

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 17 October 2017

Time: 10.40am – 5.45pm

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

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

Apologies: Councillors A Costello, L Dupre, J Gowing, K Reynolds and G Wilson

32. MINUTES – 18th JULY 2017

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 18th July 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

33. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor McGuire declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in agenda item 14(c) (minute 45(c)) as a corresponding member of the National Fire Sprinkler Network.

35. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chairman reported that twelve questions had been received from members of the public as set out in **Appendix B**. Council agreed to suspend standing order 9.3 Public Question Time to enable all public questioners to put their question to Council. In order to accommodate this proposal, no supplementary questions were permitted.

36. PETITIONS

One petition was presented by a member of the public. **Appendix C** sets out the text of the petition, and of the petition presenter's speech introducing it.

37. CHILDREN'S CENTRES – PROPOSALS FOR THE NEW SERVICE PROVISION AND RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

It was moved by the Chairman of the Children and Young People Committee, Councillor Bywater, and seconded by the Vice-Chairwoman, Councillor Hoy, that the recommendation from the Children and Young People Committee as set out on the Council agenda be approved.

Council discussed the proposals at length.

It was resolved by a majority to note the consultation response and agree –

- a) The proposals for the redesign of Children's Centres to the new Child and Family Centre Offer.
- b) To reconfirm the budget reduction of £1 million, and confirm a new investment of £100k (this would amount to an overall saving of £900k).

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

38. REPORTS OF THE CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

a) Corporate Parenting Sub-Committee

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

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) agree the proposal that the Corporate Parenting Board become a sub-committee of the Children and Young People Committee
- b) approve the Terms of Reference for the sub-committee, as set out at Appendix 1 of the Council report
- c) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

b) Principles and protocols for proactive communications with media and social media outlets

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

It was resolved unanimously to

- a) approve the approach and principles contained within the updated and revised media protocol for Cambridgeshire County Council

- b) agree that the protocol be included in the Council's Constitution as a new, fifth section of Part 5, Codes and Protocols
- c) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

c) County Council – proposed changes to the Constitution

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

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Nethsingha and seconded by Councillor Bradnam (additions in bold and deletions in strikethrough):

That Full Council

- a) approve the following amendments to the Council's Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee:
 - i) that the protocol for oral questions at Full Council in relation to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee be revised to reduce the number of reports presented from two to one ~~and the time allocated for questions from 60 minutes to 40 minutes~~, and to introduce a requirement that questions be notified in advance, as set out in Appendix 1.
 - ii) that Article 4, The Full Council, be revised to allow the relevant Policy and Service Committee to make recommendations direct to Full Council on plans statutorily approved by Full Council, as set out in Appendix 2.
 - iii) that the Protocol on Member/Officer Relations be revised to remove the prohibition on officers attending political group meetings which are not held on County Council premises, as set out in Appendix 3.
 - iv) **that the process for decision review be revised so that any 5 members of GPC may initiate a review of a decision by a policy and service committee** and that the process of Decision Review be set out in the Constitution by revising Article 6, The Statutory Scrutiny Function, and adding Decision Review Procedure Rules to Part 4 of the Constitution, Rules of Procedure, as set out in ~~the~~ **revised** appendices 4 and 5 respectively.
 - v) that the terms of reference for the Communities and Partnership Committee be amended to give that Committee responsibility for the Council's Consultation Strategy and its approach to future Business Planning consultation, as set out in Appendix 6.
- b) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals

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

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

The substantive motion on being put to the vote was carried.

It was resolved by a majority to

- a) approve the following amendments to the Council's Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee:
 - i) that the protocol for oral questions at Full Council in relation to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Overview and Scrutiny Committee be revised to reduce the number of reports presented from two to one and the time allocated for questions from 60 minutes to 40 minutes, and to introduce a requirement that questions be notified in advance, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Council report.
 - ii) that Article 4, The Full Council, be revised to allow the relevant Policy and Service Committee to make recommendations direct to Full Council on plans statutorily approved by Full Council, as set out in Appendix 2.
 - iii) that the Protocol on Member/Officer Relations be revised to remove the prohibition on officers attending political group meetings which are not held on County Council premises, as set out in Appendix 3.
 - iv) that the process of Decision Review be set out in the Constitution by revising Article 6, The Statutory Scrutiny Function, and adding Decision Review Procedure Rules to Part 4 of the Constitution, Rules of Procedure, as set out in appendices 4 and 5 respectively.
 - v) that the terms of reference for the Communities and Partnership Committee be amended to give that Committee responsibility for the Council's Consultation Strategy and its approach to future Business Planning consultation, as set out in Appendix 6.
- b) authorise the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to make any other minor or consequential amendments to the Constitution necessary for, or incidental to, the implementation of these proposals.

[Voting pattern: most Conservatives and one Independent in favour; Liberal Democrats, two Independents and one Conservative against; Labour abstained.]

39. AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17

The Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee, Councillor Shellens, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2016-17. Council noted his thanks to officers for their support.

Council noted the report.

40. PENSION FUND COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17

The Chairman of the Pension Fund Committee, Councillor Hickford, moved receipt of the annual report of the Committee for 2016-17. Council noted his thanks to members and officers of the Committee.

Council noted the report.

41. CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PENSION FUND BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17

Councillor Downes, Vice-Chairman of the Local Pension Fund Board covering the period of the report, moved receipt of the annual report of the Board for 2016-17.

Council noted the report.

42. COMMITTEES - ALLOCATION OF SEATS AND SUBSTITUTES TO POLITICAL GROUPS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLITICAL BALANCE RULES

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

To agree the allocation of seats and substitutes on committees in accordance with the political balance rules.

43. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS

It was moved by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire and resolved unanimously

To approve the change in substitute members of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority – Overview and Scrutiny Committee to appoint Councillor L Joseph to replace Councillor L Harford.

44. UNITARY GOVERNANCE MOTION RESPONSE

The Chairman of the Council, Councillor Smith, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, moved the recommendation as set out in the report.

The Chairman proposed, and Council agreed, that the following amendment from Councillor Harrison be accepted and considered together with Options 1, 2 and 3:

Add the following at the end of the Recommendation:

The following option, Option 4, is offered for consideration alongside the three options set out on Page 263:

Option 4: Seek to establish a constitutional assembly

The Council will seek to establish a constitutional assembly to develop proposals for the future structure of local government in the area and consult the public and stakeholders on these. The assembly will be composed of members of this Council, Peterborough City Council, Cambridge City and the District Councils and the office of the Mayor of

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. To ensure that the proposals are durable over time and inclusive of a wide range of public opinion, the councils will appoint members to the assembly according to current political proportionality across their collective membership (the system used for the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee).

This option ensures that each element within the existing local government structure plays an active and equal role in this important work, rather than passing responsibility to just one of these, the Combined Authority, as is proposed in Option 3. This approach seems most likely to achieve an outcome that is acceptable to all the parties. It is also by far the most likely to command the confidence of the public, whose sense of democratic connection is with directly elected government - the City, District and County Councils and the directly elected Mayor - rather than with the Combined Authority, which is at one remove from the democratic process.

Council proceeded to consider each of the four options.

Council then voted on the individual options.

Option 1: Develop proposals unilaterally for consultation with partners

County Council could choose to develop proposals in isolation and consult on these with partners. However, given the complexity of public service arrangements in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, it is unlikely that any first proposal would receive full and immediate support from all local partners. Unilateral action by the County Council may be detrimental to relationships between the County Council and other authorities. This approach would also see the County Council bearing in full the cost of the specialist external advice that would be required to develop proposals; and even

Given the strong steer from government that local areas should seek consensus on any proposals submitted for local government reorganisation, this option is not recommended.

This option was rejected unanimously.

Option 2: Seek support of City and District Councils to collaborate on proposals

County Council may choose to seek the support of other local authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough in order to develop proposals collaboratively. This would be more likely to result in proposals that are acceptable to all local organisations and have a stronger chance of success. It would likely still be challenging to reach a single common proposal across all organisations in order to submit a single proposal to government. Consideration would also be needed as to how to engage with other local public services, and in particular the Combined Authority. It is suggested that a process led by the County Council and involving only local authorities would be unlikely to do justice to this wider scope; and the work may be more appropriately led outside the County Council. Therefore, this option is also not recommended.

This option was rejected unanimously.

Option 3: Work as part of the Combined Authority to consider local government reorganisation through the Public Sector Reform programme being led by the Mayor.

The proposed Public Sector Reform programme being established by the Combined Authority utilising external expertise is likely to seek to address many of the same issues that would be explored through formal local government reorganisation and the County Council could seek to have development of options for restructure of Local Government explicitly added to the Terms of Reference for this work. The Mayor has noted a willingness to explore an independent review of governance in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Whilst this option makes no assumption about local government reorganisation, it is likely to be the most collaborative approach; and most likely to reach agreement on a way forward across all local stakeholders. Therefore, if County Council wishes to pursue development of options for LGR this is the recommended option.

This option was accepted by a majority.

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

The question on Option 4 was therefore not put.

45. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Four motions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

a) Motion from Councillor Hunt

Councillor A Taylor declared an interest in this item as a person in full-time employment who took unpaid leave to attend council meetings.

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Hunt and seconded by Councillor Bailey:

The whole country, and in particular politicians, have been shocked and horrified by the rising tide of threatening actions deployed by a few extremists who appear in no way to value our treasured democratic values.

At one end of the scale we have the murder of Jo Cox as she went about her Parliamentary duties and PC Palmer who was killed defending our elected representatives. At the other end of the scale we have County Council candidates being spat at and election posters being defaced. Of twenty recently elected MPs, seventeen said they had felt threatened by social media activity and face-to-face insults.

All Members will support, I am sure, a cry for more women and younger people to join the ranks of elected representatives at Parish, Town, District and County level. Potential candidates should and must be encouraged to be the voice of their communities and should not be afraid to stand as the result of intimidation and threats. It is often these candidates that later on aspire to take on the role of Member of Parliament. This issue currently has much national attention; on Wednesday July 13th Theresa May PM ordered Lord Paul Bew, Chair of the

Committee on Standards in Public Life, to inquire into the problem. The Prime Minister said she was “horrified by stories from colleagues about the scale and nature of the intimidation, bullying and harassment they suffered during the general election”.

It is clear that none of the established political parties or bona-fide independents would support or approve of criminal damage to posters and banners displayed on private property. It is also clear that no responsible politician or political group would sink to Facebook threats or similar activity.

During the County, Mayoral and General Elections this year, we in the Ely area have experienced a huge rash of poster defacement, social media aggression, abusive comments in writing and foul rudeness. We were fortunate to catch the Ely area criminal and the Police are making efforts to ensure that this will not be allowed to spread locally or be repeated.

We ask for Council's strong support of this motion:

"This Council abhors any act that threatens our treasured democracy, puts candidates at any level at risk or makes voters reluctant to take part in an election process. We instruct the Chief Executive to write to the head of The Crown Prosecution Service, the Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire and the Police and Crime Commissioner to express our cross party opinion. We seek urgent and substantial action if/when further examples of this threat to our democracy occur. This Council considers this to be a serious matter and believes that firm, swift and transparent actions should be taken to deal with such threats and/or criminal damage."

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Nethsingha and seconded by Councillor Williams:

To add the following two paragraphs in bold to the original motion:

This Council recognises its own powers to act to ensure more younger people are able to play an active role in the democratic process. To assist with this the council will review the timings of meetings to ensure they are held at a variety of times, not always during working hours, to encourage a wider number of people to be able to participate.

The council will also re-instate the Cambridge Youth Parliament, to ensure young people have every opportunity to learn how our democratic system works, and to express their views.

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

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

Following further discussion, the substantive motion was put to the vote. Under Part 4-1 of the Constitution, Council Procedure Rules, paragraph 15.5, more than 14 Members requested a recorded vote on this matter, which is set out in **Appendix D**.

b) Motion from Councillor Whitehead

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Whitehead and seconded by Councillor Jones:

This motion calls on the Council to instruct the General Purposes Committee to require no cuts in the provision of children's services in the budget for 2018, given the vital contribution these services make to the future of the children of Cambridgeshire.

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

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

c) Motion from Councillor Scutt

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Scutt and seconded by Councillor Meschini:

In extending greatest sympathy and support to all survivors of the horrific fire at Grenfell, and deploring the loss of life and injury, Cambridgeshire County Council recognises the importance of ensuring that no resident of the County should face what Londoners have confronted.

The Council:

- (a) acknowledges the action taken by the Chief Executive Officer and her team in undertaking a review of Council buildings;
- (b) notes that central government has instituted an independent review of building regulations and fire safety;
- (c) observes that current regulations require sprinklers in buildings above a certain height only, so that they are not generally required for County buildings or those for which the County has responsibility or provides funding such as care homes and educational facilities in Cambridgeshire;
- (d) notes that where sprinklers are fitted, the record shows that this saves lives.

The Council therefore requests that the Chief Executive Officer:

- (a) Provide to all members a recitation of the review of Council buildings and any other buildings in relation to which the Council has responsibility in the provision of services and/or funding – such as care homes and education facilities;
- (b) Consult with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority as to which County buildings and buildings such as care homes and education facilities where the County has responsibility or provides funding would be made safer by the introduction of sprinkler systems;

Once that guidance is obtained, write to the Minister responsible requesting funding so as to enable the fitting of sprinklers in those buildings.

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

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

d) Motion from Councillor Williams

Councillor Harford declared an interest in this item as an elected member of South Cambridgeshire District Council and holder of the housing portfolio.

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Williams and seconded by Councillor Batchelor:

This council notes with concern that across Cambridgeshire, home ownership is increasingly moving beyond the reach of all but the most high earning families. The ratio of median house price to median income varies from 6.57 in Fenland to 12.97 in Cambridge (2016 figures, Office for National Statistics). For lower quartile house prices and earnings the ratio varies from 7.20 in Fenland to 13.32 in Cambridge.

Barriers to housing across the county have negative consequences not only for the Cambridgeshire economy but also for public health.

Through the Housing Development Agency this council is putting forward land in its ownership to deliver social and affordable housing to meet this crisis.

To ensure that the maximum amount of social and affordable housing is delivered, this council resolves to insist that any development on land in its ownership must equal or exceed the percentage social and affordable housing target of the relevant Local Planning Authority. This Council also resolves to maximise the delivery of social rented homes on land in its ownership when considering the Social and Affordable Housing tenure options in each Local Planning Authority.

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

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

46. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – ORAL QUESTIONS

The Chairman advised that the procedure for oral questions agreed under agenda item 7(c) (minute 38(c) refers) would be applied with immediate effect.

Two questions were asked [*The questions and answers were filmed and are available (8 hours 18 minutes and 30 seconds into the recording on the Council's You Tube site at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F0u6-59IPas>).*]

The following item was agreed for further action:

- In response to a question from Councillor Downes, Councillor Nethsingha undertook to ask a question at the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee about how press statements from the Mayor were checked for accuracy.

47. QUESTIONS

a) **Questions on Fire Authority Issues**

None

b) **Written Questions**

Two written questions were submitted under Council Procedure 9.2 as set out in **Appendix E.**

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 17TH OCTOBER 2017
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Former County Councillor James McKay

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of former County Councillor James McKay who represented the Brampton division on behalf of the Conservatives from 1989 to 2001, and was Chairman of the Council from 1997 to 1999. The Council’s thoughts are with his family and friends at this very sad time.

Former County Councillor Anne Gibbins

It is also with regret that the Chairman reports the recent death of former County Councillor Anne Gibbins who represented the Great Gransden division from 1971 to 1977. The Council’s thoughts are with her family and friends at this very sad time.

Karin Dosanjh,

It is with great sadness that the Chairman reports the death of Karin Dosanjh, who had worked for the library service since 1984. Karin worked for a number of years at Cambridge Central Library where she was the library supervisor, and then later on she became a valued member of the library services support team working at the Roger Ascham Libraries Site.

AWARDS

ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE EXCELLENCE AWARDS

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Trading Standards team won the Best Service Team of the Year award for Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Regulatory Service at a ceremony in Oxford on Thursday 7 September.

The joint Trading Standards Service is recognised for being a dynamic forward looking collaboration whose contribution is felt locally, regionally and nationally.

Together the Services are a driving force within the regional Trading Standards partnership, EETSA, transforming the way the profession manages Intelligence; securing substantial investment for the partnership; initiating ground breaking initiatives and undertaking key roles within regional and national Trading Standards partnerships.

Recognised as a Centre of Excellence for Primary Authority Partnerships, it provides a valuable ‘one stop shop’ for legal advice across regulatory services to some of the country’s best known companies such as Aldi, Thomas Cook and British Sugar.

The APSE Service Awards are designed to recognise excellence in local government frontline services across the UK.

Adult Early Help were finalists in the Association For Public Service Excellence awards

I am delighted to report that Adult Early Help were finalists in the Association for Public Service Excellence awards for: Best efficiency and transformation initiative; and Best innovation and demand management initiative. These awards are a celebration and national recognition of the work of the Adult Early Help team in the establishment of its strength based approach to requests for social care and support and a very successful first year that saw 3511 customer contact the Team and 79% of its outcomes were short term interventions that avoided the need for long term care.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 17TH OCTOBER 2017

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
1.	Mr Antony Carpen	Councillor Paul Raynes	<p>With the county council making considerations to move out of Shire Hall and leasing the building to a private organisation such as a hotel firm, please can I ask the county council and councillors to commission exploratory work to convert part of the site into an expansion for the Museum of Cambridge?</p> <p>. . . This question as you've seen on the papers was also featured in a blogpost I put on my website. That was then subsequently published in the Cambridge Independent, so quite a few people will be aware of it. It follows on from newspaper reports about the possibility of selling off the Shire Hall building and possibly - or not selling it off but leasing it and turning it into a hotel and doing something different with the site. Now in principle I don't have a problem with that. To give you some historical background; this site used to be a castle and then it was a prison – also a prison where the last public hanging took place – but it also had a courthouse, a nightclub and a roller skating rink on it. Unfortunately that courthouse was demolished in the 1950s and the wonderful nightclub of which I pulled a couple of articles out from some local newspapers in the archives – I've got here if I can circulate those for all of you to see. This site was also the place where the proclamation of monarchs took place, and again I've got a photograph of the proclamation of King Edward VII and the photographs are absolutely wonderful. So my vision for this site, if it's leased off by the Council but the Council keeps ownership of it, is to turn that car park that used to be the wonderful Shire Hall courthouse site – is to turn it into a historical civic square where effectively we're expanding the existing Museum of Cambridge to tell the story of the city because at the moment we do not have that facility there. . . . So basically . . . the question calls on the executive councillors to commission officials to explore a joint project with the Museum of Cambridge, Cambridge University Museums, local history organisations and the City Council just to scope whether it's possible to build that museum. Thank you.</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Paul Raynes	Mr Antony Carpen	Thank you Mr Carpen for this question. You've left out of the account 27 people who lived in houses that were demolished to make way for the Council who were ordered to do so. ...This Council has established a cross party member working group on the future of Shire Hall,

			which I chair. That reports to the Commercial and Investment Committee of the Council. Its remit is to explore options for the relocation of Shire Hall, including the best future use of this hall. The working group is currently evaluating options. It will make recommendations to the Commercial and Investment Committee this winter. I'll make sure the working group is aware of Mr Carpen's suggestion and that it's taken into account.
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
2.	Mr Colin McGerty	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>Good morning councillors. My name is Colin McGerty (<i>inaudible</i>)... I would just like to express my disappointment and outrage that the Leader of this Council has decided not to come and hear public questions on this (<i>inaudible</i>)... There are members of your community who desperately need your support and your support for your local Children's Centre. I urge you to stand up for your community and to vote against these proposals. In a recent interview Dr Whitebread, a renowned expert in early years' education and child development, said that closing Children's Centres and centralising the provision is quite clearly a false economy. He said that if what the County Council is trying to do is improve the quality of life of citizens of Cambridgeshire and improve academic achievement, then this is going to make the situation worse. He predicted, 15 years down the line, we'll start to see an increase in crime, we'll start to see more families needing social housing and more need for social services support. That's the view of an expert. My question is this. I charge this Council with running a purposely deceptive, deeply flawed and ill-timed online consultation, which not once made clear the depth of the cuts or the number of centre closures being proposed and opened with the extremely leading question, 'Do you think that children's services should be concentrated on those who need them the most?'</p> <p>Could Councillors please explain to me how the closure of almost 50% of Children's Centres can possibly achieve this aim, leading as it will to fewer Centres based in the communities they serve, reducing the likelihood of being greeted by familiar faces and leading to much greater distances to travel to the nearest centre?. Journeys which 'those who need them the most', are least likely to have the means to make.</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Simon Bywater	Mr Colin McGerty	Thank you very much for your question. Firstly it's great to hear how your family has valued the Children's Centre services you have accessed. We have developed these proposals to build on this existing good practice, and offer a more responsive and flexible service. We will still be delivering service from 27 designated buildings, in addition to an improved outreach offer. This means we've been able to protect all frontline delivery.

			<p>Response to the consultation has been one of the highest this Council has ever received, and I think has resolved any concerns in relation to the timing of the consultation.</p> <p>Details about how those services could look in your district is outlined in the sample ‘What’s on’ that we have published in the response document.</p> <p>What we know, and what is not in dispute, is that some of the existing Children’s Centres and local venues have been in a place for many years and due to population changes, are no longer placed in areas of highest population or the greatest need. Reserving large proportions of our budget to spend on maintaining under-used buildings means we would increasingly be unable to deliver this flexibility and limit our responsiveness to the changing needs across a growing county.</p> <p>Our proposals will allow us to deliver a more flexible offer across Cambridgeshire, with an expanded outreach offer delivered into more communities and new housing developments.</p> <p>In all areas where we are planning to re-designate the current Children’s Centres we will maintain an outreach offer to enable families to access appropriate support within easy travelling distance. Thank you.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
3.	Ms Felicity Higginson	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>As a teacher and a member of the National Education Union, I have worked in state-maintained nursery schools in Cambridge for 17 years and within two Cambridge Children’s Centres since 2005. I have experienced brilliant multi-agency working for the benefit of families with young children, thus improving their educational outcomes for the children and the welfare of the whole family with early intervention work. I teach two classes of children at the moment who are entitled to 15 hours free education. Since September, I have worked with Children’s Centre staff in numerous ways. For example, the transition of children into school by meeting them and their parents at universal activities before the term has even started. I have signposted and enrolled a single dad, who through no fault of his own, is overwhelmed with two children to care for under the age of four, to access parenting with a crèche at a time and a place he can be there. I have signposted a new to Cambridge mum who speaks no English at all to ESOL classes, which happen in the same Children’s Centre, when her child is at nursery school. I have directed two families to apply for free school meals with a Children’s Centre administrative member of staff because they have no Internet at home and they have limited literacy skills. Yes, nursery school children have to apply for free school meals, unlike reception class children and Year 1 who get free school meals. I</p>

			<p>could go on, and that is only in the month of September and half of October, but time is short and we're in a hurry. Managers of Children's Centres are doing frontline jobs as family support workers and are adept at developing services, relationships and provision in response to their communities' needs. It is what has happened in the last twelve years at each of the Children's Centres that I have worked in. This will disappear under the new proposals. In the proposals the 'What's on' pages 111- 16 propose seven church sites in Cambridge in their provision. . . . As members of the congregation I'm proud of the volunteer work done by two retired teachers who have responded to the needs of the community. They get a £200.00 grant for doing so this year: they are not employable or employed or directed by the local authority so it is a misrepresentation to say that they are part of the new provision. My question therefore is how can the new proposals ensure that Children's Centre services will continue to have sufficient funding to carry out their outstanding multi-agency work, especially as nursery schools are already underfunded and have faced years of cutback?</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Simon Bywater		<p>Thank you for your question. I do appreciate that it is your first time speaking in the Chamber so you can run over, so that is no problem. The consultation related to the delivery and funding of Children's Centre activities and did not cover the funding relating to nursery education. Our nursery schools have separate funding streams that cover the provision of early years learning and childcare.</p> <p>We will be continuing to deliver Child and Family services from nursery schools that serve areas of high need. However, as the majority of nursery schools in the county are located only across Cambridge City and nearby villages, we have looked at other delivery methods across the rest of the county.</p> <p>As you have pointed out, there is an advantage in co-locating professionals in shared use buildings which is the reason we are developing more 'Child and Family Zones' which will benefit from this. Wherever possible we have looked for opportunities to share space with others where families already access services e.g. Health buildings, District Councils and community buildings.</p> <p>By changing the use of some buildings we will also be increasing the capacity of childcare in key areas. Thank you.</p>

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
4.	Mr Peter Wilson	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>I ask this question of the Council as a parent, council tax payer and a former social worker in this authority. I worked for Cambridgeshire County Council for 32 years as a social worker until retiring in 2013, as Head of Safeguarding and Standards for the Children and Families Directorate. As you can imagine during this time I had many dealings with Children’s Centres and my question is specifically about hard-to-reach families and I hope the answer will address the issue about hard-to-reach families. My question is as follows.</p> <p>What steps are the Council proposing to measure, understand and mitigate against any negative impact of reducing the number of Children’s Centres from 38 to 10, specifically in relation to</p> <p>a) hard-to-reach families whose resilience and quality of parenting will be impaired by the reduction in discrete, local, dedicated family support services - to the extent that their children are more likely to be assessed by social care as being 'in need' (within the meaning of the Children Act) or whose welfare has to be safeguarded through statutory intervention by social care- with all the attendant costs of medium to long term social care involvement; and</p> <p>b) the three priority groups referred to in the public consultation document (page 8): 0-3 year olds – we have some here; children with a disability; and children with `identified support needs`.</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Simon Bywater	Mr Peter Wilson	<p>Before we look at the vital question of getting services right for our most vulnerable families, I want to make it totally clear that what we are proposing is continued delivery from 27 buildings across the county, designated as either Child and Family Centres, or Child and Family Zones, not the ‘10’ that you refer to.</p> <p>In addition, we will be strengthening our outreach provision which will push services out into many more communities – more, in fact, than our current 38 buildings serve.</p> <p>We share your desire to protect our most vulnerable families, keeping them as independent as possible and helping them to manage their own lives with only light touch support from council services – wherever possible, preventing them from becoming ‘Children in Need’.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council is committed to Early Intervention Services as part of our ambition to see all Cambridgeshire families thrive.</p>

			For some families this may mean one-off support from a family worker or access to online information to help them to help themselves or access wider community support. For others, it may mean more intensive support – and to safeguard these services this Council must be fiscally responsible and make every effort to spend money on services, not maintenance of buildings.
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
5.	Ms Katie Olliffe	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>I'm Katie. I'm a birth and postnatal support worker in Cambridgeshire. I've used Sure Start Centres as a mother; I have volunteered at postnatal sessions at my local Sure Start Centres. I've seen first-hand how important it is to new and young families to have access to support in these early weeks and months. Every family needs support. The very fact that Sure Start Centres are easily accessible, that every family are welcome to attend groups at each Centre is a key to identifying families that need support. Women and families thrive on peer to peer support situations and are far more likely to open up about their experiences, difficulties and challenges in this environment. It is not realistic to expect the mother of a new-born to travel miles to access her nearest feeding support. Our Council should be working hard at reducing health inequalities, improving physical and mental health outcomes for our families, early intervention, building community resilience and reducing social isolation. Breast feeding support goes a long way to address these priorities. It protects babies from lung, tummy and ear infections and from cot death. If all premature infants in the UK received breast milk the deaths of around 250 babies could be prevented each year. Breast fed children have a 13% lower risk of obesity, a 35% lower risk of type 2 diabetes and a 50% lower risk of tooth decay as they grow. Breast feeding also protects mothers, lowering their risk of postnatal depression, type 2 diabetes, osteoporosis, heart disease, breast and ovarian cancer. Across the UK around 865 cases of breast cancer could be avoided each year through better breast feeding rates. Public Health England recently produced detailed commissioning guidance on infant feeding for local authorities. It emphasises peer support as an essential part of an evidence-based approach. It says commissioners in local authorities must work with NHS providers, local organisations and service users to develop the right strategy for each community. This guidance has been endorsed by the Chief Medical Officer who said, "Failure to invest in breast feeding leads to poorer health outcomes for children and women today and for generations to come. We recognise great success in some areas of breast feeding such as peer support". I urge you all to seize this opportunity, read this guidance and consider how best to ensure that. I want to ask how we are going to make sure this is addressed.</p>

	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Simon Bywater	Ms Katie Olliffe	<p>Thank you for taking the time to highlight the importance of delivering health services alongside child and family services.</p> <p>In the consultation families told us that being able to access support from health colleagues like midwives, health visitors and speech therapists from Children’s Centres has been a good thing and something they value highly. This is important to us and we will look to further integrate our work with these partners across a range of venues to offer a seamless service for families. There are already a number of health-related services described in the sample ‘What’s on’ guides we have produced, but this isn’t the extent of our ambition.</p> <p>You rightly highlighted the importance of getting this right at the very earliest days for a family, during the antenatal and postnatal periods. As part of our implementation plan we are working with commissioners from our maternity services to look at how we can work together as part of their ‘Better Births’ programme, especially in relation to basing more services in communities where possible.</p> <p>Breast feeding support is primarily provided by our health colleagues, and their clinical lead has provided me with information about substantial increases to this support. There are now three infant feeding advisors who liaise with midwifery and support women from day one rather than wait until day ten when they would otherwise access health visiting. All areas have infant feeding clinics and infant feeding advisors and health visitors will provide home visits from day one to any mother with feeding issues. In addition, women can attend their child health clinics; therefore, we have clinics covering all days of the week. With regard to postnatal depression, health colleagues have set up three postnatal depression support groups that we jointly facilitate with mental health nurses. A number of these groups and clinics will continue to be based with our Child and Family Centres and Zones.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
6.	Ms Karen Stanton	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>I’m Karen Stanton, Headteacher of Caldecote Primary School. We have a Children’s Centre on our site. In 2013 the Council asked us if the school was happy (<i>inaudible</i>) a Children’s Centre, which we did. However, I’d like to know now under the proposals how Cambridgeshire County Council is going to ensure it fulfils its statutory obligation under the Childcare Act of 2006 which places a duty on the local authority to secure sufficient childcare for working parents and to support schools to offer and expand their out-of-hours care. At Caldecote, we have built up excellent school and holiday wrap-around care services that services in excess of 120 families, looking after up to 44 children daily from the Children’s</p>

			Centre. I am asking, on behalf of parents, governors and staff, how you are going to ensure that Caldecote's Children's Centre will continue to be available for the school to provide this vital service? I'm asking this because there was a proposal that due to clawback, we would have to move out of the Children's Centre. We've built this service up: it's ludicrous to actually then say "no you've got to move out". Councillor Bywater has talked a lot about flexibility in his responses and I'd like to now say then we need to look at the needs of localities, the needs of communities and work flexibly to make sure that we actually address those.
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Simon Bywater	Ms Karen Stanton	<p>Thank you very much for your question. Yes I agree. It's important that we drill down into the information, but during the consultation we received feedback from the local community and a petition letting us know how important wrap-around care is to Caldecote.</p> <p>Officers met with the Headteacher and have amended the proposals for Caldecote. Before and after school childcare will be protected, and we are continuing discussions to identify additional space from this building for additional childcare capacity. So hopefully that answers your question. Thank you.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
7.	Mr Andrew Baxter	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>I am the Chair of Governors at the Trumpington Federation. Together with the governors of the Homerton Early Years Centre we operate two Children's Centres on your behalf. We recognise that the County Council is facing a very difficult financial situation. We're willing to cooperate in initiatives which respond to this and have done so in the past. Indeed the Children's Centres which we operate share a single manager and support team in order to make management cost savings. But I do want to ask a question which is quite specifically on the question of management arrangements. It's always tempting to make savings in management. Nobody likes managers, nobody likes being managed and if you can present it as a way of protecting the front line services, it's even more attractive to cut a manager or two. But we fear you're going too far and that you're closing off potentially valuable options. Well informed and responsive management is critical to effectiveness of front line staff. It secures quality, responsiveness and productivity. We believe that the cuts that you're proposing in respect of management puts the effectiveness of the service at risk. Children's Centres are intended to contribute to children's academic success. This depends on successful collaboration with schools. This County Council was a world leader in the delegation of responsibility to schools, an initiative which has led to radical improvements in the leadership and management of schools. That it should now embrace such a centralised</p>

			bureaucratic approach is disappointing and a backward step. The consultation document states that you do not believe that there should be a 'one size fits all' model for service delivery. But Members, you are now being asked to approve a single approach to management which risks being significantly under-resourced, remote and bureaucratic. My question, with respect, is on your order paper.
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Simon Bywater	Mr Andrew Baxter	<p>Yes. Thank you very much for your question. We are committed to making sure that we continue to work in collaboration –maintaining these approaches where they currently exist and developing more and similar approaches elsewhere.</p> <p>I'm pleased that County Council officers have had early conversations with you and that the importance of the links and communication you mention is recognised.</p> <p>We believe that our proposed structure of district based management will mean every effort is made to protect relationships with our partners. We will inform and consult with staff affected by any proposals by way of a 45 day consultation period during which we will make sure management capacity is carefully considered.</p> <p>Where we need to strengthen relationships we will do so by promoting and developing governance arrangements at a local level and ensure that key partners are involved in assisting us to shape flexible, responsive, targeted services across the County.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
8.	Mr John Oakes	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>Thank you Madam Chairman for this opportunity to address the full Council. I'm a spokesman for Cherry Hinton's Liberal Democrat members. My question is as follows: which of the professionally recognised studies concerning Early Years and Sure Start provision and the probable results of its withdrawal, were Cambridgeshire officers aware of when undertaking this cuts proposal, and how did those conclusions affect their findings?</p> <p>Now, I'm fully aware that the Council maintains there will be no loss of provision as a result of these cuts, but a quick survey of my local Cherry Hinton Children's Centre shows this is simply not the case. Twenty two percent of all parents there say that its removal to Trumpington will mean that they can't attend. If you look at the studies I refer to, which it appears the Council has not done, you will find the effects of deprivation, of closing Centres, staying with people throughout their whole lives. The only thing they excel at is getting into jail. Family, career, personal relations all suffer because of that deprivation, however small,</p>

			in the first three years. I look forward to hearing why this Council wants to perpetuate this culture of all round failure, especially at a time when the demographics show that the whole of Cambridgeshire is destined for a population spurt.
	Response from: Councillor Simon Bywater	Response to: Mr John Oakes	Response
			<p>Thank you very much for your question. I think what you said in relation to the changing demography is not disputed. As I am sure you're aware a plan for a national consultation on the future of Children's Centres was announced in September 2015, but this has yet to be published. Children's Centre provision has been maintained to a good level and standard in Cambridgeshire during this period of uncertainty.</p> <p>Officers have been involved at a national level in participating in an All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Children's Centres. This Parliamentary Group concluded that the expertise and ways of working with families which have evolved during the Sure Start era should seek to address the wider needs of more vulnerable families. This ambition is reflected in these proposals and the wider Children's Change programme, developing a more integrated approach across our Social Care and Early Help services.</p> <p>A second national response came from the Children's Commissioner in October 2016, with the publication of the 'Family Hubs' discussion paper suggesting how a whole family approach could support vulnerable children.</p> <p>Officers have also been informed by a variety of other research documents including, 'Helping Parents to Parent'- The Social Mobility Commission, 'Early Moments Matter' - UNICEF, 2017, 'The Cost of Late Intervention'- The Early Intervention Foundation, 2016, and 'Closing the Gaps' – The Sutton Trust, 2017.</p> <p>These studies have backed up the Authority's commitment to Early Help services, resulting in our continued spend across district Early Help services of more than £7million each year, in addition to the Child and Family Centre budget of £4.3million</p> <p>We have also worked hard to ensure there is no reduction in the delivery of front line services proposed as part of this restructuring.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
9.	Mr Neil Perry	Councillor Simon Bywater	Romsey Mill actively supports change that leads to the improvement in outcomes for children, young people and families and contributes to the wider community wellbeing. For over 37 years Romsey Mill has demonstrated compassion, creativity, flexibility. We've added

			<p>significant financial value. We've responded to the needs of young people, children and families in Cambridgeshire. Councillors, please understand that our disagreement with the actual proposals being put forward for the future of Children's Centre services does not come from a position of us being concerned primarily about what's happening in Cambridge city. It doesn't come from an unwillingness to face change positively: we want to engage and work with County Council colleagues. We disagree with the proposals because we believe that they contain certain recommendations, certain recommendations, that will not lead to better outcomes for children and families and will not help to grow resilient and thriving communities. I've written to each of you as Councillors individually over the weekend and I've laid out Romsey Mill's concerns about the consultation process, the information that was presented and the response to consultation. I've shared both with Councillors and at the Children and Young People Committee last week concerns about the balance of investment in early intervention versus late intervention. I've also spoken about the excellent working example of Romsey Mill. Councillor Bywater, you refer to the Children's Commissioner report about family hubs. Romsey Mill is one of the few examples in the county of a family hub that is working. It's inexplicable that there's no rationale given in the consultation as to why the services would be moved from Romsey Mill. But these are my questions. These are my questions. Having already taken £1.5 million out of the budget in the last two years, proposing a further £900,000 cut to early intervention budgets, how can we believe that this is going to enhance the wellbeing of families and how have we conscientiously taken account of the response of the public to this consultation, overwhelmingly not in support of the proposals, when very little has changed in the response?</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Simon Bywater	Mr Neil Perry	<p>Neil, thank you very much for your question and thank you for allowing me to come along to Romsey Mill to see it for myself. One thing that we do disagree on though is where the money's coming from. We're not taking it from front line services, it's coming from the re-designation of buildings, but anyway to go back to answering your question.</p> <p>The requirement to publish five clear working days before meetings is contained within the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Authorities (Access to Meetings and Documents) (Period of Notice) (England) Order 2002. This is the minimum period required and where reports are available earlier we do publish these. The timescales for the consultation were devised in order to allow the maximum available time for a public consultation. We delivered 10 weeks of public consultation, including four clear weeks of consultation outside of the school holiday period.</p>

			<p>Discussions were held with our health provider Cambridgeshire Community Services prior to and continued during the consultation to explore the viability of offering Child and Family Centre Services from the Brookfields site.</p> <p>No decisions were made on the basis of these conversations, they were merely to ensure proposals for the area were accurate and viable.</p>
No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
10	Mr Dan Greef	Councillor Steve Count	<p>My name is Dan Greef. I'm a parent who uses the Children's Centres, with my two year old daughter Hannah. Welcome Councillor Count for coming back and joining us. I just want to reflect quickly on what I've seen today and I think it's only fair that you know this. I have seen a complete contempt shown to the public by the benches on that side. Remember Councillors who you serve.</p> <p>Now my fellow Labour activists and our Councillors and I have been contacted by parents all over the county and we're listening to the anger that this Tory council and government has created. I personally have visited a number of Children's Centres and have listened to the parents' concerns about their closure. Now many of their concerns include a loss of a place to meet other parents, a loss of a place to get help when for instance suffering from something like postnatal depression, and a loss of a lifeline for many families, particularly in rural areas such as South Cambs.</p> <p>I'll now come on to my question. However, I want to give some context first. Now this Tory led council commissioned an independent review of Councillors' pay. Councillor Count and his Tory colleagues rejected that report and decided to vote themselves a huge, greedy and unjustifiable pay-rise. I'm sure that nurses, teachers, police and your own council staff wish they had the same luxury to vote themselves a pay-rise. Nationally the Tory government is squeezing Councils until the pips squeak, yet our Tory Councillors managed to find a way to fill the trough. In light of this my question is, why are Councillors accepting a pay-rise when they are cutting Children's Centre funding?</p>
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Steve Count	Mr Dan Greef	<p>My apologies to everybody for being late. I really did have to be somewhere else and it was never my intention not to be here, but that was a fact.</p> <p>In May of this year, Council decided to change its committee structure and that change meant a review of allowances was necessary for the new structure. Full Council debated the</p>

			<p>recommendations at length and this Council decided to adopt an allowance structure aligned to the UK average for county councillors.</p> <p>Whilst this was an overall rise in total, with some positions increased, others were reduced and 15 removed entirely. The rise in the basic allowance was taken by all Councillors of all political persuasions. The question mentions a ‘pay rise’ and councillors do not receive pay in the traditional sense of the word, but receive an allowance that should be designed to offset some of the time commitments, lost earnings and expenses necessary to fulfil the role of councillor. The new scheme estimated that approximately 30% of our time would still be given for free. Before adopting the new structure Cambridgeshire County Councillors had been accepting a basic allowance that was the lowest for county councillors in the whole country.</p> <p>Whilst debating allowances Council took into account the stresses on the budget necessitating savings that had been in place for some time and were likely to continue for the foreseeable future. This would include awareness of proposed savings over the five year plan. When debating any issue at full Council, Members are encouraged to look at the full picture and take differing views into account before making any decision. That decision making process endeavours to take a balanced view on behalf all of the residents of Cambridgeshire and the minutes of the debate are available to inspect and there’s an electronic link will be on the website.</p>
--	--	--	---

The following two questions were received in advance of the meeting, but the questioners did not attend to pose their questions in person. The Chairwoman said that a written response would be sent to the questioners after the meeting.

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
11.	Alice Honey Thompson <i>(Questioner did not attend Council)</i>	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>Romsey Mill has years of experience operating as a highly effective Child and Family centre, but the proposal is to close delivery of Children’s Centre services at Romsey Mill Centre in favour of a new site at Brookfields – less than a quarter of a mile away. No explanation has been provided for this in the consultation document. Romsey Mill Centre is a friendly, accessible, community-based hub from which you can receive brilliant support and be sign-posted to other services if needed. Why are you proposing to close Romsey Mill Children’s Centre when families do not want this?</p> <p>I have been a user of the Romsey Mill Young Parents Programme, the Children’s Centre and the Pre School all based at Romsey Mill. I am a young mother aged 21.</p>

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
11.	Neil Turner <i>(Questioner did not attend Council)</i>	Councillor Simon Bywater	<p>I am a parent of a child attending Careclubs wrap-around and holiday childcare located in the Caldecote Children's Centre building. As I will not be able to attend the Full Council meeting on 17th October 2017, I would like to submit the written question below for written response by the Chairman of the Children and Young People Committee.</p> <p>To ask Cambridgeshire County Council to set out, if Caldecote Children's Centre is to be redesignated, how it will ensure future usage of the building for Careclubs wrap-around and holiday childcare to ensure the council meets its statutory obligations?</p>

TEXT OF A PETITION CONTAINING 3,836 SIGNATURES PRESENTED BY NICKY SHEPARD

“We the undersigned call upon Cambridgeshire County Council to halt its review of children’s centres. This review is being driven by a misguided council decision to cut £1 million from children’s centre budgets. There are wide gaps in the achievement of children in Cambridgeshire, and children’s centres have for many years provided support and guidance to families which can help narrow these gaps. They provide good value early help services, which can prevent children from needing more expensive services later. They also provide crucial support to parents and other care-givers: knowing that a local children’s centre is there when it is needed can be a life saver. The current proposals will lead to a significant reduction in support for families across Cambridgeshire. They are being driven by pressure for budget cuts, and we call upon councillors to oppose them and to ensure parents of young children get the support they need when they need it.”

TRANSCRIPT OF MS SHEPARD’S SPEECH TO COUNCIL

Hi. I’m Nicky Shepherd and I am a local campaigner in Cambridge. I am the type of mum who will slip through the cracks if the current proposals for the children’s centre cuts go ahead. When I had my first child, my husband and I were both doing fine. I was actually working at the County Council, we had our own home, everything was OK. I had a very difficult pregnancy. I had a harrowing birth, ending up in an emergency c-section and spent a week on the special care baby unit with my son, who’s now 10. I dread to think what would have happened to me and my family had the worker at the local children’s centre not mentioned to me that it might be worth talking to my GP about postnatal depression. I still remember that day clearly; it was nearly 11 years ago. I couldn’t drive. I could barely walk the two blocks to my local children’s centre. My husband had gone back to work as a primary school teacher, leaving me alone for what felt like aeons, with no local network, no family in this country and literally, not knowing a single person in my street. I was reeling from the changes in my life, I was struggling to feed my baby and I was struggling to recover from a difficult birth experience, both mentally and physically. Walking in to that children’s centre was one of the hardest things I have ever done in my life. I am so glad today that I did, because walking in and seeing a friendly face and having somebody make me a cup of tea and hold my baby was exactly what I needed on that day and I continued to go back to the children’s centre almost every day. Because I knew no matter how bad my night was, no matter how bad my day was, no matter how worried I was about what I might do if I was alone, I could go to the children’s centre and I could find a friendly face. Now I was not in a mental state or a physical state. I could not drive for six weeks after my birth. I could not lift my buggy onto a bus because of the gash through my abdomen. I could not have got across the city or the county to another centre. It was not physically possible. And I was not on anyone’s red flag list. I was employed, I owned my own home, I’m university educated. No one would have checked that I was OK. My heart breaks for the thousands and thousands of people across this county who would be affected by these proposals. For the babies and young children who will not have the support they need. For the communities that will not be formed by the mums and parents and families in these villages. For the thousands and thousands of people who will slip through the cracks because they also are not red flag enough to be picked up by your new system. Now it is my honour to present this petition on behalf of the more than 3000 people – as of this morning there’s more than 4000 people – who have signed this petition, which is more than double the number of people who took part in the consultation. And all of these people agree with me that these proposals are damaging, they are ill thought through and they will cause irrevocable damage to our communities, our families and the place we live. I ask you elected members to vote against this proposal, to do whatever is necessary within the wheels of this democratic council to stop these proposals in order to take them back and rethink them with proper consultation in a thought through way that will not damage our society. We ask that you keep our children’s centres open.

APPENDIX D

COUNCIL OCTOBER 2017												
COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent/No Vote	COUNCILLOR	Party	For	Against	Abstain	Absent /No Vote	
ADEY D	LibD				X	JENKINS D	LibD			X		
D AMBROSE-SMITH	Con	X				JONES L	Lab	X				
BAILEY A	Con	X				JOSEPH L	Cons				X	
BATCHELOR H	LibD			X		KAVANAGH N	Lab	X				
BATES I C	Con	X				KINDERSLEY S G M	LibD				X	
BODEN C	Con	X				KING S	Cons	X				
BRADNAM A	LibD			X		MANNING I	LibD				X	
BYWATER S	Con	X				MCGUIRE L W	Con	X				
CONNOR D	Con	X				MESCHINI E	Lab	X				
COSTELLO A Apologies	Con				X	NETHSINGHA L	LibD				X	
COUNT STEVE	Con	X				RAYNES P	Cons	X				
CRAWFORD S	Lab	X				REYNOLDS K Apologies	Con				X	
CRISWELL S J	Con	X				RICHARDS C	Lab	X				
CUFFLEY K	Cons				X	ROGERS T	Cons				X	
DOWNES P J	LibD	X				SANDERSON T	Ind	X				
DUPRE L apologies	LibD				X	SCHUMANN J	Con				X	
EVERY L	Cons	X				SCUTT J	Lab	X				
FRENCH J	Cons	X				SHELLENS M	LibD				X	
FULLER R	Cons				X	SHUTER M	Con	X				
GARDENER I	Cons	X				SMITH M	Con	X				
GILES D	Ind				X	TAYLOR A	LibD	X				
GOWING J apologies	Cons				X	TAYLOR S	Inde				X	
HARFORD L	Con	X				TIERNEY S	Cons	X				
HARRISON N	LibD	X				TOPPING P	Cons	X				
HAY A	Cons	X				VAN DE VEN S	LibD				X	
HICKFORD R	Con	X				WELLS D	Cons	X				
HOWELL M	Cons	X				WHITEHEAD J	Lab	X				
HOY S	Cons	X				WILLIAMS J	LibD	X				
HUDSON P	Con	X				WILSON apologies	G LibD				X	
HUNT W T I	Con	X				WISSON J	Cons	X				
						WOTHERSPOON T	Cons	X				
						TOTAL	61	40	0	3	18	

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 17 OCTOBER 2017
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2**

Question from Councillor Anna Bradnam

Will Cllr Schuman outline the council's intentions regarding the future of the county farms?

**Response from Councillor Joshua Schumann
Chairman of Commercial and Investment Committee**

The Council's County Farm Estate is the largest asset held by the County Council. Given the Council's financial position it is therefore important for the residents of the county that the use of this asset is maximised. As a consequence the Commercial and Investments Committee has established a cross party Member Review Group to review the strategic direction and operations of the County Farms Estate. There are no predetermined outcomes for this review and therefore making any assumptions over what will come out of this review would be inappropriate at this stage.

Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven

Why have I not yet heard from my Area Champion?

**Response from Councillor Steve Criswell
Chairman of Communities and Partnership Committee**

The establishment of an Area Community Champion within each of the five districts was agreed by full Council in May. These roles fall within the remit of the recently formed Communities & Partnerships Committee. At its first formal meeting in July, the Committee agreed its terms of reference and considered future areas of work including opportunities for Area Community Champions to make a difference.

On the 24th August, the Committee approved the appointment of the five councillors to the Area Champion role. These roles and the required skills will take time to develop. Over the last seven weeks they have attended a training workshop and held 1:1 meetings with officers to start familiarising themselves with community engagement opportunities and interaction with front line services. That work is ongoing.

A part of their role will be strategic, connecting partner organisations, identifying priorities and common outcomes. Their possible appointment to outside bodies will be considered at the next Committee meeting later this month. This will enable them to liaise and support local members and communities on various localised work streams where needed and appropriate. They will work with the willing and build relationships over time. The Area Champions will be able to respond to requests from local members who ask for some support, advice or encouragement, as well as learn from each other and share good practice but this will be a two way process, so they will not necessarily be routinely contacting all members individually. Their role is not to replace or detract from that of locally elected members.

The Area Community Champions are listed below. If any member has any information they wish to share, or any issue they wish to discuss with the relevant Champion, then please feel free to contact them. I am also happy to meet any member who wishes to share any concerns they may have.

Cllr Steve Criswell
Chairman, Communities & Partnerships Committee.

Cambridge City; Cllr Elisa Meschini
East Cambs; Cllr Lis Every
Fenland; Cllr Steve Tierney
Hunts; Cllr David Wells
South Cambs; Cllr Lina Joseph