

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 15 April 2021 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Councillor Anna Bradnam – Vice-Chair

Councillors: Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Ruth Betson,
Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart,
Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane,
Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins,
Pippa Heylings, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes,
Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom,
Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams,
John Williams, Dr. Richard Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright

Officers:	Patrick Adams	Senior Democratic Services Officer
	Rebecca Dobson	Democratic Services Manager
	Susan Gardner Craig	Head of HR and Corporate Services
	Rory McKenna	Monitoring Officer
	Liz Watts	Chief Executive

1. Appointment of Vice Chair of Meeting

The Vice Chair of the Council, Councillor Anna Bradnam, chairing the meeting following the resignation of the former Chair, welcomed all those attending the online meeting. She invited all to join her in a moment of quiet reflection to commemorate the death of His Royal Highness, The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh.

The Chair then made a number of housekeeping announcements, before asking whether there was a nomination for a Vice Chair for the meeting.

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, nominated Councillor Peter Fane as Vice Chair for the meeting.

The Chair seconded the nomination.

By affirmation, Council

Resolved

To appoint Councillor Peter Fane as Vice Chair for the meeting.

2. Apologies

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors Grenville Chamberlain,

Sarah Cheung-Johnson, Gavin Clayton, Graham Cone, Clare Delderfield, Tony Mason and Dawn Percival.

3. Declaration of Interest

Councillor Heather Williams declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 11 on the agenda, the summary of decisions of the Greater Cambridge Partnership, in that she was a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly.

4. Minutes

Council agreed the minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2021, subject to the following amendments:

At Minute 7(c), to replace the word “diesel” with “eco”.

At Minute 7(e), in the fourth paragraph, to replace the word “externally” with “external”, and to replace the amount of £511,476 with £511 million.

At Minute 7(f), to replace the word “border” with “loader”.

At Minute 14(b), following reference to the recording, to replace the following two paragraphs:

“As a supplementary question, Councillor Dr Richard Williams said the answer to his question should be public rather than in private; he expressed concern at having heard of discussions to enter into a limited liability partnership, and asked for assurance that the Council’s liability was not involved.

The Leader said she knew of no such conversation. She could not predict future schemes with which the Council might be involved.”

And to substitute them with the following wording:

“As a supplementary question, Councillor Dr Richard Williams said the proposed development concerned Hill Group, with whom the Council had entered a limited liability partnership. He asked the Leader whether the Council could give an assurance that its limited liability partnership would not be involved in these kinds of developments.

The Leader replied that there had been no conversation to which she was privy regarding Hill Group as part of that partnership with Westley Green. She said she could not predict what schemes the Council would get involved in in the future with Hill Group but the Council had no plans to enter into a partnership with Westley Green.”

5. Announcements

The Chair invited the Leader of the Council to make any announcements if she wished.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Council, expressed her heartfelt

condolences to the Royal family on the death of the Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Philip, on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group. She spoke of her fond memories of the Prince's involvement in the District.

Councillor Heather Williams offered her sincere condolences to the Royal family. Speaking on behalf of the Conservative Group, she referred to the service given by His Royal Highness for which all owed him a debt of gratitude. She expressed appreciation for his legacy, which included the Duke of Edinburgh Award.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart echoed these condolences on behalf of the Labour Group and described the occasions on which he had met His Royal Highness, when he had been impressed with the Prince's energy in engaging with all present.

Councillor Deborah Roberts, speaking as the Independent Member, said she was the oldest Member of the Council and sympathised with getting older. She had been proud to have met Prince Philip as a representative of the Council when he visited Cambridge.

The Chair invited the Chief Executive to update the Council on the arrangements for the annual meeting.

The Chief Executive said virtual meetings would end on 7 May 2021, but a legal challenge was due to be heard on 21 April 2021. The results would not be known until May, so it was not yet known whether the meeting would take place in person. If it had to be in person, officers would work hard to ensure it was as Covid-safe as possible. If the meeting could be held online, it would take place virtually.

6. Questions From the Public

The Chair said she had been informed that Mr Daniel Fulton had withdrawn a question he had submitted.

The Chair invited Dr Douglas de Lacey to ask his question.

Dr Douglas de Lacey asked his question as follows:

This Council meeting is likely to approve a pay policy, and I understand its limited scope and purpose. But the concept of such policies leads me to consider broader issues of pay. In general the awarding of salary increases on a percentage basis serves to increase the disparity between the wealthiest and the poorest in our society. Would this Council in future consider the option of awarding all officers an equal quantity of money, rather than a percentage of current pay, as an example of the 'levelling up' which our Government wishes to see?

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, responded as follows:

The Council is firmly committed to addressing low pay whilst also having regard for the need to ensure fair and transparent practices to ensure pay equality.

The annual pay award for 2020/2021 included the introduction of a £10 per hour minimum rate for our lowest paid which has lifted the lowest salary point from £16,948 to £19,219 per annum.

As part of the transformation programme, the Council will be reviewing a number of employment related aspects which will include employee benefits and policies. Pay should be seen as part of an employment package and we will be talking to trade unions and listening to feedback from our staff.

Awarding an equal quantity of money to all staff would require us to fully review the pay scales; even by year one of an equal distribution, this approach would lead to staff at the top of one scale being paid more than their colleagues at the bottom of the next pay scale. As the years go on this disparity becomes greater and therefore introduces a different unfairness. The way to address this would be to completely rewrite the pay scales, which is a very significant piece of work. We are committed to undertake this piece of work but can't commit to an outcome yet.

A review of our employee package will be aimed at modernising benefit and reward while still maintaining a fair and equality proof offer to staff.

Dr Douglas de Lacey confirmed he did not wish to ask a supplementary question. The Chair thanked him for attending.

7. Petitions

The Chair said a petition has been received from Anthony Browne MP asking the Council to oppose the inclusion of Thakeham's proposal in South West Cambridgeshire in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

The Chair reminded Members that they had been informed by email in advance of the meeting of advice from the Council's Planning Counsel. This advice was that, according to the Council's Constitution and petition scheme, this petition could not be accepted at this meeting because it related to a planning decision. There were serious risks to the integrity of the Local Plan process were Members to debate this petition at the meeting. However, the Council was completely committed to listening to residents, and was grateful to the many people who had taken time to share their views. Counsel's advice was to ensure the petition was passed to the Local Plan team, which had been done, so that it could be considered as part of the wider consultation process. Members would have the opportunity to debate all site issues when the Local Plan came before them.

The Chair suggested Members note that this was the case.

Councillor Heather Williams said whilst she appreciated what the Chair had said,

and the statement in the advance email sent to Members, she would have liked to have had a discussion. She asked that her disappointment be noted.

Councillor Deborah Roberts said the advice was wrong.

The Chair said she did not wish any Member to risk predetermination, and that where Members could debate matters, they would do so. The advice received was not to do so at this meeting.

7 (a) Pay Policy Statement 2021 (Employment & Staffing Committee - 15 March 2021)

The Chair invited Councillor Henry Batchelor, Chair of the Employment and Staffing Committee, to present the report on the Pay Policy Statement 2021.

Councillor Henry Batchelor presented the report and moved the recommendation as set out.

Councillor John Williams seconded the motion to support the recommendation. He explained why the Council did not intend to seek accreditation from the Living Wage Foundation. Whilst the Council had regard to the Living Wage Foundation's rate, it paid above this rate and encouraged other employers to do so. There were costs in seeking accreditation and there would be an effect on suppliers to the Council as it could discourage small to medium sized businesses from bidding for Council contracts.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart said he sympathised with the question which Dr Douglas de Lacey had asked, to award an equal increase in money rather than percentage of salary. He recognised that pay policy was a complex area and that the disparity gap was not as great as for some other employers. However this was an expensive area in which to live. He asked that the views of trade unions be taken into account.

Councillor Heather Williams agreed with Councillor Nigel Cathcart's comments in that there was some way to go. She said when this report had been considered by the Employment and Staffing Committee it had received unanimous support. She agreed there was more that could be done to support employees in view of the high cost of living, but this was a first step and she supported the proposal.

Councillor Henry Batchelor said he agreed with the points which Councillor Nigel Cathcart had made, and supported the response given by Councillor John Williams to Dr Douglas de Lacey in that the Council would be looking at the pay gap between employees.

By affirmation, Council **AGREED** to:

Approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2021.

8. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

Members considered the reports of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Council, invited Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer, Deputy Leader (Statutory) and Lead Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Transport, to speak, as he had attended the most recent Board meeting in her place.

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer reported on the meeting of the Board which he had attended, and summarised the updates given on the Cam Metro business case and the report of the independent commission on climate change.

Councillor Peter Fane as a Member of the Combined Authority's Overview and Scrutiny Committee reported on the Committee's February meeting but noted there had been a subsequent meeting, the minutes for which were not yet available. The discussion in February had been on the Business Board, the Combined Authority's former Local Enterprise Partnership.

The Chair referred to the Business Review Task and Finish update, which reported difficulties in business participation during the pandemic. The next meeting was on 21 April following which a further update would be available.

9. Greater Cambridge Partnership

The Chair invited Councillor Neil Gough, Deputy Leader and Lead Cabinet Member for Transformation and Projects, to report on the meeting of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board held on 18 March 2021.

Councillor Neil Gough said the Executive Board referred Members to the report and committed on the commitment of another £20million towards cycling improvements and the funding of civil parking enforcement in South Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams welcomed the delivery of civil parking enforcement. He asked if there was an indication of timescale.

Councillor Neil Gough said the enforcement measure was part of the short-term prioritising agenda and scope was being worked on.

10. OxCam Arc

The Chair invited the Council to note the report and the outline work programme for 2021/22 for the Oxford – Cambridge Arc.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Bridget Smith, reported as a member of the Arc Leaders Group. She said she chaired the Board's Environmental Working Group and was pleased to report that the plenary had met on 9 March 2021 and had accepted the Working Group's recommended environmental principles. All

leaders would now bring back the principles to their councils. The principles were to be brought to the meeting of Cabinet in April. The next step would be to work the high-level principles into specific sector-based strategies.

Councillor Bridget Smith referred Members to the summary in the report of an update given to the Minister for Housing, Communities and Local Government on the Arc Spatial Framework. The timescale was ambitious and officers were working to deliver an Arc Vision this Summer.

Councillor Heather Williams asked what work had been done in relation to the tracks, to avoid diesel.

Councillor Bridget Smith said the Environment Group would like zero carbon but at the plenary all Leaders agreed to sign a letter to the Minister seeking the use of electricity or a sustainable energy source for all traffic on the East – West link.

Councillor Deborah Roberts said this was putting the cart before the horse and asked why Members' views were not sought before attending the meetings.

Councillor Bridget Smith said this was a government initiative and it was necessary to maximise the opportunity to make it as good as possible for residents. It was her job to speak for the residents of this District and to ensure there was a two-way flow of information to Government.

Councillor Nick Wright referred to the Cambourne route and said there had been no opportunity yet to make views known. All other routes had been the subject of consultation and it was not good that the preferred route had not been consulted on.

Councillor Bridget Smith said East – West Rail was a part of the project and she had made representations in relation to biodiversity. Residents' views on East – West Rail were reported back to Government.

Council noted the report.

11. Appointments and membership of Committees

Council considered changes in appointments and memberships of committees and substitutes as set out on the agenda.

The Chair invited Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Council, to speak.

The Leader said Councillor John Batchelor would be Lead Cabinet Member for Housing. This appointment followed the retirement of Hazel Smith from the Council after 17 years' service.

Councillor John Batchelor said he was delighted to take on what was an extensive portfolio, and he would work hard to make life better for South Cambridgeshire residents.

Councillor Brian Milnes, Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing, welcomed Councillor John Batchelor to the Cabinet. He paid tribute to the service given by former Councillor Hazel Smith in that role.

The Leader said as the appointment to a Cabinet portfolio was a significant commitment, the appointment of Councillor John Batchelor to be a substitute Member of the Planning Committee was withdrawn. She invited Members to note the appointment of Councillor Henry Batchelor as an ordinary Member of the Planning Committee.

Councillor John Batchelor nominated Councillor Pippa Heylings as Chair of the Planning Committee. She was well qualified having acted as Vice Chair and fulfilling the chairing role on a number of occasions.

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins, Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, seconded the nomination, which was agreed by affirmation.

Councillor Bridget Smith nominated Councillor Henry Batchelor as Vice Chair of the Planning Committee. Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins seconded the nomination.

Councillor Deborah Roberts objected to agreeing this election by affirmation. She said she considered the appointment to be political, and that another more suitable candidate was available. She nominated Councillor Heather Williams to be the Vice Chair of the Committee.

Councillor Mark Howell seconded the nomination.

A vote on the appointment of the Vice Chair for the Planning Committee was taken under Rule 17.8 of the Standing Orders. A total of 24 votes were cast for Councillor Henry Batchelor, and there were 11 votes for Councillor Heather Williams.

Accordingly, Councillor Henry Batchelor was appointed as Vice Chair of the Planning Committee.

The Chair then proposed Councillor John Williams to be the Council's representative on the Board of Cambridgeshire Horizons in place of Councillor Bridget Smith. The Vice Chair seconded the proposal, which was agreed by affirmation.

The Chief Executive clarified the fact that the appointment would take effect at the Board's next meeting after its annual meeting.

The Chair then proposed, and the Vice Chair seconded, that Councillor Eileen Wilson be appointed in place of Councillor Bridget Smith, on the Combined Authority Housing Committee. The appointment was agreed by affirmation.

12. Questions From Councillors

12 (a) From Councillor Dr Claire Daunton

Can the Leader update Council on the current status of the five-year housing land supply?

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins responded as follows.

Our updated Greater Cambridge housing trajectory (April 2021) concludes that Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire jointly have 6.1 years of housing land supply for the 2021-2026 five-year period. This conclusion is based on our five-year housing land supply being calculated jointly, using the Liverpool methodology, and applying a 5% buffer – following the governments confirmation that SCDC has met the criteria for applying a 5% (as opposed to 20%) as a result of strong performance through the last year measured through the Housing delivery test.

12 (b) From Councillor Sarah Cheung-Johnson

Northstowe residents are very pleased to hear about the £5million plus investment the council is putting into Northstowe, which shows the importance this administration puts on community and placemaking through deeds and not just words - please would the Leader explain what the next steps are and how residents might get involved in shaping their new facilities?

Councillor Neil Gough, Lead Cabinet Member for Transformation and Projects, responded as follows:

Councillor Cheung-Johnson is referring to the recently completed purchase of the local centre and Enterprise Zone – both within phase 1 of the new town.

The Enterprise Zone will become the northern gateway to Northstowe and will contain commercial buildings set within a green landscape providing green links, connections, and places for people to enjoy.

The local centre is located directly next to the employment land and presents an opportunity for the Council to help shape and bring forward the retail and commercial development.

It will create an important meeting place and local facilities such as shops for residents, linking employment and residential areas. The vision is to create a mixed-use area made up of shops, restaurants, cafes and buildings that are active, vibrant, and safe. A community building will provide a central focus point for this area.

Now the purchase of the site has been completed, the Council are committed to giving the local community an opportunity to help shape these plans.

The Council is currently in the process of considering the best options to appoint

a team to work with residents, businesses and other stakeholders to ensure they can contribute to the development. We will seek the views of Businesses and green energy specialists as well as residents.

The ambition is for construction work to begin on site in the summer of 2022.

12 (c) From Councillor Ian Sollom

Can the Leader for Planning please update Council on the planning status of the South West Cambridgeshire development?

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins, Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, responded as follows.

The proposed SW Cambridge currently has no planning status and has not yet been submitted as a site in the current local plan Call for Sites process. Officers are aware of the ambitions from the project promoters but the project, at this time, has no planning status. Should it be submitted to the Local plan Team, it will **still not** give any development status to the site, but it will be assessed alongside the large number of other sites we have had submissions for over the last 18 months. There is more information on the process on our [Call for Sites](#) FAQ webpage.

Councillor Dr Ian Sollom asked, as a supplementary question, if a submission for South West Cambridgeshire were made, what should Members advice should be given to residents on the best way to have their say and influence the decision to include Thakeham in the local plan.

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins said that when shaping the local plan Members had to take into account all relevant evidence as well as local and national policies. If a submission were made, she would encourage local residents to make their views known to councillors and refer to the planning policy. Residents would have a chance to comment formally at the next stage. The national planning policies were currently changing rapidly with the government's reforms. She would encourage residents to contact their MP.

12 (d) From Councillor Pippa Heylings

Can the Leader tell Council how many businesses have received hardship grants since November 2020?

Councillor Peter McDonald, Lead Cabinet Member for Business Recovery and Skills, responded as follows.

As of 9/4/21, we had paid out £11,159,317 in total to 4,653 businesses since November 2020 grants opened. We have paid £3,889,284 out of our £4,594,889 Additional Restrictions (discretionary - hardship) allocated pot to 1,469 South

Cambs businesses. The remaining £705,000 will be allocated and paid in accordance with BEIS guidelines by June 30th. Our local businesses have been extremely grateful for the financial support provided. For many, it has indeed meant the difference between survival or closure. We have been inundated with messages of thanks and relief, one illustrative quote of many shared here: *“Although it won’t cover all that we owe and have sacrificed personally, you cannot believe how grateful and relieved I am. This will ensure that we can get through and ready to fire on all cylinders when our wholesale customers come back and grow the business back and pay our debts in record time. This gives us the breathing space we need and allows us some mental space now that some of the anxiety has been lifted. I can’t thank you enough” (Wholesale Food Supplier).*

Councillor Peter McDonald took the opportunity to thank officers for their hard work in supporting the payments.

12 (e) From Councillor Heather Williams

Does the Leader agree that any cancellations of full council meetings should be done in consultation with Group Leaders of all political parties and the independent group convenor, and will the Leader agree to look at amending the constitution accordingly?

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Council, responded that she agreed and would be happy to look at making that change in the Constitution.

Councillor Heather Williams sought clarification of the Independent Group Convenor’s role.

At the invitation of the Leader, the Monitoring Officer said a Group comprised two or more Members. The term Independent Group Convenor was a term used at South Cambridgeshire District Council to refer to the leader of the Independent Group.

12 (f) From Councillor Dr Richard Williams

Will the Leader give an update on the progress of work on the next local plan and, specifically, when we can expect the list of preferred sites to be released to the public?

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, responded as follows.

The local plan team are continuing to work on the development of the preferred strategy and approach to key themes, look and feel / format of the Local Plan and a range of other issues. This is including continued work on the evidence base which will help the assessment of sites and inform the development of the spatial strategy. This will be set out in a “preferred options” draft of the Local Plan upon which widespread consultation will take place. The preferred options draft is due to go through the councils committee processes in September/October cycles and officers will be providing information, including briefings, on the emerging

document close to that time, once the ongoing work has helped to draw the threads of work together for this stage.

As a supplementary question, Councillor Dr Richard Williams sought clarification of democratic involvement in the local plan. Development was important to residents. An overzealous approach to local plan discussion would appear to mean that expressing a view was taken as having a closed mind. It was vital for residents to know that Members could speak on this matter. Was it possible to find a way to discuss an approach to how this could be done?

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins said the integrity of the local plan process had to be protected and should not be jeopardised.

12 (g) From Councillor Sue Ellington

What steps and innovations are the administration taking to address the significant increase in residents suffering loneliness as a result of the pandemic?

Councillor Bill Handley, Lead Cabinet member for Community Resilience, Health and Wellbeing, responded as follows.

Other local authorities have commented on the excellent way that the communities and the neighbour support networks in South Cambridgeshire have been the backbone of the Covid response. Through the Covid-19 hub at SCDC, we have encouraged the sharing of best practice between communities, and SCDC's Patch Officers have been communicating with volunteer group leaders throughout, offering help and advice. The Scrutiny & Overview Committee's Task and Finish group looked at isolation as part of their work which also highlighted the innovation and work taking place across the district and they too engaged with the leaders of the volunteer effort. I was really pleased to sit alongside fellow councillors as part of this process.

The hot meal schemes that we have been running in collaboration with Over Day Centre and C3 Churches have not only provided nutritious meals to vulnerable people but the community volunteers delivering the meals have also provided a welcome connection to the outside world for those having to isolate. We have had positive feedback on these schemes with comments from some people that the meal deliverers were often the only person they had seen or spoken to for days.

Although loneliness and its impact on health outcomes is an issue that has been brought into sharp focus by Covid, we should not forget that it has been a major national issue for decades. It would be disappointing if the community effort to alleviate loneliness during the pandemic were to be lost just as the country moves into the recovery phase. With this in mind, we are working with volunteer groups to consider their future strategy with loneliness and wider mental health issues being an important part of those plans.

We have offered all communities financial support, such as the Covid-19 Community Chest recovery grants we launched last month (which can be up to £2,000 per scheme), and we are expecting applications to be submitted that are

aimed at supporting local initiatives to reduce isolation and loneliness and their effects. I hope that all members will remind their parish councils and community volunteers about this funding and encourage them to apply.

Councillor Sue Ellington asked, as a supplementary question, what steps were the Housing service putting in place to re-start social events for sheltered housing residents.

Councillor Bill Handley said he was keen to re-open all facilities and the rooms would re-open as soon as it was safe and legal to do so.

12 (h) From Councillor Graham Cone

Will the Leader agree to review the Discretionary business support grant criteria, to bring it in line with other local councils that allow for hackney and private hire drivers that do not live within South Cambs, but are Licensed within the District, to qualify for support providing they have not received a grant from another Local Authority?

Councillor Peter McDonald, Lead Cabinet Member for Business Recovery and Skills, responded as follows.

- We have been and continue to support South Cambridgeshire based Taxi firms including private hire and chauffeur via our hardship discretionary scheme (ARG – Additional Restrictions Grant funding).
- Sole Trader Taxi Drivers resident in and licensed in South Cambs (who have also been in receipt of Self Employment Income Support Scheme, SEISS) are each receiving a discretionary payment of £500 from us – a higher value one off payment than issued by many local authorities, including Cambridge City.
- We are awarding higher value ARG payments to those in most need, depending on the specifics noted in their application forms to us, for example, if they are based in the District, not in receipt of SEISS and/or are themselves Taxi firm owners/Ltd companies and can demonstrate in excess of 40% loss of sales and lack of financial support from elsewhere, we are awarding significantly higher value payments in those specific circumstances.
- We are not able to support Taxi Drivers licensed in South Cambridgeshire but who are not resident in South Cambridgeshire as this would disproportionately prioritise Taxi Drivers as a sector within our overall ARG pot i.e. we could be paying out up to 17% of our total ARG pot to taxi drivers alone on that basis when we have a need to provide support across many sectors as equitably as possible.
- Currently, based on our rule of paying out a £500 flat fee to those licensed and resident in South Cambs (if they are in receipt of SEISS), we will still potentially be paying out c.10% of our ARG fund to Taxi Drivers if the majority of South Cambs resident drivers do apply as we expect. This 10% is an appropriate level of support for this group.
- Many Taxi Drivers have licenses across multiple districts and may be

receiving several payments from different neighbouring authorities.

Formalising the need to be both resident and licensed in the area in which one is applying for a grant mitigates some of that complexity and duplicative payment structure. It essentially minimises the danger of recipients capitalising on multiple payments from multiple authorities.

- Furthermore, ARG funding was very clearly allocated on the basis of a “£20 per head of population” allocation (ONS 2019 mid- year population estimates). On that basis, we must prioritise businesses based in (registered address in) South Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Graham Cone asked, as a supplementary question, whether there could have been collaboration with neighbouring councils to see who had claimed or not yet done so, in order to prevent people slipping through the net.

Councillor Peter McDonald agreed this was a fair point. However, the volume of work, involving over 200 requests per day sometimes, and processing of 50 to 60 grant applications per week. The approach taken was therefore considered to be a fair and equitable one.

12 (i) From Councillor Geoff Harvey

Can the Leader please tell the Council what the planning status is of the Mayor's so-called garden villages, four sites for which were recently identified in press reports?

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins, Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, responded as follows.

The CAM programme of the Combined Authority includes a programme thread around Garden Villages. The recent report to the Combined Authority Board Meeting in March, updated the Combined Authority Board on the workstreams progress which is being run by Combined Authority officers, not SCDC. To date there have been no submissions by the Combined Authority to the Local Plan process seeking to promote Garden Villages in SCDC, although support for a specific proposal from the Combined Authority has been submitted by a site promoter. Based upon press reports, none of the sites indicated have any planning status at this stage, and will, if submitted, be considered alongside all other submissions to the local plan process in the usual way.

13. Chair's Engagements

The Council noted the Chair's engagements as set out on the agenda.

The Meeting ended at 4.04 p.m.
