their upbringing. Like social care and caring for the elderly books are not an optional extra, but a vital resource for the community.

I would like to finish with the story of Professor Andrew Wiles a brilliant mathematician who made one of the most amazing breakthroughs of our age by solving Fermat’s Last Theorem. Andrew’s inspiration for this extraordinary feat came from a book he borrowed from Milton Road Library aged 10. Please do not deprive his successors of the same opportunities.

The Chairman indicated that the Council would provide a response within 10 working days following the meeting.

<b>CCC BUDGET AMENDMENT 2017-18</b>
-------------------------------------

<b>POLITICAL PARTY/PARTIES</b>	<b>UKIP</b>
--------------------------------	-------------

<b>TOTAL ADULT SOCIAL CARE PRECEPT INCREASE</b>	<b>+0%</b>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL COUNCIL TAX INCREASE</b>	<b>+0%</b>

<b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT</b>	<b>-</b>
------------------------------------	----------

<b>CHANGES TO FUNDING: (compared to S151 Officer proposed budget)</b>		
<b>ASC PRECEPT</b>	<b>-£5,135,000</b>	
<b>GENERAL COUNCIL TAX</b>		
<b>MRP FUNDING</b>	<b>+£3,100,000</b>	
<b>RESERVES</b>	<b>+£2,035,000</b>	
<b>OTHER</b>		
<b>TOTAL CHANGES TO FUNDING</b>		<b>-</b>

**UKIP amendment to the 2017 CCC Budget**

**UKIP has identified 5 core goals**

1. To freeze council tax
2. To identify new revenue streams for CCC
3. To identify savings with no impact on service delivery
4. To better integrate the council with partner organisations
5. To ultimately move to a unitary authority.

This report identifies the UKIP group’s proposal for new savings, new revenue streams and new ways of working not currently in the proposed CCC budget proposal adopted by CCC. The UKIP proposal identifies what we will do differently in order to achieve a council tax freeze whilst providing a balanced budget and no extra cuts to key front line services.

**Background and national scene**

The UKIP statement on the CCC budget plan proposal is aimed at achieving the five core goals above. We aim to make the organisation as efficient as possible while also addressing the critical need for new revenue streams.

Above all UKIP aims to initiate a cultural change in CCC to develop into an organisation willing to blur the organisational boundaries with partners and to start the transformational process into an organisation willing and capable of ultimately becoming a Unitary Authority.

We will illustrate how we will fund a tax freeze for Cambridgeshire tax payers without direct cuts to front line services beyond the current plan proposed by CCC.

The UKIP group recognises that these are difficult economic times for the people of Cambridgeshire. Residents and communities are suffering from the results of poor government decisions and difficult economic conditions.

At a time when residents are finding it difficult to pay their mortgage, heat their homes, put fuel in their cars to get to work and put food on their table, we believe that it is wrong for CCC to compound this problem further by taking more money from household budgets by increasing council tax.

UKIP is the party of small government and low tax, passionate about keeping money where it belongs, in the householder's purse, paying for essential and escalating household bills, rather than in the County Council's coffers.

UKIP is the party of efficiency, believing that councils should be as lean as possible in good economic times as well as bad.

UKIP is the party of transformation, seeking a radical agenda of change management to break down the barriers in the way of the council so that its partners are fit and willing to move to unitary status.

UKIP recognises that the changes that we seek to make would have been less challenging to implement in previous better economic times and regrets that the previous administrations did not tackle waste, inefficiencies and new revenue streams that financial pressures are now forced upon them. We are now suffering from the impact of poor past decisions.

UKIP believes that the move to the committee system of governance has allowed a more collegiate approach to decision making that has achieved greater consensus, better scrutiny and better and wider debate, more input from members and communities and better decisions.

UKIP regrets that previous administrations had not grasped the nettle of introducing new revenue streams and efficiencies over the last two decades that could have created a situation where the current financial pressures would be much less challenging.

The impact on Cambridgeshire households of the planned year on year tax rises is cumulative not just over time but also across other tax raising authorities in Cambridgeshire including district councils, Police and Crime Commissioner, Fire Authority and many town and parish councils planning to increase their tax take from limited household budgets.

UKIP opposed the introduction of a Mayor for Cambridgeshire and suggested that the original claims that the mayoral office need not cause extra cost beyond existing staff within local authorities were grossly exaggerated and whilst pleased to see more honesty in the figures of the cost of the Mayor's office being presented we believe that this is an unnecessary extra burden on the residents of Cambridgeshire. Two of the powers that the new Mayor will have are to add another line to council tax payers and business rates payers bills. UKIP oppose this extra taxation.

We recognise the urgent need for UKIP to enter the decision making institutions of national government that can positively impact local government budgets.

Despite the results of the referendum on UK membership of the EU, £55 million is still being given to the European Union every day by the UK, money which UKIP would use to provide services and infrastructure in Britain. Brexit provides the opportunity to move this spend back to the UK and directly back into local services. UKIP supports the Local Government Association position of demanding that significant amounts of the Brexit dividend are channelled to services provided by local government.

UKIP strongly believes that the UK must reduce the amount of money given away in the foreign aid budget and that it should be reduced to around £2bn which is still enough to provide essential foreign aid of water, inoculations and disaster relief. The remaining £10bn, that is currently in the foreign aid budget and which is often used on wasteful, ineffective and aspirational projects, and often provided to countries that are spending money on military, space and nuclear programmes. It is UKIP policy to channel this money back home to

support British residents in need in the UK. This is the only way of solving the funding gap in adult and children's social care and the NHS. Council tax rises fail to provide enough extra money to make a difference and add substantial extra pressure to already stretched household budgets.

Some EU legislation directly impacts CCC. Landfill tax alone costs CCC over £9 million per year.

UKIP's national policies on health, education, defence, immigration, procurement, transport and Whitehall departmental structures will also have a positive impact on local government finance and service provision.

We acknowledge, however, that UKIP is not yet in government and Cambridgeshire County Council has to work within the constraints of the poor government decisions currently being made. We therefore have not used any of these figures in our plan.

### **Amendments to the 2017/8 budget**

1. That Council tax be frozen.

This creates a deficit in the 2017/18 budget of £5,135m.

2. Use MRP to balance the budget which will have a positive impact on the revenue budget this year of up to £3.1m of the £8.6m available leaving the remainder to further seed fund revenue generating and transformational projects.
3. Reduce the general reserve being held which is currently at £16.3m by £2.035m to £14.265m

UKIP will separately provide a statement on our medium and long term savings and investment strategy that will ensure future tax freezes without service reductions that will remain possible beyond the 2017/8 budget. **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

***The figures below are the differences to the S151 Officer proposed budget and are in absolute figures.***

***Increases in expenditure and corresponding increases in funding are shown as positive figures.***

#### **Expenditure**

	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	2020-21 £000	2021-22 £000
<b>TOTAL*</b>	-	-	-	-	-

#### **Funding**

	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	2020-21 £000	2021-22 £000
<b>Council Tax will be frozen</b>	-5,135	-5,135	-5,135	-5,135	-5,135
<b>Use MRP funding</b>	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100
<b>Reduce General Reserve balance</b>	2,035	2,035	2,035	2,035	2,035
<b>TOTAL*</b>	-	-	-	-	-

**\*Totals must be equal as all budget amendments must balance.**

UKIP AMENDMENT						Appendix E					
CLLR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP	X				KENNEY G	Con		X		
ASHWOOD B	LibD		X			KINDERSLEY S	LibD		X		
BAILEY	Con		X			LAY A	UKIP	X			
BATES I C	Con		X			LEEKE M	LibD		X		
BODEN C	Con		X			LOYNES M - Apologies	Con	X			
BROWN D	Con		X			MANDLEY R	UKIP	X			
BROWN P	Con		X			MANNING I	LibD		X		
BULLEN P	UKIP	X				MASON M	Ind			X	
BUTCHER R	Con		X			MCGUIRE L W	Con		X		
BYWATER S	Con		X			MOGHADAS Z - Apologies	Lab				X
CEARNS E - apologies	LibD				X	NETHSINGHA L	LibD		X		
CHAPMAN B	Inde		X			ONASANYA F	Lab		X		
CLAPP P	UKIP	X				ORGE E A G	Con		X		
CLARK J	Con		X			PALMER J	Con		X		
CONNOR D	Con		X			REEVE P	UKIP	X			
COUNT S	Con		X			REYNOLDS K - Apologies	Con				X
CRAWFORD S	Lab		X			ROUSE M	Con		X		
CRISWELL S J	Con		X			SALES P	Lab		X		
DENT A	UKIP	X				SCHUMANN J	Con		X		
DIVINE D	UKIP	X				SCUTT J	Lab		X		
DOWNES P J	LibD		X			SHELLENS M	LibD		X		
DUPRE L	LibD		X			SHUTER M	Con		X		
FROST S	Con		X			SMITH M	Con		X		
GILES D	Inde	X				TAYLOR A	LibD		X		
GILLICK G	UKIP	X				TAYLOR S	inde		X		
HARFORD L	Con		X			TEW M	Cons		X		
HARTY D	Con				X	TOPPING P	Cons				
HENSON R	UKIP	X				VAN DE VEN S	LibD		X		
HICKFORD R	Con		X			WALSH A	Lab		X		
HIPKIN J	Inde		X			WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HOY S	Cons		X			WILLIAMS J	LibD		X		
HUDSON P	Con		X			WILSON G	LibD		X		
HUNT W T I	Con		X			WISSON J - Apologies	Con				X
JENKINS D	LibD		X			YEULETT F H	Con		X		
KAVANAGH N	Lab		X			TOTAL	69				

## Appendix F

### CCC BUDGET AMENDMENT 2017-18

<b>POLITICAL PARTY/PARTIES</b>	<b>Liberal Democrats</b>
--------------------------------	--------------------------

<b>TOTAL ADULT SOCIAL CARE PRECEPT INCREASE</b>	<b>+2%</b>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL COUNCIL TAX INCREASE</b>	<b>+1.99%</b>

<b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT</b>	<b>+£5,115,000</b>
------------------------------------	--------------------

#### **CHANGES TO FUNDING: (compared to S151 Officer proposed budget)**

<b>ASC PRECEPT</b>		
<b>GENERAL COUNCIL TAX</b>	<b>+£5,115,000</b>	
<b>MRP FUNDING</b>		
<b>RESERVES</b>		
<b>OTHER</b>		
<b>TOTAL CHANGES TO FUNDING</b>		<b>+£5,115,000</b>

### **Liberal Democrat's budget amendments, February 2017**

#### **Preamble**

The Liberal Democrat group believes that public services in Cambridgeshire are under unparalleled pressure across all sectors of service, as they are in the rest of the country. It recognises that strenuous efforts have been made by officers to provide services more cost-effectively. It is clear that:

- a. Demographic changes are increasing the demand for social care services for children and adults.
- b. Our transport network is hugely over-stretched.
- c. Central government grant has been significantly reduced over the last five years and will disappear entirely within two years

The government has allowed local councils a small level of discretion in setting council tax levels and the Liberal Democrats believe that this flexibility must be used to protect services for those who currently need them and to reduce the likelihood of even greater costs in the future.

We have only drawn up proposals for one year, as with the election of a Mayor for Cambridgeshire, and the new role of the Combined Authority it is very difficult to predict what the County Council will need to take sole responsibility for and what elements will be able to be shared with new partners.

## Specific proposals

### **Children's services: additional spending £1.795m**

- |                                                                                       |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| a. Increase services to supporting young mothers and their babies                     | £190k |
| b. maintain special needs support for schools                                         | £270k |
| c. maintain central support for the Cambridgeshire Race and Diversity Service (CREDS) | £625k |
| d. support the work of locality teams                                                 | £310k |
| e. reducing children's centre closures                                                | £400k |

### **2. Services for Vulnerable Adults: £1.905m**

- |                                                                 |       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| a. To allow for a higher percentage increase for care providers | £692k |
| b. jointly commission a specific home care service              | £700k |
| c. increase the hourly rate for home care                       | £513k |

### **Roads and transport £1.415 m**

- |                                                                            |       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| a. free parking at Park and Ride sites for Cambridge                       | £800k |
| b. subsidise bus routes and community transport                            | £315k |
| c. better maintenance of verges and footpaths                              | £100k |
| d. additional maintenance for the County's roads, pavements and cycle ways | £200k |

### **Total extra spending £5.115m**

### **Yield from increasing council tax by 2% £5.115m**

The rationale for these proposals is explained in detail below:

- 1a. The quality of care for young mothers and their babies is critical for their long-term well-being. The first three years of life are crucially important and international longitudinal studies demonstrate that it is a false economy to fail the youngest children, particularly those most vulnerable. 20% of Cambridgeshire 2 year olds are not receiving vital health checks.
- 1b. The proposals which have been presented at County Council committees remove specialist teaching support currently available to schools in Cambridgeshire. This support is particularly important for those schools in deprived areas who are struggling to meet required standards. The budget proposals suggest that schools would be able to buy back these support services from the Council. However the schools who need services the most

are the least likely to be able to afford to buy in support services. We would maintain the current budget, as we believe ensuring that every child in Cambridgeshire is offered a high quality education ought to be a key aim of the County Council.

- 1c. The current proposals withdraw all central funding from the CREDS service. This service provides translation support to schools and other educational settings who are teaching children with diverse ethnic backgrounds, and who have English as an additional language. They also provide specialist support to gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, where the children tend to have prolonged absences from school. To remove the funding from this service, and require schools themselves pay for this support would again put undue financial pressure on those schools which can least afford it.
- 1d. Locality teams work with children in the most difficult and disadvantaged families. The council's children's change programme is recommending reducing the number of teams working with struggling families from 14 to 7. We believe the cuts being made to the service are too deep and too rapid. They will be counter-productive because they will lead to higher costs later on a child's life. This additional money would halve the level of cuts required in the service, and would be focussed on increasing the number of front-line staff.
- 1e. The current proposals include £1 million of cuts to the children's centres budget. Children's centres offer support to young mums and toddlers, and are crucial in making sure mothers are supported, and children are ready for school at age five. This level of cuts risks undoing years of invaluable work in supporting young families. Children's centres have also often become community hubs, and places where other activities can take place and families be supported by a range of services such as health visitors. The level of cuts proposed is too deep and will fall hardest on the most vulnerable communities, including the rurally isolated. Our proposal mitigates some of the damage that might be caused.
- 2a. There is widespread public concern about bed delays, ambulance attendance times and Accident and Emergency waiting times. The NHS is under unprecedented pressure. We are deeply concerned that current proposals from the Conservative group will add to these pressures by restricting the money available to those providing care outside hospital. Care providers already report problems in recruiting and retaining staff in Cambridgeshire, and the County Council is struggling to find places for some elderly patients when they leave hospital. The fact that these elderly patients have to stay in hospital longer because care at home is not available leads to cancelled operations, and has led to patients being turned away at A and E. The proposals for below inflation levels of cost increase are both unwise and unrealistic.
- 2b. The joint commissioning of a specific home care service geared up to achieve rapid hospital discharge and provide a range of health and social care tasks

would allow patients to be discharged from hospital as soon as they are ready, and confident that the care they need will be available immediately.

- 2c. Increasing the hourly rate for home care workers would enable CCC to attract and retain the required work-force at a time when demand is growing and the available work force is shrinking.
- 3a. Cambridgeshire is the fastest growing economic area in the UK, and while we are proud of this success, the impact on the County transport infrastructure is of ever-increasing congestion. Free parking at the Park and Ride sites around Cambridge (which we suggest could be joint funded with Cambridge City Council) would ensure that those who need to come into the city to work have a fair alternative, and also discourage commuters from parking in residential streets.
- 3b. The historic Cambridgeshire Conservative decision in 2010 to eliminate all bus subsidies has weakened the rural bus network and necessitated a continual struggle for lifeline transport. Loss of bus services falls most heavily on the young and old, and those who are not able to drive for health or economic reasons. Liberal Democrats have long argued that maintaining bus services is critical in enabling rural mobility, and that this can require an element of subsidy. Simultaneously, financial support is essential for community transport organisations, who provide door-to-door lifeline transport and access where no other options exist.
- 3c. This money will be available both for cutting verges more frequently to allow motorists clearer views on corners, thereby increasing road safety, but equally importantly for cutting back of hedgerows along rural cycle paths, pavements and footpaths. Growth of hedges makes many pavements and cycle paths in rural areas almost unusable in the summer months, and can be dangerous, particularly if the pavement has been designated as a safe route to school.
- 3d. The County's roads, pavements and cycle ways are deteriorating at an ever-increasing rate. The number of potholes and uneven pavement surfaces has made many elderly people worried about going out in the dark, for fear of falling. It is important for health that people continue to lead active lifestyles for as long as possible. Making sure the pavements are safe, as well as filling pot-holes in the roads, should be a higher priority for road maintenance.

### **Increasing council tax**

We fully recognise that nobody wants to pay more tax than necessary. Although council tax is broadly progressive i.e. those in the highest value houses pay most in cash terms, we also acknowledge that, as a proportion of disposable income, those in the lowest council tax bands are badly affected.

**We feel that this proposed increase is justified in that most of the proposals outlined above specifically target the extra resources at those in greatest need. The extra 2% (i.e. on top of 2% for adult social care) will cost the average household 42p per week. We consider that to be a reasonable compromise in**

**difficult times and we will be making that case during the coming weeks in the hope of persuading other groups on the County Council to back our budget proposals on February 14th.**

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

*The figures below are the differences to the S151 Officer proposed budget and are in absolute figures.*

*Increases in expenditure and corresponding increases in funding are shown as positive figures.*

### Expenditure

	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	2020-21 £000	2021- 22 £000
<b><i>Children's services</i></b>					
Increase services to support young mothers and their babies	190	190	190	190	190
Maintain special needs support for schools	270	270	270	270	270
Maintain central support for Cambridgeshire Race and Diversity Service (CREDS)	625	625	625	625	625
Support the work of locality teams	310	310	310	310	310
Reducing children's centre closures	400	400	400	400	400
<b><i>Vulnerable Adults</i></b>					
To allow for a higher percentage increase for care providers	692	692	692	692	692
Jointly commission a specific home care service	700	700	700	700	700
Increase the hourly rate for home care	513	513	513	513	513
<b><i>Roads and transport</i></b>					
Free parking at Park & Ride sites for Cambridge	800	800	800	800	800
Subsidise bus routes and community transport	315	315	315	315	315
Better maintenance of verges and footpaths	100	100	100	100	100
Additional maintenance for roads, pavements and cycle ways	200	200	200	200	200
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>

### Funding

	<b>2017-18 £000</b>	<b>2018-19 £000</b>	<b>2019-20 £000</b>	<b>2020-21 £000</b>	<b>2021-22 £000</b>
<b>Raise General Council Tax increase from 0% to 1.99%</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>

**\*Totals must be equal as all budget amendments must balance.**





<b>CCC BUDGET AMENDMENT 2017-18</b>
-------------------------------------

<b>POLITICAL PARTY/PARTIES</b>	<b>Labour</b>
--------------------------------	---------------

<b>TOTAL ADULT SOCIAL CARE PRECEPT INCREASE</b>	<b>+3%</b>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL COUNCIL TAX INCREASE</b>	<b>+1.99%</b>

<b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT</b>	<b>£7,507,000</b>
------------------------------------	-------------------

<b>CHANGES TO FUNDING: (compared to S151 Officer proposed budget)</b>		
<b>ASC PRECEPT</b>	<b>£2,577,000</b>	
<b>GENERAL COUNCIL TAX</b>	<b>£5,115,000</b>	
<b>MRP FUNDING</b>		
<b>RESERVES*</b>	<b>£245,000</b>	
<b>OTHER</b>	<b>£60,000</b>	
<b>TOTAL CHANGES TO FUNDING</b>		<b>£7,507,000</b>

\*This is a contribution to the general reserve.

**Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group  
Alternative Budget  
2017-18**

**Overview**

Cambridgeshire County Council has now faced seven years of relentless austerity. All Revenue Support Grant provided by national government – once the main source of funding for all councils – for the County Council will no longer exist by the financial year 2019-20. In 2010-11, the County Council’s Revenue Support Grant was £111m per year. In 2014-15, it was £72m per year. By 2019-20, it will not exist.

Over the same period, Cambridgeshire County Council has experienced a growth in the number of adults and children in need of social care – yet all the government has done is cut the grant given to the County Council to meet that need. Due to a combination of the reduction in Revenue Support Grant, inflation, and growing demographic need, Cambridgeshire County Council slashed £225m a year between 2011/12 and 2016/17.

In social care, this meant cuts for all age groups worth £175m a year – with a further £26m a year added in 2016/17. More than two-thirds of the £26m savings were assessed by officers as having the highest level of risk in their impact on adults and children in need. In 2017-18, cuts worth £29m a year are required with £20.5m coming from Children Families and Adults Services – rising to £99m by 2021-22. Meanwhile, the Better Care Fund simply recycles existing funds and provides no new financial support for care services.

These devastating should not be dressed in Orwellian double-speak as ‘transforming lives’, ‘service improvements’, and ‘building community resilience’. Let nobody make

any mistake: these are immoral and unfair cuts impacting savagely upon the most disadvantaged and vulnerable in society. At the same time, councillors must stand up for Cambridgeshire by demanding proper funding for a civilised level of public services.

We regret that the government is essentially forcing councils to raise council tax in order to remain fiscally solvent. Raising council tax should always be a last resort but the government has left councils without any choice. The costs of failing to deliver proper services now will generate far bigger costs in the future. District councils also have the power to provide discretionary welfare support for those struggling to pay council tax. Labour-run Cambridge City Council provides such support and Tory district councils across Cambridgeshire should follow suit. The government also needs urgently to re-band council tax thresholds, since council tax rates now reflect property values poorly.

However, in the end, raising council tax is a more progressive measure than denying vital help to the neediest and most vulnerable. These services should be provided by government grant. But until the government wakes up to its responsibilities, Cambridgeshire County Council must step up to the plate.

As well as investing in public services, another way to reduce poverty and inequality is to grow the county's economy fairly and sustainably. But congestion and poor bus services in our urban centres are holding our economy back. The City Deal and devolution agenda aim to reduce congestion and pollution but the County Council could do much more to make its contribution by making bus travel more affordable and incentivising public transport.

Cambridgeshire Labour's budget amendment is designed to use what little power the County Council has to raise revenue in order to save crucial services and grow the economy fairly and sustainably. The government may be trying to reduce whatever revenue sources the County Council might have but we are determined to fight them with a responsible series of budget proposals funded from a combination of council tax and revenue-raising investments.

This budget amendment aims to protect vital frontline services for the neediest and most vulnerable in our county. It also aims towards financial prudence. We propose to establish a substantial commercial property investment fund on similar principles as the commercial property strategy currently being pursued by Labour-controlled Cambridge City Council. This will allow the County Council to use commercial rents in order to fund services independently either of council tax or national government funding. We also propose to increase the County Council's reserves from their current dangerously low levels so that the County Council is prepared for the unexpected and can invest more into services, such as its looked-after children, as and when it is required.

## **Spending**

A1. The £8.25 pay rate set by the Living Wage Foundation instead of £7.20 for all direct County Council employees: £562k recurring

We propose to pay all County Council employees a proper living wage of £8.25 per hour instead of George Osborne's phoney 'living wage'. The proper living wage is set by the Living Wage Foundation in accordance with the Centre for Research in Social Policy at Loughborough University as the amount needed in order to pay for life's essentials. By paying public-sector workers a decent wage, the County Council will act as a positive role model for the private sector. A living wage would also contribute to kick-starting economic recovery by putting money in people's pockets and reducing the cost of living. In order to include agency-contracted workers, we will push to reform the County Council's agency policy so that only employers accredited by the Living Wage Foundation win contracts.

#### A2. Five new apprenticeship posts for the County Council: £102k recurring

We propose to create five new apprenticeship posts across all the County Council's service directorates in order to mitigate the impact of staffing cuts at the County Council and to create much-needed opportunity for young people in Cambridgeshire. These employees would be paid the proper living wage. Again, the County Council would be contributing to economic recovery and acting as a model employer for the private sector.

#### A3. An emergency urban roads and pavements repair fund: £10m over four years

Over the next four financial years, we plan to plough an extra £10m into repairing roads and pavements in our urban centres. Roads and pavements in Cambridgeshire's towns and cities are a disgrace. In the busiest parts of the county, tripping hazards present a constant danger to the elderly and some streets are virtually inaccessible for wheelchairs and the disabled. Cyclists are at risk on roads and dual-use pavements. While hundreds of millions of pounds would be needed to reverse the county's backlog of repairs on roads and pavements, this fund is designed to provide an emergency measure for the most dangerous hazards.

#### A4. Restore Cambridge city centre shuttle bus service: £300k recurring

Together with the Labour Group on Cambridge City Council, we continue to regret the abolition of the city centre shuttle bus service by the Conservative administration several years ago. The service operated in an area not served by the commercial transport network and helped reduce congestion in Cambridge city centre. It also improved accessibility especially for the elderly and disabled.

#### A5. Reverse £1 Park and Ride charge: £1.2m recurring

The Park and Ride charge was imposed in the dying days of the minority Conservative administration despite howls of protest from the residents of Cambridge and the Labour Group. Implementation of the charge was a complete fiasco. Usage of the sites has plummeted. It has never raised the predicted levels of revenue. This has generated extra parking problems for nearby residents and worse congestion and pollution in the city centre. It is time those who supported the Park and Ride charge owned up and reversed their position. This budget line may come down by half in the event that the City Deal agrees to fund the other half of the cost of removing the charge.

A6. Fund streetlights on residential roads in Cambridge to 80% not 60% between 10pm and 2am: £10k recurring

Although the County Council rightly reversed its decision to switch off the streetlights at night at a recent full council meeting, many streetlights remain too dim. In a busy urban centre like Cambridge, it remains too dark between the hours of 10pm and 2am for young people, students, women, and other vulnerable groups.

A7. Remove the cut of £325k in spending on new library stock in B/R.6.209: £325k recurring

This is a decision only a total philistine would support. It is as good (or as bad) as closing libraries. Libraries are not simply the foundation of a civilised society. They provide vital recreational and employment opportunities for everyone – rich or poor.

A8. Reverse the cut to the Cambridgeshire Local Assistance Scheme in A/R.6.160: £163k recurring

The County Council nearly abolished the Local Assistance Scheme altogether before a motion from the Labour Group at full council rescued it. This is a last-resort, emergency crisis welfare fund for the neediest and most vulnerable victims of almost unimaginable circumstances. We opposed the remodelling of the service and, in the context of huge cuts, we believe the contingency is necessary and more should be done to advertise the fund.

A9. Reverse the cut to voluntary sector contracts for mental health services in A/R.6.167: £130k recurring

The voluntary sector is under too much pressure at present in delivering mental health support and the renegotiation of contracts risks resulting in deleterious outcomes for services which should be provided by local authorities.

A10. A £29m commercial property investment fund: £29m over five years

Over the coming four years, we propose to establish a commercial property investment fund and plough £29m into it. This fund would invest in commercial property primarily within Cambridgeshire but also within other opportunity areas in order to generate revenue from commercial rents which can be reinvested to deliver services. It would also be used to invest to increase revenues on County Council assets like the publicly-owned county farms estate. Each investment would produce a return of at least 6% per year. In the event that commercial opportunities exceed the budget allocated for the investment fund, the County Council might use prudential borrowing powers in order to purchase property and produce a further investment. This policy is currently being pursued by Labour-run Nottingham City Council.

A11. Invest £6.5m for adults with learning disabilities in A/R.6.114: £6.5m over four years

The County Council is proposing to cut funding for adults with learning disabilities by £8.036m over the next four financial years with the ostensible aim of 'increasing independence and resilience'. This cut would deny independence to those with learning disabilities and removal of services undermines their resilience. We believe this cut goes far too deep and will be counterproductive. The cut will be unachievable without hitting frontline services for adults with learning disabilities. We aim to mitigate the cut to more manageable levels with a savings target of £1.536m.

A12. Reverse the £2.191m cut for people with physical disabilities and autism in A/R.6.111: £2.191m over four years

The County Council's budget paper claim this cut will support people with physical disabilities and autism 'to live more independently' by slashing investment in their personal budgets. It is obvious to any sensible person that this will simply hit the most vulnerable the hardest.

A13. Reverse the cut for looked-after children by inflation savings in A/6.6.213 (savings of £418k by 2019-20) and add further investment (£1.5m) in the look-after children's budget: £1.918m over five years

This cut relies on the unachievable aim of the County Council to reduce the number of children in care to 453 by 2020/21. We propose to reverse this cut and reallocate the funding within the look-after children's budget in anticipation of a likely failure to achieve this aim. We would also add a further £300k per year into the look-after children budget in light of the difficulties faced by the County Council to reduce the number of look-after children. The Department for Education's own research into children's services concluded: 'In the future, the local councils face risks such as the growing need among some groups in the population, for example child sexual exploitation and mental health, which are particularly uncertain and have implications for future spending. The capacity to forecast and prepare for these risks is very limited.' We propose, therefore, to improve Cambridgeshire County Council's capacity.

## **Revenue receivable**

B1. Raise council tax to the full maximum amount allowed by the government without triggering a referendum

We propose to accept the freedom allowed to primary-tier authorities by the Conservative government to raise council tax by 1.99% over the coming three years and to raise the adult social care precept at 3% over the coming two financial years. The government has indicated that the adult social precept can only be raised by 6% in total over the coming three financial years. The limits on council tax increases is not clear beyond 2019-20 and the County Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) prudently assumes that the County Council will not be able to raise council at all in 2020-21. This budget amendment concurs with the caution of the MTFS and the Labour Group will reassess the situation as 2020-21 approaches.

B2 (A10): Return from the £29m commercial property investment fund

The £29m commercial property investment fund would produce a return of at least 6% on each investment.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

*The figures below are the differences to the S151 Officer proposed budget and are in absolute figures.*

*Increases in expenditure and corresponding increases in funding are shown as positive figures.*

### **Expenditure**

	<b>2017-18 £000</b>	<b>2018-19 £000</b>	<b>2019-20 £000</b>	<b>2020-21 £000</b>	<b>2021-22 £000</b>
<b>A1 – Pay Living Wage Foundation rate for all direct CCC employees</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>562</b>
<b>A2 – Five new apprenticeship posts</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>A3 – Emergency urban roads and pavements repair fund</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>
<b>A4 – Restore Cambridge city centre shuttle bus service</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>
<b>A5 – Reverse £1 Park &amp; Ride charge</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,200</b>
<b>A6 – Fund streetlights on residential roads in Cambridge to 80% not 60% between 10pm and 2am</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>A7 – Remove the cut in spending on new library stock</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>325</b>
<b>A8 – Reverse the cut to the Cambridgeshire Local Assistance Scheme</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>A9 – Reverse the cut to voluntary sector contracts for mental health services</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>A10 – A £29m commercial property investment fund</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>5,500</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>6,500</b>	<b>8,000</b>
<b>A11 – Invest £6.5m for Adults with learning disabilities</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>A12 – Reverse the cut for people with physical disabilities and autism</b>	<b>791</b>	<b>1,231</b>	<b>1,736</b>	<b>2,191</b>	<b>2,191</b>
<b>A13 – Reverse the cut for looked-after children by inflation savings and add</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>718</b>

<b>further investment in the looked-after children budget</b>					
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>7,507</b>	<b>16,057</b>	<b>16,658</b>	<b>16,701</b>	<b>16,701</b>

### **Funding**

	<b>2017-18 £000</b>	<b>2018-19 £000</b>	<b>2019-20 £000</b>	<b>2020-21 £000</b>	<b>2021-22 £000</b>
<b>B1 - Raise ASC precept increase from 2% to 3%</b>	<b>2,577</b>	<b>5,347</b>	<b>5,449</b>	<b>5,449</b>	<b>5,449</b>
<b>B1 - Raise General Council Tax increase from 0% to 1.99%</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>10,695</b>	<b>10,898</b>	<b>10,898</b>	<b>10,898</b>
<b>B2 - Return from the £29m commercial property investment fund</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>480</b>
<b>Contribution to the General Reserve**</b>	<b>-245</b>	<b>-315</b>	<b>-169</b>	<b>-36</b>	<b>-126</b>
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>7,507</b>	<b>16,057</b>	<b>16,658</b>	<b>16,701</b>	<b>16,701</b>

**\*Totals must be equal as all budget amendments must balance.**

**\*\*This is a contribution to the general reserve.**





<b>CCC BUDGET AMENDMENT 2017-18</b>
-------------------------------------

<b>POLITICAL PARTY/PARTIES</b>	<b>Conservative</b>
--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>TOTAL ADULT SOCIAL CARE PRECEPT INCREASE</b>	<b>+2%</b>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL COUNCIL TAX INCREASE</b>	<b>+0%</b>

<b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT</b>	<b>£2,780,000</b>
------------------------------------	-------------------

<b>CHANGES TO FUNDING: (compared to S151 Officer proposed budget)</b>		
<b>ASC PRECEPT</b>		
<b>GENERAL COUNCIL TAX</b>		
<b>MRP FUNDING</b>	<b>+£2,780,000</b>	
<b>RESERVES</b>		
<b>OTHER</b>		
<b>TOTAL CHANGES TO FUNDING</b>		<b>+£2,780,000</b>

**Proposed Conservative Amendments to Cambridgeshire County Council's 2017/18 Cross-Party Budget**

The pace of change at Cambridgeshire County Council has been too slow over the last four years; the most significant contributory factor is that there has been no overall control by a single party for that time. Despite the Conservatives being the largest political group, we are dependent on others for support. Conservatives are committed to change and have welcomed and embraced new ways of thinking and working, whilst other political parties have sometimes been inclined to be protectionist around existing practices and staffing. Conservatives have wholeheartedly embraced the creation of the Transformation Fund, which has seen the planning of changes to working practices, some large, some small, some new, many that are tried and tested in other authorities. Conservatives know that services can and must be better run and have contributed to and supported robust business cases that offer improvements to services and financial savings. We are confident that under a Conservative administration the Transformation Fund can deliver more and that the pace of change can be faster.

We have listened to the residents of Cambridgeshire and understand and acknowledge the issues the public want us to act on and are therefore proposing a number of changes to the 2017/18 budget:

- Provide the resource to work up a number of highways improvement schemes to deal with traffic pinch points around the county
- Improve the quality of our roads and footpaths
- Invest in mental health services

Further:

- Through the City Deal, we anticipate ending the £1 Park & Ride charge at no cost to the County Council

- We have already secured an increase in our commitment to disadvantaged children with an accelerated programme of work to improve early years literacy

In particular, we are aware that the public needs to travel throughout the county to get to work and access facilities and services, without encountering those congestion points that, although relatively small in nature, can add time and frustration to what are necessary journeys. The Conservatives, nationally and locally, led on and delivered the creation of the Combined Authority bringing £770m to the area through the devolution deal. Additionally we negotiated with Government to deliver the £500m in the Greater Cambridge City Deal. Alongside these pots of funding there are regular funds available from other streams such as the Local Enterprise Partnership. We therefore propose to work up a series of congestion beating highways initiatives to get schemes “oven ready” that can be used to access some £50m of road improvements to improve the journeys of our commuting workforce. Conservatives propose a balanced approach to the County Council’s element of Council Tax bills for next year.

Conservatives believe that there is general support from Cambridgeshire residents to apply the 2% Adult Social Care precept which is built into the cross-party proposed budget, and which will be ring-fenced and used to support some of the most vulnerable people in our communities. Conservatives have also listened to residents that are struggling to make ends meet and for whom rising bills are a constant and very real concern, many of whom live in our more rural areas; we therefore propose no increase in general Council Tax.

Proposals from other parties at General Purposes Committee to fund additional spending plans ranged from raising Council Tax bills by a total of 4.99%, to not raising Council Tax at all but funding spending plans from reserves with no proposal on how this would be sustained year on year.

Conservatives believe that the £932k funding gap in the 2017/18 budget, (which it is proposed to balance by using MRP funding which otherwise would have been transferred to the Transformation Fund), should be met by permanent savings in the 2018/19 budget to prevent an ongoing drain on the Transformation Fund. We believe that it is possible to do this through accelerated transformation of the way the Council is run. Other parties have so far made no proposals or commitment to prevent the ongoing yearly requirement of £932k a year draining out of the Transformation Fund budget as a result of the funding gap in the 2017/18 budget.

Conservatives believe that it is possible and necessary to accelerate the changes to the way the Council is run and will seek to expedite this process in the next administration.

Conservatives agree with a cross-party proposal for a 2% Adult Social Care precept in 2017/18, but believe this needs to be balanced by no increase in Council Tax. Conservatives propose to:

- Making £70k revenue available to fund the borrowing associated with making highways schemes “oven ready” in order to access £50m of funding for investing in congesting busting projects that will help alleviate those delays in

our work and social journeys that have such a negative effect on those that need to commute to work and travel around the county.

- Increase the funding for pothole repairs, services and cracks by an extra £2.15m. This is an increase of approximately 50%, enabling us to repair an extra 67,500 pot holes a year.
- Increase Gulley Clearance, grass cutting and visibility splays by £200k. This will increase cuts from two to three a year, helping prevent some of the costly emergency response work, addressing concerns raised by residents.
- Invest a further £300k in sealing and improving pavements.
- Invest an additional £60k in mental health in order to implement the public mental health strategy commitments as previously approved by the Health Committee. This includes supporting schools to deal with bullying, supporting employers to help staff at risk of mental health decline, and funding a debt advice pilot for people at risk of mental health.
- And we have now secured agreement for our earlier amendment proposal at General Purposes committee to fund the £120k early years literacy project. This will pay for literacy projects to be delivered in Wisbech, Huntingdon, North Cambridge and St Neots. They have a proven impact - the initial project in Wisbech worked with 200 families and 450 children and contributed to a 26% increase in children achieving the early years' standard over a two year period.

The total additional cost to the revenue budget of the Conservative proposals outlined in this paper is an extra £2.78m beyond the current Committee based cross-party budget and section 151 officer proposals. Although we could raise Council Tax to cover this, we do not believe that this increase has to be met by the local taxpayer. Instead we propose that for the financial year 2017/18 the cost of these investments be funded from the MRP funding. However, if the control of the Council is returned to the Conservatives at the elections in May 2017, we believe this cost can be met by accelerated transformation proposals in 2018/19 and therefore this would be a one-off draw on MRP funding. We also believe that the Transformation Fund should be repaid not just for our proposals but also the continuing subsidy of spending from the transformation fund currently proposed to be used to balance the budget for 2017/18, through further transformation proposals in 2020/21. Our proposals therefore will have no net impact on the transformation fund over the five year plan.

Conservatives have listened to residents and believe that these proposals, on top of the cross-party plans worked up through the Committee process, provide a balanced and proportionate approach to delivering what the people of Cambridgeshire want and need.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

*The figures below are the differences to the S151 Officer proposed budget and are in absolute figures.*

*Increases in expenditure and corresponding increases in funding are shown as positive figures. Expenditure*

	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	2020-21 £000	2021-22 £000
Pothole repairs and carriageway cracks sealing	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150
Gully clearance, grass cutting and visibility splay grass cutting	200	200	200	200	200
Sealing cracks in pavements and general footway improvements	300	300	300	300	300
Mental Health	60	60	60	60	60
Debt charges resulting from getting capital schemes 'oven ready'	70	70	70	70	70
Transformation project savings	-	-3,712	-3,712	-7,424	-3,712
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>2,780</b>	<b>-932</b>	<b>-932</b>	<b>-4,644</b>	<b>-932</b>

## **Funding**

	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	2020-21 £000	2021-22 £000
Use of MRP funding	2,780	-	-	-	-
Reduction in use of MRP funding (from 2017-18 gap) <sup>1</sup>	-	-932	-932	-932	-932
Repayment of MRP funding <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	-3,712	-
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>2,780</b>	<b>-932</b>	<b>-932</b>	<b>-4,644</b>	<b>-932</b>

\*Totals must be equal as all budget amendments must balance.

<sup>1</sup>These are contributions to the Transformation Fund.

The figure under 'Repayment of MRP funding' for 2020-21 (£3,712k) is repayment of the £2,780k MRP funding proposed to be used in 2017-18 in this amendment, plus repayment of the £932k MRP funding proposed to be used in 2017-18 in the officer proposed budget.

## **Net Impact on transformation fund**

*As above, negative figures are contributions to the transformation fund.*

	2017-18 £000	2018-19 £000	2019-20 £000	2020-21 £000	2021-22 £000
Current Proposal to Council	932	932	932	932	932
Current Proposal Cumulative Total	932	1,864	2,796	3,728	<u>4,660</u>
Conservative Amendments <sup>2</sup>	3,712	0	0	-3,712	0
Conservative Cumulative Total	3,712	3,712	3,712	0	<u>0</u>

<sup>2</sup>The figure for 2017-18 assumes the use of MRP funding to close the gap in the officer proposed budget (£932k) and to fund the additional investments within the Conservative amendment (£2,780k).

**CONSERVATIVE AMENDMENT**

**Appendix K**

councillor	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	Councillor	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP		X			KINDERSLEY S	LibD		X		
ASHWOOD B	LibD		X			LAY A	UKIP		X		
BAILEY	Con	X				LEEKE M	LibD		X		
BATES I C	Con	X				LOYNES M Apologies	Con				X
BODEN C	Con	X				MANDLEY R	UKIP		X		
BROWN D	Con	X				MANNING I	LibD		X		
BROWN P	Con	X				MASON M	Ind		X		
BULLEN P	UKIP		X			MCGUIRE W	Con	X			
BUTCHER R	Con	X				MOGHADAS Z Apologies	Lab				X
BYWATER S	Con	X				NETHSINGHA L	LibD		X		
CEARNS E Apologies	LibD				X	ONASA NYA F	Lab		X		
CHAPMAN B	Inde	X				ORGE E A G	Con	X			
CLAPP P	UKIP		X			PALMER J	Con	X			
CLARK J	Con	X				REEVE P	UKIP		X		
CONNOR D	Con	X				REYNOLDS K Apologies	Con				X
COUNT S	Con	X				ROUSE M	Con	X			
CRAWFORD S	Lab		X			SALES P	Lab		X		
CRISWELL S J	Con	X				SCHUMANN J	Con	X			
DENT A	UKIP			X		SCUTT J	Lab		X		
DIVINE D	UKIP			X		SHELLENS M	LibD		X		
DOWNES P J	LibD			X		SHUTER M	Con	X			
DUPRE L	LibD			X		SMITH M	Con	X			
FROST S	Con	X				TAYLOR A	LibD		X		
GILES D	Inde	X				TAYLOR S	inde	X			
GILLICK G	UKIP		X			TEW M	Cons	X			
HARFORD L	Con	X				TOPPING P	Cons	X			
HARTY D apologies	Con				X	VAN DE VEN S	LibD		X		
HENSON R	UKIP		X			WALSH A	Lab		X		
HICKFORD R	Con	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HIPKIN J	Inde		X			WILLIAMS J	LibD		X		
HOY S	Cons	X				WILSON G	LibD		X		
HUDSON P	Con	X				WISSON J Apologies	Con				X
HUNT W T I	Con	X				YEULETT F H	Con	X			
JENKINS D	LibD		X								
KAVANAGH N	Lab		X								
KENNEY G	Con	X				TOTAL	69				

<b>CCC BUDGET AMENDMENT 2017-18</b>
-------------------------------------

<b>POLITICAL PARTY/PARTIES</b>	<b>Liberal Democrats &amp; Labour</b>
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------

<b>TOTAL ADULT SOCIAL CARE PRECEPT INCREASE</b>	<b>+2%</b>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL COUNCIL TAX INCREASE</b>	<b>+1.99%</b>

<b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT</b>	<b>£5,050,000</b>
------------------------------------	-------------------

<b>CHANGES TO FUNDING: (compared to S151 Officer proposed budget)</b>		
<b>ASC PRECEPT</b>		
<b>GENERAL COUNCIL TAX</b>	<b>+£5,115,000</b>	
<b>MRP FUNDING</b>		
<b>RESERVES*</b>	<b>-£65,000</b>	
<b>OTHER</b>		
<b>TOTAL CHANGES TO FUNDING</b>		<b>£5,050,000</b>

\*This is a contribution to the general reserve.

**Joint Budget Amendment  
Cambridgeshire County Council (2017-18)  
Liberal Democrat and Labour Groups**

Proposals

1. Restore the Cambridge city centre shuttle bus service: £300k recurring
2. Reverse the £1 Park and Ride charge: £1.2m recurring
3. Remove the cut of £325k in spending on new library stock in B/R.6.209: £325k recurring
4. Reverse the cut to the Cambridgeshire Local Assistance Scheme in A/R.6.160: £163k recurring
5. Reverse the cut to voluntary sector contracts for mental health services in A/R.6.167: £130k recurring
6. The £8.25 pay rate set by the Living Wage Foundation instead of £7.20 for all direct County Council employees: £562k recurring
7. Subsidise bus routes and community transport: £200k recurring
8. Better maintenance of verges and footpaths: £100k recurring
9. Additional maintenance for the county's roads, pavements, and cycle ways: £200k recurring
10. Increase services to supporting young mothers and their babies: £190k recurring
11. Maintain special needs support for schools: £270k recurring
12. Support the work of locality teams: £310k recurring
13. Reducing children's centre closures: £400k recurring (future years savings in A/R.6.224)
14. Jointly commission a specific home care service: £700k recurring

= £5.05m

Revenue receivable in 2017-18: Increase council tax by 1.99% on top of the adult social care precept at 2%, raising £5.115m

Contribution to reserves in 2017-18: £65k

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

*The figures below are the differences to the S151 Officer proposed budget and are in absolute figures.*

*Increases in expenditure and corresponding increases in funding are shown as positive figures.*

### **Expenditure**

	<b>2017-18 £000</b>	<b>2018-19 £000</b>	<b>2019-20 £000</b>	<b>2020-21 £000</b>	<b>2021-22 £000</b>
<b>1 – Restore Cambridge city centre shuttle bus service</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>
<b>2 – Reverse £1 Park &amp; Ride charge</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,200</b>
<b>3 – Remove the cut in spending on new library stock</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>325</b>
<b>4 – Reverse the cut to the Cambridgeshire Local Assistance Scheme</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>5 – Reverse the cut to voluntary sector contracts for mental health services</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>6 – Pay Living Wage Foundation rate for all direct CCC employees</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>562</b>
<b>7 – Subsidise bus routes and community transport</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>
<b>8 – Better maintenance of verges and footpaths</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>9 – Additional maintenance for roads, pavements and cycle ways</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>
<b>10 - Increase services to support young mothers and their babies</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>190</b>
<b>11 – Maintain special needs support for schools</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>12 – Support the work of locality teams</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>310</b>
<b>13 – Reducing children’s centre closures</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>400</b>
<b>14 – Jointly commission a specific home care service</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>5,050</b>

### **Funding**

	<b>2017-18 £000</b>	<b>2018-19 £000</b>	<b>2019-20 £000</b>	<b>2020-21 £000</b>	<b>2021-22 £000</b>
<b>Raise General Council Tax increase from 0% to 1.99%</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>	<b>5,115</b>
<b>Contribution to the General Reserve**</b>	<b>-65</b>	<b>-65</b>	<b>-65</b>	<b>-65</b>	<b>-65</b>
<b>TOTAL*</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>5,050</b>

\*Totals must be equal as all budget amendments must balance.

\*\*This is a contribution to the general reserve.





## Suspension of Standing Orders Amendment

## Appendix N

CLLR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP		X			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		X		
ASHWOOD B	LibD		X			LAY A	UKIP		X		
BAILEY	Con	X				LEEKE M	LibD		X		
BATES I C	Con	X				LOYNES M Apologies	Con				X
BODEN C	Con	X				MANDLEY R	UKIP		X		
BROWN D	Con	X				MANNING I	LibD		X		
BROWN P	Con	X				MASON M	Ind		X		
BULLEN P	UKIP		X			MCGUIRE L W	Con	X			
BUTCHER R	Con	X				MOGHADAS Z Apologies	Lab				X
BYWATER S	Con	X				NETHSINGHA L	LibD		X		
CEARNS E Apologies	LibD				X	ONASANYA F	Lab		X		
CHAPMAN B	Inde	X				ORGE E A G	Con	X			
CLAPP P	UKIP		X			PALMER J	Con	X			
CLARK J	Con	X				REEVE P	UKIP		X		
CONNOR D	Con	X				REYNOLDS K Apologies	Con				X
COUNT S	Con	X				ROUSE M	Con	X			
CRAWFORD S	Lab		X			SALES P	Lab		X		
CRISWELL S J	Con	X				SCHUMANN J	Con	X			
DENT A	UKIP		X			SCUTT J	Lab		X		
DIVINE D	UKIP		X			SHELLENS M	LibD		X		
DOWNES P J	LibD		X			SHUTER M	Con	X			
DUPRE L	LibD		X			SMITH M	Con	X			
FROST S	Con	X				TAYLOR A	LibD		X		
GILES D	Inde	X				TAYLOR S	inde	X			
GILLICK G	UKIP		X			TEW M	Cons	X			
HARFORD L	Con	X				TOPPING P	Cons	X			
HARTY D apologies	Con				X	VAN DE VEN S	LibD		X		
HENSON R	UKIP		X			WALSH A	Lab		X		
HICKFORD R	Con	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HIPKIN J	Inde	X				WILLIAMS J	LibD		X		
HOY S	Cons	X				WILSON G	LibD		X		
HUDSON P	Con	X				WISSON J Apologies	Con				X
HUNT W T I	Con	X				YEULETT F H	Con	X			
JENKINS D	LibD		X								
KAVANAGH N	Lab		X								
KENNEY G	Con	X				TOTAL	69				

**CONSERVATIVE SECOND AMENDMENT**

**Appendix O**

Councillor	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	Councillor	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP		X			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		X		
ASHWOOD B	LibD		X			LAY A	UKIP		X		
BAILEY	Con	X				LEEKE M	LibD		X		
BATES I C	Con	X				LOYNES M Apologies	Con				X
BODEN C	Con	X				MANDLEY R	UKIP		X		
BROWN D	Con	X				MANNING I	LibD		X		
BROWN P	Con	X				MASON M	Ind		X		
BULLEN P	UKIP		X			MCGUIRE L W	Con	X			
BUTCHER R	Con	X				MOGHADAS Z Apologies	Lab				X
BYWATER S	Con	X				NETHSINGHA L	LibD		X		
CEARNS E Apologies	LibD				X	ONASANYA F	Lab		X		
CHAPMAN B	Inde	X				ORGE E A G	Con	X			
CLAPP P	UKIP		X			PALMER J	Con	X			
CLARK J	Con	X				REEVE P	UKIP		X		
CONNOR D	Con	X				REYNOLDS K Apologies	Con				X
COUNT S	Con	X				ROUSE M	Con	X			
CRAWFORD S	Lab		X			SALES P	Lab		X		
CRISWELL S J	Con	X				SCHUMANN J	Con	X			
DENT A	UKIP		X			SCUTT J	Lab		X		
DIVINE D	UKIP		X			SHELLENS M	LibD		X		
DOWNES P J	LibD		X			SHUTER M	Con	X			
DUPRE L	LibD		X			SMITH M	Con	X			
FROST S	Con	X				TAYLOR A	LibD		X		
GILES D	Inde	X				TAYLOR S	inde	X			
GILLICK G	UKIP		X			TEW M	Cons	X			
HARFORD L	Con	X				TOPPING P	Cons	X			
HARTY D apologies	Con				X	VAN DE VEN S	LibD		X		
HENSON R	UKIP		X			WALSH A	Lab		X		
HICKFORD R	Con	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HIPKIN J	Inde	X				WILLIAMS J	LibD		X		
HOY S	Cons	X				WILSON G	LibD		X		
HUDSON P	Con	X				WISSON J Apologies	Con				X
HUNT W T I	Con	X				YEULETT F H	Con	X			
JENKINS D	LibD		X								
KAVANAGH N	Lab		X								
KENNEY G	Con	X				TOTAL	69				

SUBSTANTIVE MOTION						Appendix P					
COUNCILLOR	Party		Against	For	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP		X			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		X		
ASHWOOD B	LibD		X			LAY A	UKIP		X		
BAILEY	Con	X				LEEKE M	LibD		X		
BATES I C	Con	X				LOYNES M Apologies	Con				X
BODEN C	Con	X				MANDLEY R	UKIP		X		
BROWN D	Con	X				MANNING I	LibD		X		
BROWN P	Con	X				MASON M	Ind		X		
BULLEN P	UKIP		X			MCGUIRE L W	Con	X			
BUTCHER R	Con	X				MOGHADAS Z Apologies	Lab				X
BYWATER S	Con	X				NETHSINGHA L	LibD		X		
CEARNS E Apologies	LibD				X	ONASANYA F	Lab		X		
CHAPMAN B	Inde	X				ORGE E A G	Con	X			
CLAPP P	UKIP		X			PALMER J	Con	X			
CLARK J	Con	X				REEVE P	UKIP		X		
CONNOR D	Con	X				REYNOLDS K Apologies	Con				X
COUNT S	Con	X				ROUSE M	Con	X			
CRAWFORD S	Lab		X			SALES P	Lab		X		
CRISWELL S J	Con	X				SCHUMANN J	Con	X			
DENT A	UKIP		X			SCUTT J	Lab		X		
DIVINE D	UKIP		X			SHELLENS M	LibD		X		
DOWNES P J	LibD		X			SHUTER M	Con	X			
DUPRE L	LibD		X			SMITH M	Con	X			
FROST S	Con	X				TAYLOR A	LibD		X		
GILES D	Inde	X				TAYLOR S	inde	X			
GILLICK G	UKIP		X			TEW M	Cons	X			
HARFORD L	Con	X				TOPPING P	Cons	X			
HARTY D apologies	Con				X	VAN DE VEN S	LibD		X		
HENSON R	UKIP		X			WALSH A	Lab		X		
HICKFORD R	Con	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HIPKIN J	Inde	X				WILLIAMS J	LibD		X		
HOY S	Cons	X				WILSON G	LibD		X		
HUDSON P	Con	X				WISSON J Apologies	Con				X
HUNT W T I	Con	X				YEULETT F H	Con	X			
JENKINS D	LibD		X								
KAVANAGH N	Lab		X								
KENNEY G	Con	X				TOTAL	69				

**County Council**

**Tuesday 14th February 2017**

**Oral Questions**

**1) Question from Councillor Peter Downes**

My question is to Councillor Brown and it is to do with the changing Government policy on the admission of unaccompanied asylum children.

You will remember that some months ago the Government agreed to accept 3000 unaccompanied asylum seekers, minors, and these were apportioned across the Country pro-rata to the size of the counties concerned. Cambridgeshire agreed to do so. I think we were allocated as it were 93, notionally, and we've taken I think about 62 or 3 so far. A few days ago, unexpectedly, the government said it would no longer honour that agreement and would reduce its figure from 3000 to 350. This has provoked outcry right across the political spectrum, including from the conservatives, and the excuse given was that the councils had lobbied Government because they couldn't afford to provide the places for these young people. Now, I mean I thought that was an absolutely disgraceful thing to say anyway because these are the youngsters who are in the greatest need of all and here is this Country turning them away. So I asked Gillian Beasley whether or not this Council had actually lobbied Government not to take any more and she was able to give me assurance that we have not done so.

So we are still, as it were, taking our share, and I want to ask Councillor Brown if he will support me and support the Council in taking a positive view of this very embarrassing and very difficult situation and to continue to take our share of unaccompanied asylum seekers.

**Response from Councillor David Brown**

Thank you Chairman. Thank you Councillor Downes for the question. . . . Just as far as numbers are concerned, as at today we have 59 unaccompanied asylum seeking children in the care of the Council.

I would also remind you all that I am Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Board. The decision to join the regional approach which gave us this figure of 93 was agreed through the Children and Young People's Committee. That was specifically really to ease the pressure on areas like Thurrock who have been . . . because unaccompanied asylum seeking children basically become the . . . well come under the care of the council where they are first landed up here. So Kent and Thurrock in particular were under extreme pressure. That decision was taken through CYP Committee and that remains the policy of this Council. It would be up to CYP Committee if they wish to change that policy, but I've certainly had no approaches from anybody suggesting that we should change the policy.

**Supplementary from Councillor Peter Downes**

I want to apologise to Councillor Whitehead. I directed it to Councillor Brown because he has tended to be the person taking the responsibility within the CYP committee for public area of work. But it was technically . . . I should have addressed it . . . I apologise. But thank you very much indeed for that reassurance which I think which I think is very important for us all to know.

## **2) Question from Councillor David Jenkins**

We've got a new railway station coming up which is really very good news. Yes, Ian Bates starts to get his pen ready. It gives us an opportunity to link more people more broadly with the railway station by bus and by bike and will Councillor Bates spare me some time in the next few weeks to talk about ways in which that might be maximised for people in the north of the County?

## **Response from Councillor Ian Bates**

I'm happy certainly to have that discussion. Just for information, we have been in discussion with the bus operators about how they will provide buses into the new railway station. Those discussions have not been completed yet, but we are in discussion. I'd be happy to meet. Can I make a suggestion that we put this into the Spokes arena and that we put that on the agenda and invite you to come?

## **3) Question from Councillor Anna Bailey**

My question is to Councillor Lucy Nethsingha as Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group.

A Lib Dem leaflet recently delivered to homes in Fulbourn talked about South Cambs District Council and its trading company, Ermine Street Housing. It reads 'Council investigated. Inland Revenue look into housing tax dodge. Shocking truth exposed. Gambling with taxpayers' money'. It goes on to say that Conservative run South Cambs District Council of which Councillor John Williams is a member is 'under investigation' by the Inland Revenue and quotes County and District Councillor Williams as warning that 'the tax dodge has put vital public services at risk'.

A retraction letter from Councillor Williams personally states that 'we did not intend to convey the impression that either the company or the council are engaged in tax evasion or tax dodges and we completely accept that all taxes are being paid in accordance with the law. To the best of our knowledge there's been no investigation by HMRC of the company.'

Of course Chairman it's a matter of law, under EU state aid rules that public bodies such as South Cambs District Council must charge the going rate of interest to its trading company. That's the law. Presumably the author of this material was following the national campaign guidance of the Association of Liberal Democrat Councillors. It's called 'Effective Opposition'. It directs party members to 'be wicked, act shamelessly, stir endlessly' and its advice continues, 'don't be afraid to exaggerate. Positive campaigning will not be enough to win control of the council. Oppose all service cuts: you are not running the council, it's not your problem'. Chairman there are people in Fulbourn who now believe these lies, who are asking questions on the doorstep and that's exactly what the Liberal Democrats sought to achieve with this leaflet. They sought to deceive the residents of Fulbourn with this depraved activity. Well, well done Liberal Democrats. You've got what you wanted. You lied to the public. You've trashed the reputation of local government, of local politics and you've achieved your deceitful ends. Well done.

## **Chairman**

Councillor Bailey, you've reached the red light.

## **Councillor Anna Bailey**

OK. Well my question, my question is . . .

**Chairman**

You have reached . . .

**Councillor Anna Bailey**

I'll put it as a supplementary.

**Chairman**

I am – I have - you've put me in a very awkward position Councillor Bailey because this is about the business of South Cambridgeshire District Council. It's not . . .

**Councillor Anna Bailey**

It's a County Councillor.

**Chairman**

Well. I'm not sure it's being a County Councillor - the rules of the oral question time - 'all questions must be relevant to matters for which the council has powers or duties' and I don't think that that actually is what you're asking about. And so it does put me in an awkward position. What I suggest that you do is having made the point, very eloquently, that we leave it at that.

**Councillor Anna Bailey**

I'd like to ask my question please and it relates . . .

**Point of Order from Councillor Steve Count**

Thank you Chair. As you've described the council's duties (*inaudible*) . . . This is being queried under the Nolan principles under Honesty, Integrity and Transparency. I therefore think that you should allow a response and then there will be a supplementary.

**Chairman**

I'm going to take legal advice actually Councillor Count.

**Councillor Anna Bailey**

He's a County Councillor portraying himself as a County Councillor. You're his leader. (*Note this comment was directed to Councillor Nethsingha, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group*)

**Chairman**

Councillor Bailey. I think we all got the message of the question but I don't think it is the business of the County Council. But I am willing to be persuaded by the Monitoring Officer that it is. (*pause for legal advice*)

Right. Councillor Bailey. I have taken legal advice from the Monitoring Officer whose advice is that this is the business of another authority. It is not the business of this authority. The fact that Councillor Williams, to whom you didn't ask the question, is a double-hatted member

isn't relevant. There is another place that you can ask this exact same question and I look forward to hearing it there. Do you wish to raise a point of order?

**Councillor Anna Bailey**

I think the advice is incorrect. It's a matter of business of this Council. As a County Councillor.

**Chairman**

OK. Well again you put me in a difficult position. I've sought legal advice from my monitoring officer and it would be irrational of me to not pay attention to that advice. Councillor Schumann did you have a point of order?

**Councillor Joshua Schumann**

Chairman you've received advice from the monitoring officer but we haven't. It was clearly - the point of order was raised by the Leader that actually, the Code of Conduct is our Code of Conduct. It is this Council's business. If the Monitoring Officer is prepared to explain to this Council why it's not the business of this Council (*under*) that Code of Conduct I'm sure we'll all be very keen to hear it.

**Chairman**

He is very happy to share his views.

**Monitoring Officer**

Right. So in terms of the Code of Conduct issue, there are two separate Codes of Conduct here. The Code of Conduct that applies to an elected member when they're acting in their capacity as a South Cambs District Council member is a different Code of Conduct to the one that applies here. The one that applies as CCC members does not apply to an elected member of this Council when they are acting in their capacity as an elected Councillor of South Cambs District Council. So there is no connection between those two.

**Chairman**

Let's hear your point of personal explanation.

**Councillor Anna Bailey**

My point of personal explanation is to reiterate that he is acting as County Councillor John Williams in the information that was sent round. It's our code of conduct.

**Councillor Peter Topping**

I'd like to raise a point of information.

**Chairman**

That's fine. I'll get to you. A moment - taking very well paid legal advice. Ok now look this is turning into a free-for-all and we were very nearly ended too. Ok. Ladies and gentlemen please sit down. We'll do it in public.

Right. Members. You can all switch your machines off because there is going to be no further discussion on this. I have already indicated that this is inappropriate and the legal advice that I have received is that it is inappropriate and I have now had Councillor Topping tell me that his legal advice (*Note: South Cambridgeshire District Council legal advice*) is it is inappropriate. So I'm drawing a line right there. Councillor Bailey, you've made your point. I daresay I'll look forward to seeing you next Thursday at South Cambridgeshire District Council's Council meeting to ask the same question. And I'm sure that we will all enjoy it just as much as we have this afternoon. So. Thank you very much. Councillor Topping you can switch your machine off. Councillor Williams can stand outside in the corner and that is the end of that particular item, thankfully. . . .