

## **COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> October 2009

**Time:** 10.30 a.m. to 5.15 p.m.

**Place:** Shire Hall, Cambridge

**Present:** Councillor L J Oliver (Chairman)

Councillors S Austen, J D Batchelor, N Bell, K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, D Brown, F Brown, P Brown, R Butcher, C Carter, J Clark, N Clarke, S Criswell, M Curtis, P J Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, N Guyatt, S Gymer, G Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, G Heathcock, W Hunt, C Hutton, J D Jenkins, S Johnstone, E Kadić, G Kenney, V H Lucas, L W McGuire, V McGuire, R Moss-Eccardt, L Nethsingha, A G Orgee, J Palmer, D R Pegram, A Pellew, J A Powley, P Read, P Reeve, J E Reynolds, K Reynolds, T Sadiq, S Sedgwick-Jell, C Shepherd, M Shuter, L Sims, M Smith, T Stone, S Tierney, J M Tuck, S van de Ven, J West, R West, F Whelan, S Whitebread, S Wijsenbeek, K Wilkins, M Williamson, G Wilson, L J Wilson and F H Yeulett

**Apologies:** Councillors I C Bates, K Churchill, S G M Kindersley, S King and A K Melton

### **27. MINUTES: 21<sup>st</sup> JULY 2009**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2009 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **28. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Peter Reeve, the newly elected member for Ramsey, and former Councillor Susan Normington.

#### Awards

The Chairman led members in congratulating the following:

- The Executive Director: Environment Services, Brian Smith, who had been given the Lifetime Contribution to Local Transport Award at the National Transport Awards ceremony
- Cambridgeshire Catering and Cleaning Services, who had won two awards at the Cateys, the catering industry's equivalent of the Oscars
- All those working in the Contact Centre on being judged a Top 50 Contact Centre for customer service and the top public sector contact centre, both for the second year running
- Trading Standards, who had been shortlisted as one of the 20 finalists in the European Public Sector Awards 2009.

## Thanks

On behalf of the Council, the Chairman thanked:

- Jane Held, the Chairman of the Local Safeguarding Children Board, who was standing down from the role
- All staff who had helped respond to the unannounced inspection of child protection services on 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009. The inspectors had concluded that the Council had a strong commitment to improving children's services
- All staff who had helped make Cambridgeshire the best performing County Council for the payment of invoices
- All staff involved in the National Customer Service Week events that had taken place between 5<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> October 2009.

## New developments

The Chairman announced the opening of the following new or improved facilities:

- Refurbished and extended buildings at Grafham Water Centre opened by the Princess Royal – 15<sup>th</sup> September 2009
- Extension of the Milton Park and Ride site – 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2009
- Cambridge Central Library – 29<sup>th</sup> September 2009
- St Neots Recycling Centre – 16<sup>th</sup> October 2009
- March Waste Transfer Station – 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2009
- Mechanical-biological waste treatment plant at Waterbeach – 9<sup>th</sup> November 2009.

The Chairman also announced:

- The issue of planning permission for residential development at Trumpington Meadows, Cambridge
- The selection of Netherhall School, Cambridge as one of the first 17 schools to join the London 2012 Get Set network.

## **29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Minute</b>	<b>Details</b>
Batchelor	34 38 a)	Member of the Pensions scheme Member of the Police Authority
F Brown	38 b)	Member of the Fire Authority
J Clark	34	Member of the Pensions scheme
Curtis	34	Member of the Pensions scheme
Downes	34	Member of the Pensions scheme and of the Pensions Committee; recipient of hospitality from fund manager
Dutton	34	Member of the Pensions scheme
Gymer	38 b) 41 b) 13	Member of the Fire Authority Possible future user of Cottenham cycle route

Heathcock	34 41 b) 3	Member of the Pensions scheme Member of Cambridge Older People's Enterprise
Jenkins	41 b) 14	Resident of Histon and Impington and possible future user of cycle route
Johnstone	33 a)	Member of the Commission for Integrated Transport
Kenney	41 b) 3 General	Member of Cambridge Older People's Enterprise Member of Environment Agency's Regional Environmental Protection Advisory Committee
L W McGuire	34	Member of the Pensions scheme
Read	34 41 b) 3	Member of the Pensions scheme Member of Cambridge Older People's Enterprise
Reeve	General	Member of Huntingdonshire District Council
J Reynolds	34  General	Member of the Pensions scheme and of the Pensions Committee; recipient of hospitality from fund manager Chairman of the East of England Regional Assembly and of Renewables East; member of the Cambridge City Fringes Joint Committee
Sedgwick-Jell	34	Member of the Pensions scheme (Anglia Ruskin University)
J West	General	Member of Fenland District Council and of March Fifth Drainage Board
R West	34	Member of the Pensions scheme
Whelan	37 41 b) 3	Parent of children at Comberton Village College Member of Cambridge Older People's Enterprise
G Wilson	33 b)	Employee of the Environment Agency
Yeulett	General	Member of Fenland District Council and of Euximoor Drainage Board

The following members declared prejudicial interests under Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Minute</b>	<b>Details</b>
Jenkins	41 b) 3	Lay member of Cambridgeshire Community Services
Lucas	41 b) 3	Chairman of Cambridgeshire Community Services

### **30. REPORT OF THE COUNTY RETURNING OFFICER**

Members noted that Councillor Peter Reeve of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) had been elected in the deferred election for the Ramsey electoral division held on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2009.

### **31. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Two members of the public attended the meeting to ask questions:

- Mrs Josephine Snaith asked the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor L W McGuire, to restore the road serving properties at 1-5 Knights Way, Milton to a serviceable standard. She expressed concern that the road

was in urgent need of resurfacing, due in part to damage caused by South Cambridgeshire District Council road sweepers using a fire hydrant on the road and in part to construction vehicles accessing the adjacent college. Both uses had now stopped, making it timely to repair the damage, reducing risk to residents, some of whom were elderly. However, Milton Parish Council had been told that repair was unlikely, since the road served only five properties. Mrs Snaith noted that there was no room to build more properties in future.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access explained that the Council had an annual road maintenance programme. As part of this programme, Knights Way had been inspected and it had been determined that although the surface of the road did not look good, the structure remained such that it was not a priority for repair. However, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access noted that he had not previously been aware of the use by road sweepers and construction vehicles, or of the comments to Milton Parish Council. He agreed to investigate these and to write to Mrs Snaith.

- Mr Andrew Roberts of the Trumpington Residents' Association reported the Association's opposition to the proposed location for the new Trumpington Recycling Centre. He expressed concern that residents had previously been advised that further consultation would take place before the proposal was submitted to Council. He asked the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram: how the location of the Recycling Centre on agricultural land in the Green Belt could be justified; how the County Council had responded to the City Council's objection to the site; whether there had been any dialogue with residents of Trumpington and adjoining villages since the last meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2009 and, if so, what outcome had been; and whether the residents' petition had been submitted to Cabinet and, if so, what the Cabinet's response had been.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning explained that this site was the only realistic option; other possibilities had previously been exhausted. However, he noted that there had been a recent change of circumstances in relation to the eastern part of the Bayer site. The landowner would be contacted again to see if the situation had changed in relation to the western part of the site. In relation to the City Council's objection, the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning noted that the County Council had carried out further work on the issues raised and had shared the results of this prior to the residents' meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2009.

Mr Roberts urged the Council to defer a decision on the location of the Trumpington Recycling Centre and to look again at brownfield options, including the western part of the Bayer site.

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning noted that it was not possible to defer the decision; planning permission had been granted for additional houses and it was essential to ensure that these houses were served by appropriate and timely facilities.

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

### **32. APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY ALDERMAN**

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Tuck, and seconded by the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor Jenkins:

To appoint Susan Normington as an Honorary Alderman.

Councillor Lucas spoke in support of the appointment. On being put to the vote, it was agreed unanimously.

### **33. REPORTS OF CABINET MEETINGS: ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Tuck, moved receipt of the reports of the Cabinet meetings held on 8<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> September 2009.

- a) Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) – County Council response to the Report of the Cambridgeshire Transport Commission (29<sup>th</sup> September 2009, Item 1)

It was proposed by the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor L W McGuire, to

Agree the suggested response to the recommendations of the Independent Transport Commission and the proposed Package and Funding Proposition as detailed in the Cabinet report for submission to the Department for Transport.

Members speaking in support of the motion made the following positive comments:

- It would be essential to take action to address traffic congestion in and around Cambridge, to meet existing challenges and the new challenges of the growth agenda. Failure to act could mean that congestion reached unacceptable levels, damaging quality of life and local, regional and national prosperity. Vehicle emissions could also rise, damaging health.
- Phase 1 of the proposal meant that work to build a new railway station at Chesterton could begin in 2012, three years earlier than previously envisaged.
- Phase 2 would seek investment in public transport and essential infrastructure. Once this was in place, a congestion charge would be introduced only as a last resort, if an agreed trigger was reached. The earliest it was thought this might occur was 2017.
- Cambridgeshire should seize the opportunity to obtain the funding being offered through TIF, not least because there were no alternative means at present of attracting funding on this scale to improve public transport and to tackle congestion.

Members speaking in support of the motion also expressed a range of concerns and reservations:

- Time was needed to work up more detailed proposals for implementation. A wide range of issues would need to be addressed; members particularly highlighted the trigger for a congestion charge and governance arrangements, including the composition of a Transport Partnership if established.
- It would be essential to engage partners and the public in this process.
- Political vision and commitment would need to be maintained.
- This could be an opportunity for radical innovation. As well as improvements to existing forms of sustainable transport such as buses and cycles, an electric system for the city centre should also be considered.
- Any increase to the number of buses travelling to the city centre would need to be very carefully considered. Some bus routes, for example along Magdalene Street, were already unacceptably congested and with unacceptably high levels of air pollution. Bus hubs located away from the immediate centre should be considered.
- There were risks inherent in a scheme dependent on the co-operation of commercial bus operators, especially given Stagecoach's substantial market share in Cambridge.
- If the introduction of the congestion charge were to be postponed, it might be difficult to identify or maintain revenue to subsidise bus services; subsidies were likely to be especially important in rural areas.
- The boundaries for a congestion charge would need to be carefully defined and the risk of nuisance parking immediately beyond the boundaries managed.
- Discounts and exemptions, for example for City residents, people on low incomes and key workers, needed to be considered in more detail.
- There was limited information in the submission on how the proposals would affect South Cambridgeshire. This would need to be made clear in the next stage.
- Coupling the development of Chesterton station to TIF meant that there was a risk that if the TIF proposal did not proceed, Chesterton station would be unfunded.
- The opening of a railway station at Chesterton should not diminish rail services to Waterbeach.
- Greater clarity was needed on the 10% local funding requirement for a TIF scheme. Given the delays to Section 106 funding and to the Community Infrastructure Levy, concern was expressed about the possible impact on local residents.

Members speaking against the motion made the following points:

- The benefits of a congestion charge were uncertain.
- A congestion charge would be an unacceptable tax on motorists and could be discriminatory, for example against people who worked in Cambridge but could not afford to live there.

- TIF funding was not essential and alternatives could be developed to reduce congestion, such as working with Addenbrooke's to vary shift patterns, or with schools to ensure that they all had travel plans.
- Public transport should be improved and people should have the choice of using it, but they should not be forced to do so.

Following the debate, a vote was taken and the motion was carried.

[Voting pattern: 53 votes in favour, 7 votes against and 2 abstentions. Most Conservatives, most Liberal Democrats and Labour and Green members in favour; six Conservatives and UKIP member against; one Conservative and one Liberal Democrat abstained. A recorded vote was requested by more than 14 members of the Council and is attached as Appendix A to these minutes.]

b) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan – Submission Plan (29<sup>th</sup> September 2009, Item 2)

It was proposed by the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment, Councillor Orgee, to

- 1) Approve the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan for the purpose of Pre-Submission Consultation in February/March 2010, and submission to the Secretary of State in July 2010
- 2) Delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Executive Director: Environment Services, the authority to make any minor amendments required that do not materially affect the content of the Plan.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Shepherd and seconded by Councillor Brooks-Gordon:

Amend recommendation (i) by inserting after 'approves':

' , with the exception of the location of the Household Waste Recycling Centre in the Cambridge Southern Fringe,' and

Amend recommendation (ii) by adding at the end:

' , including the location, after reconsideration, of the Household Waste Recycling Centre in the Cambridge Southern Fringe.'

Members speaking in support of the amendment:

- Expressed their view that the proposed location for the Trumpington Recycling Centre was not the right one. It was in the Green Belt on previously undeveloped land and would mar the visual gateway to Cambridge for visitors entering the city from the M11.

- Noted that it was no longer necessarily true to say that this was the only deliverable option: the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, had advised Council earlier in the meeting in response to a public question that another site might now come forward in time.
- Suggested that there had been insufficient consultation with local residents.
- Noted that Peterborough City Council would not be considering the Plan until December; the amendment would not jeopardise the process.

Members speaking against the amendment:

- Noted that extensive consultation had taken place to inform the present proposal for the location of the Trumpington Recycling Centre. There would be a further opportunity for comment when the Plan was published for consultation in February 2010.
- Commented that the proposed site was well situated in relation to its catchment area, was less visually intrusive than other options and was in County Council ownership so capable of being delivered.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was defeated. [Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats in favour, most Conservatives against, one Conservative and Labour members abstained.]

Members made the following comments on the main motion:

- Expressed concern that guidance on the design of waste management facilities should not limit aspirations. The design of the recently opened St Neots Recycling Centre was exemplary for its setting but would not be suitable for other locations, such as the Cambridge Southern Fringe.
- Asked for transport arrangements relating to minerals and waste to be kept under close review. Concern was expressed that lorry drivers did not always observe vehicular restrictions and could use unsuitable routes, with an adverse impact on residents. Off-peak movements should still take place during the working day. Particular care should be taken when transporting hazardous waste to the facility in Northamptonshire, especially since vehicles could be diverted onto smaller roads if major routes were blocked.
- Asked officers to discuss with Huntingdonshire District Council the proposed minerals recovery facility at Warboys, the site for which was on the other side of the village from the existing landfill site.
- Emphasised that residents should be fully involved in discussion of proposals affecting their local communities.

Responding, the Cabinet Members for Economy and the Environment, Councillor Orgee, and for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, emphasised that consultation on the proposed location of Recycling Centres had taken place in 2006, 2008 and 2009 and had generated a substantial response. It was important now to move forward to provide facilities to serve communities.



On being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

[Voting pattern: Most Conservatives, most Liberal Democrats and Labour in favour; one Liberal Democrat and UKIP member against; one Conservative member abstained.]

#### **34. 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

Ruth Rogers, Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Police Authority, attended the meeting to present the report and to answer members' questions.

- Councillor Read asked about a recent media report which suggested that £23,000 of Cambridgeshire Constabulary equipment had gone missing during the last two to three years, including a number of helmets and pairs of handcuffs. Ruth Rogers agreed to enquire and send a written response.
- Councillor Clarke urged the use of plain English and asked for the new police facility at Linton not to be called a 'point of presence'.
- Councillor Dutton highlighted recent media coverage of poor police response times in Huntingdon and Peterborough, including in one instance to a rape case, and of the implications of possible reductions to police funding. Ruth Rogers noted that response times were monitored and that in the particular case mentioned, an apology had been made. On funding, the media coverage had been of speculative comments about possible worst case scenarios. Ruth Rogers reminded members that the highest cost to the Constabulary was for its personnel.
- Councillor P Brown asked for police views on the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Panels, which were currently being reviewed. Ruth Rogers noted that whilst the format of these varied between Districts, they provided an important opportunity for face-to-face contact with the public, and helped the public to understand different agencies' roles. She would be keen to see the Neighbourhood Panels continue.
- Councillor J West asked about weekend policing arrangements, especially since some Police Community Support Officers' (PCSOs') hours were thought to have been changed so that they did not work on Friday nights or Saturdays. Ruth Rogers reminded members that the Police Authority was not responsible for operational matters, but agreed to report these comments back.
- Councillor Gymer asked Ruth Rogers for her view about fire fighters delivering police literature, for example on distraction burglaries or identifying offenders. Ruth Rogers welcomed agencies working together to identify vulnerable people and, if appropriate, make referrals for support. However,

involving other agencies in work to identify offenders was different; she was not aware of this and agreed to find out what was involved.

- Councillor Harrison asked about police attitudes to vehicle speeding in Cambridge City, given the comment of an officer at an East Area Committee that there was no significant problem in this area, which conflicted with the findings of a recent traffic survey. She also sought reassurance that police would implement new 20mph limits in Cambridge, and asked how many speeding tickets had been issued in Cambridge in the past year. Ruth Rogers noted that policing of speeding was an operational issue, but one that was raised frequently with the Constabulary at Neighbourhood Panels. She agreed to enquire about the numbers of speeding tickets issued.
- Councillor Reeve highlighted recent changes to Neighbourhood Panel arrangements and asked for these to be better publicised in future. He also sought assurance that if any funding cuts were needed, trained police officers would be retained over PCSOs. Ruth Rogers noted that publicity for meetings had been identified as an issue in a recent inspection and was being addressed. On funding, the Constabulary would make decisions about the best use of resources; she reminded members that PCSOs were recruited to enable training officers to focus on doing what only they could do.
- Councillor Batchelor expressed concern about forthcoming changes to policing arrangements in Linton and Melbourn. He sought assurance that services to these villages would not be downgraded and that PCSOs would continue to sign on locally. Ruth Rogers agreed to report back these comments but noted that over time, she hoped that people would be reassured that there was no diminution of services.

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

- Councillor Heathcock asked the Chairman of the Fire Authority, Councillor Pegram, what scrutiny would follow the recent Littleport fire, whether residents would be allowed to give evidence and whether the report would be made public.
- Councillor Hunt asked when the Littleport fire would be out; how many fires there had been at this location since January 2007; the estimated cost of extinguishing the most recent fire; whether these costs could be charged to the business's insurance company; and whether a similar fire would in future take a similar length of time to extinguish.
- Councillor F Brown suggested following the Littleport fire that better plans were needed to manage and communicate off-site repercussions arising from such incidents, for example relating to nuisance and damage.
- Councillor Gymer expressed concern that fire fighters had not been allowed to take leave during the incident; she also expressed concern that the number of appliances attending had left limited resources to respond to other incidents elsewhere in the County.

- Councillor Dutton thanked the Fire Authority for its recent support for an initiative to remove mail and newspapers from empty shops in Huntingdon, reducing fire risk; he hoped that this initiative could be extended Countywide and nationally.

Responding to members who had asked about the Littleport fire, the Chairman of the Fire Authority confirmed that:

- The fire was now out.
- It would be for the Fire Authority's Scrutiny Committee to decide what internal review should be carried out. Councillor L W McGuire was leading a separate inquiry on the role of other agencies involved.
- Two other fires had occurred at this site since January 2007, one in January 2007 and one in 2008.
- The cost to date of responding to the most recent fire was estimated as being up to £80,000. It was not possible to charge for costs directly associated with extinguishing a fire, but the owner of the site was meeting the costs of machinery hired to address the incident.
- A similar fire could take less time to extinguish in future, because of lessons learned from the special circumstances of this one. Conditions could also be improved by changing storage arrangements on site, but the Fire and Rescue Service could not require such improvements to be made.
- There were 28 fire stations in the County, who had provided cover for other incidents. He was not aware that fire fighters had not been allowed to take previously booked leave.

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

### **35. PENSIONS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2008/09**

The Chairman of the Pensions Committee, Councillor J Reynolds, moved receipt of the annual report of the Pensions Committee for 2008/09.

Councillor Downes noted that in renegotiating fund management arrangements, the Council had also renegotiated fund managers' remuneration, so that this was linked to performance against agreed benchmarks.

In response to a query from Councillor Downes, the Chairman of the Pensions Committee explained to members that the Pensions Fund was reviewed every three years to compare its value with the commitments to pensioners. The next review would take place during the coming 12 months and any gap between funding and liabilities would be addressed, working within the parameters set by Government.

Council noted the report.

### **36. AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT**

The Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee, Councillor Stone, moved receipt of the annual report of the Audit and Accounts Committee.

Councillor Downes asked whether the Committee would be considering the assurance process relating to the Integrated Children's System (ICS), the new IT system for children's services. He also asked for more information about the Committee's discussion of the relationship between schools and the local authority.

Responding, the Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee confirmed that the Committee would be considering ICS as part of the Audit Plan. In relation to schools and the local authority, he explained that the Committee had been seeking clarification on the role and responsibilities of local authority governors. The Committee had also discussed schools' accounting practices.

Council noted the report.

### **37. WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

No written questions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.

### **38. ORAL QUESTIONS**

Eleven oral questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9:

- Councillor Downes sought assurance from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, that pressure on school places in Cambridge, Cambourne and elsewhere in the County was being addressed. He also asked whether the Conservative manifesto proposal to enable private companies, faith groups, parents and charities to set up schools would intensify the local authority's challenge of managing school places. Responding, the Cabinet Member for Learning provided assurance that pressure on school places was being managed; detailed information could be provided. Any detailed proposal arising from the Conservative manifesto would be considered carefully.
- Councillor Jenkins asked the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor L W McGuire, about assurances given to Histon and Impington Parish Councillors at a meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2009 that when Kickstart funding for the Citi 7 bus service ended in July 2009, there would be no change to service provision for at least a year. Stagecoach had now publicised its intention to change both the frequency of the service and the route. He asked whether the Council would join local residents in lobbying against the changes. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access confirmed that the Council would not. He explained that economic circumstances had changed since that time and as the current route was not viable, Stagecoach was making a commercial decision to change it. He also noted that Histon and Impington would be served by new routes linked to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway.

- Councillor Pellew asked whether there were plans to grit the cycleway adjacent to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway during the winter. The Cabinet Members for Highways and Access, Councillor L W McGuire, and for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, noted that they were not aware of specific plans, but that a Countywide review of winter maintenance was currently underway.
- Councillor Reeve asked the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor L W McGuire, when average speed cameras would be installed on Forty Foot Bank near Ramsey, given that they had been promised by the end of the summer. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access confirmed that they had been expected by the end of the summer but were still awaiting clearance for use from the Government. They would be installed as soon as possible.
- Councillor Whelan asked the Cabinet Members for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, and for Learning, Councillor Harty, what steps could be taken to promote safe and sustainable travel to Comberton Village College, which was proving an increasing challenge as the numbers of pupils travelling to the College increased. Responding, the Cabinet Members confirmed that action was being taken and could include a Safer Routes to School initiative. Pressure on the College would also be alleviated by a secondary school for Cambourne, although Section 106 funding for this would not be available until the relevant housing trigger was reached.
- Councillor Gymer asked the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, why proposals for services for the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway were linked to proposals to reduce the Citi 7 service. She asked whether proposals for the Citi 7 could be revisited, particularly given the importance of this service for people employed on the business park in Histon. The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning explained that as far as he was aware, they were not linked. The Citi 7 proposals reflected a downturn in patronage. He noted that the new service from the Busway would provide a link into the Science Park every 10 minutes and connections to the city centre.
- Councillor Dutton asked the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment, Councillor Orgee, about proposals for a waste sorting facility at Cow Lane, Godmanchester, given apparently misleading recent coverage in a Liberal Democrat leaflet. The Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment explained that the Minerals and Waste Plan allocated a site on Cow Lane for waste recycling and recovery, which was expected to be run by a private operator.
- Councillor Kenney asked the Cabinet Member for Communities, Councillor P Brown, whether he shared her pleasure in the recent reopening of the Cambridge Central Library. The Cabinet Member for Communities confirmed that he did and commended the facilities, reporting that early visitor numbers had been excellent. He thanked all those who had contributed to this success.

- Councillor Hutton asked the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment, Councillor Orgee, to join her in welcoming the opening of the new Recycling Centre at St Neots. The Cabinet Member for Economy and Environment did so, commending the Centre and noting that this was part of a programme to provide better recycling facilities across the County. He noted that the County's recycling record was excellent but noted that continued effort was needed to maintain and improve it.
- Councillor Brooks-Gordon highlighted recent media coverage of the Conservative Party Conference, where it had been suggested that the Conservative Party would abolish local authority Chief Executives where they were no longer needed. She asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Tuck, for her views on this. The Leader of the Council reported that she would do what was best for Cambridgeshire and that to abolish the post of Chief Executive was not her current intention. Councillor Brooks-Gordon also asked the Leader of the Council to ensure that meetings taking important decisions were timed so that members could attend them; the Leader of the Council confirmed that she would as far as possible but that some meeting clashes were inevitable.
- Councillor Bourke asked the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor L W McGuire, about the Council's red performance indicator for pavement condition and recent spike in compensation claims for accidents on pavements. He asked whether the Cabinet Member accepted that pavements had deteriorated and what actions would be taken to improve them. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access noted that the Council's planned maintenance programme was set out in public documents, including the Local Transport Plan and the Network Plan. It was not necessarily appropriate to compare local authorities' compensation payments, since policies for payment could vary.

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

## 39. MOTIONS

### Motion from Councillor Bourke

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Bourke and seconded by Councillor Nethsingha:

The Council notes that the Government in October 2008 committed the UK to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050 in a bid to tackle climate change.

This Council acknowledges the problem of climate change, and the urgent need to do everything in its power to cut its carbon footprint with immediate effect. This Council consequently supports the aspirations of the "10:10" scheme which asks everyone – individuals, businesses and organisations – to seek a cut of 10% in their carbon emissions by 2010. The Council therefore requests that Cabinet reports to the next meeting of the Council in December on the implications of the Council

participating in the 10:10 scheme and of setting itself an ambitious target of reducing the County Council's carbon emissions by 10% in 2010/11.

The Council acknowledges that the 10% year-on-year reduction in emissions is an aspirational target, but notes that cuts of 3% or greater are required for an organisation to have successfully participated in the 10:10 scheme. Although the 10:10 scheme refers to the calendar year 2010, Cabinet is recommended that to minimise bureaucracy the Council uses the National Indicator 185 data (minus schools and outsourced contracts) for 2009/10 as the baseline against which reductions in emissions are measured, with the target to be achieved by 2010/11. Furthermore, the Council requests that cuts in services should not be seen as a means of achieving cuts in emissions.

The following amendment was proposed by the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment, Councillor Orgee, and seconded by Councillor Kenney:

Delete the submitted motion and replace with the following:

'The Council notes that the Climate Change Act (2008) committed the UK to reducing the greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050 in a bid to tackle climate change.

The Council acknowledges the problem of climate change and the urgent need to cut its carbon footprint with immediate effect. The Council therefore supports the aspirations of the "10:10" Scheme which asks everyone – individuals, businesses and organisations – to seek a cut of 10% in their carbon emissions by 2010.

The Council acknowledges that the 10% year-on-year reduction in emissions is an aspirational target, but notes that cuts of 3% or greater are required for an organisation to have successfully participated in the 10:10 scheme.

The Council notes that its Carbon Management Plan has a target of a 30% reduction in its carbon footprint over 5 years and that the Plan uses targeted intervention to use funding most effectively.

The Council notes that in 2008/9 school buildings accounted for 46% of the Council's total carbon footprint. Many of the Carbon Management Plan's interventions are targeted at school properties. However, the Council notes that the 10:10 scheme as applied to the Council would not include school buildings or outsourced services.

The Council notes that joining the 10:10 scheme could therefore result in directing funding to less effective ways of reducing its carbon footprint, and therefore requests that Cabinet reports to the next meeting of the Council in December on the full implications of the Council participating in the 10:10 scheme.'

Councillor Jenkins spoke on the amendment, commenting that it did not differ substantially from the original motion, other than slightly reducing the original motion's urgency.

The amendment was put to the vote and was carried. [Voting pattern: Conservative and Labour members in favour, no members against, Liberal Democrat and UKIP members abstained.]

Members then debated the motion as amended.

One member spoke against the motion, suggesting that the Council should focus on job creation and economic regeneration and that undue effort in relation to climate change would distract attention from these issues.

Members speaking in support of the motion:

- Commented that adapting and responding to climate change was a long-term challenge that the Council ignored at its peril.
- Supported the intentions of the 10:10 initiative but suggested that it would be important properly to check how it fitted with the Council's own Carbon Management Plan. Members noted that the promoters of 10:10 themselves noted that participants should not prioritise short-term ambition over long-term achievements; the aim was to bring the two together.

On being put to the vote, the motion as amended was carried. [Voting pattern: Conservative, Liberal Democrat and Labour members in favour; UKIP member against; one abstention.]

#### **40. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS**

It was proposed by the Chairman, Councillor Oliver, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Powley and agreed unanimously to make the following appointments to Committees and outside organisations:

- Councillor Stone to replace Councillor Harrison as a member of the Development Control Committee and Councillor Harrison to be appointed as a substitute member of the Development Control Committee
- Councillors Brooks-Gordon and Smith to be appointed as substitute members of the Joint Planning Committee for Cambridge City Fringes (Cambridge City Fringes Joint Committee).

#### **41. REPORTS OF CABINET MEETINGS: ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

##### a) Cabinet meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2009

##### 1) Highways Operational Matters

Councillor Stone asked about 'access protection parking' for private accesses. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor L W McGuire, explained that white lines were painted on the road in front of dropped kerbs, to make it clear to drivers that they should not park there.



2) Developer Section 106 Deferral Requests

Councillor Harrison emphasised the importance of setting out clearly the rationale for agreeing Section 106 deferrals, and the likely consequences of rejected requests. The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, agreed to ensure that this was done.

3) Development at Cambridge Southern Fringe: Section 106 Agreements (Glebe Farm/Clay Farm)

Councillor Harrison noted that the Glebe Farm/Clay Farm planning appeal would be ending shortly. She noted the cost of such appeals and urged that they be avoided whenever possible. The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, agreed with this view but noted developers were not always willing to reach agreement with the local authorities.

4) Transport, Education and Community Services for North West Cambridge

Councillor Jenkins expressed concern that increased traffic flow associated with this development might be met by constructing queuing lanes for the A14. He called for other, more sustainable alternatives to be found.

5) Community Infrastructure Levy: Consultation on Draft Regulations

6) Climate Change Act: Adaptation Reporting Power – Response to National Proposals

b) Report of the Cabinet meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2009

3) Green Paper: Shaping the Future Together

In view of the time this discussion item was reached and the number of members who had left, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Yeulett, asked for it to be withdrawn. He noted that useful discussion of the Green Paper had taken place at the members' seminar the previous week. The Executive Director: Community and Adult Services would use this to prepare a report for Cabinet on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2009, after which a further members' seminar would be used to finalise the Council's response for submission before the deadline of 13<sup>th</sup> November 2009.

Councillor Whelan endorsed this suggestion. The item was withdrawn.

4) National Institute of Agricultural Botany (NIAB) Frontage Site Development Section 106 Deferral Requests

Councillor Brooks-Gordon spoke against Section 106 deferrals, suggesting that it was not for the Council and Council Tax payers to prop up the private sector. She expressed concern that deferred payments might ultimately never be received.

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, reassured the Council that the payments would be received in due course. Deferral of payments meant that infrastructure would be brought forward in step with housing developments, which were proceeding more slowly than originally envisaged.

5) Block Fen/Langwood Fen Master Plan: Supplementary Planning Document Consultation

6) Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities: Supplementary Planning Document Linked to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan

Councillor Harty encouraged members to read the detailed Cabinet report on this item.

7) Recycle for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Partnership (RECAP) Waste Management Design Guide: Draft Supplementary Planning Document Linked to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan

Councillor Downes suggested that Section 106 contributions from a new development at Brampton could be used to re-open the Recycling Centre, meeting the Council's objective of locating Recycling Centres close to the communities who used them.

Councillor Stone asked how the public would be able to access this and the Supplementary Planning Document covered by the previous item. The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, confirmed that they would be available on the internet.

8) Consultation on Noise Action Plan 2010-2015 by BAA Stansted

Councillor L Wilson fully welcomed the Cabinet's response to this consultation and urged that all possible steps be taken to reduce the impact of aircraft noise on communities. He questioned BAA's view that it was not possible to stack planes over the sea.

Councillor Stone expressed concern that this consultation had not been adequately brought to the public's and Parish Councils' attention.

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, shared the Councillor's concerns about the adequacy of the consultation and noted that this had been raised with BAA.

9) Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders

Councillor Downes noted that Huntingdonshire District Council had been told that the link road would reduce emissions by shortening car journeys; the report to the County Council's Cabinet stated that it could increase the emission of exhaust gases impacting on climate change. He suggested that more work on the scheme was needed.

Councillor P Brown called for the link road to be built as soon as possible, as it was much needed and supported by local residents.

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, noted that the Cabinet had been pleased to support the redevelopment of this part of Huntingdon by making the Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders needed for the link road.

10) Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE)

Councillor Harrison asked the Cabinet and officers to ensure that changes to the CPE management arrangements did not lead to any deterioration in the quality of the service provided.

Councillor Jenkins sought confirmation of the savings expected to result from the termination of the parking services agreement with Cambridge City Council. He also asked whether these would be real savings for residents, or whether it would actually be a case of transferring costs from one Council to another.

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service and Transformation, Councillor Criswell, emphasised that quality standards would be maintained. The Council would maximise efficiency savings but would not know the exact extent of these until contract negotiations were complete.

11) Strengthening Local Democracy Consultation

Building on his previous comments, Councillor Stone suggested that a key means of strengthening local democracy would be to consult local people more effectively.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor J Reynolds, also expressed concern about the limitations of the proposals, suggesting that they did not constitute the radical transfer of power to local authorities that the Government claimed.

12) South Cambridgeshire Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document: Issues and Options Report 2 – Site Options and Policies and Longer Term Implications

Councillor Wijsenbeek asked whether there was any scope to expand the travellers' site at Fen Road, Chesterton, if this was appropriately

supported by infrastructure improvements. Councillor Williamson agreed that issues ranging from traffic flow to school places would need to be considered if this site were to be expanded, as would be the case for any other development.

Councillor Gymer suggested that decisions should not be taken about gypsy and traveller sites in new communities such as Orchard Park, Cambridge until residents and elected members were in place and able to contribute to discussions.

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, noted that the South Cambridgeshire District Council consultation had been running for three months. Local members had had the opportunity to contribute their views when the Council's response was discussed at the Growth and Environment Policy Development Group.

### 13) Cambridge Cycling Town

Councillor Stone sought assurance that the same decision-making process on possible withdrawal of free school buses would be applied for the new Sawston to Babraham cycle route as for the Milton to Impington cycle route.

Councillor Jenkins asked officers to ensure that the new Histon to Cambridge cycle route effectively addressed the challenge of crossing the A14. He and Councillor Williamson noted that local people were concerned that free school buses between Milton and Impington would definitely be withdrawn once the new cycle route was in place, despite the assurances being given about the decision-making process to be followed. Councillor Williamson noted that other routes in his division, for example from Landbeach to Milton or from Waterbeach to Horningsea, might be better supported if the Milton to Impington route were to be withdrawn.

Councillor Gymer welcomed the proposed routes from Milton to Impington and from Histon to Cambridge.

Councillor Wijsenbeek called for cycle routes to be made properly safe for children with a high pavement and kerb, not only a line on the road.

Councillor Harrison expressed her full support for the Hills Road bridge cycling trial and suggested that this was an excellent example of innovation to promote cycling.

Councillor Bourke agreed that cycling should be encouraged but expressed concern that free school buses should not be withdrawn where new routes to school were constructed, since if buses were not available, parents were likely to drive their children to school in winter. He urged the Council to undertake meaningful consultation on proposals.

Councillor Clarke welcomed the proposals for Horningsea and Fen Ditton and commended the effectiveness of the consultation, which had

engaged a significant number of local people. He and Councillor Kenney agreed that cycling should be fully encouraged and noted that implications for bus services would be addressed separately.

The Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, confirmed that new cycle routes were not being commissioned in order to withdraw home to school transport. Travel arrangements would be reviewed as a separate process once new routes were complete and local residents would be fully consulted.

14) Cambridgeshire Guided Busway Update

Councillor Stone asked whether the southern section of the Busway was still expected to open in June 2010.

Councillor Jenkins welcomed the provision of a hardtopped cycle route and maintenance track adjacent to the Busway between Histon and Impington and Cambridge. However, he noted that the cycle route would be dark in winter and asked for stud lighting to be provided. He noted that the Swavesey Kiss and Ride facility had been postponed and asked when the Oakington facility would be provided. He also expressed disappointment that buses on the Busway would not use cross-operator ticketing and asked whether Scrutiny could review this.

Responding, the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, Councillor Pegram, noted that the handover date for the southern section of the Busway was yet to be agreed. Stud lighting between Histon and Impington and Cambridge was being considered. Kiss and Ride facilities were felt to be very expensive and not consistent with the Park and Ride facilities elsewhere on the Busway and were therefore not currently planned. It was for the bus operators to reach any agreement about cross-operator ticketing; it would be illegal due to competition laws for the County Council to require this.

Chairman: