

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Please note the meeting can be viewed on YouTube at the following link:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fBMi4xSs57o>

Date: Tuesday, 11th December 2018

Time: 10:30am – 1:10pm

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor M Smith (Chairman)
Councillors: D Ambrose Smith, A Bailey, H Batchelor, I Bates, C Boden, A Bradnam, S Bywater, D Connor, A Costello, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, K Cuffley, P Downes, L Dupre, L Every, J French, R Fuller, I Gardener, J Gowing, L Harford, N Harrison, A Hay, R Hickford, M Howell, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, L Jones, L Joseph, N Kavanagh, S Kindersley, S King, I Manning, M McGuire (Vice Chairman), E Meschini, K Reynolds, C Richards, T Rogers, T Sanderson, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, A Taylor, S Taylor, S Tierney, P Topping, S van de Ven, D Wells, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson and T Wotherspoon

Apologies: Councillors: D Giles, M Goldsack, D Jenkins, L Nethsingha, and J Wisson

116. MINUTES – 16TH OCTOBER 2018

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 16th October 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

117. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

118. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

119. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chairman reported that three questions had been received from members of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

120. PETITIONS

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

121. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Treasury Management Report – Quarter 2

It was moved by the Chairman of General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hickford, that the recommendation from the General Purposes Committee, as set out in the report on the Council agenda, be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

approve the Treasury Management Report – Quarter 2 for 2018/19.

122. REPORTS OF THE CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

(a) Proposal to establish joint working across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Boards

It was moved by the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor McGuire, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Reynolds, that the recommendations of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, as set out in the report, be approved. Council noted the Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board's thanks to the Director of Public Health and Board Members for their work on the proposal.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

- a) approve amendments to the Council's Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee, and set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
- b) authorise the Deputy Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

(b) Review of Outside Bodies

It was moved by the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor McGuire, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Reynolds, that the recommendations of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, as set out in the report, be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by a show of hands to:

- a) approve amendments to the Council's Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee, and set out in the report at Section 2.
- b) authorise the Deputy Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

123. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

It was moved by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Smith, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, and resolved by a show of hands:

to approve the appointment of Councillor Hickford as Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board to replace Councillor Topping.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Labour, Independents and 8 Liberal Democrats in favour; 4 Liberal Democrats abstained.]

124. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Three motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

(a) Motion from Councillor Steve Count

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Steve Count and seconded by Councillor Connor:

In 2014 the County Council negotiated with its recognised trade unions, a collective agreement which inserted in all employees' contracts a provision to require employees to take up to three days' mandatory unpaid leave if the County Council faced significant financial difficulties.

Across the country, many councils are facing a difficult financial situation and the County Council is no different. In this financial year (2018/19), the County Council was projecting a £14.6m overspend if no action was taken due mainly to the increased demand for its services.

With the hard work and commitment of the Senior Management Team (SMT) and our employees, that overspend was reduced to around £8m without resorting to cutting services or making staff redundant.

In these circumstances SMT considered that the terms of the collective agreement were triggered as the County Council was facing significant financial difficulties. Senior managers from SMT met with the trade unions and set out those financial difficulties and told the trade unions that the mandatory unpaid leave provisions would be implemented in the financial year (2018/19) so that employees would lose around 1.2% pay whilst gaining three extra days of leave, giving a saving of £900k to the County Council's budget.

SMT sought to reduce the impact of this agreement on employees by:-

- a) negotiating a variation to the collective agreement so that the lowest paid employees, those earning less than £26,000, were not included in the agreement;
- b) spreading the deductions in the salaries of employees over a twelve month period starting in November 2018;
- c) allowing employees, who were required to work to maintain essential services, to take their unpaid leave over a twelve month period.

This Council agrees

- To note the decision of the Senior Management Team and its discussions with the trade unions as set out above;
- That the decision was fair and is supported by us as Councillors, made necessary under the present financial circumstances;
- That we as Councillors should not be exempted from the personal financial implications;
- That we as Councillors agree to 1.2% reduction in our allowances, spread over a twelve month period;
- That this motion is intended to apply to all sixty-one Councillors, not just the nine who have allowances in excess of £25,000;
- That the voting be recorded and that a vote for this motion is a voluntary request to Democratic Services to reduce the allowance as outlined. A vote against or abstention to be assumed to be no voluntary reduction. That any Councillors wishing their vote to be treated differently and for those not present should notify Democratic Services within one week of this meeting if they wish to take a 1.2% reduction in their allowance. For the sake of transparency, Democratic Services will publish on our website those Councillors who have agreed to a voluntary reduction in their allowances;
- That the Leader of the Council writes to inform all employees of the decision made by Councillors as a result of this Motion and thanks employees for their continued hard work and commitment for the residents of Cambridgeshire.

One Member requested advice from the Monitoring Officer on the legality of the motion. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the content of the motion was legally acceptable and that the motion could therefore be considered.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Dupre and seconded by Councillor Downes:

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough:

Council notes that:

- In 2014 the County Council negotiated with its recognised trade unions, a collective agreement which inserted in all employees' contracts a provision to require employees to take up to three days' mandatory unpaid leave if the County Council faced significant financial difficulties.

~~Across the country, many councils are facing a difficult financial situation and the County Council is no different. In this financial year (2018/19), the County Council was projecting a £14.6m overspend if no action was taken due mainly to the increased demand for its services.~~

~~With the hard work and commitment of the Senior Management Team (SMT) and our employees, that overspend was reduced to around £8m without resorting to cutting services or making staff redundant.~~

~~In these circumstances SMT considered that the terms of the collective agreement were triggered as the County Council was facing significant financial difficulties. Senior~~

~~managers from SMT met with the trade unions and set out those financial difficulties and told the trade unions that the mandatory unpaid leave provisions would be implemented in the financial year (2018/19) so that employees would lose around 1.2% pay whilst gaining three extra days of leave, giving a saving of £900k to the County Council's budget.~~

~~SMT sought to reduce the impact of this agreement on employees by:-~~

- ~~b) negotiating a variation to the collective agreement so that the lowest paid employees, those earning less than £26,000, were not included in the agreement;~~
- ~~b) spreading the deductions in the salaries of employees over a twelve month period starting in November 2018;~~
- ~~c) allowing employees, who were required to work to maintain essential services, to take their unpaid leave over a twelve month period.~~
- **Staff on a salary band of £26,000 or over will have their pay cut by 1.2 per cent in partial mitigation of the council's projected £8M overspend;**
- **The Conservative administration in July 2017 rejected the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel for councillors' allowances, and instead implemented a scheme of their own devising, awarding substantial rises predominantly to Conservative councillors and costing £185,000 more than the recommendations of the independent panel;**
- **A 1.2 per cent deduction from the allowances of all 61 councillors would contribute £11,241 towards the budget pressures;**
- **The Liberal Democrat group has declined to nominate a Champion for South Cambridgeshire since May 2018, already saving the Council £5,000 per annum from the allowances budget.**

This Council agrees

- To note the decision of the Senior Management Team ~~and its discussions with the trade unions~~ as set out above;
- ~~— That the decision was fair and is supported by us as Councillors, made necessary under the present financial circumstances;~~
- That we as Councillors should not be exempted from the personal financial implications;
- That ~~we as~~ **some** Councillors **may wish** to agree to a 1.2% **voluntary** reduction in **their** ~~our~~ allowances, spread over a twelve month period;
- That this motion is intended to apply to all sixty-one Councillors, not just the nine who have allowances in excess of £25,000;
- ~~— That the voting be recorded and that a vote for this motion is a voluntary request to Democratic Services to reduce the allowance as outlined. A vote against or abstention to be assumed to be no voluntary reduction. That any Councillors wishing their vote to be treated differently and for those not present should notify Democratic Services within one week of this meeting if they wish to take a 1.2% reduction in their allowance. For the sake of transparency, Democratic Services will publish on our website those Councillors who have agreed to a voluntary reduction in their allowances;~~

- **To refer the issue of members allowances to the Independent Remuneration Panel to consider whether any changes are necessary and if so to make recommendations back to Council**
- That the Leader of the Council writes ~~to~~ inform all employees of the decision made by Councillors as a result of this Motion and thanks employees for their continued hard work and commitment for the residents of Cambridgeshire.

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

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

The following amendment was subsequently proposed by Councillor Crawford and seconded by Councillor Whitehead:

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

In 2014 the County Council negotiated with its recognised trade unions, a collective agreement which inserted in all employees' contracts a provision to require employees to take up to three days' mandatory unpaid leave if the County Council faced significant financial difficulties.

Across the country, many councils are facing a difficult financial situation and the County Council is no different. In this financial year (2018/19), the County Council was projecting a £14.6m overspend if no action was taken due mainly to the increased demand for its services.

With the hard work and commitment of the Senior Management Team (SMT) and our employees, that overspend was reduced to around £8m without resorting to cutting services or making staff redundant.

In these circumstances SMT considered that the terms of the collective agreement were triggered as the County Council was facing significant financial difficulties. Senior managers from SMT met with the trade unions and set out those financial difficulties and told the trade unions that the mandatory unpaid leave provisions would be implemented in the financial year (2018/19) so that employees would lose around 1.2% pay whilst gaining three extra days of leave, giving a saving of £900k to the County Council's budget.

SMT sought to reduce the impact of this agreement on employees by:-

- d) negotiating a variation to the collective agreement so that the lowest paid employees, those earning less than £26,000, were not included in the agreement;
- b) spreading the deductions in the salaries of employees over a twelve month period starting in November 2018;
- c) allowing employees, who were required to work to maintain essential services, ~~to~~ take their unpaid leave over a twelve month period.

This Council agrees

[Vote 1]

- To note the decision of the Senior Management Team and its discussions with the trade unions as set out above;
- That the decision was fair and is supported by us as Councillors, made necessary under the present financial circumstances;

[Vote Two]

- That we as Councillors should not be exempted from the personal financial implications;
- That we as Councillors agree to 1.2% reduction in our allowances, spread over a twelve month period;
- That this motion is intended to apply to all sixty-one Councillors, not just the nine who have allowances in excess of £25,000;
- **That we as Councillors, could have the option of donating 1.2% of our allowance to the Union Fund.**
- That the voting be recorded and that a vote for this motion is a voluntary request to Democratic Services to reduce the allowance as outlined. A vote against or abstention to be assumed to be no voluntary reduction. That any Councillors wishing their vote to be treated differently and for those not present should notify Democratic Services within one week of this meeting if they wish to take a 1.2% reduction in their allowance. For the sake of transparency, Democratic Services will publish on our website those Councillors who have agreed to a voluntary reduction in their allowances; **and that democratic services will also record those councillors who have donated to the Union fund.**
- That the Leader of the Council writes to inform all employees of the decision made by Councillors as a result of this Motion and thanks employees for their continued hard work and commitment for the residents of Cambridgeshire.

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

[Voting pattern: Labour and 1 Independent in favour; Conservatives and 10 Liberal Democrats against; 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Independent abstained]

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

[Voting pattern: 33 Conservatives in favour; Liberal Democrats, Labour and Independents against; 1 Conservative abstained.]

(b) Motion from Councillor Sandra Crawford

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Crawford and seconded by Councillor Dupre:

Council notes the recent announcement that loyal hardworking employees of the council, who provide excellent support and dutiful service, will be deprived of three days' pay over the Christmas period due to the financial crisis engulfing the Council.

Council further notes that the same staff have already endured a real terms pay cut of 18% since the start of austerity in 2010.

Council agrees that we should strive to be an employer of choice providing good quality employment opportunities and fair systems of reward for our employees. This is not only the right thing to do; it also makes good business sense. Well-motivated valued employees deliver the best results. In so doing we enhance our role as community leaders, leading by example, helping to promote good quality employment for all citizens of the County.

Employees of the Council should no longer have to pay the price for the Government's decision to withdraw funding from the Council.

Council therefore instructs the Chief Executive to:

- a. Reinstate three days' pay to those employees currently under notice of its withdrawal
- b. Write to all employees before Christmas and express appreciation for their contribution and hard work throughout the year
- c. Continue to review our Human Resource strategy to ensure we are an employer of choice, and to make sure we have a resource and talent management plan to guarantee we attract and retain high calibre employees.

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

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

(c) Motion from Councillor Elisa Meschini

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Meschini and seconded by Councillor Whitehead.

Ahead of the budget setting meeting in 2019, this council notes with concern that a further £36.6m is forecast in savings for 2019/20, for a cumulative £247.1m budgeted savings since 2013/14.

When the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) was introduced in 2013, it accounted for 17.5% of the Council's total service budget. When adjusted for inflation alone, in order to fund the same proportion of the Council's budget in 2019/20, this should have increased from £85.9m to £99.9m. This council notes that, in addition to inflation, an increase in demand for council services caused by demographic trends in the County has meant that, in order to again fund the same proportion of the Council's budget in 2019/20, the RSG should have

increased further to £126.0m. This council notes with extreme concern that, based on current forecasts, the actual figure in RSG expected for 2019/20 is negative (-£7.2m).

This council notes that, since 2013, it has experienced a real terms reduction of 59.1% in government funding. This reflects the latest forecasts for changes in planned day to day spending by government department, which have seen the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government experience a 60% reduction in funding as per the autumn budget 2017. This reduction in funding is not sustainable given the current level of demand and the amount of savings already made.

This council instructs the Chief Finance Officer to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government asking to make representations to the Treasury for a review of the funding formula for Cambridgeshire. Cambridgeshire is the fastest growing area of the UK, and over the 5 years between 2012— 2016 it has contributed 1.08% to the national Gross Value Added (GVA). A fairer assessment of the funding formula should be based on and account for the rising demand for social care and children's services and the growth in older population.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Count and seconded by Councillor Hickford:

Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough

~~Ahead of the budget setting meeting in 2019, this council notes with concern that a further £36.6m is forecast in savings for 2019/20, for a cumulative £247.1m budgeted savings since 2013/14.~~

~~When the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) was introduced in 2013, it accounted for 17.5% of the Council's total service budget. When adjusted for inflation alone, in order to fund the same proportion of the Council's budget in 2019/20, this should have increased from £85.9m to £99.9m. This council notes that, in addition to inflation, an increase in demand for council services caused by demographic trends in the County has meant that, in order to again fund the same proportion of the Council's budget in 2019/20, the RSG should have increased further to £126.0m. This council notes with extreme concern that, based on current forecasts, the actual figure in RSG expected for 2019/20 is *negative* (-£7.2m).~~

~~This council notes that, since 2013, it has experienced a real terms reduction of 59.1% in government funding. This reflects the latest forecasts for changes in planned day to day spending by government department, which have seen the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government experience a 60% reduction in funding as per the autumn budget 2017. This reduction in funding is not sustainable given the current level of demand and the amount of savings already made.~~

This council notes

- **that after discussions between the Leader Councillor Steve Count, the Chief Executive Gillian Beasley and Head of Communications Christine Birchall, the Council started its FairDeal4Cams campaign in August 2017 with a series of media features over the following two months.**
- **that the Leader Councillor Count, as well as engaging in various face to face meetings, phone calls, social media activity and engagement whenever possible lobbied for Fairer funding and other extra funding opportunities, for Cambridgeshire over those last fifteen months in the following ways.**

FairDeal4Cambs	Aug 17 - ongoing	The Council started its FairDeal4Cambs campaign in earnest in August 2017 with a series of media features over the following two months, highlighting the issues for residents, and hosting a face-to-face meeting with Cambridgeshire MPs in September 2017 to give them information and background about the inequalities of our funding situation. These face to face meetings have continued (almost) quarterly ever since.
CCN Fair Funding campaign	Aug 17	The Leader of the Council was a signatory on the letter produced by County Council leaders and sent to all Conservative MPs.
Appointment of Treasury Minister	Aug 17	The Leader of the Council wrote personally to Rt Hon Elizabeth Truss on her appointment as Treasury Minister, congratulating her on her appointment and seeking her help on improved funding for county councils.
Financial issues linked to funding formula	Sep 17	Following the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive's meeting with Cambridgeshire MPs, at their request the Council wrote a series of template letters for the MPs to send to various Government departments - particularly the Department for Communities and Local Government (as it was then), the Treasury and Department for Education, highlighting the financial issues facing Cambridgeshire linked to the current funding formula, particularly contrasting this with London Boroughs.
BBC East Sunday Politics show	Nov 17	The Leader of the Council was featured on the BBC East Sunday Politics show discussing the Fair Funding campaign and the need for a business rate retention pilot scheme (not lobbying Government directly – but the programme was well watched by politicians who appear on the programme often).
Fair Funding consultation	Feb 18	The Council responded to the Government's Fair Funding consultation, and encouraged our NHS partners to develop their own submission.
Background to the Fair Funding campaign	Mar 18	The Leader of the Council, the Chief Executive and Deputy Chief Executive / Chief Finance Officer met with Rt Hon Rishi Sunak, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State in the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), to discuss the background to our Fair Funding campaign – and our submission to the Government's Funding Formula consultation.

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

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, Independents and 5 Labour in favour; Liberal Democrats, and 2 Labour against]

[Councillors Crawford, Jones, Kavanagh, Richards and Scutt have asked to have it recorded in the minutes that they voted in favour of the substantive motion in error, when they intended to vote against].

125: QUESTIONS:

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

One question was submitted under Council Procedure 9.1 of the Council's Constitution, as set out in **Appendix C**.

(b) Written Questions (Council Procedure Rule 9.2)

Three written questions were submitted under Council Procedure 9.2, as set out in **Appendix D**.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 11TH DECEMBER 2018
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Wendy Pye

It is with deep regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of Wendy Pye. Wendy starting working for the Council on 1 April 2006. She was employed as an Education Business Support Officer in the Curriculum and Leadership Team.

AWARDS

Councillor Achievement Awards 2018

Congratulations to Councillor Ian Bates, Chair of Cambridgeshire County Council’s Economy and Environment Committee, who has won a national Technology & Digital Award for his work championing digital connectivity across the county. The Local Government Information Unit and CCLA Councillor Achievement Award recognised Councillor Bates’ support for the transformational effect of digital connectivity for rural communities, business growth, and smart energy. Councillor Bates impressed the judges with his recognition of the importance of getting the foundations right in terms of digital inclusivity, overseeing large-scale projects to improve public WiFi access and 5G coverage, especially in rural parts of Cambridgeshire. Thanks to his advocacy Cambridgeshire is now over 96% covered by superfast broadband. Judges also commended his business-like approach persuading the council to invest £10m in a solar farm which has already returned significant amounts to support frontline services.

Ministry of Defence’s Employer Recognition Scheme

Cambridgeshire County Council has secured a silver award in the Ministry of Defence’s employer recognition scheme for showing support to the armed forces and their families. The Council has been recognised for demonstrating its support for the Armed Forces community, this includes helping Reserves, Service leavers, Armed Forces veterans, the wounded, injured and sick, Cadets, military spouses or partners and their families.

Launched in 2014 by the Prime Minister, the prestigious initiative was created to recognise and reward UK employers for their support and commitment to Defence. The award scheme involves bronze, silver and gold awards for employers that pledge, demonstrate or advocate support to Defence and the Armed Forces Community.

By winning the Silver award the Council has demonstrated its support by employing at least one person from the armed forces community and actively communicating and projecting a positive image of defence to their employees. It also supports Reservists by giving them the flexibility needed to plan and fulfil their annual training and mobilisation commitments. Cambridgeshire County Council employs a number of staff who have connections to the Armed Forces. The authority is also a lead signatory to the Cambridgeshire Armed Forces Community Covenant, which ensures that those who serve or have served, and their families, are treated fairly within the community.

Cambridgeshire County Council’s ‘see the difference’ campaign

Congratulations to officers across the council who picked up a national award for best research and evaluation in a communications campaign last Friday aimed at recruiting reablement workers.

Cambridgeshire County Council's 'see the difference' campaign beat off 420 national entries, to be among 70 shortlisted organisations in 18 categories at the national Comms 2.0 UnAwards 2018

The campaign was a joint piece of work by staff from Communications, Transformation, and Adult Social Care featuring heart-warming personal stories – which has helped us exceed targets for recruiting new re-ablement workers and ultimately help more people live at home independently.

National Citizen Service (NCS) Special Educational Needs Disability (SEND)

Cambridgeshire County Council's NCS SEND Summer programme won the National Citizen Service Award at the Children & Young People Now Awards 2018. The National Citizen Service programme is a once-in-a-lifetime experience for all 15 – 17 year olds and up to 25 years for young people with SEND that builds skills and confidence and helps them to get ahead in work and life. It also helps young people connect to their local community through social action projects designed and delivered by the young people themselves. Now in its sixth year in Cambridgeshire, there are a number of programmes being delivered during the summer period across the county which consist of young people living together over a number of weeks, excluding weekends, in residential centres.

The County Council's programme was recognised for its work in reaching 24 young people with special educational needs and disabilities who would not otherwise be able to take part in the NCS as well as their support workers, teachers, and parents and carers. Most of the young people required one-to-one support day and night. The challenge was to gain the trust and support of parents and to encourage four SEND schools/colleges Castle School, Granta, School, The Phoenix School and Cambridge Regional College (Huntingdon Campus) to take part so the young people could mix in a residential setting for 5 days and four nights.

Crucial to its success was the way it engaged with school staff and put in place detailed planning, meaning that every need was understood and each activity adapted to ensure everyone took part. Each young person, of which many had never been away from home before, developed physically, emotionally and socially due to the diversity of experience and the residential aspect. Young people and school colleagues identified positive changes in their behaviour through engagement in outdoor learning in challenging environments such as caving which was one of the most memorable.

Communication skills improved and confidence rose across the group with some young people who were not usually verbal found their voices, while others with complex medical needs saw a decline in symptoms during the residential phase.

MESSAGES

Visit by His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales

The Chairman was honoured to welcome His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales to Ely on Tuesday 27 November, when he visited an Almshouse run by the Thomas Parsons' Charity. The Charity owns and operates 27 Almshouses across the City of Ely and was founded in 1497. The Prince of Wales has been Patron of The Almshouse Association since 1992.

Whilst in Ely, The Prince also visited The Stained Glass Museum, located inside Ely Cathedral, in his role as its Patron.

He was then joined by Her Royal Highness The Duchess of Cornwall, who had begun her day at Addenbrooke's Hospital in Cambridge, where Her Royal Highness learned more about the charity

JDRF UK's work to promote new technologies to improve the lives of those living with type 1 diabetes.

The Duchess and The Prince went on to tour Ely Farmers' Market, where they met residents and stallholders.

Next, Their Royal Highnesses travelled to Wisbech and The Prince visited The Parish Church of St Peter and St Paul where he met local community groups and charities working in the area, whilst The Duchess of Cornwall paid a visit to the Wisbech & Fenland Museum, and learned more about how local organisations are supporting families and primary schools to improve children's literacy skills in Wisbech.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 11TH DECEMBER 2018
PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
1.	Mr Mike Mason	Councillor Josh Schumann, Chairman of Staffing and Appeals Committee	<p>My letter to all Members on the 19th March 2018 this year drew attention to the best value investigation report from Max Caller into malpractice at Northamptonshire. Amongst many Shared Services failings he identified were poor relationships preventing accountability and lack of an appreciable client role for Legal Services provided by LGSS Law Ltd.</p> <p>I pointed out the Conflict of Interest with Mr Baker, acting in the role of Monitoring Officer at the Council, and as Executive Director at LGSS Law Ltd, a company with mounting debts making little or no profit for the owning authorities.</p> <p>In May he suddenly resigned as LGSS Director of Law and Governance, Monitoring Officer at Cambridgeshire and Central Bedfordshire, together with his directorships at LGSS Law Ltd. His name as a Director of This Land Ltd was subsequently removed at Companies House.</p> <p>He then joined Bristol City Council and is currently employed in a legal role at the Borough of Kingston upon Thames. From a Freedom of Information inquiry, we now know that he was paid a sum of £26,998 in lieu of notice.</p> <p>This may seem to imply that he had been dismissed by LGSS. In an objection to the County Council's accounts, I have submitted documentary evidence in support of this statement. This and other documents have been given to the Chief Executive, the External Auditor, Members of Audit & Accounts Committee and to yourself Chairman, as Chairman of Staffing & Appeals. County Tax Payers expect minuted written assurance that any conflict of interest has been removed in respect of the postholder and that a full inquiry will be conducted to establish whether misconduct in a public office has occurred previously.</p>

	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Josh Schumann, Chairman of Staffing and Appeals Committee	Mr Mike Mason	<p>Just to start by responding, Mr Mason, that I thank you for passing the documents that you referred to, but I did only receive them yesterday afternoon, so I haven't had chance to look through the full extent of what is included in them.</p> <p>To respond to your question more specifically, Quentin Baker was employed by LGSS Law and as so, any questions regarding his employment should be addressed to LGSS Law.</p> <p>In relation to the recruitment of a Monitoring Officer for Cambridgeshire County Council, the role is now a shared role with Peterborough City Council, and therefore each Council had to approve the role before commencing the external recruitment process. There was therefore a delay, but not an inordinate delay, to both Councils to secure this arrangement. During that time both Councils had interim Monitoring Officers.</p>
	Supplementary Question from:	Question to:	Question
	Mike Mason	Councillor Josh Schumann, Chairman of Staffing and Appeals Committee	As a supplementary I would just comment that in view of the creation of a new senior management post at the Council, will Cllr Schumann give an undertaking that the Pay Policy Statement will be amended in accordance with the provision of the Localism Act 2011, the Council Constitution, and will be published on the website as soon as possible, because the Council needs to conform to law when it comes to publishing senior salaries.
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Josh Schumann, Chairman of Staffing and Appeals Committee	Mike Mason	Very briefly, Chairman, just to respond to say that I absolutely will commit to undertaking a Pay Policy Review, as Staffing & Appeals always does, and that will be published in accordance with law.

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
2.	Councillor Rod Cantrill, Cambridge City Councillor	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee	As the County Council's representative on the Combined Authority and the portfolio holder for fiscal strategy, could Councillor Count comment on the events of week commencing 26th November regarding the financial position and the outlook of the Combined Authority?
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee	Councillor Rod Cantrill, Cambridge City Councillor	<p>Thank you Councillor Cantrill, for your question in advance so I could have a look at it. The events of the week commencing 26th November, there was an Overview & Scrutiny Board, a Business Board and a Combined Authority Board.</p> <p>In terms of finance, the Medium Term Financial Strategy was presented to the Overview & Scrutiny Board on the 26th of November. A balanced four year budget was presented, and this went to the Combined Authority Board on Wednesday 28th. That balanced budget was accepted.</p> <p>The financial position of the Combined Authority is sound and the outlook is appropriate for this point in time.</p>
	Supplementary Question from:	Question to:	Question
	Councillor Rod Cantrill, Cambridge City Councillor	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee	Thank you Councillor Count. I understand that during that week the Interim CFO's contract was terminated. For the Combined Authority to lose one Interim CFO is unfortunate, for the Combined Authority to lose two Interim CFOs could be said to be careless, but for the Combined Authority to lose four Interim CFOs suggests chaos. It appears that the financial position of the Combined Authority is also in a chaotic stake.

			Could Councillor Count indicate what the political leadership is doing on the Combined Authority to address this dire position so that it actually delivers for the people of Cambridge and the people of this region?
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee	Councillor Rod Cantrill, Cambridge City Councillor	<p>I think you can hear from the resentment around the room that that is Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and not as we always we hear, simply Cambridge from certain people. Thank you for the quote from <i>The Importance of Being Earnest</i> as well, I think we're quite well aware of that.</p> <p>So, four CFOs, all of them were interim, they have all been replaced for a good reason. The last one was in a certain abrupt manner, but that's hardly chaos at the Combined Authority and it does not affect the underlying financial position of the Combined Authority, which is sound. However, from the comments we've seen from various people and the willingness to be transparent, the Combined Authority is going to commit to an external review on some of its finances and terms of reference, which will be released, which I think will help give the credibility, that I give to everybody, that we are in a sound position.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
3.	Mr Andrew Rowson	Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee	<p>The business case for LGSS savings, presented to Members in February, predicted Cambridgeshire's share of annual savings would be £706,000.</p> <p>These were dependent on the success of the ERP Gold implementation, LGSS income growth, partner customer growth, and savings from Milton Keynes Council. The stated risks were ERP Gold, Traded Services and LGSS Law Ltd. In April, ERP Gold immediately encountered serious performance and service denial problems, many of which are still unresolved eight months later.</p> <p>In August, Northamptonshire County Council announced it was repatriating Finance and Democratic Services teams from LGSS back in-house. In the same month, LGSS Joint Committee Members spoke of the reputational damage to LGSS, due to invoices not being paid, placing organisations, including charities, in financial difficulty. In September, the NCC Commissioners wrote to the Secretary of State, Mr Brokenshire, citing "very</p>

			<p>significant weaknesses in the integrity of the financial processes and reporting”, and that NCC had been “unable to assure us that the financial information in the system is accurate and reliable”. They called for an independent review as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>By November, six LGSS Law directors had resigned in the calendar year, including, as we have heard, the former Monitoring Officer in May, for reasons which have yet to be satisfactorily explained. My question is as stated in the meeting documents.</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	<p>Councillor Steve Count,</p> <p>Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee</p>	Mr Andrew Rowson	<p>I’ll answer the question that’s written, and should I not get through it in time, I’m prepared to publish the full response. The question does not appear to logically flow from the background narrative that supports it, so I’m unclear why Mr Rowson believes that LGSS will not deliver the saving targets that have been set for the current financial year.</p> <p>As Mr Rowson is aware, the governance of LGSS is through a Joint Committee. The financial monitoring statements for LGSS are a matter of public record. I am therefore as confident as I can be at this point that the savings target agreed by the three partner organisations will be delivered in 2018-19.</p> <p>The future of LGSS in its current form is however less straightforward, it’s clear that the issues faced by Northamptonshire County Council are affecting the marketability of LGSS as a deliverer of services to public bodies. This will affect the future Business Plan savings targets that were largely predicated on business growth.</p> <p>Northamptonshire County Council have already repatriated their professional Finance and Democratic Service functions. Clearly for Northamptonshire, this was an important gesture, even if in reality this simply changed reporting lines. However, their role, as a founder member, has a limited shelf life given their replacement by two unitary councils. This creates an opportunity as well as a threat for LGSS.</p>

			<p>Given the direction of travel and the issues that have arisen during 2018, the three councils have commissioned an independent review of the structure, operating model and finances of LGSS. The Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy have been contracted to undertake this work. This will provide some structure to enable informed decisions to be made which are not based on rhetoric or anecdotes. This work should be available for your evaluation in the next few weeks.</p> <p>I do however need to be clear, that whilst not a perfect operating model, the back office functions of this Council are significantly lower than they otherwise would have been and were LGSS to be dissolved completely, the cost to the Cambridgeshire taxpayer would be significant.</p>
	Supplementary Question from:	Question to:	Question
	Mr Andrew Rowson	<p>Councillor Steve Count,</p> <p>Leader of the Council and Chairman of General Purposes Committee</p>	<p>The justification for the ERP Gold project was to save money by replacing Oracle and Fujitsu with Agresso or Unit 4, a simpler tier two ERP product. On August 14th this year, five months after going live, Northamptonshire County Council's spend data show a payment to the Oracle Corporation of £29,440 with an expense type of "Computer Software Annual Licence Agreement".</p> <p>In this Council's pay data for June this year, Fujitsu services was paid £327,700 with an expense type of "Computer software purchase".</p> <p>Can you please explain why the two Councils are still paying these suppliers, what the payments are for and for how much longer will they continue?</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	<p>Councillor Steve Count,</p> <p>Leader of the Council and Chairman of</p>	Mr Andrew Rowson	<p>Thank you Mr Rowson for those follow-up questions. I shall consider them fully in due course and I shall publish a written response to this Council, the public and yourself.</p>

	General Purposes Committee		
--	-------------------------------	--	--

COUNTY COUNCIL – 11TH DECEMBER 2018

CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.1

Questions to the Council's Appointee on the Combined Authority – Councillor Steve Count

Question from Councillor Nichola Harrison

In July, the Combined Authority Board agreed a policy of "Accelerated Delivery"¹ for its proposed £5.4billion transport infrastructure programme. The policy involves "a more risk-based approach to funding" and a plan to "shorten or remove processes and procedures that build in delay to delivery". An Appendix identifies specific risks, such as higher costs, abortive expenditure and potential delays, relevant to individual projects.

In 2016, the Ely bypass project was put through an accelerated procurement and design process, which "prioritised early delivery over cost certainty"², despite extremely strong warnings from council officers about the high risks involved. These risks were realised in the form of a £13million (33%) overspend and a delayed completion. Cambridgeshire's taxpayers will be paying off the extra debt for the next 40 years.

Addressing congestion issues at Ely was very important, but a 33% overspend is a disaster for taxpayers. Lessons must be learned so that these problems are not repeated, and yet the Combined Authority's accelerated delivery policy appears to embody the same approach as that taken with Ely. If so, the Combined Authority could in future be responsible for similar financial disasters, potentially on a much larger scale.

Timely delivery is of course desirable, but the Combined Authority needs to recognise that the accelerated delivery approach creates an unusually high risk profile for both individual projects and for the Combined Authority as a whole. The Combined Authority needs to learn the lessons from Ely and ensure that it is clear about its risk appetite on each and every project, and that the additional risks are accurately quantified and managed. It should also consider the impact of the policy on its overall financial strategy and controls. It should do all this transparently and with full accountability so that the public can decide whether to support this approach or not.

As the Council's representative on the Combined Authority, will you seek to ensure that the Combined Authority's managers, and its internal and external auditors, are instructed to examine this issue and produce a detailed position statement for the public to scrutinise?

Response from Councillor Count

Thank you Councillor Harrison, for this question. In opening I'd like to highlight the huge success the bypass has been. For many years the level crossing, the underpass, caused misery to the people of Ely and surrounding areas and has held back economic growth in that area.

Only through the bold decision of a previous Conservative administration for this Council to proceed and this one to push ahead with the scheme and to commit to fund it have its benefits been realised, a decision that I think is almost universally applauded as is the fantastic design of the road and bridges.

Turning to the specific points raised in your question, we need to be aware there is always a trade-off between time and cost. In the case of Ely specifically, we took the brave decision to procure

¹ CPCA Board agenda 25th July 2018, pages 48-49, 51-64

² Response to public question, E&E Committee 12 April 2018

the contract early, to get the scheme off the ground and address the problems that I've just noted. We've been clear that although yes, the costs did rise from the original estimate, they would have been much the same had we waited and procured when more information was known, as building across a flood plain and the poor fenland soils presented many challenges for the contractor, which couldn't have initially been foreseen, but which were addressed as efficiently as possible. As you know, if we hadn't taken that decision, the funding could have been lost, and at best the bypass would have been delayed by a further 12-18 months.

As with you, I'm also clear that the Combined Authority needs to secure good value for the public money with which it is entrusted and we must be able to demonstrate that. As you mentioned in your question, the focus on delivery will be on removing unnecessary delays, and pushing ahead with schemes given the more certain long-term funding available than used to be the case for the County Council.

This, I am convinced, will benefit our residents by delivering infrastructure as soon as possible, and bringing the benefits forward.

With construction inflation running at over 5% per annum, every year lost increases costs significantly and so this needs to be considered as part of the decision making process. You will be aware that the Combined Authority is currently going through a prioritisation process of all schemes to identify those which offer the greatest value and shall be delivered first. This will be reported to the Board in due course, so I believe this addresses your point about financial strategy and transparency.

As the Council's representative on the Combined Authority and the Finance portfolio holder, I will of course expect experience from other schemes to be considered as we move forward with the ambitious programme that has been agreed. I also expect this to be fully considered and evaluated and I'm confident that the officers of the Combined Authority understand this point, and will present appropriate detail to the Board when decisions are being made to ensure we get the right balance of speed and management of risks.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 11 DECEMBER 2018
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2

1. Question from Councillor Graham Wilson

Exiting the EU is likely to have major implications for the County Council, its staff, service users and suppliers.

Most of the public sector and much of business is following Government advice and planning for both a Deal (leaving the EU on 29 March under the negotiated withdrawal agreement) and No Deal exit from the EU.

Whilst many of the implications of EU Exit are still largely unknown, the Council already anticipates, for example, a significant impact on the independent sector workforce. A survey undertaken by Skills for Care suggests that c.24% of the existing workforce are from non-UK European Economic Area (EEA) countries. Soft market feedback has indicated that whilst local providers believe EU Exit will only have marginal impact on the existing workforce, they say it will have an adverse impact on their ability to expand. This is already a market under strain.

Please will the Leader and Chair of the General Purposes Committee explain:

- The exit scenarios he is planning for
- The risks, challenges and impacts he envisages
- The mitigation measures he is taking to ensure the County Council is as well prepared as possible for exiting the EU

Response from Councillor Count, Leader and Chairman of the General Purposes Committee

There are a number of areas of activity currently underway in preparation for Brexit, all of which are interdependent:

A review of our **Emergency Planning** in relation to possible Brexit scenarios, which reflects both the multi-agency response across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and a review of situations which would be covered by existing emergency plans (for example fuel shortages, power cuts, etc.). Consideration of the resilience implications of Brexit are being addressed with partners within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Resilience Forum and our Director Corporate and Customer Services will be discussing the issue further in detail at the CPLRF Strategic Board in December.

The Corporate Risk Group has met to discuss **Risk Management** for the impacts of Brexit and to agree the right way of taking risks associated with Brexit into account in Council planning and management processes. The Group has recommended adding a risk around the short-term impacts of Brexit to our Corporate Risk Register once an impact assessment has been completed.

The Section 151 Officer and Finance team have been working through a series of guidance and technical notes issued from Central Government to model the possible **Economic and Financial** implications of Brexit.

Our Director of Communities and Safety and his teams have been working in and with community forums and District Council partners to consider the **impact for local communities** and developing communication and response plans and the Director of Public Health is staying in touch with health system planning through the Local Health Resilience Partnership.

The Transformation Team is coordinating development of a **Brexit Impact Assessment** to cover both Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Peterborough City Council (PCC). Based upon the advice from the Corporate Risk Group and informed by the advice and technical notes which have been provided by national government, the Impact Assessment will focus on the services of the two councils, statutory responsibilities and customers in their interaction with council services. The focus will be on the immediate short term issues and potential impacts rather than the likelihood of different scenarios, which are beyond the Council's control. Work to date indicates potential impact for workforce, funding, community cohesion, regulation and transport.

Service teams are considering potential impacts relevant to their particular **service delivery and service users** and developing action plans either to directly mitigate against impact or to work with partners to ensure appropriate responses are being developed. For example, Brexit is already having an impact on parts of the Health and Care workforce and Adults Services are developing recruitment and retention action plans and liaising closely with partners in health services.

The above areas of work are being informed by research, workshop sessions and meetings with services, senior leaders, Members and partners to identify, agree and evaluate potential impact and risk. The work is under continuous review by our Strategic Management Team and will be formally considered by General Purposes Committee and Audit and Accounts Committee in January.

2. Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven

As Leader of the Council, what are you doing to improve staff morale this Christmas?

Response from Councillor Count, Leader and Chairman of the General Purposes Committee

As Leader of the Council I am most concerned with delivering good quality services to residents of Cambridgeshire – at a cost that they can afford. This relies on having the right number of motivated and hard working staff in roles to deliver services to a good standard. So when my administration has been looking at ways to deliver a balanced budget in-year and for the years ahead, against a national picture of increasing demand, we have always prioritised suggestions that transform our services and increase income from commercial ventures and avoided wherever possible those which will lead to service cuts and associated job losses.

I am focussed on this all year round, not just at Christmas.

I have been discussing this approach with some of our excellent staff who I meet as part of 'back to the floor' sessions, as has our Chief Executive Gillian Beasley, who has been posting regular video blogs about her recent meetings with staff.

In November I spent some time with the Children with Learning disabilities team, both as a group and in one to one session. Everyone was very candid in telling me about their work. In that team I observed that a real strength was their morale which was very high. This was due to the team acting as a unit and being mutually supportive of each other. I deliberately opened the door to conversations regarding the funding situation and I found that while everyone would like more money for their services, there was a recognition and a strength of pride that we still provided a good service.

There was a definite unity in seeing all of us in the Council in being in this together – which is why I have put forward the motion today that all Councillors will volunteer to participate in the three days mandatory unpaid leave which staff earning more than £26k a year will have this year – by taking a 1.2% cut in our allowances, helping to safeguard up to 40 jobs in the coming year.

I am interested to hear what actions Councillor van de Ven and her colleagues will suggest to balance our budget, which will avoid any impact on services or staff.

3. Question from Councillor Lorna Dupre

How many Vehicle Activated Speed signs have been decommissioned by the council in each of the last two years for reasons of unserviceability? Of these, how many have been (or are in the process of being) replaced by parish councils or other bodies? Where VAS — which were presumably installed for a reason — are not being replaced, how is the council monitoring the effect on road safety in those locations?

Response from Councillor Shuter, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee

Over the last 20 years there have been over 360 Vehicle Activated Speed (VAS) signs installed throughout the county. Over this period, around 50 of the signs have been removed, mainly due to vehicle damage, lack of available spare parts or because another highway scheme has meant they are no longer necessary.

It is not easy to say exactly how many signs have been removed over the last 2 years as such removal is often part of a larger scheme and so there is no single record of removals. However, what is clear through a recent review with our specialist contractor, is that there are quite a number of signs (50 have been identified) that are not working and can't easily be repaired. These signs are being removed as they cause confusion when not working. In recent weeks, around 10 have been removed and the remainder of the 50 will be removed shortly.

As signs are removed the local County Member and Parish Council are contacted to make them aware of the situation and to remind the community about the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) scheme. The scheme enables communities to bid for funding to install and run mobile, battery powered signs within their area, moving the signs themselves between various locations. A number of Parishes have already taken advantage of this scheme, with some now actively requesting removal of our non-working signs so they can use the old sign post to attach their own battery powered signs. Moveable signs have a larger impact on excessive speeds than the fixed signs being removed. In addition to the LHI scheme a community can also fully fund a project to provide their own sign.

The Council's Road Safety team are involved in the process and are notified when a sign is identified for removal within an area where large numbers of personal injury accidents remain in the immediate vicinity. Where resources allow the team may then choose to replace a non-working sign if it is justified. All roads in the county are automatically monitored to identify abnormal increases in accident rates and accident cluster sites.