

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 18th December 2001

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 5.50 p.m.

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor: P W Silby (Chairman)

Councillors: P D Bailey, C M Ballard, R S G Barnwell, I C Bates, Dr T J Bear, A J Bowen, S V Brinton, J Broadway, C M Carter, M Y Chapple, R L Clarke, J E Coston, P J Downes, R Driver, J A P Eddy, M Farrar, H J Fitch, S A Giles, J L Gluza, P D Gooden, A Hansard, G F Harper, V A Hearne-Casapieri, G J Heathcock, W G M Hensley, J L Huppert, S F Johnstone, J D Jones, A C Kent, I C Kidman, S J Kime, S J E King, M L Leeke, V H Lucas, A R Mair, R B Martlew, L W McGuire, A K Melton, S B Normington, M K Ogden, L J Oliver, A G Orgee, D R Pegram, J A Powley, P A E Read, J E Reynolds, C E Shaw, R C Speechley, A B Stenner, P L Stroude, J M Tuck, J K Walters, R Wilkinson, L J Wilson and F H Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors: B Hardy and E Meyland-Smith

30. MINUTES: 16th OCTOBER 2001

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 16th October 2001 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

31. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Road safety initiative

The Chairman drew attention to a current road safety initiative in which the County Council was working in partnership with the Driving Standards Agency to target Year 11 pupils who would soon be old enough to drive.

Chairman's reception

The Chairman thanked members and representatives of partner organisations for attending the recent reception and commented on the importance and benefits of partnership working. She also commended Cambridgeshire pupils on their musical contributions to the evening.

Special meeting of Council

Members noted that there would be a special meeting of Council on 22nd January 2002 at 10.30 am, primarily to consider changes to the detailed wording of the draft Structure Plan following discussions with District Councils.

32. CABINET REPORTS

(a) Report of the meeting on 11th December 2001

The Council received a report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11th December 2001, covering the following:

Key decision for determination

1) Structure Plan Review

At the beginning of this item, the Chairman led members in thanking officers for their hard work on the Structure Plan Review, particularly in the days leading up to the meeting.

Members declared the following non-pecuniary interests:

- Councillor A J Bowen - a member of the Council for the Protection of Rural England, Cambridge University and Jesus College; he noted that although Jesus College owned land in the Green Belt, none was proposed for development and therefore he was able to speak and vote
- Councillor S V Brinton - a member of Cambridge University, Selwyn College and the East of England Development Agency
- Councillor H J Fitch - a member of the Council for the Protection of Rural England
- Councillor J L Gluza - an employee of Cambridge University
- Councillor J L Huppert - a member of Cambridge University and Trinity College
- Councillor S J Kime - owner of land and property at Church End, Cherry Hinton, close to a site to be allocated for development
- Councillor A G Orgee - an employee of an organisation forming part of Cambridge University.

In addition Councillor P L Stroude stated that he had no interest in land affected by the proposals at Longstanton/Oakington.

The Council received a number of petitions:

- Elsa Strietman presented a petition with 89 signatures from residents from the Windsor Road area of Cambridge City that opposed the removal of the National Institute of Agriculture and Botany (NIAB) and surrounding land from the Cambridge Green Belt for housing development
- Andy Cave presented a petition with 50 signatures from the Oakington Action Group that opposed the selection of Oakington/Longstanton as the site for a new settlement
- Michael Williamson of Waterbeach Parish Council presented two petitions, one with 316 signatures that opposed the proposed development of land to the north of Waterbeach due to flooding issues and one with 423 signatures that opposed the proposed development of land to the north of Waterbeach due to traffic problems on the A10

- Louise Maloch presented a petition with 457 signatures that stated that the proposed new settlement at Waterbeach would ruin the village and would adversely affect family lives
- Gerald Hinkins of Landbeach Parish Council presented a petition with 71 signatures that opposed the proposed new settlement at Waterbeach on the grounds that local roads and junctions were already overloaded and that any improvements, if at all possible, would not make any difference to the area's problems. Concerns about the possibility of flooding were also expressed.

Members asked a number of questions of the petitioners about issues raised in the petitions. The Chairman thanked the petitioners for taking the time to present their views to the Council.

Members noted that a further petition with 62 signatures had been submitted by Horningsea residents opposed to the proposed new settlement at Waterbeach on the ground that the area was already fully developed and could not cope with any further expansion.

The Council then considered in turn each of the eleven chapters of the draft Structure Plan which were proposed for adoption by Councillor J E Reynolds and seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone. Members' attention was drawn to revised wordings for draft Policies P9/3 on the Green Belt and P9/4 on the new settlement recommended by Cabinet at its meeting on 11th December 2001.

Members approved each chapter in turn, subject to the following amendments to Chapters 8 and 9:

Amendment 1

Councillor J L Huppert proposed that the words in italics below be added to the first bullet point under 'Cycling and Walking' in paragraph 8.37, Policy P8/10:

- 'Extension of Core Traffic Scheme and pedestrianisation *with appropriate facilities for cyclists* in Cambridge.'

This amendment was accepted by Councillor J E Reynolds and agreed unanimously.

Amendment 2

Councillor J E Reynolds proposed that the footnote to the fourth and fifth bullet points under 'Local Roads' in paragraph 8.37, Policy P8/10, be amended to read as follows:

'** both of the schemes will be retained unless construction has commenced at the time of adoption of the Structure Plan.'

This was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone and agreed unanimously.

Amendment 3

Councillor A C Kent put forward an amendment proposing that the reference to land to the west of Addenbrooke's Hospital be deleted from the fourth bullet point of paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/3c. The amendment was seconded by Councillor G J Heathcock. However, following a brief discussion, - with the consent of the Council, Councillor Kent withdrew the amendment, explaining that her concerns would be addressed by proposals contained within amendment 4, if these were agreed.

Amendment 4

Councillor J E Reynolds proposed a number of technical wording changes to paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/3c, to make the text accord fully with his report as the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning agreed by the meeting of Cabinet on 11th December 2001; the amended wording to be as follows (additions in italics, deletions struck through):

'Policy P9/3c Location and Phasing of Development Land to be Released from the Green Belt

Local Plans will make provision for housing and mixed-use development on land to be released from the Green Belt.

Subject to a flexible approach to the phasing of land-release, the following locations should be considered for the early commencement of development:

- North of Newmarket Road
- North of Cherry Hinton
- Cambridge Airport (*subject to availability this is a priority for development at a high density*)
- South and west of Addenbrooke's Hospital (*subject to the retention of a green corridor on the west running from the Shelford area into Cambridge north of Long Road*)
- Clay Farm and areas east and south of Trumpington

Other locations should be reserved for development if required before 2016 as follows (*subject to an assessment of the impact of transport improvements on the A14 corridor and the new settlement*):

- Between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (predominantly University-related uses)
- Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

East of Cambridge Airport is to be safeguarded for development after 2016 and only to be developed following the *substantial* development of ~~a substantial portion of~~ Cambridge Airport.

These areas will include a total capacity in the order of 16,000 to 18,000 dwellings, of which 8,000 will be required by 2016 and will be subject to:

- *sustainability assessments*
- securing transport improvements including those identified in Policy P9/10
- securing provision of other infrastructure as appropriate
- enhancement to landscape, habitat creation and opportunities for recreation within and adjoining the development areas
- *recognising the interdependence of the Addenbrooke's, Clay Farm and Trumpington sites in providing an integrated and sustainable development for this sector of the City*
- a master plan or design brief for each area identified, to be prepared jointly by the local planning authorities
- a master plan is required for the eastern sector as a whole, including Cambridge Airport and areas to the east. This must be agreed by the local planning authorities in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council before the commencement of development at Cambridge Airport. The safeguarded area should include provision for early landscaping, recreation access and biodiversity improvements
- phasing policies in Local Plans (see Policy P9/2) which will be conditional upon changing circumstances and the availability of preferred locations.

The criteria for phasing ~~in order of importance~~ are:

- previously developed land which is available for development;
- locations meeting the need for key worker housing and direct support for high tech clusters;
- linked development that brings forward shared infrastructure;
- priority for the most sustainable locations amongst the remaining areas.

Land that is not required for development before 2016 will be designated as safeguarded land for development after that date.'

The following paragraphs also to be added to appropriate sections of the supporting text in the Structure Plan:

- '14. *The City will grow considerably over the next 30 years and that growth must be in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. Cambridge will have a thriving historic centre accompanied by four expanded communities on the Northern Fringe, in West Cambridge, at Addenbrooke's and in East Cambridge. The new areas will be compact, mixed developments with efficient use of land, improved connections between housing, jobs, amenities and services and a very high quality of urban design.*
15. *Development will be underpinned by locally available employment opportunities and a full range of infrastructure with new public transport systems for Cambridge integrating the new communities into the City. These links will extend out to the market towns, the new settlement and other sustainable developments which will share with Cambridge in the expansion of high technology clusters and transport improvements.*

16. *The vision for the City area will recognise and strengthen the purposes of the Green Belt which are to preserve the setting of the City, to help shape sustainable urban development, and to provide green separation protecting local communities. Every opportunity will be taken to enhance the amenity, landscape and recreational value of the Green Belt, particularly where it adjoins new development areas.*
17. *Realisation of the vision will require a clear view of the long term developments within the current Green Belt and careful phasing of that development. An early study involving all the local authorities will be commissioned to define the contribution which land to the east of Barnwell Road can make to this vision whilst preserving the fundamental purposes of the Green Belt. Particular attention will be given to protecting the special character of Cambridge, maintaining its setting and preventing coalescence. It will also be essential to maintain the village character of both Teversham and Fulbourn. The study will define what contribution this land will make to the City as a whole and to ensure maximum use is made of the airport itself. This study will be concluded in time for consideration at the Examination in Public.'*

This amendment was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone. The amendment was adjusted by Amendment 4A below, on which members voted at the same time. The text was also affected by amendment 5.

Amendment 4A

In proposing amendment 4A, Councillor J E Reynolds explained that, as a result of discussions with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, he now recommended that the two following sentences in paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/3c warranted further consideration:

'Other locations should be reserved for development if required before 2016 as follows (subject to an assessment of the impact of transport improvements on the A14 corridor and of the new settlement)';

and

'A master plan is required for the eastern sector as a whole including Cambridge airport and areas to the east. This must be agreed by the local planning authorities in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council before the commencement of development.'

Councillor J E Reynolds proposed that both of these statements be given further consideration and discussions be held with both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council prior to any revised wording being brought back to this Council on 22nd January 2002.

This amendment was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone.

On being put to the vote, both amendments 4A and 4, as adjusted by 4A, were carried. [Voting pattern for both amendments: agreed without dissent.]

Amendment 5

Councillor J E Reynolds further proposed that the wording of paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/3c be revised as follows (additions in italics, deletions struck through):

~~'East of Cambridge Airport is to be safeguarded for development after 2016 and only to be developed following the substantial development of Cambridge Airport.'~~

~~These areas will include a total capacity in the order of 16,000 to 18,000 dwellings, of which 8,000 will be required by 2016 and will be subject to:~~

East of Cambridge Airport is to be safeguarded for development after 2016 and only developed following the substantial development of Cambridge Airport and provided that a joint study shows it can be developed whilst maintaining the fundamental purposes of the Green Belt.

These areas will

- *Promote a sustainable and spatially concentrated pattern of locations for development and sustainable travel patterns*
- *Allow scope for, rather than constrain, continuing development beyond 2016;*

whilst protecting and enhancing the historic character and setting of Cambridge and the important environmental qualities of the surrounding area.

These areas, including locations for 8,000 dwellings which will be required by 2016, will be subject to:

- sustainability assessments
- securing transport improvements including those identified in Policy P9/10,
- securing provision of other infrastructure as appropriate
- enhancement to landscape, habitat creation and opportunities for recreation within and adjoining the development areas
- recognising the interdependence of the Addenbrooke's, Clay Farm and Trumpington sites in providing an integrated and sustainable development for this sector of the City
- a master plan or design brief for each area identified, to be prepared jointly by the local planning authorities
- a master plan is required for the eastern sector as a whole, including Cambridge Airport and areas to the east. This must be agreed by the local planning authorities in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council before the commencement of development at Cambridge Airport. ~~The safeguarded~~ *This area should include provision for early landscaping, recreation access and biodiversity improvements*
- phasing policies in Local Plans (see Policy P9/2) which will be conditional upon changing circumstances and the availability of preferred locations.'

The amendment was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone and carried.
[Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Amendment 6

Councillor C E Shaw proposed that the Cabinet's recommendation concerning paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/4 on the location of the new settlement be amended from Longstanton/Oakington to Waterbeach, with all other necessary consequential amendments to the Structure Plan, including revised wording of Policy P9/4, to be considered by the Council at its meeting on 22nd January 2002.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor C M Ballard. On being put to the vote, it was defeated. [Voting pattern: 5 in favour, 5 abstentions, remainder against.]

Amendment 7

Councillor R B Martlew proposed that the Cabinet's recommendation concerning paragraph 9.22, Policy P9/4 on the location of the new settlement be amended to defer a decision so that Cambourne could be given more detailed consideration as the appropriate location with the implications for other Structure Plan policies also being reviewed.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor P J Downes. On being put to the vote, it was defeated. [Voting pattern: 5 in favour, 3 abstentions, remainder against.]

Amendment 8

Councillor J E Reynolds proposed that, under paragraph 9.22, the second section of Policy P9/4 be amended to make the text accord fully with his report as the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning agreed by the meeting of Cabinet on 11th December 2001; the amended wording to be as follows (additions in italics, deletions struck through):

'The new settlement will be planned to accommodate 6,000 dwellings by 2016, with capacity ~~for at least 50% expansion~~ *ultimately for 8,000 to 10,000 dwellings* in order to make a significant contribution to the longer-term needs of the Sub-Region.'

The amendment was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone and carried.
[Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Amendment 9

Councillor J E Reynolds noted that in paragraph 9.46, Policy P9/10, the sections on the Green Belt and new settlement referred to additional content to be considered/completed. He explained that additional wording was being prepared to reflect the transport strategy already set out in Chapter 8 and the detail of the development strategy proposed for the Cambridge Sub-Region and

proposed that this be considered at the meeting of Council on 22nd January 2002.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor S F Johnstone and carried.
[Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

Corrections

In addition, two corrections were noted, which would be incorporated into the revised draft to be presented to Council on 22nd January 2002:

- Paragraph 5.6, Policy P5/2 – percentages of new dwellings to be either located on previously developed land or utilising existing buildings to be reviewed, as percentage targets for individual Districts would currently not achieve the overall percentage target for the County of 50%
- Paragraph 8.37, Policy P8/10 – fifth bullet point under ‘Local Roads’ to be amended to read: ‘A1198 Papworth Everard Bypass’.

It was resolved:

- (a) to note that the preparation of the draft Structure Plan had taken place in accordance with the programme agreed by Cabinet on 3rd September 2001;
- (b) to agree the approach to key issues for the development strategy (as summarised in Section 7 of the report of the Director of Environment and Transport to Cabinet on 11th December 2001) and
 - (i) to endorse the approach to the Green Belt Review set out in the report of the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning (Appendix 1 to the report from Cabinet to Council)
 - (ii) to endorse Longstanton/Oakington as the location for a new settlement;
- (c) to endorse the draft Structure Plan as set out in Annex 1 to the report of the Director of Environment and Transport to Cabinet on 11th December 2001, subject to amendments agreed at this meeting and to further detailed revisions of policies and text to be agreed by the Council on 22nd January 2002, and to endorse the incorporation of revised wording for draft Policies P9/3 Green Belt and P9/4 New Settlement (Appendix 2 to the report from Cabinet to Council), as amended above;
- (d) to endorse the process for consultation set out in the report from Cabinet to Council.

[Voting pattern: (a), (b)(i), (c) and (d) unanimous; (b)(ii) 40 in favour, 6 against and 6 abstentions. Councillor P D Gooden asked for it to be recorded that he had voted against (b)(ii).]

Key decisions for information

- 2) Cambridge Central Library – Refurbishment Proposals
- 3) Budget 2002/03 – Cash Limits

Councillor S V Brinton asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, to provide a written answer setting out those obligations that the Council expected to be unable to meet, even with the proposed Council Tax increase, especially those relating to the education of children with special educational needs and pupils excluded from school. She asked for the shortfall in funding to be detailed if this were possible. She also asked for those non-statutory obligations included in the Council's Medium Term Service Priorities (MTSP) that would not now be funded to be detailed. Councillor Walters commented briefly on the pressures on services caused by the inadequacy of the Council's funding settlement from Government and advised that he would regard as a "key decision" any proposal not to carry out any of the Council's statutory duties. He agreed to respond more fully in writing.

- 4) Integration of Adult Services with Health

Other decisions/matters for information

- 5) Best Value Inspection of Waste Management
- 6) Annual Adoption and Permanence Report 2000/01
- 7) District Audit Management Letter 2000/01
- 8) The Education Bill

(b) Report of the meetings on 30th October and 20th November 2001

The Council received a report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 30th October and 20th November 2001.

Key decisions for information

- 1) Cambridgeshire Direct Contact Centre Procurement

In response to a question from Councillor S V Brinton, the Leader of Council, Councillor J K Walters, confirmed that proposals for the Centre would ensure compliance with all the requirements of data protection legislation, including in relation to sensitive Social Services personal records.

- 2) Heritage Resource and Cultural Centre – PFI Project

Councillor M Farrar, whilst welcoming the proposed PFI bid, asked (a) whether the new facility would be located in Huntingdon; and

(b) whether there was a fall back position to improve accommodation and storage facilities for the service in the event of the PFI bid not proceeding. Councillor R Pegram, the Cabinet member with responsibility for the Heritage service, advised that a number of sites for the Centre was currently under consideration but that no site had been chosen. In the event of the PFI bid not proceeding, any improvements would need to be subject to the availability of finance, although the possibility of commercial sponsorship could be explored.

- 3) Accident Remedies and Traffic Management Programme – Medium Sized Schemes
- 4) Single Status – Final Stage Implementation

Other decisions/matters for information

- 5) The Community Legal Services Initiative in Cambridgeshire
- 6) Cost Recovery for Additional Safety Cameras

Councillor A B Stenner asked about the comparative costs of speed cameras and light guns in identifying and deterring speeding. The Leader of the Council, Councillor J K Walters, advised that a range of products was being evaluated for possible use in the County.

- 7) Supporting People – Strategic Plan Consultation

Councillor I C Bates asked the Cabinet member for Social Services about the adequacy of the Social Services cash limit for 2002/03 in providing residential services for the elderly. Councillor J A Powley advised that the service would have great difficulty in meeting the demands placed on it but that it would do its best with the resources available. By working in partnership with adjoining local authorities it was hoped that more effective use could be made of the available resources.

- 8) Medium Term Service Priorities – Capital Programme

Councillor A J Bowen asked what projects were included in the 27% of the Education capital programme that would not now be funded. The Cabinet member for Education, Libraries and Heritage, Councillor R Wilkinson, agreed to provide a written answer.

Councillor M Farrar asked the Leader of Council what proportion of the funding allocated for corporate accommodation was reserved for the Shire Hall Club. Councillor Walters agreed to provide a written answer.

- 9) Budget Monitoring 2001/02
- 10) Options for Securing the Future of Etheldred House, Histon
- 11) Social Services Inspectorate – Spring Position Statement

- 12) Draft Revised Best Value Programme – The Next Five Years
- 13) Community Safety Best Value Review Inspection.

33. REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE ON 26th OCTOBER 2001

The Council received a report of the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 26th October 2001. The Chairman of the Committee, Councillor P A E Read, moved the recommendations, seconded by Councillor F H Yeulett. He also moved the following additions to the delegations recommended to be exercised by the Assistant Director (Planning) and by the Head of Strategic Planning in relation to land use planning development control, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Committee's report:

Addition of sixth bullet point to paragraph 1:

- *'are referred for Committee consideration in accordance with the provisions of Section 13.'*

Addition of new paragraph 13:

'Any member of the Committee or the local member(s) may request in writing (and give reasons) that the application be considered by the Development Control Committee. Such notification must be made within 21 days of circulation of the details of the application or within 7 days of being notified that it is intended that the decision will be determined under delegated powers. Before an application is referred to Committee, the Chairman of the Committee must give their consent.'

Councillor M L Leeke moved, as an amendment to the proposed new paragraph 13, that the final sentence be deleted. The Head of Legal Services advised that as the Chairman of the Development Control Committee was a non-executive member, he did not have the power to take such a decision.

On being put to the vote, Councillor Leeke's amendment was carried. [Voting pattern: majority in favour, 6 abstentions, none against.]

The Council then voted on the substantive motion as amended and resolved:

That the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be revised:

- (a) to amend and extend the delegated powers relating to land use development control planning as set out in Appendix 1 of the report of the Development Control Committee, subject to the addition of a sixth bullet point to paragraph 1:
 - *'are referred for Committee consideration in accordance with the provisions of Section 13'*

and to the addition of a new paragraph 13:

‘Any member of the Committee or the local member(s) may request in writing (and give reasons) that the application be considered by the Development Control Committee. Such notification must be made within 21 days of circulation of the details of the application or within 7 days of being notified that it is intended that the decision will be determined under delegated powers’;

- (b) to authorise the Head of Strategic Planning to exercise these powers in addition to the Assistant Director (Planning).

Revised County Development Control Scheme

It was resolved:

To adopt the revised County Development Control Scheme, including new consultation arrangements on planning applications (as set out in Appendix 2 of the report of the Development Control Committee) for implementation from 1st January 2002.

[Voting pattern: agreed without dissent.]

34. THE COUNCIL’S CONSTITUTION

The Council considered a report from the Chief Executive which recommended amendments to the Council’s Constitution in the following areas:

- Appointments to Committees
- Removal of LEA representatives from school governing bodies.

Councillor S V Brinton asked the Cabinet member for Education, Libraries and Heritage to confirm in writing that local members would be informed of all vacancies and appointments of Local Education Authority representatives to school governing bodies which related to their electoral division, and the tradition of giving priority to the appointment of local members to the governing bodies of their local school(s) and giving them priority over people who were not local members would continue. Councillor R Wilkinson agreed to reply in writing.

It was resolved:

- (i) that the Council Procedure Rules in the Council’s Constitution be amended as follows:
- (a) the following sentence be added to Paragraph 4.1:

'In very exceptional circumstances, such as the long term absence of members, the Chairman of Council may authorise a change in the membership of a Committee (including changes to the named substitute members); retrospectively all such changes shall be reported to the next meeting of the Council for ratification';

(b) Paragraph 4.2 be amended to read:

'For each committee the Council will appoint up to four named substitutes from each political group';

(c) Paragraph 4.4 (ii) be amended to read:

'(ii) after notifying the relevant Democratic Services Officer of the intended substitution before the start of the meeting';

(ii) that the Delegation No.17 on Page 71 of the Constitution to the Director of Education, Libraries and Heritage be amended to read:

'To appoint representatives of the Authority to school governing bodies and, if required, to approve their subsequent removal - in both cases the decisions are subject to the agreement of the relevant portfolio holder';

(iii) that the terms of reference of the Service Appeals Committee set out in Part 3 of the Constitution (Page 55) be amended by the addition of the following:

'To determine appeals against decisions of the Authority to remove a person from acting as the LEA's representative on the governing body of a school or other educational establishment';

(iv) that the Head of Legal Services be authorised to agree procedures for the conduct of all appeals heard by the Service Appeals Committee.

35. WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Members noted that no written questions had been submitted under Rule 9 of the Council Procedure Rules.

36. ORAL QUESTIONS

One oral question was asked under Rule 9 of the Council Procedure Rules:

- Councillor J L Huppert asked Councillor J K Walters, the Leader of the Council, about the format of information published relating to the Council's performance and about the Charterline's handling of a query relating to this information.

A full transcript of the question and response is available from the Democratic Services Division.

37. MOTIONS

Members noted that no motions had been submitted under Rule 10 of the Council Procedure Rules.

38. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

It was resolved unanimously to approve the following appointments:

- Policy Scrutiny and Audit Committee – addition of Councillors J E Coston, S J Kime and A R Mair as substitute members
- Education, Libraries and Heritage Scrutiny Committee – addition of Councillors P D Bailey, C M Ballard, M Y Chapple, M Farrar and V A Hearne-Casapieri as substitute members
- Environment and Transport Scrutiny Committee – replacement of Councillor B Hardy by Councillor A R Mair as a member of the Committee and addition of Councillors J E Coston, B Hardy, V A Hearne-Casapieri, S J Kime, R B Martlew and F H Yeulett as substitute members
- Social Services Scrutiny Committee – addition of Councillors M Y Chapple, J L Gluza, M L Leeke and A B Stenner as substitute members
- Best Value Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee – addition of Councillors S V Brinton, M Y Chapple, V A Hearne-Casapieri, M L Leeke and C E Shaw as substitute members
- Cambridge City Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee – addition of Councillor J D Jones as substitute member
- Huntingdonshire Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee – addition of Councillors J A P Eddy, A Hansard and J K Walters and removal of Councillors S B Normington and R Wilkinson as substitute members
- Fenland Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee – addition of Councillor R S G Barnwell as substitute member
- South Cambridgeshire Environment and Transport Area Joint Committee – addition of Councillors J E Coston, R B Martlew and L J Wilson as substitute members
- Staff Appeals Committee – replacement of Councillor J A P Eddy with Councillor V A Hearne-Casapieri.

Chairman