

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2014

**Time:** 10.30 a.m. – 2.55 p.m.

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

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

Apologies: Councillors E Cearns, M Curtis, M Loynes, P Read, P Sales, J Schumann and S van de Ven

### 82. MINUTES – 13<sup>th</sup> MAY 2014

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2014 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 83. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

### 84. REPORT OF THE COUNTY RETURNING OFFICER

Council noted that Councillor Peter Hudson had been elected to fill the vacancy in the Willingham electoral division in the by-election held on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2014.

### 85. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Members declared non-statutory disclosable interests under the Code of Conduct:

Councillor	Minute	Details
Hickford	92 (a)	Governor of Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Reeve	90(c)	Executive Member of Local Government Association and Deputy Leader of the Independent Group

In respect of the Electoral Review debate, in the interests of clarity, the Monitoring Officer had issued a dispensation relieving all members from the requirement to disclose interests and the restrictions on participating in the debate, contained in the Members Code of Conduct, relating to statutory and non-statutory interests.

**86. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No questions were received from members of the public.

**87. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

**88. SECTION 85 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972: RECOMMENDATION TO EXTEND SIX MONTH RULE**

It was proposed by the Chairman of Council, Councillor K 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 extend the Council's best wishes to Councillor Read
- c) To approve Councillor Read's non-attendance at meetings of the Council due to ill-health up to 22 January 2015 pursuant to Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972.

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

The recommendations set out in the report were proposed by the Chairman of the Boundary Review Working Party, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by the Chairman of Council, Councillor K Reynolds.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Leeke and seconded by Councillor Downes:

Delete page six and subsequent pages of Appendix 1 and replace with:

The Council also notes that:

- a) all of the district and city councils in Cambridgeshire are experiencing population growth;
- b) in the last review of boundaries in 2004 the Boundary Committee for England recommended; a forecast average number of electors per councillor of 6,639;
- c) this would suggest a council size, based on current forecasts, of 79 members.

Having weighed up all of these factors, and taking into account the need for economy, the Council is minded to propose a council size of 71 members. This number would:

- a) enable a very fair apportionment of councillors to each district and city in the

county;

- b) give a forecast average number of electors of 7,340 – a 10% increase on 2004;
- c) represent no change in the number of county councillors for Cambridge City, Fenland and Huntingdonshire; while the fastest growing districts, East Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire, would have one extra councillor each.

Proposed number of councillors for each district (2020 forecast electorates)

	% of electorate	71 councillors	% of councillors	Current councillors
Cambridge City	19.5%	14	19.7%	14
East Cambridgeshire	13.7%	10	14.1%	9
Fenland	15.2%	11	15.5%	11
Huntingdonshire	27.2%	19	26.8%	19
South Cambridgeshire	24.4%	17	23.9%	16
Total	100.0%	71	100.0%	69

The Council does acknowledge that this will inevitably result in an increase in workload for many councillors, particularly where an increase in electorate leads to an increase in casework; and where the uneven nature of the location of development means that some councillors in rural areas have to take on even more parishes and parish councils.

Additional Recommendation:

To authorise the Head of Communications and Community Engagement, in consultation with the Chairman of the Working Group, to make any consequential amendments to the submission.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

[Voting pattern: most Liberal Democrats in favour, one Independent and one Non-Aligned Independent in favour; all Conservative, Labour, most UKIP, one Liberal Democrat and one Independent Member against, 3 abstentions]

Following discussion, it was resolved:

To approve the County Council's formal submission attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

[Voting pattern: all UKIP, Labour, one Liberal Democrat and most Conservatives in favour, most Liberal Democrats and two Independents against, 3 abstentions]

## **90. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

General Purposes Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2014

### **a) Treasury Management Outturn Report**

The recommendation was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire.

Following discussion, it was resolved:

To approve the Treasury Management Report Outturn Report 2013-14.

[Voting pattern: unanimous]

General Purposes Committee on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2014

### **b) Business Planning – Capital Strategy**

The recommendation was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire.

Following discussion, it was resolved:

To agree the revisions to the Capital Strategy, to include:

- a) An advisory limit on the level of debt charges (and therefore prudential borrowing) that equates to the level of revenue debt charges as set out in the 2014-15 Business Plan over the next five years and set at £45m from 2019-20 onwards
- b) That both the recommended limit on debt charges, and the associated level of borrowing this relates to, be reviewed annually by General Purposes Committee at the beginning of the Business Planning Process and be flexed if required
- c) That changes to the phasing of the recommended borrowing limit be allowed within any three-year block, to provide for flexibility of phasing
- d) That borrowing related to Invest to Save/Earn schemes be excluded from the recommended borrowing limit
- e) That prioritisation of schemes be undertaken using an improved version of the Investment Appraisal system; the revised Appraisal System to be approved by General Purposes Committee
- f) That the process for determining the Children, Families and Adults Programme be highlighted more specifically within the Capital Strategy in order to bring the level of information in line with that for the rest of the Programme
- g) Inviting the relevant Service Committees to consider approaches to reducing

the average capital cost of providing new school places.

[Voting pattern: unanimous]

**c) UK Municipal Bonds Agency**

The recommendation was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by Councillor Hickford.

Following discussion, it was resolved:

- a) To amend the Council's current Treasury Management Strategy Statement to enable the investment of equity in the Local Government Association UK Municipal Bonds Agency vehicle to a maximum of £50,000 for the mobilisation phase and £350,000 for the launch phase
- b) That this investment be subject to the confirmation of pledges from other local authorities that meet, with those of this Council, the full cost of the two respective phases.

[Voting pattern: unanimous]

**91. COUNTY COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION: APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

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

- a) To revise the wording of Section Four of the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board's Terms of Reference (Standing Orders) to reflect the operation of the Council's new governance arrangements
- b) To appoint Councillor Orgee to be Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board.

**92. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10**

Four motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

**a) Motion from Councillor Nethsingha**

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

This Council notes the work done by Price Waterhouse Coopers because the Cambridgeshire Health economy has been identified as one of the 11 most financially challenged in the country.

This Council believes that caring for more people, for longer, in their own homes, and reducing the number and length of stay for unsuitable hospital admissions will be crucial in maintaining and improving the quality of care in the next 5-10 years.

This Council also believes it is crucial that when NHS services are under

extreme financial pressure mental health and social care services must be maintained, and not asked to make further cuts.

This Council requests that the Chief Executive write to NHS England, Monitor and the Trust Development Authority to ask that these organisations ensure the plans of and for hospitals in the Cambridgeshire area recognise this direction of travel when making their own plans for the future.

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

[Voting pattern: All Liberal Democrat, Labour, Independent, UKIP and most Conservatives in favour; three Conservatives and one Non-Aligned Independent against; four abstentions]

**b) Motion from Councillor Count**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Count and seconded by Councillor Bullen:

This Council notes that:

- There is a significant amount of positive work underway across Cambridgeshire Public Sector partners to narrow the gap in deprivation levels across the county
- Cambridgeshire continues to be a county of contrasts with pockets of highly affluent areas and areas with pockets of concentrated, multiple deprivation. This tells us that we can do more work to improve outcomes for the people of Cambridgeshire and reduce the deprivation gap in order to build a strong, cohesive and successful County
- The English Indices of Deprivation 2010 and English Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2010 used 38 indicators grouped into a range of categories that describe unmet need caused by lack of resources, including employment and health deprivation and barriers to housing and services
- In 2010, 3 Lower Layer Super Output Areas (LSOA) in Cambridgeshire fell within the most deprived 10% of areas in England, all of which are in Wisbech and all of which fell into the same category in 2007
- A further 6 areas fell within the most deprived 20% of areas nationally; these were in Wisbech, March and King's Hedges (Cambridge City).

This Council believes:

- Targeting our resources is ever more important in the current financial climate; this will enable resources to be targeted at areas that need them the most
- We must continue to find new and improved ways to tackle the issue of deprivation, especially the impact of multiple deprivation to improve outcomes for people across Cambridgeshire; the acceleration of this work must be a high priority for the new committees.

Therefore, this Council calls on the Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs to

work with their fellow committee members to:

- Continue to support the Council's commitment to tackling deprivation and narrowing the deprivation gap by adopting a more focused and targeted approach to improving performance and outcomes in this area of work, utilising the skill and capacity available within each Committee in order drive forward the identified improvements
- Identify a small number of key performance indicators relevant to the issue of multiple deprivation within each Committee area, and set measurable targets for improvement against these indicators.
- Ensure that each Service Committee maintains oversight of performance against these indicators, and that all improvements are sustainable for areas and populations of multiple deprivation beyond the life of this Council.
- Inform this Council of the indicators identified within the relevant Committee, the targets for improvement against these indicators and before the end of the life of this Council, an outline of the outcome of this work.

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

[Voting pattern: unanimous]

**c) Motion from Councillor Kavanagh**

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

This Council notes that:

- Following an extensive period of preparation and a significant amount of hard work, commitment and enthusiasm from residents, officers, partners and business across Cambridgeshire, the Tour de France event in Cambridge on 7th July was a huge success.

This Council resolves to formally record in the minutes, its thanks to:

- All those involved in making the Tour de France in Cambridgeshire a resounding success, including the Council's partners in organising the event, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Police, other public services for their co-operation, and businesses and the wider community across the County for embracing the event
- The Council officers who have been involved in bringing the event to Cambridgeshire, those involved in the preparation and operations on the day, officers who have helped ensure extensive community involvement through the Velo Festival and staff who have ensured essential services continued during the event.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Manning and seconded by Councillor Nethsingha:

Council believes that a lasting, permanent, legacy of Le Tour is the true measure of its success, and will create that legacy by resolving to:

- Commit to completing the Chisholm Trail, in its entirety, by 2020
- Commend the publication "Making Space for Cycling" and asks all Highways schemes to officially consider the recommendations within
- Publish a regularly updated map showing the current aspirations for cycle routes across Cambridgeshire
- Investigate running a (pedal) cycle equivalent of the ride to work day that happens as part of International Bike to Work Day for motorcyclists

Following discussion, it was proposed by Councillor Palmer and seconded by Councillor Hipkin that the amendment be put to the vote with no further debate. It was resolved by a majority that the amendment be put to the vote.

[Voting pattern: all UKIP, Labour, Independents and most Conservatives in favour, most Liberal Democrats against, two abstentions)

The amendment, on being put to the vote, was lost.

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats and one Conservative in favour, all other Members against)

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

[Voting pattern: unanimous]

#### **d) Motion from Councillor Downes**

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

Cambridgeshire County Council calls on the government to reconsider its decision to remove £200 million from the Education Services Grant (ESG).

Council notes that:

- Government is constantly increasing its expectations that local councils will provide support and challenge to maintained schools to raise standards
- Local councils retain a responsibility for the well-being of pupils and staff in academies and that this may require support and guidance

In the light of the above, the Council formally notes its support for the Local Government Association's plea for the proposed cut of £200 million in the ESG to be dropped.

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

[Voting pattern: unanimous]

## 93. QUESTIONS

### a) Oral Questions

Eight questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix B**. The following Councillors declared non-statutory disclosable interests under the Code of Conduct, in relation to Question (8):

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Details</b>
Chapman	Huntingdonshire District Council Cabinet Member for Customer Services
Harty	Non-executive Director of Luminus Housing Association
Shellens	Non-executive Director of Luminus Housing Association

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

- The Chairman of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Williams on the financial impact of the closure of the Amey Cespa in-vessel composter, including transport costs to alternative sites.
- The Chairman of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Dent on highways problems, including a collapsed drain, in Guilden Morden.
- The Chairman of the Adults Committee, Councillor Clapp agreed, in consultation with the Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults Services, to follow up issues raised by Councillor Bullen relating to Luminus Housing.
- Councillors Chapman and Shellens asked for a copy of Councillor Bullen's statement on Luminus Housing.

### b) Written Questions

There were no written questions.

Chairman

## COUNTY COUNCIL – 22ND JULY 2014 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

### PEOPLE

#### Willingham By-Election

The result from the By-Election held on 22nd May 2014 for the Willingham Electoral Division was:

Name	Description	Votes Cast
Susan Gymer	Liberal Democrat	338
Martin Hale	UK Independence Party	642
Peter Hudson	Conservative Party Candidate	1252
Benjamin Monks	Labour Party Candidate	471
Helen Stocks-Morgan	Green Party Candidate	295

The turnout was 38.36%, total number of votes was 3008, included within the total were 10 rejected ballot papers.

Peter Hudson was declared as the duly elected candidate for the Willingham Division and has signed his declaration of acceptance.

### AWARDS

#### The Centre for Public Scrutiny

Congratulations to Councillors and colleagues who – through the former Adults, Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee – held the Cambridgeshire Commissioning Group to account as it undertook a massive re-commissioning exercise for Older People's Services in the County. The Council's entry at The Centre for Public Scrutiny's Awards Ceremony – titled: Improving transparency and accountability in the context of the new NHS commissioning environment – won the Improving Transparency and Influence Beyond Boundaries Awards.

### SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

#### The Greater Cambridge City Deal

The Greater Cambridge City Deal was officially signed on the 19th June by the local partners and Greg Clark MP, the Minister for Cities. The deal means that £100m will be made available to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire area over five years, with potentially up to £400m over the following 10-15 years, depending on the effectiveness of the investment in driving economic growth. It will also see a new, more integrated, governance framework created to achieve that objective, which will be subject to Member decisions later this year. This is a partnership effort between the Council, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, the University of Cambridge and the Local Enterprise Partnership.

## **MESSAGES**

### **Cambridge United FC**

The Council congratulates Cambridge United FC following its promotion back to the Football League after a nine year absence.

### **David Atkinson - County Planning, Minerals and Waste Business Manager**

I have also been asked by some members of the Planning Committee present and past to acknowledge David Atkinson who retires at the end of the month after over 26 years' service with Cambridgeshire County Council. During his time in the County Planning, Minerals and Waste team he has been involved in the preparation of 3 local plans. He was also instrumental in achieving numerous Royal Town Planning Awards, covering projects such as the development of Needingworth Quarry (the biggest single mineral permission), Whitemoor Rail yard (bringing the railway back to March), Waterbeach Waste Management Park MBT, and the Minerals and Waste Plan, which is testament to the quality of the work and the vision that David has delivered within his role over the years. His knowledge and dedication will be greatly missed, even if he does put his success down to "teamwork".

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 22<sup>nd</sup> JULY 2014**

**ORAL QUESTION TIME**

**1. Question to the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, from Councillor J Williams**

With closure of the vessel composting facility at Amey Cespa Waste Management Plant at Waterbeach which treats all our household green waste, could the Chair of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee tell us the additional miles driven to take our green household waste to other facilities across the country and the assessment of the environment and impact of these additional journeys?

**Reply from the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford**

Chairman no but I will get some information.

**Supplementary Question to the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, from Councillor J Williams**

Given the seriousness of this situation I should have thought that the Chairman would already have this information and be conducting the assessment to ensure the carbon footprint of the journeys are minimised. Is the Chair a climate denier?

**Reply from the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford**

No

**2. Question to the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee Councillor J Whitehead from Councillor I Manning**

Would she like to join me in congratulating Liberal Democrat Education Minister David Laws and the coalition Government's part in the recent funding released for Cambridgeshire's Schools and could you tell me what she will be doing as chair of the relevant Committee to check where that fund is going and how effectively it will be used?

**Reply from the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee Councillor J Whitehead**

Yes we are very grateful for the money, thank you so much. I think much of the lobbying was done across party in that respect. At the moment we are considering how we are going to distribute this extra money and it will be discussed and determined by the Committee at its October meeting. So we are at the start of the process chair and at the October meeting of the Children and Young People's Committee officers are working on several different scenarios for spending the money and we will consider them at that meeting.

**3. Question to the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee  
Councillor J Whitehead from Councillor A Walsh**

Can Councillor Whitehead confirm whether all children will be able to receive free school meals by the start of the next primary school term, and whether the Government has provided every cost associated with the roll out of the programme?

**Reply from the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee  
Councillor J Whitehead**

Yes all children will be provided with their free school meals, and we are unsure as to whether they are going to get all the money to support that, but we will be keeping a very careful eye on it indeed, and if we feel that we are not getting the sufficient money to cover that, we shall be protesting very strongly.

**Supplementary Question to the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee  
Councillor J Whitehead from Councillor A Walsh**

Just to carry on a point that Councillor Downes earlier touched on, since the free school meals pupil premium has been a criteria in claiming free school meals, can Councillor Whitehead commit to the Committee looking at the impact on the pupil premium and its take up once the free school meals policy has been rolled out.

**Reply from the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee  
Councillor J Whitehead**

Yes at the moment we've received information that the pupil premium is still going to be based on the eligibility of the free school meals, which given that you technically don't have to apply for them anymore is going to make life a little tricky. What the officers have done is to devise an application form which is being sent out to all parents by the schools encouraging them to, if they are eligible for free school meals, to apply for them in order that the pupil premium can be determined on the basis of eligibility for free school meals. I hope that this is a stop gap and that some more sensible criteria are going to be made available for determining the pupil premium, but at the moment it is still going to be based on eligibility for free school meals, and we are in the County working very hard to make sure that all parents who are eligible for free school meals do apply, so we can claim the pupil premium for their children.

**4. Question to the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee  
Councillor J Whitehead from Councillor D Jenkins**

Early indications are that come 2015 when school starts again some primary schools will be oversubscribed. Can I ask Councillor Whitehead what her Committee will be doing to ensure that sufficient school places are provided for 5 year olds, so they don't end up getting bussed to strange communities for their first years of education.

**Reply from the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee  
Councillor J Whitehead**

Obviously a very, very difficult and contentious issue, clearly there are going to be new primary school places, we are currently considering along with the Environment and Economy Committee the building and provision of new schools and hopefully children will be able to go to schools that are near their homes. But unfortunately as everybody knows this is a very, very difficult issue, a very contentious issue, parents have a right to choose the schools that they want their children to go to, and inevitably schools are oversubscribed. We do have a system once places are allocated and they are allocated by officers in the County for an appeals procedure if parents feel unhappy with the school at which their child has been allocated. I have no easy, quick, or simple answers to this problem, it is one on which we spend a great deal of time. The Appeals Committee meets regularly and for quite long periods of time and I can't give any more assurances other than that the system will be continued. We will try to allocate places as fairly as possible, but I have no doubt there will be parents who will appeal and there will be problems, and I have no solutions to that and if anybody else has any I would be very grateful to hear them.

**Supplementary Question to the Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Committee Councillor J Whitehead from Councillor D Jenkins**

I guess not because that was a very comprehensive answer but I would like to ask that the dialogue remains open and we ensure that schools do not take the easy way out and say sorry 30 pupils, we are full. Do try very, very hard as I said to make sure that those 5 year olds don't get bussed five miles to the nearest schools and get stuck there for the rest of their educational lives.

**5. Question to the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford, from Councillor A Dent**

I have in my division a village called Guilden Morden and they feel slighted by the Council and their approach to what they class as dangerous roads, footpaths and the work currently being carried out by the Council there. As we speak there are a number of people working on Church Road in Guilden Morden and they are raising kerbs that have been lowered for residents just to stop drain water on a collapsed drain which has been recognised by the Council but their management has told them to raise the kerbs until the drains can be fixed. They are questioning a) the use of the budgets in this time of austerity, b) why they are not being taken into consideration in many respects for the health and safety of the elderly people in the roads of Cannon Close and Foxhill where the pavements have deteriorated so bad that they cannot be walked on.

**Reply from the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, Councillor Hickford**

Thank you Councillor Dent for giving me warning of a question, it's always nice to get that. Yes I am aware of Guilden Morden and the issues being faced, and have asked officers to actually investigate and justify their actions in this and I will be getting back to him on that.

**6. Question to the Chairman of the Fire Authority, Councillor Sir P Brown from Councillor D Brown**

I just wonder whether he could give the Council an update on progress with the new build fire station in Burwell?

**Reply from the Chairman of the Fire Authority, Councillor Sir P Brown**

Thank you Chairman, yes I am pleased to give an update. The handover will take place at the end of August, the opening of the Burwell Fire Station will take place on Monday the 15<sup>th</sup> of September and the build is on time and on budget.

**7. Question to the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee Councillor I Bates from Councillor M Mason**

This question has arisen really out of a statement in the Council's issues log of June which actually gave the information that the new Science Park Station at Chesterton, the responsibility for delivering that would be down to Network Rail and the rail operating companies as I understand and not to this Council which of course had already heavily committed to it in its budget and which had already spent £1.7m in developing this project. At the Leader's meeting in June I did raise this with the Chief Executive who indicated that he was going to London to discuss this with the department. My concern in the question is that the department have now, as it were, pulled the plug or at least changed the goal posts, and I wanted to know what the financial effect on this Council would be. Would we get the £1.7m back, since we were no longer going to deliver the scheme and was there any further clarification as to when the station would be commenced and built, would it be built to the same plans that we had already approved? So that is the basis of the question I hope that Councillor Bates can give us some indication.

**Reply from the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee Councillor I Bates**

Thank you Chairman and thank you Councillor Mason for the advance warning. Let me try to unpick some of those questions for you, let's start with the money. In our current budget there is £30m it will still remain in there at the moment because Network Rail along with the Department of Transport are going through their approval processes and they are long and they are lengthy processes to go through. So while they are going through those processes, it is sensible for us to keep that money in the budget. All indications are that they will take over the funding but they will have to go through their processes as we do. So the answer to your first thing is it will remain in the budget, I am very confident that we will actually get that money to build the station, which has got planning permission of course, it's gone through the process of planning and consultation, so that's a tick in the box. So in answer to your question about the design, the design is of course approved by our Planning Committee and therefore that is the design and that is set in concrete. If Network Rail or anyone else

wants to change that planning situation they will have to come back to us as a Council to do an amendment, I'm not anticipating any of that to happen at all, and therefore it should remain as was the planning application. When it comes to the preparation cost that the Council incurred in bringing the station to come forward, there was a meeting which was attended with senior civil servants on the 30<sup>th</sup> of last month. That was a very productive meeting, I understand, there are still ongoing discussions about that money so I can't categorically give you an answer to will we get the money back because the answer is I don't know at this moment in time. All I can tell you is there were very good constructive conversations between ourselves particularly with Graham Hughes and the Chief Executive with the department. They fully understand where we are coming from, they have asked us to do some extra work to justify the cost, which again is not unreasonable and therefore those will go back and I'm confident that we will hear shortly about the outcome of that.

**Supplementary Question to the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee Councillor I Bates from Councillor M Mason**

Can I understand that our staff will no longer be responsible for the delivery of this project?

**Reply from the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee Councillor I Bates**

If Network Rail take it over the answer is they will be responsible for delivering the project.

**8. Question to the Chairman of the Adults Committee Councillor P Clapp from Councillor P Bullen**

Following the support given to Luminus Group by both Cambridgeshire County Council and Huntingdonshire District Council to secure a grant from the HCA and a loan from HDC, and considering the fact that it has now been proven that Luminus has misled both Councils regarding the payments of home loss to previous tenants of Cromwell Square, Huntingdon, that Luminus now has a County Court judgement against them for failing to pay statutory home loss payments to their tenants, that there is substantial evidence that Luminus has pressurised elderly tenants into foregoing their legal right to home loss payments, that there is overwhelming evidence that Luminus have been overcharging elderly tenants for utilities which were in fact included in their rent, that Luminus have continued to charge elderly tenants for a warden or sheltered housing scheme when the facility was removed without notice some two years ago and that no refunds have been paid to either tenants or those on housing benefits the local authority. Luminus is attempting to reclaim the garden from a disabled tenant and that they continued to harass said tenant to give up land which is covered by secure tenancy agreement. Does this Council still support Luminus as a provider of social housing and if so what actions is it taking to ensure that Luminus treats its elderly and vulnerable tenants correctly in the future.

**Reply from the Chairman of the Adults Committee Councillor P Clapp**

The Service Director: Adult Social Care has said there are a number of issues concerning Luminus brought to our attention by Councillor Bullen. These issues are not directly related to Adult Social Care but the Service Director has looked into the issues and some of them have already been raised for Luminus. Having received further information from Councillor Bullen, the Service Director has spoken to two

tenants and is trying to secure a meeting with the Chief Executive of Luminus involving Councillor Bullen where all the issues can be discussed.

**[Note: Luminus' Response**

**Reply from Luminus Group to the allegations made by Councillor P Bullen during the meeting of Cambridgeshire County Council on 22 July 2014.**

Luminus Group ("Luminus") is surprised and disappointed to hear of the public allegations made by Councillor P Bullen ("Cllr Bullen") during Cambridgeshire County Council's meeting on 22 July 2014. Luminus was not provided with advance notice that Cllr Bullen intended to raise these allegations and as a result was not given an opportunity to respond accordingly. In light of the serious allegations made, it is necessary that Luminus publicly responds as follows:

In May 2014, prior to the Council meeting on 22 July 2014, Luminus was made aware of nonspecific matters raised by Cllr Bullen. Luminus made attempts to engage with Cllr Bullen and, on 21 May 2014, requested further details in order to arrange a convenient date for a meeting to take place. Unfortunately, Cllr Bullen failed to provide Luminus with any information and as a result a meeting could not be arranged.

Whilst Cllr Bullen's comments are non-specific in nature, they are damaging to Luminus' reputation in the local and wider area. Luminus has an excellent reputation that has been developed over a considerable number of years. Luminus is a nationally recognised, award winning organisation that aims to lead the way in working with others to provide the highest quality affordable homes and customer focused services in the communities it serves. Cllr Bullen's allegations bring this commitment into disrepute.

Luminus confirms that, on the information currently available to it the allegations made by Cllr Bullen are strenuously denied.

Following being made aware on 22 July 2014 of Cllr Bullen's comments, Luminus again requested clarification in respect of the allegations made in order that Luminus may investigate the same and fully respond to Cllr Bullen. Cllr Bullen was given until Noon on 6 August 2014 to respond. He has again failed to make contact or to provide the information requested to Luminus.

Despite Cllr Bullen's failure to respond, Luminus remains open and willing to meet with him to discuss and deal with any concerns he may have.]