

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 27 March 2012
Time: 10.30h – 16.55h
Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge
Present: Councillor J Powley (Chairman)

Councillors: J Batchelor, I Bates, N Bell, K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, D Brown, F Brown, P Brown, R Butcher, K Churchill, J Clark, N Clarke, S Count, S Criswell, M Curtis, P Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, N Guyatt, S Gymer, G Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, S Hoy, C Hutton, D J Jenkins, S Johnstone, E Kadić, S Kindersley, S King, V Lucas, I Manning, M McGuire, V McGuire, L Nethsingha, L J Oliver, A Orgee, J Palmer, D Pegram, P Read, P Reeve, J Reynolds, K Reynolds, T Sadiq, P Sales, S Sedgwick-Jell, C Shepherd, M Shuter, M Smith, S Tierney, J Tuck, S van de Ven, R West, F Whelan, S Whitebread, K Wilkins, M Williamson, G Wilson, L Wilson, F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors: S Austen, C Carter, G Heathcock, W Hunt, G Kenney, A Melton, A Pellew, T Stone

221. MINUTES – 21 FEBRUARY 2012

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 21 February 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

222. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

223. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Councillor	Minute	Details
Batchelor J	230	Member of the Police Authority
Bell N	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Bourke K	229e	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Brown F	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Brown P	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Gymer S	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Hoy S	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Manning I	229e	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
McGuire V	230	Member of the Police Authority
Pegram	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Reeve P	229b	Supporter of Ramsey & District Neighbourhood Bus service
Reynolds K	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Sales P	230	Member of the Fire Authority

Smith M	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Tuck J	230	Member of the Fire Authority
Whelan F	229d 230	Family member might be affected by the Motion from Councillor P Downes (228d) and Member of the Fire Authority
Whitebread S	229e	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Wilson G	229c	National Drought Manager for the Environment Agency
Yeulett F	230	Member of the Fire Authority

On behalf of all Members present, the Chairman declared a personal interest in relation to the report on Members' Allowances (Minute 226).

The Chairman of the Police Authority, Ruth Rogers also declared an interest in the Cambridgeshire Police Authority item, (Minute 230a), as she was undergoing a selection process to be a candidate for the Police & Crime Commissioner role.

224. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

225. PETITIONS

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

226. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

The Monitoring Officer drew Council's attention to a correction in the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel relating to the need to reinstate paragraph 3.2.

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke and seconded by the Leader of the Labour Group, Councillor Sadiq, that Council receive a report from the Monitoring Officer on the 2012 Review of Members' Allowances prepared by the Independent Remuneration Panel, subject to paragraph 3.2 of Appendix 1 being reinstated. This motion on being put to the vote was carried unanimously.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Councillor M McGuire, proposed that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

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

It was resolved:

- (a) to receive the report on Members' Allowances prepared by the Independent Remuneration Panel;
- (b) to accept the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel and implement those provisions as the Scheme of Members Allowances for Cambridgeshire County Council, with effect from 1 April 2012;

(c) to formally revoke the existing Members' Allowances Scheme with effect from 31 March 2012; and

(d) authorise the Head of Democratic & Members' Services to implement the new scheme effective 1 April 2012 to reflect the outcome of the Council's deliberations and to take any consequential action arising therefrom.

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

227. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM CABINET

a) Data Transparency and Proposed Chief Officer Pay Policy

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, and seconded by the Cabinet Member for Resources & Performance, Councillor Count, that the recommendations as set out in minute 538 of the minutes of Cabinet meeting of 6 March 2012 be approved, subject to one addition to the policy on page 3, paragraph 5.0 reflecting the median pay ratio of the Chief Executive's salary which was 1:11, as well the mean, which was 1:8. He also proposed an alteration to the pay policy, this being to remove the reference to the Fair Pay Review 2010 recommending that the pay ratio should not be more than 1:20.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Sadiq and seconded by Councillor Sales: Chief Officer Pay Policy Statement 2012/13, page 3, section 5.0, fourth paragraph, insert after '*... does not widen.*'

The Council will prepare a plan to pay all of its lowest paid employees the National Living Wage, currently set at £7.20 per hour, as soon as possible and will commit itself to always paying the National Living Wage as a minimum in the future.

The Council would prefer all of its independent sector providers to pay the National Living Wage and would ask the Cabinet to ensure that no agency workers used by Cambridgeshire County Council are paid less than the National Living Wage.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats, Labour, Green and Independent in favour; Conservatives and UKIP against, and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained].

The substantive motion on being put to the vote was carried and Council agreed to:

- (a) approve the amendments to Chief Officer Pay Policy
- (b) approve draft Chief Officer Pay Policy Statement, in line with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, noting that the current ratio of the Chief Executive's salary to the median salary in the organisation was 1:11.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Liberal Democrats, Labour, Green, UKIP and Independent in favour; the Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained.]

228. COUNTY COUNCIL CONSTITUTION

It was proposed by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Powley, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman of the Council, Councillor K Reynolds, and agreed unanimously to approve the revisions to the Council Constitution as set out in the report.

229. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

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

a) Motion from Councillor Johnstone

It was proposed by Councillor Johnstone and seconded by Councillor Harrison that:

This Council recognises Cambridge's role as the cycling capital of the United Kingdom and the importance of cycling for the economic prosperity of the area. The Council therefore welcomes Cambridgeshire's bid for improved cycle routes in the Local Sustainable Transport Fund for further investment to improve cycling to the new Enterprise Zone at Alconbury, Cambridge Science Park station and A10 corridor. The Council also acknowledges the role that cycling can play in meeting other objectives, notably improved mobility and better health outcomes.

However, the Council also recognises that cyclists can be vulnerable and therefore welcomes and supports the campaign by The Times to improve safety for cyclists. The Council therefore requests Cabinet to:

- Sign up to The Times campaign and take opportunities to promote its message within and outside Cambridgeshire;
- Consider the call by the Minister for Transport, Norman Baker, to appoint a cycling champion for Cambridgeshire; and
- Continue to work with District Councils in Cambridgeshire to use future s106 funding for improved cycle routes along key development corridors.

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

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

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning agreed to pass on the thanks of Councillor Gymer to the Officer delivering the cycleway on the B1049.

b) Motion from Councillor van de Ven

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

This Council notes that:

- Developing the economy for the benefit of all is a strategic objective of this Council;

- Rural isolation is a major obstacle to achieving that objective;
- Modal shift from the private motor car to public transport is an objective of the Local Transport Plan.

Council also notes that:

- Bus subsidy cuts to date have had a detrimental effect on people's access to public transport, including:
 - Young people seeking access to education, employment and training
 - Elderly people who rely on their bus to access the wider community and its resources
 - People with mobility problems
 - People who cannot afford private transport
- Cambridgeshire Future Transport as a public transport alternative to subsidised buses remains a highly speculative only six months before it is supposed to replace the next tranche of bus subsidy cuts;
- Cutting £1million funding for public transport undermines the Council's objectives as it is likely to increase rural isolation and increase reliance on private transport.

Council asks Cabinet to consider:

- Stopping the £1million reduction in funding to public transport subsidy;
- Carrying out a strategic review of Cambridgeshire people's transport needs, before any further changes are made;
- Conducting a cost-benefit analysis of changes to levels of support for bus and community transport provision in rural areas; taking both social and economic value into account.

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

[Voting pattern: Labour, Liberal Democrats, Green, Independent in favour; Conservatives, UKIP against; the Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained].

c) Motion from Councillor Sales

With the agreement of Council, Councillor Sales proposed the following motion, altered from that set out on the agenda (additional text underlined, deletion struck through). The motion was seconded by Councillor Bates.

This Council notes that:

- Cambridgeshire is officially in a state of drought.
- Cambridgeshire has to date failed to secure funds from government to repair drought-damaged roads.
- The large number of new homes currently being built and those proposed for the future, together with the associated increase in population will make further

demands upon water supply.

Council asks Cabinet to:

~~- Acknowledge that even though the statutory strategic responsibility for managing the drought in our region rest with Anglian Water does not rest wholly with the Environment Agency or the water companies, other agencies including the County Council have a part to play.~~

~~- Take the lead in developing a Work with partners to develop a long-term, strategic plan for sustainable drought management.~~

~~- and to publish an effective Ensure that a short-term contingency plan addresses issues in Cambridgeshire. For dealing with a severe and enduring drought in the short term as soon as possible.~~

~~- That instructions on reducing Ensure that the County estate is required to reduce water usage wherever possible. Be sent to all County establishments as soon as possible.~~

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Underline, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

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

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Liberal Democrats, Labour, UKIP, Green and Independent in favour; none against; the Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained].

The Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning agreed to include a link to the Waterwise website on the County Council's website.

d) Motion from Councillor Downes

With the agreement of Council, Councillor Downes proposed the following motion, altered from that set out on the agenda (deletion struck through). The motion was seconded by Councillor van de Ven.

This Council notes that:

- a provision of £ 100 000 per annum was provided in the Council's Integrated Plan for a possible increase in Councillor allowances;

~~- to increase Councillor allowances at a time of wage freezes, redundancies and cuts to frontline services is wrong.~~

This Council also notes that:

- young people face a particularly challenging time in the current economic environment, and difficulty accessing transport can be an impediment to those seeking education, employment, or training;

- currently, the Council has no supported transport or concessions for young people aged 16-19 who have been identified as being ' Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET).

- one of Cambridgeshire's train operating companies is exploring introducing free travel to job interviews and subsequent employment facilitated through JobCentre

Plus, and this is one of a number of examples of good practice from which to draw inspiration.

This Council calls on Cabinet to consider:

- using the £100 000 allocated set aside for an increase in Councillor allowances to provide free public transport to help young people aged 16-19 make their first steps into education, employment or training, and to use this modest endeavour as a springboard for further work toward providing affordable transport for young people.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats, Labour, Green, UKIP and Independent in favour; Conservatives against; and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained].

e) Motion from Councillor Bourke

With the agreement of Council, Councillor Bourke proposed the following motion, amended from that set out on the agenda (addition underlined). The motion was seconded by Councillor Manning:

This Council notes:

- The government's indication that Cambridge Science Park Station is likely to be included in the next series of rail franchise agreements;
- Councillor Johnstone's acknowledgement in her motion on cycling, of 'the importance of cycling for Cambridge's economic prosperity'
- That congestion in Cambridge city is expected to have increased by 28% by 2021, with harmful consequences for the local economy.

This Council further notes that:

- The Cambridge Cycle Campaign has for many years campaigned for the completion of the 'Chisholm Trail' strategic cycle route;
- The 'outer reaches' of the Chisholm Trail have already been provided to a very high standard by the Guided Bus cycleway;
- This cycle route would link together three centres of employment in the city along a North/South axis, including:
 - Addenbrooke's hospital
 - The CB1 Area
 - The Science park
- The Chisholm Trail would reduce the levels of congestion by taking vehicles off key city centre roads, including Hills Road and Milton Road;
- The pending development of Cambridge Science Park Station makes the economic case for this development even stronger;

- The Chisholm Trail is, in view of these points, the most strategically important cycle route for Cambridge's 'economic prosperity'

This Council calls on Cabinet to:

- Review and quantify the economic benefits of the Chisholm Trail;
- Seek to complete the Chisholm Trail in its entirety by 2020
- Seek early delivery of those parts of the Chisholm Trail that are easiest to complete.

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

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

230. QUESTIONS

a) Questions on Police and Fire Authority Issues

Ruth Rogers, Chairman of Cambridgeshire Police Authority, and Councillor Pegram, Chairman of Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority, responded to questions and comments on Police and Fire issues, in accordance with the guidelines agreed by the Council. These are set out in **Appendix D**. The following were identified for follow up action:

- The Chairman of the Police Authority agreed to provide a written response to Councillor Sir Peter Brown's concern that the County Council and Constabulary work together to establish the right level of prioritisation of police officers in town centres to support parking and traffic restrictions.
- The Chairman of the Police Authority, agreed to forward the figures on the reduction of police staff following the budget cuts within Cambridgeshire Constabulary.
- The Chairman of the Police Authority agreed to contact Councillor Hutton on local policing priorities in her division.
- The Chairman of the Fire Authority agreed to provide a written update on the promotion of sprinklers in buildings throughout the county.

b) Oral Questions

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

- In response to a request from Councillor Jenkins, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell agreed to follow up a request to remove graffiti visible from the guided busway and close to Orchard Park. He also agreed to follow up the suggestion that litter bins be provided at all the guided busway stops.
- In response to a request from Councillor Brookes-Gordon, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to follow up the agreed speed reduction

from 40-30mph for Huntingdon Road and report back in writing the date for implementation. He also agreed to advise Local Members of any vetoes to highways improvements from Cambridgeshire Constabulary.

- In response to a request from Councillor Reeve, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to arrange a briefing with Officers on the state of the road outside Ashbeach Primary School in Ramsey St Mary's and then contact the Local Member.
- In response to a request from Councillor Gymer, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to contact the Highways Agency regarding the problem of litter on the verges of the A14, M11, A10, A428 and other trunk roads in Cambridgeshire. He also agreed to follow up the suggestion of emailing parish councils in advance of verges being strimmed, in order that the local communities could clear them of rubbish.
- In response to a request from Councillor Churchill, the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty agreed to investigate whether a press release reporting the excellent results of a recent Ofsted report on Little Paxton Primary School had been sent out, and if not to ensure that one was released.
- In response to a request from Councillor Downes, the Cabinet Member for Learning committed to discussing the issue of the transfer of funding from Local Authorities to Cambridgeshire Academy Schools with the Schools' Forum.

c) Written Questions

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

231. 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 replace Councillor Bourke with Councillor Whelan as a member of the Service Appeals Committee pool of members. Additional changes to committee memberships were also agreed as set out in **Appendix G, following a review of the overall allocation of seats after the creation of a new UKIP Group.**

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 27TH MARCH 2012
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

AWARDS

Local Government Information Unit (LGIU) and CCLA Councillor Achievement Awards

Four County Councillors were shortlisted for awards at the LGiU and CCLA Councillor Achievement Awards. Congratulations go to Councillors Steve Tierney, Sam Hoy and Sir Peter Brown for making the short-list. Special congratulations go to Councillor Shona Johnstone for winning the Bruce-Lockhart Member Scholarship. The bursary will support Councillor Johnstone to study localism in new communities.

Youth Offending Service

The Youth Offending Service has received positive feedback from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation following a four day inspection in January. Whilst the official report will not be published until May, the early indications are that the service has performed strongly. This is a pleasing result and congratulations go to the County Manager, Anna Jack and the Youth Offending Service staff. This result reflects well upon the Service's work with its key partners who work with the Service to reduce and prevent offending by young people in Cambridgeshire.

Society of Information Technology Management (SOCITM) Better Connected Annual Report

The Council's website has been awarded the top rating of 4 stars in the SOCITM Better Connected annual report. This is the benchmark of all local authority websites and reflects an improvement from the Council's 3 star showing last year. The Council is one of only four county councils to be awarded top marks and the only local authority in the East of England. This excellent news reflects the hard work put in by all contributors to the site and the strong emphasis the Council has given towards the most commonly used tasks. Congratulations go to John Platten, Web Operations Manager, and everybody in the Web Strategy team as well as the content editors.

St Luke's Close in Huntingdon

A respite service for adults with learning disabilities has been given top marks in every category after a visit by Government inspectors.

St Luke's Close in Huntingdon, recently underwent a routine inspection by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and was found to be performing well in all aspects of the inspection.

The centre provides respite services for adults with learning disabilities, supporting six people at any one time for overnight stays and day care. In total St Luke's Close provides services to 54 people.

European Language Label Award

Cambridge Central Library has received a European Language Label Award in recognition of its "Reading Together - Leggiamio Insieme" project with the Cambridge Italian Club [CIC]. The Language Label is co-ordinated by the European Commission and awarded to innovative projects in language teaching and learning. Over the past two years, the Cambridge Italian Club has worked with the Central Library to host story and rhyme times in Italian, special events celebrating Italian culture and workshops for families on story writing and story telling. They have also donated over 400 children's books in Italian to the Central Library.

LGC National Awards

The Kick Ash work was shortlisted in two categories (Community Involvement and Public Sector Partnerships) in the LGC National Awards held in London on 14 March 2012. Being shortlisted for two categories was in itself a significant achievement, and the Kick Ash partnership between Cambridgeshire County Council and NHS Cambridgeshire was awarded a 'highly commended' (that is, second place) in the Public Sector Partnerships category. The 'highly commended' awards were made for only a minority of the categories in these awards.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

Big Bike Ride - 8th July 2012

Cambridgeshire County Council and the Cambridge News will stage two charity bike rides timed to coincide with the visit of the Olympic Flame to Cambridgeshire on July 7th and 8th. "The Cambridge News Big Bike Ride (in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council)" will feature a 20.12km family bike ride following a quiet route around Cambridge, along with a 201.2km challenge ride following a circuit around much of the County. Three good causes will benefit: Arthur Rank Hospice charity, East Anglian Children's Hospice and Press Relief.

Jigsaw Cambridgeshire Project to Help Communities Piece Together Past

A groundbreaking project in Cambridgeshire to help communities get to grips with their local archaeology will be officially launched at Shire Hall on 27 March 2012. Oxford Archaeology East and Cambridgeshire County Council have been awarded a £360,000 cash grant by the Heritage Lottery Fund for the Jigsaw Cambridgeshire community archaeology project.

The project is in response to feedback from Cambridgeshire's communities that they want to get more involved in local archaeology. Already community groups have come forward and the Jigsaw team are helping them run their own archaeology projects.

Jigsaw will set up new local community archaeology groups (Archaeology Action Groups) in conjunction with interested individuals from Cambridgeshire. These will be trained and supported by the Jigsaw Community Archaeologists to investigate, research and help protect the county's archaeology.

In addition to setting up new groups, the project will also invite existing archaeology groups to join the project and benefit from free training and equipment to help them run their digs and surveys. The grant will support community archaeology in Cambridgeshire for five years.

MESSAGES

Parkinson's UK

Congratulations go to Chris Howard, Pensions Administrator, who has just finished his 104 day row across the Atlantic for Parkinson's UK.

CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN ACTIVITIES: FEBRUARY – MARCH 2012

Chairman's engagements

Since 21 February 2012 (previous Council meeting)

- Official opening of new offices of Adder Technology - Bar Hill
- Chairman of East Cambridgeshire District Council civic reception – Ely Maltings
- Collation & Welcome of the Ven. Gordon Steele as Archdeacon of Oakham - Peterborough Cathedral

March 2012

- Mart Fair – Wisbech
- Cabinet meeting – Wisbech
- Disability Parliament – Larksfield Centre, Ely
- Anglia Ruskin University debate
- Citizenship ceremony – Shire Hall
- Chairman of Huntingdonshire District Council civic reception – Wood Green Animal Shelter, Godmanchester
- 12th anniversary Luminus conference – Brook House, Huntingdon
- Installation of Chancellor of Cambridge University
- *Buy with Confidence* event – Trading Standards, Ely Library
- County Council
- Chairman of Norfolk County Council civic service – County Hall, Norwich

Vice-Chairman's engagements

Since 21 February 2012 (previous Council meeting)

- Citizenship ceremony – Shire Hall

March 2012

- Long Service Awards – Shire Hall

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 27 MARCH 2012
PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

1. Question from Dr Tumi Hawkins, District Councillor for Caldecote, South Cambridgeshire, to the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, Councillor I Bates

The County Council Cabinet meeting that took place on 6 March in Wisbech was an eye-opener, giving me a valuable insight into your thinking process. But I wish you had some voice amplification because it was difficult to hear some of you at the top table. That said, I did hear plenty, and I do agree with your overall sentiment that we should be using public funds to provide transport services in a more efficient way.

Now I have heard two Cabinet Members say at different times, and I quote, you: *'do not wish to throw money at profit making organisations to run buses full of air round the villages.'*

I can assure you neither do the tax paying residents of this county. Unfortunately some of these residents are now suffering: they are finding that they cannot enjoy their life because either the bus service that enabled them to get out and about no longer exists, as in the 18; or the replacement service has doubled in price overnight, without warning, causing financial difficulty. And this is because these routes were the first in the tranche that was cut.

Now my question is:

Can the portfolio holder please provide the travelling figures on which the decision to remove the first tranche of subsidies was based and explain how the impact was assessed, what alternatives are being planned to replace or fund those services that have subsequently been shown to be seriously affected? Quite unlike your thinking that said that those were cut because they would give the least impact. They did not give the least impact.

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

In terms of your point that affected routes, which were not part of the subsequent consultation, it's difficult to comment specifically without service details.

What I can say however, is that subsidised services that were withdrawn in April 2011, were included within the consultation that followed. I suspect you may be confusing this with changes that operators have made to commercial services that we do not control.

I'm sorry to hear that you have been getting difficulties, and [hope you] get help from this Council to find replacement services.

The Council's Passenger Transport team is already working with a number of Local Members on similar issues including the Service 18. So if you want any more help I would ask you therefore to contact the Passenger Service Manager, Paul Nelson. Finally in terms of your specific question of subsidised withdrawals in April 2011: contracted services operated in evenings, Sundays and lightly used market days and where alternative provision was made. By prioritising these we were able to actually protect the services for essential shopping journeys and the impact on the travelling public was lessened. We estimate that the number of passenger journeys involved in the services that were withdrawn in April 2011 to be around 130 000.

Supplementary Question from Dr Tumi Hawkins, District Councillor for Caldecote, South Cambridgeshire

I'm not surprised that you were not able to give me the answer to the questions that I really did ask you. But one point I want to make as well, is that I was troubled by Councillor Clarke's statement at the same meeting, in which he said that he feels sorry for those people who live in the areas where the Local Members are fighting the cuts, as they will suffer.

Those people already are suffering, which is why I am here today asking these questions and which is why we are fighting to get some sort of replacement service for them.

Can the portfolio holder please give me the assurance that this Administration will work with some of us to find the replacement services that we require, and, not just find it, but fund it, as well. And please give me a timetable for when this will happen.

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

I can give that assurance. It is certainly this Council's position, as well stated in the past, that we will fully consult Local Members and communities about those services and look at their needs individually, on an individual basis. The timetable has been issued to Members of this Council – that is readily available to all members of the public. And of course we will work with those communities. Funds have been set aside, which is £1.3m, and that will obviously roll forward over the next three years of the programme of Cambridgeshire Future Transport.

Question from the Martin Lucas-Smith Chairman of Cambridge Cycle Campaign

Two motions today focus on the importance of a high rate of cycling to Cambridge's economy. The new developments in Cambridge, will bring tens of thousands of new people to the area, and are dependent on efficient transport. The transport modelling for the NIAB site, for example, requires 60% walking/cycling share to prevent increased problems on the A14. So these new developments, and the areas around them, must make cycling the fastest and easiest choice.

We can't knock down huge numbers of buildings in Cambridge to make space for queuing cars. Therefore the only solution is alternatives to the car if we wish to cater for a growing population.

Most people in Cambridge who cycle, own or use cars, and we have often proposed that the County Council undertake computer modelling of a 'no-cycling day' to demonstrate the huge effect on congestion if these people didn't cycle. Now imagine tens of thousands more people, coming in to the new developments, driving rather than cycling and using public transport. Gridlock. Companies will not move to or stay in a city where people cannot move around easily, and this is why cycling is so important to high-tech Cambridge: it lets the city function.

The Chisholm Trail, for instance, would get city drivers on their bikes and free up road space from those who have to drive in from the surrounding villages.

Cycling is not a namby-pamby form of hippy transport. It's absolutely key to the ability of Cambridge to work. All groups of people: wealth creators in suits, Cambridge Angels, health workers, those on the minimum wage who form the bedrock of our employment centres, all these people can be found cycling to work. (The majority do so responsibly, and continued work to crack down on illegal cycling is needed.)

Cambridge depends on high rates of cycling, and as more people come to live here, cycling has to get much better if our high-tech economy is to survive. My question therefore is: Do you agree that the growth of Cambridge and the health of its economy are absolutely dependent on increased investment in cycling infrastructure?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, Councillor Bates

The very simple answer is: yes. With a voice like this it's easier to say yes. We do see cycling as very important in Cambridge and of course throughout the county. Cycle improvements are vital to new developments, but also across the city and across the county.

I would also point out the recently amazing figures in the growth of cycling within Cambridge city for which I think this Council should be duly proud.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 27 MARCH 2012

PETITIONS

Received before the deadline for speaking and contains over 50 signatures so the Petition Organiser, or their nominee will be able to speak at the meeting.

Text of a petition containing 60 signatures presented by Mr B Rolph

Subject: - VERY POOR STREET LIGHTING

We the undersigned all residents of Neale Close, Forest Road, Leete Road and Keates Road, Cherry Hinton are earnestly requesting Cambridgeshire County Council to install new lamps where the old type have been removed, on the basis of restoring a safe and secure environment which conforms to Cambridgeshire County Council's street lighting policy.

n.b. The MOT recommendation for street lighting on side roads is lamp spacing 150ft max. and the amount of light per 100ft of linear road is 600 lumens min.

Text of a petition containing 100 signatures presented by Mr R Johnson

We want a bus from Abbey to Addenbrooke's!

We, the undersigned, call upon Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council to urge Stagecoach, or another bus operator, to create a new bus route from Abbey to Addenbrooke's Hospital. This route would address lack of direct access of those who wish to travel between Abbey Ward and Addenbrooke's Hospital, as patients, visitors and workers.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 27 MARCH 2012
QUESTIONS ON POLICE AUTHORITY BUSINESS**

Question from Councillor N Clarke

Could you just give some reassurance to the Council, that preparations for the transition to the Police Commissioner role are taking place, and if you could highlight any potential obstacles including any well known, perhaps Independent Members who may be standing, what the intention is in terms of declarations of interest, and also in terms of substituting members onto the Police Authority should there be a mass allocation of applications.

Reply from Ruth Rogers on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority

Thank you Councillor Clarke - at least it wasn't the question about the remuneration that we were discussing over lunch. I need to declare an interest on this point, as some of you will know I am going through a selection process myself. The Authority at very early doors set up a transition group, Councillor Victor Lucas is on that group, the group is absolutely dedicated to making sure that we have as smooth a transition as possible to the Police and Crime Commissioner when they come in on the 22 November. There's a lot of business going on at the moment, we feel that as an Authority that it's hugely important that prospective candidates who come forward are able to understand the context in which we are working at the moment and that the Commissioner, when they come in, are as well informed as they possibly can be, and that the complexities of the transition are carried through as smoothly as possible. I'm not sure, as you know, who all the candidates are going to be, people don't actually have to declare until I think it's quite late - it's somewhere in October. So it could be potentially quite late before we know who all the candidates are. The estimate for the Labour Party is that the decision will be known following a ballot of their members around mid June; I believe the Conservatives are looking at somewhere in mid-July. Other parties - I haven't heard anything about and don't know at the moment. I think it's unlikely there will be a mass transition out of the Police Authority, although possible, and it's something that we will certainly be mindful of; one of things that we have discussed and discussed quite openly in public, is the need to keep business going. It won't necessarily be a question of suspending some time in advance pending the arrival of the Commissioner because there will be things that need to be addressed until comparatively late, although clearly Purdah guidance will operate at the appropriate time.

Question from Councillor S Tierney

There's been some concern about the response to emergency calls and non-emergency calls to the Police, and kindly Inspector Human came to the Scrutiny Committee and gave us some results that suggested that it had improved in February. I wonder whether you can comment about whether it has continued to improve since.

Reply from Ruth Rogers on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority

Thank you and I think that's a good question, it was one of the things the Authority picked up reasonably early - that there had been a dip in that performance - and the Chief Constable has said quite openly that when we're having the kind of budget reductions that we are having there will be some difficulties seen in some places, and this was one of those. The Authority is putting a considerable amount of focus on monitoring the performance, it has begun to increase. In the report that is in your pack there are some specific figures, Councillor Viv McGuire and Councillor John Batchelor as the lead on call handling and the

lead on performance respectively, are taking a particular interest in this, as is the whole authority and we hope to see the figures continuing to increase.

Question from Councillor P Reeve

I'm an avid reader of the Police Federation magazine, the local Police Sergeant always hands it over and it's quite interesting to read. One of the issues in a more recent edition is the loathing and disgust that beat police officers and members of the police federation feel toward the Police Commissioner role, politicising the police force is one issue. But the one I would like to take up with you is the remuneration of the Police Commissioner. Maybe you'll clarify for me the actual figure that the Police Commissioner will be earning; I understand that it's potentially up to £100 000. In the light of the cuts and some of the other headlines in this magazine, which talks about the police at breaking point, neighbourhood policing having huge resource problems, police inspectors under a huge amount of pressure because of resources – would you agree that it's morally wrong for the Police Commissioner, when appointed, to accept a remuneration above that of, say the Leader of the County Council, who is responsible for services right across the board, rather than just one sector of the public service.

Reply from Ruth Rogers on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority

I'm not responsible for setting the remuneration for the Police & Crime Commissioner, that is being done nationally and the amounts are being approved by the Home Secretary. In Cambridgeshire, which of course is one of the smallest forces, the remuneration will be £70 000 a year, I understand.

I am not prepared to make any comment about comparative pay scales, it's not within my remit to change any of those, and I know that it was something that you discussed earlier.

I think it's important to recognise that articles that are in national magazines are taking a particular perspective, some of which I'm sure is valid.

In Cambridgeshire we've supported the Chief Constable in taking a very focused view of neighbourhood policing and the report that you've got in your pack touches on that.

The Neighbourhood Panels that I've been to, one of them chaired by Councillor Fred Brown, the response to that neighbourhood focus and neighbourhood approach, has actually been very positive from local people, and I believe, from the Neighbourhood Officers as well. Certainly the ones that I have spoken to, have felt that the way the Chief Constable has approached it, which is a positive approach to an inevitable budget reduction, that actually it's giving the best possible deal to local people. And, I think, although there may be areas nationally where that is not the case, in Cambridgeshire, I think, we've gone to a lot of hard work to try to make sure that neighbourhood policing is continuing to respond to local needs.

Question from Councillor Gymer

I'd like to invite you to the next Neighbourhood Panel in our patch which is on 10 April. It would be really good to see you there. I would quite like to bring it back, and I'm glad you did, to local issues. One of the things that we were all a bit worried about, and it hasn't really appeared in the press very much, was were you going to continue to support PCSOs. You know, many years ago people thought: oh we were getting a second class policing officer. But I have to say, they have been invaluable, certainly locally, when it comes to dealing with anti-social behaviour and other things that perhaps you know, we can see, that shouldn't perhaps detract from more qualified police officers. So, I know from another colleague, that

there is a commitment to continuing with PCSOs and even to perhaps increasing the numbers. But it would be quite nice to hear it from you. And I was a bit sad not to see that actually in the report.

In terms of Neighbourhood Panels, I know I disagree with some of my colleagues in south cambs, but I would like to see it encompassing, you know, more working between, both [s/c] district, parish and county councils, and I was just wondering what your feelings were on that.

Reply from Ruth Rogers on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority

There wasn't anything about PCSOs in the report primarily because at the moment it isn't an issue.

The funding that we get for PCSO comes directly from central Government and is currently ringfenced. There has been some, and continues to be some, debate about whether that will remain the case or not. It isn't uncommon for Governments of all colours to suddenly announce that a previous separate sum of money is now in your baseline, and you have to find it yourself. And I think if that's the case, then there will be some difficult decisions to be made. I think it's really helpful that you've said that the perspective on PCSOs has changed over the years. And certainly that was the view that it was – 'policing light', if you like. But I think the PCSOs, the best of them, do a huge amount of work in building community trust and community engagement. And I think that's recognised. Of course one of the reasons that they are valuable is that they are very cost effective. It won't come as any surprise to anybody, that a fully trained police officer is a quite an expensive being. And given that there are certain things that only warranted officers can do; one of things that we have focused on over the last two years is trying to make sure that police officers do those things. But I think there will be a debate, potentially a debate to be had in the future about PCSOs.

Neighbourhood Panel meetings do come in different shapes and sizes of course, some I think are very effective, some rather less so. I know that a number of areas are looking at those. And the police are working very closely with them to try to come up with an arrangement that suits everybody and gets the best possible advantage out of it for the members of the public who attend.

Question from Councillor Downes

Very simple question, just a one word answer is all that's needed. In the Hunts Post last week you were accused of being a County Councillor. Are you a County Councillor in another county because I don't think you're County Councillor here. Are you a County Councillor? Is the answer: 'No'?

Reply from Ruth Rogers on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority

The answer is certainly, 'No', not here or anywhere else.

Comment from Councillor Downes

Thank you. I think we must correct the Hunts Post which is pedalling misinformation, not I may say, for the first time.

Question from Councillor Sadiq

Can I ask, the Chief Constable, when he came to speak to the East Area Committee and also I think the Overview & Scrutiny Committee here as well, gave a commitment that the

number of frontline police officers would be preserved and protected and possibly even increased. However what is the position with regard to police staff and what has happened to the number of police staff that are currently employed by the Constabulary in the light of the budget cuts that are being implemented at the moment?

Reply from Ruth Rogers on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority

Thank you for that question and we were aware very early on, that the budget reductions were going to effect police staff disproportionately, because you can't make police officers redundant; you can make police staff redundant.

And the Authority has taken a lot interest throughout in the process of engagement with staff and how those redundancies were declared.

There has been a significant reduction in the number of staff posts - that have disappeared. I'm sorry I haven't got those figures in front of me, but can get them for you. The number of people who have been made redundant is actually significantly smaller than that. Because one of things that happened, and this was just before Julie Spence went out as Chief Constable, was an immediate freeze on recruitment. So, having intervened early there has been the opportunity to move staff around and not to make as many people redundant as we feared might be the case originally.

But there has been a reduction in posts. 75 – 80% of our budget is people, as it is with almost any statutory body. There are a limited number of places to go, and its been kept to a minimum, and its been looked at very carefully in terms of delivering the business, and gone through in some quite significant detail. But if you would like the specific numbers I can get those for you.

Question from Councillor Sir P Brown

I would like to thank the Constabulary for all the work that they have done on making the changes since the budget reductions, particularly in Huntingdonshire, I would like to thank Chris Mead for all the work that he has done in keeping Councillors and neighbourhoods informed of the changes. From our point of view I think one of the things that affect us, and Cambridge City Members can close their ears or go to sleep here, because it doesn't affect them, is town centre parking, and one of the things I would like you to look at or to comment on is: I think with all the reductions in expenditure, the police need to be better deployed than looking at parking and traffic restrictions in town centres. In Huntingdon and probably in the other towns within Huntingdonshire and across the county it is a major problem. What I don't want is for the police to be accused of inactivity when they have so much else on their agenda. What is in your programme to address this and how do you think we you can help you with that.

Reply from Ruth Rogers on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority

The way that officers are deployed in looking after and addressing parking and traffic issues is of course something that is in the remit of Chief Constable and I will take your interest in that back. It is something that comes up of course at every Neighbourhood Panel meeting that parking, speeding, inconsiderate driving, all those range of issues is a matter of huge concern for people and it certainly is something that continues to be a priority that is being addressed. Within the policing plan that has to go to the Home Office by the end of this month - end of this week, is contained people's priorities we are taking as those this year are the things that come out from Neighbourhood Panel meetings. And that is frequently parking and certainly parking and traffic has been for the last two years. That is very much seen as

an area where local Councils and the police work very closely together, but I will take that question back and see if we can give you a better answer on working together on that.

Question from Councillor C Hutton

I just wanted to follow up on something that came out of our Neighbourhood Panel last night and that was specifically following the police report. It was made very clear that we wouldn't be getting any local policing priorities for our area and things would be decided on a daily/weekly basis, rather than having a focus. I just wondered if you could comment on that for me?

Reply from Ruth Rogers on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority

I think it would be quite helpful if I could have a slightly more detailed discussion with you. I'm just looking at the clock slightly warily, I've got about 20 minutes left on my parking in the Pay and Display. Could I come back to you on that Councillor Hutton, because I think all the local panels do things slightly differently, but I wasn't aware that they were setting the priorities in a different way, so I would be interested in knowing a bit more.

Reply from Councillor V Lucas, as a Police Authority Member

First of all I just wanted to say that the Chairman of the Police Authority, Ruth, has been absolutely exemplary and beyond reproach since she declared that she may become a candidate for the Police and Crime Commissioner, and I just wanted everybody to understand that in terms of making sure that she has avoided any possible conflict of interest. The other thing Chairman I wanted to say was in addition to the answer about the transition to the Police and Crime Commissioner. Not only is the Police Authority active in terms of monitoring, reviewing and insisting on actions being taken with regard to any shortcomings that might arise in performance of the police, but also they are putting together arrangements which the Police and Crime Commissioner may wish to implement after they have been elected and take up post on the 22 November. It's up to them whether or not they take on these processes if they choose to do so it will make sure there is a seamless transition. Many of these are included in next year's Police and Crime Plan or Local Policing Plan which will be published in the next few weeks and this includes reference to community engagement and one of the values of the Neighbourhood Forums and the Area Committees has been, I think, the presence of a member of the Police Authority who have been able to take issues back where they've not been able to be resolved by the local police. I doubt very much whether the Police and Crime Commissioner will be able to attend every single meeting of all the Neighbourhood Forums, so we are coming up with proposals in the Community Engagement Section of the Local Policing Plan with regard to some ideas as to which the Police and Crime Commissioner may wish to take up.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 27 MARCH 2012
FIRE AUTHORITY QUESTIONS**

Questions to Councillor Pegram, Chairman of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

Question from Councillor Butcher (barely audible because the *microphone was not switched on*).

In October last year Cambridgeshire and Suffolk Fire & Rescue Services implemented a combined fire initiative. Could you tell me the performance and impact as a direct result of this action and are there any future plans for fire control?

Reply from Councillor Pegram, Chairman of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

In terms of fire control, first of all yes there are future plans for a level of engagement: they are with Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority and Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Brigade. They have a confidential paper going to their Fire Authority on the 18th April 2012, once that is done and if an agreement is reached regarding that paper which will comprise a full business case, then an appropriate business case will come to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority and that will be presented for deliberation in May.

Question from Councillor M McGuire

Thank you Chairman, with the apologies to the Chairman of the Fire Authority I would have given him notice to this question if I'd thought about it before this afternoon, but an event occurred which I've received an email about. Chairman, I am a member of the National Fire Sprinkler Network and on Saturday there was a fire in one of McCain's potato food processing plants. Not the one in Whittlesey, but the one in Scarborough, Chairman, where because of the fact that a sprinkler network was fitted that fire was contained very, very quickly and actually required little intervention by the Fire Service. Chairman, we heard earlier on during the debate about the drought and I don't think anybody in this chamber will have any doubt about the difference between the amount of water that's used to put out a fire when a sprinkler system operates as opposed to the amount of water that comes out of fire hoses when the Fire Service have to do that same job. So my question to the Chairman really relates in some ways to the Integrated Risk Management plan and the number of fires; and could he update us on what the Fire & Rescue Service is doing to continue with the promotion of sprinklers within our buildings within Cambridgeshire, particularly non-domestic, but possibly including domestic buildings. What is he as Chairman of the Fire Authority doing? Colleagues will recall that there was a campaign here about 10 years ago when in fact as a result of which part of our processes changed whereby now new build schools, at least I hope they are all fitted with sprinklers Chairman, but that was certainly the intention. And could he also further update us on what's happening nationally in terms of the building regulations because there was a lot of effort being put into how it actually built into the buildings regulations. An update Chairman, but I appreciate he may not be able to answer that now, but will provide a follow up answer.

Reply from Councillor Pegram, Chairman of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

It won't be a complete answer Chairman, because first of all sprinklers, essentially we are promoting through the building regs and the revised building strategies that are going on and

announced today: we are promoting that sprinklers should be part of every new domestic residence. That hasn't been adopted universally, it is a fact that it is applied in Wales, it is applied in Scotland, it is not applied in England. As far as the building regs Chairman, they change, I believe it is today, I'll stand corrected, and until we get an update that is relevant and that applies to us there won't be an update for me to share. But Councillor McGuire now that I've got your question I will respond to you in writing regarding all of the incidents that you make. I do take note of the very big difference Chairman and the point that Councillor McGuire made in terms of the amount of water used to put out the big fire we had out at Whittlesey McCain's factory and the amount that would be required if there was a sprinkler system fitted in that type of premises where there is a high risk of fire.

Question from Councillor J Clark

With reference to the development of Parkside Fire Station are you hopeful to deliver it on your set budget and also could you inform us where the new training centre is going to be please?

Reply from Councillor Pegram, Chairman of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

The Parkside Fire Station development project has incurred some slippage, it's approximately four weeks, but Chairman that is manageable and we have a six month wriggle room from the February 2013 original completion date in our current temporary fire station facility. I can state that the project is within budget and I see no reason for this to change from the information we have available, it is a very robust contract Chairman and it's being constantly monitored. As far as the training facility is concerned the new site is at Milton near to the Tesco Superstore.

Question from Councillor S Gymer

It was just a quick question and it's said in this forum for a very important reason. I believe that they are going to be looking at the gritting routes again this summer, can we please make sure that especially in the rural areas that we have good gritted roads around our retained fire stations please.

Reply from Councillor Pegram, Chairman of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

Well, it's not a question for me to answer Chairman. I'm not responsible for gritting the roads.

Comment from Councillor Gymer

But you are responsible for letting the County know which roads we would like done and maybe you could ask people.

Reply from Councillor Pegram, Chairman of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

In terms of that Chairman, the County is already aware of all sites for emergency vehicles whether it be a hospital or an ambulance centre or a fire station, or a police station for that matter. They try to keep them clear as best they can within the available fundings.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 27 MARCH 2012
MINUTE 230b) – ORAL QUESTION TIME**

1. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell, from Councillor D Jenkins

The guided busway does drive past some bridges etc one of which is close to Orchard Park and there is an enormous amount of graffiti on it, including some very rude words. Will you please ensure that it is kept continuously clean because one does expect that a sort of 'no tolerance' approach to graffiti is good news for local neighbourhoods.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell

Yes, happy to do that, Chairman. I was unaware of the problem, Officers probably are, but I wasn't, but I will certainly follow that up.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell, from Councillor D Jenkins

It is in connection with the guided busway as well, would he look to providing litter bins at stations etc so that the local people can do their best to keep the busway clean. I understand of course that this will involve some work to be done to decide who empties those litter bins.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell

I'll also follow that up Chairman.

2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count from Councillor I Manning

First of all just to tell you, obviously I support the success of LGSS, but I wonder if he could just comment on a slight concern I now have. If you look at, and correct me if some of these are wrong, the number of not just LGSS but all the partnerships the Council is going into: we've got payroll and back office as being in with Northants for over a year now; IT has just gone in with Northants; we're doing a more of a client service provider role with Norwich which is about to happen I believe, which involves a load of staff TUPEing across; we've got library IT services, I believe, merging with Suffolk outside of LGSS IT; and we've got the merge that's going in with the Fire Authority, which I understand isn't possibly quite part of your remit, it's part of the Fire Authority's remit. My concern is around whether the Council and the Cabinet has plans to ensure that we don't get a spaghetti junction style effect or we get lots of different services all merging in different ways which could potentially have been done in more efficient ways if they were slightly more joined up and if he could just reassure me on that general point.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count

Thank you for that question and a little bit of advance notice. Where you started from is absolutely right, to applaud the success of the LGSS, our partnership arrangements that started with Northamptonshire were certainly something to be worried about before I arrived here. They have come to a certain amount of fruition, there has been some savings delivered and it's taken an awful lot of Officer time and effort to get there, but I must say, well done it's all on track and going along swimmingly well.

So where do we go from here? When it was set up there was a lot of policy meetings and strategic thinking going behind as to what the optimum size would be, what things make sense for shared partnership working and what things don't. And there is very much a kind of: this isn't a one size fits all, for example the deal we are currently looking at with Norwich City Council is on three areas: IT, HR and Revs and Bens, but they've got other areas that they are not going to move in at the moment. With our own partnership working with Northamptonshire we have the estate, but we're looking at the management of the estate, but we haven't moved our farm estate. So it's very much as we go along we progress and we look at all the partners that are coming along in various guises to see what happens.

Going back to that strategic thinking, there was a lot of thought done at the start, a bit of research, as to what the optimum size would be and I believe the upper limit what we're trying to achieve - if we could get 3 or 4 - I think, I'll have to check, it was thought out if we could get a certain number, then there is not much point going beyond that because we think that we will not get the relevant savings combined. However, this like everything else will be reviewed, as we move along, each and every time a client comes along we look if the business case makes sense, we look at if we're in the right place to receive at that point in time and that might change, because what might be wrong for us tomorrow we might have the capacity to build in, so hopefully I've made some assurance.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count from Councillor I Manning

Yes, just a very slight clarification when you say 3 or 4, I presume you mean 3 or 4 authorities regardless of how the relationship is, because obviously the relationship between Northants is different from Norwich, so that would count as 3; so what were the 4?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count

Just to clarify 3 to 4 senior partner levels such as Northamptonshire is the optimum size. A different partnership level arose with Norwich and what we do get when we introduce them, (we don't just get the savings) we get the capacity both for them and us to deal with more things.

3. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates from Councillor Sir P Brown

I think my question is directed at Councillor Bates, but also with mention of Councillor Clarke, and I would like to congratulate them both on the work that they have done on pressing the Government on the A14. I think the proactive stance that was taken is excellent and no doubt Alex Plant has been behind that as well, so thank you very much. I just wonder whether you might keep pressure up a little bit since we've been told that there is likely to be anything between £8 and £12m to be spent on the viaduct at Huntingdon over the next 12 months. Is this expenditure really worth it in the long terms of things, would it not be better for the Government to bring forward the A14 project even further so that we could have that work done at the same time.

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

The A14 and the viaduct are a concern of the local people for some considerable time - is it value for money and is it money well spent? Listening to the consultants and listening to the Highway Authority who has that responsibility they seem to think the simple answer to that

question is: yes. And it would be. It's not a long term solution we are assured, quite what long term is, is a very good question and we will continue to press them and as you are aware there is a fairly detailed timescale already in place starting this Christmas when they will put up scaffolding. So the general answer I think is that the Highway's Authority feels it would be good money spent, although there are obviously questioners, like yourself, with those concerns.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates from Councillor Sir P Brown

Yes Chairman my question is: do the Highway's Authority and the Ministry of Transport speak to each other, do they know what's going on?

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

The answer is yes, they are talking to each other constantly about the viaduct because it does play into the more strategic issue of the A14 both for this county and Northampton and for Suffolk. So the answer is yes, they are talking to each other along with the consultants, which is Atkins, who are doing a lot of work obviously on the A14 currently.

4. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell from Councillor B Brooks-Gordon

Speed reduction from 40-30mph on the Huntingdon Road has cross-party support, it's been through the AJC, it's supported on all sides. Last week Councillor Reynolds, my City Council colleagues and I had a meeting with officers, the police and others. Will the Cabinet Member please agree to chase this too? That's all I'm asking for, and to report back to me in writing with a date for implementation.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell

Yes I will, Chair.

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

We learnt that the delay was due to a police veto, now the police do not have a right of veto over these things. They have a right to advise which they did into the safety audit, that was then superseded by a junction which lowered speeds anyway, they only have the right to implement what democratic Members have decided. So I would be really grateful if the Cabinet Member will advise us, Local Members, of any other vetoes (we just thought it was the ruling group dragging its heels and just not managing to get on with things), but I would be really grateful to know of any other vetoes that come forward.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell

I will do that, Chairman.

5. Question to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Councillor M McGuire, from Councillor V Lucas

Last October this Council overwhelmingly supported the covenant between the military and the community. The signing of the covenant was a big public event last December and the first meeting of the Covenant Board was held last month. Could Councillor McGuire bring

the Council up to date with regard to what progress has been made to implement the compact, particularly with regard to several issues that are emerging at the moment such as the 39 Engineer Regiment now moving from Waterbeach to Scotland much earlier than we thought, and the impact on the community and the service families who will be left behind.

Secondly, we have a large number of reservists, of all the different arms of the service going out to Afghanistan in the next few weeks and what arrangements are being made to make sure that their families are receiving the proper care. Then finally what approach is being taken by the Council and its partners with regard to the likelihood of some servicemen, with the redundancy programme expected in all the services over the next few months, being cared for and appropriate arrangements being made, should they decide to settle in Cambridgeshire?

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

I'm grateful to Councillor Lucas obviously, of asking the question, because it gives me the opportunity to update generally the Council following that decision by us to form the Community Covenant with the Military and as Councillor Lucas has already said we had a very successful signing ceremony in Cambridge just before Christmas and we had a meeting of the Board of which Councillor Lucas is a member, a couple of weeks ago. In fact I have to say it was a very well attended, I'm very grateful to all the people who did come to that meeting and we had representatives from the armed forces at a very senior level, we had many of the support organisations such as the British Legion, SSAFA (Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen & Families Association) and others, we had NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough there, and as Councillor Lucas will know we did have an update from Lt Col Seb Pollington about some of those things affecting the 39 Regiment and others.

What we have done is agree that we will have another meeting in May of the full board with the intention of setting up some task and finish groups to look at particular issues such as these ones and how it affects us. I think I'm going to take this opportunity to announce something else, colleagues will be aware that the Housing Minister, Grant Shapps, has recently made funding available to a number of authorities to help injured military personnel to return to a home that meets their needs and adapts to their new life. Now I don't believe that any of the housing authorities within Cambridgeshire will be receiving any of that money, I don't know whether they actually applied, what we will be doing as a board is to encourage them to apply for such grants where they are, this will enable them to adapt houses to suit the needs of returning servicemen, particularly for those who are disabled. And of course it was in the budget - the Chancellor announced an additional £100m to improve military accommodation and £3m, and this is relevant to us all, to double the Council Tax rebate that is deployed for military personnel.

6. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell from Councillor P Reeve

I've been approached by one of the schools in my division, Ashbeach Primary School in Ramsey St Mary's. In the opinion of the school governors and head teacher the road outside their school, that is the only road they can approach on, is now in a state that is dangerous for their students. I wonder if Councillor Criswell would join me in meeting the head teacher and the students and governors just to look at the road and hear their point of view, as soon as would be possible to fit his diary?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell

Yes, I will get a briefing with Officers, Chairman, to find out the situation and then get in touch with Councillor Reeve.

7. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell from Councillor S Gymer

Litter, A14, verges: can we please, please lean on the Highway Authority to get them to clear up things like the A14, the M11, the A10 and the A428, because when they don't that goes into our communities. So this is across Cambridgeshire, especially those of us who are adjacent to them. Also can I ask when it comes to cutting the verges, because we are going to come to that time of year, that you keep the Parish Councils informed, because it's awful to see plastic bottles strimmed where they haven't picked up beforehand and if there are local people that can go out and pick up before you come and strim; all it is, is a quick email two or three weeks beforehand, and that's no more work for us that's just one quick email, that would be so helpful to let the Parish Clerks know that that's going to happen.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell

Yes, Chairman, I will endeavour to talk to the Highways Agency, who are responsible for the trunk roads, and will follow up on the verges, to see if we can send an email out in advance, Chairman. Although I do know that some of the work is the District Councils' around the villages, so we will need to have a joined up conversation, which I will endeavour to do Chairman.

8. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty from Councillor Churchill

Will you join with me in congratulating the Head, staff, pupils and parents of Little Paxton Primary School, which in a recent Ofsted report was found to be an outstanding school, with pupils' progress often excellent, outstanding teaching over time and a Head Teacher who provides inspirational and visionary leadership.

Further, has this success story been relayed via our press releases, as I believe so many are. If not, why not? I may have missed it; especially as the school in question is within the Councillor's division.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor Harty

I certainly will join you in congratulating Little Paxton Primary School – it's an excellent school and the results of the recent Ofsted report are extremely good. I'm not sure about a press release, I certainly got a copy of the report, but I'm not sure whether we actually released one, and if we haven't, then I will make sure that there is one put out.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Churchill

Chair, I think that it would be good if a press release was put out to show our support for what is a truly excellent school, and to comment on the success that they have achieved in attaining what they have done, with this Ofsted report.

Reply from Councillor Harty

I will certainly do that Mr Chairman.

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

Chairman, in welcoming recent announcements about Cambridge Science Park Station, is the Leader of the Council aware that papers to the LGA's Transport Board last week confirmed that plans for the station had been with the Council, in fact, since 1992, when the Conservatives ran the Council. Is he further aware that in 1995 during the Labour/Liberal Democrat Administration pre-feasibility studies were undertaken on a station at Addenbrookes, but not at Chesterton, and that during the early part of this century City Liberal Democrats campaigned actively for a station at Addenbrookes. Is he also aware that the planning application for the guided busway included a link into the proposed station at the Science Park and that for many years his predecessors had been working actively with the Department for Transport and former East of England Regional Assembly to bring forward a station at the Science Park. And in the light of this would the Leader of the Council therefore like to comment on recent claims by the party opposite to have delivered the North Cambridge Railway station.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke

Thankyou Councillor Johnstone for quite an unexpected question. But there is a serious point to this - we have talked about politics today. Now I have to say that I was brought up to strive to be honest, to stand on my own two feet, and never to steal the credit for others actions. But I have to say, this Liberal Democrat paper, is the highest level of deceit I have seen for some time: 'The Liberal Democrats Deliver North Cambridge Railway Station!' And I am not soft or prissy, don't you give me that Councillor Manning. But I tell you that it is important that people understand the deceit and the dishonesty being practised for political gain by Members opposite. It is outrageous that these claims are made. Now, it is ridiculous at this Council, I have to say, that three Labour County Councillors have influence over this Executive. They come and they talk and they influence and they speak. But 21 Liberal Democrats opposite...

Point of Order from Councillor I Manning: How is this answering the question Chairman?

I've been asked to comment on your Liberal Democrats. When I read this paper, I have to say I thought: well that's just the silly antics of the City Council Liberal Democrats. And I'm getting a bit old now and I wear glasses for reading and so I put them on and lo and behold who is there peering at the back, but the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Bourke. Let me tell you some stark facts in this chamber, shall I: you do not deliver anything. There are two places for decisions – this chamber and Cabinet. You are not in influence or authority for either. To claim to deliver is delusional at best and I'll leave you to think of the rest of that...so let us start...[time up]

Supplementary Question from Councillor S Johnstone

If this document were to be filed in a library, could you suggest under which section?

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke

In the interest of my serious point about telling lies for political gain, I won't make a comment on that. Thank you.

Point of Order from Councillor P Sales:

I don't know whether this is a point of order or not. But this is supposed to be Councillors Questions, we have had a number of multiple questions. I just wondered whether or not that's within the spirit of what we are supposed to be doing. Asking a question with six parts is actually asking six questions. And that's happened on several occasions. I just wonder whether or not that's actually acceptable.

Reply from the Chairman, Councillor J Powley

He was within the time limit that was allowed for a response to the questions. How he answers the questions is entirely up to his discretion.

10. Question to the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor D Brown and the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty from Councillor Downes

It's a follow up to a question I put to them at the last Council. You will recall during the budget debate that I expressed a serious concern, shared by many in the Chamber, including on the other side, about the impact of the cuts we are having to make particularly on disadvantaged young people, on looked after children, on disabled children, on family support on youth services and so on, as a result of the Council having lost in this financial year (on the year that is just about to start) £3.1m in order to fund the academies. I pointed out that the academies were having extra income in the same year of £7m. Since I raised this question, I have followed the matter up at a national level, including with some Conservative Councillors, who share my concern about what has happened. The national picture is that academies will have received over the last two years, £1055m in LACSEG (Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant) funding and that will have been partially recouped from Councils to the tune of £415m. So this is a very, very serious transfer of money from those who need it most to those, in general, who need it least. Now I put to you a possibility of setting up, of approaching academies in Cambridgeshire, to set up a Cambridgeshire Academies Solidarity Trust and you both expressed interest and said you would look into it. Could I ask what you've done and what response you've got?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Thankyou Mr Chairman. I certainly understand the points that Councillor Downes has made. I haven't taken forward this information at all at this point in time. I think it could be very divisive... but what I am going to suggest is that we talk to the Schools Forum because that's the area from which it should begin to be discussed.

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

With respect, I don't think it is actually the Schools Forum's responsibility. I think this is a question of what one might call, what Michael Gove this weekend called (I had the privilege of listening to Michael Gove address 900 head teachers in Birmingham this weekend) and he talked about the moral purpose of government and how he was passionate for the poorest children. So I think it's a question of asking our Cambridgeshire academies' heads what their moral purpose is.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

I disagree with you. I think the Schools Forum would be quite a useful Forum to actually present the information to. The secondary schools, the majority of them now are academies,

there is no reason why we shouldn't approach them through the Schools Forum itself and bear in mind that primary schools, very few of them are academies, and maybe we will get an answer through that particular Forum.

11. Question to the Cabinet Member for Growth & Planning, Councillor I Bates from the Leader of the Labour Group, Councillor T Sadiq

In the light of the petition that was presented at the beginning of this meeting calling on the County Council to support a petition asking Stagecoach or another provider to provide a bus service from Abbey to Addenbrookes, what response is he likely to give. Is the Council likely to support that call for a service?

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

As made plain I think to the petitioner, that the Leader of the Council will write back a response to the petitioner in due course. So that is what action will be taken Mr Chairman.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member For Growth & Planning, Councillor I Bates, from the Leader of the Labour Group, Councillor T Sadiq

Does Councillor Bates agree with me that having a bus service from Abbey to Addenbrookes is one potential way of reducing some of the traffic and parking problems around Addenbrookes and that it would be worth looking into that as a way of addressing that issue as well.

Point of Order from Councillor Count:

Chairman I understand that these questions are not to be addressed on a subject that is addressed in another part of the meeting. Those questions are asked in a petition therefore those questions should not be asked here and now.

Reply from the Chairman:

Right, thank you. We will let it [the question] go. Thankyou

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 27 MARCH 2012
WRITTEN QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

Question from Councillor S van de Ven to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

The council's 2012 bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund is confined to the council's 'Growth Diamond' in the Alconbury-Huntingdon-Cambridge-Ely area, with much focus on the Guided Busway corridor. The Guided Busway has already seen an unprecedented expenditure of public money, including a continuing £1 million annual draw from the Local Transport Plan budget for a contingency account in relation to the council's unresolved legal dispute with the contractor.

Cycling infrastructure on the A10 between Harston and Melbourn is dangerous in many places and, and non-existent for several hundred metres on the incline between Melbourn and the Hertfordshire border. Cyclists depend on this A10 south corridor for commuting to work and college and for travelling between villages for local needs. What is the council's strategy for enhancing cycling infrastructure along the A10 south corridor, given that this area falls outside of the council's 'Growth Diamond'?

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

The Council's strategy for increasing cycle use is outlined in the Local Transport Plan, and our aim is to make cycling safer and more attractive to encourage users.

However, investment has to be focused where it will achieve the most in terms of increasing the number of people cycling and where reductions in car use will provide the greatest reductions in congestion and pollution. People are most likely to take up cycling for relatively short trips in and around built up areas. New cycling infrastructure has therefore been targeted on the market towns, for example Willow Bridge in St Neots, in Cambridge, and in linking the villages close to Cambridge to the City. Recent figures show that this investment has been very effective in achieving the Council's aims with an increase in cycling of 8% across the county in the last year alone.

Whilst the Council is committed to further developing cycle infrastructure, the current economic climate and level of funding we receive means that there are currently no plans for improvements to the section of the A10 noted in this question. However, should funding become available, it could then be considered. An alternative would be for the Parish Council to raise the funding for the scheme for which the County Council would then be pleased to assist with delivery.

Question from Councillor T Stone to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

The Citi 7 and 101 buses are to lose their subsidies in September. Could Councillor Bates say what conclusions as to the future of transport services in the area have been drawn as a consequence of last year's public consultation and of survey activity which took place at Whittlesford Parkway station?

The Cambridgeshire Link service was launched in December 2011. A further survey was to have been launched in 2012 with a reply paid envelope and a leaflet encouraging people to use the service. Could Councillor Bates say:

- how many copies of the survey were printed and at what cost?

- exactly where the survey was delivered and what was the delivery cost?
- how many copies of the leaflet were printed and at what cost?
- where the full survey was not delivered, which areas received copies of the leaflet?
- how many houses there are in the target area?
- why the CB22 postcode was chosen when Hinxton is almost adjacent to Whittlesford Parkway station and has a CB10 postcode?
- how many responses to the survey have been received?
- what are the conclusions to these responses?

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

I would firstly like to thank the member for Duxford Councillor Tim Stone for his question.

The purpose of the public consultation that took place last year was to look at the impacts of subsidy withdrawal, the information from which fed into the Community Impact Assessment. It didn't look at area based transport options and so has not drawn conclusions about the future of transport services within the area in question. Its purpose was to assess specific views in order to inform the decision on bus subsidy withdrawal and was considered as part of the decision making process on that subject by Cabinet.

The market research that was undertaken at Whittlesford station was aimed at assessing the likely take up of the 'Local Link' service to the station. This yielded some interesting results that I would be very happy to share. The key finding though, was that there would be limited take up of the service due to the convenience of car access to the site. This is guiding our decision making on the 'Local Link' service more generally as we move forward with the Cambridgeshire Future Transport programme.

In terms of the further survey mentioned by Councillor Stone, as part of the marketing and engagement work for the Cambridgeshire 'Local Link' service which was launched in December 2011, Cambridgeshire County Council printed 5,000 copies of an A4 Questionnaire at a cost of £120.10. We also printed 5,000 copies of an A5 leaflet at a cost of £60.05. This number was deemed sufficient although the precise number of houses in the area isn't known.

No direct delivery costs were incurred by the council as a mix of officers from the Passenger Transport team and parish councils (arranged by Councillor Stone) were used to drop leaflets and questionnaires door-to-door. The villages included in the drop were Duxford, Sawston, Whittlesford. In addition Councillor Stone kindly agreed to drop leaflets in further areas to those listed.

We chose the CB22 area simply to allow for clarity of message. Using a single postcode area was considered to be the best way of conveying clearly messages of which areas would be included in the scheme, however, with hindsight, using a wider set of postcodes may have been more appropriate.

The first questionnaire drop had an end date of 28 February 2012; the second drop had an end date of 31 March 2012. To date 205 responses have been received. Responses are currently being reviewed and we will be happy to share responses when the analysis is complete. As Councillor Stone is aware as part of the CFT programme we will be engaging further with his communities over the next few months to look at alternative transport solutions. The findings of the questionnaire will feed into this work.

Question from Councillor L Nethsingha to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor S Count

Does this Council have any staff who are paid through individual companies, or via trusts, rather than through the payroll?

Are there any individuals who have been paid more than £30,000 in consultancy fees in a single financial year for any of the past 2 years?

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

All Council staff have been, and are, paid directly.

Consultancy spend is currently coded to 3 distinct codes. These codes encompass varying types of spend. It is not possible without considerable additional work to identify whether suppliers are a single consultant, or employ many. Additionally, due to the volumes and wide range of services that are recorded against these codes, it is not possible to be certain that all miscodings have been identified and corrected.

Therefore the best information available without in-depth checking is that in 2010/11 there are 3 suppliers that appear to be individuals who have been paid more than £30,000 in that year. The most that was paid to one supplier was £32,839. In 2011-12 to date, there are no suppliers that appear to be individuals who have been paid more than £30,000. This is due to continuing and ongoing improvements in managing our consultancy contracts.

Question from Councillor T Sadiq to the Cabinet Member for Growth and Planning, Councillor I Bates

"What steps are being taken to ensure that the bus interchange at the railway station is kept clean and safe for passengers and will any information and toilet facilities be provided? What discussions has the County Council had with Greater Anglia and Network Rail about improving safety at the station roundabout especially in relation to cycle safety and parking, pedestrian crossing points and pick-up and drop-off by cars at the station entrance and the management of bus movements? Are any changes planned to the current design of the roundabout to improve traffic movements?"

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

The Cambridge rail station bus interchange is being delivered as part of the wider CB1 development. Key partners in the development are the developer Brookgate and Network Rail (NwR) and the County Council. For the Council's part, our involvement has been the detailed design and delivery of the public infrastructure, bus interchange and bus only road.

Clearly the area surrounding the bus interchange is still under development and subject to the normal construction issues such as dirt on the road ways etc. With this in mind the county is in regular communication with Brookgate to ensure the public spaces are managed effectively. There was for example, a recent issue with the build up of litter around the new bus shelters but this has now been addressed and a regular cleaning regime is now in place.

In terms of the bus stops themselves, all include real time passenger information display boards (RTPI) and the three remaining stops currently under construction will also include this. An additional information point near the station entrance is also due for installation in the next six weeks. There are no plans within the development to provide additional toilet

facilities above and beyond those that are already provided within the station buildings, although as the restaurants and other public uses that are planned as part of the development are opened, these could contain such facilities.

In terms of safety, significant improvements are planned as part of the general improvements in the area. There will be major improvements to the access arrangements including the station square, new taxi drop off areas and new access arrangements to the car parking. These are all parts of the approved masterplan for the area and the County Council is working closely with the City Council and the developer to bring these forward as soon as possible. As far as I am aware, there are no short term proposals to improve the roundabout as this will be replaced by the measures planned for the area.

Other major planned improvements are to the cycle parking where a significant increase in the number of secure spaces is planned. We have regular and ongoing dialogue with the developer and the rail franchisee to bring these elements forward as soon as possible. A specific short term proposal is for a new area of cycle parking where double height cycle parking racks will be trialled.

Appendix G

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2011/12

Changes shown in bold type

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE (11)

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

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (12)

Cllr J Batchelor	LD	Substitutes:	
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 C Hutton	C
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr I Manning	LD	Cllr S Tierney	C
Cllr V McGuire [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr F Whelan	LD
Cllr J Palmer	C	Cllr P Reeve	UKIP
Cllr M Smith	C		
Cllr R West	C		
Cllr L Wilson	UKIP		

ADULTS WELLBEING AND HEALTH (12)

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

ENTERPRISE, GROWTH AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE (12)

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

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH: JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (5)

Cllr G Heathcock	LD	Substitutes:	
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr K Bourke	LD
Cllr V McGuire	C	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr P Sales	L	Cllr K Reynolds	C
Cllr C Shepherd	LD	Cllr R West	C

COMMITTEES

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE (7)

Cllr R Butcher	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr B Farrer [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr B Brooks-Gordon	LD
Cllr S Kindersley	LD	Cllr 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		Substitutes:	
Cllr C Carter	L	Cllr G Harper	C
Cllr G Heathcock	LD	Cllr van de Ven	LD
Cllr V Lucas	C		
Cllr J Powley	C		

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (7)

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

AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (7)

Cllr S Count	C	Substitutes:	
Cllr N Guyatt [Vice-Chairman]	C	Cllr K Bourke	LD
Cllr S Johnstone	C	Cllr D Jenkins	LD
Cllr J Reynolds	C	Cllr V Lucas	C
Cllr P Sales	L	Cllr A Melton	C
Cllr C Shepherd	LD	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr T Stone [Chairman]	LD	Cllr A G Orgee	C
		Cllr M Williamson	LD

SERVICE APPEALS COMMITTEE (pool of members)

Cllr S Austen	LD	Cllr V McGuire	C
Cllr F Brown	C	Cllr J Reynolds	C
Cllr P Downes	LD	Cllr K Reynolds	C
Cllr G Heathcock	LD	Cllr S Tierney	C
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr J Tuck	C
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr R West	C
Cllr S King	C	Cllr M Williamson	LD
Cllr F Whelan	LD		

STAFF APPEALS COMMITTEE (pool of members)

Cllr J Batchelor	LD	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr N Bell	LD	Cllr L Oliver	C
Cllr B Farrer	C	Cllr A Pellew	LD
Cllr G Harper	C	Cllr J Reynolds	C
Cllr S Hoy	C	Cllr C Shepherd	LD
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr M Smith	C
Cllr C Hutton	C	Cllr 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	Substitutes:	
Cllr S Count	C	N/A	
Cllr N Guyatt	C		

JOINT COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS TO THE POLICE AUTHORITY (3)

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

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FOR CAMBRIDGE FRINGES (4)

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

JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE FOR NORTHSTOWE (4)

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHARED SERVICES (3)

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

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AREA JOINT COMMITTEES**CAMBRIDGE (6)**

Cllr C Carter	L	Substitutes:	
Cllr L Nethsingha	LD	Cllr 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	Substitutes:	
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr S Austen	LD
Cllr J Powley	C	Cllr D Brown	C
Cllr P Read	C	Cllr F Brown	C
Cllr M Shuter	C	Vacancy	C
		Vacancy	C

FENLAND (5)

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

HUNTINGDONSHIRE (6)

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

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE (5)

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

27th March 2012