

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 18th October 2011
Time: 10.30 a.m. – 5.55 p.m.
Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge
Present: Councillor J Powley (Chairman)

Councillors: S Austen, J Batchelor, I Bates, N Bell, K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, D Brown, F Brown, P Brown, R Butcher, C Carter, K Churchill, J Clark, N Clarke, S Count, S Criswell, M Curtis, P Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, N Guyatt, S Gymer, N Harrison, D Harty, G Heathcock, S Hoy, W Hunt, C Hutton, DJ Jenkins, S Johnstone, E Kadić, G Kenney (from Minute 200b onwards), S Kindersley, V Lucas, I Manning, L McGuire, V McGuire, A Melton, 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, T Stone, S Tierney, S van de Ven, R West, F Whelan, K Wilkins, M Williamson, G Wilson, L Wilson and F Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors G Harper, J Tuck and S Whitebread

189. MINUTES – 19th JULY 2011

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 19th July 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

190. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

191. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Councillor	Minute	Details
Batchelor	195	Member of the Pensions scheme.
Bates	200c	Holder of a concessionary bus pass.
Sir P Brown	200a	Alconbury Enterprise Zone part of Division.
Carter	200b	Son-in-Law in Royal Tank Regiment.
Curtis	195	Member of the Pensions scheme.
Downes	195	Beneficiary of the Pensions scheme.
Dutton	195	Contributing to the Pensions scheme.
Gymer	195	Has paid in to the Pensions scheme and has a reserved pension.
Heathcock	195	Hopes to be in receipt of a pension from the scheme in due course.
Jenkins	200a	On the East of England Highgrove Coaching Panel, working with small companies within the region.
Kindersley	200b	Organiser of the Gamlingay and Hatley Royal British Legion Poppy Appeal.

M McGuire	195	In receipt of a pension from the fund.
V McGuire	195	Husband in receipt of a pension from the fund.
Melton	195	Wife is a member of the scheme by way of her employment by Chatteris Town Council and Daughter a serving Police officer with Cambridgeshire Constabulary and a member of the scheme.
Orgee	200f	County Council representative on the Board of Governors of Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust.
Read	195	Wife in receipt of a pension from the fund.
Sedgwick-Jell	195	Member of the Pensions scheme.
West	195	In receipt of a pension from the fund.

On behalf of all members present, the Chairman declared a personal interest in the item on Members' Allowances (minute 199).

192. CABINET MEMBERSHIP

In accordance with Part 2, Article 7, Section 7.04 of the Council's Constitution, members noted that the Leader of the Council had appointed Councillor M Curtis as Cabinet Member for Adult Services to replace Councillor C Hutton, and Councillor A G Orgee as Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing to replace Councillor M Curtis.

193. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were received.

194. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

195. PENSIONS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2010/11

The Chairman of the Pensions Committee, Councillor Count, moved receipt of the annual report of the Pensions Committee for 2010/11.

Council noted the report.

196. AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

The Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee, Councillor Stone, moved receipt of the annual report of the Audit and Accounts Committee for 2010/11.

Council noted the report.

197. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE OPERATING PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURE

It was proposed by the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Group, Councillor Johnstone, seconded by the Liberal Democrat Group Leader, Councillor Bourke, that the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Group review of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee operating principles and procedures be approved

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

It was resolved:

- i) to approve the proposed changes and the associated amendments to the Council Constitution as set out in Appendix 1 of the report .
- ii) to authorise the Monitoring Officer to implement the changes at the earliest opportunity.

198. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES – ANNUAL REPORT 2010/11 AND ANNUAL WORK PLAN

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Group, Councillor Johnstone, seconded by the Chairman of the Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Tierney, moved receipt of the Overview and Scrutiny annual report for 2010/11 and moved the recommendation that Council agree the strategic work programmes for the Overview and Scrutiny Committees for 2011/12.

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

199. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

The Chairman reminded members that in order to avoid the need for each member individually to declare an interest in this report, he had already declared a personal interest on behalf of all members present.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Clarke, seconded by the Labour Group Leader, Councillor Sadiq, moved that Council receive the report of the fifth review of Members' Allowances prepared by the Independent Remuneration Panel. The 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, moved the proposal that Council:

- (a) 'numbers' formal receipt of report as (a) and adds
- (b) accepts the recommendations in the Independent Remuneration Panel report
- (c) confirms that the changes shall be implemented from the Full Council meeting of 18 October 2011
- (d) formally revokes the existing Members' Allowances Scheme with effect from that date
- (e) authorises the Head of Democratic and Members' Services to prepare a new scheme to reflect the outcome of the Council's deliberations and to take any consequential action arising therefrom.

Following discussion, in the course of which each Group Leader stated that members of their group would have a free vote, the motion, on being put to the vote, was carried.

Under Part 4, Rules of Procedure, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, more than 14 Members requested a recorded vote on this matter, which is set out in **Appendix B**.

200. MOTIONS

Eight motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

(a) Motion from Councillor Bates

It was proposed by Councillor Bates and seconded by Councillor Kadic that

This Council welcomes the approach being taken to promote economic development across the county and particularly demonstrating to potential investors that 'Cambridgeshire is open for business'. Further, this Council welcomes the immediate results of this through the designation of Alconbury as an Enterprise Zone and the work that the Council, the Local Enterprise Partnership and partners put into that designation, the recent decision taken to support borrowing to deliver super fast broadband services across the county and the approach that is being taken to bringing key pieces of our transport infrastructure forward, such as the proposed Chesterton Station.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Wilkins and seconded by Councillor Jenkins:

To add the following to the end of the motion set out on the agenda:

'This Council also recognises:

- the crucial importance of the knowledge economy to the economic success of Cambridgeshire.
- that vital to the success of the knowledge economy is the quality of life available to the people of Cambridgeshire so that current and prospective employees choose Cambridgeshire over other places.
- that essential to local quality of life are the quality of local schools and hospitals, air quality and the provision of cycling facilities and public transport, and the quality of green open space.
- that science is crucial to the Cambridgeshire economy and the hi-tech, biotech and agricultural sectors in particular.
- the importance of the growing cleantech sector to the local economy in both the Cambridge and Peterborough subregions and in helping to lead the global fight against man-made climate change'.

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

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

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

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

With the agreement of Council, the Chairman varied the order of business to take agenda item 12(e) next. He welcomed Group Captain B Walcot, Station Commander of RAF Brampton and RAF Wyton, Lieutenant Colonel Seb Pollington, Commanding Officer of Cambridge University Officer Training Corps, and Warrant Officer Ian Waters, 39th Regiment Royal Engineers, Waterbeach, who were attending for the debate on this item.

b) Motion from Councillor M McGuire

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

In May of this year the Defence Secretary published the Armed Forces Covenant which outlined the moral obligation between the Nation, the Government and the Armed Forces and aims to improve support to the Armed Forces Community (which includes serving personnel, their families and families and veterans).

One of the key measures of the covenant was the launch of a Community Covenant scheme. The aims of the Community Covenant include:

- a) encouraging local communities to support the Armed Forces Community in their area and vice versa;
- b) promoting understanding and awareness amongst the public of issues affecting the Armed Forces Community;
- c) recognising and remembering the sacrifices made by the Armed Forces Community; and
- d) encouraging activities which help to integrate the Armed Forces Community into local life.

This Council therefore:

- a) agrees to establish a Community Covenant; and
- b) calls upon the Executive Member for Community Engagement to enter into discussions with representatives of the Armed Forces in Cambridgeshire, other local authorities and organisations in the county with a view to establishing a Cambridgeshire Community Covenant Board to promote the aims of the Armed Forces Covenant.

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

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

The Chairman thanked the three Armed Forces guests for their attendance.

c) Motion from Councillor Bates

It was proposed by Councillor F Brown and seconded by Councillor Curtis that

This Council welcomes the very successful opening of the Guided Busway and the improvements in accessibility that it is providing. In particular, this Council welcomes the fact that the number of passengers using the system is so high that the bus operators have had to adjust their timetables twice already to cope with demand and that further adjustments are likely and that this is the most tangible demonstration that the busway is popular and successful.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Bourke and seconded by Councillor van de Ven [amended text shown by underlining or strikethrough, here and in subsequent motions]:

This Council notes:

- Former Council Leader Keith Walters' promise not to spend one penny of taxpayers' money on the Busway, a promise renewed by his successor Jill Tuck;
- The latest published figures indicate that the latest sum invoiced for constructing the Guided Busway is £155m (£68m over the target cost);
- The Council has already paid much of this money to the contractor up-front, and will have to win this money back in court;
- The Council's maximum liability in the event of an outright loss in court has risen to £90.1 m;
- The far-reaching and harmful consequences that losing even a fraction of the legal case could have for the Council's finances and frontline services, at a time of great economic hardship and uncertainty.

This Council welcomes the very successful opening of the Guided Busway and the improvements in accessibility that it is providing. In particular, this Council welcomes the fact that the number of passengers using the system is so high that the bus operators have had to adjust their timetables twice already to cope with demand and that further adjustments are likely and that this is the most tangible demonstration that the Busway is popular and successful. The Council also notes that a proper evaluation of the Busway's success against its stated objectives will be possible only after a longer time has passed.

The people of Cambridgeshire have already been let down by the late opening of the Busway, and other Council services continue to be damaged by the borrowing the Council is having to fund. The Council calls on the Leader to acknowledge these past failings, and the scale of the financial risk.

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

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

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

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

d) Motion from Councillor Whitebread

It was proposed by Councillor Jenkins and seconded by Councillor Nethsingha that

This Council:

- notes the overwhelming public support for libraries in the County, with almost 10,000 people having signed petitions against cuts to local library services
- welcomes the decision by cabinet to rethink previous plans for a 48% cut to the library service
- calls on the Cabinet, in developing a new model for library services, to maintain the following principles:
 - That no existing libraries should be closed
 - That libraries should only move location if there is strong local support for such a move
 - That any consultation should be on the basis of what local communities want, rather than what savings the County needs to make
 - That strong weight should be given to the important social value of libraries as public spaces for the whole community
- This Council urges cabinet to move quickly in developing proposals, so that communities can have reassurance on the future of their libraries.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Harty and seconded by Councillor M McGuire:

This Council:

- notes the overwhelming public support for libraries in the County, ~~with almost 10,000 people having signed petitions against cuts to local library services~~
- welcomes the decision by cabinet to rethink previous plans ~~for a 48% cut to the library service~~
- calls on the Cabinet, in developing a new model for library services, to maintain the following principles:
 - That no existing library service provision should be withdrawn, without consultation with the local community ~~libraries should be closed~~
 - That communities should be consulted on co-location issues and solutions ~~libraries should only move location if there is strong local support for such a move~~
 - ~~That any consultation should be on the basis of what local communities want, rather than what savings the County needs to make~~
 - That strong weight should be given to the important social value of libraries as public spaces and community hubs should be retained for the whole community
- That communities can be assured that This Council urges Ccabinet will to move quickly to develop in developing proposals and confirm continued support for the, ~~so that communities can have reassurance on the future of Cambridgeshire their libraries.~~

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

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

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

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

e) Motion from Councillor Sedgwick-Jell

It was proposed by Councillor Sedgwick-Jell and seconded by Councillor Reeve that

Council notes:

- The coalition's localism agenda.
- This Council's enthusiasm for joint working with the County's District, Town and Parish authorities.
- The need for continuing efficiency savings in all parts of local government while maintaining front line services and

Resolves:

That this Council requests the Executive to establish a delivery group to prepare the case for the re-organisation of the county on the basis of unitary authorities and to, further, liaise with the District, Town and Parish Councils to enable a joint submission for re-organisation on a unitary basis, if approved by Full Council, to be submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

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

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

f) Motion from Councillor Sadiq

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

1. The Council notes:

- (a) that the Health and Social Care Bill has passed though the House of Commons with the support of Liberal Democrat MPs and has now gone to the Lords
- (b) that the Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board for Cambridgeshire will include only three elected representatives who are all likely to come from one political party

- (c) that there is major opposition from local doctors and clinicians to the top-down reorganisation of the NHS at a time of unprecedented financial strain on the NHS including Cambridge University Hospitals forecasting a £5.6m deficit by April
- (d) that particularly given the lack of a public mandate for these reforms it is vital that there is strong, multi-party, democratic representation throughout the NHS including on the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board and Network

2. The Council asks:

- (a) the Cabinet to consider amending the final membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board and Network to include more elected councillors from all parties
- (b) the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing to make representations to members of the House of Lords and local MPs to amend the Bill to remove measures that will lead to the privatisation and the break-up of the NHS, and to strengthen democratic accountability.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Heathcock and seconded by Councillor Jenkins:

1. The Council notes:

- (a) that the Health and Social Care Bill has passed through the House of Commons with the support of Liberal Democrat MPs not including Cambridge's MP Julian Huppert and has now gone to the Lords

[remainder of motion unchanged]

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

[Voting pattern: Labour against; all others in favour.]

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

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

g) Motion from Councillor Wilkins

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

This Council

- a) recognises the importance of a well-maintained network of roads, cycleways and pavements for the enjoyment, use and safety of residents and for the economic prosperity of the county.

- b) recognises the dangers of a poorly-maintained network in terms of injury to pedestrians and cyclists, damage to cycles, cars and lorries and the increase in danger to everyone.
- c) recognises the potential long-term savings that can be achieved by adopting an asset management approach to the highways network, whereby necessary work is done to the highway before there is a pothole or other critical failure.
- d) calls on Cabinet, as part of the current IPP process, to increase substantially this Council's investment in its highways network through this approach thus saving money in the long-run and improving the quality of our pavements, cycleways and roads.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Criswell and seconded by Councillor Johnstone:

This Council

- a) recognises the importance of a well-maintained network of roads, cycleways and pavements for the enjoyment, use and safety of residents and for the economic prosperity of the county.
- ~~b) recognises the dangers of a poorly-maintained network in terms of injury to pedestrians and cyclists, damage to cycles, cars and lorries and the increase in danger to everyone.~~
- eb) recognises the potential long-term savings that can be achieved by continuing to develop the~~adopting an~~ asset management approach to the highways network, whereby preventative maintenance and early repair reduces the potential for necessary work is done to the highway before there is a potholes to develop and ~~or other critical failure.~~ road surface damage to occur.
- ec) requests Cabinet, as part of the IP process to give serious consideration to how it might ~~calls on Cabinet, as part of the current IPP process, to~~ increase substantially this Council's investment in its highways network ~~through this approach thus~~ reducing spend ~~saving money~~ in the long-run and improving the quality of our pavements, cycleways and roads.

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

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

The substantive motion as amended, on being put to the vote, was carried.

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

h) Motion from Councillor Stone

It was proposed by Councillor Stone and seconded by Councillor Batchelor that

This Council notes that it has a statutory duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 to conserve, restore or enhance biodiversity.

As part of its duty, the Council has designated 57 Protected Road Verges. 38 of these form part of County Wildlife sites and two are national Sites of Special Scientific Interest. A maintenance programme has been agreed between the County and the Wildlife Trust.

A consequence of this year's budget is that these Protected Road Verges no longer benefit from a special maintenance programme. They are cut to a one metre width from the road edge two or three times a year in the same way as other verges. Many of the Protected Road Verges are already declining in biodiversity and this will accelerate the decline.

This Council therefore asks Cabinet to give instructions that its Protected Road Verges shall be maintained forthwith in accordance with best practice as established jointly by Cambridgeshire County Council and the Wildlife Trust.

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

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

201. QUESTIONS

(a) Questions on Police and Fire Authority Issues

Councillors V Lucas, representing Cambridgeshire Police Authority, and D Pegram, representing 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 C**.

(b) Oral Questions

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

- In response to a question from Councillor Jenkins, the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to follow up how the Council was seeking to minimise the cost to parish councils of funding highway measures.
- The Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure agreed to provide a written response to Councillor Sadiq on why there had been an increase in the number of people killed and seriously injured on the County's roads in 2011.

(c) Written Questions

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

202. 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 F**.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 18TH OCTOBER 2011
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Former County Councillor John Fountain

It is with regret that the Chairman reports that former County Councillor John Fountain died on 7 September 2011. Councillor Fountain served on the County Council from 1986 to 1993, representing the Benwick and Doddington Electoral Division on behalf of the Conservative party.

Mark Vigor

It is also with regret that the Chairman reports the death of Mark Vigor. Mark retired from the Council in May 2010 after a distinguished career stretching back to 1975 including the last ten years as the Council's Head of Strategic Planning. He was a consummate professional who cared about his work, his colleagues and the future of this County.

Jake Shepherd

It is again with regret that the Chairman reports the death of Jake Shepherd. Jake was a Care Services Development Officer in the Procurement Team in Adult Social Care.

Mike Hosking

Mike Hosking, Service Director, Libraries, Learning & Culture, has left the Council after over 20 years' service in Cambridgeshire and a long and successful career in local government. The Council wishes him well in his retirement and thanks him for his long service and significant contribution to the development of services for the people of Cambridgeshire.

**Julia Barrett, Service Director: Environment & Regulation and Mark Kemp,
Service Director: Highways and Access**

Julia Barrett, Service Director: Environment and Regulation and Mark Kemp, Service Director: Highways and Access have now left the Council. The Council wishes them well for the future and thanks them for their service and significant contribution to the development of services for the people of Cambridgeshire.

Adrian Loades

Following the publication of the Ofsted Report into Children's Safeguarding Services at Peterborough City Council, Adrian Loades, Executive Director: Children and Young People's Services, has been seconded to the City Council for three days per week, for an initial period of three months, to lead the diagnosis and improvement work within the Council. Adrian will maintain his Director of Children's Services designation at the County Council during the period.

Councillor Victor Lucas

Councillor Victor Lucas has become a member of the Order of St John. Membership of the order is granted only to people who have shown exceptional service to one of its foundations, including St John Ambulance.

Louise Collier

Louise Collier, the Council's Head of Network Management (North, West and East), has been elected as a Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

Ramsey Library

On 20th September, I was delighted to be present at the formal opening of Ramsey Library. This is a magnificent addition to our library service and is also a place where Huntingdonshire District Council offers services to local people. This is a good model of a community hub.

Making Assets Count

The Making Assets Count pathfinder project, which could both save and generate millions of pounds for tax payers, has been praised by Government. The project has mapped out buildings being used by public services across Cambridgeshire to look for ways to share assets, make savings and deliver joined up services. Cambridgeshire was successfully chosen by Government to be one of 11 Capital and Asset Pathfinders projects. Communities Minister Baroness Hanham has praised the work of Cambridgeshire and other pathfinder projects.

Opening of St Neots Cyclebridge

Willow Bridge in St Neots was officially opened on Wednesday 21 September, connecting the communities of Eynesbury and Eaton Socon. The £3.5 million project includes improvements to the network of foot and cycle paths and provides a much needed safe link for local schools. The 346 metre bridge, which spans the River Great Ouse over the flood plain, was built in partnership with Huntingdonshire District Council and Sustrans.

The announcement by the Department for Business Innovation and Skills that part of the proposed Alconbury development will be an Enterprise Zone

The Department for Business Innovation and Skills have announced that part of the former Alconbury Airfield will be one of the country's new Enterprise Zones, following a bid put forward by the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership.

The Enterprise Zone will offer a number of economic benefits and incentives to those locating on the site and it is expected that this will support the creation of 8,000 new jobs. In addition, all business rates growth within the zone for a period of at least 25 years will be retained and shared by the local authorities in the Local Enterprise Partnership area to support their economic priorities and further jobs growth.

Guided Busway Opening & Patronage

The Guided Busway opened on 7th August. Passenger journeys in the first two months totalled approximately 433,000. The Business case for the scheme assumed that it would take three years for patronage to build up to around 300,000 journeys per month, and that use in the first year would be only half of that amount. Patronage in the first two months is therefore around 50% higher than forecast. Consequently, both operators have modified their timetables to improve reliability and to increase the number of bus services available. Stagecoach Sunday services have changed from hourly to every 20 minutes and Whippet from every two hours to hourly. Further additional weekday services have been added and some destinations amended to better meet customer demand. More changes are planned for late October.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 18 OCTOBER 2011
RECORDED VOTE – MOTION ON MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote
AUSTEN S	LibD		x			LUCAS V H	Con	x			
BATCHELOR J D	LibD		x			MANNING I	LibD		x		
BATES I C	Con	x				MCGUIRE L W	Con	x			
BELL N	LibD		x			McGUIRE V	Con	x			
BOURKE K	LibD		x			MELTON A	Con	x			
BROOKS-GORDON B	LibD		x			NETHSINGHA L	LibD		x		
BROWN D	Con	x				OLIVER L J	Con	x			
BROWN F	Con	x				ORGE E A G	Con		x		
BROWN P	Con		x			PALMER J	Con	x			
BUTCHER R	Con	x				PEGRAM D R	Con	x			
CARTER C M	Lab		x			PELLEW A	LibD				x
CHURCHILL K			x			POWLEY J A	Con			x	
CLARK J	Con	x				READ P	Con	x			
CLARKE N	Con	x				REEVE P	UKIP		x		
COUNT S	Con	x				REYNOLDS J E	Con	x			
CRISWELL S J	Con	x				REYNOLDS K A	Con	x			
CURTIS M	Con	x				SADIQ T	Lab		x		
DOWNES P J	LibD		x			SALES P	Lab		x		
DUTTON J J	Con	x				SEDGWICK-JELLS	Grn		x		
FARRER R	Con	x				SHEPHERD C	LibD		x		
GUYATT N	Con	x				SHUTER M G	Con	x			
GYMER S	LibD		x			SMITH M	Con	x			
HARPER G F	Con				x	STONE T J	LibD		x		
HARRISON N	Ind	x				TIERNEY S	Con		x		
HARTY D	Con	x				TUCK J M	Con				x
HEATHCOCK G J	LibD	x				VAN DE VEN S	LibD		x		
HOY S	Con	x				WEST R	Con	x			
HUNT W T I	Con	x				WHELAN F	LibD		x		
HUTTON C	Con	x				WHITEBREAD S	LibD				x
JENKINS D	LibD		x			WILKINS K	LibD		x		
JOHNSTONE S F	Con	x				WILLIAMSON M	LibD		x		
KADIĆ L	Con		x			WILSON G	LibD		x		
KENNEY G	Con				x	WILSON L	Ind		x		
KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD		x			YEULETT F H	Con	x			
KING S J E	Con				x	TOTAL		33	29	1	6

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 18 OCTOBER 2011
MINUTE 201a – QUESTIONS ON POLICE AUTHORITY BUSINESS**

Question from Councillor S Hoy

Thank you. I just have a quick question. The announcement about restorative justice and the way forward for the Police Service hasn't really been very clear yet and I am very concerned about it particularly with the domestic violence review that is ongoing because one of the problems with domestic violence is that it is very hard for a victim and a perpetrator to meet and when I met with Cambridge Women's Aid the women were saying that mediation doesn't work because they always feel that they are being sort of oppressed by, I suppose, the person committing the violence. So restorative justice does worry me and it is you know with regard to that case I just wondered what the Police Authority's thoughts were on that.

Question from Councillor S Tierney

Yes, thank you Chairman. I'd just like to raise the issue that there were some concerns about the way that the 999 service was performing, both with emergency calls and also non-emergency calls and I wonder if you would care to comment about whether that has been resolved and what measures are being taken to monitor the service to make sure that it is delivering a service fit for purpose.

Question from Councillor T Sadiq

I'd just like to ask a question about the Police and Crime Commissioner elections in November 2012 whether any announcements have been done as to how those elections will be managed and what the cost of those elections might be.

Reply from Councillor V Lucas on behalf of the Chairman of the Police Authority:

Thank you Chairman. First of all, Ms Rogers does send her apologies, as she does have another commitment otherwise she would have been here this evening. On the first question of restorative justice linked to domestic violence. First of all, the application of restorative justice, which is building up in terms of popularity amongst a lot of the community and particularly with Parish Councils where there has been vandalism. They like that approach, but it is only undertaken with the agreement of the victim. If the victim doesn't want restorative justice to be applied in a certain particular instance, well that's it, they will follow the normal process of carrying out a caution, prosecution or whatever the appropriate action would be. Linking then across to domestic violence, and this is something that concerns everybody both in the Authority and in the Constabulary, and we are keen to improve the performance in terms of reducing, particularly the re-offending incidents of domestic violence and to that end, rather than having isolated units dealing

with domestic violence, they are setting up a dedicated unit for, to address domestic violence incidents which will then have immediately on call, the expertise and professionalism to be able to deal with the case so that the local officer will have someone to refer to straight away. So we are looking at both those things together.

The next question with regard to the 999 and 101 calls, the 999 calls performance is extremely good within Cambridgeshire. That has not been affected at all. It was the 101 calls that started in June I think, and alongside the old and still running 0345 number, and a combination of introducing that new technology to deal with those, which was part of the cost saving measures within the Constabulary in order to try and more automate the response to the routine calls or non-emergency calls. And they admit that they went too far in terms of applying it and now they've gone the other way and the indications of the, this was looked at in the Scrutiny Committee within the Police Authority and we wanted to know exactly what they were going to be doing to address this problem and already, as a result of again reviewing the staffing of that, how it's processed, how the cover is provided, has resulted in significant improvements over this last two months. So we are almost back up to where we were before and continuing to improve. So I hope that addresses that.

Finally with the Police and Crime Commissioner, just, I think it does say in the report that the elections are now going to be in November next year. This will be a stand-alone election, and unless we have an unexpected General Election, there will be, there are no other elections planned to be taking place at that time, and the Government believes that the £150 million which I think it is going to cost to run that election is worth it in terms of increasing the accountability for the Constabulary being much closer to the community. It will be interesting to see what candidates come up for that election and I'm sure that many of you will have read about an infamous, almost, former Army Colonel who is going to be standing as a candidate in Kent. I have since been approached by a clutch of colonels in Cambridgeshire (and that was really quite difficult to get out) about the opportunities for becoming the Police and Crime Commissioner, but I can reassure the Council that as far as I know, there are no former naval captains intending to stand for the post. I hope that answers your question.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 18 OCTOBER 2011
MINUTE 201a – QUESTIONS ON FIRE AUTHORITY BUSINESS

Question from Councillor S Gymer

Can I please urge the Chair of the Fire Authority to look at the question of senior management's pay at the Fire Authority. We have no credibility if we do not look at all aspects when we come to budget cuts and also particularly the silver fleet. I am also very worried after the fire in Cottenham and the one at Madingley Hall, that took sixteen appliances from the county, that's half the appliances, to attend two fires, and taking any appliances off the route is going to make it harder for people to feel safe in their villages.

Question from Councillor N Bell

Yes, the Government has made it clear that in the event of a national emergency such as influenza for instance or another pandemic, or indeed a national strike over pensions, that there will be no MOD assistance, there will be no "Green Goddesses" (they've all been sold) that there will be no help for any Fire Service in the country and that Fire Services are expected to put their own resilience arrangements in place. Now my understanding is that at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority when we looked at this, we currently have arrangements which are simply at the moment talks with Surrey Fire and Rescue, and nothing has progressed beyond that because of one of the main problems being our size. But this seems to be a national problem amongst all Fire Services in the country, virtually. I would ask Councillor Pegram, one, to comment on our efforts at being resilient in the event of a national emergency, and the other, if in the event of a national strike over pensions which is nothing to do with us but something between the Government and employees of the Fire Service, whether we will, we should be asking for financial remuneration and assistance from the Government in that event.

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

You may, Chairman. First thing, senior management pay. Yeh, we've taken that on board, we have looked at it, along with the silver fleet which I understand could well be coming before scrutiny in the very near future, but that it is up to the Chairman of Scrutiny and nothing to do with me. As far as the sixteen appliances, yes, there were sixteen, the reason for that was you had a very hot, very large open environment on fire in the Co-op in, down the road here in Cottenham. At the same time, earlier in the afternoon, you'd had a massive, actually a very minor fire at Madingley Hall, which is a very high heritage site within the county, where breathing apparatus was once again employed and deployed.

The crew commander on the fireground decided he needed back-up on that site at Cottenham simply to ensure he had sufficient breathing apparatus available should it be required. As it was they managed to control the fire

outside of the store environment and satisfactorily didn't need all the appliances that did turn in. But they needed them as a contingency because of the breathing apparatus issues.

Councillor Bell, thank you, I had a bit of advance notice on this and I appreciate that. Due to the ongoing commitments associated with the military, we are no longer, who are no longer available to us, resilience in the face of pandemics or indeed national or local strike action is indeed an issue. In the event of strike action, the Fire and Rescue Service will be seriously depleted in terms of its ability to react to emergencies in and across the county and indeed as you pointed out, across the country. Your Fire Authority are continuing to press senior officers to engage with outside commercial agencies as well as with other Fire Brigades to secure agreement with them to assist in what is likely to be a national issue. We can only achieve this objective with co-operation and indeed collaboration, and political sign-up from all interested parties. That will ensure that we achieve a solution that is affordable through the required economies of scale – we are not big enough as a Fire Authority, as a Fire and Rescue Service within this county to afford, to be able to afford the level of resilience that would be required. We will of course continue to rely on management and the retained firefighters to supply a standard and level of service in what could be some very difficult times ahead. Thank you Chairman.

Supplementary Question from Councillor N Bell

You didn't answer the last part of my question, which was in the event of a national strike, which is no fault of the Fire Service in Cambridgeshire, but a national dispute, whether you would be recommending that we ask for money and assistance from national government.

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

We would in the, first of all Chairman, we don't incur the same level of expenditure in a strike situation because we don't pay the striking firefighters, as simple as that. So that money stays in the coffers and we deploy that for contingency cover. If however we found that we had to rely on outside agencies and there was excessive cost to the Authority, we would of course, submit an application to CLG, to central government, for recompense. Thank you Chairman.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 18 OCTOBER 2011
MINUTE 201b – ORAL QUESTION TIME**

1. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke, from Councillor P Reeve

Thank you. It's a question for the Leader of the Council. Recently, the Highways Authority put in a fantastic initiative to train up Town and Parish Councillors to do gritting and to provide, in their local areas and to provide the actual equipment for free to do it as well. A number of Ramsey Town Parish Councillors have done that including the local Mayor. Could I ask you to join me in praising them for the work they've done and also praising the Highways Authorities and you may not have the figures to hand but they are quite intrigued as to how many other town and parish councils have taken up this excellent scheme that truly is focused on localism and solving problems locally. Thank you.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke

Thank you very much Councillor Reeve. A horror came upon me that you thought I was going to go and join them at one moment there. Of course all these initiatives and this is not one that I am particularly familiar with I have to say, but these initiatives are really good and particularly when officers have come up with these ideas along with Cabinet members. And then they're taken up by local people, it makes such a difference and of course the other one of note is about the flexible speed limits in villages and there's an awful lot of interest now, and again this is just this Executive, saying we can be flexible and adapting to what people need so thank you for raising the question.

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

Thank you Chair. To some extent this is a related question, certainly building on what Councillor Clarke has just said. But the question is directed towards Councillor Criswell. He had advised in response to previous written questions I think that he would ensure that where Parish Councils implement their own schemes, the County Council would do whatever was in its power to minimise the cost that they incurred. And I would just like to first ask him how he has, how he is progressing with that, and is he confident that these costs are as low as possible.

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

Chairman. I'm not familiar with individual costs but officers are giving that advice and I understand that we can group together advertisements so we make it as cheap as possible. No further detail on that Chairman but I can report to Councillor Jenkins in the future on progress, and happy to do so.

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

I am glad that Councillor Criswell refers to advertisements. I've got a copy of a letter from an aggrieved Parish Council chair to Andrew Lansley, complaining that a £900 scheme is £150 actually implementing the scheme and £750 of advertising costs. I'm wondering if Mr Criswell, Councillor Criswell would like to go away and challenge the assumption that we have to incur such expensive advertising for road schemes, whereas for much bigger planning applications there is nothing like that expenditure.

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

I would be grateful if Councillor Jenkins would let me have a copy of that letter and would certainly be happy to follow it up. Of course we have been lobbying government to make advertising cheaper and more localised so that it will be cheaper and more reasonable for all.

3. Question to the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor David Brown from Councillor S Hoy

Will the Cabinet member for Children and Young People Services join me in publicly thanking staff from Children and Young People Services for their help in National Play Day that happened a few months ago. They all came down from the office and came to work at Waterlees adventure playground and it was a really wonderful day and over 200 children came along to the site and it was really good that staff had sort of come out of the office and helped the children in their play, so I'd like to thank them.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services, Councillor David Brown

Thank you Chairman and thank you Councillor Hoy. Obviously I'm clearly delighted to publicly record our thanks to our hard working staff, in their work, and particularly for that work at National Play Day. I think it's incumbent on all of us actually to, as Councillors, to congratulate our staff and praise them where it's right to do so. And clearly this is an occasion where it's right to do so.

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

Thank you, Chair. This is to Councillor Steve Criswell and it's in, a follow-on from David Jenkins' written question. Can he please confirm that the analysis of the 110, the Freedom bus from Histon, Impington, Cottenham to Ely on Thursdays, will just be on that route and that route alone, and will not be lumped in with the other routes locally.

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

Thank you Chairman. I'm not familiar with that individual bus service but our intention is that bus services should be looked at individually. It's a very lengthy process and officers have agreed that if we do not get responses to consultations on individual services that we find useful, then we can actively go and engage with people that use those individual services to supplement our information, so hopefully I can give Councillor Gymer assurance on that, Chairman.

Supplementary question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell, from Councillor S Gymer

It was just to say this doesn't just promote older people being able to get out. It promotes business in Ely as well.

5. Question to the Chairman of the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Fred Brown from Councillor M Williamson

Thank you, Chair. This question is addressed to Councillor Fred Brown, the Chair of the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Committee. There is a call-in debate tomorrow afternoon at which the redistribution of the LPSA Reward Grant is being discussed. I understand that Councillor Brown has decided not to permit representatives of the charities who are going to be suffering from this redistribution to speak at this meeting. And I'd like to, Councillor Brown to advise me what soundings and/or advice he took before making that decision.

Reply from the Chairman of the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Fred Brown

Yes Chairman. The basis the decision was taken on was, I looked at all of the paperwork and the discussion that took place on the actual Reward Grant process was a Cabinet discussion. That's where that should have been challenged. We are actually facing tomorrow a call-in of a Cabinet decision that has already been taken, and it's on the basis of that information that I don't believe this has got anything to do with the process that led to the award of the money coming to the Cabinet decision, so therefore it will be for the proposer and the seconder of the motion, the Cabinet representative and the Portfolio Holder, and then the Committee to decide whether that call-in discussion needs further process Chairman.

Supplementary question to the Chairman of the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Fred Brown, from Councillor M Williamson

Councillor Sadiq in fact has already mentioned this but on page 9 of the new procedure rules for Overview and Scrutiny it's very clear that there is a presumption in favour of non-members of the Committee and members of the

public being allowed to speak at Committee meetings. Could I ask Councillor Brown, in view of that, these new provisions in the rules of engagement for Overview and Scrutiny, to reconsider that decision and allow those people most directly affected by the decision to put their cases to the Scrutiny Committee.

Reply from the Chairman of the Resources and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Fred Brown

Chairman, my reading of that was that the decision that's just been reached by full Council is to be agreed, to go away and work up a scheme. Once that scheme is in place it might be a different story Chairman.

6. Question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell from Councillor T Sadiq

Thank you. This is a question to Councillor Steve Criswell. I would like to ask if you could comment on the latest provisional twelve month road casualty figures, which to the end of August show that there were 351 killed and seriously injured casualties compared to 339 last year, and for children the figure is 30 compared to 25 last year, so clearly a worrying rise in serious injuries and deaths on the roads, and I would like to ask Councillor Criswell whether he has any views on why this is happening.

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

Clearly any increase in casualties on our roads is very regrettable. There do tend to be seasonal variations although the general trend is downwards. I cannot tell Councillor Sadiq at the moment the reasons for the increase in the last year. As he may know I chair the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership and part of the work we do there will be to analyse the results, ascertain what reasons there could be behind the increase in accidents and what we can do with preventative measures, Chairman. I'm happy to get back with a written response to him when that position becomes clearer, Chairman.

Supplementary question to the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Councillor S Criswell from Councillor T Sadiq

Is it, given that there is this increase, is it therefore advisable that as I understand it the Road Safety Team, the Road Safety Service is being cut by two thirds, particularly the Road Safety Team which provides training to children in schools on road and cycling safety. Is it really advisable to be making those sort of cuts when we are seeing an increase in the casualty and deaths on the roads?

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

Chairman, I think Road Safety is something that we will embed in what we do and doesn't necessarily need a dedicated team. Obviously this regrettable increase has happened separate to any reduction in staff members so I don't see the connection there, but road safety will remain a high priority for us, we may just do it in different ways, Chairman.

7. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke from Councillor I Manning

I'll, I was going to ask a question of Councillor McGuire but given the information he gave to me earlier, I do not need to ask that now so I will ask a question of Councillor Clarke. Given the changes you made to the Constitution at the last but one Council meeting, which I believe were supposed to streamline and make the Council meetings more efficient, in the light of the fact that it is now nearly six o'clock, could you explain how you think those changes have succeeded.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke

Of course I can. It will be quite obvious to anyone I would guess that the whole time we have spent today has been about debating motions, matters of interest to this Council, that's democracy. That's absolutely fine. It is in Members' hands who sit in this Chamber how long we spend here, how many motions are put forward. That's absolutely right. The changes have also pushed things through to Cabinet and we've heard from Members here who have engaged at Cabinet and benefitted from that, absolutely right. Imagine sat here now with a fourth of another five or six papers of previous Cabinet meetings all to go through and the consequences are that Members on both sides would leave before we'd finished. And that is not good for democracy, it is not good to the people who we represent. It is absolutely the right way of doing things.

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

My only supplementary question would purely be to observe that it's still six o'clock and we're still sitting here. So I don't personally see that as a result. Could you suggest any other ways we could make these meetings more efficient?

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor N Clarke

I could Chair, but of course, I remain polite so I won't actually do that.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 18 OCTOBER 2011
WRITTEN QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

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

Regarding the current subsidised bus routes consultation:

1. what objective criteria will be used to determine whether or not a particular subsidised route is of value to the people who use it, the communities which it serves and the county at large?
2. which non-financial outputs will be considered and how will they be measured?
3. what steps will you take to look at the benefits of particular routes and thereby ensure that the merits of 'good' routes are not hidden by those of other routes?
4. how will you ensure that parameters which are used are relevant to a particular route so that the results of any evaluation are not biased by the use of national or even county standards?
5. the current survey is available on-line and as a paper document which runs to 20 pages. Given that many subsidised bus users are older people is it not possible to condense the survey to perhaps a couple of pages? Perhaps technology could be used to tailor the survey forms to particular routes.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Infrastructure, Cllr S Criswell

Thank you for your question about the current subsidised bus route consultation. May I start by clarifying that the purpose of the consultation is to inform a Community Impact Assessment which in turn will be used to help determine the outcome of the review into the bus subsidy withdrawal decision of last February.

Turning now to address your first 4 questions about the assessment of bus routes, the assessment of services will be carried out based on the scoring model agreed by Cabinet on 26th February 2008. In broad terms the methodology balances cost per passenger, patronage and social value scores to rank services and is undertaken on a service by service basis. The detail behind this methodology was included in the Cabinet Report and has previously been sent to Councillor Jenkins.

This assessment methodology is objective, includes non-financial outputs, highlights "good" routes and is route specific.

As for revising the questionnaire, I do not believe this to be appropriate. The questionnaire needs to be sent out in a consistent way for the results to be valid and it is not appropriate for us to decide which questions members of the public might not want to answer in advance.

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

Could Councillor Curtis provide details of the number of care homes and domiciliary care agencies who, since the collapse of the Southern Cross organisation, have given cause for concern on grounds of:

Safeguarding and or quality,

Financial viability or management and,

Contractual issues with the County, where applicable.

What plans exist to ensure that such concerns are monitored by members and that such information is within the public domain?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Councillor M Curtis

In July 2011, Southern Cross announced the plan to transfer the provision of care in the homes that they ran to alternative providers. Working with their landlords, Southern Cross have transferred the care provision in the 6 homes in Cambridgeshire to new providers. The transfer happened on 1 October, and care has continued to be provided by the same staff and homes managers, without disruption. Staff from the Adult Social Care Procurement and Contracts Team are visiting the homes over the next few weeks.

Since July 2011, the number of care homes and domiciliary agencies who have given cause for concern are as follows:

For safeguarding and/or quality issues

- 3 care homes, including 1 where new placements have been suspended
- 1 home care agency, with new packages suspended

Financial viability or management

- 2 care home agencies
 - 1 agency insolvent and care now provided by another home care agency
 - 1 contract withdrawn due to management/organisational failings and care now provided by another home care agency

Note. Both these agencies were quite new in providing home care services in Cambridgeshire and had less than 50 service users each.

Contractual issues with the County

- None

In addition, there are ongoing concerns that arose before July 2011 with 2 home care agencies and 7 care homes (Of the care homes, 2 are no longer used, 3 have new placements suspended).

Officers from the County Council and Cambridgeshire Community Services continue to monitor the quality of services provided and progress against improvement action plans agreed with providers.

To ensure that Members are able to monitor concerns about providers, the Service Director, Strategy and Commissioning, (Adult Social Care) will be providing the portfolio holder and other lead members for adult social care a confidential monthly update on concerns, that will be issued at the end of each month. This information will not be made available in the public domain because of commercial sensitivity. However, concerns about quality of care including safeguarding concerns are shared with the Care Quality Commission (CQC), and contribute to their judgements about services. CQC now publish press releases when they issue a formal warning to the owners of any care home or home care agency.

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

Cycle training for primary schools has been offered for many years through the County Council's Safer Cycling programme, in which local volunteers are trained up by the County Safer Cycling Team to deliver training to Year Six pupils. There has been no cost to schools. Often the volunteers are school teachers themselves.

During the years of government funding for Cambridge Cycling Town, an additional option of 'Bikeability' training has been available for schools in Cambridge and within the six mile radius of Cambridge Cycling Town. Bikeability is professionally run and involves a higher standard of training. Now, Bikeability is available to all primary schools in Cambridgeshire, and full funding is available from central government.

At the start of this school year, primary schools have received a letter from the County Council offering two types of cycle training for Year Six pupils – Safer Cycling, and Bikeability, both at a cost of £15 per head.

Schools have said they find the letter confusing and inadequate because: 1) the basis for the charge is unclear 2) the distinctions and advantages of the two types of training are unclear and 3) schools cannot afford the cost of £15 per head and may not take up either option.

Can the Cabinet member explain the charging system and why Bikeability training, fully funded by government, is being offered with a charge payable to County Council?

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

I am pleased to provide further information, which I hope will clarify the County Council's plans for the future delivery of child cycle training services in Cambridgeshire schools from September 2011.

For over 30 years, the Cambridgeshire County Council has successfully funded and delivered, free of charge, its own cycle training scheme *Safer Cycling* to the county's 10/11 years olds.

Approximately 4,000 primary school pupils are trained each year by an army of local volunteer instructors, e.g. parents, school staff, etc. This is the single, determining factor in the success of Cambridgeshire's cycle training scheme, compared to other schemes.

Discussions about the County Council's longer term ability to continue funding the delivery of free child cycle training, have been ongoing, since 2009. This was due to:

- (a) the longer term budget pressures facing the Council
- (b) the advent of the *Bikeability* national standards training scheme and the opportunity provided by the Cambridge Cycling Demonstration Town (CDT) project, for the Council to trial free *Bikeability* training, in the city schools, funded by the Department for Transport (DfT) *Bikeability* Grant.

This has now been successfully delivered in the CDT area schools, at similar levels of training to that in the *Safer Cycling* scheme, which has continued in the remainder of the county.

Since 2009, increasing budget pressures have meant that the Council now has to offset some of its operational costs, including those for the provision of cycle training, through income generation.

As outlined in Cambridgeshire County Council's Integrated Plan 2011 – 2014, child cycle training has to be deliverable at a neutral cost to the Council, within the next couple of years. We are currently in a transitional period working towards this. For now, the Road Safety Service has a base budget for staff costs, but this will be phased out, as part of this process.

Despite the funding challenges, the Council remains committed to maintaining access to child cycle training in all Primary schools. In recognition of the success of both the *Bikeability* and the *Safer Cycling* schemes, we are now offering schools the option of participating in either scheme.

The funds required to achieve this will be found from a combination of the introduction of small school training charge, (approximately £150 per school) reduced County Council budget and the DfT *Bikeability* Grant. Both training schemes will be charged at the same price, to contribute towards our administration costs.

Training charges for all cycle training courses will be billed directly to the school, as a school activity. It will then be up to the individual schools to decide how much, if any, of the training charge they might wish/need to pass onto parents/guardians. Any potential individual pupil hardship issues will obviously be part of the school decision making process, which schools are best placed to make.

Our proposed training charge is at the lower end of the range of charges, currently being levied by other authorities. Their experience has shown a short term reduction in participation of around 10-20%, following the introduction of charging, but that this recovered within 1-2 years. We will closely monitor the impact in Cambridgeshire and would hope to manage any negative effects accordingly.

In time, we may well want to move towards 'in-house' delivery of 'Bikeability', which may allow us to reduce overall costs, in which case we would be able to reconsider the level of the training charge.

The 'Bikeability' Grant is protected until 2015 by the current coalition Government. With no reassurance it will continue beyond then, the Council is working towards a cost effective way to deliver cycle training, should the grant cease.

Our new approach means that schools are now able to choose which training scheme best suits their needs. We are currently consulting with schools to identify the exact demand for either cycle training scheme next academic year.

I believe our new approach is the most viable way for the Council to sustain affordable child cycle training in the long term.

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 CHutton	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) 8. Cllr P Sales (L)
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 <i>Bonus Sub-Committee</i>	4 As required	3 1	1. Cllr S Count (C) 2. Cllr J Reynolds (C) 3. Cllr D Jenkins (LD) 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)

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