

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 27 March 2007

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 2.25p.m.

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor: S B Normington (Chairman)

Councillors D Baldwin, C M Ballard, J D Batchelor, I C Bates, B Bean, N Bell, B Boddington, M Bradney, J Broadway, P Brown, C Carter, S Criswell, M Curtis, A Douglas, P J Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, S A Giles, G Griffiths, B Hardy, G F Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, G Heathcock, W G M Hensley, S Higginson, E Hughes, W Hunt, J L Huppert, J D Jenkins, S F Johnstone, E Kadić, G Kenney, A C Kent, S G M Kindersley, S J E King, V H Lucas, D McCraith, L W McGuire, A K Melton, R Moss-Eccardt, MK Ogden, L J Oliver, A G Orgee, D R Pegram, J A Powley, A A Reid, J E Reynolds, K Reynolds, P Sales, M Shuter, M Smith, T Stone, J K Walters, J West, D White, K Wilkins, L J Wilson and F H Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors: R Butcher, K Reynolds, L Sims, J Tuck, H Williams

134. MINUTES: 20 FEBRUARY 2007

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 20 February 2007 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the words:

“the Cabinet member for Environment & Community Services, Councillor J Reynolds” being replaced with *“the Lead Member for Transport & Delivery, Councillor McGuire”* in the final paragraph of Item 4, Accident Remedies and Traffic Management Programme: Medium Sized Safety Schemes of Minute 129 on page 13.

135. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Keith Walters

After a decade of leading Cambridgeshire County Council, Councillor J K Walters had announced that he would be stepping down as both Leader of the Council and the Conservative Group. He would remain as Leader of the Council until the Annual meeting on 15th May 2007 and continue as the elected Member for Sawtry & Ellington until the next election in 2009.

Councillor Philip Bailey and Councillor Sharon Lee

Councillor Philip Bailey, Liberal Democrat Member for the Sutton Electoral Division, had resigned from the Council from 21 March 2007, due to a change in work commitments.

Councillor Sharon Lee, Conservative Member for the Little Paxton & St Neots North Electoral Division, had resigned from the Council from 20 March 2007, due to ill-health.

By-elections for both vacancies would be held on 3 May 2007.

Brain Gale, Director of Inclusion

On 7 March 2007 the Appointments Committee agreed proposals for the restructuring of the Inclusion Directorate within the Office of Children & Young People's Services (OCYPS), making the Director of Inclusion's post redundant from 31 March 2007. The current post holder, Brian Gale would leave the Council on this date. On behalf of the Council, the Chairman thanked Brian for his 28 years of service to Cambridgeshire County Council.

County Council Rewarded for New Recruitment Approach

The 'Life from Every Angle' diversity recruitment campaign had been awarded top prize in the Cambridgeshire Recruitment Awards – Best Recruitment Advert category. The induction programme received a commendation certificate as a runner up in its category. The Chairman congratulated those involved.

Cambridgeshire Guided Busway

The Secretary of State for Transport, the Rt Honourable Douglas Alexander visited Cambridgeshire on 5 March to attend the official start of works ceremony for the Guided Busway scheme.

Petrol Contamination

Cambridgeshire Trading Standards Service led the national response to the contaminated petrol issue by being the first service to test sample petrol for contamination. The Chairman expressed appreciation on behalf of the Council for the role that Trading Standards played in securing a favourable outcome for customers.

136. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Members declared personal interests under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct. The items to which the interests relate are shown in brackets.

- Councillor S Johnstone as a member of the Low Carbon Vehicles Partnership Board (Minute 138, Report of the Meeting held on 27 February, Item 8: Sackville House (Cambourne) Travel for Work Plan)
- Councillors Batchelor, Kindersley, McCraith and Orgee as members of South Cambridgeshire District Council (Minute 138, Report of the Meeting held on 27 February, Item 9: Proposed Joint Planning Arrangements – Major Growth Site Areas).
- Councillors Bates and Melton as members of the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board (Minute 138, Report of the Meeting held on 27 February, Item 9: Proposed Joint Planning Arrangements – Major Growth Site Areas)

- Councillor Batchelor as a member of the Pensions Scheme of South Cambridgeshire District Council (Minute 139, Pensions Committee Annual Report).
- Councillors Bean, Curtis, Downes and Heathcock as pensions fund members (Minute 139, Pensions Committee Annual Report).
- Councillor Melton by virtue of his daughter working for Cambridgeshire Police Authority (Minute 142, Item: 9(a) Report of the Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Police Authority).
- Councillor Lucas as a Non-executive Director of Hinchingsbrooke NHS Trust (Minute 138, Report of the Meeting held on 27 February, Item 10: Budget Monitoring).

137. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Sean Anderson asked the following question on behalf of Speaking Up, an advocacy organisation on behalf of people who experience learning difficulties, mental ill-health or other disabilities:

The recent scandals in learning difficulty services in Cornwall, Sutton and Merton had shocked the nation. The Commission for Social Care Inspectorate (CSCI) already ranked Cambridgeshire very poorly, as did some people who used the service. On behalf of people with learning difficulties, we are concerned that cutting the budgets will mean that services slide even further and we risk being the next county to hit the headlines for the wrong reasons. What is the Council going to do about this?

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Services, Councillor J Reynolds, responded by saying that he had considered the cases at Cornwall, Sutton and Merton. The County Council had contract requirements to ensure services met the needs of its users. A 'tool kit' called Safe in the Knowledge was used to measure performance, and action plans were drawn up to address areas needing special attention. The Council had no intention to make any cuts in its monitoring of services. In addition, the Contract Team met regularly with CSCI to consider services that were below standard.

David Willingham, Parish Councillor for Linton, asked the following question on behalf of Access 1307, a campaign group for villages on the A1307 which promoted road safety and community needs arising from the A1307, including matters relating to access, crossing, cycling, safety and speed:

The eastern stretch of the A1307 has an appallingly high accident rate, claiming four lives in the last nine months. Would the Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Highways agree without delay, to commence statutory consultation on reducing the speed limit of national speed limit sections of the A1307, between its junction with the A11 and the Suffolk boundary, down to 50mph and, subject to no objections, expeditiously implementing this reduction as soon as possible?

The Lead Member for Transport and Delivery, Councillor McGuire, responded by recording his condolences to the bereaved families concerned. The issues involved were complex and, as well as on going discussion with residents in the Horseheath area, some safety measures had been implemented (e.g. the

introduction of a right turn lane at Granta petrol station). The County Council would be reviewing the speed limit over the year and would continue to work with the police and communities to overcome problems.

David Willingham, in a supplementary question, asked for an assurance that the County Council would work with St Edmundsbury Borough Council to obtain developer contributions to improve the transport corridor.

Councillor McGuire said that the Local Authority would look at all possibilities and pursue every option available to alleviate the problem.

Transcripts of the questions and responses are available from Democratic Services.

138. REPORT OF CABINET MEETING HELD ON 27 FEBRUARY 2007

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Walters, moved receipt of the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 27 February 2007.

Key Decisions For Information

1. Property Transactions

Referring to Item 1(b)(iv) of the report, Councillor Huppert asked why the sale of the ten houses, used for staff recruitment and deemed surplus to requirements, had not been supported by the Administration when they were originally proposed for sale by the Liberal Democrat Group. Councillor Walters advised that the disposal of these houses had been under active consideration at the time.

2. Children and Young People's Services in St Neots – Love's Farm Housing - Primary School Provision

3. Gender Equality Scheme (GES)

Councillor Hughes stated that gender inequality was still an issue in public life, and that the County Council needed to set an example of gender equality for the rest of the county.

Councillor Lucas reported that the GES had a 3-year rolling Action Plan, which he would be reporting progress on. The draft scheme was on the Council's website and open to comment until the beginning of April; he thanked Members for their input to date.

4. Integrated Highway Management Centre (IHMC)

Referring to the development of the IHMC, Councillor Reid supported the backroom facility option over a visible public office, which was likely to be more expensive, less flexible and could be under-used and rendered unnecessary by widespread Internet accessibility.

In response, Councillor McGuire expressed sympathy with this view, but advised that all options would be investigated and there would be opportunity for Member input at Service Development Group meetings.

5. A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement – Response to Further Highways Agency Consultation, Ellington to Fen Drayton

As Local Member for Brampton & Kimbolton, Councillor Downes was satisfied with the route chosen and the commitment of the County Council to safeguard Rights of Way. On balance he supported the removal of Huntingdon viaduct, but was concerned about the potential impact on Huntingdon town centre and Brampton of the 30-40 Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCVs) an hour currently using this route.

Councillor Melton, expressing frustration at the interminable debate on the need to improve the A14, demanded urgent Government remedial action in order to reduce accidents and injuries on the road.

Councillor Huppert observed that much of the A14 traffic was freight, which should be encouraged to shift to rail through an East -West rail link, supported by the County Council.

Councillor McGuire replied that discussions were ongoing with the Highways Agency (HA), Huntingdonshire District Council and local councils about the removal of the viaduct and the impact on Huntingdon and Brampton and concerns would be taken on board. Regarding the East -West rail link, he reported that the Council was awaiting a response from Government on the proposal. In the meantime pressure was being applied to the Highways Agency to improve the existing A14.

6. Consultation Response on Planning Application for land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge

Councillor Ballard referred to the school provision associated with this potential new development, discussed at the Planning & Development SDG, and he supported the location on the north west as recommended by Officers. The Developers had not yet committed any money towards a new school and plans could mean school playing fields would encroach on greenbelt land. He also emphasised that homes needed to be sustainable, lifelong and easily adaptable in order that an ageing population might be able to live at home longer and reduce the need for more costly residential or NHS care.

Councillor Pegram confirmed that the location of a secondary school would mean the playing fields encroached onto the greenbelt land, although a Right of Way would divide the two. The County Council would examine every application to determine the best possible location for the school.

Councillor Kent requested that the development of community facilities, such as libraries, youth services etc., play a much greater part in the Council's Corporate Plan. There needed to be strong policy defence against developers building houses but taking no responsibility for improving community infrastructure.

Councillor Jenkins was supportive of the Council's response to the consultation. He encouraged the Council to adopt broader leadership in the development of the County by giving the following due consideration:

- an exact understanding of the phrase 'sustainable communities'
- the affect of new development on neighbouring communities
- recognition that decisions would have a 20-50+ year legacy
- the role of other Government agencies such as the Highways Agency and the Environment Agency and the need to challenge their input when necessary.

Councillor Hughes was anxious that the development be of best quality and was concerned that overly dense housing could ruin a peaceful city. She was dissatisfied with the environmental impact of the proposals, and felt it inappropriate to build a school without any sports facilities, and for facilities not to be open in school holidays. Simply building houses and roads was not 'development' - a broader vision of a sustainable community, with facilities, was required.

Councillor Johnstone replied that the new development could be made sustainable and desirable by providing services within it and that arrangements should be put in place for the cost of education facilities to be shared amongst developers in the area.

7. Public Consultation on the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Draft Revision of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England

Councillor Huppert felt that the Secretary of State requiring at the last minute a 7.8% increase in the number of houses to be built in Cambridgeshire by 2021, was wrong in principle. He expressed dismay that there had been a dilution of the commitment to the provision of affordable housing.

Councillor Kindersley commented that although Government had not suggested a review of Cambridge greenbelt land, it would be necessary in order to accommodate the required number of houses. He felt that Government had not understood that the Local Planning Authorities were unable to deliver the level of growth requested. In addition, the introduction of Supplementary Planning Gain (SPG) meant surrendering control to central Government of how the developer financial contribution would be spent locally. Infrastructure concerns had not been addressed and there was a danger of destroying the attractiveness of the Cambridgeshire sub region through over-development. The Government had missed an opportunity to cascade the 'Cambridge phenomenon' to other parts of the county, such as Fenland, which needed development and employment opportunities.

Councillor Walters stated that the original growth levels proposed by the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) had been based on the employment opportunities available locally and the need to avoid dormitory developments. The recent Government increases had compromised this aim and would lead to less sustainable developments. The Council had made and would continue to make strong objections to Government about the proposed introduction of the SPG.

Councillor Bates agreed, stating that as a result of the additions the Regional Spatial Strategy was no longer a local plan agreed by regional consultation, but a plan imposed by Government for the Region. The Government Office

was only focused on numbers of houses to be delivered, not on infrastructure, jobs or geographical inequalities.

Councillor Ballard, whilst recognising the need for more housing, did not want every conceivable space filled. How an additional 4 300 houses would affect transport in and out of Cambridge had not been properly addressed - particularly to the east of the city, although the Guided Busway would help. It had been stated that only 40% of new residents would have cars, but he questioned whether such a proposal had worked in any other city in the United Kingdom. He supported the Council's response and recommended that 40% of new development should be affordable housing.

Councillor Melton, emphasising Cambridge's heritage, felt the Council should fight to preserve the character of the city and prevent it being submerged by further development. He lamented that the opportunity to develop Fenland and the market towns was not being taken, leaving Wisbech, March and Whittlesey out on a limb. He asked that the boundaries of the Cambridge sub-region be redefined to be coterminous with the county boundary.

Councillor Harrison agreed that the Government housing target was too high for Cambridgeshire, but contended that additional housing development on the hinterlands of Cambridge was necessary to promote a healthier societal mix within it.

8. Sackville House (Cambourne) Travel for Work Plan

Councillor Moss-Eccardt considered that there should be more joined up thinking and the integration of the Travel for Work Plan with existing policies and strategies.

Councillor Hughes felt that reducing the necessity for employee and Member travel should be supported. There was too much stress on Officers and Members at present and a broader study on the issues involved in working from home was needed.

Councillor Powley said that the Travel for Work Plan for Sackville House was integrated with IT Strategy and the Office Accommodation Strategy - targets had been set and staff were cooperating with the change of mind-set needed.

9. Proposed Joint Planning Arrangements – Major Growth Sites Areas

[Regarding the establishment of the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee, Councillor Kent asked whether the Committee would report to Council, rather than just Cambridgeshire Horizons, who was to be appointed to the Committee and by whom, and how it would be scrutinised.](#)

Councillor Huppert asked that County Council revisit their membership of the Committee and sought assurances that the Council would be appointing 2 Conservatives and 1 Liberal Democrat, reflecting the current overall political balance of Council.

Councillor Walters said he would review membership, although it was contingent on the political composition of appointments made by South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC). Councillor Batchelor confirmed that

SCDC would be appointing two Conservatives and one Liberal Democrat.

Councillor Walters undertook to write to Councillor Kent regarding her other questions about the new arrangements.

10. Budget Monitoring

Councillor Ballard classified the County Council's statement that it was only £0.5m overspent as positive spin. Although the Office of Children & Young People's Services (OCYPS) budget was balanced there had been overspends in particular areas, such as Home to School Transport, set against underspends in other areas, such as the youth service. There were substantial overspends on some Shared services (e.g. a £4.4m overspend by the Learning Disability Partnership) and in the Traded services. Although the Council's strategic reserves remained at £6m, £3.9 m had been used from reserves held by the Council Offices, consequently no longer available to support spending in 2007/08.

Similarly, Councillor Stone indicated that although there were earmarked reserves of £25m and ordinary reserves of £5m, he advised that all Office reserves had been used up and that he considered that the Council was in a dangerous position.

Councillor Huppert asked that current debt levels, up until the end of February 2007, be supplied. The overspend of £0.5m had only been achieved through substantial cuts in budgets and services during 2006/07. The County Council should not be proud of its underspends, particularly on youth, which meant in effect that the last budget had not been delivered.

Councillor Johnstone said that underspends in the Youth Service had only occurred, because grant funding had become available. The underspend on Early Years provision was because there had been a slower than expected take-up of entitlement, but this was now improving and had been fully budgeted. Furthermore the cost of out of county places had been reduced by £84 000 through making more provision in-County, and £100 000 saving had been made on re-tendering Home to School transport.

Councillor Kent reminded Members that there had been vacancies freeze within the Youth Service.

Councillor Hughes felt that the Council should consciously decide to make more available for the young, particularly young people with Special Educational Needs who would benefit from additional financial support.

Councillor Downes expressed concern about the Council's relationship with the Primary Care Trust (PCT) in the context of Hinchingbrooke Hospital seeking to reduce spending by moving provision into the community. He recommended that more attention be given to the interface between primary care and Adult Services.

Councillor Broadway noticed that there was an upward trajectory with £1.28m debt outstanding, and questioned whether the target reduction to £660 000 by the end of the year could be achieved.

Councillor Powley reported that progress and action to reduce outstanding debt was actively monitored by the Office of Corporate Services (OCS) spokes meetings and that the PCT had assured the County Council that they were addressing the problem. Changes to Hinchingsbrooke Hospital would have serious implications to Adult Services at the County Council and it was important that changes were not made at County Council expense. He acknowledged that whilst reserves were marginally on the low side it would be difficult to increase them without cutting front line services. The Council had received good reports on its financial management from PricewaterhouseCoopers, the Council's external auditors.

11. Top 30 Performance Indicators 2006/07 and Performance Monitoring Quarter 3 (October – December 2006)

Councillor Huppert praised the Council for the improvements in some of the Performance Indicators, namely a reduction in those Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) on the roads, an increase in the amount of household waste recycled and an improvement in the number of invoices paid within 30 days. However he expressed concern regarding performance on the following:

BV50 -% young people leaving care aged 16+ with at least one GCSE at grade A - G or a GNVQ*

BV195 - % people aged 65+ waiting an acceptable time for care assessments

BV 54/LPSA – number of people aged 65+ helped to live at home.

He reminded Council that, according to the last Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) inspection, the Council's performance had been assessed as "average" and the rate of improvement was in the second lowest category. This was not as good as the earlier CPA which assessed the Council as "excellent" and meant that other local authorities were improving at a faster rate than Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Jenkins referred to the unacceptable performance against indicator BV195, which meant that only one in five people were waiting an acceptable time for an assessment. He questioned how recent budget cuts could contribute to an improvement in performance. He also referred to apparent errors in the presentation of the data.

Councillor Yeulett confirmed the Cabinet's commitment to seeking to improve the adult social care performance indicators.

Regarding the educational indicators BV38, 40 and 41, Councillor Kenney said that schools were improving steadily, although they had not managed to achieve their aspirations.

Councillor McGuire said that the north-west of the county was reliant on secondary places in Peterborough schools and that pressure on these places made it timely for the County Council to revisit the secondary education provision made in this part of the County.

Councillor Sales felt that performance against BV50 was an outrage, considering Councillors' corporate parental responsibility for children in care. He linked the low attainment of young people leaving care with poor life

chances.

Responding, Councillor Lucas said that there been a concentration of effort on improving the prospects and performance of Looked After Children. He informed Members that many were in Special Schools receiving vocational training, and preparing for GCSE s was entirely inappropriate.

Councillor Johnstone stated that BV50 was an unhelpful indicator referring to a small number of young people, some of whom were so severely or profoundly handicapped that they could not take any qualifications. The indicator was also distorted by the inclusion of unaccompanied asylum seekers.

Councillor Curtis referred to the potential for a distorted perception of performance by the use of poorly chosen indicators. He emphasised the need for children to achieve according to their needs and abilities and that a vocational rather than an academic education was sometimes more appropriate.

Councillor Hughes suggested that accreditation of activities undertaken over a period of time would be much more meaningful. Nevertheless a discussion on why performance on this indicator was so low was still warranted.

Councillor Reid was disappointed that there was still no indicator on carbon emissions for the County and for the Council, despite global warming being one of the greatest threats facing the world today. The County Council had not measured its carbon emissions since 2001, nor made an estimate for the county since 2004.

Councillor Oliver replied that current indicators showed increased recycling rates, a reduction of waste to landfill, and increased bus usage and that action on climate change was more important than a performance indicator.

Councillor Harrison pressed for an answer as to whether there would be a Carbon Indicator. She also felt that dismissing BV50 as an unhelpful indicator was an abdication of responsibility - a new indicator should be developed if it was considered to be misleading. The Top 30 grouping (though not the indicators themselves) was decided upon by the Council and should be taken seriously.

Councillor Walters replied by saying that the Cabinet reviewed the Council's performance against the Top 30 performance indicators bi-monthly focusing on actions that could be taken to sharpen performance. Climate change was taken seriously by the Administration and could be worth considering on an annual basis.

139. PENSIONS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2005/06

Councillor Walters moved receipt of the Pension Committee Annual Report 2005/06. There were no questions related to the report.

140. WRITTEN QUESTIONS

One written question had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9:

- Councillor Moss-Eccardt asked the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People's Services what levels of opportunity for hydrotherapy pool use and facilities were in existence before the 2005 restructuring of special schools, what levels were planned and what levels existed now. The Cabinet Member response stated that it was the responsibility of special schools' governing bodies to determine their own policy and arrangements with regard to the hire and letting of hydrotherapy pool facilities. The Castle and Granta pools opened in September 2006 and their community timetable was available. Within financial regulations, the two schools were committed to maximise community use of the premises.

Copies of the question and response are available from Democratic Services.

141. ORAL QUESTIONS

The following oral questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9:

[Councillor Reid asked the Cabinet Member for Environment, Waste and Business, Councillor Oliver to confirm that the latest Council figures on its own carbon emissions dated back to 2000/2001. Councillor Oliver agreed to supply Councillor Reid with a written answer, and commented that to achieve precise analysis would mean examining over 600 properties owned by the Council.](#)

Councillor Douglas asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Services, Councillor J Reynolds, about two traffic projects in Romsey: when work would start on the Vinery Road crossing and when the waiting times (agreed by Area Joint Committee last year) would be changed on Great Eastern Street. Councillor Reynolds replied that these schemes would be delivered during the coming year, subject to funding availability.

Councillor Douglas asked where the funding for delivery would come from, given that the budget had been reduced. Councillor Reynolds explained that funding would come from Transport Plans and that details would be available shortly.

[Councillor Huppert asked for a written explanation on how disabled parking bays, yellow line schemes and other discretionary works, would be delivered following a freeze on this budget. Councillor Reynolds replied that minor traffic management measures were in draft final form and would be released in the next few days providing a full explanation.](#)

Councillor Huppert asked the Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Services when the results of the Parking Review could be expected. Councillor Reynolds replied that Parking Policy was being considered by the Area Joint Committees, under consultation with the District Councils and that Cabinet would consider a report in due course.

[Councillor Higginson asked the Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Services, whose responsibility it was to bring roads up to standard for adoption and maintenance. Councillor Reynolds agreed to respond to this question in writing.](#)

[Councillor Higginson asked a supplementary question as to whether Astigold or Persimmon Homes were legally responsible for the adoption of their road. Councillor Reynolds praised the efforts of District and County Council Officers to](#)

[resolve this issue and would reply to Councillor Higginson in writing.](#)

Councillor Jenkins asked the Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Services to confirm that the Local Authority had reached the first stage of an agreement with the bus providers for the Guided Busway, regarding conditions, frequency and service. Councillor Reynolds confirmed that the Council had come to an initial agreement with three bus operators regarding the service they would provide and that negotiations towards a final agreement were ongoing.

Councillor Jenkins congratulated Councillor Reynolds for this first stage and asked that reliable and punctual service times could form part of the final agreement with the operators. Councillor Reynolds replied that it was the vision of the County Council to achieve reliable bus services, but that a considerable amount of joined up work with the bus operators, District and City Councils was needed to achieve this goal.

Councillor Downes asked the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, Councillor Powley, on his view on the Lyons' proposal to end Council Tax capping. Councillor Powley replied that he had not yet had opportunity to consider the detail of the report. However he did not expect that either this Government or the next would abolish capping, because of the need for financial discipline to be placed upon all areas of public expenditure.

Councillor Broadway asked the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services whether future Council purchases of tea, coffee, fruit juices and any other goods, might be purchased from fair-trade sources, in order to actively fight poverty by directly benefiting producers. By setting this example the Council would improve its 'green credentials' and enhance its own reputation. The Lead Member for Children & Young People's Resources & Planning, Councillor Pegram, informed Council that catering services were administered by Children & Young People's Services. He stated that two main considerations here were cost and carbon footprint.

Councillor Broadway responded by informing Council that fairly traded tea and coffee and non-fairly traded tea and coffee originated from the same geographical regions of Asia and South America. The rationale behind fair-trade was to provide farmers with a fair deal.

Councillor Stone asked the Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Services whether £500m was still the cost of upgrading the county road system to standard. Councillor Reynolds informed Council that a review was undertaken in 1999/2000 that identified £2 billion needed for the infrastructure of the Cambridge sub region. This figure had increased to approximately £2.8 billion, with the A14, costing £ ¾ billion, included in this figure. Thus far, approximately £ ¾ m had been received from developers and Government grants and the Council would continue to press Government for the remaining funding for roads and related infrastructure.

[Councillor Moss-Eccardt asked the Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Services on the date of commencement of the pedestrian phase for the lights at Gilbert Road / Histon Road junction in Arbury – given the important safety implications of being on the route to Mayfield School. Councillor Reynolds said that he would check the priority of this particular scheme and reply in writing.](#)

Councillor Griffiths asked the Lead Member for Community Learning & Development & Adult Social Care that, given mobile library cuts had already been reported in the press, why the report on the same, considered by the Community Learning & Development & Adult Social Care Service Development Group (SDG) was not released. Councillor Yeulett stated that discussion at SDGs were private in order to enable Members to freely discuss issues and advise the Cabinet Member of their views. It would not be prudent to release unconfirmed policies into the public domain.

Councillor Griffiths asked the Lead Member for Community Learning & Development and Adult Social Care whether these proposals were to justify cuts already set out in the budget. The services to be cut were specially adapted mobile libraries that served elderly citizens very well. Councillor Yeulett said that there would be broad consultation on the proposals. He agreed that the mobile service was highly valued and that any adverse impact on users would be mitigated by further efficiency.

A full transcript of the questions asked and the responses given is available from Democratic Services.

142. QUESTIONS ON POLICE AND FIRE AUTHORITY ISSUES

Members were invited to ask questions and comment on issues relating to the Cambridgeshire Police Authority and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority.

(a) Report of the Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Police Authority

Councillor Curtis expressed concern that aspirations for neighbourhood policing could not be met, because they were not properly resourced. Councillor Walters replied that the Police Authority's approach was to consider how expectations could be matched to the funding available.

Councillor Hughes referred to her experience of recent improvements in victim support in Cambridge and the need for additional resources for the Police.

Councillor Stone asked whether there might be a cut of neighbourhood panels as a result of the need to find savings in the Police Authority's budget. Councillor Walters replied that there was a need to cut back on expectations, which had arisen from the establishment of the local policing panels and not all aspirations could be met. Councillor Bates added that there was only a finite resource available and a below average number of police officers in the county. There was the tension of balancing resources and meeting expectations. He also agreed to report back to the Police on the comments made by Councillor Hughes.

(b) Report of the Chairman of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

There were no questions relating to the Fire Authority.

A full transcript of the questions asked and the responses given is available from Democratic Services.

143. MOTIONS

No motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

144. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

The following change in the Council's representation on the Cambridgeshire Police Authority was proposed by the Chairman, Councillor Normington, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Orgee, and agreed unanimously:

- Councillor Wilkins be nominated to the Joint Committee on Appointments to the Police Authority as the replacement for Councillor Bailey on the Cambridgeshire Police Authority.

Chairman: