

## **COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2011  
**Time:** 10.30 – 19.55  
**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge  
**Present:** Councillor L J Oliver (Chairman)

Councillors: J Batchelor, I Bates, N Bell, K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, D Brown, P Brown, R Butcher, C Carter, K Churchill, J Clark, N Clarke, S Criswell, M Curtis, P Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, N Guyatt, G Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, G Heathcock, S Hoy, W Hunt, C Hutton, J Jenkins, S Johnstone, E Kadić, G Kenney, S Kindersley, S King, V Lucas, I Manning, L McGuire, V McGuire, A Melton, R Moss-Eccardt, L Nethsingha, A Orgee, J Palmer, D Pegram, A Pellew, J Powley, P Read, P Reeve, J Reynolds, K Reynolds, T Sadiq, 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, K Wilkins, M Williamson, L Wilson and F Yeulett

**Apologies:** Councillors: S Austen, F Brown, S Gymer and G Wilson

### **134. MINUTES: 7<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2010**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **135. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

### **136. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following members declared personal interests under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Minute</b>	<b>Details</b>
D Brown	138	Trustee of Burwell Museum
Churchill	138	Governor of The Longsands Learning Partnership
Curtis	138	Trustee of Age UK, Cambridgeshire
Heathcock	138	Member of COPE (Cambridgeshire Older People's Enterprise), and with a member of family receiving care from Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Mental Health Trust (CPMHT)
Hutton	138	Governor of The Longsands Learning Partnership
Jenkins	138	Member of Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust
Johnstone	138, 143a)	Member of Ely Diocesan Board of Education, Governor of Oakington Primary School, parent of children accessing post-16 transport, parent of a child in the County Youth Orchestra, Chairman and trustee of Over Day Centre

Kenney	138	Member of COPE
Lucas	138	Chairman of Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust
Manning	138	Member of Chesterton Community Association
Melton	138	Parent of children in school, including one receiving subsidised transport to 6 <sup>th</sup> form college, and with a family member receiving an adult care partnership package
Read	138	Member of COPE and a member of East Cambridgeshire District Council
Reeve	138	Governor of Ramsey Spinning Infants School and a Governor of Ramsey Junior School and a member of The Ramsey Initiative
J Reynolds	138	Director and Chairman of Renewables East
Sadiq	138	Member of CPMHT, Governor of Ridgefield Primary School, and a Governor of Parkside Federation
Shepherd	138	Vice Chairman of Citizens Advice Bureau, Cambridge
van de Ven	138	Member of Rail Future, Chairman of Meldreth, Shepreth and Foxton Rail User Group, member of Melbourn Library Access Point
R West	138	Member of COPE, Governor of Offord Primary School
Whelan	138	Associate member of COPE , member of CPMHT, Board member of Caldecote Children’s Centre, Governor of Caldecote Primary School, member of the National Autistic Society, Cambridge Branch, parent of a child with a statement of Special Educational Needs (SEN)
Wilkins	138	Associate member of COPE
	143	
Williamson	138	Trustee and treasurer of Cambridge & County Folk Museum, treasurer of The Farmland Museum & Denny Abbey
L Wilson	138	Member of COPE

### 137. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Council noted four questions received from members of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

### 138 ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION FROM CABINET

#### a) Petitions

The Council noted that five petitions had been received from members of the public, as set out in **Appendix C**. The Chairman thanked all the petitioners and advised that the Leader of the Council would respond in writing.

#### b) Council’s Integrated Plan and Budget Proposals 2011/12

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor J Tuck, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor J Reynolds, that the recommendations on the Integrated Plan (detailed on pages 3 and 4) as set out in minute 308 of the Cabinet meeting of 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011, be adopted.

The Chairmen of the Council's five scrutiny committees respectively moved the receipt of the reports of the two Corporate Issues Scrutiny Committees, the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee, Environment and Sustainability Scrutiny Committee, Adults, Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Committee and Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Committee.

Members then debated the Council's Integrated Plan and Budget Proposals 2011/12 and the scrutiny committees' response.

The Liberal Democrat amendment, attached as **Appendix D**, was proposed by Councillor D Jenkins and seconded by Councillor P Downes.

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

[The voting pattern was as follows: Liberal Democrats and Independent in favour, Conservatives and UKIP against, Green, Labour and the Chairman and Vice Chairman abstained].

Following discussion, the substantive motion, as detailed below, on being put to the vote was carried:

That approval be given to:

- a) the Service/Directorate cash limits as set out in Section 2 of the Integrated Plan
- b) a County Budget Requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £351,840,000
- c) a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £231,169,815 (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the "fall-back" provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995)
- d) a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of "Band D" equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (220,609):

Band	Council Tax	Band	Council Tax
A	£698.52	E	£1,280.62
B	£814.94	F	£1,513.46
C	£931.36	G	£1,746.30
D	£1,047.78	H	£2,095.56

- e) the Prudential Borrowing, Prudential Indicators and Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Technical Appendix A, sub-section 6 of the Integrated Plan
- f) the report of the LGSS Director of Finance on the levels of reserves and robustness of the estimates as set out in Technical Appendix A, sub-section 8 of the Integrated Plan
- g) Capital Payments in 2011/12 up to £105.8m arising from:

- (i) commitments from schemes already approved; and
- (ii) the consequences of new starts (for the five years 2011/12 to 2015/16) shown in summary in Technical Appendix A, sub-section 6 of the Integrated Plan.

Under Part 4, Rules of Procedure, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, 14 members requested a recorded vote on this matter, which is set out in **Appendix E**.

*The Council adjourned on three occasions during Minute 138, under Part 4 Rules of Procedure, paragraph 19.5, due to a general disturbance, making the continuance of orderly business impossible.*

### **139 WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

Four written questions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.4, as set out in **Appendix F**.

### **140. ORAL QUESTIONS**

Eight oral questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix G**. In response to these questions, the following items were identified for further action:

- Cabinet Member for Communities, Councillor Sir Peter Brown agreed to attend a meeting of Chesterton Community Association (CCA) on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2011, diary permitting, to respond to CCA's proposals for Milton Road Library
- Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis agreed to write to Councillor T Sadiq, explaining the Council's ongoing responsibilities for children educated in alternative provision, particularly when that provision was deemed inadequate
- Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty, agreed to write to Councillor P Reeve to assure him that schools with a high number of children with additional languages had the resources to educate both them and their class mates adequately.

### **141. MOTIONS**

Two motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

#### **(a) Motion from Councillor S van de Ven**

It was proposed by Councillor S van de Ven and seconded by Councillor Downes that:

This Council notes:

1. that Cambridgeshire County Council exists to serve the public interest and should be fully accountable to its electors

2. that public question time at meetings of the County Council is restricted to members of the public who are able to appear in person in the Council chamber to ask their previously submitted and accepted written question
3. regrettably, this right excludes those people who are unable to be away from work and other responsibilities at the time of the Council meeting, for whom the journey to Shire Hall is prohibitively distant or expensive, or for whom the journey may be impossible due to illness or informality.

The Council agrees:

- (a) that the questions from members of the public for consideration at meetings of the County Council should be acceptable in written form, without a requirement for the questioner to be physically present in order to pose his or her question verbally
- (b) the Council's Constitution should be amended accordingly.

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

[The voting pattern was as follows: Liberal Democrats, Labour, Green, UKIP and Independent voted in favour, Conservatives against and the Chairman and Vice Chairman abstained].

**b) Motion from Councillor S Sedgwick-Jell**

It was proposed by Councillor S Sedgwick-Jell and seconded by Councillor L Wilson that:

In recognition of the current budgetary position and the impact this will have on County Council services and staff, this Council resolves that all Councillors accept a voluntary 5% cut to the basic and Special Responsibility Allowance rates set out in the Members' Allowances Scheme.

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

[The voting pattern was as follows: Labour, Green, UKIP, two Conservatives and one Liberal Democrat Member voted in favour, the Independent and the majority of Conservatives and Liberal Democrats against, and the Chairman and Vice Chairman abstained].

**142. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

It was proposed by the Chairman, Councillor L Oliver, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor J Powley and agreed unanimously to make the appointments to Committees and outside organisations as set out in **Appendix H**.

## 143. MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

### (a) Minutes of the Cabinet meeting 14 December 2010

The Council noted information reports on:

- A Joint Review of Educational Attainment in Fenland
- Internal Audit work on Safe Recruitment in Schools
- Investment in the College of West Anglia (COWA) Campus
- Prescribed alterations to Cherry Hinton Church of England Voluntary Controlled Infant School and Cherry Hinton Community Junior School
- Integrated Resources and Performance Report – October 2010
- Future Options for the Park and Ride Service
- Cambridgeshire Guided Busway
- Budget 2011/12
- Procurement Strategy
- Roman Catholic Primary School Provision in Cambridge
- Consultation on the East Cambridgeshire Draft Supplementary Planning Categories
- Government Consultation on the proposed New Homes Bonus
- Cambridgeshire Inequalities Charter
- Corporate Risk Register
- Local Government Shared Services – update.

Members commented and asked questions of the relevant Cabinet members about these items. No matters were raised that required further action.

### (b) Minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 25 January 2011

The Council noted the minutes of the Cabinet meeting of 25 January 2011. Members commented and asked questions of the relevant Cabinet members about these items. No items were agreed for further action.

- Outcome of Consultation on the Integrated Plan and the Impact of the Proposals on Communities
- Cambridgeshire Library Service Review
- Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road

- Integrated Resources and Performance Report – November 2010
- Cambridgeshire Guided Busway
- Local Government Shared Services – update.

Members commented and asked questions of the relevant Cabinet members about these items. No matters were raised that required further action.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 FEBRUARY 2011  
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**PEOPLE**

**Councillor John West**

The death of County Councillor John West, who passed away aged 66 on 7th December 2010.

Councillor West was elected to Fenland District Council in 1999 and to the County Council in 2005, representing the March North Electoral Division on behalf of the Conservative party. He was a member of March Town Council and served as mayor in 2009-10.

**Former County Councillor Elizabeth Hughes**

The death of former County Councillor Elizabeth Hughes, who died on 10th December 2010. Councillor Hughes served on the County Council from 2005 to 2009, representing the King’s Hedges Electoral Division on behalf of the Labour Party. She had also represented King’s Hedges as a member of Cambridge City Council.

**Former County Councillor Maggie Scott**

The death of former County Councillor Maggie Scott, who died on 23rd December 2010. Councillor Scott served on the County Council from 1981 to 1989 and from 1997 to 2001, representing St Ives and St Ives South Electoral Divisions on behalf of the Conservative party.

**Former County Councillor Sal Brinton**

Congratulations to former County Councillor Sal Brinton on her appointment to the House of Lords, as a working Liberal Democrat peer. Her title will be Baroness Brinton, and the geographic designation, which does not appear in the title, will be of Kenardington in Kent where the family lived when Sal was young.

**Janice Nightingale, Cycling Instructor**

Congratulations to a Cambridgeshire cycling instructor, Janice Nightingale, who has helped more than 1,000 children get on their bike safely, on being awarded an MBE in the New Year Honours List for her nearly 30 years of service as a Safer Cycling Instructor for Cambridgeshire. In the early 1980s she became one of the Council’s first volunteers after she enquired about the scheme at her daughter’s school, Icknield County Primary School, Sawston. Since then, she has provided cycling instruction at the John Paxton School in Sawston, now named the Bellbird Primary School. She now delivers cycle training at other schools in the county. In addition to providing cycle instruction for 10 year olds, she is also involved in delivering 'Pedal Power', the Council’s 'off-road' cycle training programme, for younger children, at her granddaughter’s former school, Ditton Lodge in Newmarket.

**AWARDS.**



## **CYPS Localities Team in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland**

The Home Office has selected supporting young people work carried out by the Council's Children and Young People's Services Localities Team in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland, as one of six case studies nationally of successful projects tackling anti-social behaviour.

### **Naace (the ICT association)**

For the first time Naace (The ICT Association) is presenting awards to those who make an impact with ICT. Sally Elding from the Learning Directorate has been shortlisted for the primary award, which covers work on the Cambridgeshire Children and Young People's Film Festival, an annual event at the Corn Exchange, and the wide range of events and training opportunities that the Council offers children and staff, which provide excellent opportunities to develop their creativity. The award winner will be announced in March.

### **Transitions Team**

Disabled young people need support from local agencies to enjoy the same life opportunities as their non-disabled peers. The Transitions Support Programme is a three-year initiative to improve outcomes for all disabled young people. Following external evaluation, the Cambridgeshire Team has been given the highest level award for its transitional arrangements for disabled young people. The Level 4 award has been made to only 17 local authorities nationally.

### **Investors in People – Gold Standard Award**

The County Council has been corporately awarded the prestigious Investors in People Gold standard. This award has been given in recognition of the Council achieving the highest standard of people management and development as an employer and as a consequence of the contribution of its workforce. By achieving this level of recognition the County Council becomes one of only 130 employing organisations, across all sectors of industry, to have attained such accreditation.

Although the award is a testament to all Council employees, particular thanks should be given to Michele Austin, Sally Carroll, Stewart Harris and Laura Wheal within the Organisational Development and Communications Teams for their hard work to lead and support the attainment of this major recognition.

## **SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Children's Services**

Children's services in Cambridgeshire are continuing to perform well according to the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED). The large majority of services, settings and institutions were found to be good or better. On behalf of the Council, the Chairman would like to congratulate all colleagues in or connected to the Council's work for children and young people and their families.

The Council's Adoption Service is well managed at all levels with particular strengths in supporting adopters and the provision of excellent access to psychological services, according to inspectors OFSTED. The overall quality of the agency was good and children are placed in safe families who meet their needs. They said the service had a 'committed and thorough' medical advisor. Staff within the organisation were viewed as being

'knowledgeable, skilled and committed and appropriately supported to enable them to provide a good service to children and their families'.

They found a thorough and well-established matching process for children in which comprehensive sharing of information was used to assist in the matching of children with adoptive families. Support to adoptive families was noted as being a particularly strong feature of the agency and adopters were well prepared for the task of parenting an adopted child during the preparation and assessment process. Adoptive families found the adoption and adoption support teams a valuable source of support. The report is great news and a tribute to the hard work and dedication of everyone who works in the adoption team.

### **Community Led Project - Littleport**

Baroness Newlove is working with ministers as part of a Home Office initiative to encourage local people, businesses and frontline workers in like local authorities, probation and the police, on what more they can do to make their communities safer. Littleport is one of 6 areas in the country selected where the Baroness will sponsor a community project led by young people. The project is based on 'Youthsafe', a multiagency project in Soham led by young people to combat anti-social behaviour. As part of the youthsafes initiative, young people were provided with an open space in the community by the Town Council where they could congregate and not be moved on. The young people are responsible for drawing up and enforcing the rules about how the space is used.

A multiagency project team involving young people has been drawn together in Littleport from the Parish Council, community members, Cambridgeshire County Council, East Cambs District Council and the police to consider how this project could be introduced and implemented within Littleport. Baroness Newlove will make two visits to the project one in early February and another in March.

### **Domestic Abuse Partnership**

Cambridgeshire has been chosen, by the Home Office, as one of only three counties nationally to pilot a process known as 'positive deviance' (PD) on Violence Against Women and Girls issues. The aim is to empower communities to develop solutions to 'intractable' problems from within. The approach has been used successfully to address gun crime in the US, female genital mutilation in Egypt, prison violence in Scandinavia and malnutrition in Vietnam. People connected to the Domestic Abuse Partnership from across different organisations will start to be trained how to use PD in the next couple of weeks.

### **Southern Fringe Development**

In December, the Bell School Site development received outline planning permission. The permission for this site is the final piece of the jigsaw for the Cambridge Southern Fringe Urban Extension. All developments in the Southern Fringe now have planning permission, which means new homes for about 10,000 people, including much needed affordable housing. Once complete, the Cambridge Biomedical Campus next to the Addenbrooke's Hospital Campus will also generate 9,000 new jobs.

To support the new developments, the County Council has secured £63 million in S106 contributions for the provision of new infrastructure and services. Amongst other things, significant contributions have been secured for new schools, and a community hub including a new library, the Addenbrooke's Access Road and the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. The first residents of the Southern Fringe are expected to move in late 2011.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 FEBRUARY 2011  
PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**1. Question from Ms Sarah Brown to Councillor Sir Peter Brown, Cabinet Member for Communities**

Some of you may already know me, I am a Cambridge City Councillor and I serve on your Adults Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Committee, but I am here today as a member of the public.

I want to know what progress has the Council made in proactively advancing equality for lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and transgender people (LGBT) in Cambridgeshire. In schools homophobic and transphobic bullying are a particular concern and harm done to children who are perceived to be lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender is often tremendous and can lead to diminished academic results, psychological problems for the child concerned and even culminate in suicide. What is the Council doing to create an environment where both homophobic and transphobic bullying are noticed and discouraged? In adult service provision what steps has the Council taken to ensure that members of the LGBT community are able to access services without facing unnecessary barriers, harassment or discrimination? If LGBT people are having difficulty accessing services provided or commissioned by the Council, what mechanisms does the Council have in place to detect this? Given LGBT people often face discrimination in employment and accommodation, with transgender people frequently experiencing particularly severe discrimination in both categories, how is the Council making sure that often vulnerable people in the LGBT community are not disproportionately affected in the coming reductions to social care and other public services provided by the Council?

**Reply from Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

I would just like to say to Councillor Brown that the second part of her question, I think you understand, is not related to my portfolio, but I will get a written answer for you on that. Our equality policies are supported through the Council's Diversity Group which co-ordinates equality and diversity activity across the organisation. It has three internal support networks, one of which is specifically for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender colleagues. I attend the Diversity Group in my capacity as portfolio holder for Communities; Councillor Sadiq represents the Labour Party. It is a source of disappointment that after more than one approach the Liberal Democrat Group has not come forward with a representative.

**Point of Information from Councillor Fiona Whelan, the Liberal Democrat Group Leader.**

The Liberal Democrat Group have suggested somebody, we nominated Councillor Michael Williamson at least a month ago, and it has been passed on two or three times since. Point of Information we have, we take it very seriously.

**Reply continued from Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

I accept that, thank you very much. Nationally the Council is ranked as achieving as part of the Equality Framework for Local Government. Over recent years we have consistently ranked in Stonewall's index in the top 100 LGBT employers in the country. Last year we introduced our Gender Identity Policy; this provides guidance on transgender issues and outlines the Council's approach to supporting transgender employees in the workplace. In developing this policy we have involved all

members of the LGBT group and their input and advice is invaluable. This month we have committed to becoming a leading partner in LGBT Cambridgeshire, a network that brings together LGBT colleagues across the public services in the county. We were represented at the launch meeting only last week. Our policy with regard to county schools is very much in line with national policy. All primary schools in the country have recently received a Stonewall training pack, which celebrates different families and focuses on equality. In our secondary schools there are initiatives in place to address homophobic bullying. In terms of our human resources policy, all new employees are given an e-learning module on equality and diversity.

### **Supplementary Question from Ms Sarah Brown**

We have heard a lot about employees, but rather less about members of the public and I'm somewhat surprised not to hear about the existence of any equality impact assessments. Of course equality impact assessments work well when equalities culture is pervasive, otherwise effects on sexual minorities can be overlooked with the best will in the world. I do believe, at the risk of blowing our own trumpet, that Cambridge City Council is setting best practice in this area, for example by waiving the rights that it *does* have to discriminate in the Equalities Act 2010. It also has the LGBT community very much on side and aware of LGBT issues and the message is clear: your concerns are our concerns; your values are our values. Values such as tolerance for all, the celebration of all sexual identities. Does this Council share the values of the LGBT community?

### **Reply from Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

In terms of our human resources policy, all employees are given an e-learning module which deals with diversity and equality issues and new managers are invited to attend a two hour training course on these issues. In line with all other aspects of Council policy these issues are subject to community impact assessments, a process which of course manages the impacts of our budget proposals on different equality groups. I hope you will agree that our work represents real progress which will be continued in the future.

## **2. Question from Dr Nigel Preston to Councillor Jill Tuck, Leader of the Council**

My question is about the philosophical approach that the Council is taking to the budget cuts that it is faced with and in particular whether it has learnt any of the lessons that were learnt in the private sector during 2008/2009/2010, when it was actually faced with much more serious problems than the Council faces today. So specifically, my question is about: during 2009 and 2010 many private sector organisations survived much larger reductions in income, due to the economic downturn, than those currently faced by the Council today. They did this by taking much more creative approaches than simply cutting jobs. Typically these included across the board salary reductions, maybe of 10%, and asking contracted suppliers to take similar actions, and frankly I'm baffled that I have heard no discussion around this kind of approach in any of the debate. Because these actions have very significant benefits in that, first of all, reducing the number of redundancies: it maintains organisational capability or service delivery, it minimises the impact on working capital, through having to pay out severance or redundancy payments, and of course it avoids the downstream social costs associated with redundancies. So to what extent has the Council evaluated and costed alternatives to redundancies in order to reduce costs, and if so, why have they been rejected?

### **Reply from Councillor Jill Tuck**

The Authority is in the process at this moment of formally consulting on ways to mitigate the impact of these proposed redundancies, and as part of this we are open to exploring all sorts of ways to avoid making people redundant. The sort of things we explore are very similar to those actually outlined in your question. Approaches like voluntary reduction in hours, increased flexible working patterns, and they are part of our standard approach, as well as seeking redeployment opportunities, job design and so forth. The Council is part of the national employers negotiating machinery on pay and pay awards and over the last few years there has been no standard of living increase awarded. We continue to work with our trade unions and employees to explore other cost saving and efficiency measures that may reduce the need to make redundancies, and as part of the 90 day minimum consultation process we will endeavour to productively engage on all possible options and alternatives. In addition we continue to develop innovative solutions to service design and delivery that will reduce costs and protect frontline services wherever possible. We have recently implemented a full back office sharing arrangement with Northamptonshire County Council that has resulted in significant savings across both authorities. It is also worth noting that the majority of savings proposed by the authority are about transforming services or focusing them on where they have the most effect, and without this approach the number of redundancies could have been much worse.

### **Supplementary Question from Dr Nigel Preston**

I would like to know specifically whether the issue of salary reductions has been considered, because in the private sector that was actually found to be one of the most effective tools, not appreciated by everyone, but the most effective tool for ensuring the survival of the organisation and the delivery of service capability.

### **Reply from Councillor Jill Tuck**

All I can say is that part of the consultation would take that into account. We have continued to have a pay freeze incidentally and a very strong vacancy control is in process.

### **3. Question from Mr David Wherrell to Councillor Mac McGuire, Cabinet Member for Highways and Access**

I understand in the Council's budget consultation, bus subsidies were identified by the public as among the top three most important public services to protect, and yet the Council is cutting by 100% those subsidies over four years. This will place a huge burden and expectation on Community Transport (CT). You're putting money back into the budget for Community Transport - I believe this is £1m over five years. CT bus operators will receive less BSOG (Bus Service Operators Grant) which is a way of being able to claim back some of the duty on the fuel used in those vehicles, and concessionary bus fares subsidy is also under review. Community Transport car schemes are likely to lose volunteer drivers because of the increases in fuel prices, and that is compounded by the central government's refusal to increase the 40p/per mile that volunteers can receive without paying tax. Even if the CT sector could overcome the financial problems, where is the army of volunteers going to come from to replace a £2.7m bus network?

### **Reply from Councillor Mac McGuire**

First of all could I just say Mr Wherrell that your reference to the consultation process, and I'm making the assumption you're referring to what we call the Simalto exercise; in fact it is misleading to actually say that what people wanted - that the third most important was cutting

subsidies, because if you actually look closer at the papers what you'll actually find, and I'm sure you will have picked those parts up, is that road maintenance, libraries and others came in earlier; but, what people were saying was they would accept (and this was the third most important) a reduction in the number of subsidised buses from 80 down to 50; so they were willing to accept the removal of up to 50 routes [sic]. Nevertheless in order to mitigate the effects of these changes, we are working closely with our partners, fellow authorities, voluntary groups and other community interests to devise innovative and better targeted ways in which to provide essential transport and accessibility. Greater emphasis will be placed on helping communities to step up and provide some services themselves, where this is achievable. Indeed as I recall you attended the Transport Summit held recently to start to look at the issues. The Summit is a starting point leading to a joined up public transport strategy that is community led, to help provide services to meet the needs of Cambridgeshire's current and future communities. Representatives from around 70 organisations including public services, business communities, bus operators, councils and community transport were present. There were frank discussions about the issues and agreement that a core group is set up to bring forward initiatives and better ways of working. The review will not just look at buses but also engage with communities to come forward to find local solutions that could work locally and improve transport access.

#### **4. Question from Mrs Kate Grillet to Councillor Mac McGuire, Cabinet Member for Highways and Access**

I am a cycling Cambridge citizen and I'm also a carer of a husband who has had Alzheimer's for 17 years, just by way of introduction. I note from the website [fillthathole.org.uk](http://fillthathole.org.uk) that nationally we are way down on the list of towns who fix their potholes – this winter according to their records there were 893 reports of potholes in Cambridge of which 196 were fixed, which gives a rate of fixing of 22%. As a point of comparison, Oxford fixed 65% of their pot holes and Luton and Norwich 94%. Cambridge ranks 137th out of all the authorities on their league table, of which I have a paper copy if anyone is interested. The problem also appears to be the lack of skill in the maintenance work done - even where potholes have just been repaired (in Lensfield Road, for example) the filling soon breaks up. Are sub-contractors trained to make permanent or temporary repairs?

If Councillor McGuire were to get on a bicycle to ride north down Sidney Street then south along Trumpington Street, and then north along Panton Street, you would experience for yourself the state of these roads. They suffer from subsidence, patchwork filling and lots of open holes, many from long before the winter snow came. Just as importantly, if you would like to try pushing a wheelchair, or a child's buggy along a route from Lensfield Road to the Botanic Gardens, including various streets around there, you would find that the pavements are impassable, with potholed roads the only alternative. I understand that the Council has a statutory duty to provide safe footpaths. In the past, I believe, this has been measured as no obstruction to the smooth pavement (a broken slab for example) of more than 1/2". Could you please confirm the current ruling - what depth of pothole or height of raised slab would deem the pavement or road unsafe?

I am familiar with the town of Groningen in North Holland which I regularly visit. There the local authorities know how to fix roads, how to provide safe and well maintained cycle ways, and [out of time] blah, blah, blah [sic].

#### **Reply from Councillor Mac McGuire**

Thankyou Mrs Grillet, I know what it is like to be stopped when you are in full flow, but maybe you will be able to finish off in your supplementary, as I might be able to do.

Firstly I would like to thank Mrs Grillet for her observations and agree with her regarding the condition of Sidney Street. The historic roads of Cambridge are a particular problem for us, as they were of course initially constructed in days when there was considerably less traffic. However, I am pleased to inform you that we will be undertaking repairs in Sidney Street next month. I note your comment about the care and skill of operatives and I would like to assure you that operatives are properly trained to fulfil their tasks. Over the last year we have adjusted our processes to move away from temporary repairs where possible and to ensure that we work in as efficient and effective way as possible. Last year we actually repaired 32,000 potholes and many of those arrived as a result of the very hard winter we experienced in the year 2009/10 winter. Mrs Grillet hopefully you will be pleased to know that the Council is investing over £2m over the next two years in additional funding for carriageway and footway repairs. Whilst this will not solve all of our problems it is additional funding over and above that which central Government have given us for highways maintenance. I hope Mrs Grillet you will accept that we are doing all we can to maintain the many thousands of kilometres of carriageway and footways across the county and I thank you again for your interest in the subject. You weren't able to finish, I don't think this Council would want to send a party of Councillors to Groningen, I don't think that would be seen as good money, but I have actually been there myself, although I admit that was 20 years ago, so I am quite familiar with the town, but I do take your point in terms of Sidney Street in particular.

#### **Supplementary Question from Mrs Grillet:**

Would the Council please consider not just the absolute amount of money available, or the lack of it, but the care, skill and discernment with which the funds are used. And finally, if I had to choose, given my situation, I would care for the elderly and ditch the holes in the roads.

#### **Reply from Councillor Mac McGuire**

I do take that last point on, as Mrs Grillet says, it is not about money but the care, skill and discernment with which we use it. I hope that we will be judged as having done our best in this regard, and I understand your last point as that is the view of many, many people in this community.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 FEBRUARY 2011  
MINUTE 138a) – PETITIONS**

1. A petition of 189 signatures was presented by Anna Vine Lott asking the Council not to make cuts to the Whippet Bus Service No. 114.
2. A petition of 1223 signatures was presented by Kathrine Brannan asking the Council to keep Cambridge Student Support Centre (CSSC) open and to protect it from mass student or staff cuts. CSSC catered for young people unable to attend mainstream education due to medical needs.
3. A petition of 152 signatures was presented by Tony Carter stating, 'We believe that the County Council should not make any cuts in funding subsidies to predominately rural bus routes. These routes are vital lifelines to many rural pensioners and the unemployed of the county'.

**The following two petitions were received after the deadline so the Petition Organiser, or their nominee, was not able to speak at the meeting:**

4. A petition of 247 signatures compiled by Martin Booth was received, which was opposed to the cuts to public services proposed by Cambridgeshire County Council.
5. A petition of 108 signatures compiled by Stephen Lintott was received stating: 'We believe that the County Council should not make any cuts in funding to social care provision for people with mental health problems in Cambridgeshire.'



**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 FEBRUARY 2011  
LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP STATEMENT ON AND AMENDMENT TO THE  
COUNCIL'S INTEGRATED PLAN 2011**

**See attachment**

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 FEBRUARY 2011  
INTEGRATED PLAN & BUDGET PROPOSALS 2011/12 RECORDED VOTE RESULTS**

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote
AUSTEN S	LibD				x	MANNING I	LibD		x		
BATCHELOR J D	LibD				x	MCGUIRE L W	Con	x			
BATES I C	Con	x				McGUIRE V	Con	x			
BELL N	LibD		x			MELTON A	Con	x			
BOURKE K	LibD		x			MOSS-ECCART R	LibD		x		
BROOKS-GORDON B	LibD		x			NETHSINGHA L	LibD				x
BROWN D	Con	x				OLIVER L J	Con			x	
BROWN F	Con				x	ORGE E A G	Con	x			
BROWN P	Con	x				PALMER J	Con	x			
BUTCHER R	Con	x				PEGRAM D R	Con	x			
CARTER C M	Lab				x	PELLEW A	LibD				x
CHURCHILL K	Con	x				POWLEY J A	Con			x	
CLARK J	Con	x				READ P	Con	x			
CLARKE N	Con	x				REEVE P	UKIP		x		
CRISWELL S J	Con				x	REYNOLDS J E	Con	x			
CURTIS M	Con	x				REYNOLDS K A	Con	x			
DOWNES P J	LibD		x			SADIQ T	Lab		x		
DUTTON J J	Con	x				SEDGWICK-JELLS	Grn		x		
FARRER R	Con	x				SHEPHERD C	LibD		x		
GUYATT N	Con				x	SHUTER M G	Con	x			
GYMER S	LibD				x	SMITH M	Con	x			
HARPER G F	Con	x				STONE T J	LibD				x
HARRISON N	Ind		x			TIERNEY S	Con	x			
HARTY D	Con	x				TUCK J M	Con	x			
HEATHCOCK G J	LibD				x	VAN DE VEN S	LibD		x		
HOY S	Con	x				WEST R	Con	x			
HUNT W T I	Con	x				WHELAN F	LibD				x
HUTTON C	Con	x				WHITEBREAD S	LibD		x		
JENKINS D	LibD		x			WILKINS K	LibD		x		
JOHNSTONE S F	Con	x				WILLIAMSON M	LibD				x
KADIĆ L	Con	x				WILSON G	LibD				x
KENNEY G	Con	x				WILSON L J	Ind	x			
KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD				x	YEULETT F H	Con	x			
KING S J E	Con	x									
LUCAS V H	Con	x				TOTAL		36	15	2	15

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

**WRITTEN QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4**

**Question from Councillor N Bell to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire**

Further to my written question at Full Council on 20th July 2010, the works to complete the Thistle Corner roundabout in Ely were due to be completed over 7 months ago and the section 38 agreement has been with the County Council's legal department ever since. Can Councillor McGuire now tell me when this roundabout will be fully open and what precisely is causing the inordinate delay in the opening of this important route through the City of Ely?

**Response from Councillor M McGuire**

As Councillor Bell knows, the final signing of any complex Section 38 agreement follows detailed discussions to ensure that the County Council is not taking an unnecessary risk and that the developer is content with the elements of the highway network that are being passed to the Highway Authority. The County Council continues to press the developer for their response on details within the agreement but without such a response it is impossible to progress. Given that any agreement needs action from at least two parties, it is not possible for me to give you a date when agreement will finally be reached but rest assured we will continue to press the developer for a response. I recognise that this is taking longer than we would like but I will ask Officers to keep you updated on progress.

**Question from Councillor A Pellew to the Cabinet Member for Customer Service and Transformation, Councillor S Criswell**

- 1) Please provide me with a list of the Councillors, the Councils they represent, and the party political affiliations for Councillors who are mentioned or pictured in articles in all editions of "Your Cambridgeshire" published in the last 12 months.

For the figure provided above can you provide a break down by the type of article; editorial or other.

- 2a) Please provide any policy documents that relate to editorial content on the magazine or references to external policies with which the magazine aims to comply - with specific reference about how Councillors in Cambridgeshire who aren't in the same party as the administration might submit, have approved, and publish articles for this magazine.
- 2b) Please provide a list of all press releases issued by the County Council in the past 12 months, the Councillors involved in contributing information or quotes and their party affiliations.
- 2c) Can you also provide any policy documents related to the issuing of press releases with particular reference to any documents which relate to the inclusion, or exclusion, of local members.
- 3) What mechanisms are in place to ensure that the public expectations of transparency, equality and fairness, including Cambridgeshire Behaviours are preserved when work is placed with commercial and other third party providers?

## Response from Councillor S Criswell

- 1) All of the Councillors who have appeared in Your Cambridgeshire during the past year have been Cambridgeshire County Councillors, and have appeared in their Cambridgeshire County Council capacity (some are also District Council members).

The Councillors featured were:

Councillors Tuck, Read, McGuire, Hunt, Criswell, Curtis, Oliver, Yeulett and Reynolds

Councillor Tuck appears in every edition through her introductory article. All of the other councillors have appeared in editorial articles with the exception of Councillors Read (capacity as Chairman of Development Control Committee) and Hunt (local member) and Yeulett (featured within NHS pages). Councillors Tuck, McGuire, Reynolds, Curtis and Criswell appeared in the magazine in their capacity as Cabinet members, and Councillor Oliver in her capacity as Chairman of the Council.

No party political role or description is applied to members appearing in the magazine.

It should be noted that the March edition of Your Cambridgeshire will be the last, as the County Council is developing new, collaborative arrangements for engaging with residents.

- 2a) The Council abides by the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity in its external communications.

A copy of the code is available here:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/coderecommended>

A revised Code is shortly to be considered by parliament - the Council will formulate its response to this in due course.

- 2b) The County Council issues over 700 news releases in the period concerned, which are available via the Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) website. The councillors who contributed information and quotes are those included on the news releases. Party affiliations are not included in the main body text of CCC news releases, however the portfolio held by a Cabinet Member or office (e.g. Committee Chairman) if applicable are included if a member is quoted, as is the division represented by a Councillor if this is germane to the content of the news release. Political contacts for all CCC groups are included in footer content on news releases; this information includes the contact details of the relevant spokes. Liberal Democrat members featured in news releases on a number of occasions last year - including Councillors Whelan, Stone and van de Ven - and have been given general advice and support from communications including photography on a number of occasions.
- 2c) Again the County Council abides by the Code of Recommended Practice. The County Council welcomes contributions from members which may be considered for inclusion in News Releases; inclusion of such content is agreed **before publication** with the portfolio holder responsible for the area of council business concerned.

- 3) The County Council works in partnership with a number of partners on communications activity; Cambridgeshire Behaviours apply here as they do to all areas of Council business. The Council, when placing work with, for example, designers and printers, utilises framework agreements for design and print which ensure equality and fairness in terms of the award of work to commercial companies; I would be happy to supply information on such agreements should Councillor Pellew require it.

**Question from Councillor M Williamson to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire**

In view of the very significant increases in parking charges at Waterbeach Railway Station, please could I be advised of the total income received during 2010, broken down by type (e.g. cash in the machine, season tickets, payment via mobile phone), and total expenditure including any estimated losses due to theft from the ticket machine, costs of replacing and repairing ticket machine(s) damaged in the course of thefts and all other overheads.

**Response from Councillor M McGuire**

The total income for the first 8 periods of 2010/11 has been £11404.78. The outgoings incurred have been £6205 for Business rates and £10227 to cover ticket machine costs, management fees, height barrier costs and lighting. Therefore we have made a net loss so far of £5027.22.

Income for periods 9 to 12 has yet to be received and is likely to be in the region of £6000. The final cost for the installation of the height barrier is not yet known but is expected to be £1000. Grounds maintenance work and improvements to the gravel surface in the final third of the car park have been postponed until the new financial year. A full breakdown of income by ticket type is not available but will be provided by First Capital Connect at the end of the year.

Consequently, we anticipate the final year end position to be cost neutral.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 FEBRUARY 2011**

**ORAL QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.1**

**1. Question to the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis, from Councillor van de Ven**

When a subsidised bus, that is the only means of post 16 transport, disappears, what is the plan for those post 16 children to get to school? I'm talking about a particular bus, but I'm sure there are others.

**Reply from Councillor M Curtis**

My understanding of this situation, and we've chased it up ourselves as well just to make sure, is if we are responsible for getting children to school and providing a bus service to get them to school, we will provide that bus service. If that is our responsibility, if that is what we need to do, that is what we will do. Does that answer your question?

**Supplementary Question from Councillor S van de Ven**

Thank you, it is for post 16 transport. It is the Number 31 bus, so I'll be getting back to you about it in writing then - to find out what the arrangements are.

**Reply Councillor M Curtis**

We are responsible for making sure that they are able to get to that place of learning, that is our responsibility, whether it is a bus or something else, that is our responsibility still.

**2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis, from Councillor T Sadiq**

When the kids currently being educated at EOTAS are unable either to enter the mainstream school or to continue in the unsuitable minimal provision that might remain, what statutory and moral responsibility will the Council retain, in terms of looking after their interests?

**Reply from Councillor M Curtis**

I welcome a question on EOTAS today, because I know that there were a couple of shouts from the gallery about EOTAS earlier on. I think it is worth reinforcing the point that actually we are not making cuts to EOTAS financial provision in this Council, but we will be giving it an inflationary uplift. The situation with EOTAS is that when we passed the funding to schools, when we formed the BAIPs (Behaviour and Attendance Improvement Partnerships), we challenged schools to do better and to send less children to alternative provision. The schools have responded fantastically by working together and we have now got a reduction of just under half of the number of children going to alternative provision. That is through services and changes that have been designed by schools, working in partnership. Unfortunately that means that where we have got EOTAS provision, we have to respond, we have to make changes, because of the change in provision. Our responsibility is to challenge the schools that are changing that provision to make sure that it still works.

We continue to do that and particularly with the South Cambs and City scenario we continue to work with the schools to make sure that the solution that they provide works. We have to make sure that those children that need alternative provision are receiving alternative provision, and we will work and continue to consult to make sure that is still the case.

### **Supplementary Question from Councillor T Sadiq**

What I would like to know is if the alternative provision made by schools turns out to be inadequate, what actions will the Council be able to take in order to address that problem? If I may, could the Cabinet member please provide a statement in writing describing what the continuing responsibilities will be and what measures you will take under those circumstances?

### **Reply from Councillor M Curtis**

I will get back to you in writing about that. My belief is that we are working together and the consultation that we are getting now is moving us towards a provision that will work, and we continue to negotiate and we continue to consult with the schools to make sure that is the case.

### **3. Question to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire from Councillor G Harper**

It is now some six or so months since the average time cameras were installed on the Forty Foot Bank. Can you give us an assessment of their success or otherwise by telling us how many motorists have been caught speeding on the Forty Foot Bank, after the conclusions that we came to about finding out what the high speeds were before the cameras were installed? It would appear a low prosecution rate indicates some success at curtailing the speed.

### **Reply from Councillor M McGuire**

Councillor Harper did give me notice of the question so I was able to check up on the answer, but I also had a meeting last week with the Camera Safety Partnership and asked the same question myself to find out how well we were doing. What I can say is that Cambridgeshire Police have processed a total of 45 offences for this stretch of road in the six months since the installation, and report that the system has been successful in bringing down speeds to within the speed limit - which is 50mph. Evidence from this and other average speed installations suggests that the speeds will remain low and safety will continue to be improved with the reduced speed limits. Ultimately the success of the installation will be judged on how effectively it has reduced the crash rate on this road, as cameras are about protecting the lives and wellbeing of all road users, not simply catching motorists out. Casualty data is being closely monitored and will be reported as part of the forthcoming annual joint casualty data report later this year.

Local investigations carried out before the camera installation showed that inappropriate speed and overtaking featured in many of the more serious incidents on this road. The speed survey data showed that many drivers were exceeding the speed limit both at night and during the day time. Chairman I know when people talk about this 85 percentile it gets a bit confusing, but I think that it is where 15% of vehicles are travelling well over the speed limit. I can tell you that has actually

reduced from the surveys that were carried out a few years ago before the cameras came in, the average speed then was 61mph, that has now dropped to 52mph. So I think this demonstrates the effectiveness of average speed cameras, and of course that has been replicated as we know on the A14, which of course is a Highways Agency road. So there is an argument for average speed cameras.

**4. Question to the Cabinet Member for Communities, Councillor Sir Peter Brown, from Councillor I Manning**

I hope you are aware of Chesterton Community Association's proposals to take over Milton Road Library. I understand from the Chair of the Association that he hasn't received replies from the last two submissions he made to you, although he did receive a reply to the very first one. So I would like to publically invite you to come to a meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March that the Association is holding to discuss the proposals with the local users of the service and listen to their proposals and respond them.

**Reply from Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

I am aware that the Chairman of the Chesterton Community Association has written to me in support of the Council's proposals. I will look at my diary for the 4<sup>th</sup> of March and see if I can come, and if I can I will. At the moment Christine May is arranging a whole series of meetings with all the libraries and it is our wish to come and see you at sometime in the future, but 4<sup>th</sup> of March looks OK.

**Supplementary Question from Councillor I Manning**

Just very briefly could I ask you to confirm that, everything else being equal, you would generally give more weight to a proposal to take over a library, when it is a community resource, as opposed to closing that library?

**Reply from Councillor Sir Peter Brown**

We will look at every possibility with local people, if the local people want to keep their library and are prepared to work for it, we will be very happy to support it.

**5. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor J Tuck from Councillor S Sedgwick-Jell**

Given the impact on Cambridgeshire of the finance settlement that we have just been in essence debating and particularly the continuing discrimination against Cambridgeshire, given our demographic trends, how many Coalition ministers have you, as Leader of the Council, personally spoken to in pressing our case for fairer treatment?

**Reply from Councillor J Tuck**

I was privileged to be invited to Number 10 a week or so ago and had the opportunity to speak to David Cameron, but not enough, because if you've ever been to those events it is marvellous, but they move very quickly. However I did speak to Greg Clark, Andrew Lansley and Mr Pickles, and I've had more than one discussion with Mr Pickles I can say. I can promise you that we will keep fighting for Cambridgeshire. I do meet regularly with the actual group of MPs that we have here, so I do speak to them. They are aware of our feelings and we've got the facts and I produce those to them.



**6. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty, from Councillor P Reeve**

My question is, with the Government's continued open border policy, Cambridgeshire schools are under a lot of pressure with English as another language students. This is put under even more strain with the budget cuts that are now in place. Can you assure me that schools will still be supported adequately to be able to provide a high quality education for those children and also for the other children in those classrooms?

**Reply from Councillor D Harty**

The answer is yes.

**Supplementary Question from Councillor P Reeve**

Could you outline how very briefly?

**Reply from Councillor D Harty**

I'll write to you.

**7. Question to Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire from Councillor R Moss-Eccardt:**

Earlier in the debate, Councillor Clarke seemed to indicate that he believed he was a decision maker of some sort or another, in terms of attending the Transport Summit. Could you clarify on what basis you invited Councillor Clarke to attend with you at the Summit?

**Reply from Councillor M McGuire**

Chairman as we effectively outlined earlier on when we talked about the Summit, the Summit was not intended to be a Councillor seminar, another one of those things, or a debate on whose budget is right and whose budget is wrong. It was intended to get the decision makers from around the County together, different organisations, and they ranged from people like the NHS, Community Transport, GP surgeries, school people, as many people who either commission transport or had transport as part of their responsibility. The people we invited including District Councillors were people who could actually make decisions. So I invited the Cabinet Members to attend and the Cabinet Assistants and it was under that guise, because ultimately in this Council the Cabinet and this Administration are the decision makers, and we have seen that already this afternoon, that was the rationale for inviting Councillor Clarke.

**Supplementary Question from Councillor R Moss-Eccardt**

Can I therefore ask Councillor McGuire to talk to the training champion; for Councillor McGuire to understand that Cabinet Assistants have no responsibility, decision making powers or anything else in this Authority. They are political appointments made internally in the Tory group. Otherwise it means that any political appointee, press officers, whatever, would have that same status. Could he clarify that he understands that Cabinet Assistants have no status at all in respect of the Authority?

### **Reply from Councillor M McGuire**

Chairman, I referred specifically to decision makers, I wanted people there and Councillor Clarke was there to help me, as one of the Cabinet Assistants. I am the portfolio holder, you are probably aware for instance that Councillor Clarke is with myself on the Supervisory Board at Cambridgeshire Highways, and it was in that role that I specifically wanted Councillor Clarke to be there. Ultimately whatever the appointments are in terms of Cabinet, as we know under the executive system, one of the reasons why we have executives and scrutiny is that executives are the ones that are held to account legally.

### **8. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor R Pegram from Councillor D Jenkins**

Would you kindly please give us your best estimate of the first month in which fare paying passengers will travel on the guided bus?

### **Reply from the Councillor R Pegram**

The straight answer is 'no', because until BAM Nuttall the contractor choose to handover all of the certification and to handover the bus route, which at the moment could run buses on it, physically, until we receive that documentation, until we have a formal handover, no I can't. I'm totally in the hands of BAM Nuttall – it is a construction site.

### **Supplementary Question from Councillor D Jenkins**

I would guess that it will open some 18 months or more later than the expectation of the Christmas before last, and perhaps three years later than it was originally planned. When we were going to open it the Christmas before last, it would be short of some software functionality on ticketing. Presumably we have now had a chance to sort all that and the ticketing will be fully functional and operational on day one, can you confirm that?

### **Reply from Councillor R Pegram**

No I can't Chairman, there is a meeting scheduled for tomorrow. I will get an update on ticketing at that meeting and that will give me a clear understanding of where we stand.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 FEBRUARY 2011  
MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

**Council agreed:**

- (i) to replace Councillor N Harrison with Councillor L Nethsingha as a substitute member of the Development Control Committee
- (ii) to replace Councillor N Harrison with Councillor S Gymer as a substitute member of the Joint Development Control Committee for Northstowe
- (iii) to replace Councillor N Harrison with Councillor I Manning as a substitute member of the Cambridge Environment Traffic Management Area Joint Committee
- (iv) to replace Councillor N Harrison with Councillor C Shepherd as a member of the Joint Planning Committee for Cambridge City Fringes
- (v) to replace Councillor N Harrison with Councillor K Wilkins as a representative on the Local Government Association Commissions – Urban
- (vi) to replace Councillor J West with Councillor G Harper as a member of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee
- (vii) to replace Councillor J West with Councillor N Guyatt as a member of the Adults Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny
- (viii) to replace Councillor J West with Councillor V McGuire as a substitute member of the Safer & Stronger Communities Scrutiny Committee
- (ix) to replace Councillor J West with Councillor S Hoy as a member of the Fenland Area Joint Committee.