

## COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, 22nd March 2016

**Time:** 1.30 p.m. – 6.18 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, E Cearn, 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, 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, S van de Ven, A Walsh, J Wisson, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors B Chapman and K Reynolds

### **203. MINUTES – 16TH FEBRUARY 2016**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 16th February 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **204. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

### **205. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

### **206. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The Council noted one question received from a member of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

### **207. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

## **208. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

### **Scheme of Financial Management**

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that subject to an alteration to recommendation (b) to reflect an amendment agreed at General Purposes Committee, the words "Group Leaders" should be removed and replaced with the "Chairman of General Purposes Committee", the altered recommendation as set out in minute 214 of the minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting of 15th March 2016 be approved.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To approve the revised Scheme of Financial Management for inclusion in the Council's Constitution.
- b) To delegate authority to the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of General Purposes Committee, to approve any changes as may be necessary from time to time to reflect and take account of changes in legislation, guidance, Council policy, decisions of the Council and any drafting changes or improvements to the Scheme of Financial Management (as set out in section 2.5).

## **209. ARRANGEMENTS FOR MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL TO JOIN LGSS JOINT COMMITTEE SHARED SERVICES PARTNERSHIP**

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, that subject to the following correction to Schedule 1 on page 47, the table detailing the rotation of the chair and vice chair roles between the three partner councils to read as follows:

Joint Committee Chair 2015-16 – CCC; 2016-17 - NCC; 2017-18 – MKC;  
2018-19 - CCC

Joint Committee Vice Chair 2015-16 - NCC; 2016-17 – MKC; 2017-18 – CCC;  
2018-19 - NCC;

the recommendation as set out on page 9 of the Council agenda be approved.

Councillor Count and members of the LGSS Joint Committee Councillors McGuire, Manning and Bullen thanked Members and officers for the work undertaken to successfully negotiate the addition of Milton Keynes Council to LGSS, which had now become the largest public services partnership provider in the UK.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the proposed changes to the existing Delegation and Joint Committee Agreement to reflect the addition of Milton Keynes Council as a full partner of the LGSS Joint Committee and the consequent updates to the constitutions of the Councils required to enable this, as reflected in Schedule 2 of the agreement; and
- b) Delegate to the LGSS Managing Director the power to make these and any

other necessary or incidental amendments in order to finalise and implement the arrangements.

## **210. PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015/16**

It was moved by the Chairman of the Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Schumann, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Downes, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

Councillor Manning proposed the following amendment:

Additions in bold:

Amend the recommendation as follows:

To recommend to Council:

- i) the agreement of the Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 (Appendix 1) including the pay multiple;
- ii) **the publication of the median pay ratio yearly as well as the mean pay ratio; and**
- iii) **the publication of the gender pay gap yearly**

Councillor Schumann, as the mover of the Motion, and Councillor Downes, as the seconder, agreed to alter the motion, which was accepted by the meeting without discussion.

It was resolved unanimously to agree:

- i) the Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 (Appendix 1) including the pay multiple;
- ii) the publication of the median pay ratio yearly as well as the mean pay ratio; and
- iii) the publication of the gender pay gap yearly.

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

### **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 Mini Review of Governance Procedures report be approved.

Councillor Count proposed the following amendment, seconded by Councillor Hickford.

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

Amend the recommendation as follows:

It is recommended that Full Council approve the amendments to the Council's Constitution, ~~as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee~~, as follows:-

- i) that the procedure for Oral Questions by Members at Full Council ~~be removed~~ **should allow for questions to be asked of any member of the Council who has a position of responsibility i.e. Leader of the Council, Group Leaders, Chairmen/women, Vice-Chairmen/Women, Spokesmen/women, Council representatives on Outside Bodies, Partnership Liaison and Advisory Groups and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels, and**
- ii) the limit on the number of written questions submitted to a Full Council meeting **should remain** ~~be removed~~.

Councillor Smith, as the mover of the Motion, and Councillor McGuire, as the seconder, agreed to alter the motion, which was accepted by the meeting without discussion.

It was unanimously resolved::

- i) that the procedure for Oral Questions by Members at Full Council should allow for questions to be asked of any member of the Council who has a position of responsibility i.e. Leader of the Council, Group Leaders, Chairmen/women, Vice-Chairmen/Women, Spokesmen/women, Council representatives on Outside Bodies, Partnership Liaison and Advisory Groups and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels, and
- ii) the limit on the number of written questions submitted to a Full Council meeting should remain.

## 212. GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL EXECUTIVE BOARD DELEGATIONS

This item had been considered separately by four different committees. As the recommendations were proposing changes to the Council's Constitution, 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 approved.

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

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

It was resolved to:

- a) delegate the responsibility for making decisions regarding Traffic Regulation Orders for City Deal infrastructure schemes to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board;
- b) delegate the responsibility for making decisions around and exercising Compulsory Purchase Order powers for City Deal infrastructure schemes to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board;
- c) delegate the responsibility for making decisions around Side Roads Orders for City Deal infrastructure schemes to the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board;
- d) delegate the responsibility to promote Transport and Works Act Orders for City Deal infrastructure schemes to the Greater Cambridge City Deal

Executive Board;

- e) delegate the responsibility for considering planning applications for City Deal infrastructure schemes to the Joint Development Control Committee for Cambridge Fringes;
- f) approve the amendment of the Terms of Reference of the Joint Development Control Committee - Cambridge Fringes, the Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee, the Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee, and the Cambridge City Joint Area Committee as set out in Appendices A to D to the report;
- g) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

## **213. COMMITTEES – ALLOCATIONS 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, that the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees to political groups in accordance with the political balance rules, as set out in the tabled report on green paper, be approved subject to two changes namely that the Independent Group lose a seat on the Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee to Labour but retain their seat on the Children and Young People Policy and Service Committee, and Councillor Kenney rather than Councillor Orgee remain a member of the Joint Development Control Committee – Cambridge Fringes.

It was resolved unanimously:

to agree the changes as set out in **Appendix C**.

## 214. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

The Chairman of the Council, Councillor Kindersley, seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Smith, moved the change in membership proposed for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority as set out on the yellow paper tabled at meeting.

it was resolved unanimously:

to agree to replace Councillor Jocelynn Scutt with Councillor Shellens on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority.

## 215. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Five motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

The Chairman of Council used his discretionary powers to take the fifth motion before all those included on the original agenda despatch.

### a) Motion from Councillor Nethsingha

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

This council notes the announcement by the Chancellor of a devolution deal for the East in his budget on 16th March.

This council welcomes the commitment of the government for increased investment in infrastructure in the east of England.

This council resolves to:-

- i) Formally declare and record its opposition to the proposal for a Mayor for Cambridgeshire, Peterborough, Norfolk and Suffolk, with sweeping powers over planning and transport which would reduce the influence of local people on planning for their own areas.
- ii) Request that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Local Government to bring this resolution to his attention.

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

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

Amend the recommendation as follows:

This council notes the announcement by the Chancellor of a devolution deal for the East in his budget on 16th March. **But, regrets that the deal, in its current form, is not acceptable to this council.**

~~This council welcomes the commitment of the government for increased investment in infrastructure in the east of England.~~

This council resolves to:-

- i) ~~Formally declare and record its opposition to the proposal for a Mayor for Cambridgeshire, Peterborough, Norfolk and Suffolk, with sweeping powers over planning and transport which would reduce the influence of local people on planning for their own areas.~~
- i) Request that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Local Government to bring this resolution to his attention.

Councillor Nethsingha, as the mover of the Motion, and Councillor Walsh, as the seconder, agreed to alter the motion, which was accepted by the meeting without discussion.

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

*[Voting pattern: Nearly all Conservatives, all Liberal Democrats, all UKIP, all Labour and all Independents in favour; none against; and one Conservative abstained]*

**b) Motion from Councillor Hipkin**

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

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 Cambridge 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.

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

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

### **(c) Motion from Councillor Joan Whitehead**

Councillor Whitehead proposed, seconded by Councillor Moghadas, the motion set out at 14(b) on the Council agenda. Councillor David Brown proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Harford, which was further amended at the meeting to take out reference to the percentages of secondary and maintained schools rated as outstanding. Councillor Whitehead, as the mover of the Motion, and Councillor Moghadas, as the seconder, agreed to alter the motion, which was accepted by the meeting without discussion

Following discussion, the substantive motion below, on being put to the vote, was carried unanimously by a show of hands.

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

Amend the recommendation as follows:

The Children and Young People's Committee has become increasingly concerned about the performance of many of the secondary schools in Cambridgeshire all but one of which are now academies.

According to Ofsted 16 (53%) of **secondary** schools in Cambridgeshire are rated good or outstanding; 14 (43%) require improvement and 1 (4%) is in special measures. This means that in Cambridgeshire only 49% of all secondary school pupils attend schools rated good or outstanding. So although there are some high performing academies in Cambridgeshire, there are many who are failing their pupils.

This raises an important question, namely who is responsible for the performance of academies?

There is, unfortunately, no clear answer to this question.

The situation is that:-

1. Councils have a responsibility to monitor achievement in all schools.
2. Academies, however, are ultimately responsible to Secretary of State for Education via Regional **Schools** Commissioners and are deemed to be free from Local Authority control, as the Local Government Association (LGA) have pointed out 'Currently academies are not subject to any statutory intervention, but are governed by their funding agreement with the DfE'



This produces an anomalous situation where Councils are responsible for educational achievement in academies but have no real powers to improve achievement levels if they are unsatisfactory.

Regional **Schools** Commissioners to whom academies are ultimately responsible currently also have limited powers.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the **House of Commons** Education Select Committee concluded that the scrutiny of academy schools is confused, fragmented and lacks transparency and that a fundamental reassessment of accountability and oversight of schools is necessary.

The LGA has pointed out that **some** Local Councils have a good track record in raising educational standards and quickly turning around schools that require improvement or are in special measures; ~~nationally 69.80% of secondary schools still in the maintained sector are rated outstanding or good compared with 85.69% of converter academies and 53% of sponsor-led academies.~~ The LGA believe that this proves that Councils should be regarded as education improvement partners and be able to support the work of Regional **Schools** Commissioners.

The proposal before Council is to request the Chief Executive, the Executive Director for Children and Young People, the Director for Learning and the Chair of the Young People's Committee to write jointly to the Chair of the Education Select Committee :-

1. To support the members of the Education Select Committee in their conclusion about academies and urge them to continue to pressure the Government to take seriously not just the issue of accountability and oversight of academies, but the even more pressing issue of the need for intervention to help failing academies.
2. To reinforce the point made to them by the LGA that Councils should be actively involved in the improvement of failing academies; and they should urge the Government to enable this to happen by ~~giving~~**ensuring there are** Councils the powers to intervene in academies to improve their performance, just as there are ~~have~~ in maintained schools, and that the allocation ~~to Councils from the~~ of schools' budget should contain adequate provision for school improvement.

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

Councillor Downes withdrew the following motion:

Council notes that:

- the disparity of funding of schools across the country is a long-standing problem and is in urgent need of reform
- that Cambridgeshire has been one of the worst-funded authorities because its current funding is still based on historic decisions made by this Council 30 years ago
- many people of different political persuasions and professional perspectives have lobbied hard in an attempt to reform the funding system

Council therefore

- welcomes the government's commitment to a root-and-branch reform of education funding and acknowledges the detailed work that has gone into the current consultation on a national funding formula
- agrees with the broad principles that funding for the education of young people should reflect their needs and should not be dependent on where they live nor on decisions made in different times
- will make a detailed and vigorous contribution to debate on this topic over the coming weeks

Council is nevertheless concerned that

- the draft proposals appear to reduce even further the role of the local democracy in state-funded education by making all schools directly funded by central government from 2019-20
- the draft proposals in relation to school growth appear to limit the flexibility of local authorities to respond to the specific needs of their areas
- there is no extra funding available to ease the transition to a new formula and that division between the 'winners' and 'losers' will be exacerbated
- the protection of the national allocation to schools in 'flat cash' terms is actually a cut in real terms as schools face increasing costs

Council calls on the Chief Executive to work with her colleagues in the Local Government Association to put pressure on the government to recognise, protect and fund the essential role of local authorities in

- ensuring the provision of sufficient school places
- responding appropriately and sensitively to local circumstances and needs
- working with all maintained schools and academies to improve standards for all and particularly to raise the performance and aspirations of young people from the most deprived backgrounds.

#### **(e) Motion from Councillor Ian Manning**

Councillor Manning withdrew the following motion:

This Council notes that:

- recent Government amendments to the pensions regulations will remove from local authorities the ability to make investment decisions on ethical grounds
- the Government has repeatedly stated a desire to devolve power away from central Government

Council believes that the recent pensions amendments are an unacceptable attack on local decision making, regardless of whether Council wishes to make decisions on ethical grounds or not.

Therefore, Council resolves to:

Direct the Chief Executive to write to Matthew Hancock MP, as the relevant minister, signalling this Council's objection to the moves as an unacceptable centralisation of power, and a backwards step in the devolution agenda.

**216. QUESTIONS:**

**a) Questions on Fire Authority Issues**

No questions were submitted in relation to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority report.

**b) Oral Questions**

One question was asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as amended, as set out in **Appendix D**. One question provided in advance from Councillor Mason to Councillor Bates regarding the recent accident on the Guided Busway was to be dealt with by a written response.

**c) Written Questions**

No written questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 22ND MARCH 2016  
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS****PEOPLE****Sutton By-Election**

The result from the By-Election held on 18th February 2016 for the Sutton Electoral Division was:

Name	Description	Votes Cast
Bigsby Pete	UKIP	208
Bradley Mike	Conservative	651
Dupre Lorna Helen	Liberal Democrat	1063
Winters Owen	Independent	102

The turnout was 31.6%

Lorna Helen Dupre was declared as the duly elected councillor for the Sutton Division and has signed her declaration of acceptance.

**AWARDS****Young People’s Outstanding Achievements Awards**

The young people’s outstanding achievement awards were held on Friday 19 February to recognise the individual achievements of Cambridgeshire’s looked after young people and care leavers. The awards also give young people themselves the opportunity to nominate adults that work with them who they feel have gone the extra mile for them and supported and helped them.

This year we had our biggest amount of nominations with a total of 802 nominations received, 575 for young people and 227 for adults. On the night we also had our biggest attendance with over 400 people attending which included young people and their fostering families, workers, senior managers, elected members and teachers from across schools in Cambridgeshire. All in all it was a very successful evening.

**SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS****Children, Families and Adults: £40,000 Digital Transformation Funding awarded to Cambridgeshire & Peterborough**

The Local Government Association (LGA) has awarded £40,000 as a joint partnership between Cambridge and Peterborough Local Authorities, the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Cambridge Council for Voluntary Services as part of its Digital Transformation Programme.

The objective of this Digital Transformation programme is to fund a number of council-led projects to use digital tools and approaches to support existing work on major programmes of local service transformation.

The funding will be used to support our work to provide consistent and accurate health and social care information and advice regardless of the access channel used or partner organisation contacted.

### Adults Early Help

The creation of the new Adult Early Help Service is being designed to reduce the number of referrals to social work teams and therefore the number of people being assessed for more costly care packages as well as to improve the customer experience and older and vulnerable people's health and wellbeing.

Starting from April 2016, this newly created Adult Early Help team will support and advise older people, people with a physical disability and/or sensory impairment, who are beginning to require help in older age but who do not yet have eligible needs for an ongoing care package. The team will provide expert advice over the phone, via home visits or booked appointments at community buildings. They will work to reduce the likelihood that people will need statutory services by providing an effective, preventative response, supporting people to maintain their independence for longer.

## **MESSAGES**

### Deputy Mayor and delegation from The People's Government of Nanjing Municipality, Nanjing

On 7 March, the Chairman, along with Councillor McGuire and Councillor Shuter, welcomed the Deputy Mayor and delegation from The People's Government of Nanjing Municipality, Nanjing to Shire Hall. The productive meeting identified potential areas of opportunity for economic cooperation to be explored further, and discussions helped to lay some initial foundations for a mutually beneficial relationship going forward.

### The American Air Museum in Britain

On 17 March, the Chairman attended the visit of His Royal Highness The Duke of Kent, Royal Patron, when His Royal Highness reopened The American Air Museum in Britain, at the Imperial War Museum, Duxford, Cambridgeshire.

### David Lilley and Sharon Roberts, Democratic and Members' Services Assistants

As both the above Democratic and Members' Services Assistants were shortly to retire, they had been invited to attend the Council meeting where the Chairman expressed gratitude for the support they had provided on behalf of the Council and wished them well for the future with all Members showing their appreciation through a round of applause.

**PUBLIC QUESTION TIME****COUNTY COUNCIL – 22<sup>nd</sup> MARCH 2016****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME****From Antony Carpen to Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of Economy and Environment Policy and Service Committee**

I made a video about one of the workshops that I attended. How many of you had the chance to actually watch that YouTube video? Splendid, One of you. We actually got quite a few hits from that, I think that there were over forty views so it was actually well worth doing. The reason why I mentioned this, I got a lot out of going to that workshop which was facilitated and organised for free by The Prince's Foundation, set up by His Royal Highness, The Prince of Wales and it was all about engaging people in local planning and transport systems. One of the exercises that was done in the video that Councillor Bates has indicated that he has seen was using brightly coloured dots on a big map of Cambridge and the surrounding area to allow members of the public to indicate parts of the area where they thought they didn't like, parts where they thought they did like and also parts where they thought the city and the surrounding areas and roads in particular, could be improved. For me it was a really good example of community outreach and also The Prince's Foundation were absolutely rock solid on the importance of due process in all of this and the fifty of us who went along to the workshop the following day really came out with just how important it is for to make use of due process in order to influence decisions for example that you all take. So my question to the Council is has the Council done similar exercises as I highlighted in that video and also as highlighted on The Prince's Foundation website that I linked to in the question to get people engaged and also a query as to why such an exercise, in particular, the sticky dots exercise was not done at the very start of the Greater Cambridge City Deal process?

**Response from Councillor Ian Bates**

First of all thank you for the question and yes I did watch the video. You appear to have quite a bit of competition mind you. Listening to the video, everybody is behind you in the room so it was not that easy to listen. But I did and therefore I didn't catch all the words that you were saying but 90% of them, mainly due to the background noise, so apologies for that. Maybe a lesson in future tell them to be quiet while you are doing a recording but that is another issue.

Mr Chairman, we are as an Authority very much engaged with both the City Council and South Cambs Council. We have been doing that for many years and we have worked very closely with both Authorities in local plans, that's not new. That has happened in the past. That will continue.

That comes also through the Local Transport Plan, there is one for the County but there is also one quite specifically for Cambridge and also for South Cambs. Both of those have had Member involvement all the way through the whole process and Members are engaged from all three Authorities when suggestions, proposals come forward both for the local plan also for transport. So that is not new and that will continue, I am sure, particularly as local plans develop and of course these are current local plans, there will be others coming forward and there has always been the ones back in the fifties, sixties and seventies. So the intention of all three is to work very closely. Having said all that, that really underpinned all the work that

came forward in respect of the City Deal and the negotiations that took forward with Central Government. So that underpins all of the work that actually comes forward. Now a lot of those negotiations and discussions result then in projects coming forward, they are consulted upon and there are plenty currently out for consultation which Members are aware of. So in answer to your specific question, did we have a map with stickers? No, but we have done an extensive consultation in the past, which we will continue. We also have a written agreement with the three Authorities which actually requires all three to co-operate, it is a properly legally defined document, saying all three will co-operate. So that is an important document, not only that, but it is also connected to housing so in answer to your question, I hope that satisfies you in what you have put forward.

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

Just with Duty to Co-operate, that takes me back to my Civil Service days with Local Area Agreements. Just to add, I cleared this with the Legal Officer just before the meeting with regards to the agenda item on the motion being debated today, because there has also been public concern rising around the proposed devolution deals which several Councillors were on the radio over the past couple of days and also myself this morning and I just wanted to link those discussions with really the issue that I was raising here about the importance of due process and again one of the things that I really got from The Prince's Foundation work is the importance of having solid due process to ensure that there is community support with whatever proposals are going forward. Now my personal belief is, and I have blogged about this and I have also mentioned it on the radio, that we have not had that due process with these proposals which is why again my personal belief is that the proposals as they stand should not go forward and why I commend any attempt to negotiate with the Government to try and improve what is there or to refuse them.

### **Response from Councillor Bates**

I just thank Mr Carpen for his comments

## APPENDIX C

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2015/16**

*(Changes following the Council meeting on 12 May 2015 in bold in red)*

#### **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	S CRISWELL	C	CLLR	M SHUTER	C
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	CLLR	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	T ORGEE	C	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	CLLR	<b>S-VAN-DE-KERKHOVE VACANCY</b>	IND
CLLR	A WALSH	L	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	CLLR		L
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR		L
CLLR	E CEARNES	LD	CLLR	P DOWNES	LD
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP	CLLR	M LEEKE	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	<b>L HARFORD P BROWN</b>	C
CLLR	S HOY	C	CLLR	M LOYNES	C
CLLR	G KENNEY	C	CLLR	T ORGEE	C
CLLR	<b>K REYNOLDS L HARFORD</b>	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	P SALES	L	CLLR	<b>S-VAN-DE-KERKHOVE VACANCY</b>	IND
CLLR	<b>L NETHSINGHA L DUPRE</b>	LD	CLLR	Z MOGHADAS	L
CLLR	G WILSON	LD	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	<b>P ASHCROFT R MANDLEY</b>	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	G KENNEY	C
CLLR	S FROST	C	CLLR	M ROUSE	C
CLLR	D HARTY	C	CLLR	F YEULETT	C
CLLR	M LOYNES	C	CLLR	<b>VACANCY</b>	C
CLLR	J WISSON	C	CLLR	<b>B CHAPMAN</b>	<b>IND</b>
CLLR	<b>S-VAN-DE-KERKHOVE J HIPKIN</b>	<b>IND</b>	CLLR	<b>D GILES</b>	<b>IND</b>
CLLR	F ONASANYA	L	CLLR	<b>J-HIPKIN VACANCY</b>	<b>IND</b>
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	CLLR	<b>M MASON</b>	<b>IND</b>
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	<b>L-NETHSINGHA M LEEKE</b>	LD	CLLR	Z MOGHADAS	L
CLLR	S BYWATER	UKIP	CLLR	P SALES	L
CLLR	D DIVINE	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
			CLLR	I MANNING	LD
			CLLR	<b>M-LEEKE L NETHSINGHA</b>	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>B-CHAPMAN</b>	<b>IND</b>
CLLR	<b>M-MASON</b>	<b>IND</b>	CLLR	<b>D-GILES</b>	<b>IND</b>
CLLR	E CEARNES	LD	CLLR	<b>J-HIPKIN</b>	<b>IND</b>
CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD	CLLR	<b>S-VAN-DE-KERKHOVE-VACANCY</b>	<b>IND</b>
CLLR	<b>A-WALSH D JENKINS</b>	<b>L-LD</b>	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L
CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L	CLLR	P SALES	L
<b>CLLR</b>	<b>A WALSH</b>	<b>L</b>	CLLR	<b>J-SCUTT A-WALSH VACANCY</b>	L
CLLR	A LAY	UKIP	CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP	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	<b>A-DENT L HARFORD</b>	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	<b>VACANCY</b>	C
CLLR	P TOPPING	C	CLLR	<b>VACANCY</b>	IND
CLLR	<del>S-VAN-DE KERKHOVE</del> <b>B-CHAPMAN Z MOGHADAS</b>	<del>IND</del> <b>L</b>	CLLR	D GILES	IND
<b>CLLR</b>	<b>Z MOGHADAS</b>	<b>L</b>	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
CLLR	P SALES	L	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L
<b>CLLR</b>	<b>M LEEKE</b>	<b>LD</b>	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	P CLAPP	UKIP	CLLR	A WALSH	L
CLLR	<b>P-ASHCROFT A DENT</b>	UKIP	CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD
			CLLR	<b>M-LEEKE VACANCY</b>	<b>LD</b>
			CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	<b>VACANCY</b>	LD
			CLLR	<b>P ASHCROFT</b>	UKIP
			CLLR	S BYWATER	UKIP
			CLLR	<b>R MANDLEY</b>	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	R HICKFORD	C	CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C
CLLR	B HUNT	C	CLLR	J PALMER	C
CLLR	M ROUSE	C	CLLR	D GILES	IND
CLLR	<b>B CHAPMAN</b>	<b>IND</b>	CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND
<b>CLLR</b>	<b>Z MOGHADAS</b>	<b>L</b>	CLLR	M MASON	IND
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	CLLR	<b>S-VAN-DE KERKHOVE VACANCY</b>	IND
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD	CLLR	P SALES	L
<b>CLLR</b>	<b>J WILLIAMS</b>	<b>LD</b>	CLLR	A WALSH	L
CLLR	G GILLICK	UKIP	CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP	CLLR	<b>L DUPRE</b>	LD
			CLLR	<b>D JENKINS</b>	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	<b>S-CRISWELL VACANCY</b>	C
CLLR	M LOYNES	C	K REYNOLDS	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	<b>S-VAN-DE-KERKHOVE VACANCY</b>	IND
CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP	P SALES	L
CLLR	A LAY	UKIP		L
				L
			E CEARNS	LD
			<b>L DUPRE</b>	LD
			<b>A-TAYLOR</b> L NETHSINGHA	LD
			J WILLIAMS	LD
			P BULLEN	UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP
			R HENSON	UKIP
			M TEW	UKIP

## **OTHER COMMITTEES**

### **AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (7)**

CLLR	P HUDSON	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	I BATES	C
CLLR	P TOPPING	C	J CLARK	C
CLLR	S CRAWFORD	L	<b>A-DENT VACANCY</b>	C
CLLR	M SHELLENS	LD	S FROST	C
CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD	<b>B-CHAPMAN</b>	IND
CLLR	R HENSON	UKIP	<b>D-GILES</b>	IND
			<b>J-HIPKIN</b>	IND
			<b>S-VAN-DE-KERKHOVE</b>	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
			<b>A DENT</b>	<b>UKIP</b>
			P REEVE	UKIP

### CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE (11)

CLLR	D BROWN	C	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	A BAILEY	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	<b>A-DENT VACANCY</b>	C
CLLR	K REYNOLDS	C	S FROST	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	J WISSON	C
CLLR	J HIPKIN	IND	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	D GILES	IND
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	M MASON	IND
CLLR	<b>A-TAYLOR E CEARNIS</b>	LD	<b>S-VAN-DE-KERKHOVE VACANCY</b>	IND
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP	S CRAWFORD	L
CLLR	P REEVE	UKIP	N KAVANAGH	L
			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
			<b>A DENT</b>	<b>UKIP</b>

### CAMBRIDGE CITY JOINT AREA COMMITTEE (6)

E CEARNIS	LD	<b>Substitutes (up to 4 per group)</b>	
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		LD
		P REEVE	UKIP

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

CLLR	G KENNEY	C	<b>Substitutes (two per group)</b>	
CLLR	<b>T-ORGEE J HIPKIN</b>	<b>C IND.</b>	L HARFORD	C
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	M LOYNES	C
CLLR	<b>J-HIPKIN A DENT</b>	<b>IND UKIP</b>	<b>L NETHSINGHA</b>	LD
			<b>A-TAYLOR J WILLIAMS</b>	LD
				<b>UKIP</b>
				<b>UKIP</b>

### 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)

<b>CLLR</b>	<b>L HARFORD VACANCY</b>	<b>G L</b>	<b>Substitutes (two per group)</b>	
<b>CLLR</b>	<b>P HUDSON D JENKINS</b>	<b>C LD</b>	<b>I BATES VACANCY</b>	<b>C L</b>
CLLR	E CEARNES	LD	<b>M MCGUIRE VACANCY</b>	<b>C L</b>
CLLR	<b>D JENKINS A DENT</b>	<b>LD</b> <b>UKIP</b>	M LEEKE	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
				<b>UKIP</b>
				<b>UKIP</b>

### 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	<b>VACANCY</b>	C
CLLR	P ASHCROFT	UKIP	S CRAWFORD	L
			P SALES	L
			A WALSH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L
			P DOWNES	LD
			M SHELLENS	LD
			<b>VACANCY</b>	LD
			<b>VACANCY</b>	LD
			P BULLEN	UKIP
			S BYWATER	UKIP
			P REEVE	UKIP
			<b>VACANCY</b>	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	<b>A-DENT M MCGUIRE</b>	C	D BROWN	C
CLLR	G KENNEY	C	S COUNT	C
CLLR	<b>M-ROUSE W HUNT</b>	C	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	J PALMER	C
CLLR	<b>D-GILES J HIPKIN</b>	IND	B CHAPMAN	IND
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	<b>J-HIPKIN D GILES</b>	IND
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	M MASON	IND
CLLR	<b>M-LEEKE B ASHWOOD</b>	LD	<b>S-VAN-DE KERKHOVE VACANCY</b>	IND
CLLR	P BULLEN	UKIP		L
CLLR	<b>P-REEVE A DENT</b>	UKIP	N KAVANAGH	L
			P SALES	L
			A WALSH	L
			<b>B-ASHWOOD M LEEKE</b>	LD
			E CEARNES	LD
			L NETHSINGHA	LD
			S VAN DE VEN	LD
			P ASHCROFT	UKIP
			S BYWATER	UKIP
			<b>P REEVE</b>	UKIP
			M TEW	UKIP

## SERVICE APPEALS SUB-COMMITTEE (3)

### APPOINTED FROM STAFFING & APPEALS COMMITTEE

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 22<sup>nd</sup> MARCH 2016**

**ORAL QUESTION TIME**

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

What steps will you take on adjudicating on Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to ensure that you take local considerations into account?

**Response from Councillor Count, Leader of the Council**

I have not heard one to date so I have not seen the process although I have seen the constitution. At the moment I am not exactly sure which route the TRO will go but we do have the Assembly prior to anything going in front of the City Deal Board. I am assuming that this will be the same route but if not, I will come back and clarify that. There are members of the public who are allowed to ask questions at either the Assembly or the Board and that would definitely apply to TROs at this present point in time and at the moment we are there as Councillors, there are other people there, there are Councillors on the Assembly and it is important that we listen. I must make the vital point that in the debate earlier there was talk about not enough consultation etc. on these things. These TROs form part of wider schemes. We have had an external audit of our consultation process which says it is entirely appropriate and residents are already feeding in at that stage.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Jenkins**

None