

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 15 May 2012
Time: 10.30h – 12.50h
Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge
Present: Councillor J Powley (Chairman)

Councillors: S Austen, J Batchelor, I Bates, N Bell, K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, D Brown, F Brown, P Brown, R Butcher, C Carter, J Clark, N Clarke, S Count, S Criswell, P Downes, J Dutton, N Guyatt, S Gymer, G Harper, D Harty, G Heathcock, S Hoy, W Hunt, C Hutton, D Jenkins, E Kadić, G Kenney, S King, V Lucas, I Manning, M McGuire, V McGuire, A Melton, L Nethsingha, L Oliver, T Orgee, J Palmer, R Pegram, A Pellew, P Read, P Reeve, J Reynolds, T Sadiq, P Sales, 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, G Wilson, F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors: M Curtis, B Farrer, N Harrison, S Johnstone, S Kindersley, K Reynolds, S Sedgwick-Jell, L Wilson

232. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL

The Monitoring Officer, Quentin Baker, conducted the first item: the election of Chairman. It was moved by Councillor Orgee and seconded by Councillor Lucas:

That Councillor Powley be re-elected Chairman of the County Council for the period to the next annual meeting of Council.

On being put to the vote, Councillor Powley was elected.

[Voting pattern: Conservative, the majority of Liberal Democrats, Labour, UKIP in favour; one Liberal Democrat against, and three Liberal Democrats abstained.]

Councillor Powley signed the statutory declaration of acceptance of office, took the Chair and thanked the Council for his election.

233. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by Councillor F Brown:

That Councillor K Reynolds be re-elected Vice-Chairman of the County Council for the period to the next annual meeting of Council.

On being put to the vote, Councillor K Reynolds was elected.

[Voting pattern: Conservative, the majority of Liberal Democrats, Labour and UKIP in favour; four Liberal Democrats abstained.]

The Chairman reported that Councillor K Reynolds would need to sign his

statutory declaration of acceptance of office at the next meeting.

234. MINUTES – 27 MARCH 2012

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 27 March 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

235. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

236. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Councillor	Minute	Details
Tuck J	244a)	Vice Chairman of Breakout Choir in Wisbech
Wilson G	245a)	Governor of Godmanchester Primary School

237. CABINET MEMBERSHIP

In accordance with Part 2, Article 7, Section 7.04 of the Council's Constitution, Council noted the Leader of the Council had appointed Councillor S Tierney as Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing to replace Councillor T Orgee; and Councillor T Orgee as Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure to replace Councillor S Criswell.

The Leader, Councillor Clarke, thanked Councillor Criswell for his service on Cabinet.

238. APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by the Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, and agreed unanimously:

That the recommendations for appointments to Committees set out in the tabled report on blue paper under item 7 be approved, subject to:

- Deleting the Mental Health Services in Cambridgeshire & Peterborough: Joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee; and

Enterprise, Growth & Community Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- Councillor van de Ven transferring from substitute to full membership and Councillor K Wilkins transferring from membership to substitute member.

Safer & Stronger Communities Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- Councillor Wilkins replacing Councillor Shepherd as a member and Councillor Nethsingha replacing Councillor Wilkins as a substitute member;

The full amended details of appointments to committee membership 2012/13 are set out in **Appendix B**.

239. APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by the Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, and agreed unanimously:

That the recommendations for appointments to outside organisations set out in the tabled report on yellow paper under item 8 be approved.

The full details of appointments to outside organisations are set out in **Appendix C**.

240 APPROVAL OF CALENDAR OF COUNTY COUNCIL MEETINGS

It was moved by the Chairman and seconded by the Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, and resolved unanimously:

That the following calendar of meetings for the County Council be approved:

- 17 July 2012
- 16 October 2012
- 11 December 2012
- 19 February 2012
- 22 February 2012 (Provisional)
- 26 March 2013
- 21 May 2012

241. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were received.

242. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

243. TEMPORARY ARRANGEMENTS TO COVER THE ROLE OF SECTION 151 OFFICER FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

It was moved by the Cabinet Member for Resources & Performance, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, Councillor Bates, that Council receive a report from the Chief Executive on temporary arrangements to cover the role of Section 151 Officer.

Council resolved unanimously to:

- i) Ratify the appointment of Matt Bowmer, on an interim basis, as Section 151 Officer for Cambridgeshire County Council, until such time as an alternative interim, or a permanent replacement is appointed.
- ii) Approve the proposed approach and next steps towards seeking a permanent replacement S 151 Officer outlined in the report.

- iii) Delegate to the Head of Paid Service, authority to undertake all actions necessary or incidental to the implementation of these proposals including the selection and appointment of a S 151 Officer pending ratification by Full Council at the next available meeting.

244. MOTIONS

There were two motions submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10 as follows:

(a) Motion from Councillor L Nethsingha

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

This Council notes that "The Cambridgeshire Music Partnership" has made a bid to the Arts Council England to lead the music service in Cambridgeshire.

This Council recognises that music education can have a huge impact on the life chances of the children who take part, and provide a very valuable boost to educational opportunities and outcomes of those children who choose to learn an instrument and play in music ensembles.

This Council recognises that it is crucially important that the opportunity to learn an instrument should be available to all children and not just those whose families can afford to pay for lessons.

This Council recognises that the changes brought in by the current government to the way music education is funded will provide major opportunities, but also major challenges to the music service in the next few years.

This Council therefore proposes that the administration should provide some measure of additional funding from its own money to assist the delivery arm of the music service, Cambridgeshire Music, to maintain its strength during the transitional period while the hub model takes effect.

The following amendments to the above motion were proposed by Councillor Harty and seconded by Councillor M McGuire [additional text underlined and deleted text struck through]:

This Council notes that "The Cambridgeshire Music Partnership" has made a successful bid to the Arts Council England to lead the music service in Cambridgeshire.

~~This Council therefore proposes that the administration should provide some measure of additional funding from its own money to assist the delivery arm of the music service, Cambridgeshire Music, to maintain its strength during the transitional period while the hub model takes effect.~~

This Council recognises the successful work of the Officers in preparing the bid, and consider that Cambridgeshire Children, Young People and Adults will benefit from the many opportunities that will be created.

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

[Voting pattern: Conservatives in favour, Liberal Democrats, Labour, UKIP against; the Chairman abstained.]

Following further discussion, the substantive motion, as amended below, on being put to the vote, was carried unanimously.

This Council notes that "The Cambridgeshire Music Partnership" has made a successful bid to the Art Council England to lead the music service in Cambridgeshire.

This Council recognises that music education can have a huge impact on the life chances of the children who take part, and provide a very valuable boost to educational opportunities and outcomes of those children who choose to learn an instrument and play in music ensembles.

This Council recognises that it is crucially important that the opportunity to learn an instrument should be available to all children and not just those whose families can afford to pay for lessons.

This Council recognises that the changes brought in by the current government to the way music education is funded will provide major opportunities, but also major challenges to the music service in the next few years.

This Council recognises the successful work of the officers in preparing the bid, and consider that Cambridgeshire Children, Young People and Adults will benefit from the many opportunities that will be created.

As part of the discussion on the motion the Cabinet Member for Learning agreed to consider the impact of the new arrangements on Looked After Children and children on Free School Meals.

(b) Motion from Councillor K Wilkins

With the agreement of Council, Councillor Wilkins proposed the following motion altered from that set out on the agenda (deletions struck through). The motion was seconded by Councillor G Wilson.

This Council welcomes the selection of Alconbury Airfield as the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership's (LEP) "Enterprise Zone", because of the benefits this will bring to the area.

~~This Council also notes that Enterprise Zones in their previous incarnation, under the Thatcher and Major governments, did not always result in net job creation, and often led to displacement or "boundary hopping" — the relocation of local businesses to these zones for no reason other than to take advantage of reduced business rates, often harming the economic ecosystem of existing towns and communities, with no net benefit to the economy.~~

This Council ~~further~~ notes that Urban and Civic will have the final say in the letting of individual sites to companies, but understands that the LEP has substantial scope to influence the principles that guide ~~the lettings policy~~ the development of the Enterprise Zone.

Therefore, in order to ensure that the Alconbury Enterprise Zone results in net job

creation for the LEP area and does not harm existing communities such as Huntingdon, ~~this council requests that Cabinet consider calling on the LEP to use its influence on the letting process such that the presumption is against boundary-hopping and tax avoidance.~~ it is proposed that this Council endorses the arrangements made between the LEP and Urban and Civic through the agreed Memorandum of Understanding which seeks to manage the risk of displacement as the Enterprise Zone develops. The County Council Leader is a member of the Enterprise Zone Steering Group, along with the Huntingdonshire District Council Leader, the LEP Chair and the Managing Director of Urban and Civic. The Steering Group meets to oversee development of the Enterprise Zone, including considering displacement risk.

Within those arrangements, ~~In such a lettings policy,~~ preference should be given to companies that can show that moving to the Alconbury Enterprise Zone will bring a clear and demonstrable benefit to the sub-regional economy through, for example:

- enabling them to expand their business and/or generate more jobs;
- the business being able to broaden what it does within the LEP area, for example, by adding manufacturing or development to an existing research facility elsewhere in the LEP area;
- the benefits of clustering with businesses in the same sector or proximity to businesses with which they work;

~~While not meeting these criteria directly, and subject to the success of the zone itself,~~ Preference might also be given to businesses that

- can show economic or other benefits (beyond mere tax advantages) through the consolidation of existing business premises to new and more suitable premises on the Enterprise Zone; or
- would otherwise relocate business premises from the LEP area outside the UK or EU (for reasons other than tax avoidance) and where relocation to the Enterprise Zone would be likely to result in their long-term stay in the area.

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

245. QUESTIONS

a) Oral Questions

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

- In response to a question from Councillor G Wilson, the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, agreed to provide a written response on the provision of sufficient places for children with siblings at Godmanchester Primary School.
- In response to a question from Councillor Williamson, the Cabinet Member for

Community Infrastructure, Councillor Orgee, agreed to write to Stagecoach to make representation for the No. 9 bus route to continue to include stops at Waterbeach and Landbeach.

- In response to a question from Councillor Whelan, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure together with the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, Councillor Bates, undertook to meet with Councillor Whelan to discuss working with the parish councils to restore the No. 18 bus service on Friday or Saturday evenings. The Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure also agreed to investigate further the idea of bus 'feeder services' from the villages into Park & Ride sites.
- In response to a question from Councillor Batchelor, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, agreed to communicate details regarding an alternative service to the No 16 and 9 bus service shortly.
- In response to a question from Councillor Shepherd, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, agreed to meet with Councillor Shepherd and the local Area Maintenance Engineer in Bateman Street to consider the condition of the road, and in particular the cycle lane running alongside the Botanical Gardens.
- In response to a question from Councillor Bell, the Cabinet Member for Learning undertook to meet with Councillor Bell in Ely to consider the suitability of the now disused Ely Magistrates' Court House, for the storage of the County's archives.
- In response to a question from Councillor Jenkins, the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, agreed to share Connecting Cambridgeshire maps with Members, which showed which areas would be covered by the project.
- In response to a request from Councillor Downes, the Cabinet Member for Learning, agreed to prepare a briefing note on the Government's new approach to special educational needs and disability; to add it as a topic on the next Members' Seminar, and provide the necessary assurance to parents who might be confused by the Government's new approach.
- In response to a question from Councillor van de Ven, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure and the Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Community Engagement agreed to meet with Councillor van de Ven and Great & Little Chishill Parish Speedwatch Team to discuss tackling the problem of speeding on the county's rural roads.
- In response to a question from Councillor Stone, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to consider the issue of equity with regard to the County's involvement with the maintenance of protected road verges.
- In response to a question from Councillor Whitebread, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, agreed to investigate the possibility of increased charging of utility companies for digging up the road at peak hours; and whether cyclists could be permitted through routes that were closed for cars when this maintenance was being undertaken.
- In response to a question from Councillor Hoy, the Leader of the Council,

Councillor Clarke, offered assurance that Local Members would be fully involved in the development of the Wisbech 2020 Strategy.

b) Written Questions

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

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 MAY 2012
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Nick Dawe

Nick Dawe, Local Government Shared Services: Director Finance has left LGSS. He played a pivotal role for both LGSS and Cambridgeshire County Council. The Council wishes him well for the future and thanks him for his contribution to both Cambridgeshire and LGSS.

Association of County Chief Executives

The Chief Executive, Mark Lloyd, has been elected Chairman of the Association of County Chief Executives for the next 12 months.

AWARDS

Charter for Member Development

The Council has been awarded the Charter for Member Development. Congratulations go to the Member Development Panel, Member Development Champions, Ian Lambert, Scrutiny and Improvement Manager, and Rob Jakeman, Scrutiny and Improvement Officer and their colleagues for preparing for the assessment.

Youth Offending Team

Congratulations go to staff working in and supporting the Council’s Youth Offending Team following a recent inspection made by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation. A new comprehensive report has found that work in Cambridgeshire to reduce offending and help safeguard youngsters is above the national average. The inspection focused exclusively on the work undertaken by Youth Offending Teams with children and young people who had already committed an offence.

The report says in summary: "*Overall, we consider this a creditable set of findings. We found an enthusiastic, knowledgeable and committed group of staff who were keen to deliver a high quality service and who understood the needs of the children and young people with whom they worked. Partnership work was effective and staff from a number of agencies were able to provide support to individuals and to their families. We are confident that if the recommendations in this report are implemented the improvement required can be achieved and sustained.*"

The report also found that the Safeguarding and Public Protection aspects of the work as well as reducing risk of harm and reoffending were all above the national average.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

Music Education Hubs

The Arts Council England has announced details of the nationwide network of 122 music education hubs that will play a key role in ensuring that every child has the opportunity to experience a high quality music education. Cambridgeshire County Council's bid was successful and will attract over £1.6m.

Better Bus Area Fund Bid

On 23rd March, Cambridgeshire County Council was informed by Government that its £1.7 million bid for the Better Bus Area Fund was successful and this will unlock up to £5 million pounds of funding to support bus services in and around Cambridge. The money will help improve bus journeys, make it easier for passengers to access services and reduce pollution in the historic Cambridge city centre. The key element of the Better Bus Area Fund bid is a package of measures within Cambridge city centre and on four of the key radial routes for bus services in the city (Hills Road, Mill Road, Histon Road and Milton Road). A programme is currently being developed which will include consultation with the public and key stakeholders on elements of the package to seek views on issues and options ahead of designing up any schemes.

Cottenham to Histon Cycleway

Improvements to the Cottenham to Histon cycleway have recently been completed. The £450,000 scheme was funded through the Housing Growth Fund formerly administered by Cambridgeshire Horizons.

Local cyclists have been impressed with the smooth machine-layed asphalt surface with solar powered catseyes to light the way at night. The scheme has already been successful in attracting commuters to cycle to Cambridge, in preference to adding to traffic congestion by driving.

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, our foster carers face many challenging situations but they never fail to put the best interests of the child first.

The following carers have recently retired.

Anne and the late George Dunn

Anne Dunn and George Dunn have been fostering since 1984. George died in April 2011 and Anne retired in April 2012 after 28 years. In this time Anne and George have fostered over 80 children and young people, offering time limited placements for young people, often with only an hour's notice. Anne has also been active in helping recruit new carers. Anne and George truly listened to young people and made them feel safe. They were able to turn many children's lives around and many of those children have stayed in touch and consider Anne and George as family. One social worker who worked with Anne and George described them as "a truly amazing couple". Anne has moved to a 1 bedroom property and this is the reason that she had to withdraw from fostering.

Dee and Tony Simpson

Dee and Tony have been foster carers for 19 years and had over 70 placements during this time. They were particularly skilled at working with young people with learning disabilities and young people who displayed challenging behaviour. A social worker who worked with Dee and Tony said "their home was always full of laughter". Several of their placements have been long-standing, indicative of their ability to sustain relationships and show commitment to young people. Dee and Tony were supported by all their own children, particularly Fiona, their daughter, who was their attached respite carer.

CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN ACTIVITIES: MARCH – MAY 2012

Chairman's engagements

Since 27 March 2012 (previous Council meeting)

- Chairman of Norfolk County Council Civic Service - Norwich

April 2012

- Three Citizenship ceremonies – Shire Hall
- Youthoria Awards – Neale-Wade Community College, March
- Change of Command ceremony – RAF Lakenheath
- Chairman of Suffolk County Council reception – Ipswich
- St George's Day flag-raising ceremony – Huntingdon
- Duke of York visit to Red Gate Software, Cambridge
- Wood Green Animal Shelter 25th pet blessing service – Ely Cathedral

May 2012

- **Three Citizenship ceremonies – Shire Hall**
- **Scouting event – St Ives**
- **Swansong Awards ceremony – Huntingdonshire District Council**
- **City of Ely mayor making ceremony – St Mary's Rooms, Ely**

Vice-Chairman's engagements

Since 27 March 2012 (previous Council meeting)

- Long Service Awards – Shire Hall

April 2012

- Citizenship Ceremony – Shire Hall

May 2012

- St John Ambulance Service – Peterborough Cathedral
- Cambs County Forum Reserve Forces and Cadet Association for East Anglia – briefing for Civic Leaders

COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 MAY 2012
APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2012/13

Changes shown in bold type

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE (11)

Cllr F Brown [Chairman]	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr Sir P Brown [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr K Bourke	LD
Cllr B Farrer	C	Cllr J Clark	C
Cllr N Guyatt	C	Cllr C Hutton	C
Cllr G Harper	C	Cllr S King	C
Cllr D Jenkins	LD	Cllr A Pellew	LD
Cllr L Nethsingha	LD	Cllr P Read	C
Cllr J Powley	C	Cllr C Shepherd	LD
Cllr T Sadiq	L		
Cllr M Smith	C		
Cllr M Williamson	LD		

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (12)

Cllr J Dutton	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr S Gymer	LD	Cllr J Clark	C
Cllr S Hoy	C	Cllr S Criswell	C
Cllr S Johnstone [Chairman]	C	Cllr P Downes	LD
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr G Harper	C
Cllr I Manning	LD	Cllr C Hutton	C
Cllr V McGuire [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr J Palmer	C	Cllr F Whelan	LD
Cllr M Smith	C	Cllr P Reeve	UKIP
Cllr R West	C		
Cllr G Wilson	LD		
Cllr L Wilson	UKIP		

ADULTS WELLBEING AND HEALTH (12)

Cllr S Austen	LD	Substitutes:	
Cllr J Batchelor	LD	Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD
Cllr N Guyatt	C	Cllr G Heathcock	LD
Cllr C Hutton	C	Cllr S Hoy	C
Cllr G Kenney [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr A Melton	C
Cllr V McGuire	C	Cllr J Palmer	C
Cllr P Reeve	UKIP	Cllr P Read	C
Cllr K Reynolds [Chairman]	C	Cllr C Shepherd	LD
Cllr P Sales	L	Cllr L Wilson	UKIP
Cllr S Sedgwick-Jell	G		
Cllr F Whelan	LD		
Cllr F Yeulett	C		

ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE (12)

Cllr N Bell	LD	Substitutes:	
Cllr R Butcher [Chairman]	C	Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD
Cllr J Clark	C	Cllr F Brown	C
Cllr B Farrer [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr J Dutton	C
Cllr N Harrison	I	Cllr S Kindersley	LD
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr V McGuire	C

Cllr D Jenkins	LD	Cllr M Smith	C
Cllr L Kadic	C	Cllr K Wilkins	LD
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr G Wilson	LD
Cllr P Read	C		
Cllr S van de Ven	LD		
Cllr S Whitebread	LD		

SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES (12)

Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD	Substitutes:	
Cllr S Criswell	C	Cllr J Batchelor	LD
Cllr S Hoy [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr Sir P Brown	C
Cllr L Kadic	C	Cllr J Dutton	C
Cllr S King	C	Cllr G Harper	C
Cllr A Pellew	LD	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr P Reeve	UKIP	Cllr R Pegram	C
Cllr J E Reynolds	C	Cllr P Sales	L
Cllr T Sadiq	L	Cllr T Stone	LD
Cllr M Smith	C	Cllr S van de Ven	LD
Cllr R West [Chairman]	C	Cllr L Wilson	UKIP
Cllr K Wilkins	LD		

COMMITTEES

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (7)

Cllr R Butcher	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr B Farrer [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD
Cllr S Kindersley	LD	Cllr F Brown	C
Cllr P Read [Chairman]	C	Cllr J Clark	C
Cllr M Smith	C	Cllr B Hunt	C
Cllr T Stone	LD	Cllr L Kadic	C
Cllr M Williamson	LD	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
		Cllr K Wilkins	LD

STANDARDS COMMITTEE (5)

Vice Chairman of the Council		Substitutes:	
Cllr C Carter	L	Cllr G Harper	C
Cllr V Lucas	C	Cllr G Heathcock	LD
Cllr J Powley	C		
Cllr S van de Ven	LD		

APPOINTMENTS & REMUNERATION COMMITTEE (7)

Non-Cabinet nominee	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr S Count [Chairman]	C	N/A	
Cabinet Nominee [usually relevant Portfolio Holder]	C		
Cabinet Nominee or non-Cabinet nominee	C		
Liberal Democrat Group Leader or Nominee	LD		
Relevant Liberal Democrat Spokesman	LD		
Lib Dem Nominee	LD		

AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (7)

Cllr S Count	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr N Guyatt [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr K Bourke	LD
Cllr S Johnstone	C	Cllr D Jenkins	LD
Cllr J Reynolds	C	Cllr V Lucas	C
Cllr P Sales	L	Cllr A Melton	C

Cllr C Shepherd	LD	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr T Stone [Chairman]	LD	Cllr A G Orgee	C
		Cllr M Williamson	LD

SERVICE APPEALS COMMITTEE (pool of members)

Cllr S Austen	LD	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr F Brown	C	Cllr J Reynolds	C
Cllr S Criswell	C	Cllr K Reynolds	C
Cllr P Downes	LD	Cllr C Shepherd	LD
Cllr G Heathcock	LD	Cllr J Tuck	C
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr van de Ven	LD
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr R West	C
Cllr S King	C	Cllr M Williamson	LD
Cllr V McGuire	C	Cllr F Whelan	LD

STAFF APPEALS COMMITTEE (pool of members)

Cllr J Batchelor	LD	Cllr V McGuire	C
Cllr N Bell	LD	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr S Criswell	C	Cllr L Oliver	C
Cllr B Farrer	C	Cllr A Pellew	LD
Cllr G Harper	C	Cllr J Reynolds	C
Cllr S Hoy	C	Cllr C Shepherd	LD
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr M Smith	C
Cllr C Hutton	C	Cllr J Tuck	C
Cllr S Johnstone	C	Cllr R West	C
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr F Whelan	LD
Cllr S King	C		

PENSIONS COMMITTEE (3)

Cllr J Batchelor	LD	Substitutes:	
Cllr S Count	C	N/A	
Cllr N Guyatt	C		

JOINT COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS TO THE POLICE AUTHORITY (3)

Cllr M McGuire	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr A Melton	C	N/A	
Cllr F Whelan	LD		

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FOR CAMBRIDGE FRINGES (4)

Cllr G Kenney	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr T Orgee	C	Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD
Cllr R Pegram	C	Cllr J Reynolds	C
Cllr C Shepherd	LD		

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FOR NORTHSTOWE (4)

Cllr D Jenkins	LD	Substitutes:	
Cllr S Johnstone	C	Cllr S Gymer	LD
Cllr P Read	C		
Cllr J Reynolds	C		

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES (3)

Cllr N Clarke	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr S Count	C	Cllr R Butcher	C
Cllr L Nethsingha	LD	Cllr M Curtis	C
		Cllr D Jenkins	LD

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AREA JOINT COMMITTEES

CAMBRIDGE (6)

Cllr C Carter	L	Substitutes:	
Cllr L Nethsingha	LD	Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD
Cllr N Clarke	C	Cllr K Bourke	LD
Cllr C Shepherd	LD	Cllr D Brown	C
Cllr K Wilkins	LD	Cllr I Manning	LD
Cllr S Whitebread	LD	Cllr A Pellew	LD

EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE (5)

Cllr N Bell	LD	Substitutes:	
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr S Austen	LD
Cllr J Powley	C	Cllr D Brown	C
Cllr P Read	C	Cllr F Brown	C
Cllr M Shuter	C	Vacancy	C
		Vacancy	C

FENLAND (5)

Cllr R Butcher	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr M Curtis	C	Cllr J Clark	C
Cllr S Hoy	C	Cllr S Count	C
Cllr S King	C	Cllr A Melton	C
Cllr S Tierney	C	Cllr F Yeulett	C

HUNTINGDONSHIRE (6)

Cllr Sir P Brown	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr P Downes	LD	Cllr V Lucas	C
Cllr C Hutton	C	Cllr D Harty	C
Cllr L Kadic	C	Cllr V McGuire	C
Cllr M McGuire	C	Cllr K Reynolds	C
Cllr R West	C	Cllr G Wilson	LD

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE (5)

Cllr N Clarke	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr D Jenkins	LD	Cllr S Gymer	LD
Cllr S Kindersley	LD	Cllr G Kenney	C
Cllr M Smith	C	Cllr A G Orgee	C
Cllr T Stone	LD	Cllr S van de Ven	LD
		Cllr M Williamson	LD

COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 MAY 2012
APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES

**APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES: COUNTY COUNCIL
APPOINTMENTS**

Changes shown in bold type

NAME OF BODY	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Association of Local Councils District Committees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Cambs • Fenland • Hunts • South Cambs 	4	1 to each	Cllr M Shuter (C) Cllr S Count (C) Cllr L Kadic (C) Cllr M Williamson (LD)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority	3	13	1. Cllr F Brown (C) 2. Cllr P Brown (C) 3. Cllr S Hoy (C) 4. Cllr R Pegram (C) 5. Cllr K Reynolds (C) 6. Cllr M Smith (C) 7. Cllr J Tuck (C) 8. Cllr F Yeulett (C) 9. Cllr N Bell (LD) 10. Cllr S Gymer (LD) 11. Cllr G Heathcock (LD) 12. Cllr F Whelan (LD) 13. Cllr P Sales (L)
Cambridgeshire Police Authority Note: appointments to the Police Authority are made by the Joint Committee on appointments to the Police Authority.	6	7	1. Cllr J Clark (C) 2. Cllr S Johnstone (C) 3. Cllr V Lucas (C) 4. Cllr V McGuire 5. Cllr J Reynolds (C) 6. Cllr J Batchelor (LD) 7. Cllr K Wilkins (LD)
County Councils' Network Council	3-4	4	1. Cllr N Clarke (C) 2. Cllr M McGuire (C) 3. Cllr S Johnstone (C) 4. Cllr K Bourke (LD)
East of England Local Government Association		1	Cllr N Clarke (C)
ESPO Management Committee Purchasing and contracting service for 10 member Authorities	4	2	1. Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance (C) 2. Cllr J Reynolds (C)

NAME OF BODY	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)
<i>Budget Sub-Committee</i>	As required	1	Cllr J Reynolds (C)
Local Government Association National representative body of all Local Authorities	3-4	4	1. Cllr N Clarke (C) 2. Cllr M McGuire (C) 3. Cllr S Johnstone (C) 4. Cllr D Jenkins (LD)
<i>LGA Commissions</i>			
• Rural	4	2	1. Cllr M McGuire (C) 2. Cllr D Brown (C)
• Urban	4	2	1. Cllr T Orgee (C) 2. Cllr K Wilkins (LD)
Reserve Forces and Cadets Assoc. for East Anglia To raise, recruit and administer the TAVR and Cadet Forces	2	1	Cllr V Lucas (C)

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 MAY 2012
MINUTE 245a) – ORAL QUESTION TIME**

**1. Question to Cabinet Member for Children and Young People’s Services,
Councillor D Brown from Councillor T Sadiq**

Can I ask the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People’s Services whether he can give an assurance that all possible measures have been taken to protect children in care homes in the County against possible exploitation [from] outside.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People’s Services, Councillor D Brown

Yes, is the straight answer. We will do whatever we can; clearly we need to protect our young people.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People’s Services, Councillor D Brown from Councillor T Sadiq

Can I just say that when I was a Corporate Parent visiting one of the children’s homes in the county, I was deeply impressed by the hard work of the staff in particular, and some of the really difficult circumstances they had to put up with. I’d like to know whether there is, whether the County Council will look at what other measures we could take to support the staff who are a lot of the time under a great deal of pressure looking after children who are in very vulnerable and needy positions.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People’s Services

Thank you Chairman. I echo Councillor Sadiq’s words about the hard work of all our staff in our children’s homes all across the county. I would also like to take this opportunity to advise Council that we are looking at re-invigorating our Corporate Parenting Board, and we will be looking through Group Leaders for volunteers from across the Council to sit on that Board, when we are in a position to present our plans. So, yes, hopefully that will have a significant input as well into the work in those children’s homes.

2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor G Wilson

This is a question to Councillor Harty about primary school admissions. I am very grateful that the good work of the Admissions Team and the co-operation of the two Primary Schools in Godmanchester is probably going to mean that every child who lives in Godmanchester and wanted a place in the reception in Godmanchester this September has got one. However there are thirteen children who have siblings in the schools in Godmanchester Primary School at the moment who have not been awarded a place at the school. This means parents will have to take and collect their children to two different schools, which could be between one and two miles away. Does he agree with me and the School’s Governors that we have a moral duty towards these parents and that the County should use the available Section 106 funds to provide additional places. Thank you.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Thank you Mr Chairman. I don't have the details at this point in time, and what I will do is write to you with a response.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor G Wilson

The response in the past has been there are vacancies elsewhere in Huntingdonshire, which would mean that these parents would have to transport their children to two schools. So my supplementary question is what suggestions does he have for these parents, to manage their lives, such that he can get two young children to two different schools, to ensure that they are not hanging around either before or after school. Thank you.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

We have had these similar problems before and we have overcome those problems. I will as I said write to you and respond.

3. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor M Williamson

Stagecoach released a press release which told us of all the wonderful changes they were making and when they talked about the Number 9 service which travels between Cambridge and eventually Chatteris or Littleport, but goes via Ely, they omitted to mention the fact that during the day, the new buses will not be going through either Waterbeach or Landbeach. This means that those people in Waterbeach and Landbeach who wish to go shopping in Ely during the day will find themselves cut off from easy access to the bus route. This is cause for a great deal of concern particularly among the older residents who like to go to Ely Market on a Thursday or travel up to Ely on a Saturday for shopping. I think Ely is a much more pleasant place to do their shopping than Cambridge is. I would like to ask Councillor Orgee what representations he has made or will make to Stagecoach to get them to provide a bus service that will suit the majority of people in my division and will make it possible for them to enjoy the quality of life that they previously enjoyed.

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

Thank you very much for that question and Councillor Williamson did give me warning that he was going to ask a question about the Number 9 service, and he is quite correct about the Stagecoach press release which referred to the Service 9, but didn't mention the changes affecting Waterbeach and Landbeach. I have the timetable in front of me, both the existing timetable and the revised timetable and I see that in fact that this change in route saves a mere five minutes on the service between Drummer Street and Ely. There are a number of services which go along major routes such as the A10 and then deviate to go into villages to pick up people. One that I am very familiar with is the 13 Service on the A1307 which goes into Horseheath and Linton and the Abingtons so what's been a situation in the past with this service is not unusual in terms of bus services across the county. What I propose to do is to write to Stagecoach and ask them to rethink their routing of this because it is a saving of a small amount of time on the service and it does take the service out of Waterbeach and Landbeach for so many services during the day; and I think that time could be made up within the service itself. So I shall be making those representations to Stagecoach.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure from Councillor M Williamson

I was going to [ask a supplementary], but I think that Councillor Orgee has been so helpful on this one that perhaps I won't ask a question, but I would just make a comment which he might just like to come back on. When approached, Stagecoach did indeed raise the question of saving time and indeed saving distance, a mere 1.4 miles, which I measured this morning by not going through the villages. Their suggestion was that people from Waterbeach and Landbeach could perhaps go down to Milton on the bus and then catch the bus from Milton back up to Ely. When asked if they would make sure there was a connecting service they said "Oh no, we won't make sure that it's a connecting service," so we could find people waiting for an hour in Milton trying to get from Waterbeach to Ely, a completely unsatisfactory situation. And I would just thank Councillor Orgee for his support in this matter.

4. Question for the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor F Whelan

I am going to start off by saying thank you, which at the very last minute yesterday afternoon we found out that the Number 14 service is going to be continuing. So Caldecote residents have a bus service and we are extremely grateful. What I am really after is for some help to know what we can do about the Number 18 bus service. I think poor old Councillor Criswell had my rant at the last Council meeting about all of the things we had done to engage and I am coming back to the same thing today, but I'm coming at it from a different tactic. The Number 18 bus service stopped on a Friday and Saturday nights from about six o'clock onwards. That stopped in April last year.

All of the Parish Councils along that route want to get it back one night a week, either the Friday or the Saturday. They are willing to put their hands in their pockets and help fund it. People who use it are willing to pay for a ticket rather than using a Megarider. What we are struggling with is that we have been to Officers with this, we have presented all of the different things. We don't know whether we are couching it in the wrong language, but every time we suggest something we get "No you can't do that." So what we would like to do is throw it back and say tell us what we can do and we will meet you more than half way to do it, but we would like to get this service back up and running.

Within reason we will do whatever it takes, but we need some co-operation or some willingness from Officers or some change in the way that we work with Officers to be able to get it back up and running, because the local people want it and are willing to do what it takes. Parish Councils are all willing to help, buy-in from all the District Councillors, and I'm certainly up there and I'm ready to do whatever it takes, Councillor Orgee so tell me what I need to do.

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

Thanks very much. That was a very positive contribution and question, and I am happy in the very first instance to meet with Councillor Whelan, and I think Councillor Bates, to have a meeting to see what we need to do to take it forward.

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

Just a very quick one and it comes from the people of Madingley. When we are looking at what we are doing with all of the bus routes in the future, two things actually. One is a lot of the villages have filled in questionnaires and it has gone very quiet as to where those questionnaires have gone and what has been done with the information that they have provided. And the second one is could we perhaps be a bit more creative with the Park and Rides because the villages don't use the bus service all the way into the City Centre. They are very happy if they can get to a Park and Ride somewhere and then they can actually get off and they can either go into the city or heaven forbid they might travel north in the County and go somewhere else, but it's just making it a little bit more flexible I think is what they are looking for.

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

The suggestion of in a sense feeder services into Park and Ride sites has been widely touted by a number of different residents and Councillors and I am certainly happy to look into that.

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

Well on the same topic, I'd like to add some new numbers please. The Number 16 and the 9. As you will be aware, my area is in the first tranche of the buses to be lost initially in September, but these two buses are being lost on the 10th June. What I am looking for is some assurance that an alternative service will be in place on the 10th June as has been promised as I have been assured elsewhere, but I have yet to see any contracts or any actual real evidence that some sort of replacement will be in place for the 10th June. So I'm seeking that assurance please.

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

Happy to give that assurance. Councillor Whelan referred just a minute or two ago to one particular service and the replacement for that and a press release is in progress of being created, and I had hoped that it would be out yesterday. It is not out at the minute, but that should give you all the reassurance that you seek.

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

Are press releases community engagement I wonder? Because that is what we are being promised, community engagement. We had a Community Engagement meeting a couple of weeks back in West Wrating. I might say the packed hall in West Wrating went away very disappointed, because the options that were offered to them were Dial-A-Ride and Share-a-Car type options. Whereas what everybody wanted to know in that room was how do I get to work in the morning? How do I get home from work in the evening? How do I get my children to Sixth Form college in Cambridge?

The Community Transport answer does not address that. I am again seeking assurance that we will actually be pursuing options other than what we describe as community transport, which is already doing whatever it can in our area. Those that want to use it already do and it does not actually answer the matter of the loss of the buses.

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

Thank you very much. Certain types of journeys require a regular service such as those people accessing employment, those people going to Sixth Form colleges and so on and my clear understanding is that there will be a scheduled service on this route and the details will be announced very, very shortly. I hope to be able to communicate those to you as quickly as possible.

6. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor R West

It is regarding the A1303, the Madingley to Cambridge road. I wonder if you would like to comment on the improvements that have been made and also credit the Highways Department with the design features which seem to me to enable much better running conditions.

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

Thank you. I think you are referring to the section of road just before you get to the Madingley Cemetery, and yes I've watched that work with interest and I think that the scheme that has been put in place there will be a much needed safety improvement on that part of the road; so I really welcome that scheme. And while I have the opportunity I also welcome the resurfacing of the road immediately closer to the junction with the motorway because that stretch of road was in very, very bad condition and I was delighted to see that a few weeks ago as well.

7. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor C Shepherd

Same Councillor, different topic! My question is to do with the policy for re-tarmacking or resurfacing roads, particularly cycle roads and roads in conservation areas in Cambridge. There is a street in my road [*sic*], it runs alongside the Botanical Gardens. It is in a conservation area and there is a contraflow cycle lane on this road. This lane is now impassable – the tarmac is so degraded you have to bike in the road. And so my question is that we have been told that the degradation doesn't quite meet the extent of degradation required before it is resurfaced. My question is: is there a different kind of test for degradation for cycle lanes?

Is it possible that we could have the cycle lane resurfaced, even if the whole road is not to be resurfaced, because of the danger for cycling on that one? And secondly, as this road continues, it joins the junction of Hills Road, which is a busy road and the junction is pretty much collapsed. It needs to be repaired, but throughout this road, it has got areas of paving, it is not tarmacked, it is paving as in a conservation area and we have been told that although the Highways Department will repair this road, they won't repair it with paving. They won't repair it like for like, so the second part of my question is, apart from a second policy for cycle lanes, might there also be a policy for resurfacing in a conservation area which repairs roads like for like? Thankyou

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

Thank you very much Mr Chairman. Was that a question and a supplementary question all in one?

I am very grateful to Councillor Shepherd for giving me full details of this question before the meeting, so I'm very very grateful for that. I should say that the assessment process for reactive and planned highway maintenance work does take into consideration the impact of all of highway defects on all road users and that includes cyclists and pedestrians. And as indicated in the question, highway defects close to the kerb and in cycle lanes may not affect motorised traffic that much but they have a significant impact on the impact of cycling.

What I can offer to Councillor Shepherd is that I am very happy to meet her with the engineers in Bateman Street and to ensure that the Area Maintenance Engineer takes into account the feedback of road conditions when assessments are undertaken later this year. I'll ask for the road to be inspected again to see if any repairs are warranted in time to address the issue under safety inspection procedures. So I am very happy to meet with Councillor Shepherd at the site in question. I know it is a fairly lengthy road and it is in relatively poor condition.

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

Other than to say thank you very much for that, but also the like for like, replacing paving with tarmac, can we keep the paving?

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

Yes we will look at that issue at the site meeting with Councillor Shepherd.

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

Will the Council take all measures to ensure that statutory responsibilities are considered fully in relation to proposals on the Cambridgeshire Fringes development, and I ask in particular in relation to roads, road adoption and air quality.

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

There is a written question on road adoption and it is a sore point with many people. It's interesting that when I very first moved into this county and to Sawston, the road in the estate wasn't adopted and it was of very considerable concern to residents about whether it would be adopted or not. So I can fully appreciate and understand the concerns of people placed in such situations. There is as I say a written answer about that issue and about what powers we have at the minute and we will be seeking to look at those powers to see whether under the new Localism Bill we can actually take a more proactive stance.

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

I am grateful for that Mr Chair, because the question does not address statutory responsibilities for example to deliver education. So if the road is not adopted and the developer owns the road, they could prevent people going to school, so there are important issues that are not addressed in that question and I am keen to see the Council address them. Thank you.

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

Well I am with a number of colleagues members of the Joint Development Control Committee covering Cambridge Fringes, and I'm sure we will look at those issues in very careful detail when they come before us.

9. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor P Sales

Thank you Chair. This is a question for Councillor Harty just by way of a change. The County Council's Literacy Officer is threatened with redundancy. This person has made an outstanding contribution to literacy across the County and is the only person in that role and it is actually a part time post. Can I ask the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Library Services to think again about this decision, because the impact upon adult literacy across the County will be very considerable.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Thank you Mr Chairman and thank you Councillor Sales for your notice of the question. I am not actually prepared to discuss individual cases in a public arena and we are trying to respond to the cost pressures and seek savings across the Council's services. Regrettably this has had and will involve reductions in staff and numbers. The Library Service has been carefully reviewed and structures developed for this. A key point to remember is we are not closing any Libraries.

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

Thank you. I am somewhat puzzled by the last statement because I did not actually ask a question about closing Libraries. I am not encouraged by the Councillor's reply - the Officer concerned is very well connected particularly in literacy circles at the highest possible level and to make this Officer redundant could well invite adverse publicity far in excess of the value of the proposed savings, because reputational damage does have a value, and I would ask that every consideration be given.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

I insist again that I am not prepared to discuss individual cases in a public arena. Please remember we are not closing any Libraries.

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

Returning to Councillor Orgee and I'm sorry I have not given you advance notice of this, and I could not decide what to ask you about as there are so many things, but actually it's going to be roads. In South Cambridgeshire there were 56 or 57 applications for minor highways improvements and I just want to know how are we going to go forward with that. Obviously so many of the communities want to deal with the problems in their communities and will we be having another round of minor highways improvements?

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

Thanks very much for that question. Groups of Councillors in different areas of the county have been looking at this in their own particular areas. There is £50 000 set aside for such schemes in each area and a Panel met to consider the schemes put forward in South Cambridgeshire, and as you rightly say there were over 50 schemes put forward. They've come up with some recommendations which have to be considered by myself and the appropriate senior member of staff, but those recommendations actually as they stand only amount to about £34 000. So the schemes they approved didn't use up all the money, and I'm going to look very carefully at that.

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

Many of the schemes put through were actually really maintenance issues that local people don't feel the County have been proactive enough on, and I would urge you to look at that very closely especially in South Cambs, that people don't feel they are getting their white lines, their cats-eyes, their safety crossings maintained properly.

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

I have said that I will look at it very closely, and the fact is that there is another £16 000 which has not yet been allocated.

11. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor N Bell

This involves two rather sad tales in the County. One is a Georgian Grade 2 listed courthouse in Ely, cruelly abandoned by the Courts Service, and now that was over a year ago and is still empty and deteriorating. The other sad tale is of the basement of this building being stuffed inappropriately and perhaps not perfectly with the County records. I am wondering if Councillor Harty can suggest a way that these two sad tales might be brought to one happy conclusion.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Thank you Mr Chairman and thank you Councillor Bell for the notice of your question. Like you I am quite anxious to move forward with a resolution to the archives facility and I have recently had several meetings with Officers and paid a visit to a potential site. I am open to all ideas and suggestions and will endeavour to visit Ely to assess the facility that you had mentioned to me and perhaps Councillor Bell would like to join me in visiting that facility.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor N Bell

I would like to join you to assess that. I hope that it can be a suitable building – it is certainly an important building in the city. It is 190 years old, it is Grade 2 listed, it has an old court room so some of the interior is listed as well. It would be good because storage in Cambridge has been sought for ages and there seems to be a resistance to moving from Cambridge. I'd like to see other places considered, Ely being perfect in some ways, the old County town with a superior train service to that of Cambridge, and also a superior shopping experience with its markets and free car parking.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Happy to make the arrangement to visit to Ely, and delighted if you can take me round.

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

We got this helpful second newsletter this week, I think about the Broadband project, which is in fact a good project. By the way, despite the terrible English on the poster downstairs, the newsletter itself is full of hope, but doesn't include very much of substance in terms of timetables and coverage, so perhaps I can ask Councillor Bates to give me a map of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough showing which territories will be covered by the Broadband project, which will be covered by BT and which will not be covered by anybody.

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

Thank you Mr Chairman. Not only moved forward but moved up. As you well know it is a complex project and at the moment we are in the middle of a procurement situation, so to try to obviously determine the most sensible partner we will work with, or partners. That process will finish towards the end of this year. As to what those areas that are white or grey, what has good cover or bad cover, we have that information, but we will obviously need to work with our preferred partner or partners in the next year in the roll-out of the Broadband project. So at this moment in time we have all that information and obviously those are ongoing discussions with various possible providers and partners that we will be working with. Can I just remind Members that Connecting Cambridgeshire was launched last week and I would encourage all Members to encourage their residents, their parishes, their voluntary groups to register there, what I call, demand for the service to be improved - so we are at the procurement stage. Next year will be the rollout stage. Which areas are first, second or third will be a matter for some discussion when we get to that point, but obviously we will continue to send out appropriate newsletters to Members, and not only Members of this Chamber, but further afield as well, because it is an important development, and if you look actually at what it says - one of the things Broadband will help us to boost growth, and create jobs. And I thought that might be useful for other Members in the Chamber to be reminded of such matters. So we do have those maps, and would be happy to share some of that with you, but it is a sensitive time in respect of the procurement, but I am happy to show you where we are aware of those white areas, grey areas etc. Could I also just remind you and perhaps a little plug back to you that at the moment....**timed out by the Chairman.**

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

Can I ask him to pay particular attention to the case of Orchard Park, which is in fact a 21st century development which is currently operating with 19th century telephony. It is not just that it has got slow Broadband, it has actually effectively no Broadband. It is south of the A14, it is effectively part of the city. Cambridge economic technological success, and we have seven miles of copper between the Exchange and Orchard Park. So will you pay particular attention to that and tell me when we can have that fixed please.

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

I am fully aware of the problems of that particular development Mr Chairman and thank you for the reminder.

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

No notice of this question Councillor Harty, because its fairly hot from the press. Today the Government announced new arrangements in relation to Special Educational Needs Pupils. It would be unfair for me to expect you to make a detailed statement at this point, but it is a matter of concern and I would ask you to do three things. First of all is to what we all get as Councillors: we all get concerns from our constituents about individuals, so I would ask you to do three things. First of all is to prepare a briefing note for all of us on the implications of the new system; secondly to perhaps get this topic on the next Members' Seminar so that we can have a more detailed briefing; and thirdly can you make sure that any necessary reassurances [are] given to parents, who might be confused by the announcement made by Central Government and concerned about their youngsters who have already got Special Educational Needs Statements. So if you could tackle those three things, I think that would be appreciated.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Thank you, Councillor Downes. I had heard of the changes that are taking place with regard to SEN pupils and I'd be happy to respond to all the three points that you have mentioned.

14. Question to the Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Councillor M McGuire from Councillor S van de Ven

I have a question for Councillor McGuire and perhaps you can consult Councillor Orgee about it. It's about Speedwatch and the Neighbourhood Panels, and specifically Great and Little Chishill Parish Speedwatch Team, which is obviously a volunteer team. They have been working very hard on Speedwatch since the initiative was first rolled out several years ago through the Neighbourhood Panel Forum. They have accumulated an impressive bank of evidence, I think it's probably one of the most impressive Speedwatch initiatives in the whole of the Basingbourn and Melbourn locality and Neighbourhood Panel area. They have documented a significant speeding problem – it's a small parish with limited powers to actually change driver behaviour, partly because of the nature of the problem, but also because under Localism small parishes and larger parishes are all asked to take on a lot in terms of responsibility and cost. Now after several years of this initiative and having documented the problem, there is an expectation that County Highways and the Police, after encouraging the initiatives will have a 'what-next plan' for the problem, which has been identified - which is speeding in rural areas especially. The matter has been brought up at [al]most every Neighbourhood Panel meeting and has been minuted there and I have contacted Officers in the last couple of weeks about it, and I would be very grateful if you could take an interest in this problem. I think it is a difficult one to solve – this particular Speedwatch team has some ideas, and I think they would be very glad to be asked what they are and if you could see how they might be implemented.

Reply from the Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Councillor M McGuire

Chairman I'm not sure whether this is really a question for me or for Councillor Orgee which is probably why Councillor van de Ven put it this way. I'm quite used to trying to resolve difficult problems – clearly if the Neighbourhood Panel is functioning properly, then of course together with the Police in terms of Speedwatch and our Highways, I would hope that they will take that on board so that those efforts are not wasted. If there is some particular thing that I can get involved with to help move things along then I am happy to do so, but I would suggest that we might want to have that conversation with Councillor Orgee and myself

outside so I can fully understand what might not be happening and how you feel that we can help from the County perspective in getting involved with Neighbourhood Panels to make it move. Without advance notice of the question, that is about the best I can offer you.

Supplementary Question to the Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Councillor M McGuire from Councillor S van de Ven

I'd like to invite you to the...

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

I am very happy to meet the group to hear what they have got to say.

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

I won't burden you with the Citi 7 bus but negotiations are going on nicely there. I will burden you however with something which you have heard me going on about in parish councils, that is the maintenance of protected road verges, and a letter last year which was sent to local parishes, *'I am writing to inform you that we will no longer be carrying out any verge cutting of the protected road verges in your parish. If you wish to undertake the management of the protected road verges then please get in touch with...'* As a result of that, many parish councils have responded that they will look after their protected road verges since the County seems to find it impossible so to do. Could Councillor Orgee tell me what is happening in those parishes which have declined to take on the maintenance of their own protected road verges?

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

I think Councillor Stone knows the answer to that question, which is that the County is going to do the work.

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

Certainly a supplementary question on that one, which Councillor Orgee knows is coming. That is what does he think the reaction is going to be in those parish councils, which have decided to take on this maintenance seeing that those, which haven't are going to get their road verges maintained.

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

Well I was at Babraham Parish Council last Thursday night where Councillor Stone did raise this issue. I didn't get any response from the Parish Council on that issue so I think in that case they seemed to be happy with what they were doing, and certainly one or two parish councils that have taken on such responsibility are actually going to increase the length of verge which is treated in that way. It's a fair issue and a genuine issue and I will be having a look at it to see equity and fairness.

16. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee from Councillor I Manning

I think this is another 'Councillor Orgee show' question. The Cabinet Member is probably aware that £1.5m has been allocated out of the North Area Corridor Transport Plan to fund the construction of what is normally called the Chisholm Trail Bridge near my ward. Given that the monies for that Plan come from Section 106 funding, given that I think we are all broadly supportive of the Chisholm Trail, does he feel that that this is an appropriate use of funds that are designed to mitigate the effect of developments?

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

I have taken on a lot of things very recently and I must admit I was aware of this funding, but I haven't got round to thinking about it yet. I do know the importance that many people attach to the Chisholm Trail, in fact I think that Mr Chisholm himself lives in one of the villages that I represent, so I know him fairly intimately and I am aware of the importance of cycling within the city. We have seen many great improvements in the extent of cycling within the city which is all to be welcomed and whatever we can do to improve that and make more viable routes through the city the better and so I will look at it very carefully.

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

I think Mr Chairman that I understand that it is on the agenda for this week's meeting and obviously I think that it this Thursday, and then obviously we will take what comes out of that meeting forward as appropriate. Just for information actually that comes under my portfolio rather than Tony's, so that is why I have added that little bit.

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

Just to stress that my question was about the source of the funding and whether that was felt to be appropriate, so maybe Councillor Bates could address that and my supplementary was going to be: have the Council looked, given that we all want the Chisholm Trail to happen, have the Council looked at other sources of funding, given that a press release has come out this week sort of saying that the North Area Corridor Transport Plan is where the money is going to come from. Given that the main beneficiary to that bridge is going to be increased passenger numbers to Chesterton, sorry, Cambridge Science Park Station in terms of passengers from Newmarket Road and from Fen Ditton, so given the operator is going to benefit eventually, it's whether the source of the funding is an appropriate one, and whether alternative sources of funding other than the North Area Corridor Transport Plan have been looked at?

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

I think the simple answer to that is yes we consider it is appropriate funding at this moment in time Mr Chairman.

17. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee or to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates from Councillor S Whitebread

I think this is for Councillor Orgee, but it might be for Councillor Bates. It is about streetworks, roadworks when utility companies need to dig up the road, particularly in light of

the recent roadworks in my ward along East Road in Cambridge, which lasted for I think around ten weeks, a lot longer than we thought they were going to and were extremely disruptive. In London, the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, has just started a new scheme where utility companies are charged per day for digging up the road, and they are charged a different amount of money depending on whether they are going to block the road during peak hours. So it encourages utility companies to get the work done quickly and also not to disrupt people that need to get to work. I know in Cambridgeshire we have a flat charge for a licence to do roadworks, but we don't differentiate to encourage the work to be done quickly, and I wondered whether that this was something that could be looked at.

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

I am happy to look at that.

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

If you are looking at that and the whole policy area in general, another thing you might like to consider is in Cambridge, particularly when the roads are closed to motor vehicles, it isn't always necessary for the road to be closed to cyclists, and it would be quite nice if rather than always forcing cyclists to dismount, utility companies were encouraged to try to facilitate a way that cyclists could make their way through, because if cyclists can get through it's good for them, but it's also good for the car users, because they don't have to wait for cyclists at the front to get through on a green light for them to then get on their way, that would be another thing worth looking at I think.

18. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke from Councillor S Hoy

Can you please update me as to where the Council is on the Wisbech 2020 Strategy and assure me that Local Members will be involved as early on in the process as possible, so we can lead from the bottom of this process.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke

Thank you Councillor Hoy. I have been notified of this question. I really welcome this question because since becoming Leader a year ago I've spent an awful lot of time in Wisbech promoting one of our towns that needs some support. I have spoken to the people of Wisbech on my visits and I've been struck by their passion, their raw passion for their own town, and you only have to see Councillors Hoy and Tierney to see that in action. But it is not just those people, it's about the individuals that live there. When I recently went to the College of West Anglia to do the sod cutting for the new engineering block, I was taken by everybody I met who were so very positive about their town, and I think those who talk in negative terms generally don't live there. It made me really proud to hear about the engineering block and some of the plans for it, some of the ambitions of the College of West Anglia in moving into the highly skilled careers like motor sports engineering. So this is a particularly good project. Wisbech itself working with Alan Melton, the Leader of Fenland District Council and Stephen Barclay, the local MP, we announced the 2020 vision for Wisbech and we announced that back in March, and we are already making good progress. We've had a number of meetings, we've already got plans in place to commence the tidying up around the Boathouse - the flagship business centre that's right there that needs supporting, and it just needs improving and we've got agreement with the District Council and ourselves to do some work there. We have also extended the funding for The Oasis Centre so that we can carry on the great community work that it is doing in the Waterlees

area and also all the partners who are working hard. But this is all about leadership, actually. We have engaged with Cambridge University to help work through and identify the real needs of that town and to work with the local community to produce that, and yes, absolutely, Local Members will be fully involved.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 MAY 2012

WRITTEN QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2

1. Question from Councillor P Sales to the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor M Curtis

“Does the councillor agree that there is an urgent need for reform of social care, part of which should be that the maximum anyone person should pay for residential care should be limited to £35000?”

Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor M Curtis

There is a clear and urgent need for the reform of the funding arrangements for social care. Nationally and locally, adult social care systems are under enormous pressure from demographic change. There is a general consensus that the need for reform has been clear for the last decade. Unfortunately, the previous government did nothing in response and the current government now has to address both the major economic problems it inherited and create a sustainable adult social care system. Although this is now much more difficult, I do urge the Government to grasp this issue and reform the funding arrangements for adult social care.

The recommendations of the Dilnot Commission have much to recommend them and I personally think that the idea of a cap of £35,000 on contributions to social care is a good one. However, this would have to be implemented as a part of the wider reform of funding arrangements, for which there is a pressing need.

2. Question from Councillor I Manning to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor T Orgee

“On adoption of roads by County highways for new developments:

Could the cabinet member give some detail on the speed of adoption of roads marked for such on new developments and what he thinks an acceptable timescale for adoptions to happen are?

Can he further give some statistics on the speed of completion of adoptions over the last 10 years, or a close acceptable reporting period?

In terms of both parts of the question, I would be interested in such detail as:

How often remedial works from the developer(s) are required, and some indication of why developers are allowed to put in sub standard works?

Time scales for completing any remedial works and how these timescales are enforced?

Should residents have already moved in before road adoption is complete, and how often does this happen in practice?

How are residents kept informed about the state of the roads of their development?

How often lighting columns on adopted land are completed to County standards, and working before residents move in to new developments?

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

The very first and most important point to make is that the Council does not have any powers to insist that a developer offers roads within residential development for adoption. New developer roads are effectively private roads until, and if, they become adopted.

Where a developer wishes to have roads adopted this is usually secured by Section 38 Agreement. However, again, the Council does not have any powers to insist that a developer enters into an Agreement. The Council also does not have any powers to insist that an Agreement is sealed prior to commencement of development or occupation of the dwellings.

We currently provide a financial incentive to developers to promote the sealing of an Agreement by taking a slightly reduced Inspection Fee if the developer signs the Agreement prior to works commencing on site.

Where an Agreement is sealed the developer is expected to adhere to Clauses within the Agreement to deliver works in a timely manner. The standard Agreement requires the highway works to be completed within two years followed by a maintenance period of a further year (thus 3 years in total). However, the Agreement does allow a developer to extend the time period at the discretion of the Council (for which additional fees are charged).

Taking County wide development over the last ten years, statistics show that the period from sealing of Agreement to adoption has been just under four years. Unfortunately during this period there have been some developments that have taken longer than this but the processes in place now are such that should prevent excessive delay between agreement sealing and adoption.

Remedial works are often required to be undertaken prior to the commencement of the maintenance period and invariably required prior to the adoption of the road(s) at the end of the maintenance period. This is not necessarily due to developers sub standard work, items raised are often relatively minor issues such as weed removal or gully cleansing. We undertake periodic inspection of the work as it progresses, we do not undertake day to day supervision. Developers are expected to undertake remedial work expediently having regard to their work programmes. Again we now have processes in place to ensure timely progress is made. It is important that we only take on responsibility for roads that are up to standard, to minimise the risk of the Council having to pay to put things right.

Occupation by residents prior to adoption of the roads occurs on every development. It would be wholly unreasonable to require a developer to complete roads and have them adopted prior to occupation of any of the dwellings on the site. A developer would certainly not seal a section 38 Agreement if such a clause were included.

There is a clause within the Section 38 Agreement that requires the carriageway to be made up to base course level and the footway to be complete (with street lighting) prior to occupation of any frontage dwellings. This clause generally works well and secures safe pedestrian passage to occupied dwellings.

Residents, when they purchase the dwelling would have been informed of the status of the road via the Local Authority Search.

Where there is a Section 38 Agreement in force, street lighting should be installed and working within roads where the dwellings are occupied. The Development Control

Inspectors would monitor this requirement and chase the developer if they were not complying with the relevant clause within the Agreement. There are no statistics available relating to compliance of this clause.

There have been discussions with the planning authorities to explore the potential for closer working between the authorities and the County Council to investigate how we can minimise the inconvenience for residents.