SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 24 February 2011 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Charles Nightingale – Chairman

Councillor Tony Orgee – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Frances Amrani, David Bard, Richard Barrett, John Batchelor, Trisha Bear,

David Bird, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Douglas de Lacey, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Sally Hatton, Tumi Hawkins, Liz Heazell, Mark Hersom,

James Hockney, Mark Howell, Clayton Hudson, Mrs PE Jarvis, Peter Johnson,

Sebastian Kindersley, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mike Mason, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Lorraine Morgan, Cicely Murfitt, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping,

Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, John F Williams, John G Williams,

Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright

Officers: Holly Adams Democratic Services Team Leader

Jean Hunter Chief Executive

Fiona McMillan Legal & Democratic Services Manager and

Deputy Monitoring Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Pippa Corney, Jaime Dipple, Steve Harangozo and Surinder Soond.

81. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Legal and Democratic Services Manager advised that Planning Committee members would not be bound to any particular action by their participation and voting on the motion standing in the names of Councillors Nick Wright and Mark Howell (wind farms) as the motion, if carried, would relate to addressing a planning policy issue as part of the Local Development Framework review and not to the determination of a planning application.

The following interests were declared:

Councillor Frances Amrani A personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 85(b), Housing Revenue Account, Housing Rents, Budget and Service Charges 2011/12, as her brother was a Council tenant. Notwithstanding this interest, she remained in the meeting room during this item and participated in the

discussion and vote.

Councillor John Batchelor A personal, non-prejudicial interest in items 85(a), Budget and Council Actions for 2011/12 and Council Objectives and Annual Priorities, and 85(c), South Cambridgeshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Three-Year Rolling Plan 2011-14, as an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor and as a member of the Cambridgeshire Police Authority. Notwithstanding these interests, he remained in the meeting during these items and participated in the discussions and votes.

Councillor Brian Burling A personal and prejudicial interest in item 86, Swavesey Byeways Rate 2011/12, as a Swavesey Byeways ratepayer. He left the

meeting during this item and took no part in the discussion or the vote.

Councillor Sue Ellington

A personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 86, Swavesey Byeways Rate 2011/12, as a resident of Swavesey. Notwithstanding this interest, she remained in the meeting during this item and participated in the discussion and vote.

Councillor Lynda Harford

A personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 89(e), Question from Councillor Lynda Harford to the Leader, as a member of Cottenham Parish Council. Notwithstanding this interest, she remained in the meeting during this item and participated in the discussion.

Councillor Mark Howell

A personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 85(b), Housing Revenue Account, Housing Rents, Budget and Service Charges 2011/12, as an employee of the Papworth Trust, which operated in part as a Housing Association. Notwithstanding this interest, he remained in the meeting during this item and participated in the discussion and vote.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley

A personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 85(a), Budget and Council Actions for 2011/12 and Council Objectives and Annual Priorities, as an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor and member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority, as the District Council would be collecting the precepts on behalf of both authorities. Notwithstanding these interests, he remained in the meeting during this item and participated in the discussion and vote.

Notwithstanding the advice of the Legal and Democratic Services Manager, a potential conflict of interest in item 90(b), Motion standing in the names of Councillors Nick Wright and Mark Howell, as a member of the Planning Committee. He remained in the meeting during this item but chose not to participate in the discussion and abstained from voting.

Councillor Tony Orgee

A personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 85(a), Budget and Council Actions for 2011/12 and Council Objectives and Annual Priorities, as an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor, as the District Council would be collecting the precept on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council. Notwithstanding this interest, he remained in the meeting during this item and participated in the discussion and vote.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon

A personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 89(g), Question from Councillor Alex Riley to the Leader re: historic buildings at the former Oakington Airfield, as an ordinary member of the Twentieth Century Society and of the Society for the Preservation of Historic Buildings, two of the six statutory amenities for listing buildings. He clarified that he was not in a position of management at either body and did not have any responsibility for policy-making. Notwithstanding this interest, he remained in the meeting during this item and participated in the discussion and vote.

82. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 27 January 2011 were agreed as a correct record subject

to the following amendments:

- Removal of 'vacancy' from the attendance list;
- Minute 74, Members' Allowances 2011/12: "Councillor Alex Riley spoke in favour ef against an allowance payable to licensing panel chairmen"; and
- Deletion of the resolution "that the Northstowe Portfolio Holder establish a formal means of briefing the members of affected wards after each 3+3 Group meeting" from Minute 79(a), Motion standing in the names of Councillors Lynda Harford and Alex Riley.

83. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader welcomed Councillor Clayton Hudson to his first meeting after the 17 February 2011 Bourn Ward by-election. The Leader also clarified that he had been misquoted in the media in which his comments about the cuts to the Local Public Sector Reward Grant appeared to have been references to the reduction in the Local Authority Finance Settlement.

The Chairman reported that he had been in contact with Councillor Val Barrett and that she had confirmed that she was safely away from Christchurch when the earthquake occurred.

84. PETITIONS

None received.

85. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:

85 (a) Budget and Council Actions for 2011/12 and Council Objectives & Annual Priorities (Cabinet, 10 February 2011)

Councillor Simon Edwards, Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder, introduced the proposals for the 2011/12 budget, giving a detailed explanation of the national and local backdrops. He commended it to Council as a realistic budget that appreciated the spending pressures faced by residents and the Council's responsibilities to its staff, and highlighted that:

- Council tax would be frozen for one year only, in return for which the Council
 would receive a Council Tax Freeze Grant equivalent to 2.5% for the next four
 years. A council tax increase of 3.5% had been budgeted for 2012/13 and the
 following two years to make up the shortfall;
- Most of the savings identified were in back office services;
- There would be no change to the capital programme on 2011/12, but the whole programme and associated grants schemes would be reviewed during the year;
- The authority had £7 million in reserves, which would be run down to a balance of £2.9 million by 2015/6 to maintain services during the life of the Medium Term Financial Strategy;
- There would be a reduction in the overall number of staff posts, mostly through not filling vacant posts. Redundancies, if any, would be minimal;
- It had been announced that the New Homes Bonus would be split 80:20
 respectively between the District and County Council and that the Bonus scheme
 would run for six years, although the Council was budgeting on receiving the
 Bonus only for two years as the projected funding seemed too good to be true;
 and
- The Local Government Pension Scheme and pension scheme contributions were under review nationally.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of Council, seconded the budget.

Members of the Liberal Democrat Group indicated that they would not support the budget because the recommendations included the Council's Vision, Corporate Aims, Approaches, and Actions, which they saw as the Conservative Group's manifesto. When asked by members of the Independent Group if an alternative budget would be proposed, the Liberal Democrat Group explained that they had felt that asking officers to produce an alternative budget was not a proper use of officers' time.

A full debate followed, at the conclusion of which the Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder answered queries which had been raised:

- The budget process was lengthy, with budgets being reviewed in detail at Portfolio Holder meetings, Scrutiny and Overview Committee, member workshops, briefings and Cabinet before being presented to Council, and there had been many opportunities for members to have input and ask detailed questions in advance of the Council meeting;
- The budget did not show any expenditure on paper recycling bring banks because the banks earned money for the authority;
- He undertook to make representations to government about retention of local business rates, and to provide further details about budget items listed as "other";
- Underpinning the budget and Council Objectives and Annual Priorities was a fundamental philosophy to look after vulnerable residents; and
- It was unlikely that officers would have been able to produce an alternative budget because the Council's historic low spending and prudent financial management left it with a challenging but realistic budget, but little room to manoeuvre.

Members thanked officers for their work preparing the budget.

A vote was held and, with 29 in favour, 14 against and 8 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED**:

- (a) That the capital programme and the associated funding up to the year ending 31st March 2016 be approved as submitted;
- (b) That the revised revenue estimates for the year 2010/11 and the revenue estimates for 2011/12 be approved as submitted in the General Fund summary;
- (c) That the Medium Term Financial Strategy be approved based on the assumptions set out in the report to Cabinet on 10 February 2011;
- (d) That the District Council demand for general expenses for 2011/12 be £6,934,200;
- (e) To set the amount of Council Tax for each of the relevant categories of dwelling in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 on the basis of a District Council Tax for general expenses on a Band D property of £115.46 plus the relevant amounts required by the precepts of Parish Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council and the Cambridgeshire Police and Fire Authorities:
- (f) That the prudential indicators be approved;
- (g) That Senior Management Team be instructed to identify further savings of around £225,000 per annum with effect from 2013/14 onwards;
- (h) That the further continuation of the Council's Vision and Corporate Aims and Approaches be agreed as the strategic planning framework for the organisation; and
- (i) That the List of Corporate Actions be agreed as the Council's key priority actions for 2011-12, for incorporation within the emerging Corporate Plan (2011-14) and final service plans for 2011-12.

THE FOLLOWING STATUTORY RESOLUTION IN RESPECT OF THE COUNCIL TAX FOR 2011-12:

That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2011-12 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

- (a) £79,712,190 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act (gross expenditure including parish precepts, the Housing Revenue Account and additions to reserves)
- (b) £62,815,950 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act (gross income including the Housing Revenue Account and use of reserves)
- (c) £16,896,240 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year (net expenditure) being the district amount of £12,967,170 and the parish precepts of £3,929,070
- (d) £6,032,970 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of formula grant increased/decreased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from/to its collection fund to/from its general fund in accordance with Section 97(3)(Council Tax transactions) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988
- (e) £180.88 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year (average Council Tax for a band D property for the District including parishes)
- (f) £3,929,070 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (parish precepts)
- (g) £115.46 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates (average Council Tax for a Band D property for the District excluding parishes), the amounts being for each of the categories of dwellings shown below in **Table 1**
- (h) In accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, the basic amounts of council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a special item relates are shown by adding the amounts for band D for the District Council in **Table 1** and **Appendix A**
- (i) In accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands are shown by adding the amounts for each band in **Table 1** and **Appendix A**.

That it be noted that for the year 2011-12 the Cambridgeshire County Council and the Cambridgeshire Police Authority and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authorities have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of

Table 1	Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
County Council	698.52	814.94	931.36	1,047.78	1,280.62	1,513.46	1,746.30	2,095.56
Police Authority	113.04	131.88	150.72	169.56	207.24	244.92	282.60	339.12
District Council	76.97	89.80	102.63	115.46	141.12	166.78	192.43	230.92
Fire Authority	38.58	45.01	51.44	57.87	70.73	83.59	96.45	115.74

and

(j) That the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts set out in **Appendix B** as the amounts of council tax for the year 2011-12 for each of the categories of dwellings shown in **Appendix B**.

85 (b) Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Housing Rents, Budget & Service Charges 2011/12 (Cabinet, 10 February 2011)

Councillor Mark Howell, Housing Portfolio Holder, presented the 2011/12 rents, charges and the revised Housing Revenue Account (HRA) estimates. He reminded members of the need to increase rents to the maximum amount because it was upon that figure that the government was basing the Council's ability to pay back the forthcoming £205.5 million debt it would receive on 1 April 2012. Any reduction in rates would increase the difficulty in paying back the debt. The Housing Portfolio Holder was unable to guarantee that there would be no further changes to the sheltered housing schemes, which were primarily funded by Supporting People, and it was that body which would set the delivery of service. Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of Council, seconded the recommendations.

Council **RESOLVED** that:

- (a) from the first rent week in April 2011, rents for existing tenants are increased in line with the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) guidelines, based on an inflationary adjustment of 5.1%, with a maximum variation of £2.00 towards the phasing in of rent restructuring;
- (b) charges for other services and facilities are increased as outlined below

Service or Facility	Current Charge p.w.	Proposed Charge p.w.	Increase / Decrease		
	£	£	%	£	
Charges for Flats with Communal Areas					
Blocks with a Door Entry System	2.00	3.00	50.0	1.00	
Other Blocks	1.00	2.00	100.0	1.00	
Sheltered Housing Charges					
Tenants					
- support element	15.14	13.63	-10.0	-1.51	

communal facilities	711	7.50	5.1	0.36
- communal facilities	7.14	7.50	5.1	0.36
Equity Shareholders				
Maximum Charge (exclusive of capital				
works)				
- schemes with communal facilities	30.32	31.58	4.2	1.26
- schemes without communal facilities	20.53	21.29	3.7	0.76
Alarm System Service Charges*				
Individual Alarms				
- where the Council supplies the alarm	3.98	4.08	2.5	0.10
- where the user supplies the alarm	3.22	3.30	2.5	0.08
* plus VAT where appropriate				
Garage Rents				
Garages rented to a Council tenant or	7.22	7.59	5.1	0.37
leaseholder				
N.B. In excess of two garages will be subject				
to VAT				
Other Garages (subject to VAT)	9.97	10.48	5.1	0.51

- (c) in the event that the final reduction required in the support element of the sheltered housing service charge differs from that proposed, that authority to agree any change be delegated to the Housing Portfolio Holder; and
- (d) that the revised Housing Revenue Account estimates for the year 2010/11 and the revenue estimates for 2011/12 be approved as submitted in the HRA summary (**Appendix A**).

Councillor Cathcart abstained from voting.

85 (c) Community Safety 3-year Rolling Plan 2011-2014 (Cabinet, 10 February 2011)

Councillor Ray Manning and Councillor Tom Bygott, the Council's representatives on the South Cambridgeshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, proposed and seconded the Community Safety Three-Year Rolling Plan, which had already been agreed by other partners. Members discussed whether 'rural crime' was more relevant than 'farm crime' to the majority of residents and Councillor Manning, noting that the Partnership had a rolling plan of priorities, undertook to raise this at the next meeting.

Council **RESOLVED** to adopt the South Cambridgeshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Community Safety Plan 2011-14.

85 (d) Investment Strategy (Treasury Management) 2011/12 (Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder, 15 February 2011)

Councillor Simon Edwards, Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder, presented the interim investment strategy which would serve the Council until such time as the necessary arrangements for addressing the forthcoming £205.5 million Housing Revenue Account (HRA) debt were in place. He advised members that initial reports about a new investment strategy and loan arrangements would be presented at his Portfolio Holder meetings in autumn 2011 and recommendations would be made to full Council for approval, preferably at an ordinary rather than extra-ordinary meeting. Councillor Peter Topping, Corporate Governance Committee Chairman, seconding the recommendation, highlighted the Council's successful investment record, which had achieved the fifth highest results in its comparator group, and which was done entirely by officers.

Council **RESOLVED** to adopt the Interim Investment Strategy 2011/12.

86. SWAVESEY BYEWAYS RATE 2011/12

Councillor Brian Burling declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a byeways ratepayer and left the room for the duration of this item, taking no part in the discussion or decision.

The draft minutes of the February 2011 Swavesey Byeways Advisory Group meeting were circulated and Councillor Peter Topping, the Council's representative on the Advisory Group, explained that the Group's recommendation had been to maintain the current level of byeway maintenance, funded by a levy of 90 pence. Councillor Ray Manning seconded the recommendation of the Advisory Group.

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- (a) maintain the current level of byeway maintenance for the period 2011/12; and
- (b) levy a rate at 90 pence to fund the required maintenance for the period 2011/12.

87. QUESTIONS ON JOINT MEETINGS

Council **NOTED** that there had been two items on the Joint Development Control Committee: Cambridge Fringes agenda, only one of which had related to South Cambridgeshire, and that that item had been deferred for a site visit.

88. UPDATES FROM MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Nothing to report.

89. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

89 (a) From Councillor John Batchelor to the Leader of the Council

Councillor John Batchelor asked the Leader, "In the interests of openness and transparency could we have Cabinet Minutes tabled at full council for noting? This would give members a better understanding of the work of the Cabinet and an opportunity to raise issues of interest and or concern."

The Leader replied that he could not see any extra benefit or improvement to Council meetings by including Cabinet minutes, which were already sent to members by e-mail, published on the intranet and website, and linked from the Weekly Bulletin. He reminded members that Cabinet meetings were open and members and public were able to ask questions.

Councillor Batchelor replied that Cabinet meetings were open for those able to attend, but for those who could not, having the papers at Council meetings would give them the opportunity to examine the work of the Cabinet, and asked Councillor Manning to reconsider. Councillor Manning appreciated the time commitment required to attend meetings, and noted that there already were mechanisms for asking questions of the Cabinet at Council meetings.

89 (b) From Councillor Janet Lockwood to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Janet Lockwood asked the Leader, "My village Hauxton has no shop, no doctor's surgery, no dentist, no post office or bank. The elderly and infirm rely totally on

the subsidised bus service to access these facilities, and they will be marooned without them. They value their independence and do not want lifts. What is this Council doing to protect the subsidised bus service which supports a huge number of its rural residents? I note this features in the stated Aims and Approaches of this Council viz: 'playing our part in improving rural services including transport links.'"

The Leader referred the question to Councillor Nick Wright, Planning Portfolio Holder, who replied that the District Council was not responsible for the bus service and could not afford to replace the County Council subsidy, but that the District Council took seriously its responsibility to support community transport schemes and had a good record of service over the past three years. Councillor Lockwood asked if the District Council could recommend to the County Council that Park and Ride sites be used as community transport hubs. Councillor Wright replied that there was a County Council consultation on bus services was underway and that residents should take the opportunity to make their representations.

89 (c) From Councillor Bridget Smith to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Bridget Smith, explaining that parishes benefit from s106 contributions when a nearby field is used for housing, asked, "South Cambridgeshire District Council is currently handling 10 planning applications for large scale photovoltaic installations. Obviously, the reduction in CO_2 emissions that these installations would deliver is completely in line with the council's aims. It is hoped that this council will be encouraging support for initiatives of this type and also supporting parish councils to do likewise. However, PV installations do not require any S106 contribution despite the fact that their owners may derive significant financial benefit. Some degree of local benefit could go a long way to encouraging parishes to support their approval. What can this council do to secure local community benefits in association with large scale PV installations?"

The Leader referred the question to Councillor David Bard, New Communities Portfolio Holder, who replied that there was not any policy framework to impose such a charge on developers, but that he was aware that the government was seeking to negotiate a 'community contribution' developers of photovoltaic installations, similar to those sought from wind farm developers. In response to Councillor Smith's follow up question about the timescale for having such arrangements in place, Councillor Bard said that the matter was up to the Planning Committee to determine.

89 (d) From Councillor Jonathan Chatfield to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Jonathan Chatfield, stating that members had appreciated the recent social media training, asked, "How is the Cabinet planning on making greater use of social media? Are we most likely to see the Leader on Facebook, Twitter or YouTube?"

The Leader explained that he personally did not plan to set up social media profiles, but that the Council was in the process of developing a corporate policy which would be considered by Senior Management Team and then the Northstowe Portfolio Holder as the member responsible for communications. It was up to individual members to decide whether or not they would use social media.

Councillor Chatfield, as his follow-up question, highlighted the importance of moving beyond traditional channels of communication to engage more widely with residents, and asked whether members would be allowed to tweet in the Council Chamber. The Leader cited recent correspondence from Bob Neill, MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Communities, which encouraged Councils to allow the press and public to

tweet and blog from within public meetings, and asked that the Constitution Review Working Party consider the implications for members and for the public. He added that, until the necessary amendments were made to Standing Orders, Council bodies could suspend the standing order prohibiting the recording of meetings.

89 (e) From Councillor Lynda Harford to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Lynda Harford asked the Leader, "When I attended the appeal hearing for Plot 12 Victoria View, Smithy Fen I was concerned that the absence of an up to date Gypsy & Traveller Development Plan Document was the Council's Achilles Heel. This concern has been endorsed by my reading of the inspector's decision to allow the appeal. Whilst I am aware that the defence of this is the lack of up to date guidance from central government this has, I believe, now left Cottenham in a much more vulnerable position with regard to future development of Smithy Fen. The parish council have been urging progress on the Gypsy & Traveller DPD having long since identified the risk and the current legal occupants of the site deserve more certainty around the future in order that efforts to restore the area to one where they can feel safe and proud to live may be made. It is simply not acceptable that the council continues to drag its feet on this matter and I would ask that the administration tells us what urgent action it proposes to take to mitigate the risk to my parishioners posed by the current laissez faire policy." She clarified that her question referred to the actions of the Cabinet and not the work of officers.

The Leader referred the question to Councillor David Bard, New Communities Portfolio Holder, who replied that details of two further sites had been presented at his December 2010 meeting and were being investigated, but that the authority was currently in a policy vacuum as the anticipated new government guidance was still outstanding and the Regional Spatial Strategy targets had been dropped. Cambridgeshire County Council was currently undertaking a survey to inform new local targets, and the Portfolio Holder would be pleased to hear from members if they knew of possible sites.

Councillor Harford asked that the District Council seek assurance from the County Council that the local needs assessment would not be further delayed, and then the response communicated to parishes. Councillor Bard explained that any plan which came forward must be demonstrably sound and that it would be expensive and futile to act prematurely.

89 (f) From Councillor Frances Amrani to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Frances Amrani asked, "This council voted to recommend a boundary review for those wards which border Cambridge City. What measures does the leader have to manage the impact on this proposed budget that any shortfall from the loss of new homes bonus may have as a result of this boundary review?"

The Leader replied that the boundary review was a joint application to the Boundary Commission from the District and City Councils and had been undertaken because residents in the areas in question felt that they were part of the City rather than the District, and that the proposals would save money in the long run because officers would no longer have to administer issues relating to two authorities with different administrations and Local Development Frameworks. None of the boundary changes would take effect within the next three years, during which time the New Homes Bonus would be paid, and the original submission to the Boundary Commission had included a requirement either to adjust the New Homes Bonus to take account of changes, or to establish a voluntary agreement to share the Bonus between both authorities.

Councillor Amrani expressed concern about the risk assessments, particularly for the impact on the northern villages, and asked whether there were any options to backtrack on the boundary review. Councillor Manning said that risks would be managed appropriately and that the review was logical, sensible and done in the best interests of residents. There would be a full consultation with residents once the Boundary Commission had met to consider the application.

89 (g) From Councillor Alex Riley to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Alex Riley asked, "The Longstanton and District Heritage Society has been agitating to get numerous buildings associated with the former Oakington Airfield preserved. This would require finance from the Homes and Communities Agency, as well as using up land which was intended for use as part of Northstowe. Is there an estimate both of the cost of restoring and preserving these buildings, and of the area which their proposal would remove from the Northstowe footprint? What consequences would this have, both for the Northstowe s106, and for the green separation between Northstowe and the nearest villages?"

Councillor Manning shared Councillor Riley's concerns, and said that it was estimated that the preservation of all the buildings would remove £20 million from the Northstowe section 106 agreement. He believed that there should be a permanent memorial to the 7th Squadron in Northstowe, but noted that some of the buildings identified for preservation had not been built until after the 7th Squadron had left. He then referred the question to Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Design and Heritage Champion.

Councillor Wotherspoon said that English Heritage had now visited the site and its decision was awaited. After a previous survey in 2002, English Heritage had concluded that there were no heritage buildings left, but was now reviewing this in respect of some of the buildings. The Longstanton and District Heritage Society had supported this review, but wanted it extended to cover all eight buildings. If all eight were preserved, it would remove approximately 10 hectares from the 430-hectare development site, in an area which was intended to be primarily housing with a local centre. Although the Northstowe Area Action Plan encouraged the re-use of existing buildings where sustainable, only the officers' mess and a number of pillboxes had been identified as those for which sustainable future use could be sought. He undertook to provide Councillor Riley with a full copy of his response for e-mailing to residents.

Councillor Riley noted that the demolition teams were already working on site and expressed concern that some of the crushing appeared to be taking place in situ and not away from habitable dwellings as required, and asked that an explanation be sought from the Homes and Communities Agency.

90. NOTICES OF MOTION

90 (a) Standing in the name of Councillors Liz Heazell and Hazel Smith

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Legal and Democratic Services Manager advised members that if they did not believe that it would be possible to debate this motion without reference to employees past or present, the motion should be adjourned to the end of the meeting and debate should be held in private session.

Councillor Liz Heazell, proposing the motion, accepted the advice of the Legal and Democratic Services Manager and said that there was no intention of referring to individuals. She explained that, in a time of great uncertainty for local government, a consistent strand had been the need for shared services, and that it was time for the

authority to establish a policy. She proposed that: "This Council firstly congratulates all those in the Environmental Health Department on the way that the staff has conducted business following the resignation of the Chief Officer last Spring, and the retirement of the long-serving Principal Officer last summer.

"Secondly, this council requests that the search for a new Chief Officer be put on hold. This would enable the Senior Management Team to explore the possibility of SCDC sharing a Chief Environmental Health Officer with another authority. The position of Principal Officer should also be considered for a joint appointment. It would be sensible to use this opportunity to devise a policy regarding shared services in general.

"In view of the cuts, the Liberal Democrat Group believes that local taxpayers would favour the possibility of a permanent saving in expenditure, bearing in mind that a saving could mean the possibility of using the money saved on a more necessary or desirable objective."

Councillor Hazel Smith, seconding the motion, explained that actions in one authority would affect neighbouring authorities and so it was natural to look to neighbours for sharing services. The motion was not about individuals' posts but about whether the Council needed to replace two vacancies or could save money by sharing the appointments with another authority, and about setting up a policy framework for future shared services.

During debate it was noted that:

- It was the role of the Head of Paid Service to determine the senior management structure:
- Shared services took a long time to set up and it was too early to determine whether or not those set up elsewhere would deliver the proposed long-term savings;
- Although the structures put in place by the previous Corporate Manager to guide
 the service during the interim had been successful, there was not sufficient
 capacity in the team to provide overall strategic direction of a corporate area
 which provided such a wide range of services.
- Health and Environmental Services was the most visible of the Council's services areas and it was impractical to continue without a head of service;
- It was impractical to suggest that one service area be selected for shared services and an overall strategy was needed;
- There was always a risk that the Council's service levels could decline if shared;
 and
- The advertisement for the vacant Corporate Manager post was already published and applications had already been received.

A vote was held and with 17 in favour, 30 against and one abstention, the motion was declared **LOST**.

90 (b) Standing in the names of Councillors Nick Wright and Mark Howell

Councillor Nick Wright, proposer, explained that the motion sought to require developers to prove that wind farms would not cause a nuisance to residents. Councillor Mark Howell seconded the motion.

Members discussed the pros and cons of wind farms and other forms of renewable energy:

- The Council had a duty of protection to the rural environment;
- Nowhere in South Cambridgeshire was land more than two miles from dwellings;

- Members had an obligation to consider each planning application on its merits or decisions would be at risk of challenge;
- The country could not continue to mine energy and must consider renewables;
- There were already parameters set on coal and oil extraction and the motion sought to establish similar parameters for renewable energy;
- The motion, if passed, would be subject to public consultation as part of the Local Development Framework, and it was certain that developers would make representations.

A vote was taken and, with 22 in favour, 17 against, 4 abstentions and one member not voting, it was **RESOLVED** that this Council supports seeking energy from renewable resources. However, applications for wind farms (2 turbines or more) cause deep concerns to our residents by nature of their size, scale and noise. This Council believes that a minimum distance of 2 kilometres between a dwelling and a turbine should be set to protect residents from disturbance and visual impact. If the applicant can prove that this is not the case a shorter distance would be considered. This will be addressed during the review of the Local Development Framework.

90 (c) Standing in the name of Councillor John G Williams

Councillor John G Williams proposed the motion, seconded by Councillor Simon Edwards, noting that it was essential that a proper and thorough consultation be held about future Local Authority Finance Settlements.

It was **RESOLVED** that this Council recognises the important part that local government has to play in tackling the country's financial deficit. Contrary to national government, local government has made efficiency savings of three per cent in each of the past eight years. However the government settlement this council and others have received is so structured to make its biggest hit in this coming financial year and this front loading means we have not had the lead in time necessary to re-engineer services on a lower cost base in a planned and measured way. The settlement is for two years only out of the five year period of the national government and therefore this and other councils could be faced with a similar situation in two years time. We therefore agree that this council should write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to draw attention to the difficulties caused by the current front loading and ask that before the next local government settlement takes place in 2013 there is extensive consultation with local authorities on its implementation to minimize its impact on vulnerable communities and front line services.

91. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

The Chairman's	s engagements since the last Council meeting were N	OTED.
	The Meeting ended at 5.30 p.m.	

PARISH	Parish Council Special Expenses per dwelling Valuation bands															
	Α				С		D		Е		F		G		Н	
	£	р	£	р	£	р	£	р	£	р	£	р	£	р	£	р
												-				
Great Abington	22.	49	26.	24	29.	.99	33	.74	41.	24	48.	74	56.2	23	67	.48
Little Abington	36.	30	42.	35	48.	40	54	.45	66.	55	78.	65	90.7	'5	108	.90
Abington Pigotts	0.	00	0.	00	0.	.00	0	.00	0.	00	0.	.00	0.0	0	0	.00
Arrington	36.	78	42.	91	49.	.04	55	.17	67.	43	79.	69	91.9	95	110	.34
Babraham	59.	19	69.	.06	78.	92	88	.79	108.	52	128.	25	147.9	8	177	.58
Balsham	38.		45.		51.			.46	71.		84.				116	
Bar Hill	43.	52	50.	77	58.	.03	65	.28	79.	79	94.	29	108.8	30	130	.56
Barrington	35.	72	41.			63	53	.58	65.	49	77.	39			107	
Bartlow	0.	00		.00	0.	.00		.00		00		.00	0.0	0		.00
Barton	25.	24	29.	45	33.	65	37	.86	46.	27	54.	69	63.1	0	75	.72
Bassingbourn	32.	10	37.	5 1	42.	Ω1	10	.27	59.	$\cap \cap$	69.	72	80.4	15	റെ	.54
Bourn	51.		60.			.89		.21 .50					129.1		155	
Boxworth	16.		19.			.43		.23	30.		36.		42.0			.46
Caldecote	55.		65.			.36							139.4			
Cambourne	66.		77.			.70							166.3			
Carlton	14.			16	19.			.79	26.		31.		36.7			.12
Canton	17.	′ '	17.	10	13.	.01	22	.00	20.	30	J1.	.00	30.7	'		. 12
Castle Camps	22.	34	26.	.06	29.	79	33	.51	40.	96	48.	40	55.8	35	67	.02
Caxton	28.	37	33.	10	37.	.83	42	.56	52.	02	61.	48	70.9	3	85	.12
Childerley	0.	00	0.	.00	0.	.00	0	.00	0.	00	0.	.00	0.0	0	0	.00
Chishill	47.	27	55.	15	63.	.03	70	.91	86.	67	102	43	118.1	8	141	.82
Comberton	46.	43	54.	17	61.	.91	69	.65	85.	13	100.	61	116.0	8(139	.30
2 : 1	•	00	•	00	•	00	•	00	•	00	0	00	0.6		•	00
Conington		00		00		.00		.00		00		.00	0.0			.00
Coton	40.		47.					.54	73.				100.9			
Cottenham	42.		50.			.19		.34	78.				107.2			
Croxton	35.		41.			73		.70	65.		77.				107	
Croydon	17.	93	20.	92	23.	.91	26	.90	32.	88	38.	.86	44.8	33	53	.80
Dry Drayton	19.	41	22.	65	25.	.88	29	.12	35.	59	42.	.06	48.5	3	58	.24
Duxford	32.	34	37.	73	43.	12	48	.51	59.	29	70.	.07	80.8	35	97	.02
Elsworth	37.	05	43.	22	49.	40	55	.57	67.	92	80.	27	92.6	32	111	.14
Eltisley	36.	83	42.	97	49.	.11	55	.25	67.	53	79.	81	92.0	8	110	.50
Great & Little Eversden	21.	39	24.	95	28.	52	32	.08	39.	21	46.	34	53.4	17	64	.16
For Dittor	20	20	4 4	71	E A	00	E 7	40	70	0 E	00	00	05.0		114	00
Fen Ditton	38.					.09		.48	70.:		83.				114	
Fen Drayton	25.		30.					.82	47.		56.		64.7			.64
Fowlmere	37.	20	43.	40	49.	.60	55	.80	68.	20	80.	60	93.0	U	111	.60

PARISH	Parish Council Special Expenses per dwelling Valuation bands									
	A B C D E F G									
	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p£ p			
Foxton	25.66	29.94	34.21	38.49	47.04	55.60	64.15 76.98			
Fulbourn	38.75	45.21	51.67	58.13	71.05	83.97	96.88 116.26			
Gamlingay	71.42	83.32					178.55 214.26			
Girton	31.38	36.61	41.84	47.07	57.53	67.99	78.45 94.14			
Little Gransden	21.63	25.24	28.84			46.87	54.08 64.90			
Grantchester	53.03	61.87	70.71	79.55		114.91	132.58 159.10			
Graveley	35.27	41.15	47.03	52.91	64.67	76.43	88.18 105.82			
Hardwick	37.35	43.57	49.80	56.02	68.47	80.92	93.37 112.04			
Harlton	36.51	42.59	48.68	54.76	66.93	79.10	91.27 109.52			
Harston	26.57	31.00	35.43	39.86	48.72	57.58	66.43 79.72			
Haslingfield	61.86	72.17	82.48	92.79	113.41	134.03	154.65 185.58			
Hatley	20.66	24.10	27.55	30.99	37.88	44.76	51.65 61.98			
Hauxton	38.62	45.06	51.49	57.93	70.80	83.68	96.55 115.86			
Heydon	19.12	22.31	25.49	28.68	35.05	41.43	47.80 57.36			
Hildersham	75.83	88.46	101.10	113.74	139.02	164.29	189.57 227.48			
Hinxton	33.01	38.52	44.02	49.52	60.52	71.53	82.53 99.04			
Histon	58.25	67.96	77.67	87.38	106.80	126.22	145.63 174.76			
Horningsea	52.75	61.54	70.33	79.12	96.70	114.28	131.87 158.24			
Horseheath	23.46	27.37	31.28	35.19	43.01	50.83	58.65 70.38			
Ickleton	41.51	48.42	55.34	62.26	76.10	89.93	103.77 124.52			
Impington	48.73	56.85	64.97	73.09	89.33	105.57	121.82 146.18			
Kingston	39.82	46.46	53.09	59.73	73.00	86.28	99.55 119.46			
Knapwell	27.51	32.09	36.68	41.26	50.43	59.60	68.77 82.52			
Landbeach	29.37	34.27	39.16	44.06	53.85	63.64	73.43 88.12			
Linton	54.13	63.15	72.17	81.19	99.23	117.27	135.32 162.38			
Litlington	34.86	40.67	46.48	52.29	63.91	75.53	87.15 104.58			
Lolworth	17.69	20.63	23.58	26.53	32.43	38.32	44.22 53.06			
Longstanton	44.57	51.99	59.42	66.85	81.71	96.56	111.42 133.70			
Longstowe	30.17	35.20	40.23	45.26	55.32	65.38	75.43 90.52			
Madingley	46.25	53.95	61.66	69.37	84.79	100.20	115.62 138.74			
Melbourn	64.86	75.67	86.48	97.29	118.91	140.53	162.15 194.58			
Meldreth	36.45	42.52	48.60	54.67	66.82	78.97	91.12 109.34			
Milton	48.13	56.16	64.18	72.20	88.24	104.29	120.33 144.40			
Guilden Morden	36.49	42.57	48.65	54.73	66.89	79.05	91.22 109.46			

PARISH	Parish Council Special Expenses per dwelling Valuation bands									
	٨	Б	С							
	A £ p	B £ p		D £ p	E £ p	F £ p	G H £ p£ p			
Steeple Morden	£ p 29.89	£ p 34.87	£ p 39.85	£ p 44.83	£ p 54.79	£ p 64.75	£ p £ p 74.72 89.66			
Newton	19.71	23.00	26.28	29.57	36.14	42.71	49.28 59.14			
Oakington/Westwick	38.90	45.38	51.87	58.35		84.28	97.25 116.70			
Calcington, v v Catwork	00.00	40.00	01.07	00.00	71.02	04.20	07.20 110.70	,		
Orchard Park	46.54	54.30	62.05	69.81	85.32	100.84	116.35 139.62	<u>'</u>		
Orwell	41.21	48.08	54.95	61.82	75.56	89.30	103.03 123.64	ŀ		
Over	21.55	25.14	28.73	32.32	39.50	46.68	53.87 64.64	ŀ		
Pampisford	41.54	48.46	55.39	62.31	76.16	90.00	103.85 124.62) -		
Papworth Everard	51.38	59.94	68.51	77.07	94.20	111.32	128.45 154.14	ŀ		
Papworth St Agnes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00 0.00)		
Rampton	48.49	56.57	64.65	72.73	88.89	105.05	121.22 145.46	;		
Sawston	69.25	80.80	92.34	103.88	126.96	150.05	173.13 207.76	j		
Great Shelford	28.57	33.33	38.09	42.85	52.37	61.89	71.42 85.70)		
Little Shelford	27.53	32.12	36.71	41.30	50.48	59.66	68.83 82.60)		
Shepreth	56.54	65.96	75.39	84.81	103.66	122.50	141.35 169.62	-		
Shingay-cum-Wendy	14.67	17.12	19.56	22.01	26.90	31.79	36.68 44.02	<u>)</u>		
Shudy Camps	26.42	30.82	35.23	39.63	48.44	57.24	66.05 79.26	j		
Stapleford	36.50	42.58	48.67	54.75	66.92	79.08	91.25 109.50)		
Stow-cum-Quy	28.06	32.74	37.41	42.09	51.44	60.80	70.15 84.18	,		
Swavesey	34.91	40.72	46.54	52.36	64.00	75.63	87.27 104.72	-		
Tadlow	16.48	19.23	21.97	24.72	30.21	35.71	41.20 49.44	ļ		
Teversham	44.97	52.46	59.96	67.45	82.44	97.43	112.42 134.90)		
Thriplow	19.03	22.21	25.38	28.55	34.89	41.24	47.58 57.10)		
Toft	41.63	48.57	55.51	62.45	76.33	90.21	104.08 124.90)		
Waterbeach	51.75	60.37	69.00	77.62	94.87	112.12	129.37 155.24	ļ		
Weston Colville	27.47	32.04	36.62	41.20	50.36	59.51	68.67 82.40)		
West Wickham	23.37	27.27	31.16	35.06	42.85	50.64	58.43 70.12) -		
West Wratting	28.10	32.78	37.47	42.15	51.52	60.88	70.25 84.30)		
Whaddon	47.53	55.46	63.38	71.30	87.14	102.99	118.83 142.60)		
Whittlesford	28.43	33.17	37.91	42.65	52.13	61.61	71.08 85.30)		
Great Wilbraham	48.92	57.07	65.23	73.38	89.69	105.99	122.30 146.76	;		
Little Wilbraham	21.03	24.54	28.04	31.55	38.56	45.57	52.58 63.10)		
Willingham	45.03	52.53	60.04	67.54	82.55	97.56	112.57 135.08	,		
Wimpole	19.75	23.05	26.34	29.63	36.21	42.80	49.38 59.26	;		

PARISH

County Precept, Fire Precept, Police Precept and District Council General and Special Expenses per dwelling Valuation bands

			_		ion bands		_	
	Α	В	С	D	Ε	F	G	Н
	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Great Abington	949.60	1,107.87	1,266.14	1,424.41	1,740.95	2,057.49	2,374.01	2,848.82
Little Abington	963.41	1,123.98	1,284.55	1,445.12	1,766.26	2,087.40	2,408.53	2,890.24
Abington Pigotts	927.11	1,081.63	1,236.15	1,390.67	1,699.71	2,008.75	2,317.78	2,781.34
Arrington	963.89	1,124.54	1,285.19	1,445.84	1,767.14	2,088.44	2,409.73	2,891.68
Babraham	986.30	1,150.69	1,315.07	1,479.46	1,808.23	2,137.00	2,465.76	2,958.92
Dabranam	300.50	1,130.03	1,515.07	1,473.40	1,000.25	2,137.00	2,400.70	2,950.92
Balsham	966.08	1,127.10	1,288.11	1,449.13	1,771.16	2,093.19	2,415.21	2,898.26
Bar Hill	970.63	1,132.40	1,294.18	1,455.95	1,779.50	2,103.04	2,426.58	2,911.90
Barrington	962.83	1,123.30	1,283.78	1,444.25	1,765.20	2,086.14	2,407.08	2,888.50
Bartlow	927.11	1,081.63	1,236.15	1,390.67	1,699.71	2,008.75	2,317.78	2,781.34
Barton	952.35	1,111.08	1,269.80	1,428.53	1,745.98	2,063.44	2,380.88	2,857.06
Bassingbourn	959.29	1,119.17	1,279.06	1,438.94	1,758.71	2,078.47	2,398.23	2,877.88
Bourn	978.78	1,141.91	1,305.04	1,468.17	1,794.43	2,120.69	2,446.95	2,936.34
Boxworth	943.93	1,101.25	1,258.58	1,415.90	1,730.55	2,045.19	2,359.83	2,831.80
Caldecote	982.88	1,146.70	1,310.51	1,474.33	1,801.96	2,129.59	2,457.21	2,948.66
Cambourne	993.64	1,159.24	1,324.85	1,490.46	1,821.68	2,152.89	2,484.10	2,980.92
Carlton	941.82	1,139.24	1,255.76	1,430.40	1,726.67	2,132.69	2,354.55	2,825.46
Canton	341.02	1,090.79	1,233.70	1,412.73	1,720.07	2,040.01	2,334.33	2,023.40
Castle Camps	949.45	1,107.69	1,265.94	1,424.18	1,740.67	2,057.15	2,373.63	2,848.36
Caxton	955.48	1,114.73	1,273.98	1,433.23	1,751.73	2,070.23	2,388.71	2,866.46
Childerley	927.11	1,081.63	1,236.15	1,390.67	1,699.71	2,008.75	2,317.78	2,781.34
Chishill	974.38	1,136.78	1,299.18	1,461.58	1,786.38	2,111.18	2,435.96	2,923.16
Comberton	973.54	1,135.80	1,298.06	1,460.32	1,784.84	2,109.36	2,433.86	2,920.64
	0.0.0	1,100.00	1,200.00	1, 100.02	1,7 0 1.0 1	2, 100.00	2, 100.00	2,020.0
Conington	927.11	1,081.63	1,236.15	1,390.67	1,699.71	2,008.75	2,317.78	2,781.34
Coton	967.47	1,128.72	1,289.96	1,451.21	1,773.70	2,096.20	2,418.68	2,902.42
Cottenham	970.00	1,131.67	1,293.34	1,455.01	1,778.35	2,101.69	2,425.01	2,910.02
Croxton	962.91	1,123.40	1,283.88	1,444.37	1,765.34	2,086.32	2,407.28	2,888.74
Croydon	945.04	1,102.55	1,260.06	1,417.57	1,732.59	2,047.61	2,362.61	2,835.14
Dry Drayton	946.52	1,104.28	1,262.03	1,419.79	1,735.30	2,050.81	2,366.31	2,839.58
Duxford	959.45	1,119.36	1,279.27	1,439.18	1,759.00	2,078.82	2,398.63	2,878.36
Elsworth	964.16	1,124.85	1,285.55	1,446.24	1,767.63	2,089.02	2,410.40	2,892.48
Eltisley	963.94	1,124.60	1,285.26	1,445.92	1,767.24	2,088.56	2,409.86	2,891.84
Great & Little Eversden	948.50	1,106.58	1,264.67	1,422.75	1,738.92	2,055.09	2,371.25	2,845.50
Fen Ditton	965.43	1,126.34	1,287.24	1,448.15	1,769.96	2,091.78	2,413.58	2,896.30
Fen Drayton	952.99	1,111.82	1,270.66	1,429.49	1,747.16	2,064.82	2,382.48	2,858.98
Fowlmere	964.31	1,125.03	1,285.75	1,446.47	1,767.91	2,089.35	2,410.78	2,892.94
Foxton	952.77	1,111.57	1,270.36	1,429.16	1,746.75	2,064.35	2,381.93	2,858.32
Fulbourn	965.86	1,126.84	1,287.82	1,448.80	1,770.76	2,092.72	2,414.66	2,897.60
. albourn	000.00	1,120.04	1,201.02	1, 1 70.00	1,770.70	_,002.12	_,	2,007.00
Gamlingay	998.53	1,164.95	1,331.38	1,497.80	1,830.65	2,163.49	2,496.33	2,995.60
Girton	958.49	1,118.24	1,277.99	1,437.74	1,757.24	2,076.74	2,396.23	2,875.48
Little Gransden	948.74	1,106.87	1,264.99	1,423.12	1,739.37	2,055.62	2,371.86	2,846.24

APPENDIX B

County Precept, Fire Precept, Police Precept and District Council General and Special Expenses per dwelling Valuation bands

	Valuation bands								
	Α	В	С	D	Ε	F	G	Н	
	£р	£р	£р	£р	£р	£р	£р	£р	
Grantchester	980.14	1,143.50	1,306.86	1,470.22	1,796.94	2,123.66	2,450.36	2,940.44	
Graveley	962.38	1,122.78	1,283.18	1,443.58	1,764.38	2,085.18	2,405.96	2,887.16	
,		, -	,	,	,	,	,	,	
Hardwick	964.46	1,125.20	1,285.95	1,446.69	1,768.18	2,089.67	2,411.15	2,893.38	
Harlton	963.62	1,124.22	1,284.83	1,445.43	1,766.64	2,087.85	2,409.05	2,890.86	
Harston	953.68	1,112.63	1,271.58	1,430.53	1,748.43	2,066.33	2,384.21	2,861.06	
Haslingfield	988.97	1,153.80	1,318.63	1,483.46	1,813.12	2,142.78	2,472.43	2,966.92	
Hatley	947.77	1,105.73	1,263.70	1,421.66	1,737.59	2,053.51	2,369.43	2,843.32	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	1,100.70	1,200.70	1, 121.00	1,101.00	2,000.01	2,000.10	2,010.02	
Hauxton	965.73	1,126.69	1,287.64	1,448.60	1,770.51	2,092.43	2,414.33	2,897.20	
Heydon	946.23	1,103.94	1,261.64	1,419.35	1,734.76	2,050.18	2,365.58	2,838.70	
Hildersham	1,002.94	1,170.09	1,337.25	1,504.41	1,838.73	2,173.04	2,507.35	3,008.82	
Hinxton	960.12	1,120.15	1,280.17	1,440.19	1,760.23	2,080.28	2,400.31	2,880.38	
Histon	985.36	1,149.59	1,313.82	1,478.05	1,806.51	2,134.97	2,463.41	2,956.10	
11151011	900.30	1,149.59	1,313.02	1,470.00	1,000.51	2,134.97	2,403.41	2,950.10	
Horningsea	979.86	1,143.17	1,306.48	1,469.79	1,796.41	2,123.03	2,449.65	2,939.58	
Horseheath	950.57	1,109.00	1,267.43	1,425.86	1,742.72	2,059.58	2,376.43	2,851.72	
Ickleton	968.62	1,130.05	1,291.49	1,423.80	1,742.72	2,039.58	2,421.55	2,905.86	
	975.84				•	,			
Impington		1,138.48	1,301.12	1,463.76	1,789.04	2,114.32	2,439.60	2,927.52	
Kingston	966.93	1,128.09	1,289.24	1,450.40	1,772.71	2,095.03	2,417.33	2,900.80	
Knapwell	954.62	1,113.72	1,272.83	1,431.93	1,750.14	2,068.35	2,386.55	2,863.86	
Landbeach	956.48	1,115.72	1,275.31	1,434.73	1,753.56	2,072.39	2,391.21	2,869.46	
Linton	981.24	1,1144.78	1,308.32	1,471.86	1,798.94	2,126.02	2,453.10	2,943.72	
	961.24	1,122.30	1,282.63		1,763.62	2,120.02	2,404.93	2,885.92	
Litlington				1,442.96		•	•		
Lolworth	944.80	1,102.26	1,259.73	1,417.20	1,732.14	2,047.07	2,362.00	2,834.40	
Longstanton	971.68	1,133.62	1,295.57	1,457.52	1,781.42	2,105.31	2,429.20	2,915.04	
Longstowe	957.28	1,116.83	1,276.38	1,435.93	1,755.03	2,074.13	2,393.21	2,871.86	
Madingley	973.36	1,135.58	1,297.81	1,460.04	1,784.50	2,108.95	2,433.40	2,920.08	
Melbourn	991.97	1,157.30	1,322.63	1,487.96	1,818.62	2,149.28	2,479.93	2,975.92	
Meldreth	963.56	1,124.15	1,284.75	1,445.34		2,087.72	*	2,890.68	
Weidicui	300.00	1, 124.10	1,204.70	1,440.04	1,700.00	2,007.72	2,400.00	2,030.00	
Milton	975.24	1,137.79	1,300.33	1,462.87	1,787.95	2,113.04	2,438.11	2,925.74	
Guilden Morden	963.60	1,124.20	1,284.80	1,445.40	1,766.60	2,087.80	2,409.00	2,890.80	
Steeple Morden	957.00	1,116.50	1,276.00	1,435.50	1,754.50	2,073.50	2,392.50	2,871.00	
Newton	946.82	1,104.63	1,262.43	1,420.24	1,735.85	2,051.46	2,367.06	2,840.48	
Oakington/Westwick	966.01	1,127.01	1,288.02	1,449.02	1,771.03	2,093.03	2,415.03	2,898.04	
outing to the troot the tr	000.01	1,121.01	1,200.02	1,110.02	1,771.00	2,000.00	2, 110.00	2,000.01	
Orchard Park	973.65	1,135.93	1,298.20	1,460.48	1,785.03	2,109.59	2,434.13	2,920.96	
Orwell	968.32	1,129.71	1,291.10	1,452.49	1,775.27	2,098.05	2,420.81	2,904.98	
Over	948.66	1,106.77	1,264.88	1,422.99	1,739.21	2,055.43	2,371.65	2,845.98	
Pampisford	968.65	1,130.09	1,291.54	1,452.98	1,775.87	2,098.75	2,421.63	2,905.96	
Papworth Everard	978.49	1,141.57	1,304.66	1,467.74	1,793.91	2,120.07	2,446.23	2,935.48	
Papworth St Agnes	927.11	1,081.63	1,236.15	1,390.67	1,699.71	2,008.75	2,317.78	2,781.34	
1 3 3	•	,	,	,	,	, -	,	,	
Rampton	975.60	1,138.20	1,300.80	1,463.40	1,788.60	2,113.80	2,439.00	2,926.80	
•									

APPENDIX B

County Precept, Fire Precept, Police Precept and District Council General and Special Expenses per dwelling Valuation bands

	Valuation bands								
	Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	
	£р	£р	£р	£р	£р	£р	£р	£р	
Sawston	996.36	1,162.43	1,328.49	1,494.55	1,826.67	2,158.80	2,490.91	2,989.10	
Great Shelford	955.68	1,114.96	1,274.24	1,433.52	1,752.08	2,070.64	2,389.20	2,867.04	
Little Shelford	954.64	1,113.75	1,272.86	1,431.97	1,750.19	2,068.41	2,386.61	2,863.94	
Shepreth	983.65	1,147.59	1,311.54	1,475.48	1,803.37	2,131.25	2,459.13	2,950.96	
Shingay-cum-Wendy	941.78	1,098.75	1,255.71	1,412.68	1,726.61	2,040.54	2,354.46	2,825.36	
Shudy Camps	953.53	1,112.45	1,271.38	1,430.30	1,748.15	2,065.99	2,383.83	2,860.60	
Stapleford	963.61	1,124.21	1,284.82	1,445.42	1,766.63	2,087.83	2,409.03	2,890.84	
Stow-cum-Quy	955.17	1,114.37	1,273.56	1,432.76	1,751.15	2,069.55	2,387.93	2,865.52	
Swavesey	962.02	1,122.35	1,282.69	1,443.03	1,763.71	2,084.38	2,405.05	2,886.06	
Tadlow	943.59	1,100.86	1,258.12	1,415.39	1,729.92	2,044.46	2,358.98	2,830.78	
Teversham	972.08	1,134.09	1,296.11	1,458.12	1,782.15	2,106.18	2,430.20	2,916.24	
Thriplow	946.14	1,103.84	1,261.53	1,419.22	1,734.60	2,049.99	2,365.36	2,838.44	
Toft	968.74	1,130.20	1,291.66	1,453.12	1,776.04	2,098.96	2,421.86	2,906.24	
Waterbeach	978.86	1,142.00	1,305.15	1,468.29	1,794.58	2,120.87	2,447.15	2,936.58	
Weston Colville	954.58	1,113.67	1,272.77	1,431.87	1,750.07	2,068.26	2,386.45	2,863.74	
West Wickham	950.48	1,108.90	1,267.31	1,425.73	1,742.56	2,059.39	2,376.21	2,851.46	
West Wratting	955.21	1,114.41	1,273.62	1,432.82	1,751.23	2,069.63	2,388.03	2,865.64	
Whaddon	974.64	1,137.09	1,299.53	1,461.97	1,786.85	2,111.74	2,436.61	2,923.94	
Whittlesford	955.54	1,114.80	1,274.06	1,433.32	1,751.84	2,070.36	2,388.86	2,866.64	
Great Wilbraham	976.03	1,138.70	1,301.38	1,464.05	1,789.40	2,114.74	2,440.08	2,928.10	
Little Wilbraham	948.14	1,106.17	1,264.19	1,422.22	1,738.27	2,054.32	2,370.36	2,844.44	
Willingham	972.14	1,134.16	1,296.19	1,458.21	1,782.26	2,106.31	2,430.35	2,916.42	
Wimpole	946.86	1,104.68	1,262.49	1,420.30	1,735.92	2,051.55	2,367.16	2,840.60	