

## **COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2011  
**Time:** 10.30 a.m. – 4.45 p.m.  
**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, K Churchill, J Clark, N Clarke, S Criswell, S Count, P Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, N Guyatt, S Gymer, G Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, G Heathcock, S Hoy, W Hunt, C Hutton, D J Jenkins, S Johnstone, E Kadić, G Kenney, S Kindersley, V Lucas, I Manning, L McGuire, V McGuire, L Nethsingha, J Palmer, D Pegram, A Pellew, P Read, P Reeve, J Reynolds, K Reynolds, T Sadiq, P Sales, S Sedgwick-Jell, C Shepherd, M Shuter, M Smith, T Stone, S Tierney, J Tuck, S van de Ven, R West, F Whelan, S Whitebread, K Wilkins, M Williamson, G Wilson and F Yeulett

**Apologies:** Councillors M Curtis, S King, A Melton, L J Oliver and A Orgee

### **178. MINUTES – 17<sup>th</sup> MAY 2011**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **179. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

### **180. 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>
Austen	185 a)	Member of COPE
Clarke	186	Son an apprentice at Waterbeach Barracks
Heathcock	185 a)	Member of COPE
Kenney	185 a)	Member of COPE
Manning	184 c)	Employee of an IT company undergoing change
L W McGuire	185 a)	Member of COPE
V McGuire	185 a)	Member of COPE and employee of caring agency
Read	185 a)	Member of COPE
Tierney	185 c)	Operator of two retail trading units
van de Ven	185 a)	Member of COPE
Whelan	185 a)	Associate member of COPE
Wilson	184 a)	Environment Agency employee

## **181. CABINET MEMBERSHIP**

In accordance with Part 2, Article 7, Section 7.04 of the Council's Constitution, members noted that the Leader of the Council had appointed Councillor Count to replace Councillor Oliver as the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance.

## **182. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No questions were received.

## **183. PETITIONS**

Two petitions were presented by members of the public, as set out in **Appendix B**. The Chairman thanked the petitioners and advised that the Leader of the Council would respond in writing.

## **184. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION FROM CABINET**

### **a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Proposals Map C: Minerals Safeguarding Area and Supporting Supplementary Planning Documents**

It was proposed by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, that the recommendations as set out in minute 379 of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2011 be approved.

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

It was resolved:

- a) To adopt the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (as amended by Planning Inspector J G King); and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Proposals Map C: Minerals Safeguarding Areas.
- b) To adopt the Block Fen/Langwood Fen Master Plan and the Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities Supplementary Planning Documents.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Labour, Green, UKIP and one Independent in favour; Liberal Democrats abstained.]

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor Bates, asked for his thanks to officers for their sustained work on these documents to be recorded.

### **b) Flexible Retirement Policy**

It was proposed by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, that the recommendation as set out in minute 380 of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2011 be approved.

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

It was resolved:

To approve the Revised Flexible Retirement Policy.

**c) Local Government Shared Services – Information Technology and Facilities Management**

It was proposed by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, that the recommendation as set out in minute 409 of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2011 be approved.

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

It was resolved:

- a) To endorse this proposal, approve the consequent changes in the officer structure within Cambridgeshire County Council, and insofar as the functions and responsibilities exercised under the auspices of the Information Technology and Facilities Management Services are Non-Executive Functions, delegate these functions to the Local Government Shared Services (LGSS) Joint Committee, LGSS Managing Director and LGSS Director of Operations, as appropriate.
- b) To agree to the amendment of the Council's scheme of delegation to reflect these changes and authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Group Leaders, to finalise the precise wording of the amendments and date of implementation.

**185. MOTIONS**

Four motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

**a) Motion from Councillor Sales**

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

This Council notes:

- The crisis facing 750 Southern Cross care homes across the country, including 6 in Cambridgeshire;
- That there are 105 older people and 14 with learning disabilities funded by Cambridgeshire County Council living in Southern Cross homes in and of county;
- Concern about care standards within residential homes has caused the Council to intervene on a number of occasions;

- The impending closure of Kingswood Park home/day centre in March on 31 October; and
- Earlier problems with Appletrees homecare in Bar Hill which required urgent Council intervention.

The Council asks the Cabinet to:

- a) Carry out a comprehensive review of the fitness of purpose of all independent sector care providers in Cambridgeshire;
- b) Put in place robust contingency measures to deal with current and future crises giving the welfare of residents the highest possible priority, including provision of an alternative dementia day centre in March;
- c) Review the funding contracts agreed with care home providers and to assess the impact of funding cuts on the viability of providers; and
- d) Do everything possible to help providers avoid job losses at a time of high unemployment.

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

[Voting pattern: Labour, Liberal Democrats, Green and one Independent in favour; Conservatives and UKIP against.]

**b) Motion from Councillor van de Ven**

With the agreement of the meeting, this motion was altered from that set out on the agenda paper to the one set out below.

It was proposed by Councillor van de Ven and seconded by Councillor Williamson that

Council notes:

In last year's pre-budget public consultation, protecting subsidised bus services was identified as one of the three top public service priorities.

Following the Council's decision to withdraw all bus subsidies over a four-year period, Cabinet is now seeking to undertake a review of the decision to withdraw subsidised bus service funding over four years, including consultation of relevant groups and the in-depth assessment of the impact of the proposals on the Council's public sector equality duty, linking this to the Cambridgeshire Future Transport project (*Cabinet Item 10, page 1, ii.*).

The first phase of bus subsidy withdrawal has already taken place resulting in the disappearance of a number of bus services which provided life-line services to elderly and disabled members of the public.

The application for Judicial Review that has been lodged following the Council's decision to cut bus subsidies.

Recommendation:

Council asks Cabinet to commission an independent and transparent review of all the bus subsidy cuts, including those that led to the service cuts of 17 April.

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

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

**c) Motion from Councillor Bourke**

Councillor Read queried whether this motion set out an appropriate issue for the Council to debate. The LGSS: Director of Legal advised that the motion was valid. The meeting agreed to accept it, as amended from that set out on the agenda paper to the one set out below.

It was proposed by Councillor Bourke and seconded by Councillor Whitebread that

Council notes:

Diverse high-streets, with a healthy representation of small traders, can form an integral part of the social fabric of local communities.

The competitive environment of the high street increasingly tends to produce generic streets populated by chain stores, resulting in 'Clone Towns'.

The Localism Bill is designed to give more powers to local councils and local people to shape their neighbourhoods.

Liberal Democrat parliamentarians have responded to a call for action from Cambridge City and County Councillors by tabling an amendment to the Localism Bill – 'The Cambridge Amendment' (153AKC) – that would allow councils and the local community to protect the diversity of the local high street by giving Councils a new power to take into account whether the business is 'independent' or 'multiple'.

Labour parliamentarians have tabled an amendment (153AKA) that requires Councils to adopt a sequential, 'town centre first' approach to development of retail sites in order to stop retail diversity in town centres being harmed by out-of-town developments.

Recommendation:

Council calls on members to pressure their respective political parties to support these amendments to the Localism Bill.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green in favour; Conservatives and UKIP against.]

**d) Motion from Councillor Wilkins**

It was proposed by Councillor Wilkins and seconded by Councillor Brooks-Gordon that

Council notes:

The repeated failure of the massive £1.2 billion 10-lane superhighway upgrade to the A14 to get government funding.

The poor safety record of the A14 especially for accidents involving HCVs, with 924 recorded accidents on the section from Hinchingbrooke interchange to Girton between 1999 and 2010.

The threat from the Government that any large scheme for the A14 could not be funded until 2020 at the earliest.

Council calls on the Cabinet to push for a new smaller scheme for the A14 that:

Improves the safety record of the A14 by bringing the junctions up to motorway standard.

Improves the A14's ability to cope with minor accidents by increasing the means by which damaged vehicles can be removed quickly from the carriageway.

Introduces Electronic Traffic Management systems, shown to reduce accidents and increase traffic throughput.

Replaces the Huntingdon viaduct with an alternative dual carriageway.

Is sufficiently scaled down for the work to be funded from the normal Highways Agency budget enabling the project to be commissioned and built when the government's next Comprehensive Spending Review period begins in 2014/5.

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

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

**186. ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

- In response to a question from Councillor Gymer, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, confirmed that officers would be reviewing signage on the Guided Busway.
- The Leader of the Council agreed to arrange a written response to Councillor van de Ven on the introduction of a 50 mph speed limit on the A10 between Foxton level crossing and the Shepreth Frog End junction.

- The Leader of the Council agreed to arrange a written response to Councillor Brooks-Gordon on the timing of implementation of a new speed limit on Huntingdon Road, Cambridge.
- The Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, agreed to provide Councillor Shepherd with more information on the Council's retention policy for artefacts from archaeological digs.
- In response to a question from Councillor Nethsingha, the Leader of the Council agreed to ask the Standards Committee to review whether a suspended member should be able to claim a member's allowance.
- The Leader of the Council agreed to arrange a written response to Councillor P Brown on the Council's work with partners to bring forward new infrastructure in Huntingdon.
- The Leader of the Council agreed to ensure that the local member, Councillor Williamson, was involved from the outset in discussions about the future of the Waterbeach Barracks site.
- The Leader of the Council agreed to provide Councillor Sadiq with more detailed information on the funding of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).
- The Leader of the Council to speak to Councillor J Reynolds about the publicity arrangements for promoting the Guided Busway.
- In response to a question from Councillor Downes, the Cabinet Member for Learning agreed to ask the Executive Director: Children and Young People's Services to write to Council employees responsible for supporting schools in raising standards refuting recent comments made by the Secretary of State for Education.
- In response to a question from Councillor Jenkins, the Leader of the Council agreed to investigate whether the Council could liaise with partners to enable local communities to halt traffic during the two minutes' silence at Remembrance Day services.

#### **187. WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

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

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

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

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 19 JULY 2011  
MINUTE 179 – CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**PEOPLE**

**Rod Craig, Executive Director: Community and Adult Services**

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the death of Rod Craig, Executive Director: Community and Adult Services. Rod was a well liked and respected leader who always strove to provide the best services he could for Cambridgeshire’s communities. As a Director and former Social Worker he had an in-depth knowledge and understanding for those working on the frontline. To his colleagues, he was a good friend who was always there to provide support and challenge. His bright, intelligent and witty brand of management will be sorely missed and the County is a poorer place for his passing. Our thoughts at this time are with his family and his friends and colleagues.

**Former County Councillor Joan Fiddy**

It is with regret that the Chairman also reports that former County Councillor Joan Fiddy died on 1 May 2011. Councillor Fiddy served on the County Council from 1989 to 1993, representing the Melbourn Electoral Division on behalf of the Conservative party.

**Leader of Liberal Democrat Group**

The Council notes the election of Councillor Kilian Bourke as Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group to replace Councillor Fiona Whelan.

**Gordon Jeyes OBE**

Gordon Jeyes, the Council’s former Executive Director for Children and Young People's Services, has been awarded an OBE in the Queen’s Birthday Honours List for his services to Local Government. Gordon has been a pivotal figure in local government for many years - in Scotland, here in Cambridgeshire and now in Ireland. He led Children and Young People's Services in Cambridgeshire with vision, energy and commitment. He was widely respected and always put children and young people at the heart of everything he did.

**Environment Services**

The Council welcomes Alex Plant who started his duties as Executive Director: Environment Services on 4 July 2011.

Also commencing their new Service Director roles in Environment Services on the same date were Graham Hughes, Service Director: Strategy and Development, and John Onslow, Service Director: Infrastructure Management and Operations.

**Leon Livermore, Head of Trading Standards**

Leon Livermore has been elected as the Chairman of the Trading Standards Institute for the forthcoming year. This is a great honour for Leon and the authority, at a time when the whole of the Consumer Law Enforcement landscape is being reviewed.



## **Janet King, Senior Social Worker, Children and Young People's Services**

Janet King, Senior Social Worker, Children and Young People's Services received a social work award presented by Unison General Secretary, Dave Prentis and President, Angela Lynes. Janet has been called 'an inspiration who has changed the lives of many people'.

## **Association of County Chief Executives**

The Council congratulates the Chief Executive, Mark Lloyd, on his election by his peers to the position of Vice-Chairman of the Association of County Chief Executives. It is likely that in 2012/13 he will be Chairman of the Association.

## **Councillor Linda Oliver**

Former Council Chairman, Councillor Linda Oliver, has sent her apologies for the Council meeting as she will be welcoming, on behalf of the Council, a Chinese delegation.

## **AWARDS**

### **Cambridgeshire Music**

The music service provided by Cambridgeshire County Council has been described as 'good with outstanding features' in a recent review. Cambridgeshire Music is evaluated annually to a variety of standards covering breadth, access, quality of delivery and support and leadership. In the space of a year the service has developed from an 'improving service' to 'a good service with outstanding features'.

### **Victoria Road Children's Home**

Victoria Road is the Council's children's home in Wisbech. The unit was inspected by Ofsted on 15 June and was found once again to be "Outstanding". Ofsted are now using a new rating framework to measure the newly issued National Minimum [Care] Standards and by the inspector's own admission it is considerably more difficult than ever before to achieve "Outstanding". Victoria Road has been rated "Outstanding" in five of the last seven inspections. The inspector was particularly impressed by the work carried out by the Manager, Wendy Bowen, and the Assistant Manager, Andrew Nixon on a new policy regarding the use of mobile phones and other electronic communication systems and the new procedures for tracking young "missing from care." The main thing that impresses at Victoria Road is the dedication of the staff to the care of their young people and how they continually seek to help their young people develop and achieve.

### **Education Equality Index 2011**

The Council has been ranked as the Number One Council by Stonewall for tackling homophobic bullying in schools in Stonewall's first Education Equality Index 2011. Several schools in the county contributed to the winning evaluation. St Matthew's Primary School in Cambridge features on Stonewall's new training DVD for schools, while Impington Village College has been instrumental in promoting and championing lesbian, gay and bisexual issues across its curriculum.

Cambridgeshire's submission for the award was led by CREDS (Cambridgeshire Race Equality and Diversity Service) in partnership with SexYOUality – a Cambridgeshire charity for lesbian, gay and bisexual young people – a partnership identified as a particular strength

by Stonewall. Council Leader, Councillor Nick Clarke collected the award at Stonewall's Education for All conference at the National Library in London on 1 July 2011 from Schools Minister Nick Gibb.

## **The Adult Placement Scheme in Fenland and East Cambridgeshire**

A placement scheme which encourages and enables people with learning difficulties to make the most of their lives has won praise from the Care Quality Commission. The Adult Placement Scheme in Fenland and East Cambridgeshire provides respite, outreach, daycare and permanent placements for 38 service users linking them with a network of 38 dedicated carers in the two districts. The carers support the service user to whom they have been carefully matched to enable them to participate in social activities in the community, help them to take advantage of opportunities and learn new skills and assist and encourage them towards a more independent life.

## **SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Cambridgeshire Guided Busway**

The Cambridgeshire's Guided Busway will open on Sunday 7 August. Busway services will run seven days a week, and from Monday to Saturday 7am to 7pm there will be buses running between St Ives and Cambridge at least every 10 minutes. Services to Huntingdon will be every 20 minutes with an hourly evening service running until midnight. The dedicated track for guided buses will mean passengers will be able to travel by public transport between St Ives Park & Ride and the Science Park in Cambridge in just 20 minutes.

Cambridge Gateway – a project to improve bus, cycle and pedestrian access into Cambridge railway station – was completed earlier this year, and the new link to Hills Road will also open on 7 August to tie in with the start of Busway services.

The Busway will be the longest track of its kind in the world and includes two new Park & Ride sites at St Ives and Longstanton with spaces for hundreds of cars, and covered cycle parking. The shorter southern section connects Cambridge Railway Station, Addenbrooke's Hospital and Trumpington Park & Ride with a completely traffic free link. The route will open on a Sunday to help get the service up and running before commuters begin using the route and further information on the services for the first day will be publicised in the coming weeks.

Surfacing of the cycleway next to the track between Swavesey and Cambridge will also be completed before the route opens. This means walkers, cyclists and horse riders will also be able to begin benefitting from the high quality, safe and car-free route from 7 August.

### **2 Seas Funding**

The Council joined forces with other organisations in northern Europe and has been successful in bidding for £370,000 of European funding to continue to develop cycling infrastructure and to encourage cycling in Cambridge.

Under the name 'Bike Friendly Cities' the European partners will be financed with a grant from the European Interreg 2 Seas Programme up to Summer 2014 to develop their own innovative cycling projects and collaborative projects. The other partners include local

authorities in Middelburg (The Netherlands) and Boulogne (France), as well as social enterprise Mobiel from Kortrijk (Belgium) and the UK sustainable transport charity Sustrans.

In Cambridge the installation of 'no entry except cycles' signs in 4 locations on 14th June marked the start of the programme. This signing arrangement allows for safe and easily understood 2 way cycling in narrow streets adding to the extensive cycle network in the city. Such signs are commonplace in the other partner cities and more sites in Cambridge could follow.

### **Commencement of Street Lighting PFI**

The Council welcomes the start of the street lighting PFI project and the improvements in the quality of lighting it will bring to Cambridgeshire allowing dimming at night and reducing energy use by 50% on a 5 year period. Additionally the new service will deliver cost savings which can be put into other front line services

### **CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN ACTIVITIES - MAY TO JULY 2011**

One of my priorities when I was elected Chairman in May was to give Members a regular update of the engagements undertaken by myself and the Vice-Chairman in the period leading up to each County Council meeting. This is the first of those updates – I hope Members find it useful. The information will also be published on the Council's website.

#### **May 2011**

- Official opening of extensions to Manea Primary School with boxer Dave 'Boy' Green
- Visit to Shire Hall by Ramsey Junior School – talk to children about Chairman's role and functions
- Twinning visit to Kreis Viersen, Germany, for choirs celebration
- Two Citizenship ceremonies, Shire Hall
- *Music on the Mound*, Shire Hall
- American Cemetery Memorial Day, wreath laying on behalf of County Council

#### **June 2011**

- RFCA Cambridgeshire County Forum, Civic Leaders' Briefing, Cambridge
- Mayor of St Ives' civic service and parade
- Change of Command ceremony, RAF Alconbury
- Learning Disability Parliament for Adults, Wood Green Animal Shelter
- Cambridgeshire Regiment Association Annual Service and Parade, Ely
- Cambridgeshire Carers' Conference, The Maltings, Ely
- Annual Civic Leaders' Tour, RAF Alconbury and RAF Molesworth
- Waste Management Park open day, Waterbeach
- Rod Craig - Celebration of Life, Colchester Rugby Club and commemorative celebration for Rod Craig, Shire Hall
- Flag-raising ceremony for Armed Forces Day, Shire Hall
- Official opening of The Bellbird Primary School, Sawston by the Duke of Gloucester
- Two Citizenship ceremonies, Shire Hall
- Proclamation of 800th Midsummer Fair, Cambridge
- Congregation for the Conferment of Honorary Degrees, Senate House, Cambridge, with the Duke of Edinburgh
- *Measure for Measure*, Chairman's Evening, Huntingdon

- Change of Command Ceremony, RAF Mildenhall
- Mayor of Ely Civic Service, St Peter's Church, Ely
- Patronal Festival service and installation of the Bishop of Brixworth, Peterborough Cathedral
- Summer anti-drink driving event, Ely Tesco
- Mayor and Mayoress of Wisbech 'At Home' - Wisbech

### **July 2011**

- Independence Day celebration, RAF Alconbury
- Huntingdon Civic Service, St Mary's Church, Huntingdon
- Viva awards ceremony, Soham
- Cambridgeshire Young People's 2011 Film Festival awards ceremony, Cambridge
- Wreath laying at Sea Sunday Service, St Mary's Church, Huntingdon
- Lincolnshire County Council Service of Dedication, Lincoln Cathedral
- Citizenship ceremony, Shire Hall
- Reception to celebrate first anniversary of the opening of the Advice Hub, Citizens' Advice Bureau, Cambridge
- *Read it Again* event - Cambridgeshire Children's Picture Book award ceremony, Doddington
- Sod-cutting event, Jeavons Wood Primary School, Cambourne
- Chairman of Norfolk County Council civic reception, Easton College

### Vice-Chairman's engagements

#### **May 2011**

- Two Citizenship ceremonies, Shire Hall

#### **June 2011**

- Installation of the Mayor of Peterborough and Civic Service, Peterborough Cathedral
- Citizenship ceremony, Shire Hall
- Cambridge Music *Striking Together* event, The Guildhall, Cambridge

#### **July 2011**

- Mayor of Wisbech Civic Service, Church of St Peter and St Paul, Wisbech
- Citizenship ceremony, Shire Hall

*Cllr John Powley, Chairman, Cambridgeshire County Council*

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 19 JULY 2011  
MINUTE 183 – PETITIONS**

1. Text of a petition containing 71 signatures presented by Keith Murray, Branch Chair of the National Union of Journalists in Cambridgeshire:

“We urge the County Council to vigorously oppose any cut to the local output of BBC Radio Cambridgeshire.

We believe local radio stations are a vital part of the local community holding local politicians to account, supporting local community groups and covering local sporting events.”

2. Text of a petition containing 70 signatures presented by Kerry Cook:

“The Conservative-run County Council has axed all funding for subsidised buses – the worst bus cuts in England. Local services that will be affected include 16, 16a, 19, 46.

People who rely on these services, including the elderly and vulnerable, will be isolated in their communities”.

Received 134 names on slips with the following text:

“We, the undersigned, want our local bus service saved. We call on the County Council not to cut the financial support to our local service.”

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 19 JULY 2011  
MINUTE 186 – ORAL QUESTIONS**

**1. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell, from Councillor Gymer**

I would like to ask a question about the accident that happened on the Guided Busway yesterday, in my patch and David's. My concern and certainly those reflected locally is that the signage is not there. It's complicated and people have been using the guide way, the actual guide way and the cycle track, to get around. My worry is that because the signage isn't there and especially with the start of the Guided Busway, that people will be acting in a certain way, they will have habits that will put themselves in danger, like the cyclist yesterday, which resulted in him having a broken leg. The thing is, it's not good enough in my opinion to say that it's their job to get out of the way. What if they are a small child? What if they have a hearing problem? You know hooting the horn is – I'm just trying to give the background and to keep being interrupted means I can't give the background. What I am asking is that the Guided Busway team look at putting signage back in place at the crossroads, where cars are going through red lights because they are not used to seeing buses; that they look at all the crossings, especially in Orchard Park and Histon. It's not just crossing the guide way, it's crossing the cycle track as well. I want to see public safety safeguarded.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

Apologies for Cabinet members who have had to go to another meeting. Let's be fair, what is going on here? An accident took place on what's effectively the end of a construction site. It's called the Guided Busway, not the Guided Cycleway. The incident took place on the rails themselves so the individual should not have been there. I will accept the fact that it may have taken one or two more weeks longer than we thought to get the Guided Busway up and running and people may have started to use it for a cycleway, but clearly they shouldn't. Warnings have been issued and there is signage there, but I fully expect that officers will be reviewing all of the signs along the length of the Guided Busway for completeness, accuracy and to make sure that the greatest attention to public safety is made.

**Supplementary question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Gymer**

Particularly at Water Lane is a place that we really would like something done. I would just like to say, if it was a construction site than that is quite a problem, if we are allowing the public actually on it and we're not safeguarding this.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

My understanding is that they are not actually allowed on there and notices have been put up and people are told that they shouldn't be there. I am not going to be specific about any junction because we want the whole of the Guided Busway to be safe for the people of Cambridgeshire.

**2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell, from Councillor van de Ven**

Earlier this year, residents of Foxton and Shepreth were told that following a speed limit review of the A10 between Foxton level crossing and Frog End junction, a 50mph speed limit would be introduced before the end of this financial year. Shepreth Frog End junction has long been an accident blackspot and Foxton level crossing is one of the most abused crossings outside of London. A speed limit reduction will not eradicate problems but will be a helpful measure. Unfortunately the speed limit reduction has not yet been implemented. The matter has been followed up more than once with officers but no clear answer yet has been given as to when the measure will be implemented. When will the measure be implemented? I did give Councillor Criswell notice of my question.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

I'm not familiar with that particular issue but I will assure you I will get back to you with a written answer following this meeting.

**3. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Brooks-Gordon**

This may also have to be deferred but I will read it out anyway so that it can be answered. Residents of Castle Ward are delighted that the speed limit on the Huntingdon Road is going to come down under the new regulations. West Central Area Committee voted to put £2,000 towards it as did Girton Parish Council, in order to pay for the speed cameras to be moved further up Huntingdon Road. So it's a question about implementation and also would this be chased? I'll be quite happy to have the answer later when the Cabinet member is here to give me an answer on that.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

I'm happy to get back to you afterwards.

**4. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Manning**

Question to the Leader of the Council asking what support he will be able to offer me on an issue on my ward. I've got a pub that is known both nationally and actually it was in the New York Times list of 15 top things to do in Cambridgeshire. The Haymakers is a live music venue which has had to close down on Saturday. I would like to know what support Councillor Clarke can offer me in trying to ensure that we get this pub reopened as soon as possible.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

This is not a matter, I believe, for this Council. Of course we wish to support all business but it must be good business and actually it's down to the individuals that live close to that public house to frequent it. I guess that there may be some help that the City Council may provide but from a County Council perspective I find it difficult to offer support for this pub, is a city pub any different to all the other pubs across the breadth of our County that are closing and facing the same difficulties. This is

something that is clearly in the hands of local people: you support it or you lose it like a lot of facilities.

**Supplementary question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Manning**

I'm disappointed but expected that rather impotent response. The point about this is that it is a tied pub, it's run by a national brewery. The City Council, the Liberal Democrat-run City Council, and indeed in this chamber today the Liberal Democrat Group did propose a way that we could be able to support that and that was an amendment to the Localism Bill, which you guys failed to protect and failed to vote for, so there's one way you could have supported it.

**5. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, from Councillor Shepherd**

Given the demise of the proposal for the Historic Centre for the safeguarding, preservation and storage for Countywide documents and archives, can he assure us please that there is a Plan B?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

Can I thank Councillor Shepherd for giving notice of the question. Just to say that the County Council is just as committed to finding a site and a solution for the Cambridge History Centre but it remains a long-term vision. We do recognise that it's some years away but the archives space does need to have some improvement. At this present time we have BUPA preparing a business case to look at how improvements could possibly be made and also the financial model required for that. So we are working on an improvement and we want to try and retain a long term goal of a History Centre.

**Supplementary question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, from Councillor Shepherd**

Could I just say that we've recently passed the planning approval for Trumpington Meadows, the new school and housing development in Trumpington. If you go down there now it's a huge muddy field and thanks to the planning process that allows Cambridge Archaeology Department to go in and dig up places before they get built over, they have dug up this area. It's absolutely fabulous and if people haven't been down there I would recommend it. It's a huge pre-Iron Age settlement, really really interesting; people have lived there for over 2,000 years and they have dug up all sorts of really interesting artefacts; some of them are quite rare. When I was there I was somewhat horrified for the Head of the Archaeology Department to tell me, when I asked him about these things, he said did I want to take them home with me because they would be throwing them away, because they didn't know where they would be stored. So could I just have some assurance that the business case and this model which is presumably happening but will take some time, will include not just papers but artefacts and also that there is somewhere where these things are going to be kept before they are thrown away? Don't throw them away please.

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

I can assure you that we do regard the History Centre in terms of its value and the archives themselves. I see no reason why we shouldn't take certain artefacts into the archives but that's a question for the Head of Archives to respond to. I do know that in



certain circumstances they do not retain all of the artefacts; they will select and keep so many. It's an item that I'm quite happy to take up for you, to find out some more information and come back to you.

**6. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Nethsingha**

Was the Leader of the Council as surprised as I'm told the members of the Standards Committee were to discover that this Council's Constitution allows for a member who has been suspended from the Council to continue to draw an allowance? Would he agree that this is an unsatisfactory situation and something that the Standards Committee should be asked to look at over the next year?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

I think I was surprised actually and I think that it is something that the Standards Committee should look at.

**7. Question to the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Hutton, from Councillor Hoy**

In my division we have a Southern Cross home and to inform many elderly people and their families, I would like to ask for some clarification. I have received a very detailed briefing and for that I am very grateful but can you give me an indication of the scale of the problem, specifically on how our County compares to other Counties in terms of numbers of residents affected?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Hutton**

Thank you Councillor Hoy. I understand that you have a particular issue in your division and please rest assured, as we were discussing earlier, that we will be doing everything that we possibly can to make sure that certainly at the moment people's fears are allayed. If the worst did come to the worst then we would do everything we can to move people locally. In terms of the scale of the problem, we have had a briefing; we've got just over 100 people in Cambridgeshire. I'm not sure of all the figures in terms of comparable Counties. I was talking to a colleague in Essex and they have 1,000 residents with Southern Cross. Even worse for them is that they are actually all in one half of the County and so should they need to move they have actually got to go elsewhere. I think it's about 600 in Norfolk. If you need any other figures I can get back to you on that. So I don't want to minimise the scale of the problem that we have, because it is a problem, but just that others have got it at least as bad if not worse.

**8. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor P Brown**

My question was to Councillor Bates but in his absence perhaps Councillor Clarke might take note of it and it is as follows. Huntingdon's residents are looking forward to the future of the town, particularly with the commercial development in the town centre and in the west of the town. Meeting both projects will ensure local prosperity for decades to come. However, this could be marred if the necessary infrastructure is not in place. By this I mean by resolving a number of transportation and road safety issues both in the conservation areas, the town centre and on the main roads leading into Huntingdon. Can he assure me that within the provisions of the Localism Bill that

this Council will work with its partners and ensure that the appropriate funding is put in place?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

Councillor Brown, thank you for raising that point, I can certainly assure you that we will work with all our partners in the interests of improving business and improving our County. I'm not in a position to give you assurances about spending money at the moment but I'm more than happy to take this up afterwards and talk to officers.

**Supplementary question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor P Brown**

Can I just stress the aspect of our partners? Because I think that we know where the Council are coming from. We haven't got a lot of money but out there we have partners who we are working with in Huntingdonshire who may help us. This is why I'm stressing that under the Localism Bill can we work with our partners to ensure that the infrastructure is in place?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

Very content to do that after the meeting.

**9. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Williamson**

My question is about the extraordinary news that I have just heard about the closure of Waterbeach Barracks, which will be happening according to the Government in 2014/2015. It was originally going to be addressed to Councillor Bates but since he's gone I guess the Leader takes over. Part of the motivation for the Government selling the Barracks or at least vacating the Barracks is to help to alleviate the local housing shortage. Back in 2003 when the Structure Plan was approved by this Council Waterbeach came second to Northstowe, in fact Northstowe was the site for the new town. Northstowe is still not built and it's still not in existence. Would the Leader of the Council agree with me that it would be ridiculous to start to develop Waterbeach unless and until Northstowe has at least shown its ability to satisfy the local housing issues?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke**

Thank you for the question. This is breaking news as we all know. Can I declare an interest, my son is an apprentice at Waterbeach, so we will be directly affected. Whether we switch building from our current plans is unlikely on the hoof today in this Council meeting, but of course this is another variable that we will need to plan into our thinking and into our medium- to long-term planning. Perhaps I can just read some words out for members if I may that have been prepared.

'There has been an outline proposal for housing development at Waterbeach for many years and Waterbeach was considered as a candidate for a major new settlement at the time that Northstowe was chosen. Clearly this primarily would be an issue for South Cambs as the planning authority and we would wish to work with them in a normal way to consider any proposals. It seems likely that any closure would not be immediate and we will of course want to discuss the situation further with the MoD, Defence Estates and the District Council over the coming days. We will want to

consider the economic impacts flowing from this and work with the MoD to minimise the impacts and manage the impact on local suppliers and the broader local community and to look positively at what opportunities this may create for future economic growth, given the strategic location of the site’.

This actually builds on some of the work that we were doing at the Board meeting, it seems like weeks ago but only a couple of days ago. The LEP is concerned about a number of military bases in our area. It’s by no coincidence that we have flat land and lots of airfields were built and taken over by the army later. So this is thinking at the LEP level and clearly we will be working locally to see what we can do to mitigate the quite considerable impact it may have on the local economy.

**Supplementary question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Williamson**

My real concern is that by releasing this, a lot of pressure may be put on the County and the District Councils to agree to the development, which previously has been rejected. The state of the A10, for example, causes major issues about doing such a significant development in Waterbeach. Will the Leader assure me that proper planning considerations will take place and that pressure from the Ministry of Defence or Defence Estates to realise the maximum possible profit from selling the airfield will not necessarily sway their judgement on the planning and economic value of the site and the problems the site has?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

I will give every assurance that the correct planning processes will take place. As I’ve signalled before in the last two months, as the local member I will be expecting you to be involved in the very early stages of all the activity that takes place there. If you are not for any reason, you must let me know and I will make sure you are.

**10. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Sadiq**

Can I ask the Leader of the Council to update Council on the current state of funding for the Local Enterprise Partnership?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

The funding in general terms is about £140,000 at the moment, which has been made up largely from the local authorities all contributing £7,500 and I think we are contributing £25,000 and others are contributing more as well. That is a pretty small amount of money but it is about an enabling organisation not about a commissioning organisation. But clearly it is all very new and a number of different models are being explored and thought about at Board level there and I will get back to you. I will happily confirm the numbers in writing after this meeting.

**Supplementary question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Sadiq**

May I ask specifically in relation to the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership, what is happening with that?

## **Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

The Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership is in the process of being wound up and there was a sum of about £70,000 after redundancy costs available for distribution. Bearing in mind that the GCP has been funded almost exclusively from EEDA and local authorities, it seems very reasonable that that money should be returned to local authorities. In fact in this case it was a general consensus among local authorities that it should go into the LEP, to help support the fairly frugal amount of money that is there at the moment. I have to say I was particularly disappointed at the GCP meeting, if you bear in mind that the GCP is a very odd organisation, in that part of it is made up of the Operating Board, which sort of does stuff, and then there is the other Board that finally decides things and that's made up of the members.

The operating board decided that £70,000 should not go back to the public purse but it should go into a clean tech Shell Company. In essence, the Director who works for the GCP made a pitch for that money to go into the Shell Company. He would be paid redundancy money and then move over and become an employee of that new company. I fought against that tooth and nail and I was very disappointed when the Liberal Democrat Leader of the City Council, despite agreeing with me that the money should go back into the public purse, on the day changed her mind and voted for it to go into the clean tech. I'm afraid to say it doesn't look at all well.

## **Point of information from Councillor Nethsingha**

I believe the Leader of the Liberal Democrats on the Cambridge City Council did that because of new information which had arisen and that she had attempted to try and tell the Leader of this Council.

## **11. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Tierney**

I note from the Chairman's remarks that this Council has recently won an award from Stonewall, which is excellent, inspiring news. However it has recently been brought to my attention that there was a news story from the Cambridge Evening News in January 2010 regarding some homophobic remarks made in a conversation between Councillor Bourke and some friends. I wonder if you would care to comment on how these two items are compatible?

## **Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

Thank you for the advance notice of this question. I praise you on your research, I have to say. I was very proud to be invited to London recently to pick up the award on behalf of Cambridgeshire, as we were the highest ranking in the Stonewall's first Education Equality Index 2011. Tackling homophobia is nothing new in Cambridgeshire. We have been a member of Stonewall's Education Champions Programme since it started in 2008 and have embraced its principles with energy and enthusiasm. The programme has given our schools invaluable access to a wide range of resources and support. Cambridgeshire County Council regards the prevention and tackling of homophobic bullying to be an essential component of our work with children and young people but alas, not everyone has that view it seems. Councillor Kilian Bourke was a member of a group on the social networking site Facebook, littered with jokes about homosexuality. Gay rights groups reacted angrily to the site, also criticised by ex-Cambridge Lib Dem MP David Howarth, who was a

Facebook friend of Kilian Bourke. In one post he said the group would ridicule all and sundry with a dazzling repertoire of scathing insults.

**Point of personal explanation from Councillor Bourke**

I made a big mistake, it was a pathetic attempt at parody, I regret it completely. I apologised unreservedly for my mistake but I should also point out that I was not a Councillor at that time and if, Chair, Councillor Clarke's Administration wishes to open debate around issues, embarrassments, that have happened in the past of individuals before they became Councillors, so be it, but it achieves nothing. It's the opposite of streamlining and it risks reducing democratic debate to nothing more than a food fight. So if you want to go down that road, do, but I think it would be a shame.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

If I may finish, we are very keen on transparency on the other side. You are very keen on transparency you want to know about everything, you need to know about the Leader that you have chosen. The people of Cambridgeshire need to know about it. Let me finish with a quote from the gay rights campaigner Peter Tatchell, who said with attitudes like these, I don't see how he can possibly represent his lesbian and gay constituents, these gratuitous anti-gay insults render him unfit for public office.

**12. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Reeve**

This question is for the Leader of the Council. It's not quite as relevant as the last statement made, actually I think that's one of the most relevant pieces of information I've heard today about hypocrisy on this Council; however, I will still ask it. One of the great things that has happened since May and one of the great culture shifts on this Council seems to have been the level of consultation that officers have with local members. I've experienced it; I'm sure everybody across this Chamber has experienced it; however, one of those consultations has just led me to ask this question. It was asking local members about their view on building more wind farms on County Council land. I'm asking the question because one of the key weaknesses of the Localism Bill is in planning. It generally doesn't take account of local people's opinion and under PPS22 and PPS1 pretty much ties the hands of District Councils on any matter relating to renewable energy and especially to wind farms. It gives people the right to build them, or communities the right to build more where you might not want them, but it certainly doesn't give communities the right to oppose them. In the light of this could I ask for the Leader of the Council's assurance, and I've heard the business argument for them, but can I ask for the Leader of the Council's assurance that if there is popular opposition from local communities about a wind farm application on County Council land, which is after all is public land paid for by the taxpayer, that this Council wouldn't make land available for those sites?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

Again not my portfolio, of course, but I can give you assurance that we are not mindful to be building any wind farms on County Farm land or any land that we own at the moment or for the foreseeable future.

**13. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor J Reynolds**

I've been to two or three meetings in the last couple of weeks and have been approached by various people, two people in fact, who have said that they have been told at other meetings that the guide way would not be open in August but that it's likely to be September or even later. This was to their great worry, because they keep hearing that it's going to open in August. Can the Leader of the Council reassure the Council that it will be open as predicted in August and that those members who have been talking about a later opening are completely and utterly wrong?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

There would be no one more worried than me if I thought the 7<sup>th</sup> of August opening day was slipping. I can give absolute assurance it will open on the 7<sup>th</sup> of August. If I'm pushing it, it will open.

**Supplementary question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor J Reynolds**

This concerns the Busway again. Could Councillor Clarke tell me and tell the Council what work is being done to encourage the patronage amongst businesses and other parts of the community to use the guide way? The benefits are both for the economy and also for recreation.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

I can't give you specifics because it's not my portfolio as you well know, but there is an active campaign to ensure that the people of Cambridgeshire are made aware of the benefits and the attributes and the timescales, the journey times and all the rest of it. That's all in hand but I just can't give you specific details. I can speak to you afterwards.

**14. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty, from Councillor Downes**

I'm sure you will agree with me that we have a collective responsibility for providing the best possible education for all the pupils in all our schools, primary schools, special schools and secondary schools and that includes of course them being happy and safe and well balanced and well disciplined and so on. It also includes raising academic standards. I think that you will agree with me that the role played by our local authority officers in supporting schools to raise standards is crucial and it is one that I think we collectively value. Therefore I'm asking you to join me in totally repudiating the remarks made by the Secretary of State, Michael Gove, on Thursday June the 16<sup>th</sup> at 7.50 on the Today programme when he was being interviewed by Sarah Montague about the fact that he was taking 800 failing schools out of local authority control and making them academies, because local authorities are teams of bureaucrats not committed to raising standards of achievement. I was appalled by that remark and I hope you will join me in repudiating it and giving a message of total support to our local authority officers.

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

I take note of the points that you make. I would have to say to you that I would not agree with those remarks and I think that we have an excellent set of officers here in Cambridgeshire who play a splendid role in terms of raising education standards.

**Supplementary question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty from Councillor Downes**

Can I ask you to convey that message via Mr Loades to our colleagues, so that they are reassured about our position irrespective of what Michael Gove says?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

I'm happy to do that.

**15. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Jenkins**

Will he agree with me that Remembrance Sunday and the associated two minutes' silence at the Cenotaph service are important elements in this country's support for its armed forces and that the latter especially should be able to proceed without undue disturbance?

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

I'm going to take your question on absolute face value in the innocence that it came across and I absolutely agree that Remembrance Sunday is a very special day. It's a very important day. The two minutes' silence should be cherished as should our armed forces, so I fully support that.

**Supplementary question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Jenkins**

Yes Chair, let me confirm to the Leader that there are no tricks. Will he therefore, and thank you for your agreement, instruct the relevant Cabinet members – and there may be more than one – to liaise with other organisations – I'm thinking about the police but there would be others as well – and establish a simple and pragmatic process for local communities to halt traffic close to remembrance services at the time of the two minutes' silence and to do so in good time before this year's ceremonies.

**Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke**

I absolutely agree with your sentiments. What is involved technically, I would have to look up afterwards, but on the basis of a simple request it sounds very sensible to me. Whether we are able to achieve it everywhere or not is another matter. We will certainly look into it.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 19 JULY 2011  
MINUTE 187 – WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

**Question from Councillor Sadiq to the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing,  
Councillor Curtis**

NHS cuts are expected to hit mental health services particularly badly with the most vulnerable people being put at risk. 6,000 jobs in mental health trusts are expected to be lost nationwide. Could the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing set out what measures are being taken to assess and mitigate the impact of funding cuts on mental health services in Cambridgeshire at a time when increasing demand for services is expected?

**Response from the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Curtis**

NHS Cambridgeshire (NHSC) and Cambridge and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) will be entering into a public consultation in the autumn in relation to the impact of funding reductions regarding local mental health services. We understand there is a requirement for them to make 12% efficiency savings over 3 years in line with national expectations. We understand that no further savings will be required on top of this. NHSC and CPFT are currently developing the plans for reconfiguring service delivery to achieve the savings required.

The Cabinet has worked to minimise the impact of the financial challenges faced by the County Council on its investment in mental health services, in recognition of the expectation of increasing demand linked to the financial climate. (Note savings target of £20,000 in 2011/12 and no further reductions planned in the IPP period).

As the plans emerge from the work being undertaken by CPFT and NHSC, we will be better placed to assess the potential impact and discuss with partners potential ways to mitigate this through joint approaches.

The public consultation will also provide the Cabinet and Adults, Wellbeing and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee with the opportunity to respond to the full detail of the proposals.

We know the historic issues and concerns about mental health across the UK - but they are as much organisational as they are financial. We will use our new local influences on health to deliver improvements. It is the difference between New Labour centralist thinking and the Conservative led-coalition's modern progressive localist principles.

Within the context of proposed savings we have been able to continue to jointly develop elements of work programmes that will enhance and improve local services. Examples of this include:

- Working to develop and implement an integrated pathway between CYPS and CAMH for children and young people with emerging and early mental health problems. This is linked to the redesign and transformation of CAMH services and will bring clinicians closer to children and young people through work with schools, locality teams and children's centres.



- Using the IAPT (Improving Access to Psychological Therapies) programme to train professionals who don't have a specialist mental health background who work with young people in the community to enable them to provide effective early support.
- Jointly developing specifications for local open access preventative services that ensure a strong interface with local primary mental health services to prevent service duplication and enhance skills.
- Implementing Self Directed Support across mental health services. This included a major retraining programme, including voluntary sector partners, mental health staff and supported housing.
- Developing services that meet emerging needs, particularly around the diagnosis and management of Young Onset Dementia.
- Jointly investing in Access to Work Programmes to increase opportunities to support people with mental health problems to both maintain and access employment.
- Continuing to develop and commission Supported Living Schemes with the intention of enabling people to be supported as locally as possible in order to prevent people moving out of the County and to ensure efficient usage of local acute beds.
- Participating in service redesign to ensure a collaborative approach to delivering evidence based outcomes across both health and social care.

**Question from Councillor Pellew to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell**

When the new Highways Reporting System was introduced, one of the reasons given for its high cost was that it would enable those reporting problems to be kept up to date on the status of them.

The current response to a report via the website is "Thank you for reporting this Highways problem. It has been investigated, appropriate action taken and the report is now closed".

Does the Cabinet Member agree that calling the item closed implies it is fixed, and therefore does not meet the stated objective which encourages those reporting the problem to be up to date on the status? Is this an acceptable way of communicating with Cambridgeshire residents?

**Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell**

Councillor Pellew is referring to what was the original default response when the news system was introduced, and I recognise that this was not the best response we could have offered residents.

We are currently reviewing the reports system and the wording of responses. In doing so we are aiming to provide a better and more informative range of appropriate replies, along with general improvement to the system's user-friendliness. These changes are due to be in place by the end of August.

## **Question from Councillor Jenkins to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell**

Cambridgeshire County Council has already made progress against the localism agenda to the extent that it has delegated to Parish Councils and other local bodies the rights to initiate, design, finance and procure projects relating to local speed limits, parking and road safety.

Could the Cabinet Member please confirm Parish Councils' rights in this respect? Can he confirm that Parish Councils may:

- Determine the need for speed limits, parking controls and road safety projects
- Where appropriate commission the design and specification of such limits, controls and projects secure funding; and
- Procure the necessary goods and services to deliver them?

Such activity is of course subject to such limits, controls and projects meeting standards currently in place.

Will the Cabinet Member furthermore encourage officers to:

- Work with Parish Councils to enable such limits, controls and projects to be progressed without delay; and
- Interpret the standards in a way which does not unnecessarily increase their costs?

## **Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell**

Councillor Jenkins has seen our leaflet that explains our approach to third party funding of highway measures and the more recent leaflet that sets out our new approach to the setting of local speed limits in towns and villages.

I would strongly encourage local communities to consider their needs for their local streets.

The County Council has to target its limited resources to the highest priorities in terms of safety and we are keen to support communities who wish to invest in their local streets, particularly where we are unable to make them a priority for County Council funding.

We will provide support and guidance to local communities throughout the process. Local communities are able to commission their own designs which would be subject to the same checking processes that are applied to the Council's own schemes.

Local communities are also able to procure works through their own contractors. The contractors are expected to follow all the procedures necessary to work on the public highway that the Council's own contractors are required to follow to protect themselves and the public, and to work to the same specifications.

Depending on the nature and extent of the work, it may be necessary for legal agreements to be put in place to enable some construction works on the highway, as is done with property developers when they carry out work on the public highway. We will take a pragmatic approach to these matters to minimise bureaucracy wherever possible.

I should point out that any additional maintenance liabilities or operational costs that result from locally funded schemes would need to be met by communities themselves.

The Executive Director and his team will be very happy to discuss any proposals with members.

### **Question from Councillor Bourke to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

What has been the total cost to date of the consultation process on the planned changes to Libraries? Please provide the breakdown of the total cost, including the cost of written material, of hosting consultation meetings, and the cost of officer time dedicated to this process.

### **Response from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty**

The costs incurred in hosting public consultation meetings regarding the Library Service Review to date are as follows.

For the 2010 round of 10 Public Consultation meetings the total costs were £6,151 for the production and printing of handouts a questionnaire, and a film clip. This sum also includes the hire of venues for meetings where necessary. Limited numbers of copies of printed materials were produced but the questionnaire was also available through the County Council website, and this saw the return of some 5,648 questionnaires, 3557 in paper form along with 2091 on-line responses. Also included in the costs for 2010 was the production of a separate short film clip which was shown at all of the public meetings as well as at a number of other venues, including a major exhibition at the Grafton Centre. Clearly this film clip also helped in raising awareness in relation to the significant response rate for the linked questionnaire.

Staff arranging the meetings did so as part of their day to day work, and attendance at meetings in the evening by senior staff is an expected part of their duties and is not an additional cost. Travel expenses would have been occurred at the standard County Council rates.

For the early 2011 round of Public Consultation meetings the costs incurred so far are £973 for the production and printing of handouts, and also for the hire of venues. The same position applied to staff costs as for 2010. In both instances venue costs were kept to an absolute minimum by using the local library itself where it was of sufficient size to take the numbers we anticipated would attend. We estimate that almost 2,000 people have attended the 18 meetings held in 2011.

I believe that this is an incredibly modest cost when you consider the very large numbers of people we have been able to engage with and the very valuable views and opinions they have fed into the process, and which will help us reach informed and measured decisions and a way forward for the library service in the future.

### **Question from Councillor Pellew to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count**

Given the Information Commissioner's recent guidance on the publishing of statutory information - that requiring people to travel to Shire Hall to inspect documents should not be considered as complying with the Freedom of Information Act - what efforts is this Council now making to fully comply with the Act and how will this affect the publishing of new

information, whether statutory publication is required or not (for example an unedited register of Members' interests)?

## **Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count**

The requirement for Councils to create and maintain a Register of Members' Interests is found under the Local Government Act 2000 – this requirement is to make available on site a full register of interests of Members.

The Register of Members' Interests contains a range of information about Councillors which would be regarded as Personal Data according to the Data Protection Act. It includes information about a Councillor's employment, property interests and interests in commercial entities.

This information on interests should be declared and available for those who have a need to know, however the Data Protection Act requires that we process information only for the purposes specified at the time the Councillors provided it. They were informed that it would be used to populate the Register held at Shire Hall; therefore any additional processing would need either the consent of the individuals or a legal basis to bypass the consent requirement. Since there is no such legal basis, we must rely on individual consents. Any additional processing which we do is in addition to this requirement is on a voluntary basis and has no backing in statute or case law.

In the interests of being open and transparent with information and data sets, the Council has approached their Members with a view to seeking their voluntary consent for the publication of their data on the Council's Website. It is a matter for each member to decide whether they wish all or any of their data to be published on the internet.

In response to a Freedom of Information request, the Council has relied on the exemption provided under s.21 (Information available by other means). This exemption is an absolute exemption which does not require a public interest test. The Freedom of Information Act also contains an exemption to the duty to disclose for Personal Data protected by the Data Protection Act.

The Information Commissioner's Office has released guidance in relation to using this exemption, which is available here:

[http://www.ico.gov.uk/upload/documents/library/freedom\\_of\\_information/detailed\\_specialist\\_guides/awareness\\_guidance\\_6\\_-\\_information\\_reasonably\\_accessible\\_to\\_the\\_applicant\\_by\\_other\\_means.pdf](http://www.ico.gov.uk/upload/documents/library/freedom_of_information/detailed_specialist_guides/awareness_guidance_6_-_information_reasonably_accessible_to_the_applicant_by_other_means.pdf)

Specifically, the ICO has dealt with information only available for inspection in the following paragraph:

*"Information which is only available on inspection, for instance by visiting the premises of the authority, is not to be considered reasonably accessible even though it is disclosed or published under statute unless it falls within a class of information included in the authority's publication scheme."*

This information falls under Class 6 of the Publication Scheme (Lists and Registers) where we make it clear that the information is available in paper format.

<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/FB716738-D366-40C1-9F6C-C1C489B2B5CD/0/2009publicationschemeguide.pdf>

The information is considered to be published in accordance with the requirements of statute and we have, where consent has been provided, carried out additional voluntary work to make this information more available to interested parties. However, there is no compulsion on the Council or its members to make more information available online and the Council would be acting in breach of the Data Protection Act and in some cases the Human Rights Act, if it published this information on the internet without consent.

**Question from Councillor van de Ven to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell**

What assurances can the Leader provide regarding the position of small parishes with very limited scope for precepting, in the matter of 'Funding for Small Local Schemes' considered by Cabinet on June 14?

**Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell**

I am aware of concerns raised by some Parish Councils and I welcome Councillor van de Ven's question as an opportunity to clarify the situation.

When considering the funding for small local schemes, Cabinet decided that a joint funding aspect through a Parish Council contribution should be retained, to demonstrate that Parish and Town Councils had a vested interest in the schemes. The third party funding element remains set at £1 per elector, up to a maximum of £5,000 to match the County's contribution.

As indicated at the meeting by the Leader of the Council, officers have been tasked with investigating alternative flexible funding schemes to give Parish Councils greater flexibility on contributions over a period of time, to ease any budget pressures. These mechanisms are still being developed.

In terms of the transitional funding arrangements already agreed for this financial year, it is recognised (particularly in South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire) that some Parish Councils will have been offered a scheme, but may not have budgeted for a contribution.

Officers have been asked to be as flexible as possible over not only the timescale for providing contributions but also on the level of contribution, given that many of the schemes that are likely to be taken forward are low cost, and the level of contribution needs to be proportionate.

Where Parish Councils have concerns I would encourage local councillors to discuss these matters with the Director for Infrastructure Management and Operations to agree a way forward, to try and make sure we do not discourage parishes from taking part in the work programme.

I have also asked the Director for Infrastructure Management and Operations to reflect further on this issue to ensure that we have proportionate arrangements in place for future contributions, which will be communicated to parishes well ahead of any bidding process for 2012/13.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 19 JULY 2011**

**MINUTE 188 – MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

**RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE (11)**

Cllr F Brown [Chairman]	C	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr Sir P Brown	C	Cllr J Clark	C
Cllr R Farrer	C	Cllr T Orgee	C
Cllr N Guyatt	C	Cllr A Pellew	LD
Cllr G Harper	C	Cllr P Read	C
Cllr D Jenkins	LD	Cllr C Shepherd	LD
Cllr S King [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr M Smith	C
Cllr L Nethsingha	LD	Cllr T Stone	LD
Cllr J Powley	C		
Cllr T Sadiq	L		
Cllr M Williamson	LD		

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (11)**

Cllr J Palmer	C	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr J Batchelor	LD	Cllr K Churchill	C
Cllr J Dutton	C	Cllr J Clark	C
Cllr S Gymer	LD	Cllr P Downes	LD
Cllr S Hoy	C	Cllr G Harper	C
Cllr S Johnstone [Chairman]	C	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr I Manning	LD	Cllr S Tierney	C
Cllr V McGuire [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr F Whelan	LD
Cllr T Orgee	C		
Cllr G Kenney	C		
Cllr R West	C		

**ADULTS WELLBEING AND HEALTH (12)**

Cllr S Austen	LD	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr N Guyatt	C	Cllr K Bourke	LD
Cllr G Kenney [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr K Wilkins	LD
Cllr S King	C	Cllr G Heathcock	LD
Cllr V McGuire	C	Cllr S Hoy	C
Cllr K Reynolds [Chairman]	C	Cllr A Melton	C
Cllr P Sales	L	Cllr J Palmer	C
Cllr S Sedgwick-Jell	G	Cllr P Read	C
Cllr C Shepherd	LD		
Cllr M Smith	C		
Cllr F Whelan	LD		
Cllr F Yeulett	C		

**ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE (12)**

Cllr N Bell	LD	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr R Butcher [Chairman]	C	Cllr K Bourke	LD
Cllr J Clark	C	Cllr J Dutton	C
Cllr R Farrer [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr N Guyatt	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 S van de Ven	LD
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr S Whitebread	LD
Cllr P Read	C		
Cllr K Wilkins	LD		
Cllr G Wilson	LD		

## SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES (12)

Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr S Hoy	C	Cllr J Batchelor	LD
Cllr L Kadic	C	Cllr Sir P Brown	C
Cllr S King	C	Cllr K Churchill	C
Cllr A Pellew	LD	Cllr J Dutton	C
Cllr P Reeve	UKIP	Cllr G Harper	C
Cllr J E Reynolds	C	Cllr S van de Ven	LD
Cllr T Sadiq	L	Cllr F Whelan	LD
Cllr M Smith	C	Cllr K Wilkins	LD
Cllr S Tierney [Chairman]	C	Cllr P Sales	L
Cllr R West [Vice-Chairman]	C		
Cllr S Whitebread	LD		

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (7)

Cllr R Butcher	C	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr B Farrer [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD
Cllr S Kindersley	LD	Cllr J Clark	C
Cllr P Read [Chairman]	C	Cllr N Guyatt	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		<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr C Carter	L	Cllr G Harper	C
Cllr K Churchill	C	Cllr van de Ven	LD
Cllr G Heathcock	LD		
Cllr J Powley	C		

## APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (7)

Non-Cabinet nominee	C	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
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	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
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 V McGuire	C
Cllr K Bourke	LD	Cllr J Reynolds	C
Cllr F Brown	C	Cllr K Reynolds	C
Cllr P Downes	LD	Cllr S Tierney	C
Cllr G Heathcock	LD	Cllr J Tuck	C
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr R West	C
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr M Williamson	LD
Cllr S King	C		

**STAFF APPEALS COMMITTEE (pool of members)**

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

**PENSIONS COMMITTEE (3)**

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

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS TO THE POLICE AUTHORITY (3)**

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

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FOR CAMBRIDGE FRINGES (4)**

Cllr G Kenney	C	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr T Orgee	C	Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD
Cllr C Shepherd	LD		
Cllr M Smith	C		

**JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FOR NORTHSTOWE (4)**

Cllr D Jenkins	LD	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr S Johnstone	C	Cllr S Gymer	LD
Cllr P Read	C		
Cllr K Reynolds	C		

**JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR CAMBRIDGE CITY FRINGES (3)**

<i>The Secretary of State had been asked to revoke the Order setting up this Joint Committee. None of the authorities are therefore appointing.</i>			
---	--	--	--

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES (3)**

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

### **EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE (5)**

Cllr N Bell	LD	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
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	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr M Curtis	C	Cllr J Clark	C
Cllr S Hoy	C	Cllr A Melton	C
Cllr S King	C	Cllr F Yeulett	C
Cllr S Tierney	C	Cllr S Count	C

### **HUNTINGDONSHIRE (6)**

Cllr Sir P Brown	C	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr P Downes	LD	Cllr S Criswell	C
Cllr C Hutton	C	Cllr V Lucas	C
Cllr L Kadic	C	Cllr R Pegram	C
Cllr V McGuire	C	Cllr K Reynolds	C
Cllr R West	C	Cllr G Wilson	LD

### **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE (5)**

Cllr D Jenkins	LD	<b>Substitutes:</b>	
Cllr S Kindersley	LD	Cllr S Gymer	LD
Cllr N Clarke	C	Cllr G Kenney	C
Cllr M Smith	C	Cllr S Criswell	C
Cllr T Stone	LD	Cllr S van de Ven	LD
		Cllr M Williamson	LD

## APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES: COUNTY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

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

NAME OF BODY	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)
<u>LGA Commissions</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rural</b></li>   <li>• <b>Urban</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>1. Cllr M McGuire (C)</b> <b>2. Cllr D Brown (C)</b></p> <p><b>1. Cllr T Orgee (C)</b> <b>2. Cllr K Wilkins (LD)</b></p>
<p>Reserve Forces and Cadets Assoc. for East Anglia</p> <p><b>To raise, recruit and administer the TAVR and Cadet Forces</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>Cllr V Lucas (C)</b></p>

\* N.B. Councillor Sales erroneously appeared on the list of Cambridgeshire Police Authority members presented to Council and has been deleted from the list in these minutes.