

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on  
Thursday, 29 January 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor David Bard – Chairman

Councillors: Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Caroline Hunt, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Edd Stonham, 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 Richard Barrett, Tom Bygott, Alison Elcox, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Mark Howell, Peter Johnson, Janet Lockwood, David Morgan and Cicely Murfitt.

### **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 previous meeting held on 27 November 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### **5. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, outlined his intention to include a standing item at future meetings of Full Council to enable Members to ask questions regarding the Greater Cambridge City Deal. He welcomed any such questions at this meeting being raised under agenda item 11 'questions on joint meetings'.

### **6. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No questions from the public had been received.

**7. PETITIONS**

No petitions for consideration by Full Council since the previous meeting had been received.

**8. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:****8 (a) Localised Council Tax Support Scheme (Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder, 15 July 2014)**

Council considered a report which reviewed the operation of the 2013/14 and 2014/15 Localised Council Tax Support Schemes and set out options for the 2015/16 Scheme.

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, presented the report and proposed that Council approved the Localised Council Tax Support Scheme for 2015/16 as set out in the report.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Lynda Harford and Council unanimously **APPROVED** the Localised Council Tax Support Scheme for 2015/16.

**8 (b) Recorded Votes (Civic Affairs Committee, 15 January 2015)**

The Civic Affairs Committee had considered the motion referred to it at the previous meeting of Full Council regarding a proposal to introduce recorded votes for all votes taken at meetings of Full Council, except for decisions on appointments or decisions taken by affirmation, and had recommended to Council that the motion be lost.

The Chairman asked for a vote on the recommendation of the Civic Affairs Committee, clarifying that a vote in favour of the recommendation meant voting against the introduction of recorded votes. With 31 votes in favour and 13 against the recommendation of the Civic Affairs Committee was supported and the original motion was **LOST**.

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

**In favour**

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Caroline Hunt, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

**Against**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Jonathan Chatfield, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Aidan Van De Weyer, David Whiteman-Downes and John Williams.

(NOTE – Councillor Mervyn Loynes was not in attendance for the consideration of this item).

**8 (c) Petitions Scheme (Civic Affairs Committee, 15 January 2015)**

The Civic Affairs Committee considered a revised version of the Council's Petitions Scheme and recommended its approval. Councillor David Bard, Chairman of the Civic Affairs Committee, therefore proposed that the revised Petitions Scheme be approved.

Councillor Kevin Cuffley, Vice-Chairman of the Civic Affairs Committee, seconded the proposal and Council unanimously **APPROVED** the revised Petitions Scheme.

**8 (d) Annual Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 (Employment Committee, 29 January 2015)**

*(NOTE – the Chief Executive and Executive Director, Corporate Services, left the meeting during consideration of this item).*

Councillor Alex Riley reported that the Employment Committee had unanimously recommended the Pay Policy Statement to Full Council for approval, so he proposed that the Statement for 2015/16 be approved.

Councillor Francis Burkitt seconded the proposition.

Councillor John Williams acknowledged that the Statement 'had regard' to the Living Wage, but reflected on other Councils that had made more of a commitment to conform to the Living Wage as part of their Pay Policy Statements. He therefore moved an amendment to the last section of paragraph 3.1, replacing the words 'also have regard' with the word 'conform' so that it read:

"The Council will conform to the Living Wage when it agrees annual pay awards for its staff".

Councillor Chatfield seconded the amendment.

In debating the amendment, the following points were made by Members:

- South Cambridgeshire was an expensive place to live, but the amendment would not make a great deal of difference;
- the words 'having regard' actually meant you could pay more than the Living Wage, whereas the word 'conform' did not provide that flexibility;
- South Cambridgeshire District Council did not have national salary scales and had its own independent salary scales for its employees. The Council should have the freedom to continue to set its own scales;
- the Council was becoming out of line with neighbouring authorities with regard to the Living Wage and should be setting an example to other employers in the area;
- it was too much of a risk to commit to aligning the Council's salary scales with the Living Wage. If it did and the Living Wage rate increased the Council would be required to pay it without identifying where the money would come from to fund any such increase;
- the setting of the Living Wage rate was completely unregulated;
- it was more important to provide employees with opportunities to work hard, develop, progress and ultimately earn more, which was what the Organisational Development Strategy aspired to accomplish;
- if the Living Wage increased then the Council could reconsider that aspect of the Pay Policy Statement;

- the Pay Policy Statement already demonstrated a commitment to pay the Living Wage, so the amendment was unnecessary.

Voting on the amendment, with 10 votes in favour, 31 against, 2 abstentions and 1 not voting, the amendment was lost.

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

#### **In favour**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Tumi Hawkins, Douglas de Lacey, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

#### **Against**

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Caroline Hunt, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

#### **Absention**

Councillors Philippa Hart and Jim Stewart.

#### **Not voting**

Councillor Pippa Corney.

(NOTE – Councillor Sebastian Kindersley was not in attendance for the consideration of this item).

Councillor Douglas de Lacey moved an amendment to remove the words “employees within the scope of this policy” where referenced throughout the document and replace them with the word “employees”.

It was noted that this would require a comprehensive review of the document as certain paragraphs, such as paragraph 1.1, would no longer make sense. The Legal and Democratic Services Manager also reported that the Localism Act 2011 stated to whom the policy specifically related.

For those reasons, the Chairman ruled the amendment out of order.

Voting on the original motion, with 38 votes in favour, 1 against, 4 abstentions and 1 not voting, Council **APPROVED** the Annual Pay Policy Statement 2015/16.

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

**In favour**

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Caroline Hunt, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Jim Stewart, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, Aiden Van de Weyer, David Whiteman-Downes, John Williams, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

**Against**

Councillor Douglas de Lacey.

**Abstention**

Councillors Anna Bradnam, Tumi Hawkins, Bridget Smith and Hazel Smith.

**Not voting**

Councillor Pippa Corney.

(NOTE – Councillor Sebastian Kindersley was not in attendance for the consideration of this item).

**9. NORTHSTOWE JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Council considered proposed amendments to the Independent Group's membership on the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the following changes to the Independent Group's membership on the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee:

Councillor Douglas de Lacey to be appointed as Member of the Committee in place of Councillor Edd Stonham.

Councillor Edd Stonham to be appointed as a substitute on the Committee in place of Councillor Douglas de Lacey and be the first named substitute.

Councillor Neil Davies to retain his position as a substitute on the Committee and be the second named substitute.

**10. MOTION TO RESCIND A PREVIOUS DECISION**

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, proposed the following motion with regard to the rescinding of a decision made at the previous meeting of Full Council in respect of the governance arrangements for the Greater Cambridge City Deal:

*"That the decision to include the words 'subject to the deletion of the words 'at the discretion of the Chairman' at paragraph 11 of the Standing Orders set out in Annex A' in resolution (a) of the item on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Governance Arrangements be rescinded."*

In moving the motion, Councillor Manning explained that Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council had both approved a version of the Terms of Reference for the City Deal Executive Board which retained the words that this Council had agreed to remove at its previous meeting. He sought to align this Council's decision with that of the other two Councils by rescinding that aspect of the original decision so that the same governance arrangements were agreed by the three City Deal partner Councils.

A motion to rescind a previous decision of the Council required the signatures of twelve Members. Councillors Francis Burkitt, Simon Edwards, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Mark Howell, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, David McCraith, Ben Shelton, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright were noted as being the twelve signatories.

Councillor Roger Hickford seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued and, in speaking against the motion, the following points were made:

- it was disappointing to receive this motion to rescind a decision that had been made so recently;
- this Council had democratically made a decision regarding this matter and to rescind that decision would be wrong;
- the motion showed a lack of leadership. The Leader should have made the case to the other two Councils to amend their decisions in respect of the governance arrangements for the City Deal;
- nothing had changed since the original decision was taken at the last meeting, so the motion should be voted down.

The following points were noted by those Members speaking in favour of the motion:

- it was disappointing that the amendment regarding the removal of the words 'at the discretion of the Chairman' regarding the public speaking protocol for the Executive Board was accepted as part of the original decision. The use of this wording was standard practice, and featured in the Standing Orders for this Council for example;
- the removal of the words 'at the discretion of the Chairman' did not change anything as further sections in the protocol still provided the Chairman with the ability to use his or her discretion;
- supporting the motion would bring this Council in line with the other two Councils, who had democratically voted in favour of the original Terms of Reference for the Executive Board. It was only right, therefore, for this Council to agree to the same set of documents when the removal of the words 'at the discretion of the Chairman' from the public speaking protocol did not necessarily change anything.

Voting on the motion, with 29 votes in favour, 13 against and 2 abstentions, Council **AGREED** the following motion:

*"That the decision to include the words 'subject to the deletion of the words 'at the discretion of the Chairman' at paragraph 11 of the Standing Orders set out in Annex A' in resolution (a) of the item on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Governance Arrangements be rescinded."*

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

**In favour**

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Roger Hickford, James Hockney, Caroline Hunt, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Jim Stewart, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

**Against**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Jonathan Chatfield, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

**Abstention**

Councillors Neil Davies and Edd Stonham.

(NOTE – Councillor Mervyn Loynes was not in attendance for the consideration of this item).

**11. QUESTIONS ON JOINT MEETINGS**

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, invited Members to ask questions regarding the Greater Cambridge City Deal.

Councillor Bridget Smith, as one of the Council's representatives on the City Deal Joint Assembly, reflected on what she felt was a poor meeting of the Executive Board in comparison to the significant debate that took place on priority infrastructure schemes at the meeting of the Joint Assembly on 12 January 2015. She felt that the schemes agreed for inclusion in the City Deal infrastructure programme for the first five years were very city-focussed and asked for the Leader's views, together with his views on cycle routes following a comment he made at the meeting of the Board questioning the value of cycle routes longer than two miles in length.

Councillor Manning said that his comments regarding cycle routes had been taken out of context. He acknowledged that people cycled for longer than two miles and explained that he was talking about increased Park and Ride facilities to include adequate cycling facilities, so that people would only need to cycle two miles to get into Cambridge rather than drive their private vehicles into the city.

Councillor John Williams referred to comments made by Councillor Tim Bick, Chairman of the City Deal Joint Assembly, in November 2014 who had expressed his concern that transport schemes would go ahead without adequate scrutiny. Councillor Williams suggested that this was exactly what was happening and asked the Leader for his views.

Councillor Manning explained that the Executive Board at its meeting on 28 January 2015 agreed a programme of priority infrastructure schemes, with each individual scheme now having further feasibility work undertaken to assess options and deliverability. The outcomes of this work would be reported back to the Joint Assembly and the Executive Board for further consideration.

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer asked the Leader whether he was aware of the significant evidence available which outlined the benefits of cycle paths to aid congestion and enable journeys to be made more quickly and safely without coming into contact with other road users.

Councillor Manning was of the opinion that the only realistic way to solve the congestion problems in the centre of Cambridge was through providing Park and Ride facilities on the outskirts of the city, together with sufficient facilities for cyclists. He accepted that people wanted to cycle, but did not believe that the provision of long cycle ways would fundamentally change the way in which people travelled around the Greater Cambridge area and in and out of the city.

Councillor Manning added that the Greater Cambridge City Deal was constrained by the Government as schemes had to be identified that could be delivered in the first five years of the Deal, with evidence of their delivery being necessary in order to secure the next tranche of funding.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, as one of the Council's representatives on the City Deal Joint Assembly, asked the Leader whether he thought it was wrong to compare the deliberations of the Joint Assembly with those of the Executive Board, especially since most Members of the Board were in attendance at the meeting of the Assembly on 12 January 2015. He also asked the Leader whether he felt it was wrong to say that the schemes within the programme were city-focussed and that it was wrong to say that schemes had been given the go ahead, since they were only concepts at this stage that would be worked up into more detailed proposals for further consideration at a later stage.

Councillor Manning agreed with Councillor Burkitt's points and reiterated that the schemes put forward as priority schemes by the Executive Board at its meeting on 28 January 2015 would be worked up into much more detailed proposals, setting out options and more accurate information on anticipated deliverability and cost.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley did not think that decisions made at the Executive Board should be based on opinion, but should be supported by evidence. He asked the Leader for evidence to support his claim made at the meeting of the Executive Board that most children in South Cambridgeshire came into Cambridge to be educated. Similarly, he asked the Leader for evidence to support his statement at the same meeting where he said that a third of the people living in Cambridge worked in South Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Manning responded by clarifying that, with regards to education, he was referring to higher education rather than education generally. He explained that he attempted at the meeting to put across the point that residents of South Cambridgeshire, or people working in or travelling through the district, had a vested interest in the City Deal, as well as a significant interest in improving Cambridge's congestion problems.

Councillor Roger Hickford, as one of the County Council's representatives on the Joint Assembly, did not think that the schemes were city-focussed and asked the Leader whether he felt they were.

Councillor Manning emphasised that the City Deal was a partnership and had attracted so much potential Government investment because of the way in which the District Council was working with Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, the Local Enterprise Partnership and University of Cambridge. He did not believe the schemes put forward by the Executive Board were city-focussed but acknowledged that the title 'City Deal' was perhaps slightly misleading.



Councillor Roger Hall asked what consideration had been given to those people who did not have their own private cars, but who could also not use a bicycle.

Councillor Manning reported that he and other Members of the Executive Board had recently met with senior representatives of Stagecoach, who were very keen to engage with the City Deal process and have an opportunity to provide an improved bus service across the Greater Cambridge area.

Councillor Ben Shelton, in his capacity as Chairman of the Partnerships Review Committee, informed the Leader that his Committee recently agreed to invite Members of the City Deal Executive Board to attend a future meeting and discuss the Greater Cambridge City Deal. He asked whether the Leader would be willing to take part in such a meeting.

Councillor Manning indicated that he would be willing to attend a meeting of the Partnerships Review Committee to discuss the City Deal.

Councillor Tony Orgee asked the Leader to confirm that the process followed ahead of the Executive Board's consideration of the City Deal prioritised infrastructure scheme programme commenced with an original list of schemes totalling £752 million and that a more appropriate list was recommended by the Joint Assembly which discounted approximately £400 million of schemes. He took this opportunity to emphasise that other funding sources were available for infrastructure schemes that could be embedded as part of the City Deal programme.

Councillor Manning confirmed that this was the process that had been followed in the lead up to the Executive Board meeting on 28 January 2015 and that the programme agreed by the Board at this stage totalled approximately £180 million.

Councillor Deborah Roberts was keen for money to be spent only on those schemes that would add value, and referred to a cycleway that had been introduced in her ward recently at a cost of £300,000 which she felt was hardly used. She was also of the opinion that Park and Ride facilities needed to be made more attractive, and that one way of generating more use would be to remove the parking charge.

Councillor Manning confirmed that individual proposals would be considered very closely, involving consultation with local Members and residents.

## **12. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

### **12 (a) From Councillor Peter Topping**

Councillor Peter Topping asked the following question:

“In planning the amenities for the future residents at Northstowe, is the advice and views of the Local Access Forum being taken into account in accordance with Section 95 of the Countryside Act 2000?”

I am a member of the Local Access Forum for Cambridgeshire.”

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning and Transportation, responded by saying that the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum had been quite proactive with regard to the proposed development at Northstowe. Officers from South Cambridgeshire District Council had been invited to attend the meeting of the Forum in August 2014 prior to the submission of the phase 2 planning application. A further

meeting between representatives of the Forum and Council officers had been held in October and the comprehensive views of the Local Access Forum were included in the report presented to and considered by the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee on 28 January 2015, which included a number of recommendations.

Work was taking place to reconnect some severed links to public rights of way, as well as increase the number of circular routes in villages around the Northstowe area.

**12 (b) From Councillor Kevin Cuffley**

Councillor Kevin Cuffley asked the following question:

“Will the Leader confirm if this Council has received any complaints about the reduced waste and recycling collections over the Christmas period?”

Councillor Mick Martin, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, responded to the question and said that 97 complaints had been received regarding the service over the Christmas period. To put that into context, however, he reminded Members that the service currently covered 63,000 residents and over the two week period after restructuring collection rounds over 180,000 bins had been collected. The 97 complaints were in the process of being examined.

He added that no complaints had been received following changes to green bin collections, although further complaints had been received in response to the extremely heavy winds experienced in January. These complaints particularly related to paper waste whereby the caged vehicles used did not completely secure the waste and resulted in the creation of some litter. The Council's refuse collection teams had attempted to resolve this as much as possible.

Councillor Martin also highlighted the need for the Council to make further efficiency savings and stated that the new joint working arrangement for waste collection with the City Council would deliver savings. He also reported that reductions in fuel costs had resulted in a saving in the service's fuel bill of £90,000. In addition, it was noted that two senior officers left their positions in August and September and it had not been possible at this stage to appoint replacements. This had also resulted in savings of approximately £100,000.

Councillor Cuffley asked, as a supplementary question, what the impact had been on landfill as a result of the new arrangements for green bin collections.

Councillor Martin did not know at this stage and explained that data from 1 December through to the winter collection period, including Christmas, was in the process of being collated. This would be presented to Councillor Martin's Portfolio Holder Meeting on 25 February 2015, and subsequently the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.

**12 (c) From Councillor Ben Shelton**

Councillor Ben Shelton asked the following question:

“Will the Leader clarify that if Article 4 is adopted by this Council then pubs that have already closed will qualify for this protection?”

Councillor Nick Wright, Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, answered the question by saying that pubs that had closed and had not already changed their use could, subject to the outcome of the public consultation currently being undertaken, be

included as part of an Article 4 direction should the Planning Committee decided on adoption of such a direction. The consultation opened at the beginning of the month and closed on 23 February 2015.

Councillor Shelton asked, as a supplementary question, whether pub owners or landlords would be eligible for the supporting businesses workshops facilitated by the Council.

Councillor Wright confirmed that pub owners and landlords would be eligible. He reported that the workshops had proved to be very successful and took this opportunity to ask Members to extend invitations to any representatives of local businesses in their wards to attend future workshops, the dates and subjects of which were noted as follows:

- 5 February 2015 – business planning;
- 18 March 2015 – finding new customers;
- 27 April 2015 – improving profit.

### **13. NOTICES OF MOTION**

#### **13 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Robin Page**

Councillor Robin Page was not in attendance to present his motion, which had been deferred for the last two meetings of Full Council.

This motion was **WITHDRAWN**.

#### **13 (b) Standing in the name of Councillor James Hockney**

Councillor James Hockney was extremely concerned about plans to close the Natwest branch in Histon and referred to other examples in South Cambridgeshire whereby branches had closed and communities had lost their banking facilities. He reflected on local businesses, the vulnerable and the elderly in particular who depended on local bank branches and moved the following motion:

"This Council has significant concerns about the proposed closure of Natwest Bank in Histon. This is due to the effect it will have on residents in the local area having to travel into Cambridge. Depriving one of the larger communities in the District and surrounding villages of a retail banking services is a regressive and unwelcome step. This motion requests that the Chairman of the Council writes to Natwest on these grounds."

Councillor Edd Stonham seconded the motion, supporting Councillor Hockney's comments, and stated that the branch at Histon was very regularly used.

Councillor Jonathan Chatfield reported that 543 people had already signed a petition against the closure of this branch and moved an amendment to include the following:

"This motion requests that the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development identifies all remaining banks in South Cambridgeshire villages and writes to them, inviting them to engage with the Council.

This motion further requests that the Chairman of the Council writes to Natwest urging them to postpone their decision and instead to engage with the local community to find a way to save the bank. The Chairman should also draw this matter to the attention of the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills who is in discussions with the main

retail banks about retaining local branches.”

The mover of the original motion accepted the amendment, which became the substantive motion.

Members spoke in support of the substantive motion, sharing Councillor Hockney’s concerns.

Council unanimously **AGREED** the following motion:

“This Council has significant concerns about the proposed closure of Natwest Bank in Histon. This is due to the effect it will have on residents in the local area having to travel into Cambridge. Depriving one of the larger communities in the district and surrounding villages of a retail banking service is a regressive and unwelcome step. This motion requests that the Chairman of the Council writes to Natwest on these grounds.

This motion requests that the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development identifies all remaining banks in South Cambridgeshire villages and writes to them, inviting them to engage with the Council.

This motion further requests that the Chairman of the Council writes to Natwest urging them to postpone their decision and instead to engage with the local community to find a way to save the bank. The Chairman should also draw this matter to the attention of the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills who is in discussions with the main retail banks about retaining local branches.”

#### **14. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS**

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

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.20 p.m.**

---

