

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 7th December 2011

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 4.30 p.m.

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, R Butcher, C Carter, K Churchill, J Clark, N Clarke, S Count, S Criswell, M Curtis, P Downes, R Farrer, N Guyatt, S Gymer, N Harrison, D Harty, S Hoy, C Hutton, D J Jenkins, S Johnstone, E Kadić, G Kenney, S King, V Lucas, I Manning, M McGuire, V McGuire, L Nethsingha, L J Oliver, A Orgee, J Palmer, D Pegram, A Pellew, P Reeve, J Reynolds, K Reynolds, T Sadiq, P Sales, S Sedgwick-Jell, C Shepherd, M Shuter, M Smith, T Stone, S Tierney, J Tuck, S van de Ven, R West, F Whelan, S Whitebread, K Wilkins, M Williamson, G Wilson, L Wilson and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors S Austen, P Brown, G Heathcock, W Hunt, S Kindersley and P Read

203. MINUTES – 18th OCTOBER 2011

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 18th October 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

204. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

205. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Councillor	Minute	Details
Batchelor	209 f)	Governor of Linton Village College
Brooks-Gordon	210	Registered disabled due to a limiting condition
Clarke	209 f)	Governor of Fen Ditton Community Primary School
Curtis	209 f)	Chairman of Governors of Alderman Jacobs Primary School
		Governor of Sir Harry Smith Community College
Downes	209 f)	Governor of Brampton Village Primary School
Harty	209 f)	Governor of two primary schools in St Neots
Hutton	209 f)	Governor of St Neots Learning Partnership
		Governor of Eynesbury Church of England Primary School
Kenney	209 f)	Governor of Sawston Village College
Nethsingha	209 f)	Governor of Parkside Federation

Orgee	209 f)	Governor of Granta School Governor of Great Abington Primary School
Pellew	209 f)	Chairman of Governors of Manor Community College
Powley	209 f)	Governor of Weatheralls Primary School
Reeve	209 b)	Board Member of the Ramsey and District Community Bus Association
	209 f)	Governor of Ramsey Community Junior School
Sadiq	209 f)	Governor of Parkside Federation Governor of Ridgfield Primary School
Shepherd	209 g)	Vice-Chairman of Cambridge and District Citizens' Advice Bureau Management Committee
Shuter	209 f)	Governor of Bottisham Village College
West	209 f)	Governor of Offord Primary School
Whelan	209 g)	Single parent of child with autistic spectrum disorder Committee member of Cambridge branch of National Autistic Society
Wilson G	209 f)	Governor of Godmanchester Community Primary School
Wilson L	209 f)	Governor of Monkfield Park Primary School Governor of Jeavons Wood Primary School Governor of Histon Early Years Centre
Yeulett	209 f)	Governor of Neale-Wade Community College

On behalf of all members present, the Chairman declared a personal interest in the item on members' allowances (Minute 208).

206. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were received.

207. PETITIONS

One petition was presented by a member of the public, as set out in **Appendix B**. The Chairman thanked the petitioner and advised that the Leader of the Council would respond in writing.

208. THE PROCESS ADOPTED TO APPOINT THE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL IN JULY 2011

It was moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke and seconded by the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor Bourke, that Council receive a report from the Monitoring Officer on the process adopted to appoint the Chairman and members of the Independent Remuneration Panel in July 2011.

Following brief discussion, Council agreed unanimously

To note the report.

209. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Seven motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

(a) Motion from Councillor Manning

It was proposed by Councillor Manning and seconded by Councillor Gymer that

This Council notes:

- The recent allowances review and the public outcry over it
- The stated aim of many members, including the current Council Leader and Opposition Group Leader to include more people from more varied walks of life in local democracy, including those with full-time day jobs and/or those unavailable during the day.

Further this Council assumes:

- Standard working hours for a majority of Cambridgeshire residents for the purposes of this motion are considered to be Monday-Friday 0900-1700

Therefore this Council resolves to:

- Hold two of the full Council meetings and 25% of each of the Overview and Scrutiny meetings outside of 'standard' working hours as defined above*
- Provide Councillors with the opportunity to participate in training outside of standard working hours.

This should be put in place from June 2013, so that all Councillors would be aware of their commitments prior to the next County Council election.

*Given the length of full Council, this could include meetings starting early in the afternoon.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, reported that in accordance with the Members' Development Charter, a review was taking place to help ensure diversity amongst members and fair representation of residents. The review would include consideration of meeting times. He invited Councillor Manning to participate in the review and undertook to bring its findings for debate at a public meeting.

On this basis, Councillor Manning agreed to withdraw his motion.

b) Motion from Councillor van de Ven

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

Council notes:

- Community transport is 'an important and appropriate transport service in many areas of a rural county such as Cambridgeshire' (*quote from Cambridgeshire County Council's 2011 bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund*). Community transport plays a vital role in providing

essential transport links for Cambridgeshire residents who lack access to public or private transport.

- At the time of its February 2011 decision to cut 100% of bus subsidies, Council pledged to strengthen its support to community transport providers, who would face an increased demand for their services as subsidised bus services were withdrawn.

However since that time, support for community transport has been systematically undermined by the Council's own actions:

- The Council's £5 million Local Sustainable Transport Fund bid, including a £1.4 million community transport component, was lost as a direct result of the Council's legally challenged decision to cut bus subsidies, and Government has told the Council not to include any community transport component in a second bid to the Fund.
- Cabinet unanimously agreed the reallocation of the Local Public Service Agreement funds earmarked for the Care Network's development of new community car schemes in South Cambridgeshire, reassigning that funding instead to the development of high speed broadband, and has proposed no replacement funds for this collection of new community transport schemes.

The Council further notes that a one-off Government grant of £258,000 specifically intended for community transport has been held in reserve, due to the possibility that this money could at some future point be useful to the nascent 'Cambridgeshire Future Transport' project, which is based on the premise of profit-making franchises underwritten by the taxpayer, of which no pilots are yet in place, and for which no evidence of transport needs has been collated.

The process of cutting bus subsidies will resume any time from April, with a consequent reduction in transport options for many Cambridgeshire residents.

Council therefore resolves:

- To urge the executive to do all that is necessary to allocate the Government's community transport grant of £258,000 to established community transport initiatives in Cambridgeshire.

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

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

c) Motion from Councillor M McGuire

It was proposed by Councillor M McGuire and seconded by Councillor Hoy that

This Council calls on the Department for Communities and Local Government in consultation with the Local Government Association to

introduce a national scheme of allowances for elected members of County and District Councils, Unitary and Metropolitan Authorities.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Downes and seconded by Councillor Bourke [additional text underlined]:

This Council calls on the Department for Communities and Local Government in consultation with the Local Government Association to introduce a national scheme of allowances for elected members of County and District Councils, Unitary and Metropolitan Authorities and calls for no increase in allowances to take place in Cambridgeshire until either such a scheme is implemented or until April 2013, at the earliest.

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

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats and Labour in favour, Conservatives and one UKIP and two independent members against, Chairman and Vice-Chairman and one Green member abstained.]

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

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, some Liberal Democrats and one Labour member in favour; some Liberal Democrats, one UKIP member, one Green member and one independent member against; Chairman, Vice-Chairman, one Liberal Democrat and two Labour members abstained.]

d) Motion from Councillor Nethsingha

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

This Council regrets the cuts that have been made over the past 18 months to the Youth Service, the bus network and the reduction in hours that the Contact Centre is open.

This Council notes that:

- The Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee was promised a review of the Communications spending of the Council well over a year ago
- No such review has been brought to the Committee
- While the Council's Integrated Resources and Performance Plan for this year included savings in the Communications budget of £100,000, the Resources report for September shows that these savings have not been made.

This Council calls upon Cabinet to ensure that the promised review of Communications spending is completed with all possible speed, and asks the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance to investigate the failure to make the savings recommended for this year.

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

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

e) Motion from Councillor Bourke

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

This Council notes:

- The recent Conservative decision, currently under review, to cut 100% of funding for subsidised bus services
- The local bus operator's subsequent decision to make reductions to commercial services and not to renew the Quality Bus Partnership
- The negative impact these cuts have already had on the quality of bus transport available to local people, and concern about the implications of further cuts
- The lack of significant competition in the bus industry in Cambridgeshire
- The frequent lack of connections between bus and rail services.

This Council also notes that 'Quality Bus Contract Schemes' (Local Transport Act 2000, 2008) would allow the Council to:

- Draw up contracts for the provision of bus services and then invite commercial operators to bid to provide that service, using a franchising arrangement to introduce competition for the marketplace
- Specify the terms of bus services, including routes, stops, frequency and ticket prices, increasing democratic influence and allowing social as well as commercial imperatives to be taken into account
- Ensure better connections between bus and rail
- Take commission on ticket sales from the profitable services, generating revenue that could be reinvested to improve public transport for those people who have poor services through (e.g.) community transport, bus priority measures and rural buses.

This Council calls on Cabinet to investigate ways to use Quality Bus Contract Schemes as a means to provide improved public transport for Cambridgeshire people.

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

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

f) Motion from Councillor Downes

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

This Council notes that:

- The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for Cambridgeshire schools is well below the national average and below the grant of many similar shire counties
- Congratulates the Cambridgeshire Schools' Forum and local MPs on their efforts to bring this anomaly to the attention of the Government
- Having been the pioneer county of Local Financial Management, welcomes the Government's intention to give all schools the maximum flexibility to decide the best way to spend the available resources, subject to the cost-effective provision of specialised services.

The Council calls on the Government to:

- Adopt an Activity Led Funding formula methodology which demonstrates clearly what the money provided will actually purchase in terms of services to young people
- Recognise the extra costs for areas of rural sparsity which are not currently recognised in the distribution formula
- Ensure that the calculation of the supplementary grant to academies (Local Authority Centre Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG)) is done in such a way as to not financially disadvantage those schools that choose to remain as part of the Local Authority family.

On being put to the vote, the motion was agreed unanimously.

g) Motion from Councillor Sadiq

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

Council notes that:

- There are 16,455 children (13.3% of all children) living in poverty in Cambridgeshire
- Fenland and Cambridge City have the highest percentages of children living in poverty above the England average; however, over 70% do not live in the most deprived areas of our county

- 75% of children in poverty in Cambridgeshire come from workless households, compared to 42% nationally
- The cost of child poverty to Cambridgeshire's Children's Services could be as much as £96 million a year and is about 2% of acute sector NHS expenditure
- Children's Commissioners have warned that benefit changes could push more families into poverty. Take-up of benefits and getting people into work are both critical factors in preventing poverty.

Council asks Cabinet to:

- Encourage all members to use their electoral division data sets and the Child Poverty Needs Assessment for Cambridgeshire to know and understand how poverty affects families living in their divisions, and to represent their needs
- Encourage all local businesses to work with the County Council to improve labour market flexibility, to offer more apprenticeships, and to accept more applicants from poorer backgrounds
- Support the work across the Council to develop the Council's own apprenticeship scheme
- Support and enhance the work across the Council for early intervention with families
- Encourage the Local Enterprise Partnership to include poverty alleviation and reducing economic disadvantage as one of its strategic priorities and to work with the County Council to improve pathways to employment and stimulate economic development and job creation
- Work with District Councils and voluntary organisations to encourage greater ~~benefit take-up~~ take-up of relevant benefits and to provide better support to families who will be hit hardest by benefit changes.

Following discussion, the motion was put to the vote and was carried.

[Voting pattern: All in favour except Chairman and Vice-Chairman, one Conservative and one UKIP member, who abstained.]

210. QUESTIONS

a) Oral Questions

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

- In response to a question from Councillor Pellew, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell, agreed to ensure that details of gritted cycle routes were published separately on the Council's website,

together with details of Council gritting equipment and grit available for local use.

- The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, Councillor M McGuire, agreed to write to Councillor Brooks-Gordon about the process for renewing disabled parking badges ('blue badges').
- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, agreed to write to Councillor Reeve with details of paid employee hours used for trade union activities.
- In response to a question from Councillor Gymer, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell, agreed to review Highways new build guidance to ensure that gating at road junctions was widely enough spaced to allow mobility scooters to pass through.
- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, agreed to send a written response to Councillor Harrison's question on when bus services would be restored to their pre-cut standards, or when a business plan would be published to show how this would be achieved.
- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, agreed to advise Councillor Sadiq in writing as to how many Council contracts with small and medium enterprises had been lost as a result of recent cuts.

b) Written Questions

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

211. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

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

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 7th DECEMBER 2011
MINUTE 204 – CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Jo Sinclair

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the death of Jo Sinclair. Jo was key to the creation of and support to a range of childcare settings across Cambridgeshire. Jo first worked with the Out of School Childcare Action Project and then within the Care and Education Service. She has worked for the past 7 years within the Childcare Business and Employer Support Team, more recently known as the Childcare Sufficiency Team. The Council's thoughts are very much with her family, friends and close colleagues.

Changes to Strategic Management Team

Adrian Loades now leads on Adult Social Care activities. His job title is Executive Director: Children and Young People's Services & Adult Social Care. Library Services and Community Engagement are now part of Pat Harding's Customer Service and Transformation Team. The elements of Community and Adult Services relating to Culture and Adult Learning have joined Environment Services and are led, at Executive Director level, by Alex Plant. The Council thanks Pat Harding for accepting a secondment to lead Community and Adults Services at very short notice.

AWARDS

ShapeYourPlace

Congratulations to the ShapeYourPlace team for winning gold for 'best website or microsite' at the Chartered Institute for Public Relations Pride Awards (East Anglia).

www.shapeyourplace.org lets residents across Fenland share community news, begin debates about the local area and raise issues with the Police, the fire services and local councils.

England Broadband Network (E2BN)

The County Council is part of the East of England Broadband Network (E2BN) set up to help raise standards in teaching and learning by the use of broadband technology. The project has won the Next Generation Challenge 2011 'Collaborative Advantage' Award.

Next Generation is The UK's showcase for Next Generation broadband activity - enabling a wider understanding of digital network investment as the essential foundation for local economic growth and innovation.

Natural England Biodiversity Awards 2011

Two Cambridgeshire Mineral sites have been given awards at the Natural England Biodiversity Awards 2011 - Kings Dyke Nature Reserve and Little Paxton Quarry - for

the work that has been done on restoring and enhancing habitat and supporting biodiversity.

Switchover Help Scheme Team Charter Award

Sarah Freeman, Trading Standards, who led the digital switchover educational programme on behalf of the County Council, received an award from the Switchover Help Scheme. The 'Switchover Help Scheme Team Charter Award' was presented to her for her exceptional contribution to raising awareness of the Help Scheme in Cambridgeshire - a scheme that provided extra help with the switchover for those aged 75 or over, those in care homes, those eligible for certain disability allowances, and those registered blind or partially sighted. Television can be a vital companion for many of these residents, and Sarah's work will have helped to ensure not only that they were able to continue watching their televisions, but also that rogue traders were not able to mislead them over what was required.

The award also recognised her work with the County, District and Parish Councils in Norfolk and Suffolk, sharing with them the Council's approach to raising awareness to support them in the subsequent digital switchover in their counties.

Society of Information Technology Management - Graham Williamson Research Award for 2011

Steve Grange, Web Project Manager, has been awarded SOCITM's Graham Williamson Research Award for 2011. The award enables the winner to undertake a short research project connected with their work – including overseas. Steve is planning to use his award to visit Vancouver in Canada to investigate the City's use of user-centered design and user experience in driving the content and use of the City's website. This will be really helpful because Steve is currently project managing a series of improvements to the Council's website. Following his return to the UK, Steve will be invited to make a series of presentations to SOCITM audiences about his experiences and what he has learned.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

Growing Places Fund

The Local Enterprise Partnership has been awarded Growing Places Fund cash from Government of £10.66M. The fund is to support development projects that can deliver jobs and economic growth and is expected to operate as a revolving / rolling fund, akin to the Cambridgeshire Horizons rolling fund.

SmartLIFE Low Carbon centre

The Minister of State for Energy and Climate Change, Gregory Barker MP opened the SmartLIFE Low Carbon centre at the Cambridge Regional College site in Kings Hedges on 31st October. The centre will provide skills training for people working on the fields of renewable energy and energy efficiency, as well as offering dedicated business support facilities for low-carbon enterprises.

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan has been signed off following public consultation and an in-depth examination by an independent

planning inspector. The Plan which has received national recognition puts forward key sites for mineral extraction and waste management across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough with the aim of ensuring that up to 70,000 new homes being built in the next 15 years can be delivered as sustainably as possible.

South Fens Business Centre Enterprise Space, Chatteris

Phase 2 of the South Fens Business Centre in Chatteris has now been completed and was opened for business on 19th October. The County Council has supported this important scheme with contributions of £200k towards the cost. The Council has also agreed to support a Third Phase of 4 units adjacent to this, and construction work is already underway.

Witchford Recycling Centre

Last month saw the opening of a new recycling centre in Witchford in East Cambridgeshire. The new facility opened to the public on Thursday 3 November and is indoor with a split-level so residents no longer need to climb steps to recycle as they did at the old open air site at nearby Grunty Fen. The site which also has an innovative green roof is a great example of what can be achieved when the County Council works in partnership with residents and businesses for the good of the local community. It also reinforces the Council's ongoing commitment to invest in new services and facilities to cut the amount of waste which ends in landfill.

Winter Preparation & Communities

The Highway Teams have been working throughout the summer to ensure the Council is prepared for the coming winter. This year, the Council has been working with the city and district councils and with over 30 parish and town councils to provide them with salt and equipment to treat cycleways and pavements that they are concerned about.

This work has included training over 80 volunteers to spread salt safely and effectively and provide them with suitable equipment. In addition, the Council will be treating the Guided Busway and its adjacent bridleway.

Approved Trader Scheme

Cabinet recently approved Buy with Confidence as the local approved trader scheme. This scheme aims to help consumers make informed shopping choices and avoid rogue traders, as well as helping good businesses attract new customers. The Council has already been contacted by over 60 businesses interested in joining the scheme and the Trading Standards service is currently going through the application and vetting process with them.

CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN ACTIVITIES OCTOBER TO DECEMBER 2011

Chairman's engagements

October 2011 (since previous Council meeting on October 18)

- Guest at opening of Dolphin Children's Centre – Waterbeach
- Guest at opening of Ditton Lodge Primary School
- Guest at opening of Great Gidding Primary School
- Mayor of March Civil Service – March
- Wood Green Animal Shelter reception – House of Commons
- Citizenship Ceremony

November 2011

- Veterans Day Ceremony - Madingley American Ceremony
- Fostering and Adoption awards ceremony – Wood Green, Godmanchester
- Remembrance Day parade & service - Great St Mary's Church, Cambridge
- Arrival of Rickshaw Challenge for Children in Need – Shire Hall
- Peppercorn lunch and tour of Marshall's – Cambridge
- Mayor of Cambridge Reception – Sainsbury Laboratory, Cambridge
- Annual Service of Thanksgiving – RAF Alconbury Chapel
- Cambridgeshire Community Foundation photographic exhibition and talk – Ely Cathedral
- Lecture by Kim Howells MP – Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge
- 3 Citizenship Ceremonies – Shire Hall

December 2011

- NHS Cambridgeshire *Let's Engage* event – Arbury Community Centre
- Yuletide winter reception – RAF Mildenhall
- Chairman of St Neots Town Council reception and carol concert – St Neots parish church
- Annual Octavia Hill service – St Peter & St Paul Church, Wisbech
- Rehearsal for Schools' Carol Service – King's College, Cambridge
- Schools' Carol Service – King's College, Cambridge
- High Sheriff Awards – Peterborough

Vice-Chairman's engagements

October 2011 (since previous Council meeting on October 18)

- Annual reception – Cambridge University Air Squadron
- Opening of Somersham Children's Centre

November 2011

- Opening of new recycling facilities – Witchford
- Citizenship Ceremony
- Chairman of South Cambridgeshire District Council reception – Abington Hall
- Wreath laying ceremony and 2-minute silence – Shire Hall
- Remembrance Service and parade – Huntingdon

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 7th DECEMBER 2011
MINUTE 207 – PETITIONS**

Text of a petition containing 275 signatures presented by Ms S Sharp:

'The people who have participated in this petition are regular users of the 106 Cottenham to Ely/Ely to Cottenham Bus Service.

We, the undersigned request the County Council to take note of this petition and think of the disruption that will be caused if this service is axed, as recently proposed. The petition is clear evidence that the 106 Cottenham to Ely/Ely to Cottenham Bus service, currently operated by Dews, is of vital importance to the residents of the connecting villages, who rely upon the service for daily transport.'

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 7th DECEMBER 2011
MINUTE 210 – ORAL QUESTIONS**

1. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Whitebread

I've got a press release here. You went to see the Cambridgeshire Environmental Education Service work at Stibbington in November. You said after your visit that the children were very enthusiastic about the environment and how they might care for it and you thought they returned to their schools better equipped to lead action for the environment. So I wonder if you could give us a few words on why you think it is so important that children lead action for the environment?

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke

Thank you, I could give you a yes or no answer to that as it's not really a proper question, but let's just deal with the thrust of it. What is wrong with protecting our environment? There is nothing wrong with that at all and to teach our young people to do that is absolutely right. Where I have issues if there are any at all, is when sensible debate, sensible policy and sensible choices get hijacked by certain people who have different theoretical ideas that aren't practical and there is an issue here about living in the real world. So I have never spoken against the environment, it's a fabulous place, I've travelled lots of the world, it's a great place, why shouldn't it be? To teach our children that is absolutely fantastic, so I'm not really sure the point of your question.

Supplementary question from Councillor Whitebread

Well I think we know what we are all getting at, which is that obviously you have carried out the previous Leader's budget proposals to basically scrap the Climate Change and Environment Team. You've removed climate change from any appearance on any Cabinet papers or any other papers. You've deferred and basically banned development of large scale wind energy on County land. I was just hoping, so that I could sleep more easily at night, that you do care in some sense about the environment and so is that all I'm going to get then for Cambridgeshire residents?

[No response from the Leader of the Council]

2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Orgee, from Councillor Shepherd

My question is addressed to Councillor Orgee. He referred earlier to the JSNA, the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for this Council. With the latest round of health re-organisation, the upshot of throwing all the pieces into the air and letting them all scatter again, one of them was that public health has come back to this Council and it's now the responsibility for this Council, as it was many years before of course, for the public health announcements and statements. We have already heard how important it is for all sorts of things that public health statements are twinned in with our statements on poverty,

strategy and education with everything else because it all leads into it. To that end I note within the JSNA and in other statements by Dr Robin, the Director of Public Health, the issue about tobacco smoking and health. There was a report on the radio this morning just talking about it, from Cancer Research, saying that tobacco is by far the most significant precursor to poor health and cancer. So it was a great surprise that I saw that this County invests in tobacco companies via the Pension Fund. I wondered if, in order to marry up the things that we do with the things that we say, that Councillor Orgee would be interested in looking into the Pensions Committee with a review to disinvest in those funds so that he could make a suitable statement about it?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Orgee

My understanding is that public health comes back as a responsibility of this Council from 2013. The issue about the pensions and the Pensions Committee, as I understand it, the Pensions Committee does have regular reviews of its investment strategy and the focus of their strategy in particular as I understand it is the investment returns help to pay for pensions in the future. There are regular reviews of the investment strategy and I understand that such a review is carried out as a matter of course.

Supplementary question from Councillor Shepherd

The amount of investment in tobacco companies in the Pensions Fund is 1.9%. We could easily disinvest from this with no problem or difficulty at all. The notion that investing in tobacco companies is essential to create a positive outcome for pensioners is of course rubbish, otherwise we could all invest in tobacco companies and become millionaires. So I would really hope that, for sake of public health announcements very specifically, that the Councillor would take this up and encourage the Pensions Committee to look at disinvesting from these funds.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Orgee

I think this is actually better addressed by Councillor Count, because it is already being done.

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

Just for a point of clarity, I've asked the Pensions Committee already to look into ethical investments, specifically with a view to tobacco companies. That is actually being put on the agenda for the next meeting, I believe. I've asked officers to do that, it isn't known because it hasn't hit the agenda yet but if you want me to show you the emails pertaining to that, so you will see that this is on record as already underway. There are no promises going to be made about Pension Committee outcomes but I do agree with you that we need to have a discussion on the subject because of the impacts on one area. I need to make sure as Chair of the Pension Committee that we do not let down the people in the public service that have their funds invested with us, so we need to have an adult grown-up discussion on that subject. I hope that answers you entirely.

3. Question to the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor Jenkins

I strongly believe and I have some evidence, but not overwhelming evidence yet, that most of the people who ride on subsidised bus services are either older people or in some way disadvantaged and so removal of bus subsidies would have a disproportionate effect on people who actually depend on them. So what I'm asking Councillor Curtis is how he and the officers in his area going to be engaging explicitly to make sure decisions about subsidised bus routes are taken with the interests of those people in mind?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Curtis

It's an interesting question. The difficulty with it is that a lot of the same arguments you could make about younger children and I have the benefit of held both portfolios. So it's not a question necessarily that's best asked of me, I don't believe, but I will say this, that I will do with older people's services what I did with children's services, that is that make sure I fulfil the challenge about older people and the impact on older people and everything that goes on in the Council. It doesn't stop this Council having to make tough decisions in those areas but that is something I do as a portfolio holder anyway and I'll keep doing it with this. There are good arguments about the benefits to younger people of getting them into using more buses, as much as there are for older people. So I don't think it is technically an answer for me but the commitment I'll give is that as a Cabinet Member for Adult Services I will make sure that those views are brought into the equation every time and in any debate where it is appropriate at the Council.

Supplementary question from Councillor Jenkins

The reason I did ask Councillor Curtis is that of course I'm going to refer to the 110 freedom bus which goes every Thursday from Histon and Impington, through Cottenham, Willingham and Wilburton to Ely market. That has an average occupancy of 35 people every week and I've got some data responses, I have hard evidence here that 90% of them have bus passes. It's their club and their way of getting out and they go there every week and if the bus was removed they would not have any way of getting to Ely. So there is a particular service I'd like you to take particular interest in, it goes on a Thursday morning, 9.30 am outside the Co-op in Histon, if you would like to join me it's a pleasure. We could get off in Cottenham and have a coffee at the Community Centre.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Curtis

Of course we know older people use buses and use their bus passes a lot, there's a no-brainer about that and we know they have an impact and these issues have. What we are trying to do as a Council is to be innovative. If there is a threat to a service that has a regular use of 35 people, maybe the question is not how we keep that as it is, but how do we make that work more innovatively so it actually doesn't run at a loss. That's the point and that's why its not just a debate for me, because there are other things that will impact elsewhere and so of course how does that impact and the impact it has on

older people is a question I'll ask; but it's part of a wider debate about how we make that work better and be more innovative about it.

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

A local resident in my division has raised the issue of the gritting of cycle routes, given that a full 25% of all journeys to work in Cambridge are by bike and the benefits to local businesses of people travelling to work in a way other than by a car are substantial. Can I ask for the priority of the gritting of cycling routes to be raised?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell

As you know we have a quad bike which does cycle routes where we can in Cambridge and there is an opportunity for local communities to add to that by doing extra routes with volunteers and we provide the bagged salt and the equipment. If there are particular routes that are a problem and you would like to get those back to me, they can be assessed as part of the annual process by which we arrange our gritting runs.

Supplementary question from Councillor Pellew

Can I ask that the gritting information for cycle routes be published separately under the cycling section of the County Council's website, so that we can give a measure of certainty to cyclists regarding what will and won't be gritted? Can I also ask the ability of Parishes and Districts to grit their own cycle routes with County grit, can I ask that some information be published on that as well on the website?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell

Yes, quite happy to do that, or point you to it because I believe it's already there; members of course have had all that information in the past but happy to follow that up.

5. Question to the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor Brooks-Gordon

It regards renewals of blue badge disability badges in cars. I've had two cases not dissimilar to this and it's been investigated with the officers at call centres and not had much response, the system is overly bureaucratic. What happens is that when people need to renew their blue badges they actually have to send the blue badge away and that's highly problematic. Some people in Cambridge need their cars to be able to park just outside their own homes and they get penalties when the badge gets sent away. Those in rural areas need them to come into Cambridge and to hospital appointments and what have you. They cannot do without those badges for the period of time it needs to be sent away; sometimes it takes two weeks for it to come back. Others when they are faded with the ink, again they get penalties and it has to be sent away, so they are without these badges so the system is not working as it is.

All that I'm asking is the system is looked into of renewal and then reported back to me.

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

It actually comes under my portfolio but the assurance I give you is that I will have a discussion with Pat afterwards and look into that. I wasn't aware of these problems but I will look into them and see if we can give you at least a written response to it.

Comment from Councillor Brooks-Gordon

I am grateful for that but I should declare an interest because I'm registered disabled with a life limiting condition, so I should have mentioned that.

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

The Conservative Cabinet Minister in charge of Local Government, Eric Pickles, has attacked the use of public funds to pay for Council trade union officials, branding them 'non-jobs on the rates'. He states that town halls should review the merits of payments as it was wrong for Council Tax to be used to subsidise union activity and that trade union activity should be carried out on a voluntary basis. He also stated that all local authorities need to be making sensible savings to protect frontline services and to keep Council Tax down and that he thinks that the idea of trade unionists working in the public sector on trade union business, rather than serving the public, isn't right. He stated in the Commons that these are non-jobs on the rates and it's wrong that Council Tax should be used to subsidise trade union activity. The Tax Payers Alliance campaign group has estimated the national cost of these activities to be £113m a year and following last week's strike the Conservative Prime Minister has said that the system needs to be reformed. Do you agree with your Prime Minister and Eric Pickles; and how many paid staff hours are used by publicly funded offices in Cambridgeshire County Council for trade union activities?

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke

Thank you for raising what is a very important issue. Unfortunately the question is sort of painted in black and white and it isn't like that at all. This Council has a really good reputation of working with our staff and with our trade unions. The trade unions themselves perform a really effective function and shortly after becoming the Leader I met with all the Leaders and had briefings from HR at a very senior level. I was surprised that the role that they perform actually saves us money; if they weren't there we would be paying elements of HR to do that work. What I was impressed about was the distinction between, I'm guessing, my prejudice about trade union officials and the reality – that they look at the complaints they receive from their members and quite early on say, to be fair, 'You are not being bullied, that is just strong management' and that saves us a huge amount of work and the fact that it is dealt with at the ground level is really helpful. So the question really is should we be paying any money out of the public purse? Well actually, practically speaking, these roles need to be performed, whether it is by trade union

officials or by HR staff. I think at the moment here in this County it works, the relationships work, we get an effective bang for our buck. Do I agree with everything that our Secretary of State and the Prime Minister says at all time? Of course not. We are local government, we have our own thinking and our own minds, but the premise of the inference that we shouldn't be paying the public purse for trade unions I think is wrong actually. I think that you just need to look further down to the detail to see the benefits it produces.

Supplementary question from Councillor Reeve

Only that it wasn't my words, it was your Prime Minister's words, but the heart of the question is, how many hours do we actually pay for trade union officials to work?

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke

I don't know but I can certainly come back to you; but just to remind you that he is your Prime Minister as well.

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

It's not that I'm a bad loser but at the last Council you and some of your side turned down a proposal that we should protect our protected road verges. The excuse at the time, or the statement at the time, was that you were engaged in very close consultation with the Wildlife Trust and it was all going to be resolved. Could you give us an update?

Reply the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell

The only update I have is that those discussions are still going on.

Supplementary question from Councillor Stone

When do you expect them to be concluded? Will it all be over by Christmas?

Reply the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell

They will be concluded as soon as possible.

8. Question to the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Count, from Councillor Nethsingha

The Cabinet is proposing to spend up to £20,000 on improving broadband speeds across the County. Can Councillor Count tell me what criteria will be used to determine where and how this money will be spent?

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

Well, first of all, I think you by now realise that the Cabinet allocated a budget of up to £20m, but it doesn't necessarily mean that we are going to spend all

of that. It does give us the flexibility and the headroom to negotiate with whoever will be our supplier in the long run. The difficulty with what this buys us is the fact that the open market is installing broadband at the moment. What we are trying to achieve by spending this money is to roll out this superfast broadband to the areas where they don't cover. So we have a team now in place that are working hard to discover what will be promised and therefore which areas we need to fill in and also the capabilities of what is being promised and therefore we need to work what capabilities we wish to find. So I can assure you there is a team working on this, the criteria are moving because we don't want to pay for something that we are going to get anyway. So I think that is the best way that I can answer that question at the moment.

Supplementary question from Councillor Nethsingha

Just to say that that's very interesting, that the team are already working on that. It would be very useful and informative to have information on who that team is and who they are working to. Would the Cabinet Member be prepared to forward that to me?

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

I can tell you that this comes under the IT department under Noelle Godfrey. A Broadband Project Manager has been appointed, his name escapes me but I can get back to you on that, Steve Cole, I have met him. He is the project manager, I'm sure he can give you a briefing on where we are at the moment should you require it and any further details you might require.

9. Question to the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor Sales

The home care budget stands in excess of £30m. 60% of it doesn't actually reach the frontline clients; I would like to know whether he is happy about that situation.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Curtis

Technically I believe this question is out of order, because it has already been covered by a written answer, but I'm going to answer him anyway. The trouble is you can't, what's happiness in terms of that, it is difficult, the point for me and the point that's made in the written answer as well is that and the point that I made this morning on what was a very interesting discussion on the radio as well. 'Am I happy?' That's not the right question, really, because we can't influence that, what we can do is to the right work when we are setting the contracts to make sure that the providers justify their overheads, that's one thing we can do.

The second thing we can do is the sort of work and the sort of thinking we talking about being (a) more preventative and (b) more joined up in the way that we provide adult services. Part of that means reducing the number of people that go through doors by making them more skilled and multi-skilled, that will save us money, that will save providers money and the theory is that if

that is going to save us money and one of the reasons is you have got a more multi-skilled workforce, that might mean you can pay them more as well.

There are other things that you can do about making sure that they are properly organised so you can reduce travelling time and it's the travelling time between appointments, some of which there are difficult issues around there as well. So all those things are things we can do something about. Am I happy? It's something I need to look at and keep an eye on it and I think it's a valuable, valuable debate and comment that you have made.

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

This is something that has happened to somebody in my area, basically his buggy got stuck. The larger buggies that the elderly favour are quite large, they are 5ft by 2¹/₂ft in width and they can't turn through the gates, you know the safety features that are at the end of paths to get you on to main roads. I understand that they are there to stop the children running into the road or young cyclists careering out but these people need to be able to get around our village. What I'm asking is, is it possible to look at the new build book in Highways to actually include some guidance on how these can be fitted, to not just allow the children to be safe but also to allow elderly people to get through these chicanes because at the moment there is no guidance for new builds.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell

I would be very happy to do that.

11. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, from Councillor Harrison

When will bus services be back to the standard that they were before the cuts took place, or indeed those further cuts place in public transport services? I don't ask this frivolously, I do believe that the Council should be operating to a timetabled business plan in relation to this incredibly important service and none of us are arguing that it is important as to how people get around. We know that Council has got the Cambridgeshire Future Transport initiative going but it is clearly going slowly and I'm not criticising it for that but it is slow. It takes time to put these sorts of things together, it's nearly a year now since budget setting time and so on. It's soon going to be a year that this project will have been underway. Can I have an answer as to when services will be back to that standard or alternatively if it makes it easier for him, could I have an answer as to when the Council will produce a business plan so that people such as myself and members of the public will be able to interpret when they will get better bus services?

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke

We'll have to get back to you with some details in a written answer but to deal with the general thrust, we have to be careful what we are talking about, about bus services. Are we talking about our Park & Ride bus service, are we talking about other services etc

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

The Leader has said that one of his priorities is to make Cambridgeshire 'open for business' and I would like to ask him what he believes the impact of the cuts in County Council spending, what the impact of that has been on private sector business.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke

Of course our spending cuts will have an impact, of course they will, but I was heartened to find out the other day when I was speaking at the Federation of Small Businesses event is that we spend 25% of our spend with small and medium enterprises locally. I thought that was actually a much higher figure than I was expecting. If you take into account sub-contractors for our Highways activity it goes up to 33%, so in the sense that we are placing our spend locally where we can I think that is an extremely, well a much higher number than I was expecting and clearly we need to do some more.

To build on that we also have a website link designed for smaller contracts, to allow people to bid much more easily. It also means that you only have to fill out a pre-qualification questionnaire once and just alter it as you go through more and more bids, so the Council is very aware that it wishes to spend its money wisely and locally wherever the law allows us to do.

The real impact has got to be of course on our services to the people that have had to leave this organisation and what we are hoping is that some of our bigger thinking in terms of things like the Chesterton Station, the superfast broadband, the work we are doing quietly on the A14 behind the scenes and other things will help to generate the economic wellbeing that this County deserves and people who are in employment can help themselves. So in short, yes, there is a short term deficit as a result of people having to leave this organisation, which we recognise but on the positive side against the trend we are making capital investments that will help to generate an effective economy for Cambridgeshire.

Supplementary question from Councillor Sadiq

Is this one of those other things where the Leader doesn't agree with our Chancellor and our Prime Minister? It was stated quite clearly when the new Government came in that as the State withdrew from the public sector, the private sector would expand and fill the gap. Now clearly that has not worked, it hasn't happened, so we are now left with a situation where this Council is looking at stimulating its own economy and being the opposite of what the Government has said it would do. Could I ask the Leader whether an analysis of how many businesses and contracts have been lost as a consequence of cuts? Could an analysis be undertaken and provided, because I think it is essential for us to know what the impact on business has been in our County Council.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke

I wish I'd brought a document with me for a meeting that I'm having tomorrow, I think, with Warren East, the Chief Executive of ARM, in which we have

reviewed the companies that have actually grown and been successful in Cambridgeshire because it's an item that I want to be discussing with him about how do we better create the atmosphere and the environment for companies, world beating companies like ARM, to survive. In terms of the detailed analysis, we will get back to you with a written answer but I would ask you to give way a little bit in that I don't wish to be tying up unnecessarily officers for weeks on end to solve what is actually a very complex question. I would much rather they were helping us solve some of the Adult Social Care issues that we have.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 7th DECEMBER 2011
MINUTE 210 – WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

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

The 20mph speed limit in Mill Road, Cambridge has been given little promotion by the County Council and little or no enforcement by the police.

Reducing vehicle speeds is a high priority for the residents and users of this street and many others in Cambridgeshire. Will the Cabinet member therefore

- a) seek a commitment from the police to increase their level of speed enforcement activity in Mill Road and elsewhere
- b) instruct county council officers to conduct a publicity campaign to promote compliance with the speed limit in Mill Road and other roads with 20mph limits.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell

As Councillor Harrison highlights, speeding is one of the most frequent traffic management and safety concerns raised across the county and it is one of the key areas for attention by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership. However, there is a need to ensure that the resources to tackle speeding are targeted in the most effective way.

The speed surveys undertaken after the introduction of the 20mph speed limit in the Mill Road area suggest a reasonable level of compliance during the day and evening periods but some evidence of higher speeds during early hours of the morning.

With regard to speed enforcement activity, through our Safety Camera Partnership with the police, priority is given to sites where excessive speed has resulted in serious or fatal road casualties. In the case of Mill Road, whilst there is a long history of high levels of injury accident, casualty severity is lower than the average for the city. There are also operational difficulties in deploying mobile safety camera units in areas like Mill Road. Therefore, any enforcement activity would be better provided by local policing teams rather than by mobile camera units.

There is an opportunity for local communities to influence and inform local policing priorities through the police liaison process undertaken at the City Council's East Area Committee and I would recommend that the concerns over the lack of enforcement activity should be pursued through this route.

Given the long standing road accident problem in Mill Road, I understand the desire to see more attention given to raising the profile of the 20mph speed limit and I have asked the Head of Road Safety & Parking Services to meet with Councillor Harrison to consider practical ways in which this might be achieved, taking into account the results from the speed surveys. Whilst this approach may be appropriate in Mill Road and other streets with significant accident problems, I would not support it

being a priority merely on the basis of a street or area having a 20mph limit. Our priority must be to focus on roads with frequent and high severity accident problems.

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

Cambridgeshire is now in a huge transitional time in terms of the future of public transport provision. Why has the county council not therefore undertaken systematic and comprehensive research on the transport needs and prospects of its residents, similar to that conducted elsewhere, for example by Hertfordshire County Council (Bus Strategy 2011-31 and Intalink Strategy 2011-2016), and Gloucestershire County Council and Fenland District Council (GIS mapping)?

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

The County Council prides itself on its robust policies and it is therefore wrong to suggest that systematic research to inform its transport policies has not been undertaken. For example, over a number of years the County Council has undertaken a significant amount of research and study into the accessibility problems that face its residents. As part of the development of the second Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2006-11 (LTP2), comprehensive GIS mapping of accessibility issues was undertaken for the entire county, looking at a range of services including health care, employment, education and town / retail centres. This was part of a wider evidence base that informed the accessibility strategy in LTP2. This mapping assessment was updated to inform the development of the third Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26 (LTP3), and remains relevant today.

It is easy to identify additional study work that could be undertaken out of general interest, but before this is done, it must be clear that this will have a useful purpose that is not duplicating current knowledge, which is the approach we take. In this context, in the last two years, the County Council has for example, provided targeted accessibility advice to:

- Assess the impact of proposed changes to the locations from which out of hours health care provision is provided, for NHS Cambridgeshire.
- Inform the development and review of Market Town Transport Strategies.
- Provide annual assessments of the accessibility of new development to key services for the District Councils.
- Provide accessibility mapping of access to key services to inform the Cambridgeshire Future Transport programme.
- Inform the NHS Cambridgeshire / County Council Joint Strategic Needs Assessment phase 5 (Prevention of Ill Health in Adults of Working Age).

The experience with LTP2 also showed that whilst the comprehensive evidence base is useful, the real value is added when work is undertaken at a local level to dig down into the issues and problems, and identify local solutions. So whilst we do have a wide scale evidence base, we are clear that it is the local knowledge that is far more likely to identify deliverable and sustainable solutions than further high level study work.

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

How much money has been lost to fraud by Cambridgeshire County Council? I am particularly thinking of the figure published on the BBC Website - "The East of England managed to lose £21.5m (up 67% from the previous year)" - and would like to know what figure, if any, Cambridgeshire contributed to this figure. A comparison with previous years would also be helpful as would a commentary (if required).

What training do members of staff receive to help them identify attempts to defraud the Council? Is there an existing policy in place for staff to follow when they have identified fraud (and is this available to members)?

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

As part of the reporting requirements for the production of the 2010/11 Statement of Accounts the County Council reported to the Audit Commission that the value of fraud identified and investigated within the Council was £202,900 of which £198,000 was immediately recovered.

The value reported for 2009/10 was £2,300.

In respect of specific policies and procedures, the following are in existence and are available on CAMWEB:

- Anti Fraud and Corruption Policy
- Whistleblowing Policy
- Anti Money Laundering Policy

With regards to training and awareness, Internal Audit ran a fraud awareness week campaign in September 2010.

There is also an online e-training course in "Fraud Awareness" which is available and the Internal Audit Intranet pages also include pages on Fraud Awareness which can be found at: http://camweb/cd/fpp/arm/internal/fraud/fraud_awareness_week.htm

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

The Council currently has a policy that in areas covered by residents' parking schemes, residents can lose their right to permits by carrying out major building work on their property. An example of this would be someone entitled to a residents' permit, who converts his house into one house and one basement flat. He could then not only be refused the right to a permit for the new flat, but also lose his right to a permit for his house.

There have been several incidents in my ward where this has happened. Does the Cabinet Member not think it unfair that someone could carry out work completely unrelated to parking (i.e. not creating any new parking space) and still lose their right to a residents' permit?

Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that this approach is inconsistent with allowing residents of new developments in controlled parking areas to use visitors' permits?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor Criswell

The policy relating to new development in residents' parking areas was reviewed in May 2010 as part of a wider review of parking policy. Local members in Cambridge were consulted via the Area Joint Committee, as part of this process.

The policy is as follows:

Within existing residents' permit scheme areas, any new development within an established residents' parking scheme will not qualify for the provision of residents' parking permits. The redevelopment of an existing dwelling or dwellings that results in an increase in the number of dwellings will preclude the issuing of permits to any of the dwellings, including the existing dwelling or dwellings.

Where development takes place within the curtilage a property that does not involve any material change to the existing dwelling or dwellings but results in the provision of additional but separate dwellings, no permits will be issued to the new dwelling(s) but the existing dwelling(s) will retain the right to apply for residents' permits.

All dwellings whether existing or newly developed will be eligible to apply for visitors' permits.

In most residents' parking schemes there is significant pressure on parking capacity as the number of permits issued often exceeds the number of parking spaces available. Therefore, the policy is necessary to mitigate the impact of new development on locals parking capacity and to ensure that new development does not exacerbate existing operational parking pressures. Anyone considering development plans will need to balance the benefits they receive as a result of the development with the potential loss of residents' permit rights. Development proposals can include the provision of off-street parking to mitigate any loss of residents' parking permits.

To provide a level of accessibility to residents parking areas for those visiting residents, the policy provides for the provision of visitor permits but, again, development proposals can provide alternative off-street parking for visitors. If, through the planning process, it is determined that development would have a significant detrimental impact on the operation of a residents parking scheme, it is possible, through a S106 agreement with the developer, to remove the right to acquire visitor parking permits for those living in the development.

Question to the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Curtis, from Councillor Sales

This year the total budgeted figure for domiciliary care across all client groups is approximately £35m. The Council pays care agencies an hourly rate of £15.75 for domiciliary care. Most care agencies pay their care staff only slightly more than the legal minimum wage of £6.08 per hour. Let's be generous and say £6.20 on average.

This means that approximately £9.55 per hour is swallowed up in agency fees of one sort or another. Is it acceptable to the lead member that so much of this year's domiciliary care budget will not be directly spent on the client?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor Curtis

The difference between the hourly rate paid to agencies and the amount paid to care staff has to cover a range of overheads including:-

- Premises (agencies are required to have registered premises in Cambridgeshire)
- Management costs (supervisors, care-co-ordinators, HR, Assessors, Trainers, phones for some carers)
- Recruitment (includes advertising, induction training, CRB checks)
- Care Quality Commission fees (registration fees, inspection fees)
- Insurance (including professional indemnity)
- Costs of temporary staff (used when permanent staff are off sick)
- Training (every worker is required to have completed the common standard training before they are allowed to start work)
- Travel costs (some agencies pay staff if they use their own cars, others provide fleet cars that drop staff off. Some agencies pay staff up to 25p per mile, this has to come out of the £15.75)

The Council does not pay any enhancements over and above the £15.75 for evening, weekend or Bank Holiday working as is the case in some councils. Staff working unsocial hours are paid enhancements for unsocial shifts and these costs will come out of the £15.75 the Council pays.

The rates paid to staff by agencies will vary depending on the seniority and experience of the worker, in some cases these rates will also increase where agencies have problems recruiting staff. The decision on how much to pay staff is a commercial decision for each provider and will be based on a number of factors, some of which are listed above. The tender process next year will test the competitiveness of the market to ensure that the Council is purchasing effective services that meet the needs of vulnerable people in the community.

Looking ahead, contracts are due to expire next year. The tendering process will test the market and the need to deliver effective services to vulnerable people. The process will require tenderers to provide a more detailed breakdown of costs.

This information will be used to evaluate further the overheads, including those relating to administration, property, etc. as well as those directly related to training, development, safeguarding and travel.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2011/12**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 M Smith	C		
Cllr R West	C		
Cllr L Wilson	I		

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 S King	C	Cllr A Melton	C
Cllr V McGuire	C	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 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 R Pegram	C
Cllr J E Reynolds	C	Cllr P Sales	L
Cllr T Sadiq	L	Cllr S van de Ven	LD
Cllr M Smith	C	Cllr F Whelan	LD
Cllr S Tierney [Chairman]	C	Cllr K Wilkins	LD
Cllr R West [Vice-Chairman]	C		
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 K Bourke	LD	Cllr J Reynolds	C
Cllr F Brown	C	Cllr K Reynolds	C
Cllr P Downes	LD	Cllr S Tierney	C
Cllr G Heathcock	LD	Cllr J Tuck	C
Cllr B Hunt	C	Cllr R West	C
Cllr G Kenney	C	Cllr M Williamson	LD
Cllr S King	C		

STAFF APPEALS COMMITTEE (pool of members)

Cllr J Batchelor	LD	Cllr L Nethsingha	LD
Cllr N Bell	LD	Cllr L Oliver	C
Cllr 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

CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES: COUNTY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

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

NAME OF BODY	MEETINGS PER ANNUM	REPS APPOINTED	REPRESENTATIVE(S)
<i>Bonus Sub-Committee</i>	As required	1	Cllr J Reynolds (C)
Local Government Association National representative body of all Local Authorities	3-4	4	1. Cllr N Clarke (C) 2. Cllr M McGuire (C) 3. Cllr S Johnstone (C) 4. Cllr D Jenkins (LD)
LGA Commissions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural • Urban 	4 4	2 2	1. Cllr M McGuire (C) 2. Cllr D Brown (C) 1. Cllr T Orgee (C) 2. Cllr K Wilkins (LD)
Reserve Forces and Cadets Assoc. for East Anglia To raise, recruit and administer the TAVR and Cadet Forces	2	1	Cllr V Lucas (C)