

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on  
Thursday, 22 September 2016 at 2.00 p.m.

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

Councillors: David Bard, Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Doug Cattermole, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Simon Crocker, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Raymond Matthews, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Des O'Brien, Tony Orgee, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Peter Topping, Ingrid Tregoin, 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  
Tom Lewis Head of the 3C Shared Service Legal Practice  
Graham Watts Democratic Services Team Leader

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Grenville Chamberlain, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Mick Martin, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Edd Stonham and Richard Turner.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Nick Wright declared a non-pecuniary interest in item number 13(d) as he was a Governor at Papworth Hospital.

Councillor Mark Howell declared a non-pecuniary interest in item number 13(d) as he was a volunteer at Papworth Hospital.

### **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 Annual General Meeting held on 19 May 2016 and the extraordinary meeting held on 28 June 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### **5. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Sue Ellington, Chairman, reported with regret that this would be Jean Hunter's last meeting of Council as Chief Executive following her decision to leave the authority. Councillor Ellington said that she had really enjoyed working with Mrs Hunter and invited

other Members of the Council to say a few words.

Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, paid tribute to the welcoming, transparent and professional nature of Mrs Hunter, characteristics which he said had shone through in her time as this Council's Chief Executive. He reflected on his recent opportunity in his role as Leader to work closely with Mrs Hunter and had seen the esteem to which senior members of the civil service held for her. Councillor Topping added that it was not just the Council that owed a debt of gratitude to her, but also residents and other groups of people who had been influenced by her judgement and determination. He gave his personal thanks to Mrs Hunter for everything she had done as Chief Executive.

Councillor Ray Manning, former Leader of the Council, said that in his time as a Councillor he had never known a better Chief Executive, someone who he said had shown him in particular great patience and understanding. He thought that South Cambridgeshire was a better place for Jean Hunter having taken up the Chief Executive role in 2010 and helping the Council improve, with the Council running extremely well and efficiently as a result. He was sad to see Mrs Hunter leave and gave his personal thanks to her, stating that he had really enjoyed working with her which he said was both a pleasure and inspiration.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Opposition, reflected on the appointment process for the vacant Chief Executive position in 2010 and said that Jean Hunter was far superior to any other applicant at that time, adding that she had fulfilled and exceeded all expectations. Councillor Smith highlighted in particular that it was nice to have had a woman as the Council's Chief Executive, stating that only 24% of local authority Chief Executives in the country were women. She paid tribute to Mrs Hunter, saying that she never lost her cool, even at times when her patience must have been significantly tested. Councillor Smith made the point that Mrs Hunter had steered the Council through some very troubled times, citing significant austerity measures in particular as an example. She thanked Mrs Hunter for her hard work and efforts in her time as Chief Executive and said she would miss her humour and friendship.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey, convenor of the Independent Group, recalled Jean Hunter coming to meet him in his village of Girton when she was first appointed as Chief Executive, as she was keen to discuss with him as local Member any of his concerns relating to his ward. He praised this approach and added that he and his group had always had help and support from Mrs Hunter. Councillor de Lacey said that the Chief Executive position was an enormous challenge, but under her leadership the Council ran very steadily which he said was an indication of how much she would be missed.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart said that Jean Hunter had demonstrated the right balance of openness, caution, judgement and experience, and a real ability to listen to the views of Members. Councillor Cathcart said that Mrs Hunter had also visited him in Bassingbourn and had recognised that all villages were different, demonstrating an early understanding of the requirements of this district.

All Members gave Jean Hunter a round of applause.

Councillor Peter Topping welcomed Councillor Nick Wright to Cabinet as Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services. He paid tribute to Councillor Mick Martin for the excellent work he had done whilst on Cabinet, especially the transition of the Joint Waste Service in his time as Portfolio Holder for Waste and Environmental Services, which he said he had dealt with admirably.

**6. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

No questions from the public had been received.

**7. PETITIONS**

No petitions for consideration by the Council had been received.

**8. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:****8 (a) Approval of UK Municipal Bonds Agency's Framework Agreement (Cabinet, 14 July 2016)**

Councillor Simon Edwards, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, presented a report which sought authority to enter into the borrowing documents prepared by the UK Municipal Bonds Agency. It was noted that the Agency required that local authorities borrowing from the Municipal Bond entered into its Framework Agreement.

Councillor Edwards reminded Members that the Council had previously invested £50,000 into the Agency. It was not an obligation to become a borrowing authority and he confirmed that there were no proposals at present for the Council to borrow from the Municipal Bond. Councillor Edwards emphasised, however, that by entering into the Framework Agreement at this stage the Council would ensure that it had the option to consider doing so in the future. He highlighted other options for borrowing, such as through the Public Works Loan Board or the Council's own Bond as examples.

Councillor Edwards proposed the recommendations of Cabinet, that the Council:

- (a) approved the Council's early entry into the Framework Agreement and its accompanying schedules including the joint and several guarantee.
- (b) delegated authority to the Executive Director (Corporate Services) as Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer to sign those documents, as appropriate, on behalf of the Council.
- (c) delegated authority to the Executive Director (Corporate Services) as Section 151 Officer to agree amendments to the framework as appropriate, in consultation with the Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder and the Chairman of the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee.

Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, seconded the proposition.

Councillor Hazel Smith queried the position the Council would be placed in should another authority default on its commitment and the proportion any such repayment was likely to be. Councillor Edwards said that until the Council had entered into a borrowing arrangement using this facility it would be very difficult to estimate. It was noted, however, that the Agency had big plans in place for the Municipal Bond on the market with many more local authorities likely to invest, which would essentially spread that risk.

Council unanimously:

- (a) **APPROVED** the Council's early entry into the Framework Agreement and its accompanying schedules including the joint and several guarantee.

- (b) **DELEGATED** authority to the Executive Director (Corporate Services) as Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer to sign those documents, as appropriate, on behalf of the Council.
- (c) **DELEGATED** authority to the Executive Director (Corporate Services) as Section 151 Officer to agree amendments to the framework as appropriate, in consultation with the Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder and the Chairman of the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee.

#### **8 (b) Cambridge Ice Arena (Cabinet, 14 July 2016)**

Councillor Simon Edwards, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, presented a report which provided the Council with an opportunity to consider approving a loan of £1,850,000 to the Cambridge Leisure and Ice Centre for the Cambridge Ice Arena.

Councillor Edwards said that this provided the Council with a great opportunity to be part of providing an exciting facility for South Cambridgeshire and the city of Cambridge, with the Council essentially being asked to provide the final part of funding to ensure delivery of the arena. A copy of the business plan was appended to the report. It was noted that the £1,850,000 would be funded through the Council's prudential borrowing facility and would result in the Council receiving approximately £500,000 in interest as a result. Alongside this financial benefit, however, Councillor Edwards made the point that supporting this proposal meant that the Council would be helping to deliver a wonderful community facility. He referred to the Wing development and was of the opinion that something like this would make a real difference and help with the creation of a new community in the area.

Councillor Edwards proposed the recommendations of Cabinet, that the Council approved a 25 year loan of £1,850,000 through the prudential borrowing facility in order to address the funding gap in respect of the Cambridge Ice Arena.

Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, seconded the proposition.

Councillor Robert Turner, Portfolio Holder for Planning, supported the proposal and highlighted paragraph 6 of the report which stated that the proposed ice arena met the needs of the Cambridge Leisure and Ice Rink Centre, the University of Cambridge, but more importantly from Councillor Turner's perspective, the wider community and catchment area.

Councillor John Williams was disappointed that the University of Cambridge had not backed this proposal financially and asked whether the project, with this loan, had sufficient funds in place to proceed.

Councillor Charles Nightingale sought an assurance that the facility would be open for public use and not restricted by club membership.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart asked why the City Council or County Council had not been asked to invest in this project or approached to provide the loan. He was also concerned about the costs of the project overrunning and was unsure who would be responsible for paying the balance in such circumstances. Councillor Cathcart was surprised that no reference had been made to revenue, trading performance, anticipated receipts or expenditure as part of the business case. He questioned the anticipated take up of people seeking to use such a facility, which he perceived as being to facilitate specialist sports, and asked whether enough work had taken place with experts to establish the managerial and operation aspects of this proposed ice arena.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Opposition, reflected on the amount that had been requested, which equated to a significant 40% funding gap, noting with caution that bank funding or other grant funding opportunities had not been approached. However, having attended a recent briefing for Members of the Council and having had the opportunity to ask questions and learn more about the detail behind the proposal, she outlined her support for the loan. She explained that this project had already been ongoing for ten years and that the ice arena, when built, would provide 15 fulltime equivalent jobs for the area and that the design of the facility itself was environmentally sympathetic and sustainable. She added that the risk to the Council was minimum.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey was surprised that the report or business case did not include a risk assessment.

Councillor John Batchelor asked whether consideration had been given to the use of the UK Municipal Bond, further to the previous item, rather than through prudential borrowing in order to finance the loan.

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer said that this would be a great resource for local people, but was disappointed with the business case which he felt lacked detail. He also attended the briefing for Members and had welcomed the opportunity to ask questions, following which he was supportive of the proposal.

Councillor Peter Topping echoed the point raised by Councillor Nightingale and agreed that this facility had to be open to the public and for community use.

Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, said that ice skating in particular was a very social sport. He referred to the significant number of people attracted to the temporary ice rink erected at Parker's Piece in Cambridge every year as anecdotal evidence that there was demand for this facility.

In answer to the questions put forward as part of the debate, Councillor Edwards made the following points:

- the Council would do everything it could in working with partners to ensure that this facility was open to the public and for community use;
- the amount requested via the loan was the only missing element of funding for the project, so the project would be able to proceed should the loan be approved;
- the City Council or County Council were not involved in this proposal due to the fact that South Cambridgeshire District Council was approached to provide the funding first;
- a risk assessment had been undertaken and was considered as part of the Council's due diligence and in the writing up the draft loan agreement, with contingency plans forming part of that;
- in terms of trading, the facility managed by the same operator in Stretton exceeded all expectations in terms of revenue, with another facility at Swindon achieving one million visitors in its first year. The Swindon facility had a catchment of 50,000 people whereas the Cambridge Ice Arena would have a catchment area of approximately 400,000 people;
- borrowing could have taken place through the Municipal Bond, but it was felt that the amount being borrowed was too small to justify it.

Voting on the proposition, with 45 votes in favour and 2 abstentions, Council **APPROVED** a 25 year loan of £1,850,000 through the prudential borrowing facility in order to address the funding gap in respect of the Cambridge Ice Arena.

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

### **In favour**

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Doug Cattermole, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Simon Crocker, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Des O'Brien, Tony Orgee, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Peter Topping, Ingrid Tregoeing, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, Aidan van de Weyer, David Whiteman-Downes, John Williams, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

### **Abstentions**

Councillors Nigel Cathcart and Douglas de Lacey.

#### **8 (c) Interim arrangements for the positions of Chief Executive Officer, Head of Paid Service, Electoral Registration Officer and Returning Officer (Employment Committee, 15 September 2016)**

NOTE – Alex Colyer left the Council Chamber during consideration of this item.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the appointment of Alex Colyer as Interim Chief Executive Officer, Head of Paid Service, Electoral Registration Officer and Returning Officer for up to nine months or until the permanent appointment of a Chief Executive Officer.

#### **8 (d) Appointment of Monitoring Officer (Employment Committee, 15 September 2016)**

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the appointment of Tom Lewis, Head of the 3C Shared Services Legal Practice, as South Cambridgeshire District Council's Monitoring Officer.

#### **9. APPOINTMENT TO THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**

Councillor unanimously **APPROVED** the appointment of Graham Jagger as a member of the Independent Remuneration Panel, for a further three-year term of office.

#### **10. APPOINTMENT TO THE AUDIT AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the appointment of Councillor Grenville Chamberlain onto the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee.

#### **11. OUTSIDE BODIES: APPOINTMENT TO SWAVESEY INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD**

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the appointment of Councillor Nick Wright onto the Swavesey Internal Drainage Board.

**12. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS****12 (a) From Councillor Douglas de Lacey**

Councillor Douglas de Lacey referred to a newspaper article which had stated that the charge to pay using plastic was supposed to be no more than around 0.6 per cent of the purchase price, yet he understood that South Cambridgeshire District Council was charging up to 2.5 per cent when residents used their credit cards to pay for their Council Tax or other services. He said that, since the lowest Council Tax bill was over £1000, this amounted to a £20 or more surcharge over the recommended rate. Councillor de Lacey therefore asked the Leader to inform the Council how much it had garnered since the Council had introduced this surcharge on credit card payments from the residents it was supposed to serve.

Councillor Simon Edwards, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, reported that all of the Council's transactions were processed by Capita who charged the Council for each transaction and that this charge was effectively passed on to the person making the payment. This charge accounted for an interchange rate, a payment service provider rate, an acquisition rate and a card issuer rate.

Councillor Edwards confirmed that the Council had received £13,977 in such charges in the last financial year, but had paid £14,196 for the processing of these payments which had incurred a small loss of £219 over the year.

Councillor de Lacey, as a supplementary question, asked the Portfolio Holder to ensure that these charges were made clear to residents prior to payments being made, as well as there being a clear indication as to how such charges could be avoided through alternative payment methods.

Councillor Edwards reported that residents were encouraged to pay for Council Tax and other services, where they could, by direct debit which would ensure that this issue was avoided. It was also noted that anyone currently paying for a bill or service were fully informed of any charges that applied prior to the payment, as well as being informed of alternative arrangements for the processing of payments that would not incur such a charge.

**12 (b) From Councillor Janet Lockwood**

Councillor Janet Lockwood asked the Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services to update the Council on the state of the Customer Contact Centre following a number of complaints she had received about its performance. She suggested that a review of staffing levels and the training provided may be worthwhile.

Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, confirmed that recent performance had declined due to a reduced number of staff in the Customer Contact Centre following a number of vacancies, resulting in longer waiting times for calls to be answered. Three new permanent officers and three temporary officers had been appointed to the team who had all commenced their roles on 22 August 2016 and were going through their training, which had been accelerated. It was noted that those staff leaving the Contact Centre had left as a result of being promoted to other positions within the Council.

**12 (c) From Councillor Aidan van de Weyer**

Councillor Aidan van de Weyer asked, with house building starting at Northstowe and the possibility of applications from other large sites, whether the Planning Portfolio Holder and the Strategic Planning Portfolio Holder were considering creating a New Communities Joint Development Control Committee to manage this.

Councillor Robert Turner, Portfolio Holder, said that he was not considering the establishment of any additional planning or development control committees at this stage. He added, however, that if a specific committee was needed to consider applications relating to larger sites then this issue would be considered again in due course.

Councillor van de Weyer, as a supplementary question, made the point that a Joint Development Control Committee was an active means of managing new sites as they came in, not just from a planning perspective but in terms of the whole process relating to new communities. He was also concerned about Mayoral Development Corporations as a result of devolution and asked whether the Council should put in place its own structures to demonstrate that South Cambridgeshire District Council could sufficiently manage its own affairs.

Councillor Turner, referring to devolution, was not prepared to comment until the outcome of the extraordinary Council meeting scheduled to be held on 26 October 2016 where the devolution proposal would be considered. He said that the Council's current Planning Committee was more than capable of dealing with any applications that were coming forward, all of which would be judged on their merits. Councillor Turner also made the point that a Joint Development Control Committee was already in place for the Cambridge fringes. He reiterated that he would consider introducing something similar for South Cambridgeshire District Council in the future, but only if it was necessary.

**12 (d) From Councillor David Bard**

Councillor David Bard, in view of a generally expressed criticism that all planning authorities were accepting lower levels of affordable housing, asked what the Council was doing to respond to the acknowledged acute availability and affordability challenges in the district.

Councillor Lynda Harford, Portfolio Holder for Housing, made the general point that there would be no affordable housing at all without granting planning permission for development to occur. Councillor Harford reported that the Council's housing and planning sections had developed an ever-closer working relationship and that there was a real determination to better manage the Council's relationships with developers in its role as the planning authority, particularly around the difficult subject of viability. She reiterated and emphasised the importance of building and maintaining good relationships with providers going forward and expressed a desire for more transparency and clearer information around viability, something which the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development had raised at a recent meeting of the Planning Agents' Forum. Councillor Harford explained that a better mutual understanding of expectations could lead to a smoother process, with permissions granted more quickly where they were appropriate. She added that the way in which applications were initialled looked at should be widened, so that they were not solely viewed on how they delivered housing but how they delivered sustainable communities.



Councillor Harford said that the Council had some influence in the development of Government policies, reporting that the authority had earned respect for some of the things it was doing in respect of this agenda.

**12 (e) From Councillor Aidan van de Weyer**

Councillor Aidan van de Weyer said that there was great concern among South Cambridgeshire residents about the plans to manage congestion in Cambridge by blocking the ring road during peak hours. Firstly, he was concerned that the plans would discriminate unfairly on residents who may have no choice but to drive into the city due to disability, limited income, the nature of their work, having young children or the inaccessibility of their destination to public transport. Secondly, he was of the view that the plans would displace a huge amount of traffic through the villages surrounding Cambridge as people found alternative routes to getting across the city. Councillor van de Weyer therefore asked the Portfolio Holder to confirm why alternative methods of managing congestion had not been included in the consultation.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, Portfolio Holder for the Greater Cambridge City Deal, emphasised that lots of consultations had been held in respect of the City Deal's schemes and that there was not just one consultation taking place. Alternative methods of managing congestion were included in a consultation known as the 'call for evidence' held earlier in the year. The outcomes of that consultation exercise had been listened to and had developed into what was now known as the 'eight-point plan', which was currently being publicly engaged upon. Councillor Burkitt made the point that as part of any City Deal consultation, anyone could suggest alternatives by submitting a response. He reiterated the point that alternative methods had been considered.

Councillor van de Weyer, as a supplementary question, asked whether the Portfolio Holder recognised that the proposed solution would displace tens of thousands of cars through villages as they would have no way of getting through the ring road and that this would impact South Cambridgeshire the worst as a result.

Councillor Burkitt responded by saying that he did not recognise that point of view at all.

**12 (f) From Councillor Anna Bradnam**

Councillor Anna Bradnam was delighted to read in the Cambridge News that the percentage of waste recycled and composted in South Cambridgeshire had increased from 56.35% in 2010/11 to 58.1% in 2014/15. She congratulated the Council's hardworking staff in the waste team for encouraging people in South Cambridgeshire to achieve this improvement.

She also noted, however, that over the same period recycling in Cambridge City had dropped from 43.7%, the national average, to just 43.1%. Councillor Bradnam said it would be a great shame if, under the Joint Waste Service remit, a less committed approach in the City were to drag down the excellent recycling rates achieved up to now in South Cambridgeshire.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services was therefore asked how he anticipated the Joint Waste Service would improve rates of recycling in Cambridge City and how likely he thought it was that it would achieve the proposed target of 50% of waste recycled and composted by 2020.

Councillor Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, echoed the sentiments to the excellent staff at the Joint Waste Service who he said should be congratulated. He said that the key part of achieving 58.1% of recycling and composting was that none of this would be placed in landfill. Councillor Howell highlighted that this Council was learning just as much from Cambridge City Council as the City Council was from South Cambridgeshire District Council. Figures for the city had gone up to 43.8% and were projected to slowly increase.

In terms of how the service and performance would be improved further, Councillor Howell said that collection rounds would be better aligned and harmonised between the two areas. For example, green and blue bins in the city were currently collected on different days whereas it was proposed to collect both bins on the same day to improve efficiency. He also highlighted the different nature of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, citing for example the fact that Cambridge had more flats, apartments and houses of multiple occupancy compared to the rural nature of South Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Bradnam, as a supplementary question, asked how likely it would be for Cambridge City to achieve the 50% target by 2020.

Councillor Howell reported that the combined performance of the Joint Waste Service was currently 52%, so it was already in excess of the target and that over the coming year this rate would increase even further. He emphasised that the two authorities were working together as a Joint Waste Service and that its performance should be measured as a single service.

## **12 (g) Questions without notice**

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Opposition, said that the Council's emerging Local Plan strongly upheld protection for the green belt, adding that the authority's corporate aims were focused on ensuring that residents had a high quality of life and for South Cambridgeshire to remain as a marvellous place to live. She therefore asked what the administration was going to do to secure these ambitions in the light of the Greater Cambridge City Deal's recommended option for the A428. She explained that these proposals consisted of laying a busway through the most sensitive part of the western green belt and potentially doing untold damage to the quality of life of residents living in Coton, Hardwick and Caldecott, which 4,000 residents had signed a petition against.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, Portfolio Holder for the Greater Cambridge City Deal, as an elected Member representing four villages within the green belt said that the green belt was very important to him personally. He was unsure what the administration would do at this stage, but he declared that he would agonise long and hard over the next three weeks leading up to the City Deal Executive Board meeting.

Councillor Smith said that this was a huge issue and was concerned that the City Deal had, so far, been very focussed on the city of Cambridge. She did not want to see the quality of life of South Cambridgeshire residents sacrificed as a result and looked forward to the upcoming debates at meetings of the Local Liaison Forum, hopeful that the Joint Assembly and Executive Board would pay heed to what residents had to say.

### 13. NOTICES OF MOTION

#### 13 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Peter Johnson

Councillor Peter Johnson proposed that Council approved the following motion:

“We are proud to live in a diverse and tolerant society. Racism, xenophobia and hate crimes have no place in our country. Our Council condemns racism, xenophobia and hate crimes unequivocally. We will not allow hate to become acceptable.

We will work to ensure that local bodies and programmes have the support and resources they need to fight and prevent racism and xenophobia.

We reassure all people living in this area that they are valued members of our community.

This Council publicly condemns any such attacks and make it clear what steps the Council will take to tackle this racist, xenophobic and criminal behaviour.”

Councillor Ingrid Tregging seconded the motion.

Councillor David Bard proposed an amendment to delete, add and replace words so that the motion read:

“We are proud to live in a diverse and tolerant society. Racism, xenophobia and hate crimes have no place in our country. The Council expresses its grave concern at the recent reported increase in hate crime and condemns all types of hate crime unequivocally. It wishes to reassure all people of whatever nationality or ethnicity whether living in South Cambridgeshire or further afield that they are valued members of our community.

The Council acknowledges that it has robust procedures in place to combat discriminatory behaviour or language on the part of its employees and members and requests the relevant portfolio holder to keep these under active review.

The Council will cooperate with other relevant agencies through the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership to continue to make the elimination of hate crime a priority.”

Councillor Peter Johnson, as mover of the original motion, accepted the amendment.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the following motion:

“We are proud to live in a diverse and tolerant society. Racism, xenophobia and hate crimes have no place in our country. The Council expresses its grave concern at the recent reported increase in hate crime and condemns all types of hate crime unequivocally. It wishes to reassure all people of whatever nationality or ethnicity whether living in South Cambridgeshire or further afield that they are valued members of our community.

The Council acknowledges that it has robust procedures in place to combat discriminatory behaviour or language on the part of its employees and members and requests the relevant portfolio holder to keep these under active review.

The Council will cooperate with other relevant agencies through the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership to continue to make the elimination of hate crime a priority.”

**13 (b) Standing in the name of Councillor Francis Burkitt**

Councillor Francis Burkitt, Portfolio Holder for the Greater Cambridge City Deal, proposed that Council approved the following motion:

“This Council notes the recent press comment concerning the possible promotion of a new train station at Cambridge South, and will be interested in any planning application that may be submitted, and hopes that any application will be submitted as soon as possible; whilst noting, of course, that nothing in this motion should be construed as influencing the process or manner in which such an application would be considered.”

Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, seconded the motion.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley agreed with the sentiments of motion but was of the opinion that this Council’s message should be stronger. He therefore proposed an amendment to amend and delete words so that the motion read:

“This Council notes the recent press comment concerning the possible promotion of a new train station at Cambridge South, and will be interested in any planning application that may be submitted, and hopes that an application will be submitted as soon as possible.”

Councillor Burkitt, as mover of the original motion, accepted the amendment.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning, provided feedback following a recent meeting he had attended of the West Anglian Taskforce, a group responsible for building the case for upgraded rail infrastructure on the West Anglia Main Line to improve connections between London, Stansted and Cambridge. He was keen to see as much lobbying on the introduction of a new station at Cambridge South as possible and reported that the Chairman of the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership had indicated that this would provide great potential for development.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the following motion:

“This Council notes the recent press comment concerning the possible promotion of a new train station at Cambridge South, and will be interested in any planning application that may be submitted, and hopes that an application will be submitted as soon as possible.”

**13 (c) Standing in the name of Councillor Aidan van de Weyer**

Councillor Aidan van de Weyer proposed that Council approved the following motion:

“This Council notes the decision by the Greater Cambridge City Deal (GCCD) to change the definition of affordable housing on exception sites for the purposes of its commitment to building 1,000 extra homes for local people.

This Council particularly welcomes the GCCD’s agreement that ‘due consideration be given to the housing needs of local people’.

The commitment to 1,000 new homes on rural exception sites for people with a local connection was an important factor when this Council made its decision to participate in the City Deal.

This Council therefore expresses its support for Cabinet's recent decision that affordable housing delivered on these sites will be allocated to meet both local and general housing need with first consideration always being given to local need."

Councillor Kevin Cuffley seconded the motion.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the following motion:

"This Council notes the decision by the Greater Cambridge City Deal (GCCD) to change the definition of affordable housing on exception sites for the purposes of its commitment to building 1,000 extra homes for local people.

This Council particularly welcomes the GCCD's agreement that 'due consideration be given to the housing needs of local people'.

The commitment to 1,000 new homes on rural exception sites for people with a local connection was an important factor when this Council made its decision to participate in the City Deal.

This Council therefore expresses its support for Cabinet's recent decision that affordable housing delivered on these sites will be allocated to meet both local and general housing need with first consideration always being given to local need."

**13 (d) Standing in the name of Councillor Mark Howell**

Councillor Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Housing, proposed that Council approved the following motion:

"This Council asks the City Deal to pay particular regard to the public transport needs of employees of Papworth Hospital, in the context of its announced relocation to the Biomedical Campus."

Councillor Howell made the point that this did not solely relate to Papworth Hospital, but sought to address a significant bottleneck at junction 11 of the M11 which would be made worse as a result of the increased traffic following the relocation of Papworth Hospital. The introduction of an additional road only for use by public transport would, in his opinion, help alleviate the problem.

Councillor David Whiteman-Downes seconded the motion.

Councillor John Williams made reference to current bus services, highlighting numerous cancellations that commonly occurred and a lack of bus drivers in the area. He said that a huge issue for South Cambridgeshire was affordability, stating that key workers found it difficult to live in the district as a result of the very high living costs and insisted that the problem ran deeper than infrastructure.

Councillor Burkitt, Portfolio Holder for the Greater Cambridge City Deal, reported that a report on this proposal had been placed in the public domain following consideration by the City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board in October 2014. In his opinion this proposal made perfect sense.

Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, supported the motion, particularly with regards to the added congestion that would be caused by existing staff as well as 125,000 to 150,000 outpatients and inpatients.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley supported the sentiments of the motion but was concerned that making decisions on a small part of the problem, as was being proposed, would mean that the issue was not being considered as part of the more overarching and strategic vision of the City Deal.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the following motion:

“This Council asks the City Deal to pay particular regard to the public transport needs of employees of Papworth Hospital, in the context of its announced relocation to the Biomedical Campus.”

### **13 (e) Standing in the name of Councillor Bridget Smith**

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Opposition, proposed that Council approved the following motion:

“This Council notes the result of the EU Referendum and now commits to doing everything that it can to protect, support and enhance the position of the residents of South Cambridgeshire, in whatever new agreements are sought and reached with the European Union and its member countries and the rest of the world and otherwise, as a result of the Referendum decision to leave the EU.

In particular this Council believes:

- (1) That the financial position of local authorities such as South Cambridgeshire must not be further worsened and should, if possible, be improved.
- (2) That the Government must give an immediate guarantee that the existing rights of citizens of other European Union countries who are already living in South Cambridgeshire will be protected.
- (3) That the importance of high tech and life science industries as well as of scientific research in South Cambridgeshire must be recognised and action taken to protect their futures.
- (4) That there must not be any weakening of environmental legislation and employment rights that at present derive from EU directives.”

Councillor John Williams seconded the motion. He was particularly concerned with the outcome of the EU referendum from the perspective of the amount of money the University and many companies based in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire currently received from the EU, stating that 19,000 people in the area worked in jobs that were dependent on EU funding. He was keen to see as much EU funding secured as possible as a result of any deal to leave the EU.

Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader and Corporate and Customer Services Portfolio Holder, proposed an amendment to delete the words ‘in particular this Council believes’ from the end of the first paragraph and the subsequent paragraphs (1) to (4). He was concerned that the Council was potentially placing too much of a restriction on itself at this stage when negotiations were only just at a starting point and referred to other key industries that had not been specifically mentioned in the motion as it originally stood.

Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, seconded the amendment as he did not believe that the detail behind the points listed in (1) to (4) of the original motion was as apparent as had been presented.

Councillor van de Weyer was of the opinion that it was at this stage that the Council should make it clear what it wanted to negotiate about, stating that the first paragraph of the original motion did not go into any detail with the subsequent points providing a clear message.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley was disappointed with the amendment and felt that the Council's administration was missing an opportunity to act rather than wait for more details to emerge, citing the city of Oxford as an example of an area that was seeking to take advantage and lobby the Government on behalf of its residents at an early stage.

Councillor Simon Edwards, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, could not agree with the second point in particular without a reciprocal arrangement for those residents of South Cambridgeshire who worked in the EU. He agreed with the point that this was the early stages of a negotiation and that the Council should not indicate its position at this time.

Voting on the amendment, with 30 votes in favour and 15 votes against, the amendment was carried.

Enough Members as prescribed by 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, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Simon Crocker, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Des O'Brien, Tony Orgee, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

#### **Against**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Nigel Cathcart, Doug Cattermole, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Cicely Murfitt, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Ingrid Tregoin, Aidan van de Weyer and John Williams.

(Councillors Tom Bygott and Neil Davies were not present at the meeting during this vote).

Debating the substantive motion, Councillor Bridget Smith was disappointed with the amendment which she felt was not portraying a strong enough message from the Council. She reflected on lots of people currently living in the district with significant uncertainties regarding their futures and thought that the original motion was an opportunity for the Council to influence decision-making going forward.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the following substantive motion:

"This Council notes the result of the EU Referendum and now commits to doing everything that it can to protect, support and enhance the position of the residents of South Cambridgeshire, in whatever new agreements are sought and reached with the European Union and its member countries and the rest of the world and otherwise, as a result of the Referendum decision to leave the EU."

**14. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS**

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

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.10 p.m.**

---