

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Please note the full meeting can be viewed on YouTube at the following link:

<https://tinyurl.com/FullCouncil20March2018>

Date: Tuesday, 20th March 2018

Time: 10.30 am – 4.45 pm

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, A Costello, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell K Cuffley, P Downes, L Dupre, L Every, J French, R Fuller, I Gardener, J Gowing, L Harford, N Harrison, A Hay, R Hickford, M Howell, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, L Jones, 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, D Connor, D Giles and L Joseph

66. MINUTES – 6TH FEBRUARY 2018

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 6th February 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

67. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

68. 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 agenda Item 10e) Motion from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha.

Councillor Scutt declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute No.72 on the basis that the sale of Shire Hall might impact on the public access from one side of the city to the other, which she used.

Councillor Shuter declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute No.75(g) as a local governor / director of a school academy.

69. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

70. PETITIONS

One petition was presented by a member of the public. **Appendix C** sets out the text of the petition and the presenter's speech introducing it.

71. PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2018/19 AND GENDER PAY GAP REPORTING

It was moved by the Chairman of Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Schumann, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hudson, that the recommendation from the Staffing and Appeals Committee, as set out in the report be approved.

In response to a query regarding the date for the Chief Executive to report back on the review of factors impacting on the Gender Pay Gap, the Chairman, Councillor Schumann, confirmed that the Chief Executive would be bringing a report to Staffing and Appeals Committee but an exact date had not yet been set. He undertook to inform Councillor Scutt of the date, when known.

It was resolved unanimously:

to approve the Chief Officer Pay Policy Statement 2018/19 (Appendix 1) including the pay multiple and the Gender Pay Gap Report 2018 (Appendix 3).

72. SHIRE HALL AND CAMBS 2020

It was moved by the Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee, Councillor Schumann, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Hay, that the recommendations from the Commercial and Investment Committee, as set in the report be approved.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Amanda Taylor and seconded by Councillor Nethsingha (Additions in bold and deletions in strikethrough):

It is recommended that the Council:-

- a. Endorses the locality and partnership based approach upon which the model is based;
- b. Endorses the decision of the Commercial and Investments Committee to remove the 'do nothing' option' with regards to the Council's future development of its headquarters and locality model
- c. Confirms that the Council will retain a presence in Cambridge and that the public access to the site and its ancient monument status will be protected and;
- d. Authorises the Commercial and Investment Committee to take **forward the plans for moving to a new site, bringing back the final decision on a location to Full Council when full business cases for the options have been looked at in detail.** ~~all decisions necessary, or incidental, to the selection and delivery of a Hub and Spoke configuration model for the County Council.~~
- e. **In preparing the business cases, and designing the new hub it should be assumed that meetings of the Council will rotate around Cambridgeshire, to ensure that members of the public across the**

County have access to public meetings in a variety of locations which have good public transport links. Proposals for this should be presented to Full Council alongside the final decision on location.

The Chairman indicated that following the debate a separate vote would be taken on the amendment to item d, and the additional recommendation e).

During the debate, the Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee invited any member of the Council to attend the Committee when the final report on the re-location of Shire Hall was considered.

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

[Voting pattern: Thirteen Liberal Democrats and Independents in favour; Conservatives and five Labour against; one Liberal Democrat and one Labour abstained]

Following further discussion, the amendment on the additional recommendation e) on being put to the vote was lost.

[Voting pattern: Thirteen Liberal Democrats and one Independent in favour; Conservatives, five Labour and one Independent against; one Liberal Democrat and two Labour abstained]

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

It was resolved to:

- a) Endorse the locality and partnership based approach upon which the model was based;
- b) Endorse the decision of the Commercial and Investment Committee to remove the 'do nothing' option' with regards to the Council's future development of its headquarters and locality model
- c) Confirm that the Council would retain a presence in Cambridge and that the public access to the site and its ancient monument status would be protected and;
- d) Authorise the Commercial and Investment Committee to take all decisions necessary, or incidental, to the selection and delivery of a Hub and Spoke configuration model for the County Council.

[Voting pattern: Thirty two Conservatives in favour; twelve Liberal Democrats, seven Labour, one Conservative and one Independent against; one Conservative, two Liberal Democrats and one Independent abstained]

73. REPORT OF THEE CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

a) Changes to the LGSS Scheme of Delegation

It was moved by the Chairman of Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor McGuire, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Reynolds, that the recommendations from the Constitution and Ethics Committee, as set out in the

report be approved.

It was resolved by to:

- a) approve the following amendments to the Council's Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee:
 - i) the revised Scheme of Delegation to Officers, Constitution Part 3D, attached as Appendix A
 - ii) the revised Article 11, Officers, attached as Appendix B
 - iii) the revised Part 7, Management Structure, attached as Appendix D
- b) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

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

b) County Council – Proposed Changes to the Constitution

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

It was resolved to:

- a) approve the following amendments to the Council's Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee:
 - i) that the Terms of Reference of the Adults Committee be amended to include safeguarding and mental health services in the list of social care services, relating to the delivery of which the Committee had delegated authority to exercise the Council's functions, as set out in Appendix 1.
 - ii) that the Terms of Reference of the Children and Young People Committee be amended to include safeguarding and mental health services in the list of services relating to children and young people, relating to the delivery of which the Committee had delegated authority to exercise the Council's functions, as set out in Appendix 2.
 - iii) that the Terms of Reference of the Economy and Environment Committee be amended to reflect the structure of the Place and Economy Directorate, as set out in Appendix 3.
 - iv) that the Terms of Reference of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee be amended to reflect the structure of the Place and Economy Directorate, as set out in Appendix 4.

- v) that the terms of reference for the Communities and Partnership Committee be amended to give that Committee responsibility for exercising all the Council's functions in respect of all areas covering Adult Careers Information and Guidance, Adult Skills, Learning Services and Community Learning, as set out in Appendix 5.
- b) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Labour, Independents and two Liberal Democrats in favour; twelve Liberal Democrats abstained]

74. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority – Overview and Scrutiny Committee

It was moved by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Vice Chairman, Councillor McGuire, and resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

To approve the change of membership on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee to appoint Councillor David Connor to replace Councillor Jan French.

75. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

a) Motion from Councillor Henry Batchelor

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Batchelor and seconded by Councillor Amanda Taylor:

This council recognised that in the 21st century fast and reliable access to the internet is vital. People who do not have access to the internet are not only cut off from many key services, such as banking, looking for work or learning new skills, but also from access to social interaction.

This council recognises that libraries have a key role to play in ensuring everyone has access to the internet, by providing computers and Wi-Fi.

This council believes that this service should be available to all residents and that no one should be excluded from accessing the internet by poverty. For this reason this council believes internet access in libraries should be free to all Cambridgeshire residents.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats, Labour and Independent in favour; Conservatives against.]

b) Motion from Councillor Anna Bailey

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Bailey and seconded by

Councillor Hunt:

UK Power Networks (UKPN) owns and is exclusively responsible for the maintenance and upgrading of the electricity infrastructure and supply network across London, the South East and the East of England.

This Council relies on the services of UKPN to deliver and connect power to new infrastructure projects across Cambridgeshire. The performance of UKPN in delivering its services is critical to the Council's ability to deliver projects in a timely and efficient manner and can either enhance or damage the Council's reputation.

This Council has concerns about the performance of UKPN, illustrated by the following three examples:

- 1) In early June 2016 the Council sought an estimate from UKPN to divert a major power line which was necessary to deliver the Ely bypass project. UKPN was slow to respond, were reluctant to engage and provide estimates until payment had been made and took until March 2017 to begin to work more collaboratively with the Council. This caused a three month delay to the project schedule, and a consequential increase in costs. This Council believes that if UKPN had engaged with the Council and Network Rail sooner, this delay would have been avoided.
- 2) In August 2016 the Council undertook night time resurfacing of Cambridge Road in Ely, a project which had been deliberately delayed by some 18 months in order to ensure any and all works that would require excavation had been carried out in advance. It was known before the resurfacing works were undertaken that a large developer would soon require a new high capacity power connection from Witchford Road to the Ely prime site at the end of Cambridge Road.

UKPN supplied drawings to the developer confirming that the necessary ducting for the new connection was available beneath the road surface.

Only two months after completion of the resurfacing, the drawings were found to be incorrect, resulting in the new road surface having to be re-excavated along a substantial length to accommodate the additional duct and new connection. This caused unnecessary and substantial cost to the developer, extreme annoyance and inconvenience to local residents and reputational damage to the Council which required considerable management time and resource from the local Councillor, and the Council's management and communications teams.

- 3) A light controlled pedestrian crossing was installed before the end of November 2017 by the Council in Hop Row, Haddenham on the A1123, a facility that had been much anticipated by local residents, being the result of a bid to the Local Highways Initiative scheme. UKPN took **until mid-**February 2018, some ten weeks later, to connect the power supply allowing the crossing to finally be operational. Despite officers and local Councillors determined efforts to get UKPN to connect the power in a timely fashion, UKPN made false promises and gave apparently unfounded reasons for not carrying out the work.

This Council has concerns about the performance of UKPN, illustrated by the examples above, which are by no means an exhaustive list, and therefore

instructs the Chief Executive to write to UKPN requesting investigation of the above examples and confirmation of measures they will take to improve its service to the Council in the future.

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

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

c) Motion from Councillor Jocelynn Scutt

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Scutt and seconded by Councillor Richards:

Libraries have suffered disproportionately in cuts and in 2016-2017 a cut of £325k was covered by removal of the Book Fund. The Book Fund is now restored, however, the cut of £325k remains. A Working Party was established by the Chair of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee to devise sources of revenue from library facilities and sources. Originally comprising Conservative members only, it extended its membership to Liberal Democrat, Labour and Independents so that all views could be sought.

Proposals endorsed by a majority of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee include some that can be supported generally – not to make up for a shortfall in library services funding (which should come from general County revenue and, if necessary, reserves) but to provide revenue add to a properly resourced library budget:

- A rise in room and facilities' letting fees, with 'different rates for different types of organisations' - commercial and profit organisations should pay commercial rates for room hire;
- Donation boxes – placed prominently to encourage giving;
- Charging groups for use – for example, Language Schools which benefit from facilities (particularly the Central Library) which they do not provide, albeit charging their students and should contribute to the public purse as they run commercial enterprises;
- Rise in fees and charges – all by 2.2% for inflation, with commercial letting rate increased by 25% across all libraries except community or partner lettings will increase by 2.2% only.

Some proposals need careful monitoring:

- Higher charges for events – including author talks and arts events – charges must be set at levels that do not preclude community participation and that accommodate to persons who are unemployed or at financial disadvantage;
- Co-location of public services – creation of 'hubs' generating income and 'meeting people's needs more effectively': co-location should not be endorsed where this means Children's Centres are placed in libraries as was proposed for Cherry Hinton Library (a proposal now it seems reversed) and Central Library, nor where staff are required to take on roles properly filled by professionals qualified in a particular field – for example, elderly medical care such as required by persons suffering from dementia or Alzheimers.

Some proposals are detrimental to the library service and to the community our libraries serve:

- 'Library Extra' or 'premium membership' scheme providing 'access to a range of value-added special membership benefits, for example 'premium member receptions' - draws invidious distinctions between the 'haves' and the 'have nots': already Cambridge is recognised as the most unequal city in the nation, and Cambridgeshire (as well as Cambridge) has areas of real deprivation;
- Charging for computer access - £1 per hour for computer use by all 18 and over, after an initial free half hour use albeit Universal Credit applications and Cambridgeshire County Council online transactions will be carried out free of charge – this does not overcome the fact that this is antithetical to the whole purpose of libraries and runs against the County's responsibility to residents.

The County Council therefore:

1. Determines that a sum of £325k be allocated to the Libraries budget from the smoothing reserve or transformation fund to support the Library Service in the 2018-2019 financial year.
2. Requests the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee to revisit its decision of 13 February with a view to reversing it insofar as it seeks to establish distinctions between library users on the basis of income – in particular the 'premium membership' scheme and charging for computer/internet use, and integration of any services placing burdens upon staff that they are not trained to serve.

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

[Voting pattern: Labour, two Liberal Democrats and one Independent in favour; Conservatives, three Liberal Democrats and one Independent against; seven Liberal Democrats abstained]

d) Motion from Councillor Joan Whitehead

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Whitehead and seconded by Councillor Richards:

Council notes with considerable regret that the Schools Forum have endorsed the decision by Primary Schools to cease funding the Cambridgeshire Race, Equality and Diversity Service (CREDS) from the dedicated schools funding block. This is particularly regrettable as the Primary Offer contributed 95% of CREDS funding

CREDS, however, do far more than provide a service for Primary Schools specifically:-

CREDS works with schools, settings, parents/carers, communities and partners to support the raising of the educational achievement of:

1. Black, Minority Ethnic (BME) children and young people;
2. Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) children and young people
3. Children with English as an additional language (EAL)
4. Refugee children and young people

CREDS also works to ensure the rights of children and young people who fall within the statutory protected characteristics, including:

1. Those who identify as lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB), gender questioning or transgender;
2. Those with special educational needs (SEN) and/or disabilities.

Prejudice-related incidents can occur at any time in any school and the service is frequently requested to support with such cases. So CREDS supports and has a lead role on behalf of the Council in a variety of areas such as Equalities and Diversity Awareness, Prejudice Related Incident Data Entry (PRIDE) and partnership working with other agencies.

Currently the County Council contributes £20,000 to the CREDS budget. The Labour group believe that it is vitally important further funding is found from the Council's budget to allow CREDS to continue to work on behalf of the Council to provide these vital services for vulnerable members of the school community.

The County Council therefore agrees to allocate additional funding from the smoothing reserve to support the CREDS service.

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

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

e) Motion from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha

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

This Council notes:

- the decision taken by the Commercial and Investment Committee to close the traded service which provides school meals to children across Cambridgeshire.
- that the current system of provision ensures that children in schools across Cambridgeshire have a guarantee that a school meal of good quality is available to any school child across the County for a similar price.
- that given its remit, the Commercial and Investment Committee is interested in the commercial aspects of the school meals business.
- that school meals are particularly important for those children in the lowest income families, as they receive free meals at school.

This Council believes:

- that good quality school meals are important in supporting Cambridgeshire's children to make the best educational progress.
- that the provision of good quality school meals is an important part of promoting good healthy eating habits, an issue which is being given increasing importance by Public Health England, who are expressing growing concern about obesity in young people.

- that the provision of good quality school meals at a fair price is an important part of ensuring equality of health outcomes across Cambridgeshire.

This Council therefore asks that the decision to close the service providing school meals is reviewed by a task and finish group made up of members of the Children and Young People and Health Committees, as well as members of the Commercial and Investment Committee so that these issues can be taken into account before a decision to close the service is taken.

In discussion, Councillor Schumann made reference to views expressed by Councillor Nethsingha in a private session of Commercial and Investment Committee, which she asked him to withdraw as being inappropriate to raise in a public meeting of Council. Councillor Schumann refused to withdraw the comments, and as a result, Councillor Nethsingha requested that reference be made in the minutes.

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

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

f) Motion from Councillor Lorna Dupre

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

This Council currently notes the proposals for the future of Cambridge Magistrates Court, including the closure of the building with its work being relocated to existing courts in Cambridge, Huntingdon and Peterborough.

This Council also notes the current consultation being undertaken to find out the public's views on the proposals.

This Council objects to the proposals to close Cambridge Magistrates Court for the following reasons:

- (i) that residents from the Cambridge and South and East Cambridgeshire areas could be forced to travel to Peterborough or Huntingdon to attend a hearing as participants in court proceedings;
- (ii) that the proposals dilute the sense of place and mutual community responsibility which is valuable in underpinning the most local level of the justice system; and
- (iii) that the impact assessment in relation to the proposals is flawed as it fails to monetise the costs to be imposed on court users.

This Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to the responsible minister, Lucy Frazer, MP setting out the Council's objections to the proposals.

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

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

g) Motion from Councillor Sandra Crawford

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Crawford and seconded by Councillor Bywater. The motion included alterations from the version included on the agenda and were agreed by the meeting without discussion. (**Appendix D** sets out the changes to the original motion included on the agenda)

The Council notes:

- the Innovation Trust are planning to academise the Spinney school along with two others; the Mayfield and the Fulbourn School. The Berwick Bridge School is also being encouraged to become an academy
- Parents, teachers, school governors and other campaigners do not understand the process and they do not feel that the consultations are either long enough, or that they give a thorough and balanced view of all of the risks, as well as any perceived benefits.

The Council believes:

- That fair consultations must be carried out. Parents, teachers and councillors must be made aware of the risks, and given much longer consultation meetings, and given the full facts, and all of the known risks, and encouraged to be involved in the decision making process.

The Council is recommended to:-

- 1) use its good offices to urge the governing bodies to engage parents, teachers and councillors at the earliest stages and have a better range of opinions present at the consultations to ensure that the informed consent of parents, councillors and teachers is obtained.
- 2) ask the Executive Director People and Communities to develop an advice paper for schools which are considering changing their status. The paper will include our recommended approach to consultation including timing (i.e. before the academy order is sought), the duration of the consultation and what information should be shared with parents. This will, however, only be advice as ultimately, the decision to become an academy rests with the governing body.

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

h) Motion from Councillor David Jenkins

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

Council notes that:

- Both revenue and capital spend on highways maintenance has declined in recent years;

- Capital spend on 'infrastructure management and operations' is largely funded from a loan which will reduce to zero in 2022/23; and
- Revenue spend on 'local infrastructure maintenance and improvement' is significantly grant funded with no guarantee of continuing availability.

It furthermore notes that:

- Highway conditions as measured by annual surveys have slowly but steadily declined in recent years; and
- There's a general impression that pothole incidence is increasing.

Council recognises that roads in poor condition:

- can be unsafe and can cause vehicle damage; and
- are a poor advertisement for a county which is supposed to be an national economic driver.

Council therefore call upon the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee to:

- determine what investment would be needed in order to improve road conditions to a level whereby ongoing repairs are reduced
- secure such investment and associated resources to be able to carry it though
- budget for a level of revenue spend which ensures that the investment can be supported.

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

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

Councillor Amanda Taylor requested that she be recorded as being in favour of the motion having not recorded her vote by the time the electronic vote closed.

76. QUESTIONS:

(a) CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – ORAL QUESTIONS

No questions were received by the deadline under Council Procedure 9.1. of the Council's Constitution.

(b)) QUESTIONS ON FIRE AUTHORITY ISSUES

The Chairman of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority was asked to provide an oral or written update on the Home Office announcement on the Police and Crime Commissioner's business case. In response, Councillor Reynolds indicated that there was no update to paragraph 2.1 of the report.

(c) Written Questions

Four written questions were submitted under Council Procedure 9.2 as set out in **Appendix E**.

Chairman

Appendix A

COUNTY COUNCIL – 20TH MARCH 2018 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

PEOPLE

Professor Stephen Hawking

The Council was saddened by the passing of Professor Stephen Hawking on 14 March. Professor Hawking achieved so much despite a decades-long battle with motor neurone disease, with which he was diagnosed while a student, and eventually led to him being confined to a wheelchair and to communicating via his instantly recognisable computerised voice. Whilst recognised by the world as one of the most important scientists to contribute to our understanding of the universe, he will equally be remembered for his determination in battling with his condition, which made him a champion for those with a disability around the world. The Council's thoughts are with his family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

The meeting stood in silence for a period of time as a mark of respect.

MESSAGES

Northamptonshire County Council

It was highlighted that Councillors had received a briefing provided to Northamptonshire County Council Councillors by Sarah Homer, the interim LGSS Managing Director.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 20th MARCH 2018**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
1.	Louise Crook Cambridgeshire resident, parent, teacher and employee of Cambridgeshire County Council	Councillor Simon Bywater Chairman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee	The County affirms the value of the Cambridgeshire Race, Equality and Diversity Service (CREDS) and has no criticism of the service. Why then in light of the current political climate of negative attitudes towards immigration and refugees and an increase in hate crime, withdraw support and funding, when schools are a key element/part of the community. Where such a programme is required, could the Leader of the County Council please explain how the County Council will secure the financial backing of the need for equality and diversity services in our county?
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Simon Bywater Chairman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee	Louise Crook Cambridgeshire resident, parent, teacher and employee of Cambridgeshire County Council	As the questioner was not present and as there was a motion on the subject later on in the agenda, the Chairman moved on and invited the second question.
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
2.	Ms Nicky Massey Cambridge Resident	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	My name is Nicky Massey and I'm a parent and campaigner in Cambridge City. I have campaigned on many issues including improving disability access, the cuts to our Children's Centres and Early Years funding, and pedestrian and cyclist safety to name a few. It gets frustrating to hear time and time again that there is a lack of funding and there is nothing more the County Council can do to help. Our roads, for example, are in such a bad shape, crumbling away with more pot holes than road, due to funding cuts from Central Government, and our pavements are a hazard to all, especially to disabled people and the elderly. Decisions have had to be made such as lowering our lights across the County to save money due to budget costs, adding

			<p>costs to our library services, and watching while our severely underfunded Early Years Education Centres are falling into financial trouble; having to make decisions such as increasing rates, that will mean that lower income families are hit even harder. I have yet to hear when this Council has asked for more urgent funding from Central Government to be able to properly manage this Council Instead of trying to prop it up.</p> <p>At the last County Council meeting on 6th February it was decided that our Council Tax will raise a total of 4.99%, raising £7.5million, to help plug a £4.3million hole in the County Council budget. The remaining £3.2 million will be put into a smoothing reserve.</p> <p>Would Councillor Count agree that by doing so, while at the same time making so called savings by cutting our Children's Centres, putting a charge on the Library computers which will only affect the vulnerable and those in need, at the same time as having huge holes in our roads and in Abbey Ward in particular, holes in on our pavements, making them unsafe for pedestrians. In addition to the fact that our street lighting, especially in Abbey Ward, has been cut back and is so poor that it encourages anti-social behaviour, would you agree that saving for a rainy day when it is already pouring, is a bad and negligent plan?</p>
	Response from: Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	Response to: Ms Nicky Massey Cambridge Resident	Response
			<p>Full Council agreed to put £3.7million into a specific fund (the smoothing reserve). Substantial gaps have been projected over the following four years of the plan, based on latest information on budget pressures, particularly in adult and children services, and the outcome of the provisional local government finance settlement. A total of £106million in new savings over the five year term are needed, with significant concerns about how to achieve the £12million and £22million in unidentified savings still to be planned for 2019/20 and 2020/21.</p> <p>Although the Business Plan has assumed a level of demographic growth for the services provided by the County Council, the level of demand seen over the last 12 months has been unprecedented. If this level of additional demand is repeated again in 2018/19 the base funding will simply be insufficient, for example, referrals from Addenbrooke's Hospital to social care have risen from 100 to 150 a week in the last few months.</p>

			<p>The £1 hourly charge for computer use in libraries is only charged after an initial half hour free. And people who have a genuine need will continue to access the service for free at all times, which includes children up to the age of 18 and those completing essential online forms such as on gov.uk sites, universal credit applications or County Council online transactions. Councillors will be reviewing the arrangement in September to see how it is working, and identify if changes need to be made.</p> <p>Our budget process includes contingency planning and planning for the medium term. We are not saving for a rainy day as you put it, we are evaluating the information we have now and making considered and competent financial planning using a factual basis.</p>
	Supplementary question from:	To:	
	Ms Nicky Massey, Cambridge Resident	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	<p>Yesterday, in Parliament, MP Daniel Zeichner asked Ministers for more funding for Early Years Education, and cited the example of 'The Fields Nursery' in Abbey. The answer given was that Early Years Education is flourishing and further funds is not required. Is that this Council's view?</p> <p>The decision to cut funds to our Children's Centres has had an impact to some of the centres that have a Nursery and Day Care provision such as 'The Fields' in Abbey Ward. We have been told that extra funding is not available and while I'm working very closely with The Fields, trying to find other funding resources before time runs out, I ask, as there is an extra pot of money that the County Council will hold, can 'The Fields' have some of the Reserve funding to put back some of the cuts that have been made to the Children's Centres, and to be able to allow them to continue their excellent nursery school facilities and childcare, without having to reduce their staffing levels, which would reduce the amount of children that they can take, and without having to increase prices such that the least well-off families will find it even harder to work full-time?</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	Ms Nicky Massey Cambridge Resident	<p>Yes, thank you, I can't comment on what was said in the House yesterday, I don't have access to the full information or been able to look at that, but I certainly can comment on the Children's Centre changes. When these Children's Centres changes were put in front of us, there were some very considered and</p>

			<p>deliberate actions about delivering these services to those most in need. Now we had a service that was built about historic location of buildings, but we wanted to increase the outreach model to those that are in need, rather than just having an excellent service where our buildings are located. That plan is being transitioned at the moment, it's an excellent plan, a plan that I believe in, there will be some differences across the County, but it is very much in line with what we have in mind. Now the savings that you refer to are not cuts to the services being offered to the children, but actually savings made from the buildings costs and from the management costs and the back office, so there have been no cuts on the front line, in fact there have been increase in the front line, so no, I cannot ask this Council to dip into the Smoothing Reserve for what is actually a positive reasonable change in the services being delivered.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
3.	<p>Ms Carla McQueen Cambridge Resident</p>	<p>Councillor Simon Bywater Chairman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee</p>	<p>Hello, I'm Carla McQueen, a campaigner for East Chesterton.</p> <p>Cambridge City Council maintain our wonderful Community Centre in East Chesterton, and they run the fabulous CHIPPS which provide them that need it most, activities during term and out of term.</p> <p>In East Chesterton, anti-social behaviour among teenagers has significantly increased over the past twelve months, and as I was researching to find the trigger, it came to my attention that the Tory weighted County Council had cut the funding for the 11+ youth group, that runs on a Tuesday.</p> <p>Therefore my question is, can Councillor Count restore the funding for Brown's Field Community Centre Tuesday evening Youth Group, in order to provide our teenagers a focus in East Chesterton. This will help reduce the anti-social behaviour we as a community have been facing over the last twelve months. Furthermore, does Councillor Count agree it is important to give our teenagers a positive focus and to show them that we care?</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	<p>Councillor Simon Bywater Chairman of Children and Young People</p>	<p>Ms Carla McQueen Cambridge Resident</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your question. Firstly I'd like to confirm that this Council remains committed to creating a positive range of opportunities for young people across the county, which we seek to achieve in a variety of ways depending on the needs of young people and their communities.</p>

	Policy and Service Committee		<p>Increasingly our role has become one of supporting, enabling and developing a range of providers, including community groups and organisations who want to get involved in provision for young people, and who are often far better placed to directly deliver those services than the Council. Providers of youth clubs across the city now include Romsey Mill, Abbey People, the City Council as well as the County Council in some cases. This approach allows the Council to focus our work on smaller, targeted groups, and one-to-one work with young people, who perhaps have Multiple or more complex needs, and this does include a daytime youth group at the Brown's Field Centre.</p> <p>I'm also pleased to report that the open access Brown's Field Youth Club has very recently restarted, with the first Club meeting held on 20th February. This will be run by our City Council partners, and is initially aimed at young people aged between 11-14, school years 7-9.</p> <p>The County Council will continue to develop its role in supporting community groups and organisations, by providing guidance and expertise on all aspects of running clubs, including providing vocational qualifications in youth work.</p>
	Supplementary question from:	To:	
	Ms Carla McQueen Cambridge Resident	Councillor Simon Bywater Chairman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee	<p>Given the recent cost cutting in Children and Young People's services, can County Councillor Bywater acknowledge that this is leading to problems for children and families, and recognise the direct link between that and anti-social behaviour, and people in our communities deserve better. I run a Youth Group at Brown's Field Community Centre for children with Special Needs, and I know it's not a huge expense. We have got a significant problem in East Chesterton, and our teenagers need this group reinstated, so I please ask you to reconsider. Thank you.</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	
	Councillor Simon Bywater Chairman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee	Ms Carla McQueen Cambridge Resident	<p>I agree that there are issues around the County, I can't give you promises at the moment that there will be funding for your specific group, because I don't know the situation. What I can tell you is that our own lead officer is continuing to work closely with Brown's Field, and to offer support to the City Council lead, including advising on funding opportunities from 'Living Sport' that supports more people to be active and more engaged within their communities. The City Council will now be making an application to this Fund.</p>

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
4.	Mr Baiju Varkey Cambridge Resident	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	<p>My name is Baiju Varkey, I live in Cambridge for 13 or 14 years.</p> <p>My question: in view of the severe financial difficulties that Northamptonshire County Council now faces, and the consequences of that for LGSS, will you not be well advised to use the existing infrastructure at Shire Hall and to run the LGSS core and statutory functions from those premises? Especially in the light of the emerging new lines of co-operation with Peterborough, and indeed a new Combined Authority?</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	Mr Baiju Varkey Cambridge Resident	<p>Thank you for the question, it is certainly in a lot of people's minds at the moment. LGSS is a shared service delivery model, of three core authorities: Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire County Councils, and Milton Keynes Council, and the services delivered by LGSS are back office functions and these encompass things like professional Finance, Human Resources, Information Technology, Transactional Finance, Democratic Services, Legal Services, LGSS Law Ltd, and the Pension Services. And the vast majority of staff that deliver services to Cambridgeshire County Council remain located at Shire Hall, and are included in the Business Case elsewhere on this agenda. As LGSS is a shared service, there are of course some roles that are shared across the three partner organisations. This results in some of the staff being located in Northamptonshire or Milton Keynes, supporting the Council, and vice versa.</p> <p>Northamptonshire's financial challenges are well known, and have been for some time. The government have undertaken a review on the financial governance of the Council, and published the findings on the 15th March. And although the report recommends a two unitary authority approach for Northamptonshire, operating from 2018, there are still many processes for this to go through before it becomes a reality.</p> <p>At this stage it is simply not possible to understand what the full implications will be for LGSS if this happens. What is clear, however, is that we have our own financial challenges and we need to focus on managing them to ensure that we don't get in to the same position as Northamptonshire. We must therefore continue to focus our efforts on delivering transformation, operational efficiencies, and our commercial</p>

			<p>programme.</p> <p>If for whatever reason staff are transferred to Cambridgeshire on the back of what is happening at Northamptonshire, we will build these into our future plans. However, given the nature of the support they provide, these staff do not need to be located in Cambridge. We have a flexible and agile workforce, and we will continue to develop this approach. Work is a thing you do, not a place you go to.</p> <p>As you say, we are integrating services with Peterborough, and we will build on our excellent start we have made in this area. And this is another argument for considering alternative locations for hosting staff outside of Cambridge, so thank you for highlighting this opportunity in your question.</p>
	Supplementary question from:	To:	
	Mr Baiju Varkey Cambridge Resident	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	<p>Given the revelations of serious incompetence, in last week's report about Northamptonshire, should not the priority for Cambridgeshire, now be to rescue and rehouse those parts of LGSS that relate to the people of Cambridgeshire And should not the rescue come ahead of any plan to sell Shire Hall, especially in view of the absence from today's public paper of any proper comparison of the projected costs and benefits of selling, versus keeping or leasing? Why is commercial sensitivity being used to hide the most important comparison – the financial comparison? Why are we, the people, not permitted to see key parts of business cases, that is, the financial Business case. Could it be because negotiations with buyers have already been started, even before a vote has been taken? Thank you.</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	
	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council	Mr Baiju Varkey Cambridge Resident	<p>The question of whether we need to 'rescue' the staff from Northamptonshire, I think is overplaying it a bit at the moment. These staff are very comfortable in their locations, and what we will do is have a considered plan, as we discuss the way forward with Northamptonshire, possibly even Government gets involved, and we will have a considered plan for how to deal with that.</p> <p>We moved off the subject slightly into the later debate on Shire Hall, but thank you for raising it. With regards to the commercial sensitivity, there are three options on the paper, there is the 'do nothing' option of staying at Shire Hall, and there are Options 2</p>

			<p>and 3, which are other locations. Now should the decision be not to remain at Shire Hall, there will obviously need to be negotiations taking place with landowners, for example, so that will be commercially sensitive, so I think it's right to protect that. However the financial information, which is vetted by Members from all parties, as well as our Section 151 Officer, is available for us to scrutinise, and that does show that a gap of something like £58M, between the 'do nothing' and the other two cases. So I'm sorry that you personally haven't got enough information, but I can assure you that the full Council - every Member of this Council - can have access to that information.</p>

PETITION : REINSTATE THROUGH CITI 8 SERVICES TO CAMBRIDGE STATION AND ADDENBROOKE'S.

The text of this petition was as follows:

“Because of congestion within Cambridge, Stagecoach now terminates the Citi 8 service from Cottenham through Histon & Impington and along the Histon Road in the centre of Cambridge whereas previously it has continued to Cambridge Station and Addenbrooke's. This means that passengers to and from these destinations must change buses to continue their journeys.

“Changing buses is not easy because there is poor signage, it extends journey times and it's particularly worrisome for older people, for those who are disabled and for those who might be going for or returning from treatment at Addenbrooke's.

“Furthermore, the Citi 8 bus no longer stops at the same bays as incoming buses from Cambridge Station and Addenbrooke's. Passengers must first cross St Andrews Street and then Emmanuel Street to get to the Citi 8 bay (where there is no bus shelter for this 20 minute interval bus service) for continued travel towards Cottenham.

“Cambridgeshire County Council and/or the Greater Cambridge Partnership are asked to:

1. work with Stagecoach to eliminate the delays that currently occur south of the city centre so that Stagecoach can reinstate through services; and in the meantime
2. improve the signage at the city centre bus interchange so that it is clear to arriving travellers which bus to board to complete their ongoing journeys.”

The petition was presented by Lilian Rundblad, Chair, Histon Road Area Residents' Association who stated:

“Yes, thank you for letting me speak about this very good petition. To reinstate this through Citi8 service is important for the people living in the north of Cambridge. So, because of the congestion within Cambridge, Stagecoach now has terminated the Citi8 service from Cottenham through Histon and Impington, and along the Histon Road, in the centre of Cambridge, whereas previously it has continued to Cambridge Station and Addenbrooke's. This means that passengers to and from these destinations must change buses, to continue their journeys.

“Changing buses is not easy because there is poor signage. It extends journey times, and is particularly worrisome for older people, for those who are disabled and for those who might be going for, or returning from, treatment at Addenbrooke's. Furthermore, the Citi8 bus no longer stops at the same bays as incoming buses from Cambridge Station and Addenbrooke's. Passengers must first cross St Andrews Street, then

Emmanuel Street, to get to the Citi8 bay, where there is no bus shelter for this 20 minute interval bus service, and for their continued travel towards Cottenham.

May I also add that during this online petition, we have also received concerns from parents, about the bus change for their children in the city centre, on their way home from Long Road and Hills (Road) Sixth Form Colleges. So the Cambridgeshire County Council and/or the Greater Cambridge Partnership are asked to work with Stagecoach to eliminate the delays that currently occur south of the city centre, so that Stagecoach can reinstate through services, and in the meantime improve the signage at the city centre bus interchange, so that it is clear to arriving travellers which bus to board to complete their ongoing journeys. Thank you”

The Chairman indicated that the Council would provide a written response following the meeting (Note: The Constitution provides for a response to be provided within 10 working days following the meeting)

COUNTY COUNCIL: 20TH MARCH 2018

10(g) Motion from Councillor Sandra Crawford

Councillor Bywater's amendments to Councillor Crawford's motion as follows

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

The Council notes:

- ~~In my ward of Cherry Hinton, the Innovation Trust are planning to academise the Spinney school along with two others; the Mayfield and the Fulbourn School. The Berwick Bridge School in my ward is also being encouraged to become an academy~~
- ~~Parents, teachers, school governors and other campaigners have approached me to inform me that most parents do not understand the process and they do not feel that the consultations are either long enough, or that they give a thorough and balanced view of all of the risks, as well as any perceived benefits. People leafleting parents at the schools asking for further consultations have been asked to stop and leave the premises by some staff.~~
- ~~A meeting was organised in my local ward for individuals who are both concerned about academies and feel that the consultation process does not meet with the Gunning Sedley criteria. Reports have been given that some teachers have felt intimidated into not discussing the process with parents. This creates a poor teacher parent relationship, something that has been of huge value to children in the past in Parent Teacher Associations. Individuals from the Trust did not attend the meeting or send deputies when they were otherwise engaged. The Regional Schools commissioner was invited but did not attend.~~
- ~~A letter to parents from one school above dated 25th January 2018 only mentioned the consultation evening in a small paragraph, and this was on the 7th February, and the period of time from this event to the end of the consultation period was only until the nineteenth February.~~

The Council believes:

- ~~That fair consultations must be carried out. In the case of academisation, there are several precedents in the national and local news which must be taken into consideration when considering the risks of becoming an academy, which I reference below. Parents, teachers and councillors must be made aware of these risks, and given much longer consultation meetings, and given the full facts, and all of the known risks, and encouraged to be involved in the decision making process.~~
- ~~These precedents and risks include:~~
 - ~~The 21 schools in Wakefield asset stripped by the trust, to the tune of several million, and left as "orphan schools," and the 40,000 children in other orphan schools around~~

~~the country. Guardian, 6th Dec 2017~~

- ~~• The school in the Isle of Wight that failed and was returned to the Local Education Authority (LEA). Guardian 14th November, 2017 Fiona Millar~~
- ~~• Cuts to school budgets in LEA schools are not more damaging than the financial crisis faced by the Multi Academy Trusts (MATs), as LEA schools are protected by the fact that Councils are responsible for the schools. MATs face similar cuts but have huge bureaucratic costs; the huge salary costs of the Chief Executive Officers regarding the Harris trust (£500,000) is just one example.~~
- ~~• The Regional Schools Commissioner, Sue Baldwin, has raised concerns with the St Neots Learning Partnership over the lack of progress with improving standards of performance at Ernulf Academy. Any school in this situation can be moved to another MAT unknown to the parents.~~
- ~~• Failure of an academy in Felixstowe 21st February – East Anglian Daily Times, and two failures in Manchester – “millions squandered” Manchester Evening News 30th January.~~
- ~~• Report in the Guardian of the financial crises which faces MAT schools in general, 27th January 2018.~~
- ~~• The loss of democratic accountability in terms of local authority, teacher and parent governance which is so important to the education and wellbeing of our children to a board of directors who are business driven.~~
- ~~• The loss of the original terms and conditions of teachers, and the wastage of teaching staff increasing in MATs. National Union of Teachers (NUT) report.~~

The Council is recommended to:-

- 1) use its good offices to urge the governing bodies to engage parents, teachers and councillors at the earliest stages and have a better range of opinions present at the consultations to ensure that the informed consent of parents, councillors and teachers is obtained.
- 2) ~~encourage the schools mentioned here to extend their consultation periods.~~
- 3) ~~ensure a genuine choice to remain in LEA control is offered to parents.~~
- 4) **actively provide support and advice to school governing bodies with the aim of raising awareness of their statutory legal obligation to consult in line with the Sedley and Gunning principals. ask the Executive Director People and Communities to develop an advice paper for schools which are considering changing their status. The paper will include our recommended approach to consultation including timing (i.e. before the academy order is sought), the duration of the consultation and what information should be shared with parents. This will, however, only be advice as ultimately, the decision to become an academy rests with the governing body.**
- 5) ~~make available to all school governing bodies, as well as trust bodies seeking to set up or of take on academies in Cambridgeshire, accurate information highlighting the increased costs and legal obligations associated with taking a school out of local authority control.~~

COUNTY COUNCIL – 20th MARCH 2018
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**1. Question from Councillor Sandra Crawford**

During the Adults Committee Meeting of the 8th March I asked the Chair Councillor Bailey and the officers present why the members of the Adult leads and members of the Committee had not been briefed on the reports in the Local Government Chronicle and the HSJ, and various newspapers regarding a scheme to move hospital patients into people's private homes for respite care. I also asked why it was not on any future agendas. The Company Care BnB, which is run by the Chief Executive Paul Gaudin, co-ordinates respite care in people's private homes. Private householders can earn £1000.00 per month looking after patients who need extra care when they leave hospital.

I was told by the Chair of the Adults Committee that Cambridgeshire County Council were not at present considering this scheme as a pilot and that is why there had been no briefings. Councillor Harrison made it clear to me that "I should not jump to conclusions" about the scheme, as it had many merits and was needed in times when we were having difficulties with delayed transfers of care, and that she knew Paul Gaudin and supported the idea.

It states in the Local Government Chronicle that Paul Gaudin's Company is

"now establishing a working group with Cambridgeshire County Council and has begun advertising for host households in the County, which includes the East Cambridgeshire constituency of junior health minister Stephen Barclay. The Conservative controlled council confirmed the new group would meet for the first time imminently to discuss the innovative Care Rooms concept. Councillor Bailey told the HSJ the make-up of the Group and chair was still being confirmed, but it would include a senior adult social care council officers, council commissioners and front line social care and NHS representation."

1. Why is there a lack of transparency and absence of due process leading to the establishment of a joint Care BnB and County Council working group, which should have been the subject of an open well documented report to the Adults Committee seeking approval?
2. Due to the lack of due process at committee level, the following question needs to be asked:- Is due diligence being followed as to the risks to patients coming out of hospital i.e. is the council taking note of reports from Essex County Council, who have dropped this pilot scheme due to what they called "safeguarding concerns about care being provided by non-care professionals." Adult social care directors are reported as expressing considerable concern about the initiative and the risk to effective safeguarding of vulnerable patients / service users it represents. Southend University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust has no intention of taking part in the pilot saying that it "would compromise the safety and quality of care of its patients and was a huge and risky venture."
3. Why is there no involvement in the proposed working group of the Clinical Commissioning Group and relevant NHS provide trusts as we are talking here about effective discharge of hospital patients towards whom the NHS has a duty of care as well as the County Council.

Response from Councillor Anna Bailey
Chairman of Adults Committee

1. The decision to provide Care Rooms with information and insight into the system in

Cambridgeshire falls within the ordinary business of the Council as the local authority has a statutory duty to manage the care market. As the information given to Care Rooms did not represent a change of Council Policy or commit the Council to significant expenditure there is not a requirement to present it to Committee. While at some point, it may be helpful to provide the Committee with information on the Council's involvement, our contact with Care Rooms is very much at an early stage. I can confirm that the County Council has not made a decision to enter into a partnership with Care Rooms. Rather, Cambridgeshire County Council is interested in exploring a range of approaches in terms of the most effective way to promote independent living in the community, both for those who we support and those who fund their own care. Within this context, the Council was approached by CareRooms Chief Executive Paul Gaudin. We have had initial discussions with him about his ideas of delivering home based services, as an alternative to traditional short-term institutional settings, such as care homes or hospitals. The model is at an early stage of development and the Council along with other national and local organisations has offered information and insight into the health and social care landscape. I can confirm that there are no immediate plans for the Council to commission any services from or enter into any partnership with Care Rooms.

2. As indicated in response to the previous question, as this matter falls within the ordinary business of the Council and within the Council's statutory responsibilities, it is clear that there has been no breach of "due process". I can confirm that the Council has not made any decision in relation to entering into a working arrangement with Care Rooms.
3. An initial meeting has taken place between Care Rooms and selected Adult Social Care staff employed by the County Council. Additionally, communication has taken place with the NHS in the form of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation Trust, concerning the addition of a community nurse to the working group. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation Trust are receptive to this proposal and are considering the most appropriate representation.

2. Question from Councillor Jocelynn Scutt

Residents of Arbury Division are concerned about the company arrangements and financial dealings in relation to Milton Road Library and generally. Please advise:

The precise status of This Land Ltd, the company now existing in place of Cambridgeshire Housing & Investments Company (CH&IC) as to:

The directors and, where any director is not an employee of the County Council:

- 1) the full qualifications of that individual to be a director of CH&IC and thence This Land Ltd and upon which the decision was made to appoint him a director;
- 2) by whom the decision was made to appoint him a director;
- 3) what if any payment is being made to him whether by the County Council or This Land Ltd or any other source to him as a director;
- 4) what supervision or other mechanism is being employed to ensure he is operating within the requirements of the County Council as the owner of This Land Ltd;
- 5) for how many other companies, if any, he works and where he is based.

Why it was considered necessary to change the name of the company CH&IC to This Land Ltd and:

- a) how it was determined and who determined upon the name This Land Ltd;
- b) the precise cost of change of name (registered on or about 14 February);

- c) the precise of cost of listing new companies related to This Land Ltd and what is the purpose of each;
- d) the cost of the glossy brochure that has been issued in the name This Land Ltd and its purpose.

Who is or are shareholders in the company This Land Ltd and each of the other companies listed (on or about 15 and 16 February 2018).

Specifically as to Milton Road Library:

- i. Who and how was it decided that the freehold of Milton Road Library site would pass to This Land Ltd;
- ii. What is the sum that is to be paid to the County Council for the freehold transfer to This Land and has it been paid in full or if not how is it to be paid and what is the timing;
- iii. What is the intention as to the seven (7) flats to be built on Milton Road Library site – that is, are they to be retained by This Land Ltd to provide an income stream to the County Council or are they to be sold or subject to long-leases and, if so, who has made or will make that decision;
- iv. If the flats are to be sold or subject to long-leases how will the sale or long-lease price be set.

Generally:

- A. How and by what process does the Council make decisions to set up companies relating to its functions and assets;
- B. How are probity and due diligence ensured and assured;
- C. Does the Chair intend to bring forward proposals to improve transparency and rigour of those decisions, and if not, why not.

Response from Councillor Josh Schumann

Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee

Chairman as Councillor Scutt has asked a number of questions that require detailed and technical responses I would simply like to respond now by saying that a briefing note regarding This Land will be circulated to all members. This will include information which will hopefully answer the questions raised by Councillor Scutt, in addition to this a members seminar can be scheduled to provide further information - It is worth noting that some parts of Councillor Scutt questions would need to be answered in a confidential setting and therefore would not be able to be disclosed during this public meeting.

With regards to the decision to sell Milton Road library to This Land, the decision was taken by the Commercial and Investment committee and went through the same process that all other sites have been through. As the committee agreed this transaction any questions regarding the details about the sites development should be asked of This Land.

Councillor Scutt's final questions can largely be answered by looking through the reports presented to the Commercial and Investments committee, and formerly the Assets and investment committee, in which the process and decision to establish the development company have been well recorded. I cannot agree with the insinuation that the process has not been fully transparent and would suggest that Councillor Scutt, or other members of Councillor Scutt's party, engage more fully with the numerous workshops and meetings that we have previously and continue to hold in order to better understand our decisions.'

3. Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven

The Combined Authority Strategic Bus Review paper considered in November 2017 states that: *'Buses provide vital services to our communities. They have the potential to provide economic and social benefits by connecting people with jobs, shops and facilities; they can minimise social isolation; and can reduce congestion on some of our busiest roads.'* Given the desperate state of financing lifeline transport especially in rural communities, and Cambridgeshire County Council's current caretaker role in managing key bus subsidies, it is concerning that four months on the Strategic Bus Review has yet to commence. Therefore, please can the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee explain what steps are being considered to protect Cambridgeshire residents from isolation when the current round of subsidies expires, given the possibility that the council's caretaker role could continue beyond next financial year.

Response from Councillor Ian Bates **Chairman of Economy and Environment Committee**

The Strategic Bus Review is an important and complex piece of work, and the Combined Authority is keen to ensure that the scope of works is robust and will deliver what is needed. Due to the sensitivity of this study and the importance to securing the right consultancy support, the Combined Authority has been engaging with other authorities who have undertaken similar work. As a result of this advice the Combined Authority has re-assessed its procurement approach which has, unfortunately, led to a delay in starting this study. The documentation necessary to support this new procurement approach will soon be finalised and it is anticipated that formal procurement will commence before the end of the month.

Our position is quite clear. Where the Council has agreed to subsidise bus services, it has been agreed that this will continue until April 2019. Beyond that point we expect the Combined Authority to take over responsibility for funding bus services, indeed the delegation of this responsibility to the County Council is only for the 2018/19 financial year.

The Council is very mindful of the impact of any withdrawal of subsidised bus services on our communities, and until the Combined Authority assumes responsibility for funding subsidised bus services, we will work positively with them to ensure that communities are not left 'high and dry', and that services continue seamlessly where they are needed.

4. Question from Councillor Lorna Dupre

"What practical response is the County Council as lead local flood authority making to the Great Ouse Tidal River Baseline Report of July 2017, which demonstrates that around £100M of 'partnership funding' – over and above any funding available from central government – will be required to manage future flood risks related to the Great Ouse Tidal River System? What action is it taking to seek to protect current and planned infrastructure in the affected zones, including but not only the A1101, A1123, A142, A10, A47, and to work with partner agencies and landowners to protect current and future investment in railway lines, sewage treatment works, electricity pylons, as well as over 20,000 hectares of agricultural land and around 1,000 residential properties?"

Response from Councillor Ian Bates **Chairman of Economy and Environment Committee**

Thank you Cllr Dupre for this question.

When the publication of the Great Ouse Tidal River Baseline Report took place, this was presented to the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC) on which my colleagues Cllr Wotherspoon and Cllr Smith sit. The report highlights the importance of this catchment and sets out some important messages for the future of flood risk management. The County Council

supports the work and, through its role on the RFCC, will work collaboratively with the Environment Agency and Cambridgeshire's Internal Drainage Boards to develop and review management options going forward.

It is clear also that the situation described in this report is not unique to just the Great Ouse Tidal River catchment and the need for a much longer term partnership approach to asset management in the whole of the Fens area is needed. The Environment Agency has therefore proposed a three-phase partnership project to enable a holistic review and options development process for the future of flood risk management in the Fens. The three phases will be as follows:

1. Data gathering leading to a collective understanding of the situation. This initial stage, starting now, is crucial because flood risk management in the Fens is currently undertaken by a large number of different organisations. All of the different approaches, data, flood models and asset investment plans need to be collated.
2. Partnership development of high level action plan to strategically review future options for managing flood risk
3. Development of phased action plan to implement the preferred options

This is a long-term project and estimated timescales to deliver the first two phases is 7 years. The council is supportive of this work and as the project develops will take a key role in the steering group to ensure that any future options seek the best for Cambridgeshire. The council will also ensure the Combined Authority is kept abreast of the project's relevance in protecting the county's communities and infrastructure.

A member briefing seminar is being organised by our officers and the Environment Agency and the date will be confirmed shortly. As part of the project, the RFCC is keen to ensure good engagement with all stakeholders so we would very much encourage you to come along to this session where more detailed questions can be answered.