

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 25 September 2014 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor David Bard – Chairman
Councillor Sue Ellington – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Richard Barrett, Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Alison Elcox, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Mark Howell, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, David McCraith, David Morgan, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, Aidan Van de Weyer, David Whiteman-Downes, John Williams, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright

Officers:	Alex Colyer	Executive Director, Corporate Services
	Jean Hunter	Chief Executive
	Fiona McMillan	Legal & Democratic Services Manager and Monitoring Officer
	Graham Watts	Democratic Services Team Leader

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tom Bygott, Caroline Hunt, Raymond Matthews, Robin Page and Ed Stonham.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at this stage of proceedings.

3. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

The Chairman reminded Members that they needed to update their register of interests whenever their circumstances changed.

4. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor David Bard, Chairman of the Council, reminded Members that his Chairman's Reception would be held on 7 November 2014.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, welcomed Councillor Robert Turner to his first meeting of Full Council since his appointment as Portfolio Holder of Planning. Councillor Manning also made the following announcements:

- two workshops for Members from Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on the Infrastructure Programme for the Greater Cambridge City Deal would be held on 2 October 2014 in Cambourne and 10 October 2014 in Cambridge. All Members were encouraged to attend either event;
- meetings were due to be held throughout October at Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to consider shared services proposals. A report scheduled to be considered by Cabinet on 16 October 2014 would be published earlier than usual on 2 October 2014 to coincide with the publication of the same report by Cambridge City Council and Huntingdonshire District Council.

Members of the Council joined the Chairman by way of a round of applause in congratulating Councillor James Hockney on recently becoming a father for the first time.

6. **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No questions from the public had been received.

7. **PETITIONS**

No petitions had been received.

8. **TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:**

8 (a) **The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 (Civic Affairs Committee, 25 September 2014)**

Councillor Kevin Cuffley, Vice-Chairman of the Civic Affairs Committee, proposed the recommendation contained within the report. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Douglas de Lacey.

Upon being put to the vote Council unanimously **AGREED** to set the level for officer decisions considered as 'materially affecting the Council's financial position' at Level 4 in the Council's Financial Regulations and above, i.e. at present values, over £50,000.

9. **MEMBER DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2014-17**

Councillor David Whiteman-Downes presented the Member Development Strategy for 2014-17 to the Council and proposed that it be approved. Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, seconded the proposal.

In debating the Strategy, Councillor Douglas de Lacey, Convenor of the Independent Group, was of the opinion that training and development opportunities did not appear to be as flexible and responsive as the Strategy's main objectives indicated. He cited an example whereby a Member of his group had not received Planning Committee training as he had been unable to attend the training session on the one date allocated. Councillors Lynda Harford, Chairman of the Planning Committee, and Robert Turner, former Chairman of the Planning Committee, both indicated that officers had offered one-to-one training to any Member unable to attend the main Planning Committee training session.

Upon being put to the vote Council **APPROVED** the Member Development Strategy for 2014-17.

10. APPOINTMENT TO THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, proposed the recommendations contained within the report. Councillor Sebastian Kindersley seconded the proposal and Council:

- (a) **AGREED** to re-appoint Simon Harris as a member of the Independent Remuneration Panel for a three-year term of office, with an expiry date of 31 July 2017.
- (b) **CONFIRMED** that the level of expenses paid to the individual members of the Independent Remuneration Panel be no more than £200 each per financial year. The final amount payable to be agreed by the Executive Director in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

11. QUESTIONS ON JOINT MEETINGS

No questions on joint meetings were received.

12. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**12 (a) From Councillor Peter Johnson**

Councillor Peter Johnson asked the Housing Portfolio Holder the following question:

"Why is a charge of £5 per hour being introduced for use of the Denson Close Waterbeach Sheltered Housing Community Room by the residents of that Sheltered Housing Scheme?"

Councillor Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Housing, responded to the question and said that this was not specific to the Waterbeach Sheltered Housing Community Room and that this affected all such facilities across the district. Charging for use of these facilities was considered as part of the sheltered housing review in 2011/12 and a report from that review came to his Portfolio Holder Meeting in February 2012 recommending a regularisation of charges to both internal and external groups. Councillor Howell reported that a significant period of time had been taken to allow for consultation on this issue and as a result of 115 letters being sent to individuals or organisations, only 9 people provided a response. He clarified that if solely for use by internal groups the charge would be £2.50 per hour, whereas the charge was £5 per hour for external groups, where the number of external people exceeded 55% of the group. Councillor Howell reflected on the cost of renting similar facilities, such as village halls or other community rooms, and felt that these charges were very reasonable.

As a supplementary question Councillor Johnson asked whether there were any further hidden charges.

Councillor Howell responded by saying that he had allowed two and a half years for these arrangements to be introduced so did not accept that they were hidden charges.

13. FROM COUNCILLOR KEVIN CUFFLEY

Councillor Kevin Cuffley asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Could the Leader explain how the new method of refuse collection will improve the service for residents given that there will be a break in service over the Christmas period?”

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, responded to the question and explained that these changes were part of moving towards better working conditions that would eventually deliver a better service and savings. The service would be more resilient, with smarter and quicker routes, and the reduction of green bin collections during winter months when green waste was minimal would add to the potential for savings.

Councillor Manning reflected on the break in service over Christmas and was of the opinion that the way Christmas fell this year, with Christmas Day and Boxing Day being a Thursday and Friday respectively, made the impact seem worse than it was. Councillor Manning made it clear that side-waste would be collected when the rounds returned after the Christmas break.

The Leader added that the Scrutiny and Overview Committee would be asked to review the impact of the new arrangements in the New Year.

14. FROM COUNCILLOR SEBASTIAN KINDERSLEY

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Many members of the Council were horrified by the recent appeal decisions at Waterbeach which effectively declared open season on our communities leaving them all vulnerable to unplanned, unsustainable and unwanted developments. Furthermore the decisions effectively destroyed the Council's ambition to have a plan-led development strategy with consequences not only for South Cambridgeshire but also the City of Cambridge.

Could the Leader please outline the steps he and the Cabinet have taken to take control and leadership of the situation relating to the Waterbeach appeal decisions, in particular (but not limited to) details of contact/discussions/meetings with Members of Parliament, Ministers, Government bodies/groups, Parliamentary Select Committees, senior civil servants, the media, other authorities facing the same or similar issues, the Local Government Association and South Cambridgeshire's Parish Councils?”

Councillor Robert Turner, Portfolio Holder for Planning, responded to the question and informed Council that he would be holding regular Portfolio Holder Meetings where any Member could attend and ask questions on this issue. He would also be holding a meeting with all political group leaders on 26 September 2014 and had indicated to officers that he would like regular meetings with the Inspector as part of the examination process.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley was of the opinion that nothing had been done to change the impact of these decisions at Waterbeach and even the Memorandum of Understanding with Cambridge City Council would not change anything. He did not believe any negotiations with the bodies referred to in his original question had taken place, which he claimed was a complete dereliction of duty and abandonment of leadership, and asked the Portfolio Holder, as a supplementary question, what he intended to do about it.

Councillor Turner referred to an email he sent to all Members of the Council when the initial decision at Waterbeach was announced, in which he invited any Member to contact him if they were of the view that the Council should challenge the decision.

He emphasised that he had not received a single response from any Member of the Council to that email, which made it clear in his mind at the time that the consensus of opinion from the Council was that an appeal should not be submitted. He reiterated that he would meet on a regular basis with the Inspector throughout the examination process and do as much as he could to ensure that the Local Plan went through as soon as practically possible.

Councillor Turner reflected on a number of appeals that had been submitted elsewhere in the country and recent debates held in parliament on this issue, none of which had been successful or had resulted in different outcomes. In closing, he reminded Members that the Council voted through the Local Plan for submission to the Secretary of State in March 2014 and although some Members voted against it, he was of the opinion that the Council would be in a much more difficult position had the Plan not have been submitted at that stage.

15. FROM COUNCILLOR JANET LOCKWOOD

Councillor Janet Lockwood asked the Housing Portfolio Holder the following question:

“Please could the Housing Portfolio Holder tell Council how many developments of six houses or more have been allowed to give commuted sums to the Council in lieu of affordable housing, and how the commuted sums for affordable housing from small developments have been spent over the past ten years?”

Councillor Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Housing, reported that in the last five years there had been 78 Section 106 development sites, excluding the Cambridge Southern Fringe strategic sites. For 65 of those developments the affordable housing element had been utilised to generate 940 new affordable homes across the district. Commuted sums had been accepted on the 13 remaining schemes where the Council had waived the right to 32 units for an amount of £945,977. £914,073 of this money had been spent on 14 schemes in the same time period, enabling a further 83 affordable homes to be built which was a ratio of 2.6 new homes for every one unit taken as a commuted sum.

Councillor Howell also highlighted that there had been a significant contribution to the Council's commuted sum pot of over £1 million in respect of new developments in Papworth Everard where there was no requirement for extra affordable homes within the village. A specific programme to spend this money was being developed.

Councillor Lockwood, as a supplementary question, asked how much of the original funding remained and where this was held in the Council's budget.

Councillor Howell confirmed that approximately £31,000 was waiting to be spent and that this currently sat within the Council's housing budget.

15 (a) From Councillor Bridget Smith

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, asked the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development the following question:

“The recent performance of our Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) has been poor in the extreme with proportionally less money awarded to us than to other LEPs. What is this Council planning to do to ensure that our LEP improves its performance and productivity and that South Cambridgeshire in particular derives maximum benefit from the LEP?”

Councillor Nick Wright, Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, reminded the Council that the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership was one of five partners for the Greater Cambridge City Deal and was very supportive towards that, as well as being financially supportive with regard to the A14 improvement scheme.

Councillor Wright shared Councillor Smith's disappointment with regard to the first round of growth agenda funding granted to the Local Enterprise Partnership, however, he was confident that with increasing local authority engagement, through the City Deal process in particular, the Partnership should receive a better share of funding in the next round.

Councillor Smith was concerned that there was only four weeks to go before the next bid for growth agenda funding had to be submitted. She felt that residents had a right to know how the Local Enterprise Partnership was spending public money in the area and was particularly interested to understand how the governance model behind the Partnership operated. Councillor Smith therefore asked, as a supplementary question, whether the Council's Corporate Governance Committee would be scrutinising the governance of the Local Enterprise Partnership.

Councillor Wright made the point that the Local Enterprise Partnership's Board made decisions as to the governance model to be used by the wider Partnership. The Corporate Governance Committee at its meeting on 3 September 2014 had expressed an interest in considering the governance of the Local Enterprise Partnership, further to which an invitation had been extended to the Partnership's Chief Executive Officer to attend the next meeting. Due to imminent changes in key personnel at the Partnership it was felt by the Chairman of the Corporate Governance Committee that it was not the appropriate time to follow up this invitation.

16. FROM COUNCILLOR TUMI HAWKINS

Councillor Tumi Hawkins asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

"On 10th February 2012, a High Court Judge ruled that 'The saying of prayers as part of the formal meeting of a Council is not lawful under section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972, and there is no statutory power permitting the practice to continue'.

This Council subsequently and swiftly abolished the long standing practice of saying prayers before Full Council meetings.

On 18 February 2012, this shocking ruling was subsequently overtaken when the Local Government Secretary Eric Pickles announced a major new power contained in the Localism Act 2011 which he fast tracked, to allow local councils to continue to include prayers at meetings. Mr Pickles in announcing the new powers said:

'As a matter of urgency I have personally signed a Parliamentary order to bring into force an important part of the new Localism Act - the general power of competence - that gives councils the vital legal standing that should allow them to continue to hold formal prayers at meetings where they wish to do so.'

'We will stand for freedom to worship, for Parliamentary sovereignty, and for long-standing British liberties.'

This Council has yet to act on this revised directive.

Can the Leader please tell us when this Council will stand up for freedom to worship in this authority and take steps necessary to enable the return of our long standing practice of prayer to be said before Full Council meetings?"

Councillor David Bard, Chairman of the Council, answered the question and confirmed that changes to the practice of saying prayers at meetings of Full Council occurred as a result of the Chairman's discretion when Councillor Jim Stewart was Chairman of the Council seven years ago and was nothing to do with the court ruling in 2012. Councillor Bard would continue the practice of allowing those in attendance to have a moment's reflection in silence before the commencement of proceedings so that individuals could choose to do whatever they wanted in accordance with their own personal beliefs.

17. NOTICES OF MOTION

17 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Robin Page

This notice of motion was **DEFERRED** to the next meeting.

17 (b) Standing in the name of Councillor Sebastian Kindersley

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley proposed the following motion:

"This Council welcomes the increased funding and improved coordination that the City Deal will bring. However the emerging details of the undemocratic decision-making process and inadequate scrutiny structure raise profound concerns. The current proposals can only be acceptable if the City Deal is a stepping stone towards a unitary authority.

This Council therefore requests that the Cabinet and officers begin actively working towards the creation of a unitary council, in particular by engaging with neighbouring councils, political groups and central government. This should be done as publicly and transparently as possible, for example through a joint working party, so that the whole electorate can be informed and involved in the discussion."

Councillor Kindersley made it clear that the purpose of this motion was not to commit the Council in anyway, but simply to ask that preliminary work commenced on the concept of creating a unitary authority. With significant partnership working already occurring between Councils in Cambridgeshire, or likely to occur in the near future, through various shared services proposals and the Greater Cambridge City Deal he felt that it was the right time and an ideal opportunity to explore the creation of a unitary authority.

Reflecting on what he perceived as being a great deal of confusion experienced by residents in understanding which services were the responsibility of Parish Councils, the District Council and the County Council, Councillor Kindersley felt that a unitary authority arrangement would make much more sense to them. He also listed a number of Councils in the last three years who had established unitary arrangements whereby tens of millions of pounds in each case had been saved as a result.

Councillor Deborah Roberts seconded the proposal and was in favour of investigating the prospect of a unitary authority, especially in view of the amount of money that she felt could be saved.

In debating the motion, the following comments were made:

- a unitary authority brought with it strategic advantages, particularly with regard to planning, transport and housing;
- the proposed governance arrangements for the Greater Cambridge City Deal meant that from 2019 the Local Plan would in fact be decided by the three Leaders of the three partner Councils and representatives from the Local Enterprise Partnership and University, rather than by this Council. It would therefore be better for a unitary authority to be established with proper control and influence over all of its areas of responsibility, with proper democracy;
- the motion was solely proposing an evidence gathering exercise to enable the Council, at the relevant time, to make an informed decision on whether or not to establish a unitary authority;
- South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council had two completely different focuses, so a unitary authority in this area would not be well-suited. The District Council was focused on 'place' in terms of services such as planning, housing, street cleaning, and waste collection whereas the County Council had a focus on 'people' through services such as education and social services for example. There were naturally cross-overs, but the primary focuses were very different;
- the City Deal, and other shared services proposals, sought to identify strategic partners for those services that could be delivered jointly, enabling the Council to draw on the knowledge and experience of other partners to improve the level of service for residents;
- it was clear from Ministers that combined authorities were seen as the way forward, rather than unitary authorities. A combined authority for the City Deal, should such an arrangement be introduced, would see transport powers transferred from the County Council for the first time;
- the City Deal had been considered and worked up in partnership for the last two years and it should be given an opportunity to progress. The three partner Councils would be asked to make a definitive decision on the City Deal proposals in due course, meaning that this issue would be debated at a meeting of Full Council.

Voting on the motion, with 19 votes in favour, 32 votes against and 1 abstention, the motion was lost.

Enough Members as prescribed by the Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors Henry Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Jonathan Chatfield, Neil Davies, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Cicely Murfitt, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Aidan Van De Weyer and John Williams.

Against

Councillors Richard Barrett, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Alison Elcox, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Mark Howell, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, David McCraith, David Morgan, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Neil Scarr, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

Abstention

Councillor David Bard.

18. STANDING IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR JAMES HOCKNEY

Councillor James Hockney proposed the following motion:

“The Council expresses disappointment with the recent decisions by Planning Inspector Pete Drew, allowing appeals against refusal of planning permission for developments on Cody Road and Bannold Road Waterbeach. These have given rise to considerable uncertainty and anxiety, especially among residents of my ward, concerning development of land not allocated for housing either in the current Local Development Framework or the submission Local Plan.

The Council welcomes the agreement between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on a Memorandum of Understanding that the phasing of housing delivery across the two areas should be taken together, including for calculating the five-year land supply.

The Council also looks to the inspector heading the public examination into the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans to provide clarity on the five-year land supply question at the earliest opportunity so to protect communities like Waterbeach from speculative developments.”

Councillor Hockney reflected on the loss of the Barracks at Waterbeach and the significant impact that this had on the village, coupled with the threat of a new town as part of the Council’s submission Local Development Plan. An important aspect set out in the Local Plan from the perspective of the community of Waterbeach was the partial separation between the village and the proposed town. Councillor Hockney said that these decisions by the Planning Inspector had now taken this partial separation away, with another 57 applications having been approved which were originally refused by the Council’s Planning Committee. He was pleased that the Committee refused the applications, as he was of the view that this sent a signal out to developers that South Cambridgeshire District Council was not afraid to refuse applications just because of the risk of losing a planning appeal.

Councillor Hockney went on to state that this was not just an issue for Waterbeach, but could relate to any community in South Cambridgeshire that had speculative development coming forward.

Councillor Alison Elcox seconded the proposal and agreed that this issue affected every ward in South Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley proposed an amendment to remove the last paragraph of the motion and replace it with the following:

“This Council formally and respectfully requests that the Inspector moves consideration of all housing land supply issues to the start of the Inquiry proceedings.”

The proposer and seconder of the original motion accepted the amendment, which became the substantive motion.

It was proposed by Councillor Ray Manning and seconded by Councillor Alex Riley that the motion be put to the vote, further to which Council unanimously **AGREED** the following motion:

“The Council expresses disappointment with the recent decisions by Planning Inspector Pete Drew, allowing appeals against refusal of planning permission for developments on Cody Road and Bannold Road Waterbeach. These have given rise to considerable uncertainty and anxiety, especially among residents of my ward, concerning development of land not allocated for housing either in the current Local Development Framework or the submission Local Plan.

The Council welcomes the agreement between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on a Memorandum of Understanding that the phasing of housing delivery across the two areas should be taken together, including for calculating the five-year land supply.

This Council formally and respectfully requests that the Inspector moves consideration of all housing land supply issues to the start of the Inquiry proceedings.”

19. STANDING IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR JOHN WILLIAMS

Councillor John Williams proposed the following motion:

“With negotiations going on between South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council on the merging of the kerb side waste collection service of the two authorities, this Council wants to see as a result of any such merger no further deterioration in quality and frequency of its household refuse collection service which has seen the South Cambridgeshire household recycling rate be far better than that of the city.”

Councillor Williams was concerned about the changes to refuse collection rounds over the Christmas period this year and the impact that this would have on the level of service provided to residents. He was also keen to ensure that the high level of service provided by South Cambridgeshire District Council with regard to refuse collection did not deteriorate as a result of entering into a shared service with Cambridge City Council.

Councillor Bridget Smith seconded the proposal.

Councillor Alex Riley proposed the deletion of the words ‘further’ and ‘quality and frequency of’ so that the motion read:

“With negotiations going on between South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council on the merging of the kerb side waste collection service of the two authorities, this Council wants to see as a result of any such merger no deterioration in its household refuse collection service which has seen the South Cambridgeshire household recycling rate be far better than that of the city.”

This amendment was accepted by the original proposer and seconder and became the substantive motion.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey proposed an amendment to replace the words ‘wants to see’ with the word ‘insists’. The amendment was not accepted by the proposer of the original motion and so the amendment was withdrawn.

Councillor Mick Martin, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, welcomed the positive comments about the performance of the refuse collection service. He made it clear that the first principle of operating a shared service was that it must provide the same or better service to residents. A document outlining the business case for the proposed shared service arrangement would be published shortly for consideration by the Council's Cabinet, the details of which were confidential at this stage. Councillor Martin was of the opinion that any decision made on the motion at this meeting would be premature and could potentially obstruct the proposals contained within the Cabinet report.

In view of Councillor Martin's comments, Councillor Alex Riley proposed that the Council adjourned debate of this motion to enable Cabinet to consider the report on the shared services proposal at its October meeting. Councillor de Lacey seconded the proposal and Council **ADJOURNED** the debate of this motion.

20. **STANDING IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR AIDAN VAN DE WEYER**

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer moved the following motion:

"While recognising that the new town of Northstowe requires a huge amount of infrastructure investment from developers and that affordable housing obligations must allow developments to be economically viable, this Council is concerned that affordable housing provision in Northstowe is being squeezed down to a level that threatens the sustainability of the new town and the contribution that it can make to the district-wide supply of social housing.

This Council reiterates its support for the planning policies concerning affordable housing.

This Council expects the Homes and Communities Agency to agree that all information about viability is made public so that the decisions on this matter can be fully scrutinised."

Councillor Van de Weyer reflected on the good work taking place at Northstowe, particularly with regard to public transport within the town and good links to Cambridge, the inclusion of attractive and safe cycling facilities and decent educational facilities from the outset, but was of the opinion that there was still a lot to do to get it right. He felt that the people who lived there needed to form a sustainable community and that almost all of the market housing would be beyond the reach of any family that did not have two very good incomes. Councillor Van de Weyer was therefore keen to ensure that the level of affordable housing for Northstowe was as near to 40% as possible.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning and Transportation, seconded the proposed.

Council unanimously **AGREED** the motion.

21. **CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS**

Council noted those engagements attended by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman since the last meeting.

It was noted that the Vice-Chairman had not attended the photo call with the Minister on 30 July 2014 due to a cancellation.

The Meeting ended at 3.50 p.m.
