

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 6th February 2018

**Time:** 10.30am – 3.25pm

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillor M Smith (Chairman)  
Councillors: D Ambrose-Smith, H Batchelor, I Bates, C Boden, A Bradnam, A Bailey, S Bywater, D Connor, A Costello, S Count, S Crawford, K Cuffley, P Downes, L Dupre, L Every, J French, R Fuller, I Gardener, D Giles, J Gowing, L Harford, N Harrison, A Hay, R Hickford, M Howell, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, L Jones, L Joseph, N Kavanagh, S Kindersley, S King, I Manning, M McGuire (Vice Chairman), E Meschini, L Nethsingha, P Raynes, K Reynolds, C Richards, T Rogers, T Sanderson, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, A Taylor, S Taylor, S Tierney, P Topping, S van de Ven, D Wells, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and T Wotherspoon

Apologies: Councillors D Adey and S Criswell

### **58. MINUTES – 12TH DECEMBER 2017**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 12th December 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **59. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

### **60. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

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.

### **61. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The Chairman reported that three questions had been received from members of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

### **62. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

### **63. COUNCIL'S BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET PROPOSALS 2018-23**

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman of Council, Councillor McGuire, 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.

Before asking the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee to move the recommendations, the Chairman drew attention to the Business Cases, which were not included as part of the agenda but were available via a link in the Business Plan to the Council's website. The Business Cases included, where relevant, a Community Impact Assessment. She explained that the Council took very seriously the need to be aware of the impact that its policies, decisions, and services had on communities across Cambridgeshire, and the importance of using this information to inform the preparation of the Business Cases. All Councillors would have seen where relevant, for each of the detailed proposals, a Community Impact Assessment

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hickford, that the recommendation from the General Purposes Committee as set out on pages 3 to 5 of the Council agenda be approved.

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 planning process.

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

Councillor Nethsingha moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Dupre as set out in **Appendix C**.

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

*[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats and Independents in favour; Conservatives against; Labour abstained.]*

#### **The voting record is included at Appendix D**

Councillor Whitehead moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Kavanagh as set out in **Appendix E**.

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

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

#### **The Voting Record is included at Appendix F.**

In opening the debate on the main Business Plan, the Chairman invited all Policy and Service Committee Chairmen/women to speak if they so wished.

Prior to the vote being taken on the motion, the Liberal Democrat Group Leader indicated that her preference would have been for a separate vote on the Council Tax increase, which her Group would have supported.

Following further discussion, the original motion on being put to the vote was carried as set out in the voting record at **Appendix G**.

*[Following the closure of the vote, Councillor Nethsingha indicated that she had voted in error in favour of the motion and requested that the record should show that she had meant to vote against.]*

It was resolved:

1. To approve the amended recommendations from General Purposes Committee made on the 23 January 2018 relating to the Business plan, specifically to:
  - a. Approve the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan.
    - i. Set the general council tax precept increase for 2018-19 to 2.99% and the Adult Social Care Precept at 2% as per b-d below.
    - ii. Balance the 2018-19 budget by use of additional council tax receipts.
    - iii. Allocate the additional funds raised from the increase in general council tax beyond those used to balance the 2018-19 budget to a smoothing reserve
  - b. Approve a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £807,480,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.
  - c. Approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £279,489,859.22, 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. Approve 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 (223,622.3), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% Adult Social Care (ASC) precept increase and a 2.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	£833.22
B	7/9	£972.09
C	8/9	£1,110.96
D	9/9	£1,249.83
E	11/9	£1,527.57
F	13/9	£1,805.31
G	15/9	£2,083.05
H	18/9	£2,499.66

- e. Note and approve 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 A of the report).

- f. Approve the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan including capital expenditure in 2018-19 up to £254.7m arising from:
  - Commitments from schemes already approved;
  - The consequences of new starts in 2018-19 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 6.9 of the Business Plan.
- g. Approve 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 2018- 19 as required by the Local Government Act 2003)
  - iii. The Investment Strategy for 2018-19 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.
2. Authorise the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the Business Plan so as to take into account any changes deemed appropriate resulting from the final Local Government Finance Settlement and updated Business Rates information, as set out in paragraph 2.9 of the report.

#### **64. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – ORAL QUESTIONS**

Two questions were asked under Council Procedure 9.1 as set out in **Appendix H**.

***[The questions and answers were filmed and are available (5 hours 33 minutes into the recording on the Council's You Tube site at <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/council/councillors-&-meetings/council-meetings-live-web-stream/>***

#### **65. WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

Six written questions were submitted under Council Procedure 9.2 as set out in **Appendix I**.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 6<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 20187  
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**PEOPLE**

**Beverley Garner**

It is with deep regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of Beverley Garner who was killed in a traffic accident on the A14. Beverley was employed to work as a Passenger Assistant by T&T one of our home to school/college transport operators on the route serving Highfield Littleport, supporting children and young people with complex special educational needs. In addition, up to 1 December 2017, she was employed by Cambridgeshire Catering and Cleaning Services working at St Helen’s Primary School in Bluntisham.

**Alexa Cox**

It is also with deep regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of Alexa Cox, a much loved and respected member of the Archives Team. Alexa had worked in Archives for many years as a Relief Archivist, based at Huntingdonshire Archives at Huntingdon Library. During that time she gained an unrivalled knowledge of Huntingdonshire’s history, and her depth of knowledge, her helpfulness and her unfailing good humour were widely appreciated by everyone who worked with her and by all the members of the public with whom she came into contact.

**MESSAGES**

**His Royal Highness The Earl of Wessex to Cambridge**

The Chairman was honoured to welcome His Royal Highness The Earl of Wessex to Cambridge recently, on behalf of the County Council, when he visited the Arthur Rank Hospice Charity, Shelford Bottom, Cambridge on Friday 19 January, to formally open the new building.

His Royal Highness was in Cambridge for two days, and during that time also visited the Real Tennis Club in Cambridge, and attended a Department of Education Award Dinner at Jesus College.

**Recognition of today being a historic day in terms of voting rights in this Country**

The Chairman highlighted that it was 100 years ago to the day that ‘The Representation of People Act 1918’ was passed that allowed women to vote for the very first time and also extended the right to vote to all men over the age of 21.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 6<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2018****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Ms Nicky Massey Cambridge Resident</b>	<b>Councillor Simon Bywater Chairman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee</b>	<p>My name is Nicky Massey and I'm a parent of three children living here in Cambridge. On the 17th October 2017 the Conservative County Councillors voted to continue with a plan to close 21 Children's Centres in Cambridgeshire, to change the hub based system which offers less place-based provision for the 0 – 5 year olds. The changes were done with a view to saving just £900,000 and the decision came despite great protest and opposition which will continue. We are now in February and the closures will be put into effect from April, with no clear plan as to where the families will be getting support from in their areas that will lose out. Because of the closures of the wonderful Children's Centres like Romsey Mill in Cambridge, Centres like the Fields in Abbey ward will have immense pressures added to them. Despite staying open they will be losing a large percentage of their funding and have like many others already suffered from the previous funding cuts to Children's Centres and early years education. Centres are facing a restructuring under the County Council Children's Centres scheme, simply to save money and not improve our services to children and families. The cuts will cause damage to children and families across Cambridgeshire and the damage will not be easily reversible. The families that need help the most will find help more difficult. If you do not put back the £900,000 into the budget, with funding now found from the proposed Council Tax rise, the damages will affect many families and for which you will both be responsible and accountable for.</p> <p>So Councillor Bywater my question is:</p> <p>our Children's Centres and early years services have already seen vital resources cut back over the years. How will the County be sure to</p>

			assess and report on the effect that the closures of the Children's Centres will have on our families and supporting services such as social care?
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Councillor Simon Bywater Chairman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee	Ms Nicky Massey Cambridge Resident	Yes, thank you very much Chair and thank you very much for your question. We know how important it is for parents and carers to be able to access support when they most need it. We have agreed to change the way we deliver our Children's Centre offer. This will mean we will be providing more outreach support so that we can reach more people rather than just delivering services from buildings. We have reduced management and building costs. By April we will have changed our model and will be able to provide a list of what will be on offer, where and when. We will ensure this information is published widely. To enable us to make the changes needed to the Children's Centre offer, we have set up a project group with appropriate officer attendance. They have developed an implementation plan to ensure the new service offer will be in place from April. This is seen as business as usual, as we are always striving to improve the services. We will continue to monitor the impact of the changes after April. Thank you.
	<b>Supplementary question from:</b>	<b>To:</b>	<b>Question</b>
	<b>Ms Nicky Massey</b>	<b>Councillor Simon Bywater</b>	So the question was, how would you monitor and be able to report on the impact that the changes will have? And I haven't heard that being answered.
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Councillor Simon Bywater</b>	<b>Ms Nicky Massey</b>	I think I did make that clear Chair, but just to elaborate further. The matter will come back to the Children and Young People (CYP) Committee next month. We will discuss some of the proposals that are put forward and like I say, we'll then monitor as we go forward but, the proposals will be published in April.

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
2.	<b>Ms Carla McQueen Cambridge Resident</b>	<b>Councillor Mathew Shuter Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee</b>	<p>I'm a resident of East Chesterton. I and my fellow neighbours are extremely concerned about the high number of potholes down the length of Milton Road and the cost of what appears to be a botched . . . repair to some, done only a few weeks ago. Milton Road is now really dangerous for both cyclists and drivers. The potholes are down the whole of the road from the Science Park to Mitcham's Corner. What makes it worse is that some of them were supposedly fixed recently, yet in many places the repairs haven't even held for a few weeks before collapsing. So it looks as if the work has been botched. Surely this is just a waste of public money, when other services like our Children's Centres are having their own budgets slashed. Therefore my question to you Councillor Shuter is, can you tell us if he considers the repair work done on Milton Road to be good value for money for the council, given the appalling state the road is in once again with the potholes almost the entire length of the road, which makes it unsafe for cyclists and car drivers? Also can Cllr Shuter confirm how much the recent repairs cost? Given that most of the filling work has mainly degraded, were these repairs good value for money?</p>
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Councillor Mathew Shuter Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee</b>	<b>Ms Carla McQueen Cambridge Resident</b>	<p>Thank very much for your question. It's not my normal route into Cambridge but I, following your question, went to have a look at Milton Road and I notice exactly what you're talking about. There is a patchwork of repairs all the way down Milton Road. Milton Road is a very difficult site for us in that there are proposals, as I'm sure you know, coming forward to the Combined Authority to extensively change and remodel Milton Road. So it's really therefore a maintenance issue rather than a complete resurfacing which is what would probably normally have happened. I can tell you the cost in the last year for those repairs has been £20,000. So in the great scheme of things not an enormous amount of money. However we always want to get good value for that money. Looking at the road from the Science Park down to Gilbert Road, an awful lot of that is to do with utilities that have been put in over the years. There's a complete patchwork of lines there</p>

			<p>which is where the utilities have been put in and some of that is breaking away, but we did do some extensive patching there with a new technique which is used on motorways and highways, to seal the edges. Now in small areas that's broken away, but most of it is still intact. The area where I thought there was more concern was from Gilbert Road down to Mitcham's Corner. There are some quite considerable potholes there, but they're very similar in nature to those potholes which have opened up during this winter across the whole of Cambridgeshire and indeed across the whole of the country. They're due to the fact that the surface under there, which was laid 25 years ago, is very brittle and so therefore patching is a very difficult thing to do and to be really robust. However, we are going back on the 9th of February as I'm sure you've seen signs out, to have a look at the whole of the problem and to do patching work there and to try and improve the situation. But I understand the concerns of residents. We're doing the very best we can, but it is good value for money and I think we have done a good job: I would say 80% of the repairs have held very well but it is a very difficult surface for us, so bear with us, and we'll do our best to make it as good as we possibly can.</p>
	<b>Supplementary question from:</b>	<b>To:</b>	<b>Question</b>
	<b>Ms Carla McQueen</b>	<b>Councillor Mathew Shuter</b>	<p>OK, so having noted the cost of the works already carried out and the fact that the conditions are very poor once again and it's also on the side roads going off into Milton Road. I can think of Kendal Way where there's a huge pothole; it's really, really dangerous and I think people who are partially sighted can have quite significant accidents there. So will Councillor Shuter agree that this is extremely unsatisfactory value for money for the Council, extremely poor service to residents and we as a council and as a community, should expect better.</p> <p>.</p>
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Councillor Mathew Shuter</b>	<b>Ms Carla McQueen</b>	<p>No I'm afraid I don't agree. It's a problem that all counties have right the way across the country filling potholes at this time of year. We're doing an incredibly good job in Cambridgeshire and in fact we're employing very modern techniques. We now have a device called the 'Dragon</p>

			<p>Patcher' and we're the first to really employ that across the country, so we're looking at every method possible. We're getting good value for money out of our contractor Skanska and we are continually driving down the costs where we possibly can. If potholes appear, especially in the roads off to the side, please report them. They need to be put on the reporting system. You will then virtually get an instant email back telling you that it's on the system and we will get out there and repair them as quickly as we possibly can. But I believe we're getting good value for money and, you know we do repair things in a very timely manner.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
3.	<b>Baiju Varkey Thittala</b>	<b>Councillor Josh Schumann Chairman of Commercial and Investment Policy and Service Committee</b>	<p>My question is to the Council is on the basis of an article published in '[Cambridge News]'. I quote. "One of Cambridge's best known landmark could become a hotel" and the News says, "the Council's plan to relinquish the site". My question to the Council.</p> <p>Shire Hall has been a landmark building in the Cambridge area since the 1930s. We are proud to have a site in castle which has been a seat for local government since 1068 and has been erected by William the Conqueror. Would the Council consider the historic importance and special architectural wide use of this site so it should be protected for future generations. If Council is planning to lease or sell this property to a private entity, then what would be the impact of those public services that are being rendered across Cambridgeshire? I am a resident: I want to know all these services that are being rendered from Shire Hall will be continued and if so, where? Thank you.</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	<b>Councillor Josh Schumann Chairman of Commercial and Investment Policy and Service Committee</b>	<b>Baiju Varkey Thittala</b>	<p>Thank you for the question. I'm responding as the Chairman of the Commercial and Investment Committee. Shire Hall is currently the administrative centre of the Cambridgeshire County Council. As a single site it is also the most valuable asset on Cambridgeshire County Council's balance sheet. The Council serves all residents in the County and therefore needs to design services and their provision that will</p>

			<p>deliver for all of those communities. The Council is therefore seeking to deliver as many services closer to the communities that they represent and support. This will result in the need to re-locate many of the staff currently using Shire Hall. For some functions this is not possible, or logical, and therefore there will always be a need to have an administrative centre. We do not believe however that this requires a building of the size and prominence of Shire Hall. Furthermore an increasing number of staff, that do not provide front line services, are now shared with other organisations. Various roles are shared with Peterborough City and other partners in the local government shared services teams. Our workforce of today does not work in the same way it did in years gone by and it would be foolish of ourselves to allow us to think that we can work in the same buildings. As a consequence, the nature of how we manage services delivery is changing and we need to ensure that our property is an enabler to this approach, not a barrier. When we were elected with a clear majority by the Cambridgeshire electorate in last May's election we made it clear that we were going to push the commercialisation agenda as far as we could, in order to protect vital services that this Council provides to all residents of Cambridgeshire. We simply cannot ignore the fact therefore that this room that we are sat in today remains empty for the vast majority of the year and that the operating costs of Shire Hall are in excess of £2m a year. It is important to note that when we took the decision to leave Castle Court it created a revenue stream of £1.25m. Are we seriously going to place bricks and mortar above our residents? Others might, but this administration isn't and won't. We are committed to do all it takes to protect services both now and in the long term. Making this Council more sustainable is the only way that we can achieve this.</p>
	<b>Supplementary question from:</b>	<b>To:</b>	<b>Question</b>
	<b>Baiju Varkey Thittala</b>	<b>Councillor Josh Schumann</b>	<p>I quote Councillor Steve Count's blog. "The provisional decision to move was taken in December by County Council's Commercial and Investment Committee. The final decision about its location will be considered at the Commercial and Investment Committee in the next couple of months." Why such a momentous decision, converting public property into private property, has not been granted as a separate</p>

			agenda item for the public to get a chance to scrutinise so it would be transparent, and why such a decision has been taken in closed doors by the Committee?
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Councillor Josh Schumann</b>	<b>Baiju Varkey Thittala</b>	In response to the supplementary question, there has been no decision taken behind closed doors. It would be premature for us to discuss all options open to us around the future location of an administrative centre for commercial reasons and we have to act on behalf of the residents of Cambridgeshire in their best interest and if we take those decisions in public too early, it could have financial implications for us going forward and I also wish to add that any further decision will be taken by this Council in this chamber.

**COUNCIL MEETING: 6th February 2018**

**Business Plan Amendment**

**Liberal Democrat Group**

**Introduction**

**Cambridgeshire deserves better.**

For the past 6 years Cambridgeshire residents have faced relentless cuts and falling standards in our public services.

Our local hospitals are struggling to cope with increased demand, with delayed discharges well above the national average at 522 bed day delays in the most recent set of figures, (the national average being 399).

Our roads are deteriorating year on year, with more potholes, more uneven surfaces, and more accidents.

The quality of the air we breathe is poor in the cities where it is measured, but across large areas of the County we have no idea how bad it is, as there is no measurement.

Half our children's centres are facing closure, with young parents being expected to travel longer distances to access support services.

Failure over several years to build up rural bus networks has left many villages with little or no public transport. Residents in our villages who do not drive are cut off, with many villages having almost no bus service left. Families of 16-18 year olds face huge transport costs as subsidy of post-16 transport has been cut at the same time as the school leaving age has increased, leaving families with costs of hundreds of pounds, which they have no choice but to pay. 16-18 education and training transport support has been eliminated, at the very time that the school leaving age has increased - putting a high financial burden on families, while also reducing choice for less well-off students, who are no longer able to afford the travel to their chosen post-16 centres.

This record of falling standards has become a political choice by the Conservatives now in control of Cambridgeshire County Council. For the past 2 years the Council has had the option of raising more money locally to support local services. Across the Country local councils of all political colours have taken the chance to support local services. Cambridgeshire has been almost alone in not taking the clear indication from central government that we should use the options open to us to support local services.

This year the Liberal Democrats are again proposing that we should be doing all we can to provide support to our public services here in Cambridgeshire. We believe

that the cuts have gone much too far, and that Cambridgeshire's residents deserve better.

The first task to be tackled in this year's budget is to deal with the £4.3 million deficit left by the budget pushed through by the Conservatives last year. Each year we have seen promises made about how the numbers of children and vulnerable adults needing care would fall. Yet every year there have been deficits in either the children's or adults budgets, and this year in both. This is no way to run a council responsibly and it cannot continue.

However while tackling the deficit is an urgent priority, we feel that investing in better services for Cambridgeshire residents is also urgent. Cambridgeshire's residents are fed up with paying more and getting less. They need to see that their council tax is giving them a better standard of service. We have focused our investment in the following areas:

### **Proposed changes to council tax over the Business Plan Period**

Although the Council will consider the budget on an annual basis the Medium Term Financial Strategy and therefore the resource allocations within the Business Plan are predicated on a rolling five year approach. It is therefore proposed that the MTFS should reflect the following tax proposals at this point for financial planning purposes.

<b>Year</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>	<b>20/21</b>	<b>21/22</b>	<b>22/23</b>
<b>Current</b>	<b>4.99%</b>	<b>3.99%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Proposed</b>	<b>4.99%</b>	<b>3.99%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>

### **Proposed changes to resource allocations**

Reflecting the above commentary, the amendments to the resources allocated in the finance tables are as follows:-

<b>Service</b>	<b>Additional Resource Allocation £000 18/19</b>
Special Educational Needs (P&C)	275
Reverse Children's Centres savings (P&C – A/R.6.224)	772
Reverse Children's Centres savings (C&I – F/R.6.110)	128
Adults Social Care investment (P&C)	500
Reverse further Adults Services saving (A/R.6.177)	282
16-18 Bus Pass (P&E)	500
Additional Bus Subsidy (P&E)	500
Highways and Footpath Maintenance (P&E)	426
Local Highways Improvements &	500

Street Lighting (P&E)	
Air Quality Monitoring (P&E)	25
Member Services Saving (LGSS)	-256
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,652</b>

These amendments are permanent changes to the resources allocated within the Business Plan unless otherwise stated.

### Revised Overall Funding Position

	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	2020-21 £'000	2021-22 £'000	2022-23 £'000	Total £'000
<b>Total Saving Requirement</b>	<b>36,687</b>	<b>20,632</b>	<b>21,718</b>	<b>5,010</b>	<b>10,410</b>	<b>94,393</b>
<b>Identified Savings</b>	-25,034	-11,427	-590	1,074 <sup>1</sup>	2,539 <sup>1</sup>	<b>-33,438</b>
<b>Identified additional Income Generation</b>	-11,653	-3,129	537 <sup>1</sup>	-207	-19	<b>-14,471</b>
<b>Residual Savings to be identified</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,076</b>	<b>21,665</b>	<b>5,877</b>	<b>12,930</b>	<b>46,548</b>

<sup>1</sup> Positive figures represent a reversal of short term savings/investments from previous years

In light of the above the following amendments is proposed to the Recommendations:

## 6. Council's Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2018-23

Amendment from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

*Recommendation:* It is recommended that Full Council:-

1. Approve the amended recommendations from General Purposes Committee made on the 23 January 2018 relating to the Business plan, specifically to:
  - a. Approve the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan **subject to the following**:
    - i. Set the general council tax precept increase for 2018-19 to 2.99% and the Adult Social Care Precept at 2% as per b-d below.
    - ii. Balance the 2018-19 budget by use of additional council tax receipts.
    - iii. Reduce the Members' Services budget by £256k.

- iv. Allocate the additional funds raised from the increase in general council tax, **and the additional saving as set out in iii**, beyond those used to balance the 2018-19 budget to ~~a smoothing reserve~~ **fund the following investments and reversal of savings:**

Service	Additional Resource Allocation £000 18/19
Special Educational Needs (P&C)	275
Reverse Children's Centres savings (P&C – A/R.6.224)	772
Reverse Children's Centres savings (C&I – F/R.6.110)	128
Adults Social Care investment (P&C)	500
Reverse further Adults Services saving (A/R.6.177)	282
16-18 Bus Pass (P&E)	500
Additional Bus Subsidy (P&E)	500
Highways and Footpath Maintenance (P&E)	426
Local Highways Improvements & Street Lighting (P&E)	500
Air Quality Monitoring (P&E)	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,908</b>

- b. Approve a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £807,480,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.
- c. Approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £279,489,859.22, 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. Approve 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 (223,622.3), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% ASC precept increase and a 2.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
------	-------	------------

A	6/9	£833.22
B	7/9	£972.09
C	8/9	£1,110.96
D	9/9	£1,249.83
E	11/9	£1,527.57
F	13/9	£1,805.31
G	15/9	£2,083.05
H	18/9	£2,499.66

- e. Note and approve 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 A).
- f. Approve the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan including capital expenditure in 2018-19 up to £254.7m arising from:
  - Commitments from schemes already approved;
  - The consequences of new starts in 2018-19 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 6.9 of the Business Plan.
- g. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan, including:
  - j. 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 2018- 19 as required by the Local Government Act 2003)
  - iii. The Investment Strategy for 2018-19 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.
2. Authorise the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the Business Plan so as to take into account any changes deemed appropriate resulting from the final Local Government Finance Settlement and updated Business Rates information, as set out in paragraph 2.9 of this report.

# CCC BUDGET AMENDMENT 2018-19

POLITICAL  
PARTY

LIBERAL DEMOCRATS

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
TOTAL ADULT SOCIAL CARE PRECEPT INCREASE	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL GENERAL COUNCIL TAX INCREASE	2.99%	1.99%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
BUDGET GAP ( <b>SURPLUS</b> ) BEFORE AMENDMENTS	-	£11,958,000	£15,726,000	<b>-£350,000</b>	£6,509,000
REDUCTION IN FUNDING FROM COUNCIL TAX	-	-	£5,939,000	£6,227,000	£6,421,000
FUNDS NOT ALLOCATED TO SMOOTHING RESERVE	- <b>£3,652,000</b>	<b>-£5,882,000</b>			
<b>REVISED BUDGET GAP (<b>SURPLUS</b>)</b>	-	<b>£6,076,000</b>	<b>£21,665,000</b>	<b>£5,877,000</b>	<b>£12,930,000</b>
PLANNED USE OF SURPLUS					
NET INVESTMENT IN ADDITIONAL SERVICES	£3,652,000				
<b>FINALISED BUDGET POSITION RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£6,076,000</b>	<b>£21,665,000</b>	<b>£5,877,000</b>	<b>£12,930,000</b>



COUNCIL BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET PROPOSALS CLLR NETHSINGHA AMENDMENT Appendix D												
COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/ No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote	
ADEY D Apologies	LibD				X	JENKINS D	LibD	X				
D AMBROSE- SMITH	Con		X			JONES L	Lab			X		
BAILEY A	Con		X			JOSEPH L	Cons		X			
BATCHELOR H	LibD	X				KAVANAGH N	Lab			X		
BATES I C	Con		X			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD	X				
BODEN C	Con		X			KING S	Cons		X			
BRADNAM A	LibD	X				MANNING I	LibD	X				
BYWATER S	Con		X			MCGUIRE L W	Con		X			
CONNOR D	Con		X			MESCHINI E	Lab			X		
COSTELLO A	Con		X			NETHSINGHA L	LibD	X				
COUNT STEVE	Con		X			RAYNES P	Cons		X			
CRAWFORD S	Lab			X		REYNOLDS K	Con		X			
CRISWELL S Apologies	Con				X	RICHARDS C	Lab			X		
CUFFLEY K	Cons		X			ROGERS T	Cons		X			
DOWNES P J	LibD	X				SANDE RSON T	Ind	X				
DUPRE L	LibD	X				SCHUMANN J	Con		X			
EVERY L	Cons		X			SCUTT J	Lab			X		
FRENCH J	Cons		X			SHELLENS M	LibD	X				
FULLER R	Cons		X			SHUTER M	Con		X			
GARDENER I	Cons		X			SMITH M	Con		X			
GILES D	Ind	X				TAYLOR A	LibD	X				
GOWING J	Cons		X			TAYLOR S	Inde	X				
HARFORD L	Con		X			TIERNEY S	Cons		X			
HARRISON N	LibD	X				TOPPING P	Cons		X			
HAY A	Cons		X			VAN DE VEN S	LibD	X				
HICKFORD R	Con		X			WELLS D	Cons		X			
HOWELL M	Cons		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	Cons		X			
						WOTHER SPOON T	Cons		X			
						TOTAL						

**COUNCIL MEETING: 6th February 2018**

**Business Plan Amendment**

**Labour Group**

**Introduction**

The Labour group support the 3% increase in Council. However we believe that the £3.652 surplus left after the budget has been balanced for 2018-2019 should be invested in services and not kept as a 'smoothing reserve' to deal with in year budget pressures.

**Investment in Services summarised in Table below**

**The Labour group would like to see additional investment in the following services.**

1. **Libraries** – We are pleased to see that the book fund has been restored but this was at the expense of reduced funding elsewhere in the library budget. We would **propose £325k further investment in libraries** given the vital role they play in many of our communities.
2. **Local highways Initiatives** – This is an initiative highly valued by the people of Cambridgeshire, allowing the delivery of local projects which greatly enhance the environment. **We propose an additional £200k of investment in this area.**
3. **Lighting** – The level of lighting in residential streets has been the source of complaints from residents about 'pools of darkness' in many streets. Given that the level of illumination cannot be increased in the 'switch on to 10pm period' due to the type of lamps installed we would propose an **investment of £450k** for replacing some of 10% of lights that were removed from residential streets. We would envisage this working in the same way as the LHI scheme, with residents making a case and applying for a lamp to be replaced.
4. **Bikeability programme** - The bikeability scheme, which educates young people in safe cycling is funded by a ringfenced grant; for 2018-2019 there is likely to be a shortfall in funding - an **investment of £60k** would cover the shortfall.
5. **Looked After Children** – A grant from the transformation fund has been awarded for an in-depth research on the issue of Looked After Children, primarily why do we have more of them than our 'statistical' neighbours and why do our children spend longer in care. There is also money for a

campaign to recruit more foster parents. This will take time to produce results in the meantime pressures on this 'demand led' budget will continue in 2018-2019 **so we propose an additional £1.5 million for Looked After Children.**

6. **Children's Centres** - The Labour Group believe that children's centres are vital to give children the best start in life. The Labour group therefore believe that the cuts to children's centres should be reversed. **We propose an addition £900k to ensure that children's centres remain open.**
7. **Adult Social Care** - The biggest issue for adult social services is delayed discharges from hospital. The availability of respite care beds, (or intermediate care beds as they are sometimes called) are vital to ensure that individuals can be discharged from hospital in a timely manner. **We propose to put aside £217k for the purchase of respite care beds.**

**Total investment £3.652 million**

### **Future Investment**

**Health Visiting.** Health visits to new born children and mothers will continue in 2018-2019 at the same level as the current financial year to be paid for from Public Health reserves. The Labour group believe that any reduction in health visiting for new born children and mothers must be avoided and propose that that money to continue this service be built into the base line budget for Public Health from 2019 onwards.

**Adult Services.** The Biggest issue for adult social services is delayed discharges from hospital due to a shortage of beds. This is not a short term problem and it is not going to go away. The Labour Group therefore ask the Council, as a matter of urgency, to look at building our own care homes. This has been suggested on a number of occasions and we believe it should be acted upon.

### **Proposed changes to council tax over the Business Plan Period**

Although the Council will consider the budget on an annual basis the Medium Term Financial Strategy and therefore the resource allocations within the Business Plan are predicated on a rolling five year approach. It is therefore proposed that the MTFS should reflect the following tax proposals at this point for financial planning purposes.

<b>Year</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>	<b>20/21</b>	<b>21/22</b>	<b>22/23</b>
<b>Current</b>	<b>4.99%</b>	<b>3.99%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Proposed</b>	<b>4.99%</b>	<b>4.99%*</b>	<b>2.99%</b>	<b>2.99%</b>	<b>2.99%</b>

\* the increase in the Council Tax precept limit to 3% has not been confirmed beyond 2018-19, these assumptions will be reviewed annually and updated as required

## Proposed changes to resource allocations

Reflecting the above commentary, the amendments to the resources allocated in the finance tables are as follows:-

Service	Additional Resource Allocation £000 18/19	Additional Resource Allocation £000 19/20
Street Lighting (P&E)	450	
Library Services (P&E)	325	
Looked After Children Services (P&C)	1,500	
Local Highways Infrastructure Projects (P&E)	200	
Cycling Team (P&E)	60	
Public Health		238
Children's Centres (P&C)	900	
Respite Beds (P&C)	217	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,652</b>	<b>238</b>

These amendments are permanent changes to the resources allocated within the Business Plan unless otherwise stated.

## Revised Overall Funding Position

	2018-19 £'000	2019-20 £'000	2020-21 £'000	2021-22 £'000	2022-23 £'000	Total £'000
<b>Total Saving Requirement</b>	<b>37,613</b>	<b>17,825</b>	<b>12,709</b>	<b>-4,516</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>64,132</b>
Identified Savings	-25,960	-11,189	-590	1,074*	2,539*	<b>-34,126</b>
Identified additional Income Generation	-11,653	-3,129	537*	-207	-19	<b>-14,471</b>
<b>Residual Savings to be identified</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-3,507</b>	<b>-12,656</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>-3,021</b>	<b>-15,535</b>

**\*Positive figures represent a reversal of short term savings/investments from previous years**

In light of the above the following amendment is proposed to the Recommendations:

## 6. Business Plan 2018-19 to 2022-23

Amendment from Councillor Joan Whitehead

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that Full Council:-

1. Approve the amended recommendations from General Purposes Committee made on the 23 January 2018 relating to the Business plan, specifically to:
  - a. Approve the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan **subject to the following:-**
    - i. Set the general council tax precept increase for 2018-19 to 2.99% and the Adult Social Care Precept at 2% as per b-d below.
    - ii. Balance the 2018-19 budget by use of additional council tax receipts.
    - iii. Allocate the additional funds raised from the increase in general council tax beyond those used to balance the 2018-19 budget to a smoothing reserve ~~fund the following investments:~~

Service	Additional Resource Allocation £000 18/19	Additional Resource Allocation £000 19/20
Street Lighting (P&E)	450	
Library Services (P&E)	325	
Looked After Children Services (P&C)	1,500	
Local Highways Infrastructure Projects (P&E)	200	
Cycling Team (P&E)	60	
Public Health		238
Children's Centres (P&C)	900	
Respite Beds (P&C)	217	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,652</b>	<b>238</b>

- b. Approve a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £807,480,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.3 of the Business Plan.
  - c. Approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £279,489,859.22, 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. Approve 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 (223,622.3), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2% ASC precept increase and a 2.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	£833.22
B	7/9	£972.09
C	8/9	£1,110.96
D	9/9	£1,249.83
E	11/9	£1,527.57
F	13/9	£1,805.31
G	15/9	£2,083.05
H	18/9	£2,499.66

- e. Note and approve 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 A).
- f. Approve the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan including capital expenditure in 2018-19 up to £254.7m arising from:
- Commitments from schemes already approved;
  - The consequences of new starts in 2018-19 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 6.9 of the Business Plan.
- g. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan, including:
- 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
  - The Affordable Borrowing Limit for 2018- 19 as required by the Local Government Act 2003)
  - The Investment Strategy for 2018-19 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.

2. Authorise the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the Business Plan so as to take into account any changes deemed appropriate resulting from the final Local Government Finance Settlement and updated Business Rates information, as set out in paragraph 2.9 of this report.

# CCC BUDGET AMENDMENT 2018-19

## POLITICAL PARTY LABOUR

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
TOTAL ADULT SOCIAL CARE PRECEPT INCREASE	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL GENERAL COUNCIL TAX INCREASE	2.99%	2.99%	2.99%	2.99%	2.99%
BUDGET GAP BEFORE AMENDMENTS	-	£11,958,000	£15,726,000	-£350,000	£6,509,000
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FROM COUNCIL TAX	-	-£2,807,000	-£3,070,000	-£3,299,000	-£3,488,000
FUNDS NOT ALLOCATED TO SMOOTHING RESERVE	-£3,652,000	-£5,882,000			
REVISED BUDGET GAP (SURPLUS)	-£3,652,000	£3,269,000	£12,656,000	-£3,649,000	£3,021,000
PLANNED USE OF SURPLUS					
INVESTMENT IN ADDITIONAL SERVICES	£3,652,000	£238,000			
FINALISED BUDGET POSITION RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL	£0	£3,507,000	£12,656,000	-£3,649,000	£3,021,000

COUNCIL BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET PROPOSALS CLLR WHITEHEAD AMENDMENT											Appendix F
COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ADEY D Apologies	LibD				X	JENKINS D	LibD	X			
D AMBROSE-SMITH	Con		X			JONES L	Lab	X			
BAILEY A	Con		X			JOSEPH L	Cons		X		
BATCHELOR H	LibD	X				KAVANAGH N	Lab	X			
BATES I C	Con		X			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD	X			
BODEN C	Con		X			KING S	Cons		X		
BRADNAM A	LibD	X				MANNING I	LibD	X			
BYWATER S	Con		X			MCGUIRE L W	Con		X		
CONNOR D	Con		X			MESCHINI E	Lab	X			
COSTELLO A	Con		X			NETHSINGHA L	LibD	X			
COUNT STEVE	Con		X			RAYNES P	Cons		X		
CRAWFORD S	Lab	X				REYNOLDS K	Con		X		
CRISWELL S J Apologies	Con				X	RICHARDS C	Lab	X			
CUFFLEY K	Cons		X			ROGERS T	Cons		X		
DOWNES P J	LibD	X				SANDERSON T	Ind	X			
DUPRE L	LibD	X				SCHUMANN J	Con		X		
EVERY L	Cons		X			SCUTT J	Lab	X			
FRENCH J	Cons		X			SHELLENS M	LibD	X			
FULLER R	Cons		X			SHUTER M	Con		X		
GARDENER I	Cons		X			SMITH M	Con		X		
GILES D	Ind			X		TAYLOR A	LibD	X			
GOWING J	Cons		X			TAYLOR S	Inde	X			
HARFORD L	Con		X			TIERNEY S	Cons		X		
HARRISON N	LibD	X				TOPPING P	Cons		X		
HAY A	Cons		X			VAN DE VEN S	LibD	X			
HICKFORD R	Con		X			WELLS D	Cons		X		
HOWELL M	Cons		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	Cons		X		
						WOTHERSPOON T	Cons		X		
						TOTAL					

COUNCIL’S BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET PROPOSALS 2018-23 – Motion Appendix G												
COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote		COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ADEY D	LibD				X		JENKINS D	LibD		X		
D AMBROSE-SMITH	Con	X					JONES L	Lab		X		
BAILEY A	Con	X					JOSEPH L	Cons	X			
BATCHELOR H	LibD		X				KAVANAGH N	Lab		X		
BATES I C	Con	X					KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		X		
BODEN C	Con	X					KING S	Cons	X			
BRADNAM A	LibD		X				MANNING I	LibD		X		
BYWATER S	Con	X					MCGUIRE L W	Con	X			
CONNOR D	Con	X					MESCHINI E	Lab		X		
COSTELLO A	Con	X					NETHSINGHA L	LibD	X			
COUNT S	Con	X					RAYNES P	Cons	X			
CRAWFORD S	Lab		X				REYNOLDS K	Con	X			
CRISWELL S	Con				X		RICHARDS C	Lab		X		
CUFFLEY K	Cons	X					ROGERS T	Cons	X			
DOWNES P J	LibD		X				SANDERSON T	Ind		X		
DUPRE L	LibD		X				SCHUMANN J	Con				X
EVERY L	Cons	X					SCUTT J	Lab		X		
FRENCH J	Cons	X					SHELLENS M	LibD		X		
FULLER R	Cons	X					SHUTER M	Con	X			
GARDENER I	Cons	X					SMITH M	Con	X			
GILES D	Ind				X		TAYLOR A	LibD		X		
GOWING J	Cons	X					TAYLOR S	Inde		X		
HARFORD L	Con	X					TIERNEY S	Cons	X			
HARRISON N	LibD		X				TOPPING P	Cons	X			
HAY A	Cons	X					VAN DE VEN S	LibD		X		
HICKFORD R	Con	X					WELLS D	Cons		X		
HOWELL M	Cons	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	Cons	X			
							WOTHERSPOON T	Cons	X			
							TOTAL VOTING	57				
							For	34				
							Against	23				

## **APPENDIX H**

### **COUNTY COUNCIL – 6TH FEBRUARY 2018**

### **CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.1**

#### **Questions to the Council's Appointee on the Combined Authority – Councillor Steve Count**

##### **Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven**

*[Reference – page 299 of the Council agenda]*

1. Looking ahead at the Greater Cambridgeshire Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership and steps to align its responsibilities with the work of the Combined Authority, how will the Leader ensure that the LEP's geographic remit (including financial support) for strategic cross-county border transport infrastructure is addressed by the Combined Authority? Thanks.

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

I don't appear to have received a written response for this question.

##### **Chair**

Based on that, can we get a written response over to you?

##### **Councillor Count**

My sincere apologies. It's somehow fallen through the cracks or I've simply let the paperwork – I will get a written response to you and I will circulate that written response to the council. My sincere apologies for this.

##### **Councillor van de Ven**

If there is a simple answer I am happy to receive it.

##### **Councillor Count**

Yeah, what worries me about . . . I am involved in the LEP that is being wound down. I'm involved in the combined authority. I'm also privy and have previously been on the GECP so I'm aware of all the bodies that are involved and the difficulties about this and I'm worried that if I stray from . . . a script on this one it may set hares running that I wouldn't want . . . I am deeply sorry that this isn't prepared and in front of me yet at the moment, I'd rather not give you a verbal response at this point in time (*be*)cause it's not here. I will certainly give you that and I will circulate it to the council. My apologies.

##### **Question from Councillor Nichola Harrison**

*[Reference – Agenda Item No.2.1 of the Combined Authority 31 January 2018 agenda]*

2. . . . it seems to me, as I believe it does to a lot of people over on this side, that we're not as an opposition seen to be incredibly Cambridge focused. I've always ever since I was first elected, even as a City Councillor, always taken the view that our County is one community and that we must stick up for each other. We must work together to make the lives better for

everybody and I notice that Councillor Scutt made this point earlier and I do so wholeheartedly agree with her and it does distress me when I hear comments like from Councillor Hickford about 'this not being a Cambridge budget' or something, as though there's some kind of getting at Cambridge on the Conservative benches. I do hope not. I really, really do hope not. It is not how we see the world and I do hope that the Conservatives don't see it like that either. I say that now because . . . I'm asking a question about the Greater Cambridge Partnership' I suppose that is a Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire focused area. This is not I hope a parochial question, but it is an important one. So my question is, the Cam Metro scheme has emerged from a study jointly commissioned by the Combined Authority and the Greater Cambridge Partnership and yet a report to the Combined Authority Board about the scheme states: 'The Combined Authority as the strategic transport authority for the area will be responsible for the next and future phases of the project'. So could Councillor Count please explain the Greater Cambridge Partnership's future role in the project?

### **Response from Councillor Count**

The Combined Authority recognises that the Greater Cambridge Partnership has been promoting and developing public transport corridors across a number of schemes which broadly align with the indicative Metro routes. As a result, the following amendment to the Mass Transport Board paper was approved by the Combined Authority Board: And that is, quote, I will circulate afterwards by the way, 'The Combined Authority agree to liaise with the Greater Cambridge Partnership to ensure Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP's) current and future plans for high quality public transport corridors are consistent and readily adaptable to the emerging proposition for a CAM Metro network.' Unquote. The specific nature of this interaction has not yet been confirmed but over the coming months there will be discussions with the GCP leadership to determine what their relationship with the project will be. However, as clearly stated in the report, as the Strategic Transport Planning Authority, the Combined Authority will be leading the CAM Metro project and making all the key decisions.

### **Supplementary Question from Councillor Harrison**

I would like to really. I would just like to, I suppose in a way, to mark this moment because I think it is a significant moment. I think about six months ago I asked the Leader of the Council whether or not the Greater Cambridge Partnership was likely to retain, I think I used the word autonomy or control, over the City Deal budget and decision making process and I think he struggled perhaps to give me a straightforward answer, because at the time, he explained to me that structural decisions were being made and so on. But at that time my question certainly was focused on the notion that the Greater Cambridge Partnership was a body which has been given money and powers by the Government and ought to be left, you know, to deliver on that. We have now moved a very long way away from that. That may be something that was always inevitable, but I think it is important that we recognise it. Because certainly for South Cambridgeshire and the City and you know actually the areas that - anybody really who comes within the ambit of Cambridge and that includes most of our population I suppose at some point or other – for anybody concerned, the Greater Cambridge Partnership, the City Deal is an incredibly important project that could, you know, it stands the chance to transform not just our transport system but our society and economy and environment along with it, so it is really, really important. And I think the fact is that this passing of power over to the Combined Authority in this respect is something that we need to note, because we need to make sure that however the Combined Authority does propose to develop these plans in the future, and that in fact, it is consistent not just that the GCP's plans are consistent with it, but that it is consistent with the GCP's plans.

### **Response from Councillor Count**

I have nothing to add as this is a statement.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 6<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2018**  
**WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

**1. Question from Councillor Anna Bradnam**

In July 2017 China and Hong Kong announced a clampdown on ‘foreign garbage’, that is, they have imposed very tight contamination standards on 24 categories of imported waste, especially paper and plastic. As the UK has exported more than 2.7 million tonnes of waste plastic to China and Hong Kong since 2012, please let us know:

What effect, if any, will the loss of this market have on the County Council’s waste disposal process and budget and, if there will be an effect, what practical changes might this necessitate in the service in future?

**Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter**  
**Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

The vast majority of paper and plastic separated for recycling arise through kerbside collections which are undertaken by the City and District Councils and not the County Council which is the waste disposal authority. The District and City Councils have a contract to separate out dry recyclables and arrange onward recycling. The principal impact of changes to the global market place will therefore be dependent on the specific contractual arrangements those Councils have with their contractor.

Plastic and paper is also collected for recycling at the Household Recycling Centres in Cambridgeshire, which are part of the County Council’s Waste PFI Contract. The contractor is responsible for recycling some plastic and paper separated at the Household Recycling Centres. An additional service for recycling hard plastics has also been added since the contract was let. The arrangement is that the contractor takes on the risk of variations in global prices with an expected income already factored into the contract price for the recyclable materials that were originally specified. For these materials, therefore, there is no impact on the County Council. However, in the case of the hard plastics, the County Council bears the risk of price fluctuations for recycling. With the changes in material being accepted by China, this material has seen an increase in the price of disposal and this is feeding through to the County Council. At present the expected impact is approximately £40k in a full financial year. We are working closely with Amey our contractor to find the most appropriate and cost effective markets and means of disposal of this material to minimise this impact.

**2. Question from Councillor Tom Sanderson**

The proposed pedestrian crossing in Hartford Road, Huntingdon has been delayed for several months. It’s required to aid users of the Saxongate learning centre cross this busy road safely, many of whom are wheelchair users.

What is the reason for the continued delays and when will the crossing be fully operational?

**Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter**  
**Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

I understand Cllr Sanderson's concerns about getting this crossing completed and on his final point, am pleased to report that the proposed zebra crossing at High St/Hartford Rd, Huntingdon is nearing completion and should be operational in week commencing 12<sup>th</sup> February.

There are a number of reasons for the delay in completing the scheme but I can assure Cllr Sanderson that throughout that time, the County Council team has been working hard to have it operating as soon as possible.

Although the resurfacing of the road on Saxongate and St Mary's Street, in preparation for the crossing, was completed quickly along with changes to the footway layout, there have been a number of reasons for the time it has taken to complete the crossing.

The impact on the nearby Grade II listed building needed to be considered, following concerns raised by the District Council's conservation team and it required subsequent approval to proceed by the Town Council. The Council's contractor Skanska also had a shortage of design engineers for a period of time that delayed the programme. This has now been rectified. Added to this, there were also delays from the supplier of the new lighting columns and beacons, required for the safe operation of the crossing and UK Power Networks, who own and maintain the electricity cables and lines in this region, did not have resources available to connect them to a power supply when required.

I appreciate how frustrating the delays have been and can assure Cllr Sanderson that we continue to push our suppliers hard to complete work quickly and will ensure that any lessons that can be learnt from this experience will be.

**3. Question from Councillor David Jenkins**

The budget for Local Infrastructure and Improvement for 2018/19 is £5124 thousand.

Can the Chair of Highways & Community Infrastructure please advise the budgets and outturns for the years 2013/14 to 2017/18 on the same basis?

**Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter**  
**Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

My understanding of the budget that Cllr Jenkins is seeking confirmation on is the revenue budget for Local Infrastructure & Streets and the maintenance of the highway network. The table below shows the budget and spend for each year from 2013/14 through to 2017/18:

Local Infrastructure & Streets	Gross Budget 2018-19 £000s	Fees, Charges & Ring-fenced Grants £000s	Net Budget £000s	Actual expenditure for year	Forecast as at 311218	Expenditure to date as at 311218
2013/14	£6,686	-	£6,686	£7,140		
2014/15	£4,928	-	£4,928	£5,048		
2015/16	£4,237	-	£4,237	£4,418		
2016/17	£3,448	-	£3,448	£3,534		

2017/18	£5,414 (Incl £2,650 investment from Transformation fund)	-	£5,414		£5,463	£4,207
2018/19	£5,377	-£231	£5,146			

#### **4. Question from Councillor Nichola Harrison**

Does Cllr Shuter agree with me that the quality of many pothole repairs and other road surfacing works carried out by Skanska under the council's highways contract is unsatisfactory and, if so, what is he doing about it?

#### **Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter** **Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

The quality of workmanship across the highway network is one of the key areas of focus for Cambridgeshire Highways. Last year 38,000 potholes were repaired across the county and the vast majority of these repairs were carried out to a high standard. We work closely with Skanska and the supply chain to ensure that all work is of an acceptable standard and that this standard is applied consistently across Cambridgeshire.

I am aware that there are some instances where standards of work are not as we would expect and I am committed to minimising that. We are working hard with the contractor to ensure that all work is done well and I can ensure you that Skanska is committed to that too. When we become aware of work below the standard we would expect, we investigate it and it will be rectified. For instance last summer, there was a period of high temperature and a number of recently surface dressed roads deteriorated. These were all addressed by Skanska and their supply chain in a timely and efficient manner and at no cost to the authority.

To improve the overall quality of pothole repairs, in conjunction with Skanska, we have also just launched a new version of the Dragon Patcher, which since the start of the year has repaired 1700 potholes. Nicknamed the 'dragon' because it fires out flames to dry out the road surface. It is then cleaned with compressed air and sealed with a stone mix and hot bitumen. This is much quicker and simpler compared to traditional methods. It is much more efficient, as it can repair up to 150 potholes a day, is faster and quieter than traditional methods and ensures a consistently acceptable standard to all repairs.

All of this said, if there are areas of repair that Cllr Harrison or any other Member feels have not been completed correctly, please let the team know and it will be looked into.

#### **5. Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven**

Given assurances set out in the Children's Centre consultation response that families should continue to receive the services and support they need, perhaps in an even better way than before, how exactly will provision be made in each area where a current children's centre is to be 're-designated' from 1 April 2018? Please provide specific information for each case.

#### **Response from Councillor Simon Bywater** **Chairman of Children and Young People Committee**

As we presented in the response document to full council in October we will maintain the current level of expenditure on frontline delivery and we are pleased to confirm that there is no reduction

in the numbers of frontline staff delivering services direct to families. As a result of this continued commitment to maintaining the investment in frontline staff, the volume of services available to families will also be protected.

Officers are currently finalising the district based offer to be communicated to families later this month and an update paper will be taken to Children and Young People's committee in March where this restructure and new service offer will be monitored. There are still a number of details to be confirmed over the next couple of coming weeks so we are not in a position to offer exact details at this point as we are keen to communicate the new programme once finalised to families to minimise any confusion in communities.

The new programmes will offer a large amount of continuity with successful activities continuing across all districts. This will be complemented by a range of new activities, designed to meet the changing needs across the county and delivered in locations that take services into communities previously not served by a Children's Centre.

**6. Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven**

What has been the total cost of preparing options for and carrying out the Children's Centre Services consultation?

**Response from Councillor Simon Bywater**  
**Chairman of Children and Young People Committee**

The total cost for preparing options for and carrying out a Children's Centre services consultation was £5368. There were no additional staffing costs as this formed part of officers' current roles.

This was made up of costs for the design, printing and distribution of the consultation document and survey of £3831, venue hire for engagement workshops with partners and staff of £1447, and social media countywide advertising of £90.