

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 21st July 2015

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 3.45 p.m.

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillors P Ashcroft, B Ashwood, I Bates, C Boden, D Brown, P Brown, P Bullen, R Butcher, S Bywater, E Cearns, B Chapman, P Clapp, J Clark, D Connor, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, A Dent, D Divine, P Downes, S Frost, D Giles, G Gillick, S Hoy, L Harford, D Harty, R Henson, R Hickford, J Hipkin, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, G Kenney, S Kindersley, A Lay, M Leeke, I Manning, M Mason, M McGuire, Z Moghadas, L Nethsingha, T Orgee, J Palmer, P Read, K Reynolds, M Rouse, P Sales, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Smith, A Taylor, M Tew, P Topping, A Walsh, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors A Bailey, M Loynes, F Onasanya, P Reeve, S Rylance, M Shuter, S Van de Kerkhove and S van de Ven

150. MINUTES – 12TH MAY 2015

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 12th May 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

151. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

152. REPORT OF THE COUNTY RETURNING OFFICER

Council noted that Councillor Samantha Hoy had been elected to fill the vacancy in the Wisbech South Electoral Division in the by-election held on 4th June 2015 and Councillor Zoe Moghadas had been elected to fill the vacancy in the Romsey Electoral Division in the by-election held on 25th June 2015.

153. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

154. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No public questions were received.

155. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

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

The Chairman welcomed back Councillor Read to a Council meeting and, with the

agreement of Council, withdrew the report.

157. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

TREASURY MANAGEMENT QUARTER FOUR REPORT

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendation set out in Minute 115 of the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting of 19th May 2015 be approved. In moving the report, Councillor Count highlighted that in relation to page 6, paragraph 6.3 the first line reading "As at 31st March the level of investment totalled £35.5" required the insertion of a small 'm' to signify that the amount was a million.

In response to question from Councillor Mason regarding the reference in paragraph 9.3 on what the accumulated accrued interest of £0.635m represented, Councillor Count undertook to provide a written response.

It was resolved unanimously:

to approve the fourth quarter update and Treasury Management Outturn Report 2014/15.

158. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP REFRESH)

It was moved by the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Cearns, that the recommendation set out in Minute 134 of the minutes of the Economy and Environment Committee meeting of 26th May 2015 be approved.

In response to a request from Councillor Wilson, Councillor Bates agreed to ask the officers to address some of the potential inconsistencies on the Council website in relation to options for a link road between Hartford and Godmanchester, and in consultation with his Vice-Chairman, to notify Members if changes were required.

It was resolved unanimously:

to approve the adoption of the refreshed LTP: Policies and Strategy and the new LTP, long Term Transport Strategy to Council as core documents of the Third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan, replacing the original document that was adopted in March 2011.

**159. CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO FULL COUNCIL
LOCAL AUTHORITIES (STANDING ORDERS) (ENGLAND) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015**

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

It was resolved unanimously:-

- (i) to approve the revisions to Part 4.7 of the Constitution (Officer Employment Rules) as set out in Appendix A to the report; and
- (ii) to authorise the Monitoring Officer to amend the Constitution accordingly and to prepare a procedure note setting out the steps for convening an Independent Panel.

**160. ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL:
SUBMISSION TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR
ENGLAND**

The Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman Councillor Smith, moved all the recommendations for approval as set out in the report of the Electoral Review Working Group.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

- A) to approve a formal submission to the LGBCE restating that 63 single member divisions is the Council's preferred electoral arrangement.

Council then considered each recommendation in turn.

- B) That Council is recommended:

- i) to approve a division proposal for Cambridge City
(*shown as scenario A within recommendation Bi. in Appendix One*).

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Walsh and seconded by Councillor Hipkin:

Replace recommendation Bi with the following

Council resolves to:

- approve a division proposal for Cambridge City, broadly accepting the LGBCE boundaries, but abolishing the two-Member division of Castle and Newnham and creating two separate Divisions, and altering the Arbury boundary slightly, as detailed in Scenario B below and the map attached to the report.

Cambridge City: Scenario B

	Electorate 2020	Variance 2020 (%)
Arbury	7,724	-7.0%
Barnwell	8,538	3.0%
Castle	8,712	5.0%
Cherry Hinton	8,839	7.0%
Chesterton	8,977	8.0%
King's Hedges	8,996	9.0%
Newnham	9,037	9.0%
Queen Edith's	7,828	-5.0%

Romsey	8,670	5.0%
St Paul's	8,231	-1.0%
St Matthew's	8,490	3.0%
Trumpington	7,708	-7.0%
Total	101750	n/a

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

[Voting pattern: nearly all Conservatives, all Labour, two UKIP, two Independents in favour; all Liberal Democrats, six UKIP, and one Conservative against; one UKIP and one Independent abstained.]

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

[Voting pattern: nearly all Conservatives, all Labour, two UKIP, two Independents and one Liberal Democrat in favour; ten Liberal Democrats and six UKIP against; one Conservative, one Liberal Democrat and one Independent abstained.]

- ii) to approve a division proposal for East Cambridgeshire *(two alternative scenarios are shown within recommendation Bii. Scenario A or Scenario B in Appendix One to the report).*

Councillor Count moved the adoption of Scenario B as an amendment which was seconded by Councillor Schumann. Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was carried.

[Voting pattern: all Conservatives, nine UKIP, all Labour, three Independents and one Liberal Democrat in favour; nine Liberal Democrats against; and two Liberal Democrats abstained.]

A further amendment was moved by Councillor Hunt and seconded by Councillor Schumann as follows:

“ the following name changes are proposed:

- “Sutton South and South Ely Villages” to “Haddenham and Sutton South”
- “Soham South and South Soham Villages” to “Fordham Villages and Soham South”
- “Sutton North and Downham Villages” to “Downham Villages and Sutton North”

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

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion as amended was carried unanimously by a show of hands.

- iii) to approve the division proposal for Fenland, excluding Wisbech *(shown as recommendation Biii. in Appendix One to the report).*

The Chairman, with the agreement of Council, proposed to alter the wording of this Recommendation “To approve the two division proposals for Fenland excluding

Wisbech (Shown as recommendation Biii in appendix one). Showing this Council's preference for Scenario A representing 10 divisions and also Scenario B representing 9 divisions should LGBCE not accept 63 members.

On being put the vote, the altered recommendation was agreed unanimously on a show of hands.

- iv) to approve a division proposal for Wisbech *(three alternative scenarios are shown within recommendation Biv. Option A, B or C. in Appendix One to the report).*

Councillor Count moved the adoption of Option C as an amendment which was seconded by Councillor Hoy.

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

[Voting pattern: all Conservatives, all Labour, two UKIP, two Independents and one Liberal Democrat in favour; eleven Liberal Democrats, six UKIP and one Independent against; and one UKIP abstained.]

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

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

- v) to approve the division proposal for Huntingdonshire *(shown as recommendation B v) in Appendix One to the report).*

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Criswell and seconded by Councillor Harty:

The current proposal before full council for Huntingdonshire from the member working group creates a division (HDC_17) within St Neots that will have 16% electoral variance in 2020, an amount outside of that normally accepted by the Boundary Commission.

This amendment proposes to change the recommendations for electoral divisions for St Neots to be consistent with those proposed by the Boundary Commission within their draft recommendations published 12th May, 2015.

To change the proposed HDC 11, HDC 14 and HDC 17 divisions to the following:

Division	Electorate 2020*	Electoral Variance 2020 (based on 63 Members)
St Neots Priory Park and Little Paxton	8,723	5%
St Neots The Eatons	8,466	2%
St Neots Eynesbury	8,111	-2%

* Source: LGBCE, May 2015

The amendment does not have any impact on arrangements beyond the St Neots divisions specified above.

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

[Voting pattern : nearly all Conservatives, all Labour, five UKIP, three Liberal Democrats and one Independent in favour; eight Liberal Democrats, four UKIP, one Conservative and one Independent against; one Liberal Democrat and one Independent abstained]

A further amendment was proposed by Councillor Downes and seconded by Councillor Nethsingha:

To change the proposed Huntingdonshire District Council 2 and 3 divisions and accept the Boundary Commission proposals for the divisions called 'Alconbury & Kimbolton' and 'Brampton & Buckden', as shown on page 78 of the Boundary Commission's report.

Following discussion, it was proposed by Councillor Sales and seconded by Councillor Walsh that the amendment be put. On being put to the vote, this proposal was carried by a majority

The amendment on being put to the vote was lost.

[Voting pattern: all Liberal Democrats, one Conservative, one UKIP and one Independent in favour; nearly all Conservatives, seven UKIP, seven Labour and one Independent against; one UKIP and one Independent abstained]

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion as amended was carried on a show of hands.

As an alteration of the recommendations, the Chairman proposed, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, the following additional recommendation:

- vi) to approve the LGBCE draft proposals in the consultation for South Cambridgeshire.

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

161. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN / WOMAN OF THE ADULTS COMMITTEE / APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council, Councillor Smith, and resolved unanimously:

- a) to agree the appointment of Councillor Tew as the Chairman of the Adults Committee.
- b) to agree to replace Councillor Chapman with Councillor Schumann on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority.

162. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Three motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

(a) Motion from Councillor Roger Hickford

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

This Council notes that:

- A. Cambridgeshire County Council faces extreme financial pressures having made £165m of cuts over the past four years and needing to make a further 101.5m of cuts in the following five years.
- B. In order to protect front line services going forward, developing new sources of income is an important element of the Council's Business Plan to mitigate the impact of the financial pressures and to achieve this the Council is committed to taking a more commercial attitude to its business and assets in order to develop those new income streams.
- C. The business case underpinning the Cambridge Library Enterprise Centre (CLEC) proposal predicted that it would have raised significant income for the Council but in the event it proved to be a controversial proposal and did not attract sufficient public and political support to be progressed.
- D. The important role that Spokes plays in the Committee structure in the passing of information from members to officers and vice versa, and highlighting potential issues so that officers can work on solutions (or not), and potentially save the Council money through officers not carrying out unnecessary work.

And, as a consequence, Council:

- A. Requests that the way in which the CLEC proposals emerged and were developed is examined to understand what lessons can be learnt.
- B. Recognises that as financial pressures on the Council increase, a more effective way of identifying and developing commercial proposals is developed.
- C. Recognises the important role that Spokes should play in the Committee system.

Therefore, this Council resolves:

- To request that the Audit and Accounts Committee;-
 - undertake a review of the process by which the CLEC proposals emerged and were developed and to make recommendations on how that process could be improved;
 - prepare a protocol, recognising the need to raise additional income,

for dealing with new commercial proposals covering matters to include:

- Scoping of proposals to be considered
 - Engagement with members
 - Dealing with confidential information
- to undertake a review of the Spokes position within the Committee system and how it could be more effective;
 - to report the findings of that review to Council as soon as possible.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Ashwood and seconded by Councillor Taylor:

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough.

Amend the recommendation as follows:

This Council notes that:

- A. Cambridgeshire County Council faces extreme financial pressures having made £165m of cuts over the past four years and needing to make a further 101.5m of cuts in the following five years.
- B. In order to protect front line services going forward, developing new sources of income is an important element of the Council's Business Plan to mitigate the impact of the financial pressures and to achieve this the Council is committed to taking a more commercial attitude to its business and assets in order to develop those new income streams.
- C. The business case underpinning the Cambridge Library Enterprise Centre (CLEC) proposal predicted that it would have raised significant income for the Council but in the event it proved to be a controversial proposal and did not attract sufficient public and political support to be progressed. **Further, thanks to investigative work by a member of the public, the competency of the lead negotiator on the KORA side was put in doubt.**
- ~~D. The important role that Spokes plays in the Committee structure in the passing of information from members to officers and vice versa, and highlighting potential issues so that officers can work on solutions (or not), and potentially save the Council money through officers not carrying out unnecessary work.~~ **The role of the Group spokes people is currently not defined precisely in the constitution, and is the subject of some disagreement between the different members of this Council.**

And, as a consequence, Council:

- D. Requests that the way in which the CLEC proposals emerged and were developed is examined to understand what lessons can be learnt.
- E. Recognises that as financial pressures on the Council increase, a more effective way of identifying and developing commercial proposals is developed.

- F. Recognises the important role that Spokes should play in the Committee system.

Therefore, this Council resolves:

- To request that the Audit and Accounts Committee;-
 - ~~undertake a review of the process by which the CLEC proposals emerged and were developed and to make recommendations on how that process could be improved;~~
 - prepare a protocol, recognising the need to raise additional income, for dealing with new commercial proposals covering matters to include:
 - Scoping of proposals to be considered
 - Engagement with members
 - Dealing with confidential information
- **To request the Constitution and Ethics Committee** to undertake a review of the Spokes position within the Committee system and how it could be more effective;
- to report the findings of that review to Council as soon as possible.

Further Council asks the monitoring officer to commission an independent inquiry of the process, with simple terms of reference, to highlight failings at both officer and democratic level, and recommendations to prevent such failings in future.

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

[Voting pattern: eleven Liberal Democrats, one Conservative, and one Independent in favour; nearly all Conservatives, nine UKIP, seven Labour and one Independent against; one Liberal Democrat and one Independent abstained]

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

(b) Motion from Councillor Steve Count

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Count and seconded by Councillor David Brown:

This Council notes that:

Freemasonry is one of the world's oldest and largest non-religious, non-political, fraternal and charitable organisations. It is a society concerned with moral and spiritual values.

There are 250,000 Freemasons belonging to 8,000 Lodges throughout England and Wales, and districts overseas. Worldwide, the figure rises to six million Freemasons.

The Standards Board for England issued guidance in January 2004, confirming

that membership of the freemasons must be declared under the councillors' Code of Conduct which was then in force. The code required councillors and other members to declare membership of charities. However, the guidance related to a different code of conduct, that code of conduct was repealed by central government in 2012 when the Standards Board was abolished on 1 April 2012.

At the time, the United Grand Lodge (<http://www.ugle.org.uk/>) advised The Standards Board for England that when freemasons pay their annual subscription fee to their lodges, part of the fee goes to the Freemasons Grand Charity. Therefore, freemasons must register membership of their freemason lodge on the Register of Interests and declare their membership before, or during, council meetings where appropriate.

Although members and officers should already be aware of this, the guidance issued by Cambridgeshire County Council regarding the Code of Conduct, (in common with some other Councils) does not specifically mention Freemasonry as a group that should be declared, on the official declaration of interests register.

This Council believes:

- That transparency is important to this Council and a councillor's or senior officer's membership of the Freemasons should be declared. This transparency is further supported by the United Grand Lodge of England as it states that Freemasonry prides itself on its transparency, as not only are Freemasons completely free to acknowledge their membership, they are encouraged to do so.
- That specifically giving guidance in our Code of conduct enables the public to have greater confidence in our commitment to transparency.
- That specifically giving guidance in our Code of conduct adds certainty to members and senior officers, to their obligation to register their membership.

Therefore, this Council resolves to require that:

- All Cambridgeshire County Councillors and Senior Officers should declare their membership on the relevant Council register of interests.
- As with all other interests, if their 'partner' (spouse or civil partner), a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as though in a civil partnership is a member of the Freemasons this must also be declared.

The Constitution and Ethics Committee is asked to consider how best to work this statement of intent into our Code of conduct.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Reynolds and seconded by Councillor Dent:

Delete all after "This Council resolves" and insert, " The matter is referred to the Constitution & Ethics Committee without further discussion and that all papers relating to case law on this subject are made available to the Committee when they consider the matter" so that the motion as amended with additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough reads:

“This Council notes that:

Freemasonry is one of the world’s oldest and largest non-religious, non-political, fraternal and charitable organisations. It is a society concerned with moral and spiritual values.

There are 250,000 Freemasons belonging to 8,000 Lodges throughout England and Wales, and districts overseas. Worldwide, the figure rises to six million Freemasons.

The Standards Board for England issued guidance in January 2004, confirming that membership of the freemasons must be declared under the councillors’ Code of Conduct which was then in force. The code required councillors and other members to declare membership of charities. However, the guidance related to a different code of conduct, that code of conduct was repealed by central government in 2012 when the Standards Board was abolished on 1 April 2012.

At the time, the United Grand Lodge (<http://www.ugle.org.uk/>) advised The Standards Board for England that when freemasons pay their annual subscription fee to their lodges, part of the fee goes to the Freemasons Grand Charity. Therefore, freemasons must register membership of their freemason lodge on the Register of Interests and declare their membership before, or during, council meetings where appropriate.

Although members and officers should already be aware of this, the guidance issued by Cambridgeshire County Council regarding the Code of Conduct, (in common with some other Councils) does not specifically mention Freemasonry as a group that should be declared, on the official declaration of interests register.

This Council believes:

- That transparency is important to this Council and a councillor’s or senior officer’s membership of the Freemasons should be declared. This transparency is further supported by the United Grand Lodge of England as it states that Freemasonry prides itself on its transparency, as not only are Freemasons completely free to acknowledge their membership, they are encouraged to do so.
- That specifically giving guidance in our Code of conduct enables the public to have greater confidence in our commitment to transparency.
- That specifically giving guidance in our Code of conduct adds certainty to members and senior officers, to their obligation to register their membership.

Therefore, this Council resolves ~~to require that:~~

~~— All Cambridgeshire County Councillors and Senior Officers should declare their membership on the relevant Council register of interests.~~

~~— As with all other interests, if their ‘partner’ (spouse or civil partner), a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person~~

~~with whom the member is living as though in a civil partnership is a member of the Freemasons this must also be declared.~~

~~The Constitution and Ethics Committee is asked to consider how best to work this statement of intent into our Code of conduct.~~

The matter is referred to the Constitution & Ethics Committee without further discussion and that all papers relating to case law on this subject are made available to the Committee when they consider the matter"

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

[Voting pattern: twenty Conservatives, ten Liberal Democrats, all Labour, six UKIP and three Independents in favour; three Conservatives, and one UKIP against; and one UKIP abstention.]

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

[Voting pattern: nineteen Conservatives, nine Liberal Democrats, four Labour, three Independents and one UKIP in favour; six UKIP, four Conservatives, against; and three Labour, one Conservative, one Liberal Democrat and one UKIP abstained.]

(c) Motion from Councillor Ian Manning

Councillor Manning withdrew the following motion:

Council notes with concern the sequence of events that led to the approval of an agreement with KORA and its subsequent cancellation when procedural deficiencies came to light.

Council believes that this experience raises fundamental questions about:

- the relationship between officers and members in the development of policies and in procurement procedures;
- issues in relation to commercial confidentiality.

Council calls on the Constitution and Ethics Committee to review all these areas and bring forward revised protocols that will allow the Council to function democratically, efficiently and transparently.

Further Council asks the monitoring officer to commission an independent inquiry of the process, with simple terms of reference, to highlight failings at both officer and democratic level, and recommendations to prevent such failings in future.

Finally Council acknowledges that the entire history of the potential involvement with Kora has reflected badly on this Council and the residents it serves. Thus, Council as a whole offers an apology to the residents of Cambridgeshire.

163. QUESTIONS:

a) Oral Questions

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

- In response to a question from Councillor Giles, the Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, agreed to respond in writing on the plans for the future in relation to parking charges in St Neots.
- In response to a request from Councillor Schumann, the Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, agreed to investigate why Isleham Parish Council had been forced to write to the Chief Executive to get a response to a highways issue.
- In response to a question from Councillor Chapman, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, Councillor Bates, undertook to pursue a likely date for a Market Town Transport Strategy for St Neots, while making it clear that it was dependent on Huntingdonshire District Council producing the Master Plan for St Neots.
- In response to a question from Councillor Taylor, the Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, undertook to investigate the continued delay to the repair of the traffic bollards on Worts Causeway.
- In response to a question from Councillor Manning, the Chairman of the Adults Committee, Councillor Tew, undertook to look into whether the Independent Living Fund was to be ringfenced.
- In response to a question from Councillor Hickford, the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee, Councillor Whitehead undertook to investigate the claim that the majority of children with a statement were not receiving support after the age of 16.

b) Written Questions

No written questions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2.

Chairman

APPENDIX A**COUNTY COUNCIL – 21ST JULY 2015
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS****PEOPLE****Wisbech South By-Election**

The result from the By-Election held on 4th June 2015 for the Wisbech South Electoral Division was:

Name	Description	Votes Cast
Susan Lesley Carson	UKIP	298
Samantha Hoy	Conservative	1020
Josephine Ratcliffe	Liberal Democrat	61
Dean Lyndon Reeves	Labour	219

The turnout was 20%.

Samantha Hoy was declared as the duly elected councillor for the Wisbech South Division and has signed her declaration of acceptance.

Romsey By-Election

The result from the By-Election held on 25th June 2015 for the Romsey Electoral Division was:

Name	Description	Votes Cast
Deborah Aitchison	Green	467
Richard Jeffs	UKIP	46
Nichola Martin	Liberal Democrat	782
Zoe Moghadas	Labour	829
Rahatul Raja	Conservative	100

The turnout was 32.5%.

Zoe Moghadas was declared as the duly elected councillor for the Romsey Division and has signed her declaration of acceptance.

AWARDS**Sir Hugh Duberly KCVO**

The Council is delighted to report that the Lord-Lieutenant, Sir Hugh Duberly, has been awarded the Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order in the Queen's Birthday Honours 2015.

Stonewall's Education Equality Index 2015

Cambridgeshire has been ranked third in LGBT charity Stonewall's *Education Equality Index 2015* for its work in tackling homophobic bullying in its schools. The Council's submission for the award was led by CREDS (Cambridgeshire Race Equality and Diversity Service) in partnership with SexYOUality – a Cambridgeshire charity for lesbian, gay and bisexual young

people. They were required to submit evidence of the work they had done with schools and youth groups on training and educating young people to tackle and overcome homophobic behaviour.

APPENDIX B**COUNTY COUNCIL – 21ST JULY 2015****ORAL QUESTION TIME****1. Question from Councillor D Giles to Councillor R Hickford, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee**

My question is to Cllr Hickford and it refers to the car parking charges in St Neots. The Town Centre Shops in St Neots are suffering as a result of on-street car parking charges. This is caused by the out of town supermarkets offering free parking and with two new out of town supermarkets now being built, the problem will not get any better. Can I have his assurance that there will be no further increases in car parking charges in our town for at least five years? That's one – and two – that the car parks will still remain free on Sundays?

Response from Councillor R Hickford

I have no knowledge of this one Chairman - no you can't have my assurance, but I will get back with our plans for the future that we know of at the moment and write to you on them – and the Sunday one.

2. Question from Councillor J Schumann to Councillor R Hickford, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee

My question is for the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee and I have pre-briefed the Chairman. The question is would the Chairman agree that it is wholly unacceptable that Isleham Parish Council or any Parish Council had to write to the Chief Executive to get a response regarding a highways issue, the reason the result of staffing issues, and can the Chairman investigate and continue to monitor this unsatisfactory situation?

Response from Councillor Hickford

Yes, I agree it is unsatisfactory for any Parish Council to have to write to the Chief Executive for a response and I shall investigate with officers and get back to the Councillor.

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

My question should be quite quick. A couple of meetings ago, I asked about the Market Town Transport strategy for St Neots. I did get a written response but it didn't have any date as to when that Market Town Transport Strategy would be prepared. I still haven't received a date and I wondered if perhaps the Chairman of E&E would be able to provide me with one?

Response from Councillor Bates

Councillor Chapman is quite right with the facts that he has just disclosed. We are in discussion with Huntingdon District Council. My understanding is that Huntingdon District Council are planning to do a master plan for St Neots. We would therefore wait for the master plan and the Transport Plan for St Neots and the surrounding area to be done at the same time, working in partnership with them, so the reason there is no date, is that we are

waiting for Huntingdon District Council and their timetable to bring the two together so there can be a collective document for both transport and master plan.

Supplementary question from Councillor Chapman

I look forward to receiving the date when that master plan is coming into place and seeing the date of the Market Town Transport Strategy below that.

Response from Councillor Bates

It's not a date yet given to me and therefore I cannot pass that date on at this moment in time, but obviously we will pursue that.

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

My question is to Councillor Whitehead, the Children and Young People Community Chair person. Would she agree that two recent statements by the Secretary of State, Mrs Nicky Morgan that the pupil premium will be continued at its present level, which is good, and she has also said that she will proceed towards a National Fair Funding Formula. Now that was not expected, because it was very much a coalition statement but she said that, so would you join me in welcoming those statements?

Response from Councillor Whitehead

I think Council recognise that as a hallmark Peter Downes question and all I am required to do is to say "I agree".

Supplementary question from Councillor Downes

The difficulty with Mrs Morgan's statement was that she said that it is a very complicated matter and that it will take at least two years to produce a National Fair Funding Formula. Now Cambridgeshire pupils cannot wait two years, because they are already very badly funded. Now I want to ask you and all colleagues who have any influence in London, in Westminster, to point out to Mrs Morgan that the work on devising a National Fair Funding Formula was done in very great detail over two years between 2000 and 2002. It was a very substantial piece of work and it was very highly regarded at the time and it was rejected by the Labour Government in place. Now my point is this, that this process can be short circuited if she were to look in the filing cabinet on floor seven of Sanctuary Buildings. My question is this, would Councillor Whitehead join me and others in using all the influence possible on our elected members, our MPs, to get this matter expedited?

Response from Councillor Whitehead

Yes of course we will do that Chairman and may I ask that perhaps Councillor Downes will bring that matter to the next meeting of the Children and Young People Committee and we will therefore write to the Secretary of State for Education on that matter.

5. Question from Councillor E Cearns to Councillor S Count, Leader of the Council

This is a question to the Leader of the Council. Following the unanimous vote for looking at the future governance of this Council and following that, a recommendation made at General Purposes Committee to set up the working group, does he share my surprise that the Chief Executive has today sent a letter recommending a combined Authority without any reference

to that said working group or indeed any detail of that being worked up by that working group.

Response from Councillor Count

Unfortunately I am not sure exactly of the basis of Councillor Cearn's information, or how he is dissecting the letter. There is a slight mismatch between reality and what has just come over in that statement. The Chief Executive has not written to the Government saying that we want a combined Authority. He has written to the Government to say that we and other authorities are in discussions and we would like to enter into further discussions and that covers a range of things, the offers that we are making to Government, including the governance that might occur. There is no specific task in there, so sorry.

Supplementary question from Councillor Cearn's

The detail that is attached to that letter sets out very clearly and asks for a combined authority with a breakdown of other options and other considerations, and can you give me an assurance of how the wider membership is going to be involved in that consultation process and most importantly, the communities that we are here to serve.

Response from Councillor Count

The letter sets out the type of governance that can be considered and the present legislation and that currently considered by the Leaders. It does not say we are going down a specific route. I can tell you that all Authorities are not signed up to a single specific route at this point in time and we have actually commissioned an outside body to have a look at various options that are in front of us and that ranges not just from a combined authority, but other options as well. So as in moving forward when we have more detail for something that we wish to share, we can, but I must remind this organisation that the actual combined authority model actually retained the County Council, so we will be fully involved at the right point in time.

6. Question from Councillor A Taylor to Councillor R Hickford, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee

My question is to Councillor Hickford as Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure. It is about a small local matter that I shouldn't really have to bring to you at Council but I have had repeated assurances and let downs from officers I'm afraid. As you know I represent a ward on the fringes of Cambridge and we have traffic bollards on Worts Causeway, one of our residential streets, which is the first of the ones in the ward as opposed to the countryside. The bollards are there so that cars don't speed down from the 60mph zone into a residential area. These have been broken since 2013. We keep getting assurances that something is going to happen in a few weeks' time. Would Councillor Hickford agree with me that 18 months to mend some traffic bollards is unacceptable and would he be able to use his good offices to try to get things moving please?

Response from Councillor Hickford

Again I had no knowledge of this but it does seem unacceptable and I will have a word with officers as well to find out what is going on there and get back to you.

Supplementary question from Councillor Taylor

Just to say thank you very much. I appreciate that because 60mph traffic in a residential area is quite dangerous so thank you for that.

7. Question from Councillor L Nethsingha to Councillor R Hickford, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee

My question is also to the Chair of H&CI and it regards to street lighting in Cambridge or street lighting across the County in fact. Does the Chair recognise that the process leading to the publication of maps of areas of the County where the county is considering turning off street lights was not sufficient. Local Members should have been given greater warning and more information about the process prior to it appearing in the public domain. To inform Members 48 hours before the maps appeared in the Cambridge News is not sufficient. Does he recognise that there is a world of difference between a discussion about dimming street lights and what appears close to a full-blown intention to turn them off. That a street dimly lit is vastly different from a street with no lighting at all. Lastly, does he recognise that Cambridge as a University city with a very large student population who depend largely upon walking and cycling to get around, is very different from our neighbouring authorities who may have already tried this street light switch off. For many Cambridge students and indeed many professors, midnight is an early night, whether they are socialising or working. The Transport Plan for this city relies heavily on persuading people to leave their cars at home. We will not persuade a Chesterton PhD student to cycle into work in the morning if he or she does not feel safe to cycle home again in the evening after dinner in college, or a long evening in the library. Can he reassure me that this street lighting consultation is a genuine consultation and that if a district or parish says no, that will be respected.

Response from Councillor Hickford

The default position of this Council is to turn the street lights off between 12 midnight and 6 in the morning. The consultation is with local authorities, our partners and as far as you are concerned, it is with the City, and I have met with Lewis Herbert and there is consultation with the City Council and of course, whatever is fed back will be looked at. Consultations are for information purposes and then the option that the City Council or any local authority has, including Parish Councils, is that they can pay to keep them on pro rata or for all those six hours. So that is the default position of the Council at the moment and yes, you are right, there is consultation going on but it is not with residents it is with the local authorities.

Supplementary question from Councillor Nethsingha

I am deeply concerned by that response. I am deeply concerned that a consultation should only be with other councils and not with residents when this will have a huge impact on residents and I would like the Chair respond to my perception that the transport situation within Cambridge City is different from the rest of the Council and that if the City Council is not willing to fund this, the Council should not turn those lights off.

Response from Councillor Hickford

Cambridge City keep saying that it is a special case and to a certain extent it is and I am sure the Councillor already knows that we are proposing to keep some street lights on in those six hours in the centre of Cambridge, for those specific reasons, but the default position of this Council is as I already stated.

8. Question from Councillor I Manning to Councillor M Tew, Chairman of the Adults Committee

I believe this question is probably best addressed to the new Chair of the Adults Committee. I of course appreciate that he has only just become the Chair of that Committee. It is about the Independent Living Fund which for any Members who are not aware supports very high needs individuals to be able to work and live full lives productively, was closed earlier this year to new entries and has been passed on to this Council. Would he be willing to look in very strongly to making sure this fund is ring-fenced and not reduced as it is transferred into the County Council.

Response from Councillor Tew

I will investigate and get back to you with a written reply.

Supplementary from Councillor Manning

Thank you very much and I would encourage him to look into the possibility because these are very, very high needs individuals who may not come to their Councillor for help, that there can be some way established that through the Committee so individual local Councillors can make sure that anyone in their Divisions does get proper help does have a route to go to.

9. Question from Councillor R Hickford to Councillor J Whitehead, Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee

My question is for the Chair of Children and Young People and I did brief her that this was coming up. The Government states that there should be a smooth transition for statemented children from pre-16 to post-16 education. Can the Chair tell me the figures of the percentage of children within Cambridgeshire that have a statement of pre 16 that end up with a statement for an EHCP post 16?

Response from Councillor Whitehead

As far as we are aware, all children with a statement up to 16 do move through to post 16 and still carry with them that statement, that they are not re-assessed after the age of 16 and therefore they should move smoothly straight through onto the new calendar funding that you have talked about and that is what we understand is happening. If you have got examples of or you know of where that has not happened and a statemented child has lost their statement, then if you let us know about that case, we will investigate it, but as far as we are aware, all pupils should move through that transition smoothly.

Supplementary question from Councillor Hickford

I do have a follow-up on that Chair. My son is statemented and was re-assessed and there is no smooth transition at all and the statement was taken away and a SENCO at his local school has informed me that nine out of ten children are not actually getting any support after, that they had before 16. So my question I guess is, would you like to investigate this as much as I would like you to?

Response from Councillor Whitehead

Certainly if you would provide the name of the school and names of pupils, then yes, we certainly will investigate. Thank you.

10. Question from Councillor P Sales to Councillor R Hickford, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee

This is to the Chairman of HCI. I would like to know why there is no effective monitoring of the street light replacement programme.

Response from Councillor Hickford

Why is there no effective monitoring of the street light replacement programme? With Balfour Beatty, you mean?

Response from Councillor Sales

Yes, that's the one.

Response from Councillor Hickford

I'm just making sure that I know which question I am trying to answer. When you say "monitoring" are you assuming from our side or from Balfour Beatty's side. I know I should not be asking you the question but I just want to make sure that we have the question right.

Response from Councillor Sales

I don't really care who monitors it, as long as someone monitors it somewhere. Shall I ask my supplementary at the same time? Would he like to come meet the residents of Harvey Goodwin Avenue in Cambridge who have been falling not over, but into holes in the ground for about three months. And they have only just recently been filled in, but it took an awful lot of effort to get anything done.

Response from Councillor Hickford

I know there has been a lot of problems with Balfour Beatty and the procedures that they carry out. I am sure that when this Private Finance Initiative (PFI) was sorted out in 2010 we would not be doing the same now. I have had many complaints about holes in the ground – they have one team who come along to look at a lamp, they have another team who come along and go "hmmmm", another team who come along and take the lamp out, dig a hole. It does take unfortunately three to four months sometimes for the holes to be dug in, to be filled in, which to me is unacceptable. I know that we have looked at it and Balfour Beatty and the contract says that they can actually do this and leave it that sort of length of time. It is unfortunate, if there is any other concerns, if I can smooth anything over with the Councillor and his local residents, then of course I will come and meet them.

11. Question from Councillor G Wilson to Councillor I Bates, Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee

This question is for Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of Economy and Environment about a meeting he is going to tomorrow that I have been excluded from. So you are aware that there has been considerable concern in Huntingdonshire about the traffic impact from the new development that is planned at Wyton airfield and tomorrow Councillor Bates is going to a workshop with District Council officers and a couple of HDC Members and County Council Members to discuss and this is in quotes "transport infrastructure challenges relating to Wyton and surrounds". The Head of Transport Infrastructure Policy and Funding has described this as a seminar for key County Council and District Council officers and

Members to explain all of the options looked at and why we have drawn the conclusions we have and to talk about the next steps. So why have I, as a key local Member, been excluded from that meeting?

Response from Councillor Bates

Can I start actually by thanking Councillor Wilson for giving prior notice. The workshop which has been organised which is going to be attended by myself and my Vice-Chairman was organised by Huntingdonshire District Council. My understanding is that it will consider the growth agenda across the whole District and how the two Authorities will best work together to deliver this. So in answer to your question, it is about the whole District, not just part of the District and I am content for instance as a result of that workshop, which is tomorrow, which is in Huntingdon, to consider your request or perhaps we could perhaps meet and discuss as necessary if there is an outcome, but it does cover the whole District and it is being organised by Huntingdonshire District Council, we are invited.

Supplementary question from Councillor Wilson

I am surprised by that comment as the invitation to you and Councillor Cearn's came from a County Council officer implying that there was a joint workshop, not one led by the District. But I am not clear why I or other local Members can't go and hear the conclusions at the same time as you are hearing them. I think it is very unfortunate this is going on in secret, because my concern is that officers will be pre-empting the decision that needs to be made by Members who can evaluate all the options that have been considered, hear the answers from the officers and the pros and cons of each, and then understand why a particular option has been chosen, rather than is often the case with these situations, we are told what the answer is and is extremely difficult to get it changed subsequently, as we have discovered today, so if I can't come tomorrow, when will you be inviting other local Members and other District Council Members to a meeting, bearing in mind that this meeting was set six weeks ago. So does it take six weeks to organise the next meeting?

Response from Councillor Bates

Just to perhaps follow on, I repeat myself, this came from Huntingdonshire District Council. They invited us to come to the meeting. It is a workshop. It's not a decision making forum. I understand all the concerns that you have. I understand my concerns of my villages as well. Those are not unknown to the officers at District and County. I am sure all of those will be discussed at some point in the future, but we are looking at the whole District. There are many other developments around Huntingdonshire, at Alconbury, in St Neots and other places. It is covering the whole District, the conversation is how the two Authorities can best work together in the future to deliver this agenda.