

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

t: 03450 450 500
f: 01954 713149
dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15
minicom: 01480 376743
www.scambs.gov.uk



12 March 2014

To: Chairman – Councillor David Bard
Members of the Civic Affairs Committee – Councillors Kevin Cuffley,
Simon Edwards, Alison Elcox, Jose Hales, Sebastian Kindersley,
Douglas de Lacey, Ray Manning, Raymond Matthews, Deborah Roberts,
Jim Stewart, Robert Turner and Bunty Waters

Quorum: 4

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **CIVIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**, which will be held in **SWANSLEY ROOM, GROUND FLOOR** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **THURSDAY, 20 MARCH 2014 at 10.00 a.m.**

Members are respectfully reminded that when substituting on committees, subcommittees, and outside or joint bodies, Democratic Services must be advised of the substitution *in advance of* the meeting. It is not possible to accept a substitute once the meeting has started. Council Standing Order 4.3 refers.

Yours faithfully
JEAN HUNTER
Chief Executive

The Council is committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to its agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you.

AGENDA		PAGES
PROCEDURAL ITEMS		
1.	Apologies for Absence	
2.	Declarations of Interest	
3.	Minutes of Previous Meeting To authorise the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2013 as a correct record.	1 - 4
DECISION ITEMS		
4.	Motion to Consider Proposal for Recording Votes	5 - 10
5.	Northstowe Community Governance Review	11 - 14

INFORMATION ITEMS

6. **Trumpington Meadows Community Governance Review** 15 - 18
7. **Update on Code of Conduct Complaints** 19 - 20
8. **Dispensations Granted by the Monitoring Officer**
Following due consultation with the Independent Person a dispensation was granted to Councillor Nigel Cathcart and Councillor David Bard on 26th February to enable them to take part in discussions and vote in the Extraordinary Meeting of Council on 13th March 2014 in relation to the Proposed Local Plan. Councillor Bard's dispensation is also applicable to any other meetings related to the Local Plan at which the site H1/c in Sawston is discussed for a four year period until March 2018.

STANDING ITEMS

9. **Dates of next meetings**
There are no future meetings currently scheduled. Members are asked to bring their diaries.

OUR LONG-TERM VISION

South Cambridgeshire will continue to be the best place to live, work and study in the country. Our district will demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth. Our residents will have a superb quality of life in an exceptionally beautiful, rural and green environment.

The Council will be recognised as consistently innovative and a high performer with a track record of delivering value for money by focusing on the priorities, needs and aspirations of our residents, parishes and businesses.

OUR VALUES

We will demonstrate our corporate values in all our actions. These are:

- Trust
- Mutual respect
- A commitment to improving services
- Customer service

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR VISITORS TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE HALL

Notes to help those people visiting the South Cambridgeshire District Council offices

While we try to make sure that you stay safe when visiting South Cambridgeshire Hall, you also have a responsibility for your own safety, and that of others.

Security

When attending meetings in non-public areas of the Council offices you must report to Reception, sign in, and at all times wear the Visitor badge issued. Before leaving the building, please sign out and return the Visitor badge to Reception.

Public seating in meeting rooms is limited. For further details contact Democratic Services on 03450 450 500 or e-mail democratic.services@scambs.gov.uk

Emergency and Evacuation

In the event of a fire, a continuous alarm will sound. Leave the building using the nearest escape route; from the Council Chamber or Mezzanine viewing gallery this would be via the staircase just outside the door. Go to the assembly point at the far side of the staff car park opposite the staff entrance

- **Do not** use the lifts to leave the building. If you are unable to use stairs by yourself, the emergency staircase landings have fire refuge areas, which give protection for a minimum of 1.5 hours. Press the alarm button and wait for help from Council fire wardens or the fire brigade.
- **Do not** re-enter the building until the officer in charge or the fire brigade confirms that it is safe to do so.

First Aid

If you feel unwell or need first aid, please alert a member of staff.

Access for People with Disabilities

We are committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to our agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you. All meeting rooms are accessible to wheelchair users. There are disabled toilet facilities on each floor of the building. Infra-red hearing assistance systems are available in the Council Chamber and viewing gallery. To use these, you must sit in sight of the infra-red transmitter and wear a 'neck loop', which can be used with a hearing aid switched to the 'T' position. If your hearing aid does not have the 'T' position facility then earphones are also available and can be used independently. You can get both neck loops and earphones from Reception.

Toilets

Public toilets are available on each floor of the building next to the lifts.

Recording of Business and Use of Mobile Phones

We are open and transparent about how we make decisions. We allow recording, filming and photography at Council, Cabinet and other meetings, which members of the public can attend, so long as proceedings at the meeting are not disrupted. We also allow the use of social media during meetings to bring Council issues to the attention of a wider audience. To minimise disturbance to others attending the meeting, please switch your phone or other mobile device to silent / vibrate mode.

Banners, Placards and similar items

You are not allowed to bring into, or display at, any public meeting any banner, placard, poster or other similar item. Failure to do so, will result in the Chairman suspending the meeting until such items are removed.

Disturbance by Public

If a member of the public interrupts proceedings at a meeting, the Chairman will warn the person concerned. If they continue to interrupt, the Chairman will order their removal from the meeting room. If there is a general disturbance in any part of the meeting room open to the public, the Chairman may call for that part to be cleared. The meeting will be suspended until order has been restored.

Smoking

Since 1 July 2008, South Cambridgeshire District Council has operated a Smoke Free Policy. No one is allowed to smoke at any time within the Council offices, or in the car park or other grounds forming part of those offices.

Food and Drink

Vending machines and a water dispenser are available on the ground floor near the lifts at the front of the building. You are not allowed to bring food or drink into the meeting room.

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 3

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Civic Affairs Committee held on
Thursday, 5 December 2013 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Tony Orgee – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Kevin Cuffley Alison Elcox
Sebastian Kindersley Douglas de Lacey
Ray Manning Raymond Matthews
Jim Stewart Bunty Waters

Officers: Graham Aisthorpe-Watts Democratic Services Team Leader
Andrew Francis Electoral Services Manager
David Lord Senior Lawyer
Fiona McMillan Legal & Democratic Services Manager and
Monitoring Officer
Tracy Mann Development Officer
John Pym New Village Senior Planning Officer

Grant Osbourne (Independent Person) and Gillian Holmes (Deputy Independent Person) were in attendance, by invitation.

25. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Bard, Simon Edwards and Robert Turner.

26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute number 32 as he was a County Councillor for the Gamlingay Electoral Division, which included the area of Trumpington Meadows.

27. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 September 2013 were confirmed and signed by the Vice-Chairman as a correct record.

28. REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND POLLING PLACES

The Civic Affairs Committee considered a report which set out the results of a recently undertaken review of parliamentary polling districts and polling places as required by the Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013.

Details of the review had been sent by email to all District Councillors and Parish Clerks in South Cambridgeshire and no significant concerns were raised. An email from Councillor Hazel Smith was circulated which outlined her support of Milton Parish Council's view that it would need a larger polling station for the General Election in 2015 and that Milton Community Centre would be more appropriate. Andrew Francis, Electoral Services Manager, reported that he was aware of the issue at Milton and reassured Members that this would be considered in the lead-up to the 2015 General Election. Comments on specific polling stations had been received but it was noted that polling stations were not a formal part of the review into parliamentary polling districts and polling places. The District Council's Equality and Diversity Officer and the Acting Returning Officer at

East Cambridgeshire District Council had also been consulted as part of the review and their comments were set out in the report.

The Civic Affairs Committee **RECOMMENDED** to Council that no changes be made to the polling districts and places currently in place in South Cambridgeshire and **NOTED** that there would be a need for future local reviews in areas of concentrated development.

29. REPORTS FROM MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES

A report was considered which provided the Civic Affairs Committee with an opportunity to review the way in which Members reported information back to the Council following meetings of outside bodies they had been appointed to.

The Committee agreed that update reports from Members appointed to outside bodies should be submitted to the Partnerships Review Committee rather than full Council, other than Members of Cabinet who should continue to provide update reports to Cabinet.

Discussion ensued on the duration of update reports as to whether they should be submitted annually or after each meeting of the particular body. It was agreed that update reports should be submitted in line with the Partnerships Review Committee's schedule of meetings.

The Civic Affairs Committee **AGREED** that all Members appointed to an outside body should submit a written update report to each quarterly meeting of the Partnerships Review Committee, instead of Council, with the exception of those Members who already report to Cabinet.

30. UPDATE ON CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINTS

Consideration was given to a report on complaints cases regarding alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct.

The Civic Affairs Committee **NOTED** the progress of outstanding complaints.

31. NORTHSTOWE COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

A report was considered which updated the Civic Affairs Committee on progress to date in relation to the Longstanton, Oakington and Northstowe boundary review.

It was reported that there were very different opinions locally regarding the changing of boundary lines, the timing of such changes and the establishment of a standalone parish or town council. Officers were in the process of having informal discussions with Longstanton and Oakington Parish Councils and were also organising public drop-in sessions to informally discuss potential boundary changes to Longstanton and Oakington in light of the Northstowe development. A number of suggestions had been put forward by Oakington and Westwick Parish Councils and local residents that had attended public events to date, details of which were set out in the report.

Taking these suggestions into account, an officer working group had recently met and recommended that the current boundary between Longstanton and Oakington be left in place until such time as there were 1000 electors within the Northstowe Development Framework Document framework outline. This could act as a trigger for establishing Northstowe Parish Council, based on the legislation for the number of residents there needed to be for a parish council to be created.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley felt that it was important for a parish council to be established straight away, or as soon as possible, and reflected on lessons learnt at Bar Hill, Orchard Park and Cambourne regarding new communities and governance arrangements. He was of the opinion that residents currently living in the area affected by the Northstowe development should be given an opportunity to formally consider issues that would impact them in the years to come and that there should be enough people at Rampton Drift to set a parish council up immediately. Councillor Douglas de Lacey echoed these points and wanted to see more consultation with those new communities that had experienced similar governance issues.

Councillor Ray Manning reminded those present that Longstanton Parish Council had experienced problems in seeking expressions of interest from residents at Rampton Drift to stand as Parish Councillors. Taking into account the points raised regarding further consultation, he informed Members that no consultation had yet been undertaken with Willingham or Over Parish Councils and felt that it was appropriate to bring this issue back for reconsideration at a future meeting. He also emphasised the importance of contributions from local Members, two of whom were unfortunately unable to attend this meeting.

Councillor Alison Elcox suggested inviting people who were Parish Councillors at the time of similar reviews undertaken in the past, such as at Cambourne or Orchard Park, in order that they could share their knowledge having gone through this process. It was noted that the Community Governance Review procedure had changed significantly since Cambourne and Orchard Park and that Histon or Impington would be more appropriate from comparative purposes as they had followed the same process.

Councillor Jim Stewart proposed that this item be deferred to the next meeting so that local Members could be in attendance. It would also provide Members and officers with an opportunity to undertake more consultation and look into further information surrounding the issues discussed at this meeting.

The Civic Affairs Committee **DEFERRED** this item to its next meeting on 20 March 2014.

32. TRUMPINGTON MEADOWS COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

The Civic Affairs Committee considered a report which provided an update on progress to date in relation to the potential changes to parish boundaries at Haslingfield and Grantchester, in order to create a new parish for the development at Trumpington Meadows.

Members noted that Grantchester had agreed, in principle, to include a triangle of land known locally as Lingey Fen near to Bryon's Pool within its boundary. This meant that officers could begin informal consultation on full proposals, including the transferring of this land which was currently within Haslingfield. A new boundary line could be drawn at the same time to establish a new parish for Trumpington Meadows.

The Civic Affairs Committee **NOTED** the report.

33. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Civic Affairs Committee **AGREED** that that its next meeting would be held on 20 March 2014 at 10.00 a.m.

Councillor Tony Orgee, Vice-Chairman, closed proceedings by reporting that David Lord, Senior Lawyer, would be retiring later this month. He thanked Mr Lord for his service to the Council and in particular for the support he had provided to the Civic Affairs Committee, and congratulated him on his retirement.

The Meeting ended at 10.50 a.m.

Agenda Item 4



South
Cambridgeshire
District Council

Report To: Civic Affairs Committee
Lead Officer: Fiona McMillan, Legal and Democratic
Services Manager and Monitoring Officer

20 March 2014

Proposed amendments to the Constitution – recorded votes at meetings of Full Council

Purpose

1. This report sets out the implications of Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 and provides the Committee with an opportunity to consider a Notice of Motion referred from the meeting of Full Council on 27 February 2014 in relation to recorded votes.

Recommendations

2. That the Civic Affairs Committee:
 - (a) recommends to Full Council the introduction of a new paragraph 16.6 headed 'Record vote on budget decisions' to the Council's Standing Orders, to read:

"If the Council is considering an item on the Council's budget or the setting of the Council Tax, the names for and against the motion or amendment, abstaining from voting or not voting will be taken down in writing and entered into the minutes."
 - (b) Recommends to Full Council any necessary further amendments to Standing Orders as a result of considering the motion referred from the meeting held on 27 February 2014.

Reasons for Recommendations

3. The Council is required to amend its Standing Orders so as to include provisions for the recording of votes at budget meetings.
4. Depending on the outcome of the Committee's consideration of the motion referred from Full Council, it may be necessary to recommend to Full Council any necessary further amendments to the Council's Standing Orders under the section on recorded votes.

Background

5. The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 came into force on 25 February 2014. There are a number of provisions within the Regulations, but the amendment relevant to the Council is the new requirement for the votes of individual Members to be recorded when cast on budget decision items.

6. This new regulatory requirement is seen by the Government as necessary to allow local people the opportunity of seeing how their Councillors voted on all substantive motions agreeing the budget or setting Council Tax. The Government's rationale for change is set out in Brandon Lewis MP's letter dated 4 February 2014 to the Leader, attached at **Appendix A**.
7. Councillor Aidan Van De Weyer presented a Notice of Motion to Full Council on 27 February 2014 and the following resolution was passed:

"This Council requests that the Civic Affairs Committee considers and proposes amendments to the Council's Standing Orders so that all votes, except for those taken by affirmation and for appointments, are recorded in the manner described in Standing Order 16.5 (Recorded Vote)."
8. Councillor Van de Weyer explained to Council that his reason for seeking the motion was that he was questioned after the last Council meeting as to which way people had voted on a motion and was unable to demonstrate this. He felt that the introduction of recorded votes for all matters requiring a vote would make the Council more answerable to its electorate and make it more obvious if a party whip had been imposed prior to a vote.

Considerations

The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014

9. The Regulations make it mandatory for the Council to amend its Standing Orders so that all votes on budget decision items at meetings of Full Council are recorded in the minutes for that meeting.
10. The proposed amendments to the Council's Standing Orders, as set out in paragraph 2(a) of this report, ensure that the requirements of the Regulations are met.

Motion deferred from the meeting of Full Council, 27 February 2014

11. The Committee is invited to consider the motion referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 27 February 2014, as set out in paragraph 7 of this report.
12. The Council's Standing Orders currently make the following provision for recorded votes:
 - (a) A recorded vote can be instigated when any six Members, or a quarter of those present at the meeting (whichever is the fewer) demand it. The names for and against the motion or amendment will be taken down in writing and entered into the minutes for the meeting, together with the names of any Members abstaining from voting or not voting.
 - (b) A demand for a recorded vote overrides a demand for a ballot, but the recorded vote procedure does not apply to voting on appointments.
 - (c) Members have the right to require that their individual vote on a motion or amendment be recorded in the minutes.

Options

13. The Council is required to amend its Standing Orders to include provision for a recorded vote on all budget decision items. The Committee could support recommendation (a) in paragraph 3, or propose an alternative form of words for inclusion in the Council's Standing Orders.
14. The Committee could support the principles of the motion referred to in paragraph 7 of the report and recommend this to Full Council. In doing so it would have to put forward specific changes to the wording of the Council's Standing Orders, or delegate this to officers in liaison with certain Members, such as the Chairman of the Committee and Councillor Van De Weyer as proposer of the original Notice of Motion.
15. The Committee could agree not to put forward any recommendations to Full Council on the subject of the motion referred to in paragraph 7 of the report and maintain the current practice of recorded votes, other than those relating to budget decision items.

Implications

16. In the writing of this report, taking into account financial, legal, staffing, risk management, equality and diversity, climate change, community safety and any other key issues, the following implications have been considered: -

Legal

17. The Council is required by law to amend its Standing Orders to require a recorded vote for budget meetings as soon as is practicably possible.

Consultation responses (including from the Youth Council)

18. No consultation on the content of this report has been undertaken.

Effect on Strategic Aims

19. This report does not have any significant effect on the Council's strategic aims.

Background Papers

The following document was used in the preparation of this report:

The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, which can be viewed online via the following link:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2014/165/made>

Report Author: Graham Aisthorpe-Watts – Democratic Services Team Leader
Telephone: (01954) 713030

This page is left blank intentionally.



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

Brandon Lewis MP
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State

**Department for Communities and Local
Government**

Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

The Leader
Principal Councils in England

Tel: 0303 444 3430
Fax: 0303 444 3986
E-Mail: brandon.lewis@communities.gsi.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/dclg

Dear Leader

04 February 2014

Recorded Votes at Budget Meetings

In the coming weeks, your council will be holding its annual budget meeting at which it will be formally taking decisions about its expenditure on local services and council tax levels for the year ahead. These discussions will affect the lives and household budgets of all who live in the council's area. Local people should be able to see how those they have elected to represent them have voted on these critical decisions.

Accordingly I am writing to you today to say that the Government's expectation is that at this year's budget meetings, all councils will adopt the practice of recorded votes – that is recording in the minutes of the meeting how each member present voted – on any decision relating to the budget or council tax. People will thus be able to see how their councillors voted, not only on the substantive budget motions agreeing the budget, setting council taxes or issuing precepts, but also on any amendments proposed at the meeting.

We are very clear that any serious commitment to transparency and democratic accountability, which I am confident we all share, demands nothing less in today's circumstances. I know that the practice of recorded votes is already being followed in a range of circumstances across councils. If local people are to continue to have confidence in their councils and their elected representatives, then the practice of recorded votes needs to be followed everywhere on this year's budget decisions.

To facilitate this, we have last week made 'The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014'. These Regulations make it mandatory for councils as soon as is practicable after the Regulations are in force, to amend their Standing Orders so as to include provisions requiring recorded votes at budget meetings.

I recognise that some councils may be holding budget meetings before they have formally amended their Standing Orders, but nothing prevents the council from simply resolving to holding a recorded vote, in line with the Regulations.

BRANDON LEWIS MP

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 5



South
Cambridgeshire
District Council

Report To: Civic Affairs Committee
Lead Officer: Head of Legal and Democratic Services

20 March 2014

Northstowe Community Governance Review

Purpose

1. To update Civic Affairs Committee with regard to progress in relation to the Longstanton, Oakington & Westwick and Northstowe Boundary Review.

Recommendations

2. It is recommended that the Committee approves to leave the current boundary between Longstanton and Oakington & Westwick in place until such time as there is more clarity in relation to timing and size of future phases of the Northstowe development.
3. At the same time, Officers continue to work with the local parish councils, local residents, and any working group that is set up, and report on progress and changing views and considerations to each Civic Affairs Committee.

Reasons for Recommendations

4. Following on from the update presented to Committee in December 2013, Officers have now completed the public events as set out in the December Report. As well as the public events and meeting with Rampton Drift residents, Officers have also visited the parish council meetings of Longstanton and Oakington & Westwick to continue discussions in relation to any boundary changes. There remain very different opinions as to changing boundary lines and the timing of any changes, along with concern at making changes while there remains a lack of clarity in relation to the timescale of future phases of Northstowe.

Background

5. The views captured at the public events and meeting with Rampton Drift residents reflected the differences of opinion that had been captured earlier in the year:
 - Some local residents would like to see boundary changes carried out using the DFD framework so that Northstowe becomes a stand alone parish council immediately.
 - Some local residents would like to see a phased approach to changing the boundary.
 - Some would like Northstowe to remain part of Longstanton.
 - No formal view has, as yet, been received from Longstanton Parish Council.
 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council's view remains to leave the boundary as it is until such time as the build out reaches Oakington.
 - A general lack of appetite amongst local people to become parish councillors for Northstowe.

Considerations

6. The Chair of Longstanton Parish Council and the Local Member for Longstanton attended the meeting with Rampton Drift residents. Although there was a lack of appetite amongst the residents present to become parish councillors for Northstowe (or Longstanton), there was some interest in the idea put forward by the Chair of Longstanton Parish Council to form a small 'Northstowe' working group. This working group could work alongside Longstanton Parish Council and be involved in discussions and work relating to Northstowe, working alongside SCDC Officers as well as Longstanton Parish Council. The working group could include local residents that are interested in being involved with Northstowe but are not currently able or willing to undertake the commitment of being a parish councillor. This would also enable them to gain confidence and understanding of governance at a local level. Members of the working group would also then learn more about parish council roles and responsibilities. Officers are holding a special meeting with Longstanton Parish Council to discuss further on 17 March so a verbal update will be provided at the Committee meeting.

Options

7.
 - (i) **Stand Alone Northstowe Parish/Town Council (as described in December's Report):**

Set up a stand along Northstowe Parish/Town Council immediately, using the DFD framework outline as the new boundary. Locally, this remains the least supported option.
 - (ii) **Phased Boundary Change for Longstanton (as described in December's Report):**

Use a phased approach for the boundary changes as each phase of Northstowe is granted permission. Locally, this has a small amount of support.
 - (iii) **Defer further work on boundary changes:**

This is the preferred option until such time as there is more clarity in relation to timing and size of future phases of Northstowe. Officers would continue to work with the parish councils of Longstanton and Oakington & Westwick, as well as local residents and any 'working group' that may be set up. Officers would continue to report back to each Civic Affairs Committee meeting with regular updates on Northstowe's progress and recommendations as to timings of any boundary changes.

Implications

8. There are no significant implications.

Financial

9. If a CGR is to be undertaken there will be associated costs of publicity and consultation which need to be met by the Council. It is not possible to quantify those costs at this stage.

Legal

10. Compliance with the 2007 Act and associated guidance will help avoid challenge to the process or the outcome.

Staffing

11. It is expected that a CGR can be carried out within existing staff resources in New Communities and Legal.

Risk Management

12. There are no significant implications.

Equality and Diversity

13. There are no significant implications.

Climate Change

14. There are no significant implications.

Consultation responses (including from the Youth Council)

The Youth Council is currently considering this and will respond more formally at its next meeting on 13th April 2014

Background Papers

Where [the Local Authorities \(Executive Arrangements\) \(Meetings and Access to Information\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#) require documents to be open to inspection by members of the public, they must be available for inspection: -

- (a) at all reasonable hours at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council;
- (b) on the Council's website; and
- (c) in the case of documents to be available for inspection pursuant to regulation 15, on payment of a reasonable fee required by the Council by the person seeking to inspect the documents at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Report Author: Tracy Mann – Development Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713342

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 6



South
Cambridgeshire
District Council

Report To: Civic Affairs Committee
Lead Officer: Head of Legal and Democratic Services

20 March 2014

Trumpington Meadows Community Governance Review

Purpose

1. To update Civic Affairs Committee with regard to progress so far as regards the potential changes to parish boundaries at Haslingfield and Grantchester, in order to create a new parish for the development at Trumpington Meadows.

Recommendations

2. It is recommended that the Committee notes progress is in line with the June 2013 Civic Affairs Report.

Reasons for Recommendations

3. Further to the Committee's Report of 5 December 2013, Officers are now informally consulting on the proposed boundary changes between Haslingfield and Grantchester.

Background

4. In June 2013 Committee agreed that a Community Governance Review should be undertaken to consider the future governance arrangements for the new community at Trumpington Meadows. Officers then began informal discussions with interested parties, including Haslingfield and Grantchester Parish Councils.

Considerations

5. Officers have attended the Southern Fringe Community Forum with displays and information relating to the proposed boundary changes; a formal letter has now been received from Trumpington Residents' Association (see attached). Officers are attending a public meeting with Haslingfield Parish Council and local residents on 16th April to consult on the boundary changes and the Parish Council's proposed traffic calming measures. Cambridge City Council Officers and Members have been consulted although no response has been received as yet. Officers will be visiting neighbouring parish councils to explain the boundary changes in May and June. Details of the proposals and where to find more information will also be included in the Welcome Packs that are distributed to new residents as they move in to Trumpington Meadows.

The name of the new parish is also one of the responsibilities of this Committee as part of the Community Governance Review and suggestions for names will be included in the informal consultations that are currently taking place.

Action	When	Who
Public Meeting at Haslingfield Parish Council and local residents	16/04/2014	TM & JP
Public Meeting at Grantchester Parish Council and local residents	May 2014	TM & JP

Informal consultation meetings with Harston and Hauxton Parish Councils to inform of changes.	June 2014	TM & JP
Update Report to Civic Affairs Committee	Next meeting	TM

Implications

There are no significant implications.

Financial

6. If a CGR is to be undertaken there will be associated costs of publicity and consultation which need to be met by the Council. It is not possible to quantify those costs at this stage.

Legal

7. Compliance with the 2007 Act and associated guidance will help avoid challenge to the process of the outcome.

Staffing

8. It is expected that a CGR can be carried out within existing staff resources in New Communities and Legal.

Risk Management

9. There are no significant implications.

Equality and Diversity

10. There are no significant implications.

Climate Change

11. There are no significant implications.

Consultation responses (including from the Youth Council)

12. The Youth Council is keen to see new governance arrangements set up for Trumpington Meadows because it will be an urban extension so feel more part of the City than a rural District.

Background Papers

Where [the Local Authorities \(Executive Arrangements\) \(Meetings and Access to Information\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#) require documents to be open to inspection by members of the public, they must be available for inspection: -

- (a) at all reasonable hours at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council;
- (b) on the Council's website; and
- (c) in the case of documents to be available for inspection pursuant to regulation 15, on payment of a reasonable fee required by the Council by the person seeking to inspect the documents at the offices of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Report Author: Tracy Mann - Development Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713342



28 February 2014

Tracy Mann
South Cambridgeshire District Council

Thank you very much for the information about the Parish Boundary Review of the existing Haslingfield parish.

In the absence of a revision of the City/District boundary, the Trumpington Residents' Association supports the proposed new boundaries which seem very realistic. Although it will cover a small area, the new parish will have a substantial urban population compared with the residual Haslingfield parish.

We are less sure about the potential name of the new parish. As you know, the history of the area is that it was in Trumpington parish until 1934. The parish had existed for 1000 years at that point, as described in the Victoria County History:

The ancient parish of Trumpington lay immediately south of Cambridge. Almost triangular in shape, before 1900 it covered 2,312 a. ... In 1912 the north-east corner of the parish, 497 a. including all the land north of the Long or Mill road, which runs due east from the Cambridge-Trumpington road to the Hills road, was transferred to the city of Cambridge. In 1934 most of the rest of Trumpington parish, including the whole of the village, was incorporated in the city; 382 a. in the south-west, virtually uninhabited, were transferred to the adjoining parish of Haslingfield. From: 'Parishes: Trumpington', A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 8 (1982), pp. 248-267. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=66760>.

We do not think 'Trumpington Meadows' would be a good choice for the name. The term has no historic context and was applied by the current developers when they took on the land. Given that 50% of the homes in the Trumpington Meadows development will be within the City and not in the new parish, we feel on balance that this name would be confusing.

We have thought about other permutations of 'Trumpington', and 'West Trumpington', 'South Trumpington' or 'South West Trumpington' seem to us to be possibilities (the latter is the most accurate but may be too cumbersome).

We next considered names with an historic connection with the immediate area. When Trumpington was enclosed by Act of Parliament in 1804-09, land to the west of Hauxton Road was awarded to Christopher Anstey, the owner of Anstey Hall, and the area was called 'Hauxton Field' (http://www.trumpingtonlocalhistorygroup.org/subjects_farming_enclosure3.html). Most of the land was later farmed as Anstey Hall Farm. It was acquired by the Plant Breeding Institute in 1950 and PBI used the local name 'Maris' for many of its plant developments (http://www.trumpingtonlocalhistorygroup.org/subjects_PBIhistory.html). Before the Anstey family, the manor later called 'Anstey Hall' had been held by a series of owners including the

Trumpington Residents' Association

A Company Limited by Guarantee. Company Number 6729377. Registered in England.

Registered Office: Trumpington Pavilion, Paget Road, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9JF.

www.trumpingtonresidentsassociation.org Page 17

Bowyer, Bacchus and Thompson families. Unfortunately, none of this offers up a suitable name, with 'Anstey Parish' and 'Maris Parish' both seeming awkward.

Another approach might be to follow the style of nearby parishes and create a name with 'Ha ...' as its starting point and 'ton' as its end, such as 'Hatton Parish'.

A final suggestion is to create a name based on the river, but unfortunately the branch of the Cam that forms the southern boundary of the new parish is the 'Granta' and not the 'Rhee', and there are prior claims on 'Cam' and 'Granta'!

When we had a brief discussion about this at our members' meeting on 26 February, there was no consensus whether it was positive or negative to have 'Trumpington' as part of the parish name, but on balance, our suggestion for the preferred name is 'West Trumpington' or 'South Trumpington'.

Andrew Roberts
Secretary
Trumpington Residents' Association

Agenda Item 7

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Civic Affairs Committee

20th March 2014

AUTHOR/S: Monitoring Officer

UPDATE ON CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINTS

Purpose

1. To update members on complaints cases regarding alleged breaches of the code of conduct.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That the Civic Affairs Committee **note** the progress of outstanding complaints and the conclusion of cases resolved since the last meeting.

3. **Complaint cases concluded since last meeting:**

- (a) **CORCOM 956**

The complaint was made by a resident in relation to a district councillor, who is also a parish councillor, concerning his involvement in an issue in his parish in which he is alleged to have an interest which has not been declared. After consideration of the evidence by the Monitoring Officer and the Independent Person it was considered that the district councillor did not have any relevant interests to declare and had not breached the code of conduct so no further action would be taken.

4. **New complaint cases/cases outstanding at 10th March 2014:**

- (a) **CORCOMS1054, 1055, 1056, 1057**

This complaint was made by a representative of a group of residents about four parish councillors following negotiations taking place on the renewal of a lease on a building owned by the parish council. As one of the councillors was the chairman of the parish council the parish council requested that the complaint was dealt with by the Monitoring Officer. The complainant alleged a number of breaches of the code of conduct including failure to treat with respect, bullying and threatening behaviour, inappropriate conduct and displaying a lack of leadership. The Monitoring Officer and Independent Person concluded that the four councillors did not appear to have breached the code of conduct or acted improperly in any way and felt the complaints stemmed from frustration at the outcome of the lease negotiations which was not an appropriate use of the code of conduct complaints procedures. It was also concluded that parish councillors who support the actions of their Chairman in representing the parish council's wishes did not display a lack of leadership. No further action is to be taken.

(b) **CORCOM 1046**

This complaint was made by a two parish councillors and a resident about a parish councillor. As one of the councillors was the chairman of the parish council the parish council requested that the complaint was dealt with by the Monitoring Officer. The complaints involve failure to declare interests at the parish council. Further responses are currently awaited before the written evidence will be considered by the Monitoring Officer and Independent Person.

5. **Other complaints**

The Monitoring Officer continues to advise a number of parish councils in relation to conduct-related issues such as when and how to declare interests which do not form the basis of a formal complaint.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Localism Act 2011
SCDC Code of Conduct Complaints procedures

Contact Officer: Fiona McMillan
Monitoring Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713027