

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 16th December 2014

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 3.50 p.m.

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

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

Apologies: Councillors P Clapp, P Read, and M Tew.

104. MINUTES – 14TH OCTOBER 2014

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 14th October 2014 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

105. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

106. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor J Palmer declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 112 c), as the Leader of East Cambridgeshire District Council, the Council with responsibility for developing the Local Plan for the District area.

107. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were received from members of the public.

108. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

109. SECTION 85 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – RECOMMENDATION TO EXTEND SIX MONTH RULE

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

- a) To note that Councillor Philip Read has not been able to attend meetings of

the Council due to ill health since his attendance at a meeting of full Council on 25th March 2014;

- b) To note that Council agreed, at its meeting on 22nd July 2014, to approve Councillor Read's non-attendance at meetings of the Council due to ill health up to 22nd January 2015 pursuant to Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972; and
- c) To approve Councillor Read's continued non-attendance at meetings of the Council due to ill-health up to 22nd July 2015 pursuant to Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972.

110. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Treasury Management Quarter Two Report

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

- In response to a question from Councillor Mason, Councillor Count agreed to ask the Chief Finance Officer to review the answer given to Councillor Mason at a previous Council on the same subject of capital to ensure it was fully understood.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To agree the Treasury Management Quarter Two Report 2014-15.
- b) To agree amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS), detailed in section 2.

111. CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO FULL COUNCIL

a) Greater Cambridge City Deal Governance

The recommendations set out in the report from Constitution and Ethics Committee were moved by the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by Councillor Reynolds. With the unanimous agreement of Council, the Chairman proposed an alteration to recommendations "c" and "f" as follows:

Replace recommendations c) and f) with the following:

- c) to confirm that the Cambridgeshire County Council Leader for the time being, shall be the Cambridgeshire County Council representative on the Executive Board.
- f) to confirm the principle that the political proportionality of the Cambridgeshire County Council seats on the Assembly shall reflect that amongst the Council's elected members for the divisions within South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council administrative boundaries and that the representatives shall be drawn from those divisions and will be appointed on the nomination of the relevant Group Leaders.

Following discussion, it was resolved to:

- a) approve the Terms of Reference for the Executive Board attached at Appendix 1;
- b) approve the proposed delegated authorities listed below:

Greater Cambridge Executive Board

- Authority to set and review the objectives to be achieved by the strategic investments made pursuant to the Greater Cambridge City Deal agreement dated 19 June 2014.
- Authority to:
 - Approve single position statements in relation to strategic City Deal issues.
 - Approve projects, including the allocation of project funding, which fall within the ambit of the City Deal agreement.
 - Approve the major priorities under the auspices of the City Deal.
 - Approve plans and strategies necessary or incidental to the implementation of the City Deal agreement.
 - Consider recommendations from the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly.

Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly

- Authority to advise the Greater Cambridge Executive Board in connection to the achievement of the objectives of the City Deal agreement.
 - Authority to prepare and submit reports and/or recommendations to the Greater Cambridge Executive Board.
- c) confirm that the Cambridgeshire County Council Leader for the time being, shall be the Cambridgeshire County Council representative on the Executive Board.
 - d) appoint the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee as the Council's substitute representative on the Executive Board;
 - e) approve the Terms of Reference for the Assembly attached at Appendix 2;
 - f) confirm the principle that the political proportionality of Cambridgeshire County Council seats on the Assembly shall reflect that amongst the Council's elected members for the divisions within South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council administrative boundaries and that the representatives shall be drawn from those divisions and will be appointed on the nomination of the relevant Group Leaders.
 - g) instruct officers to investigate at the earliest opportunity arrangements for substitute members on the Assembly.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, most Liberal Democrats and Labour in favour; UKIP, Independent Group and the Non-Aligned Independent against; one Liberal Democrat abstained]

b) Hearings Sub -Committee's Sanction

The recommendation set out in the report from Constitution and Ethics Committee was moved by the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by Councillor McGuire.

During discussion, Councillor McGuire proposed a motion, seconded by Councillor Count, that Councillor Leeke named under Rule 19.3 of the Constitution should not be heard further.

[Voting pattern: Most Conservatives, Labour and one Independent member in favour; UKIP, most Liberal Democrats, two independent members, the Non-Aligned Independent and one Conservative against; one Liberal Democrat and one Independent member abstained.]

[Councillor Count noted after the vote had closed that he had intended to vote for the motion rather than against.]

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

[Voting Pattern: Conservatives, Labour, three Independents, two UKIP, two Liberal Democrats in favour; most UKIP, five Liberal Democrats and the Non Aligned Independent against; seven Liberal Democrats and one Independent abstained.]

112. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Four motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

a) Motion from Councillor Fiona Onasanya

Councillor Onasanya withdrew the following motion:

Council notes:

- There have been a number of significant changes to the educational system in recent years, changes which have resulted in an increasingly diverse and autonomous school system.
- To maintain and develop the standards of early education, the Early Years Service provides support and challenge across the sector. This includes working with providers in the Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector such as nursery, primary schools and Children's Centres.
- The PVI sector accommodates approximately 80% of funded education places for three or four year olds. They are also the largest provider of free early education for the most vulnerable two year olds.
- Local Authorities retain a statutory duty under the 1996 Education Act to promote high standards so that children and young people achieve well and fulfil their potential: this statutory duty is fundamental.
- The importance of Play in children's development needs to be recognised.
- For many children today, nursery education provides their only opportunity for active, creative, play (including outdoor play) which is recognised by

psychologists as vital for physical, social, emotional and cognitive development. However, two key qualifications currently being drawn up for nursery teachers and child carers no longer require training in how children learn through play. This is unacceptable, particularly in a sector serving the most vulnerable group in society, which has a right to properly trained, professional and highly competent workers, and where workers have a right to proper, professional training;

Further this Council recognises:

- The Too Much Too Soon campaign is seeking to see the introduction of developmentally appropriate and evidence-based policymaking for the early years.
- This must be backed by the recognition that nursery teachers and child carers must be of the highest standard, with proper, professional training which includes training in how children learn through play.

This Council believes:

- Early childhood must be recognised as a crucial stage in its own right not just as a preparation for school.

This Council resolves:

- To request that the Children and Young People Committee investigate ways of ensuring that training in how children play is reinstated as a vital part of nursery teachers and child care workers' professional development.
- To ask the Chief Executive to write to the Department for Education on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council expressing concern about the impact of the government's early years policies on the health and wellbeing of our youngest children and requesting other factors which enable a child to flourish to be explored.

b) Motion from Councillor Bullen

Councillor Bullen withdrew the following motion:

The council believes that:

- it already has a balanced budget for the financial year 2015/2016.
- it will be increasingly difficult to balance the budget for future years without a significant increase in either grant funding or a rise in Council Tax above 1.99%.
- it currently has a surplus of £2.5m which could be utilised to pay the interest on a prudential loan of circa £30m which could then be used to build rental housing which would provide a rental income of circa £2.6m per year for perpetuity. Furthermore, the investment would be an appreciating asset of this council for decades to come.
- public service organisations in Cambridgeshire have responded to the enormous financial challenges faced over the past several years in an

innovative and responsible manner. However significant funding shortfalls and continued pressure on public sector budgets persist, and at some point these financial pressures will inevitably have an impact on the ability of local government organisations to deliver good quality and safe services to the residents of Cambridgeshire.

- it is therefore in the public interest to explore the potential to create new revenue streams which could raise additional funds to be used for the provision of council services to the people of Cambridgeshire.

The council notes that:

- the current surplus of £2.5m if spent on services would be a 'one-off' expenditure during the next financial year and the funds would never be available again. By utilising these funds to pay the interest on a prudential loan, a future income of circa £2.6m could be realised from financial year 2016/2017 and that this additional revenue stream would be available for perpetuity.
- it currently owns land that could be utilised for the building of additional housing.
- in the current financial situation, all Local Authorities are finding it harder to provide essential care services to their residents who need them and that all possible additional revenue streams should be explored.
- a rise in council tax above 1.99% would require a local referendum which would be unlikely to achieve sufficient public support given the current financial climate.

This Council therefore calls on the Chief Executive to:

- investigate the service benefits, costs and possible income generation of utilising the current surplus of £2.5m to pay the interest on a prudential loan which would then be used to purchase and/or build additional rental housing for the people of Cambridgeshire;
- consider how best to establish a housing organisation wholly owned by Cambridgeshire County Council, or with a partner(s), where it would be located, how it would be staffed and which services it could undertake in order to provide an income stream for the future of Cambridgeshire County Council;
- provide an estimate of the costs and benefits for Cambridgeshire County Council arising from the creation of a housing organisation, financed in the way stated above, at the first available full council meeting following the conclusion of the investigation.

c) Motion from Councillor Graham Wilson

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Wilson and seconded by Councillor Mason.

This Council acknowledges:

- the County Council is committed to its overarching vision: *“Creating communities where people want to live and work: now and in the future”*.
- Cambridgeshire is the fastest growing county and local district councils are proposing large developments in their new emerging Local Plans which go to 2031 (Huntingdonshire’s is going to 2036).
- a number of transport improvements are committed or promised, notably the A14, but without further mitigation, the cumulative impact of the traffic generated from new developments will lead to increased congestion on the county’s roads.
- Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) is a consultee on the Local Plans and, although it has no powers to stop development, it has the opportunity to explain the impacts of the development and propose ways to mitigate them to make the impacts acceptable.
- The National Planning Policy Framework states (para 32): *All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:*
 - *the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;*
 - *safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and*
 - *improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.”*
- The third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) is a statutory document which sets out CCC’s transport objectives, policies and strategy for the county. LTP3 seeks to address *existing transport challenges as well as setting out the policies and strategies to ensure that planned large-scale development can take place in the county in a sustainable way*. The report says: *While we must have a vision for the future, we must also be realistic and recognise that we do not have the resources to deliver all of the measures we would wish to over the lifetime of the Plan, particularly given the current economic climate.*
- CCC’s suite of transport strategies is based on extensive traffic analysis and environmental appraisal (including a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the proposals. In a number of locations, officers have been able to show that the interventions proposed are beneficial and are unlikely to cause unacceptable environmental impacts and would support the proposed development. In a number of locations however, potentially adverse environmental impacts have been identified. The papers for the October and November 2014 Environment and Economy Committee included the sentence: *The SEA and HRA identify issues with a number of interventions in the LTTS that will need to be considered and addressed in detail when schemes are brought forward. It is possible that this work will lead in future to schemes being removed from the LTP, LTTS or from other strategies should it not be possible to avoid unacceptable impacts or provide suitable mitigation.* This implies some of the schemes being proposed may be removed

when studied in more detail, potentially implying development may occur which has severe impacts.

Therefore this Council resolves to:

- continue to encourage and support development that benefits the local community and economy
- continue to provide advice to the district councils developing their Local Plans on:
 - o the potential traffic and transport implications of proposed developments; and
 - o potential feasible, affordable and sustainable solutions to mitigate impacts with an assessment of the residual impacts
- object to proposals in draft Local Plans if CCC assessments indicate that potential interventions are not deliverable or the residual cumulative impacts of development will be severe
- advise district councils that they, or the promoter of sites being put forward for development, should submit their own traffic and transport assessment to the County Council for comment if county council officers are not confident potential solutions are deliverable (including considering potential funding limitations) and won't have severe environmental consequences.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats, UKIP, three Independents and one Conservative in favour; most Conservatives against; Labour and one Conservative Labour abstained.]

[Councillor Yeulett noted after the vote had closed that he had intended to vote against the motion rather than for it.]

[Councillor Curtis declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct as an employee of a company seeking work on the Houghton and Wyton Airfield development and left the meeting whenever the Airfield development was discussed.]

d) Motion from Councillor Susan van de Ven

The following motion was proposed by Councillor van de Ven and seconded by Councillor McGuire. In moving the motion, Councillor van de Ven requested an alteration to the text as published on the agenda to add the word no to the first sentence of B before "no longer viable".

A. Cambridgeshire County Council describes Community Transport as 'providing journeys for people who have difficulty using conventional public transport.'

- This includes a wide spectrum of people who are at risk of a) social isolation and b) lack of access to essential public services, including health services.

- Many clients require door-to-door service due to infirmity.
 - Community Transport is not a substitute for conventional passenger transport, but in some deprived isolated rural areas where public transport is poor or absent its role has expanded to provide a wider range of lifeline access.
 - Community Transport schemes vary but are by definition non-profit and in some cases they depend on volunteer input. Without council funding to support dial-a-ride schemes and mileage reimbursement for volunteer drivers through community car services, important schemes would not be viable.
- B. Efforts to quantify the financial cost of isolation of vulnerable people and to understand the potential impacts on public service budgets should Community Transport be no longer viable, are underway:
- Fenland Association for Community Transport's paper 'Community Transport, Health and Social Care' (April 2014) provides a window on some of the financial savings to the NHS and Adult Social Care achieved through Community Transport in Cambridgeshire.
 - A Transport and Health JSNA is being produced by County Council officers for the Health and Wellbeing Board, to be published in April 2015.
- C. Different Council services are engaged in disparate exercises relating to future commissioning and funding of Community Transport.
- An Adult Social Care Transport Policy that defines, and effectively tightens, eligibility criteria for transport support is now in preparation, but without reference to any Community Transport cost benefit analysis.
 - Business Planning for Community Transport takes place under the umbrella of Cambridgeshire Future Transport, in the Economy, Transport and Environment Directorate, but without reference to any Community Transport cost benefit analysis.
- D. A lack of joined-up thinking, including information sharing across the Council and a common strategy for the future of Community Transport that rests upon a clear understanding of its costs and benefits, puts vulnerable people at risk and brings inevitable consequent costs to the public purse, including in particular social care and health providers.
- Information about Community Transport options is not routinely known and considered in the course of commissioning transport for vulnerable people.
 - The Cambridgeshire Future Transport Member Steering Group is theoretically in a position to promote a coordinated multi-disciplinary approach to the provision and funding of community transport, as its membership now cuts across council directorates, however it has not been deployed to do so and the Steering Group is dormant.

And, as a consequence, recognises:

- That a coordinated, multi-disciplinary strategic approach, involving expertise

from Public Health, Adult Social Care, and Economy, Transport and Environment, as well as the NHS and Community Transport providers and user representatives, would provide the best possible future for Community Transport, in terms of contributing to the wellbeing of vulnerable people and helping to avert the financial consequences of isolation.

Therefore, this Council resolves:

- To revive the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Member Steering Group for the purpose of actively promoting a coordinated, multi-disciplinary strategic approach to Community Transport, and
- To instruct the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Steering Group in its advisory role to draw upon the Community Transport cost benefit analysis method, as exemplified by the Fenland Association for Community Transport 'Community Transport, Health and Social Care' paper (April 2014), as well as the forthcoming Transport and Health JSNA, and any other relevant studies, with the overarching aim of helping to ensure that available Council funding is deployed in the most effective manner and that the council is best-equipped to make the case to Government and the NHS for joint funding arrangements if necessary.

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

113. QUESTIONS

a) Oral Questions

Nine questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix C**.

In response to these questions, the following items were agreed for further action:

- In response to a question from Councillor Scutt on dangerous school runs in the Cambridge area, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates, agreed to report back information regarding training to encourage schools to participate in cycling and walking, how often it took place, the take up of that training, and the restrictions that could be placed outside schools.
- In response to a question from Councillor Kavanagh, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates agreed to investigate and report back on the measures in place around Marshall Airport to keep the flight path safe.
- In a response to a question from Councillor Williams, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates agreed to provide a full written response with regard to bus emissions in Cambridge.
- In response to a question from Councillor Jenkins, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates agreed to take the matter of traffic congestion in Cambridge to the next spokes meeting of the Economy and Environment Committee.

c) Written Questions

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

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16TH DECEMBER 2014
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

County Councillor John Reynolds

It was with regret that the Chairman reported the recent death of County Councillor John Reynolds. Councillor Reynolds served on the County Council since 1981, representing the Bar Hill Division, on behalf of the Conservative Party. The Council's thoughts are with his family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

Bob Tuckwell, Strategic Transport Adviser, Retirement

After more than 40 years in Local Government, Bob Tuckwell, the Council's Strategic Transport Adviser, was retiring due to ill health.

Bob had been one of the County Council's most committed and respected officers with over 25 years' service, throughout which he had been involved in and advised on some of the Council's key projects. Bob had been a key advocate for the Council since the late 1980s for his work on the A14 improvement scheme when this was first identified as being needed. Bob worked diligently to continually make a professional and evidence based case for the A14. Coincidentally the Development Consent Order for that scheme would be submitted on the 31st December, the same day that Bob retires.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

Whittlesey Community Hub

The official launch of Whittlesey community hub, a partnership venture between the County Council and Fenland District Council, took place on 15 December 2014 within the town's library building. The hub brought together all the services previously provided by the library and Whittlesey's Fenland@your service shop, making it easier for people to access all the information they need in one convenient and central location. This was the second venture between Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council, following the successful partnership at Chatteris Community Hub.

Cambridgeshire County Council's community hub programme continued to develop partnerships, with the aim of achieving efficiencies through co-location whilst improving the face-to-face delivery of public sector services where they are most needed.

AWARDS

National School Travel Awards - Runner Up

The County Council was voted as runner-up in the Walking Initiative category of the Modeshift National School Travel Awards for the Road Safety Team's work to develop a music video encouraging parents to park away from the school gates.

The Kids Say Park Away," developed in conjunction with Heart Cambridgeshire, had been viewed over 6,000 times on YouTube and is being used alongside the Road Safety Team's suite of interventions to help schools across Cambridgeshire encourage safe and sustainable

travel for their pupils. The film was now being used by other Local Authorities, including Nottingham City, Nottinghamshire County and West Sussex Councils.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 16th DECEMBER 2014

ORAL QUESTION TIME

County Council – 16th December 2014
Oral Questions

1. Question to the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor L Nethsingha

This is a question to Councillor Ian Bates as Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee. At the last General Purposes Committee there was an item on the sale of Estover Playing Fields in March. Estover Playing Fields are a much-valued local community asset and there has been great concern amongst that community about the approach taken by this Council. The playing fields are not allocated for development in the Local Plan and yet there is a proposal that this Council would like to build a large number of houses on them. I would like to ask the Chair of the Economy and Environment Committee for reassurance that this Council will not start to act as a “pushy developer” in promoting building on a site, which is neither allocated by the District Council for development, nor is there support among the local community for development there. I was glad to see that the decision on this site was deferred. My question is on the broader question of policy – please can you reassure me that the Council will not push for large scale development on sites which are not allocated for building in their local plans.

Response from the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor S Count

I believe that this may be more of an appropriate question for the Chair of GPC Committee as this is not part of the Economy and Environment Committee. I think that everyone is aware that I am fully up to date on Estover Playing Fields. Unfortunately, the problem here is a lack of knowledge of the circumstances which haven’t actually been fully outlaid. The Fenland District Local Plan actually has a high reliance on one of their policies which does not require their allocations and at any point adjoining a town throughout Fenland applications up to the number 249 houses can come forward, which is very different to the way in which other Councils have approached their Planning process. So therefore if anybody brings forward any applications there, it is not a pushy developer, but the way that the Fenland District Plan has been structured.

Supplementary question from Councillor L Nethsingha

I have serious concerns and I do think it is an astonishing way to develop a Local Plan to allow for that number of houses to be built anywhere in that area without any kind of transport infrastructure just for a start. But the point remains about the community support – I think that, if there is no allocation in the Local Plan and there is significant community opposition to this and it is a site owned by the Council - there is a petition on this site which is of 700 signatures - I do not think that this Council should be pushing for development of that scale, however many holes there may be in the Fenland Local Plans, so I would like reassurance that you will not be pushing too hard for them.

Response from the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor S Count

Thank you again, and once again you misunderstand the thing. The way that the Plan works is the claims for the infrastructure have to be met, so Planning Applications will not go through unless they satisfy the Local Plan, and the words “pushy developer” again are

inappropriate. I think in the County Council's Plan to bring forward the enhancement for the sports and playing fields, is the part of this equation that you haven't seen at all. Despite the fact that there is a very large and vocal lobby group, it does not represent all of the people in that area and it is yet to be decided when the plans come to fruition, exactly what all the people do or do not think, and what is the best. I think that you do not have the full information to actually go ahead - and just take it from newspaper headlines most of all - and make a judgement like that.

2. Question to the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee, Councillor J Whitehead from Councillor P Downes

Does Councillor Whitehead share my concern about the extent to which the Department for Education puts constraints upon Local Authorities in the way that they can allocate funding to schools. A particular example I have in mind arose last week at the Schools Forum and Councillor Harty and I were there and I think we were both equally astonished to hear that the DfE prevents Local Authorities from giving supplementary funding to schools with falling rolls if they are not deemed by OfSTED to be good or outstanding. Now our vision as Councillors is that we are responsible for the wellbeing of all pupils in whatever school, whether it be Academies or Maintained Schools and whether they happen to be classified in one of these categories. Now the point about the falling rolls is that when a school loses a number of pupils for whatever reason, it becomes more cost-ineffective to educate the children remaining in the school. Therefore the County Council in the past has had a scheme which as it were compensates these schools in this situation. We are no longer allowed to do that and I think that is deplorable because it is probably those children in those schools that actually need the help more than those who are in good or outstanding schools. So I want to raise this point so that I guess some of you are unaware of that and I think it is very serious and I want to ask for Councillor Whitehead's views on that and her support, in case we decide to take any action in future.

Response from Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee, Councillor J Whitehead

Thank you Councillor Downes. Yes I would certainly support that. I am sure that as most people know, on the Children and Young People's Committee and other Committees, I thoroughly disapprove of the way that funding is allocated to schools, end of story. I certainly would feel that this discrimination which is what it is; is totally unhelpful and unacceptable. I also would like to stress that we are very much constrained in how we can allocate money. It does say for example that the £25,000 extra money we have got that it can be given to providers as well as schools. I think we are a provider at the County Council level, and I think therefore that we should be able to have some of that money to deal with some of the problems we have got. I am told we cannot do it, and as somebody pointed out, when is a provider not a provider? The answer – when it is a Local Authority.

3. Question to the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates from Councillor J Scutt

Yesterday in the Cambridge News, it was reported that there were twenty most dangerous school runs in the Cambridge area, and although one is concerned about the entire twenty, or any that come after the twenty, I do note that over the period 2008 – 2013, the total number of accidents in roads nearby, Milton Road Primary School was 78 and Chesterton Community College was 72, and these are two educational institutions within West Chesterton. What we do know is that we can ensure safety and environmental sustainability through cycling and walking, so I would like to ask what steps is the Council taking to lower

the accident rate around schools, particularly by eliminating so many cars around the schools and reverting to cycling and the use of pedestrian mode to get to schools?

Response from the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates

I think actually that the Chairman's announcement this morning indicated some of the work that the County does, so hopefully that was helpful to you. Thank you for providing the statistics to me earlier today. We do training as you know and we continue to do that training to encourage schools to participate in cycling and walking. That question you have addressed is quite comprehensive – we do monitor accidents as I'm sure you appreciate throughout the County, not only in school areas but elsewhere as well. I think for the completeness of your question, it will be better that I give you some facts and figures as well about the training, how often they take place, what the take up is of that training, about the restrictions that can be placed outside schools. So I think I will give a brief outline and I will ask officers to give you a much more comprehensive answer. It is a problem for all of our schools, you go round the County and you see the same sorts of problems in all the Divisions and some deal with it better and some not so. I think a written, comprehensive answer deserves that I think.

4. Question to the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates from Councillor N Kavanagh

In the light of the online retailer, Amazon's desire to test parcel delivery drones in the Cambridge area, and the fact that drones can now be purchased by the general public, what means are in place to keep the Marshall Airport flight path safe? Particularly for those of us who live under them?

Response from the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates

I am reliably informed that the guns are being delivered today. Any of those who are ex-RAF trained will be recruited shortly to assist Marshalls to ensure that they are shot down. On a serious note, I understand the question and I haven't a clue to the answer. I think that should give Graham Hughes some sleepless nights trying to find the answer. Maybe what he might do is to take your name and address, so that we can have it delivered by air and dropped from an appropriate height.

Supplementary question from Councillor N Kavanagh

I am sure that Mr S Claus, as he does his deliveries on the 24th December will be very reassured by your comments.

5. Question to the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates from Councillor J Williams

Councillor Hipkin mentioned earlier that it would appear that Cambridge City now has the worst level of air pollution of anywhere in the country and that is mainly due to bus engines. He will know that we have a quality bus contract and within that contract those bus operators who signed up to that contract should by now be operating buses that comply with Euro 5 emissions. Now you only have to go outside this building to see that neither Stagecoach nor Whippet have buses that are operating to Euro 5 emissions, in fact most of them are barely

reaching Euro 3 emissions. What action has this Council taken against those operators that have signed the quality bus contract to ensure they are complying with it?

Response from the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates

I think the starting point is to remember that they are commercial operators and therefore I will endeavour to ask the question of Stagecoach and the other bus operators about what their current position is in respect of the buses that they run and how they are compliant and give you a written answer in due course.

Supplementary question from Councillor J Williams

They signed up to a quality bus contract. Our side of the deal was that we would provide bus priority measures, we have provided bus lanes, we have provided bus shelters and we have provided bus priority measures. In return they were supposed to be providing us with quality bus services and as part of that contract that was to ensure that they operated the best possible fleet, the greenest fleet, the lowest emissions fleet, that was their side of the bargain. We have had this quality bus contract now for five years. They should be complying with that contract – they are not complying with that contract. To say that therefore because they are commercial operators we have no power over them, we might as well tear up that quality bus contract because it is worthless.

Response from the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates

Thank you for the supplementary question. I will give you a written answer. Thank you.

6. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count from Councillor A Lay

At the last full Council meeting, held on the 14th October, I asked Councillor Steve Count a question regarding the position of the proposal to build on the Estover Playing Field in March. He was forewarned of this question by myself, so there should have been no problems with any answer. I assumed that I and the Council would get a direct and truthful reply. I am now informed by several members of the public who record the transmission of this Council, that the Council was misled by Councillor Count. Councillor Count said that the Playing Field is a bare field and that it is virtually unused, and that there were no objections by residents to proposed housing on the Playing Field when the area was part of the North-East Housing allocation in the Core-Strategy early last year. Unfortunately the Estover Playing Field is not a bare field, it holds approximately 15 mature trees each of which has a tree preservation order on it. The area is also surrounded by substantial mature hedgerow which is conducive to a wildlife habitat. The playing field is regularly maintained by the Estover Playing Field Association. In addition, football is played on the field every weekend, both Saturday and Sunday and the public use the area along with their children on most days. A petition of 645 signatures and a 150 emails and letters all objecting to housing were sent to March Council and Councillor Count was well aware of this fact. Councillor Count is both a Town Councillor (interruption by the Chair that allotted time is being exceeded). Will Councillor Count reaffirm to this Council that the statement he made at the full Council meeting on 14th October was true?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count

There is quite a bit in there for me to take through. The first thing about being forewarned about the question – yes, I was forewarned on the morning of the meeting of a full Council.

Now it may not occur to Councillor Lay but normally I sit there doing my work all day long. I have a bit of lunch then I come back. So I put some thought into it, but I certainly did not have hours or days to actually prepare a written statement. So if some bits are partially incorrect then we will hear about them now. Members of the public do not record this – it is recorded by us and it is transmitted to members of the public so that every single word that gets said in error or in accuracy, are actually out there and the ones that you have picked up on – bare field - I am going to grant that. It was absolutely wrong for me to have said that it is a bare field – there are some trees on it, there are nice trees, they have TPOs on them. They are at one quadrant of the field and there is a pavilion that is built there, but, the proposals that were drawn up that I have seen in the past and the proposals that I presented at the Oliver Cromwell Hotel in July, specified that any proposals would be sympathetic to those trees and try to keep as many as possible. The vast majority of the trees are actually on the circumference, it is not a hedgerow, and there are a lot of trees on the circumference. So although it is technically incorrect, I don't feel that it had anything to do with any proposals that the County Council were bringing forward. When I said the words "virtually unused", I am comparing that to the potential it had as a fully-developed sports hub. What we are talking about is two adult playing pitches, tennis courts, multi-use games area – there is a substantial contribution of £500,00 being offered by the County Council to deliver all that on the back of these 99 houses that are being proposed on the field. Now if that is denied, it will actually deny the people of March the opportunity to have that fully developed sports field, but in the same way. (Interruption from the Chair)

Supplementary question from Councillor Lay

Just a few short sentences. I understand from Steve Count that he might have made a technical error or made a few mistaken sentences. Either way I am not happy with his answer.

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count

Thank you for that. I think we have cleared that up. What I am not happy about is UKIP parachuting themselves into March and trying to tell the people of March how to run their community. We have a District Council, we have a Town Council, and we have a County Council. The sort of stuff you get up to now – "Vote UKIP to save Estover". You don't even know all the facts about Estover and yet you bus in people, two Parliamentary candidates, three people from Wisbech.....

Point of order from Councillor Paul Bullen

Mr Chairman, this is not the venue for a party political broadcast against another party. This is not answering the question.

Chairman

I am pretty certain you said that tongue in cheek Councillor Bullen. But equally it is not a point of order either.

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count

...700 signatures which you quite rightly have said put down by the people of March using the correct process to actually deal with this issue and you parachute in and try to curry favours with things like that. You should be ashamed of yourselves. Lucy (Cllr Nethsingha) – you normally look at all the parts of the equation of this argument and you should not buy into all the rhetoric you read in the newspapers, or gets promoted by UKIP. You should

come and find out what every point of view is and see what the potential for that area is before you so quickly make your minds up.

7. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count from Councillor P Reeve

My question is to the Leader of the Council and it is on the same issue of Estover Park.

I was recently invited by members of the community and Councillors within Fenland to a meeting to hear residents' points of view. I notice that the Council Leader is a local Member and wasn't there and it is a shame that he was not there to hear their points of view. It is partly in connection to the answer he just gave to Councillor Lay's question on infrastructure on that park. Will he apologise to the people of March for this Council getting in the way of the Estover Playing Field Association being able to bid for external funding to get a significant amount of sports and recreational infrastructure on that field, much more than the developers are offering in part of the field if we give it up and put a huge amount of housing on there. Because this Council did get in the way of that funding bid on the basis that we refused to give any significant tenure to the site. We refused to give them a lease that was substantial enough to be able to attract the funding they felt they were able to get to develop the whole site. The people of March have been let down and it feels like it is in a bid to be able to push the residents off the site and housing into the site. Will you apologise for that?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count

Thank you Councillor Reeve. A number of points there.

On my non-attendance at the meeting in March, the meeting as far as I'm aware was a "Stop Development on Estover" meeting. It was labelled as that, it was branded as that. It was not an open forum for a discussion - it was labelled as "How do we stop the development" so I am not sure what the purpose of me going there was. I was actually doing County Council business in Cambridge City on that night.

In terms of the County Council getting in the way, this has been explained before. The County Council has an obligation to look after its assets for the people of Cambridgeshire. Now I could stand here and argue to all of you to give me that prime place, look after me, and make those 700 people vote for me in the next election. It is quite likely that I will lose my seat over this, but it is not possible to do that because it is not possible just to give away assets for areas that we don't actually have direct responsibility for. What has been brought forward is a compromise plan that actually looks after the people of Cambridgeshire on the one hand, but also looks after the people of March with quite a nice proposed plan. It has been complicated along the line because there have been so many reiterations of differences and a very, very good media and lobbying campaign. But the other half of the story isn't out there – it will go out there as time progresses and I think that what is there is actually good for the people of March. About this funding thing – a lot of the funding that is available is based on matched-funding. So simply giving over a lease does not attract the same level of funding that if the majority of the field was given over with a long term lease which was the proposal, and a cash sum, and therefore the development that is possible that way in my eyes, and I shall see who else's eyes, is a much better proposition than the other one.

Supplementary question from Councillor P Reeve

He (Councillor Count) has not answered my question. My question was actually will he apologise to the people of March and whilst he is at it, will he apologise to the people of Cambridgeshire for his actions this afternoon when he voted against the City Deal?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count

I am not sure about the second one but I think it was when I said I had pushed the wrong button – is that what we are talking about? Yes I am sorry to the people of Cambridge that I pushed the wrong button, and I said it immediately at that point in time and not to the point about the people of March. I am actually fighting for the people of March here. I know a lot of people agree with me, but if you actually say that every time a lobby group actually has more right to an opinion. I got voted in here to use my sense to do the best for the people. Now I know that there is a strong amount of opposition to this but it is actually because I put my head above the parapet and am actually prepared to try and do something that there is such a reaction. A lot of people are riding the crest of the wave – UKIP for example are actually not proposing to do anything - you are just sitting there and ruining it for the people that may benefit.

8. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count from Councillor A Walsh

My question will be brief and not to do with the Estover Playing Field. There are some members of the Conservative Group who also sit on South Cambridgeshire District Council. My question is to the Leader – does he support the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council to pay all of its staff the living wage?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count

I am simply unaware of that. Whilst I approve of whatever route South Cambs uses under its own terms of governance to make its decisions, what that has to do with the County Council, I'm not sure.

Supplementary question from Councillor A Walsh

Well in that case I would like to ask is he aware of any members of his own group who have raised the question of their own political consistency of supporting the policy at District Council level but not at County Council level? Has any member of his group made any communication along those lines with the Leader?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor S Count

I can confirm straight away, No – there hasn't, but at the end of the day the difficulties faced by County Councils and District Councils are well known. The severe financial difficulties we have here are very different to the type of difficulties faced by Districts and Cities and if the question was raised here, it would be on its own merits. It was raised I believe in the last year and this Council voted at that point in time not to proceed with the living wage.

9. Question to the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates from Councillor D Jenkins

This is not a question about March or Houghton and Wyton so Councillor Curtis can remain in the room. It is I think for Councillor Bates as Chair of the E&E Committee.

There are increasing reports of bus congestion in the City. I get a lot of them in my email traffic and if you look at the Facebook pages of different villages around Cambridge, people are forever complaining. Recently, Andy Campbell was interviewed on the radio on the subject and he said yes, congestion is higher than he has ever known it in the City and he says that on the one hand it is probably due to the booming economy and I think we can all bear testimony to that. I have spoken to retailers and people running restaurants and they

are all very happy with the level of business they are getting, but he also raises the question as to whether or not there is any knock-on impact of the Park and Ride parking charges. We do know that City Deal is supposed to make everything wonderfully better, but that is going to be in two or three years' time. We actually have a serious problem today, because Andy Campbell says that if things do not improve, he is going to consider removing services because he cannot run them properly. I would suggest and will you please put this on as an agenda item for the E&E Committee in January so that this can be addressed and we can work together to see if there are any short term solutions which we can work on with Stagecoach and others.

Response from the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor I Bates

Thank you. I think a few comments. You have mentioned the City Deal – I have not heard the interview that you were referring to, so perhaps that would be useful for me to hear exactly what the Managing Director of Stagecoach said. Remember there are bus lanes, remember we have just actually got some cameras in there to stop cars using those bus lanes but I am happy to take a paper to Spokes, which is the right way forward first, before it goes to Committee. I have not seen the forward agenda for January – it is pretty heavy already and therefore I think it should rightly go to Spokes first and then on to Committee but I think that is the decision for the Spokes and I will discuss that with my Vice-Chairman and the Spokes at that meeting but I will ask for that to be put on the agenda. I cannot promise that it will be dealt with in January, but I hope you will understand that.

Response from Councillor D Jenkins

I agree with that as an approach. I think that is fair – I would just point out that the issue is now, so there is no point in hanging around. And whilst I am standing here I wish everybody a Merry Christmas and a Good New Year and hope we have a good 2015.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 14 OCTOBER 2014

WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2

Question from Councillor Alan Lay

Councillor Lay would like to thank the Chair of the Children & Young People Committee (CYP) for her comprehensive reply to his written question at the last meeting of this Council.

Unfortunately, the previous answers have raised further issues and it is, therefore, requested that the following additional questions be answered:

Can you please state exactly which payments (and for how much) are Statutory and which are 'in line with the Council's policy of providing preventative support that meets a family's needs at an earlier stage before they require more intensive and higher cost services'.

Chair CYP is correct when she states that 'The written statement to Parliament produced by the Communities Minister on Translation into foreign languages. March 2013, which reaffirmed the approach to not translate documents or provide interpretation services unless for an emergency situation or to comply with the Equalities Act'.

Can you please confirm exactly what is considered an 'Emergency Situation' and in exactly what circumstances this Council provides these services to comply with the Equalities Act.

It is believed that there is no provision in any statute for the Council to provide all translation or interpretation services at the Council's expense and, therefore, the Council should charge the recipient for any and all such services.

Can you please confirm if this Council does charge for any translation or interpretation service and, if not, under what authority is the service provided at council tax payers expense. Furthermore, will she look into the possibility of charging for all such services in the future?

**Response from Councillor Joan Whitehead,
Chairwoman of Children and Young People Committee**

1. *Can you please state exactly which payments (and for how much) are Statutory and which are 'in line with the Council's policy of providing preventative support that meets a family's needs at an earlier stage before they require more intensive and higher cost services'.*

Reply: The data on the payments provided across the Council relates to over 3,300 transactions during the period April 2012 to August 2014. In order to determine under what circumstances interpretation or translation services were provided each transaction would need to be considered individually, and manually tracked back to the budget holder who would then need to identify each client and from this look at their case in order to determine if the support was required to meet a statutory duty or if the activity was in line with the County Council policy of providing preventative support. Over the last three years support has been provided in a range of languages including British Sign Language.

As a broad indication, much of the preventative work in Children, Families and Adult (CFA) Services is carried out by the Enhanced and Preventative Services Directorate where

although delivering preventative support, much of this is statutory in nature, for example carrying out education welfare work or has its basis in statutory activity for example delivery of parenting support through Children's Centre activities.

The Council's services are very aware of the need to avoid unnecessary expenditure and seek to strike a balance between the cost of interpretation services and the benefits and potential savings achieved through understanding the needs and issues of a family promptly to ensure that the right support, if any, is provided.

This expectation that spend is minimised is reflected in our policy around translation of publications: we do not now translate materials such as posters and leaflets unless there is clear operational need to do so.

2. *Can you please confirm exactly what is considered an 'Emergency Situation' and in exactly what circumstances this Council provides these services to comply with the Equalities Act.*

Reply: Emergency situations are not currently defined across the Council; instead staff will use their professional judgement in each situation, usually in conjunction with support from their line manager, to decide when interpretation or translation services should be procured, to meet a crisis situation or as part of delivery of their statutory responsibilities.

Across CFA Services, Children's Social Care is most likely to meet families in emergency situations and crisis. Examples include:

- A parent who doesn't speak English is taken ill or involved in an accident or incident and has children who need to be accommodated by the Council: in this case we need their written agreement to accommodate their children and thus need to ensure they can understand the situation and what they are agreeing to.
- A child protection referral when there is a pressing need to understand the family circumstances and the balance of risks and protective factors that a child is subject to in order to form a very rapid view of the risk to the child of being within the family unit.
- Some adults are unwilling to communicate with Council services. The availability of interpretation and translation services reduces a potential barrier to communication and the safeguarding of vulnerable children (and adults).

More generally, where a family or individual is referred in crisis, services need to understand the situation and risks. To do this, if a child or adult does not understand English then interpreter services are required to ensure effectively communication or example to clarify if any abuse or crime has occurred or is at risk.

In respect of our duty under the Equalities Act, the Council is bound by the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) of the Equality Act 2010 to show due regard for the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (for example, disability, race, ethnicity, age, gender) and persons who do not share it. This includes the need to ensure people can use the services we provide and make reasonable adjustments to enable them to do this. The Council has a general duty not to discriminate unlawfully.

3. *Can you please confirm if this Council does charge for any translation or interpretation service and, if not, under what authority is the service provided at council tax payers expense. Furthermore, will she look into the possibility of charging for all such services in the future?*

Reply: This Council does not charge the individuals concerned for the interpreter or translation services it uses to deliver services to them.

The authority by which the Council does this is its statutory obligation under the Equalities Act and provision of such interpretation or translation services is required to ensure compliance with our duty under this Act.

The services are also provided to assist in discharging a range of responsibilities within safeguarding and other legislation. There is also an operational risk in that charging for interpreter services will act as a deterrent for some individuals to raise concerns with the Council.

It is not intended to look into the possibility of charging for all such services for these reasons.