

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on  
Thursday, 26 January 2017 at 2.00 p.m.

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

Councillors: David Bard, Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Doug Cattermole, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Simon Crocker, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Ingrid Tregoing, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Nick Wright

Officers: Patrick Adams Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Alex Colyer Interim Chief Executive  
Rory McKenna Deputy Monitoring Officer

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Nigel Cathcart, Neil Davies, Jose Hales, Tumi Hawkins, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Raymond Matthews, Des O'Brien, Deborah Roberts, David Whiteman-Downes and Tim Wotherspoon.

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

Councillor Francis Burkitt declared a non-pecuniary interest on items of discussion regarding the City Deal as the Council's representative on the Greater Cambridgeshire City Deal Executive Board.

### **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 17 November 2016, which then reconvened on 21 November 2016, were agreed as a correct record, subject to the amending of the word "Planning" to "Housing" in the first sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 20.

### **5. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Peter Topping explained that a Tackling Social Isolation Task and Finish Group was being set up, with Councillor Sue Ellington as Chairman. Councillors wishing to serve on the Group were invited to contact Councillor Ellington.

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

None.

**7. PETITIONS**

None.

**8. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:****8 (a) Interim Polling Districts Review (Civic Affairs Committee, 9 December 2016)**

Councillor Simon Crocker proposed and Councillor Robert Turner seconded the recommendation, as laid out in the report.

Council unanimously

**AGREED** the adoption of the following changes to the Council's scheme of Polling Districts and Polling Places:

- (a) Deletion of the existing polling district of Fen Ditton (RA1), and creation of two new polling districts of Fen Ditton West (RA1) and Fen Ditton East (RA2). Residents in RA1 will continue to vote in Fen Ditton. Residents in RA2 will need to attend the polling station in Teversham to vote in the county elections next year. They will vote in Fen Ditton for other elections.
- (b) Deletion of the existing polling district of Whittlesford South (WH2), with all WH2 properties being moved into the polling district of Whittlesford (WH1).
- (c) Amendment of the appointed polling place for the polling district of Childerley (NL2) to incorporate the parish of Knapwell. This will allow electors in Childerley to visit the Knapwell station for the county elections next year.
- (d) Creation of a new polling district of Trumpington Meadows (PG2), with all the properties within the boundary of the new polling district being moved from Haslingfield (PG1).

**8 (b) Community Governance Review: Haslingfield Parish Council (Civic Affairs Committee, 9 December 2016)**

Councillor Janet Lockwood, local member for Harston and Hauxton, proposed this recommendation by explaining that it had the support of the affected parish councils and local residents associations. Councillor Doug Cattermole, local member for Haslingfield, seconded the recommendation.

Councillor Charlie Nightingale proposed and Councillor Ben Shelton seconded the proposal that instead of Trumpington South the new parish should be named Fawcett due to the association the area had with the Fawcett family. Councillor Simon Crocker explained that the name Trumpington South had the support of the Civic Affairs Committee and the Trumpington Residents' Association and none of the parish council representatives at the meeting had objected to this name. He added that a future governance review would be required to set up a parish council and the residents could propose a name change then. Councillor David Bard cautioned against agreeing to give the parish a name which had not been consulted on. A vote was taken and with 6 votes in favour, 33 against and 3 abstentions the proposal was lost.

Council unanimously

**AGREED**

- (a) Option B as laid out in the report, due to the support of local parish councils, local organisations and local residents for this option.
- (b) That the new parish be named "South Trumpington".

**8 (c) Localised Council Tax Support Scheme (Finance & Staffing Portfolio Holder Meeting, 16 August 2016)**

Councillor Simon Edwards proposed this recommendation, as Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder. He explained that the proposed scheme was affordable and he urged Members to support it. Councillor Peter Topping seconded the recommendation and Councillor Bridget Smith stated that the Liberal Democrat group supported it.

Council unanimously

**AGREED** to reaffirm the current Localised Council Tax Support Scheme for the Civic Year 2017-18.

**8 (d) Annual Pay Policy Statement (Employment Committee, 26 January 2017)**

Councillor Alex Riley proposed this recommendation, by explaining that that the Employment Committee had met that morning and had amended the recommendation as laid out in the agenda to include both the post of Joint Director Planning and Economic Development in the list of posts that apply to the policy and the inclusion of the Combined Authority Mayoral elections in the list of fees set by the Government. Councillor Riley also explained that the Local Pay Claim 2017 from UNISON was for noting and that any comments on the pay award should be made to the Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder who would decide the pay award after the budget had been set. Councillor Ray Manning seconded this proposal.

Councillor John Williams suggested that all staff should be paid the living wage and that the pay award should be determined before the budget was set. Councillor Edwards explained that when the pay award was set the Council was paying the living wage, but since then the Living Wage Foundation had adjusted the living wage figure.

Council unanimously

**AGREED** To approve the Pay Policy Statement, with the inclusion of the "Joint Director Planning and Economic Development" as the third bullet point in paragraph 1.1 and the inclusion of the words "Combined Authority Mayoral" in the list of election fees set by the Government as listed in the third paragraph under 14.1.

**8 (e) Appointment of Two Councillors to the Scrutiny Committee of the Combined Authority**

Councillor Peter Topping recommended that the Council appoint Councillor Alex Riley and Councillor John Batchelor as this authority's representatives on the Scrutiny Committee of the Combined Authority. Councillor Bridget Smith seconded the proposal.

Council unanimously

**AGREED** to appoint Councillor Alex Riley and Councillor John Batchelor as this authority's representatives on the Scrutiny Committee of the Combined Authority.

Council also agreed to recommend to the Scrutiny Committee of the Combined Authority that its constitution should allow for substitute members to be appointed.

## **9. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

### **9 (a) From Councillor John Williams**

Councillor John Williams asked his question as tabled.

Councillor Lynda Harford explained that this question was relevant to both the Housing and the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder. She reminded councillors that earlier in the meeting the Leader had announced that a Tackling Social Isolation Task and Finish Group was being set up. She then made the following points:

- The Council recognises the value of older people in the District.
- The Council manages 43 Sheltered Housing Schemes in 30 of our villages.
- The Council employs 11 Sheltered Estate Officers who work with tenants to organise outings and activities, which often take part in the communal rooms.
- The Council employs a team of Visiting Support Officers who help residents to find and access local groups. They also offer practical help with the claiming of benefits, paying of bills and purchasing essential supplies.

Councillor Williams recognised the support the Council was providing its own tenants, but asked what support was being offered to elderly residents who did not live in our council houses, particularly with regard to mobility. Councillor Harford responded by stating that the Council needed to both work with its partners to improve rural transport and to ensure that funding was secured from developers to help provide vital services including community transport.

### **9 (b) From Councillor Bridget Smith to the Leader of Council**

Councillor Bridget Smith asked her question as tabled.

Councillor Lynda Harford explained that the issue of delivering housing was relevant to both the Housing and the Planning Portfolios. She explained that:

- The low housing figures were not unique to this area.
- The Government had recognised that this was a national issue and a White Paper was expected.
- The Council was keen to work with small and medium-sized house builders (SMEs) to deliver more houses, but recognised that many SMEs had moved away from house building.
- The Council championed self-build, especially those looking to use 21<sup>st</sup> century technology.
- The housing deal secured through devolution should speed up the delivery of houses.
- The refusal of planning applications that were then granted on appeal unnecessarily delays the process whilst giving false hope to residents opposed to

these developments.

In her supplementary question Councillor Bridget Smith expressed concern about the delay in the construction of housing after planning permission had been given and in particular the lengthy bureaucratic process that SMEs had to follow to build relatively small projects. Councillor Harford agreed that the Government's requirements were onerous and she requested that if there were any examples where councillors felt that the Council had not properly assisted a builder, particularly with the tendering process, they should contact her directly.

**9 (c) From Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer to the City Deal Portfolio Holder**

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer asked his question as tabled.

Councillor Francis Burkitt explained that the Mouchel review had been carried out in spring 2016 and had recommended that instead of a larger number of officers working part-time, there should be a smaller number of officers working full-time as part of a dedicated City Deal team, which had now been established. The review had also recommended that the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and University representatives on the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board should be given a vote, but as these representatives are not publicly elected they could not be permitted to vote in the spending of public money. This stance was supported by both the LEP and Cambridge University. The other recommendation that had not been accepted was an issue that had to be determined through the HR process.

**9 (d) From Councillor Philippa Hart for the Leader of Council**

The Chairman declared that the 30 minutes allowed for questions had expired. This meant that there was insufficient time to answer Councillor Philippa Hart's question and so a written response would be provided.

**10. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**10 (a) Standing in the Name of Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer**

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer proposed this motion by stating that this was last proposed in November 2014 and since then the majority of votes at Council had been recorded in any case. He concluded that by recording its votes Council would show that it was both open and transparent.

Councillor Nick Wright seconded this motion by stating that all councillors had the courage to be elected and so should be prepared to show their residents how they had voted on the issues decided by Council. He added that recording how councillors had voted was also a useful historical record that could be referred to in future debates.

It was explained to members that full Council had the power to decide that all votes at full Council were recorded, but if it wanted votes at other committees of the authority to be recorded then the matter should be discussed by the Civic Affairs Committee before a decision was taken at Council. It was agreed that only the votes at Council should be recorded.

Council unanimously

**AGREED** The following motion:

that all votes at Council, except for those taken by affirmation and for appointments, be recorded in the manner described in Standing Order 16.5 (Recorded Vote) and the necessary amendments be made to the Constitution.

#### **10 (b) Standing in the Name of Councillor Bridget Smith**

Councillor Bridget Smith proposed the motion and spoke of the importance of having a transport strategy for Greater Cambridge that was based on accurate up-to-date evidence. Councillor John Williams seconded the motion and spoke of the need to reassure residents that important decisions and strategies were being decided on reliable information.

Councillor Francis Burkitt explained that he supported the motion, but pointed out that there were 19 other recommendations in the report, which were also worthy of the Council's support. Councillor Peter Topping also supported the motion and championed the need for independent validation of the City Deal's strategies. He added that these reviews needed to be publicly available.

In summing up Councillor Bridget Smith stated that the challenge was to ensure that the City Deal had a positive effect on the lives of the District's residents and she expressed concern that it was too focused on the city at the expense of the surrounding area.

The Council unanimously

**AGREED** The following motion:

In the light of the recently published City Deal external review, this Council strongly supports the recommendation:

‘to undertake a refresh of the transport strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to ensure it is up-to-date and reflects the impact of any latest development patterns and other relevant changes.’

Furthermore, this Council supports the recommendation:

‘to ensure the transport and economic evidence base is up-to-date.’

#### **10 (c) Standing in the Name of Councillor David Bard**

Councillor David Bard proposed this motion by stating that the Council had passed a motion in 2010 opposing a congestion charge in Cambridge. The situation had changed since then and he was asking the Council to confirm this position. He stated that only two cities in Britain had a congestion charge: London and Durham. London had an excellent transport system and Durham's congestion charge was restricted to a single road. Proposals for congestion charges for Manchester and Edinburgh had been rejected by 78.8% and 75% of the public respectively. Councillor Nick Wright seconded the motion.

The following points were made against the motion:

- The authority needed to wait and see the exact terms of any congestion charge before deciding whether to oppose it or not.
- There was insufficient evidence to make a definite decision.
- Funds generated by a congestion charge could be used to improve alternative modes of transport, including free parking at Park & Ride sites.
- Instigating a congestion charge could remove the need for other less palatable charges.
- The Council should be open to considering the wider benefits of a congestion

charge to avoid the allegation of nimbyism.

The following points were made for the motion:

- Motorists in our villages have no viable alternative to get to Cambridge.
- The cost of the charge would have to prohibitively high for it to make a difference to congestion in the city.
- A congestion charge would be a tax that would fall disproportionately on our residents.
- Infrastructure needed to be improved before a congestion charge could be contemplated.
- Concern was expressed at the cost of a referendum on this issue when residents' opposition was clearly known.
- Steps to improve traffic flow should be considered to reduce congestion.
- A congestion charge would not work in a city the size of Cambridge.
- A congestion charge could have a negative impact on Cambridge's economy.
- Congestion in London had not been reduced by the charge.

Regret was expressed on both sides of the debate that this issue had been politicised, although there was disagreement on who was responsible for this.

A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

**In favour (31)**

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Simon Crocker, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, David McCraith, Charlie Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright.

**Against (8)**

Councillors Henry Batchelor, Philippa Hart, Janet Lockwood, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Ingrid Tregoeing, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams

**Abstain (2)**

Councillors Doug Cattermole and Cicely Murfitt.

Therefore Council

**AGREED** the following motion:

While welcoming City Deal proposals to improve public transport access to Cambridge, this Council reiterates its opposition to a congestion charging scheme. A congestion charge would have the effect of selectively penalising those residents of South Cambridgeshire who currently have no realistic alternative to the car for travel into Cambridge for work.

**11. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS**

Those engagements attended by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman since the last meeting were noted.

**12. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

Council noted that its next meeting will be held on Thursday 23 February 2017 at 2pm.

Council **AGREED** the following meeting dates:

- Thursday 25 May 2017 at 2pm
- Thursday 28 September 2017 at 2pm
- Thursday 23 November 2017 at 2pm
- Thursday 25 January 2018 at 2pm
- Thursday 22 February 2018 at 2pm

It was noted that whilst the Council meetings scheduled for July were cancelled in 2015 and 2016, an extra meeting could be held between May and September if necessary.

---

**The Meeting ended at 4.05 p.m.**

---