

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 16th February 2016

**Time:** 10.30 a.m. – 22.03 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, S Bywater, E Cearns, P Clapp, J Clark, D Connor, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, D Divine, P Downes, 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, A Lay, M Leeke, M Loynes, R Mandley, I Manning, M Mason, 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, M Tew, P Topping, A Walsh, J Wisson, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors R Butcher, B Chapman, A Dent, G Kenney, K Reynolds and S van de Ven

### 192. MINUTES – 15TH DECEMBER 2015

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 15th December 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 193. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

### 194. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman reported that the Monitoring Officer had exercised his discretion to grant a dispensation to all elected members of Cambridgeshire County Council taking part in the debate on the Council's business plan.

Councillor Jenkins declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 197a), as a member of Histon and Impington Parish Council which had made representations to the County Council along with others, to urge the Council to vote for a 2% Council Tax rise being offered by the Government for Adult Social Care.

### 195. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Council noted three questions received from members of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

### 196. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

## 197. COUNCIL'S BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET PROPOSALS 2016-21

It was moved by the Chairman of Council and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council and resolved unanimously to suspend any standing orders in connection with the Business Plan debate in order to accommodate a procedure agreed by the Council's Group Leaders.

The Chairman reported that as Item No.6, the Council's Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2016-21 report, had not been available for public inspection five clear days in advance of the meeting he would be exercising his discretion under Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow discussion of the report on the basis that it was important that the Council received all relevant information to help it make a decision on the Business Plan.

As the General Purposes Committee had been unable to reach agreement on the 2016/17 budget and associated business plan proposals, the Chairman of Council, Councillor Kindersley, seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council, Councillor Smith, moved the Council's Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2016-21, as set out within Agenda Item 6.

The Chairman invited the Leaders of the Groups to make their opening statements on the Business Plan. In his speech the Leader of the Council and other Group Leaders paid tribute to the hard work undertaken by officers during the Business Plan process.

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

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

Amend the recommendation as follows:

It is recommended that Council:-

~~(a) Agree the recommendations within the 2016-17 Business Plan report that was considered by General Purposes Committee on 2 February 2016 and set out in paragraph 3.1 of this report; and~~

~~(b) Agree to the requests made by the individual Service Committees to remove a number of savings proposals as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the Business Plan committee paper considered by General Purposes Committee on 2 February 2016.~~

**1. Considers the Business Plan, including supporting Budget, Community Impact Assessments, Consultation Responses and other material, in the light of all planning activities undertaken to date.**

**2. Agrees the following:**

~~The decisions sought from Council are therefore:-~~

~~a) Before considering the Business Plan, the Council notes the comments set out in the Chief Finance Officer's Section 25 Statement on the robustness of the Council's budget and reserves.~~

- a) **That approval is given to the Service/Directorate cash limits as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan.**
- b) **That approval is given to a total County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of ~~£770,237,186~~ £775,205,952 as set out in Section 2, Table 5.3 of the Business Plan.**
- c) **That approval is given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of ~~£253,437,019.62~~ £258,401,390.95 (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995), as set out in Section 2, Table 5.3 of the Business Plan.**
- d) **That approval is given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of "Band D" equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (217,164), as set out in Section 2, Table 5.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a **general 1.99%** increase in the County Council element of the Council Tax of **1.99%**, as well as a further increase of 2% reflecting a charge for adult social care services:**

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)	
A	6/9	<del>£778.02</del>	<b>£793.26</b>
B	7/9	<del>£907.69</del>	<b>£925.47</b>
C	8/9	<del>£1,037.36</del>	<b>£1,057.68</b>
D	<b>9/9</b>	<b>£1,167.03</b>	<b>£1,189.89</b>
E	11/9	<del>£1,426.37</del>	<b>£1,454.31</b>
F	13/9	<del>£1,685.71</del>	<b>£1,718.73</b>
G	15/9	<del>£1,945.05</del>	<b>£1,983.15</b>
H	18/9	<del>£2,334.06</del>	<b>£2,379.78</b>

- e) **That approval is given to the transfer of £4.9m to the General Reserve and that service committees be asked to consider how the sum could be utilised for 2016/17 and to make proposals to the General Purposes Committee in May 2016.**
- f) **That approval is given to the report of the Chief Finance Officer on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out in Section 2 of the Business Plan.**
- g) That approval is given to the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan.
- h) That approval be given to capital expenditure in 2016-17 up to ~~£486m~~ **£185.8m** arising from:
- Commitments from schemes already approved; and
  - The consequences of new starts in 2016-17 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 5.9 of the Business Plan.
- i) That approval is given to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan.
- j) That approval is given to the Prudential Borrowing Prudential Indicators as set

out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.

### **3. Endorse the priorities and opportunities as set out in the Strategic Framework**

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix C**.

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

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

Amend the recommendation as follows:

It is recommended that Council:-

- ~~(a) Agree the recommendations within the 2016-17 Business Plan report that was considered by General Purposes Committee on 2 February 2016 and set out in paragraph 3.1 of this report; and~~
- ~~(b) Agree to the requests made by the individual Service Committees to remove a number of savings proposals as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the Business Plan committee paper considered by General Purposes Committee on 2 February 2016.~~

**1. Considers the Business Plan, including supporting Budget, Community Impact Assessments, Consultation Responses and other material, in the light of all planning activities undertaken to date.**

**2. Agrees the following:**

~~The decisions sought from Council are therefore:-~~

- ~~a) Before considering the Business Plan, the Council notes the comments set out in the Chief Finance Officer's Section 25 Statement on the robustness of the Council's budget and reserves.~~
- a) **That approval is given to the Service/Directorate cash limits as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan for 2016/17, and that future years' cash limits be considered indicative at this point.**
- b) **That approval is given to a total County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £770,237,186 £766,623,338 as set out in Section 2, Table 5.3 of the Business Plan.**
- c) **That approval is given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £253,437,019.62 £248,492,193.07 (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995), as set out in Section 2, Table 5.3 of the Business Plan.**
- d) **That approval is given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of "Band D" equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the**

District Councils (217,164), ~~as set out in Section 2, Table 5.4 of the Business Plan~~ reflecting ~~a 1.99% no~~ increase in the County Council element of the Council Tax:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)	
A	6/9	<del>£778.02</del>	<b>£762.84</b>
B	7/9	<del>£907.69</del>	<b>£889.98</b>
C	8/9	<del>£1,037.36</del>	<b>£1,017.12</b>
D	<b>9/9</b>	<b><del>£1,167.03</del></b>	<b>£1,144.26</b>
E	11/9	<del>£1,426.37</del>	<b>£1,398.54</b>
F	13/9	<del>£1,685.71</del>	<b>£1,652.82</b>
G	15/9	<del>£1,945.05</del>	<b>£1,907.10</b>
H	18/9	<del>£2,334.06</del>	<b>£2,288.52</b>

- e) That approval is given to the utilisation of the £3.2m transitional funding from central government, as well as the transfer of £1.7m from general reserves to revenue, in order to offset for 2016/17 the pressure caused by increasing Council Tax by less than assumed in budget modelling.
- f) That approval is given to the report of the Chief Finance Officer on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out in Section 2 of the Business Plan.
- g) That approval is given to the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan.
- h) That approval be given to capital expenditure in 2016-17 up to ~~£486m~~ **£185.8m** arising from:
- Commitments from schemes already approved; and
  - The consequences of new starts in 2016-17 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 5.9 of the Business Plan.
- i) That approval is given to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan.
- j) That approval is given to the Prudential Borrowing Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.
- 3. Endorse the priorities and opportunities as set out in the Strategic Framework**

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix D**.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Chairs of the Policy and Service Committees were invited to speak first, if they so wished.

Members then debated the Council's Business Plan and the Budget Proposals for 2016/17

Following discussion, the original motion, detailed in Agenda Item No. 6, on being put

to the vote was lost.

The voting record is attached as **Appendix E**.

As a result of the above vote on the original motion there was no longer a Budget proposal. The Chairman therefore adjourned the debate and meeting and asked all Members to return to their group rooms with a view to commencing discussions/ negotiations in order to arrive at a recommendation which would gain sufficient support to achieve a majority. The Chief Executive, Section 151 Officer and Monitoring Officer were asked to visit each group room in order to assist and support discussions/ negotiations with a view to reconvening the meeting when any further motion on the budget could be considered.

*The meeting adjourned at 2.55p.m. and reconvened at 7.50 p.m.*

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

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

Amend the recommendation as follows:

It is recommended that Council:-

~~(a) Agree the recommendations within the 2016-17 Business Plan report that was considered by General Purposes Committee on 2 February 2016 and set out in paragraph 3.1 of this report; and~~

~~(b) Agree to the requests made by the individual Service Committees to remove a number of savings proposals as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the Business Plan committee paper considered by General Purposes Committee on 2 February 2016.~~

**1. Considers the Business Plan, including supporting Budget, Community Impact Assessments, Consultation Responses and other material, in the light of all planning activities undertaken to date.**

**2. Agrees the following:**

~~The decisions sought from Council are therefore:-~~

~~a) Before considering the Business Plan, the Council notes the comments set out in the Chief Finance Officer's Section 25 Statement on the robustness of the Council's budget and reserves.~~

a) **That approval is given to the Service/Directorate cash limits as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan for 2016/17, and that future years' cash limits be considered indicative at this point.**

b) **That approval is given to a total County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £770,237,186 £770,262,112 as set out in Section 2; Table 5.3 of the Business Plan.**

c) **That approval is given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £253,437,019.62 £253,456,564.39 (to be received in ten**

equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995), ~~as set out in Section 2, Table 5.3 of the Business Plan.~~

- d) That approval is given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of “Band D” equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (217,164), ~~as set out in Section 2, Table 5.4 of the Business Plan~~ reflecting a ~~1.99%~~ **no** increase in the **general** County Council element of the Council Tax, **and an Adult Social Care Precept of 2%:**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>Amount (£)</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>6/9</b>	<b>£778.02</b>	<b>£778.08</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>7/9</b>	<b>£907.69</b>	<b>£907.76</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>8/9</b>	<b>£1,037.36</b>	<b>£1,037.44</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>9/9</b>	<b>£1,167.03</b>	<b>£1,167.12</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>11/9</b>	<b>£1,426.37</b>	<b>£1,426.48</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>13/9</b>	<b>£1,685.71</b>	<b>£1,685.84</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>15/9</b>	<b>£1,945.05</b>	<b>£1,945.20</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>18/9</b>	<b>£2,334.06</b>	<b>£2,334.24</b>

- e) That approval is given to the report of the Chief Finance Officer on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out in Section 2 of the Business Plan.
- f) That approval is given to the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan.
- h) That approval be given to capital expenditure in 2016-17 up to ~~£186m~~ **£185.8m** arising from:
- Commitments from schemes already approved; and
  - The consequences of new starts in 2016-17 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 5.9 of the Business Plan.
- i) That approval is given to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan.
- j) That approval is given to the Prudential Borrowing Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.
3. **Endorse the priorities and opportunities as set out in the Strategic Framework**

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix F**.

As there were no further motions in respect of the Business Plan, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8.21 p.m. in order for there to be further discussions/negotiations between the political groups. There were further adjournments due to there not being any agreed new motions. The meeting recommenced for the final time at 9.40 p.m.

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

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

Amend the recommendation as follows:

It is recommended that Council:-

~~(a) Agree the recommendations within the 2016-17 Business Plan report that was considered by General Purposes Committee on 2 February 2016 and set out in paragraph 3.1 of this report; and~~

~~(b) Agree to the requests made by the individual Service Committees to remove a number of savings proposals as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the Business Plan committee paper considered by General Purposes Committee on 2 February 2016.~~

**1. Considers the Business Plan, including supporting Budget, Community Impact Assessments, Consultation Responses and other material, in the light of all planning activities undertaken to date.**

**2. Agrees the following:**

~~The decisions sought from Council are therefore:-~~

~~a) Before considering the Business Plan, the Council notes the comments set out in the Chief Finance Officer's Section 25 Statement on the robustness of the Council's budget and reserves.~~

a) **That** approval is given to the Service/Directorate cash limits as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan **for 2016/17, and that future years' cash limits be considered indicative at this point.**

b) **That** approval is given to a total County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of ~~£770,237,186~~ **£770,262,112** as set out in Section 2; Table 5.3 of the Business Plan.

c) That approval is given to a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of ~~£253,437,019.62~~ **£253,456,564.39** (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995), ~~as set out in Section 2, Table 5.3 of the Business Plan.~~

d) That approval is given to a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of "Band D" equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (217,164), ~~as set out in Section 2, Table 5.4 of the Business Plan~~ reflecting a ~~4.99%~~ **no** increase in the **general** County Council element of the Council Tax, **and an Adult Social Care Precept of 2%:**



Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
------	-------	------------

A	6/9	£778.02	£778.08
B	7/9	£907.69	£907.76
C	8/9	£1,037.36	£1,037.44
D	9/9	£1,167.03	£1,167.12
E	11/9	£1,426.37	£1,426.48
F	13/9	£1,685.71	£1,685.84
G	15/9	£1,945.05	£1,945.20
H	18/9	£2,334.06	£2,334.24

- e) That approval is given to the report of the Chief Finance Officer on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out in Section 2 of the Business Plan.
- e) That approval is given to the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan.
- f) That approval be given to capital expenditure in 2016-17 up to ~~£486m~~ **£185.8m** arising from:
- Commitments from schemes already approved; and
  - The consequences of new starts in 2016-17 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 5.9 of the Business Plan.
- g) That approval is given to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan.
- h) That approval is given to the Prudential Borrowing Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.
- 3. Endorse the priorities and opportunities as set out in the Strategic Framework.**
- 4. Further agrees that the Conservative Group should work with the UKIP Group to design a revised public budget consultation model for 2016-17.**

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

The voting record is attached as **Appendix G**.

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

### **a) Treasury Management Strategy 2016-17**

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendation as set out in minute 195 of the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting of 14th January 2016 be approved.

It was resolved unanimously:

to approve the draft Treasury Management Strategy for 2016-17, including:

a) The Capital Financing and Borrowing Strategy for 2016-17 including:

- i) The Council's policy on the making of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) for the repayment of debt, as required by the Local Authorities (Capital Finance & Accounting ) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008
- ii) The Affordable Borrowing Limit for 2016-17 as required by the Local Government Act 2003

b) The Investment Strategy for 2016-17 as required by the Communities and Local Government (CLG) revised Guidance on Local Government Investments issued in 2010.

**b) Minimum Revenue Provision Policy**

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendation as set out in minute 201 of the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting of 2nd February 2016 be approved.

It was resolved unanimously:

to approve the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy for 2015-16.

**c) Municipal Bonds Agency Update**

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendations as set out in minute 200 of the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting of 2nd February 2016 be approved.

It was resolved unanimously:

1. to note:

- a) The risks of entry into the Framework Agreement and Guarantee, and undertaking borrowing from the UK Municipal Bonds Agency; and
- b) The Counsel opinion of Jonathan Swift QC.

2. to approve entry into the Framework Agreement and accompanying Schedules (Document 3 of the Documents Package within confidential Appendix A: Documents Package) listed:

- c) Schedule 1: Form of Authority Accession Deed
- d) Schedule 2: Form of Guarantee
- e) Schedule 3: Loan Standard Terms
- f) Schedule 4: Form of Loan Confirmation

3. Subject to the above, to delegate authority to the Council's Section 151 Officer and Monitoring Officer to execute all the necessary contractual arrangements, including the Framework Agreement, Guarantee and Schedules listed in recommendation number 2.

## 199. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM HEALTH POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE

Councillor Jenkins the Chairman of the Health Policy and Service Committee moved the following motion as set out in minute 195 of the Health Policy and Service Committee of 21st January 2016. The motion included an amendment proposed by Councillor Orgee which was accepted as an alteration to his motion by Councillor Jenkins and agreed by the meeting without discussion:

*Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough*

This Council:

- understands the impact of Public Health expenditure on health outcomes and future costs in the broader health economy in Cambridgeshire as evidenced by a comprehensive body of information including its own Prevention Strategy
- notes the Government's recent announcement to follow the 2015/16 mid-year cut in the Public Health Grant with a another cut for 2016/17 and further annual cuts in future years
- ~~• believes that these continuing cuts are ill advised because they will result in higher long term health costs~~
- ~~• accepts that a broad approach to the Government through the Secretary of State for Health, its MPs and the Local Government Association is needed if these cuts are to be reversed~~
- **notes the changes made within its own Public Health budget from 2015/16 to 2016/17**
- **notes that effective spending on Public Health results in medium to long term savings rather than short term savings**

**Resolves therefore to:**

- ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Health and the Cambridgeshire MPs to ~~brief them on the likely impact of the cuts,~~ **inform them of the importance that the County Council attaches to prevention,** and to provide them with a copy of this County's Prevention Strategy
- ask the Chief Executive to ~~table a motion at the LGA conference calling for the Government to rethink its approach to funding Public Health and to increase funding for public health interventions~~ **raise the issue of prevention and Public Health funding at the LGA to see if there is support for requesting Government to rethink its approach to funding Public Health, and, if appropriate, to table a motion at the LGA conference.**

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

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

### **a) Mini Review of Governance Procedures**

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 be withdrawn and initially taken back to Group Leaders for further discussion. This was agreed by the meeting without discussion.

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

Two motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

### **(a) Motion from Councillor John Hipkin**

Councillor Hipkin withdrew the following motion:

This Council notes the contents of the recent Cambridgeshire Research Group (CRG) IMD Summary of IMD (Index of Multiple Deprivation) data for Cambridgeshire comparing the differences in national and local ranks and deciles from IMD 2010 to IMD 2015.

This Council further notes the main findings of the CRG Summary as follows:

- Compared to 2010, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire now rank as more deprived in national terms than previously – Cambridge City ranks as less deprived.
- Cambridgeshire now has 16 LSOAs (Lower-layer Super Output Areas) in the 20% most deprived nationally –this is compared to 9 in 2010. Two are in Cambridge City, two are in Huntingdonshire and 12 are in Fenland.
- Four of the LSOAs in Fenland are in the 10% most deprived nationally, all of which are in Wisbech. Eight of the top 10 most deprived LSOAs in Cambridgeshire are in Fenland. Two are in Cambridge City.

This Council notes the ongoing work of the Wisbech 2020 project and the continued benefits it expects to bring.

However this Council regards this latest data as disappointing and deeply concerning and calls upon the County Council to:

- embrace and promote policies for the regeneration of the most deprived parts of Cambridgeshire on an equal footing to those designed to stimulate the growth of the more prosperous parts of the county
- expedite capital projects, such as the Wisbech to March rail link, which will do much to connect comparatively isolated market towns and villages in Cambridgeshire to those areas of the county where employment opportunities are greater
- resolve that as the County's Business Plan gets under way, the Council will be especially mindful and give special weight in their deliberations to the impact

proposed measures will have upon the county's most disadvantaged communities.

- investigate as a matter of urgency why an exceptionally high proportion of secondary schools in Fenland are deemed by OFSTED to be inadequate require improvement and are underperforming and promote policies designed to reverse this trend.

*\* Lower Layer Super Output Areas are a geographic hierarchy designed to improve the reporting of small area statistics in England and Wales.*

**(b) Motion from Councillor Steve Criswell**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Criswell and seconded by Councillor Tew:

This council recognises the huge range of beneficial activities undertaken by volunteers, community groups and local councils across Cambridgeshire.

The council also recognises the commitment and improving working practices of staff and service providers in delivering local services as efficiently as possible to meet local need.

This council is committed to protecting the vulnerable and caring for those who need us most.

The council is transforming services, improving our business planning and seeking closer working with partner organisations to become as efficient as possible.

However, this council recognises it cannot do all things for all people. The more active and better connected communities are, the more people's lives are enhanced and the less reliant they become on assistance from outside their community.

With shrinking budgets across the public sector, this council is determined to help minimise the impact of any service reductions to our communities. The Council's Strategy for Building Resilient Communities, entitled 'Stronger Together' identifies ways in which this may be achieved. This strategy is central to our ability to manage demand for our services – through supporting families and communities to do more to prevent the escalation of need and also to support the most vulnerable. However to achieve success, we will need to engage with and invest in our communities to support them embark on a period of change.

The challenges we face are not confined to this council. The need to make savings exists across all public sector partners resulting in a combined impact upon our communities as well as each other.

Therefore, this council calls upon the Chief Executive to:

1. Submit a Delivery Plan for 'Stronger Together', our strategy for Building Resilient Communities, to General Purposes Committee as soon as possible. This will identify how we will deliver the outcomes of this strategy. It will demonstrate how costs can be avoided, where community based alternatives could replace and potentially improve on council services, where the impact of cuts that have to be made to front line services can be mitigated and how demand on our services can be reduced.

2. To include as part of the Delivery Plan an Invest to Save bid to the Transformation Reserve to secure appropriate investment in community initiatives to deliver the outcomes of the Strategy that will have a social and financial value that will enhance peoples' lives.
3. To determine a governance structure to oversee this investment, and the initiatives it supports, that includes partner organisations with a view to sharing the outcomes, costs and benefits of 'invest to save' initiatives across the whole public sector, thereby helping to mitigate the impact on our communities and each other.

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

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

## **202. QUESTIONS:**

### **a) Oral Questions**

One question was asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix H**. There was no action arising.

### **b) Written Questions**

No written questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16TH FEBRUARY 2016  
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS****PEOPLE****County Councillor Philip Read**

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of County Councillor Philip Read. Councillor Read served on the County Council since 1975, representing the Sutton Division, on behalf of the Conservative Party. He was appointed an Honorary Alderman by the Council in May 2005. The Council's thoughts are with his family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

The By-Election for the Sutton Division will take place on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2016.

**County Councillor Steve van de Kerkhove**

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of County Councillor Steve van de Kerkhove. Councillor van de Kerkhove served on the County Council since 2013, representing the St Neots Eaton Socon & Eynesbury Division, as an Independent. The Council's thoughts are with his family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

**Former County Councillor Tony Manning**

It is also with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of former County Councillor Tony Manning who represented the Chesterton Division on behalf of the Conservative Party from 1973 to 1981. The Council's thoughts are with his family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

**Suzy Edwards, Marcus Gynn & Michelle Dowdeswell**

Again the Chairman reports with enormous sadness the deaths of Suzy Edwards who worked in the Adult Learning and Skills Team for over ten years, Marcus Gynn, from the LGSS Learning and Development (Organisational and Workforce Development) team, and Michelle Dowdeswell, Business Support Assistant who worked with the Ramsey, Sawtry, Yaxley Locality Team for over 7 years. The Council's thoughts are with their family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

**AWARDS****Inclusion Cambridgeshire**

Two people at Inclusion Cambridgeshire have been recognised for the outstanding contributions they have made to people recovering from drug and alcohol issues.

Julie Whitfield (recovery worker at Wisbech) won the award for being an unsung hero while Andy Burley (Prison Inreach engagement worker) won the award for being support worker of the year.

Inclusion are commissioned by Cambridgeshire County Council to provide treatment services for people with drug and alcohol issues in Cambridgeshire.

**SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Loneliness campaign**

Over the Christmas period, the Council (Children Families and Adults Services and Public Health) ran messages, online and in the local press, aimed at raising awareness of loneliness in Cambridgeshire, and coinciding with the Age UK /John Lewis media campaign. The focus of this work was on what individuals can do – how they can ‘reach out’, providing suggestions and contacts, ranging from simply the importance of having a conversation with someone to volunteering time.

Each of the Facebook posting reached around 1,300 people and was shared by partner organisations from the statutory and voluntary sector.

### **Successful Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspections of in house adult social care provision**

Four in house provisions have been inspected under the new CQC standards; all four received a rating of Good following the inspection. The two respite units received positive recognition of the staff team and support offered.

### **Free Childcare for 2 year olds**

Funded Two’s Support Officers and Cambridgeshire Children’s Centres are supporting families to access their 15 hours of free early education for two year olds. This year the Council has supported 83.5% of eligible 2 year olds –that’s 1,492 children – to access their entitlement.

### **MESSAGES**

#### **LGBT History Month 2016**

The Council has been marking LGBT History Month 2016 by flying the rainbow flag at Shire Hall since 1 February. To further show its support for LGBT History Month, and by extension its commitment to the Cambridgeshire Equalities Pledge, the Council will be holding a formal flag raising ceremony for Members, staff, and the public. It will take place on Tuesday 23 February on the lawn outside Shire Hall at 1.30 p.m. All those attending the ceremony will have the opportunity to be part of a human rainbow, formed by people wearing t-shirts in the six colours of the rainbow flag.



**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16TH FEBRUARY 2016**

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**1) From Antony Carpen to Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee**

The Severn Place Development received planning approval on 03 Feb 2016 from Cambridge City Council councillors on the casting vote of the Planning Committee chair. The previous evening at a meeting of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign, campaign officers stated that county council officials as statutory consultees had not raised objections regarding transport access even though in the opinion of the campaign in their submission to the planning process, there were clear concerns.

Quotations reported from the planning hearing reported on social media indicated that City Councillors had concerns about transport access, but because the County Council as the transport authority had not raised these, they as City Councillors felt that they had their hands tied. Refusing the application on transport grounds where the County Council had not raised objections would make such a refusal straight forward to overturn by a Planning Inspector.

Two former City Councillors – Mr Tim Ward and Mr Colin Rosenstiel posted on social media that this was not the first time the County Council as statutory consultees had failed to raise objections on transport access on planning applications heard by Cambridge City Council.

I would therefore like to hear whether:

- 1) it is the opinion of the County Council transport officers that they had no issues with the transport access to that site
- 2) whether there are any possible procedural changes that allow for the assessment to be challenged before it is submitted/finalised as statutory consultees which was an issue raised by campaigners at the Cambridge Cycling campaign meeting
- 3) whether transport officers feel they have sufficient capacity to carry out the functions required of them as statutory consultees – and if not whether the County Council can increase their resources or perhaps move to a system where officers can perhaps crowd-source the much needed scrutiny function until such a time that local government resources can be increased to enable them to carry out their statutory duties and in the blog post I have put links to the planning application referred to.

**Response from Councillor Roger Hickford**

Mr Carpen, in response to your specific questions, on question 1 the opinion that County Council transport officers, they had no issues, yes they did have issues, but as in all pre-planning, they are in consultation with people putting in the plans and their concerns were actually made good, and so they did not have to actually put in any refusal or recommendation for refusal because of that.

Procedural changes, there is already consultation both public, elected representatives, you can go through committee so there is lots of ways that you can have input into things. I cannot think of anything but I will put it in my response if I do think of something.

As for transport, officers feel they have sufficient capacity to carry out their functions required of them as statutory consultees. The simple answer is yes, they take this very, very seriously. Yes, there is less money than before, but they will make sure that they always fulfil their function in this regard.

### **Supplementary question from Mr Carpen**

The reasons for those three questions were again on the back of social media discussion and what I felt was a little bit of a soap opera, a news vacuum if I can put it that way, and I think in particular where a number of accusations were perhaps being thrown about where we didn't have perhaps the full information that would have been useful to have to have informed the debate. I think also there are a number of issues that were raised in terms of the sequencing of some of the applications in particular with some of the controversy in part related to the Greater Cambridge City Deal. One of the things that strikes me with a lot of the negative comments is that it can give the impression that's all you get from the work that you do, and I think one of the things that I try to do, certainly coming to these meetings, is to try and put the other side of the huge amount of work that goes into it.

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

My response to the non-question is that I fully understand. I think there is an important role here and it is a role that we actually have in the County Council and it is called the County Councillor, and therefore the local County Councillor, whoever that may be for yourself, or in this particular issue, is the conduit to make sure that information is flowing both ways. So I understand what you are saying, but I think there might be some misuse there as well. I will put it in a response.

### **2) From Dr Sean Lang, Committee of the Friends of Cambridge Central Library to Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee**

The Friends of Cambridge Central Library which is a new group welcomes the chance to respond to the consultations on the future of the Central Library and of the Cambridgeshire Collection and is preparing a full response to the latter in order to inform the Council in its decision-making. However, we would like to know:

- a) Why the public consultation response form on the Cambridgeshire Collection deals only with proposed cuts in Opening Hours and makes no mention of the proposed major cuts to the Collection's staffing?
- b) Why, *proportionate to its size*, the proposed cuts to the Collection are considerably heavier than those proposed for the Library, and so much heavier than those proposed for the Council as a whole?
- c) Whether, in order to allow FCCL and other interested parties and there are plenty of them to prepare fully worked-out and constructive proposals for the future development of the Cambridgeshire Collection, the Council would be prepared to extend the deadline for any final decision about the Collection's long-term future, so that such proposals can be taken into account?

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

Thank you Dr Lang. A more comprehensive response will come to you later, but taking in order at the moment, why does it not include staffing? We are looking at opening hours and the effects of that - that is what the consultation is about. As far as we are concerned we are looking to still keep one part time professional, we are looking to have two part-time assistants and those three supported by other staff from within the Library, so the consultation is not specifically about staffing levels. It is more about the effect of opening hours etc.

Proportionality of the cuts – actually it is proportional, because of everything that has gone on before in the Council. This is no more disproportional than anything else. We have had to make service cuts and save money in all areas and if you like it is the turn of this particular one to be looked at. Just because it is a little bit bigger, maybe now it means it hasn't had anything before, but it has always been in the pipeline I guess. So proportionally I think you will find that it is the same as all the others.

Whether to allow the Friends of Cambridge Library the time – we are hoping that the changes will secure the future going forward, and therefore anything that can be added to that process by the Friends of Cambridge Central Library is more than welcome but we are, where we are, as far as what you are asking for – to extend the deadline? There is a deadline, it is in the Business Plan at the moment, but that does not mean that things cannot change after the deadline. Obviously we will work with whoever including yourselves to actually make things as good as possible after.

### **Supplementary question from Dr Sean Lang**

It's about proportionality. In terms of percentages, the proposed cuts for the Library as a whole and admittedly not entirely black and white, amount to about 10%. The cuts the Cambridgeshire Collection has had over the past one and a half years since 2014, if the proposed cuts go through, amount in staffing to 60%. The numbers of staff involved in the Cambridgeshire Collection are much smaller than the Library as a whole, so essentially, and you will find it all laid out in our response, the Cambridgeshire Collection cannot operate on the basis of the proposed cuts and that is why we raised the question.

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

I understand and I will give you a written response but the way I am looking at it is that the Cambridgeshire Collection is part of the Library Service overall, and also it will be supplemented going forward with some of the general staff from the Library, so there is give and take on both sides, but I will get a proper response to you.

### **3) Question from Stephen Swift to Councillor Roger Hickford, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee**

The County Library Service is set to be heavily impacted by the Plan before Council.

We probably all agree on the benefits of libraries but the issue in hand is how to balance the books. Given the major cuts already applied to this service, the proposed scale of cuts seems disproportionate so are these cuts being intelligently targeted? Council spending is often just that – spending.

The library service is one area where the Council is investing – be that in people, facilitating competitiveness of local business or even helping launch new businesses. So while Councils are often viewed primarily as support services they should also empower the

electorate and the commercial sector to thrive but hack away at this facilitating infrastructure and the commercial health of the wider County will surely suffer.

Currently, much of the benefit is intangible or unrecorded on traditional accounts but the Council does reap these hidden dividends and should be looking to make them grow and this kind of links to the essence of my point. However, the essence of my point is one of opportunity for the Council itself. The Council aspires to become a more commercial beast – it has its Transformational Agenda. The Library and Cambridgeshire Collection offer enormous potential in this regard.

The Council's own Library Income Strategy Group, formed late last year, identified scores of opportunities to offset the proposed cuts with new income streams, a chance to channel these dividends more directly to its own accounts. Even as we sit here, some of these ideas are in the early stages of implementation, some sadly held up in other Council departments and more, queuing up behind. So we are faced with a situation where at the very moment that green shoots of a more commercial approach are starting to show what could be achieved, staff losses hamper future efforts to raise revenue.

Time is needed and my question is actually a very positive one I think.

First, can we redirect or reconsider the cutbacks to allow for this opportunity or failing that, to allow us to see whether these germinating schemes can be a model for transforming the Council's fortunes? Can we at the very least, have a meaningful stay of execution for these Library cuts?

### **Response from Councillor Hickford**

Thank you to the questioner again. Obviously it is related to the previous question and I will make sure that answers are made public so you can both have them.

You are simply asking if there can be a reconsideration of what you consider to be ill-directed cuts. If I had my way we would not have any cuts at all, but please bear in mind that these have been considered much, much more than once, many, many times by Members with consultations etc but we are where we are. Please, please note that the Library Service is an integral part of our Transformation Agenda. My Committee, the H&CI Committee have already said that we are not going to cut mobile libraries because we want to see where they fit in to the overall picture. The Library Service is Cambridgeshire, it is not just Cambridge and so we really have to bear that in mind. We, as Members, are trying to decide something for Cambridgeshire. Cambridge is obviously a big part of that, but not all of it. We are also looking to see what we can do with Libraries to introduce other services - make them front doors and pubs and other things at the moment, that's all part of the transformation so going forward. I am hoping that we can make more of them rather than just, as you say, cutting them.

### **Supplementary question from Stephen Swift**

I would clarify that I was speaking in terms of Cambridgeshire. It doesn't really address my question; I am not sure whether you are saying that there can be an extension. It is a question of giving it a bit of breathing space if there is an opportunity here, but we actually cut off the opportunity to find out whether it will work, because we are feeling that we have this deadline. If there is flexibility in moving that or shuffling the timing of the cuts or something like that, that is really why I think the cuts are ill-directed as I have said, and I have suspicions about quite why they are apportioned in the way they were, but I am still not sure from your response whether you are saying there can be a change in the implementation date of these cuts.

## **Response from Councillor Hickford**

I think what I am saying is that we are where we are. I don't expect the cuts to change anything we want to introduce going forward. So that is why we need to work with everyone to find out where we go from here. Can there be an extension to the deadline? Etc, well no, but I don't think that should impede on what we would need to do in the future as far as the transformation is concerned.

# COUNTY COUNCIL – CLLR WALSH AMENDMENT

# APPENDIX C

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP		✓			KENNEY G	Con				A
ASHWOOD B	LibD	✓				KINDERSLEY S G	LibD	✓			
BAILEY A	Con		✓			LAY A	UKIP		✓		
BATES I C	Con		✓			LEEKE M	LibD	✓			
BODEN C	Con		✓			LOYNES M	Con		✓		
BROWN D	Con		✓			MANDLEY R	UKIP		✓		
BROWN P	Con	✓				MANNING I	LibD				A
BULLEN P	UKIP		✓			MASON M	Ind	✓			
BUTCHER R	Con				A	MCGUIRE L W	Con		✓		
BYWATER S	UKIP		✓			MOGHADAS Z	Lab	✓			
CEARNS E	LibD	✓				NETHSINGHA L	LibD	✓			
CHAPMAN B	Ind				A	ONASANYA F	Lab	✓			
CLAPP P	UKIP		✓			ORGEE A G	Con		✓		
CLARK J	Con		✓			PALMER J	Con		✓		
CONNOR D	Con		✓			REEVE P	UKIP		✓		
COUNT S	Con		✓			REYNOLDS K	Con				A
CRAWFORD S	Lab	✓				ROUSE M	Con		✓		
CRISWELL S J	Con		✓			SALES P	Lab	✓			
DENT A	Con				A	SCHUMANN J	Con		✓		
DIVINE D	UKIP		✓			SCUTT J	Lab	✓			
DOWNES P J	LibD	✓				SHELLENS M	LibD	✓			
FROST S	Con		✓			SHUTER M	Con		✓		
GILES D	Ind	✓				SMITH M	Con		✓		
GILLICK G	UKIP		✓			TAYLOR A	LibD	✓			
HARFORD L	Con		✓			TEW M	UKIP		✓		
HARTY D	Con		✓			TOPPING P	Con		✓		
HENSON R	UKIP		✓			VAN DE VEN S	LibD				A
HICKFORD R	Con		✓			WALSH A	Lab	✓			
HIPKIN J	Ind	✓				WHITEHEAD J	Lab	✓			
HOY S	Cons		✓			WILLIAMS J	LibD	✓			
HUDSON P	Con		✓			WILSON G	LibD	✓			
HUNT W T I	Con		✓			WISSON J	Con		✓		
JENKINS D	LibD	✓				YEULETT F H	Con		✓		
KAVANAGH N	Lab	✓				TOTAL		23	37	0	

# COUNTY COUNCIL – COUNCILLOR BULLEN AMENDMENT

# APPENDIX D

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/N o Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP	✓				KENNEY G	Con				A
ASHWOOD B	LibD		✓			KINDERSLEY S G	LibD		✓		
BAILEY A	Con		✓			LAY A	UKIP	✓			
BATES I C	Con		✓			LEEKE M	LibD		✓		
BODEN C	Con		✓			LOYNES M	Con		✓		
BROWN D	Con		✓			MANDLEY R	UKIP	✓			
BROWN P	Con		✓			MANNING I	LibD				A
BULLEN P	UKIP	✓				MASON M	Ind		✓		
BUTCHER R	Con				A	MCGUIRE L W	Con		✓		
BYWATER S	UKIP	✓				MOGHADAS Z	Lab		✓		
CEARNS E	LibD		✓			NETHSINGHA L	LibD		✓		
CHAPMAN B	Ind				A	ONASANYA F	Lab		✓		
CLAPP P	UKIP	✓				ORGEE A G	Con		✓		
CLARK J	Con		✓			PALMER J	Con		✓		
CONNOR D	Con		✓			REEVE P	UKIP	✓			
COUNT S	Con		✓			REYNOLDS K	Con				A
CRAWFORD S	Lab		✓			ROUSE M	Con		✓		
CRISWELL S J	Con		✓			SALES P	Lab		✓		
DENT A	Con				A	SCHUMANN J	Con		✓		
DIVINE D	UKIP	✓				SCUTT J	Lab		✓		
DOWNES P J	LibD		✓			SHELLENS M	LibD		✓		
FROST S	Con		✓			SHUTER M	Con		✓		
GILES D	Ind					SMITH M	Con		✓		
GILLICK G	UKIP	✓				TAYLOR A	LibD		✓		
HARFORD L	Con		✓			TEW M	UKIP	✓			
HARTY D	Con		✓			TOPPING P	Con		✓		
HENSON R	UKIP	✓				VAN DE VEN S	LibD				A
HICKFORD R	Con		✓			WALSH A	Lab		✓		
HIPKIN J	Ind		✓			WHITEHEAD J	Lab		✓		
HOY S	Cons		✓			WILLIAMS J	LibD		✓		
HUDSON P	Con		✓			WILSON G	LibD		✓		
HUNT W T I	Con		✓			WISSON J	Con		✓		
JENKINS D	LibD		✓			YEULETT F H	Con		✓		
KAVANAGH N	Lab		✓			TOTAL		11	48	0	

COUNTY COUNCIL – BUSINESS PLAN MOTION

APPENDIX E

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/N o Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP		✓			KENNEY G	Con				A
ASHWOOD B	LibD		✓			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		✓		
BAILEY A	Con	✓				LAY A	UKIP		✓		
BATES I C	Con	✓				LEEKE M	LibD		✓		
BODEN C	Con	✓				LOYNES M	Con	✓			
BROWN D	Con	✓				MANDLEY R	UKIP		✓		
BROWN P	Con	✓				MANNING I	LibD		✓		
BULLEN P	UKIP		✓			MASON M	Ind	✓			
BUTCHER R	Con				A	MCGUIRE L W	Con	✓			
BYWATER S	UKIP		✓			MOGHADAS Z	Lab		✓		
CEARNS E	LibD		✓			NETHSINGHA L	LibD		✓		
CHAPMAN B	Ind				A	ONASANYA F	Lab		✓		
CLAPP P	UKIP		✓			ORGEE A G	Con	✓			
CLARK J	Con	✓				PALMER J	Con	✓			
CONNOR D	Con	✓				REEVE P	UKIP		✓		
COUNT S	Con	✓				REYNOLDS K	Con				A
CRAWFORD S	Lab		✓			ROUSE M	Con	✓			
CRISWELL S J	Con	✓				SALES P	Lab		✓		
DENT A	Con				A	SCHUMANN J	Con	✓			
DIVINE D	UKIP		✓			SCUTT J	Lab		✓		
DOWNES P J	LibD		✓			SHELLENS M	LibD		✓		
FROST S	Con	✓				SHUTER M	Con	✓			
GILES D	Ind		✓			SMITH M	Con	✓			
GILLICK G	UKIP		✓			TAYLOR A	LibD		✓		
HARFORD L	Con	✓				TEW M	UKIP		✓		
HARTY D	Con	✓				TOPPING P	Con	✓			
HENSON R	UKIP		✓			VAN DE VEN S	LibD				A
HICKFORD R	Con	✓				WALSH A	Lab		✓		
HIPKIN J	Ind		✓			WHITEHEAD J	Lab		✓		
HOY S	Cons	✓				WILLIAMS J	LibD		✓		
HUDSON P	Con	✓				WILSON G	LibD		✓		
HUNT W T I	Con	✓				WISSON J	Con	✓			
JENKINS D	LibD		✓			YEULETT F H	Con	✓			
KAVANAGH N	Lab		✓			TOTAL		28	33	0	



COUNTY COUNCIL – FIRST MOTION COUNCILLOR COUNT

APPENDIX F

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/N o Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP		✓			KENNEY G	Con				A
ASHWOOD B	LibD		✓			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		✓		
BAILEY A	Con	✓				LAY A	UKIP		✓		
BATES I C	Con	✓				LEEKE M	LibD		✓		
BODEN C	Con	✓				LOYNES M	Con	✓			
BROWN D	Con	✓				MANDLEY R	UKIP		✓		
BROWN P	Con	✓				MANNING I	LibD		✓		
BULLEN P	UKIP		✓			MASON M	Ind	✓			
BUTCHER R	Con				A	MCGUIRE L W	Con	✓			
BYWATER S	UKIP		✓			MOGHADAS Z	Lab		✓		
CEARNS E	LibD		✓			NETHSINGHA L	LibD		✓		
CHAPMAN B	Ind				A	ONASANYA F	Lab		✓		
CLAPP P	UKIP		✓			ORGE E A G	Con	✓			
CLARK J	Con	✓				PALMER J	Con	✓			
CONNOR D	Con	✓				REEVE P	UKIP		✓		
COUNT S	Con	✓				REYNOLDS K	Con				A
CRAWFORD S	Lab		✓			ROUSE M	Con	✓			
CRISWELL S J	Con	✓				SALES P	Lab		✓		
DENT A	Con				A	SCHUMANN J	Con	✓			
DIVINE D	UKIP		✓			SCUTT J	Lab		✓		
DOWNES P J	LibD		✓			SHELLENS M	LibD		✓		
FROST S	Con	✓				SHUTER M	Con	✓			
GILES D	Ind	✓				SMITH M	Con	✓			
GILLICK G	UKIP		✓			TAYLOR A	LibD		✓		
HARFORD L	Con	✓				TEW M	UKIP		✓		
HARTY D	Con	✓				TOPPING P	Con	✓			
HENSON R	UKIP		✓			VAN DE VEN S	LibD				A
HICKFORD R	Con	✓				WALSH A	Lab		✓		
HIPKIN J	Ind	✓				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		✓		
HOY S	Cons	✓				WILLIAMS J	LibD		✓		
HUDSON P	Con	✓				WILSON G	LibD		✓		
HUNT W T I	Con	✓				WISSON J	Con	✓			
JENKINS D	LibD		✓			YEULETT F H	Con	✓			
KAVANAGH N	Lab		✓			TOTAL		30	31	0	

COUNTY COUNCIL – SECOND MOTION CLLR COUNT

APPENDIX G

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/N o Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
ASHCROFT P	UKIP				NV	KENNEY G	Con				A
ASHWOOD B	LibD		✓			KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		✓		
BAILEY	Con	✓				LAY A	UKIP		✓		
BATES I C	Con	✓				LEEKE M	LibD		✓		
BODEN C	Con	✓				LOYNES M	Con	✓			
BROWN D	Con	✓				MANDLEY R	UKIP		✓		
BROWN P	Con	✓				MANNING I	LibD		✓		
BULLEN P	UKIP		✓			MASON M	Ind	✓			
BUTCHER R	Con				A	MCGUIRE L W	Con	✓			
BYWATER S	UKIP			✓		MOGHADAS Z	Lab		✓		
CEARNS E	LibD		✓			NETHSINGHA L	LibD		✓		
CHAPMAN B	Ind				A	ONASANYA F	Lab		✓		
CLAPP P	UKIP		✓			ORGE E A G	Con	✓			
CLARK J	Con	✓				PALMER J	Con	✓			
CONNOR D	Con	✓				REEVE P	UKIP		✓		
COUNT S	Con	✓				REYNOLDS K	Con				A
CRAWFORD S	Lab		✓			ROUSE M	Con	✓			
CRISWELL S J	Con	✓				SALES P	Lab		✓		
DENT A	Con				A	SCHUMANN J	Con	✓			
DIVINE D	UKIP		✓			SCUTT J	Lab		✓		
DOWNES P J	LibD		✓			SHELLENS M	LibD		✓		
FROST S	Con	✓				SHUTER M	Con	✓			
GILES D	Ind	✓				SMITH M	Con	✓			
GILLICK G	UKIP	✓				TAYLOR A	LibD		✓		
HARFORD L	Con	✓				TEW M	UKIP		✓		
HARTY D	Con	✓				TOPPING P	Con	✓			
HENSON R	UKIP		✓			VAN DE VEN S	LibD				A
HICKFORD R	Con	✓				WALSH A	Lab		✓		
HIPKIN J	Ind	✓				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		✓		
HOY S	Cons	✓				WILLIAMS J	LibD		✓		
HUDSON P	Con	✓				WILSON G	LibD		✓		
HUNT W T I	Con	✓				WISSON J	Con	✓			
JENKINS D	LibD		✓			YEULETT F H	Con	✓			
KAVANAGH N	Lab		✓			TOTAL		31	28	1	

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 16TH FEBRUARY 2016**

**ORAL QUESTION TIME**

**Question from Councillor Jenkins to Councillor Count, Leader of the Council**

Will you agree with me that it is best to have discussions well in advance of meetings so that differences can be resolved beforehand and alternative compromises developed rather than leaving them to the last minute and running into the chaos that we have had today?

**Response from Councillor Count**

I kind of go along with the kind of general theory that Councillor Jenkins is talking about. I somehow suspect that what Councillor Jenkins really wants to ask will be about the supplementary because he must have something specific in mind I might be able to help with.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Jenkins**

Thank you for your answer. I think we know what we are talking about, let's do it better next time. I have no question.