

## **COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday, 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016

**Time:** 1.30 p.m. – 5.35 p.m.

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillor S Kindersley (Chairman)  
Councillors: P Ashcroft, B Ashwood, A Bailey, I Bates, C Boden, 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, L Dupre, S Frost, D Giles, G Gillick, L Harford, D Harty, R Henson, R Hickford, J Hipkin, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, G Kenney, A Lay, M Leeke, R Mandley, I Manning, M McGuire, Z Moghadas, L Nethsingha, F Onasanya, T Orgee, J Palmer, P Reeve, M Rouse, P Sales, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, M Smith (Vice-Chairwoman), A Taylor, S Taylor, M Tew, P Topping, S van de Ven, A Walsh, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and F Yeulett

Apologies: E Cearn, M Loynes, M Mason, and K Reynolds

### **217. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN / WOMAN OF COUNCIL**

It was moved by Councillor Hipkin, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha and resolved unanimously:

That Councillor Kindersley be elected Chairman of the County Council for the period to the next annual meeting of the Council.

Councillor Kindersley signed the statutory declaration of acceptance of office, took the Chair and thanked the Council for his election.

### **218. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN / WOMAN OF THE COUNCIL**

It was moved by Councillor Kindersley, seconded by Councillor Count and resolved unanimously:

That Councillor Smith be elected Vice-Chairwoman of the County Council for the period to the next annual meeting of the Council.

Councillor Smith signed the statutory declaration of acceptance of office, took the Chair and thanked the Council for her election.

### **219. MINUTES – 22<sup>nd</sup> MARCH 2016**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **220. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

## **221. REPORT OF THE COUNTY RETURNING OFFICER**

The Council noted that Councillor Simone Taylor had been elected to fill the vacancy in the St Neots, Eaton Socon and Eynesbury Division by-election held on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2016.

## **222. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

## **223. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No questions were received from members of the public.

## **224. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

## **225. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM PENSIONS COMMITTEE**

### **Cambridgeshire's Pension Fund Assets into the Access Pool**

It was moved by the Chairman of the Pensions Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hickford, that the recommendation as set out on the Council agenda be approved.

It was resolved:

To approve that the Cambridgeshire Pension Fund pools with ACCESS.

*[Voting pattern: All Conservatives, Liberal Democrats, nearly all UKIP, Labour and nearly all Independents in favour; one UKIP and one Independent abstained]*

## **226. CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO FULL COUNCIL**

### **a) Proposed Changes to membership and standing orders of the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board**

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

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

- a) approve the expansion of the membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board by the addition of
  - i. a third representative of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group
  - ii. a representative from each of the five local NHS providers as set out in appendix A to the report
- b) approve the amendment of the Board's standing orders to

- i. specify that the Vice-Chairman/woman will be drawn from the Clinical Commissioning Group representatives on the Board
  - ii. remove the requirement that the quorum must include the Chairman/woman or Vice-Chairman/ woman
  - iii. permit the nomination of a Chairman/woman for a meeting at which neither Chairman/woman nor Vice-Chairman/woman is present
  - iv. increase the size of the quorum from five to eight members as set out in report appendix B
- c) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals

## **b) Establishing an Assets and Investments Committee**

It was moved by the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendations as set out in the report from the Constitution and Ethics Committee, subject to the following amendments to the terms of reference in Appendix A, be approved:

- Under 'Membership' on page 28 delete the words '(including substitutes) General Purposes Committee,' and insert the word 'Council';
- Under 'Delegated Authority' on page 29 in the last line of the last paragraph delete the words 'General Purposes Committee' and insert the word 'Council'

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

- a) approve the establishment of an Assets and Investments Committee to deliver effective governance and management of the Council's property and asset portfolio;
- b) approve the amendments to the Council's Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee, in Appendices A to E; and
- c) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

## **c) Arrangements for the Appointment of Independent Person(s)**

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

In discussion, a Member raised the possibility of introducing a seven year limit on re-appointments in order to maintain the independence of the Independent Person(s). The Vice-Chairman acknowledged the need for the Constitution and Ethics Committee to consider this in the future.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

- (a) extend the current appointment of Sean Brady and Gillian Holmes as Independent Persons to 30 October 2019.
- (b) the level of remuneration to each independent person remaining at £500 a year plus expenses.

**d) Scheme of Delegation**

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

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

agree the scheme of delegation or such part of it as the Constitution determines it is for Council to agree (as set out in Part 3 of the Constitution).

**227. COMMITTEES – ALLOCATION OF SEATS AND SUBSTITUTES TO POLITICAL GROUPS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLITICAL BALANCE RULES**

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

to agree the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees in accordance with the political balance rules as set out in **Appendix B**.

**228. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN/WOMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN/WOMAN**

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council, Councillor Smith, that the appointment of the Chairman / woman and Vice Chairman / woman as set out in the tabled report on pink paper be approved:

Councillor Count paid tribute to the role played by Councillor McGuire as Deputy Leader and Vice-Chairman of General Purposes Committee. Following discussion in respect of the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, it was resolved:

- a) to agree the appointment of the Chairman/woman and Vice-Chairman/woman of the following Committees as set out in **Appendix C**.

General Purposes Committee  
Adults Policy and Service Committee  
Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee  
Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee  
Health Policy and Service Committee  
Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee

- b) to agree the appointment of Councillor Orgee as the Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

*[Voting pattern: All Conservatives, four UKIP, three Independents in favour; All Labour, five UKIP, one Liberal Democrat against: Nearly all Liberal Democrats, three UKIP, and one Independent abstained]*

## 229. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

It was moved by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Smith, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

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

*[Additions in bold and deletions in strike through]*

It is recommended that Full Council:

- i) remove the requirement that the Cambridgeshire County Council Leader for the time being, shall be the Cambridgeshire County Council representative on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board; **and also remove the requirement that the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee be the Council's substitute representative on the City Deal Executive;**
- ii) appoint ~~an alternative representative~~ Councillor **Lucy Nethsingha** to be the Cambridgeshire County Council representative on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board; **and appoint Councillor Ed Cearns to be the Council's Substitute representative on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board;**
- iii) approve the appointment of representatives to outside bodies detailed in Appendix A subject to any changes proposed at Council; and
- iv) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

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

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

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Count seconded by Councillor Bates.

*[Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough]*

It is recommended that Full Council:

- i) remove the requirement that the Cambridgeshire County Council Leader for the time being, shall be the Cambridgeshire County Council representative on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board; **and also remove the requirement that the Chairman of the Economy and Environment**

**Committee be the Council's substitute representative on the City Deal Executive;**

- ii) ~~appoint an alternative representative~~ **the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee** to be the Cambridgeshire County Council representative on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board; **and appoint the Cambridgeshire County Council Leader to be the Council's Substitute representative on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board;**
- iii) approve the appointment of representatives to outside bodies detailed in Appendix A subject to any changes proposed at Council [includes a change to the membership of County Councils' Network Council to replace Councillor McGuire with Councillor Hickford]; and
- iv) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

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

*[Voting pattern: All Conservatives, nearly all UKIP, all Labour, three Independents and one Liberal Democrat in favour; None against; Nearly all Liberal Democrats and one Independent abstained]*

## **230. APPROVAL OF CALENDAR OF COUNTY COUNCIL MEETINGS**

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

- 19th July 2016
- 18th October 2016
- 13th December 2016
- 21st February 2017
- 24th February 2017 (Provisional)
- 28th March 2017
- 23rd May 2017

## **231. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10**

Six motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

### **a) Motion from Councillor Count**

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

Council notes that:

- over the last 5 years £190m of revenue savings have been delivered
- further savings of £124m will be required over the period of the current
- medium term financial strategy
- although some broad savings have been identified within the plan for

years beyond the current financial year if these are fully delivered, and no new service pressures arise in the next 5 years, there is still a further budgetary gap of £30m by the end of the current Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)

Council further recognises the ways in which services are delivered are constantly evolving. Technology, and new ways of working, plays a significant part in that evolution. This has enabled the Council to commence a programme of property rationalisation, including most significantly, Council's earlier decision to vacate and subsequently lease Castle Court. This has delivered annual savings in excess of £1m without any impact on the citizens that we serve, enabling us to protect services to the most vulnerable in our communities.

Council also acknowledges that the cost of real estate, whether commercial or private, varies immensely across the County. However the cost of real estate within Cambridge City is consistently the most expensive.

Council further recognises that

- Shire Hall is the most valuable property within the Council's asset portfolio
- Its primary function is as office accommodation including the hosting of the Council's computer room
- Officer and member movements to Shire Hall exacerbate traffic pressures within the City
- The majority of staff using the building live outside of the City

Council further believes that the cost of service delivery should also be weighed against quality of the outcomes that are achieved. Even with enhancements to technology, and more agile ways of working, some services are better located together. Some service provision is best suited to a hub approach; some from locations closer to the community; and for some require no fixed base at all.

Council accepts that decisions on service delivery have, to date, been driven by either outcomes or savings. The County Council, has not in more recent years, fully evaluated alternative options for the use of Shire Hall and how the functions currently hosted from there could be provided in the future.

Whilst the opportunity will need to be fully assessed Council believes that:

- There may be potential savings, and or, operational benefits in reconsidering Shire Hall as its main base of operations
- Given the nature and location of Shire Hall the potential opportunity for realising a significant benefit to the residents of Cambridgeshire cannot go un-tested
- In re-considering the current location of the Council's Head Quarters the opportunity could facilitate a new working relationship with the Council's partner organisations

Council calls on the Chief Executive to develop an options appraisal that

- Considers alternatives to Shire Hall to determine the most effective way to deliver services, currently hosted within Shire Hall

- Considers alternatives to Shire Hall to determine the most effective method for fulfilling the Council's democratic duties and responsibilities
- Evaluates the potential alternative uses of Shire Hall

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

*[Voting pattern: All Conservatives, all Liberal Democrats, all UKIP, all Independents in favour; All Labour against]*

## **(b) Motion from Councillor Steve Count**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Count and seconded by Councillor Palmer, the motion included an amendment proposed by Councillor Bullen which was accepted as an alteration to his motion by Councillor Count and agreed by the meeting without discussion:

*[Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough]*

This council notes the efforts Government is making in order to allow decentralisation of powers and budgets from Central Government. This council has been in discussions with local public service delivery partners and government in order to pursue devolution. Those discussions have resulted in various scenarios involving moving towards combined authorities of various sizes and geographies.

This council further recognises that in any one geographic point in Cambridgeshire Local Government is presently exercised by up to three separate and distinct organisations of Local Government; those being:

1. Town, Parish or Ward.
2. District or City.
3. Cambridgeshire County Council.

Should this council join a combined authority there would be a further distinct organisation. "The combined authority".

In the creation of a new body there would inevitably be a process of change and a period of change can provide an opportunity for improvements. This council acknowledges that all of these different bodies execute separate distinct and valued functions. Although these can be referred to as tiers there is no order of seniority or subservience as the delegated and adopted functions of each are quite different. The functions and service each delivers is a result of historic and piecemeal changes, rather than by a complete design.

In pursuing any combined authority model this council further acknowledges the concerns that there is a potential for added and unwelcome bureaucracy: Whilst also recognising the addition of a body with new devolved powers from Government presents an opportunity to pursue a course to reduce bureaucracy and waste, whilst increasing efficiency.

The principal of subsidiarity, of delivering services at the lowest appropriate level is acknowledged as being of benefit to the public. Therefore any reorganisation should look at strategy, procurement, commissioning and service delivery separately, for each service provided; in order to determine the appropriate level for the determination or delivery of each area of responsibility. This in depth piece of work should commence



at the acknowledgement of the formation of a combined authority and be fully implemented no later than the end of the first four year cycle of a combined authority. This piece of work should not be fettered in advance by any attempt to pre-determine outcomes by excluding or promoting any particular models but should be evidence based to provide a conclusion.

Should this council join a combined authority, **whether or not as part of a devolution deal**, then this council believes

- Bureaucracy should be reduced to the minimum necessary to perform its duties.
- Any proposal for the introduction of a new governing body would need to be cost neutral or better.
- A time of change is an opportunity to re-examine current practises.
- A redesign of service delivery can be found that whilst incorporating additional powers from Government, is demonstrably more efficient and less bureaucratic than the present forms of governance.

Therefore, **should** this council **form part of a combined authority, whether or not as part of a devolution deal**, it resolves to seek agreement from all participating bodies in any combined authority agreement to:

- Commit to a full and complete review of service delivery across all tiers.
- Commit to designing governance and delivery that is initially a maximum of cost neutral.
- Commit to a final design that aims to deliver a reduction in bureaucracy and cost.
- Commit to determining service delivery at the lowest appropriate level that makes efficient use of resources.
- **Commit to producing recommendations on how best to ensure local democracy in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is enhanced rather than diminished by exploring how best to capitalise on our town and parish councils.**
- Commit to a time scale of a maximum two years for review and maximum two years for implementation. The start to coincide with the formal acknowledgement of joining of a combined authority.
- **Commit to forming a cross-party working group of Councils to assist in undertaking the required exploration.**
- **Commit to public consultation on the resultant proposed changes of governance.**
- Commit to using an evidence base to help shape the final outcome.

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

*[Voting pattern: All Conservatives, all Liberal Democrats, all UKIP, all Independents in favour; All Labour against]*

### **(c) Motion from Councillor Paul Bullen**

Councillor Bullen withdrew the following motion:

This council believes that:

- there is significant potential to achieve large scale financial savings in the cost of providing local government services that could be realised by replacing the six

existing Councils in Cambridgeshire with two unitary councils and an overarching Combined Authority which reflects the identity and interests of local communities whilst delivering effective and convenient services to residents.

- 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.
- in addition to the financial position, the division of responsibilities between different tiers of councils results in waste, duplication and confusion amongst local residents. A single Combined Authority, consisting of two unitary authorities, would improve efficiency, deliver improved quality services and outcomes for residents and ultimately achieve better value for the public purse.
- the current national political climate does not lend itself to the creation of a single unitary authority in the immediate short term, however, in these austere times, two unitary authorities as a combined authority, with additional devolved powers, is the only way we can achieve the required financial savings and maintain frontline services.
- it is therefore in the public interest to explore the potential to create a unitary form of local government for Cambridgeshire based on two unitary authorities with a Cambridge and Peterborough footprint and with a single Combined Authority for Cambridgeshire.

The council notes that:

- the Government is committed to a devolution deal for the East of England and would welcome increased investment in infrastructure for this area.
- the evidence suggests there is significant potential for achieving financial savings by moving to two unitary authorities, for example Cornwall Council confirmed that “in delivering £40m of savings in 2010/11 and the projected savings plans of £170m for 2011 onwards, a significant element of these savings can be delivered because we are a unitary authority”.

This Council therefore calls on the Chief Executive to:

- initiate a public consultation on the proposed model and to investigate the service benefits, costs and savings of moving to a single Combined Authority comprising two unitary authorities for Cambridgeshire, involving residents, businesses, partners and all interested stakeholders;
- produce recommendations on how best to ensure local democracy in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is enhanced rather than diminished by exploring how best to capitalise on our town and parish councils;
- work with a cross-party working group of Councils whilst undertaking the required exploration; and,

- provide an estimate of the costs and benefits for Cambridgeshire arising from a change to unitary working for consideration at the first available Council Meeting in 2016.

**(d) Motion from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha**

Councillor Nethsingha withdrew the following motion:

This council notes the government intention, announced by Nicki Morgan, of forcing all schools to become academies by 2020 whether they wish to or not.

This council also notes the opposition to this position from the County Councils Network (CCN) and many parent governors.

This council requests that the Chief Executive write to the Education Secretary stating that this council opposes any forced academisation of schools.

**(e) Motion from Councillor Anna Bailey**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Bailey and seconded by Councillor Rouse, the motion included an amendment proposed by Councillor Walsh which was accepted as an alteration to her motion by Councillor Bailey and agreed by the meeting without discussion:

*[Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough]*

It has long been recognised that the A10 north of Cambridge suffers from high levels of congestion; with planned developments along its length this is set to worsen.

The ongoing A10 Corridor Study, funded by the County and District Councils, developers and the City Deal is due to report later this year. The scope of this study, however, ends at Ely and does not address the issues along the whole route.

This Council recognises the immediate and future capacity issues of the A10 as expressed in the draft Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire 2015, which, in summary, states:

*“There are a number of areas on the strategic and primary route network that require measures to be introduced for capacity reasons, with a particular emphasis on longer distance trips. These include: the A10 connecting Cambridge, Ely, Littleport and Downham Market.”*

This Council recognises that the development of Ely North and Waterbeach barracks will significantly increase the amount of traffic and welcomes the possibility of the City Deal to fund the South Cambridgeshire portion of the A10 between Milton and the border with East Cambridgeshire near the Lazy Otter.

This Council welcomes the statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he will “look closely” at the bid for upgrading the A10 between Ely and Cambridge.

~~This Council recognises the opportunities presented by the proposed East Anglia Devolution Agreement to support delivery of comprehensive improvements to the A10 between Cambridge and Kings Lynn in Norfolk.~~

This Council recognises the need to undertake further scoping and business case work and therefore instructs the Chief Executive to:

- Commission a further high level economic and route options study for the A10 north of Cambridge to complement the existing A10 study for use in future bidding exercises
- Work with Norfolk County Council to develop a case for whole route improvement from Cambridge to Kings Lynn
- Work with the two Local Enterprise Partnerships to develop funding bids for the development and delivery of a scheme of improvement on the A10 north of Cambridge
- Continue to lobby government for improvements to the whole of this vital route.

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

*[Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough]*

It has long been recognised that the A10 north of Cambridge suffers from high levels of congestion; with planned developments along its length this is set to worsen.

The ongoing A10 Corridor Study, funded by the County and District Councils, developers and the City Deal is due to report later this year. The scope of this study, however, ends at Ely and does not address the issues along the whole route.

This Council recognises the immediate and future capacity issues of the A10 as expressed in the draft Transport Strategy for East Cambridgeshire 2015, which, in summary, states:

*“There are a number of areas on the strategic and primary route network that require measures to be introduced for capacity reasons, with a particular emphasis on longer distance trips. These include: the A10 connecting Cambridge, Ely, Littleport and Downham Market.”*

This Council recognises that the development of Ely North and Waterbeach barracks will significantly increase the amount of traffic and welcomes the possibility of ~~the City Deal~~ **these developments** ~~to funding~~ the South Cambridgeshire portion of the A10 between Milton and the border with East Cambridgeshire near the Lazy Otter.

This Council welcomes the statement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he will “look closely” at the bid for upgrading the A10 between Ely and Cambridge.

This Council recognises the need to undertake further scoping and business case work and therefore instructs the Chief Executive to:

- Commission a further high level economic and route options study for the A10 north of Cambridge to complement the existing A10 study for use in future bidding exercises
- Work with Norfolk County Council to develop a case for whole route improvement from Cambridge to Kings Lynn
- Work with the two Local Enterprise Partnerships to develop funding bids for the development and delivery of a scheme of improvement on the A10 north of Cambridge

Continue to lobby government for improvements to the whole of this vital route

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

*[Voting pattern: Nearly all Liberal Democrats, all Labour in favour; all Conservatives, most UKIP, two Independents against; two UKIP, two Independents and one Liberal Democrat abstained]*

Following further discussion, the substantive motion as altered motion on being put to the vote was carried.

*[Voting pattern: All Conservatives, nearly all Liberal Democrats, all UKIP, all Labour and all Independents in favour; none against; three Liberal Democrats and one Independent abstained.]*

**(f) Motion from Councillor Jocelynn Scutt**

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

The Council notes that to facilitate effective and efficient progress of the Greater Cambridge City Deal, Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council each delegated to the City Deal Executive Board various of their respective powers. Specific and confined to matters going to facilitation of Greater Cambridge City Deal (the City Deal) projects, these delegated powers include:

Greater Cambridge City Deal – summary of delegations

Cambridgeshire County Council	Cambridge City Council	South Cambridgeshire District Council
<b>Economy &amp; Environment Committee (delegated to Exec. Board)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Making decisions around and exercising Compulsory Purchase Order powers</li><li>• Making decisions around Side Roads Orders</li><li>• Promote Transport and Works Act Orders</li></ul>	<b>Planning Committee (delegated to Cambridge Fringes JDCC)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Planning consent for City Deal infrastructure schemes</li></ul>	<b>Planning Committee (delegated to Cambridge Fringes JDCC)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Planning consent for City Deal infrastructure schemes</li></ul>

<b>Highways &amp; Community Infrastructure Committee (delegated to Exec. Board)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making decisions re. Traffic Regulation Orders</li> </ul>		
<b>Planning Committee (delegated to Cambridge Fringes JDCC)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning consent for City Deal infrastructure schemes</li> </ul>		

All and any exercise of those delegated powers by the City Deal Executive Board is governed by legislative requirements including, for example (in relation to Traffic Regulation Orders – TROs) those under the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

Whilst recognising this, due to some expression of community concern, on 1 March 2016 the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee in supporting delegation of decisions re Traffic Regulation Orders included a requirement that safeguards be incorporated into the process by which the delegated power of decision-making vis-à-vis Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) be exercised by the City Deal Board.

At its meeting on 3rd March 2016, the City Deal Board agreed to incorporate safeguards.

As Cambridgeshire County Council has responsibility in relation to residents of Cambridgeshire, the Council resolves to ask the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment to write to the City Deal Executive Board to ask it to consider the following safeguards:

1. Upon determining that a delegated power relating to Compulsory Purchase Order powers, Side Road Orders (SROs), Transport and Works Act Orders (TWAOs), Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) or Planning consent, the City Deal Executive Board will notify the relevant authority and Councillors for the area where the proposed power is to be exercised.
2. The Councillors referred to in paragraph 1 will be consulted in relation to the exercise of the power.
3. On an annual basis, the City Deal Executive Board will provide to the relevant authority a list of orders made in accordance with the delegated power – that is, for example, a list of all TROs granted in relation to City Deal projects.
4. Any safeguards the City Deal Executive Board establishes are to be notified to the County Council and its Economy & Environment Committee, Highways &

Community Infrastructure Committee, and Planning Committee so soon as practicable.

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

*[Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough]*

The Council notes that to facilitate effective and efficient progress of the Greater Cambridge City Deal, Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council each delegated to the City Deal Executive Board various of their respective powers. Specific and confined to matters going to facilitation of Greater Cambridge City Deal (the City Deal) projects, these delegated powers include:

#### Greater Cambridge City Deal – summary of delegations

Cambridgeshire County Council	Cambridge City Council	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Economy & Environment Committee (delegated to Exec. Board) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making decisions around and exercising Compulsory Purchase Order powers</li> <li>• Making decisions around Side Roads Orders</li> <li>• Promote Transport and Works Act Orders</li> </ul>	Planning Committee (delegated to Cambridge Fringes JDCC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning consent for City Deal infrastructure schemes</li> </ul>	Planning Committee (delegated to Cambridge Fringes JDCC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning consent for City Deal infrastructure schemes</li> </ul>
Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee (delegated to Exec. Board) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making decisions re. Traffic Regulation Orders</li> </ul>		
Planning Committee (delegated to Cambridge Fringes JDCC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning consent for City Deal infrastructure schemes</li> </ul>		



All and any exercise of those delegated powers by the City Deal Executive Board is governed by legislative requirements including, for example (in relation to Traffic Regulation Orders – TROs) those under the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

Whilst recognising this, due to some expression of community concern, on 1 March 2016 the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee in supporting delegation of decisions re Traffic Regulation Orders included a requirement that safeguards be incorporated into the process by which the delegated power of decision-making vis-à-vis Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) be exercised by the City Deal Board.

At its meeting on 3rd March 2016, the City Deal Board agreed to incorporate safeguards.

As Cambridgeshire County Council has responsibility in relation to residents of Cambridgeshire, the Council resolves to ask the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment to write to the City Deal Executive Board to ask it to consider the following safeguards:

1. Upon determining that a delegated power relating to Compulsory Purchase Order powers, Side Road Orders (SROs), Transport and Works Act Orders (TWAOs), Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) or Planning consent, the City Deal Executive Board will notify the relevant authority and Councillors for the area where the proposed power is to be exercised.
2. The Councillors referred to in paragraph 1 will be consulted in relation to the exercise of the power. **If the County member for the Division objects to the power, or an element thereof, the Board should refer the objection back to either the Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee in the case of areas outside Cambridge City or Cambridge Joint Area Committee in the case of areas inside Cambridge City, and that committee should make the final decision on if the power can be used.**
3. On an annual basis, the City Deal Executive Board will provide to the relevant authority a list of orders made in accordance with the delegated power – that is, for example, a list of all TROs granted in relation to City Deal projects.
4. Any safeguards the City Deal Executive Board establishes are to be notified to the County Council and its Economy & Environment Committee, Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee, and Planning Committee so soon as practicable.

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

*[Voting pattern: All Liberal Democrats, one Conservative and one UKIP in favour; Nearly all Conservatives, nearly all Labour, 3 Independents and one UKIP against; Most UKIP, one Conservative and one Independent abstained]*

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

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



## **232. ANNUAL REPORTS FROM POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEES**

### **(i) Adults Policy and Service Committee**

The Chairman of Adults Policy and Service Committee, Councillor Tew, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2015/16.

### **ii) Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee**

The Chairwoman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee, Councillor Whitehead, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2015/16. As part of her introduction, she thanked members of the Committee with particular thanks to her Vice-Chairman, Councillor David Brown. She also drew attention to particular issues of concern and risk to the Council.

### **iii) Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee**

The Chairman of Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee, Councillor Bates, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2015/16. As part of his introduction, he thanked his Vice-Chairman, Councillor Cearns, and the Committee spokes, Councillor Kavanagh the Council's Cycling Champion and Councillor Shuter the Council's Business Champion, as well as all the Members on the Committee and the officers who supported the Committee.

### **iv) Health Policy and Service Committee**

The Chairman of the Health Policy and Service Committee, Councillor Jenkins moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2015/16. He thanked the Committee members for their active support in being able to scrutinise and challenge the NHS and to help obtain a large number of service improvements.

### **v) Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee**

The Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee, Councillor Hickford, moved receipt of the annual report of Committee for 2015/16. As part of his introduction, he thanked his Vice-Chairman, Councillor Reeve, and members of the Committee. He also thanked Councillor Shellens for leading the Cambridge Library Enterprise Centre (CLEC) Review, Councillor Ashwood for leading on the Libraries Review and Councillor Criswell for leading on the Highways and Maintenance Review.

### **vi) General Purposes / Leader of the Council**

The Leader of the Council and Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, moved receipt of the annual report of the Leader of the Council and General Purposes Committee for 2015/16. As part of his introduction, he thanked the Committee and in particular he thanked his Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, for the support he had provided to the Council in his Deputy Leader role over many years. He also thanked all Members of the Council for their involvement in the democratic process, and he thanked the existing workforce, Strategic Management Team and Democratic Services for their continued support.

## **233. QUESTIONS:**

### **a) Oral Questions**

Eight questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix E**

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

- In response to a question from Councillor Bates, the Chairman of the Health Policy and Service Committee agreed to provide a written response regarding discussions by the Health Committee in respect of Hinchingbrooke Hospital.
- In response to a question from Councillor Giles, the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee, Councillor McGuire agreed to provide a written response regarding grass cutting in St Neots.
- In response to a question from Councillor Chapman, the Chairman of Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee, Councillor Bates, reported that officers would write to Councillor Chapman with details of future District-wide Transport Strategies in the County.
- In response to a question from Cllr Dupre, the Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee, Councillor McGuire agreed to provide a written response detailing the Council's compliance with its own covenant to minimise the impact of its contractors and subcontractors lorries in local communities.
- In response to a question from Councillor Nethsingha, the Chairwoman of Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee, Councillor Whitehead, undertook to provide a written response regarding the proportion of the County's maintained schools which were good or outstanding and the proportion of academy schools in the County that were good or outstanding.

### **b) Written Questions**

One written question was submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2. and is included at **Appendix F**.

Chairman

## COUNTY COUNCIL – 10TH MAY 2016 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

### PEOPLE

#### **St Neots Eaton Socon & Eynesbury Division By-Election**

The result from the By-Election held on 5th May 2016 for the St Neots Eaton Socon & Eynesbury Electoral Division was:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Votes Cast</b>
James Corley	Independent	479
Doctor Nik Johnson	Labour	625
Simone Leigh Taylor	Independent	1104
Karl David Wainwright	Conservative	1024

The turnout was 27%

Simone Leigh Taylor was declared as the duly elected councillor for the St Neots Eaton Socon & Eynesbury Electoral Division and has signed her declaration of acceptance.

### SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

#### **Adults Early Help Team**

The new Adult Early Help Team was launched early April as part of our Transforming Lives strategy. The team provides expert advice, information and preventative interventions to support older and disabled people to live at home for longer without requiring formal long term social care support. The service focuses on prevention, and considers the health and well-being of individuals at first point of contact to provide timely and proportionate responses to needs and issues. The team has a range of experience and expertise, and early performance indicates this approach is working well. The team will be fully staffed in the next few months.

#### **Cambridgeshire Adoption Scorecard Analysis (2012-15)**

The Council has sustained its strong performance in ensuring that children are placed for adoption quickly and without delay. The recently published national adoption scorecard shows that Cambridgeshire is one of only four Local authorities nationally to have met both the Government's thresholds for adoption timescales.

### **His Royal Highness The Earl of Wessex KG GC**

On Friday 6<sup>th</sup> May His Royal Highness The Earl of Wessex KG GCVO visited Bottisham Village College to celebrate the 60th Anniversary of the Duke of Edinburgh's award scheme. HRH was greeted by flag waving students and the school jazz band. He then started off a series of 20 small challenges that students from schools all over Cambridgeshire had come to Bottisham Village College to take part in. HRH also took part in some of the challenges and then went on to visit the 'world tree' sculpture on which Duke of Edinburgh students had written their thoughts about the benefits of being part of Duke of Edinburgh. Just before departing by helicopter he presented long service certificates to 8 Duke of Edinburgh leaders, the longest of which was 38 years' service! The event was organised by Tracy Grant, Duke of Edinburgh Manager for Cambridgeshire County Council, and we are extremely grateful to Bottisham Village College for hosting this event.

### **Karin Aston, Democratic and Members' Services Officer**

As Karin was shortly to retire and this was her last meeting, the Chairman expressed gratitude for the support she had provided to Members for many years, and on behalf of the Council wished her a long and happy retirement with all Members showing their appreciation through a round of applause.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2016/17

### POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEES

#### **GENERAL PURPOSES (17)**

CLLR	A BAILEY	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	I BATES	C	CLLR	D HARTY	C
CLLR	D BROWN	C	CLLR	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	S COUNT	C	CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	CLLR	M SHUTER	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	T ORGEE	C	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	A WALSH	L	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	E CEARNIS	LD	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR		L
CLLR	M LEEKE	LD	CLLR		L
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	CLLR	P DOWNES	LD
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP	CLLR		LD
CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP	CLLR	M SHELLENS	LD
CLLR	M TEW	UKIP	CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD
			CLLR	S BYWATER	UKIP
			CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP
			CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP
			CLLR	A LAY	UKIP

#### **ADULTS (13)**

CLLR	A BAILEY	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	C BODEN	C	CLLR	P BROWN	C
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	CLLR	M LOYNES	C
CLLR	S HOY	C	CLLR	T ORGEE	C
CLLR	G KENNEY	C	CLLR	M SMITH	C
CLLR	F YEULETT	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	D GILES	IND	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	L DUPRE	LD	CLLR	Z MOGHADAS	L
CLLR	G WILSON	LD	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	R MANDLEY	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
CLLR	M TEW	UKIP	CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
			CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD
			CLLR	P DOWNES	LD
			CLLR	I MANNING	LD
			CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD
			CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP
			CLLR	P CLAPP	UKIP
			CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP
			CLLR	A LAY	UKIP

## CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE (13)

CLLR	D BROWN	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	P BROWN	C	CLLR	S HOY	C
CLLR	S FROST	C	CLLR	G KENNEY	C
CLLR	D HARTY	C	CLLR	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	M LOYNES	C	CLLR	F YEULETT	C
CLLR	J WISSON	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	Z MOGHADAS	L	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	M LEEKE	LD	CLLR	F ONASANYA	L
CLLR	S BYWATER	UKIP	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
			CLLR	I MANNING	LD
			CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD
			CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD
			CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP
			CLLR	P CLAPP	UKIP
			CLLR	G GILICK	UKIP

## ECONOMY & ENVIRONMENT (13)

CLLR	I BATES	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	J CLARK	C	CLLR	R BUTCHER	C
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	CLLR	D CONNOR	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	CLLR	D HARTY	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	CLLR	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	M SHUTER	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	M MASON	IND.	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	E CEARNES	LD	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	A LAY	UKIP	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP	CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
			CLLR	S KINDERSLEY	LD
			CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD
			CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD
			CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP
			CLLR	G GILICK	UKIP
			CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP



## HEALTH (13)

CLLR	L HARFORD	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	CLLR	P BROWN	C
CLLR	M LOYNES	C	CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C
CLLR	T ORGEE	C	CLLR	J WISSON	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	CLLR		C
CLLR	P TOPPING	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	Z MOGHADAS	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	P SALES	L	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L
CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	P CLAPP	UKIP	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	A DENT	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
			CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD
			CLLR	M LEEKE	LD
			CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR		LD
			CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			CLLR	S BYWATER	UKIP
			CLLR	R MANDLEY	UKIP
			CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP

## HIGHWAYS & COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE (13)

CLLR	R BUTCHER	C		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	D CONNOR	C	CLLR	I BATES	C
CLLR	S CRISWELL	C	CLLR	S FROST	C
CLLR	B HUNT	C	CLLR	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	CLLR	J PALMER	C
CLLR	M ROUSE	C	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	G GILLICK	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP	CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
			CLLR	L DUPRE	LD
			CLLR	D JENKINS	LD
			CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD
			CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP
			CLLR	S BYWATER	UKIP
			CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP
			CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP

## **REGULATORY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE (11)**

CLLR	D CONNOR	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	C BODEN	C
CLLR	B HUNT	C	K REYNOLDS	C
CLLR	M LOYNES	C	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	M SHUTER	C
CLLR	M MASON	IND	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	D GILES	IND
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	S KINDERSLEY	LD	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP	P SALES	L
CLLR	A LAY	UKIP		L
				L
				L
			E CEARNS	LD
			L DUPRE	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
			J WILLIAMS	LD
			P BULLEN	UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP
			R HENSON	UKIP
			M TEW	UKIP

## **OTHER COMMITTEES**

### **ASSETS & INVESTMENT COMMITTEE (7)**

CLLR	C BODEN	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C		C
CLLR		C		C
CLLR	P SALES	L		C
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD		C
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP		L
CLLR	A DENT	UKIP		L
				L
				L
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
				LD
				LD
				LD
				UKIP
				UKIP
				UKIP
				UKIP

## AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (7)

CLLR		C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	I BATES	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	J CLARK	C
CLLR	P TOPPING	C		C
CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND		C
CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L	S FROST	C
CLLR	M SHELLENS	LD	D GILES	IND
CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP	J HIPKIN	IND
			M MASON	IND
			S TAYLOR	IND
			N KAVANAGH	L
			F ONASANYA	L
			A WALSH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L
			P DOWNES	LD
			D JENKINS	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
			G WILSON	LD
			P BULLEN	UKIP
			S BYWATER	UKIP
			A DENT	UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP

## CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE (11)

CLLR		C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	D BROWN	C	A BAILEY	C
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C		C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	S FROST	C
CLLR	K REYNOLDS	C	J WISSON	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	D GILES	IND
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	M MASON	IND
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	S TAYLOR	IND
CLLR	E CEARNES	LD	S CRAWFORD	L
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP	A WALSH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L
			P DOWNES	LD
			M LEEKE	LD
			S VAN DE VEN	LD
			J WILLIAMS	LD
			P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			S BYWATER	UKIP
			P CLAPP	UKIP
			A DENT	UKIP

## CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (6)

		<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
E CEARNES	LD		
I MANNING	LD	B ASHWOOD	LD
A TAYLOR	LD	L NETHSINGHA	LD
N KAVANAGH	L		LD
J SCUTT	L		LD
A WALSH	L	Z MOGHADAS	L
		F ONASANYA	L
		P SALES	L
		J WHITEHEAD	L

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD (5)**

M LOYNES	C	<b>Substitutes (one per position):</b>	
T ORGEE	C	P TOPPING	C
J WHITEHEAD	L	F YEULETT	C
L NETHSINGHA	LD	P SALES	L
P CLAPP	UKIP	D JENKINS	LD
		P REEVE	UKIP

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - CAMBRIDGE FRINGES (4)**

CLLR	T ORGEE	C	<b>Substitutes (two per group)</b>	
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	L HARFORD	C
CLLR	A WALSH	L	M LOYNES	C
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			J WILLIAMS	LD
				L
				L
				IND
				IND

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES JOINT COMMITTEE (3)**

M MCGUIRE	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
I MANNING	LD	I BATES	C
P BULLEN	UKIP	S COUNT	C
		R HICKFORD	C
		M SHUTER	C
		D JENKINS	LD
		L NETHSINGHA	LD
		M LEEKE	LD
		M SHELLENS	LD
		S BYWATER	UKIP
		P CLAPP	UKIP
		P REEVE	UKIP
			UKIP

**NORTHSTOWE JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (4)**

CLLR	E CEARNS	LD	<b>Substitutes (two per group)</b>	
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD		L
CLLR	P SALES	L		L
CLLR	A DENT	UKIP	M LEEKE	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
			P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			R HENSON	UKIP

### PENSION FUND COMMITTEE (6)

CLLR	S COUNT	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	J CLARK	C
CLLR	J WISSON	C	K REYNOLDS	C
CLLR	M LEEKE	LD	F YEULETT	C
CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L		C
CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP	S CRAWFORD	L
			P SALES	L
			A WALSH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L
			P DOWNES	LD
			M SHELLENS	LD
				LD
				LD
			P BULLEN	UKIP
			S BYWATER	UKIP
				UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP

### PENSION FUND COMMITTEE INVESTMENT SUB-COMMITTEE (4)

CLLR	S COUNT	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	J WISSON	C
CLLR	M LEEKE	LD		C
CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP		LD
				UKIP

[Note: Membership drawn from Pension Fund Board membership]

### PENSION FUND BOARD (2 Employer Representatives)

CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C		
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD		

### STAFFING & APPEALS COMMITTEE (11)

CLLR	P BROWN	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	D BROWN	C
CLLR	G KENNEY	C	S COUNT	C
CLLR	W HUNT	C	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	J PALMER	C
CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	D GILES	IND
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	M MASON	IND
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP		L
CLLR	A DENT	UKIP	N KAVANAGH	L
			P SALES	L
			A WALSH	L
			E CEARNES	LD
			M LEEKE	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
			S VAN DE VEN	LD
			P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			S BYWATER	UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP
			M TEW	UKIP

### SERVICE APPEALS SUB-COMMITTEE (3)

APPOINTED FROM STAFFING & APPEALS COMMITTEE AS AND WHEN NEEDED

## Appendix C

### APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN/WOMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN OF THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEES:

COMMITTEE	CHAIRMAN/WOMAN	VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN
General Purposes	Councillor Steve Count	Councillor Roger Hickford
Adults	Councillor Michael Tew	Councillor Anna Bailey
Children and Young People	Councillor Joan Whitehead	Councillor David Brown
Economy and Environment	Councillor Ian Bates	Councillor Ed Cearns
Health	Councillor David Jenkins	Councillor Tony Orgee
Highways and Community Infrastructure	Councillor Mac McGuire	Councillor Peter Reeve

### APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN/WOMAN TO THE FOLLOWING:

	CHAIRMAN/WOMAN
Health and Wellbeing Board	Councillor Tony Orgee

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES: COUNTY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS**

<u>NAME OF BODY</u>	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)	CONTACT DETAILS
<b>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Councillor B Ashwood (LD)</li> <li>2. Councillor P Brown (Con)</li> <li>3. Councillor R Butcher (Con)</li> <li>4. Councillor S Bywater (UKIP)</li> <li>5. Councillor D Divine (UKIP)</li> <li>6. Councillor D Giles (Ind)</li> <li>7. Councillor M Loynes (Con)</li> <li>8. Councillor M McGuire (Con)</li> <li>9. Councillor L Nethsingha (LD)</li> <li>10. Councillor P Sales (Lab)</li> <li>11. Councillor J Schumann (Con)</li> <li>12. Councillor M Shellens (LD)</li> <li>13. Councillor J Wisson (Con)</li> </ol>	<b>Democratic Services</b> <b>Room 117</b> <b>Shire Hall</b> <b>Cambridge</b> <b>CB3 0AP</b>
<b>County Councils' Network Council</b>	<b>3-4</b>	<b>4</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Councillor P Bullen (UKIP)</li> <li>2. Councillor S Count (Con)</li> <li>3. Councillor R Hickford (Con)</li> <li>4. Councillor L Nethsingha (LD)</li> </ol>	<b>Lisa Wood</b> <b>Local Government</b> <b>House,</b> <b>Smith Square,</b> <b>London,</b> <b>SW1P 3HZ</b>

<u>NAME OF BODY</u>	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)	CONTACT DETAILS
<b>East of England Local Government Association</b>	<b>1 minimum</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Councillor S Count (Con)</b>	<b>Ms Celia Tredget West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP33 3YU</b>
<b>Local Government Association</b>  <b>National representative body of all Local Authorities</b>	<b>3-4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1. Councillor S Count (Con) 2. Councillor M Leeke (LD) 3..Councillor M McGuire (Con) 4. Councillor P Bullen (UKIP)</b>	<b>Fatima de Abreu Member Services LGA Local Government House, Smith Square London SW1P 4HZ</b>
<b>Cambridge City Deal Executive</b>	<b>Quarterly</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee (Councillor I Bates)</b>  <b>Leader of the Council (Councillor S Count substitute)</b>	<b>Graham Watts, South Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge CB23 6EA</b>



NAME OF BODY	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)	CONTACT DETAILS
Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly	Quarterly	3	<p><b><i>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</i></b></p> <p><b>Currently:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Councillor R Hickford (Con)</li> <li>2. Councillor N Kavanagh (Lab)</li> <li>3. Councillor M Leeke (LD)</li> </ol>	<p>Graham Watts, South Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, Cambridge CB23 6EA</p>

**County Council Oral Questions**

**1. Question from Councillor Ian Bates to Councillor David Jenkins, Chairman of the Health Policy and Service Committee**

Thank you Mr Chairman. This question actually is addressed to Councillor Jenkins as Chairman of the Health Committee and it will be a complex answer so I'm content for a written answer. As Chairman of the Committee would he please inform all members about the discussions which have been taking place regarding Hinchingsbrooke Hospital. There has been much speculation – there has been much discussion locally – about Hinchingsbrooke Hospital and what I want really to try and fully understand is the role and the views of the Health Committee on what is being possibly suggested, not just about changing management of clinical services, but also about the article which I sent in which is on the front page of the Cambridge Evening News – sorry the Hunts Post – in respect of the proposals which were shelved in respect of the step down beds that were there which would have aided that particular hospital to deliver a more inclusive surgery and also inclusive facilities for staff. So what I really want to do is receive a written response about the role, about the views, where it's being discussed. A written answer would be most useful because it is a complex subject and I would not expect you to give a response on my question. I think it needs a lot more thought. So thank you.

**Chairman**

Thank you Councillor Bates. Councillor Jenkins are you happy to provide a written response?

**Response from Councillor Jenkins**

Yes I will do so but I'll give a bit of an interim response now. We did meet with the Chairman of Hinchingsbrooke and the Chief Operating Officer two or three weeks ago – Julia was there with us – and they gave us a fairly frank explanation of what they were up to with Peterborough and I don't have my notes with me – they're in another book – but the intention is although service changes are not intended – they're not planning any service changes – they are not obliged to do any consultation. Because of the nature of any possible co-operation and they haven't decided on anything yet but if they do, they are going to consult on it and there is a timetable for that and I'll check my notes and tell you exactly what it's going to be. One of the things that did come out of it is that from the Peterborough side there's an interest in saving money, as we all are, but from the Hinchingsbrooke side it's more a concern with improving quality of patient care. But I will give you a full response.

**2. Question from Councillor Derek Giles to Councillor Roger Hickford**

My question really is to Councillor Hickford down here and I have already alluded to the problem of grass cutting or the lack of or the standard of grass cutting in St Neots and I wonder whether I can have your assurance that something productive will be coming forward to the Town Council, St Neots Town Council, who are willing and able to cut the grass for Cambridgeshire County Council Highways etc, but there seems to be a sticking block between the officers and HDC and the end result basically is that our customers, our residents, are suffering.

**Response from Councillor Hickford**

I didn't know this question was coming but I'll answer on behalf of Mac McGuire. I'm sure that we will have some liaison with the Town Council; it's exactly what we're trying to do at

the moment. I have heard that there have been some problems but I will get officers on to it and I'm sure Mac'll be straight on to it as well.

**3. Question from Councillor Barry Chapman to Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of the Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee**

I'd like to talk about my role as a community navigator. The role is periodically to keep an eye on those who may be elderly, infirm or require assistance to cope with doing basic tasks. I've been doing this for three years now... that's why I'm here today again to ask Councillor Bates if he is able to cope and if so, why has nothing still been done about a market town transport strategy for the county's largest town?

**Response from Councillor Bates**

Right. In response to Councillor Chapman the agreement that has been reached with Huntingdonshire District Council is there will be a Huntingdonshire Transport Strategy which is currently being developed, so it will not be based on individual towns like St Neots or St Ives or Huntingdon but it will be a whole district transport strategy, as we have done in other parts of this county, which is basically in East Cambs, City and South Cambs. So it will encompass all of that within the transport strategy for Huntingdonshire which closely links of course to their local plan.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Chapman**

I'd like to ask Councillor Bates then how that process works with the capital plans of the County Council in providing for the infrastructure that's much needed for the town with the fastest rate of population growth of anywhere in the UK and hasn't had a market town transport strategy since 2008, which was a light touch revision of the 2001 version, and when will that be delivered? We have another 5000 houses being applied for at this very moment.

**Response from Councillor Bates**

Well I think it's a complex subject. There has been obviously things within the long term transport strategy which has been identified. There are issues in relations to the A428 which engages with the Highways England and also with the A1 as well. I think it would be appropriate that I ask the Director to draw up what I call some briefing notes for Councillor Chapman that he can take that away, but we will not be doing transport strategies on individual market towns, as in the future they are district based transport strategies.

**4. Question from Councillor Dupre to Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of the Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee**

This is a question for Councillor Bates again. Cambridgeshire County Council recently announced a covenant to be signed by hauliers in which they would undertake to minimise the impact of their lorries on local communities. I'd like to ask Councillor Bates what plans the County Council has to become a signatory to its own covenant and to require its contractors and sub-contractors to do so also, which is a move in which I can assure him he would have my whole hearted support.

**Response from Councillor Bates**

Well I think actually I am the wrong person to be asking the question. It really should be addressed by my colleague Councillor Hickford. I am aware of the covenants. I'm aware - I was with one of my parishes last night with a large haulager, one of the biggest and who was

one of the original people that signed the covenant, and I think it would be much more appropriate if Councillor Hickford responded.

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

I didn't know about this one. I think the question was, say that again? Covenant. OK. I'll have to get a written response to you on that one. I apologise.

### **5. Question from Councillor Peter Reeve to Councillor Sebastian Kindersley, the Chairman of Council**

Thank you Chairman. My question's a brief one. It's for you Chairman. I wonder if you would be willing to pass on my thanks to the Chief Exec Gillian Beasley for the personal approach and work she's done in Ramsey Forty Foot. We had a catastrophic event where a car went off the road and through somebody's house and I've been absolutely taken aback by the Chief Exec's role in actually taking care of the individual and the local family as well as the strong leadership, the vision and the partnership and enabling work that she does on a strategic level for this Council. I thought Mark Lloyd was the best Chief Exec I would ever come across and I think the new Chief Exec has proved me wrong, so Chairman if you wouldn't mind putting that on the record for me.

### **Response from the Chairman**

I will indeed. I'm sure that we have every confidence in our Chief Executive being the best there is. I think we will note that.

### **Point of Order from Councillor Steve Count**

Whilst I wholly endorse that, which is why I waited until you'd finished before I stood up, if I remember correctly you're not allowed to ask questions of the Chairman of the Council . . . So I didn't want the ball, so I deliberately let that go and well done and thank you for saying it, but I think that people should get used to the fact that he's exempt. OK?

### **6. Question from Councillor David Jenkins to Councillor Roger Hickford**

This is for Roger, and he's not exempt. We've recently acquired £1, 000,000 from the Government's pothole action fund. Can Roger please tell us what it's going to be used for?

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

It's just under £1,000,000. It's part of I think a £250,000,000 fund. It's our portion that we have and what will it be used for? I'd like to think that we will use it for potholes but, it's not going to do them all but it will certainly help with some backlog that we've got as well.

### **Supplementary question from Councillor Jenkins**

It's not as simple as that. £1,000,000 equals about 2000 potholes. Over the last few years we've filled 2000 potholes a year. My question is, does that mean we're now going to fill 4000 this year, or are we somehow going to fritter that money away and still do 2000?

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

I can definitely say that my aim would be to do double, OK, but we will have to have the capacity to do that and that is an issue which we really have to consider here. Just giving

money doesn't mean all of a sudden we've got a magic workforce to go and do the work. So that would be my aim, so thank you for the question.

**7. Question from Councillor Lucy Nethsingha to Councillor Joan Whitehead, Chairwoman of the Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee**

My question is to Councillor Whitehead. When I withdrew my motion on the forced academisation of schools there was some concern from some Members that in fact the apparent withdrawal of the threat of forced academisation was not as clear as it appeared. So I would like to ask Councillor Whitehead whether the removal of the threat to force all primary schools in Cambridgeshire to become academies has indeed gone away, or whether our schools are still in danger of being forced down a route to change their governance arrangements in such a way which will significantly reduce the ability of this Council to support our primary schools and also remove the rights of parents to sit on local schools' governing bodies.

**Response from Councillor Whitehead**

Thank you Chair. I think the answer to that is we don't yet know exactly what the Government's turn round means. They have stated that they still have an aspiration to make all schools academies, so I think we need to monitor very, very carefully what is going to come out subsequently to saying they're not going to force all schools to become academies and there have been certain rumours flying around and there have been certain things obviously still in place that if a school, a maintained school, goes into special measures or requires improvement, then there can be pressure on that school to become an academy. That I suspect is going to continue. I think one of the difficulties is that if you force all your schools to become academies, as we discussed last time in the Council, what do you then do about failing academies? Do they have to then become maintained schools? So I think it's a very open question at the moment and certainly the Committee and I'm sure everybody else will be very carefully monitoring what is going to subsequently come out of the government on their policy on education.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Nethsingha**

I am not sure that Joan will necessarily have the answer to this now, so a written response would be entirely acceptable, but I would be grateful if she could let me know at some point what proportion of our local authority schools are good and outstanding and what proportion of Cambridgeshire's academies are good and outstanding.

**Response from Councillor Whitehead**

I don't have *(that data)* at my fingertips but it was presented last time, but certainly we can provide that detail of data for anybody who wants it.

**8. Question from Councillor Ashley Walsh to Councillor Lucy Nethsingha**

My question relates to how well the business of the Council can be expedited when members sit on more than one local authority and it's funnily enough, for Councillor Nethsingha. In 2009 and 2013 Councillor Nethsingha's group said the following three things. Would you rather have three councillors, or would you prefer to have four strong voices? Hipkin, this is Councillor Hipkin, is already on the City Council and wants to cut your representation and drastically increase his allowances by getting elected on the County Council. What an accusation to make. There is no need for anybody to double up on the City and County Councils. I note that Councillor Nethsingha has recently been elected to the City Council.

Does she agree with these comments, or does she think that accusations or rank hypocrisy are fair?

### **Response from Councillor Nethsingha**

I'm very happy to answer Councillor Walsh's question. The answer to the question is that I did not make those comments when they were made. They were made by the Councillor who was standing against Councillor Hickford (*sic*) at the time. She was entirely entitled to run her election campaign as she wished, but it was not my election campaign. Having sat previously on Gloucester City Council with a number of members who were also County Councillors, I have never had a problem with Councillors sitting on both authorities and I think there are a number of Councillors who sit on this Council who also sit on their District Councils and I think many of them do an excellent job in representing their residents on both Councils. And I also think that there is quite a lot to be said for having joined up thinking across both Councils. I think this is something that we could do with in Cambridge and I hope to be able to provide that.

### **Supplementary from Councillor Walsh**

As well as joined up thinking across the Councils, perhaps we could have some more joined up thinking between Liberal Democrat candidates Mr Chair.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 10 MAY 2016  
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

**Question from Councillor Paul Sales**

I would like to ask the Chairman of General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, to ensure that the requirement for tax compliance questions are built into procurement procedures (using government Procurement Policy Note 03/14). Tax dodging is particularly harmful in developing countries as governments are deprived of money which could be used for education and health. It is important that corporations are aware that their activities to avoid tax overseas are taken into account when they bid for large contracts at council level.

**Response from Councillor Steve Count, Chairman of General Purposes Committee**

The Procurement process is split into two stages, the first is selection stage and the second is award stage. The selection stage is used to assess the bidding organisation whilst the award stage is to assess the solution being procured. It is the selection stage that is relevant to the area you have raised the issue of tax compliance. This selection stage is typically conducted via a Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) to shortlist bidders in a first round of a procurement tender. If the interest is likely to be low then the issue of the tender will incorporate a selection stage that includes these Pre-Qualification questions as an initial set of pass fail questions to prelude the questions specific to evaluating the proposed service or provision to the Council.

Since the update of the Public Contract Regulations 2015 there have been several new rules for public sector organisations that Lord Young in particular introduced. Much of the Public Contract Regulations 2015 is to address the frustrations with suppliers bidding through the public sector and enabling simpler procedures. The Public Contract Regulations 2015 succeed the Procurement Policy Note you referenced which applies to legislation prior to the 2015. One rule is the mandate that everyone must use one agreed form of selection criteria (PQQ) which was devised and issued by central government (Crown Commercial Services) who update as and when they see fit. The rationale behind this rule was due to the increasing frustration from bidders responding to different pre-qualification questions and to different evaluation. Therefore every local government organisation should be asking the same pre-qualification questions at this point.

I can confirm that the CCS Pre-Qualification covers many topics including an elimination question on Topics such as Slavery, Tax Avoidance and terrorism to name a few.

The other notable key point I need to also address in the update of the Public Contract Regulations is the issue of 'self-declaration' regarding exclusion grounds and selection criteria. In short this means bidders must be trusted to declare themselves that their answers in the Pre-Qualification are truthful with only the winning tenderer being required to provide evidence to back this up if challenged during due diligence. This element about due diligence is mentioned in our tender documentation and following declaration of a winner in a procurement the due diligence is expected to be carried out with the winner.

The Council can still ask for evidence to be provided at any point in the procedure where necessary for the proper conduct of the procedure.

Where there is a concern that conflicts with any declaration made by the supplier, the Council has the right to exclude the supplier from the bidding process forcing a termination of contract if awarded or going to next preferred bidder. Suppliers can be excluded at any

stage of the procurement procedure if evidence comes to light. This is no longer confined to the pre-qualification stage.

Suppliers should not be excluded if they have provided sufficient evidence of 'self-cleaning' (i.e. demonstrated that concerns have been addressed adequately). The regulations give examples of self-cleaning measures.

Mandatory exclusion lasts for five years. Discretionary exclusion can be for up to three years.