

County Council: Minutes

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

Date: Tuesday 15th December 2020

Time: 10:30am – 13.15pm

Present:

Councillor M McGuire (Chairman)

Councillor L Every (Vice-Chairwoman)

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

Apologies for Absence:

Apologies were received from Councillors Kevin Cuffley, Lina Nieto, Matthew Shuter and David Wells.

244. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 13th October 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 13th October 2020 were approved as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman when the Council returned to its offices.

245. Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman made a number of announcements, as set out in Appendix A, and following tributes by Councillors Hunt and Nethsingha a minute silence was observed for Honorary Alderman, John Powley.

246. Declarations of Interest

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

247. Public Question Time

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

248. Petitions

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

249. Item for Determination from General Purposes Committee

Treasury Management Report – Quarter Two Update 2020-21

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

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the Treasury Management- Quarter Two Update 2020-21.

250. Cambridgeshire Local Pension Fund Board Annual Report 2019-20

The Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Local Pension Fund Board, Councillor King, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2019-20.

Council noted the report.

251. Committees – Allocation of Seats and Substitutes to Political Groups in accordance with the Political Balance Rules

The Chairman had agreed to take this item as a late report under the discretionary powers given to him under the Local Government Act 1972 on the following grounds:

Reasons for lateness – Councillor Crawford only last week left the Labour Group to join the Independent Group, which means proportionality needed to be reviewed.

Reasons for Urgency- To enable the Council to approve the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees in accordance with political balance rules.

It was moved by the Chairman, Councillor McGuire, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Every, that the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees to political groups in accordance with the political balance rules, as set out in Appendix B, be approved.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Approve the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees to political groups in accordance with the political balance rules, as set out in Appendix B.

The Deputy Leader reported that Councillor French had been appointed as a substitute member on the Planning Committee.

252. Motions Submitted Under Council Procedure 10

Three motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

(a) Motion from Councillor Ian Manning

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Manning and seconded by Councillor Bradnam:

Council notes:

- The decision of Highways and Transport Committee on 10th March 2020, to suspend all work on resident parking schemes for a year from that date
- The paper to that meeting suggested that many Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) projects were not progressing
- The funding provided for the schemes from the Greater Cambridge Partnership is up for review in January 2021
- The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic in accelerating the move to Active Travel support from Government and the Gear Change report published on 27th July 2020 -[Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking](#)

Council believes:

- Since the decision many GCP projects have progressed - for example the Chisholm Trail bridge being in place, Histon Road progressing and the Milton Road project having been agreed to progress
- Many areas waiting for parking schemes nearby to implemented ones are experiencing extreme pressures in parking, making lives extremely difficult for residents
- Pressures have been made worse by the increase in home working as part of the Covid-19 pandemic

- Government policy has clearly shifted in favour of restricting the ease of use of private car journeys in favour of active travel and public transport, and this Council should follow this lead

Therefore, Council believes that the decision made on the 10th March meeting should be reconsidered at the next meeting of the Highways and Transport Committee.

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

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

(b) Motion from Councillor Bill Hunt

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Hunt and seconded by Councillor Criswell.

The A1123 runs between Soham and Hartford near Huntingdon, there is also a small two mile stretch between Haddenham and Witcham Toll which is classified as A1421.

This council notes:

1. For many years the villages of Wicken, Stretham, Wilburton, Haddenham, Earith, Wyton and Bluntisham have been split in two and impacted by the A1123, as well as the town of St. Ives.
2. Vehicles have been hit whilst parked, cyclists injured, houses suffered significant damage, tractors have overturned and pollution levels are increased by the volume and type of traffic that regularly uses this road as a strategic route.
3. Over the last 15 years speed limits have been introduced and extended, a signage programme has been installed, light controlled crossings have been put in place and "Speedwatch" has been very active throughout the villages affected by the A1123. These measures indicate the efforts that have been made to reduce the speed of all traffic and especially Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).

We believe that now that the A14 is constructed and open we finally have the opportunity to dramatically improve the quality of life for around 10,000+ of our residents.

Up to now, the A1123 has been colloquially known and used as the "A14 bypass". Whenever the A14 experienced increased traffic or congestion a large percentage was diverted, caused either by Sat Nav or local knowledge, and used the A1123.

The Ely southern bypass opened two years ago and this has taken some pressure off the A1123. Some vehicles travelling from Bury/Ipswich/ Felixstowe towards the Midlands/North/Ireland/Scotland now do not turn left at Soham. The recently opened £1.5 billion A14 upgrade has the potential to transform life in the A1123 towns and villages.

If the A1123 were to be changed to a "B" road eventually Sat Nav systems would not suggest vehicles, particularly HGVs, should use the Soham to Huntingdon route. Revised signage should indicate the new status and also, where possible, indicate that the route is not appropriate for the current volume of HGV traffic.

This route directly affects the divisions of the following Councillors, who have proactively worked with Councillor Bill Hunt, to support the views of their residents by supporting him in

bringing forward this motion: Councillor Kevin Reynolds, Councillor Ryan Fuller, Councillor Steve Criswell, Councillor Ian Bates.

This Council therefore resolves to take the following step:

Instruct the Executive Director for Place and Economy to pursue the reclassification of the A1123 (and A1421) from "A" to "B".

In proposing the following amendment, Councillor Wilson drew attention to a correction to the second line of the second paragraph to replace "Arlington" to "Arrington". The meeting agreed the change without discussion.

The amendment, as corrected, was seconded by Councillor Sanderson (additions in bold and deletions in strikethrough):

Many villages in Cambridgeshire suffer from heavy traffic. Heavy goods vehicles in particular cause houses near busy roads to shake and speeding makes village centres feel less safe for walkers and other non-motor road users.

The A1123 **which** runs between Soham and Hartford near Huntingdon **is one such, as are the A1198 through Godmanchester and Arrington, the A603 through Wimpole, the B1050 through Willingham, the B1049 through Cottenham, Histon and Impington, the A10 through Harston, and the B1046 through Barton, Cottenham and the A1421** ~~there is also a small two-mile stretch between Haddenham and Witcham Toll which is classified as A1421.~~

This council notes:

1. For many years the villages of Wicken, Stretham, Wilburton, Haddenham, Earith, Wyton and Bluntisham have been **badly impacted by traffic** ~~split in two and impacted by the A1123,~~ as well as the town of St. Ives **and many many other towns and villages throughout Cambridgeshire.**
3. Vehicles have been hit whilst parked, cyclists injured, houses suffered significant damage, tractors have overturned and pollution levels are increased by the volume and type of traffic that regularly uses this road as a strategic route.
4. Over the last 15 years **on the A1123** speed limits have been introduced and extended, a signage programme has been installed, light controlled crossings have been put in place and "Speedwatch" has been very active throughout the villages affected by the A1123. ~~These measures indicate the efforts that have been made to reduce the speed of all traffic and especially Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).~~ **However other measures such as nighttime HGV restrictions, weight restrictions for vehicles who do not have direct business in the area, average speed checks or changes to the road layouts to improve safety for pedestrians and lower speeds have not yet been tried to the extent many residents have requested.**

We believe that now that the A14 is constructed and open we finally have the opportunity to dramatically improve the quality of life for around 10,000+ of our residents.

Up to now, the A1123 has been colloquially known and used as the "A14 bypass". Whenever the A14 experienced increased traffic or congestion a large percentage was diverted, caused either by Sat Nav or local knowledge, and used the A1123.

The Ely southern bypass opened two years ago and this has taken some pressure off the A1123. Some vehicles travelling from Bury/Ipswich/ Felixstowe towards the Midlands/North/Ireland/Scotland now do not turn left at Soham. The recently opened £1.5 billion A14 upgrade has the potential to transform life in the A1123 towns and villages.

~~If the A1123 were to be changed to a "B" road eventually Sat Nav systems would not suggest vehicles, particularly HGVs, should use the Soham to Huntingdon route. Revised signage should indicate the new status and also, where possible, indicate that the route is not appropriate for the current volume of HGV traffic.~~

~~This route directly affects the divisions of the following Councillors, who have proactively worked with Councillor Bill Hunt, to support the views of their residents by supporting him in bringing forward this motion: Councillor Kevin Reynolds, Councillor Ryan Fuller, Councillor Steve Criswell, Councillor Ian Bates.~~

Councillors across the whole of Cambridgeshire share the desire to make our villages safer, with cleaner air and a high quality of life.

This Council therefore resolves to take the following step:

Instruct the Executive Director for Place and Economy to:

- pursue the reclassification of the A1123 (and A1421) from "A" to "B".
- **work with parish councils and residents in towns and villages such as Godmanchester, Wicken, Wilburton, Haddenham, Sutton, Earith, Willingham, Cottenham, Harston, to establish what measures could best be used to reduce the impact of high traffic levels, and in particular their use by heavy goods vehicles on the A and B roads running through them.**
- **discuss with parishes measures including, but not limited to re-classification from A to B roads, average speed checks, traffic calming measures which improve the safety of pedestrians and other road users.**
- **bring a paper back to the Highways and Transport Committee indicating what options are likely to be most effective and which are supported by local villages and what the cost implications of the various measures would be.**

Following discussion, it was proposed by Councillor Hickford and seconded by Councillor Bailey that the question be now put. It was resolved by a majority that the question be now put to the vote.

[Voting pattern: 30 Conservatives and 2 Labour in favour; 12 Liberal Democrats, 2 Independents, 1 Conservative against; 5 Labour, 3 Liberal Democrats and 1 Independent Abstained.]

Without further discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote, was lost.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives and 1 Labour against; 15 Liberal Democrats and 2 Independents in favour; 6 Labour and 1 Independent abstain.]

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

The original motion on being put to vote was carried.

The Chairman asked the Chairwoman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee to consider a review of the Constitution relating to the deadline of a submission of an amendment which could negate a motion.

(c) Motion from Councillor Lorna Dupré

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Dupré and seconded by Councillor Simone Taylor, the motion included an amendment proposed by Councillor Criswell which was accepted as an alteration to her motion by Councillor Dupré and agreed by the meeting without discussion (Additions in bold and deletions shown in strikethrough):

This Council resolves to endorse the call of the Local Government Association for

- ~~Devolution of some of the National Citizen Service (NCS) funding to local authorities, and~~
- Release of the Government's promised £500 million Youth Investment Fund, announced in September 2019, to help boost youth services, including improving facilities and training youth workers.

This Council further resolves to engage with the Government's spring review of Government programmes to support youth services, announced in the Chancellor's recent autumn statement, and to actively promote ~~the above position~~ to Government **a complete review of the £100m National Citizen Service allowing a direct relationship with local authorities to develop a more flexible model to suit local need.**

In so resolving, this Council is mindful of the need for urgent investment in youth services to offer young people safe places to meet, support them to succeed in school, training, or employment, and help them avoid long-term unemployment, mental health problems, and being lured into criminal activity.

This Council notes LGA analysis showing that spending by local authorities on youth services nationally has reduced by 69 per cent since 2010/11, from £1.4 billion to £429 million, with the loss of more than 4,500 youth work jobs and the closure of 750 youth centres.

Meanwhile the National Citizen Service (NCS) receives an estimated 95 per cent of the Government's youth services budget, despite only one in six eligible young people taking part and a fall of eight per cent in participants in the past year. National Citizen Service offers just two to four weeks of voluntary activity for 16 to 17-year-olds, receiving £1.26 billion in government funding from 2016 to 2020.

This Council believes that ~~all some~~ of this National Citizen Service funding would be better spent on all-year-round **locally prioritised** provision for young people of all ages, **on clearly defined outcomes** rather than a time-limited programme which is restricted to a narrow age group and is attracting only a relatively small number of teenagers. The Government's £500 million Youth Investment Fund is expected to reach only around half of council areas, and this Council believes that all local authority areas need to have enough funding to ensure youth services are available for local young people.

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

253. Questions

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

No questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.1 of the Council's Constitution.

(b) Written Questions (Council Procedure Rule 9.2)

Four questions were submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.2, as set out in Appendix D.

Chairman

County Council – 15th December 2020

Chairman's Announcements

People

Former County Councillor John Powley

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the death of former County Councillor and Honorary Alderman, John Powley, who represented the Soham and Fordham Villages Division on behalf of the Conservative Party from 1967 to 1977 and 1997 to 2013. During this time, he was the Cabinet Member for Social Services and Corporate Services as well as Chairman of the Council from 2011-13. The Council's thoughts are with his family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

Awards

Public Service Communications Award

The Council's Communications Team received a Bronze national award for its work in communicating with communities in Peterborough around the rapid response to rising infection rates in the city. This prestigious national award was staged jointly by the LGcomms and the Government Communication Service (GCS) to recognise the achievements of communicators in the public sector.

Using postcode data and information on the spread of COVID the Communications Team was able to focus its messages on specific sections of the Peterborough community where infections were at their highest. Local information was used to communicate with residents about the need to follow public health advice and Government guidelines. The work carried out during COVID-19 has been used as a blueprint for the communications work done across the whole of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Association of Democratic Services Officers (ADSO) – Learner of the Year 2020

Nick Mills, Democratic Services Officer, has won the ADSO Learner of the Year 2020. Together with James Veitch, formerly a Democratic Services Assistant, and now an Energy Projects Officer in the Energy Investments Unit, they both successfully completed the ADSO Certificate of Democratic Knowledge. The Certificate comprises seven knowledge modules covering all aspects of Democratic Services. These are assessed through the submission of written assignments and by responding to questions through, for example, a professional discussion.

Nick was awarded the Learner of Year out of over 20 candidates nationally. To win this award you need to demonstrate the following: demonstrated significant progress, innovation or resilience during the course of their studies; applied their learning in the workplace for the benefit of their organisation; demonstrated new skills or personal development as a result of their studies; shown that their qualification and learning experience has directly influenced their progression in the workplace; and their nomination is supported by their employer.

Service Developments

Alconbury Topping Out Ceremony – 28th October 2020

The Chairman attended the Topping Out ceremony at the new Alconbury Weald HQ on Wednesday 28th October.

Messages

Remembrance Sunday / Armistice Day – 8th and 11th November 2020

This year because we are working differently due to COVID, we were not able to commemorate Remembrance Sunday and Armistice Day in the same way. On Remembrance Sunday the Chairman laid a wreath on behalf of the people of Cambridgeshire at the War Memorial, Hills Road, Cambridge. The Chairman recorded a special video for Armistice Day encouraging everyone to observe the two minutes silence if they would like to wherever they were working at home or in the office.

Chairman's Commendations awarded in November

Earlier this year the Chairman announced a monthly scheme to celebrate the fantastic work of those who have gone above and beyond in supporting their local communities since lockdown began in March due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The scheme will run for at least six months and Members are reminded to continue to send in their nominations. During the first week of every month, the Chairman will issue a certificate to those nominated.

The Chairman was delighted to issue a further three certificates during November to individuals, businesses and community groups in recognition for their excellent work throughout the Covid-19 pandemic. Full details of each Member's nomination can be seen on the council's website.

Committee Membership 2020/21

Policy and Service Committees

General Purposes (17)

				Substitutes	
CLLR	A BAILEY	C	CLLR	D AMBROSE-SMITH	C
CLLR	I BATES	C	CLLR	C BODEN	C
CLLR	S BYWATER	C	CLLR	A HAY	C
CLLR	S COUNT	C	CLLR	M HOWELL	C
CLLR	S CRISWELL	C	CLLR	S HOY	C
CLLR	M GOLDSACK	C	CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	CLLR	L NIETO	C
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	CLLR	M SHUTER	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	CLLR	T WOTHERSPOON	C
CLLR	L DUPRÉ	LD	CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR	S KINDERSLEY	LD
CLLR	P MCDONALD	LD	CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	CLLR	G WILSON	LD
CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L	CLLR	L JONES	L
CLLR	E MESCHINI	L	CLLR	J SCUTT	L
			CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
CLLR	D GILES	IND.	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	IND.
CLLR	T SANDERSON	IND.		S TAYLOR	IND.
				-	IND.

Adults (10)

				Substitutes	
CLLR	D AMBROSE-SMITH	C	CLLR	J FRENCH	C
CLLR	A BAILEY	C	CLLR	L EVERY	C
CLLR	A COSTELLO	C	CLLR	J GOWING	C
CLLR	M GOLDSACK	C	CLLR	A HAY	C
CLLR	M HOWELL	C	CLLR	W HUNT	C
CLLR	D WELLS	C	CLLR	L NIETO	C
CLLR	N HARRISON	LD	CLLR	P MCDONALD	LD
CLLR	G WILSON	LD	CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	VACANCY	LD
CLLR	L JONES	L	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
			CLLR	C RICHARDS	L
			CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
CLLR	S CRAWFORD	IND.	CLLR	D GILES	IND.
			CLLR	T SANDERSON	IND.
			CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND.

Children & Young People (10)

				Substitutes	
CLLR	D AMBROSE SMITH	C	CLLR	D CONNOR	C
CLLR	S BYWATER	C	CLLR	A COSTELLO	C
CLLR	L EVERY	C	CLLR	K CUFFLEY	C
CLLR	A HAY	C	CLLR	M GOLDSACK	C
CLLR	S HOY	C	CLLR	J GOWING	C
CLLR	J WISSON	C	CLLR	M HOWELL	C
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	CLLR	H BATCHELOR	LD
CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD	CLLR	A BRADNAM	LD
			CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD
CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
			CLLR	E MESCHINI	L
			CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND.	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	IND.
			CLLR	D GILES	IND.
			CLLR	T SANDERSON	IND.

Commercial and Investment Committee (10)

				Substitutes	
CLLR	I BATES	C	CLLR	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	C BODEN	C	CLLR	L NIETO	C
CLLR	M GOLDSACK	C	CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C
CLLR	J GOWING	C	CLLR	M SMITH	C
CLLR	T ROGERS	C	CLLR	S TIERNEY	C
CLLR	T WOTHERSPOON	C	CLLR	D WELLS	C
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	CLLR	L DUPRE	LD
CLLR	P MCDONALD	LD	CLLR	M SHELENS	LD
			CLLR	G WILSON	LD
CLLR	L JONES	L	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
			CLLR	E MESCHINI	L
			CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
CLLR	VACANCY	IND.	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	IND.
			CLLR	D GILES	IND.
			CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND.

Communities and Partnership Committee (10)

				Substitutes	
CLLR	A COSTELLO	C	CLLR	D AMBROSE SMITH	C
CLLR	S CRISWELL	C	CLLR	D CONNOR	C
CLLR	L EVERY	C	CLLR	K CUFFLEY	C
CLLR	J FRENCH	C	CLLR	J GOWING	C
CLLR	L NIETO	C	CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	CLLR	D WELLS	C
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	CLLR	D JENKINS	LD
CLLR	H BATCHELOR	LD	CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD
CLLR	E MESCHINI	L	CLLR	L JONES	L
			CLLR	J SCUTT	L
			CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
CLLR	T SANDERSON	IND.	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	IND.
			CLLR	D GILES	IND.
			CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND.

Environment & Sustainability (10)

				Substitutes	
CLLR	I GARDENER	C	CLLR	J FRENCH	C
CLLR	J GOWING	C	CLLR	M GOLDSACK	C
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	CLLR	L HARFORD	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	CLLR	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	M SHUTER	C	CLLR	S HOY	C
CLLR	T WOTHERSPOON	C	CLLR	M SMITH	C
CLLR	A BRADNAM	LD	CLLR	S KINDERSLEY	LD
CLLR	L DUPRE	LD	CLLR	P MCDONALD	LD
			CLLR	G WILSON	LD
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	CLLR	L JONES	L
			CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
			CLLR	E MESCHINI	L
CLLR	VACANCY	IND.	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	IND.
			CLLR	D GILES	IND.
			CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND.

Health (10)

				Substitutes	
CLLR	D CONNOR	C	CLLR	C BODEN	C
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	CLLR	M GOLDSACK	C
CLLR	A HAY	C	CLLR	J GOWING	C
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	CLLR	M HOWELL	C
CLLR	K REYNOLDS	C	CLLR	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	CLLR	L NIETO	C
CLLR	L DUPRE	LD	CLLR	D JENKINS	LD
CLLR	S VAN DE VEN	LD	CLLR	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			CLLR	G WILSON	LD
CLLR	L JONES	L	CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L
			CLLR	E MESCHINI	L
			CLLR	J WHITEHEAD	L
CLLR	VACANCY	IND.	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	IND.
			CLLR	D GILES	IND.
			CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND.

Highways and Transport (10)

				Substitutes	
CLLR	I BATES	C	CLLR	J FRENCH	C
CLLR	D CONNOR	C	CLLR	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	R FULLER	C	CLLR	W HUNT	C
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	CLLR	M SHUTER	C
CLLR	M HOWELL	C	CLLR	M SMITH	C
CLLR	S KING	C	CLLR	S TIERNEY	C
CLLR	I MANNING	LD	CLLR	H BATCHELOR	LD
CLLR	A TAYLOR	LD	CLLR	L DUPRE	LD
			CLLR	D JENKINS	LD
CLLR	N KAVANAGH	L	CLLR	L JONES	L
			CLLR	E MESCHINI	L
			CLLR	J SCUTT	L
CLLR	D GILES	IND.	CLLR	S CRAWFORD	IND.
			CLLR	T SANDERSON	IND.
			CLLR	S TAYLOR	IND.

Regulatory

Planning Committee (8)

			Substitutes	
CLLR	D CONNOR	C	J FRENCH	C
CLLR	I GARDENER	C	R FULLER	C
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	J GOWING	C
CLLR	B HUNT	C	M HOWELL	C
CLLR	M SMITH	C	P HUDSON	C
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	H BATCHELOR	LD
CLLR	S KINDERSLEY	LD	A BRADNAM	LD
			D JENKINS	LD
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	L JONES	L
			N KAVANAGH	L
			E MESCHINI	L

Other Committees

Audit and Accounts Committee (7)

			Substitutes	
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	I BATES	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	C BODEN	C
CLLR	T ROGERS	C	J FRENCH	C
CLLR	D WELLS	C	M SHUTER	C
CLLR	M SHELLENS	LD	S KINDERSLEY	LD
CLLR	J WILLIAMS	LD	I MANNING	LD
CLLR	G WILSON	LD	L NETHSINGHA	LD

Constitution and Ethics Committee (8)

			Substitutes	
CLLR	D CONNOR	C	I BATES	C
CLLR	L HARFORD	C	C BODEN	C
CLLR	R HICKFORD	C	S BYWATER	C
CLLR	L EVERY	C	J GOWING	C
CLLR	K REYNOLDS	C	VACANCY	C
CLLR	S KINDERSLEY	LD	L DUPRE	LD
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	VACANCY	LD
			A TAYLOR	LD
CLLR	J SCUTT	L	L JONES	L
			N KAVANAGH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L

Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board (5)

		Substitutes (one per position):	
S HOY	C	S BYWATER	C
R HICKFORD	C	M GOLDSACK	C
M HOWELL	C	P HUDSON	C
S VAN DE VEN	LD	L NETHSINGHA	LD
L JONES	L	E MESCHINI	L

Corporate Parenting Sub-Committee (5)

			Substitutes	
CLLR	A COSTELLO	C	D CONNOR	C
CLLR	L EVERY	C	K CUFFLEY	C
CLLR	A HAY	C	M GOLDSACK	C
CLLR	A BRADNAM	LD	H BATCHELOR	LD
			A TAYLOR	LD
			VACANCY	LD
CLLR	E MESCHINI	L	L JONES	L
			N KAVANAGH	L
			J WHITEHEAD	L

[Note: Membership drawn from Children and Young People Committee membership includes subs]

Pension Fund Committee (6)

			Substitutes	
CLLR	A HAY	C	C BODEN	C
CLLR	I GARDENER	C	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	T ROGERS	C	J SCHUMANN	C
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	VACANCY	LD
CLLR	D JENKINS	LD	L NETHSINGHA	LD
CLLR	M SHELLENS	LD	G WILSON	LD

Pension Fund Committee Investment Sub-Committee (4)

			Substitutes	
CLLR	I GARDENER	C	A HAY	C
CLLR	T ROGERS	C	R HICKFORD	C
			J SCHUMANN	C
CLLR	P DOWNES	LD	VACANCY	LD
CLLR	M SHELLENS	LD	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			G WILSON	LD

[Note: Membership drawn from Pension Fund Committee membership]

Pension Fund Board (2 Employer Representatives)

CLLR	S KING	C		
CLLR	E MESCHINI	L		

[Note: Members of the Board cannot be members of the Pension Fund Committee]

Staffing & Appeals Committee (8)

			Substitutes	
CLLR	D AMBROSE SMITH	C	S BYWATER	C
CLLR	P HUDSON	C	R HICKFORD	C
CLLR	W HUNT	C	S KING	C
CLLR	M MCGUIRE	C	K REYNOLDS	C
CLLR	J SCHUMANN	C	S TIERNEY	C
CLLR	B ASHWOOD	LD	L DUPRE	LD
CLLR	N HARRISON	LD	L NETHSINGHA	LD
			S VAN DE VEN	LD
CLLR	L JONES	L	N KAVANAGH	L
			E MESCHINI	L
			J SCUTT	L

Service Appeals Sub-Committee (3) (Two Conservatives, And One Liberal Democrat)

Appointed from Staffing & Appeals Committee as and when needed

Agenda Item 8 b) – Motions submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10

Recorded Vote for Councillor Bill Hunt Motion

COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent / No Vote
AMBROSE-SMITH D	Con	X				JENKINS D	Lib Dem			X	
ASHWOOD B	Lib Dem			X		JONES L	Lab	X			
BAILEY A	Con	X				KAVANAGH N	Lab	X			
BATCHELOR H	Lib Dem			X		KINDERSLEY S	Lib Dem			X	
BATES I C	Con	X				KING S	Con	X			
BODEN C	Con	X				MANNING I	Lib Dem			X	
BRADNAM A	Lib Dem			X		MCDONALD P	Lib Dem			X	
BYWATER S	Con	X				MCGUIRE L W	Con	X			
CONNOR D	Con	X				MESCHINI E	Lab	X			
COSTELLO A	Con	X				NETHSINGHA L	Lib Dem			X	
COUNT S	Con	X				NIETO L	Con				X
CRAWFORD S	Ind			X		REYNOLDS K	Con	X			
CRISWELL S J	Con	X				RICHARDS C	Lab	X			
CUFFLEY K	Con				X	ROGERS T	Con	X			
DOWNES P J	Lib Dem			X		SANDERSON T	Ind			X	
DUPRE L	Lib Dem			X		SCHUMANN J	Con	X			
EVERY L	Con	X				SCUTT J	Lab	X			
FRENCH J	Con	X				SHELLENS M	Lib Dem			X	
FULLER R	Con	X				SHUTER M	Con				X
GARDENER I	Con	X				SMITH M	Con	X			
GILES D	Ind			X		TAYLOR A	Lib Dem			X	
GOLDSACK	Con	X				TAYLOR S	Ind			X	
GOWING J	Con	X				TIERNEY S	Con	X			
HARFORD L	Con	X				VAN DE VEN S	Lib Dem			X	
HARRISON N	Lib Dem				X	WELLS D	Con				X
HAY A	Con	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab	X			
HICKFORD R	Con	X				WILLIAMS J	Lib Dem			X	
HOWELL M	Con	X				WILSON G	Lib Dem			X	
HOY S	Con	X				WISSON J	Con	X			
HUDSON P	Con	X				WOTHERSPOON T	Con	X			
HUNT W T I	Con	X				Total		37	0	19	5

County Council – 15 December 2020

Written Question under Council Procedure Rule 9.2

1. Question from Councillor Sebastian Kindersley

London Luton Airport (LLA) currently shares arrival routes and holds with Stansted Airport. A public consultation is taking place ending February 5th 2021 inviting comment on proposed changes that will separate routes further out and higher up and create a new hold for Luton arrivals. The joint consultation, co-sponsored by LLA and air traffic control provider NATS, is looking at two options to simplify the arrival routes for flights into LLA.

The proposals being put forward by LLA and NATS affect areas not only in the immediate vicinity of the Airport but also wider areas across Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire and Suffolk. Cambridgeshire communities such as Gamlingay, St Neots, Waresley, Abbotsley and the Gransdens could see aircraft leaving the new stack proposed Northwest of St Neots and descending through 8000ft to 7000ft immediately above these communities; and the consultation documents describe the effect of these changes as adverse and detrimental.

The consultation presents two closely related options. It is not therefore a true consultation as it does not disclose all the options that were considered and the reasons why they were discounted. To that end is Cambridgeshire County Council prepared to ask LLA and NATS to recommence the whole route assessment and public consultation process, considering all options completely transparently and this time to include residents and local authorities right from the start?

Response from Councillor Josh Schumann, Chairman of Environment and Sustainability Committee

I would like to thank Cllr Kindersley for this question on what is quite a complicated matter. I can confirm that officers of the Council are currently assessing the consultation material, working with officers from South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire and so the points Cllr Kindersley raises are very much in our minds.

In undertaking the consultation, I am told that the Civil Aviation Authority have been following governments guidelines as set out in the Air Navigation Guidance 2017, which includes regulations on conducting consultation when a proposed change in airspace is being mooted. The guidance states that *“local authorities, other organisations and individuals who may represent the interests of people living in the neighbourhood of the aerodrome that are likely to be affected by the proposed change below 7,000 feet. Changes at or above 7,000 feet will usually not have a noticeable impact so consultation is unlikely to be necessary.”* (Department for Transport, Air Navigation Guidance 2017, Section 2.9)

The consultation notes that the proposal for stacking over the Huntingdon area takes place over the level of 8,000 feet, and therefore LLA have not been mandated to consult with relevant authorities in and around Huntingdonshire, although many members have expressed regret that NATS and LLA have not.

We understand that representatives from a number of surrounding authorities were invited to attend a stakeholder session on the 29th August 2019 near Luton Airport after which follow-up engagement took place via email. To the best of knowledge of officers, no such invitation was extended to Cambridgeshire County Council, and no attempts were made to engage the Council

on these proposals via email or letter. While the authorities that attended the session represent areas where the impact of additional plane traffic will be more significant than our own, there is a significant part of our region, specifically the south-western parts of South Cambridgeshire, where additional plane traffic would be flying below 7,000ft as shown by the graphics in the consultation documents (Sections 5.19-5.74).

With respect to point (b), the consultation document advises that only one 'upper option' features in the consultation, this option being Option 1.4 (i.e. the Huntingdon stack), the other upper options having been rejected. It is the view of officers that there is an insufficient level of detail on the proposed flight paths from the Huntingdon stack to Luton airport to determine the exact impact on communities in South Cambridgeshire and there is an emerging need to seek more clarity on this.

I do therefore agree that some action with LLA and NATS is needed and will be asking Steve Cox, Executive Director, Place & Economy write to LLA and NATS to express our concerns over the process and to seek supplementary details not provided in the consultation document, so that officers are able to robustly assess the exact impact these proposals will have on those affected areas in South Cambridgeshire, and better inform the County Council's formal response to the consultation, which is required by 5th February 2021. In the event that such additional detail is not provided, then I will be asking the Executive Director to request that the consultation be re-done in order that the consultation can provide a level of engagement and detail that gives confidence to members that the proposals will not adversely affect the communities they represent.

2. Question from Councillor Lorna Dupré

Public transport to serve Alconbury

At a meeting of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority Board on Wednesday 25 September 2019, the Board was asked what assurances could be given to ensure that an interim public transport solution would be in place when Cambridgeshire County Council relocated to Alconbury. The minutes of the meeting (Minute 419) record that 'The Mayor commented that Cllr Count had assured him that there would be a solution in place by 2021 which both the Combined Authority and Cambridgeshire County Council could support'. What public transport solution will be in place by 2021 to provide public access to Alconbury Weald and how has the County Council indicated its support for it?

Response from Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council

The Cambs 2020 Programme sees Cambridgeshire County Council moving from our HQ in Cambridge city to a Hub and Spokes model, with a smaller purpose built HQ in Alconbury Weald and offices across the County allowing our staff to be closer to the communities they serve.

For the teams moving from Shire Hall to Alconbury Weald, we recognise that while public transport is available between the two locations, the current route available is reasonably long. Therefore, Cambridgeshire County Council has undertaken an options appraisal to consider a chargeable bus service reducing the time/distance between Cambridge and Alconbury Weald.

This proposal (created using employee feedback) has now been taken through internal governance approval, however funding still needs to be identified before it can be confirmed. The proposal would see Cambridgeshire County Council commissioning a public bus service (available to staff and members of the public) between Cambridge North Station, an additional pick up in Bar Hill, before completing the journey at Alconbury Weald. The service would be commissioned for a fixed period of one year to support the transitional period for staff. If this proves successful the Council could consider extending beyond this period. In providing a public bus service, this enables opportunities for individuals outside of the organisation to utilise this service and maximise the capacity available, and it will promote sustainable travel to our staff to reduce single occupancy car journeys.

3. Question from Councillor Lorna Dupré

Staff transport to Alconbury

Will the Leader please update the Council on arrangements for staff transport to Alconbury Weald?

Response from Councillor Steve Count, Leader of the Council

The answer is included in the response to question 2.

4. Questions from Councillor Lorna Dupré

1. How much was CCC's original loan to This Land?
2. How much has been loaned subsequently?
3. How much of the principal was expected to be repaid between the initial loan and the present date?
4. How much of the principal has actually been repaid in that period?
5. How much interest was due between the initial loan and the present date?
6. How much interest has actually been received in that period?
7. Councillors were advised that the council would receive a 3.0-3.5 per cent margin on all loans to This Land. What margin is CCC actually receiving?
8. How many sites is This Land now disposing of on the open market?
9. Does the value of the land owned by This Land outweigh the Company's financial obligation to the council?

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

Thank you for these questions. I should begin by drawing attention of Councillors to the reports received by the Commercial and Investment Committee regarding This Land, the Council's wholly owned housing development company, most recently in October 2020 and April 2020. Some of that information remains commercially sensitive and I have of course been mindful of that in drafting this answer.

[I am aware that several incorrect assertions were made about This Land, in a satirical magazine in recent weeks, so I welcome this opportunity to put on record the information in this reply.]

1. The original loan from CCC to This Land, advanced in November 2017, amounted to £2.8m.
2. The total amount loaned to This Land from CCC from November 2017 (including that initial sum) to date is £123.477m.
3. Pursuant to the loan agreements agreed by This Land and CCC, £11.3m of that principal amount was scheduled to be repaid to the Council during that period to date.
4. As planned, £11.3m has indeed been repaid to the Council by This Land. This means the total amount on loan today is £112.177m. There is further commentary on the total amounts on loan and the requested total facility within the reports to C&I Committee.

5. The amount of interest due to the Council from This Land since November 2017 is £13.134m.
6. The actual interest received by CCC during that period is £13.134m.
7. Councillor Dupré refers to the approximate margin quoted in the 2016 outline business case. For each loan advanced, the Council has considered the lending terms with regard to the length of loan and underlying collateral and so as to avoid state aid. Land loans also resulted in a simultaneous capital receipt for the Council, negating the need to immediately borrow. In this context, interest rates were not determined as a product of achieving a particular margin compared to the Council's cost of borrowing, and the exact rates are likely to be commercially sensitive. Across the total portfolio of lending to This Land, compared to equivalent borrowing costs to the Council, I can confirm the average margin exceeds 3%.
8. A core objective in setting up This Land was to sell properties to private purchasers. We are starting to see some successes with sales and Members heard at a shareholder meeting earlier this month about progress by the company which is quite dynamic. The homes at the first developments at Cityglades are proving popular. In terms of the overall strategy with disposals, I would refer you to the reports to C&I Committee which set out the site-by-site approach.
9. The financing that the Council has advanced to This Land is both for land acquisition as well as development and construction costs. On this basis, it is likely that the market value today of the land owned by This Land today does not exceed the total amount on loan from the Council. This is not unexpected and C&I Committee has considered the risk and reward from developing the property owned by This Land through the company's planned investment and construction. Only as that development progresses and completes will the uplifts in values be fully realised, as is the nature of property development.
10. Crucially, This Land's financial obligations to the Council are appropriately phased over the coming years. The company's cashflow position means it is already strongly placed to meet its financial obligations to the Council over the next 12 months and has an appropriate longer-term plan for continuing to deliver the significant interest returns scheduled as well as repaying principal sums as they fall due and as we have already seen to date, throughout the lifecycle of the company. There is more detail on loan security, and gross development values, as assessed by an independent valuer, within the C&I Committee reports.