

County Council: Minutes

Please note the meeting can be viewed here:
[Recording of the County Council Meeting](#)

Date: Tuesday 9th February 2021

Time: 10:30am – 16.00pm

Present:

Councillor M McGuire (Chairman)

Councillor L Every (Vice-Chairwoman)

D Ambrose Smith	D Giles	L Nethsingha
B Ashwood	M Goldsack	L Nieto
A Bailey	J Gowing	K Reynolds
H Batchelor	L Harford	C Richards
I Bates	N Harrison	T Rogers
C Boden	A Hay	T Sanderson
A Bradnam	R Hickford	J Schumann
S Bywater	M Howell	J Scutt
D Connor	S Hoy	M Shuter
A Costello	P Hudson	M Shellens
S Count	B Hunt	M Smith
S Crawford	D Jenkins	A Taylor
S Criswell	L Jones	S Taylor
K Cuffley	N Kavanagh	S Tierney
P Downes	S Kindersley	S van de Ven
L Dupré	S King	J Whitehead
J French	I Manning	G Wilson
R Fuller	P McDonald	J Wisson
I Gardener	E Meschini	T Wotherspoon

Apologies for Absence:

Apologies were received from Councillors David Wells and John Williams.

254. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 15th December 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th December 2020 were approved as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman when the Council returned to its offices.

255. Chairman's Announcements

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

256. Declarations of Interest

The Chairman reported that the Deputy Monitoring Officer had exercised her discretion to grant a dispensation to all elected members of Cambridgeshire County Council taking part in the debate on the Council's Business Plan.

There were no other declarations of interest under the Code of Conduct.

257. Public Question Time

The Chairman reported that one question had been received from a member of the public, as set out in Appendix B.

258. Petitions

The Chairman reported that no petitions had been received from members of the public.

259. Audit and Accounts Committee Annual Report 2019-20

The Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee, Councillor Shellens, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2019-20. Council noted his thanks to members of the Committee and officers for their support.

Council noted the report.

260. Council's Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2021-22 to 2025-26

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor McGuire, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman of Council, Councillor Every, and resolved unanimously to suspend any standing orders in connection with the Business Plan debate in order to accommodate a procedure agreed by the Council's Group Leaders.

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hickford, that the recommendations from the General Purposes Committee as set out on pages 9 to 10 of the Council agenda be approved.

The Chairman invited the Leaders of the Groups to make their opening statements on the Business Plan. In their speeches Group Leaders paid tribute to the hard work undertaken by all officers during such unprecedented times.

The Chairman then opened the debate on all sections of the Business Plan and invited amendments to the overall budget proposals.

Councillor Count moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Hickford as set out in Appendix C.

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

[The voting record is included at Appendix D].

Councillor Nethsingha moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Dupré as set out in Appendix E.

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

[The voting record is included at Appendix F].

Councillor Meschini moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Kavanagh as set out in Appendix G.

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

[The voting record is included at Appendix H].

In opening the debate on the main Business Plan, the Chairman invited all Policy and Service Committee Chairmen/women to speak if they so wished.

Following further discussion, the substantive motion on being put to the vote was carried as set out in the voting record at Appendix I.

It was resolved to:

1. Approve the Business Plan, including supporting budget, business cases, Transformation Fund Bids, consultation responses and other material, in light of all the planning activities undertaken to date.
- 2.a Approve the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan, to be balanced and amended with the following adjustments:

Revised budget gap as proposed £000		2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
		9,612	17,637	12,884	13,638	10,611
Permanent change by year £000		2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
b	Footpaths and pavements – revenue investment	-	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
c	Footpaths – revenue impact of capital investment (if 100% CCC funded)	+36	+161	+117	+73	+30
d	B1050 – design costs	+170	-170	-	-	-
e	B1050 – revenue impact of capital investment (if 100% CCC funded) <i>[based on an indicative estimate prior to design works]</i>		+61	+228	-3	-3
f	Flood attenuation and biodiversity– verges, gullies, grips: permanent investment; developing local flood resilience, targeted alleviation works, supporting community alerts and improving information access.	+1,090	-680	-	-	-
Revised revenue budget gap after investments		10,908	18,009	14,229	14,708	11,638
<i>Financing adjustments</i>						
g	Application of remaining MRP policy review benefit	-4,115	+590	+565	+542	+529
h	Revise Council Tax policy to +1.99% general & +1.00 % ASC precept	-3,026	-191	-107	-109	-137
i	Application of transformation funding to address remaining gap	-3,767	+3,767	-	-	-
Revised budget gap after financing adjustments		0	22,175	14,687	15,141	12,030

- 2.j Approve a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £888,457,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.1 of the Business Plan, including a levy of £9,246,000 payable to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for the delivery of Transport Services and a levy of £433,000 payable to the Environment Agency for flood and coastal schemes.
- 2.k That Approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £323,810,193.33, as set out in Section 2, Table 6.3 of the Business Plan (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995).
- 2.l Approve a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of “Band D” equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils

(231,331.0), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 1% ASC precept increase and a 1.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	933.18
B	7/9	1,088.71
C	8/9	1,244.24
D	9/9	1,399.77
E	11/9	1,710.83
F	13/9	2,021.89
G	15/9	2,332.95
H	18/9	2,799.54

3. Approve the Capital Strategy as set out in Section 6 of the Business Plan including:

- Commitments from schemes already approved,
- Expenditure on new schemes in 2021-22 shown in summary in Section 2, Table 6.7 of the Business Plan.

And increase the current capital programme as follows:

- Invest a total of £10m in Footpaths and Pavements between 2021-22 and 2024-25 to maintain a combined annual capital and revenue investment of £4m
- Invest £6.8m in improvements to the B1050

4. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in Section 7 of the Business Plan, including:

- i. The Council's policy on the making of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) for the repayment of debt, as required by the Local Authorities (Capital Finance & Accounting) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.
- ii. The Affordable Borrowing Limit for 2021- 22 (as required by the Local Government Act 2003).
- iii. The Investment Strategy for 2021-22 as required by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) revised Guidance on Local Government Investments issued in 2018, and the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 3 of Section 7 of the Business Plan.

5. Authorise the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make technical revisions to the Business Plan, including the foregoing recommendations to the County Council, so as to take into account any changes deemed appropriate. This includes updated information on District Council Tax Base and Collection Funds, Business Rates forecasts and Collection Funds and any grant changes, as well as appending the agreed budget submitted by the Greater Cambridge Partnership, in the County Council's role as the host authority.

- (a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Council Procedure Rule 9.1)

One question was submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.1 of the Council's Constitution as set out in Appendix J.

- (b) Written Questions (Council Procedure Rule 9.2)

Three questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2, as set out in Appendix K.

262. Appointment of Director of Resources and Section 151 officer

The Chairman accepted the Appointment of Director of Resources and Section 151 Officer report as a late report on the following grounds:

1. Reason for lateness: The appointment was only made by the Staffing and Appeals Committee on 4 February 2021.
2. Reason for urgency: To enable all Members to be made aware of the appointment.

It was moved by the Chairman of the Staffing and Appeals Committee, Councillor Schumann, and seconded by Councillor Hudson that the recommendation from the Staffing and Appeals Committee be noted.

It was resolved unanimously to:

note the appointment of Tom Kelly to this statutory role.

Chairman

County Council – 9th February 2021

Chairman's Announcements

People

Sandra Manning, Librarian

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the death of Sandra Manning who was a Librarian in Papworth Everard and passed away peacefully on the 27th of October 2020 in the Arthur Rank Hospice with her family around her. She was diagnosed with stage 4 bowel cancer in July 2017 and fought the illness very bravely for the past three and a half years.

Sandra worked at Papworth Library since 2001 as the Library Supervisor and enjoyed helping the younger generations to discover reading, organising the summer read every year, as well as teaching the older generations to get online. Sandra was a wife, a mother, a lover of books, creative arts, music, and cake decoration perfectionist and will be dearly missed by all.

The Council's thoughts are with her family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

Captain Sir Tom Moore

Captain Sir Tom Moore sadly died in hospital aged 100 after testing positive for coronavirus. Sir Tom's fundraising efforts raised more than £32m for the NHS, walking 100 laps of his garden before his 100th birthday during the first national lockdown in April. Sir Tom had a link with Cambridgeshire as the managing director of March Concrete Products Limited in the 1980s.

The Council's thoughts are with his family, and friends at this very sad time.

Awards

Queen's Nurse

Shaynie Larwood-Smith who leads the County Council Traveller health team (which sits within the Public Health directorate) was appointed the status of Queen's Nurse. Queen Nurse title is available to individual nurses who have demonstrated a high level of commitment to patient care and nursing practice. Being a Queen's Nurse has put Shaynie in touch with a country wide network of community nurses. Many of these work in inclusion health and as such are an invaluable resource for her work with Gypsy & Travellers. Being part of the Queens Nurse network has also brought recognition for Shaynie's work with Gypsies & Travellers. This has led to her being contacted by other professionals within both inclusion health and mainstream health and professional publications about the work of the Traveller Health Team. Most recently this has been around managing the response to Covid-19 in a culturally appropriate & empowering way.

Messages

The COVID-19 vaccination programme

The COVID-19 vaccination programme – the biggest in NHS history – is well underway. In Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, we now have 23 Primary Care Vaccination Sites, four large

scale Vaccination Centres, with two more opening this week, and two Pharmacy Vaccination Sites, as well as our hospital sites. The rollout of the vaccination programme in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is on track to offer vaccinations to the top four priority cohorts by the middle of February. Thousands of vulnerable local people have already received their first vaccination, with thousands more being vaccinated every day.

In total up to the 31st January, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care System had delivered a total of 153,641 vaccination doses in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. 88.2% of our over 80 population had had their first dose, with 92.9% of all residents between 75-79 having received theirs. Our area is now performing well for vaccinations in both a regional and national context.

Detailed information about the local vaccination programme and vaccination sites is available on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group website.

Chairman's Commendation Scheme

Earlier last year the Chairman announced a monthly scheme to celebrate the fantastic work of those who have gone above and beyond in supporting their local communities since lockdown began in March 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The scheme was to initially run for at least six months, but as sadly we are still in the middle of the pandemic, the Chairman has taken the decision to increase the commendation scheme for a further three months to the end of April 2021, so that we can continue to recognise those from our local communities who continue to provide so much support.

The Chairman was delighted to issue a further 8 certificates during December and January to individuals, businesses, and community groups in recognition for their excellent work throughout the Covid-19 pandemic. Full details of each Member's nomination can be seen here [Chairman's Commendation Scheme - Cambridgeshire County Council](#)

County Council Public Question Time – 9th February 2021

Public Question No.1

Question from Dr Alexandra Bulat

Thank you very much Chairman, I hope you can hear me well. Good morning. I would like to ask a question about the future of The Fields Children's Centre in Cambridge, Abbey Ward. This centre is at the heart of the Abbey community and essential for many families and their children in early years. But the recent restructuring and changes have had a tangible impact on both parents and children. There are many concerns amongst residents about the future of the children's centre. So, I would like to ask what steps is the County Council taking to ensure that the services provided by The Fields can, and will, be maintained as a state-funded nursery school in the long term, without negatively affecting families in Abbey. Thank you.

Response from Councillor Simon Bywater, Chairman of Children and Young People Committee

Thank you for the question Dr Bulat. [Excuse me while I just change screens here.] The Fields Child and Family Centre contains both the maintained nursery school which offers early year education and childcare for children aged 2-4 and the child and family centre who run a combination of both universal and targeted services for families living in the Abbey Ward. These services are delivered in partnership with health visitors, midwives, local authority colleagues, local voluntary organisations, and Job Centre Plus. Until August 2019, The Fields also ran a Bay Nursery for children aged 0-2 years. Regrettably, the governors had to take the decision to close it due to financial pressures. As is often the case in areas of deprivation, the Senior Team was unable to strike the balance between the levels of fees it needed to charge to be viable, whilst still being affordable for parents. We recognise that it has been a very difficult time for children, families and staff as recent changes have taken affect at The Fields Nursery School with a reduction to the number of staff. These changes were, however, necessary due to the closure of the childcare provision for the under-2 age group. Along with the increasing financial pressures faced by experienced by maintained nursery schools nationwide. Council continues to work collaboratively with the Senior Management and Leadership Team and the governing body of The Fields to review its financial position and identify what steps are necessary in order to ensure that the provision remains sustainable in the longer term. The council is fully supportive of the nursery school's decision to federate with the Brunswick Nursery School and College Nursery School which would enable resources to be shared and new members of staff to work across all three sites, leading to further cost efficiencies. In addition to this, a feasibility study has been commissioned by the council, following the restructure of staff to ensure that the use of space is maximised, and to identify any other usage for surface areas of the building which would provide additional income to the nursery school and improve its financial position. Thank you, Chairman.

Supplementary question from Dr Alexandra Bulat

Thank you very much for your answer recognising that it has been very difficult for families in Abbey, but I'm afraid all the residents still remain very concerned that The Field has lost a third of its staff and over twenty places during this pandemic. So, especially in the context that one in five children in Abbey live in poverty. So, my follow up, very quick follow up, because I have a lot of questions. One follow up is, will the fact there is supplementary funding for state-maintained

nursey schools is only guaranteed, as I understand it, for just a few months, will the county council actually make it a priority to seek a commitment from, a further commitment from, central government to actually enable all nurseries to plan ahead, instead of just having to deal with crisis management and urgent situations. Thank you.

Response from Councillor Simon Bywater, Chairman of Children and Young People Committee

Thank you for the supplementary question. As you know, it is government funded. Sadly, there is only guaranteed that for another year. It is a frustration that we all have at the local authority in relation to long-term planning for our maintained nursery schools. Let me just reassure you that the local authority will continue to offer support where and when it can, and I am happy to take further questions and meet you outside of this meeting to continue the discussion. Thank you, Chairman.

County Council- 9th February 2021

Agenda Item No. 7 – Council's Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2021-22 to 2025-26 – Conservative Amendment

Proposals:

The Conservatives have worked hard throughout the year to show leadership, and engendered cross-party co-operation to deliver a forward looking, ambitious and balanced budget. Most of the budget proposals, we have been able to constructively deliver in this way.

This Conservative Budget Amendment, continues to deliver on the Conservative manifesto promises, residents' aspirations and prudent financial management, which we committed to, when residents put the Conservatives back in control of the council in 2017.

Our Conservative proposals are based on the fundamentals below.

- 1) To deliver our services effectively, efficiently and with good outcomes
- 2) To deliver enhanced services or additional outcomes that our residents have made plain they require from us
- 3) To balance the above two demands with a commitment to do everything possible to minimise the financial burden on our residents

Delivering our services effectively, efficiently and with good outcomes

Our benchmarking from external independent sources, shows that we are a low-cost authority with good outcomes. In terms of efficiency our total net service expenditure is £155 a head less than the county average. Cambridgeshire County Council delivers its services per capita at approximately £100million less a year than the County average. Additionally, we continue to campaign for fairer funding, because quite staggeringly; if Cambridgeshire residents received the same core funding allocation as London residents, this Council would receive an additional £132m per year.

Delivering enhanced services or additional outcomes that our residents have made plain they require from us

Some previous examples, when our residents said spend more on highways, we listened: In 2018/2019 we added £18m to the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), increasing the revenue budget, and made a further investment of £6.366m in 2020/2021. When our residents asked us to accelerate our plans to achieve Carbon Net Zero, we allocated £16m on making buildings more efficient, and enabling the changeover to electric vehicles.

To be clear, the Conservatives in just two budget areas, proposed in the last two years, allocated and voted through £34m to improve our roads, verges, pavements and towards our environment strategy, all of which the major opposition parties have argued and voted against.

Today, having listened to the concerns of our residents, we propose to invest a further £29.7 million in Cambridgeshire Highways over the MTFS 2021 - 2026

- £20 million extra for footpath maintenance
- £2.73 million extra for flood attenuation and improving our biodiversity.
- £6.97 million in improvements to the B1050

Absolute investment levels: year-by-year (capital and revenue)

2021-26 Conservative Budget Proposals	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	Total
Footpaths and Pavements	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	20,000
B1050 Improvements	170	6,800				6,970
Flood Attenuation and Biodiversity	1,090	410	410	410	410	2,730
Total Additional Investment	5,260	11,210	4,410	4,410	4,410	29,700

Balancing the above two demands with a commitment to do everything possible to minimise the financial burden on our residents

Now more than ever we need to concentrate on keeping the burden of Tax as low as possible for our residents. The Coronavirus pandemic has impacted on our residents and their families, our way of life and the local as well as national economy. To automatically inflict the maximum possible increase, of 4.99% is unthinkable to us as Conservatives. We have therefore made a carefully calculated decision to balance the budget gap for next year of £9,612,000 by:

- Halting all further top-ups to the Transformation Fund from the Councils MRP policy immediately, releasing £4.115m revenue in 2021/22.
- Redeploying Council Taxpayers' money from the Transformation Fund for one year, so that our residents don't have to pay £3.767m extra in Council Tax in 2021/22

The Conservative group, having delivered on our promises, our priorities and exhausted all other prudent financial measures, also accept as a last resort, we must recommend to Council that it:

- Balances the remaining budget gap by setting the Adult Social Care Precept at 1.00% and Council Tax at 1.99%

Proposed by Councillor Count, Seconded by Councillor Hickford

2. ~~Receives the following recommendations to Council:~~

- Replace recommendations 2a, 2b and 2c as follows:**

- | Revised budget gap as proposed £000 | | 2021-22 | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | 2025-26 |
|---|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | 9,612 | 17,637 | 12,884 | 13,638 | 10,611 |
| Permanent change by year £000 | | 2021-22 | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | 2025-26 |
| b | Footpaths and pavements – revenue investment | - | +1,000 | +1,000 | +1,000 | +1,000 |
| c | Footpaths – revenue impact of capital investment (if 100% CCC funded) | +36 | +161 | +117 | +73 | +30 |
| d | B1050 – design costs | +170 | -170 | - | - | - |
| e | B1050 – revenue impact of capital investment (if 100% CCC funded)
<i>[based on an indicative estimate prior to design works]</i> | | +61 | +228 | -3 | -3 |
| f | Flood attenuation and biodiversity– verges, gullies, grips: permanent investment; developing local flood resilience, targeted alleviation works, supporting community alerts and improving information access. | +1,090 | -680 | - | - | - |
| Revised revenue budget gap after investments | | 10,908 | 18,009 | 14,229 | 14,708 | 11,638 |
| | <i>Financing adjustments</i> | | | | | |

g	Application of remaining MRP policy review benefit	-4,115	+590	+565	+542	+529
h	Revise Council Tax policy to +1.99% general & +1.00 % ASC precept	-3,026	-191	-107	-109	-137
i	Application of transformation funding to address remaining gap	-3,767	+3,767	-	-	-
Revised budget gap after financing adjustments		0	22,175	14,687	15,141	12,030

- 2j Approve a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £888,457,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.1 of the Business Plan, including a levy of £9,246,000 payable to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for the delivery of Transport Services and a levy of £433,000 payable to the Environment Agency for flood and coastal schemes.**
- 2k Approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £323,810,193.33, as set out in Section 2, Table 6.3 of the Business Plan (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995).**
- 2l Approve a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of “Band D” equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (231,331.0), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 1% ASC precept increase and a 1.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:**

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	933.18
B	7/9	1,088.71
C	8/9	1,244.24
D	9/9	1,399.77
E	11/9	1,710.83
F	13/9	2,021.89
G	15/9	2,332.95
H	18/9	2,799.54

3 Increase the current capital programme by adding the following to recommendation 3:

- **Invest a total of £10m in Footpaths and Pavements between 2021-22 and 2024-25 to maintain a combined annual capital and revenue investment of £4m**
- **Invest £6.8m in improvements to the B1050**

Agenda Item No. 7 – Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2020-21 to 2024-25

Recorded Vote for Conservative Amendment – proposed by Councillor Count

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote		COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote
AMBROSE-SMITH D	Con	X					JENKINS D	Lib Dem		X		
ASHWOOD B	Lib Dem		X				JONES L	Lab		X		
BAILEY A	Con	X					KAVANAGH N	Lab		X		
BATCHELOR H	Lib Dem		X				KINDERSLEY S	Lib Dem		X		
BATES I C	Con	X					KING S	Con	X			
BODEN C	Con	X					MANNING I	Lib Dem		X		
BRADNAM A	Lib Dem		X				MCDONALD P	Lib Dem		X		
BYWATER S	Con	X					MCGUIRE L W	Con	X			
CONNOR D	Con	X					MESCHINI E	Lab		X		
COSTELLO A	Con	X					NETHSINGHA L	Lib Dem		X		
COUNT S	Con	X					NIETO L	Con	X			
CRAWFORD S	Ind		X				REYNOLDS K	Con	X			
CRISWELL S J	Con	X					RICHARDS C	Lab		X		
CUFFLEY K	Con	X					ROGERS T	Con	X			
DOWNES P J	Lib Dem		X				SANDERSON T	Ind			X	
DUPRE L	Lib Dem		X				SCHUMANN J	Con	X			
EVERY L	Con	X					SCUTT J	Lab		X		
FRENCH J	Con	X					SHELLENS M	Lib Dem		X		
FULLER R	Con	X					SHUTER M	Con	X			
GARDENER I	Con	X					SMITH M	Con	X			
GILES D	Ind			X			TAYLOR A	Lib Dem		X		
GOLDSACK M	Con	X					TAYLOR S	Ind		X		
GOWING J	Con	X					TIERNEY S	Con	X			
HARFORD L	Con	X					VAN DE VEN S	Lib Dem		X		
HARRISON N	Lib Dem		X				WELLS D	Con				X
HAY A	Con	X					WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HICKFORD R	Con	X					WILLIAMS J	Lib Dem				X
HOWELL M	Con	X					WILSON G	Lib Dem		X		
HOY S	Con	X					WISSON J	Con	X			
HUDSON P	Con	X					WOTHERSPOON T	Con	X			
HUNT W T I	Con	X					Total		34	23	2	2

Note – the electronic polling system did not work for Councillor Bates so he gave his vote orally before the poll closed

County Council: 9th February 2021

Agenda Item No. 7 –Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2021-22 to 2025-26 – Liberal Democrats Amendment

Proposals:

This year has been an extraordinary year both for this Council and for the residents of Cambridgeshire.

When the Council set its budget last year, no-one could have predicted just how significantly the virus which had arrived here in January would affect our lives. A year on, while we know that Covid-19 has had a catastrophic impact for the last twelve months, we cannot tell what the impact of this combined with Brexit will be for the coming year, or what the scale of the ongoing damage to our local economy will be.

In a state of extreme national and local uncertainty, with more uncertainty to come, this Council must set a budget which is prudent, but which also allows us to build back stronger and better in the coming years.

Our priorities for this Council are therefore focused on four key issues.

Communities

Over the last year, residents across Cambridgeshire have come together in amazing acts of mutual support. Council staff and many councillors have been among those at the forefront of these activities, many of which have been publicly recognised through the Chairman’s Commendation Scheme.

Communities have been hard hit and placed under pressure, at a time when they have already experienced Conservative cuts to children’s centres, and the long slow decline of youth services and public transport. The pandemic has added pressure for parents home-schooling their children, with young people and many adults experiencing anxiety and poor mental health.

This Council needs to use its budget to help local people rebuild and strengthen their local communities, in a way that increases fairness and equality of opportunity across our county. That is why we propose to invest £600,000 this coming year, £1.2M the following year, and £2M in subsequent years, in universal community support services across the county, working with partner councils to increase this provision where we can. This new community support will be based in libraries, children’s centres and other local facilities and will work with existing local groups and organisations to help our communities build back better. Regular local youth centres, where young people know they can drop in and talk to an adult they know, who is not from their school or their family, have been shown to have a beneficial impact on young people’s mental health. Such support is also of great value to vulnerable adults, which is why this new additional help will be there for the whole community.

Jobs

Small and medium sized businesses in Cambridgeshire have been hit hard by the double whammy of the pandemic and Brexit. The impact on jobs and training places for young people has been disproportionate.

South Cambridgeshire District Council has shown just how effective business support can be, and how crucial it is in the current nightmare environment for many small and medium enterprises.

To ensure that the Council is ready to play its part in a strong - and green - economic recovery, this proposal seeks to establish a programme of work which will ensure that Cambridgeshire is well placed to take advantage of the £3bn green investment package promised by Government; target support to those small and medium enterprises which are focused on sustainability and green recovery; invest in green jobs and particularly green apprenticeships; encourage a more diverse, local and sustainable supply base, making it easier for new entrants such as small businesses and voluntary, charitable and social enterprises to compete and win public contracts; and identify and support the businesses, projects and people who are invested in a long term, green and sustainable recovery.

That is why we propose to invest £200,000 this coming year, and £400,000 in the following and subsequent years to coordinate support for small businesses, in particular focusing on coordinating work between businesses and FE colleges to increase the number of apprenticeships available to young people in the area. This investment will establish and resource a programme which links commercial, procurement, recovery, and green initiatives, working closely with the Combined Authority, district councils, and partners across the system.

Climate change

The pandemic must not mean that we slow our commitment to dealing with the climate crisis. 2020 was one of the hottest years on record, and the three hottest years on record have all been in the past five years. Fires and temperatures of over 35 degrees in the Arctic demonstrate that combatting climate change is more urgent than ever. Closer to home, flooding and extreme weather has taken its toll on our own communities.

The council has already made commitments to tackling the climate emergency, supporting schools and other organisations to make the transition to cleaner heating. We need to expand that work and increase its pace, backing more projects such as the one in Swaffham Prior, so that more communities are able to invest in a green future.

We need to contribute to the aim of doubling nature and increasing biodiversity, as well as addressing the carbon emissions from Cambridgeshire's peatlands and the potential to turn this carbon source into a powerful carbon sink.

That is why we propose to invest a further £400,000 this coming year, and £800,000 in subsequent years in green energy for schools and other public buildings; and a further £200,000 this coming year, and £400,000 in subsequent years, to work with the Council's County Parks teams and with tenants of the County Farms estate to identify areas of land which could contribute to this ambition.

Highways

Across Cambridgeshire residents are frustrated and angry at the state of local roads, drains, and gullies, with dangerous potholes which reappear only weeks after they have been filled, and blocked gullies leading to damage to homes and commercial premises. The Conservative administration has proved utterly incapable of keeping roads, pavements, cycleways, and verges in a reasonable state. We will make the maximum possible investment now and look to radical reform under a Liberal Democrat-led or influenced administration in future years.

We also continue to believe that young people need safer travel to school, and to be empowered to make their own decisions about better road safety, and healthier and more sustainable lifestyles.

That is why we propose to invest an additional £5M a year for two years, then £500,000 in year three, and £400,000 for the final two years of the Medium Term Financial Strategy, to improve the condition of our roads, pavements, and cycleways, and ensure local drains are kept clear; and £40,000 in each of the coming five years to expand the Junior Travel Ambassadors scheme, demand for which has outstripped the funds available.

Finally

The Liberal Democrats have consistently objected to the level of waste and duplication in this Council, especially now that the Mayor's Combined Authority has taken over so much of the Council's role. Conservatives both in Westminster and on this Council are cutting services for some of our most vulnerable citizens, while at the same time wasting money on excessive committees and unjustifiable roles. A huge number of Conservative councillors receive substantial special allowances.

The Council must work harder and more efficiently for its residents. That's why we would save £105,000 each year by cutting spending on Councillor SRAs.

Our alternative budget reduces waste and duplication, while investing in the key priorities of highway safety, active travel, community and business support, and investment to tackle the climate emergency.

Our budget amendment this year balances the need to invest in the recovery of our communities after the devastation of the pandemic, Brexit, and years of Conservative cuts, with the recognition that family incomes are also under pressure. Our proposals would mean a two person household in a Band D property (i.e. above average house value) would face an increase in Council Tax of 39p a week more than the existing proposals. Single person households, students and those on benefits would pay half or less than half of that. At a time when the vulnerable have suffered most, we must make sure our communities get the support they need to rebuild.

Amendment to Substantive Motion

Proposed by Councillor Nethsingha, Seconded by Councillor Dupré

Replace recommendations 2 and 3 as follows:

- 2a Approve the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan, to be balanced and amended with the following adjustments:**

<i>Revised budget gap as proposed £000</i>		2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
		0	22,175	14,687	15,141	12,030
Permanent change by year £000		2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
b	Footpaths and pavements—revenue investment	-	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
c	Footpaths—revenue impact of capital investment (if 100% CCC funded)	+36	+161	+117	+73	+30
d	B1050—design costs	+170	-170	-	-	-
e	B1050—revenue impact of capital investment (if 100% CCC funded)		+61	+228	-3	-3
f	Flood attenuation and biodiversity—verges, gullies, grips	+1,090	-680	-	-	-
Revised budget gap after Conservative commitments removed		-1,296	21,803	13,342	14,071	11,003
b	Community Support Hubs	+600	+600	+800	-	-
c	Green apprenticeships and support for businesses	+200	+200	-	-	-
d	Junior Travel Ambassadors	+40	-	-	-	-
e	Green Investment (capital impact on revenue)	+4	+20	+34	+34	+33
f	Roads, pavements and cycleways improvement and enhancement (capital impact on revenue)	+45	+213	+170	+16	+12
g	Increasing biodiversity (capital impact on revenue)	+2	+10	+17	+17	+16
h	Reduction in Councillors' Special Responsibility Allowances	-105	-	-	-	-
Revised budget gap after investments and savings		-510	22,846	14,363	14,138	11,064
<i>Financing adjustments</i>						
j	ASC precept at 1.50% rather than 1.00% for 2021/22	-1,543	-87	-43	-65	-47
k	Revise 2022-23 Council tax policy to +1.99% general and +1.5% ASC precept	-	-4,788	-317	-153	-185

l	Revise 2023-26 Council tax policy to +1.99% general and +1.0% ASC precept	-	-	-3,332	-3,711	-3,976
m	Reduction in use of one-off transformation funding to address remaining budget gap	2,053	-2,053	-	-	-
Revised budget gap after financing adjustments		0	15,918	10,671	10,209	6,856

- 2n Approve a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £890,039,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.1 of the Business Plan, including a levy of £9,246,000 payable to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for the delivery of Transport Services and a levy of £433,000 payable to the Environment Agency for flood and coastal schemes.**
- 2o Approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £325,392,497.92, as set out in Section 2, Table 6.3 of the Business Plan (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995).**
- 2p Approve a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of “Band D” equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (231,331.0), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 1.5% ASC precept increase and a 1.99% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:**

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	937.74
B	7/9	1,094.03
C	8/9	1,250.32
D	9/9	1,406.61
E	11/9	1,719.19
F	13/9	2,031.77
G	15/9	2,344.35
H	18/9	2,813.22

3. Amend recommendation 3 and Increase the current capital programme by the addition of the following items

- ~~Invest a total of £10m in Footpaths and Pavements between 2021-22 and 2024-25 to maintain a combined annual capital and revenue investment of £4m~~
- ~~Invest £6.8m in improvements to the B1050~~
- Invest a total of £11.3m in Roads, Pavements and Cycleways; £5m per year in 2021-22 and 2022-23, £0.5m in 2023-24 and £0.4m in 2024-25 and 2025-26.
- Invest grant funding, in addition, into Cambridgeshire’s highways, pursuant to allocations and conditions awaited from government.

- **Invest £0.2m in biodiversity projects in 2021-22 and £0.4m per year from 2022-23 to 2025-26**
- **Invest £0.4m in green energy for schools and other organisations in 2021-22 and £0.8m per year from 2022-23 to 2025-26**

Agenda Item No. 7 – Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2020-21 to 2024-25

Recorded Vote for Liberal Democrat Amendment – proposed by Councillor Nethsingha

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote
AMBROSE-SMITH D	Con		X			JENKINS D	Lib Dem	X			
ASHWOOD B	Lib Dem	X				JONES L	Lab		X		
BAILEY A	Con		X			KAVANAGH N	Lab		X		
BATCHELOR H	Lib Dem	X				KINDERSLEY S	Lib Dem	X			
BATES I C	Con		X			KING S	Con		X		
BODEN C	Con		X			MANNING I	Lib Dem	X			
BRADNAM A	Lib Dem	X				MCDONALD P	Lib Dem	X			
BYWATER S	Con		X			MCGUIRE L W	Con		X		
CONNOR D	Con		X			MESCHINI E	Lab		X		
COSTELLO A	Con		X			NETHSINGHA L	Lib Dem	X			
COUNT S	Con		X			NIETO L	Con		X		
CRAWFORD S	Ind			X		REYNOLDS K	Con		X		
CRISWELL S J	Con		X			RICHARDS C	Lab		X		
CUFFLEY K	Con		X			ROGERS T	Con		X		
DOWNES P J	Lib Dem	X				SANDERSON T	Ind	X			
DUPRE L	Lib Dem	X				SCHUMANN J	Con		X		
EVERY L	Con		X			SCUTT J	Lab		X		
FRENCH J	Con		X			SHELLENS M	Lib Dem	X			
FULLER R	Con		X			SHUTER M	Con		X		
GARDENER I	Con		X			SMITH M	Con		X		
GILES D	Ind	X				TAYLOR A	Lib Dem	X			
GOLDSACK M	Con		X			TAYLOR S	Ind	X			
GOWING J	Con		X			TIERNEY S	Con		X		
HARFORD L	Con		X			VAN DE VEN S	Lib Dem	X			
HARRISON N	Lib Dem	X				WELLS D	Con				X
HAY A	Con		X			WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HICKFORD R	Con		X			WILLIAMS J	Lib Dem				X
HOWELL M	Con		X			WILSON G	Lib Dem	X			
HOY S	Con		X			WISSON J	Con		X		
HUDSON P	Con		X			WOTHERSPOON T	Con		X		
HUNT W T I	Con		X			Total		18	40	1	2

Note – the electronic polling system did not work for Councillor Bates so he gave his vote orally before the poll closed

Agenda Item No. 7 – Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2021-22 to 2025-26 – Labour Amendment

Proposals:

The aim of this amendment is to provide funds, during these unprecedentedly difficult times for Cambridgeshire families, to both maintain services and to provide for additional services, after covering the budget deficit.

To do this the Labour group propose to top up the 2% rise in the Adult Social Care Precept already present in the budget with a modest 1% rise in General Council Tax. In addition, the Labour Group propose to take £13m from the Transformation Fund. This allows us to match every penny raised in Council Tax, with some to spare, with funding from the Transformation Fund to total a £6.5m investment into services for 2021/22 and beyond.

Amendment to substantive motion

Proposed by Councillor Meschini, Seconded by Councillor Kavanagh.

Replace recommendations 2 and 3 as follows:

- 2a Approve the Service/Directorate budget allocations as set out in each Service/Directorate table in Section 3 of the Business Plan, to be balanced and amended with the following adjustments:**

<i>Revised budget gap as proposed £000</i>		2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
		0	22,175	14,687	15,141	12,030
<i>Permanent change by year £000</i>		2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
b	Footpaths and pavements – revenue investment	-	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
c	Footpaths – revenue impact of capital investment (if 100% CCC funded)	+36	+161	+117	+73	+30
d	B1050 – design costs	+170	-170	-	-	-
e	B1050 – revenue impact of capital investment (if 100% CCC funded)		+61	+228	-3	-3
f	Flood attenuation and biodiversity – verges, gullies, grips	+1,090	-680	-	-	-
g	Application of remaining MRP policy review benefit	-4,115	+590	+565	+542	+529

Revised budget gap after Conservative proposals removed		2,819	21,213	12,777	13,529	10,474
b	Top up for the Innovate and Cultivate Fund	+700	-700	-	-	-
c	Covid Recovery Fund – topping up winter support, all year-round	+4,393	-4,393	-	-	-
d	Bikeability Scheme	+100	-100	-	-	-
e	Contingency fund for help with return to school	+1,000	-1,000	-	-	-
f	Investment in Adult Social Care	+300	-	-	-300	-
g	Real Living Wage for all staff	+7	-	-	-	-
Revised budget gap after investments		9,319	15,020	12,777	13,229	10,474
<i>Financing adjustments</i>						
h	Revise Council tax policy to +1.00% general and +2.00% ASC precept	-40	-3	-	-	-1
i	Application of transformation funding to address remaining budget gap	-9,279	9,279	-	-	-
Revised budget gap after financing adjustments		0	24,296	12,777	13,229	10,473

- 2j Approve a total county budget requirement in respect of general expenses applicable to the whole County area of £888,498,000 as set out in Section 2 Table 6.1 of the Business Plan, including a levy of £9,246,000 payable to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for the delivery of Transport Services and a levy of £433,000 payable to the Environment Agency for flood and coastal schemes.**
- 2k Approve a recommended County Precept for Council Tax from District Councils of £323,851,833.46, as set out in Section 2, Table 6.3 of the Business Plan (to be received in ten equal instalments in accordance with the fall-back provisions of the Local Authorities (Funds) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 1995).**
- 2l Approve a Council Tax for each Band of property, based on the number of “Band D” equivalent properties notified to the County Council by the District Councils (231,331.0), as set out in Section 2, Table 6.4 of the Business Plan reflecting a 2.00% ASC precept increase and a 1.00% increase in the Basic Council Tax precept:**

Band	Ratio	Amount (£)
A	6/9	933.30
B	7/9	1,088.85
C	8/9	1,244.40
D	9/9	1,399.95
E	11/9	1,711.05
F	13/9	2,022.15
G	15/9	2,333.25
H	18/9	2,799.90

3. Amend recommendation 3 by removing the following items from the capital programme

- ~~Invest a total of £10m in Footpaths and Pavements between 2021-22 and 2024-25 to maintain a combined annual capital and revenue investment of £4m~~
- ~~Invest £6.8m in improvements to the B1050~~

Agenda Item No. 7 – Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2020-21 to 2024-25

Recorded Vote for Labour Amendment – proposed by Councillor Meschini

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote
AMBROSE-SMITH D	Con		X			JENKINS D	Lib Dem		X		
ASHWOOD B	Lib Dem		X			JONES L	Lab	X			
BAILEY A	Con		X			KAVANAGH N	Lab	X			
BATCHELOR H	Lib Dem		X			KINDERSLEY S	Lib Dem		X		
BATES I C	Con		X			KING S	Con		X		
BODEN C	Con		X			MANNING I	Lib Dem		X		
BRADNAM A	Lib Dem		X			MCDONALD P	Lib Dem		X		
BYWATER S	Con		X			MCGUIRE L W	Con		X		
CONNOR D	Con		X			MESCHINI E	Lab	X			
COSTELLO A	Con		X			NETHSINGHA L	Lib Dem		X		
COUNT S	Con		X			NIETO L	Con		X		
CRAWFORD S	Ind	X				REYNOLDS K	Con		X		
CRISWELL S J	Con		X			RICHARDS C	Lab	X			
CUFFLEY K	Con		X			ROGERS T	Con		X		
DOWNES P J	Lib Dem			X		SANDERSON T	Ind			X	
DUPRE L	Lib Dem		X			SCHUMANN J	Con		X		
EVERY L	Con		X			SCUTT J	Lab	X			
FRENCH J	Con		X			SHELLENS M	Lib Dem			X	
FULLER R	Con		X			SHUTER M	Con		X		
GARDENER I	Con		X			SMITH M	Con		X		
GILES D	Ind	X				TAYLOR A	Lib Dem		X		
GOLDSACK M	Con		X			TAYLOR S	Ind			X	
GOWING J	Con		X			TIERNEY S	Con		X		
HARFORD L	Con		X			VAN DE VEN S	Lib Dem		X		
HARRISON N	Lib Dem				X	WELLS D	Con				X
HAY A	Con		X			WHITEHEAD J	Lab	X			
HICKFORD R	Con		X			WILLIAMS J	Lib Dem				X
HOWELL M	Con		X			WILSON G	Lib Dem		X		
HOY S	Con		X			WISSON J	Con		X		
HUDSON P	Con		X			WOTHERSPOON T	Con		X		
HUNT W T I	Con		X			Total		8	46	4	3

Note – the electronic polling system did not work for Councillor Bates so he gave his vote orally before the poll closed

Agenda Item No. 7 – Council’s Business Plan and Budget Proposals 2020-21 to 2024-25

Recorded Vote for Substantive Motion

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote
AMBROSE-SMITH D	Con	X				JENKINS D	Lib Dem		X		
ASHWOOD B	Lib Dem		X			JONES L	Lab		X		
BAILEY A	Con	X				KAVANAGH N	Lab		X		
BATCHELOR H	Lib Dem		X			KINDERSLEY S	Lib Dem		X		
BATES I C	Con	X				KING S	Con	X			
BODEN C	Con	X				MANNING I	Lib Dem		X		
BRADNAM A	Lib Dem				X	MCDONALD P	Lib Dem				X
BYWATER S	Con	X				MCGUIRE L W	Con	X			
CONNOR D	Con	X				MESCHINI E	Lab		X		
COSTELLO A	Con	X				NETHSINGHA L	Lib Dem		X		
COUNT S	Con	X				NIETO L	Con	X			
CRAWFORD S	Ind		X			REYNOLDS K	Con	X			
CRISWELL S J	Con	X				RICHARDS C	Lab		X		
CUFFLEY K	Con	X				ROGERS T	Con	X			
DOWNES P J	Lib Dem		X			SANDERSON T	Ind			X	
DUPRE L	Lib Dem		X			SCHUMANN J	Con	X			
EVERY L	Con	X				SCUTT J	Lab				X
FRENCH J	Con	X				SHELLENS M	Lib Dem		X		
FULLER R	Con	X				SHUTER M	Con	X			
GARDENER I	Con	X				SMITH M	Con	X			
GILES D	Ind	X				TAYLOR A	Lib Dem		X		
GOLDSACK M	Con	X				TAYLOR S	Ind		X		
GOWING J	Con	X				TIERNEY S	Con	X			
HARFORD L	Con	X				VAN DE VEN S	Lib Dem		X		
HARRISON N	Lib Dem		X			WELLS D	Con				X
HAY A	Con	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab		X		
HICKFORD R	Con	X				WILLIAMS J	Lib Dem				X
HOWELL M	Con	X				WILSON G	Lib Dem		X		
HOY S	Con	X				WISSON J	Con	X			
HUDSON P	Con	X				WOTHERSPOON T	Con	X			
HUNT W T I	Con	X				Total		35	20	1	5

Note – the electronic polling system did not work for Councillor Bates so he gave his vote orally before the poll closed

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee Question – 9th February 202

Question No.1

Question from Cllr Lucy Nethsingha

So, my question to Councillor Count refers to Appendix 3, minutes six of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting of the 25th of January.

On the 25th of January the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the Combined Authority received an update from the Combined Authority's Director for Housing on the status of the £170 million affordable housing programme being led by the Combined Authority: £70 million Cambridge and £100 million for the rest of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. At that time, the Government was continuing to hold back £45 million of the £100 million for the rest of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for reasons which it had been suggested include the performance of the Combined Authority in handling that programme. Two weeks later, and potentially only seven weeks from the end of the programme, what news can the leader of the council give us on when or even whether this money will be released, and what will be the impact on the programme and the County if the money is not released.

Point of order from Cllr Anna Bailey

Sorry to interrupt, but on a point of order, are these not questions to the County representatives on the relevant committee? So, I'm a bit unsure as to why Councillor Nethsingha is addressing her question to Councillor Count. I don't believe he sits on the Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee.

Response to point of order from Cllr Mac McGuire, Chairman of the Full Council

Can I come in there, Councillor Bailey? It is because I invited members to ask questions of the County, of the Council's Representative on the Combined Authority – Councillor Count. That is why the question is to him. Councillor Count?

Response to point of order from Cllr Count

Before I answer, I don't want to tread on anyone's toes, but I think it's a constitutional thing, so if Lucy refers to ONS papers, she has to refer to ONS. If it's a Combined Authority meeting, then can we please clarify because I don't want to tread on anyone's toes here.

Response to point of order from Cllr Mac McGuire, Chairman of the Full Council

Okay, could I just clarify for myself - probably because I wasn't paying attention quite to the question (apologies to Councillor Nethsingha). So, was your question one of Councillor Count as sitting on the Combined Authority, or was it an overview and scrutiny question?

Explanatory response from Cllr Nethsingha

My question is to Councillor Count as the member sitting on the Combined Authority. If he would like me to find the point in the Combined Authority meeting where this might have been raised, which I imagine would have been, it would have been raised at the most recent meeting of the Combined Authority, I'm happy to go and find that if that is necessary. But this is definitely a

question him as our representative on the Combined Authority on an important Combined Authority programme.

Response from Cllr Mac McGuire, Chairman of the Full Council

Can you, are you able to deal with this outside of this meeting, as you said you were going to go away and find out.

Response from Cllr Lucy Nethsingha

I'm happy I would like Councillor Count to answer now. If he can't answer then we'll have to have it after the meeting, but I hope that he does understand what's going on here, because it is an important Combined Authority programme.

Response from Cllr Mac McGuire, Chairman of the Full Council

Can you, are you able to answer Councillor Count?

Response from Cllr Steve Count

Yes, I am, to the best of my ability Chair. So, as far as I understand the assertion that Councillor Nethsingha's made is correct, and that £45 million of housing money so far withheld by the government whilst they look into certain aspects I think she would be called performance. There is a major difference of opinion between the Combined Authority and the MHCLG on the length the programme. There is supporting letters from people such as the Labour, Labour leader, Lewis Herbert clearly defining the end of the programme is March 22, not 21; and the Chief Executive of Campus City. I use them as examples to show that this is not a Conservative response, but actually a cross party response. Now this is probably the main stumbling block as to the end of the programme, and it revolves around whether five years was five years from the date of funding received or five years being the financial year which is being received seems to be probably the crux of the majority of the matters here. These discussions are ongoing with MHCLG and the Combined Authority, and understand that the mayor, James Palmer, met with the minister quite recently, and will be updating soon on the progress on those discussions. I can't give any progress on them because we've yet to be updated ourselves, but that was the position the last that I understand it.

Supplementary question from Cllr Lucy Nethsingha

Thank you, Councillor Count. I asked what the implication would be if that money was not released. Are you able to answer that?

Response from Cllr Steve Count, Council's representative on the Combined Authority and Overview Scrutiny Committee

I don't suppose I'm able to answer that in the terms that this has been discussed. More that options knowing, knowing as I do, the past being the past portfolio holder of the finance for the Combined Authority, that there are options open for how this may move forward, if it was to be withheld. But I'm sure Councillor Nethsingha, along with myself of course, wishes that MHCLG accepts the explanations and releases the money as soon as is possible.

Response from Cllr Lucy Nethsingha

I certainly do hope it is released, thank you.

Response from Cllr Mark Goldsack, Council Representative on the Combined Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Authority Committee

I apologise, the mute button got me. I wanted to point out that I am the representative on that CPCA committee. Unfortunately, due to family circumstances that have just been explained, I didn't make the meeting of the 25th, and unfortunately my substitute is off on long-term sick, so I haven't got that information, but I'm quite happy to be part of the answer to that to support Steve if there is anything at that meeting when I've had the chance to go through the full minutes and everything in full

County Council – 9 February 2021

Written Question under Council Procedure Rule 9.2

1. Question from Councillor Ian Manning

Recently it was reported that complaints made to the arms length management company responsible for Grenfell Tower were ignored as residents were put on a list to not be responded to (see <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/oct/21/grenfell-fire-inquiry-landlord>). Noting the County Council's policy on when and if contact with residents can be restricted here: <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/council/contact-us/council-complaints-procedures/customer-handling-policy#decision-to-restrict-contact-with-cambridgeshire-county-council-0-10> please could the County detail:

The number of such individuals currently on any such lists, the date they were put on the list, last review date and the summary reason for adding them.

Can the Council confirm that it has no residential tenants, either directly, or via This Land Ltd, and currently has no plans to do so?

Response from Councillor Mark Goldsack, Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee

The County Council holds no residential tenancies for any of the assets within its portfolio and has no plans to do so. This Land Limited also has no residential tenants at this point in time. Given the nature of their business it is possible that This Land might issue a residential tenancy in the future. However, there are no proposals within their business plan, and highly unlikely ever to be, that would involve the development of high rise blocks of flats.

2. Question from Councillor Bill Hunt

1. Please advise me of the planned dates for start and finish of Lancaster Way roundabout scheme on A142 near Witchford.
2. What is the extra cost of the additional crossing safety measures on eastern arm of A142?
3. Who is paying for this extra work?
4. May I have a map and description of these enhanced crossing and safety measures?
5. Would the western arm design proposed by Ely cycling campaign on the A142 have delayed completion of this scheme and what would have been the (estimated) additional cost?
6. Were additional funds available?
7. How many jobs were created on the business park as a result of these improvements?

Response from Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of Highways and Transport Committee

Thank you, Councillor Hunt, for these questions in relation to the scheme on the Lancaster Way Roundabout which the County Council is delivering on behalf of the Combined Authority and East Cambridgeshire District Council.

As I am sure you are aware, this was considered at length at the end of last year at the Highways and Transport Committee and has been the subject of much discussion between CCC and CA officers. I have provided individual answers for each of your specific questions below.

1. Please advise me of the planned dates for start and finish of Lancaster Way roundabout scheme on A142 near Witchford?

Construction of the scheme started on the 1st February 2021 and the works are due to complete by 30th April 2021 although the team is working to shorten this programme where possible.

2. What is the extra cost of the additional crossing safety measures on eastern arm of A142?

The crossing on the Eastern arm of the roundabout is included in the current scope of works and was added after the public consultation on the scheme. The actual cost of the crossing works is £218k and the cost of these works are included in the allocated funding from the Combined Authority and East Cambridgeshire District Council.

3. Who is paying for this extra work?

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and East Cambridgeshire District Council are paying for the whole of the scheme and there are no financial implications for the County Council.

4. May I have a map and description of these enhanced crossing and safety measures?

I have attached a plan (appendix) of the proposed changes to this written answer. In broad terms, what is being provided is widening to accommodate 2 lane entries on the A142 legs and Lancaster Way leg with additional queuing length on Lancaster way. Improvements for cyclists and pedestrians were reviewed during the design stage through a controlled crossing feasibility report recommending a Toucan crossing to be provided on the A142 to the east side of the roundabout connecting with the existing shared use pedestrian and cycle path infrastructure.

5. Would the western arm design proposed by Ely cycling campaign on the A142 have delayed completion of this scheme and what would have been the (estimated) additional cost?

Officers have looked at this and estimated an indicative extra cost of about £30,000 for construction of new shared use path sections connecting to the crossing, however, there are a number of risks in this such as re-profiling of the existing embankments and statutory undertakers' costs that could make this significantly higher. These works would increase the overall construction delivery programme of the scheme and delay the opening of this much needed scheme although without further work, it is not possible to quantify exactly how long the delay would be.

6. Were additional funds available?

No additional funding is available for this as far as I am aware. Officers have agreed funding for the East side crossing, but I am not aware that any more funding would be available for the western arm crossing.

7. How many jobs were created on the business park as a result of these improvements?

The scheme will benefit Lancaster Way Business Park which already provides employment for about 2,000 staff. This vital scheme is also projected to support economic growth within East Cambridgeshire and is expected assist in the generation of just over 3,000 jobs, 75% of which are expected from the local area.

3. Question from Councillor Graham Wilson

The heavy rain in late December 2020 caused extensive surface water flooding over large parts of Cambridgeshire. Much of the flooding was exacerbated due to the lack of maintenance of “ordinary watercourses” by riparian owners and blocked road gullies and drains. This question concerns the implementation of the County Council’s responsibilities in my division of Godmanchester and Huntingdon South:

1. Maintenance of ordinary watercourses

Cambridgeshire County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority and has powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to regulate ordinary watercourses (outside of internal drainage districts) to maintain a proper flow by enforcing obligations to maintain flow in a watercourse and repair watercourses, bridges, and other structures in a watercourse. In Godmanchester many ditches, streams and connecting culverts were partially or completely blocked with debris and silt before the December 2020 floods.

Please can the Council Leader advise:

- where and when in Godmanchester and Huntingdon South, the council has enforced obligations to require riparian landowners to maintain flow in a watercourse and repair watercourses, bridges and other structures in a watercourse in the last five up years to December 2020 to reduce the risk of flooding
- what resources it has to undertake this work
- whether he will assure the public that CCC will ensure watercourses across the county are regularly inspected by CCC officers and enforcement action taken to keep watercourses and ditches clear of debris and silt in order to maintain flow and reduce flood risk

2. Cleaning of road gullies

The Conservative administration made a decision some years ago to stop the annual cleaning of all gullies within the County, and instead set up a targeted planned maintenance programme. Cambridgeshire County Council also say they will clear blocked gullies and drains where issues are identified through their cyclic inspections regime or following reports from customers through the online reporting tool. Depending on the hierarchy of the location, a cyclic inspection is due to be carried out either monthly, quarterly or annually by Highway Inspectors; reported issues are investigated by the Local Highway Officers and any required works are organised. Officers say “The safety of the public is our priority and we will always endeavour to repair defects that meet with our intervention levels within the specified response times. As you will be aware, our budgets are extremely stretched and they are only sufficient to carry out essential repairs that meet intervention criteria.”

Please can the Council Leader advise:

- what the planned drainage maintenance programme and cyclic inspection programme in Godmanchester and Huntingdon South is
- how many gullies and road drains have been cleared as a result of those programmes in the last five years to December 2020

- how many gullies and road drains have been cleared as a result of members of the public reporting faults in the last five years to December 2020
- what resources it has to undertake this work across the county
- whether he will assure the public that CCC will ensure road gullies and drains are regularly inspected by CCC officers and action taken to keep gullies and drains clear of debris and silt in order to maintain flow and reduce flood risk

Responses from Councillors Josh Schumann, Chairman of Environment and Sustainability Committee & Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of Highways and Transport Committee

Responses to the questions are set out below:

- where and when in Godmanchester and Huntingdon South, the council has enforced obligations to require riparian landowners to maintain flow in a watercourse and repair watercourses, bridges and other structures in a watercourse in the last five up years to December 2020 to reduce the risk of flooding

No formal enforcement action has been taken, however in numerous locations across Huntingdonshire, including Godmanchester the council has attended site to meet with landowners and highlight areas where maintenance is required (e.g. clearance of vegetation to maintain flow).

- what resources it has to undertake this work

The small team is involved in a wide range of flood risk management activities including planning, consenting, flood investigation, delivery of projects and riparian enforcement. There is no team specifically dedicated to watercourse enforcement, however appropriate action is taken when the team becomes aware of maintenance issues on watercourses

- whether he will assure the public that CCC will ensure watercourses across the county are regularly inspected by CCC officers and enforcement action taken to keep watercourses and ditches clear of debris and silt in order to maintain flow and reduce flood risk.

As identified above, the LLFA has powers rather than duties under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and we are not in a position (nor are any other LLFAs) to regularly inspect watercourses. We do however commit to working with communities more closely to raise awareness of riparian roles and responsibilities and we encourage residents and councillors to report issues of blocked or poorly maintained watercourses to us at floodandwater@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

- what the planned drainage maintenance programme and cyclic inspection programme in Godmanchester and Huntingdon South is –

Cyclic inspections are undertaken across the county network based upon the hierarchy of the road, for example an A road will be inspected monthly where as a cul-de-sac will receive an annual inspection. Godmanchester in its entirety will have the gullies cleaned between the 1st Feb – 31st Mar 2021.

- how many gullies and road drains have been cleared as a result of those programmes in the last five years to December 2020 –

Although we keep records of works undertaken, this is not a figure that can be easily prepared as it would take many hours and may not be complete. It is therefore not possible to answer this directly, but as noted above, gullies are inspected on a cyclic basis and when one is identified as being blocked, it will be cleaned.

- how many gullies and road drains have been cleared as a result of members of the public reporting faults in the last five years to December 2020 -

Similarly, although we keep records of works undertaken, this is not a figure that can be easily prepared as it would take many hours and may not be complete. It is therefore not possible to answer this directly, but all reports will be investigated and if a gully needs cleaning then it will be.

- what resources it has to undertake this work across the county –

There are two in house gully machines managed by Skanska, that deliver gully cleaning across the county. In addition to these, throughout the year, we use third party drainage contractors across the county to carry out cleaning, jetting, route cutting and investigations of drainage systems.

- whether he will assure the public that CCC will ensure road gullies and drains are regularly inspected by CCC officers and action taken to keep gullies and drains clear of debris and silt in order to maintain flow and reduce flood risk –

There is already a cyclical programme of inspections as noted above and any identified works required will be undertaken by officers in accordance with the Highway Operational Standards. That said, we are looking closely at how cleaning of gullies can be improved and we already have some additional resource for February and March to address the worst affected areas.