

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 13 July 2023 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Peter Fane – Chair
Councillor Peter Sandford – Vice-Chair

Councillors: Michael Atkins, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Paul Bearpark, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Ariel Cahn, Dr. Martin Cahn, Graham Cone, Stephen Drew, Libby Earle, Sue Ellington, Corinne Garvie, Bill Handley, Sunita Hansraj, Sally Ann Hart, Geoff Harvey, Carla Hofman, Mark Howell, Helene Leeming, Daniel Lentell, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Annika Osborne, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Richard Stobart, Dr Susan van de Ven, Natalie Warren-Green, Bunty Waters, John Williams, Dr. Richard Williams and Eileen Wilson

Councillors Cllr Dr Shrobona Bhattacharya, Cllr Dr Tumi Hawkins and Cllr Heather Williams were in attendance remotely.

Officers: John Murphy Monitoring Officer
Liz Watts Chief Executive
Andrew Francis Elections and Democratic Services
Manager

1. Apologies

Council held a minute's silence to reflect on the sad news that an officer had lost family members in a house fire.

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors Jose Hales, James Hobro, Lina Nieto, Bridget Smith and Dr Aidan Van de Weyer.

1. Apologies

Council held a minute's silence to reflect on the sad news that an officer had lost family members in a house fire.

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors Jose Hales, James Hobro, Lina Nieto, Bridget Smith and Dr Aidan Van de Weyer.

2. Declaration of Interest

Councillor Heather Williams declared an Other Registerable Interest in agenda item 11 as a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly.

3. Register of Interests

The Chair reminded Members that Democratic Services should be informed of any changes to their Register of Members' Financial and Other Interests form.

4. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2023 were agreed as a correct record by affirmation, subject to the amendment of the word “formal” to “former” in the last sentence of minute 21.

5. Announcements

The Chair announced that Cambourne Youth Partnership would be his chosen charity for the following year. He explained that it was important to engage more with the youth in the District and a task and finish group had been set up to help facilitate this. Nigel Taylor, Chair of the Trustees of Cambourne Youth Partnership, highlighted the work of the Partnership, which had been in existence for 15 years and had recently moved to a purpose built youth centre called Cambourne Soul. Cambourne Youth Partnership worked with both the Town Council, which awarded it an annual grant, and the charity Romsey Mill, which provided funding and facilities to the Partnership.

The Chair hoped that the Council would be able to both raise money for the Cambourne Youth Partnership and to engage with the Partnership on the issue of youth engagement. The Chair announced that the Youth Engagement Task and Finish Group would report to the Council at its next meeting. Councillor Richard Stobart, Chair of the Task and Finish Group, explained that the Group had defined young people as aged 11-25 and were focussing on the need to engage with businesses, schools and colleges in the District.

6. Questions From the Public

The Chair explained that he would only accept public questions that were within the scope of the Council's public speaking scheme and he could reject any questions or statements that were not about matters that the Council was responsible for, or if the statement made was vexatious, defamatory or frivolous.

A request to speak had been made by Mr Fulton but he was not present.

7. Petitions

None received.

8. To Consider the Following Recommendation:

8 (a) Audit and Corporate Governance Committee Annual Report 2022/23

Councillor Michael Atkins, Chair of the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee, presented this report on the work of the Committee during the last year. He explained that past audit of accounts had been delayed but only approximately 12% of local authorities were up to date with their audit requirements. The Council's processes had been improved and the audit of the 2019/20 accounts had been completed in less than 12 months. Work was now

underway on the 2020/21 accounts and the Committee would continue to monitor the progress of the audit. The Committee had monitored the Council's risk management, treasury management, governance arrangements and the work of its internal auditors. He thanked the members of the Committee and its supporting officers for their work during the last year.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams asked whether the target of completing the 2020/21 audit by September 2023 was realistic and whether the ultimate aim was to complete future audits on time. Councillor Michael Atkins confirmed that the audit was still on track to be completed by mid-September. He also confirmed that the aim was to be completing audits on time in two years.

Councillor Anna Bradnam praised the report for being succinct and clear. The Chair echoed this sentiment.

Council **noted** the report.

9. Extension to Six Month Attendance Rule and Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair of Employment and Staffing Committee

On a point of information, Councillor Daniel Lentell asked if all officers had complied with the rules regarding the registering of their non-pecuniary interests. The Chair stated that this issue of officer interests was currently being examined by the Monitoring Officer and he suggested that Councillor Daniel Lentell should either wait for that process to be completed or contact the Monitoring Officer outside the meeting.

Councillor Brian Milnes, Deputy Leader, presented this report that invited the Council to extend the attendance requirements of Section 85 of Local Government Act 1972 for Councillor William Jackson-Wood for a further six months and to appoint a new Chair and Vice-Chair of the Employment and Staffing Committee. On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Graham Cone expressed his support for the recommendations and wished Councillor William Jackson-Wood a full recovery.

Councillor Brian Milnes proposed and Councillor John Williams seconded the recommendations in the report. A vote was taken and by affirmation

Council

Agreed to

- A)** Waive the attendance requirements of Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972 for Councillor William Jackson-Wood and to extend the six-month attendance rule for a period of a further six months from the date of this meeting.
- B)** Appoint Councillor Sally Ann Hart as Chair of the Employment and Staffing Committee and Councillor Anna Bradnam as Vice-Chair of the Employment and Staffing Committee with immediate effect.

10. **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority**

Councillor Judith Rippeth stated that Councillor Charlotte Cane had been elected the Chair of the Cambridge and Peterborough Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Andy Coles had been elected as Vice-Chair of the Committee.

Council **noted** the report.

11. **Greater Cambridge Partnership**

The Deputy Leader explained that a special joint meeting of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly and the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board had been held to discuss the results of the Making Connections consultation on 26 June and these had then been reviewed by the Executive Board on 29 June.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams requested that the Council support the extension of the Sawston greenway to link with the national cycle route to Whittlesford. The Deputy Leader explained that he could not give that assurance because alternatives had to be considered before the funding was committed. Councillor Dr Richard Williams expressed his disappointment in this response, as none of the alternatives being considered would provide links to Whittlesford, Thriplow, Duxford or Fowlmere.

In response to concerns regarding the Making Connections consultation, the Deputy Leader explained that the consultation had resulted in 140,000 free text answers that were now being assessed. Councillor Heather Williams stated that there were alternatives to the Sustainable Travel Zone but it was being suggested that the alternative was to do nothing, which was untrue. Councillor Daniel Lentell stated that improvements could be made to transport in the area without levying a congestion charge. The Deputy Leader offered to discuss this matter with Councillor Heather Williams outside the meeting to get a fuller understanding of her concerns.

Council **noted** the reports.

12. **Update on Oxford to Cambridge Pan Regional Partnership**

In the absence of the Leader it was agreed that any questions would be replied to in writing.

Council **noted** the report.

13. **Membership of Committees and Outside Bodies**

Council **noted** that no amendments were made to the membership of committees or outside bodies.

14. Questions From Councillors**14 (a) From Councillor Daniel Lentell**

Does the Leader agree with the immediate past chair of Cambridgeshire County Council that it is fundamentally undemocratic for Fenland, East Cambs, and Huntingdonshire District Councils to be unrepresented through the Greater Cambridge Partnership?

The Deputy Leader disagreed with the assertion that the Greater Cambridge Partnership was undemocratic, as its purpose was to improve infrastructure in the Greater Cambridge area due to the growth in jobs and housing. Fenland, East Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire District Councils were not signatories to the deal, as they are not part of Greater Cambridge.

As his supplementary question Councillor Daniel Lentell asked why other Cambridgeshire councils had not been included in the Greater Cambridge Partnership as part of its transition to a Unitary Authority. The Deputy Leader stated that Cambridgeshire was represented in the Greater Cambridge Partnership, as County Councillors formed a third of voting members on the Partnership, which had been set up by a Conservative administration, as part of a national programme of city deals.

14 (b) From Dr Shrobona Bhattacharya

Could the leader of council please provide an update on the progress of the Cambourne High Street project in today's Full Council Meeting?

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins explained that it had been six months since the applicant who owned the site had last engaged with the Council. She expressed the hope that the High Street will be developed but the Council had limited power to assist with this. In answer to Councillor Dr Shrobona Bhattacharya's supplementary question, Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins indicated that a further update would be provided in six to twelve months' time.

14 (c) From Councillor Michael Atkins

With the recent publication of the East West Rail Route update report, many residents in my ward and across the district are deeply concerned about the impact this scheme will have on their homes and communities. How can residents best voice their concerns and seek changes to the scheme, and how will the Council and Leader support them?

The Deputy Leader explained that the Council were engaging with both East West Rail and the residents affected. The Minister had not responded to several messages from the Council as it was hoped that the local MP would agree to contact the Minister on the Council's behalf. He requested that residents also contact their local MP to encourage East West Rail to reduce the impact of the route on the local area. Local engagement meetings and online meetings were

being held and residents were encouraged to attend.

As his supplementary question, Councillor Michael Atkins asked how the Council was engaging with East West Rail to represent its residents by seeking improvements to the scheme. The Deputy Leader explained that representatives of the Council had met representatives of East West Rail at a number of rail summits and online meetings. The Council would continue to attend these meetings and act on behalf of residents.

14 (d) From Councillor Susan van de Ven

Small village food banks that have arisen in response to the cost-of-living crisis have seen continuing demand as the struggle to make ends meet persists for many people. The 'road shows' designed to ensure that cost-of-living support information is known and can be taken up where needed will be very welcome, and those coordinating food banks are in a good position to share. The recent addition of the mobile food hub is very welcome - please can we have an update on progress so far?

Councillor Bill Handley explained that as part of the sustainable food network officers had contacted all the known food banks in the District and a networking meeting had been held recently, where partnership working had been discussed. As a result the Council had produced a leaflet, which will be distributed through the food banks, offering guidance on the cost of living including details of how to apply for a discount in Council tax. The possibility of officers running outreach sessions at the food banks was also being considered. Mobile food hubs had just been launched and were visiting three locations each week. The Council's own data was being used to determine which locations to visit. Residents were able to visit a foodbank without a booking or a referral. It was noted that the Council will receive an update on the cost of living schemes, including this one, at its next meeting.

There was no supplementary question.

14 (e) From Councillor Pippa Heylings

Could the Leader explain the impact on communities and local authorities of Government plans contained in the Levelling Up Bill to replace Section 106 contributions with an Infrastructure Levy. This levy will only be payable by developers on the sale of the first house. Specifically what will be the impact on "infrastructure first" strategies, and on the provision of affordable and social housing.

In the absence of Councillor Pippa Heylings, it was agreed to provide her with a written answer to her question.

14 (f) From Councillor Richard Stobart

The Council recently received a grant from the Government's Shared Prosperity Fund (SPF). Some of the grant will be allocated to High Street developments.

Please will you give an update on the SPF and comment on how the funding will complement other High Street initiatives.

Councillor Peter McDonald explained that £1.7m was available for South Cambridgeshire from the Shared Prosperity Fund for three years. It had taken time to agree the grant funding agreement with the Combined Authority and the Government. The High Street project had been allocated £200,000, which would be open to parish councils, businesses and community groups. A further £100,000 had been allocated to protect ATMs. The scheme would be formally launched in November this year.

As his supplementary question, Councillor Richard Stobart asked what was being done to assist street traders on the High Street. Councillor Peter McDonald explained that the Council had a stallholder directory on the website, which it was looking to update to ensure that local businesses could link with each other and the local community. This list continued to grow.

14 (g) From Councillor Dr Richard Williams

When did the administration become aware that the Environment Agency was seeking to block large scale development in the District on the basis that the development plans 'pose a significant risk to our local water environment'?

The Deputy Leader explained that the Environment Agency had registered an objection regarding the developments at Waterbeach and the Bourn airfield following consultation with the Council.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams expressed concern that the Council had been aware of the views of the Environment Agency for a year but not shared this with councillors. As his supplementary question, he asked why this information had not been shared with councillors and if members would be briefed on this matter. Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins explained that this information had been included in the annual monitoring report two months' ago. The Environment Agency had been dependent on the water resource management plan from Cambridge Water, which had been completed in May this year. Councillor Dr Richard Williams thanked both Cabinet members for their answers and requested that a briefing on this issue be provided to all councillors.

14 (h) From Councillor Graham Cone

Will the leader agree that full council should debate the four-day week trial and commit to having a report at the next full council meeting that can be debated and voted on by all members of this council?

Councillor John Williams explained that a decision would be taken at the end of the 12 month trial of the four-day-week, which would be based on all the available evidence resulting from the trial. So therefore it would not be appropriate to debate this matter at this time.

Councillor Graham Cone stated that the majority of councillors had not voted or

debated the four-day-week. He suggested that it would be difficult to reverse the decision and asked why the Council's leadership were not prepared to have a debate. Councillor John Williams reiterated that Council would be provided with all the evidence before it made a decision on the four-day-week. The latest evidence showed that performance had either been maintained or improved and there was no reason to have a vote on this matter half-way through the 12 month trial.

14 (i) From Councillor Bunty Waters

Does the Leader think its unsustainable plan to 'double Cambridge' by building 57,000 extra houses might have had anything to do with the Environment Agency deciding to block all large scale development in the District?!

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins expressed her disappointment at the number of extra homes stated in the question, which was the number of houses in the needs assessment and not the number of houses that were planned. A figure of 37,000 homes had been included in the 2018 Local Plan and the Environment Agency had made it clear that growth would be dependent on a water management process assessment. The water issue would have to be resolved for the housing in the emerging Local Plan to be agreed and the Council was working with the water supply company on this issue.

As her supplementary question, Councillor Bunty Waters asked if the Council could ensure that an adequate water supply was a prerequisite for all significant growth. Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins replied that all planning applications were decided on their own merit and the Environment Agency was a statutory consultee.

15. Notices of Motion

15 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Annika Osborne

Councillor Annika Osborne introduced her motion, which proposed a change in electoral laws to replace the first past the post system with proportional representation, which would ensure that smaller party's vote shares would be reflected in the number of seats won and that single parties would no longer achieve a majority of seats with less than 40% of the vote.

Councillor Graham Cone stated that he favoured the first past the post system, as it made representatives accountable to the electorate. He asserted that a referendum should be required to change the voting system and the Council should focus on local issues that were within its control.

Councillor Tom Bygott stated that changing the political system to proportional representation would benefit the Liberal Democrats and the Council should support its residents and not their political parties. He expressed his support for the first past the post system which allowed voters to select the best representative for their area and allowed independent candidates to be elected.

He opposed proportional representation which would increase extremism and lead to undemocratic deals being made to establish coalition governments.

Councillor Dr Martin Cahn disagreed with the suggestion that proportional representation favoured the Liberal Democrats as the current system had allowed the ruling group to win 80% of the seats with only 48% of the vote. He expressed his support for the motion, as proportional representation was fairer and the examples of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland indicated it was what the electorate wanted.

Councillor Dr Richard Williams stated that he would rather debate matters that the Council had direct control over. He asked which form of proportional representation the motion favoured, as some forms of this system did not ensure that the percentage of votes cast equated with the number of seats won. For example, the system used in Wales allowed the Labour party to have 50% of the seats with only 38% of the vote. He stated that proportional representation did not end minority rule as the current Chancellor in Germany had been elected with only 25% of the vote.

Councillor Daniel Lentell explained that whilst he personally did not support proportional representation he had been elected as a Liberal Democrat and so he would vote in favour of the motion. He quoted the results of recent elections which indicated that proportional representation did not necessarily benefit the Liberal Democrats. He asserted that the Liberal Democrats did not need to change the political system to be successful. Instead they needed to stop supporting unpopular policies such as the congestion charge.

Councillor Sue Ellington stated that it was important that the electorate were provided with named individuals to vote for and proportional representation led to stronger, more radical views in smaller parties, getting a disproportionate influence.

Councillor Stephen Drew expressed the view that proportional representation would improve politics and make the country a better place. He asserted that most other European countries had proportional representation with successful coalition governments. He concluded that a proportional representation system was more democratic and that was why the Liberal Democrats supported it.

Councillor Brian Milnes stated that when the Conservatives lost the Mayoral election under a proportional representation system they decided to change it back to a first past the post system. He asserted that there was no correlation between the number of votes gained by each political party in the 2019 general election and the numbers of seats they won. He concluded that a proportional representation system would result in the election of a government that the people wanted.

Councillor Eileen Wilson stated that the first past the post system was a relic from a bygone age, whilst proportional representation produced an outcome that better reflected the will of the electorate and could improve voter turnout.

Councillor John Williams announced that he would not be voting, as he missed the start of the debate.

Councillor Annika Osborne proposed and Councillor Eileen Wilson seconded the motion. A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

In favour (24):

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Paul Bearpark, Anna Bradnam, Ariel Cahn, Dr Martin Cahn, Stephen Drew, Libby Earle, Peter Fane, Bill Handley, Sunita Hansraj, Sally Ann Hart, Carla Hofman, Helene Leeming, Daniel Lentell, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Annika Osborne, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford, Richard Stobart, Natalie Warren-Green and Eileen Wilson

Against (5):

Councillors Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Bunty Waters and Dr Richard Williams.

Abstain (0)

Council **agreed** the following motion:

First Past the Post (FPTP) originated when land-owning aristocrats dominated parliament and voting was restricted to property-owning men.

In Europe, only the UK and authoritarian Belarus still use archaic single-round FPTP for general elections. Internationally, Proportional Representation (PR) is used to elect the parliaments of more than 80 countries. These countries tend to be more equal, freer and greener.

PR ensures all votes count, have equal value, and that seats won match votes cast. Under PR, MPs and Parliaments better reflect the age, gender and protected characteristics of both local communities and of the nation.

MPs better reflecting the communities they represent in turn leads to improved decision-making, wider participation and increased levels of ownership of decisions taken.

PR would also end minority rule. In 2019, 43.6% of the vote produced a government with 56.2% of the seats and 100% of the power. Fair, proportional votes also prevent 'wrong winner' elections such as occurred in 1951 and February 1974.

PR is the national policy of the Labour Party, Liberal Democrats, Green Party, SNP, Plaid Cymru, Reform UK and Women's Equality Party along with a host of Trade Unions and pro-democracy organisations.

PR is already used to elect the parliaments and assemblies of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Its use should now be extended to include Westminster.

This Council therefore resolves to write to H.M. Government calling for a change in our outdated electoral laws and to enable Proportional Representation to be used for UK general elections.

15 (b) Standing in the Name of Councillor Natalie Warren-Green

Councillor Natalie Warren-Green explained that on 16 May 2023 a motion had been passed by the County Council to help childminders to set up and relocate in the county. The amount of support from Government for parents was increasing and so it was reasonable to assume that demand for childcare would increase but local data indicated that the number childminders available was decreasing. Unfortunately many new developments in the district included covenants that prohibited child care provision in domestic premises. Councillor Natalie Warren-Green was pleased to report that the Council's officers were working with Homes England to address this issue. The purpose of the motion was to ensure that childminders living in new developments in the district could establish their businesses in their homes.

Councillor Judith Rippeth expressed her support for the motion that would help childminders to provide a range of vital services in new developments that would assist in building a new community. She explained that different childcare settings, including childminders' homes, were important as it provided choice and often a cheaper alternative to nurseries. Childcare was important in a new development, as many new residents would be living apart from the support of their extended families.

Councillor Sue Ellington supported the motion but suggested that it was unlikely that the developer would enforce such a covenant.

Councillor Daniel Lentell supported the motion, as childminding was of vital importance. He understood Councillor Sue Ellington's point but he did not think the onus should be on the resident to get the covenant changed. He recommended that developers be asked to waive the covenant.

Councillor Graham Cone supported the motion and the efforts of officers engaging with Homes England. It was important that the Council took the lead in this matter.

Councillor Tom Bygott supported the motion and congratulated Councillor Natalie Warren-Green for identifying the issue and bringing it to the attention of Council. He doubted that those who introduced the covenants had childcare in mind.

Councillor Annika Osborne supported the motion, as a former childminder.

Councillor Eileen Wilson supported the motion. She stated that nurseries in her ward were full and had a waiting list that would not open until September 2024. Childminders were essential to make the Government's childcare initiative work.

Councillor Dr Tumi Hawkins supported this motion, which was timely given the recent Government announcement regarding development in the area. All new

development will benefit from this motion. She suggested that Section 106 payments could be used to provide childcare.

Councillor Anna Bradnam supported this motion, which would benefit the new towns that would be built in the area. Ofsted would ensure that childcare facilities were in suitable locations.

Councillor Helene Leeming supported the motion. She explained that new developments had a higher proportion of children than more established settlements and parents were less likely to have family support nearby. The absence of childcare in a new development increased dependency on the car and risked oversubscribing other childcare providers in neighbouring villages. This made the provision of local childcare vital, but they were being restricted by the existence of covenants that should be removed.

Councillor John Batchelor, as Lead Cabinet Member for Housing, stated that the Council did not put any covenants on its tenants, who were free to become childminders.

Councillor Natalie Warren-Green proposed and Councillor Judith Rippeth seconded the motion in the report. A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

In favour (28):

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Paul Bearpark, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Ariel Cahn, Dr Martin Cahn, Graham Cone, Stephen Drew, Libby Earle, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Bill Handley, Sunita Hansraj, Sally Ann Hart, Carla Hofman, Helene Leeming, Daniel Lentell, Brian Milnes, Annika Osborne, Dr Lisa Redrup, Judith Rippeth, Peter Sandford, Richard Stobart, Natalie Warren-Green, Bunty Waters, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Against (0)

Abstain (0)

Council **agreed** the following motion:

South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) notes that on 16 May 2023, Cambridgeshire County Council at its Full Council meeting, passed a motion to request that District Councils throughout Cambridgeshire consider on strategic new developments, a planning condition that developers covenants explicitly exempt childcare provision on domestic premises, where there is an identified need which can be demonstrated. And highlight the importance of such changes with developers and house builders to ensure that they are aware of the barrier that these covenants can cause.

South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) recognises that some house builders place restrictive covenants on properties which prohibit residents living within them from running a business from home, including providing childcare. Whilst it is possible to have a covenant revoked, it is not guaranteed. Although covenants are not exclusive to strategic developments, it appears to be for these

that the issue is most prevalent.

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service has been discussing this blanket covenant with Homes England who are now aware that the restriction on childminders works at cross purposes with their intention that residents of new builds have a positive experience living in their homes. It is also clear that sustainable community requires residents to be able to access work, education and all services by either active travel or public transport. Requiring whole new communities to drive to access child care facilities is in conflict with South Cambs zero carbon policy.

SCDC now has an opportunity to capture, working with Cambridge City Council, the need for more childminders in the emerging joint local plan through policy which excludes childminders from the restriction of operating businesses from home.

This motion is requesting support for SCDC to address this need as follows:

1. Commence meetings with Homes England and other house builders active across South Cambridgeshire to (a) address this childcare crisis for new communities being delivered as part of the current adopted Local Plan 2018 and (b) in view of the predicted growth, engage them in policy development to achieve buy-in for policy that will meet the needs of childcare providers and families in the emerging joint local plan
2. Develop a planning policy regarding Childminders that will include feedback from the engagement with house builders and stakeholders across South Cambridgeshire, and organisations like PACEY, to ensure that the needs are balanced across all the interests in the community so that Childminders are exempt from a blanket covenant to restrict businesses being run from homes.

16. Chair's Engagements

The Chair stated that former Councillor Robin Page, who had been one of the authority's original councillors had died. He was known for his conservation work.

Chair stated that he had gone on one engagement since the last Council meeting, which was a reception given by the High Sherriff at Wisbech on 28 June. The Vice Chair had attended the Memorial Day ceremony at the American Cemetery on 29 May and the Civic Leaders Open Day at RAF Molesworth on 22 June.

The Chair invited local members to bring events in their ward to his attention if it was felt that attendance by the Chair would help to highlight the role of the District Council.

The Meeting ended at 4.20 p.m.
