

## **CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday 22nd April 2020

**Time:** 2:00pm – 4:10pm

**Present:** Councillors L Every (Chairwoman), K Reynolds (Vice-Chairman), D Connor, L Harford, R Hickford, D Jenkins, J Scutt and A Taylor

### **98. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies were received from Councillor Kindersley (substituted by Councillor Taylor)

There were no declarations of interest.

### **99. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14TH JANUARY 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14th January 2020 were approved as a correct record and it was agreed that they would be signed by the Chairwoman when the Council returned to its offices.

### **100. COMMITTEE STRUCTURES**

The Committee received a report on proposed changes to committee structures. Members were informed that the proposed abolition of the Economy & Environment and Highways & Infrastructure Committees, followed by the introduction of the Environment & Sustainability and Highways & Transport Committees, would allow for an increased focus on the environment and sustainability, in line with the Council's commitment to confront the declared Climate Emergency. While establishing the terms of reference for these proposed new committees, the opportunity had been taken to review those of all other policy and service committees, with suggested amendments outlined in the report. In order to ensure that the Chairman/woman of each policy and service committee was represented on the General Purposes Committee, an increase to its membership had also been recommended. Due to Cambridge City receiving a different service to other areas of the County, where alternative processes already existed for making the decisions currently made by the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC), it was proposed to abolish CJAC by the end of July 2020. It was also proposed to withdraw from the Joint Development Control Committee for Cambridge Fringes (JDCC) by the end of July 2020, for the reasons detailed in sections 4.8 and 4.9 of the report.

The Chairwoman informed the Committee that she had exercised her discretion and extended the deadline for the submission of written questions and statements from members of the public up to the afternoon prior to the day of the meeting, and that 39 submissions had been accepted in relation to the abolition of CJAC and the withdrawal from the JDCC. These had been published on the Council's website, circulated to Committee Members and attached to these minutes as **Appendix 1**. It was noted that a further 16 statements had been submitted after the deadline, which would be published on the website after the meeting and attached to these minutes as **Appendix 2**. Due to the large number of statements that had been accepted, and in order to manage the virtual meeting effectively, the Chairwoman stated that they would not be read out at the

meeting, given that Members had had sufficient time to read and consider them prior to the meeting.

Responding to the issues raised in the written statements about the proposed abolition of CJAC, the Service Director of Highways and Transport identified three main areas of concern: a loss of democratic accountability, the supposed benefits of the proposal and the differences between the city of Cambridge and other areas of the County. While acknowledging the concerns raised about a potential loss of democratic accountability, he emphasised that CJAC was not a strategic transport committee but instead was responsible for considering the localised details of such strategic decisions that were made elsewhere. He explained that the initial stages of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) would remain the same if CJAC was abolished, with TROs being automatically made when no objections were received and officers attempting to resolve minor objections through negotiation. If the objections were unresolved, the matter would be taken up by the Assistant Director of Highways in conjunction with the Local Member, and in the event of continued disagreement, a final decision would be made by the Highways & Infrastructure Committee. It was noted that residents and local councillors held the same rights to attend, speak and submit petitions at a Highways & Infrastructure Committee as they did at a CJAC meeting. He observed that the rest of the County already adopted this process and only a small number of TROs were ultimately considered by the Highways & Infrastructure Committee.

To clarify the benefits of abolishing CJAC, he argued that the process of refining and implementing TROs would be quicker and more efficient in terms of officers' time. He acknowledged that the urban city of Cambridge differed geographically and demographically from the rest of the mainly rural County but observed that all the issues were essentially local area decisions. Local Members were already successfully involved in all areas outside Cambridge and there was no reason to believe that it would be any different in Cambridge.

The Interim Assistant Director of Environment and Commercial addressed the written statements specific to the proposed withdrawal from the JDCC in **Appendix 3** attached to these minutes.

The Chairwoman exercised her discretion to accept requests from the Leader of Cambridge City Council (Councillor Lewis Herbert) and the Deputy Leader of South Cambridgeshire District Council (Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer) to address the Committee regarding the proposals to abolish CJAC and withdraw from the JDCC respectively.

Councillor Herbert urged the Committee to defer making a decision until proper consultation had been held involving the councils and communities affected, arguing that there was no urgency to make a decision, especially during the ongoing Covid-19 crisis. Drawing attention to the 39 statements that had been submitted by members of the public, he praised CJAC for serving as a voice of the city and noted that it had represented a partnership between the councils for over 20 years. Highlighting the importance of the councils' partnership on issues related to the climate emergency, including air pollution, congestion, cycling and pedestrianisation, he suggested that one week's notice did not represent the level of consultation that would have been expected. Identifying 12 County Councillors, 42 City Councillors, 130,000 residents, businesses and universities as being affected and involved, he argued that Cambridge differed to other towns and communities across the County and lamented that the County Council would be located over 20 miles away from the city when it moved to Alconbury Weald.

Councillor Van de Weyer highlighted collaborative working between the different local authorities, businesses and university as fundamental to the success of Cambridge over the past 20 years. He identified the County Council's involvement as a core member of the JDCC to be of specific importance in this regard, citing its responsibility for educational facilities as an example of its central part to play in new communities. Observing that the Leader of the County Council had previously publicly appealed to partner councils to work together in partnership, he suggested that the proposed withdrawal from the JDCC did not reflect such full engagement. Expressing disappointment that there had not been prior consultation between partners, he suggested that there had been no consideration of the effects, especially given the current economic crisis, and that no robust alternatives to participation in the JDCC had been presented. He expressed concern over how the proposals would be perceived by other groups with a stake in the future development of Cambridge and noted that many of them had submitted written responses against the proposals.

Councillor Jones was invited to speak to the Committee as the local Member for Petersfield. As a former Chairwoman and current Vice-Chairwoman of CJAC, she praised the hard work and success of CJAC's assistance on complex transport issues, observing that Peterborough City Councillors benefited from being able to deal with local highways matters through their respective committees in much the same way as CJAC in Cambridge. Suggesting that abolishing CJAC would be contrary to the Council's Think Communities approach given that it would diminish working with communities, she observed that all Members of the Highways & Infrastructure Committee lived outside of Cambridge, and that other areas of the County faced different challenges. She argued that the high level of public participation in CJAC meetings would not be replicated in Highways & Infrastructure Committee meetings, as they were held during the working day, when many members of the public would be unable to attend due to work commitments, also noting that they would be hosted in Alconbury Weald once the Council moved there. She questioned why transparent and accountable decision making was no longer considered relevant, as suggested in paragraph 3.1 of the report, and drew attention to paragraph 3.2, arguing that in 2013 it had been considered unimportant whether other districts accepted or declined the invitation to re-establish a Joint Area Committee and therefore it should not be used as a reason for abolishing one in 2020. Suggesting that officers would actually end up spending more time on TROs, given the extended process before they would be taken before the Committee and the fact that local knowledge would not be taken advantage of, she called for a deferral of the decision in order to hold a proper consultation.

Councillor Meschini was invited to speak to the Committee as the local Member for King's Hedges. Expressing disappointment at the hostility displayed between the County and City councils that needed to work together, especially during the current Covid-19 crisis, she suggested that it was not the right time to be considering such a divisive issue. Alluding to the different political make-up of the two authorities and other underlying differences, she argued that such issues should not inform the decision on whether to abolish CJAC. She referenced a survey of County Councillors' opinions on a range of issues, noting that while responses indicated 18-13 in favour of abolishing CJAC and 14-12 in favour of withdrawing from JDCC, an amalgamation of the Economy & Environment Committee with the Highways & Infrastructure Committee had received stronger support at 20-11. She questioned why two of those votes were being used to support the proposals while a stronger vote had not led to an equivalent proposal to amalgamate the two committees. However, one Member suggested that a separate section of the report was effectively amalgamating the two committees.

Councillor Richards was invited to speak to the Committee as the local Member for Castle, and as a current Member of the JDCC, she praised it as an excellent example of shared planning and transport delivery, with all three local authorities working together. She considered it as fundamental that the County Council ensured the public realm and highways were integrated in the visions for new communities early on in their development stage, citing libraries and schools and other community infrastructure as particular areas of concern. Questioning the arguments supporting the proposed withdrawal from JDCC in paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 of the report, she suggested that Darwin Green had been an example of why consultation with the community early in the process was so important and that it should actually be increased rather than decreased, observing that new developments often crossed boundaries between different local authorities. Noting the importance of embracing partnership working during the current Covid-19 crisis, while acknowledging the increased pressure that officers found themselves currently under, she argued that withdrawing from the JDCC by the end of July was not the right thing to do and should be deferred until a later date when public consultations had been held.

Responding to the issues raised by local Members, the Interim Assistant Director of Environment and Commercial informed Members that on average less than one application per year went from the County Council to the JDCC, which she suggested was a small amount. She emphasised that the proposed changes were not based on criticism of the quality of the work carried out by the relevant committees and that officers would continue to work together across the different authorities. Noting that the JDCC would continue to function if the County Council decided to withdraw, she suggested that it would also see benefits and could even improve how it worked. While acknowledging the pressures that officers were currently working under, she argued that the proposed changes would not create a significant amount of extra work.

While discussing the proposals for the abolition of the Economy & Environment and Highways & Infrastructure Committees, the introduction of the Environment & Sustainability and Highways & Transport Committees, revisions to policy and service committees' terms of reference and an increase of the membership of General Purposes Committee, Members:

- Clarified that the proposals being considered by the Committee involved the abolition of the Economy & Environment and Highways & Infrastructure Committees, followed by the introduction of the Environment & Sustainability and Highways & Transport Committees. While acknowledging that this would involve the replacement of two committees with two new committees, the Executive Director for Place and Economy argued that the terms of reference of the new committees would differ and allow for the Environment & Sustainability Committee to absorb a significant additional workload around climate change.
- Considered whether the Environment & Sustainability Committee's proposed delegation "to recommend to Council and monitor the Council's Climate Change and Environment Strategy and Environment Fund", as laid out on page 5 of the report, was strong enough to ensure that climate change issues were acted on. It was suggested that the Committee should be able to scrutinise decisions that were felt likely to cause any negative impacts on sustainability and/or climate change, with one Member proposing that the Committee would benefit from the ability to initiate reviews of decisions made by policy and service committees – a power currently only held by the General Purposes Committee. The Democratic Services Manager

observed that the Decision Review Procedure Rules (Part 4.7 of the Constitution) were not included as part of the proposed changes and suggested that a report considering the issue be presented at the subsequent meeting on 30th June 2020, to which the Committee agreed.

- Argued that it made sense to increase the size of the General Purposes Committee in order to allow all the policy and service committees' Chairmen/women to be represented in its membership.

While discussing the proposals to abolish CJAC by July 2020, Members:

- Observed that local transport issues were one of the most common themes of discussion between residents and their local councillors, and the level of importance placed on the matter was further demonstrated by the large number of written statements that had been submitted by members of the public.
- Noted that CJAC meetings were often well attended by the public and the level of interaction between the local authorities, local Members, residents and resident associations was excellent, despite frequent disagreements.
- Highlighted that many of the issues that were considered by CJAC involved TROs that crossed boundaries and therefore required multiple County Councillors and City Councillors to work together and that the current process was effective.
- Expressed concern about decisions on Cambridge-specific issues being made by a Committee completely comprised of Members that did not live in Cambridge.
- Argued that because Cambridge was different to other areas of the County it required different processes, and that other areas opting not to have an Area Joint Committee should not mean that Cambridge should not be allowed one.
- Identified the fact that Cambridge did not have parish councils as a disadvantage for residents, given that parish councillors were involved in Local Highway Improvement (LHI) schemes and TROs elsewhere across the County. It was suggested that CJAC performed the same function in Cambridge and to remove the Committee would leave a democratic deficit, as LHI schemes and TROs that were taken to the Highways & Infrastructure Committee would not benefit from such local involvement.
- Cautioned that officers would be required to take sides in disagreements between residents and that their workload would be increased due to the prolonged process of issues reaching the Committee stage.
- Suggested that there were no actual benefits identified in the report that would result from the abolition of CJAC. One Councillor noted that he lived outside Cambridge and given that he did not have local experience or knowledge of the issues in Cambridge he could only rely on what was included in the report. He argued that the report did not analyse the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed changes or provide any coherent evidence for supporting the abolition of CJAC, making it impossible for him to make an informed decision.
- Questioned the timing of the item being considered, given that members of the public were unable to attend and present their arguments or ask questions. It was

noted that the written submissions had not been read out and that officers had not addressed all the issues that had been raised. One Member suggested that it was not an appropriate time to deal with such matters and that it was not a fair process, representing an affront to ethics and democracy. Another Member noted the pressure that officers were currently working under and criticised the fact that they were required to work on issues that did not appear to be time critical, when there were greater concerns to be dealt with.

- Considered deferring the item and reconsidering it at a later date following consultations and further consideration.

While discussing the proposals to withdraw from the JDCC by July 2020, Members:

- Argued that the fact that the JDCC used different democratic processes and templates to the County Council did not amount to a reason for withdrawing from the Committee, as suggested in paragraph 4.7 of the report, and that such issues could be resolved by officers.
- Suggested that it was reasonable to have different processes in different areas if there were different challenges and needs in each area.
- Argued that the report failed to provide evidence to support the proposed changes.
- Expressed concern over the timing of the issue being considered, with more important matters needing to be dealt with.
- Thanked members of the public for submitting written statements and provided assurances that they had all been read and considered.
- Argued that withdrawal from the JDCC would not lead to a considerable amount of its delegations being withdrawn, and that it would continue to function with the remaining two authorities and members of the public would continue to have the opportunity to present their views in the same way. It was further suggested that the County Council would still participate and contribute to the JDCC, particularly with regard to the infrastructure items with any strategic applications.
- Questioned why the reasons for originally establishing the JDCC, as laid out in paragraph 4.2 of the report, no longer applied.
- Suggested that the best practice mentioned in paragraphs 3.3 and 4.4 of the report would involve consultation with partner authorities before a decision on withdrawal or abolition had been made.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Recommend the following changes to the Constitution, as set out in the report, to full Council:

- a) The abolition of the Economy and Environment and Highways and Infrastructure Committees;
- b) The introduction of the Environment and Sustainability and Highways and Transport Committees;
- c) Revisions to the terms of reference of the General Purposes, Adults, Children and Young People, Commercial and Investment, Communities and Partnership and Health Committees; and
- d) Increase the membership of General Purposes Committee from fifteen to seventeen.

It was resolved to:

Recommend the following changes to the Constitution, as set out in the report, to full Council:

- a) The abolition of the Cambridge Joint Area Committee by the end of July 2020 following the discussions set out in paragraph 3.3 of this report; and
- b) The withdrawal from the Joint Development Control Committee for Cambridge Fringes by the end of July 2020 following the discussions set out in paragraph 4.4 of this report.

## **101. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CONSIDERATION OF ADULT MENTAL HEALTH GUARDIANSHIPS**

The Committee received a report which detailed a proposed change to the way in which Adult Mental Health Guardianships were determined. It was emphasised that the Council dealt with a small number of such cases and therefore it was difficult for Members to gain and maintain a strong knowledge and experience of the issues. Attention was drawn to the proposed process as laid out in section 2.4 of the report.

While discussing the proposed changes, Members:

- Expressed regret that there was not a Member with sufficient knowledge or experience to be able to undertake the role. The Mental Capacity Act Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Manager noted that officers undertook the role in most other local authorities, and assured Members that safeguards or costs to the person under guardianship or the relative making the appeal would not be affected by any change to the process.
- Suggested that the presence of Members provided reassurance to relatives that there were checks and balances in the process.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Recommend the changes to the Constitution, as set out in paragraph 2.5 of the report, to Full Council for approval.

## **102. SCHEME OF DELEGATION**

The Committee received a report on the Scheme of Delegation for its consideration and it was noted that the Council's Constitution required the Scheme of Delegation to be considered at each Annual Meeting of the Council.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Recommend to Council that it agree the Scheme of Delegation or such part of it as the Constitution determines it is for Council to agree (as set out in Part 3 of the Constitution).

## **103. CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN**

The Chairwoman informed the Committee that the Monitoring Officer would present a report at the next meeting on 30th June 2020 regarding the consultation phase of the Local Government Association's Model Code of Conduct.

Acknowledging that the next meeting would also include a further report on a review of the Decision Review Procedure Rules (Part 4.7 of the Constitution), with regard to the ability of the Environment and Sustainability Committee to initiate reviews of decisions made by policy and service committees, the Committee noted its agenda plan.

Chairwoman  
30th June 2020



**CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE MEETING – 22ND APRIL 2020**

**AGENDA ITEM 3: COMMITTEE STRUCTURES**

**WRITTEN STATEMENTS**

No.	Question from:	Question
1.	Councillor Colin McGerty  (Cambridge City Council)	Can the Constitution and Ethics Committee please explain how the vital function played by parish councils in providing residents with transparency and direct access to local democracy and until now, catered for in Cambridge, where we do not have parish councils, by the Cambridge Joint Area Committee, will in future be replicated within Cambridge?
2.	Mr Michael Page  (Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association)	<p>Regarding abolition of the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC). This proposal has come as a surprise to residents in Cambridge and we are very concerned that it should be coming forward for decision so soon during the Covid lockdown.</p> <p>We are also concerned that this proposal will strip away an important element of local democracy which currently enables residents, through their local city councillors and CJAC, to engage in important decisions affecting their lives. We fear that decisions will have to be taken by councillors elsewhere in the county who will not have the benefit of local knowledge and the evidence and pre-scrutiny currently provided by the CJAC process. Transparent and accountable decision making is at the heart of the county's constitution regarding Joint Area Committees.</p> <p>I urge this committee to take note of these real concerns and ask that this proposal is put on hold to allow for more public scrutiny and debate before it goes forward to the full council.</p>
3.	Camcycle – Cambridge Cycling Campaign	<p>We urge councillors to delay decisions about the Joint Area Committee and Cambridge Fringes until proper scrutiny can be applied.</p> <p>Camcycle is strongly of the view that decisions about transport and development in Cambridge should be a democratic process including city residents and councillors. It is for this reason that we object wholeheartedly to these proposals that will silence the voices of those whose views are most needed, the residents and workers of Cambridge.</p>

		<p>We further believe that the timing of this proposed change is in very poor judgement. Now more than ever we need responsive local transport policies that will facilitate the safe movement of key workers and allow socially distanced essential journeys. Scrapping a key transport committee is an irresponsible diversion at a time when we simply cannot afford it.</p> <p>Our position on this matter remains the same as in 2012, when a similar situation arose. Whilst it is entirely appropriate that the rural councillors who run the County Council have oversight of budget and some say in transport matters in Cambridge – they may well travel here – that is very different to withdrawal of any guarantee that there will be a majority of people from Cambridge deciding these questions.</p> <p>These proposals would mean that no councillor, or indeed, resident would have any meaningful say in any transport plan or project suggested or mooted for the city. This is as unacceptable as any rural district in Cambridgeshire being denied a voice were the situation reversed.</p> <p>Cambridge is a different place to rural towns and villages. It is a dense city, with high levels of employment and housing, and is struggling with the effects of the councils’ growth agenda. It also has by far the highest levels of cycling. As a result, allocation of road space is very highly contested, unlike other areas.</p> <p>The area committee over the past 20 years has regularly seen strong debates about balancing the needs of residents, commuters, those driving, those cycling, and so on. It is right that those debates should continue. Proper consideration of difficult issues like this will not be properly resolved by relegating them to an official deciding in private or by having them decided in Alconbury by councillors who have far less experience of Cambridge’s cycling culture or who rarely travel here.</p>
4.	Charles Nisbet	<p>As Chairman of the Milton Road Residents' Association I am most concerned at the proposal in Item 3 on the agenda to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC). This committee allows the residents of Cambridge to express their wishes and concerns to County Councillors about issues which are otherwise in the sole control of the County Council but which impact entirely on the population of the City. For example, those who live outside the City may see it as somewhere whose function is to provide them with employment and shopping opportunities, plus free parking in its many streets: those who live within the City may feel otherwise and need the opportunity to say so; the CJAC provides such an opportunity.</p> <p>In itself such an abolition is highly undesirable, but to effect it without real public scrutiny at the first on-line meeting of the Constitution and Ethics Committee smacks of the sort of underhand procedural methods resorted to by dictators across the world to eliminate public opposition to their wishes.</p>

		<p>Would the Constitution and Ethics Committee please acknowledge that this is not a proper, not an ethical way to use the mechanisms of local government and either reject this proposal or at least defer a decision on it until it can be more fully debated?</p>
5.	<p>Accordia Community and Residents Association</p>	<p>We object very strongly to this proposal.</p> <p>The residents of the Accordia estate saw the Joint Committee in action when it considered the plans for a residents parking scheme for the estate. These discussions demonstrated the importance of local understanding in reaching decisions on traffic management issues affecting the City, and also showed that the Councillors involved worked very well together in a rational atmosphere. On this evidence, the Committee certainly meets the criterion of ... improv[ing] service delivery in the context of best value and more efficient, transparent and accountable decision making. No evidence is offered that the alternative approach outlined in paragraph 3.5 would work better.</p> <p>The justification offered in paragraph 3.4 of the proposal is extremely thin. Simply to assert without evidence that “it is not considered reasonable or appropriate that one area in the county should receive a different service than (sic) others” is meaningless. It is perfectly logical for one area to be covered by a different framework if it has distinct characteristics that require a high level of local understanding. (Cambridge for example is the UK City with the highest level of cycle commuting, and the 11th highest number of days with excess air pollution). By whom are the present arrangements not considered “reasonable or appropriate?” – apparently not by the other districts in Cambridgeshire, which as the proposal itself spells out, chose not to seek distinct committees to apply to them. Similarly, no evidence is offered to support the assertion that withdrawal from the Committee will provide “equity of service across Cambridgeshire and will allow officer time to be used more effectively on schemes across the county.” If the Council is acknowledging that at present it provides the rest of the County with a lower level of service, this is a very serious claim which must be supported by evidence.</p>
6.	<p>Histon Road Area Residents’ Association</p>	<p>Histon Road Area Residents’ Association HRARA is strongly of the view that decisions about transport and development in Cambridge should be a democratic process including city residents and councillors. It is for this reason that we object wholeheartedly to the County Council’s proposed scrapping of Cambridge’s Transport Committee and the transfer of powers to a county body – it will silence the voices of those whose views are most needed, the residents and workers of Cambridge.</p> <p>If the proposal to scrap the Cambridge-specific CJAC committee, and I quote Cambridge News,</p> <p><i>“which primarily deals with transport issues, follows a spate of political disagreements between the county council and South Cambs District and Cambridge City Councils, including over changes to residents parking schemes, road charging, and the role of the Greater Cambridge Partnership”</i></p>

		<p>we further believe that the timing of this proposed change is in very poor judgement. Now more than ever we need responsive local transport policies that will facilitate the safe movement of key workers and allow socially distanced essential journeys.</p> <p>Abolishing a key transport committee is an irresponsible diversion at a time when we simply cannot afford it, so the Histon Road Area Residents' Association (HRARA) urges the County Council's Constitution and Ethics Committee to reject this proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC).</p>
7.	Nicki Marrian	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed abolition of the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC).</p> <p>The abolition of this committee would make it very much more difficult for residents to make their views heard at the County Council, particularly when the Council's main activities move to Alconbury next year.</p> <p>Discussion of this proposal next Tuesday at a virtual meeting, with no members of the public present to comment and ask questions, will severely inhibit the opportunity for Cambridge residents to scrutinise the proposals and make their views on the abolition of this committee known.</p> <p>I request that you reconsider this proposal and delay making a decision until the implications can be debated more widely.</p>
8.	Alan Ackroyd	<p>Friends of mine have drawn my attention to a move of the Cambridge County Council to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee and the Joint Development Control Committee for Cambridge Fringes.</p> <p>I am writing to you to express my strong objection to this move. Cambridge is an historic, unique and distinctive city and with its two universities, teaching hospital, biotech campus and technological industry hubs. It is both a service centre and a financial power-house for the county and East Anglia.</p> <p>Cambridge universities and businesses attract personnel from all over the world and must be able to offer a modern and environmentally responsible lifestyle to attract the best staff. Removing the voice of Cambridge residents and their representatives from the development of the city and its fringes can only jeopardise the continued development of this city in such a direction and bring difficulties for the future of the city.</p> <p>I write to ask you to oppose this move, or at least to postpone a decision until proper democratic consideration may be given to it. To rush this decision through in a closed-doors meeting would be shameful.</p>

9.	Sam Davies	<p>Having read the papers relating to the proposed abolition of CJAC, I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to this curtailing of democratic processes within Cambridge.</p> <p>Taken in conjunction with the County Council's relocation to Alconbury, this will make it extremely difficult for Cambridge residents to have their views represented on issues directly concerning their city. It is even more concerning that you would attempt to drive this proposal through at a virtual meeting, with no members of the public present to ask questions or scrutinise the discussion.</p> <p>I have seen no explanation of any urgent reasons which would require this decision to be taken at this time, and therefore request that you delay making a decision until residents are better able to engage with the arguments for and against.</p>
10.	Deborah Latham  (Garden Walk Residents Association)	<p>I am writing to express concern at the proposed termination of the CJAC Committee.</p> <p>This concern arises because there really must be local scrutiny and influence over issues affecting residents in Cambridge – including residents' parking and traffic calming, to ensure these issues retain a high profile, given their major health and safety, and environmental impacts.</p> <p>The important injection of real local issues, solutions and inclusion of local people's experience of living in their localities and the insight this gives, must be present in meetings so that Councillors are in touch with the real world experience of local areas. It would therefore be a major concern if this opportunity is lost in the termination of CJAC, given that the membership of the County Highways Committee is predominately County Councillors from outside Cambridge – County Councillors who are not and cannot be in touch with real and challenging Cambridge issues, and arguably who are highly unlikely to have the interests of local Cambridge people in mind as such.</p>
11.	Councillor Dave Baigent  (Cambridge City Council)	<p>I am a Cambridge City Councillor in Romsey and I am writing to ask Cambridge County Council to maintain CJAC and JDC.</p> <p>First can I say I served on CJAC for three years and currently serve on JDC.</p> <p>Both these committees are splendid examples of democracy in action as they bring together three elected councils to make joint decisions on matters of importance to residents in those areas. I outline briefly my main concerns:</p>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most importantly they ensure an accord between our three councils. In outcome it reduces conflict and disagreement between councils and has the knock on effect of making constituents part of the process of decision making in areas that sometimes have confused responsibility.</li> <li>2. These committees bring together councillors from the area who operate at different levels and this widens the democratic mandate of decision making and in particular its combined knowledge must improve outcomes.</li> <li>3. Things that happen in Cambridge City have a considerable effect on the residents of the surrounding areas, as it is an employment, arts and shopping hub. It is therefore right that all three councils are involved in decisions where responsibility blurs and will effect residents of all three councils.</li> <li>4. One further point that is an unintended consequence, is that by meeting together networks are improved and a wider understanding of the work of the three councils is achieved.</li> </ol>
12.	Lori Passmore	<p>I am writing regarding the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee. I am disappointed that this is being proposed and I object to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The Cambridge Joint Area Committee provides a voice to local residents. It works well. For example, last year, residents attended the meeting to discuss changes to the residents’ parking scheme on Blinco Grove. The final outcome appears to be an excellent compromise and satisfactory to all parties. Similarly, many local residents attended the meeting to implement the resident’s parking scheme in the area including Blinco Grove. Thus, this committee in particular is an effective voice for the community.</li> <li>– Abolishing the Cambridge Joint Area Committee will make it much more difficult for residents to make their views heard, especially if meetings will not take place in Cambridge and will move to Alconbury.</li> <li>– The decision to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee will be taken at a virtual meeting without consultation with the public and with no ability for the public to ask questions. This is not a fair process.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I therefore request that this decision be delayed until Cambridge residents can have a proper opportunity to scrutinise the proposals and make their views on the abolition of this committee known.</li> </ul>
13.	Liz Kan	<p>I agree strongly, that we must keep these issue linked to local groups that show a good interest for we live, work and play here, therefore really understand what is needed now.</p> <p>I understand that it's easier to centralise, but that is when ventures fail for the future use of an area. Please this is very important.</p>
14.	The Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations	<p>We are writing to express concern about the decision to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee. The abolition of this committee will make it much more difficult for city residents to make their views on transport issues heard at the County Council, particularly when the County Council's main activities move to Alconbury.</p> <p>This is a significant change that is being made during the Covid lock-down. We believe the decision should be postponed to allow time for consultation, scrutiny and a proper democratic process.</p>
15.	Katie Maynard	<p>As Chair of a city centre Residents' Association I write in opposition to the proposal by Cambridgeshire County Council to close the Cambridge Joint Area Committee. It is vital that decisions - especially those involving transport should be considered at a local level to bring local understanding to any decision.</p> <p>Cambridge residents have their own particular needs and it is important that transport decisions such as parking or cycling issues can be considered by those affected by any changes. Living in an area with many schools, narrow roads and the concerns of residents regarding safety and pollution with increasing rat run traffic it has been vital - especially over the last few years - for local representation to discuss issues such as parking and cycling.</p> <p>I would like to see the evidence of how this proposed change would be helpful. It would be helpful to review evidence to show what benefit there would be to local residents in Cambridge and how the change would help the Cambridge environment and local council, now and in the longer term.</p>

16.	Windsor Road Residents' Association	<p>We object to the recommendation, under Item 3 of the meeting of the Constitution and Ethics Committee on 22 April, to close down Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC) and transfer its powers to the County Highways Committee by the end of July 2020.</p> <p>We feel that there should be an opportunity for public engagement and that residents should be consulted.</p> <p>Removal of an important layer of local democracy should not happen by the back door in a period of distraction, but should be delayed until it can receive proper consultation and consideration.</p>
17.	Richard Folley	<p>I have recently read of your proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee. Quite frankly, I am appalled - as a Cambridge City resident I consider this forum to be very important for the discussion of our very different (from the more rural) County issues.</p> <p>It is just a pity that Cambridge City continues to be a part of the County administration!</p>
18.	Roger Crabtree	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to dispense with the CJAC.</p> <p>As the former chair of the Rustat Neighbourhood Association, I have both attended and spoken at CJAC meetings over many years.</p> <p>I believe that the Committee fulfils a very useful purpose, as it combines City and County Councillors so that issues relating to an important range of topics can be properly debated in a balanced way.</p> <p>To pass its powers and responsibilities to the Transport Committee, as proposed, will deny that joint approach and thus fails to allow proper debate of issues relating to Cambridge City transport and traffic.</p> <p>As our area expands - and it is planned that it will massively do so in the coming years - proper debate on transport and traffic matters in our already congested city is crucial and in my view it is vital for not only the city but also the surrounding commuter belt that decisions are made jointly.</p> <p>I therefore urge you to abort the proposed abolition of this committee. If anything we should be strengthening its powers.</p>

19.	Finlay Knops-McKim	<p>I have recently been made aware of the proposed scrapping of the Cambridge Joint Area Committee, and am emailing to express my concerns. The JAC has provided a valuable forum for discussion and planning related to Cambridge-specific transport and development issues over many years. It allows engagement with a variety of civic groups, and robust debate that leads to policies suitable for a unique city such as Cambridge.</p> <p>I strongly feel that delegating policy decisions to county officers, and committees that explicitly exclude the City Council is not acceptable. It will actively prevent the development of innovative transport solutions so needed by the UK's tech and cycling capital, and lead to a democratic deficit. I appreciate that the county and city councils have their political differences, but this change will not just be a point scored against an opposition party – It will have long lasting and negative impacts on the residents of Cambridge and the surrounding area.</p> <p>The timing of this move is also extremely poor. We are in the middle of a global pandemic, the impact on our society of which will be felt for many months and years. Effective transport policy is vital in this time – keeping our key workers moving, and keeping others making vital journeys socially distanced to reduce the strain on our NHS. The temporary interventions required to do this in Cambridge City are only possible if the City Council is empowered to make such decisions, especially with regards to TROs. Pre-occupying the council with these sorts of political changes both reduces its ability to rapidly respond as required, and then eliminates the rapid response ability once those powers are gone.</p> <p>A change such as this should also be put out to consultation at the very least. Civic engagement is difficult at the best of times, but when the only way to engage is via email or difficult-to-attend virtual meetings, it becomes impossible for many. If this scrapping is pursued, it should be after a full public consultation that is not carried out hidden under the shroud of quarantine. Hiding unpopular political decisions behind an international pandemic is simply not on.</p> <p>I hope these points are of some contribution to the debate, and I would ask that you consider recommending the decision on scrapping the committee be delayed to a later, more appropriate date – after the public have been allowed to fully scrutinise the proposals.</p>
20.	Arbury Road East Residents' Association Committee	<p>We are very concerned that the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee will have a negative effect on the residents of Arbury Road.</p> <p>Without CJAC our interests will not be represented by local councillors on transport matters related to Arbury Road, including safe cycling, traffic flow and pollution.</p>

		<p>We believe that the disbandment of CJAC would have a profoundly negative effect on the involvement of all Cambridge's residents in important local matters.</p> <p>We therefore ask that any discussion/decision about CJAC's future be deferred, to allow full consideration and consultation by Cambridge residents before any future discussion.</p> <p>And we would add that the timing of this constitutional proposal during a national crisis and our lock down we consider an affront to both ethics and democracy.</p>
21.	Edward Leigh	<p>I have attached a petition prepared by Smarter Cambridge Transport calling for the proposal to abolish CJAC to be suspended until more extensive consultation can be carried out. It will go live on the County Council website as an e-petition to be presented to Full Council on 19 May – unless the Constitution and Ethics Committee withholds its recommendation for the proposed change go to Full Council.</p> <p>Smarter Cambridge Transport believes that CJAC fulfils an important and valuable role in deciding local transport matters, a role that elsewhere in the county is performed by town and parish councils.</p> <p>We also believe that the county's involvement in JDCC for Cambridge Fringes is critically important to ensure that spatial and transport planning decisions are made in a co-ordinated way. This is especially true given the huge challenges ahead to build more homes and support more jobs much more sustainably than now. Getting transport infrastructure and services right is essential to achieving that.</p>
22.	<p>Councillor Martin Smart</p> <p>(Cambridge City Council)</p>	<p>I am writing with regard to proposals to abolish Cambridge City Joint Area (Transport) Committee, and to withdraw from Joint Development Control - Cambridge Fringes planning committee.</p> <p>As Chair of both Planning and Planning and Transport committees in Cambridge I regularly sit with other committee members and listen to representations from residents, the business community and indeed, from other councillors. All are welcome to come to the table and contribute to the debate, to both inform by extending the evidence base, and indeed, by the power of their rhetorical argument. It does not matter if they are a college Lord or the daughter of a bed-ridden mother. All are equal at the table and it is the content of what they say rather than how they say it that might or might not hold sway with their elected representatives. Such is the nature of the administrative detail of a fair and just society, of a place where the democratic right of the citizen to have their say is placed in high regard. The people of Cambridge quite rightly demand to have their say on a whole range of matters, sometimes contrary to the intention of any given ruling administration, but that is completely right and proper.</p>

		<p>As a member of both the above mentioned committees I have never ceased to be amazed at the selfless sheer hard work and determined resourcefulness exhibited by speakers attending to add to the debate, and also of the intimate degree of local knowledge exhibited, all of which contribute so usefully toward the quality of decision making by committee members. Furthermore, the quality and power of decision making by those councillors of different authorities and political persuasions, when, faced with what might on the face of it be a perfectly reasonable item, begin pulling it apart in debate, and against the odds, rejecting said item, and sending it back from whence it came.</p> <p>You, the political leadership of Cambridgeshire County Council would appear to have come to a decision. However, I would urge you all to listen, and listen hard, to the debate from the Leaders of both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and indeed, from many others, and then think again. At the very least, a constructive approach would be a joint review of both Committees with council partners, including Cambridge City Council. There will always be room for improvement and we must always strive to do better for our residents. However, there is absolutely no argument that I can see for damaging both committees in this way, and for breaking the long established council to council partnerships that have grown up over so many years.</p>
23.	<p>Claire Ruskin (Cambridge Network)</p>	<p>From a business and resident point of view I am concerned that you are proposing radical changes to decision-making structures at the moment.</p> <p>The changes you are proposing should surely be discussed transparently, with the logic for changes set out openly. If you consider current structures such as JDCC and CJAC to be ineffective or inappropriate then the case should be set out in a way that those involved can understand and agree with. People like me, with no party political angle, should be able to understand the logic and appreciate the transparency.</p> <p>This is not a time to be making changes of significant impact to the region without a very strong case, which I can't see that the County Council has. To be open to scrutiny is even more vital in an economy that is stressed, and the County Council seems to be announcing major changes without having consulted partners at the City Council or South Cambridgeshire Council or indeed any residents or businesses. In my extensive interactions with business people and residents around the wider region I am always hearing that they want joined up thinking and integrated actions, not being split into different local authority silos that they don't feel any need to hear about. The proposals seem to take us back not forward.</p> <p>Getting transport and planning decisions for Greater Cambridge right is in the interests of the whole county and the UK.</p> <p>My request is that you withdraw this proposal until the parties can have proper consideration and scrutiny, which may not be until we are through recovery from COVID-19.</p>

24.	Professor Phil Allmendinger	It's very worrying for a major employer with significant development plans, research activity and at a time of uncertainty and national need to have to contend with premature and unsettling changes with no real justification. I would urge you to rethink this.
25.	Paula Downes  (Coldhams Lane Residents' Association)	<p>I write as the Chair of the Romsey Residents Association, a body of some 105 local residents in Cambridge, to register the Association's firm objection to the planned decommissioning of the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (item 3.3, meeting 22.4.2020). We believe this proposal has not been thought through. We urge the C&amp;E Committee to think again and to reject it.</p> <p>The Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC) serves the needs of the City of Cambridge. It is a uniquely complex transport environment, balancing the needs of business, municipal function, local residents, the two universities and green policy. The City is quite unlike other areas of the County, and it has different needs, so we do not accept the argument that an equitable policy is simply 'the same for all'. On the contrary, our members believe an equitable policy means that responsibility for local transport related issues—the function of the Joint Area Committee—remain with local representatives and residents, i.e. the City Council and CJAC.</p> <p>The need for resident parking permits, control of one-way streets, the opening up of new cycle lanes etc. are all matters that require local knowledge and direct experience of the developing City and its changing environment. As such, it should be handled by CJAC, as a subset of the City Council, who live and work in the environment in question, and who answer directly to local voters. It makes little sense, in our view, for decisions pertaining to the transport environment to be taken away from those Officers with primary knowledge of and direct interest in the area being affected.</p> <p>We do not accept the relevance of an argument that since a working process is in place elsewhere in the County, it can reasonably subsume the City of Cambridge. If anything, this is precisely wrongheaded: local needs are best governed by local people. Transport in the City of Cambridge is best governed by CJAC.</p> <p>A recent example is the installation of double yellow lines at the intersection of Cromwell Rd with Coldhams Lane, where excessive parking created a dangerous environment for vehicles turning into Cromwell Rd., hindered crossing to the Nuffield Health, and impinged on a pedestrian crossing. It is</p>

		<p>indicative of the good functioning of the current arrangements that members of CJAC were able to act efficiently to resolve this. The area is much the better for it.</p> <p>Finally, as members will know, it is often impractical or impossible for local people to make their views known at public meetings. Time windows for meetings are narrow, and opportunities to attend are often lost, particularly for disabled residents, those pinned to medical appointments, professional and childcare responsibilities. If CJAC is dissolved, it would make it harder for the members of our Residents' Association, the local people of Romsey in Cambridge, to give input into policy that affects them, and to voice concern when disputes arise.</p> <p>For all these reasons, the Members of the Residents Association urge the Committee members to reject the proposal and to retain the existence of Cambridge's Joint Area Committee.</p>
26.	Peter Studdert	<p>My attention has been drawn to Agenda Item 3 of the meeting of the Constitution and Ethics Committee to be held on 22nd April, at which your Committee is being recommended to endorse a proposal to withdraw County representation from the Joint Development Control Committee for the Cambridge Fringes and to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Transport Committee. As a former Director of Joint Planning for Cambridge's Growth Areas from 2007-2011 I should be very grateful if you would give consideration to the following comments:</p> <p>The move by the County Council to withdraw from the JDDC is deeply puzzling. Implementation of Cambridge's ambitious growth agenda is a shared responsibility between all three authorities, and the Fringes JDCC is one of the most successful illustrations of shared planning and transport delivery across the UK.</p> <p>The unilateral withdrawal by one party from the JDCC would give out a very poor message to central Government, as well as to local communities. The County Council has a key role in ensuring that the public realm and highways are well integrated into the vision for the new neighbourhoods. Although the County functions could be discharged independently from the other authorities, the value of a joint approach is that all three authorities are seen to be engaging in a co-operative spirit on the complex challenges that these new neighbourhoods represent.</p> <p>The County Council is a key partner in ensuring a joined-up approach to making a success of the new neighbourhoods, and it's essential that community infrastructure such as transport routes, schools and libraries are properly considered and integrated into the overall development both at the outline</p>

		<p>application/S106 Agreement stage and at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The Director of Governance and Legal Services puts forward two reasons for withdrawing from the JDDC in the report to Committee, neither of which stand up to scrutiny. Para 4.7 states that the JDDC has different administrative processes from the County's own Planning Committee, such as giving local residents an opportunity to express their views through a Development Control Forum (DCF). It's difficult to see why this should be a problem as the DCFs enhance local democracy - perhaps the County ought to change its Planning Committee procedures to make them more open and transparent?</p> <p>Secondly para 4.8 states that no other part of the County has a similar Joint Committee, so it should withdraw from this one out of fairness to the rest of the County. However the growth sites on the Cambridge City/South Cambs fringes are unique in their complexity because they straddle administrative boundaries, and this context is also unique in the County and so benefits from these special arrangements.</p> <p>I'm dismayed too to see that the County Council is also proposing to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Transport Committee. This would be a hugely retrograde step and I'm sure that there will be a lot of objections from local residents and businesses in Cambridge who want to see both of the local authorities co-operating in a consensual manner on traffic and transport issues, rather than having in the near future to travel to Alconbury to make their case to a totally separate County Council committee, and to officers working there.</p> <p>I very much hope that your Committee will oppose the recommendation and maintains the County Council's commitment to these two crucially important Joint Committees.</p>
27.	Claire Cameron	<p>As current Chair of the Rustat Neighbourhood Association I am writing to add my objections to the proposal to disband the area committee. There are many ongoing developments in the City which require proper scrutiny to ensure they have the support of the residents and workforce nearby. The Committee is an extremely valuable opportunity to practice democratic debate and should be retained.</p>
28.	Harriet Gillett	<p>I read with dismay in the Cambridge Cycle Campaign communication about the proposal to be discussed tomorrow 22 May by the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to close the Cambridge Joint Area Committee. Apparently its powers would be transferred to the County Highways Committee. This would mean issues such as residents parking and traffic calming would be decided by predominantly county councillors from outside of Cambridge who would not understand the severity of the traffic issues in Cambridge, and hence unlikely to support actions that CJAC supports.</p>

		I believe these discussions should be postponed to a later date to allow for proper public engagement and that residents should be properly consulted.
29.	Storey's Way Residents Association	<p>The Committee Members of the Storey's Way Residents Association (SWRA) only received a note yesterday about the proposal to close down the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC) and transfer its powers to the County Highways Committee.</p> <p>CJAC is very well attended by local residents and is an important local forum. We therefore would like to express our concerns about the possible closure of CJAC.</p> <p>The SWRA Committee is of the view that the proposal and decision should be deferred until a later date, at least until proper public attendance may be possible at the Constitution and Ethics Committee. Moreover, we believe that there should be a public consultation and review of this decision.</p>
30.	Councillor Richard Robertson  (Cambridge City Council)	<p>I am writing to you as the chair of the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC) with regard to the proposal to abolish the Committee. I have served on CJAC for the last six years and with that experience it is clear to me that the proposal would lead to a poorer service to the community and far more work for the Highways and Transport Committee if full transparency and accountability in decision making is to be maintained.</p> <p>Local residents quite rightly take a close interest in changes proposed to the street outside their home, particularly if it involves parking, as many of our city residents do not have their own off-street parking. Virtually all the proposals we handle are contentious and draw support and objection from near neighbours. We always have residents, often large numbers of them, attend our meetings to question proposals in detail.</p> <p>It is stated that contentious issues would be referred back to the Highways and Transport Committee where "Local Members and the public will be able to.... make their views known." That is going to lead to a lot of extra work for that committee. I have looked back at the agendas of the existing Highways committee for the past six years and there have been no items requiring assessment and adjudication on the sort of local highway improvement schemes CJAC deals with at almost every meeting. Our meetings often take two or three hours to deal with representations from the public and decide on these issues. It seems clear that CJAC should continue to be delegated this work rather than burden the Highways and Transport Committee who will have more strategic issues to deal with.</p> <p>The report states that in 2013 all district councils in the county were offered the opportunity to set up a Joint Area Committee for their district but only Cambridge accepted as the others all felt they would be of</p>

		<p>limited value. This conclusion is not surprising because Cambridge is intrinsically very different from the other districts. The city has a 140,000 residents in a much more densely populated area. Every day we host large numbers of people from elsewhere in the county when they travel in to work, shop, use services and be taught at places of further and higher education. And of course Cambridge is also a magnet for huge numbers of tourists every year.</p> <p>It's not that Cambridge has an unfair advantage in having CJAC to deal with highway improvement and parking issues, it's that the pressures of heavy traffic congestion and related parking pressures make it essential that adequate time is made available to listen to the concerns of local residents whose lives would be affected by proposals, and to assess and adjudicate on them. It is also of note that unlike the other districts we do not have any parish or town councils to assess proposals and take into account representations from local residents. CJAC fulfils that role.</p> <p>The report states that the County Council's constitution "allows the Council to appoint Area Joint Committees as it sees fit, if it is satisfied that to do so will improve service delivery in the context of best value and more efficient, transparent and accountable decision making." In my experience it is essential that CJAC is not abolished as to do so would have completely the opposite effect. And it would add considerably to the work of the Highways and Transport Committee if full and proper consideration is to continue to be given to the detail of highway improvements and parking proposals which affect the lives of Cambridge residents.</p> <p>I hope you will see that this proposal has not been thought through and should be rejected.</p>
31.	Tim Burford	<p>I am very alarmed by what I'm reading about the county council trying to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee and make decisions that directly impact the lives of a quarter of the county's population far away in Alconbury. Consultation will be greatly impeded, and I hope you will admit that consultation is not a delaying mechanism but something that will usually lead to major improvements to plans.</p> <p>In addition, to rush this through while democracy is undermined by not being able to have real physical meetings looks particularly bad. I do hope you will reconsider and delay this until proper scrutiny and democratic process can resume.</p>
32.	Daniel Zeichner MP	<p>I am finding near universal concern across Cambridge about the proposals on the Joint Development Control Committee. Given the current crisis I would urge you to defer and allow a more extended discussion.</p>

33.	Trumpington Residents' Association	<p>The Trumpington Residents' Association is most concerned that a report to this Wednesday's meeting asks the Committee to recommend to the Council abolition of the Cambridge Joint Area Committee and withdrawal from the Joint Development Control Committee. We value both of these committees and ask that residents in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire are consulted before the County Council makes such fundamental decisions, so that the Council is fully informed by the views of the people they would most affect.</p> <p>It is our reasonable expectation that the three councils whose decisions on these matters affect us should work together and be seen by the public to do so. These decisions, if made, would seem to conflict with this important principle. We do not agree, as the report argues, that the current arrangements unduly favour Cambridge and disadvantage other areas in Cambridgeshire. They respond appropriately to the different circumstances of Cambridge and help to ensure equity in our local governance with all parts of Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>It is in light of this and the importance we attach to the functions served by both committees that the association makes this urgent request.</p>
34.	Councillor McPherson  (Cambridge City Council)	<p>I am most concerned that should the proposed abolition go ahead it will deprive the residents of the Cambridge of their opportunity to both directly influence decisions taken in their own city and also deprive them of the opportunity to have their democratically elected Councillors represent them at a properly convened and recorded meeting where issues can be properly debated and informed decisions made and the process of those decisions can be scrutinised and challenged by both elected councillors and residents alike. I therefore strongly believe that the democratic process will be seriously compromised by such a decision and it should on these grounds, and those of Cllr Robertson be completely discounted and the CJAC be allowed to continue in its present form.</p>
35.	Terry Horsnell	<p>Since this will have a potentially large impact on the means of City residents to make their views known to the County Council, I would ask you to defer this abolition proposal until such time as Cambridge residents have had a chance to have their say.</p>
36.	Tom Parker	<p>I would like to register my objection to the scrapping of the Cambridge Transport Committee. It is important that decisions regarding transport developments in Cambridge involve representatives from the city council as well as the county council, so that the people taking the decisions are more directly involved in the city whose future they will be affecting. I note that other parts of the county could also have taken up the opportunity to have similar Committees but declined to do so - that should not be a reason to abolish the one that does exist, especially when it affects the major city and employment hub in the county council area.</p>

37.	Jane Paterson-Todd (Cambridge Ahead)	I understand the County Council is considering withdrawing from the Joint Development Control Committee, from August. As you know Cambridge Ahead continues to support the joint working of the local authorities to help realise and accelerate plans for the region and we would be keen to understand more the County Council's thinking behind this consideration.
38.	Chris Rand	I would like to add my name to those objecting to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
39.	Councillor Mike Sargeant  (Cambridge City Council)	<p>It was recognised, in 2007 by Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council along with the Department of Communities for Local Government, the need for 'very substantial strengthening of the delivery arrangements for sustainable growth in and around Cambridge.' This included the setting up of the Joint Development Control Committee – Fringes.</p> <p>More recently, the Combined Authority Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) said:</p> <p><b>KEY RECOMMENDATION #13</b> New collaborative ways of working need to be developed, which provide for <b>tailored solutions</b> to the needs of each of the <b>three distinct economies.....</b>' (Greater Cambridge, Greater Peterborough and the Fens)</p> <p>In addition, it said: <b>KEY RECOMMENDATION #3:</b> The UK Government should adopt a 'Cambridge or overseas' mentality towards knowledge-intensive (KI) business in this area, recognising that in an era of international connectivity and footloose labour, many high-value companies will need to relocate abroad if this area no longer meets their needs. Ensuring that Cambridge continues to deliver for KI businesses should be considered a nationally strategic priority.</p> <p>The proposal from the County Council to withdraw from the Joint Development Control Committee – Fringes is removing an existing '<b>tailored solution</b>' of the sort that the CPIER was recommending and putting nothing in its place. The County Council are recommending uniformity across the County without any reference to the needs of each of the '<b>three distinct economies</b>'.</p> <p>The Fringe sites contain some of the most important technological businesses in the country. It will also provide many of the sites that will provide much of the new jobs that are vital to the Mayor's objective to double GVA while providing homes close to jobs and minimising the need for people travelling long</p>

		<p>distances to work. These are all issues that I would suggest Cambridgeshire County Council should be involved in at the planning stage.</p> <p>It is vital that local authorities work together as has been illustrated so much by the current pandemic. I urge the Cambridgeshire County Council Constitution and Ethics Committee not to take a hasty decision on this matter which could have a long term negative impact on the vital part that Greater Cambridge will play in recovering from the impact of the pandemic and the future prosperity both locally and for UK PLC.</p>
--	--	---

**CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE MEETING – 22ND APRIL 2020**

**AGENDA ITEM 3: COMMITTEE STRUCTURES**

**WRITTEN STATEMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE DEADLINE**

No.	Question from:	Question
1.	Friends of Mitcham's Corner	<p>We are very concerned that there is a proposal by the Cambridgeshire County Council to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee (CJAC). The CJAC is a very important aspect of the democratic process within Cambridge and needs to be retained.</p> <p>The CJAC is comprised of our local elected City and County Councillors and as such are the people best placed to consider the issues that affect Cambridge City. They are residents of the City, known to all and available to discuss community issues. They have a deep and broad understanding of the myriad local concerns that affect us all in the City on a daily basis, and what the effects of changes to policy and practices can have on local neighbourhoods and the City as a whole.</p> <p>With this connectivity and knowledge, the CJAC is in a very good position to help resolve City issues and bring informed support to the County Council to aid decision making.</p> <p>Cambridge is a city of 140,000 residents in numerous neighbourhoods, all with differing concerns and requirements that also need to interact with each other. The CJAC is vital to this process of interaction and resolution.</p> <p>Transport issues within Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City have become highly politicised, and the various vested interests have demonstrated that they will circumvent public discussion and oversight in order to achieve their visions. This is precisely the time that a democratic forum like the CJAC is most needed: abolishing it would take away a vital layer of locally focussed decision making.</p> <p>Friends of Mitcham's Corner represent the aspirations of the local community, with a focus on development and transport issues. We feel that the large-scale highways projects in the north of Cambridge (the A14, Histon Road, Milton Road) are being carried out at the expense of the Mitcham's Corner area, hindering its redevelopment as an 'Opportunity Area'. We must have a voice in this future, and channels like the CJAC must not be closed to us.</p>

2.	Heather Warwick	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
3.	Christine Parkinson	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
4.	Brian Dawson	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
5.	Nigel Ley	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
6	Lindsey Terry	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
7.	Richard Stewart	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
8.	Ian Hutchinson	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out. It seems a completely nonsensical idea and to push through without any consultation an abuse of a difficult situation.
9.	Eldon Allison	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
10.	Mike Beasley	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
11.	Sue Procter	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.
12.	Stephanie Palmer	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out. Decisions should be made as close as possible to the areas that will be affected.
13.	Barrie Hunt	I would like to object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out.

14.	Councillor Rosy Moore  (Cambridge City Council)	I would like to state my objections to the proposal to abolish Cambridge Joint Area Committee which is an important part of local democracy for the residents of Cambridge. It is wrong to make this decision in the midst of the Coronavirus crisis when many people are correctly working hard to support their communities at this time and are not focused on council committees. Please postpone this decision until you have been able to carry out the appropriate consultation.
15.	Paul Bearpark  (Waterbeach Cycling Campaign)	<p>I'm writing on behalf of Waterbeach Cycling Campaign. The campaign was established about 2 years ago and now has about 130 signed up supporters. We campaign for better cycling infrastructure in and around Waterbeach which will undergo significant development over the next few years with the establishment of the Waterbeach New Town.</p> <p>We have become aware that the County Council's Constitution and Ethics Committee is being asked to recommend abolishing the Cambridge Joint Area Committee and the Joint Development Control Committee. We are concerned that this will have a detrimental impact on transport decisions in and around Cambridge.</p> <p>Our understanding is that these committees make decisions at a local level taking consideration of local residents' views. Without these committees decisions will be made about transport in and around Cambridge by County councillors who have little appreciation of the needs of people living in or close to Cambridge. It is not at all clear what the abolition of these committees will really mean because there is little information about the proposals (other than to abolish committees) and there has been no consultation as far as we are aware.</p> <p>This seems to be a very poor time to be making a decision which could have significant implications for Cambridge and the Cambridge fringe which has dramatically different transportation and development issues to the wider county.</p> <p>Therefore, I urge you to consider carefully whether this is the right time to withdraw support for these committees without proper scrutiny and consultation.</p>
16.	Steve Jackson	<p>I must object to the proposal to abolish the Cambridge Joint Area Committee without more extensive consultation being carried out, especially with those directly affected by this proposal</p> <p>Would you please let me know what measures, if any, you are prepared to articulate to ensure local democracy remains ..... local, and prevent this attempted (dare I say?) gerrymandering?</p>

**CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE MEETING – 22ND APRIL 2020**

**AGENDA ITEM 3: COMMITTEE STRUCTURES**

**RESPONSES TO WRITTEN STATEMENTS ON THE PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL FROM JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

No.	Questioner	Question
3.	Camcycle	<p>The Cambridge Cycling Campaign touched upon concerns surrounding the “democratic process” and that city residents and councillors would be “silent voices”. My response to that from a Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) perspective is that the planning process allows for any concerns and objections to be submitted by residents and councillors alike, including officer comments from the Greater Cambridge Planning Team, all of which are taken into account before a recommendation is proposed to elected councillors. So if a decision is made today for elected Members to withdraw the Council’s delegation of County planning applications and City Deal related matters to the JDCC for determination, and therefore their right to vote at JDCC, this would not remove the voice of residents or their representatives (specialist officers or political representation).</p> <p>Furthermore the public speaking rights at both JDCC and Planning Committee allow representations to be made directly to the decision makers, so the process in this regard won’t change.</p>
8.	Alan Ackroyd	<p>Mr Ackroyd also made reference to removing the voice of Cambridge residents and their representatives, so from a JDCC perspective I hope this has been clarified through my response to question 3 from Camcycle.</p>
11.	Councillor Dave Baigent (Cambridge City Council)	<p>Councillor Baigent acknowledged his work serving on the JDCC and raised four separate points that I would like to respond to in turn.</p> <p>His first point was in relation to the accord between the three councils and the knock on effect of making constituents part of the decision making process in areas that sometimes have confused responsibility. What I would say to that is that officers from all three councils will still all work together to ensure concerns of local residents and elected members are taken into account in the decision making process, which like my answers to written statements 3 and 8, will ensure that everything is taken into account before a decision is reached. Furthermore in relation to the confusion over responsibility I agree with this wholeheartedly. However, having</p>

		<p>some county applications being determined by JDCC and others by the County Council's Planning Committee is actually adding to this confusion, a prime example being the Abbey to Chesterton Bridge being considered by the County Council's Planning Committee and the Chisholm Trail by JDCC, so I actually think having all County applications considered in the same way would help an element of this confusion.</p> <p>His second point relates to a wider democratic mandate of decision making providing improved outcomes. Whilst I can understand the point being made here, I would suggest that those considering planning decisions come to a planning meeting open to the items in front of them and without any pre-determined opinions or decisions being made, so the right to speak process allows different knowledge and experiences to be highlighted for their consideration of material planning matters, ahead of a decision being reached. Both JDCC and the Council's Planning Committee allow local members to speak and this would not be lost if a decision is taken by the Council to withdraw from the JDCC.</p> <p>His third point is that things that happen in Cambridge City can have wider implications that should involve all three councils involved in the decision making process. I would agree that this is the case in all areas of the county, particularly where development in one district administrative area can have a larger impact on a neighbouring district than where the development is occurring – HGVs passing through villages is an example of this. I do not think this is unique to Cambridge. Nonetheless, in the same way as highlighted in my response to his second point, the ability to hear from local councillors and residents as part of the right to speak process ensures that such matters are considered ahead of any decision, in the same way as they are at present. As such, there would be no difference in assessing the planning merits of any planning application or the process undertaken by officers, the only difference would be which elected members vote on it.</p> <p>His fourth point relates to an "unintended consequence" of improved networking and a wider understanding of the work of the three councils. Given that the officer relationship and joint working is not proposed to change I have assumed that this relates to political networks, which can no doubt be addressed through other means than the JDCC.</p>
21.	Edward Leigh	<p>Mr Leigh touched upon the critical importance of JDCC for the Cambridge Fringes to ensure that spatial and transport planning decisions are made in a co-ordinated way. In my response to that I would say that any strategic growth planning applications will continue to be considered by the relevant City, District and County Council, as already takes place in the Greater Cambridge area and across the growth sites in other areas of the County. The JDCC is not critical to this taking place. The support from specialist officers, including input and technical assistance from a transport perspective will continue, alongside the strategic planning co-ordination of key areas such as health and education matters in the negotiation of the Section 106 agreements. As such, the</p>

		input, co-ordination and approach to spatial planning is not proposed to change in the event that a decision is taken for County Councillors to withdraw from the JDCC, as it is not the committee that provides this.
22.	Councillor Martin Smart (Cambridge City Council)	<p>Councillor Smart acknowledged the quality and power of decision making by councillors of different authorities and different political persuasions and the quality of speakers attending the debates. I would agree with him that both the JDCC and the County Council’s Planning Committee have excellent input from local communities and residents alike and some excellent members that sit on them. Furthermore, planning decisions are not political and are therefore based on material planning reasons and the adopted development plan. Therefore, even if a decision were made today for the County Council to withdraw from the JDCC, I have no doubt that this quality of input would remain on both committees.</p> <p>Reference was also made to “damaging” the committee and “breaking” partnership working if a decision were taken today to withdraw from the JDCC. From my perspective the JDCC would not be “damaged” by losing County Councillors voting on the items, as the excellent joint working undertaken by officers would continue to ensure that decision makers are given all the views for a decision to be taken. This is in line with my thoughts already given on similar concerns raised in written statements 3, 11 and 21; as well as being relevant to some other similar concerns raised in written statements 23, 26, 32, 33, 37 and 39.</p>
23.	Claire Ruskin (Cambridge Network)	Ms Ruskin raised the new structures being based on “ineffective or inappropriate” current structures. I just wanted to clarify that the proposals being considered today stem from member workloads and committee workloads (particularly taking account of the Climate Change Emergency declared by the Council), and equity across the whole of the county, not upon any reflections made to individuals or committees.
26.	Peter Studdert	<p>Mr Studdert raises a number of points in relation to JDCC. Some of these have already been covered in my earlier responses, but I think it is worth touching on some of these to demonstrate my consideration of his points and to allow members of the Constitution and Ethics Committee an opportunity to consider these in detail ahead of reaching their view.</p> <p>The first point I want to reiterate is that the background to the proposal to withdraw from JDCC stems from member workloads and equity across the county, so it is in no way a reflection of the performance and success of the JDCC over nearly 13 years. Furthermore, the processes that have delivered the success referred to are set to remain from an officer perspective, and if anything there are opportunities to review the remit of JDCC to make it even better, particularly given that the City Council and SCDC now have a shared planning service. The officer support and joint working will remain, so I truly believe that the shared planning and transport delivery will continue.</p>

		<p>The second point relates to his view that this will provide “a very poor message to central Government, as well as to local communities”. Given the officer support and cross working arrangements already in place, which are set to continue, I don’t think this is the way the communication should be given or received. The ambition for growth and economic success has not changed and without wishing to seem disrespectful to any local resident, I don’t think they will see any noticeable change to what is being proposed.</p> <p>The third point relates to key partner working and a joined up approach in applications and S106 stage. As reflected in my response to written statement 21, the county input into the vision and delivery of strategic infrastructure will not change, and the officer joint working is not proposed to stop, so this would not change if a decision is taken today for county councillors to withdraw from the JDCC.</p> <p>The fourth point relates to the challenges for withdrawing from the JDCC that do not “stand up to scrutiny”. Whilst I don’t intend to go into detail or be drawn into a debate on whether JDCC is better or worse than the County Council’s Planning Committee and processes, or whether Cambridge is unique when it comes to planning decisions which I have already touched upon in my response to written statement 11, I come back to the fact that there are different administrative processes that come as a result of the JDCC, with the planning templates and the Development Control Forum being only two examples of these differences; and with the retention of this committee it is additional workloads for members and does not provide equity across the County.</p>
<p>32. &amp; 33. &amp; 37. &amp; 39.</p>	<p>Daniel Zeichner MP Trumpington Residents’ Association Jane Paterson-Todd (Cambridge Ahead) Councillor Mike Sargeant (Cambridge City Council)</p>	<p>Mr Zeichner MP, Trumpington Residents’ Association, Jane Paterson-Todd and Councillor Sargeant all raise concerns around the loss of the JDCC and in particular potential implications to joint working, while in some cases seeing JDCC as the “tailored solution” for this happening. However, as already covered in previous answers, it is not JDCC that provides this and the officer joint working arrangements are not proposed to change, so the same specialist involvement and support will continue to be given across the area, and the planning process will therefore not change, other than by who votes on the respective items.</p>