

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 25th March 2014

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 5.50 p.m.

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

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

Apologies: Councillors P Lagoda and J Scutt

57. MINUTES – 18th FEBRUARY 2014

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 18th February 2014 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

58. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

59. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Councillor	Minute	Details
Cearn	65 c)	Trustee of SexYOUality
Hickford	65 e)	Governor of Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust
Jenkins	66	Governor of Impington Village College

60. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were received from members of the public.

61. PETITIONS

One petition was presented by a member of the public, as set out in **Appendix B**. The Chairman thanked the petitioner and advised that the Leader of the Council would respond in writing.

62. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION FROM CABINET

a) Statement of Community Involvement

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Count, that the recommendation as set out in minute 152 of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 4th March 2014 be approved.

It was suggested by Councillor Cearns that all references in the Statement of Community Involvement to 'Parish Councils' be changed to refer to 'Parish Councils and/or Area Committees'. The principle of this suggestion was accepted by members, but some felt that a close review of the document was needed to ensure that the changes were made appropriately.

The following amendment was therefore proposed by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates (additions underlined):

To adopt the Statement of Community Involvement as proposed to be amended, further minor amendments to be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment and other relevant officers.

The amendment was put to the vote and was agreed unanimously.

Members then voted on the substantive motion as amended and it was resolved unanimously:

To adopt the Statement of Community Involvement as proposed to be amended, further minor amendments to be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning in consultation with the Executive Director: Economy, Transport and Environment and other relevant officers.

b) Smoke Free Environment Policy

The recommendation set out in minute 160 of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 4th March 2014 was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Orgee.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor McGuire and seconded by Councillor Wisson (additions underlined):

To adopt the Smoke Free Environment Policy, subject to the deletion of the prohibition of employees from using e-cigarettes in or on County Council premises or in County Council work time if off-site, as referenced in paragraph 2.4 4) of the Cabinet report.

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

[Voting pattern: some Conservatives, 1 Labour member, some Liberal Democrats, 2 UKIP and 2 Independent members in favour; most Conservatives, most Labour, most Liberal Democrats, most UKIP and one Independent member against; 1 Conservative, 1 Liberal Democrat, 1 UKIP and 1 Independent abstained.]

It was resolved:

To adopt the Smoke Free Environment Policy.

[Voting pattern: some Conservatives, most Labour, some Liberal Democrats, some UKIP and 1 Independent in favour; some Conservatives, some Liberal Democrats, some UKIP and 2 Independents against; 2 Conservatives, 1 Labour, 1 UKIP and 1 Independent abstained.]

c) Greater Cambridge City Deal

The following recommendation arising from the Cabinet meeting held on 24th March 2014 was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates:

To agree the principles of the Deal contained in the officer's report.

On being put to the vote, the recommendation was agreed unanimously.

63. ANNUAL PAY POLICY STATEMENT

It was proposed by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, that Council:

Approve the Chief Officer Pay Policy Statement 2013/14 as set out in Appendix 1 to the Council report, including the pay multiple.

The following amendment to paragraph 5.0 of Appendix 1 was moved by Councillor I Manning and seconded by Councillor Shellens (additions shown in bold and deletions struck through):

5.0 Pay Equity – The Pay Multiple

The Council monitors the relationship between the remuneration of its Chief Officers and Deputies and the remuneration of its lowest paid employees.

The Council defines its 'lowest paid employees' as employees paid on the first spinal column point (scp 5) of the National Joint Council (NJC) pay spine for Local Government Services employees. This is the lowest rate of pay applied to Council employees, currently £12,435 per annum.

~~The current ratio of the Chief Executive's salary to the mean salary in the organisation is 1:8. This is based on a mean average salary of £24,035.~~

~~The Fair Pay Review 2010 recommends that the pay ratio should not be more than 1:20. Therefore, the Council falls well within this range.~~

~~The Council commits to calculating the pay ratio on an annual basis.~~

The Hutton review of Fair pay 2011

(http://www.hmtreasury.gov.uk/d/hutton_fairpay_review.pdf)

states that Government "should require that public bodies annually publish chief executive's (or equivalent) earnings, median earnings of the organisation's workforce, and the ratio between these two figures in their

annual remuneration reports”.

The current ratio of the Chief Executive’s salary to the median salary in the organisation is 1:9. This is based on a median average salary of £23,118.00.

The Council commits to calculating the median pay ratio on an annual basis to monitor trends.

Secondly, excluding staff who have been moved into the employ of Council via TUPE in that year, Council commits to ensure that this pay ratio does not widen by the next review.

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

[Voting pattern: 1 Conservative, most Labour, all Liberal Democrats, 2 UKIP and 1 Independent in favour; most Conservatives, some UKIP and 1 Independent against; 2 Labour, some UKIP and 2 Independents abstained.]

Council then voted on the original motion and it was carried.

[Voting pattern: all Conservatives, all Labour, some Liberal Democrats, most UKIP and 2 Independents in favour; 1 Liberal Democrat against; some Liberal Democrat, some UKIP and 2 Independents abstained.]

In response to a question from Councillor I Manning, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, committed to publishing the medial pay ratio as part of the Annual Pay Policy Statement.

64. MEMBERS’ ALLOWANCES

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

To receive the report prepared by the Independent Remuneration Panel on Members’ Allowances.

The following recommendations were moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor K Reynolds, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman of Council, Councillor Kindersley:

- (a) To consider the Panel’s recommendations and determine whether to accept the recommendations as they stand or with amendments or alternatively to make a different scheme altogether
- (b) To confirm the date on which the new scheme will come into effect
- (c) To formally revoke the existing Members’ Allowances Scheme with effect from that date
- (d) To authorise the Monitoring Officer to prepare a new scheme to reflect the outcome of the Council’s deliberations and to take any consequential action arising therefrom.

An amendment to the Panel’s recommendations was proposed by Councillor Sales and seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, as set out in **Appendix C**.

The following clarification on costs was provided by the Chief Finance Officer:

Cost per annum of the scheme proposed by the Independent Remuneration Panel, assuming a maximum of one Special Responsibility Allowance per member	£780,275
Cost per annum of the scheme set out in the amendment proposed by Councillor Sales	£775,910
Maximum cost per annum of the current scheme	£840,702
Cost per annum of the current scheme at present	£789,090

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was carried.

[Voting pattern: 2 Conservatives, all Labour, most Liberal Democrats, all UKIP and all Independents in favour; most Conservatives against; some Conservatives and two Liberal Democrats abstained.]

Members then voted on the recommendations as amended and it was resolved:

- (a) To consider the Panel's recommendations and determine to accept them as amended and detailed in Appendix C to these minutes
- (b) To confirm that the new scheme will come into effect on 13th May 2014
- (c) To formally revoke the existing Members' Allowances Scheme with effect from that date
- (d) To authorise the Monitoring Officer to prepare a new scheme to reflect the outcome of the Council's deliberations and to take any consequential action arising therefrom.

[Voting pattern: some Conservative, all Labour, most Liberal Democrats, all UKIP and all Independents in favour; most Conservatives against; some Conservatives and 1 Liberal Democrat abstained.]

65. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Six motions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10, as follow.

a) Motion from Councillor I Manning

The following motion was proposed by Councillor I Manning and seconded by Councillor McGuire. In moving the motion, Councillor I Manning requested an alteration to the text as published on the agenda, which was accepted by Council and is shown below (deletions struck through and additions underlined).

This Council notes that new Highways schemes which involve reconfiguring existing street layouts:

- Are generally expensive and take a significant Council resource and time to implement
- Are difficult to get 'right' partly due to how hard it is to predict accurately the effect of the changes

- That because schemes are permanent once implemented, concerns and possible resistance to them tends to become more stringent and polarised.

This Council recognises:

- The success New York City has had in making changes to its streetscapes in the last 6 years, under transport commissioner Janette Sadik-Khan, including:
 - Increase in shop revenues
 - Reduction in traffic accidents
 - Rejuvenation of previously run down areas
- That a key factor in that success has been real world, cheap, temporary trials of schemes.

Therefore this Council resolves to ask ~~Cabinet~~ the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community infrastructure in consultation with relevant Spokes to look at the projects currently in the transport delivery plan and local highways improvements schemes, and task a cross section of members to work with the local projects team to use this methodology to help deliver these projects.

Following discussion, the motion was put to the vote and was carried.

[Voting pattern: all Conservatives, all Labour, all Liberal Democrats, most UKIP and all Independents in favour; 1 UKIP member against; no abstentions.]

b) Motion from Councillor Kavanagh

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

This Council notes:

- The work already done by the County Council and its partners to establish and promote the Wisbech 2020 vision
- The aim of the Wisbech 2020 vision to make Wisbech “a great place to work, a great place to live and a great place to visit”
- The work already done by the County Council to establish the business case for the re-use of the former March to Wisbech railway line
- The ongoing work investigating the costs of re-using the railway line.

This Council considers:

- That improved transport links to Wisbech play a vital part in securing the Wisbech 2020 vision, both in creating access to employment elsewhere in the County and in encouraging investment in the town
- That the former March to Wisbech line presents an opportunity to provide improved transport for Wisbech through a link to the national railway network.

This Council therefore calls on Cabinet:

- To continue to support the aims of the Wisbech 2020 vision
- To continue to investigate and promote the re-use of the former March to Wisbech railway line as an important element in the Wisbech 2020 vision
- To identify potential sources of funding for the re-use of the former March to Wisbech line and work with Network Rail and other agencies to secure early delivery.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Jenkins and seconded by Councillor van de Ven (additions in bold):

This Council notes:

- **The frequent support shown by Members in this and the previous two Councils for the re-opening of the March to Wisbech railway line**
- The work already done by the County Council and its partners to establish and promote the Wisbech 2020 vision
- The aim of the Wisbech 2020 vision to make Wisbech “a great place to work, a great place to live and a great place to visit”
- The work already done by the County Council to establish the business case for the re-use of the former March to Wisbech railway line
- The ongoing work investigating the costs of re-using the railway line
- **The presence of County Council owned land in close proximity to the March to Wisbech railway line.**

This Council considers:

- That improved transport links to Wisbech play a vital part in securing the Wisbech 2020 vision, both in creating access to employment elsewhere in the County and in encouraging investment in the town
- That the former March to Wisbech line presents an opportunity to provide improved transport for Wisbech through a link to the national railway network.
- **That it also offers the potential to enable the development of economic opportunities in close proximity to it.**

Furthermore this Council is aware that work on the Wisbech 2020 vision has progressed but that there will be many who are unaware of this.

This Council therefore calls on Cabinet:

- To continue to support the aims of the Wisbech 2020 vision **and to work with Fenland District Council to ensure that resources continue to be made available to the project and that progress is regularly reported on the web-site**

- To continue to investigate and promote the re-use of the former March to Wisbech railway line as an important element in the Wisbech 2020 vision.
- To identify potential sources of funding for the re-use of the former March to Wisbech line and work with Network Rail and other agencies to secure early delivery.

And furthermore:

- **To work in concert with the Local Enterprise Partnership and Fenland District Council to develop plans whereby County Council owned land can be developed to support the economic growth of that part of the county.**

Following discussion, the amendment was put to the vote and was lost.

[Voting pattern: all Liberal Democrats and 1 Independent in favour; all Conservatives, all Labour, all UKIP and most Independents against; no abstentions.]

Council then debated the substantive motion. On being put to the vote, it was carried.

[Voting pattern: all Conservatives, all Labour, all Liberal Democrats, most UKIP and all Independents in favour; no votes against; some UKIP members abstained.]

c) Motion from Councillor Cearns

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Cearns and seconded by Councillor I Manning:

This Council notes

- The County Council did not fly the rainbow flag during the recent Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) history month and took no part in the programme of events
- A significant number of local authorities, including our own district councils of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, flew the flag this year
- Currently, the Council flies flags for the following days or events: Commonwealth Day, St George's Day, Europe Day and Armed Forces Day. The Union flag is flown on all other days, apart from Council meeting days when the Council Coat of Arms is flown
- Social attitudes towards homosexuality have changed significantly with only a minority of the UK population now thinking homosexuality is wrong – 50% thought it was wrong in 1983 compared to 22% in 2012.

By not flying the flag in support of LGBT people, Council risks sending a contradictory message to the public, because in many other areas it does support them, for example:

- Council has a good record of support for LGBT people, including receiving national recognition from LGBT rights organisation Stonewall

- The Council itself released a press release in February promoting adoption and fostering by same sex couples as a positive option for looked after children.

However, this Council believes there is still much work to do to achieve equality for LGBT people:

- LGBT adults and children face a significantly higher risk of self-harm, bullying, hate crime as well as general health inequalities, much of which is made worse if they feel that official bodies do not accept and support them
- Internationally LGBT people are under threat, as highlighted by recent controversies around homophobic laws in Russia around the time of Sochi Olympics and Paralympics, as well as Uganda's homophobic laws, to name but two examples.

Therefore, this Council believes:

- There is a serious need for all UK public bodies to clearly show their solidarity for the acceptance of LGBT people
- Flying the rainbow flag during LGBT history month is a cost effective way of doing this
- By not flying the flag a very negative message is sent to young people who are LGBT, with the implication that the County Council does not support them
- LGBT rights are human rights and the rainbow flag represents a wider public message about tolerance and respect of others that goes beyond any one minority group. Whilst some members are rightly concerned about a proliferation of flags, flying the rainbow flag does not set a precedent, and any new requests should be taken on their individual merit.

Therefore this Council resolves to:

- Fly the rainbow flag in LGBT History month starting in 2015.

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

[Voting pattern: some Conservatives, some Labour, most Liberal Democrats, some UKIP and all Independents in favour; most Conservatives and some UKIP members against; some Conservatives, some Labour, 1 Liberal Democrat and 1 UKIP member abstained.]

At this point the Chairman of Council, Councillor K Reynolds, had to leave. The remainder of the meeting was chaired by the Vice-Chairman of Council, Councillor Kindersley.

d) Motion from Councillor I Manning

The following motion was proposed by Councillor I Manning and seconded by Councillor Taylor. During debate an amendment was proposed by Councillor D Brown, which was accepted by Councillor I Manning and other Council members and is shown underlined in the text below.

This Council notes:

- The Council's commitment to transparent decision making
- Oral recordings of Full Council meetings are now made available publicly on the County Council website
- Many Councillors tweet live from the Council Chamber during the meeting, allowing Cambridgeshire residents to follow decisions made
- Many other Councils also provide live streamed video recordings of Council meetings
- The software that is used for electronic voting is already configured to record the individual votes of all Councillors.

Further, in the case of video recording and streaming, Council notes:

- Local blogger Richard Taylor recently demonstrated at Cambridge City Council how easy it is to do this via YouTube, a Laptop and the public wireless
- A member of the communications team or democratic services already present at Full Council could carry out camera operation
- That, given the previous two bullet points, this should not incur additional costs to the Council.

To improve the transparency of local Government, Council resolves to:

- Implement a live video feed and resolves to set this up via the quickest possible method by the next Full Council meeting
- Ask the Constitution and Ethics Committee to recommend to Council to amend the current and new constitution, in operation from 13th May 2014, to have the individual voting records of Councillors published on the Council's website.

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

[Voting pattern: most Conservatives, all Labour, all Liberal Democrats, most UKIP and 1 Independent member in favour; some Conservatives, some UKIP and 2 Independent members against; 1 UKIP and 1 Independent member abstained.]

e) Motion from Councillor Bourke

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Bourke and seconded by Councillor Bailey. In moving the motion, Councillor Bourke requested an alteration to the text as published on the agenda, which was accepted by Council and is shown below (deletions struck through).

Council notes:

- Papworth hospital, the UK's main heart and lung specialist hospital, has long planned to move to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, next to

Addenbrooke's hospital. Co-location with Addenbrooke's would enable best quality clinical care to be provided for patients with complex chest and heart conditions, and would also create a world-leading solid organ transplant centre. The advances in knowledge and medical innovation that would result from this would improve clinical outcomes locally and nationally

- Formal consultation on these plans took place in 2005, when a regional Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee examined the plans in detail and supported the move on clinical grounds. The detailed financial and clinical case that has subsequently been developed has been supported by both the Department of Health and Monitor
- In recent weeks the Treasury has put the planned move on hold by asking Monitor to review two specific aspects of it:
 - (i) Papworth's finances and the finances of the proposed move – these have been reviewed twice in the past three years without concerns being raised, Papworth being one of the NHS's strongest performing hospitals financially
 - (ii) A clinical review to examine the arguments for and against proposals to locate the facility next to Addenbrooke's hospital as planned, as well as a clinical review of the feasibility of using the extra capacity at Peterborough hospital, in particular its vacant fourth floor

The immediate context for these reviews is provided by Monitor's "Options Report" on the state of Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, the NHS's most loss-making Trust.

This report explains that "*The Department of Health is currently putting £40 million a year into the trust so it can balance its books and fund all the services that local people need*". Half of this annual subsidy, approximately £20 million per annum, "*is directly attributable to the costly 35-year private finance scheme (PFI) undertaken by the previous trust management in 2009 in order to build a state-of-the-art hospital*", a PFI that Monitor opposed at the time.

The Options Report recommends four work streams designed to improve the trust's financial position, but concludes that some subsidy from central government will continue to be needed.

Council notes:

- The clinical benefits that would result from Papworth's planned relocation to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus would clearly be lost if it were required for financial reasons to relocate to Peterborough hospital instead
- The Treasury's desire to actively investigate this alternative therefore represents a particularly extreme example of the way in which PFIs can lead to reconfigurations of the local health economy that bear little relation to current or future population health care needs, and often penalise successful and viable NHS trusts in an attempt to bail out nearby PFI trusts whose viability is threatened.

Council resolves:

4. To strongly support Papworth hospital's relocation to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and to write to the Treasury, Department of Health and Monitor to this effect.
- ~~2. To call on the government to pool or nationalise NHS PFI debt, so that service change is based on population health care needs and clinical outcomes, not financial outcomes in isolation from other factors; to end the arbitrary distortion between different hospital trusts and health outcomes that is created by holding these debts locally; and to make it easier to refinance, re-negotiate and ultimately to pay off these debts.~~

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

[Voting pattern: most Conservatives, all Labour, all Liberal Democrats, most UKIP and all Independent members in favour; 1 UKIP member against; 1 Conservative member abstained.]

f) Motion from Councillor Mason

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Mason and seconded by Councillor Bullen. In moving the motion Councillor Mason noted that an amendment had been suggested by Councillor Wilson. This was accepted by Councillor Mason and other Council members and is shown underlined in the text below.

Council notes that Cambridgeshire residents and members continue to express disquiet and concern over the failure of the Council to properly scrutinise and publicise the financial, contractual and operational legacy associated with the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. Furthermore it is noted that much of the business in connection with the contract and subsequent legal action has not been conducted in open meetings and that this is not in the public interest or in accordance with Council's aims and policies.

Council therefore hereby resolves to set up a cross party Scrutiny Panel with wide and comprehensive terms of reference, to fully examine, in public, all aspects of this major infrastructure scheme and to report back to Council with recommendations following an agreed timetable.

This Scrutiny Panel will take into account the findings of the forthcoming Independent Review and will report before any work is commissioned on further Guided Busway projects.

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

[Voting pattern: all Liberal Democrats, some UKIP and 3 Independent members in favour; most Conservatives, all Labour and 1 UKIP member against; 1 Conservative, 3 UKIP and 1 Independent abstained.]

66. QUESTIONS

a) Questions on Fire Authority Issues

Members had the opportunity to ask questions and comment on Fire Authority

issues, in accordance with the guidelines agreed by the Council. One comment was made, as set out in **Appendix D**.

b) Oral Questions

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

- The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Taylor on the follow-up to her petition to Cabinet in May 2012 on lighting the cycle track adjacent to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway and particularly her request that this be included as a Section 106 Southern Corridor project.
- The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, agreed to send Councillor Nethsingha a written update on progress in re-establishing the Cambridge Environment and Traffic Management Area Joint Committee, including any proposals for the training of its members.
- The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, agreed to arrange a meeting with Councillor J Reynolds and officers to discuss concerns about street lighting in Dry Drayton, Bar Hill and Girton, including local residents' proposals to resolve these concerns and the possibility of a local financial contribution.
- The Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel, Councillor McGuire, suggested to Councillor Shellens that he add an item on the efficacy of meetings to the agenda for the next Panel.
- The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, agreed to meet Councillor Downes to discuss possible legislative reform that would enable local authorities to open new schools.
- The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, agreed to send a written response addressing comments made by Councillor Jenkins on the distribution of the additional funding for Cambridgeshire schools recently announced by the Minister of State for Schools.
- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, agreed to respond to material to be provided by Councillor Sales on a local resident's concerns about the timeliness of the publication of information on the Council's website.

c) Written Questions

Two written questions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2, as set out in **Appendix F**.

67. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES AND OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

No appointments to Committees or outside organisations were made.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 25th MARCH 2014
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Retirement of Pat Harding, Corporate Director: Customer Service and Transformation

Pat Harding, the Council’s Corporate Director: Customer Service and Transformation retires from the Council at the end of March. Pat joined the Council in 2003 and has held a number of positions during her 11 years with the Council. She was appointed as Head of Customer Contact in 2003 and became Corporate Director for Customer Services and Transformation in 2009.

AWARDS

'Finding My Way'

The film 'Finding My Way' was named winner of the 7th BFI British Future Film Festival 15-19 year olds documentary category. The film was made by four young care leavers who met for an intensive 4-day animated summer school at Anglia Ruskin University. It is about the challenges and expectations of leaving Council care.

Nomination for award for Addenbrooke’s Energy Innovation Centre

The planning application for a new Energy Innovation Centre which will serve Addenbrooke’s Hospital and its developing Cambridge Biomedical Campus that was managed by the Council’s officers was a finalist in this year’s national Placemaking Awards under two categories – Sustainability and Development Management. Council officers worked very closely with the applicants to bring the important scheme forward.

MESSAGES

BBC Sport Relief

The Contact Centre was once again part of the BBC Sport Relief event, being a donation centre on 21st March 2014. 75 volunteers took calls on the night and raised £70,000.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 25th MARCH 2014
PETITIONS**

Text of a petition containing 1,210 signatures presented by Julian Huppert MP

“Fix Our Pavements

Sign below to urge Cambridgeshire County Council to take action on the state of the pavements in Cambridge”.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 25th MARCH 2014

8. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

Amendment from Councillor Sales

Additions in bold and deletions struck through

Proposed Members' Allowances Scheme

Appendix 1

1. Scheme of Allowances

1.1 Elected members of Cambridgeshire County Council may claim the following allowances as specified in this Scheme:

- Basic allowance;
- Special responsibility allowances; and
- Travel and subsistence allowances.

Financial loss allowance is not available to Councillors.

1.2 The basic allowance and special responsibility allowances are indexed to the annual percentage 'cost of living' award for local government staff at spinal column 49 until 31 March 2018. The basic allowance and special responsibility allowances will be paid in equal monthly instalments and will be subject to tax and national insurance deductions.

2. Basic Allowance

2.1 The basic allowance is ~~£8,600~~ **£7,700** per annum for 2014-15.

3. Special Responsibility Allowances

3.1 No member may receive more than one special responsibility allowance **except for the Chairman/woman of General Purposes Committee and the Leader of the Council, and the Vice-Chairman of General Purposes Committee and the Deputy Leader of the Council.** No allowances other than the basic allowance and special responsibility allowances are payable.

Role	Calculation	Allowance 2014-15
Group Positions		
Leader of the Largest Group	£500 per seat	£16,000 £15,000
Deputy Leader of the Largest Group	75% of Group Leader	£12,000 £11,250
Leader of the Second Largest Group	£500 per seat	£7,000
Deputy Leader of the Second Largest Group	75% of Group Leader	£5,250
Group Leader	Major Group (over 10 members)	£11,000
Deputy Leader		£8,250
Leader of the Third Largest Group	£500 per seat	£6,000
Deputy Leader of the Third Largest Group	75% of Group Leader	£4,500
Leader of the Fourth Largest Group	£500 per seat	£3,500

Deputy Leader of the Fourth Largest Group	75% of Group Leader	£2,625
Group Leader	Minor Group (over 3 and up to 10)	£7,000
Deputy Leader		£5,250
Leader of the Fifth Largest Group	£500 per seat	£2,000
Deputy Leader of the Fifth Largest Group	75% of Group Leader	£1,500
General Purposes Committee		
Chairman and Leader of the Council		£6,000*
Vice-Chairman and Deputy Leader of the Council		£3,000*
Service Committees		
Service/General Purposes Committee Chair	N/A	£12,000
Service/General Purposes Committee Vice Chair	N/A	£9,000 £6,000
Committee Spokes+		
	Major Groups	£6,000
	Minor Groups (pro rata to 10)	
	Group of 7	£4,200
	Group of 4	£2,400
Regulatory Committees		
Audit Committee Chair	N/A	£4,500
Pension Fund Board Chair	N/A	£4,500
Planning Committee Chair	N/A	£4,500
Other Roles		
Adoption/Fostering Panel Member	N/A	£2,500

* These allowances are in addition to other SRAs.

+ Where a group holds the Vice-Chairmanship on a committee a separate allowance for spokes will not be payable in respect of that group and that committee. An allowance for Spokes will not be payable for General Purposes Committee.

- 3.2 Where a councillor in receipt of a special responsibility allowance fails to attend at least 50% of the meetings for which that allowance is paid in any six month period, that councillor shall be invited to repay an appropriate sum of the allowance received during that period.

4. Travel expenses

- 4.1 Travel by private vehicles will be reimbursed at the rates set for tax allowance purposes by the Inland Revenue for business travel. Currently these are 45p per mile for the first 10,000 miles and 25p a mile thereafter and an additional 5p per mile where a passenger (another councillor) is carried.
- 4.2 Parking fees and public transport fares will be reimbursed at cost on production of a valid ticket or receipt. In the case of travel by rail, standard class fare or actual fare paid (if less) will be reimbursed.
- 4.3 Travel and subsistence allowances are not payable for journeys undertaken outside the County, other than for authorised attendance on behalf of the Council at those meetings

under Section 10 (below) that are held outside the County. International travel shall require approval in advance by all Group Leaders.

4.4 Taxi fares will only be reimbursed on production of a valid receipt. Taxis should only be used where use of an alternative is not available or if the following conditions are applicable:

- There is a significant saving in official time;
- The councillor has to transport heavy luggage or equipment; and/or
- Where councillors are travelling together and it is therefore a cheaper option.

4.5 Travel expenses will be reimbursed for any journey undertaken where the councillor was undertaking approved duties (see Section 10 below). Travel expenses will only be reimbursed if claimed within two months.

5. Subsistence expenses

5.1 Overnight hotel accommodation must be booked through Democratic Services who will ensure that accommodation is booked at the appropriate market rate. Higher rates of accommodation will only be booked where it is clearly in the County Council's interest and formal approval has been given in advance by the Democratic Services Manager. Any other reasonable and unavoidable costs related to overnight stays will be reimbursed on production of a receipt.

5.2 When members are attending a conference on behalf of the Council, there shall be some discretion as to amount that can be claimed in respect of the cost of meals taken that are not provided as part of the conference fee. The Head of Democratic Services shall be authorised to allow claims to cover the actual cost of the meal, up to a reasonable maximum (£10 for lunch, £15 for an evening meal) and upon production of a receipt.

5.3 Subsistence expenses will only be reimbursed if incurred where the councillor was undertaking approved duties (see section 8 below).

6. Dependents' carers' expenses

6.1 Councillors with care responsibilities in respect of dependent children under 16 or dependent adults certified by a doctor or social worker as needing attendance will be reimbursed, on production of valid receipts, for actual payments to a registered or professional carer. Where care was not provided by a registered or professional carer but was provided by an individual not formally resident at the member's home, a maximum hourly rate of £6.50 will be payable.

6.2 Dependents' carers' expenses will only be reimbursed if incurred where the councillor was undertaking approved duties (see section 9 below).

7. Pensions

7.1 Councillors who are members of the Local Government Pension Scheme on 1 April 2014 continue to be eligible for membership in respect of both their basic allowance and special responsibility allowances for the remainder of the term of office they are serving on that date. Councillors who are not existing members of the scheme on that date may not join the scheme after 1 April 2014.

8. Stationery

- 8.1 No claims can be made for the cost of printer cartridges, paper, envelopes, stamps, pens, or other stationery and nor are these to be provided free of charge by the Council.

9. Co-opted Members – Financial Loss Allowance

- 9.1 A financial loss allowance may only be paid to non-elected members of committees or sub-committees. Co-opted members serving on committees shall be eligible to claim a £50.00 flat fee per meeting attended in addition to travel and subsistence allowances.
- 9.2 The fee shall also be paid for attendance at appropriate training events and seminars. Where an event is scheduled to last for a whole day, there shall be some discretion for doubling the usual rate, where this is considered reasonable. The Democratic Services Manager shall be authorised to exercise such discretion.

10. Approved duties

- 10.1 Travel, subsistence and dependents' carers' expenses incurred when undertaking duties matching the following descriptions may be claimed for:
- a) Attendance at meetings of Full Council and any committees, working groups or other bodies of the Council of which the councillor is a member;
 - b) Attendance at meetings of committees, working groups or other bodies of the Council of which the councillor is not a member but to which the councillor has received a specific, individual invitation by the Chairman of that body;
 - c) Attendance at Council premises for the purposes of taking part in formal briefings, training sessions or attending pre-arranged meetings with senior officers to discuss the business of the Council.
 - d) Representing the Council at external meetings, including Parish and Town Councils and those of voluntary organisations where the member is there on behalf of the Council;
 - e) Attendance at events organised by the Council and/or where invitations have been issued by officers or councillors (including Chairman's events and other corporate events);
 - f) Attendance at meetings/events where the Member is an official Council representative or requested by the Leader or the relevant Service Committee Chair; and
 - g) In respect of dependents' carers' expenses only, undertaking general councillor responsibilities including surgeries.

Expenses incurred as a result of attendance at political group meetings or other party political events may not be claimed for.

11. Renunciation of Allowances and Part Year Entitlements

- 11.1 A Councillor may elect to forego any part of their entitlement to an allowance under this scheme by providing written notice to the Monitoring Officer.

11.2 If an amendment to this Scheme is made which affects payment of an allowance in the year in which the amendment is made, then in relation to each of the periods:

- a) beginning with the year and ending with the day before that on which the first amendment in that year takes effect; or
- b) beginning with the day on which an amendment takes effect and ending with the day before that on which the next amendment takes effect, or (if none) with the year;

the entitlement to the allowance will be to the payment of such part of the allowance as it has effect during the relevant period as bears to the whole the same proportion as the number of days in the period bears to the number of days in the year.

11.3 Where the term of office of a Councillor begins or ends otherwise than at the beginning or end of a year, the entitlement of that Councillor to a basic allowance or special responsibility allowance shall be to the payment of such part of the basic allowance as bears to the whole the same proportion as the number of days during which his term of office subsists bears to the number of days in that year.

11.4 Where this Scheme is amended as mentioned in 11.2 and the term of a Councillor does not subsist throughout a period mentioned in 11.2, the entitlement of any such Councillor to a basic allowance or special responsibility allowance shall be to the payment of such part of the basic allowance referable to each such period (ascertained in accordance with that sub-paragraph) as bears to the whole the same proportion as the number of days during which his or her term of office as a Councillor subsists in that period bears to the number of days in that period.

11.5 The Council has the power to withhold payment of all allowances if a member (or co-opted member) ceases to be a member (or co-opted member) or ceases to be entitled to receive an allowance for a period. The authority may require that such part of the allowance as related to any such period be repaid to the Authority.

12. Taxation

12.1 Allowances are liable for Income Tax and National Insurance contributions.

12.2 Subsistence allowances for meetings or events held on the Shire Hall site are classed as emoluments for Income Tax and National Insurance contributions. This includes either sums claimed or meals provided by the Authority. Meals provided or claimed for meetings in locations other than Shire Hall are not taxable.

12.3 The Council will record all meals provided at Shire Hall, and will remit the tax due to the Inland Revenue at the end of the year. Members are asked to note meals taken on the Shire Hall site on their claim forms. No direct taxation will be charged to individual members for those meals taken at Shire Hall. Members claiming subsistence for meals purchased when attending meetings at Shire Hall will have tax deducted from their claim on a monthly basis. Members are encouraged to take advantage of the meals provided at Shire Hall whenever possible.

12.4 Members can claim some deductible expenses against tax for costs incurred in acting as a member for which no reimbursement is received from the Authority:

- Travel by car - where a member uses his or her own car for the performance of duties, but does not receive a mileage allowance, e.g. for a non-approved duty, the Tax Office may grant a deduction on the costs incurred based on 50% of the Council's

approved rate. Members would need to keep records of their mileage on non-approved duties in order to claim this deduction on their tax return.

- Travel by public transport - where a member incurs additional costs for which no allowance can be obtained from the Authority, these costs can be claimed as a deductible expense.
- Where regular payments are made to an assistant to provide secretarial support to a member for any support services which are not provided by the Authority.
- Where money is spent on the hire of rooms for surgeries or public meetings providing they are not for party political purposes.
- Where additional household expenses are incurred (light, fuel etc.) relating to those parts of members' homes that are used for duties as members, Inland Revenue will accept a standard deduction of £120 per year to cover these costs.

12.5 Any items claimed should be itemised on the tax return - Inland Revenue may require evidence and details of the expenditure incurred. Refunds for non-claiming tax allowances can be made for up to the previous six years.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 25th MARCH 2014
FIRE AUTHORITY QUESTIONS**

1. Comment from Councillor D Brown

I would just like to inform Council how well the new build is going in Burwell with the new fire station. Thank you.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 25th MARCH 2014
ORAL QUESTIONS**

1. Question to Councillor Bullen, Chairman of Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee, from Councillor Curtis

Does Councillor Bullen agree that the press release about a TB outbreak in a packaging factory in Chatteris which was put out by UKIP last Friday, contained inaccurate medical information? In particular does he agree that the statement that there was a risk of contamination through contact with vegetables could have caused communities to feel unsafe? Will he please explain the timeline that led the press release being put out and his involvement in it? Will he in particular explain what medical advice was sought before that press release was issued and at what point was he advised that rather than hiding the issue?

Reply from Councillor Bullen

This has nothing to do with my role as Chairman of the Committee. However, I am happy to give an answer either publicly or privately.

Comment from the Chairman

Perhaps outside the Chamber would be best.

2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor van de Ven

At the last Council meeting, Councillor McGuire announced that a cross-party group of Councillors would be looking at how to spend the extra funding that was found for public transport, hopefully with an aim to solve some of our community transport and Cambridgeshire Future Transport issues. I haven't heard yet when that might be convening and I'm hoping that it might be soon.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure

I could answer that by saying me too, I hope it will be soon. I did chase the officers myself recently to find out what was happening. I'm never quite sure when we decide to set up these, how much of this is with Group Leaders deciding, but I do understand that with the exception of I think the Independent Group, who I don't think have anyone attending, we now have the nominees for that group and I think we will get that underway pretty quickly now. I think that is important as I was getting quite frustrated about the length of time it has taken, but it wasn't in my hands and I hope you will understand that but we will get it underway soon.

3. Question to the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Orgee, from Councillor Onasanya

Given the current press on the cases of TB at the moment, please could you elaborate on the rate of transmission? I know in the media there has lots of press about TB in Chatteris and I just wanted you to shed some light on the transmission.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing

Thank you very much, I will try and do my best. Public Health England is the body which employs epidemiologists to look at data on all reported cases of active TB across the country and to look at patterns in that data. They have recently identified that in the two years from January 2012, there have been 17 cases of TB associated with packing factories in Chatteris. All these cases have received treatment and are no longer infectious and I think that is a very important point. Also, close contacts with those people have also been treated as necessary. Now as a routine precaution, because of the association with Public Health England, epidemiologists have identified additional screening of workers which will be carried out in one of the factories and that is due to start next month. So, basically the appropriate organisation had been involved, has acted appropriately and as I say, all the cases are no longer infectious. There has also been reference to a death and my information is that the death, although TB may have contributed to the death, it did not cause the death so I think that is an important point to make as well. I hope that gives you some reassurance as to the scale of what happened. By looking at all the data nationwide, this pocket has been identified fairly recently and appropriate actions have been taken and will be taken.

4. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor I Manning

We all noted Councillor Curtis's resignation as Leader of the Council recently. I would like to ask him if he has any thoughts as to who his successor might be?

Response from the Leader of the Council

Somebody on this side of the Chamber.

Supplementary question from Councillor I Manning

I wonder if he could tell us in that case what personal qualities he might expect in a follow-up Leader?

Response from the Leader of the Council

That's who replaces me in terms of Group Leader of the Conservative Party. This is important that this side of the Chamber and our group take a serious look at that but you've seen and heard my comments and the reality is, as Leader of this Council, I have loved 90% of it, I have hated 10% of it, absolutely detested it and the issue is the more I came to look at next year the more I realised that that 10% is going to become 40 and 50% and you've seen the message that I have put out and my reasons why I felt I had to make that decision. It wasn't any easy decision; I could have done lots of other ...

Comment from Councillor Bullen

Point of order Mr Chairman, this is a personal statement

Response from the Vice-Chairman of Council (in the Chair), Councillor Kindersley

Councillor Bullen, he has one minute to finish his response.

Response from the Leader of the Council

... and there were things I could have done. I could have found out if I'd liked it, I could have found another job and walked away and left this Council in disarray but I've chosen not to do that. I chose to make a judged decision. I would urge Council Leaders, rather than the reaction we got the other day, which was actually full of inaccuracies that my group have been 100% behind me this whole year, they've been absolutely fantastic okay. The reasons I stood were my reasons alone, I would urge Group Leaders, reflect on today, how much of this stuff we have done today has been introspective, how much of this could have been done elsewhere without tying up Members time and effort, just think about those things please because we are going to have a problem. If you go into denial we just carry on business as usual. If we don't we are going to have a problem.

5. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor Bourke

I understand that following our recent discussion of the Disability Access Review in Cabinet, Councillor Curtis met with Max Jacob Black, a local campaigner, an activist who is going to help with the next stages of our review and that Councillor Curtis suggested that he would like to try to create a Disability Access Campaign Group across the county and this is along vaguely similar, not identical lines but similar lines to something we had discussed with various officers and we are looking forward to proposing in the next stage of the review, it's not exactly the same, we were thinking more about planning, this is a campaign group in general but I think that sounds like an excellent initiative and could he perhaps tell us a little bit more about that, when it might be brought forward and anything else he thinks is relevant?

Response from the Leader of the Council

I think you have slightly got what I said to MJ wrong. I must say that I had a great meeting with MJ and what came out of it was a recognition from my perspective that we have a lot of groups in Cambridgeshire that are able to lobby and do lobby such as our Looked After Children Panel is a great example and there are a number of others and the reality is that there is nothing cross-county that allows disabled people to have a voice, not just about access issues but about disability issues in general and that is what I was looking at is how we can do something to create a group that actually is able to lobby this Council and other organisations actually about disability issues is not just about the access and highways issues that was discussed at Scrutiny but my vision would be something wider than that because I do think that the conversation I had with MJ sort of moved onto not just the access issues but actually the fact that there are other areas as well and I just think that is the right response. How we do that I don't know because obviously funding is an issue, lots of other things but that would be my aspiration and my vision and it's one of the things that I will be talking to the Chief Executive about trying to move forwards.

Supplementary question from Councillor Bourke

Again I think this is a very good idea. This wasn't meant to be a political argument, actually I think everyone who has helped out with the work we have been doing is quite genuine in wanting to improve the standards of disability access in the county. Might I ask that given a small number of Members have already given up the time to try and do some work on this that they might be involved as we take this forward?

Response from the Leader of the Council

Absolutely, I have no problem with that at all. It has to be something – the important thing to me is that we find a vehicle where we can get people with disability have a means of challenging this Council and others. Ultimately I would like them to decide who is involved and how it works but that is my aim.

6. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor Taylor

Bit of a memory question, but I did give him some notice of this but I would like to ask him if he remembers a petition that I brought to your Cabinet in May 2012 asking for lighting for the southern section of the guided busway bridleway for walkers and cyclists, for safety reasons and does he also remember Cabinet also approving the section 106 funding for that lighting?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure

To be honest Chairman, although Councillor Taylor did say she was going to ask me a question about the guided bus route, she didn't actually give me the detail of the question. I can't at this moment recall, I can remember there was a petition about it but I cannot recall the business about the 106 so what I would suggest is that following this meeting Chairman, I will give a response to that in writing and advise Councillor Taylor where we are on that but as I said I don't personally recall the response to that petition at that time.

Supplementary question from Councillor Taylor

Thank you. To remind you – yes there was a petition signed by about 200 commuters and residents of the Queen Edith's and Trumpington areas asking for light for the guided busway because it is one of the good things about the guided busway is the bridleway and it is heavily used by walkers and cyclists going to work for personal reasons but it is not as used as widely as it might be as when it is used in winter during the commuting period in the morning and evening it is pitch black, there is no light at all. We have had examples of people sustaining physical injuries such as broken wrists and broken teeth. There is not only the risk of injury, we want it lit to stop personal injury and to encourage people to use it more and many women ... also the risk of personal safety and we have heard about the burglars from Histon today as well. So Councillor McGuire, I'm asking you really if you will undertake to remind officers about it and to try and help us realise this as it is now two years since the question was asked.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure

It is a difficult question to answer because as I say I don't recall it and you will probably detect as Councillor Bates was saying in my ear, he doesn't recall it but we will look into it – I cannot make it clearer than that.

7. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor P Brown

I'm not quite sure whether my question should be addressed to Councillor Orgee or Councillor McGuire, at the start of the day it was to Tony but I gather it has been

transferred to Mac. It is on behalf of the Alconbury Weston Parish Council who say we are indeed fortunate that the severe flooding that we have experienced in many parts of the country has not been affected here in Cambridgeshire. What plans have we in place to update Members on this Council and parish councils to talk about emergency planning procedures and in the event of a future disaster?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure

Chairman, Councillor Orgee did pass it over to me so I did have advance notice and the officers have provided an answer which I might have a little bit of difficulty in reading because it doesn't scan very well. We have a current up to date flood plan agreed with our partners in the local resilience forum. This plan, in line with other emergency arrangements, manages the response to a flood event. The management of the event would require that the directors of CS&T and the Chief Executive would be involved and would therefore inform Members. Additionally the Emergency Management Team would ensure through the Comms Team, that where there is flooding, the local member for the area would be kept up to date. Additionally, if helpful, we have now begun a significant piece of work to address the potential East Coast flooding in the Wisbech area. I hope that answers the question that Councillor Brown was asking Chairman.

8. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, from Councillor Nethsingha

It is about the Cambridge AJC and I was just wondering if there is any update on information on that and on progress on that and whether he could reassure me that training will be included in that – I think it is supposed to be taking place, happening after the move to the Committee system in May. Will training be included for that as well as the other committees?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning

I can't give you a categoric answer to the question about training so I think the sensible way to go forward is actually for me to take away this question and give you a written answer.

9. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor J Reynolds

I'm sure he will already be aware of some of the issues and it concerns street lighting in three of my villages that I have some concerns about. I have been trying to get these issues resolved for some time picking up the point that the Leader of Council said about getting it done before the need to come to this building but I've not had much success and I'm just wondering whether Councillor McGuire can help me and help the residents of Dry Drayton, Bar Hill and Girton? We do need to have a few more extra lights or lights put back. The residents want not a lot, just a few here and there. I have raised it with the Chief Executive and various other people. We have found lights that are not required and could be easily moved but it does seem that no-one is willing to actually take the action to sort out this particular problem and I just wonder whether Councillor McGuire would help me, help my residents and those people that have to walk in the dark in areas where there isn't any lighting and indeed where there is narrow roads without any pavements you actually get these very few lights sorted out before next winter. Thank you.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure

Chairman, thank you. Councillor Reynolds did say he was going to ask me about street lighting but I wasn't quite sure what. As Councillor Reynolds is well aware having himself been involved with the contract right at the beginning, there are certain constraints within the contract. If he is having difficulties on a particular thing and he did mention the Chief Executive have been involved, what I would suggest, I am happy Councillor Reynolds to facilitate a meeting, certainly initially with Tom Blackburne-Maze who is the officer responsible, to see whether or not, first I need to understand the problem, I think we all need to understand, and see if there is any way we can meeting your needs, what you are asking for, within the terms of the contract. I would hope that we can, where possible to be flexible, we would be flexible Chairman, and as I say I think the best thing is to set up the meeting. So that is the officer to Councillor Reynolds and I am happy to facilitate such a meeting.

Supplementary question from Councillor J Reynolds

Thank you very much for that response, I will be please to take that up and we will move forward with all those people concerned. There is one other thing that gives me concern and that is some people in the villages would be prepared to make a contribution to move these lights but we have received a price from Balfour Beatty, a price of just over a thousand pounds to move a light. This seems to be an extraordinary amount of money for such a simple process to move a light from an existing pole hole to one that was a light hole a few months ago. Perhaps this is profiteering but it certainly seems something somebody needs to get to grips with an also I have a letter from officers saying they have identified these five or six lights that can be moved without any detriment and that was in consideration with Balfour Beatty as well so we have done all of the work, we just need the action.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure

Chairman, as Councillor Reynolds and other know, I am always in favour of third party funding where it is appropriate and we don't turn down money. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on the costs, I am not a street lighting engineer, I'm not an expert but I will pick this up with the officers again.

10. Question to the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel, Councillor McGuire, from Councillor Shellens

Attending this month's meeting of the Crime and Police Commission Panel at Huntingdon with the Commissioner, his deputy, his finance officer and his chief exec, all travelling from Camborne, neither the last two spoke, a committee secretary and a councillor from Peterborough, our very own Councillor Curtis who was soon to make a very exciting announcement and a loose scattering of other councillors. There were two questions from HDC where the answer was that everything was wonderful, the only bit of interest for me was a brief complaint from Peterborough was that nobody had bothered to tell him of the forthcoming EDL march in his ward to which the answer was "well that's not my job". The meeting lasted just 45 minutes. The most interesting questions in previous meetings have been met with "this is an operational matter and as such is not the business of this meeting". Would Councillor McGuire agree with me (1) that the five members of the committee that did not attend this meeting had made a wise decision as this is not a good investment of time and (2) that the continuing failure of the Commissioner to attend this Council is greatly to be

regretted, (3) it suggests that democratic oversight model for the Police is completely broken and (4) that this Council should initiate a quick and dirty survey of surrounding councils to see if the problem is general or if there is something we can implement to provide an improved service to our community?

Response from the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel

Chairman, I think it is worth reminding Council that when the PCP was set up, and remember this is not a committee of this Council and therefore it doesn't technically follow on there. I made an offer Chairman as one of our representatives on there that if anybody wanted to ask a question they can ask a question of any member because as I say, it is a panel that goes across several authorities as well as having independent members so therefore it is not accountable to this Council as such but as one of the members yes I am. No I cannot agree with you because unfortunately I was one of those five members, as you know, who I believe unavoidable in the absence of Councillor Count, he was sunning himself in Australia, I had to as Vice Chair of the Appointments and Remuneration Committee, chair that meeting for a very important appointment and therefore had to give my apologies to the PCP so I wasn't there to hear the debate or count who was there and who was not, but I know it was very ably chaired by Councillor Ablewhite, so it is difficult for me to answer this question but no I don't agree, I cannot agree because I don't know the ins and outs.

Supplementary question from Councillor Shellens

A comment Chairman that I think Councillor McGuire has agreed with me that he was doing something useful which he wouldn't have done if he'd been with us and I want to go back to my question that this council should initiate a quick and dirty survey of surrounding councils to see if the problem is general or whether there is something we can do, that we can implement to provide an improved service to our community.

Response from the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel

I will try not to do anything dirty Chairman but I would suggest the best move we can make for this Councillors to challenge is that he puts that on the agenda for the next meeting of the PCP to such thing. That way, with the agreement of the other members we can do such a thing; I do not have the power myself simply as the chairman of that meeting to carry out or initiate that review.

11. Question to the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, from Councillor Downes

As you know, I have been very concerned for some time about the process by which local authorities have to commission new schools. I pointed out before this is a very long winded and costly process and doesn't necessarily guarantee a successful outcome. You and I, Councillor Brown and Councillor Divine have recently been through a process in relation to Littleport Secondary School and that was very revealing in a number of ways particularly about the cost of the way new schools are funded and the top slice that needs to be taken from new schools in order to fund what is essentially a very small, the academy chain which is very small, inefficient local authority. But the good news is that the Conservative Chairman of the LGA Children and Young Peoples Committee has recently said that he thinks that we ought to put pressure on government to restore to local authorities the right to set up their own schools, their own community schools and not to be required to employ an academy chain. I think that is a good move, it's a good move coming from the Conservatives in particular and my question to you is would you support that and if

you would support it, would you use your offices either directly or through your Leader as I will through my contacts to see if we can get the government or an incoming government to change its mind on that particular piece of legislation?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning

Councillor Downes, I am quite happy to agree to perhaps meet with you and we can make arrangements to carry this process forward.

12. Question to the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning, Councillor Harty, from Councillor Jenkins

We have recently had the announcement for extra funding for schools in Cambridgeshire which is good news and congratulations to all those involved in the effort of bringing it in and by the way I should register an interest as I am a governor of Impington Village College. Will he confirm to me that the money when it comes will go all to schools and not have some of it syphoned off to pay for administration or whatever might want to get its hands on it.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning

Thank you for that question. I am pretty sure that the Schools Forum is the forum for that particular issue.

Supplementary question from Councillor Jenkins

Second question since I am responsible for one particular school in part of course, I am concerned that the school gets its fair share and can Councillor Harty confirm that all schools will get their fair share of this funding?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning

To make it easier, I will write to you with the information.

13. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor Sales

I don't know quite who to ask this question of, it is to do with information being published on the internet. In order to be open and transparent with residents, the County is committed to publishing information on the website in a timely manner. There are examples of this not happening. Democratic scrutiny and public participation in discussion of issues is being obstructed. Could the Member responsible for the publication of information on the website please rectify this situation.

Response from the Leader of the Council

Could you send me the specific details because without these it is hard to challenge somebody so if you could send me what information you have got, then of course I will take it up and it is worth saying at this point, I do not know the reasons for this but we are just about at that point where our new website is going to be launched which will be a big step forward. It is a lot more reactive and the design and layout will be such that people will be much better able to access the information that is most important to them.

Supplementary question from Councillor Sales

I am being persistently and generally persecuted by someone who feels that they do not have the information quickly enough and they have numerous examples of this and I will get them to put it all together so that I can in turn forward it on to you.

Response from the Leader of the Council

Whoever takes over as Leader of the Council will find that they are persistently persecuted by one or people too. Send me the details and I will deal with it.

14. Question to the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Orgee, from Councillor Bullen

I did yesterday give this question to Councillor Orgee in writing and I will read from my writing so that I ask the question exactly how I gave it to him. Following the recent announcement that there has been a TB outbreak amongst eastern European migrant workers at two vegetable packing plants in Chatteris and that at least one migrant worker has died, can Councillor Orgee tell the Council why both this Council and the local Health Authority and Health England decided to withhold these facts from the local population?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing

Thank you very much. Councillor Bullen did give me this question yesterday. The answer is as follows. First of all the epidemiologists only identified this cluster of cases very recently. But I did make sure that the local Member would be briefed as soon as possible after I had received that information and she was in fact briefed thirteen days ago. The point is that Public Health England have not identified any evidence of risk to the general public in Chatteris and therefore the incident has not been publicised. TB spreads through prolonged local close contact. Often people living in the same household or sometimes in the workplace and sometimes, as in this case, where people are travelling in close proximity to one another to the workplace. So therefore it is the close contact that is needed for transmission of this disease but therefore messages and awareness raising about TB have been provided in the packing factories. There is no evidence that TB can be transmitted through produce packed at the factories. So for those reasons Public Health England felt that there was no particular need to publicise this information, because it was information, cases had been developed over a period of two years, cases had been treated as and when they arose and it only looking at the data afterwards that the specialists could identify the cluster of cases arising in this particular area and as I indicated in the previous answer there is going to be screening of workers in at least one of the factories and that will start very shortly and all close contact of those people who did contract the disease in the past they have also been screened and looked at.

Supplementary question from Councillor Bullen

Bearing in mind that it is an established fact that the TB outbreak has been brought into the country by eastern European migrant workers, will the Council now propose that migrants from areas of known TB infestation are health screened before settling in the County of Cambridgeshire. And indeed the World Health Organisation's own website says that generally one person with TB will infect approximately fifteen others.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing

I was given advance notice of this question as well and the answer to this one is as follows. First of all there are two ways in which screening can currently happen if eastern European migrants from countries with a relatively high prevalence of TB arrive in Cambridgeshire. The first is that their GP may identify that a newly registered patient who is a recent migrant has risk factors for TB or has a history of TB and therefore may refer them to chest clinic for screening, and secondly they may be screened as part of an occupational health check before starting work. Now I would say that neither of these is mandatory. But Public Health England have published a TB strategy which recommends that new migrants from areas of high TB prevalence should be screened systematically for latent TB in parts of England where the local rate for TB is high. However the rates of TB in most eastern European countries within the EEU although higher than the UK do not reach the target level set by Public Health England. Peterborough has a rate of TB which does count as a high prevalence area although Cambridgeshire does not. I should point out that in most of these cases, the people involved are believed to have lived in Peterborough and not in Chatteris. So therefore the national strategy would not advise putting a systematic TB screening programme for new migrants in place in Cambridgeshire County but it may well do in Peterborough which is where most of these cases originated.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 25th MARCH 2014

WRITTEN QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2

1. Question from Councillor van de Ven to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire

Cambridgeshire hopes to see further central government grant funding for new off-road cycle paths in many rural areas. Ecological restoration of road-side verges when new cycle paths are completed is not part of the work programme and this is a missed opportunity, resulting partly from disparate remits across different authorities. Indeed the potential exists to bring about higher than previous standards of biodiversity on verges by introducing drought and rabbit resistant varieties of wildflower to add to existing grasses, at very low cost. Should the County Council be looking for cooperative measures to make ecology restoration integral to the work programme of cycle path construction, thus tackling two objectives in the realm of environmental protection and enhancement?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire

The Council has been very successful in obtaining government grants for new cycleways and it is pleasing to see these schemes now being implemented.

Generally in schemes such as this on completion the verges are topsoiled and seeded with a standard seed mix either side of the new cycle path, and then the grass will be cut as part of the cyclic maintenance programme. The objective is generally to ensure the new cycle paths can be of sufficiently good width and connect from A to B, and thus the majority of the cost is used for path construction/tarmac. Providing anything non standard adds to project costs and could mean paths have to be narrower. There is also the potential for higher future maintenance costs.

Larger transport schemes offer more scope to enhance biodiversity. Extensive measures were incorporated into The Busway project, and for Riverside Bridge measures such as bird and bat boxes were introduced.

I would like to thank Councillor van de Ven and the A10 Cycling Campaign for their work to enhance the grass verge on the recently built cycle route alongside the A10 at Shepreth. This was an excellent example of partnership working between the County Council, South Cambs and local people.

We will of course continue to grasp future opportunities to use volunteers, and involve local communities where it is practical, to enhance schemes.

2. Question from Councillor van de Ven to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire

The County Council's DBS checking system for community transport volunteer drivers can be onerous and off-putting, at a time when drivers are badly needed. Volunteers must walk their disclosures in to Shire Hall offices regardless of where they live, and this can entail a lengthy and expensive journey from distant reaches of the county. Once at Shire Hall the process to issue a driver with an ID badge is lengthy and inefficient. All in all the experience of acquiring or renewing a DBS has the potential to

dissuade potential community transport drivers from signing up. What can be done to remove the unnecessary hassle and expense?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Infrastructure, Councillor McGuire

Many thanks for raising the question about Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) clearance procedure.

I appreciate that the national changes introduced by the DBS have caused issues for all community transport and volunteer car schemes.

All individual voluntary car schemes and community transport drivers' duties can be defined as regulated activity therefore requiring an Enhanced DBS, which the authority then vets and approves.

Therefore officers of the authority are required to see original disclosure certificates. As a result of the national changes, the DBS now only sends the applicant the disclosure certificate (the County Council no longer receives a copy of this certificate). This means that the applicant has to present their disclosure in person, this enables verification to be undertaken of the individual's disclosure certificate and status.

To try and assist with this requirement, I am pleased to advise that officers of the Authority have in place a flexible approach to processing disclosures that have no notified convictions. There are a number of staff within the Social and Education Transport Team who can verify these disclosures at locations away from the Shire Hall site in Cambridge utilising all of the Authorities facilities across Cambridgeshire, and where possible individuals' own properties. These meetings need to be booked in advance so they can be coordinated with officer's movements, thus reducing unnecessary additional expense to the both the authority and volunteers.

This process has been very effective and taken up by a number of our service providers including commercial companies, community car schemes and community transport providers. Officers in the Passenger Transport Service have recently met with volunteer drivers at Perry, Ely, Buckden, Sawtry and Wisbech for the purposes of assisting with DBS checking.

I would also state that when we verify the applicant through this method the individual will leave the meeting with a letter which acts as authority to work, prior to the issue of their individual CCC DBS badge. So no delay occurs in order to 'wait' for a badge.

Officers appreciate that the DBS process is cumbersome, therefore officers within Social and Education Transport team are committed to being early adopters of the LGSS DBS E-bulk processes which will improve the processes further as it will allow the opportunity to complete the process on line and the time taken to receive a certificate will be reduced to a week compared to 4-6 weeks at present. The new systems will be in place in about 3 months.

The County Council has and continues to take action to make the DBS clearance process more convenient for the volunteer drivers and help to reduce the expense involved in obtaining a DBS certificate.