

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on  
Thursday, 27 September 2018 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Dr. Douglas de Lacey – Chairman  
Councillor Anna Bradnam – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Ruth Betson,  
Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart,  
Sarah Cheung Johnson, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield,  
Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Philippa Hart,  
Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Pippa Heylings, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt,  
Alex Malyon, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival,  
Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Nick Sample, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith,  
Dr. Ian Sollom, Peter Topping, Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters,  
Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright

Officers:	Beverly Agass	Chief Executive
	Alex Colyer	Executive Director
	Kathrin John	Democratic Services Team Leader
	Stephen Kelly	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
	Rory McKenna	Deputy Head of Legal Practice

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Grenville Chamberlain and Gavin Clayton.

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

#### Item 8 (a) – Adoption of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

The Chairman advised that it would be taken as read that all Members who had declared interests at the meeting of Council on 13 March 2014 would have the same interest at this meeting.

Members who had recorded such interests at Minute 94 of the meeting held on 13 March 2014 (available for inspection on the Council's website) were:-

- Councillor Nigel Cathcart - disclosable pecuniary interest. Councillor Cathcart reiterated at this meeting that he had a disclosable pecuniary interest (as he was the joint owner of a potential site in Bassingbourn). He had been granted a dispensation to both speak and vote by the Monitoring Officer on 26 September 2018 and so could fully participate in the meeting.
- Councillor Tumi Hawkins - non-pecuniary interest. Councillor Hawkins restated her interest at this meeting.
- Councillor Douglas de Lacey - non-pecuniary interest
- Councillor Deborah Roberts - non-pecuniary interest
- Councillor Bridget Smith - non-pecuniary interest

- Councillor Hazel Smith - non-pecuniary interest
- Councillor Peter Topping - non-pecuniary interest
- Councillor Aidan Van De Weyer - a non-pecuniary interest
- Councillor John Williams - non-pecuniary interest
- Councillor Nick Wright - non-pecuniary interest

**Item 14(e) – Question from Councillor Nick Wright**

Councillor Bridget Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest in the question from Councillor Wright relating to The Tree at Stapleford, insofar as she had invited residents involved in the Tree campaign to a meeting at the Eco Hub in Gamlingay.

**Item 15(b) – Motion in the name of Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn**

Councillor Dr. Cahn declared a non-pecuniary interest in the Motion he had submitted on the basis of his membership of Cambridge Stays and South East Cambridgeshire for Europe.

**Item 15(c) – Motion in the name of Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer**

Councillor Philippa Hart declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the Motion submitted by Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer and indicated that she would withdraw during discussion and voting thereon.

**3. REGISTER OF INTERESTS**

The Chairman reminded Members that they needed to update the Register of Interests whenever their circumstances changed.

**4. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 19 July 2018 were confirmed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, subject to the amendment of the fifth bullet point of Minute 9(e) by deletion of the words “Council’s benchmarking group” and their replacement by the word “Country”. Clarification was sought as to whether the words “carrot and stick” in the second bullet point of Minute 16(a) on page 14 of the minutes accurately reflected the words used by Councillor John Williams but no evidence to the contrary was forthcoming.

**5. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

With reference to item 8(a) on the agenda (Adoption of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan), the Chairman referred to the circulation of an Errata sheet and the recommendations from Cabinet at its meeting held on 24 September 2018. The recommendations were identical to those in the officer report on page 23 of the Council agenda.

The Chairman reminded Members that at the last Council meeting an item had been included to enable reports to be given by the Leader/Deputy Leader and Lead Cabinet members. He reported that, following feedback, Cabinet had concluded that the format

had not worked well and the item had therefore been dropped from the agenda for the time being. Cabinet members would be happy to provide updates in relation to their areas of responsibility outside the meeting.

Councillor Philippa Hart, Lead Cabinet Member for Customer Services and Business Improvement, announced that after a successful trial using Office 365, it was planned to roll out Office 365 to all Members in the week commencing Monday 8 October 2018. Councillor Hart asked for a few Members to volunteer to test the guides supplied to set up the new access. She would be emailing further information to Members shortly. Councillor Mark Howell, pointed out that he had been one of the Members identified to trial Office 365 but noted that he had not received a single email. He indicated that he had raised this issue with 3C ICT. The Chairman suggested that Councillor Howell should pursue this further with the Lead Cabinet Member outside the meeting.

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

### **6 (a) From Tim Wotherspoon (County Councillor for the Cottenham and Willingham Division) to the Leader of the Council**

The following question had been received from Tim Wotherspoon (County Councillor for the Cottenham and Willingham division):

“Dame Kate Barker published the final report of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review in the middle of September. It says things such as "Our findings show that the area continues to grow strongly, in all likelihood significantly more so than the government's figures suggest". Some surveys indicate that business is growing at 10% a year, and faster in South Cambridgeshire than Cambridge City. Now that we are embarking on the next round of plan making, can the Leader give residents, entrepreneurs and businesses - not just in our own district but across the country and throughout the world - confidence that the planning system is fast enough to match this level of growth?”

The Chairman noted that County Councillor Wotherspoon was unable to attend the meeting owing to another commitment and would therefore be sent a written response.

## **7. PETITIONS**

No petitions for consideration by the Council had been received.

## **8. RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

### **8 (a) Adoption of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (Cabinet - 24 September 2018)**

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, in introducing this item, recorded her thanks to all staff involved in working on the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and noted that she would be writing to thank them for their efforts.

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer, Deputy Leader of the Council proposed the recommendations of Cabinet, at its meeting held on 24 September 2018, regarding adoption of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Councillor Van de Weyer acknowledged that he had previously expressed reservations about the Local Plan process. However, the Inspector's report had now been received and, subject to

incorporating the associated Main Modifications, the Inspector had concluded that the Plan was sound. The only options available to the Council were to adopt or reject the Local Plan. He believed that it was important to act in the best interests of the whole District as failure to adopt the Plan could lead to a return to the problems associated with a lack of five year housing land supply. With the Local Plan in place, the focus should be on how to create superb places for residents to live and to address housing need. Councillor Van de Weyer noted that the Council would almost immediately need to begin developing the next Local Plan.

Councillor Deborah Roberts seconded the motion.

During discussion upon the motion:-

- Having repeated her thanks to the officers for their work on the Plan, Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins observed that her concern had always been about the proposal for Bourn Airfield and that she had represented the views of the residents in her ward on this. Notwithstanding continuing reservations, Councillor Dr. Hawkins accepted that the best course of action was to adopt and begin to deliver the Plan in order to protect communities, subject to provision of the required infrastructure, particularly along the A428 and A10. In view of her vocal opposition to the Bourn Airfield proposal she planned to abstain on the vote and did not intend to lead the delivery of the Bourn Airfield development as Lead Cabinet Member for Planning. However as ward councillor she would work with the Deputy Leader and Officers to achieve the best outcomes possible, including good quality housing of all types and the right infrastructure.
- Councillor Peter Topping was concerned that Cabinet had only met to consider the Local Plan on 24 September 2018 given his understanding that it had been received on 31 August 2018 and questioned why the Cabinet had not met earlier on such an important issue. He remarked that he would be supporting the Plan given its importance in protecting green belt and investing in large community development on existing brownfield sites. He was sceptical about whether the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning could fulfil her responsibilities in the light of the position she had expressed.
- Councillor Mark Howell referred to previous comments and indicated that he would vote against the Local Plan and suggested that the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning should do likewise.
- Councillor Sue Ellington indicated her support for the Plan and echoed earlier comments made by Councillor Topping.
- Councillor Graham Cone confirmed his support for the Local Plan which he regarded as the correct course of action to protect residents and villages and secure desperately needed affordable local housing.
- Councillor Brian Milnes highlighted earlier references to the role of the Local Plan in protecting green belt and the need for infrastructure to be in place before development took place and made comments regarding voting at a recent Planning Committee.
- Councillor Peter Topping strongly challenged any suggestion that voting in planning was carried out on a political basis. Following comments by another Member, the Chairman indicated that he would not allow further discussion on this.
- Councillor Roberts, in seconding the motion, reminded those present that the opposition in the previous Council had expressed reservations about the Local Plan and had voted against it. She respected the position being adopted by the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning in support of her ward.
- Councillor Nick Wright indicated his support for the Local Plan which he believed protected the green belt and noted the additional houses to be provided were

generally on brownfield sites. He also pointed out that there had been support from some Independent and Labour members for the Local Plan in the previous Council.

- Councillor Nigel Cathcart stated that he supported the Local Plan on the basis that it tried to address competing requirements and minimise the potential damage.
- Councillor Van de Weyer, in summing up, responded to Councillor Topping's question about the timing of the Cabinet meeting, noting that the final decision for adoption was now before the whole Council. He emphasised the importance of ensuring that infrastructure, most notably along the A428 and A10, was provided in advance of development and expressed the view that by adopting the Local Plan, the Council would be supporting the delivery of the houses, infrastructure and jobs needed by the District.

Upon being put to the vote, votes were cast as follows:

**For (41):**

Councillors Phillip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Ruth Betson, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Dr. Douglas de Lacey, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Philippa Hart, Geoff Harvey, Pippa Heylings, Steve Hunt, Alex Malyon, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Nick Sample, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Peter Topping, Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright

**Against (1):** Mark Howell

**Abstain (1):** Dr. Tumi Hawkins

Council

**RESOLVED to:**

1. Note the Inspectors' Report containing the Inspectors' Main Modifications to be made to the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan in order for it to be found sound (Appendix 1); and
2. Note the schedule of Additional Modifications (Appendix 2) to the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan to make minor updates and corrections; and
3. Note the Main Modifications to the submitted Policies Map published alongside the Inspectors' Report as a reference document to the examination (Appendix 3);
4. Adopt the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, including both Main and Additional Modifications (Appendix 4);
5. Adopt the South Cambridgeshire Policies Map 2018, including Main Modifications and Additional Modifications (Appendix 5); and
6. Authorise the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, in liaison with the Deputy Leader, to make minor typographical amendments or updates in preparing the final version of the Adopted Local Plan and Policies Map.

## 9. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY

The Council noted reports prepared by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority summarising the work of the Authority during June and July 2018.

The Council's representatives on the Combined Authority were invited to comment on the reports, as summarised below.

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, provided an update on the meeting of the Combined Authority Board held on 26 September 2018 and highlighted the following issues:

- The Board had considered a review of the Constitution. The Mayor had power to nominate appointments to Committees, Chairmanships and Portfolio holders.
- The appointment of an interim Chief Finance Officer had been confirmed.
- Interim arrangements for covering the role of Chief Executive had been discussed. The role was to be shared jointly between the Monitoring Officer and Chief Executive of East Cambridgeshire District Council. The Leader had argued for external recruitment to the role to be undertaken.
- The Board had considered the Housing Strategy and it was now proposed to use £60m of the £100m affordable housing fund to enable provision of 2,000 additional housing units, with £40m being allocated to a new revolving fund. However there had been no indication of funding being allocated according to greatest need. The Leader indicated that she would continue the work of her predecessor, Councillor Topping, to fight to ensure that South Cambridgeshire received its fair share of the funding allocation.
- Discussion had taken place on the submission of a Business Rates pilot bid. It had been agreed that 10% of funds would be ring-fenced for use by the Combined Authority for a growth fund; 10% would be split between the two Social Care Authorities in recognition that the costs of growth fell disproportionately on those authorities with the remaining 80% of funds being distributed per capita across all constituent authorities. The Leader indicated that she had refused to take the decision to consent to the bid on behalf of the Council as a constituent authority unilaterally and had taken the matter to Cabinet for decision.
- The Board had received the Cambridge and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report. The Leader had sought to obtain the Board's approval to accept all of the recommendations in the report, which had not been supported, although the Board had agreed to "welcome" rather than "note" the report.
- The Leader had submitted a motion calling on the Combined Authority urgently to commission an independent organisational review to include delivery objectives for 2018/19; governance, staffing, operations and project delivery in order to give assurance as to the impact, independence and transparency of the Combined Authority. The motion had not been approved but a review would be conducted by the two Interim Chief Executives which was expected to focus on the internal staffing structure.

Councillor Allen reported on the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 24 September 2018, noting that cross party support had been received for a number of the issues raised including concerns about:-

- the number of temporary appointments at the Combined Authority and the challenges this presented in terms of scrutinising matters in view of the lack of continuity in staffing.
- the allocation of housing funding as referred to earlier by the Leader.
- proposals for variation of the call-in scheme which had now been referred back for reconsideration.

Councillor Tony Mason noted that a further meeting of the Audit Committee would take place on 28 September 2018.

Councillor Peter Topping reported that he had substituted for Councillor Chamberlain at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He noted that during the discussion on the housing allocation he had pointed out that the Agreement with the Government had contained specific reference to housing need in this part of the County. Councillor Topping expected that further discussions would take place on the Housing Strategy at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and referred to the importance of ensuring that the £100m fund was spent in the way intended and benefited the residents of South Cambridgeshire. Additionally, the Committee had highlighted the need for an overall assessment of the many projects being managed within the Combined Authority.

In response to questions from Members, the Leader:

- Indicated that she had questioned the use of development companies in the Combined Authority and had been advised that the proposed use of such companies had been part of the original devolution deal.
- Noted that it was important to continue to scrutinise and challenge the Combined Authority's decisions where appropriate and to speak out in support of the best interests of South Cambridgeshire.
- Commented on the increasing wage bill in the Combined Authority.
- Provided further background on the decision to give Constituent Authority consent to the Business Rates Pilot submission, noting that she had been advised that if the Combined Authority had not been part of the bid, it was most unlikely that a bid would succeed and that it would not have been realistic to have submitted a separate bid.

Council **RECEIVED** the reports summarising the work of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority in June and July 2018.

#### **10. APPOINTMENT TO THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL (IRP)**

The report of the Executive Director was submitted which invited Council to authorise officers to proceed with a recruitment and selection exercise to recruit a new member of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) in the light of the decision of Mr Kevin McIntyre not to seek reappointment for a further term of office.

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, moved the recommendations in the report. In so doing, she thanked Mr McIntyre, on behalf of the Council, for his work during his term of office as a member of the IRP.

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer seconded the proposal.

Council by affirmation

#### **RESOLVED**

To authorise the Executive Director to undertake a recruitment and selection process and recommend the appointment of a new member of the Independent Remuneration Panel for a three year term of office.

## 11. **REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL: SCHEME OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES 2018/19**

The Council received the report of the Executive Director which invited consideration of the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) in respect of the Scheme of Members' Allowances 2018/19. A copy of the Panel's report was attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

Councillor Ian Sollom moved the following motion:

1. That the Independent Remuneration Panel be thanked for their work in producing the report at Appendix A.
2. That, having had regard to the report, this Council does not support the adoption of the recommendations on the grounds that it does not appear adequately to evidence the reasoning behind the proposed allowances.
3. That the Council therefore agrees that:
  - (a) in accordance with the mechanism adopted in previous years, all allowances be raised in line with the staff pay award for 2018/19; and
  - (b) an SRA of £444 (to be adjusted in accordance with 3 (a) above), be awarded to the Chairmen of the Grants Advisory and Climate Change and Environment Advisory Committees.
4. That the Scheme of Members' Allowances for 2018/19, revised in accordance with 3 (a) and (b) above, be introduced with effect from 8 May 2018.
5. That the Executive Director be authorised to implement and advertise the scheme and make any consequential amendments to the Scheme of Members' Allowances in Part 6 of the Constitution.
6. That the Independent Remuneration Panel be requested to undertake a review of the Scheme of Members' Allowances for 2019/20.

In moving the motion, Councillor Sollom thanked the IRP for their work. He noted that the review had been a challenging one bearing in mind the implementation of the new ward boundaries, the reduction in the size of the Council and the change in the political management arrangements. However he did not think that there was sufficient evidence to justify to the public supporting the recommended increase in the Basic Allowance or to increase the Special Responsibility Allowances without further analysis of what those special responsibilities entailed. He therefore proposed that the Council should adopt the practice followed in previous years to increase allowances in line with the staff pay award.

In response to a question from Councillor Mark Howell, the Executive Director confirmed that the costs shown for the current scheme on page 91 of the report related to a Council of 57 Members. To reflect the cost of the current scheme on the basis of 45 Members the overall total would need to be reduced by about £60,000.

Councillor Mark Howell seconded the motion.

During discussion:-

- Councillor Deborah Roberts observed that during her service as a councillor, the Council had repeatedly not accepted the recommendations of the IRP. She noted that following the recent boundary review, some wards had grown

considerably in size and the workload had likewise increased. It was not reasonable to expect councillors to be out of pocket and it was important that recompense was sufficient not to deter candidates from standing for election. She suggested that it would be reasonable to at least raise allowances in line with inflation.

- Councillor Philippa Hart noted that Members were placed in a difficult situation in having to vote for their own allowances. She spoke of the importance of attracting candidates from diverse backgrounds to the role of councillor and also highlighted the need to obtain a better evidence base to inform future reviews of allowances.
- Councillor Graham Cone supported the proposal not to accept the recommendations and felt it would have been difficult to justify a 9% increase in the Basic Allowance to the electorate.
- Councillor John Batchelor indicated that he had sympathy with the comments made by Councillor Roberts but felt it was difficult to accept the recommendations in the absence of any data around workloads. It was important that arrangements were put in place to enable data to be gathered on workloads over the next 6 months so that the IRP had the information needed to carry out their next review.
- Councillor Topping acknowledged that councillors were not well remunerated but believed it was the right decision not to accept the recommendations of the IRP.
- Councillor Howell, as seconder of the motion, felt it was inappropriate to accept the increases recommended by the IRP and agreed it was right to link the allowances to the staff pay award. He also argued that the recent elections had indicated that there was no difficulty in attracting candidates to stand for election.

Upon being put to the vote, votes were cast as follows:

**For (42):**

Councillors Phillip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Ruth Betson, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Dr. Douglas de Lacey, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Philippa Hart, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Pippa Heylings, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Alex Malyon, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival, Judith Rippeth, Nick Sample, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Peter Topping, Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright

**Against (0)**

**Abstain (1):** Councillor Deborah Roberts

Council

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Independent Remuneration Panel be thanked for their work in producing the report at Appendix A.
2. That, having had regard to the report, this Council does not support the adoption of the recommendations on the grounds that it does not appear adequately to evidence the reasoning behind the proposed allowances.
3. That the Council therefore agrees that:

- (a) in accordance with the mechanism adopted in previous years, all allowances be raised in line with the staff pay award for 2018/19; and
  - (b) an SRA of £444 (to be adjusted in accordance with 3 (a) above), be awarded to the Chairmen of the Grants Advisory and Climate Change and Environment Advisory Committees.
4. That the Scheme of Members' Allowances for 2018/19, revised in accordance with 3 (a) and (b) above, be introduced with effect from 8 May 2018.
  5. That the Executive Director be authorised to implement and advertise the scheme and make any consequential amendments to the Scheme of Members' Allowances in Part 6 of the Constitution.
  6. That the Independent Remuneration Panel be requested to undertake a review of the Scheme of Members' Allowances for 2019/20.

## 12. URGENT EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The Council received an information report from the Monitoring Officer on a decision taken as a matter of urgency and which had been exempted from call-in under Scrutiny and Overview Procedure Rules 12.18 – 12.20. Rule 12.19 provided that decisions taken as a matter of urgency must be reported to the next available meeting of the Council.

The report indicated that a decision had been taken by Cabinet, at its meeting held on 5 September 2018, to approve submission of a Bid for funding through the Government's Additional HRA Borrowing Programme 2019/20 – 2021/22 Prospectus to support the construction of additional new build council homes as detailed in the exempt report to Cabinet (which was not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972). The Government's deadline for submission of bids had been 7 September 2018. The decision therefore needed to be implemented before the expiry of any call-in period in view of the deadline set by the Government for submission of bids.

Council **NOTED** the report.

## 13. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND OUTSIDE BODIES

Council **NOTED AND ENDORSED** the following amendments to memberships of committees:

### Scrutiny and Overview Committee:

- Councillor Steve Hunt to replace Councillor Dawn Percival as a member of the Committee.
- Councillor Judith Rippeth to replace Councillor Eileen Wilson as a member of the Committee.
- Councillor Jose Hales to replace Councillor Hunt as a substitute on the Committee
- Councillor Henry Batchelor to replace Councillor Rippeth as a substitute on the Committee

### Planning Committee:

- Councillor Heather Williams to replace Councillor Grenville Chamberlain as a member of the Committee

- Councillor Grenville Chamberlain to replace Councillor Williams as a substitute on the Committee

Council **AGREED** to appoint Councillor Alex Malyon as a representative on the Swavesey Internal Drainage Board as a replacement for Councillor Dawn Percival.

#### 14. **ADJOURNMENT**

The Chairman adjourned the meeting for a short break at 3:30pm. The meeting resumed at 3:47pm.

#### 15. **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

##### 15 (a) **From Councillor Sue Ellington**

*South Cambridgeshire District Council is a rural district with significant rural responsibilities although the district is becoming increasingly urban with significant housing development. Can the Environment Portfolio Holder reassure the Council that given recent staff changes the vitally important historical knowledge and expertise in relation to the management of 200 miles of awarded water courses will be retained and managed to enable farming and prevent flooding?*

Councillor Neil Gough, the Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing agreed that institutional knowledge in this area was very important and indicated that he would work with the Director of Health and Environmental Services to ensure that this was not lost. He commented that this area of work had been overseen by Paul Quigley, Head of Service, Environmental Commissioning, with Pat Matthews, and noted that Paul would be retiring on 28 September 2018 after 31 year's service with South Cambridgeshire District Council. The Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing placed on record the Council's collective thanks to Paul for his advice, support and exemplary work during his service with the Council.

Councillor Ellington, as a supplementary question, asked when the work on Mare Fen would be complete as she understood that the planning permission for Stage 2 at Northstowe was dependent on the work being completed. The Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing commented that work was continuing on the scheme but referred to his understanding that whilst the legal documentation had not been completed, the agreements for the construction and adoption of Mare Fen had been agreed between the Environment Agency and Homes England. He would update Councillor Ellington on further progress.

##### 15 (b) **From Councillor Ruth Betson**

*The Deputy Leader of the Council has said that there is an "urgent need to bring forward new transport infrastructure to keep up with the demand of new builds". As this Council's representative on the board of the Greater Cambridge Partnership, can he tell us which proposals for the A428 route he supports to address that urgency?*

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer, the Deputy Leader of the Council, acknowledged that the newly adopted Local Plan would provide for 19,500 houses in District, including growth at Bourn Airfield and Cambourne. There was therefore a need for high quality public transport links along the Cambourne to Cambridge corridor and it was an important part of the Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) work to deliver that route. The GCP had been working on the scheme for 3.5 years and was now working closely

with the Combined Authority to ensure that provision of infrastructure in the A438 corridor aligned with the objectives for the wider area. He acknowledged the urgency of delivering a high quality public transport link between Cambourne and Cambridge and confirmed he would do his utmost, within the institutional framework available, to ensure that this happened.

Councillor Betson, as a supplementary question, asked whether the Deputy Leader would support her in making representations to Highways England to ask them to review their modelling and to bring the short single lane section of the carriageway on the A428, where it joined the A14 at the Girton Interchange section, back to dual carriageway. The Deputy Leader concurred that it was illogical for the section of highway in question to be single carriageway and agreed to support Councillor Betson in making representations to Highways England. He noted that there were further plans for improvements of the Girton Interchange and upgrading of the A428 but these were some way off and therefore he was happy to support the making of representations to Highways England with the aim of bringing this section of road back to dual carriageway.

**15 (c) From Councillor Bunty Waters**

*What is the Leader of the Council doing to ensure the dualling of the A10 proceeds at a pace sufficient to cope with the traffic from the new Waterbeach development?*

The Deputy Leader of the Council reported that the Combined Authority had commissioned the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study to explore proposals for securing enhancement of capacity in the A10 corridor, including making the transport mitigations necessary to support the phased delivery of the new town north of Waterbeach. The results of the survey were expected by the end of the year and whilst it was necessary to await the outcomes of the survey, it was anticipated that the improvements would be likely to include dualling of the A10 and junction improvements.

Councillor Waters referred to concerns expressed by residents about traffic and blocking in Cody Road, Waterbeach and suggested that previous experience in Bar Hill and Northstowe had highlighted the need for robust communications with Highways England. The proposals for dualling the A10 were likely to have a significant impact for residents in Waterbeach and, as a supplementary question, she asked what could be done to support the local community. The Deputy Leader confirmed that he was conscious of the potential problems that could arise in the absence of good communications. He noted that the A10 scheme would be a Combined Authority, rather than Highways England, project and agreed that appropriate and timely communication would be essential.

**15 (d) From Councillor Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya**

*What efforts is the Council making to ensure the right balance is achieved for Cambourne High Street, particularly ensuring that community interests are served?*

The Leader of the Council reported that proposed development of the High Street in Cambourne had received enthusiastic local support. There had been extensive consultation with the community and Council officers were working with the Greater Cambridge Partnership to seek to obtain funding for highways infrastructure associated with the scheme. She understood frustrations that the project was not moving along more quickly but repeated that there was real enthusiasm to ensure that the right scheme was delivered to enable development of a sustainable and vibrant high street.

As a supplementary question, Councillor Dr. Bhattacharya asked when it was expected

that the plans for the High Street might be agreed so that she could communicate this to local residents. The Leader indicated that she was unable to give a firm indication of when the plans might be agreed as this was dependent on negotiations with the GCP, developers, architects and designers. It was also important to ensure that proper account was taken of the outcomes of the consultation. She shared Councillor Dr. Bhattacharya's frustrations but would provide more information as soon as she was able.

**15 (e) From Councillor Nick Wright**

*Why is this Liberal Democrat administration slow and reluctant to support our village community groups trying to purchase The Tree at Stapleford and the Three Tuns at Guilden Morden by failing to start the compulsory purchase orders?*

The Leader of the Council reported on her understanding that the community group was proceeding with the purchase of the Three Tuns at Guilden Morden and thus a compulsory purchase order would not be necessary. She asked whether Councillor Wright had spoken with the community group in Stapleford since May. She noted that she had met with the community group and officers a few weeks earlier to establish current progress. This had taken place shortly after the landowner had lost the planning appeal and a window of opportunity accordingly remained for the community group to seek to negotiate a voluntary sale. It was therefore hoped that a sale might still be achievable. The Leader therefore believed that the community group was content with the way in which the Council was engaging in respect of this matter.

Councillor Wright commented that the owners of the sites appeared to have an unrealistic expectation of their value and that if compulsory purchase powers were triggered, this would enable independent valuers to establish the true value of the sites, which had now stood vacant for some years. As a supplementary question, he therefore asked whether the Council would trigger compulsory purchase orders to help community residents realise a sensible price so that their business ventures were not overloaded with debt at the outset. The Leader indicated that she understood the point being made but the community group in Stapleford had agreed that there was still time in which to negotiate a private purchase and were happy to proceed on that basis. The community group would no doubt come back to the Council if appropriate.

**15 (f) From Councillor Peter Topping**

*Will the Leader of the Council undertake to instruct officers to consider, with their counterparts in the Cambridgeshire Constabulary, pre-emptive injunctions as one means by which to prevent unlawful trespass and encampments on village greens and recreation grounds in South Cambridgeshire?*

The Leader of the Council recognised that Councillor Topping's ward had experienced issues as outlined in the question but noted that pre-emptive injunctions were expensive and complicated and served only to displace encampments to other areas rather than properly to address the issue. The Council was talking to local authorities who were using pre-emptive injunctions to learn more about the implications of their use. However the seeking of such injunctions represented a last resort response and it was important to be mindful of the impact on other neighbouring authorities in terms of displacement of encampments. The Leader noted that the Council had responded to the Government's consultation on the subject but recognised the need to aim for an effective long term solution. She also pointed out that many of the encampments recently experienced had been on private land and thus injunctions would not have been of any assistance. Where encampments had been on public land it had proved possible to manage the issue relatively quickly. Officers had been instructed to consider all options in order to

achieve a long term solution and nothing was off the table.

Councillor Topping observed that some communities had resorted to digging banks to discourage further encampments and whilst he was pleased to hear that nothing was off the table, he was concerned that longer term solutions were being sought and felt action should be taken to support communities. As a supplementary question, he asked what other “shots were available in the locker” to address the issue. In response, the Leader reminded Councillor Topping of comments made by Councillor Hazel Smith at a previous Council meeting regarding the need for transit sites to be built into the next Local Plan. Whilst this would not wholly address the problem it could be part of a longer term solution. Pre-emptive injunctions were expensive, complex and lengthy processes and it was important to spend public money wisely. It was also necessary to be mindful of the impact of displacing encampments elsewhere. The Leader advised that a workshop on illegal encampments was taking place on 18 October 2018.

**15 (g) From Councillor Heather Williams**

*The need to be on target with recycling contamination levels is key to getting the best value from our rubbish, what initiatives are happening to explain to our residents the issues and encourage recycling?*

The Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing acknowledged that recycling contamination was both financially and environmentally wasteful and indicated that the real target was to reduce waste contamination to nil in order to avoid both current penalties in the order of £10,000 a month and diversion during the course of a year of about 2,500 tons of waste placed in blue bins to landfill. The Council was therefore doing all possible via its communication channels to educate residents to recycle correctly. The last South Cambridgeshire magazine had contained an article on plastic recycling and this week events linked to the national “Plastic Recycling Week” had taken place.

Councillor Williams, as a supplementary question, asked whether the new Administration would support the promotion of recycling champions and community co-ordinators to engage with residents about recycling. The Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing confirmed that engaging with the community in getting the recycling message across was critically important and therefore all channels for achieving this would be explored. The scope for engaging with key stakeholders and other groups would also be looked at.

**16. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**16 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Peter Topping**

Councillor Peter Topping moved the following motion as set out in the agenda:-

“The Leader of the Council received a letter from the Housing Minister dated 26 July asking her “to bring forward ambitious proposals for transformational housing growth, including new settlements”, by mid-September.

This Council notes the recommendations set out in the recently published report by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review that councils should focus on “exemplary” place making and quality of design in order to ensure that accelerated house building does not remove the qualities that make South Cambridgeshire an attractive place for companies to invest in and people to move to,

and therefore instructs the Chief Executive and the Director of Planning and Economic Development to bring proposals forward, as the planning authority, that demonstrate how the Council is proposing to meet this expectation.”

In moving the motion, Councillor Topping commented that, during a visit to South Cambridgeshire earlier in the year, Sir Oliver Letwin had observed that some of the settlements under construction fell short of the ambition to achieve quality place making. Councillor Topping noted that the Council owed a duty to its residents to ensure that the significant amount of development to be delivered in the future was of the very highest standard. He drew comfort from the wording in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report that called for exemplary design. Whilst welcoming the opportunity being afforded to communities to take part in design workshops, Councillor Topping emphasised the importance of the Council focusing on place making and high quality design so that people continued to move to South Cambridgeshire because it was an attractive place to live.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Nick Wright.

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer moved that the second paragraph of the motion be amended by the deletion of words and their replacement (as indicated in strikethrough and underlined text below respectively) to read as follows:

This Council notes the recommendations set out in the recently published report by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review that councils should focus on “exemplary” place making and quality of design in order to ensure that accelerated house building does not remove the qualities that make South Cambridgeshire an attractive place for companies to invest in and people to move to, and therefore instructs the Chief Executive and the Director of Planning and Economic Development to prepare a presentation ~~bring proposals forward~~, as the planning authority, that demonstrates how the Council is meeting ~~proposing to meet~~ this expectation.”

Councillor Van de Weyer explained that the motion as worded did not recognise the active work already being undertaken by the Council in this area. His amendment accordingly proposed that officers should make a presentation to Members highlighting the activity of the Council in promoting high quality design and he gave some examples of work already taking place.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins.

During discussion:-

- Councillor Nick Wright indicated that he did not support the amendment as he wished to see positive proposals coming forward, rather than just a presentation from officers.
- Councillor Peter Topping also spoke in support of more positive action to address the issue, rather than one presentation and commented on the need to ensure that officers were not constrained in responding to the challenge.
- Councillor Philippa Hart disputed whether calling for a presentation was a less active course of action and supported the amendment.
- Councillor Bridget Smith echoed the points made by Councillor Van de Weyer about the work already in progress and noted that focusing on exemplary place making was a priority for the new Administration. She referred to a recent Leaders’ meeting she had attended relating to the Oxford/Cambridge corridor at which she had taken the opportunity to articulate the vision that South Cambridgeshire would be a seed

bed for high quality design and environmentally sustainable development. She supported the amendment because much work was already underway and it was appropriate for a presentation to be delivered to update Members on that work.

- Councillor Deborah Roberts commented that she had sympathy for both the original motion and the amendment. However she had reservations about the wording of that part of the amendment that stated "...that demonstrates how the Council is meeting this expectation." Councillor Roberts questioned whether the Council was meeting the expectation already and therefore suggested that the wording should be amended to read "...that demonstrates how the Council is seeking to meet this expectation". Councillor Van de Weyer indicated his acceptance of this alteration of the wording of his amendment.

Prior to putting the amendment to the vote, the Chairman confirmed that the revised wording put forward by Councillor Roberts and accepted by Councillor Van de Weyer, formed part of the amendment before Council.

Upon being put to the vote, votes were cast on the amendment as follows:

**In favour (32):**

Councillors Phillip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Dr. Claire Daunton, Dr. Douglas de Lacey, Clare Delderfield, Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Philippa Hart, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Pippa Heylings, Steve Hunt, Alex Malyon, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Nick Sample, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson

**Against (10)**

Ruth Betson, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Peter Topping, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams and Nick Wright

**Abstain (1)**

Peter Fane

During discussion on the substantive motion:

- Councillor Nigel Cathcart felt that there had been insufficient focus on design in the past and commented on the need for a design guide setting out general principles and expected standards. He welcomed the opportunity presented by the motion to increase awareness of design and its importance in fostering a sense of community wellbeing but questioned how raising standards of design would be achieved and hoped that sufficient resource would be available to support delivery of the objective.
- Councillor Philippa Hart reflected that there was insufficient focus on design considerations and wondered whether there might be merit in the Planning Committee taking a tour of examples of good and bad design. She spoke of the importance of preserving the quirky features that made villages unique and also commented on the need to explore further the findings in the CPIER report.
- Councillor John Batchelor, in his capacity as Chairman of Planning Committee, reflected on the "bog standard" nature of many designs presented and suggested that the Council needed to do more to make clear its expectations to developers.
- Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins reminded the Council of the launch of village design statements which described the distinctive character of a village and set out

guidelines for how this should be enhanced by new developments. The village design statements would be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents so would be a significant consideration in determining applications and appeals. 8 villages had been selected to be part of a pilot scheme and it was expected that the new village design statements would be delivered in 2018/19.

- Councillor Nick Wright, with reference back to the development of Northstowe, commented on an award winning design guide which had been prepared by Cambridge Horizons and which most local authorities across Cambridgeshire had signed up to. He suggested that the guide should be revisited and updated. Councillor Wright spoke in support of an approach favouring urban and modern design in the new towns to be created in the District, rather than seeking to recreate villages in those new developments.
- Councillor Topping agreed that the findings of the CPIER report should be considered in more depth. He felt that there was a need to speak with a range of audiences outside the Council, including developers and residents, to promote exemplary place making and quality of design. Councillor Topping welcomed the assurances given that work was already in progress but noted that his original motion had sought to achieve the bringing forward by officers of proposals in support of the delivery of the ambitions outlined.

Upon being put to the vote, votes were cast as follows on the substantive motion:

**In favour (41):**

Councillors Phillip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Ruth Betson, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Dr. Claire Daunton, Dr. Douglas de Lacey, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Philippa Hart, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Pippa Heylings, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Alex Malyon, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Nick Sample, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Peter Topping, Aidan Van de Weyer, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright

**Against (2)**

Graham Cone and Bunty Waters

**Abstain (0)**

Council

**RESOLVED:**

The Leader of the Council received a letter from the Housing Minister dated 26 July asking her “to bring forward ambitious proposals for transformational housing growth, including new settlements”, by mid-September.

This Council notes the recommendations set out in the recently published report by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review that councils should focus on “exemplary” place making and quality of design in order to ensure that accelerated house building does not remove the qualities that make South Cambridgeshire an attractive place for companies to invest in and people to move to, and therefore instructs the Chief Executive and the Director of Planning and Economic Development to prepare a presentation, as the planning authority, that demonstrates how the Council is seeking to meet this expectation.

**16 (b) Standing in the name of Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn**

In accordance with Council Standing Order No. 14.7 (a), Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn altered the motion of which he had given notice, with the consent of the meeting by revision of the seventh paragraph of the motion to read as follows (additions shown in underlined text and deletions in strikethrough text):

“The Council calls on the Government to abandon plans for a hard Brexit and to give the electorate, in particular the South Cambridgeshire electorate, the opportunity to assess the original promises of a seamless Brexit with minimal impact made by the Leave campaign by giving the electorate (including resident European citizens) a vote on whether to accept the proposed withdrawal arrangements or to retain the many benefits local residents currently enjoy ~~by~~ with the option of staying in the European Union.

Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn accordingly moved the following motion as altered:-

“In the 2016 Referendum on the European Union the South Cambridgeshire District voted 60.2% in favour of remaining in the European Union.

The negotiations on withdrawal that have followed the national decision to leave the EU have progressed at a slow rate and the precise nature of any final deal is still uncertain with clear divisions among those who voted to leave and a lack of support among the Government’s members of parliament for the adopted ‘Chequers proposals’. It is therefore clear that there is uncertainty whether any final deal will have wholehearted support and can be carried through Parliament.

In recent months a campaign has developed which proposes a People’s Vote on any final deal (or no deal), with the alternative to remain in the EU, to ensure that the path taken has majority support among the electorate.

A number of letters have been received by members asking the Council to support this initiative.

The Council notes that:

- (i) The Governor of the Bank of England has stated that the average household income in Britain is now £900 lower than that anticipated if the decision to leave the EU had not been taken.
- (ii) There are a large number of non-UK EU nationals resident in the district whose life, and that of their UK-national families, has been destabilised by uncertainty. Apart from the social impacts, this has resulted in the loss of staff by local businesses and the NHS.
- (iii) Due to uncertainty about whether the deal that will be agreed with the EU will achieve a Parliamentary majority, ‘no deal’ appears a very credible outcome. This has been described by Chancellor Hammond as having “large fiscal consequences” and by independent observers as “overwhelmingly negative”.
- (iv) All avenues currently being considered by the Government impose increasing delays for goods at our international frontiers and no facilitation would be provided for trade in services which form a major element in the local economy.
- (v) Recent opinion poll evidence has suggested an overall trend in public opinion away from support for leaving the EU and in favour of a vote on the conditions of any departure. A vote on the terms of withdrawal with the option to remain would ensure that we leave, should we do so, with wholehearted support for the actual conditions of withdrawal.
- (vi) The anticipated rapidly deteriorating economic situation if Brexit proceeds is likely

to accelerate austerity, which has already caused acute problems in providing local authority services and has severely affected local residents, in particular those in social housing or in receipt of benefits.

- (vii) Evidence of illegal overspending has been presented (and accepted by the Electoral Commission) and court challenges on the constitutional position are still continuing. A vote on the withdrawal terms would ensure that any decision is accepted as sound by both sides of the argument rather than being fought out in the courts.

The Council believes that the interests of its residents would be best protected by a referendum on the terms of leaving the European Union with the possibility of rescinding Article 50 and remaining in the EU.

The Council calls on the Government to abandon plans for a hard Brexit and to give the electorate, in particular the South Cambridgeshire electorate, the opportunity to assess the original promises of a seamless Brexit with minimal impact made by the Leave campaign by giving the electorate (including resident European citizens) a vote on whether to accept the proposed withdrawal arrangements or to retain the many benefits local residents currently enjoy with the option of staying in the European Union.

The Council should write to our two local MPs calling on them to defend the interests of the District's citizens by supporting this campaign."

In support of his motion, Councillor Dr. Cahn commented that 60.2% of electors in South Cambridgeshire had voted to remain in the European Union. He referred to the current national position with regard to the Brexit negotiations and to the continuing uncertainty. With regard to the position locally, Councillor Dr. Cahn noted that the uncertainty with regard to the future of EU citizens had already led to difficulties in recruiting staff in the service, health and agricultural sectors. He spoke in support of the People's Vote which would give the electorate the opportunity to vote on any final deal or no deal, with the alternative to remain in the EU.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Nigel Cathcart. Councillor Cathcart spoke in favour of the motion, commenting that many details had not been dealt with adequately before the Brexit referendum, including the implications for migration and cross border trading. He believed that parameters had changed in the two years since the referendum and therefore argued that electors should have an opportunity to vote on any final deal, with the option of staying in the EU.

During discussion on the motion:

- Councillor Deborah Roberts felt it was inappropriate for such a motion to be debated in the Council meeting, particularly in view of the earlier declared membership of a pro-EU pressure group. She spoke strongly against the motion, noting that a majority of electors had voted to leave the EU and argued that it would be undemocratic to seek a further vote on the issue.
- Councillor Ruth Betson was surprised the motion was on the agenda as it appeared to relate to national business. She opposed the motion arguing that it would not be democratic to seek a further vote and that it was wrong to defy the outcome of the referendum in June 2016.
- Referring to earlier comments, the Chairman ruled that the subject matter of the motion did affect the District and accordingly the motion was in order.
- Councillor Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya commented that there were many highly skilled workers outside the EU and that there might now be a level playing field in terms of filling vacancies.

- Councillor Heather Williams felt her role was to represent her residents and did not feel she had a mandate to vote either way on this national issue. She believed it was the role of national government to resolve this issue.
- Councillor Phillip Allen, quoting the former Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, David Davis, argued that a democracy that could not change its mind ceased to be a democracy. He referred to the spike in hate crime, the increase in nationalism and the apparent rise in the extreme right wing.
- Councillor Philippa Hart reflected that it was important to uphold democracy but it was the job of Councillors to represent the interests of their residents.
- Councillor Geoff Harvey pointed out that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report had highlighted a bad settlement of the Brexit process as one of two major risks to the wider economies of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. He argued that in view of the lack of specificity in the original referendum and the potential impact for the local economy, it was justified to call for the electorate to be given the opportunity to vote.
- Councillor Nick Wright felt strongly that the will of the public had been expressed in the referendum in 2016 and therefore did not support the motion.
- Councillor Peter McDonald referred to the continuing lack of certainty about the terms of withdrawal some 27 months after the original referendum and felt it was right that the motion was before Council for debate.
- Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins echoed earlier comments about the rise in intolerance and supported the motion to write to the MPs calling for a People's Vote, arguing that people could still vote to leave.
- Councillor Sarah Cheung Johnson highlighted the potential impacts of Brexit for the local economy. She spoke in support of the motion noting that electors should be asked to vote on the terms of the final deal, or no deal.

The Chairman ruled that the 30 minutes allowed for debate under Council Standing Order No. 12.5 had expired and invited Councillor Dr. Cahn, as mover of the motion, to sum up.

Councillor Dr. Cahn spoke in favour of allowing electors to have a say on the terms of any final deal, or no deal and urged Members to vote in favour of his motion.

Prior to the vote being put, Councillors Dr. Cahn declared a non pecuniary interest as a member of the Cambridge Stays and South East Cambridgeshire for Europe. Councillor Harvey declared a non pecuniary interest as a member of Cambridge Stays. Both Members indicated that they would not participate in voting upon the motion.

(Note: Councillor Brian Milnes declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as a service provider to the EU and withdrew from the meeting and took no part in discussion or voting on the item).

Upon being put to the vote, votes were cast as follows:-

**In favour (28):**

Councillors Phillip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Pippa Heylings, Steve Hunt, Alex Malyon, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Dawn Percival, Judith Rippeth, Nick Sample, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson

**Against (11):**

Ruth Betson, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Dr. Douglas de Lacey Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Peter Topping, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright

**Abstain (2):**

Geoff Harvey and Heather Williams

Council

**RESOLVED:**

In the 2016 Referendum on the European Union the South Cambridgeshire District voted 60.2% in favour of remaining in the European Union.

The negotiations on withdrawal that have followed the national decision to leave the EU have progressed at a slow rate and the precise nature of any final deal is still uncertain with clear divisions among those who voted to leave and a lack of support among the Government's members of parliament for the adopted 'Chequers proposals'. It is therefore clear that there is uncertainty whether any final deal will have wholehearted support and can be carried through Parliament.

In recent months a campaign has developed which proposes a People's Vote on any final deal (or no deal), with the alternative to remain in the EU, to ensure that the path taken has majority support among the electorate.

A number of letters have been received by members asking the Council to support this initiative.

The Council notes that:

- (i) The Governor of the Bank of England has stated that the average household income in Britain is now £900 lower than that anticipated if the decision to leave the EU had not been taken.
- (ii) There are a large number of non-UK EU nationals resident in the district whose life, and that of their UK-national families, has been destabilised by uncertainty. Apart from the social impacts, this has resulted in the loss of staff by local businesses and the NHS.
- (iii) Due to uncertainty about whether the deal that will be agreed with the EU will achieve a Parliamentary majority, 'no deal' appears a very credible outcome. This has been described by Chancellor Hammond as having "large fiscal consequences" and by independent observers as "overwhelmingly negative".
- (iv) All avenues currently being considered by the Government impose increasing delays for goods at our international frontiers and no facilitation would be provided for trade in services which form a major element in the local economy.
- (v) Recent opinion poll evidence has suggested an overall trend in public opinion away from support for leaving the EU and in favour of a vote on the conditions of any departure. A vote on the terms of withdrawal with the option to remain would ensure that we leave, should we do so, with wholehearted support for the actual conditions of withdrawal.
- (vi) The anticipated rapidly deteriorating economic situation if Brexit proceeds is likely to accelerate austerity, which has already caused acute problems in providing local authority services and has severely affected local residents, in particular

those in social housing or in receipt of benefits.

- (vii) Evidence of illegal overspending has been presented (and accepted by the Electoral Commission) and court challenges on the constitutional position are still continuing. A vote on the withdrawal terms would ensure that any decision is accepted as sound by both sides of the argument rather than being fought out in the courts.

The Council believes that the interests of its residents would be best protected by a referendum on the terms of leaving the European Union with the possibility of rescinding Article 50 and remaining in the EU.

The Council calls on the Government to abandon plans for a hard Brexit and to give the electorate, in particular the South Cambridgeshire electorate, the opportunity to assess the original promises of a seamless Brexit with minimal impact made by the Leave campaign by giving the electorate (including resident European citizens) a vote on whether to accept the proposed withdrawal arrangements or to retain the many benefits local residents currently enjoy with the option of staying in the European Union.

The Council should write to our two local MPs calling on them to defend the interests of the District's citizens by supporting this campaign.

**16 (c) Standing in the name of Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer**

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer moved the following motion as set out on the agenda:

"This Council welcomes the commitment by government to invest in the Oxford-Cambridge corridor and to enable it to make a nationally significant contribution to economic growth.

This Council sees the construction of the central section of the East West Rail line as being transformational for the regional economy, allowing sustained growth and geographical expansion of our high value industries such as life sciences, IT and digital.

This Council believes that at this stage in the design process it is essential for all route options to be evaluated. The selection of route options must be based on analysis of how they support and unlock housing and employment growth and how they fit with our existing development strategies.

This Council acknowledges that infrastructure investment on this scale carries enormous risks in its impacts on the environment while also presenting us with an unprecedented opportunity to make positive contributions to the net biodiversity and natural capital gain of the areas affected. This Council therefore commits itself to promoting environmental enhancement of benefits (such as flood management, water availability, noise and air pollution mitigation, health and landscape/amenities) along the corridor and asks that this is included in the route evaluation criteria.

This Council recognises that East West Rail and the growth of the corridor more generally will bring significant change to existing communities. It will work closely with those affected from the earliest stages of the project and will ensure that the delivery bodies do likewise.

This Council will continue to collaborate with the East West Railway Company on the route options and on analysing their benefits and impacts.

This Council will coordinate its work with all the local partners as well as the East West

Rail Consortium, of which the Council is a long-standing member.

This Council requests that the Leader and Chief Executive write to the East West Railway Company, the Department of Transport, Network Rail and our MPs to express our aspirations for East West Rail in these terms.”

In introducing the motion, Councillor Van de Weyer reported that consultation was about to start on the route of the central section of the East West rail line and that it was important to raise awareness in advance of the consultation of the impact that the project could make on the regional economy. It was expected that the East West Rail Company would consult on more than one route and it was important that the benefits and impacts of each route were analysed. Councillor Van de Weyer argued that the more the Council got involved in the discussion, the more it could influence and shape the outcomes. He noted that he had already raised issues about mitigating environmental impacts and securing environmental enhancements along the route. Councillor Van de Weyer explained that another reason for putting forward the motion was to underline the need to look at a range of routes. He referred to a previous report by Network Rail examining some routes, but argued that a more comprehensive review was needed.

The motion was seconded by Councillor John Williams

During discussion upon the motion:-

- Councillor Nigel Cathcart commented that the Council had just adopted the Local Plan and had agreed the housing requirements for a significant period of time in the future. He noted that East West Rail and the associated growth in the corridor would be likely to draw more housing development to the District outside the scope of the Local Plan. This gave rise to questions and concerns that needed to be reviewed before the East West Rail proposals could be enthusiastically welcomed, however, with the caveats around housing growth, Councillor Cathcart acknowledged that if the project was going to proceed, it was important to engage with the process.
- Councillor Tom Bygott observed that East West Rail had the scope to transform the economy. He was pleased to note that the Council had now joined the East West Rail Consortium and was actively engaging within the organisation. Councillor Bygott was supportive of the motion but emphasised the need for all options to be evaluated and for the criteria for route selection to be looked at carefully. He also stressed the importance of protecting the countryside. With reference to the second sentence of the third paragraph of the motion, Councillor Bygott suggested that, as an amendment to the motion, the words “be based on” should be replaced by the words “take account of”. Councillor Van de Weyer, as the mover of the motion, agreed to accept this alteration.

(Note: Councillor Philippa Hart declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item and left the room during discussion and voting thereon).

Upon being put to the vote, votes were cast as follows:

**In favour: (40)**

Councillors Phillip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Ruth Betson, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Dr. Douglas de Lacey, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Pippa Heylings, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Alex Malyon, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Nick Sample,

Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Peter Topping, Aidan Van de Weyer, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright

**Against (0)**

**Abstain (1)**

Councillor Nigel Cathcart

Council

**RESOLVED:**

This Council welcomes the commitment by government to invest in the Oxford-Cambridge corridor and to enable it to make a nationally significant contribution to economic growth.

This Council sees the construction of the central section of the East West Rail line as being transformational for the regional economy, allowing sustained growth and geographical expansion of our high value industries such as life sciences, IT and digital.

This Council believes that at this stage in the design process it is essential for all route options to be evaluated. The selection of route options must take account of analysis of how they support and unlock housing and employment growth and how they fit with our existing development strategies.

This Council acknowledges that infrastructure investment on this scale carries enormous risks in its impacts on the environment while also presenting us with an unprecedented opportunity to make positive contributions to the net biodiversity and natural capital gain of the areas affected. This Council therefore commits itself to promoting environmental enhancement of benefits (such as flood management, water availability, noise and air pollution mitigation, health and landscape/amenities) along the corridor and asks that this is included in the route evaluation criteria.

This Council recognises that East West Rail and the growth of the corridor more generally will bring significant change to existing communities. It will work closely with those affected from the earliest stages of the project and will ensure that the delivery bodies do likewise.

This Council will continue to collaborate with the East West Railway Company on the route options and on analysing their benefits and impacts.

This Council will coordinate its work with all the local partners as well as the East West Rail Consortium, of which the Council is a long-standing member.

This Council requests that the Leader and Chief Executive write to the East West Railway Company, the Department of Transport, Network Rail and our MPs to express our aspirations for East West Rail in these terms.

**17. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS**

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

**18. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Council

**RESOLVED:**

To exclude the press and public from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that its consideration is likely to involve disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended).

**19. RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

**19 (a) Ice Rink Funding Agreement (Cabinet - 5 September 2018)**

Council received the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting held on 5 September 2018, together with the report of the Executive Director (which were not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972) regarding the Cambridge Ice Arena funding agreement. Members noted that the recommendations of the Cabinet had been superseded by the recommendation in the report of the Executive Director.

Councillor John Williams moved the recommendations in the report, which were seconded by Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer.

Detailed discussion ensued and a short adjournment took place between 6.08pm and 6.14pm.

An amendment was proposed by Councillor Mark Howell and seconded by Councillor Neil Gough.

Council John Williams agreed to accept the amendment.

Council by affirmation

**RESOLVED:**

That consideration be deferred to a future meeting of the Council as further information is required from a third party before Members can make an informed decision.

---

**The Meeting ended at 6.18 p.m.**

---