

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 18th October 2016

Time: 1.30 p.m. – 5.25 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, J Clark, D Connor, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, A Dent, D Divine, P Downes, L Dupre, D Giles, G Gillick, L Harford, R Henson, R Hickford, J Hipkin, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, N Kavanagh, G Kenney, M Leeke, M Loynes, R Mandley, I Manning, M Mason, Z Moghadas, L Nethsingha, F Onasanya, T Orgee, J Palmer, P Reeve, K Reynolds, M Rouse, P Sales, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, M Smith (Vice-Chairwoman), A Taylor, S Taylor, M Tew, S van de Ven, A Walsh, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and F Yeulett

Apologies: R Butcher, B Chapman, P Clapp, S Frost, D Harty, A Lay, M McGuire and P Topping

247. MINUTES – 19th JULY 2016

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 19th July 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

248. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

249. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor A Taylor declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 261(e), as she had a child at secondary school.

250. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No public questions were received.

251. PETITIONS

No questions were received.

252. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

a) Medium Term Financial Strategy

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

It was resolved to:

- a) Acknowledge the indicative departmental cash limits and the move towards transformation;
- b) Confirm, in light of the move towards a more corporate approach to Business Planning, the policy for 2016-21 on whether any additional savings requirement arising from service pressures and investments be:
 - allocated corporately and redistributed on the basis of services' budget size; and
- c) Approve the Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy.

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

b) Capital Strategy

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hickford, that the recommendations from the General Purposes Committee as set out on the Council agenda be approved subject to in recommendation b) replacing the first word "Whether" with the word "That".

It was resolved to agree:

- a) Revisions to the Capital Strategy to align it with the Transformation Delivery Model and reflect the introduction of a Capital Programme Board.
- b) That the advisory limit on the level of debt charges (and therefore prudential borrowing) should be kept at existing levels, which are higher than the level of debt charges approved in the 2016-21 Business Plan.
- c) That borrowing related to Invest to Save/Earn schemes should continue to be excluded from the advisory debt charges limit.

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

**253. REPORT OF THE STAFFING AND APPEALS COMMITTEE –
APPOINTMENT OF A DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND AN INTERIM EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR FOR CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND ADULTS**

It was moved by the Chairman of the Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Schumann, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Dent, that the recommendations from the Staffing and Appeals Committee as set out on the Council agenda be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to note the appointments of:

- a) Chris Malyon to the post of Chief Executive; and
- b) Wendy Ogle-Welbourn to the post of Interim Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults.

**254. REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE – NORTHSTOWE
JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

It was moved by the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Scutt, that the recommendations from the Constitution and Ethics Committee as set out on the Council agenda be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands:

That Council resolve that:

- a) the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee be wound up with immediate effect.
- b) there be further consideration of committee arrangements for the new settlements when there was more clarity about the timing of the relevant strategic decisions.
- c) the Constitution be amended by deleting Part 3C-B, Terms of Reference for Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee, and renumbering subsequent sections of Part 3C.
- d) the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, be authorised to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

255. AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

The Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee, Councillor Shellens, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2015/16. As part of his introduction, he expressed his gratitude to the Finance, Internal Audit Teams and Rob Sanderson, Democratic Services Officer, for the continued excellent support they had provided during the year. He also thanked the Committee members for their participation and

the excellent way they had all worked together. As an update to the written report he highlighted the late signing off of the Statutory Accounts for 2015-16, and the Committee's and officers concerns regarding the performance of the new External Auditors.

In response to a request from Councillor A Taylor, he agreed to provide an update regarding what actions from the Cambridge Library Enterprise Centre Review (CLEC) review were still outstanding.

In response to a request from Councillor Mason, Councillor Shellens agreed to provide an update regarding progress on the Council producing an Asset Register and the registration of all Council owned property and land. Council noted the report.

256. PENSION FUND COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

Councillor Count as the former Chairman of the Pension Fund Committee moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2015/16.

Council noted the report.

257. LOCAL PENSION FUND BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

In the absence of the Chairman Councillor McGuire, Councillor Nethsingha the other County Councillor appointed to the Local Pension Fund Board moved receipt of the annual report of the Board for 2015/16.

Council noted the report.

258. COMMITTEES - ALLOCATION OF SEATS AND SUBSTITUTES TO POLITICAL GROUPS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLITICAL BALANCE RULES

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

To agree the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees in accordance with the political balance rules.

259. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN/WOMAN OF THE ADULTS COMMITTEE

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

To approve the appointment of Councillor Adrian Dent as the Chairman of the Adults Committee.

260. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

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

To approve the change in membership to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority to appoint Councillor Mervyn Loynes to replace Councillor Julie Wisson.

261. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Fivemotionshad been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

a) Motion from Councillor Connor

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Connor and seconded by Councillor Bailey:

This Council notes:

- the potential closure by the Cambridge and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) of the Minor Injury Units (MIU) in Wisbech, Doddington and Ely.
- there are significant funding challenges for the CCG and NHS in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area, which is one of the most challenged Health economies in the country.
- Wisbech is an area of multiple deprivation and the subject of extensive work by this council and partner organisations such as the Wisbech 2020 project in order to help address some of these issues.
- all three MIUs serve populations in excess of 30,000 with significant transport distances and issues separating them from A & E services at Kings Lynn, Peterborough, Cambridge and Hinchbrook.

The CCG has recently engaged in a series of consultations with the public and partners and is in the process of deliberation on the future provision of services in these areas. In recognition of the issues above. This Council calls on the Chief Executive, on behalf of the Council, to write to the CCG and explain that:

- the geographical locations means that a walk in service must be offered as part of the solution.
- the ongoing work in Wisbech to tackle issues of multiple deprivation would be seriously undermined by a loss of services in that area.
- thiscouncil opposes the closure of the MIUs unless a satisfactory replacement service is offered in those geographies.

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

b) Motion from Councillor Count

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

This Council:

- Notes the severe pressures on NHS services and budgets in the Cambridgeshire area, which is one of the most challenged health economies nationally.
- Recognises that whilst we are moving towards fairer funding than at present, the current £17m gap makes it extremely challenging for the NHS and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to allocate sufficient resource to transformation.
- Supports Cambridgeshire's Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) aspirations for transformation to create a sustainable health system through an increased focus on prevention and care closer to home.

Therefore this Council asks the Chief Executive to write to the CCG on behalf of the County Council and call upon them to:

- deliver a transformation of services programme which reduces pressures on local acute hospitals, and makes best use of the community hospital estate and other community services to deliver their aspirations.
- work closely with this Council's social care and public health services in order to deliver joined up transformation based on the individuals needs.
- deliver a transformation programme that seeks to reduce geographical inequities, ensuring good equitable access to Healthcare throughout all parts of the County.
- join with the County Council to invest in our communities and contribute towards sustainable projects that increase resilience, prevent high cost interventions and enhance people's lives.

Furthermore this Council asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Health and local MPs, on behalf of the County Council to:

- emphasise the links between the successful and growing economy in Cambridgeshire, associated population growth, and the need for transformation to make the local NHS clinically and financially sustainable in this context.
- call upon national government to provide significant transitional funding and transformational support to the Cambridgeshire's NHS, to strengthen preventive community services and care closer to home and reduce the pressures on local hospitals.
- call upon national government to review, recognise and correct the link between growth, lagged funding and the funding allocation.

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

Deletions shown in strikethrough.

This Council:

- Notes the severe pressures on NHS services and budgets in the Cambridgeshire area, which is one of the most challenged health economies nationally.
- Recognises that whilst we are moving towards fairer funding than at present, the current £17m gap makes it extremely challenging for the NHS and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to allocate sufficient resource to transformation.
- Supports Cambridgeshire's Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) aspirations for transformation to create a sustainable health system through an increased focus on prevention and care closer to home.

Therefore this Council asks the Chief Executive to write ~~to the CCG on behalf of the County Council and call upon them to:~~

- ~~— deliver a transformation of services programme which reduces pressures on local acute hospitals, and makes best use of the community hospital estate and other community services to deliver their aspirations.~~
- ~~— work closely with this Council's social care and public health services in order to deliver joined up transformation based on the individuals needs.~~
- ~~— deliver a transformation programme that seeks to reduce geographical inequities, ensuring good equitable access to Healthcare throughout all parts of the County.~~
- ~~— join with the County Council to invest in our communities and contribute towards sustainable projects that increase resilience, prevent high cost interventions and enhance people's lives.~~

~~Furthermore this Council asks the Chief Executive to write~~ to the Secretary of State for Health and local MPs, on behalf of the County Council to:

- emphasise the links between the successful and growing economy in Cambridgeshire, associated population growth, and the need for transformation to make the local NHS clinically and financially sustainable in this context.
- call upon national government to provide significant transitional funding and transformational support to the Cambridgeshire's NHS, to strengthen preventive community services and care closer to home and reduce the pressures on local hospitals.
- call upon national government to review, recognise and correct the link between growth, lagged funding and the funding allocation.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats, UKIP and Labour in favour; Conservatives and

Independents against]

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Count and seconded by Councillor Orgee to the initial action paragraph. Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough:

“Therefore this Council asks the Chief Executive to write to the CCG on behalf of the County Council ~~and call upon them~~ **invite them to work with us to...**”

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

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

A further amendment was proposed by Councillor Nethsingha and seconded by Councillor Leeke as follows:

In the fourth bullet of the proposed action request to the CCG to add the following words shown in bold;

join with the County Council to invest in our communities and contribute **ideas and staff time** towards sustainable projects that increase resilience, prevent high cost interventions and enhance people's lives.

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

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

Councillor Count, seconded by Councillor Hickford, moved that the question be put. On being put to the vote, this proposal was carried.

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

The substantive motion on being put the vote was carried.

This Council:

- Notes the severe pressures on NHS services and budgets in the Cambridgeshire area, which is one of the most challenged health economies nationally.
- Recognises that whilst we are moving towards fairer funding than at present, the current £17m gap makes it extremely challenging for the NHS and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to allocate sufficient resource to transformation.
- Supports Cambridgeshire's Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) aspirations for transformation to create a sustainable health system through an increased focus on prevention and care closer to home.

Therefore this Council asks the Chief Executive to write to the CCG on behalf of the County Council and invite them to work with us to:

- deliver a transformation of services programme which reduces pressures on local acute hospitals, and makes best use of the community hospital estate and other community services to deliver their aspirations.
- work closely with this Council's social care and public health services in order to deliver joined up transformation based on the individuals needs.
- deliver a transformation programme that seeks to reduce geographical inequities, ensuring good equitable access to Healthcare throughout all parts of the County.
- join with the County Council to invest in our communities and contribute towards sustainable projects that increase resilience, prevent high cost interventions and enhance people's lives.

Furthermore this Council asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Health and local MPs, on behalf of the County Council to:

- emphasise the links between the successful and growing economy in Cambridgeshire, associated population growth, and the need for transformation to make the local NHS clinically and financially sustainable in this context.
- call upon national government to provide significant transitional funding and transformational support to the Cambridgeshire's NHS, to strengthen preventive community services and care closer to home and reduce the pressures on local hospitals.
- call upon national government to review, recognise and correct the link between growth, lagged funding and the funding allocation.

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

c) Motion from Councillor Manning

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Manning and seconded by Councillor Reeve:

Council notes:

- That Cambridgeshire, as a high growth area, processes a large number of planning applications, which give rise to the potential for a large amount of significant archaeology, a finite and non-renewable resource that is unique to this County
- The international reach of the recent archaeological work at Must Farm Quarry, Whittlesey, and the critical role carried out by the Council's members and officers in that work
- The draft Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Bill 2016 included the statement that "pre-commencement planning conditions are only imposed by local planning authorities where they are absolutely necessary"

- That such conditions are an essential tool in managing Cambridgeshire's historic environment to promote sustainable development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- A petition against this threat to the need to carry out archaeological surveys garnered over 18,000 signatures
- The response to that petition provided some reassurance of the importance Government places on the need to protect the historic environment and reaffirmed Government's commitment to the NPPF
- The Government is currently consulting on this matter

Council believes:

- That archaeological surveys are vital in maintaining Cambridgeshire's historical record, and the draft Neighbourhood Planning and Infrastructure Bill, as currently worded, potentially undermines this
- Although the Government consultation again reaffirms the NPPF as justification for such conditions, there remains the opportunity for such conditions to be refuted unless the Council goes to appeal; this will cause delays in development and is not a good use of resources
- There is an emerging opportunity to further develop the County's chargeable archaeological services, and this would be threatened by the bill

Therefore, Council:

- Reaffirms its commitment to support appropriate and sustainable development for the good of all in line with national planning policy
- Resolves to write, via the Chief Executive, to the Prime Minister and Minister for Planning, asking for an unequivocal commitment to the ability of Local Authorities to impose planning conditions they deem necessary to protect the archaeological record

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

d) Motion from Councillor Nethsingha

Councillor Nethsingha withdrew the following motion:

This council notes the results of the consultation on a Devolution Deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

This council notes that during the consultation the public were consulted on the basis that a devolution deal was only possible with an elected mayor, and that despite being told about the insistence on an elected mayor, the majority of respondents to the survey opposed an elected mayor for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

This council notes that the new prime minister, appointed since the devolution deal was agreed by the leaders of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough councils, has

indicated that under her government elected mayors are not as central to devolution deals as was the policy of the previous government.

This council therefore calls on the Chief Executive to pause the current devolution negotiations to allow time to explore the option of a devolution deal on the basis of the current offer but without the requirement for an elected mayor.

e) Motion from Councillor Downes

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

This council notes that Cambridgeshire has a strong and long-standing tradition of comprehensive education with powerful local community links.

The council notes the announcement by the Prime Minister of her intention to allow secondary schools to introduce academic selection and existing grammar schools to expand.

This council calls upon the Chief Executive

- a. to write to the Secretary for State for Education to remind her of the compelling research evidence that selection at 11 does not raise academic standards for the majority of children and is counter-productive in terms of pupils' personal morale and well-being and
- b. to continue to encourage all those involved in education in Cambridgeshire, whether in academies or Local Authority schools, to work together and with County Council staff to promote further improvement within education in Cambridgeshire, with the aim of achieving good local schools for all.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats, Labour, four Independents, one Conservative and one UKIP in favour; twenty two Conservative and five UKIP against; two Conservatives and one UKIP abstained]

262. QUESTIONS

a) Questions on Fire Authority issues

One question was asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix B**.

b) Oral Questions

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

- In response to a question from Councillor Cearn, Councillor Count, Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, agreed to provide a written answer on the impact of the recent down time of the Council website, particularly in relation consultation deadlines and commercial transactions and the protocols in place to manage such issues.
- In response to a question from Councillor Manning, a written answer would be provided by Councillor Bates, the Council's representative on the City Deal Executive Board, on whether City Deal monies could be used to replace mature trees that had been felled as part of congestion improvement schemes. The Chairman of Council asked the Vice-Chairwoman to ask the Constitution and Ethics Committee to consider the rationale of questions at Council to the Council's representative on the Cambridge City Deal Executive Board.
- In response to a question from Councillor Boden a written answer would be provided by Councillor Bates, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, regarding the timescale for the production of the Fenland Local Transport Strategy and local member involvement.
- In response to a question from Councillor Scutt, a written response would be provided by Councillor Count, the Leader of the Council, setting out the financial and resource implications of the office of directly elected Mayor part of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution deal.
- In response to a question from Councillor Kavanagh, a written answer would be provided by Councillor Bates, the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee, on which independent schools provided a minibus service to transport their pupils from Park & Ride sites and measures to help encourage other schools to take similar action.
- In response to a question from Councillor Bullen, a written answer would be provided by Councillor Count, the Leader of the Council, confirming what information would be provided in advance of the Extraordinary Council meeting in November regarding the total costs of the Combined Authority..
- In response to a question from Councillor Whitehead, a written answer would be provided by Councillor McGuire, Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee, regarding the contribution that the City Council and the parishes were making towards the cost of lighting and the difference in cost between providing reduced lighting compared to having full lighting.

c) Written Questions

Two written questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2. with the responses to them included as **Appendix D**.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 18TH OCTOBER 2016
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Heidi Chalkley, Social Worker

The Chairman reports with enormous sadness the death of Heidi Chalkley, Social Worker, in Huntingdonshire in CIN unit 12. Heidi had completed her training to be a Social Worker last year and was just about to complete her assessed and supported year of employment, of which she was due to pass with flying colours, and was working within Children's social care. She was a great social worker, with a lot of potential, who was highly professional and passionate about her job and the families she worked with. Heidi had a bubbly personality which made her a pleasure to work with and she was highly thought of. She will be sadly missed by her team and all that knew her as well as by the children and families she worked with. The Council's thoughts are with her family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

Adrian Loades, Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults

Adrian Loades, the Council's Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults left the Council on 16 September to become Corporate Director of People at the London Borough of Redbridge. Adrian has been with this Council for 15 years and has achieved a considerable amount in one of the most challenging areas of any Council's work. The Chairman, on behalf of the Council, will be thanking Adrian Loades at the meeting for his contribution to the work of the Council over the last 15 years and to wish him all the best for his future career.

MESSAGES

HRH The Duke of Gloucester

The Chairman was honoured to welcome the Duke of Gloucester to Cambridge recently, on behalf of the County Council.

On Friday 23 September 2016, HRH The Duke of Gloucester officially opened Trumpington Community College, Cambridge.

During the day, HRH also formally opened Cowan Court at Churchill College, the newly rebuilt Nuffield Health Cambridge Hospital, and met with members of the Shrievalty Trust at Cambourne Police Station.

County Council – 18th October 2016
Questions to the Chairman of the Fire Authority

Question from Councillor Derek Giles

Thank you Chairman. Yes I am a member of the Fire Authority, but I think this gives a very good opportunity. So I would ask the question of the Chairman of the Fire Authority to update the Council with regard to the Police and Crime Commissioner's intention to take over the responsibility for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Service as detailed in the Police and Crime Commissioner's Bill and I would also ask him to comment; does he agree with me, with the old proverb 'if it ain't broke don't mend it'?

Response from Councillor Sir Peter Brown, Chairman of the Fire Authority

Thank you Chairman and thank you Councillor Giles for your question. I would refer members to item 5 on the report, which does in fact cover the issue about the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), but I would just like to add a few comments. I think we all know that the PCC has publicly announced his intention to become what we call an 'early adopter' for looking after local fire service matters, but that is subject to a business case which he's preparing. Mr Ablewhite has said that he will share his business case and consult once the legislation has passed through parliament, which is expected to be at the turn of the year. Members of the Fire Authority are meeting officially on Thursday, when we had hoped to talk to the Police and Crime Commissioner about his actions. Unfortunately he can't be present at the meeting, so we have to wait. However I think it's fair to say that we have had informal discussions and I think it is the wish, it's the unanimous wish, of all the members of the Fire Authority to continue the work that we are doing in terms of collaboration with both the police and ambulance services. However, I think we do feel strongly that in the interests of the public and the fire service, integration is not an option we wish to adopt. Both the County Council and Peterborough City Council will have the opportunity to comment on the proposals that the PCC brings forward at the appropriate time, when we hope that you will support our view.

Councillor Bill Hunt

I'd just like to for the record say that I totally support Councillor Brown in his opinion that it would be totally unsuitable to merge the police force and the fire service. If we take a lesson from France, you can see that the fire service and the ambulance service work together and they work very well. I can just imagine a sort of fire service arriving with the police force on the Oxmoor in Huntingdon and seeing how well they're respected and I think there would be problems and I think the working of training fire service people to do ambulance or health type jobs is a very good use of resources. But I think that the merging of police and fire service would be fraught with danger.

County Council

Tuesday 18th October 2016

Oral Questions

1) Question from Councillor Edward Cearn

It's a question to the Leader of the Council and Chair of GPC. I believe he's aware of the question. On the 19th September the main County website was unavailable. Was the Leader aware of this and has he requested an explanation and a review into what happened?

Response from Councillor Steve Count

Thank you Chairman. The first I was aware of it was about an hour ago when I was apprised that there would be this question to me, so I haven't done anything about it.

Follow-up question from Councillor Cearn

. . . I was saying was the Leader aware of the fact the website was down . . . My follow-up question is, given that we are delivering the transformation programme and the digital strategy and therefore the Council is becoming far more reliant on technology and so are residents in the way that we engage with them, what impact did this have on residents being able to meet deadlines of either consultations or commercial transactions with the Council and was there analysis done of this?

Response from Councillor Count

The way the initial question was put was "was I aware of it and what did I do about it?". It was simply true, that was my answer, I wasn't aware of it until an hour ago and I didn't do anything about it. . . . I wasn't aware, so my apologies. But I was made aware of this question in advance and the second bit of the question I think is much more pertinent, because apparently due to the collapse of the website on that date I am informed that certain people that use the website for transactions missed their deadlines and perhaps there might be other things that you could conceive would miss a deadline like the consultation response. Therefore what I believe is the appropriate thing to do now that I am aware about it, would be to discuss with the appropriate officers what protocol is in place for when a website crashes and to find out whether that can automatically assist those areas that are cut off by deadlines.

I hope that satisfies Councillor Cearn in the realms of an oral answer but I think that it deserves a little bit more work behind the background. I shall do that work and then I shall get back to you to see where this questioning leads me.

2) Question from Councillor Ian Manning

This is a question to Councillor Bates in his position as our member on the City Deal Executive Board. There's been a statement recently from the Chair of the City Deal Board, Councillor Lewis Herbert, that as part of the proposals for Milton Road, mature trees will be put back or replaced in some way if the final decision is to cut them down. My understanding of the City Deal terms is that they are very specific about what City Deal money can and

can't be spent on, especially talking about transport schemes. Has he or the Board received specific confirmation that City Deal money can be spent on mature trees?

Response from the Chairman

Councillor Bates do you know the answer to this question? Because I'm disinclined to accept it, given that it is asked to you in your capacity as member of another authority.

Councillor Manning

Sorry. Chair on a point of order please, it does say that Council representatives on Outside Bodies.

Chairman

I'm still not convinced that Councillor Bates is a representative of an Outside Body: he's a part of an Outside Body. Well, do you have an answer to the question because if you do . . . ?

Councillor Ian Bates

I do have an answer, but bearing in mind maybe what you've just said, maybe better that I give a written answer for everybody. I have the answer and the answer is a simple "yes", but I will expand further. Councillor Manning did pre-warn me of the question so I am aware – I have got the answer. Predominantly the answer is "yes" and we can fund it but I will expand I think a little bit on a written answer to the written question.

3) Question from Councillor Chris Boden

I have a question for the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee or, if it's not, perhaps Chairman you could advise me which Chairman is responsible I understand that a revised Fenland Local Transport Strategy is due to be published by the County Council within the next 12 months and my question is, when will the process of producing this Strategy commence and when will interested local members be able to have an input? Thank you.

Response from Councillor Ian Bates

I had an answer to the previous question but not an answer to this question, But thank you for the question: I think it's about timing and about engagement. What I think sensible is, I don't have prior notice apart from a couple of hours ago, that I actually get that information and we circulate that information to all interested parties Mr Chairman.

4) Question from Councillor Dr Jocelynne Scutt

My question is to Councillor Count and I did actually ask this question earlier today and I wanted to ask it now, in the Chamber. Would Councillor Count please outline, precisely and with clarity, the financial and resource implications of a Mayor being required as a part of the Peterborough Cambridgeshire devolved authority? That is of course what salary will the Mayor be paid and how will it be pegged, that is against what standard to measure rises, but in addition to that, what administrative support system will there be and what are the calculations that that will cost.

For example, the Mayor must surely have an Executive Assistant: if there's a Chief Executive Officer, that Chief Executive Officer would obviously cost and have an executive system.

There must be a support structure for the authority itself: that is even if the members of the authority are not paid or receive no allowance, which seems somewhat astonishing, there must be administrative backup for that whole authority. So please, what are the financial resource implications, because there is surely no suggestion that the Mayor will be a one horse show?

Response from the Chairman

Before I call Councillor Count to answer this may I draw your attention to part of the summary guidelines, which require questions to be capable of being adequately answered within two minutes. I think that's very unlikely on the list of questions that you've just put, so I'm just flagging this up so we don't have this again.

Response from Councillor Steve Count

Thank you Chairman. There are parts of this question that I can answer with some degree of clarity and some of it I will describe as a work in progress. Until it gets to a stage where there is agreement in the combined authority area, having gone through its process, I cannot give an answer because it may well change.

The bit that I can give clarity on is where we are at present, in that we have appointed an interim arrangement which goes from now until May of next year. That interim arrangement is made up of existing council officers that are in existing organisations, but because they are of different values and different significance and different amount of work that they have to put in to get us to the endgame, it's primarily for the purpose of recharging across the authorities. I don't have the figures in my mind – we can flesh that out – but it is in the region of £130,000 from now till May and that includes a part-time Chief Executive, about half a week. It includes a Chief Financial Officer part-time and a Monitoring Officer part-time: apart from that I can't remember. These are existing officers that are actually spending more time on devolution than you would normally expect from them. So for example, the Chief Executive of Fenland is the interim Chief Executive of the combined authority and Fenland is reimbursed for the value that he's putting here through the other partners. So there's no extra cost involved. In terms of moving forward, that is not solidified yet, so it would be remiss of me to try and paint a picture that is still in a period of flux. As this becomes available, we will float the responses into the meetings.

In fact today at the Group Leaders' meeting, there was a suggestion for how this Council can get a full report from myself at every single Council meeting, and we've yet to see where that will go with the Constitution and Ethics Committee, but it is a proposal to have a full written resource. . . . One bit of clarity then: OK the one piece of clarity that I do know that is drawn up from the start is members will not receive any additional allowance for this. They are the leaders of the existing authorities and it is believed that they are remitted sufficiently to do this job as a member of the combined authority. So nobody gets any extra allowance for this.

Supplementary question from Councillor Scutt

Thank you. Just a request that we have this in writing and also confirmation because as I understand it, the authorities that exist are actually paying for this, so there is money being paid and it's coming for example from this County Council. That's my understanding of what you've *(gap in recording)said regarding that* . . officers are being paid. They're therefore doing work on this project and not on the projects of the County Council.

Response from Councillor Count

I didn't quite understand where I'd gone wrong in my explanation. So what I'll ask is that we try and lay this out clearly in a written area on that point.

Chairman

Quite right. Thank you.

5) Question from Councillor Ashley Walsh

On a related theme Mr Chair, my question is to you . . . and I've consulted both the Chief Executive and the Monitoring Officer, to ask (*if*) at any stage in the devolution discussions has there been any indication either from the Prime Minister or any Secretary of State for Local Government that a devolution agreement could be possible without a direct elected Mayor? Is there any indication that that was their view yesterday, or that they might change their view before we come to the vote in November? . . You might wish to refer to the Chief Executive in answering that question.

Response from the Chairman

Well, I actually think that it's more appropriate that it's a Councillor and it should be Councillor Count.

Response from Councillor Steve Count

I can give this Chamber from my recollection a very accurate portrayal of what was said by the Secretary of State yesterday. However, I think that Councillor Ashley Walsh is looking for somebody without a political leaning for this?

So if I try and do my best and then, if it's OK with the Chief Executive, look for her to affirm that I'm either on the right lines or exactly right. So the first point I would make is that the press release yesterday was from SajidJavid. This was released - not interpreted by the local media and re-hammered – the press release that came out from the County Council comes from SajidJavid's office and it reiterates the necessity for this devolution deal to have a Mayor. That's in black and white. It's irrefutable. At the meeting yesterday during his opening speech, unprompted by questions at that point in time, he spoke at some length about why the government wanted a Mayor. He talked about when they took on their new portfolio roles as Cabinet members, the first thing to do was re-examine the existing policies of their predecessors to see if they still agreed with them. He said the subject of a Mayor came up, with Theresa May, with a sub-committee of the Cabinet examining and it was a very short conversation that led them to the conclusion they will still require a Mayor for significant devolution deals and ours is one of the most significant in the country. They've said - he said - Cornwall has no requirement for a Mayor, but Cornwall never got the sums of money or power anything like that we're talking about here and if they want anything remotely like this, then there will be an absolute requirement for a directly elected Mayor. And the reason behind this all was the government has two very high-up ideas on their agenda. One is housing. The second is productivity. They are dismayed that amongst - I cannot remember correctly whether it's G7 or G20 countries but - we are 20 productivity points behind the average, and they said that they're looking at every way of upskilling our workforce and bringing forward productivity and the system that goes behind it. And they said at this point in time, they do not believe that the fragmented decision making that the combined authority will help with or the lack of a single point at the top of the chain is helping that situation. And therefore there will be no break in their link between significant devolution deals and the requirement for a directly elected Mayor, which is successful in the G7 or G20 countries.

. . . Can I just look?

Chairman

I'll do that bit. . . . perhaps the Chief Executive could just nod assent to the correctness of what Councillor Count has said?. (Note: CE nods assent) . Councillor Walsh?

Councillor Walsh

No supplementary.

6) Question from Councillor Noel Kavanagh

As part of the effort to reduce congestion in Cambridge during term time when congestion is at its peak, - something like 15% of extra traffic at that time - some independent schools provide a minibus service to transport their pupils from Park & Ride sites . . . directly to school premises. Thus making it unnecessary for parents to drive their cars into the city. Which schools provide this service and how can other schools be encouraged to follow this example of how to make a significant contribution to reducing the congestion in Cambridge?

Response from Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee

Thank you, I had slight advance warning of this. . . . we have invested as you well know in Trumpington Park & Ride, there has been actually work done there to enable more minibuses to enter there, to make sure that that reduces the congestion. Regretfully, I can't actually name all the schools as I stand here at the moment, so I will actually ask that we actually gather those. I know they operate, I know they operate well, but which precise schools I don't know so I'll have to take that away and come back to you. I would perhaps like to suggest that we all know the congestion falls when the schools are in half-term. So perhaps, as you're sitting next to Councillor Whitehead, it's perhaps something that we jointly should take up in trying to encourage perhaps some of our academies and primary schools to actually adopt the same process. I'm sure that would be welcomed by the City Board, both the Assembly and the Executive.

7) Question from Councillor David Jenkins

This is a question for Councillor Bates as our representative on an Outside Body, namely the City Deal Executive Board. May I continue?

Chairman

It depends what the question is. . . .

Councillor Jenkins

Councillor Bates. There's considerable unease about the City Deal Phase 1 proposals. This comes from business people who see them as obstructive, from those who commute to work in the City who see them as adding expense with little benefit and from residents, who just see irreversible damage to the public realm. This has been evidenced by protest marches and meetings, petitions, a poll in the Cambridge News and our MPs calling for a rethink. I would not be surprised if the current consultation does not add further reinforcement to this

position. Does Councillor Bates agree with me that, given this broad public concern, it would be appropriate for the City Deal Executive Board to show real leadership and to pause, before going ahead and maybe spending £100,000,000 quickly and badly?

Councillor Ian Bates

(*Chairman*) perhaps I should refer it directly to yourself bearing in mind that you intervened at the last question about the City Deal, so I think . . .

Chairman

I am very unhappy about taking questions about the City Deal. I think the appropriate place to do it is at the City Deal. If the question is about your role as a County Councillor at the City Deal that's one thing, but it's not. It's about you as part of the Executive Board making decisions at the City Deal. So I'm very ambivalent about this and I'm uncomfortable about it because I think we need further legal thought on this for subsequent meetings because this is obviously going to continue to be an issue. If you have an answer for it Councillor Bates, I'm happy to hear it.

Councillor Bates

No I don't have - I have not (*had*) advance warning of that question. I know of all the issues: we have finished the consultation and that's I think all I will say at this moment in time.

Supplementary from Councillor Jenkins

I was going to make a comment (*Chairman*) about your . . . ruling there. . . . Because if I remember right it is this Chamber which approves the position of Councillor Bates on that Board. So he is our representative.

Chairman

Nonetheless. The questions that were asked were about decisions that be made by a different body, of which Councillor Bates is part of a decision making triumvirate and I just am very uncomfortable without taking legal advice - you know which I don't think that the Monitoring Officer can deliver fully here now – I'm very uncomfortable about the questions on the City Deal matters when Councillor Bates is one of the executive decision makers. But?

Councillor Jenkins

He is our person on that Board.

Chairman

Which is why I wanted to hear the question.

Councillor Jenkins

Would you like to hear my follow-up?

Chairman

Sure.

Follow-up from Councillor Jenkins

Does Councillor Bates further agree with me, just assuming he had agreed with the first . . . (Chairman.I don't think we can assume anything) . . . that we need to take a more strategic approach to spending City Deal money? That we need to learn more from other cities, with similar challenges, which have already implemented solutions? That we should take advantage of the wealth of expertise in this city and its universities and that we should listen to those with particular expertise? That way we might get the innovative and forward looking solution which this city needs. Take them both away. Wait for the ruling. There are many people both in this Chamber and throughout the City which will be interested in our response to those questions.

Chairman

Councillor Dr Scutt. You wished to raise a point of order. Do you . . . ? (*Councillor Scutt indicates "no".*) Thank you. I think just two points I want to add, which is first of all perhaps the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee will take this away in conjunction with the Monitoring Officer and give this some thought. And it may be something that that committee wishes to give some thought to. And secondly that questions – leading point about the summary on questions is that they must be relevant to matters for which the Council has powers or duties – and I reiterate my kind of concern that the City Deal Board isn't quite that. So, you know we'll thrash it out no doubt at committee and then I won't be put in this position again because we will have a definitive statement. Which God knows we need. . . .

8) Question from Councillor Paul Bullen

This subject has been touched on and all I need is a "yes" or "no" answer from the Leader, hopefully. . . Councillor Count we did discuss this this morning, but bearing in mind I'm of the opinion now that the pendulum has definitely gone on the side of, it would appear, that this government is going to insist on a directly elected Mayor. But before we debate the whole concept of devolution in full Council next month I'd like your assurance that you will endeavour, and I realise it may not (be) possible, to get for us beforehand the cost, therefore the salary, of the elected Mayor, the cost of his or her office, the cost – additional costs – of the combined authority, the additional costs of any overview and scrutiny and the additional mileage costs, whereby you're saying that members won't get any more allowances, of them attending all of those committees etc. I believe that we need that financial information to have a proper debate on devolution and to make the right decision.

Response from Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council

It is my understanding that the paper that comes to us in November has all of these details fully fleshed out. I would like to ask that a note of the specific questions (there was a list there) be recorded, so that we know that when we come up with the answers, all of those are covered. It's never been my intention to hide anything from this authority. We need to go into this deal with an open mind and understand all of the implications and I think that, you know, as part of that devolution debate, discussion, members briefings etc, there will also be the other side of the coin, hopefully fully fleshed out, how much money will be arriving and what sort of transformation that will make to the area, to balance up the equation to a certain extent.

The point about the members' mileage is made. Obviously if I'm going to a members meeting or a combined authority meeting I will be claiming from this Council the mileage for

it, so there would be a, miniscule shall we say, cost there. But of course I understand that that means that I won't be here in this building for that entire day, which I know people are disappointed about because I didn't actually notice a website going down, so obviously I'm not here 24 hours a day seven days a week but I will do my best. So any other questions, you know as we develop the answers I am here as your conduit into this proposed new organisation, and if you have these questions I will do my best to answer them. I'm not hiding anything. Some things aren't ready yet but when they are ready it's been my intention, as I revealed at Group Leaders this morning, it's my intention to be the most open person and transparent person the way we've done it. And I must add Chairman, that the difficult question you had with the City Deal and the way that they are asked questions in the future, we may need to consider how I am asked questions in the same way. Which I've volunteered to come here but I think we do need to protect – I'm going off subject here – but we do need to protect people having various bites of the same cherry shall we say. And if there's a process for answering questions in one place that you're all invited to and another one, we need to segregate out what I will be doing there for you, and I think that goes the same for City Deal. But I am at your disposal is all I can say.

9) Question from Councillor Joan Whitehead

My question was to Councillor McGuire and I did give it in advance, but he's not here. So I assume it would be to the Deputy Chair of that Committee. It's about lighting and it is a question to which I would expect a written answer rather than a verbal one. I'm sure along with many Councils we've had complaints from our constituents about the very, very, very dim lighting which is now provided in residential areas, certainly in the city and possibly in other areas too. I was under the impression that the City Council were going to pay to keep the lights on and my understanding was that they would be on and not these absolutely mega dim things which make it totally dark.

So one, I'd like to ask is what is the contribution that the City Council and the parishes are making towards the lighting bill and secondly, what is the difference in cost between having these incredibly dim lights, which are almost useless, on all night versus having decent lighting to one o'clock in the morning and then perhaps having the lights off from one in the morning till six? And I would just like to – I think it would be of interest to all Councils to see what are the differences in costs between those two things – and indeed what is the contribution that the City and the parishes are paying towards this dim lighting, which quite frankly would seem to me to be a waste of their money? Thank you.

Response from Councillor Peter Reeve

Thank you Chairman. Of course the lighting is a flexible lighting system so it can be dimmed up and down, but there is a cost to that as been alluded in the question, and they can also be switched on and off as has been alluded to. The details will be provided in a written answer.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 18 OCTOBER 2016
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2

Question from Councillor Maurice Leeke

The white lines on the carriageway for the roundabout above the A14 are now virtually invisible. Despite many requests, including from local parish councils, we have had no success in getting these lines repainted.

Could the Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee please use whatever influence he has with the Highways Agency to have this work done.

Response from Councillor Mac McGuire
Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee

Thank you for your question regarding the road markings on the A10 roundabout, which runs over the A14.

Officers are fully aware of the poor state of these road markings and have been working hard to get the lines repainted. As you will be aware the A14 (including slip roads) is the responsibility of Highways England (HE) and in this instance so too is the structure that sits above the A14. This structure enables the A10 to run over the top of the A14. The road surface and thus the road markings are however the responsibility of the County Council (CCC).

The nature of the junction arrangement and interaction between the A10 and A14 means it is more complex than normal for work to take place and a significant level of traffic management is required to allow the works to take place safely. This in turn results in a much higher cost to that which is ordinarily associated with repainting road markings.

Officers have been working hard with Highways England for some time to identify a safe and affordable method of delivering these works and so I am now pleased to confirm that a cost and appropriate level of traffic management has been agreed with the aim of completing the works by the end of November. As soon as we have a firm date the Local Highway Officer managing this work will update the Local Member and Parish Council.

Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven

Given the council's overwhelming objective to support independent and healthy living for all, reduce traffic congestion, and encourage walking wherever possible, what priority is given to pavement repair in the expenditure of our Highways maintenance budget? What is the proportionate expenditure of County Highways maintenance budget on roads and pavements?

Response from Councillor Mac McGuire
Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee

Thank you for your question regarding the highway maintenance budget.

The relative allocations of funding for roads and pavements align with the principles set out in the County Council's approved Strategy for Highway Asset Management. This Strategy notes the importance of the county's roads, that they are the highway assets in most need of attention and the imperative to arrest the deterioration of Cambridgeshire's roads. The

Strategy also notes the importance that residents attach to the condition of the county's roads.

Since April 2015 the Council has been working to the standards set out in our Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (HIAMP). The HIAMP outlines how the Asset Management Strategy objectives will be achieved; setting out service standards, response times and reactive maintenance intervention levels that can be resourced and which are financially sustainable. The plan gives consistency of approach across the Highways service to ensure our limited resource is spent well.

The total highway maintenance budget for 2016/17 (excluding staff and overheads) is £20,030,334. This is made up of funding from the Local Transport Plan, Prudential Borrowing and specific grants (e.g. pothole action fund) and is a mix of capital and revenue.

The current split between roads and pavements is:

Pothole specific funding (Inc. patching)	£3,018,567
Footway specific funding	£1,698,224
Road maintenance (non-patching)	£15,313,543
Total	£20,030,334

Members have the opportunity to amend the approach, standards and intervention levels set out in the HIAMP on an annual basis, taking into account the total budget available. The current standards reflect the funding levels set out within the County Council's Business Plan from 2015/16 until 2019/20. It is reviewed annually and approved by members prior to the start of each financial year. The HIAMP is currently being reviewed in preparation for 2017/18 and will come before the Highways & Community Infrastructure committee in February 2017 seeking member approval.