

County Council - Minutes

Please note the meeting can be viewed on YouTube at the following link: [Cambridgeshire County Council Live Stream - YouTube](#)

Date: Tuesday 20 July 2021

Time: 10.30 a.m. – 14:35 p.m.

Present:

Councillor D Giles (Chair)

Councillor S Kindersley (Vice-Chair)

D Ambrose Smith	L Dupré	E Meschini
M Atkins	S Ferguson	B Milnes
H Batchelor	J French	E Murphy
A Beckett	R Fuller	L Nethsingha
K Billington	I Gardener	K Prentice
G Bird	N Gay	C Rae
C Boden	M Goldsack	K Reynolds
A Bradnam	B Goodliffe	T Sanderson
A Bulat	N Gough	D Schumann
S Bywater	J Gowing	J Schumann
D Connor	R Hathorn	N Shailer
S Corney	A Hay	A Sharp
A Costello	M Howell	P Slatter
S Count	R Howitt	S Taylor
P Coutts	S Hoy	F Thompson
H Cox Condron	J King	S Tierney
S Criswell	M King	S van de Ven
C Daunton	S King	A Whelan
D Dew	M McGuire	G Wilson

Apologies for Absence:

Apologies were received from Councillors Peter McDonald and Mandy Smith.

14. Minutes – 18th May 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 18th May 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

15. Chair's Announcements

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

16. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Bulat declared a disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 23 c), as Co-chair of the Young Europeans Network for the3million. The Monitoring Officer had exercised her discretion to grant a dispensation to allow Councillor Bulat to take part in the debate.

Councillor Howell declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in relation to Minute 20, Members' Allowances, as he knew a member of the Independent Remuneration Panel. He stated that he had not and would not speak to this person on this matter.

17. Public Question Time

The Chair reported that two questions had been received from members of the public, as set out in Appendix B.

18. Petitions

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

19. Items for determination from Policy and Resources Committees

(a) Strategy and Resources Committee

Treasury Management Report – Quarter Four Update 2020-21

It was moved by the Chair of the Strategy and Resources Committee, Councillor Nethsingha, and seconded by the Vice-Chair, Councillor Meschini, that the recommendation from the Strategy and Resources Committee, as set out on the Council agenda, be approved.

It was resolved by a majority by show of hands:

To note the Treasury Management Quarter Four Report for 2020/21.

[Voting pattern: The majority of Conservatives, Liberal Democrat, Labour and Independents in favour; 1 Conservative abstained]

(b) Environment and Green Investment Committee

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan document (Version for Adoption)

It was moved by the Chair of the Environment and Green Investment Committee, Councillor Lorna Dupré, and seconded by the Vice-Chair, Councillor Nick Gay, that the recommendations from the Environment and Green Investment Committee, as set out on the Council agenda, be approved.

It was resolved unanimously by show of hands to:

- a) Note the conclusions of the independent Inspector who was appointed to examine the submitted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
- b) Adopt Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan, incorporating modifications as recommended by the Inspector ('Main Modifications') and other minor editorial modifications ('Additional Modifications'), as attached at Appendix B, subject to recommendation (f).
- c) Revoke and not use for decision making the following council documents:
 - Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011); and
 - Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals (2012).
- d) Endorse that the Cambridgeshire 'Policies Map' be updated in accordance with the draft maps as published during the examination of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, as included at Appendix D of the report.
- e) Agree to revoke the following two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) for decision making purposes in the Cambridgeshire area, and with such revocation only taking effect from the same date that the new Plan was adopted:
 - Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD (2011); and
 - Block Fen / Lingwood Fen Master Plan SPD (2011).
- f) Agree that recommendation b) only comes into effect if Peterborough City Council had already agreed to adopt the Plan; or, if that agreement was not yet achieved by Peterborough City Council, recommendation b) would come into effect from the date that Peterborough City Council agreed to adopt the Plan.

20. Members' Allowances

It was moved by the Chair of Council, Councillor Giles, seconded by the Vice-Chair of Council, Councillor Kindersley, and agreed unanimously by show of hands to formally receive the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel on Members' Allowances.

The recommendations as set out in the covering report were moved by the Chair of Council, Councillor Giles, seconded by the Vice-Chair of Council, Councillor Kindersley.

The Council thanked the Independent Remuneration Panel for its work on the review of Members' Allowances.

Following discussion, on being put to the vote, it was resolved by a majority by show of hands to:

- (a) consider the Panel's recommendations and accept the recommendations as they stand.
- (b) confirm the date of 10 May 2021 for the new scheme to come into effect.

- (c) formally revoke the existing Members' Allowances Scheme with effect from that date.
- (d) authorise the Monitoring Officer to prepare a new scheme to reflect the outcome of the Council's deliberations and to take any consequential action arising therefrom.
- (e) agree that the Chair and Vice-Chair of Council, which were not part of the Members' Allowances Scheme, should receive an allowance of £10,462 and £3,170 respectively.
- (f) ask the Constitution and Ethics Committee to prepare a policy to support parental leave for councillors for Council approval.
- (g) ask the Independent Remuneration Panel to undertake a review of the allowances for the new Policy and Service Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs in twelve to eighteen months' time.

[Voting pattern: 17 Conservatives, Liberal Democrat, Labour and Independents in favour; 9 Conservatives against; 2 Conservatives abstained.]

21. Appointment of Vice-Chair of Audit and Accounts Committee

It was moved by Councillor Nethsingha, seconded by Councillor Wilson, and resolved unanimously by show of hands to:

Appoint Councillor Nick Gay as Vice-Chair of the Audit and Accounts Committee for the municipal year 2021-2022.

22. Appointments to Outside Organisations

It was moved by the Chair of Council, Councillor Giles, seconded by the Vice-Chair, Councillor Kindersley, and agreed unanimously by show of hands to:

Appoint Councillor Sanderson as the Council's fourth representative on the Local Government Association, and Councillor Atkins as the Liberal Democrat appointee on the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

23. Motions Submitted Under Council Procedure 10

Five motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

a) Motion from Councillor Mark Goldsack

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Goldsack and seconded by Councillor J Schumann:

Under the previous Conservative administration Cambridgeshire County Council committed in May 2020 to support the delivery of net-zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire when it approved its Climate Change and Environment Strategy. Work

started last year scoping 'Local Area Energy Planning' as a 'route map to net zero by 2050' for Cambridgeshire which was also highlighted in the recent report by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission for Climate Change. A planned approach, such as 'Local Area Energy Planning' offers a more cost effective long term solution for decarbonisation and provides better local benefits for our communities.

The Council has already committed to investment into renewable energy generation and it is clear that Cambridgeshire must generate more renewable energy to help deliver its targets and its fair share of carbon emission reductions. Good examples of work underway are projects such as Solar Together, supporting residents to purchase solar PV for their roofs; Abraham Smart Energy grid, which uses already developed land to generate solar PV over car spaces; and solar farms, such as North Angle Solar Farm, which is at an acceptable human scale. These widely supported, Conservative administration schemes have resulted in huge praise for the County's efforts from groups and people including Friends of the Earth, putting Cambridgeshire County Council as one of, if not the leading, Green focussed local authority.

There are examples of renewable energy projects that are not best practice exemplars, or suitable at the size and scale being proposed in rural communities. It is important the council and its partners highlight both good and bad practice and find better local solutions. The proposed Sunica development, a 500MW solar farm that covers 2800 acres of farmland on the Eastern edges of Cambridgeshire, will impact the villages of Isle ham, Chippenham, Snail well, and Kennet, plus a number of villages in West Suffolk. For context it is over 2100 football pitches worth of land and will change the rural nature of the countryside in just one project! The electricity generated by this project will feed directly into the National Grid at Burwell providing no local benefit. There are so many better ways to get the same volume of renewable energy generated in Cambridgeshire than private solar PV farms of this scale using greenfield sites in the countryside.

In the village of Isleham, the consultation undertaken by Sunica falls well short of the statutory minimum required. It was a late addition to the site plan and after most of the consultation work in neighbouring villages was undertaken. The good people of Isleham are being unheard and mis-treated by this process, despite several representations to Sunica direct.

The planning decision for the proposed Sunnica Project falls under the legislation for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects that will ultimately be determined by the Secretary of State. As it stands the Sunnica Project is not supported by the relevant elected Members of West Suffolk District Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, and Suffolk County Council, as the other relevant 'host' planning authorities. In addition, both local MP's; locally elected County Council members; and all local and neighbouring Parish/town councils stand against the development.

This Council is requested to agree:

- The Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State to express concern at the size and scale of the proposed 500MW Sunnica solar farm on agricultural farmland. The letter is to propose that better solutions for generating this scale of renewable energy can be achieved through a combination of retrofitting solar PV on roofs of homes and businesses; on brownfield sites and with smaller scale solar PV farms that work in harmony with the local communities. Delivery can be

achieved using 'Local Area Energy' planning which Local Authorities can lead in collaboration with their communities.

- The letter is to include that the consultation process for the proposed Sunnica development has major weaknesses and has failed local people, particularly in Isleham which was left out of early discussions.
- The letter is to also confirm that the planned size and spread of the proposed Sunnica development is wrong for the level of green field land required; has an unreasonable impact on the daily lives of rural communities; and that the Council does not support the Sunnica Proposal.
- The Council shares a copy of the letter sent to the Secretary of State with the other 'host' planning authorities, both local MP's, and the Cambridgeshire Parish Councils of Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett, Snailwell and Soham; to ensure its objections to the proposed Sunnica scheme are known.

Councillor Dupré moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Gay, as follows (Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough):

~~Under the previous Conservative administration Cambridgeshire County Council committed in May 2020 to support the delivery of net-zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire when it approved its Climate Change and Environment Strategy. Work started last year scoping 'Local Area Energy Planning' as a 'route map to net zero by 2050' for Cambridgeshire which was also highlighted in the recent report by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission for Climate Change. A planned approach, such as 'Local Area Energy Planning' offers a more cost effective long term solution for decarbonisation and provides better local benefits for our communities.~~

The Joint Administration of the County Council is committed to reviewing the strategy with the aim of moving forward the Net Zero target for Cambridgeshire County Council towards 2030. This review will be carried out in the light of developments such as fresh information from the independent Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Commission on Climate Change, and successful trials of Local Area Energy Planning in Newcastle, Bridgend and Manchester.

The Council has already committed to investment into renewable energy generation and it is clear that Cambridgeshire must generate more renewable energy to help deliver its **ambitious decarbonisation** targets and its fair share of carbon emission reductions. Good examples of work ~~underway~~ **under way** are projects such as Solar Together, supporting residents to purchase solar PV for their roofs **and domestic battery storage**; ~~Ba~~**Abraham** Smart Energy grid, which uses already developed land to generate solar PV over car spaces; and solar farms, such as North Angle Solar Farm., which is at an acceptable human scale. ~~These widely supported, Conservative administration schemes have resulted in huge praise for the County's efforts from groups and people including Friends of the Earth, putting Cambridgeshire County Council as one of, if not the leading, Green focussed local authority. These schemes,~~ **developed by officers in the Council's Climate Change & Energy Services team, have been supported across parties and by communities, putting Cambridgeshire in a strong position from which to extend its climate and sustainability ambitions.**

~~There are examples of renewable energy projects that are not best practice exemplars, or suitable at the size and scale being proposed in rural communities. It is important the~~

council and its partners highlight both good and bad practice and find better local solutions. The proposed ~~Sonica~~ **Sunnica commercial** development, a 500MW solar farm that covers 2800 acres of farmland on the Eastern edges of Cambridgeshire, will impact the villages of Isleham, Chippenham, Snailwell, and Kennett, **Burwell and Reach** plus a number of villages in West Suffolk. ~~For context it is over 2100 football pitches worth of land and will change the rural nature of the countryside in just one project! The electricity generated by this project will feed directly into the National Grid at Burwell providing no local benefit. There are so many better ways to get the same volume of renewable energy generated in Cambridgeshire than private solar PV farms of this scale using greenfield sites in the countryside.~~

~~In the village of Isleham, the consultation undertaken by Sonica falls well short of the statutory minimum required. It was a late addition to the site plan and after most of the consultation work in neighbouring villages was undertaken. The good people of Isleham are being unheard and mis-treated by this process, despite several representations to Sunnica direct. It is disappointing that communities including Isleham were included late in the initial round of consultation, and that COVID restrictions in force at that time limited the nature of the consultation that could be undertaken.~~

~~The planning decision for the proposed Sunnica Project falls under the legislation for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects that will ultimately be determined by the Secretary of State. As it stands the Sunnica Project is not supported by the relevant elected Members of West Suffolk District Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, and Suffolk County Council, as the other relevant 'host' planning authorities. In addition, both local MP's; locally elected County Council members; and all local and neighbouring Parish/town councils stand against the development. A joint response was made by this Council in December 2020 along with Suffolk County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, and West Suffolk Council, which acknowledged the need to increase renewable energy generation, while noting that no updates to the National Policy Statements for Renewable Energy Infrastructure had been produced to indicate that solar PV on the scale proposed is appropriate.~~

~~This Council is requested to agree resolves:~~

- ~~to continue to work in partnership with Suffolk County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, and West Suffolk Council to make representations in respect of the Sunnica proposals as they develop.~~
- ~~The Chief Executive writes to instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State to express concern at the size and scale of the proposed 500MW Sunnica solar farm on agricultural farmland, the effect of COVID restrictions on opportunities for public engagement and the omission of some residents from the initial round of consultations, and the impact of the proposals on rural communities. The letter is to propose that better solutions for generating this scale of renewable energy can be achieved through a combination of retrofitting solar PV on roofs of homes and businesses; on brownfield sites and with smaller scale solar PV farms that work in harmony with the local communities. Delivery can be achieved using 'Local Area Energy' planning which Local Authorities can lead in collaboration with their communities.~~
- ~~The letter is to include that the consultation process for the proposed Sunnica development has major weaknesses and has failed local people, particularly in Isleham which was left out of early discussions.~~

- ~~The letter is to also confirm that the planned size and spread of the proposed Sunnica development is wrong for the level of green field land required; has an unreasonable impact on the daily lives of rural communities; and that the Council does not support the Sunnica Proposal.~~
- ~~To The Council shares a copy of the letter sent to the Secretary of State with the other 'host' planning authorities, both local MP's, and the Cambridgeshire Parish Councils of Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett, **Reach**, Snailwell and Soham; to ensure its objections to the proposed Sunnica scheme are known.~~
- **To share** a copy of the letter sent to the Secretary of State with the other 'host' planning authorities, both local MP's, and the Cambridgeshire Parish Councils of Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett, **Reach**, Snailwell and Soham.; to ensure its objections to the proposed Sunnica scheme are known.

Following discussion under Part 4 Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, more than 14 Members requested a recorded vote on this matter.

After further discussion, on being put to the vote the amendment was carried, as set out in the recorded vote in Appendix C.

Following discussion, on being put to the vote by show of hands the substantive motion, as set out below, was carried by a majority.

Cambridgeshire County Council committed in May 2020 to support the delivery of net-zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire when it approved its Climate Change and Environment Strategy.

The Joint Administration of the County Council is committed to reviewing the strategy with the aim of moving forward the Net Zero target for Cambridgeshire County Council towards 2030. This review will be carried out in the light of developments such as fresh information from the independent Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Commission on Climate Change, and successful trials of Local Area Energy Planning in Newcastle, Bridgend and Manchester.

The Council has already committed to investment into renewable energy generation and it is clear that Cambridgeshire must generate more renewable energy to help deliver ambitious decarbonisation targets. Good examples of work under way are projects such as Solar Together, supporting residents to purchase solar PV for their roofs and domestic battery storage; Babraham Smart Energy grid, which uses already developed land to generate solar PV over car spaces; and solar farms, such as North Angle Solar Farm. These schemes, developed by officers in the Council's Climate Change & Energy Services team, have been supported across parties and by communities, putting Cambridgeshire in a strong position from which to extend its climate and sustainability ambitions.

The proposed Sunnica commercial development, a 500MW solar farm that covers 2800 acres of farmland on the Eastern edges of Cambridgeshire, will impact the villages of Isleham, Chippenham, Snailwell, Kennett, Burwell and Reach plus a number of villages in West Suffolk.

It is disappointing that communities including Isleham were included late in the initial round of consultation, and that COVID restrictions in force at that time limited the nature of the consultation that could be undertaken.

The planning decision for the proposed Sunnica Project falls under the legislation for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects that will ultimately be determined by the Secretary of State. A joint response was made by this Council in December 2020 along with Suffolk County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, and West Suffolk Council, which acknowledged the need to increase renewable energy generation, while noting that no updates to the National Policy Statements for Renewable Energy Infrastructure had been produced to indicate that solar PV on the scale proposed is appropriate.

This Council resolves:

- to continue to work in partnership with Suffolk County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, and West Suffolk Council to make representations in respect of the Sunnica proposals as they develop.
- to instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State to express concern at the size and scale of the proposed 500MW Sunnica solar farm on agricultural farmland, the effect of COVID restrictions on opportunities for public engagement and the omission of some residents from the initial round of consultations, and the impact of the proposals on rural communities.
- To share a copy of the letter with the other 'host' planning authorities, both local MP's, and the Cambridgeshire Parish Councils of Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett, Reach, Snailwell and Soham-
- To share a copy of the letter with the other 'host' planning authorities, both local MP's, and the Cambridgeshire Parish Councils of Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett, Reach, Snailwell and Soham.

[Voting pattern: the majority of Conservatives, Liberal Democrat, Labour and Independents in favour; 1 Conservative against; 1 Conservative abstained.]

b) Motion from Councillor Elisa Meschini

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Meschini and seconded by Councillor M King:

The covid-19 pandemic has exposed the need for sustainable government funding to carry local authorities through this pandemic and beyond. It has also exposed the effects of this government's failure to update – despite intensive lobbying on the subject – the funding formula for Cambridgeshire.

Cambridgeshire, as a fast growing area of the UK, makes a positive contribution to the national Gross Value Added. A fairer assessment of the funding formula should be based on and account for the rising demand for social care and children's services, the growth in older population, and the rising deprivation as a result of incomes being affected by the pandemic. The recent census will 'reset' population statistics from 2021 and funding allocations must be updated to reflect the results of the census as and when available as the current 2011-based projections significantly understate population growth in Cambridgeshire.

This Council instructs the Chief Executive to work with leaders (political and officer) and MPs to present the case for a review of the funding formula for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to Government by November 2021.

Following discussion, on being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by show of hands.

c) Motion from Councillor Lorna Dupré

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Dupré and seconded by Councillor Bulat.

This Council notes that:

1. the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020 gives powers in UK law to implement provisions for protecting citizens' rights in the Withdrawal Agreement, and the similar separation agreements with Switzerland and with the EEA EFTA states (Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway);
2. the provisions in the Withdrawal Agreement set out a framework for the continued legal residence (and associated rights, including social security and healthcare rights) of EU citizens living in the UK, and UK nationals living in the EU, beyond 31 December 2020;
3. EU citizens may apply for the EU Settlement Scheme, with a deadline of 30 June 2021 which has now passed; and
4. the House of Commons briefing paper 8772 Citizens' rights provisions in the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill 2019-20 highlights that some EU citizens may be unaware of the need to apply for settled status or may have difficulty in doing so.

This Council recognises

- a. its role in ensuring that EU citizens know they are welcome in Cambridgeshire, and in working together with partner authorities and agencies to ensure information about late application to the EU Settlement Scheme is available and accessible;
- b. its responsibilities towards Looked After children, and adults in receipt of Social Care, who are EU citizens, and in particular the importance of ensuring that all care leavers who have to apply to the EU Settlement Scheme have been supported to make a successful application for full settled status;
- c. The many factors which might satisfy as eligible reasons for a late application to be accepted, including
 - where a parent, guardian or Local Authority has failed to apply on behalf of a child
 - where a person has or had a serious medical condition, which meant they were unable to apply by the relevant deadline
 - where someone is a victim of modern slavery or is in an abusive relationship

- where someone is isolated, vulnerable or did not have the digital skills to access the application process
 - where a person was unable to apply by the relevant deadline for compelling practical or compassionate reasons – including in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- d. the difficulties faced by many applicants to the EU Settlement Scheme resulting from the insistence of the Government on digital-only proof of status; and
- e. the need for advice, not just for applicants, but also for those required to check residents' digital proof of full settled status.

This Council therefore resolves

- A. to work with partner councils and agencies to deliver a proactive and readily accessible information campaign about late application, and support to make such applications, through public facilities including (but not limited to) libraries and community centres, to ensure no EU citizen is left unaware of the need to apply, and where to turn to get the help they need, whether from this Council or other agencies;
- B. to mobilise the County's Community Resilience Group to share the responsibility to promote late applications and provide the support some people may need to apply;
- C. to ensure all Looked After Children and adults in receipt of Social Care, who are EU citizens and for whom the Council is responsible, have been supported to complete applications to the EU Settlement Scheme, and that late application is pursued as a matter of urgency for all such residents who have not made an application to the EU Settlement Scheme before the 30 June deadline;
- D. to develop and implement a targeted programme, through the Council's Think Communities team and its relationships with district, city, town and parish councils, to engage with EU citizens most likely to fall into vulnerable categories including those in (c) above; E. to provide IT support in libraries and other venues to support applicants who are finding it difficult to complete the digital application process, or to view and prove their digital status; F. to provide training for council staff to signpost EU citizens if they come into contact with someone without full settled status;
- G. to request that colleges delivering English language courses ensure they include messages about late applications in their course materials, and liaise with the Mayor and Combined Authority as the funding body for Skills to support this initiative; and
- H. to work with partner councils and agencies to provide a programme of information for those such as landlords and employers whose roles require them to check digital proof of status.

Following discussion, on being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by show of hands.

d) Motion from Councillor Steve Tierney

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Tierney and seconded by Councillor Hoy:

This Council recognises that our County highways have been significantly underfunded for many years, through various administrations (including when Labour, the Liberal Democrats and Independents shared control.) While there may have been good reasons for hard decisions to be taken, the situation is unsustainable.

This Council notes that the highways budget has experienced a £6m reduction in central government grant compared to the previous year. The LibDem (led) Administration has failed to allocate £6.3 Million to the highways budget from the identified revenue underspend in 2020-21, despite suggestions during election campaigns that the paucity of highways condition would be remedied. Areas of deprivation, already subject to disparities of wealth and health are of particular concern when even their basic infrastructure is in poor condition. Urgent action must be taken before our highways fall into any further disrepair. This action is needed across the County, but initial focus should be on those areas with the greatest deprivation.

Areas of Greatest Deprivation:

Fenland 003F	Staithe	1758
Fenland 002C	Waterlees	2010
Fenland 002D	Waterlees	2857
Fenland 007B	March East	3174
Fenland 003I	Medworth	3986
Fenland 003H	Medworth	4231
Cambridge 006F	Abbey	4183
Fenland 001D	Roman Bank	4872
Cambridge 006D	Abbey	5217
Fenland 004C	Elm & Christchurch	5380
Fenland 003C	Octavia Hill	5517
Fenland 006D	Lattersey	5753
Fenland 002A	Clarkson	5877
Cambridge 001C	Kings Hedges	6022
Hunts 008B	Huntingdon N.	6125
Hunts 008A	Huntingdon E.	6204
Fenland 003B	Octavia Hill	6816
Fenland 004A	Elm & Christchurch	6854
Fenland 005A	March Nth.	6920
Fenland 004E	Parson Drove & Wisbech St Mary	6927
Fenland 004F	Parson Drove & Wisbech St Mary	7346
Hunts 022D	Eaton Socon	7433

This motion does not seek to blame the current administration, as successive budgets have created the issue. It does, however, note that the current administration now has the power to take decisions to address an imbalance between the wealthiest and poorest parts of the County.

Therefore, this Council agrees to:

- a) An immediate audit of roads and footpaths in these areas or greatest deprivation to be concluded before Winter 2021.
- b) Dedicated and significant spend on the highways and footpaths of the following divisions; Staithe, Waterlees, March East & Rural, Medworth, Abbey to bring all

highways in these areas up to a quality standard that taxpayers and road users should be able to expect. This work to take place in 2021 and 2022.

- c) This action to be followed by extensive audits in other areas in 2022, once these areas of deprivation are completed and in good condition.

Councillor Nethsingha moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Bird as follows (Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough):

This Council recognises that our County highways have been significantly underfunded for many years, ~~through various administrations (including when Labour, the Liberal Democrats and Independents shared control.) While there may have been good reasons for hard decisions to be taken, the situation is unsustainable.~~

This Council notes that the highways budget has experienced a £6m reduction in central government grant compared to the previous year. ~~The LibDem (led) Administration has failed to allocate £6.3 Million to the highways budget from the identified revenue underspend in 2020-21, despite suggestions during election campaigns that the paucity of highways condition would be remedied.~~

This Council notes that while no new money has been allocated to the highways budget since the reduction in funding from the Conservative government, the new Joint Administration has made a long term commitment to seek to maintain or increase spending on highways, footways and cycle maintenance. The new administration has also made a commitment to health in all policies and will be seeking to increase the accessibility of active travel and public transport to all residents across Cambridgeshire, working in partnership with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).

Areas of deprivation, already subject to disparities of wealth and health are of particular concern when even their basic infrastructure is in poor condition. **The less well off are particularly hard hit by lack of access to public transport or walking and cycling infrastructure. Health and education outcomes are significantly worse in areas of high deprivation, and lack of access to transport for those who cannot drive is one factor in those poorer outcomes.**

~~Urgent action must be taken before our highways fall into any further disrepair. This action is needed across the County, but initial focus should be on those areas with the greatest deprivation.~~

Areas of Greatest Deprivation:

Fenland 003F	Staithe	1758
Fenland 002C	Waterlees	2010
Fenland 002D	Waterlees	2857
Fenland 007B	March East	3174
Fenland 003I	Medworth	3986
Fenland 003H	Medworth	4231
Cambridge 006F	Abbey	4183
Fenland 001D	Roman Bank	4872
Cambridge 006D	Abbey	5217
Fenland 004C	Elm & Christchurch	5380
Fenland 003C	Octavia Hill	5517

Fenland 006D	Lattersey	5753
Fenland 002A	Clarkson	5877
Cambridge 001C	Kings Hedges	6022
Hunts 008B	Huntingdon N.	6125
Hunts 008A	Huntingdon E.	6204
Fenland 003B	Octavia Hill	6816
Fenland 004A	Elm & Christchurch	6854
Fenland 005A	March Nth.	6920
Fenland 004E	Parson Drove & Wisbech St Mary	6927
Fenland 004F	Parson Drove & Wisbech St Mary	7346
Hunts 022D	Eaton Socon	7433

This motion does not seek to blame the current administration, as successive budgets have created the issue. It does, however, note that the current administration now has the power to take decisions to address an imbalance between the wealthiest and poorest parts of the County.

Therefore this Council agrees to:

- a) ~~An immediate audit of roads and footpaths in these areas or greatest deprivation to be concluded before Winter 2021.~~ **and cycle paths across the County, focussing first on areas of high deprivation.**
- b) **Work with the CPCA and GCP to audit access to public transport across the County, with a particular focus on access to post-16 education.**
- ~~b)c) To achieve improvements in highways according to need advised by Officers. Dedicated and significant spend on the highways and footpaths of the following divisions; Staithe, Waterlees, March East & Rural, Medworth, Abbey to bring all highways in these areas up to a quality standard that taxpayers and road users should be able to expect. This work to take place in 2021 and 2022.~~
- ~~e) d) To review further highways maintenance as part of its Highways Improvement Board currently being established. This action to be followed by extensive audits in other areas in 2022, once these areas of deprivation are completed and in good condition.~~

Following discussion under Part 4 Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, more than 14 Members requested a recorded vote on this matter.

After further discussion, on being put to the vote the amendment was carried as set out in the recorded vote in Appendix D.

Following discussion, on being put to the vote by show of hands the substantive motion as set out below was carried by a majority.

This Council recognises that our County highways have been significantly underfunded for many years.

This Council notes that the highways budget has experienced a £6m reduction in central government grant compared to the previous year.

This Council notes that while no new money has been allocated to the highways budget since the reduction in funding from the Conservative government, the new Joint Administration has made a long term commitment to seek to maintain or increase spending on highways, footways and cycle maintenance. The new administration has also made a commitment to health in all policies and will be seeking to increase the accessibility of active travel and public transport to all residents across Cambridgeshire, working in partnership with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).

Areas of deprivation, already subject to disparities of wealth and health are of particular concern when even their basic infrastructure is in poor condition. The less well off are particularly hard hit by lack of access to public transport or walking and cycling infrastructure. Health and education outcomes are significantly worse in areas of high deprivation, and lack of access to transport for those who cannot drive is one factor in those poorer outcomes.

Areas of Greatest Deprivation:

Fenland 003F	Staithe	1758
Fenland 002C	Waterlees	2010
Fenland 002D	Waterlees	2857
Fenland 007B	March East	3174
Fenland 003I	Medworth	3986
Fenland 003H	Medworth	4231
Cambridge 006F	Abbey	4183
Fenland 001D	Roman Bank	4872
Cambridge 006D	Abbey	5217
Fenland 004C	Elm & Christchurch	5380
Fenland 003C	Octavia Hill	5517
Fenland 006D	Lattersey	5753
Fenland 002A	Clarkson	5877
Cambridge 001C	Kings Hedges	6022
Hunts 008B	Huntingdon N.	6125
Hunts 008A	Huntingdon E.	6204
Fenland 003B	Octavia Hill	6816
Fenland 004A	Elm & Christchurch	6854
Fenland 005A	March Nth.	6920
Fenland 004E	Parson Drove & Wisbech St Mary	6927
Fenland 004F	Parson Drove & Wisbech St Mary	7346
Hunts 022D	Eaton Socon	7433

This motion does not seek to blame the current administration, as successive budgets have created the issue. It does, however, note that the current administration now has the power to take decisions to address an imbalance between the wealthiest and poorest parts of the County.

Therefore this Council agrees to:

- a) An immediate audit of roads and footpath and cycle paths across the County, focussing first on areas of high deprivation.
- b) Work with the CPCA and GCP to audit access to public transport across the County, with a particular focus on access to post-16 education.

- c) To achieve improvements in highways according to need advised by Officers.
- d) To review further highways maintenance as part of its Highways Improvement Board currently being established.

[Voting pattern: 16 Conservatives, Liberal Democrat, Labour and Independents in favour; 3 Conservatives against; 8 Conservatives abstained.]

e) Motion from Councillor Steve Count

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Count and seconded by Councillor J Schumann:

Background

The first meeting where the new Liberal Democrat administration was then in charge, was the Cambridgeshire County Council AGM, May 18th 2021. At the meeting Council agreed to make changes to the constitution under “Matters of urgency” constitutional process, as agreed through its chair.

Significant concerns

Whilst the weight of evidence piles up across the board, demonstrating the chaotic way the Council is being led, these two more significant issues require attention of full council now.

May 18th 2021 – Meeting of full council. Changes to the constitution were allowed by the Chair Councillor Derek Giles, as matters of urgency. Whilst this is the Chair’s decision, the decision has to be in line with legislation and the Council’s constitution. If this decision failed a legal challenge, every subsequent committee decision would be open to serious challenge. The question of whether it was legal or not has now led to the council seeking legal advice from two separate external sources. With the ultimate outcome a lack of confidence in the decision, and the soundness of it. In the absence of a more confident determination the Conservative group, despite not agreeing with many of the decisions made by the new administration, seeks to secure them, as they were made according to the rules of democracy. We therefore ask that all decisions made that day and subsequently be ratified by full council today, rather than revisit each and every single decision. This will effectively reduce the threat of a possible legal challenge.

Recommendations to Council

This Council ratifies all of the decisions made at the AGM of Cambridgeshire County Council on May 18th 2021 and all subsequent decisions made through the committee system, from that date till now.

Following discussion, it was proposed by Councillor Count and seconded by Councillor J Schumann, under Part 4 – Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, Section 11 – Motions without notice, (k) that the debate be adjourned until legal advice had been sought.

Following discussion under Part 4 Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, paragraph 15.5 of the Constitution, more than 14 Members requested a recorded vote on this matter.

The motion to adjourn the debate on being put to the vote was lost as set out in the recorded vote in Appendix E.

Under Part 4 – Rules of Procedure, Part 4.1 – Council Procedure Rules, Section 11 – Motions without notice, (g), it was proposed by Councillor Count, and seconded by Councillor J Schumann, that the motion be withdrawn. Councillor Count reported that he would be lodging a formal complaint about the Council's failure to provide him with the legal advice which had been shared with the other groups.

24. Questions

(a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee

One question was submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.1 of the Council's Constitution.

(b) Written Questions (Council Procedure Rule 9.2)

No questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2 of the Council's constitution.

Chair

Chair's Announcements – 20th July 2021

People - New Director of Public Health

The Council is delighted to welcome its new Director of Public Health, Jyoti Atri, who started work on 14 June 2021. Jyoti replaces Dr Liz Robin who retired at the end of April.

Messages -

American Memorial Day – Cambridge American Cemetery

This year due to COVID-19, the Chair was not able to attend Cambridge American Cemetery on Memorial Day to honour the men and women who died while serving in the U.S. military. On Monday 31st May a wreath was laid at Cambridge American Cemetery on behalf of the Chair and people of Cambridgeshire.

Citizens ceremonies

Citizens ceremonies are still being held without dignitaries due to COVID-19.

Tree planting ceremony at Alconbury Civic Hub (New Shire Hall)

The Chair and Mrs Giles attended the tree planting ceremony at the wildlife garden at Alconbury Civic Hub on 18 June 2021. R G Carter donated 6 trees to the wildlife garden to celebrate its centenary year. The planting of the trees was carried out in collaboration with Cambridgeshire County Council, Urban and Civic and the local school, Ermine Street Church Academy.

Armed Forces Week

To honour and support the men and women who make up the Armed Forces Community, Cambridgeshire County Council flew the Union Flag & the Armed Forces flags for the week of 21 to 27 June to commemorate all service men and women in the Armed Forces.

Ground-breaking ceremony at Marleigh Primary Academy

The Chair and Mrs Giles attended the ground-breaking ceremony at Marleigh Primary Academy in Cambridge on 23 June. The academy is due to be completed in October 2022. The Chair felt very privileged to be a part of the history of Marleigh Primary Academy and looks forward to returning next year to see it completed.

Queens Award for Enterprise – Anglian Water

The Chair and Mrs Giles attended the Queens Awards for Enterprise at Grafham Water on 7 July to witness Anglian Water receiving the prestigious Queens Award. It was awarded by Julie Spence, Lord Lieutenant of Cambridgeshire. The Chair felt honoured to be a guest at the event and congratulates Anglian Water on their success.

County Council Public Question Time – 20 July 2021

Public Question No.1

Question from East Cambridgeshire District Councillor Bill Hunt to the Leader of the Council:

Thank you, Chair and good morning. I don't have the option of sitting, so I'll stand. This is a question for the Leader of the Council, which I'm sure you've all had sight of. Over six months ago, on the 15th December 2020, Full Council passed a motion reference the A1123 and the A1421. The resolution was: instruct the Executive Director of Place and Economy to pursue the reclassification of the A1123 and the A1421 from A to B. This is the road that goes from Soham to Huntingdon and it goes through Haddenham, Stretham and Wicken and Earith and Bluntisham. It was voted that all the Liberal Democrat members abstained and would not support this motion. They had, which had, overwhelming support from the parishes of Wicken, Stretton and Haddenham -

Interjection from Councillor Nethsingha:

Chair, can I say this is not the question that was given notice of. Could he ask that question first, he has an opportunity to answer this one afterwards?

Continuation of question from East Cambridgeshire District Councillor Bill Hunt to the Leader of the Council:

Ok. It was noted that all the Liberal Democrats abstained and would not support this motion that had overwhelming support from the parishes of Wicken, Stretham, Wilburton and Haddenham. There is great concern that the rainbow alliance administration will kick this proposal down the road with more talk about surveys, pollution studies and more investigation. Will you confirm please - sorry I'll delete please, I put it in there to be polite –will you confirm that you will listen to the residents of the A1123 villages and push ahead with this action without delay. Alternatively, will you procrastinate, ignore the wishes, and indeed the needs of these communities who are in danger. Thank you.

Chair response:

Thank you, Councillor Hunt. In the absence of Councillor McDonald, who is self-isolating, could I ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Nethsingha, to respond please.

Response to East Cambridgeshire District Councillor Bill Hunt from Councillor Nethsingha, Leader of the Council

Thank you, Councillor Hunt. I was going to apologise for sitting while you're standing, but maybe I won't. I'm going to answer the question that you put in for the public question, which was not the question you've just asked, and then we'll come back to the question you've just asked for your supplementary. As indicated in our joint agreement, the new Joint Administration is committed to reducing the impact of traffic on our towns and villages and cities.

Response from East Cambridgeshire District Councillor Bill Hunt:

Could you speak a little bit closer to the microphone please? Thank you.

Continuation of response to East Cambridgeshire District Councillor Bill Hunt from Councillor Nethsingha, Leader of the Council:

As indicated in our joint agreement, the New Joint Administration is committed to reducing the impact of traffic on our towns, villages and cities. Speeding, heavy goods vehicles and congestion all cause major problems for those living near major roads in our towns, cities and villages.

Tackling the impact of traffic can take away many forms - can take many forms - and as a joint administration, we are determined to look at a wide range of options for improving the quality of life and tackling the impact of traffic on those living near to major roads. In some areas, this may be best done by tackling speeding, or rat running. In others, it may be best done by giving high priority to pedestrians or cyclists and other road users. We will be looking at all the options with a real openness to listening to local views on what would be the most effective measures to tackle traffic in our towns, cities, and villages. Thank you.

Chair response:

Thank you Councillor Nethsingha. Councillor Hunt, do you have any supplementary?

Supplementary question from East Cambridgeshire District Councillor Bill Hunt:

Yes, I do have a supplementary, and, Councillor Nethsingha, I note what you have said, and my supplementary question falls into three parts:

- a. Do you support the reclassification of the A1123 and A1421 from A road status to B? That's one section.
- b. Will you honour the County Council, the Full Council it was, motion of December 2020 which was supported by East Cambs District Council, a Full Council motion, the parishes of Wicken, Stretham, Wilburton and Haddenham. So that's, will you honour the County Council's motion?
- c. When will you be able to comply with the clear wishes of the residents?

Thank you.

Chair response:

Thank you, Councillor. Would you like to respond to that Councillor Nethsingha?

Response from Councillor Nethsingha, Leader of the Council:

Thank you Chair. on the reclassification of that road, my support will not be what determines that decision. That decision will be made by the Highways Committee, once they have received the report, which there has been a significant amount of work done to consider whether that classification would be in the best interests of the people of Cambridgeshire.

I have to say, that I have some concerns about the significant loss of money that there would be if that road were reclassified, and it is not clear to me that reclassifying that road would provide the benefits that residents in that area wish for and it would also lead to an ongoing loss of income for this Council. But the decision will not be made by me, it will be made by the Highways Committee when they are fully informed of the results of the investigation into that piece of work.

On how we would tackle the issues of traffic in those villages: There are numerous ways of tackling traffic in those villages, some of which may be considerably more effective than changing the name, or the number, of the road. Thank you.

Public Question No.2

Question from Fenland District Councillor Andrew Lynn, to Councillor Goodliffe, Chair of the Children and Young People's Committee:

Good morning everyone and thank you for letting me come this morning. My name is Andrew Lynn. I am the mayor of Wisbech, Wisbech Town Council, and Fenland District Councillor for the Clarkson ward in Wisbech, as well as a foster carer for almost nine years. At the most recent meeting of the Children and Young People Committee, Cambridgeshire County Council's Vice-Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Committee on more than one occasion described foster carers as "amateur".

Foster carers provide a vital and valuable role for children in Wisbech and across the County and they are rightly valued for their contribution to children's welfare throughout this the country. Foster carers undergo intensive and consistent training. I am personally trained up to a diploma level 3 in caring for children and young people. I am fully first aid trained and also have completed over fifty different training courses.

Will the Leader of the Council demonstrate that Cambridgeshire County Council has not lost faith in its foster carers by firstly, unequivocally, reputing the comments that foster carers are "amateur"; and secondly by reiterating the previous Council policy, not merely supporting existing foster carers, but appealing for additional potential foster carers to come forward in the County.

Chair's response:

Thank you for that question. Now, I will ask Councillor Goodliffe, the Chair of the Children and Young People's Committee to respond to that. You have two minutes.

Response from Councillor Goodliffe, the Chair of Children and Young People Committee:

Thank you, Mayor Lynn.

Thank you for raising this question as it provides me with the opportunity to place on record my most sincere admiration for the professionalism of our Cambridgeshire foster carers, including, of course, yourself and your family. I would like to record my thanks for the incredible contribution all foster carers make to the lives of our children and young people in our care.

I think it is important to provide some context in respect to the comment made by Councillor Slatter at the Children and Young People's Committee:

She was seeking to distinguish between very small children's residential homes that might provide care for two or three children at any one time, with the care provided by foster carers who might

also look after a similar number of children and, children and young people. Councillor Slatter made the comment about amateur foster carers in contrast with the employees of the children's homes. She was interested in exploring the differences in the profiles of children and young people who may be placed in one form of care, as opposed to another. Councillor Slatter immediately apologised for any offence she had unintentionally caused by this unfortunate choice of words.

I am sure that all members of the Council will join me in thanking our foster carers for the love and care they provide to some of our most vulnerable children and young people. The Leader and Deputy Leader have asked me to specifically confirm that supporting our existing foster carers and doing all we can to recruit new foster carers to come forward are among the highest priority for children's services in this Joint Administration. Councillor Slatter shares these priorities. She recognises and understands the professionalism, level of training you mentioned this morning, and experience that all foster carers bring to the Cambridgeshire County Council, and most importantly to the children and young people in their care. She remains upset that her unfortunate use of a word has caused offence.

To conclude, I'm very pleased to have this opportunity to place on record our gratitude to all of our Cambridgeshire foster carers for their dedication and the lifechanging difference that they make to children in our care. We will ensure that our foster carers continue to receive all the support that is needed, do all we can to support the continued recruitment of new foster carers to our fostering family.

Chair's response:

Thank you for that. Councillor Lynn, do you have any supplementary questions?

Supplementary question from Fenland District Councillor Andrew Lynn:

I do, yes. I'm a little bit, disappointed that it seems that you've just sat there and just gave me a lot of excuses for one of your councillors, and, at least, the Vice-Chairman of the Committee calling foster carers amateur on any level cannot be considered as acceptable at all. And, in late of that, I want to ask if the Leader intends to replace the Vice-Chairman of the County Council's Corporate Parenting Committee with someone who is not so fundamentally prejudiced against foster carers and the role that they fulfil in helping children to get the best possible start in life?

Response from Councillor Sebastian Kindersley:

Chairman, I've had advice that Councillor Lynn may wish to recall the comments he's made, as they are personal.

Comment from Fenland District Councillor Andrew Lynn:

They may sound personal, but I don't see them any more personal than being called amateur by a professional in this. And much less than defamatory. What is, what do you consider defamatory? Do you not consider foster carers being called amateurs defamatory?

As you can see, I'm not here for pleasure, I'm quite upset about this. I know lots of foster carers that have dealt with children that are so damaged that it would make your toenails curls, and if you was ever unfortunate enough to have to see and deal with some of these children, and get them through life so that they can survive as adults, then you would understand how exactly how I feel, and why I feel this question is very relevant.

Chair's response:

Thank you for that Councillor Lynn. Yes, I'm sure we all appreciate your, great, great concern at the unfortunate wording that was used

Response from Councillor Goodliffe, the Chair of Children and Young People Committee:

If I may, all I can do is reiterate my apologies. I understand your position. Foster carers are absolutely professional, and in my working life I have worked with many families like yours, and many children and I do understand the difficulties of the job and the absolute commitment that foster carers, like yourself, dedicate to it and I'd like to thank you for all of your work and say we do honour and thank all of our professional foster carers.

Voting Record for Amendment to Item 10 (a) (Minute 23(a))

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote
AMBROSE-SMITH D	Con		X			HAY A	Con		X		
ATKINS M	Lib Dem	X				HOWELL M	Con		X		
BATCHELOR H	Lib Dem	X				HOWITT R	Lab	X			
BECKETT A	Lib Dem	X				HOY S	Con		X		
BILLINGTON K	Con		X			KINDERSLEY S	Lib Dem	X			
BIRD G	Lab	X				KING JONAS	Con		X		
BODEN C	Con		X			KING MARIA	Lib Dem	X			
BRADNAM A	Lib Dem	X				KING SIMON	Con		X		
BULAT A	Lab	X				MCDONALD P	Lib Dem				X
BYWATER S	Con		X			MCGUIRE M	Con		X		
CONNOR D	Con		X			MESCHINI E	Lab	X			
CORNEY S	Con		X			MILNES B	Lib Dem	X			
COSTELLO A	Con		X			MURPHY E	Lib Dem	X			
COUNT S	Con		X			NETHSINGHA L	Lib Dem	X			
COUTTS P	Lib Dem	X				PRENTICE K	Con		X		
COX CONDRON H	Lab	X				RAE C	Lab	X			
CRISWELL S J	Con		X			REYNOLDS K	Con		X		
DAUNTON C	Lib Dem	X				SANDERSON T	Ind	X			
DEW D	Con		X			SCHUMANN DAN	Con		X		
DUPRE L	Lib Dem	X				SCHUMANN JOSH	Con		X		
FERGUSON S	Ind	X				SHAILER N	Lab	X			
FRENCH J	Con		X			SHARP A	Con		X		
FULLER R	Con		X			SLATTER P	Lib Dem	X			
GARDENER I	Con		X			SMITH M	Con				X
GAY N	Lab	X				TAYLOR S	Ind	X			
GILES D	Ind	X				THOMPSON F	Lib Dem	X			
GOLDSACK M	Con		X			TIERNEY S	Con		X		
GOODLIFFE B	Lab	X				VAN DE VEN S	Lib Dem	X			
GOUGH N	Lib Dem	X				WHELAN A	Lib Dem	X			
GOWING J	Con		X			WILSON G	Lib Dem	X			
HATHORN R	Lib Dem	X				Total		32	27		2

Voting Record for Amendment to Item 10 (d) (Minute 23(d))

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote
AMBROSE-SMITH D	Con		X			HAY A	Con		X		
ATKINS M	Lib Dem	X				HOWELL M	Con		X		
BATCHELOR H	Lib Dem	X				HOWITT R	Lab	X			
BECKETT A	Lib Dem	X				HOY S	Con		X		
BILLINGTON K	Con		X			KINDERSLEY S	Lib Dem	X			
BIRD G	Lab	X				KING JONAS	Con		X		
BODEN C	Con		X			KING MARIA	Lib Dem	X			
BRADNAM A	Lib Dem	X				KING SIMON	Con		X		
BULAT A	Lab	X				MCDONALD P	Lib Dem				X
BYWATER S	Con		X			MCGUIRE M	Con		X		
CONNOR D	Con		X			MESCHINI E	Lab	X			
CORNEY S	Con		X			MILNES B	Lib Dem	X			
COSTELLO A	Con		X			MURPHY E	Lib Dem	X			
COUNT S	Con		X			NETHSINGHA L	Lib Dem	X			
COUTTS P	Lib Dem	X				PRENTICE K	Con		X		
COX CONDON H	Lab	X				RAE C	Lab	X			
CRISWELL S J	Con		X			REYNOLDS K	Con		X		
DAUNTON C	Lib Dem	X				SANDERSON T	Ind	X			
DEW D	Con		X			SCHUMANN DAN	Con		X		
DUPRE L	Lib Dem	X				SCHUMANN JOSH	Con		X		
FERGUSON S	Ind	X				SHAILER N	Lab	X			
FRENCH J	Con		X			SHARP A	Con		X		
FULLER R	Con		X			SLATTER P	Lib Dem	X			
GARDENER I	Con		X			SMITH M	Con				X
GAY N	Lab	X				TAYLOR S	Ind	X			
GILES D	Ind	X				THOMPSON F	Lib Dem	X			
GOLDSACK M	Con		X			TIERNEY S	Con		X		
GOODLIFFE B	Lab	X				VAN DE VEN S	Lib Dem	X			
GOUGH N	Lib Dem	X				WHELAN A	Lib Dem	X			
GOWING J	Con		X			WILSON G	Lib Dem	X			
HATHORN R	Lib Dem	X				Total		32	27		2

Voting Record for Adjournment of Item 10 (e) (Minute 23(e))

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote
AMBROSE-SMITH D	Con	X				HAY A	Con	X			
ATKINS M	Lib Dem		X			HOWELL M	Con	X			
BATCHELOR H	Lib Dem		X			HOWITT R	Lab		X		
BECKETT A	Lib Dem		X			HOY S	Con	X			
BILLINGTON K	Con	X				KINDERSLEY S	Lib Dem		X		
BIRD G	Lab		X			KING JONAS	Con	X			
BODEN C	Con	X				KING MARIA	Lib Dem		X		
BRADNAM A	Lib Dem		X			KING SIMON	Con	X			
BULAT A	Lab		X			MCDONALD P	Lib Dem				X
BYWATER S	Con	X				MCGUIRE M	Con	X			
CONNOR D	Con	X				MESCHINI E	Lab		X		
CORNEY S	Con	X				MILNES B	Lib Dem		X		
COSTELLO A	Con	X				MURPHY E	Lib Dem		X		
COUNT S	Con	X				NETHSINGHA L	Lib Dem		X		
COUTTS P	Lib Dem		X			PRENTICE K	Con	X			
COX CONDRON H	Lab		X			RAE C	Lab		X		
CRISWELL S J	Con	X				REYNOLDS K	Con				X
DAUNTON C	Lib Dem		X			SANDERSON T	Ind		X		
DEW D	Con	X				SCHUMANN DAN	Con	X			
DUPRE L	Lib Dem		X			SCHUMANN JOSH	Con	X			
FERGUSON S	Ind		X			SHAILER N	Lab		X		
FRENCH J	Con	X				SHARP A	Con	X			
FULLER R	Con				X	SLATTER P	Lib Dem		X		
GARDENER I	Con	X				SMITH M	Con				X
GAY N	Lab		X			TAYLOR S	Ind		X		
GILES D	Ind		X			THOMPSON F	Lib Dem		X		
GOLDSACK M	Con	X				TIERNEY S	Con	X			
GOODLIFFE B	Lab		X			VAN DE VEN S	Lib Dem		X		
GOUGH N	Lib Dem		X			WHELAN A	Lib Dem		X		
GOWING J	Con	X				WILSON G	Lib Dem		X		
HATHORN R	Lib Dem		X			Total		25	32		2

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Questions under Council Procedure Rule 9.1

Question to the Council's Appointee on the Combined Authority Board – Councillor
Nethsingha

Question from Councillor Bradnam:

I'm on, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, which is paper 11A and I am looking at an unnumbered page but it refers to the meeting on the 20th July, I think. Let me just check. 30th June, that's right. And I wanted to ask the Leader, was she surprised by the reluctance of the Conservative representatives on the Combined Authority Board, their reluctance to support the recommendations of the Combined Authority Commission on climate change, which was debated at that meeting?

Response from Councillor Nethsingha:

Thank you for your question. I was, indeed, extremely surprised by the unwillingness of members of Conservative councils across Cambridgeshire to support the recommendations of the Climate Commission. There was an attempt at the meeting to try to reduce the number of recommendations to only one, which was an extremely disappointing outcome. I think it's a serious issue that councils across this county were not willing to support the Combined Authority's desire to accept the recommendations of this extremely high powered and excellent report on climate, which was received in that meeting. And, it was disappointing that none of the Conservative members at that meeting were willing to support the recommendations. A significant number of them tried to amend it so that only one recommendation would be going forward. So, thank you for that question.