

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 11th December 2012

Time: 10.30am – 3.40pm

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor J Powley (Chairman)

Councillors: J Batchelor, I Bates, K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, D Brown, F Brown, P Brown, R Butcher, K Churchill, J Clark, N Clarke, S Count, S Criswell, M Curtis, P Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, N Guyatt, S Gymer, G Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, S Hoy, W Hunt, C Hutton, D Jenkins, S Johnstone, L Kadić, G Kenney, S King, V Lucas, I Manning, M McGuire, V McGuire, A Melton, L Nethsingha, L Oliver, T Orgee, J Palmer, P Read, P Reeve, J Reynolds, K Reynolds, T Sadiq, P Sales, S Sedgwick-Jell, C Shepherd, M Shuter, M Smith, T Stone, S Tierney, J Tuck, S van de Ven, R West, F Whelan, S Whitebread, M Williamson, G Wilson, L Wilson and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors: S Austen, N Bell, C Carter, G Heathcock, S Kindersley, R Pegram, A Pellew and K Wilkins

270. MINUTES – 16th OCTOBER 2012

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 16th October 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

271. ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

272. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Manning declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in minute 276 under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct as a member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign. Councillor Whelan declared a prejudicial interest in minute 277 and left the Chamber for the duration of this item.

273. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were received.

274. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

275. TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT – QUARTER TWO

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Resources & Performance, Councillor Count, that the recommendations as set out in minute 665 of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 27th November 2012 be approved.

Councillor Stone, as Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee, congratulated the administration on a solid report. Noting that the Council's treasury adviser had recently been reappointed following a joint procurement process exercise, Councillor Stone asked why, given that the Council managed its investments so conservatively, there was any need to appoint an external adviser. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance undertook to look into this question and to reply to Councillor Stone in writing.

It was resolved to note the Treasury Management Report, Quarter Two 2012-13.

276. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION

It was proposed by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Powley, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

The following amendment to paragraph 3b of the revised version of the Constitution Part 3B – Responsibility for Functions, The Cabinet and the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, as set out in Appendix A to the report before Council, was proposed orally by the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Councillor M McGuire, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor K Reynolds, as Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee [deleted text is shown struck through, ~~thus~~, and additional text is shown underlined, thus]:

The person or persons exercising any delegated authority shall ensure that appropriate consultation is undertaken, including consultation with the Leader, other Cabinet Members, the relevant local County Councillors ~~elected Members (including district/parish council Members where appropriate)~~ and the Chief Executive.

Following discussion, the amendment to Appendix A, on being put to the vote, was carried.

[Voting pattern: Most Conservatives in favour; Liberal Democrats, Labour, UKIP, Green member and independent member against; Chairman and one other Conservative abstained.]

In the course of further discussion, Councillor Manning, seconded by Councillor Sedgwick-Jell, proposed orally that Rule 21.3 of the revised version of the Constitution Part 4 – Rules of Procedure, Access to Information Procedure Rules, as set out in Appendix B to the report before Council, be amended to address concerns raised by the Cambridge Cycling Campaign. He proposed that a minimum period of two weeks should be allowed for consultation on the officer report and that a mechanism should be developed by which the Cambridge Cycling Campaign would be notified instantly when the officer report was published on the Council's website. After further discussion, Councillor Manning withdrew his amendment on the basis that the matter would be re-referred to the Constitution and Ethics Committee.

Following further discussion, the substantive motion, on being put to the vote, was carried and Council agreed to:

- a) Approve the following amendments to the Council's Constitution.
 - i. The deletion of Article 10 and the consequential renumbering of subsequent paragraphs

- ii. The revision of Part 3B – Responsibility for Functions, The Cabinet and the Leader’s Scheme of Delegation as set out in Appendix A to this report
 - iii. The revision of the Access to Information Procedure Rules as set out in Appendix B to this report
 - iv. Revisions to the header and footer design and information in respect of Part 4 of the Constitution
 - v. The addition of the sentence, “When a member moves a motion, he or she will speak to explain the purpose of the motion before it is seconded.” to paragraph 5.1 of Annexe C to the Council Procedure Rules
 - vi. The changing of the name of the Development Control Committee to Planning Committee, in section 1 of Part 3C of the Constitution and throughout.
- b) Authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to implement these amendments with effect from 24th December 2012, and to make any other amendment to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

[Voting pattern: Most Conservatives in favour; Liberal Democrats, Labour, UKIP, two Conservatives, Green member and independent member against; Chairman, Vice-Chairman and one other Conservative abstained.]

277. MOTIONS

Three motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

(a) Motion from Councillor P Downes

It was proposed by Councillor Downes and seconded by Councillor Bourke that:

This Council:

- notes with concern the findings of the recent Ofsted inspection of part of the Children’s Service provision, deemed to be 'inadequate';
- acknowledges that the welfare of children and young people is one of its primary responsibilities; and
- welcomes the Action Plan drawn up by officers in response to the inspection.

The Council asks the Cabinet to:

- ensure the Executive Member for Children and Young People’s Services (CYPS) takes a close personal interest in the implementation of this Action Plan; and
- ensure that the forthcoming Business Plan for 2013-14 allocates sufficient funding to this area of work so that the newly-formed social care units are not burdened with excessive case-loads.

The Council also:

- calls on the Chairman of CYPS Scrutiny Committee to make this matter a high priority in the near future.

The following amendment to Councillor Downes's motion was proposed by Councillor D Brown and seconded by Councillor Lucas [additions in bold and deletions struck through]:

This Council:

- notes with concern the findings of the recent Ofsted inspection, ~~of part of the Children's Service provision,~~ **between the 10th and 20th September 2012, of arrangements for the Protection of Children,** deemed to be 'inadequate';
- acknowledges that the welfare of children and young people is one of its primary responsibilities; and
- welcomes the Action Plan drawn up ~~by officers~~ in response to the inspection.

The Council asks the Cabinet to:

- **acknowledge that the Cabinet Member** ~~ensure the Executive Member for Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) is taking~~ **takes** a close personal interest in the implementation of this Action Plan; and
- ensure that the forthcoming Business Plan for 2013-14 allocates ~~sufficient funding~~ **appropriate resources** to this area of work. ~~so that the newly-formed social care units are not burdened with excessive case loads.~~

The Council also:

- **calls on the Chairman of CYPS Overview and Scrutiny Committee to make this matter a high priority in the near future.** ~~consider~~ how Overview and Scrutiny can contribute to the action plan and process; and
- calls on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to work with the regional and national sector-led improvement structures to provide an effective review of how the actions being taken are impacting on actual practice.

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

[Voting pattern: all except one Liberal Democrat in favour on a show of hands]

Following further discussion, the substantive motion was put to the vote and carried unanimously, as follows:

This Council:

- notes with concern the findings of the recent Ofsted inspection, between the 10th and 20th September 2012, of arrangements for the Protection of Children, deemed to be 'inadequate';

- acknowledges that the welfare of children and young people is one of its primary responsibilities; and
- welcomes the Action Plan drawn up in response to the inspection.

The Council asks the Cabinet to:

- acknowledge that the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) is taking a close personal interest in the implementation of this Action Plan; and
- ensure that the forthcoming Business Plan for 2013-14 allocates appropriate resources to this area of work.

The Council also:

- calls on the Chairman of CYPS Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider how Overview and Scrutiny can contribute to the action plan and process; and
- calls on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to work with the regional and national sector-led improvement structures to provide an effective review of how the actions being taken are impacting on actual practice.

(b) Motion from Councillor S Whitebread

It was proposed by Councillor Whitebread and seconded by Councillor Nethsingha that:

This Council notes:

- the Government's pledge to be the greenest government ever;
- the significant role local authorities have to play in this, by helping the UK to meet its targets set out in the 2008 Climate Change Act;
- the view of the House of Commons Committee on Climate Change that "a failure to secure reductions (in CO2 emissions) across the areas where local authorities have significant influence would leave emissions above levels required to meet (national) carbon budgets"; and
- that Cambridge is a world leader in climate change research, with the University research centres, British Antarctic Survey, numerous Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and clean tech companies all based here.

Council therefore regrets:

- the Council's deletion of the 'climate change' section under implications in Cabinet and Committee reports; and
- recent comments from the Leader of the Council that "global warming may not exist and if it does is not caused by human activity".

Council calls on the Cabinet to:

- affirm its commitment to tackling climate change; and
- reinstate a "climate change and environment" section under implications in Cabinet and Committee reports.

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

[Voting pattern: Labour, Liberal Democrats, Green and Independent in favour; Conservatives and UKIP against; Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained].

(c) Motion from Councillor T Sadiq

It was proposed by Councillor Sadiq and seconded by Councillor Sales that:

Council notes:

- that in response to a written question in February 2012 it was reported that there were 853 employees directly employed by Cambridgeshire County Council who were paid below the National Living Wage at the then rate of £7.20 per hour. The new rate is £7.45 per hour outside London.
- that the idea of the Living Wage commands cross-party support and business support. The Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, has said that "Paying the London Living Wage is not only morally right, but makes good business sense too" and Linklaters said "We want good people and the Living Wage is a good way of getting and keeping them."
- that several local authorities like Birmingham, Cardiff and Newcastle have become Living Wage employers.

This Council calls on Cabinet:

- to carry out an assessment of how Cambridgeshire County Council could become an accredited Living Wage employer, what it would cost, how quickly it could be done, and what mechanisms it could use to encourage contractors and other Cambridgeshire employers to also pay the National Living Wage.
- to prepare a report for consideration by Cabinet and Council as soon as possible.

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

[Voting pattern: Labour, Liberal Democrats, Green and Independent in favour; Conservatives and UKIP against; Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained].

278. QUESTIONS

a) Oral Questions

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

- In response to a question from Councillor Reeve, the Leader undertook to task officers to assure him that political affiliation had not been used either wholly or partly as the assessment criteria for fitness to be a foster parent, and undertook to respond to Councillor Reeve in writing.
- In response to a question from Councillor van de Ven, the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning undertook to look into what had been proposed recently by a coalition of bus operators in relation to free transport for job seekers nationally, and then to respond to Councillor van de Ven in writing.
- In response to a question from Councillor Sir P Brown, the Cabinet Member for Learning agreed to meet Councillor Brown at Stukeley Meadow Primary School with an officer from Safer Routes to School in order to look at parking on site and in the road outside the school. He also undertook to find out whether there had been any changes made to the catchment area of the school, and to respond to Councillor Brown in writing.
- In response to a question from Councillor Brooks-Gordon, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to meet Councillor Brooks-Gordon at the NIAB development to look at the roads and discuss what could be done about problems being experienced there.
- In response to a question from Councillor G Wilson, the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning undertook to arrange for an officer to supply Councillor Wilson with copies of the transport assessments which had been undertaken when the development site on the edge of Godmanchester had been considered in the last Huntingdonshire District Council core strategy. He also undertook to ensure that the modelling undertaken would be included within the transport assessments for the Godmanchester and Alconbury developments, and to ensure that the completed transport assessments were forwarded to local and neighbouring members in due course.
- In response to a question from Councillor Manning, the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning agreed to walk with Councillor Manning and local residents round the area of the new Chesterton rail station, including the Bramblefields local nature reserve.
- In response to a question from Councillor Nethsingha, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to follow up with her outside the meeting the question of the nature of the current gritting regime in Adams Road.
- In response to a question from Councillor Downes, the Cabinet Member for Learning agreed to clarify the long paragraph, which set out the reasons for changes in Special Educational Needs funding methodology, within the letter that had been sent to Cambridgeshire parents about the changes in school funding; to make that clarification available to schools promptly; and to encourage schools to pass the information on to the relevant parents.
- In response to a question from Councillor Gymer, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure undertook to check how up to date the map of gritting routes on the Council's website was, and agreed to ensure that proactive measures were taken to keep the road network clear.

- In response to a question from Councillor Sadiq, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to look again at the status of the South Area Parking Review, and at consideration of the views expressed in consultation responses and other proposals that might be forthcoming from residents.
- In response to a question from Councillor Jenkins, the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning agreed that he or officers would be happy to convey to the Highways Agency the views of Councillor Jenkins and residents on the A14 Girton junction eastbound works to be carried out under the Pinch Point programme, and agreed to arrange a meeting for Councillor Jenkins with officers to discuss his and his residents' concerns.
- In response to a question from Councillor Sales, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance undertook to find out from officers the correct route that the annual report on the County Farms Estate should take, and to ensure that Councillor Sales received a copy of the report.

b) Written Questions

Three written questions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2, as set out in **Appendices C and D**.

279. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

It was proposed by the Chairman, Councillor Powley, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor K Reynolds, and agreed unanimously to replace Councillor Shona Johnstone with Councillor John Clark on the Audit and Accounts Committee.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 11th DECEMBER 2012
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Former County Councillor Bob Burke

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of former County Councillor Bob Burke. Councillor Burke served on the County Council from 1985 to 1998, representing the Peterborough Division of Werrington, on behalf of the Conservative Party. He had previously been a member of the "old" Peterborough and Huntingdon County Council from 1971 to 1974. Councillor Burke was Vice-Chairman of the County Council from 1989 to 1991 and Chairman from 1991 to 93.

High Sheriff Nominations

Councillor Victor Lucas has been nominated in the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court as prospective High Sheriff for the County of Cambridgeshire for the year 2015/16. He will be formally appointed in March 2015 when Her Majesty The Queen uses a bodkin to prick his name on the list of nominations.

Gayle Gorman, Service Director: Learning

Gayle Gorman, the Council's Service Director: Learning, leaves the Council at the end of December 2012. The Chairman, on behalf of the Council, wishes Gayle every success for the future and thanks her for her contribution and service to both the Council and the children and young people of Cambridgeshire.

AWARDS

Making Assets Count

The Council has won the Association of Chief Estates Surveyors 2012 award for Excellence in Property Management for its work on Making Assets Count in Cambridgeshire.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

First Phase of Northstowe Granted Outline Approval

The first phase of Northstowe new town has been granted outline planning approval by the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee. This represents a significant step towards delivering much needed housing within Cambridgeshire and will help to support future economic growth. The first phase will comprise 1,500 new homes, a Primary School, shops and five hectares of employment land. A start on site could be achieved in 2013, with the first houses being occupied from 2014. County and District officers will continue to work with the Joint Promoters to ensure that Northstowe is an exemplar development and an attractive community for residents and businesses.

First jobs approved for Enterprise Zone

Planning permission has recently been granted for the first building on the Alconbury Enterprise Zone. The planning permission is for conversion of two existing buildings to house a demonstration and highly innovative recycling plant.

The planning decision was made in just 39 days reflecting close co-operation between the County Council and Huntingdonshire District Council and shows the benefits of the Enterprise Zone designation. It is expected that many thousands more jobs will follow this first occupier.

Super Connected Cambridge

The Chancellor of the Exchequer has announced that Cambridge is one of twelve cities awarded capital resources to bring faster broadband to the City. This proposal will boost the local economy by delivering broadband speeds greater than 80-100 mbps for businesses, speeding up residential connectivity, and providing high speed wireless across the urban Cambridge area.

The successful bid has been developed by Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council working together with MPs and the greater Cambridge business and academic community to cover the urban Cambridge area where the density of properties places high demands on broadband coverage.

It is part of the Connecting Cambridgeshire programme to bring better broadband to homes and businesses across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, particularly in rural areas. Super-connected Cambridge will enhance and spread technology, innovation and enterprise across the county to boost the local economy. Better broadband connectivity will also support the health and wellbeing of residents by ensuring communities can access digital services and online learning opportunities, as well as working from home.

MESSAGES

Retiring Foster Carers

Foster carers provide loving, supportive homes for Cambridgeshire's looked after children and young people. They work around the clock to help those in their care achieve their potential and, in many cases, prepare them for a move on to permanent homes or independence. Along the way, the Council's foster carers face many challenging situations but they never fail to put the best interests of the child first.

Kim and John Sumsion have been fostering since 1998 and retired this year. They worked closely with the department, young people and their families in promoting and giving young people opportunities to develop skills to enable them to live independently and fully participate in society. Kim and John have shown total commitment in providing a warm, nurturing, caring, safe and fun-filled home life where they recognised young people's emotional and educational needs.

The Council would like to thank Kim and John for their contribution and wish them all the very best for their retirement.

Sharing eGovernment learnings with senior government officials from Danang City, Vietnam

On 7th November the Council warmly welcomed a delegation of senior government officials from Danang City, Vietnam. The 15 delegates learnt about the work Cambridgeshire County Council is doing to deliver services digitally, including how the Council engages with its communities through Shape Your Place and how, through EU funded projects, it is addressing the digital inclusion agenda by supporting citizens with the required skills and access to go online. The delegates took back with them a number of insights and ideas on how they could tackle the similar challenges that they are experiencing.

The Duke and Duchess of Cambridge

Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge visited Cambridge on 28th November. The Chairman of the Council, Councillor John Powley, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Nick Clarke, and the Chief Executive, Mark Lloyd, had the pleasure, on behalf of the Council, of meeting them when they visited Manor Community College.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Council, would also like to take the opportunity of congratulating their Royal Highnesses on their happy news.

CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN ACTIVITIES: 17 OCTOBER – 11 DECEMBER 2012

Chairman's engagements

October

- 50th Anniversary Cromwell Museum, Huntingdon.
- March Town Council Civic Service, St Peters Church, March.
- Opening of New Trinity School, Foxton, Cambs.

November

- Citizenship Ceremonies, Shire Hall.
- Mayor of Wisbech "At Home", Hill Street, Wisbech.
- Remembrance Day Wreath Laying at Shire Hall.
- The Addenbrooke's Charitable Trust Annual Lecture and Reception 2012 "The Gift of Life", Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge.
- Remembrance Sunday in Huntingdon, Wreath laying.
- Veterans Day Ceremony, Cambridge American Cemetery, Wreath Laying.
- Cambridge and District Citizens Advice Bureau, Annual General Meeting, Cambridge.
- Children's Centre, Bottisham.
- South Cambs Chairman's Reception, Wellcome Trust, Hinxton, Cambs.
- R.A.F. Mildenhall and R.A.F. Lakenheath Thanksgiving Service, Ely Cathedral.
- Mayor of Peterborough Civic Service, All Saints Church, Paston, Peterborough.
- Visit of Duke and Duchess of Cambridge, Manor School, Cambridge.
- Rural Cambs Citizens Advice Bureau, South Fens Business Centre, Chatteris.

December

- Chairman's Reception, Shire Hall.
- Rehearsal for Kings College Carol Service.
- Kings College Chapel, A Service of Lessons and Carols for Schools. Read Lesson.

- Citizenship Ceremony, Shire Hall.
- Huntingdonshire District Council, Civic Service of Nine Lessons and Carols, Read Lesson.
- R.A.F. Lakenheath and Mildenhall Winter Yuletide Reception.
- Mayor of St Neots Christmas Carol Concert.
- Wood Green's Christmas Carol Concert

Vice-Chairman's engagements

October

- Citizenship Ceremonies, Shire Hall
- Wood Green Animals Charity Annual Reception, House of Commons
- HRH The Princess Royal visit to the Scott Polar Research Institute, Cambridge

November

- Mayor of Cambridge's Reception 2012, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge
- Citizenship Ceremony, Shire Hall

December

- Mayor of March's Civic Carol Service – St. Peter's Church, High Street, March
- Citizenship Ceremony, Shire Hall

COUNTY COUNCIL – 11th DECEMBER 2012

ORAL QUESTION TIME

1. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke, from Councillor P Reeve

Good afternoon Chairman, thank you. My question's to the Leader of the Council and it's, bearing in mind the excellent and I'm sure he will agree with me that foster carers within Cambridgeshire and across the country provide an excellent and essential service that can't be duplicated in any other way. My question for you is bearing in mind the appalling discrimination that we saw in Rotherham, of which Government Ministers and Shadow Government Ministers alike have berated and condemned, can you give me your absolute assurance that in this Council in Cambridgeshire we have not used political affiliation either wholly or partly as the assessment criteria for who's a fit foster parent and instead we've used the criteria - I'm sure it's a lot more technical - but the criteria of love and provision and guidance and support which are all the essential elements of fostering and political affiliation shouldn't be a part and I'd like your assurance it hasn't been a part of the decision making process here.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke

Thank you. All discrimination of any sort is not acceptable including political discrimination. I cannot give you an assurance today that that does not happen but I'll be tasking officers to assure me that that has not happened after this event and I will come back to you in writing. It should not happen, we will not allow it to happen but I just don't know what's happened in the past but we will look into it. I cannot believe that to be true for one moment.

2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor S van de Ven

I have a question for Councillor Bates. Thank you very much for taking up my question at our last Council meeting about the prospect of using concessionary fares on trains. As you know the most recent Lib Dem budget amendment included a scheme for free transport for young people who are not in education, employment or training, that was last February. I was pleased to learn this week that a coalition of bus operators including Stagecoach nationally have joined forces to provide free transport to job seekers. Also in Cambridgeshire, as I think I have mentioned before, First Capital Connect offers free rail travel for people starting jobs via Job Centre Plus assistance until their first pay cheque. So I'm wondering if you might be amenable to going back to the proposal for free transport for young people not in education, employment or training, in order to address the issues which are still unresolved. So that would include young people seeking training and education but also those in areas without public transport network, so if you don't have a bus or a train that provision is no good to you. And I think there are some areas where we could make this happen, maybe through Cambridgeshire Future Transport. Just going back to what Councillor Sadiq said a moment ago we are dealing all the time with consequences of poverty and I don't think there's any reason why councils can't be innovative and why we should wait for governments to find answers. So that is my question.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

Thank you Mr Chairman, I'm not aware of the announcement for Stagecoach at this moment in time and certainly happy to look into what actually in detail as to precisely what is being said and what is being suggested, and certainly I think the sensible thing is and the sensible approach is first for me to have a look into what has precisely been said, precisely what has been proposed and certainly come back to you in writing, I think, with an answer once I have undertaken that with the appropriate support from the officers.

3. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor Sir P Brown

Thank you Mr Chairman, my question is to Councillor Harty and I suspect although it is my question it's quite relevant to every member in this room, if you have a primary school in your division. The Governors at Stukeley Meadows Primary School have been voicing serious concerns about road safety outside their school, particularly at dropping off time in the morning and picking up time in the evening. The Stukeley Meadows School is on a side road on a housing estate, it has outside double yellow lines, single yellow lines, zigzag lines, a pelican crossing, a lollipop lady and yet we still have problems, with parents parking on all those lines both sides of the road at all times when they are picking up their children. The Governors of the school have approached myself and Councillor Kadic to see what we can do about this, bearing in mind that they think this is a County Council problem. Councillor Kadic and myself have a meeting with the Governors next week, to see how the issue can be resolved. The Governors are extremely worried about forthcoming accidents that might happen to children and what are the County Council going to do about it? My question is does the Council have a policy on such issues? If it does have a policy what is it and can it be conveyed to the Governors and the Headteachers? If not what other things can he say to me that I can take back to reassure the Governors, and secondly can he please tell me has there been any increase in the catchment area of the school?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Thank you Mr Chairman and thank you for the question. Car parking of course is a responsibility of the school itself within the school grounds and where we can we offer advice and guidance to parents, particularly if they're looking at Safer Routes to School for example, and the opportunity to encourage walking and cycling. But the responsibility for driving and parking cars outside the school is with the parents and those parents are the people that have to be addressed and I would say to you that this happens, it doesn't just happen at Stukeley Meadows, it happens also in other parts of the County. Now I'm not aware that we have as such a policy that you can turn over and use but what I would say to you, I am quite happy to come up with you and meet on site and have a look at what is happening on site and the way that it's being treated in terms of parking on the adjacent road and also bring an officer for Safer Routes to School to have a look as well. What was the other question? I'm not aware of any changes that have been made to the catchment area but I will find out for you and come back to you.

4. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor B Brooks-Gordon

Thank you Mr Chair, this is a question about the adoption of roads with the new development, and there's a history obviously in other parts of Cambridgeshire where there have been wranglings between developers and the County Council or the

responsible Councils for the adoption of roads, the residents always suffer. That's now happening in my ward with the NIAB development, with inconsiderate parking in the cycle lanes, now those roads are not adopted, I want us to be able to work together to deal with this so we can head off some of those historical problems. So my question is – and I apologise for not giving further advance of this question because I only did learn about some of these issues this week and then investigated them further. It creates a problem and if we can head it off now it will improve things in the longer term, and be less costly longer term because of course people we can then improve model shift and people using their bicycles to use those cycle lanes especially children going to school. So has the, can the Cabinet member tell me, if the Council is starting to develop a policy on the adoption of roads in all of the development that is going to, the development already beginning, over and above its old policy that has caused problems in the past? Because this development is so enormous it obviously does merit it.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

This is obviously a real issue which has affected a number of places in the past and we want to try and head it off in the future, and one of the issues that has come up before the Cabinet in recent meetings are local development plans for the future in a number of our District Council areas and one of the points that we made very, very strongly is this point about road adoptions and District Councils making sure that bonds or something like that are actually taken out when development takes place in order to make sure that if the Developer finishes and moves away and a road isn't adopted then there are funds in place to do something. So it is an important issue that we are trying to make sure doesn't arise again in the future. As far as the current situation is concerned in the area that you represent, I'm very happy to come out and have a look at the road with you and discuss what we can do about that particular circumstance, if that would be helpful.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee, from Councillor B Brooks-Gordon

Yes, Mr Chair. I'm very grateful for that to Councillor Orgee, very grateful indeed because of course this development spans three boundaries, it's an area where the AJC would have been a fantastic forum for discussion in days of yore but sadly we won't have that so it is an area where we need to think ahead and start having a consultation group set up and I'm grateful to Councillor Orgee for that.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

If Councillor Brooks-Gordon will get in touch with me afterwards we can fix up a date for a meeting.

5. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor T Stone

Thank you Chair. My question is also for Councillor Orgee and it concerns notification of traffic and planning issues. We've discovered this week that Mr Cameron now really knows about the A14, which is a big announcement and a lot of people out there think why can't he put in a shovel immediately, we know we need a road let's build it. Life just isn't like that. We've also had announcements of lights along the guided bus maintenance tracks, we've had announcements about new cycleways, we

shall be having in due course announcements about minor highways improvements. Delighted that we actually got the opportunity to talk about residual funding which will be new, or unexpected should I say, issues for our roads but what is happening with all these announcements is that the people out there are saying why can't we have one of those for us now, here, something different which hasn't been planned. We already know in my neck of the woods that the A505 will be blocked solid by 2021, that's been known for some time. We also know that the A1307 has a pressure group operating because it wants more safety on the A1307 now, and there are lots of other bits and pieces which are coming in which are actually being paid for by Parish Councils because the County can't afford it. Part one of the beginning of the question. We have the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan, which takes us up to 2020 something. We have the County working to support local plans as they evolve, we know that we have annual network plans for maintenance and highway improvements. So here's the question: could I ask that when making announcements about new investments they should be put in the context of plans, both long term and short term, or if they are not in that context where the additional money is coming from? Perhaps it's Councillor Clarke's money tree. That would not only manage the expectations of local people but also of members and could we also amend the Local Transport Plan when developments demand? It's a long introduction but really quite simple.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

Yes, I think I got most of that one. I think there is a genuine issue here and that is that there are a number of different announcements at different times and people wonder why, say Cambridge is getting this money or why some other scheme is going ahead and people don't always realise the various pots of money where this is coming from. There is a paper going to Cabinet next week and where there are a number, I think it's over £2m, going to various schemes in Cambridge and some of the villages immediately north of Cambridge. Well that's all coming out as I understand it of development money, Section 106 money, so that's a separate pot. We've also got the minor highways improvement scheme which is totally funded by the County with some support from Parish Councils and other Councils as well. So what we've got are different pots of money with decisions being made at different times being announced and I can understand why the public doesn't realise perhaps where one pot of money has come from, where another pot of money's come from, why this announcement is being made now, why another announcement is being made at another time. I do remember going back a little bit to the locally funded minor highways schemes during this current financial year where in several areas local Councils met, made decisions, recommendations discussed and approved and the South Cambs Panel had to meet twice and so came at a later date and the Cambridge City proposals came at a later date still. So from that one overall County scheme there are actually three separate announcements in time varying over several months but basically all coming from the same pot of money. So I certainly take your point about when we make announcements, I think they ought to be very, very clear as to just where the funding is coming from and for what purpose. I hope that's broadly answered the question but you've got a supplementary if I haven't.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor T Stone

Does the Local Transport Plan need amending and could it be amended as it goes on? We've got this very long term Local Transport Plan which says what we are

trying to do. If we change our minds when things happen, because of events, should we not change our Local Transport Plan to reflect that?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

I've been told to say yes. Basically we've got a very long term strategy at the minute that is being worked on by a group of County, City and South Cambs District Councillors and that is taking us way beyond 2031 into the very distant future, so that's a very, very long term aspiration and I'm sure what we need to do is to make sure that various plans, the shorter term Local Transport Plan and those plans come together so that we have a coherent both shorter scale plan and a longer term plan.

6. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor G Wilson

Thank you Chairman, this is a question for Councillor Ian Bates. In Godmanchester a developer has just submitted a revised planning application for over 750 houses, a new two-form entry primary school, new shops and offices on the edge of Godmanchester. Will the Cabinet member send me and Councillor Dutton, who's the other member for Huntingdon East and Godmanchester, the transport assessments which were undertaken when the site was considered in the last Huntingdonshire District Council core strategy, which would have been prepared by County Council officers? And secondly confirm that the transport assessment of the current proposal will take account of the new mix of development, which includes more car journeys from the new offices being proposed and from the bigger primary school. A realistic assessment of the benefit of some of the measures the developer is talking about, including lots of buses and the impact of other major developments that are going on in Godmanchester and Huntingdon and in particular the ones at Alconbury Weald that the Chairman mentioned, where we are hoping that thousands of jobs will be created in the next few years.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

Thank you Mr Chairman, and thank you Councillor Wilson for advance notice of the question. Certainly I would be only to pleased to convey that information to yourself and Councillor Dutton as well, and I'll ask the officers, obviously you are going back more than one or two years when that original core strategy was developed, so I will ask the officers to as they say dig it out of the records and forward it to you in due course. In answer to your second question I think you are possibly aware that the information was provided I think on Friday to Huntingdonshire District Council, so it is days old and obviously the County Council officers will look at those transport assessments as a result of that document which has just come in. Obviously it is too early days to say precisely what outcome that would be, because they need to do that assessment, take into consideration all the developments which have changed and obviously they will look about the Post Street junctions, they will look about the business park, the size of the school which has increased in size, so all of that will be taken into account of the doing the transport assessment. Remember of course the modelling is done is the same sort of model which happens in other parts of the County so it will be consistent in its approach both not just for the Godmanchester Bearscroft development but others as well and obviously I'll take back the Alconbury, I'm sure it would have been included but I'll ensure that it is included within that transport assessment. When that's finished and it will take some time to do, you'll be only to pleased to ask the officers to forward both yourself and Councillor Dutton and other members because I think one of the things that was mentioned actually was of

course that it has a greater impact sometimes, my division for instance is fairly close as well, and other members will be in the room like Sir Peter Brown, so I will ensure that other members are also informed of what that assessment actually comes back.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor G Wilson

I have given Councillor Bates notice of the supplementary so he could just answer it but I feel that I ought to just ask it. If the traffic assessment indicates, as I suspect it will, that there will be increased congestion in Godmanchester and the Huntingdon ring road, will he make sure that officers recommend rejection of the development, or if not ensure that mock traffic levels are monitored and if traffic congestion is predicted to increase that he will either stop the development or ensure that levels of development are scaled and phased approvals are given as at Northstowe where we are controlling the amount of traffic on to the A14.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

Thank you Mr Chairman, it will be too early for me to comment on that matter as the assessment's not been done, when it's done I'm sure we will be making comments.

7. Question to Councillor M McGuire as Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel from Councillor V Lucas

Thank you Chairman. This is a question for Councillor McGuire as Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel. Could Councillor McGuire remind us of the name of that other Sheriff, the Police and Crime Commissioner. I've been contacted by several Parish Councillors in my division who are wondering who it is, because by now they would have expected to hear in previous years from the Police Authority, and knowing that I was formerly a member of the former Police Authority, with regard to a consultation on the precept and being able to comment on perhaps the priorities that police were going to have in order to underpin the budget.

Reply from Councillor M McGuire as Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel

Chairman, yes I'm sure that I and many other people around here could actually give you the name of the Police Commissioner which is Sir Graham Bright. For those of you not familiar, think Sweet'N Lo, because he does those little things for his business. I can also tell you Chairman as of today it's been formally announced that the deputy Police Commissioner is Mr Brian Ashton.

Supplementary Question to Councillor M McGuire as Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel from Councillor V Lucas

Thank you Chairman, thank you for that very bright answer. With the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel, which I think is some time in January, will the public have an opportunity of putting questions to the Police and Crime Commissioner and possibly their deputy as well?

Reply from Councillor M McGuire as Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel

Chairman, I can't give you an answer to that question because the agenda for the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel has not been determined. We have got a scheduled meeting on January, early January, I'm not sure of the date off the top of my head but it's somewhere around January the 5th. The Police and Crime Panel is

a meeting of, is a joint committee of the authorities within the policing area of Cambridgeshire, and we also have two independent co-opted members. It is a meeting held in public, there is no requirement for us to take questions to the Police Commissioner or to his deputy. I don't even know that they are going to be attending, Councillor Lucas, and to my knowledge we have not determined the agenda for that meeting.

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

Thank you Chair. My question is for Councillor Bates on local impacts to East Chesterton from the rail station. Could he just confirm to me that he is keenly aware, and I would actually just like to thank him publicly for the amount he has been involved in this as a local member in the process, but can he just confirm to me that he is aware of the two major concerns which are around overspill parking from the station and the Bramblefields local nature reserve, and on those two points can he confirm that we do have money allocated to combat the parking problem if arises, or if we want to do it in advance, and can you just confirm that there are no plans to tarmac over Bramble fields as has been suggested in some quarters.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

Thank you Mr Chairman and thank you Councillor Manning, certainly I think you have invited me to have a walk around that area, I will be happy to take up that offer that will be the new year rather than on a cold winter's night. I can confirm that there are no plans at the moment to tarmac over that area and obviously when it comes to parking at what I call consequences of, obviously we will take all of that into account. It is crucial for the development of Cambridgeshire as you know to develop that station but obviously there is impact on other areas which we will take full account of in due course. I'm happy to walk with you and some of your residents I know would like to join us and I'm happy for that to happen in the new year.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor I Manning

Just a brief one. I'd just like him to just, he's aware of two specific projects that will mitigate the impacts on the station, and obviously benefit the area, one is the Chisholm cycle bridge, and the other one is the cycle campaign's proposal to block off Nuffield Road, which has support from local businesses, the local school and the medical centre. Will he just confirm that he is keeping an open mind on both those proposals and if you could indicate that he supports them it will be even better but if he can just indicate that he is keeping an open mind, specifically on Nuffield Road and the Chisholm bridge.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

I can certainly confirm that I'm going to have an open mind and certainly I will be fully aware of all the issues as have been identified by Councillor Manning and fully aware and so are the officers as well within this project.

9. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor L Nethsingha

Thank you. My question is to Councillor Orgee. Back in July I asked Councillor Orgee for his support in improving the gritting regime for Adams Road, a key cycle

route from the City Centre out to the west Cambridge site. I was very disappointed to learn in late November that no change was planned for the gritting of this route and I have subsequently discovered that the policy on which gritting priorities are decided includes no mention of cycling at all. In a City where over a fifth of the journeys are made by bicycle this is a failure to keep the transport system working for a substantial section of the community. The ability of those of us who live in the City to get around by bike also has a significant knock on effect for those trying to commute into and out of the City. On the occasions when I get into my car to drive my daughter to school rather than going by bike I add to the level of congestion for everybody who has to travel in by car regularly. I have already received several complaints and photographs of cyclists slipping on the ice, following the light snowfall last week. Please could Councillor Orgee review this route urgently again and consider increasing the gritting for this area of Cambridge, as the current system is not working. If he is not willing to review the route this year, please could he come and meet with residents to explain why the route is not on the primary network?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

Yes, Councillor Nethsingha did ask this question at the July meeting and we did have a look at this route in context of all the other routes in Cambridge. There is some gritting that takes place on this route and she will know that we did actually increase the gritting on cycle routes going out to west Cambridge, that's a new route, and cycle routes to many other surrounding villages. So we have actually doubled the gritting on cycle routes in the whole area in this new regime and we have been able to do that within existing budgets.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor L Nethsingha

I do because I am very puzzled by that because my information from the Council officers was that no change had been made to the gritting on this route. So perhaps Councillor Orgee would like to agree to follow this up with me afterwards and find out whether he's correct or I'm correct?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

Happy to.

10. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor P Downes

Thank you. My question is to Councillor Harty. The distribution of funding to schools within Cambridgeshire has changed this year, as you know and the changes are causing turbulence and concern, as those of us who are governors of primary schools and secondary schools know only too well. The reason is that the Government centrally has dictated the way in which funding is distributed and I would like to thank you publicly for signing the letter to the Minister drawing his attention to these concerns. I would also like to thank the officers who have given schools a good explanation of basic funding problems but there is still one element which is causing concern and it is concern to governors and to teachers and to parents and I've had a lot of representations on this matter. It's to do with special educational needs funding, now you did sign a letter which has been sent out to a lot of individuals who have brought this to your attention, and it contains a paragraph which in my view is unclear

as to the real reasons behind the change in special educational needs funding. It's causing concern in schools, they have already had one Cambridgeshire academy which has said that it doesn't want to have any children with special educational needs because it can't afford to pay the costs and I think that academy has got a fairly firm rebuff from officers saying that they can't do that. So my question to you is this, would you either now in public give us an explanation of the special educational needs funding methodology, or if that's a bit much for two minutes, would you like to write it out in a way in which we can use it to meet the requests that we have from the heads, governors and parents?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Thank you Councillor Downes for those few words. We have talked about this particular issue regarding the SEN funding and the process and the new formula that is there and it has caused turbulence and concern, and I'm aware of that. Through our discussion we have also agreed that it needs to have, this particular letter has a fairly long paragraph which needs to have further clarifying certain items and also understanding of that paragraph that's been issued, and I will certainly look at the paragraph and to seek clearer understanding and happy to respond back to you by letter.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor P Downes

I think, if I may say so, it's parents of children with Special Educational statements who are confused about what is going to happen and when. So if you could make that available promptly, and encourage schools to inform the relevant parents so that they are reassured.

11. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor S Gymer

Thank you chair, I'll try and keep it brief. I'd like to ask Councillor Orgee, and I'm sorry for not giving you fair warning although I think we might be going over ground already covered. With the report of a harsh winter predicted would it be possible to be more proactive in keeping the network going? I particularly want to point out that the website is not up to date with relevant information, particularly the gritting routes, they are the old version, it's not the new version that's up there and again, like Councillor Nethsingha, we're getting conflicting information from the website and from officers. The other thing, and it's great that we can now tweet about gritting routines, I have noticed, but it's things like when we bother as either Councillors or Parish Clerks or even an ordinary member of the public to report a pothole, it's not that we are making it up, it's a fact that it's there. And then you get something that says "do not reply" or "referred" and it's not actually very helpful, people don't know what's happening to it, they don't see the pothole being filled, so please can you make it easier for people to interact with Highways but also be proactive and when people report things that we are actually on top of it quickly. Case in point, I've reported a pothole, and now it's a dangerous pothole, according to Councillor Jenkins because time has elapsed.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

Just a point about the gritting teams, last Wednesday they were out county-wide at 4am in the morning, gritting all the roads that are on our list and the conditions in South Cambridgeshire were such that they went out and did a second run in South

Cambridgeshire at 6 o'clock that morning. So I think I'd like to use this opportunity to say thank you very much to the gritting teams because they've been out on a number of occasions already this winter and I'm sure they'll be out a number more. Yes, there are some problems with the website, I think it's only fair to acknowledge that, and we are actually working on that at the minute because yes it's quite clear that some of the responses that people get back are not appropriate and don't convey any information one way or the other. It's important to keep people up to date with exactly what is going on and I'll check about the map on the website as well.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor S Gymer

Can we be proactive about keeping things going?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

Yes we will and Councillor Clarke and myself will be going over the gritters in due course.

12. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor J Reynolds

Thank you Chairman, this is a question for Councillor Bates. Can I thank Councillor Bates for visiting last July the area in Girton which was subject to some recent flooding, some 25 dwellings and a lot of land. As local member I've been pressing for a speedy action to agree and implement a permanent solution to prevent any further flooding of the homes, gardens etc in that area. Can he tell me what action he has taken along with officers and other authorities to deliver as soon as possible a solution acceptable to local residents?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

Thank you Mr Chairman, and thank you for the advance warning of that question. County Council Highways along with the flood defence team here are working certainly closely with the Environment Agency, with South Cambs District Council and with the Parish Council and the Highways Authority, the Highways Authority of course responsibility for the A14 which is close to this particular area. There is a meeting organised on the 18th December between County Council officers and the Environment Agency to see where we're going, what progress has been made. As you know there was a drop-in session fairly recently which was well attended by local residents. So I would hope that following the meeting on the 18th December that we will be able to take things forward. That modelling which will inevitably have to be taking place I think will be available to us in February. So I would hope after the meeting and the modelling over that time, by February we should have a way forward, I would hope.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor J Reynolds

Thank you Chairman, a quite simple one and this leads on. It has been identified by residents that the flooding problem has been caused by service pipe work, and an inadequate river capacity on the bridge between Girton and Oakington Road. Can Councillor Bates help me, have officers with the Environment Agency and other

partners concluded that the service pipe work is the only cause of flooding, or are they still looking at possible solutions to prevent flooding from other areas in that vicinity?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

Thank you Mr Chairman. I think the simple answer is to that is we believe at this moment in time that it is only those pipes, and not necessarily on just that bridge but on maybe other bridges as well. I'm unaware of any other what they call obstacle in that particular area. So I think it is the pipes but it's not just the one bridge I'm assured.

13. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor T Sadiq

Thank you very much Chair. It's a short question, it's only two pages. It's a question for Councillor Orgee. Could the Councillor give me his view as to the status of the South Area Parking Review following the recent exhibitions of various proposals that were put to local residents? I have to say that from the perspective of my residents near the station, there's a great deal of disappointment about the fact that various proposals that have been consulted on by the local residents' association were not up for consideration and there seemed to be a narrowing of the options.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

Thanks very much, I'm first of all conscious that this whole process has been rather slow, to put it mildly, and I'm sorry to hear that there's a feeling that some views haven't really been properly taken into account. I'll look at it and get back to you, I think that's the best way forward.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor T Sadiq

Thank you I'm reassured by that response. Some of my residents some years ago proposed the extension of double yellow lines at the junction of Rustat Road and Flamsteed Road and at the time they were told that this wasn't possible because double yellow lines had to be a standard length. Now we hoped that those kind of issues could be taken in as part of the South Area Parking Review, there might be some flexibility that could be applied. Can I ask for his assurance that notwithstanding the pace of the South Area Parking Review that if residents were to come forward with a similar proposal that they would be looked on with more sympathy this time.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

Thanks very much, last night as Councillor Whitebread said I was actually at a meeting about parking in a particular area of Cambridge and issues such as that were looked at. I'd be happy to look at that again in your context.

14. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor D Jenkins

Thank you Chair, I thought you were never getting to me. Councillor Bates, about the A14. We're getting some investment under the Pinch Point Funding Programme to

add a little bit of extra lane capacity at what is called the Girton junction going east bound. I understand that the Highways Agency will not be consulting on this and just going ahead and doing it, but no doubt the County Council will be making some representation to make sure it's done right. Could you tell me what the process is for providing input before anything actually gets done.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

As you appreciate Mr Chairman this is a Highways Authority project, not a County Council project. So obviously if you have any way that you wish to feed into that I would be only pleased to feed that through myself or the officers to the Highways Authority, Highways Agency

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor D Jenkins

May I just express some puzzlement that the County Council would not have an opinion and would not be venturing that opinion? Because the people who live in Impington have lots of opinions and are particularly concerned that their interests are looked after. We recognise that it'll be good for people who drive along that road, that it won't necessarily be good for local residents and we need to balance their needs against the needs of the former. So I think we need to have a little chat later, Councillor Bates, especially on behalf of the residents of Lone Tree Avenue. This is as an alternative to the dates that Councillor Orgee is going to have and the walks that you are taking with Councillor [sic]. It is important people who live there have had promises made to them by the Highways Agency in previous guises and those promises have not been kept and we need to look after them.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

I'm certainly happy to meet Councillor Jenkins outside of the chamber and organise a suitable meeting with officers to discuss the A14, particularly his concerns on behalf of his residents.

15. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates, from Councillor C Shepherd

Thank you very much. My question is to Councillor Bates and it's about the compulsory purchase payments due to the people of Trumpington who live alongside the guided busway in Trumpington down there. And I'm pleased to say to this chamber that after nearly a year of lobbying when I first asked the Council to make these payments speedily, I am now told that some of them have now been made, after nearly a year as I say. But can you please confirm to me perhaps all of them have been made? Could you confirm have all of them been made, and could you also confirm the total amount of payments made? Thank you.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

Thank you Mr Chairman, and thank you for advanced warning of the question, there were 30 people along that particular Trumpington cutting area that could have claimed for compensation. At this moment in time there's only one who has not agreed to the terms of the settlement. There is 12 now transfers which have taken place and payment has been made, so 12 out of the 30 have received payment to date. The other 18 plots are still in discussion, I would hope by the end of this financial year that they should be resolved and those future will be able to receive the appropriate

funding for compensation. So I would hope by the end of the year that all will have received payment. In answer to your second question, how much actually has been paid, and I apologise to read, it's £138,637.67 to date.

16. Question to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count, from Councillor P Sales

Thank you Chair. It's a question for Councillor Count I believe. Earlier on we heard that the County had won a prize for making assets count, which is very welcome news. One of our prized assets is the County Farms estate, which is very extensive, and it seems somewhat to have dropped the radar. It seems to be a long time since we've had any report to this chamber about the activities of the County Farms estate and I just wondered if he could organise for a report to come to us about the progress of that particular sphere of activity?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count, from Councillor P Sales

Yes, thank you for that question and mentioning the award that the Estates team won. I can confirm verbally that the farm estates are doing very well, we are very pleased with our tenant farmers, we are very pleased with the relationship we've built up with them and I'm very pleased with how they are coming along in the economic climate. In fact just recently I was mentioning to informal Cabinet the fact that the actual people trying to get onto our tenanted estate, the quality and number of them, has been improving and we're very pleased about that. We've also been rolling out solar panels across some of the farms and investing some money in there, which is another plus. As far as reporting goes I believe we do a once a year document which I'd be happy to share and as far reporting to the Council chamber, I'm not sure that's the correct place for it. But I shall find out from officers the correct place to bring this report, I think it's pretty much all good news, and I will ensure that you receive a copy.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count, from Councillor P Sales

I'd just like to point out that to my knowledge there's over a hundred tenant farmers and about 32,000 acres of land valued at over £8,000 an acre, and I think that it is the right place with an asset of that size, I think this is the right place for a report to come at least on an annual basis.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count, from Councillor P Sales

Please don't misunderstand me Councillor Sales, I wasn't disagreeing with you. As a fairly novice Councillor, with less than two years' experience, I was simply saying that I was unaware of the correct protocol. What I shall do is discuss with my officers, find out the correct route for this and share that with you and if here is a good place for it, let it be, but I'm sure it will all be good news.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 11 DECEMBER 2012
WRITTEN QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

Question from Councillor J Reynolds to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

With the increases in passenger usage of the Guided busway:

1. What action is being taken to ensure adequate provision of buses to meet future passenger demand?
2. What is the maximum number of buses that can operate safely on the Busway?
3. What are the monthly passenger journey figures for the Busway from commencement in August 2011?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

Many thanks to Councillor Reynolds for his question. I am pleased to provide the following response:

1. Both Stagecoach and Whippet have increased the frequency of buses continually since the opening of the Busway over a year ago. The latest improvements should come into operation on 3rd December with additional buses being provided for passenger demands at specific times of the day. The current fleet is seen as adequate for overall demand at present. In the short term additional buses will be put on to specific routes at the busier times of the day to deal with peak demand rather than a blanket increase in buses per hour. However, as demand increases we are likely to see further investment in fleet from operators.

Recent changes include:

Whippet doubling the number of inbound journeys from St.Ives on the C route to Drummer street between 07:50 and 10:20 a.m.. Adding a return to the D service from Drummer street at 17:25 which calls at Shire Hall.

Stagecoach the A and B routes now running every 15 minutes rather than every 20 minutes.

The County Council meets the Operators on a regular basis to manage the efficient operation of the Busway and the services using it. County Council Officers and both operators are continually reviewing how to achieve further improvements to services.

2. The recommended distance between buses at full line speed (56mph, 90kph) is 500m which equals a time gap of 20 seconds. The absolute maximum safe capacity of the Busway is therefore 180 buses per hour in each direction which would far exceed likely requirements. The Busway currently operates at the equivalent of 15 buses per hour at its busiest time. As a comparison, the Adelaide guided busway operates 100 buses per hour at peak times.
3. Please see Data in Excel appendix attached.

Joseph Whelan, Head of Passenger Transport, would be pleased to deal with any further queries regarding the Busway.

Question from Councillor J Reynolds to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

A14 Highway Agency, Highway improvements under the Pinch Point programme, Girton

Can the portfolio holder provide from the Highways Agency the projected reduction of morning east bound peak time congestion traffic between Bar Hill and Girton following the implementation of the proposed third lane from Girton to Histon?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, Councillor I Bates

The Highways Agency at its Bedford Office has provided information from an assessment undertaken with the A14 highway model of journey times in the construction year 2014. This indicates that taken across the morning peak period (between 06.30 and 09.30), the average journey time saving between Bar Hill and Milton Interchanges would be 3 minutes. This is on a journey that otherwise without the improvement scheme is forecast to take 8 minutes 20 seconds:

Question from Councillor J Reynolds to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

A14 Highway Agency Maintenance of balancing ponds, Girton

I understand from local residents that balancing ponds that store storm water from the A14 north west of Girton are not being effectively maintained to enable them to perform as designed. Can the portfolio holder provide from the Highways Agency confirmation that work will be undertaken without delay to clean out these ponds thereby reducing the risk of flooding in Girton village?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, Councillor I Bates

The Highways Agency at its Bedford Office has responded as follows indicating that the balancing ponds have recently been maintained:

“Both the A14 (was the old A604 & A45) and the M11 drainage systems were constructed in the mid to late 1970’s. The layout of the carriageways and areas drained are still as-built. At the A14 / M11 / A428 / A1307 Girton Interchange there are 10 containment drainage lagoons which discharge into either Washpit or Beck Brooks. These lagoons have been cleared and maintained within the last 5 years, the last date on which clearance took place was Summer 2011.

It will be important to bear in mind that with the TIP (Targeted Improvement Programme) scheme being designed for the A14 westbound carriageway at Girton and the Pinch Point scheme being designed for the A14 eastbound carriageway between Girton and Histon, the increase in surface area of carriageway will necessitate a re-examination of the drainage and if necessary bringing it up to current standards if found to be different from that which was put in place in the late 1970's.”

If Councillor Reynolds has any further specific information suggesting that there remains a problem, I would be more than happy to take that up with the Highways Agency.

Month	Ticket Machines	Concessions	On-Bus	Total Passengers	Rolling Total	Notes
Aug-11	47749.5	50498	80949	179196.50	179197	Open date 7/8/11
Sep-11	48019.5	56195	105209	209423.50	388620	
Oct-11	54165	56837	111007	222009.00	610629	Half term
Nov-11	51056.5	55910	113904	220870.50	831500	
Dec-11	49590.5	48266	109536	207392.50	1038892	
Jan-12	44318.50	50790	104580	199688.50	1238581	
Feb-12	51033.00	46596	98153	195782.00	1434363	
Mar-12	54968.75	55680	110492	221140.75	1655503	
Apr-12	51794.50	46935	100688	199417.50	1854921	
May-12	50254.00	52151	112821	215226.00	2070147	may bank holiday
Jun-12	50983.50	49434	107289	207706.50	2277853	2 bank holidays
Jul-12	61352.25	53938	116396	231686.25	2509540	
Aug-12	58644.25	63124	121682	243450.25	2752990	
Sep-12	54705.25	60740	128939	244384.25	2997374	
Oct-12	66573.75	67145	146485	280203.75	3277578	
Nov-12						
Dec-12						
Jan-13						
Feb-13						
Mar-13						
Apr-13						
May-13						
Jun-13						