



# SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING  
THURSDAY, 26 AUGUST 2004

REPORTS AND MINUTES

South Cambridgeshire Hall  
Cambourne Business Park  
Cambourne, Cambridge  
CB3 6ES

If the press and public are likely to be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item on the grounds that exempt information is to be considered, it will be necessary to pass the following resolution: "That under Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph (quoting relevant paragraph) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act."

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

TO: The Chairman and Members of the  
South Cambridgeshire District Council

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the next meeting of the Council will be held in the Council Chamber at 2.00 p.m. on

Thursday, 26th day of August 2004

and I am, therefore to summon you to attend accordingly for the transaction of the business specified below.

**DATED** this 18th August 2004

**GJ HARLOCK**  
Finance and Resources Director

---

### **AGENDA**

**1. MINUTES**

To authorise the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd July 2004 as a correct record.

In relation to the remarks in Minute 2 on declarations of interest, the Monitoring Officer will provide Members with a written guidance note on interests arising from membership or support of campaign groups.

(Pages 1 - 10)

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To receive any declarations of interest from Members on matters arising in this agenda.

**3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

None received to date.

**5. DRAFT STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2003-2004**

To approve the draft Statement of Accounts. The Statement is enclosed separately with this agenda and the explanatory report of the Finance and Resources Director is attached.

(Pages 11 - 14)

**6. RECORDING OF MEETINGS**

To consider whether to pursue further the recording of debates. The report of the Finance and Resources Director is attached.

(Pages 15 - 24)

## 7. **APPOINTMENTS**

Arising from the last meeting, to make appointments to:

### **Duxford Airfield Management Liaison Committee**

The terms of reference allow for only one member representative from this Council. Councillors RGR Smith and JA Quinlan have both expressed interest; only one can be appointed.

### **Sawston Village College Sports Users' Committee**

The College is happy to accept as many representatives as the Council wishes to send. The catchment area comprises Babraham, Duxford, Sawston, the Shelfords, Stapleford and Whittlesford. Council is invited to appoint interested members.

To note:

### **The Junction (observer on Board of Management)**

The Junction are happy to have two representatives from the Council. Council appointed Councillors Hockney and Mrs Corney if two representatives were acceptable.

### **Cambridgeshire ACRE (Local Agenda 21)**

This was a time limited group which no longer exists

### **Great Ouse Area Environment Group**

This group has been replaced by the Environment Agency Central Area Advisory Panel, which is appointed by a selection process, with three local authority places. There are no vacancies at this time.

### **Old West Internal Drainage Board**

The IDB is happy to retain the services of both Mr Manning and Mr Wyatt (Council had suggested one of them).

## 8. **SUSPENSION OF CALL-IN**

The Environmental Health Portfolio Holder will be asked on the 6th September 2004, following discussion by the Licensing Committee, to approve the draft new Licensing Policy for public consultation. In order for the results of the consultation to be taken into account in the formulation of the final policy and the policy to be approved, published and distributed before 7th February 2005, the "first appointed day" of the Licensing Act 2003, consultation needs to begin on 8th September 2004. The Chairman of the Council and the Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee have consequently agreed that the call-in procedure will not apply to this decision.

It was not possible to begin preparing the policy statement until receipt of government guidance in July 2004. The policy will be presented to Council after the consultation period.

**FOR INFORMATION**

**TO RECEIVE THE REPORTS OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS**

(\* indicates that the minutes have already been confirmed as a correct record)

9. **CABINET 24TH JUNE 2004 \*** (Pages 25 - 30)
10. **CABINET 20TH JULY 2004**  
**N.B. The recommendations at minutes 3 (Policy and Financial Review), 4 (2004-05 Pay Award) and 5 (Policy on Traveller Issues) were considered by Council on 22nd July 2004** (Pages 31 - 40)
11. **DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL COMMITTEE 7TH JULY 2004** (Pages 41 - 48)
12. **LICENSING COMMITTEE 5TH JULY 2004** (Pages 49 - 50)
13. **STANDARDS COMMITTEE 21ST JULY 2004** (Pages 51 - 54)
14. **SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE 24TH JUNE 2004 \*** (Pages 55 - 56)
15. **SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE 15TH JULY 2004** (Pages 57 - 62)
16. **AUDIT PANEL 14TH JULY 2004** (Pages 63 - 66)

**TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS ON JOINT MEETINGS**

17. **CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP 23RD JULY 2004** (Pages 67 - 72)
18. **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT AREA JOINT COMMITTEE**  
 Access to the minutes of the meeting of the 28th June 2004 was circulated in the weekly bulletin of 4th August 2004.
19. **CAMBRIDGE CITY AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT JOINT STRATEGIC FORUM**  
 Access to the minutes of the meeting of the 18th July 2004 is being circulated in the weekly bulletin of the 18th August 2004.
20. **CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS**  
 To note the following Chairman's engagements since the last Council meeting:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Other remarks</b>
23 July 2004	Tenants Best Kept Garden Competition	Accompanied by Cllr Mrs Murfitt and the Portfolio Holder
27 July 2004	Best Kept Garden – sheltered housing and vegetable	Accompanied by Cllr Mrs Murfitt and the Portfolio Holder
29 July 2004	“Glasshouse” Art Exhibition	
30 July 2004	RAF Brampton and Wyton Families day	

This page is intentionally left blank

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Council held on  
Thursday, 22 July 2004 at 2.00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Councillor RF Bryant – Chairman  
Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt – Vice-Chairman

**Councillors:** SJ Agnew, Dr DR Bard, RE Barrett, JD Batchelor, EW Bullman, BR Burling, NN Cathcart, Mrs PS Corney, Mrs J Dixon, Ms SJO Doggett, SM Edwards, Mrs A Elsby, R Hall, Dr SA Harangozo, Mrs SA Hatton, Mrs JM Healey, Mrs EM Heazell, JA Hockney, MP Howell, HC Hurrell, Mrs HF Kember, SGM Kindersley, RMA Manning, RB Martlew, MJ Mason, DC McCraith, DH Morgan, Mrs JA Muncey, CR Nightingale, Dr JPR Orme, R Page, EJ Pateman, A Riley, Mrs DP Roberts, NJ Scarr, J Shepperson, Mrs GJ Smith, Mrs HM Smith, RGR Smith, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, RT Summerfield, Mrs VM Trueman, RJ Turner, Dr SEK van de Ven, Mrs BE Waters, DALG Wherrell, Dr JR Williamson, NIC Wright and SS Ziaian-Gillan

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors JP Chatfield, Dr JA Heap, Mrs CA Hunt, JA Quinlan, JH Stewart and TJ Wotherspoon.

**1. HOUSING OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

Before the formal meeting, a briefing on the housing stock options appraisal was given by Stephen Hampson (Housing and Environmental Services Director) , Solma Ahmed (Community Housing Task Force, ODPM), Robin Tebbut (HACAS Chapman Hendy) and Jon Holden (PS Consultants, independent tenant advisor).

It was noted that the deadline for considering options for the future of the housing stock was July 2005. Those options were: to retain the stock; to transfer it to a housing association; to use a private finance initiative; or to form arms-length management arrangements. A mixture of the options could be used. Tenants must be involved in the considerations and the final decision must have their support. A number of different methods would be used to inform and consult them.

The guests answered a number of questions, in which it was made clear that there would be no additional funding from the Government but that meeting the Decent Homes standard was the goal and the option chosen must be aimed towards that. There was no fifth option. The Housing and Environmental Services Director added that the options would be compared against the Council's objectives and that he expected the provision of affordable homes to be high on that list. Equity share-holders would be included in consultations; how the properties would be dealt with in the event of any transfer had still to be considered.

The Chairman thanked the visitors and the tenant representatives who were in attendance and reminded Members that this was one of the major issues on the Performance Plan for the current year so there would be opportunity for debate.

**2. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of Council held on the 24th June 2004 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following:

**Declarations of Interest** (Minute 4)

Councillor R Page claimed that the Monitoring Officer's advice on the declaration of interests was important and wrong in saying that if a Member had fought for a cause s/he could not then take part in debate and voting on the matter, and that the Minutes were very inaccurate and too brief. He felt that it was important to have the full text of the advice in the Minute. Councillor Dr DR Bard queried whether that part of the advice referred only to regulatory committees. The Chairman agreed to take the request away and look at what could be included.

Councillor NJ Scarr pointed to this as another example of where meetings ought to be recorded. He gave a reminder that Councillor Page had raised this in February and that it had slipped again and again, and asked the Chairman to ensure action.

**CASCADE Update** (Minute 8.1)

Councillor Page asked that, in the interests of accountability, Councillor Batchelor's statement at the last meeting that the Council could not withdraw from the Contact Centre because it had spent £1 million should be recorded in the Minutes. Councillor Page considered that the Contact Centre had delivered an inferior means of communication at great cost. Councillor Batchelor stated that he had said that the Council had made a substantial investment, with over £1 million committed, but the reward would be reaped eventually. It was

**AGREED** that the Minutes be amended to record Councillor Batchelor's reference to the cost of the Contact Centre.

**Scrutiny and Overview**

Councillor DALG Wherrell commented that he had also raised the recording of meetings more than a year previously. He then went on to ask the Chief Executive to explain the results of his investigation into what had happened to cause the sudden last minute withdrawal of the call-in item from the agenda of the last Scrutiny and Overview Committee meeting. The Chief Executive responded that he had not yet completed his investigation but that it appeared the original advice that the decision could be taken by the portfolio holder had been given in the light of the greater freedom being given to portfolio holders. Paragraph 1.3.1 of the Delegation Rules, stating that if the local Member disagreed with a proposal it should be referred to Cabinet, had been overlooked and had not been recognised until just before the Scrutiny and Overview meeting.

Councillor Wherrell asked for a report to the next Council meeting on what action had been taken and Councillor MP Howell, Chairman of the Committee, asked that the report should be presented to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee, to which all Members would be welcome.

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts reiterated requests for fuller reports and recording and her view that the Constitution was far too long for anyone to know all its provisions.

**Appointment of Members of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee** (Minute 14)

The Chief Executive clarified that the reserve member of the Committee was not a substitute in the event of a member being unable to attend, but was the group's nomination should a member resign from the Committee.

**Reports of Meetings** (Minute 21)

Councillor Mrs VM Trueman reported on a planning application which the Parish Council and the two local Members had wanted referred to the Development and Conservation Control Committee but which had been decided at a Chairman's Delegation meeting.



She would have attended that meeting had she known it was possible and asked that the application be taken back so that there could be a site visit. Councillor Mrs JM Healey, Committee Chairman at the time, stated that site visits and referral to Committee were within the discretion of the Chairman. Although it was possible that the local Members might have swayed the decision, there had been lengthy debate and she was satisfied with the decision. It was confirmed that the decision notice had been signed and that the applicants were at liberty to appeal.

The Chairman curtailed detailed descriptions, but agreed that he had always understood that if a local Member requested reference to the full Committee this happened. Councillor RGR Smith, current Committee Chairman, advised Members that if they did not submit comments on an application the assumption was that they agreed with the officers' recommendations.

### 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following interests in items before Council were declared:

Councillor Dr DR Bard	Correspondence had been received from one of the developers in relation to the Local Development Framework. However, it appeared that all Members had received the correspondence
Councillor MP Howell	In references to Papworth Hospital in the Local Development Framework, as a governor and because of his wife's work as a volunteer
Councillor A Riley	In relation to Northstowe, because of the proximity of his dwelling to the site
Councillor SM Edwards	In relation to Northstowe, because of the proximity of his dwelling to the site

### 4. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

The draft Preferred Options reports for the Local Development Framework (LDF) as recommended by officers and Member working groups were presented and Council was invited to approve the reports for public participation purposes. The Chairman emphasised that Members would have the opportunity to discuss the documents further after the public participation.

The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder explained that the timing, which was being driven by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Infrastructure Partnership, was very tight. Knowing that many were reluctant to endorse the high level of development set out in the Structure Plan, Councillor Bard advised that the Council had the opportunity to shape these developments and warned that if the Council did not proceed with making its plans, the Government could step in, possibly with a Development Corporation.

Debate ensued about the level of development required of the area by the Government and, in the view of a number of Members, the wish to refuse to accept that requirement on the grounds that it could not be sustainable. Councillor Bard expressed his sympathy but pointed out that similar arguments were debated during the preparation of the Structure Plan. In addition, he and officers had spent hours recently arguing against the extra 18,000 houses suddenly proposed for the next regional plan, but this did not relate to the papers before Council today.

Turning to Northstowe, Councillor SM Edwards argued that the three site options were equally viable and should be put forward for public consultation as equals, rather than as a preferred option, a variation and a rejected option. The other vital issue was the green separation for existing villages: if option 3 (extending over the railway line) were agreed as viable, the green separation area would have to be changed. Councillor Edwards therefore proposed the removal of reference to the actual amount of green separation pending the result of consultations. He argued that the preservation of the existing villages must be the priority and that the Council should not be forced by the Government to follow a timetable which did not allow for a good planning process.

Councillor A Riley supported Councillor Edwards in general terms, but proposed that there should be no decision on the Northstowe site until the green separation areas had been agreed. In addition, he objected to some of the proposed possible uses (for example allotments, playing fields, cemetery) of the green separation zone. He also considered that far reaching decisions were in danger of being taken in unseemly haste.

Councillor Bard warned that flexibility applied not only to the Council and residents but also to the developers. One of the reasons for the preferred option was that extending the site over the railway line was most likely to expose it to future expansion. He also cautioned against relying too much on green separation being retained in perpetuity. On the guided bus, Councillor Bard reported that the County Council had submitted an application under the Highways and Works Act, which was to be subject to an Inquiry. In principle the line was adjustable, but reopening the debate on the route at this stage would put the project back years. Councillor Bard agreed that the timetable for bringing forward Northstowe was very demanding, but feared that if the Council took an undue amount of time in preparing its plans the result might be that it had no say in decisions on the new town.

It appeared to Members that they were being asked to approve documents under threat from the Government and a request was made that this should be recorded.

In debate, points made included:

- that these were not documents ready to be presented for consultation and should be referred back for further discussion
- that houses at Northstowe would be occupied years before the A14 was improved
- the green separation distance was paramount and 200 metres was insufficient
- the green separation areas should be commuted to the parish council
- there was a real danger of being railroaded on the options being presented to people
- there was little confidence in the boundary of the new town holding
- the Council should not be swayed by developers' plans but consider the detail of a planning application in the same way as any other
- the public should be offered all the options
- it was doubtful whether 8,000 houses and necessary facilities could be accommodated on the old airfield without compromising the green separation
- a site visit should be held
- lessons appeared not to have been learned from Cambourne
- the site was one of the worst in the area for building, being at sea level
- land quality north of the railway line was worse than elsewhere in the area
- Willingham residents were unhappy as the traffic survey had not yet been carried out
- most local people had had no information except from Gallaghers

- all site options were favoured by one developer or another
- the rejected option could be changed to the least preferred

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the Structure Plan set a timetable of a start on site in 2006, and that officers were trying to work to this agenda. On this basis, the first dwellings could possibly be occupied in 2007. The timetable was tight and to meet it difficult decisions would need to be taken. If there were undue delay, those setting the targets would be likely to consider the options available to ensure that development began on time.

He also explained that the Ministry of Defence's interpretation of "previously developed land" offered at the Examination in Public and relied upon by Councillor Edwards was incorrect. This had been confirmed by the Examination in Public Panel, who concluded that the definition as contained in PPG3 was that all of the land within the curtilage of such a site would also be defined as previously developed.

On the amendment proposed by Councillor A Riley, seconded by Councillor Mrs DP Roberts, Council

**RESOLVED** that no decision be made on the site selection for Northstowe until the green separation for Longstanton and Oakington has been decided.

Names were requested and the voting was as follows:

**For the amendment**

Mrs PS Corney	Mrs HF Kember	A Riley
BR Burling	SGM Kindersley	Mrs DP Roberts
Mrs J Dixon	RMA Manning	Mrs VM Trueman
Ms J Doggett	RB Martlew	RJ Turner
SM Edwards	MJ Mason	NJ Scarr
R Hall	DH Morgan	Mrs BE Waters
Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs CAED Murfitt	DALG Wherrell
JA Hockney	CR Nightingale	NIC Wright
MP Howell	EJ Pateman	SS Ziaian-Gillan

**27**

**Against the amendment**

SJ Agnew	RF Bryant	DC McCraith
Dr DR Bard	NN Cathcart	RGR Smith
JD Batchelor	Mrs JM Healey	

**8**

**Abstention**

RE Barrett	HC Hurrell	Mrs HM Smith
EW Bullman	Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs DSK Spink
Mrs A Elsby	Dr JPR Orme	RT Summerfield
SA Harangozo	J Shepperson	De SEK van de Ven
Mrs EM Heazell	Mrs GJ Smith	Dr JR Williamson

**15**

On a further amendment proposed by Councillor A Riley, seconded by Councillor Mrs DP Roberts, Council

**RESOLVED** that all references to "double counting" in the land use budget and possible uses of the green separation in the Northstowe Preferred Options Report be deleted.

Names were requested and the voting was as follows:

**For the amendment**

RE Barrett	MP Howell	J Shepperson	
JD Batchelor	HC Hurrell	Mrs GJ Smith	
RF Bryant	Mrs HF Kember	Mrs HM Smith	
EW Bullman	SGM Kindersley	RGR Smith	
BR Burling	RMA Manning	Mrs DSK Spink	
Mrs PS Corney	RB Martlew	RT Summerfield	
Mrs J Dixon	MJ Mason	Mrs VM Trueman	
Ms J Doggett	Mrs JA Muncey	RJ Turner	
SM Edwards	Mrs CAED Murfitt	Mrs BE Waters	
Mrs A Elsby	CR Nightingale	DALG Wherrell	
R Hall	A Riley	Dr JR Williamson	
SA Harangozo	Mrs DP Roberts	NIC Wright	
Mrs SA Hatton	NJ Scarr	SS Ziaian-Gillan	
JA Hockney			<b>40</b>

**Against the amendment**

SJ Agnew	Mrs JM Healey	Dr JPR Orme	
Dr DR Bard	Mrs EM Heazell	EJ Pateman	
NN Cathcart	DC McCraith	Dr SEK van de Ven	
			<b>9</b>

**Abstention**

DH Morgan			<b>1</b>
-----------	--	--	----------

Councillor SM Edwards clarified that the reference to “re-evaluation” in the amendment circulated would be satisfied by stating that the options would be presented as equals, and on his amendment, seconded by Councillor SJ Agnew, Council

**RESOLVED** that Council present the three site location options for Northstowe as equal options, A, B and C, in order that the public may be consulted in a fair and unbiased way.

Names were requested and the voting was as follows:

**For the amendment**

SJ Agnew	Mrs HF Kember	J Shepperson	
RE Barrett	SGM Kindersley	Mrs GJ Smith	
JD Batchelor	DC McCraith	Mrs HM Smith	
EW Bullman	RMA Manning	RGR Smith	
BR Burling	RB Martlew	Mrs DSK Spink	
Mrs PS Corney	MJ Mason	RT Summerfield	
Mrs J Dixon	Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs VM Trueman	
SM Edwards	Mrs CAED Murfitt	RJ Turner	
Mrs A Elsby	CR Nightingale	Dr SEK van de Ven	
R Hall	Dr JPR Orme	Mrs BE Waters	
SA Harangozo	EJ Pateman	DALG Wherrell	
Mrs SA Hatton	A Riley	Dr JR Williamson	
MP Howell	Mrs DP Roberts	NIC Wright	
HC Hurrell	NJ Scarr	SS Ziaian-Gillan	
			<b>42</b>

**Against the amendment**

Dr DR Bard	NN Cathcart	Mrs JM Healey	
RF Bryant			<b>4</b>

**Abstention**

DH Morgan

Mrs EM Heazell

JA Hockney

**3**

Council then turned to the recommendations contained in the report enclosed in the agenda and

**RESOLVED** that

- (a) the following Local Development Framework Preferred Options reports, incorporating the amendments set out in the schedule of changes (Appendix F to the report), be published for the purpose of public participation:
- Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document
  - Rural Centres Development Plan Document
  - Cambridge East Area Action Plan
  - Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan
  - Northstowe Area Action Plan (incorporating the amendments agreed above)
- (b) the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and Initial Sustainability Appraisal for each of the preferred options papers be published for public participation;
- (c) the following documents be authorised for public consultation:
- Urban Capacity Study
  - Audit and Assessment of Need for Outdoor Play Space and Informal Open Space in South Cambridgeshire
- (d) minor editing and refinement of the Preferred Options public participation papers prior to publication be delegated to the Development Services Director and that any material amendments be agreed by the Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder.

**5. POLICY AND FINANCIAL REVIEW 2005-06**

The recommendations of Cabinet on the 20th July 2004 supporting the need for a five year strategy and a basis for public consultation were circulated at the meeting. The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder apologised for the short time available for consideration but emphasised that the Strategy was not being put forward for approval but, rather, for a process for public consultation. He advised that 4% savings were being requested in order to achieve 2% overall since some proposals would not be acceptable. Councillor Summerfield confirmed that Cabinet had found Appendix E to the report too detailed and was to revisit it.

At the request of Councillor Mrs GJ Smith, it was **AGREED** that there should be at least one public meeting (paragraph (f)). Councillor Mrs Smith also asked that each parish council should be invited to send at least one representative.

The Leader reported that the steering group was to meet the following Tuesday and invited all Members to lobby the group with ideas.

Council

**RESOLVED** to

- (a) support the need for the development of a five year strategy combining service, financial and workforce elements, including the identification of priorities, with a draft going to Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2004;
- (b) approve the revised annual process for Continuous Improvement Plans (CIPs) and budget preparation as indicated in report paragraph 3.3 and Appendix B;
- (c) agree that the authority wishes to remain debt-free and confirm the following financial policies to form part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy:
  - reduction of the working balance to £1.5 million;
  - debt-free status; and
  - use of capital receipts to fund General Fund capital expenditure in addition to the HRA and ICT, subject to the impact on the HRA being acceptable
- (d) agree to conduct public consultation for the Council's future financial strategy, with flexibility in the use of capital receipts;
- (e) indicate a preferred maximum budget option of setting the Council Tax at the shire district average to keep within possible capping criteria, as indicated in Appendix D to the report, adjusted for all capital expenditure to be financed from capital receipts such that a higher level of revenue expenditure is supported; both for the purpose of consultation and to enable officers to start budget planning, but on the clear basis that the final decision will be subject to the results of consultation;
- (f) authorise a *South Cambs Magazine* survey as the most appropriate vehicle for public consultation, with at least one public meeting at the Council offices and a web-based survey; a member/officer steering group being the appropriate means of steering the consultation;
- (g) request portfolio holders to discuss with their lead officers realistic options for savings of 4%, including an indication of the likely amounts, for presentation as part of the public consultation and with a view to savings in 2005/06; and agree that a percentage of savings is to be found from support services.

## 6. 2004-05 PAY AWARD

Cabinet's recommendation of a 4.2% pay award was circulated at the meeting, together with details of the changes to terms and conditions of employment agreed with Unison. The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder outlined the background to local pay negotiations, arising from recruitment and retention difficulties, and Council

**RESOLVED** that a pay award of 4.2% be applied from 1st April 2004 and that budgets be increased by £98,000 to address the resultant shortfall.

Councillor NJ Scarr declared his interest as a Unison official and took no part in the vote.

## 7. POLICY ON TRAVELLER ISSUES

Cabinet on 20th July had recommended the adoption of the policy on Traveller Issues with an amendment to encourage the advance submission of planning applications. The Leader, commending the policy, asked for a further amendment to paragraph 3, adding to point D "engage with the traveller community to make available...". This amendment arose from discussions with the portfolio holder for traveller welfare.

The Leader commented on the meeting with other similarly affected councils at the Local Government Association annual conference, the aim of which had been to get together to lobby the Government rather than to discuss policies. The Head of Policy and Communications added, in reply to a question, that the Parliamentary Select Committee on travellers had made it clear that they wanted comments only from the Local Government Association, which was the reason for the meeting at the conference.

In response to concerns about the proposed amendment to point D, the Community Development Portfolio Holder explained that it arose from issues coming out at the current planning enquiry on land at Cottenham and the need to involve travellers in decisions affecting them. She confirmed that there was to be a joint group including travellers and that the assessment of their needs was progressing. Councillor Mrs Roberts thanked the Head of Policy and Communications for his invaluable help and the Cottenham and Histon Members for their support. The Leader pointed out that local residents were covered in point A.

It was confirmed that retrospective planning applications had to be properly considered; the aim in this document was to encourage travellers to talk to the planners in advance of setting up a site.

Council

**RESOLVED** that the policy on Traveller Issues be adopted as presented, with the following revised wording in paragraph 3:

- D. engage with the traveller community to make available appropriate and authorised traveller sites – identifying suitable additional sites, where necessary, and accommodating the service needs of travellers, wherever possible;
- E. give full consideration to proposed sites when travellers approach the Council in advance about their proposals;

## 8. DURATION OF MEETING

In accordance with standing Order 9 (Duration of Meetings), Council **AGREED** to continue the meeting beyond the four hour limit.

## 9. APPOINTMENTS

Council considered the need for more appointees to the Licensing Committee (to a maximum of 15) in order to spread the workload expected when the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003 came into force on 7th February 2005, and

**RESOLVED** that for 2004/05 the following additional Members be appointed to the Licensing Committee:

Mrs SA Hatton  
 JA Hockney  
 A Riley  
 Dr JR Williamson  
 One further appointee required

Council further

**RESOLVED** that the following appointments be made:

<b>South Cambs Magazine Editorial Panel</b>	Mrs CAED Murfitt Dr SEK van de Ven
<b>Cambridge Southern Fringe Member Reference Group</b>	Chairman Development and Conservation Control Committee Mrs EM Heazell (Haslingfield) Mrs HF Kember (Shelford) CR Nightingale (Shelford)
<b>Cambridge East Member Reference Group</b>	Planning & Economic Development Portfolio Holder Ms CA Hunt (Teversham) RJ Turner (Fen Ditton) Ms SJO Doggett or NJ Scarr (Fulbourn) <i>[Ms Doggett is to be the representative]</i>

## 10. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

The Chairman's engagements since the last meeting were **NOTED**.

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.07 p.m.**

---



**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	Council	26th August 2004
<b>AUTHOR/S:</b>	Finance and Resources Director	

**RECORDING OF MEETINGS**

**Purpose**

1. To consider whether discussions at meetings should be recorded electronically.

Effect on Corporate Objectives

- |    |                              |   |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| 2. | Quality, Accessible Services | Recording of debates could help full information on decision making more accessible |
|----|------------------------------|---|

**Background**

3. On a notice of motion from Councillor R Page, Council on 26th February 2004 agreed that the legal, financial and practical implications of recording meetings should be investigated and a report made to Council (Minute 13.1).
4. A communiqué was sent round to the Democratic Services sections of the local authorities in the Eastern region. Of those that responded only Peterborough Unitary Authority recorded their meetings. None of the officers who responded had any positive comments to make about recording meetings, which appears to be an unusual practice. The only exception to this was the installation of web-cams that broadcast meetings live onto the Internet. Cambridgeshire County Council, Essex County Council, Brentwood Borough Council all either have web-cams or have submitted orders for such a service to the company UKCouncil.
5. It should be noted that Section 100 of the 1972 Local Government Act states that Councils are not obliged to record meetings. Standing Order 21.4 prohibits the recording of meetings without a resolution. Councillors will need to consider if they wish to amend Standing Orders to allow just official Council recording and not public recording, or allow public and Council recording.

**Considerations**

***Alterations in Practice***

6. If meetings are to be recorded then certain established practices will have to alter.

Identifying Speakers

7. All speakers will need to state their name or job title clearly at the beginning of a contribution and indicate whether they have a particular reason for making the contribution (e.g. local member).

In Confidential Session

8. The recording machine would need to be switched off when the meetings go into private session and this would cause a short interruption to the meeting.

**Security**

Criteria for Member Access

9. Members will need to consider who will have access to these recordings and who will respond to related member requests. Members may prefer to access the records themselves. Democratic Services could keep two copies of all recordings. One copy to be lent out to a member on request, the other to always remain on site, accessible from the computers in the portfolio holders' room, to ensure recordings are available on demand. Alternatively, Democratic Services could be responsible for processing all requests regarding these records. There could be resource implications if there were a large number of requests. It would be advisable to have a trial period of whichever option Members decide on.

Criteria for Public Access

10. This report recommends that for practical reasons, members of the public are not permitted access to this information, with the exception that during a planning appeal, appellants would have to be allowed access to the same records as the Council. It would be difficult for the public to either receive or download these records electronically due to the size of the files, which would probably be over 100 megabytes for each meeting. E-mails sent from the Council are currently restricted to be no more than 1 megabyte. It is possible that only the most current recording of each public meeting be kept on the Internet. The Council does not have the resources to allow a member of the public to access this information at the Council offices. The time it takes to transcribe even a short passage in recorded minutes would make it impossible for current staff to comply with requests from the public. It is possible to allow members of the public to pay for the minutes to be transcribed by a professional company, although this option for most people would be prohibitively expensive. Peterborough Unitary Authority does not transcribe their recordings for the public, except for appeals which are available to both parties.

Providing Transcriptions

11. This report recommends that officers should be required to transcribe no more than short passages from recorded meetings. Peterborough Unitary Authority warn that it takes an officer about a day to transcribe an hour of meeting. Due to time taken finding the relevant point in the recording, it takes an officer about half an hour to transcribe a specific point made by a member. If members envisage making regular requests, then serious consideration should be given to appointing extra staff.
12. Members will need to decide who should have access to these recordings. If access is to be restricted then a criteria will be required and maintained by designated officers. Council may wish to consider allowing the public to hire a private company to transcribe the records of the relevant meeting. The charges vary, but one company charges £120 an hour (of their time). Another charges £100 for every 7,200 words.

Storage

13. Although neither disks or CDs take up a large amount of room, space is not limitless. Councillors will need to decide how long these records should be kept. Alternatively the records could be sent to the County archives.

***Practicalities***

14. Council will need to decide which meetings will be recorded. The officer suggestion is that it should be restricted to only public meetings that are held in the Council Chamber.

Quality of Recording

15. Members will need to speak clearly into their microphones to ensure that their voice is properly recorded.

Options

16. A company called Tyco installed the microphones in the Council Chamber and have been approached regarding the possibility of installing some form of recording device that would be linked to the microphones. The option of using a tape recording system has been rejected as it would be more expensive and more limited than other alternatives. The Tyco engineer indicated that the most suitable option is the use of an MP3 player that could be attached to the microphone system. The engineer stated that the cost would be between £500 to £1,000 and he was prepared to give a free demonstration.

***Web-Casting***

17. The other option is web-casting and UKCouncil, who implemented the County Council system, appear to be the leaders in this field. This would record sound and pictures and would allow residents and officers to view meetings in progress or search through the archives for previous meetings, without having to attend any meetings. This is the most ambitious option and would enhance the Council's e-government strategy.
18. By broadcasting in real time the Council would have no control over the records kept and quotes could easily be taken out of context.

Resources Required for Web-Casting

19. The system requires an officer to operate the camera during the meeting and the system would need to be set up and taken down before and after each public meeting. The officer(s) responsible for this would need to be IT literate and be able to recognise members, but would also be required to spend hours in a meeting operating the system.
20. UKCouncil state that they would be able to provide 25 hours a month web-casting time for an annual cost of £21,600. More information regarding web-casting and its additional benefits are included in appendix 1. The quality of the recordings can be assessed by visiting UKCouncil's web-site on: [www.ukcouncil.net](http://www.ukcouncil.net)

Financial Implications

21. The cost of implementing a sound recording system would be a one-off cost of between £500 to £1,000. The cost of implementing a web-casting system would be an annual cost of £21,600, if done by UKCouncil. Members should note that a budget would have to be identified.

Legal Implications

22. The courts and the Standards Board for England can require release of recordings. Appellants would be allowed access to the recorded tapes of files of the relevant public meetings. This could lead to more cautious advice from officers.

Staffing Implications

23. There would be no staffing implications providing that any requests for a full transcription of a meeting are contracted out to a commercial company and requests for specific quotes from individual members are kept to a minimum.
24. Additional officers would be required to comply with frequent requests for transcripts of meetings. This could be avoided if a sensible criteria was agreed that ensured that only occasional requests for transcripts were received.
25. The installation of a web-casting system would require an extra officer to be present at each meeting to operate this system.

Risk Management Implications

26. Recording meetings could aid appeals against decisions made by the Council. There is the risk that comments that had little influence on the meeting could be taken out of context.

Consultations

27. Tyco and UKCouncil have been consulted, as have the local authorities in the eastern region.

Conclusions/Summary

28. The main benefit of recording meetings would be the improvement in record keeping. Unfortunately no recording system exists that will easily allow the recorded word to be accessed quickly without an increase in officer hours. The cost needs to be considered as there is no specific budget, with money available, for the implementation of a recording system. Recording meetings could restrict officers from providing unambiguous advice and restrict members from expressing clear opinions due to the concern that their comments could be quoted out of context in subsequent appeals.

Recommendations

29. Council need to decide whether to continue to pursue this issue in light of the disadvantages highlighted in this report.

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: A Business Cast for Web-Casting (a document from UKCouncil)  
Web-Casting Frequently Asked Questions (a document from UKCouncil)  
Focus (May 2004 edition) Article: "Democracy Online"

**Contact Officer:** Patrick Adams – Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713408

## Webcasting – discussion paper

### What is webcasting?

'Webcasting' means transmitting a video signal ('streaming') out to the Internet in real-time via a specialised website. Anyone with access to the Internet, an appropriate viewing tool (Real Player or Windows Media Player), and speakers/soundcard on their PC can then view such events 'live'.

In addition because the video signal is digital, such events can also be captured on disc (archived) and viewed at any later date. Webcasts can be viewed via the Internet or an Intranet. The actual picture is only about 3" square, but the movement is smooth and, more importantly, the sound quality is good<sup>1</sup>. Although access to webcast events would be via the Councils website (or the Intranet for staff / Members), this would simply provide a link to the specialised site from which the video would be streamed.

The two main key features of webcasting is firstly the ability to stream both live and archive (on demand) content. This makes this an extremely effective communication tool as it enables viewers to look at content where and when they want rather than needing to attend the council at a set time. Secondly by using the internet as the transmission medium it is also possible to 'attach or link' related information to the webcast to enhance the viewing experience.

### Why webcast?

There are a number of arguments in favour of webcasting which break down as follows:

1. Webcasting is a tool for e-democracy  
The e-democracy landscape is still being defined however webcasting is being consistently mentioned as part of the emerging picture and a number of leading Councils are already using the technology. Key points are:
  - Seamless transmission of meetings/events/briefings makes the council more accessible and transparent to its citizens
  - There is a clear case for showing that webcasting encourages e-participation by giving citizens access to core council business without the intermediary of Council minutes or media coverage
  - Most people receive most of their information from words and pictures – not by reading it. Webcasting communicates with people using a medium that they are familiar with and that they trust
2. Webcasting has a wide application within the communication strategy than just supporting an e-democracy agenda. Webcasting can be a useful internal communication tool to enable officers and members to keep up to date with current debate and can also be a simple way of adding multimedia content to the website – something that users are increasingly interested in seeing.

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that, sometimes, organisations claim to be webcasting if they have one or more fixed cameras at a variety of locations showing a particular view which is updated every 15 to 60 minutes. This is normally known as a webcam. This report does not cover this style of webcasting

3. Webcasting is not limited to formal meetings and as such can deliver excellent value for money. Other content that has been webcast by local authorities includes:
  - Events
  - Internal and external briefings
  - Promotional content (e.g. tourism videos)
  - Training content
4. Implementing leading edge technology enhances our reputation as a forward thinking and innovative authority.

It should also be noted that councils that have commenced webcasting have received a positive rating from the Audit Commission (within the CPA process) on the contribution to communication of webcasting.

### **What are the different approaches to implementation?**

There are a number of issues to consider with respect to implementation. Chiefly these are:

#### **Content capture**

Minimum disruption to meetings – we don't want to build a requirement for intrusive cameramen or technology into our meetings. The solution we choose needs to be discrete and not distract from the main business of the events and meetings we are webcasting. We also need to ensure that any webcasting project has the most minimal impact on staff resources as possible and can be serviced from our current skills base.

#### **Value added information**

On examination of what other authorities are doing it is clear that just streaming audio/video content is not enough. In order for webcasting to be effective the content needs to be communicated with additional contextual information such as speaker names and agenda items to ensure that the viewer can make sense of what they are seeing. It's also extremely important to index archived meetings to ensure that viewers can go straight to the content that they need. To ensure maximum value from this cross department support on considering and proving access to relevant information will be important.

#### **Infrastructure requirements**

We need to minimise impact on our IT infrastructure. We have assumed that we do not want to increase our IT overhead with streaming servers etc and that we want a solution that has a small footprint on our environment.

#### **Service and support**

Given that a number of other Council's are already webcasting we want to be able to learn from their experiences rather than developing systems and processes from scratch ourselves.

#### **Promotion and communication**

To ensure value is achieved it will be essential to incorporate a suitable promotion and communication strategy not only at the launch of the webcasting facilities but also on an ongoing basis.

### **Who else is webcasting?**

There are currently 14 Councils webcasting regularly and up to 50 Councils who have webcast at least one event. There are also an increasing number (currently in excess of 50 Councils) actively considering webcasting. You can see specific examples of Local Government webcast content on the following Council's websites:

- <http://www.hullcc.gov.uk/webcast/index.php>
- [www.lancashire.gov.uk](http://www.lancashire.gov.uk)
- <http://www.wakefield.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/OnlineServices/Webcasting/default.htm>
- <http://www.london.gov.uk/webcasts.jsp>

### **What can it be used for?**

To achieve the best value from the project and good take up of the technology a planned programme of other meetings and events should also be considered. These events should be based on those likely to engage citizens, boost use of the service, and create a positive PR for the organisation.

Use in internal communications should also be maximised to realise value; for example, webcasting and archiving Staff Briefings for those who cannot attend would be one way to use webcasting to enhance and improve communication with staff.

Nearly all councils that are currently webcasting have experienced a significant enhancement to their internal communications abilities through allowing access to meetings for staff and more specific staff briefings. There are also potential internal training and induction courses benefits which should be considered for Members/Officers

### **Who is providing the service – potential suppliers?**

There are a large number of 'webcasting' companies within the UK who could provide encoding and hosting abilities, however only one - UKCouncil which offer a more complete service to match the required services. This includes not only the hardware and software required to webcast with value added content but also training and process support to assist the Council in rolling out the technology in the most effective way possible. Their system meets the key criteria listed and is constantly being updated to reflect evolving webcasting best practise.

UKCouncil are the current market leaders providing webcasting services to 95% of the Local Authorities that are/have webcast in the UK plus SOLACE, IDeA LGA and all 3 Political Parties. In addition they also manage the only Local Authority webcasting user group which is an ideas exchange and development forum attended by Authorities webcasting within the UK.

In addition there has only been one Local Authority that has gone through a full procurement tender process for webcasting services, being Devon County Council. Details of their evaluation might be available however they appointed UKCouncil Ltd

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

There appears to be sufficient evidence to confirm that as a technology it operates successfully provided it is set up and operated correctly. Measuring what it is used for and viewership is an ongoing exercise and is linked to what a Council is looking to achieve and how. Based on the information our recommendation is .....

**Additional information that has appeared in Council briefing documents:**

***What degree of editorial control should there be (if any) and what protocols would be needed for camera operators?***

The Director of Broadcasting for the Houses of Commons and Lords has the longest and richest history of such broadcasting in the UK. Their written standards have the following key points:

- No 'editorial' control of content should be exercised.
- Cameras should focus on the person speaking in a head and torso shot and when no-one is speaking, the Chairperson.
- There may be reasons why a different kind of shot is sometimes appropriate. This will be laid out in written guidelines.

***What training is required for staff?***

To deliver some of the more innovative and beneficial elements of Webcasting the officer(s) running the project should be skilled in PR and event management to maximise positive media coverage. Staff operating the equipment will need to be trained in its use and will need to receive training on the protocols adopted. This would most likely be supplied by the chosen webcasting company.

***What protocols would be needed for members?***

Members do not need any specific protocols regarding webcasting. Professional conduct, which is already common to all Council meetings, is all that is required.

It is recommended that guidelines should be adopted about use of microphones and fixed seating plans to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of webcasts.

***What training is required for members?***

Generally there is no specific training required for members although webcasting should be mentioned in the Members induction. Members should also be made aware of the cameras' presence at the beginning of each meeting.

It is recommended that Chairpersons do receive training on webcasting as although significant changes are not required it makes for a far more effective and accessible record of the meeting if certain verbal techniques for 'signposting' the meeting and explaining proceeding are adopted. This training need only be brief (1 hour) and could be shortened further if assimilated into other training for Chair people.

***What happens if certain members do not wish to be filmed? (right to refuse under data protection act)***

The importance of adhering to Data Protection legislation is absolutely recognised but it should not be seen as a barrier to webcasting.

Should a Member not wish to be shown this can be achieved – a blank screen and a message explaining the Member does not wish to be shown can appear when they contribute to a webcast meeting. It is important to note that in practice there is only



one instance of this across tens of councils and hundreds of Members working with webcasting of their meetings.

Members of the public attending meetings should be made aware that the meeting is going to be webcast (signage, Chairperson announcement, and information leaflets available on request) but in Councils currently running the system it is not common practice to ask permission to film the public. Although members of the public may be caught on camera incidentally in the course of filming proceedings (depending on seating and room layout), guidelines dictate that the public gallery is not deliberately shown.

For special events permission will be sought from those involved on a case by case basis. This will require particularly careful planning in the case of youth events though there are Councils with experience in this area that are available to advise the Council.

### ***Would it be best to go for a 'pilot' scheme first?***

Yes. If webcasting is taken forward a pilot scheme lasting one year is recommended. A period of a year is necessary so the impact and implications of the project can be fully realized.

### ***With the Chamber having listed building status, is it actually possible to install fixed cameras in the Council Chamber?***

Yes it is possible, because it is not necessary to fix anything to the fabric of the Chamber in order to have a 'fixed' system.

### ***Risks and assumptions***

This project requires significant investment; in services from suppliers and staff time to run the project. The expenditure is justifiable if the benefits of the technology can be realised. The biggest risk the project faces is not leveraging the technology to its full extent and therefore not getting value for money from the expenditure. Hence the recommendation of a full programme of 'other' events webcast combined with full officer support is provided.

Related to the above paragraph is the risk that if only Council meetings are webcast the Authority risks negative publicity because costs of the technology could be perceived as unacceptably high. To date no negative publicity has been received from the Councils currently webcasting indeed in Lancashire County Council specific support and encouragement from the local press has been evidenced

There are always risks related to technology failure however webcasting is well established technology and should not be considered to be at any greater risk of failure than other IT systems.

### ***Legal implications***

There are two legal issues raised by webcasting technology: Data protection and privacy and the admissibility of webcasting footage as legal evidence.

On the issue of data protection and privacy please see paragraphs above.

On the issue of admissibility as evidence Members should note that legally webcasting footage can be used by, for example, The Standards Board for England as evidence. In practice there is only one case where this has been tested and it was to the benefit of Members in Camden who were able to demonstrate that in a planning decision due process had been followed and thus avoid a judicial review. In this case the minutes of a meeting were not a clear enough record to settle the matter. There has been a case at Lancs CC whereby an incident due to be reported in the Local Paper on the behaviour of the Leader of the Council was proven to be different to the proposed report.

**CABINET**

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on  
Thursday, 24 June 2004

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs DSK Spink MBE (Leader of Council)

Councillors:	RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader of Council and Finance & Resources Portfolio Holder
	Dr DR Bard	Planning & Economic Development Portfolio Holder
	JD Batchelor	Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability & Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder
	SGM Kindersley	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder

---

**Procedural Items**

---

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None declared.

---

**Decisions made by the Cabinet and reported for information**

---

**2. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY LEADER**

On the nomination of Councillor Mrs DP Roberts, seconded by Councillor Mrs EM Heazell and there being no further nominations, it was

**AGREED** that Councillor RT Summerfield be elected as Deputy Leader of the Council for the coming year.

**3. ALLOCATION OF PORTFOLIOS**

Cabinet **AGREED** the following Portfolios:

Community Development	Mrs DP Roberts
Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning	Mrs JM Healey
Environmental Health	SGM Kindersley
Housing	Mrs EM Heazell
Information and Customer Services	JD Batchelor
Planning and Economic Development	Dr DR Bard
Resources and Staffing	RT Summerfield

**4. APPOINTMENTS**

Cabinet **AGREED** the following appointments:

**Conservation Advisory Group (10 Members)**

SJ Agnew	R Page
NN Cathcart	JA Quinlan
Dr JA Heap	RGR Smith
Ms CA Hunt	RJ Turner
Dr JPR Orme	NIC Wright

& Mrs JM Healey, Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder

**Equity Share Advisory Group (10 Members)**

EW Bullman	DH Morgan
Ms SJO Doggett	Mrs BE Waters
Mrs A Elsby	DALG Wherrell
MP Howell	

& Mrs EM Heazell, Housing Portfolio Holder

**Land Drainage Advisory Group (13 Members)**

EW Bullman	A Riley
Ms J Dixon	J Shepperson
SM Edwards	Mrs HM Smith
Mrs SA Hatton	RGR Smith
RMA Manning	Dr JR Williamson
MJ Mason	NIC Wright
EJ Pateman	

& SGM Kindersley, Environmental Health Portfolio Holder

**Milton Country Park Advisory Group (7 Members)**

R Hall	Mrs JA Muncey
Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs HM Smith (Local Member)
Mrs HF Kember	RT Summerfield (Local Member)
MJ Mason	

& Mrs DP Roberts, Community Development Portfolio Holder

**Planning Policy Advisory Group (9 Members)**

RF Bryant	Mrs CAED Murfitt
Ms J Dixon	CR Nightingale
R Hall	JH Stewart
MJ Mason	TJ Wotherspoon
DH Morgan	

& Dr DR Bard, Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder  
 & Mrs JM Healey, Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning PFH  
 & Chairman of Development and Conservation Control Committee

**Travellers Consultative Group (10 Members)**

Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
RE Barrett	Cabinet appointment (confirmation awaited)
Ms J Dixon	Cabinet appointment (Cottenham Ward)
Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder ( <i>as required</i> )
SGM Kindersley	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
Mrs JA Muncey	Cabinet appointment (Histon Ward)
Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder
Mrs HM Smith	Cabinet appointment (Milton Ward)

2 Development and Conservation Control Committee appointments  
 & local member(s) when specific sites are under discussion or where matters of policy

will affect the parish(es)

#### **Waste Management Advisory Group (9 Members)**

JP Chatfield	Mrs GJ Smith
Dr SA Harangozo	Mrs BE Waters
RB Martlew	DALG Wherrell
Mrs CAED Murfitt	Dr JR Williamson
NJ Scarr	
& SGM Kindersley, Environmental Health Portfolio Holder	

#### **Housing Options Appraisal Working Group**

It was **AGREED** that six Members be appointed to the Housing Options Appraisal Working Group from amongst those Members who had indicated an interest in housing issues, once those Members had been advised of the probable work and time commitments for the Working Group.

#### **Member Training Advisory Group**

It was **AGREED** that the following members be appointed to the Member Training Advisory Group and that further expressions of interest be sought:

Mrs SA Hatton	DALG Wherrell
Mrs BE Waters	
& JD Batchelor, Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder	

#### **Northstowe Member Steering Group**

Cabinet **AGREED** to co-opt onto the Northstowe Member Steering Group all local Members with immediate interests in the area, although any co-opted Member could decline appointment if he/she chose. It was confirmed that City Councillor Jenny Bailey had been appointed by Cambridge City Council. It was therefore **AGREED** that the Steering Group comprise:

Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
BR Burling	Willingham & Over Ward
Mrs PS Corney	Willingham & Over Ward
Ms J Dixon	Cottenham Ward
SM Edwards	Cottenham Ward
R Hall	Bar Hill Ward
Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder
RMA Manning	Willingham & Over Ward
A Riley	Longstanton Ward
Mrs DSK Spink	Leader of Council
Mrs BE Waters	Bar Hill Ward
TJ Wotherspoon	Cottenham Ward
& Development and Conservation Control Committee Chairman with Development and Conservation Control Committee Vice-Chairman or shadow portfolio holder as substitute	
Jenny Bailey	Cambridge City Council
John Reynolds	Cambridgeshire County Council member for Girton Ward (substitute: Shona Johnstone, member for Willingham Ward)

Cabinet **AGREED** to disband the Health Improvement Advisory Group.

**Joint and Outside Bodies**

Cabinet **AGREED** the following appointments:

**County Council / Cambridge City / South Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Forum**

Mrs DSK Spink	Leader of Council
Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
JD Batchelor	Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder
Chairman or Vice-Chairman of	Development and Conservation Control Committee
RT Summerfield (substitute)	Deputy Leader of Council

**Cambridgeshire Councils' Association**

Mrs DSK Spink	Leader of Council
RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader of Council
Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder
Mrs EM Heazell (substitute)	Housing Portfolio Holder

**South Cambridgeshire Environment & Transport Area Joint Committee**

Mrs DSK Spink	Leader of Council
RT Summerfield	Deputy Leader of Council
Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
JD Batchelor	Information and Customer Services Portfolio Holder
SGM Kindersley	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
Mrs DP Roberts (substitute)	Community Development Portfolio Holder

**South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership Board**

Mrs DSK Spink	Leader of Council
Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder

Cabinet **CONFIRMED** the following appointments made by Council:

**Camb Sport**

Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder
----------------	--

**Cambridge City Centre Consultative Forum**

Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
------------	--

**Cambridgeshire ACRE (Local Agenda 21)**

Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder
---------------	--

**Cambridgeshire Councils' Association Waste Forum**

SGM Kindersley	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
----------------	---------------------------------------

**Cambridgeshire Transport Forum Reference Group**

Dr DR Bard	Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder
------------	--

**East Anglia Tourist Board**

Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder
---------------	--

**East of England Regional Assembly**

Mrs DSK Spink	Leader of Council
---------------	-------------------

**Local Government Association: General Assembly and Rural Commission**

Mrs DSK Spink

Leader of Council

Mrs JM Healey

Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning  
Portfolio Holder

**5. APPOINTMENT OF AN EXECUTIVE MEMBER TO ATTEND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

Cabinet **AGREED** that Councillor Dr DR Bard attend the Local Government Association Annual Conference from 6-9 July 2004 in Bournemouth.

It was **NOTED** that Council had appointed Councillor Mrs GJ Smith as the non-executive Member to attend the Conference.

**6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was **AGREED** that the Cabinet meeting programmed for the 8th July 2004 be postponed to Tuesday, 20th July 2004 at 9.00 a.m. *[time subsequently changed to 2.30 p.m.]*; but that normally the start time of Cabinet meetings revert to 10.00 a.m.

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.50 p.m.**

---

This page is intentionally left blank



**CABINET**

At a meeting of the Cabinet held on  
Tuesday, 20 July 2004

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs DSK Spink MBE (Leader of Council)  
Councillor RT Summerfield (Deputy Leader of Council and Finance & Resources Portfolio Holder)

<b>Councillors:</b>	Dr DR Bard	Planning & Economic Development Portfolio Holder
	JD Batchelor	Information & Customer Services Portfolio Holder
	Mrs JM Healey	Conservation, Sustainability & Community Planning Portfolio Holder
	Mrs EM Heazell	Housing Portfolio Holder
	SGM Kindersley	Environmental Health Portfolio Holder
	Mrs DP Roberts	Community Development Portfolio Holder

Councillors RF Bryant, Ms SJO Doggett, Mrs A Elsby, Mrs SA Hatton, MP Howell, Dr JPR Orme, J Shepperson, Mrs BE Waters and Dr JR Williamson were in attendance, by invitation.

---

**Procedural Items**


---

**1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The Leader was authorised to sign the minutes of the meetings held on 20<sup>th</sup> May and 24<sup>th</sup> June 2004 as correct records.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None declared.

---

**Recommendations to Council and  
Decisions made by Cabinet and reported for information**


---

**3. POLICY AND FINANCIAL REVIEW 2005-06**

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder introduced the report outlining a potential framework for the future planning of Council services and budgets, and for public consultation on available options.

Clarifications were sought and given:

- Both Members and senior officers would participate in discussions about progress against the Corporate Objectives and issues to be addressed in formulating a corporate medium term strategy (report paragraph 2.6);
- It was desirable to begin public consultation as early as possible during the year, although it was necessary to know the Council's financial position as a base so the public were aware of any financial constraints and could make an informed decision if asked to prioritise options;
- The replacement Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) process would be less complicated than its predecessor, allowing the Council's financial position to be clear by the end of the calendar year;

- The Council was likely to avoid capping in 2005/06, but not in 2006/07 and subsequent years if the current criteria remained in force;
- The possible 2% savings per annum would be across all departments;
- Although progress towards the Decent Homes Standard could be slowed by one year, it was a rolling programme of improvements and could not continue to be slowed annually;
- The recent BMG Community Development survey could be used to help formulate questions for the public consultation; and
- Appendix E contained examples of the kinds of questions which could be asked, not recommended actual questions.

Financial options were discussed. The options appeared to be to borrow, since the advantages of being debt free had significantly reduced; to make savings elsewhere, or to finance non Housing Revenue Account (HRA) capital expenditure from capital receipts instead of from the General Fund revenue account. It was noted that transitional relief on the pooling of Right to Buy capital receipts, due to the debt free status, was estimated to be worth about £4.6 million in total, but that this had to be used for affordable housing. After the transitional period, 75% of Right to Buy receipts would have to be pooled, but the remainder could be used for General Fund or HRA purposes.

The Finance and Resources Director confirmed that the £26.601 million in reserves from capital receipts (paragraph 4.7) was reduced by the amount already identified for funding capital grants otherwise funded from revenue.

Councillor JD Batchelor asked for a further option, taking into account some flexibility in the use of capital reserves, although Council would first have to accept that not all capital receipts would be allocated solely for housing. Councillor RT Summerfield pointed out that £1 million capital receipts would finance a £20 reduction in Band D Council Tax. The Finance and Resources Director advised that this option had not been put forward because of Council's policy decision not to use capital reserves for General Fund spending, most recently through the Housing Strategy and HRA Business Plan adopted by Council on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2004.

The Housing Portfolio Holder reminded members that it was an awkward time to reduce or remove HRA funding as it would limit the options available to tenants during the recently commenced Housing Stock Options survey. The Housing and Environmental Services Director expected to be asked to provide exemplifications of the impact on the HRA of any changes in the use of capital receipts and offered to provide a more detailed report for Cabinet in October.

Cabinet considered but rejected a recommendation for a review of the scope to increase income from fees and charges because in the only areas where significant income could be generated, development control and building control, fees and charges were restricted by law.

Members discussed the most appropriate methods of consulting the public, being aware of the small numbers who had attended public consultation meetings the previous year. It was recognised that responses to a questionnaire with *South Cambs Magazine* would be self-selecting but, on previous experience, this method would elicit the greatest number of responses and at a relatively modest cost. The Head of Policy and Communications gave an assurance that, although there was a requirement to consult, the method was not specified.

Cabinet **RECOMMEND THAT COUNCIL**

- (a) support the need for the development of a five year strategy combining service, financial and workforce elements, including the identification of priorities, with a draft going to Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2004;
- (b) approve the revised annual process for Continuous Improvement Plans (CIPs) and budget preparation as indicated in report paragraph 3.3 and Appendix B;
- (c) agree that the authority wishes to remain debt-free and confirm the following financial policies to form part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy:
  - reduction of the working balance to £1.5 million;
  - debt-free status; and
  - use of capital receipts to fund General Fund capital expenditure in addition to the HRA and ICT, subject to the impact on the HRA being acceptable
- (d) agree to conduct public consultation for the Council's future financial strategy, with flexibility in the use of capital receipts;
- (e) indicate a preferred maximum budget option of setting the Council Tax at the shire district average to keep within possible capping criteria as indicated in Appendix D to the report, adjusted for all capital expenditure to be financed from capital receipts such that a higher level of revenue expenditure is supported; both for the purpose of consultation and to enable officers to start budget planning, but on the clear basis that the final decision will be subject to the results of consultation;
- (f) authorise a *South Cambs Magazine* survey as the most appropriate vehicle for public consultation, possibly with one public meeting at the Council offices and a web-based survey; a member/officer steering group being the appropriate means of steering the consultation;
- (g) request Portfolio Holders to discuss with their lead officers realistic options for savings of 4%, including an indication of the likely amounts, for presentation as part of the public consultation and with a view to savings in 2005/06; and agree that a percentage of savings are to be found from support services.

Cabinet **AGREED**

- (a) that Councillors JD Batchelor, Mrs DSK Spink and RT Summerfield be appointed to the Member / officer steering group for the public consultation exercise;
- (b) that the Member / officer steering group meet as soon as possible in view of the need to proceed quickly in this matter, noting the deadlines for the September issue of *South Cambs Magazine*.

**4. 2004-05 PAY AWARD**

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder circulated the outcome of the Joint Pay Award Panel meeting of 19th July and explained that it was important to adhere to the policies agreed in 2003/04 to keep the competitive edge for staff recruitment and retention. Councillor Mrs DP Roberts supported the recommendations and suggested that performance on recruitment and retention should be reviewed in one year to see if the new policies were successful.

The Chief Executive confirmed that it was now felt that there were strong benefits to maintaining core hours but that this would be discussed further at a later date. He explained that the Council's approach to market supplements was reviewed on an individual basis for those few staff receiving supplements; it was possible the supplement could drop at review time as the basic rates rose.

**Cabinet RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL**

that a pay award of 4.2% be applied from 1st April 2004 and that budgets be increased by £98,000 to address the resultant shortfall.

**Cabinet AGREED**

- (a) that a commitment be made to reviewing the Council's approach to alternative forms of working, including the use of term time contracts and annualised hours, by March 2006, subject to consultation with UNISON on the detailed proposals;
- (b) that further consultation be held on the removal of core hours from the flexible working hours policy;
- (c) that all flexi-leave provision be capped at:
  - 2004/05 – 8 days
  - 2005/06 – 6 days
  - 2006/07 – 4 days
- (d) that the accumulation of flexi-leave beyond the above levels be granted only in exceptional circumstances, subject to Chief Officer approval;
- (e) that a corporate time recording system be introduced, subject to consultation with UNISON on the detailed proposals;
- (f) that one concessionary leave day for new and existing employees be withdrawn effective 2005/06 (affecting Christmas 2005), to be reinstated only when an extra day is required to close the Council Offices between Christmas and New Year and for that purpose only; and
- (g) that overtime arrangements be reviewed subject to consultation with UNISON on the detailed proposals.

**5. TRAVELLERS POLICY**

The Head of Policy and Communications explained that the policy was developed to combine all existing Travellers policy statements into one document, to inform applicants for the new Travellers Project Manager post of the Council's policy, and to demonstrate the Council's commitment to these issues to the local communities and national policy makers. Members commended the Head of Policy and Communications on the report, and asked that point E of paragraph 3 of the Policy be re-phrased to clarify that the Council would give full consideration to proposed private sites when travellers approached the Council in advance, rather than with a retrospective planning application.

The Leader clarified that the role of the Travellers Project Manager was not a site manager for Cottenham, as had been reported in the media.

**Cabinet RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the policy on Traveller Issues be adopted.

---

**Decisions made by the Cabinet and reported for information**

---

**6. PENSIONS - EMPLOYEES PRE 1972**

The Finance and Resources Director explained that it was preferable to have a clear Council policy for calculating Compensatory Added Years (CAY) for employees with pre-1972 service, rather than dealing with each case on an individual basis. The policy would affect any staff who were being made redundant or retired in the interests of service efficiency, who were over the age of 50, and who had 5 or more years of pensionable service.

Cabinet **AGREED**

to adopt a policy of awarding Compensatory Added Years (CAY) including pre-1972 service, where appropriate, whether or not the employee has made additional contributions in order to uprate their pre-1972 service, so long as this does not provide the employee with a greater benefit than they would be received at their expected date of retirement.

**7. PENSIONS - FIXED TERM EMPLOYEES**

The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder advised that new legislation meant that employees on fixed-term contracts would have the same pension rights as other staff. The new policy sought to restrict liability should a former fixed-term employee, aged over 50 and with a minimum of two years of pensionable service with this authority, claim full pension rights.

Cabinet **AGREED**

that the Council's discretionary policy regarding the award of Compensatory Added Years (CAY) would not apply to individuals employed under fixed-term contracts.

Cabinet **NOTED** the direct and indirect pension cost implications for the Council resulting from the amendment to primary legislation relating to fixed-term employees.

**8. HUMAN RESOURCES (HR) STRATEGY**

The Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) highlighted the need for a Human Resources Strategy and Cabinet had approved the strategy framework on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2004. The Resources and Staffing Portfolio Holder had been assured by the Human Resources Manager that the objectives would be delivered within the proposed timescale. The cost of the objectives had been included in current budgets, but any additional financial implications, such as issues arising from the staff survey, would be addressed through the CIP process.

The phrase "develop our staff" was re-phrased to "encourage staff development".

Cabinet **AGREED** to adopt the HR Strategy.

## 9. **POLICIES FOR PROTECTION OF CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS FROM ABUSE**

New statutory obligations and related initiatives required all authorities to co-operate more fully to ensure that abuse situations were highlighted as early as possible. The District Council's role would be to be aware of possible abuse situations and to bring concerns to the attention of the lead authority, Cambridgeshire Social Services. Two lead officers had been identified and were awaiting training. Training for Members would be included as the programme was implemented.

Councillor MP Howell, Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee, recommended that all staff should be able to volunteer for Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks, that any staff members visiting vulnerable people should be accompanied by a CRB-checked member of staff, and that both these staff members should be the same sex as the person they were visiting.

The list of situations where abuse of vulnerable adults may occur contained examples only and was not meant to be exhaustive. The lead officers would bring to the training session Members' questions about the Council's lone worker policy and in which circumstances an adult could be identified as vulnerable.

Cabinet **AGREED**

- (a) to approve the Protection of Children and Young People from Abuse Policy and the Protection of Vulnerable Adults from Abuse Policy;
- (b) that there should be a progressive implementation of the policies, subject to information and training being provided across the Council, with a view to full implementation by autumn 2004.

## 10. **LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICE AGREEMENTS**

Local Public Service Agreements, contracts entered into by local authorities with central governments, could result in the award of "performance reward grants" if the delivery of improved services achieved pre-set targets. The Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder drew Cabinet's attention to the two proposed options for dividing the performance reward grants and Cabinet

**AGREED** to support the division of performance reward grant money equally between the 5 Local Strategic Partnerships and that the Cambridgeshire County Council be strongly recommended to adopt this approach.

## 11. **COLLECTIVE CABINET RESPONSIBILITY**

The issue of collective Cabinet responsibility had been considered at several previous meetings and the Constitution Review Working Party had recommended some simplified wording.

Members discussed the issue and made the following points:

- collective responsibility could be irrelevant as the Council was moving towards a recorded voting system, meetings were open to the public, and those opposed to Cabinet decisions could be identified from the minutes;
- the CPA team had identified the importance of Cabinet showing clear direction and leadership, and confusion and mixed messages resulted when dissenting

- views were expressed after a decision was taken;
- if Members were prepared to serve on Cabinet, they must be prepared for the responsibilities and restrictions;
- Members could face difficulty when their residents' views contradicted a Cabinet decision;
- amending the wording from "must not disagree" to "should not disagree" would allow for exceptional circumstances when a Member felt it necessary to disagree publicly;
- the protocol asked Members to accept that a democratic decision had been taken, to abide by it and not to work actively against it.

Cabinet **AGREED** the following wording as the Collective Responsibility Protocol, purely as a decision of Cabinet and not for incorporation into the Constitution:

"Cabinet Members should not disagree with agreed Cabinet decisions outside Cabinet meetings. Cabinet Members may speak against recommendations from Cabinet at Council. They are in no different position from any other member of the Council in respect of decisions made by Council, but are asked to use discretion."

## 12. APPOINTMENTS

Cabinet **AGREED**

- (a) that the Leader be named by office as a member of the Travellers Consultative Group;
- (b) to accept the nominations of the Development and Conservation Control Committee:
  - the Chairman of Development and Conservation Control Committee, ex-officio, with the Vice-Chairman as substitute;
  - Councillor MJ Mason
  - Councillor TJ Wotherspoon
- (c) That the Community Development and Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holders represent the Council on the South Cambridgeshire Crime and Disorder Partnership Group for 2004/05.

---

### Information Items

---

## 13. TRAVELLERS COSTS QUARTERLY UPDATE

Cabinet received the report on expenditure to date in connection with Travellers, for the financial year 2004/05. The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder confirmed that this expenditure represented all costs covered by the original enforcement budget, but not additional costs from Community Development. Cabinet asked that future reports include costs from all budgets.

Cabinet **NOTED** the report.

## 14. PREDICTED OUT-TURN 2003-04

Cabinet had received a draft version of this report on 20<sup>th</sup> May. This final report, showing the provisional outturn figures for 2003/04 and how they compared to the

original estimates when the Council Tax and rents were set, was still subject to Audit adjustments.

Cabinet **NOTED** the report.

**15. QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT AND PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS**

The report demonstrated Council's performance against budget for the first quarter of the 2004/05 financial year, and monitored the indicators under the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities, which did not apply to debt-free authorities. There could be underspending on the original General Fund estimates, but the figures did not take into account any additional resources agreed by Council, this Cabinet meeting, or the possibility of high costs on Refuse Collection.

Cabinet **NOTED** the projected expenditure position and the monitoring of prudential indicators.

---

**Standing Items**

---

**16. MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE**

None.

**17. CAMBOURNE**

This item was removed from the agenda.

**18. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 8, 9 and 12 of Schedule 12A of the Act).

---

**Confidential Items**

---

**19. TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4TH JUNE 2004**

The Leader was authorised to sign the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2004 as a correct record.

**20. PROVISION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS**

The Community Development Portfolio Holder drew attention to the issues facing the Council in terms of the provision of facilities in new developments, especially in light of issues at Cambourne. There were significant concerns in the Community Development department for future developments, such as the more urban facilities expected for Northstowe, and Councillor Mrs Roberts proposed investigating receiving a commuted sum from developers and approaching professional organisations for the facilities, instead of allowing developers to take responsibility for their provision. The Head of



Community Services noted that the community provisions section of the Local Development Framework would need amending if the Council sought to receive commuted sums from developers to provide facilities itself.

The Development Services Director explained that, while investigations were under way to determine the possibility of accepting a commuted sum from developers to finance planning officers for large developments, it was essential to demonstrate that this would not create the impression those officers were under the influence of the developers, and to ensure that the developers could not withdraw the funding. The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder clarified that central government was developing new legislation to allow section 106 contributions to be used more flexibly, but no details were known.

The Chief Executive advised to continue under the current system for the time being, providing a benchmark against which other options could be measured. He warned of the difficulty involved in making leisure facilities profitable should the Council find itself managing one. The Leader reminded members that the Infrastructure Partnership, which had not been established during the early stages of Cambourne development, would provide additional support in new developments.

Members appreciated the report and expressed concern at the officer time and Council resources directed away from sports and arts development in existing villages by work on provision of facilities in new developments.

Cabinet **NOTED** the report.

---

**The Meeting ended at 5.35 p.m.**

---

This page is intentionally left blank

**DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION CONTROL COMMITTEE**

At a meeting held on Wednesday, 7 July 2004 at 10.00 a.m..

Councillors	RE Barrett	JD Batchelor
	RF Bryant	Mrs PS Corney
	SM Edwards	R Hall
	Mrs SA Hatton	Mrs JM Healey
	Mrs EM Heazell	HC Hurrell
	SGM Kindersley	RB Martlew
	MJ Mason	DH Morgan
	Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	CR Nightingale	Dr JPR Orme
	EJ Pateman	A Riley
	Mrs DP Roberts	NJ Scarr
	RGR Smith	RJ Turner
	NIC Wright	SS Ziaian-Gillan

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dr DR Bard, Mrs J Dixon, Mrs CA Hunt, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, JH Stewart and TJ Wotherspoon.

**PROCEDURAL ITEMS****1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

Councillor RF Bryant, Chairman of Council, took the Chair at the beginning of the meeting, and paid tribute to the high profile, which Councillor Mrs JM Healey had given the Development and Conservation Control Committee during her three years as its Chairman.

Councillor Mrs JM Healey nominated Councillor RGR Smith as Chairman of the Committee. Councillor SGM Kindersley seconded this nomination.

There being no other nominations, it was

**RESOLVED** that Councillor RGR Smith be elected Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee for the coming year.

Councillor RGR Smith took the Chair, endorsed the comments of the Chairman of Council, and conveyed his good wishes to Councillor JH Stewart, who had declined the opportunity to stand for the Chairmanship, having served as Vice-Chairman during the past 12 months.

**2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Councillor RF Bryant nominated Councillor Dr JPR Orme as Vice-Chairman of the Committee. Councillor JD Batchelor seconded this nomination.

Councillor Mrs JA Muncey nominated Councillor CR Nightingale as Vice-Chairman of the Committee. Councillor RJ Turner seconded this nomination.

Councillor Mrs DP Roberts nominated Councillor Mrs SA Hatton as Vice-Chairman of the Committee. Councillor SM Edwards seconded this nomination.

Upon a secret ballot being conducted, the votes cast were as follows:

Councillor Dr JPR Orme	13 votes
Councillor Mrs SA Hatton	8 votes
Councillor CR Nightingale	5 votes

As no candidate had secured more than 50% of the votes cast, Councillor CR Nightingale was eliminated from the contest and a second secret ballot was conducted. The votes cast in this second ballot were as follows:

Councillor Dr JPR Orme	18 votes
Councillor Mrs SA Hatton	8 votes

**RESOLVED** that Councillor Dr JPR Orme be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee for the coming year.

### 3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee authorised the Chairman to sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2004, copies of which had been included in the agenda for the Annual Council meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2004.

### 4. APPOINTMENTS TO THE TRAVELLERS CONSULTATIVE GROUP

**RESOLVED** to recommend to the Cabinet that the Leader of the Council (Councillor Mrs DSK Spink) become an ex-officio member of the Travellers Consultative Group.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) that the Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee become an ex-officio member of the Travellers Consultative Group, with the Vice-Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee becoming an ex-officio substitute for the Committee Chairman; and
- (2) that Councillors MJ Mason and TJ Wotherspoon be appointed to the Travellers Consultative Group by the Development and Conservation Control Committee.

### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND INCIDENTAL ITEMS**

#### 5. **S/0574/04/F - HEYDON**

Erection of House and Garage with Annexe Over Following Demolition of Bungalow and Outbuilding at 43 Fowlmere Road For Mr & Mrs K Esplin

**REFUSED** contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members acknowledged that the proposed house was acceptable, but took the view that, by virtue of its height, bulk and position, the proposed garage/annexe building would be unduly overbearing in the street scene and would create a 'tunnelling effect' along this section of Fowlmere Road. It would thereby be out of keeping with the character and appearance of development on the west side of Fowlmere Road and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

(Councillor Mrs Harris, Vice-Chairman of Heydon Parish Council, addressed the meeting.)

#### 6. **S/1018/04/F - GREAT SHELFORD**

Relocation of Mobile Home to House Temporary Staff – 144 Cambridge Road for Shelford Lodge Ltd

**DEFERRED** to enable more information to be sought about the application and for a site visit.

**7. S/0840/04/F - PAMPISFORD**

Erection of kennel and cattery buildings at Haydn, Bourn Bridge, Abington for Mr and Mrs Dropinski

Members were **MINDED TO APPROVE** the application, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to no objections being raised by the Highways Agency, it being referred to the Secretary of State, and not being called in by him for determination. Having visited the site, Members took the view that this was an appropriate location for the particular proposal, notwithstanding its location in the Green Belt, because they considered that kennels/catteries were an essential part of the service infrastructure. The proposal would go some way towards meeting an unmet demand in the area; away from residential properties, was appropriate for kennels/cattery buildings; and, importantly, would not detract from the openness or rural character of the Green Belt. The proposal therefore did not materially conflict with either Policy P9/2a of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 or Policy GB2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

**8. S/0989/04/F - STEEPLE MORDEN**

Extension and conversion into 18 flats, The White House, 66 Hay Street for ARJ Construction Ltd

Members were **MINDED TO APPROVE** the application, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Such approval would be subject to the proposal being advertised as a departure from the Development Plan, being referred to the Secretary of State, and not being called in by him for determination. Approval would be for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services and subject to the Section 106 Legal Agreement and Conditions referred to therein, and to a further Condition requiring that an archaeological assessment be carried out. Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt, the local Member, expressed her appreciation of the high level of service and assistance given to the village in the past couple of years by the Area 4 Planning Officer and his team.

(Councillor S Travers-Healy from Steeple Morden Parish Council addressed the meeting, and endorsed the comments of Councillor Mrs Murfitt.)

**9. S/0445/04/F - LANDBEACH**

Change Of Use Of Paddock To Residential Garden associated With 43A High Street and The Erection of Mower And Tractor Store (Retrospective Application) At Land Rear Of 43a High Street For B York

**REFUSED**, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services. Having visited the site, Members considered that the proposal represented an inappropriate use in the Green Belt, which would have an adverse effect on the rural openness and character of the countryside in the Green Belt. It conflicted, therefore, with Policy P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and Policies SE9 and GB/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004. The Committee also **RESOLVED** to take appropriate enforcement action. A Member asked officers to investigate the height of the fence along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries.

**10. S/0607/90/F - LITTLE GRANSDEN**

Regional Gliding Competition, Gransden Lodge Airfield For Cambridge Gliding Club  
**DELEGATED APPROVAL** in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services.

(Councillor SGM Kindersley declared a personal interest as Clerk to Hatley Parish Council.)

- 11. S/1051/04/F - BAR HILL**  
Erection of 2.4 metre high security fencing and gates at Units 49 and 50 Viking Way, Bar Hill for Coal Pension Properties Ltd.  
This item had been **WITHDRAWN** from the agenda, having been determined in accordance with delegation procedures.
- 12. S/0578/04/F - SHEPRETH**  
Erection of House and Garage Following Demolition of Existing Bungalow, 15 High Street for Upware Marina.  
**REFUSAL** for the reason set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.
- 13. S/0593/04/O - BASSINGBOURN-CUM-KNEESWORTH**  
Residential development following demolition of existing and alterations to access road, 131 The Causeway and land adjoining for Mrs C Parker  
**DELEGATED APPROVAL** of outline consent, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement securing the provision of affordable housing and an education contribution, and to safeguarding Conditions.  
(Councillor RGR Smith declared a personal interest as an adjacent landowner.)
- 14. S/0470/04/F - BOURN**  
Removal of Agricultural Occupancy Condition (Condition 1 of Planning Permission S/0017/86/F), Beck Farm, Toft Road, for Mr C White.  
Unconditional **APPROVAL** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services.
- 15. S/2570/03/F - CAXTON**  
Use of Site and Building for Weekly Car Auction for Kartsport UK, Royston Road (Mr S Butcher)  
**APPROVAL** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Condition referred to therein and an additional Condition prohibiting karting from taking place on auction days. Members asked officers to explore, with the applicant, the use of appropriate advance-warning information boards.
- 16. S/6232/04/RM - CAMBOURNE**  
Twenty six Dwellings at GC20, Land off Jeavons Lane, Cambourne for Granta Housing Trust Ltd  
**DELEGATED APPROVAL** of amended drawings date stamped 24<sup>th</sup> May 2004, for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement and to the Conditions referred to therein. Members asked officers to discuss with the Local Education Authority the issue of the adequate provision of education places within the village.
- 17. S/1895/03/O - COMBERTON**  
Erection of six houses and four Flats on land off Milner Road for Mrs M Morgan  
**DELEGATED APPROVAL** of site plan date stamped 18<sup>th</sup> December 2003 and layout plan date stamped 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2004 for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement securing the provision of affordable housing and the requested educational contribution, to the Conditions referred to in the report, and an additional Condition prohibiting the operation of powered equipment in the evenings and at weekends during the construction period.

- 18. S/0701/04/F - COTTENHAM**  
Change of Use of Unit 2 from agricultural use to caravan storage (Retrospective) at Setbroad Farm, Oakington Road for Mr M. Ragnauth  
**APPROVAL** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein.
- 19. S/0560/04/F - GAMLINGAY**  
Extensions to Dutch Barn, Brook Farm, Little Heath for R Woodcraft.  
**DELEGATED APPROVAL** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services, subject to the receipt of an amended layout plan showing sufficient space for landscaping on the northern boundary, the comments of the Local Highways Authority and the Conditions set out in the report.
- 20. S/2194/01/F - GAMLINGAY**  
Erection of Egg Production Unit and Storage Building together with Access, Land at Station Road, for Mr I Quince  
**DEFERRED**, in line with the amended recommendation of the Director of Development Services, in order to explore the proposal's impact on ecology, access and the risk of flooding, and to evaluate the result of consultation on the revised drawings.
- 21. S/2193/01/F - GAMLINGAY**  
Agricultural Mobile Home and access, land at Station Road for Mr I Quince  
**DEFERRED** pending the results of outstanding consultations and the work required in respect of application reference S/2194/01/F (Minute no. 20 above refers).
- 22. S/0934/03/F - CALDECOTE**  
Erection of six dwellings, land off Samian Close/West of East Drive, Highfields for Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd  
**DEFERRED** to enable officers to investigate, together with the Environment Agency, the issue of storm water drainage.
- 23. S/0951/04/F - HISTON**  
Variation of Condition 3 of Planning Permission S/0242/01/F to allow hot food Takeaway service between 11.00am and 2.30pm, and 5.00pm and 11.00pm at 44 Station Road for R Dias  
**REFUSED** for the reasons set out in the report from the Director of Development Services presented to the Committee at its meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2004. The proposal to allow lunchtime takeaway sales on a permanent basis was defeated by 13 votes to seven. The proposal to allow evening takeaway sales on a trial basis was defeated by 18 votes to three with two Members not voting.  
(Councillor Max Parish, Chairman of Histon Parish Council, addressed the meeting. Councillor R Hall declared a personal Interest because of the close proximity of his house to that of the local representative of the Federation of Small Businesses.)
- 24. S/1066/04/F - LONGSTANTON**  
Erection of fence and gate and Change of Use of land to domestic garden at 4 Magdalene Close, Longstanton for R Hinde  
**DEFERRED** for a site visit.  
(Councillor A Riley declared a personal interest as having voted on this application when it was considered by Longstanton Parish Council.)
- 25. S/1122/04/O - LONGSTANTON**  
Erection of two Dwellings Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling; Corner Cottage, Woodside for Mrs G.Hayden-Smith  
**DELEGATED APPROVAL** of amended plans, for the reasons set out in the report from

the Director of Development Services, subject to the Conditions referred to therein and to the applicant being informed of the need to safeguard the Ash tree from development. (Councillor A Riley declared a personal interest in this item as having contributed to the consideration of the application by the Parish Council.)

**26. S/0891/04/A - FEN DITTON**

Erection of 4 signs, The Blue Lion Public House, 2 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton for Greene King Pub Company

**DELEGATED APPROVAL** of Sign H, subject to the applicant agreeing to install down-lighting and to the standard advertisement Conditions referred to in the report from the Director of Development Services.

Signs K and L **REFUSED** for the reasons referred to in the report from the Director of Development Services.

Sign B **REFUSED**, contrary to the recommendation contained in the report from the Director of Development Services, for the reasons stated therein for refusing consent for Signs K and L.

### APPEALS

**27. APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION**

The Committee **NOTED** the following from the report prepared by the Director of Development Services:

- Decisions notified by the Secretary of State

The Deputy Director of Development Services informed Members that this Council's record of winning appeals exceeded the national average. A significant reason for this was that the Authority regularly updated its planning policies.

- Summaries of recent decisions of interest
- Appeals received
- Local Inquiry and Informal Hearing dates scheduled before the Committee's next meeting on 4th August 2004
- Appeals withdrawn or postponed
- Advance notification of future local inquiry and Informal Hearing dates (subject to postponement or cancellation)

**28. PLANNING TOUR OF THE NORTH OF THE DISTRICT**

Members noted that the last tour, on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2002, had focused on new development in the south of the District. It was

**RESOLVED** that a tour of new development in the north of the District be arranged to take place on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2004, starting at 10.00am.

**29. ENFORCEMENT ACTION - PROGRESS REPORT**

The Committee **NOTED** an Index of current Enforcement Cases and a report, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2004, detailing progress being made with Enforcement Action.

For the benefit of new Members, the Deputy Director of Development Services explained that John Koch, Appeals Officer, was responsible, at Appeal Hearings, for giving evidence as a witness on behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council.



In connection with 19/03 (Moor Drove, Cottenham Road, Histon), and following discussion by Members, the Enforcement Officer emphasised the importance of considering the outcome of the public inquiry on 10<sup>th</sup> August 2004 before taking further action.

#### **TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

##### **30. 01/04/SC - 2 ERMINE STREET NORTH, PAPWORTH EVERARD**

The Committee considered a report on Tree Preservation Order 01/04/SC, which had been made in Papworth Everard, under delegated powers, on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2004.

As the Council had not received any objections to the provisional Order within the permitted period, it was

**RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 01/04/SC at 2 Ermine Street North, Papworth Everard be confirmed without modification.

##### **31. 02/04/SC - 4 ORCHARD ROAD, HASLINGFIELD**

The Committee considered a report on Tree Preservation Order 02/04/SC, which had been made in Haslingfield, under delegated powers, on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2004.

The Council had received one objection to the provisional Order within the permitted period. A site visit, involving the then Chairman of the Development and Conservation Control Committee (Councillor Mrs JM Healey), the local Member (Councillor Mrs EM Heazell) and the Trees and Landscape Officer thus took place on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2004. In line with the recommendation from that site visit, it was

**RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 02/04/SC at 4 Orchard Road, Haslingfield be confirmed without modification.

#### **STANDING ITEM**

##### **32. CAMBOURNE SECTION 106 AGREEMENT - FACILITIES AND TIMING OF PROVISION**

The Committee received a further report on progress being made by the Developers of Cambourne in complying with their obligations under the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20<sup>th</sup> April 1994. The Senior Planning Assistant gave a verbal update.

**RESOLVED** that the Council reaffirm its stance in relation to seeking substantial compliance with the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 20<sup>th</sup> April 1994, and that the Development and Conservation Control Committee request a further update at its next meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2004.

#### **INFORMATION ITEM**

##### **33. DEPT OF THE ENVIRONMENT CIRCULAR 8/93 - AWARD OF COSTS IN PLANNING AND OTHER (INCLUDING COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER) PROCEEDINGS**

The Committee **NOTED** the contents of this Circular, published on 29<sup>th</sup> March 1993.

---

**The Meeting ended at 5.00 p.m.**

---

This page is intentionally left blank

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Licensing Committee held on  
Monday, 5 July 2004

Councillors:	RE Barrett	EW Bullman
	R Hall	Mrs HF Kember
	Mrs JA Muncey	Mrs CAED Murfitt
	NJ Scarr	J Shepperson
	DALG Wherrell	

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dr JPR Orme and Dale Robinson.

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

- 1.1 **RESOLVED** that Councillor RE Barrett be elected Chairman of the Committee for the coming year.

**2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

- 2.1 **RESOLVED** that Councillor EW Bullman be elected Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the coming year.

**3. MINUTES**

- 3.1 Minute 6.4 – the Licensing Officer confirmed that the Fire Department would inspect licensed premises at the request of this Council and that they would bear the costs incurred.
- 3.2 The Licensing Officer was requested to clarify with the Fire Officer if Insurance Companies required proof of fire regulation approval for licensed premises, prior to issuing insurance certificates.
- 3.3 The Chairman was authorised to sign as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2003.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 4.1 None received.

**5. REQUEST FOR CONSENT STREETS, PAMPISFORD**

- 5.1 Pampisford Parish Council had requested that certain streets in Pampisford be considered for Consent Street Status in order to control street trading in the village, particularly vehicle sales. The Committee, on noting the contents of the report provided in the agenda,

**AGREED** that Brewery Road, Beech Lane, Church Street, High Street, London Road and Town Lane, Pampisford be designated as Consent Streets.

- 5.2 Councillor NJ Scarr informed the meeting that he had noticed an increase in vehicle sales occurring on the side of roads in many of the Council's villages. In response the Assistant Solicitor clarified that the Act relating to Consent Streets stipulated that anyone trading from roads that had received Consent Street Status would require permission to sell any article or goods.

**6. INTRODUCTION OF LICENSING CONDITIONS FOR STRETCH LIMOUSINES**

6.1 The current conditions used by this Council addressed the general requirements for licensing standard vehicles under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, they did not however make a provision for more specialised vehicles, ie stretch limousines. This Council currently have 2 such vehicles licensed and in order to promote public safety for passengers and other members of society, the Committee

**RECOMMEND** to the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health and Cabinet that a new paragraph be introduced under Sections 47 and 48 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 entitled 'Stretch Limousines' and the following conditions be introduced as additional to those currently in place for normal vehicles. These conditions are:

- (a) All stretch limousines should meet the Q.V.M (Quality Vehicle Modifier) issued by the Ford Motor Company or the C.M.C (Cadillac Mastercoach Builder) or have relevant approval documentation of the originating chassis supplier approving the conversion as presented for licensing.
- (b) No vehicle will be licensed if that part of the vehicle converted exceeds a length of 10' in part or whole.
- (c) Passenger capacity will be determined by how many forward or rear facing seatbelts are within the vehicle. (Side facing seatbelts will not be considered for licensing purposes.)
- (d) Correct tyres as recommended by the manufacturer must be fitted to include appropriate weight loading of the converted vehicle.
- (e) That no stretch limousine over 6 years of age from the date of its first registration shall be licensed.
- (f) The maximum weight of any converted vehicle shall not exceed 7100lbs (3220Kg).

**7. LICENSING ACT 2003 - VERBAL UPDATE**

7.1 The Licensing Officer reported that the Secretary of State would be approving the guidance relating to the Licensing Act 2003 during the forthcoming week and an official leaflet would subsequently be distributed to all Councils. It was anticipated that the first appointed day for accepting applications under the new Act would be 7<sup>th</sup> February 2005 and an approved council policy would be required before that date. Members would be updated as and when additional information was available.

---

**The Meeting ended at 2.05 p.m.**

---

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Standards Committee held on  
Wednesday, 21 July 2004

**PRESENT:**

Members:	P Brindle	Independent Member
	RF Bryant	District Council Member
	EW Bullman	District Council Member
	NN Cathcart	District Council Member
	Mrs G Everson	Parish Council Member
	D Gilbertson	Independent Member
	DW Payne	Parish Council Member
	Mrs VM Trueman	District Council Member

Apologies for absence were received from the Monitoring Officer and from K Barrand (Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils).

---

**Procedural Items**

---

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**2. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

On the nomination of Mrs G Everson, seconded by Councillor Mrs VM Trueman, and there being no further nominations, it was

**RESOLVED** that Mr D Gilbertson be re-elected Chairman for the 2004/05 municipal year.

**3. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

On the nomination of Councillor EW Bullman, seconded by Mrs G Everson, and there being no further nominations, it was

**RESOLVED** that Councillor Mrs VM Trueman be re-elected Chairman for the 2004/05 municipal year.

**4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING**

The Chairman was authorised to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2003 as a correct record.

**Hearing Procedure – Budget (Minute 6)**

There were a number of on-going investigations, of which at least one would be returning for a local hearing. The Deputy Monitoring Officer agreed to determine whether it would be possible to conduct hearings within the existing budget, removing the need to ring-fence additional funds.

**Standards Committee Role and Function** (Minute 9)

The Chairman circulated a draft mission statement; comments were sought by 13 August. It was hoped that the final statement could be publicised in the winter edition of *South Cambs Magazine*.

**Case Tribunal Reports and references made to Ethical Standards Officers** (Minute 10(d))

The Standards Board for England (SBE) had hired an additional Ethical Standards Officer (ESO), for a total of five ESOs for the entire country.

---

**Decision Item**

---

**5. HEARINGS PROCEDURE TRAINING FOR MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE NOT YET TRAINED**

The final regulations were expected sometime during the summer and it was felt that training all Committee members, and inviting Committee members from other authorities, would be useful, especially with a forthcoming hearing. Members were pleased with the previous training, but felt that it would have been helpful to have a break-out area for private deliberations during the hearing role-play exercises. There would be value in inviting the information and media officers to attend the training and to provide advice on how hearings could be reported.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer advised that there should be a pre-meeting before the hearing to review procedures.

The Standards Committee **AGREED** to schedule a training session for Monday 20 September from 10 am to 4 pm in the Ground Floor Meeting Room at South Cambridgeshire Hall, with the Mezzanine reserved as a break-out area.

**6. STANDING ITEMS****6 (a) Operation of Members' Code**

The SBE had written to clarify two issues relating to the Members' Declaration of Interests: membership of the Freemasons and membership of political party concert associations or other organisations seeking to influence policy or public opinion. The information on the Freemasons had been reported in a recent CALC circular, but not all Parish Councils were members of CALC.

The Standards Committee **AGREED** to send a letter to all Parish Councils, copied to District Councillors, explaining the clarifications received relating to the Declaration of Interests.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer advised of a recent Court of Appeal ruling which determined that a Councillor who had declared a prejudicial interest in a matter could not attend discussion of that matter in a personal capacity, i.e., as a member of the public. Advice to Councillors facing a similar situation was to submit opinions in writing to the Chairman and not to attend the meeting during discussion of the relevant item.

**6 (b) Advice to, and training of, District and Parish Council Members in relation to the Members' Code**

The Standards Committee annual assembly would be held in Birmingham on 13-14 September and the Committee nominated Councillor Mrs VM Trueman to attend both days, with Mrs G Everson attending on the 13<sup>th</sup>. The Standards Committee budget would be used to cover registration, accommodation, travel and subsistence expenses.

Subject to the availability of the Monitoring Officer, an in-house Code of Conduct "familiarisation" event would be scheduled for District and Parish Councillors, similar to the roadshows held last year. Members noted the poor attendance at the roadshows held at Village Colleges and it was felt that one session at South Cambridgeshire Hall would be sufficient. It was imperative that the District Council did not appear to be establishing itself as the training authority, as CALC did provide similar training to those Parish Councils which were members, and that it did not take responsibility for the outcome of the training.

**6 (c) Dispensations**

No applications had been received.

**6 (d) Case Tribunal reports and references made to Ethical Standards Officers**

Mr D Payne declared an interest in one case and withdrew from the room during its discussion.

Six references had been made to Ethical Standards Officers (ESO):

- i. A complaint had been made about a Parish Councillor and the ESO determined that no further action be taken. The complainant made a subsequent complaint and the ESO was investigating. The Parish Councillor was also a District Councillor and the second complaint regarded declarations of interest at Parish and District Council planning meetings, and also referred to District Council officers;
- ii. A complaint had been made in February 2003 about a Parish Councillor failing to treat others with respect, unlawfully discriminating against others and bringing the authority into disrepute. The ESO's report, issued in March 2004, determined that no further action be taken;
- iii. The ESO was investigating a complaint that a Parish Councillor, who was also a District Councillor, failed to declare an interest in a planning item at a Parish Council meeting;
- iv. The ESO had dismissed a complaint against a Parish Councillor alleged to have used their position to influence a decision on a planning application;
- v. A complaint received about a member of the District Council would be the subject of a public hearing. The complainant alleged that the member had brought the authority into disrepute and failed to treat others with respect. The draft decision of the ESO had been received and the final report was imminent. The hearing would be scheduled no sooner than two weeks and no later than three months after receipt of the final report. The Deputy Monitoring Officer confirmed that the SBE would continue to process the case even if the people involved had left the authority;
- vi. A complaint against a Parish Councillor alleged to have brought the authority into

disrepute had been dismissed by the ESO as not significant enough to justify investigation.

**6 (e) Operation of National Codes of Conduct and other statutory functions of the Monitoring Officer**

The final regulations were expected by the end of the summer.

**6 (f) Operation of the Council's "whistle-blowing" policy**

The Chairman explained that this had been included as a standing item on the agenda in case any of the Council's internal Human Resources policies revealed allegations against Councillors. There were no matters to report.

**6 (g) The handling of complaints and investigations by the Ombudsman**

The Corporate Complaints Administrator (CCA) circulated the Ombudsman's annual letter 2003/04. There had not been any findings of maladministration. A new database had been established to provide a bigger picture of all complaints received by the Council, not just those made to the Ombudsman, from which Cabinet would receive an annual report. Members felt that issues relating to ethical standards and the Code of Conduct could arise from within other complaints and the Standards Committee **RESOLVED** to write to the Chief Executive seeking clarification that policy structures were in place to identify all breaches of the Members' Code of Conduct whether or not they arose from a formal complaint to the SBE, and highlighting the need to ensure that all complaints about Elected Members be forwarded to the Monitoring Officer for determination by the Standards Committee.

The CCA explained that some complainants wished to remain anonymous, prohibiting further action, but the Standards Committee felt that they should be informed of any complaints about Councillors in case similar complaints were later received. The Deputy Monitoring Officer clarified that members had an obligation to report any complaints they received, but that the Standards Committee should become involved only where there was substance to the complaint. The Monitoring Officer had discretion to determine which cases would be presented to the Committee, although, in the interests of public accountability, transparency and openness, it would lend credence to the standards process to make the Committee aware of all complaints even if no further action were taken.

The Standards Committee **AGREED** that they would in future receive a report of all complaints received by the Council and not just those made to the Ombudsman. This would be in addition to that provided by the Monitoring Officer in relation to SBE complaints and investigations.

**7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday 10 November 2004 at 10 am in the first floor meeting room.

---

**The Meeting ended at 3.45 p.m.**

---



**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee held on  
Thursday, 24 June 2004

**PRESENT:**

Councillors:	SJ Agnew	RE Barrett
	RF Bryant	NN Cathcart
	R Hall	MP Howell
	HC Hurrell	MJ Mason
	DC McCraith	DH Morgan
	Mrs CAED Murfitt	CR Nightingale
	Mrs GJ Smith	Mrs HM Smith
	Dr SEK van de Ven	DALG Wherrell

**1. APOLOGIES**

None.

**2. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

Councillor SJ Agnew proposed and Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt seconded Councillor MP Howell for Chairman. There were no other nominations and Councillor Howell was duly elected as Chairman for the forthcoming year.

**3. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Councillor NN Cathcart proposed and Councillor SJ Agnew seconded Councillor Mrs GJ Smith for Vice-Chairman. There were no other nominations and Councillor Mrs GJ Smith was duly elected as Vice-Chairman for the forthcoming year.

**4. TO DECIDE MEMBERSHIP OF AUDIT PANEL**

Nominations were invited for the Audit Panel, sub-group of this Committee.

The Committee

**AGREED** to appoint the following members to Audit Panel for 2004/05, the Chairman Councillor Howell and the following members from each political group: Councillors DH Morgan (Conservative), RF Bryant (Independent), NN Cathcart (Labour) and Mrs GJ Smith (Liberal Democrat).

**5. TO NOTE THE DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

It was noted that future meetings would be held on:

**2004:** 15<sup>th</sup> July, 19<sup>th</sup> August, 16<sup>th</sup> September, 21<sup>st</sup> October, 18<sup>th</sup> November & 16<sup>th</sup> December

**2005:** 20<sup>th</sup> January, 17<sup>th</sup> February

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.10 p.m.**

---

This page is intentionally left blank

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee held on  
Thursday, 15 July 2004

PRESENT: Councillor MP Howell – Chairman  
Councillor Mrs GJ Smith – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	SJ Agnew	RE Barrett
	RF Bryant	NN Cathcart
	R Hall	HC Hurrell
	MJ Mason	DH Morgan
	Mrs CAED Murfitt	Mrs HM Smith
	Dr SEK van de Ven	DALG Wherrell

Councillors Dr DR Bard, Mrs EM Heazell, SGM Kindersley, Mrs DP Roberts, NJ Scarr, Mrs DSK Spink MBE, RT Summerfield and Dr JR Williamson were in attendance, by invitation.

Expert witnesses in attendance for item 6:

Ian Burns	- South Cambs Primary Care Trust
Judy Dean	- Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust
Dr Subash Tandon	- Associate Specialist Psychiatrist, Cambridge & Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust
Jeanette Harding	- Service User Consultant
Alison Baggott	- Head of Supported Housing BPHA

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor DC McCraith.

**2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of 15<sup>th</sup> April 2004 were agreed as a correct record.

Councillor RF Bryant asked whether an estimate of the percentage variation between the General Fund outturn and original budget was now available. Councillor RT Summerfield, portfolio holder for Resources and Staffing, stated that the latest figures were available in next week's Cabinet agenda.

It was understood that a paper copy of the amended Constitution would be presented to all members shortly. A précis would be available in the autumn.

The minutes of 24<sup>th</sup> June 2004 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendment to the first sentence of Minute 3, Election of Vice-Chairman:

- Councillor SJ Agnew not Councillor Mrs HM Smith seconded Councillor Mrs GJ Smith for Vice Chairman.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

None received.

**5. DRAFT AGENDA PROGRAMME**

The following amendments to the draft agenda programme were agreed:

- The Christmas Waste Collection Service would be discussed at the October meeting
- The Committee will receive a report on the Best Value Review of Waste Management and an evaluation report of the newly implemented collection system at the December meeting
- The Committee will re-evaluate the Christmas Waste Collection at the January meeting
- The Update report of the Community Safety Best Value Review will be postponed from December until February

It was understood that the Committee would be able to hold a more detailed review of its agenda programme after discussing the CPA report.

The Committee **NOTED** the Draft Agenda Programme.

**6. CALL-IN: TRANSFER OF LAND AT THE GREEN ROAD, SAWSTON TO BEDFORDSHIRE PILGRIMS HOUSING ASSOCIATION**

Councillor Mrs EM Heazell, Housing portfolio holder, explained that before making the original decision, she had been advised by the Legal Section that this decision could be taken at the portfolio holder level. However, the Legal Section had now revised that view and were now advising that this decision should be made by the Cabinet.

The Chief Executive explained that Council had ruled that portfolio holders were responsible for any executive decisions that were not specifically reserved as matters for the Cabinet. It was for this reason that Councillor Mrs Heazell had been advised that the decision was within her remit. However, the Constitution states on page M1, in paragraph 1.3.1 in the section "Delegation Rules":

*"Where a proposed decision of a portfolio holder is not supported by a local member, the matter should be referred to a meeting of the Executive, where the local member/s would have the right to speak."*

It was for this reason that the Legal Section were advising that this decision should have been referred to Cabinet.

It was noted that as the original decision was procedurally incorrect, this matter should be decided by Cabinet. The Committee decided not to discuss this issue any further on the understanding that a future Cabinet decision could be called-in as the original call-in was invalid.

The Chairman expressed his disappointment in this oversight and apologised to the expert witnesses who came for the call in.

**7. PERFORMANCE PLAN**

The Head of Policy and Communication gave a presentation on the Performance Plan and its usefulness for members of this Committee. He highlighted some key issues and questions that the Committee may wish to consider as part of its scrutiny role. This included the need to give particular attention to those performance indicators which were below average or were struggling to improve.

The Chairman advised members to bring their copy of the Performance Plan to every meeting of the Committee.

Following publication of the Council's CPA result on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2004 the Committee will receive a presentation on the main points and implications for the scrutiny role at its next meeting.

## **8. SICKNESS ABSENCE**

Councillor Summerfield, portfolio holder for Resources and Staffing, introduced this item. He explained that out of the three below average performance indicators that were the responsibility of his portfolio, staff sickness was the only matter where there had been no improvement. Annual staff turnover had decreased from 12% in 2002/03 to 8% in 2003/04 and the number of staff receiving an annual appraisal had increased from 74% to 96% in the same time period. However, it was acknowledged that 11 days sickness absence per full time equivalent was unacceptable and it was hoped that this year's target of 8 days would be achieved.

The Head of Policy and Communication suggested that the Committee focus on what could be done to help managers apply corporate HR procedures consistently in order to reduce the number of days lost due to staff sickness.

### **Commentary on Performance**

The Human Resources Manager explained that short-term sickness had reduced to an average of 5.5 days but the overall figure had increased due to a rise in long-term sickness. The number of staff off sick for more than 20 working days during the year had increased from three in 2002/03 to twenty in 2003/04.

The Council was seeking to be more proactive in reducing sickness rates by promoting regular exercise and stress management. In response to questioning the Human Resources Manager explained that regular exercise was promoted by the Council, including cycling to work, because it was beneficial to health and was a sustainable form of transport. She explained that members of staff could join the gym at the Cambridge Belfry Hotel in Cambourne at a discounted rate and that exercise classes would be held at the Council's offices.

The Human Resources Manager explained that long-term sickness was harder for senior officers to manage as this absence was supported by sickness certificates from GPs. The Finance and Resources Director explained that 4 of those on long term sick for 2003/04 had been off work for the entire year. He suggested that this raised questions about how the Council administered long term sick leave.

In response to questioning the Finance and Resources Director confirmed that usually staff on long-term sick leave would receive full payment for the first 6 months of leave and then half pay for the next 6 months. However, under exceptional circumstances, more generous terms had been agreed.

### **Referrals to Addenbrookes**

Staff on long-term sick leave were referred to Addenbrookes. Each referral cost

approximately £80 and staff could only be seen on Fridays. Unfortunately there could be delays of up to 3 weeks before staff were seen by Occupational Health. In response to questioning the Human Resources Manager explained that the County and City Councils had started using a new provider and this Council would monitor progress before taking any action.

### **Sickness Management**

The Human Resources Manager asserted that the reduction in short-term sickness reflected well on the new sickness management system. It was noted that the new system had only been in place for 18 months and it was expected that the full benefit was yet to be realised. Refresher courses for existing managers would be held, while full training would be compulsory for new managers.

It was understood that managers had been advised on how to conduct return to work interviews that would determine reasons for absence without harassing staff.

Members of the Committee made the following points:

- It was unacceptable that the Council's staff sickness levels were higher than those of neighbouring authorities.
- The report's short-term absence figures for January to March 2004 could be affected by winter illnesses.
- Stress could be the cause of other illnesses such as digestion problems or head aches.
- It was imperative that the Council took positive action to reduce staff stress as it was seen as a community leader and a good employer.
- Staff should be offered health checks in order to prevent long-term sickness.
- There was less incentive for staff to take walks at lunch time in Cambourne than at the Hills Road office.
- Concern was expressed at the increase in sickness amongst staff now in the departments of the Chief Executive, Finance and Resources and Housing and Environmental Services.

The Committee expressed the hope that flu injections for staff could help reduce short-term sickness during the winter months. The Human Resources Manager stated that September was the best month to promote the availability of flu injections.

In response to questioning, the Human Resources Manager stated that 6.1% of staff were registered disabled. It was noted that Joanne Abbott had given a presentation on the implications of the Disability Discrimination Act for the Council.

On the request of the Chairman, the Human Resources Manager agreed that in future reports, the table showing absence by category would include a breakdown analysis by department. Councillor Summerfield stated that the Safety Committee received reports on work related injuries and these could indicate if a specific department had a particular problem in this area.

The Committee **NOTED** the report and will monitor the Council's progress in improving this performance in due course.

## **9. BEST VALUE REVIEW OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

The Policy and Review Manager introduced this report, by reminding the Committee that

affordable housing was one of the Council's annual priorities. He advised that the Review aimed to conclude in September and that, in view of the importance of affordable housing to the aims of the Council the portfolio holders for housing and planning and economic development should also be invited to attend meetings. The Committee was invited to examine Member representation on the review team, as one of the Review's members had stood down as a Councillor.

No volunteers were forthcoming from the Committee for membership of the review team. The Senior Democratic Services Officer will place an article in the Weekly Bulletin inviting members to volunteer onto this best value review.

## 10. **GROUNDS MAINTENANCE TASK AND FINISH GROUP**

Councillor Mrs GJ Smith introduced this update on the progress made on the Grounds Maintenance Task & Finish Group. It was requested that an extra member was required on the Task and Finish Group and the Committee **AGREED** to appoint Councillor DP Morgan to that position.

### **Section 106 Agreements**

It was noted that the Group were working on a plain English version of an explanatory note of Section 106 Agreements. The Chairman explained that the plain English report was designed to provide easily understandable advice to parish councillors on the Section 106 agreements. It was noted that parish councillors were advised that the Council was neutral in the process and the parish council should seek legal advice from a solicitor.

The following points were made:

- Section 106 agreements competed with the Local Development Framework
- The process needed to be policy driven
- It was extremely difficult for parish councils to revise the Section 106 Agreements after they were agreed
- It was imperative that the procedures for establishing Section 106 Agreements be clarified for parish councils, as this would aid enforcement.

It was noted that the Committee had a contingency fund of £40,000 and the Chairman asked the Committee to consider commissioning CALC to conduct a large scale survey to write a good practice guidance for parish councils on Section 106 agreements.

Members of the Committee made the following comments:

- Parish Councils find the wording of Section 106 Agreements verbose and guidance from CALC would be welcome.
- CALC were the best placed organisation to carry out this work.
- CALC refers these matters to its National Association and preventing parish councils from dealing directly with the National Association slows up the process.
- Parish Councils needed to be involved in the writing up of the Section 106 at the planning application stage.
- Section 106 agreements are too complex for a simple guide.
- All Section 106 agreements were different and CALC would be unable to provide a useful guide.

The Committee decided not to approach CALC.

The Leader of Council explained that Section 106 Agreement were complex and the

experience at Cambourne had taught the Council to insist that construction work for facilities be started at certain trigger points as this would provide an earlier indicator of progress instead of relying on trigger points for the completion of works.

The Leader stated that Section 106 agreements were the product of negotiation between developers and parish councils and it was unlikely that developers would agree to draconian measures that could be taken against them in the event of non-compliance. She concluded that the Development and Conservation Control Committee would be the most appropriate body to examine this process.

It was noted that the Section 106 plain English report be examined at the next meeting.

## 11. MONITORING THE EXECUTIVE

The Chairman presented this report, which reviewed the way the Committee monitors the executive and suggested that specific monitoring roles for individual members be considered. It was noted that the Committee's last 6 monthly report had highlighted the gap between executive and non-executive Councillors. The Chairman suggested that some form of shadowing could help to reduce this gap.

Member of the Committee made the following comments:

- There could be a conflict of interests if a monitor had to scrutinise a portfolio holder of the same party.
- A monitoring role could help ambitious Councillors to get onto Cabinet, but these Councillors would be serving themselves, not the Committee.
- Specific monitoring roles were unnecessary as all members were invited to attend Cabinet and portfolio holder meetings and minutes of these meetings were available.
- To allocate specific monitoring roles would upset the balance between the executive and non-executive members.

Councillor GJ Smith suggested that the Committee consider allocating monitoring roles that were relevant to all portfolios. Councillors MJ Mason and NN Cathcart supported this suggestion.

The Leader stated that non-executive members have been able to attend and speak at Cabinet for the last three years. However, very few members have taken advantage of this offer. She asserted that reading the minutes was a poor substitute for attending the meeting and witnessing the debate. She concluded against a shadowing role, which could only be awarded to a minority of non-executive members and so would fail to help the majority of back-bench members.

The Committee **AGREED** that an e-mail should be sent to all Members, reminding them that they are invited to attend all meetings of Cabinet and portfolio holders and the agendas of these meetings are available.

## 12. PROGRAMME OF KEY DECISIONS

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

## 13. TO NOTE THE DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Committee **AGREED** to alter the date of the October meeting from the 21<sup>st</sup> October to Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> October.



The Committee **NOTED** that future meetings would be held on:

**2004:** 19<sup>th</sup> August, 16<sup>th</sup> September, 19<sup>th</sup> October, 18<sup>th</sup> November & 16<sup>th</sup> December

**2005:** 20<sup>th</sup> January, 17<sup>th</sup> February, 17<sup>th</sup> March & 21<sup>st</sup> April

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.30 p.m.**

---

This page is intentionally left blank

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Audit Panel held on  
Wednesday, 14 July 2004

**PRESENT:**

Councillors: MP Howell  
RF Bryant  
NN Cathcart  
Mrs GJ Smith

Councillors SGM Kindersley, RT Summerfield and Mrs DSK Spink MBE were in attendance, by invitation.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor DH Morgan.

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

Councillor RF Bryant proposed and Councillor Mrs GJ Smith seconded Councillor MP Howell for Chairman of Audit Panel. There being no other nominations, Councillor MP Howell was elected as Chairman of the Panel.

Councillor Howell proposed and Councillor Bryant seconded Councillor Mrs GJ Smith as Vice-Chairman of the Audit Panel. There being no other nominations, Councillor Mrs GJ Smith was elected as Vice-Chairman of the Panel.

**2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Councillor RT Summerfield declared a personal interest as a former partner of Touche Ross, a predecessor firm of Deloittes.

**3. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2003 were agreed as a correct record.

**Matters Arising**Reservations and Amendments

It was understood that John Golding had provided more details to members regarding two reservations to the Performance Management.

Integrating Risk Management within Service Planning and Delivery

The Finance and Resources Director informed the Panel that a two-day intensive training programme had been carried out last January.

Human Resources Strategy

This would be discussed by Cabinet on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2004.

**4. STRATEGIC AUDIT PLAN 2004-07**

Daniel Hellary from Internal Audit presented this report in the absence of Minesh Jani. Daniel reported that projects with a higher risk assessments tended to be inspected

annually by internal audit, medium risk assessments were inspected bi-annually and low risk assessments once every three years. He explained that Corporate Governance had been postponed last year and this explained why inspection was annual even though it was designated a medium risk.

It was noted that the inspection quarters were: April to June, July to September, October to December and January to March.

The Finance and Resources Director explained that in order to ensure IT systems were properly audited, he had traded fifty "normal" audit days in exchange for twenty five additional inspection days on Information Risk Management. There would be no additional cost to the Council from this arrangement.

#### **Wheeled Bins and Green Boxes**

The Finance and Resources Director had devoted some of the allocation for ad hoc exercises to the examination of wheeled bins and green boxes due to concerns expressed by staff that the Council had not received the agreed order of recycling boxes. For a similar reason ten inspection days had been allocated to the security and stock of wheeled bins.

#### **Capital Expenditure**

The Finance and Resources Director explained that the Council's unusual non HRA capital expenditure programme which included promotion dual use facilities, instead of actually building and running its own centres.

#### **VAT**

The Finance and Resources Director stated that due to "teething" problems with the new IT system the VAT returns had not been completed on time.

### **5. ANNUAL AUDIT PLAN 2004-05**

The Panel noted the plan.

### **6. HEAD OF AUDIT OPINION**

The Finance and Resources Director informed the Panel that internal audit were contracted to produce these reports within ten days of the end of the quarter and to date had a 50% success rate. The Chairman expressed his disappointment in the lateness of this report and stated that in future the panel would refuse to discuss these reports if they were not available at least three clear working days before the meeting.

#### **Systems Receiving Substantial Assurance**

The Finance and Resources Director paid tribute to his staff for their time and effort in implementing the new financial system. He expected that the percentage of systems receiving substantial assurance would substantially increase from the 2003/04 figure of 47% now that the new system had been successfully introduced.

#### **Managing Risk**

It was noted that the Council had now implemented a strategic risk register. Daniel Hellary explained that corporate governance had increased in significance due to the failure of high profile companies like Enron.

### **7. INTERIM AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS 2003-04**

John Golding introduced this report. He emphasised the difference between internal

audit who are employed by the Council and external audit who are employed by the Audit Commission, and act to provide independent assurance as to the use of public monies.

### **Financial Control**

On behalf of external audit John Golding acknowledged that the relatively small size of the Council's accounting function led to some unavoidable control weaknesses. However, adequate internal controls were in place in relation to the prevention and detection of fraud and corruption.

### **Pensions**

The Finance and Resources Director reported that due to the condition of the stock market the Council had a shortfall in the pension fund. Advice from the Administrators of the Pension Fund was that District Councils should provide for a 1.5% increase in the employers' contribution rate, for each of the next three years. A 1% increase in the contribution would be the equivalent of approximately £100,000; £500,000 over the next three years. It was noted that this was a national problem and the ODPM had suggested that the employees contribution be increased from 6% to 8%.

### **Grants Co-ordination**

John Golding explained that a more co-ordinated approach to grant claims could allow the Council to be more successful when bidding for extra funds from external organisations.

### **Budget Reports to Cabinet**

John Golding stated that not all budget holders were appraised on their budgetary performance. It was noted that in satisfaction of an earlier external audit report, at three monthly intervals Cabinet are now provided with budgetary performance information by the Finance and Resources Director. Portfolio holders are provided with budgetary control information at regular intervals, as agreed. In response to questioning the Finance and Resources Director explained that the Finance Management System gave an up to date position of the Council's budgets.

### **Reconciliations**

The Finance and Resources Director explained that reconciliations of bank and control accounts were now carried out every month.

### **Budget Holder Training**

The Finance and Resources Director stated that he encouraged all budget holders to go on appropriate training, the only exceptions would be those with discretionary budgets that were so small it would make training economically unviable.

## **8. AUDIT AND INSPECTION PLAN 2004-2005**

John Golding explained that for future years the external auditors will be presenting their audit plan at the start of each financial year due to a change in the Audit Commission's requirements. The improvement and assessment element of the plan would be brought to the Panel following the Improvement planning process to be undertaken after publication of the Council's CPA report.

**John Golding AGREED** to ascertain the fee for improvement and assessment for 2003/04 and send the information to the Senior Democratic Services Officer who would then distribute to the rest of the Panel.

**9. MATTERS OF TOPICAL INTEREST**

None.

**10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Audit Panel would be convened once there was sufficient business to be considered.

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.00 p.m.**

---

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP**

A meeting of the South Cambridgeshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership was held on  
Friday, 23 July 2004

**PRESENT:** Linda Oliver (Cambridgeshire County Councillor) – Chairman  
Julie Abbott (Police Community Support Officer)  
John Ballantyne (Chief Executive, SCDC)  
Julie Bristow (Youth Work Manager)  
Chris Brown (Assistant Director, Environment, CCC)  
Michael Campbell (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)  
Mark Chalmers (Community Safety Research Officer)  
Judy DiBon (Police Community Support Officer)  
Jane Healey (District Councillor)  
Laura Hudson  
Alan Johnson (Detached Youth Worker)  
Pat Kilby (Cambridge Fire)  
Simon McIntosh (Head of Community Services, SCDC)  
Fran Morris (Community Safety & Partnership Officer, Cambridgeshire Constabulary)  
Nicole Morton (Partnership Support Officer)  
Paul Ormerod (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)  
Emma Pawson (CJIP Project Manager)  
Tricia Pope (Community Development Manager, SCDC)  
John Reynolds (Cambridgeshire Police Authority)  
Deborah Roberts (District Councillor)  
Gemma Webb (Community Safety Officer, CCC)

**1. Election of Chairman**

1.1 Linda Oliver proposed and John Reynolds seconded Jane Healey as Chairman. Deborah Roberts proposed John Ballantyne as Chairman. There being no seconder for John Ballantyne, Jane Healey was duly elected as Chairman for the forthcoming year, for a maximum tenure of 2 years.

1.2 Later in the meeting Linda Oliver was elected unopposed as Vice-Chairman.

**2. Apologies for Absence**

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cheryl Arnold (Young Peoples Initiatives Officer, SCDC), Ian Burns (Primary Care Trust), Jeannette Perkins (Connexions) and Andrew Powell (Probation).

**3. Minutes of Meeting Held on 26th April 2004**

3.1 The Minutes of the meeting of the Group held on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2004 were confirmed as a correct record.

4. **Matters Arising**

Travellers Protocol (Minute 3.1)

- 4.1 Deborah Roberts reported that the current enquiry regarding the travellers' site at Smithy Fen had highlighted the importance of having a protocol that was agreed by all the relevant public authorities. The enquiry had adjourned until September. Simon McIntosh stated that, in the light of recent events, local partners were strongly in favour of a protocol. The Group supported the establishment of a protocol and **Paul Omrerod** explained that the police authority had a draft policy document, which he would e-mail to lead officers.

5. **Pooled Fund Application - Nicole Morton**

- 5.1 Nicole Morton presented this application from the Connections Bus Project which will provide diversionary activities to young people aged 11-18 from Histon, Impington, Fulbourn, Comberton and Oakington for 5 weeks of the summer holiday period ranging from the last week of July and whole of August.
- 5.2 The Partnership **AGREED** to award the Connections Bus Project £1,788, which was half the total cost.

6. **Progress of Audit - Gemma Webb**

- 6.1 Gemma Webb and Mark Chalmers presented this report. It was noted that the audit was progressing well. However, the audit would not be complete in time to circulate before the next meeting of the Partnership on 18<sup>th</sup> October. It was suggested that the next meeting could be postponed to allow the completed audit to be discussed. The Officer Support Group agreed to circulate a suggested date for the October meeting, which will allow the audit to be circulated prior to the meeting.
- 6.2 **Mark Chalmers** agreed to e-mail the lead officers the audit's probable completion date.

7. **Improvement Plan - Chris Brown**

- 7.1 Chris Brown presented this report on the Improvement Plan which had originated from an internal audit carried out to satisfy Go-East. The Plan defined the roles and responsibilities of key groups and officers.
- 7.2 The Group commended the document and noted its usefulness to those who were new to the Partnership. In response to questioning Chris stated that the aim of the improvement plan was to ensure that a structure existed that could monitor crime reduction initiatives. It was suggested that monitoring was the responsibility of the Task Groups who tended to meet monthly. Each Task Group has an Action Plan and the quarterly newsletter provides a link between these Groups and this Partnership.
- 7.3 **Chris Brown** agreed to add a section to the Improvement Plan on "exception reporting" that would describe the process by which a Task Group should report a monitoring issue to the Partnership Group.

8. **Community Strategy LSP - Simon McIntosh**

- 8.1 Simon McIntosh presented this item. At his request the Partnership recognised the importance of the LSP's role in reducing crime and **AGREED** to appoint the Chairman,



Jane Healey, as the Partnership's representative on the LSP, and that the Community Strategy would be taken into account when the new Community Safety Strategy is being prepared. **Simon McIntosh** will circulate copies of the agreed Community Strategy.

**9. Position of PCSO's - Francesca Morris**

9.1 Fran Morris presented this item. She explained that the three proposed PCSOs at Bar Hill, Sawston and Gamlingay had not yet been recruited. It was hoped that these officers would be in post by the autumn. These posts would be funded by South Cambridgeshire. Funding from the Home Office would secure three additional posts for Histon & Impington, Melbourn and Cambourne.

9.2 It was noted that a PCSO had been proposed for Cambourne as this was a new settlement and the deployment of a PCSO could help the development of community spirit. If a success, PCSOs could be proposed for Northstowe.

9.3 It was understood that Home Office funding was only guaranteed until 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006, but current Government policy appeared to support the introduction of more PCSOs.

9.4 It was noted that it took at least three months to recruit PCSO due to the rigorous interviewing and training process. Many prospective PCSOs failed to pass this process.

**10. PCSO Report from Linton - Judy DiBon**

10.1 Judy DiBon, PCSO for Linton, explained that youths had been gathering on a recreational area in Copperfields, Linton. These youths had been drinking and intimidating local residents, leaving behind broken bottles. Young car drivers from Haverhill had also congregated on this area. To deal with this situation a 9pm curfew was being imposed under Section 30 of the Antisocial Behaviour Act. PCSOs would instruct youths to move on after this time. It was hoped that, with the assistance of outreach work, the youths would move to the recreation ground, which had better facilities including the Linton Action for Youth centre, and could not be accessed by cars.

10.2 It was noted that a media strategy was in place to try and prevent sensationalist headlines.

**11. Update on ASB Target Villages - Cheryl Arnold**

11.1 In the absence of Cheryl Arnold, who was unable to make the revised date of the meeting, Tricia Pope presented this report. She reported that from January to June 2004 three villages had been targeted: Bar Hill, Willingham and Fulbourn. Particular success had occurred in Fulbourn where crime had been reduced by working with both individuals and families. Both Julie Bristow and Alan Johnson asserted that the work being carried out in Fulbourn needed to continue.

11.2 It was agreed that this project was important but concern was expressed regarding its continued funding. Linda Oliver explained that a 50% reduction in funding from the Government made it harder for the County Council to continue funding these projects. It was recognised that these projects required suitable volunteers as well as funding.

**12. Local Public Service Agreement - Gemma Webb**

12.1 Gemma Webb introduced this report which updated the Partnership about the progress made on the Local Public Service Agreement.

12.2 The Partnership **NOTED** the progress being made towards the establishment of a LPSA for antisocial behaviour.

13. **Presentation on Cambridgeshire Criminal Justice Intervention Programme (CJIP) - Emma Pawson**

13.1 Emma Pawson presented this item on the Cambridgeshire Criminal Justice Intervention Programme who reduce the effects of crime on the community by encouraging offenders who misuse Class A drugs away from crime and into treatment. The CJIP Programme brings together and builds upon a number of existing projects into a single integrated system, being driven forward by a multi-agency Board. Emma reported that the Cambridge CJI team should be operational by October.

13.2 The Partnership **NOTED** the report.

14. **Update on Traveller Issues - Simon McIntosh**

14.1 Simon McIntosh presented this item. He stated that the absence of "stop over" sites made it difficult to move travellers on from illegal sites, as the police were unable to use their Section 62 powers without one.

14.2 It was noted that there were no obvious places within the District to place a "stop over" site. Concern was expressed that a temporary "stop over" site would become a permanent site and so would have achieved nothing except attracting more travellers to the area. It was agreed that this was a national problem and required a national solution. Deborah Roberts stated that there had been considerable interest in a travellers' seminar set up at short notice at this year's LGA conference.

14.3 Deborah Roberts had received complaints from Cottenham residents about a lack of police presence. Paul Ormerod stated that there had been 150 hours of police time in Cottenham and he agreed to send Deborah copies of letters sent to the police from Cottenham residents, thanking them for their efforts.

14.4 It was noted that some traveller groups created no problems and cleared up sites before leaving. However, it was noted that some traveller groups caused damage and left behind waste that was expensive to clear up. It was suggested that the demand for migratory workers had decreased and the District could not sustain the current group of travellers who had been in Cambridge/South Cambs for the last 3 months.

15. **Quarterly Task Group Newsletter - Nicole Morton (enclosed)**

15.1 Nicole Morton presented this newsletter. She stated that unfortunately the document could only be e-mailed to those who had the relevant software package and this meant the newsletter, in its current format, could not be e-mailed to parish councils. It was agreed that the newsletters should continue to be posted out. **Nicole** agreed to add her contact number to the newsletter.

16. **Any Other Business**

**Strategy Consultation Event**

16.1 Nicole Morton explained that this event would take place on 3<sup>rd</sup> November at Marshall Aerospace.

ASB Caseworker Post

16.2 Nicole Morton reported that an appointment had been made, subject to references. The appointee was expected to be in post by mid-August.

17. **To Confirm the Dates of the Next Meetings**

- 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2004 [*this date was decided outside the meeting*]
- 24<sup>th</sup> January 2005 at 10am
- 25<sup>th</sup> April 2005 at 10am

---

**The Meeting ended at 11.42 a.m.**

---

This page is intentionally left blank