

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 21 February 2019 at 3.45 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,
Grenville Chamberlain, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, 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, Deborah Roberts, Nick Sample,
Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Peter Topping, Dr.
Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams,
Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Officers:	Patrick Adams	Senior Democratic Services Officer
	Susan Gardner-Craig	Head of HR and Organisational Development
	Kathrin John	Democratic Services Team Leader
	Stephen Kelly	Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development
	Rory McKenna	Deputy Head of Legal Practice
	Bob Palmer	Interim Executive Director

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Judith Rippeth.

2. COUNCILLORS NIGEL GAWTHROPE AND EDGAR MONK

The Chairman reported, with sadness, on the deaths of Councillor Nigel Gawthrope, the Mayor of Cambridge and former South Cambridgeshire District Councillor, Edgar Monk.

The Council stood in silence in memory of Nigel Gawthrope and Edgar Monk.

Councillor Mark Howell spoke about his memories of former Councillor Edgar Monk.
Councillor Nigel Cathcart spoke about both Councillor Gawthrope and former Councillor Monk.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were made as follows:

- Councillor John Batchelor declared a non-disclosable pecuniary interest in items 8(d) (Business Plan 2019 – 20) and 8(e) (Budget report) in his capacity as one of the Council's representatives on the Ermine Street Housing Limited Board. Councillor Batchelor remarked that he had withdrawn from the last meeting (minute 3 of the meeting held on 29 November refers) following legal advice. However that advice had been given on the understanding that the representatives received reward for their roles. In fact, Councillor Batchelor confirmed that neither of the Council's representatives on the Board received any recompense for so doing.

- Councillor Dr. Ian Sollom declared a non-disclosable pecuniary interest in items 8(d) (Business Plan 2019 – 20) and 8(e) (Budget report) in his capacity as one of the Council's representatives on the Ermine Street Housing Limited Board.
- Councillor Nick Wright declared an interest insofar as he had seen reference to the A14 upgrade in the papers before Council and he was a receiver of funds in compensation in connection with the upgrade scheme.
- Councillor Sue Ellington declared a non-disclosable pecuniary interest in item 9 (Swavesey Byeways Rate 2019/20) as a resident of Swavesey (although not a ratepayer).
- Councillor Nigel Cathcart declared an interest in item 8(d) as he rented a Council garage.

4. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

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

5. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 29 November 2018 were confirmed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman subject to the following corrections:-

- Page 17 – Minute 15 (b) (Motion standing in the name of Councillor Peter Topping)

In the sixth bullet point, delete “without” and insert “with”;

- Page 20 – Minute 15 (c) (Motion standing in the name of Councillor Grenville Chamberlain)

In the first bullet point, delete “Smith” and insert “Williams”.

It was noted that exempt minute 19 would be dealt with at the end of the meeting following consideration of the exclusion of the press and public.

The Chairman remarked upon the length of the minutes and indicated a wish to move towards more concise minutes.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Dr. Douglas de Lacey, the Chairman of the Council:

- Indicated that, following comments after the previous Council meeting that he had been overly generous in allowing Members time to speak, it was his intention to adhere to the time limits in the Council Standing Orders at this meeting;
- Reported that he would be attending Councillor Nigel Gawthrope's funeral on the following day;
- Congratulated Councillor Grenville Chamberlain on being awarded an OBE in the New Year's Honours 2019; and
- Encouraged all Members to attend his Charity Concert, “An Evening with Handel”

which would take place on Monday 18 March 2019 at 7.00pm at Histon Baptist Church. He would also welcome the donation of raffle prizes for the event and volunteers to help out on the evening.

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, was delighted to report that the Council had now signed up to the Disability Confident scheme and had committed to achieving level 1. This initiative had arisen following the submission of a motion from Councillor Peter McDonald to a previous meeting of the Council. Councillor Bridget Smith was also pleased to announce that Councillor Sarah Cheung Johnson had been appointed as the Council's lead member to promote the scheme and to raise the profile of disabled people and their interests.

7. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

7 (a) From Dr. Josiane Chuisseu

The following question had been received from Dr. Josiane Chuisseu:

What are the procedures and timelines for actions when residents have reported issues with the upkeep of properties and more concerning when their tenants have been linked to substance misuse, intimidation and vandalism? What are the key performance indicators used by South Cambridgeshire Council to ensure that the properties it manages and the tenants in those properties adhere to the rules and laws in place?

The Chairman reported that unfortunately, owing to the later start time for the meeting, Dr. Chuisseu was unable to attend the meeting to ask her question in person and she had requested him to read out the question on her behalf.

The Chairman accordingly read out the question and noted that a written response would be sent and that this would be appended to the minutes.

8. PETITIONS

No petitions from the public for consideration at this meeting had been received.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

9 (a) Pay Policy Statement (Employment & Staffing Committee, 17 January 2019)

Councillor Henry Batchelor, the Chairman of the Employment and Staffing Committee, proposed the recommendations of the Committee at its meeting held on 17 January 2019.

Councillor John Williams seconded the motion.

Councillor Gavin Clayton was pleased to note that the current ratio between the highest and lowest pay points was 1:9.1, remarking that the average ratio in local authorities was 1:15. However a social attitudes survey had suggested that 1:6 should be the preferred ratio and thus the Council still had work to do on this.

Councillor Heather Williams welcomed the indication in the report that the median pay gap was -13.18% in favour of females.

Councillor Sue Ellington referred to criticism in previous years that the Council had not sought to achieve accreditation from the Living Wage Foundation. Councillor John Williams responded that it was not correct to say that accreditation had been sought, rather an argument had been put forward for payment of the true living wage to staff. In that context, he was pleased to report that, taking account of the pay award for 2018/19 and the proposed pay award from April 2019, the Council would now be paying staff the living wage.

Council by affirmation

RESOLVED:

That the Pay Policy Statement for 2019 be approved.

9 (b) Localised Council Tax Support Scheme (Cabinet - 5 December 2018)

Councillor John Williams, the Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, proposed the recommendation from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5 December 2018 with regard to agreement of the Localised Council Tax Support Scheme for 2019/20.

Councillor John Williams reported that the Council was required to review the Localised Council Tax Support Scheme annually to make sure it remained fit for purpose and provided people in need with an appropriate Council Tax discount based on their circumstances. The way the Council's scheme was structured allowed discounts on all Council Tax bands. Not all authorities did this but it was important that this was in place as both housing associations and the Council had properties in higher bandings. The scheme supported the objective of ensuring housing was affordable to live in. There had been a need to review the scheme for the forthcoming year in view of the introduction of Universal Credit. To develop the scheme the Council had learned lessons from other authorities where Universal Credit had been in place for a longer period as indicated in paragraph 24 of the report. Councillor John Williams indicated the expectation that a briefing would be held for Members on how the scheme was progressing.

Councillor Anna Bradnam seconded the motion.

Councillor Gavin Clayton noted that he had abstained from voting on this item when it had been considered by Scrutiny and Overview Committee. He referred to paragraph 4 of the report which suggested that the scheme had been designed so that those claiming Localised Council Tax Support should not *in the main* be worse off. Councillor Clayton was concerned at the use of the words "in the main" and commented on his understanding that Liverpool City Council had conducted a full equality impact assessment in respect of their scheme. He hoped that appropriate mechanisms would be in place at this Council to support people in circumstances where they experienced a prolonged period of loss of income.

Councillor Anna Bradnam reported on her attendance at one of the briefings held for Members on the proposed changes and outlined the reasons why a banding system had been preferred, including providing greater certainty for residents and creating a system that was more manageable.

Councillor John Williams responded to the points raised by Councillor Clayton, noting that officers had reviewed the impact on all claimants and that 10 claimants would be slightly worse off under the revised scheme. Funding was in place to support residents in cases of hardship.

Council, by affirmation

RESOLVED:

That the Income Bands Discount Localised Council Tax Support Scheme (Option 2) be approved for 2019 – 20.

9 (c) Council Tax Empty Homes Premium (Cabinet - 6 February 2019)

Councillor John Williams, the Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, presented the recommendations of Cabinet held on 6 February 2019 which invited Council to approve the charging of an increased Council Tax Empty Homes Premium as indicated in option 16A in the report. In moving the motion, Councillor John Williams noted that the aim of the new charging structure was to encourage as many empty homes back into use as possible. Given the housing pressures faced in the District, Councillor John Williams argued that it did not make sense to have houses sitting empty for many years. He recognised however that there could be very valid reasons for a home to be left empty for some time, such as when it was going through probate, and therefore confirmed that officers would do their best to advise and guide property owners and that decisions would be made on a case by case basis.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Hazel Smith.

Council, by affirmation

RESOLVED:

That the charging of an increased Council Tax Empty Homes Premium, as set out in Option 16A of the report of the Interim Executive Director, be approved.

9 (d) Business Plan 2019 - 2024 (Cabinet - 6 February 2019)

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, moved the recommendations from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 6 February 2019 which invited the Council to approve the Business Plan 2019 – 2024. She was pleased to present the ambitious plan to the Council and highlighted the key elements, including proposals under each of the four priority areas “Growing local businesses and economies”; “Housing that is affordable for everyone to live in”; “Being green to our core” and “A modern and caring Council.” Councillor Bridget Smith also emphasised that the Business Plan had been informed by, and responded to, feedback received following the public consultation exercise. A new approach to gathering views on the Business Plan had been followed this year with feedback being sought on a set of high level priorities, rather than on a detailed plan. There was therefore confidence that there was public support for the proposed priority areas.

Councillor Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer seconded the motion.

During discussion:

- Councillor Ruth Betson pointed out that, despite the comments regarding the positive response to the public consultation, only 168 responses had been received.
- Councillor Philippa Hart spoke on the “Modern and caring Council” priority, particularly highlighting the action to put the customer at the centre of everything the Council did by embedding it into the organisation’s culture to deliver

continuous improvements.

- Councillor Bill Handley was supportive of what he regarded as an exciting Business Plan and welcomed the package of proposals to support businesses, particularly the support for start-ups and small businesses and the proposed simplification of the Council's procurement process.
- Councillor Pippa Heylings spoke strongly in support of the proposed measures to tackle climate change in the Business Plan, including the commitment to becoming a Zero Carbon Council and the proposals for investing in renewable energy generation and for maintaining and improving air quality across the District.
- Councillor Philip Allen was pleased to see the proposed measures for preventing homelessness and providing support for vulnerable people which he felt supported values of compassion and decency.
- Councillor Sarah Cheung Johnson welcomed the commitment to deliver community facilities at Northstowe. Citing the decision of the County Council not to relocate to Northstowe, she commented that Northstowe had not always felt supported by local government but believed that the proposal around provision of community facilities underlined the Council's commitment to building a thriving community. She thanked the Council's Community Development Officers for their support.
- Councillor Nick Wright expressed the view that the Business Plan built on the 2018/19 Plan and was pleased to see development of what he regarded as many of the proposals in the previous plan.
- Councillor Anna Bradnam welcomed the proposals to review taxi licensing policies to incentivise taxi operators and drivers to improve air quality. She also referred to a Government consultation on statutory guidance to be issued to taxi and private hire licensing authorities on protecting children and vulnerable adults and was pleased to note that the Council already undertook many of the measures mentioned.
- Councillor Gavin Clayton made a plea for the housing priority area to be amended to refer to housing that is **truly** affordable for everyone to live in. He was also disappointed that the section on growing local businesses and economies did not make any mention of the role of the charity and not for profit sector.
- Councillor Peter Fane supported the objectives in the Business Plan but was mindful of the challenge of delivering them. He particularly referred to the challenge of maintaining vitality in small villages and of providing truly affordable homes in such villages. Councillor Fane believed that it was important to promote neighbourhood plans; review the target for the number of new affordable homes built on rural exception sites each year and to look at the provisions of paragraphs 77-78 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Councillor Eileen Wilson commented that affordable housing was not just about "bricks and mortar" but also about the provision of high quality public transport as an alternative to using the car. She therefore felt that residents should be encouraged to engage with the Greater Cambridge Partnership "Choices for Better Journeys" consultation.
- Councillor Deborah Roberts expressed her disappointment at the apparent absence from the plan of any acknowledgement of the significant amount of growth facing the District. The plan also did not appear to reference the potential implications of the East-West Bedford to Cambridge rail project in terms of bringing even further growth to the District. She was therefore concerned at the absence of a recognition of the significant extent of growth proposed in South Cambridgeshire and the public concerns associated with such growth.
- Councillor Clare Delderfield commented on the proposal to run an annual

programme of resident and community education and promotional campaigns to increase recycling and spoke about the importance of involving children and young people in such campaigns.

- Councillor Peter Topping expressed the view that the themes in the plan were broadly similar to those in the previous year's document. However he felt that the plan ought to address some of the realities associated with the significant development facing the District and not just aspirations.
- Councillor Nigel Cathcart welcomed the plan but reflected on the development affecting the District. He also spoke of the need to preserve the built environment and to ensure that listed buildings and conservation areas were protected. He particularly highlighted the need to preserve village pubs and noted that this was not mentioned in the plan.
- Councillor Geoff Harvey was enthusiastic about the ambitious approach to the green agenda outlined in the plan. In particular, he was pleased to note that the Council had now decided to invest in green energy generation allowing it to benefit from the feed in tariff which ceased from 1 April 2019 and referred to what he considered to be the low risk nature of such an investment.
- Councillor Sue Ellington remarked on the apparent absence of any reference to social isolation or social inclusion in the plan.
- Councillor Pippa Heylings commented on the proposal to develop a new Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document as part of the Local Plan process in order to enable due weight to be given to biodiversity considerations in the planning process and was pleased that this proposal had received cross party support at the Climate Change and Environment Advisory Committee. She further remarked that the previous Business Plan had not contained any reference to climate change or carbon. Finally, Councillor Heylings indicated that she would welcome the establishment of a Citizen's Assembly for young people in South Cambridgeshire.
- Councillor Dr. Ian Sollom welcomed the Business Plan which he regarded as both ambitious and credible. He was particularly pleased to see the focus on affordable housing and spoke on the particular challenges faced by young people. Councillor Dr. Sollom believed that the Council had more to do in delivering affordable housing for everyone but particularly for young people.
- Councillor Heather Williams was supportive of the green initiatives proposed in the plan. She was also appreciative of the need to work with local businesses, but felt that it was important to strike the right balance between supporting businesses and protecting the interests of residents. Councillor Heather Williams echoed earlier comments regarding the potential impact of the East-West Rail project in terms of additional development and on the need to protect village pubs.
- Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins felt that the plan was bold and exciting and did not agree that it simply built on the themes of its predecessor. She also responded to earlier Members' comments on the significant growth facing the District, noting that the plan contained proposals to build thriving communities. Councillor Dr. Hawkins additionally highlighted the proposal to require developers to consider and plan for an energy secure, zero-carbon future.
- Councillor Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, in seconding the motion, welcomed the plan which he believed contained a mix of concrete measures and longer term ambitions.
- Councillor Bridget Smith summed up and thanked Members for their contributions. She also agreed to review the plan with a view to picking up some of the omissions highlighted by Members during the debate.

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

In favour (33):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Dr. Douglas de Lacey, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, 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, Deborah Roberts, Nick Sample, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Against (11):

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

Abstain (0)

Council accordingly

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Business Plan, as set out at Appendix A, incorporating feedback from the Scrutiny and Overview Committee, be approved.
- (2) That the Chief Executive, in consultation with Lead Cabinet Members, be authorised to prepare detailed implementation plans and associated performance measures and ensure these are reflected in directorate service plans and quarterly position reports during 2019/20.
- (3) That the Chief Executive be authorised to make any minor wording changes required before publication, in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

9 (e) Medium Term Financial Strategy, General Fund Budget 2019-20 (including Council Tax setting), Housing Revenue Account Budget 2019-20 (including housing rents), Capital and Investment Strategies and Treasury Management Strategy (Cabinet, 6 February 2019)

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, presented the recommendations of the Cabinet which invited the Council to approve the financial strategies and budgets as detailed in the submitted report and appendices.

In introducing the report, Councillor John Williams highlighted the following points:

- The Business Plan changed the direction of the Council and so the General Fund Budget and Housing Revenue Account and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) had also changed course and would include opportunities for income generation, partnerships and delivering a bigger programme.
- The proposals supported delivery of a more responsive and productive organisation fit to tackle the challenges over the coming five years.
- There was now no budget shortfall expected at the end of the financial year and more funds were available to increase the General Fund reserve in readiness for the Government's Fair Funding Review and Brexit.
- The need to borrow to lend to Ermine Street Housing and the Ice Rink had been

avoided.

- There had been some good fortune, such as the abandonment of the negative Revenue Support Grant and receipt of extra money to support expenditure on elections.
- The Executive Management Team had done a sterling job in keeping costs down whilst maintaining frontline services. This had enabled the Council to go beyond the one per cent pay award previously budgeted to help make working for South Cambridgeshire District Council more attractive.
- As the Council transformed over the coming five years, it was expected that more income would come from commercialisation to offset the loss of Government funding and the expected diversion of some Business Rates away from district councils. This would enable a more diverse investment portfolio that was aligned to the Business Plan to support spending on services to grow to over £20m by 2024.
- Notwithstanding the positive position, there could be no let up on identification of savings and in order to build up reserves, a £3m savings target had been set over the life of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- In return for the 10p a week increase in South Cambridgeshire's Council Tax for households in an average property, it was planned to:-
 - Have more resources to support Universal Credit claims;
 - Increase resources to tackle fly tipping;
 - Spend more on building homes that were affordable;
 - Spend more on green initiatives to achieve the zero-carbon goal;
 - Support wellbeing and healthy living;
 - Provide capital funds to diversify income; and
 - Bring staff pay up to competitive levels.
- The adoption of an investment strategy would ensure that the Council's investments were aligned with the Business Plan, delivered value for money and put in place robust governance arrangements.

The Lead Cabinet Member for Finance thanked the Finance team, led by Bob Palmer, Interim Executive Director, for their hard work in preparing the Budget and HRA.

The Lead Cabinet Member for Finance accordingly proposed the recommendations, together with the statutory Council Tax Resolution that had been circulated in a supplement.

Councillor Tony Mason seconded the proposal.

During discussion:

- Councillor Tom Bygott commented that a healthy balance of £6.751m had been inherited at the beginning of the financial year. He sought further information about how the £3m required savings would be achieved; what the purpose of the Business Efficiency Reserve was and how the £1m for that reserve would be funded.
- Councillor Ruth Betson noted that it was helpful to start the budget process with a sound baseline and audited accounts but in that context was concerned that the previous year's accounts had not yet been signed off. She questioned how the Council could be assured that the budget was sound in the absence of the approved accounts.
- Councillor Nigel Cathcart spoke about the need for a long term strategy for Council house rents.
- Councillor Nick Wright indicated that he found it difficult to have confidence in the budget submitted. He particularly highlighted concerns around spending on agency fees for planning staff; performance of the planning service; the proposal to

implement the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the use of Council land for self building plots, rather than building affordable housing. Councillor Wright also sought further information about the Council's transformation plans.

- Councillor Graham Cone was cautious about whether the aspiration to generate 25% of Council spending from investments could be achieved, citing what he regarded as the Administration's previous negative attitude to investment in Ermine Street Housing.
- Councillor Mark Howell asked whether a guarantee could be given that Right to Buy receipts would be spent within the specified timescale and would not have to be returned to the Government; what was being done to address the high levels of rent arrears amongst former tenants and why the mobile warden budget appeared to have decreased by half.
- Councillor Bunty Waters noted that initial contributions to the A14 upgrade costs had been due to be funded from any surpluses from the New Homes Bonus, however the report now indicated that no surpluses were forecast and another source of funding was needed to provide the remaining £1.326K for the Council's contribution. She asked how that shortfall would be met to ensure the A14 contribution of £5m from the Council.
- Councillor Peter Topping was concerned at the apparent lack of definition around the Business Efficiency Reserve. He referred to the original earmarking of £50k in respect of the costs of management consultants undertaking the organisational review and noted that he had not had the opportunity to meet with those consultants despite earlier indications that opposition Members would have the chance to do so. He also expressed reservations at the earmarking of funding for the engagement of consultants in the planning service which he considered to be a risk. Councillor Topping did not believe that the Investment Strategy had sufficient substance and indicated that he was unable to support it.

In response to points raised, the Lead Cabinet Member for Finance commented that:

- The Council did not previously have an Investment Strategy and that now all investments could be reviewed objectively against the criteria in that strategy;
- Ermine Street Housing was the Council's only trading company, so rather than having all the Council's "eggs in one basket", the opportunity was now being taken to diversify the Council's investment portfolio;
- The Council was seeking to keep its options open on implementing CIL hence inclusion of the reference to it in the Capital Strategy;
- Council land was disposed of at the market rate so that the receipts could be used for Council housing;
- The Council was in the final year of imposed rent reductions of 1%. The Housing Strategy was out for public consultation and would indicate the proposed direction of travel for the service. It was hoped that there would be more headroom to review the strategy for rents going forward;
- The accounts which had yet to be signed off related to the previous financial year and reflected, in part, problems experienced with the Financial Management System;
- A programme of transformation and service reviews would be developed to ensure the Council was fit for the 21st century and an earmarked reserve was needed to take forward this work. However it was anticipated that some of the work proposed would be cost neutral; and
- No savings were required in the next year but a £3m savings target was being proposed over the life of the MTFS to bolster reserves in readiness for the Government's Fair Funding Review.

As an amendment to the motion, Councillor Heather Williams moved:-

“That recommendation (w) be amended by the addition of the following words shown in italics:

- (w) Approve the Capital and Investment Strategies 2019-20 to 2023-24 Appendix 3 and 3 A, *subject to amendment of Appendix 3A (Investment Strategy) on page 342 – paragraph 4, second paragraph by the deletion of “for approval” at the end of the paragraph and the substitution by “for review. Any investment opportunities that PIGB wishes to pursue would be presented to a Scrutiny Sub-Committee (who will have fulfilled the same training requirements as those of PIGB members). The recommendations of the Scrutiny Sub Committee will be made to the Executive Director in conjunction with the Lead Member for Finance.”*

In moving the amendment, Councillor Heather Williams indicated that she was uncomfortable with the governance arrangements for the Property Investment Governance Board (PIGB) proposed in the Investment Strategy which effectively appeared to place responsibility for approving significant investments in the hands of four people. She therefore supported the establishment of a Scrutiny Sub Committee of Members whose role would be to review proposed investments. Whilst appreciating the commercially sensitive nature of the information and the need for swift decision making, Councillor Heather Williams believed that involving a Scrutiny Sub Committee would increase the openness and transparency of the decision making process.

Councillor Grenville Chamberlain seconded the amendment.

During discussion on the amendment:

- Councillor Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, the Deputy Leader of the Council, referred to the comments of Councillor Heather Williams on decisions about investments being in the hands of a small number of people and drew a parallel with the governance of Ermine Street Housing, but noted that no investment strategy was in place to guide decision making there nor any opportunity for Scrutiny and Overview Committee to review decisions. Turning to the amendment, he indicated his concern that introducing a sub committee to pre-scrutinise decisions would both slow down the decision making process and undermine the role of the PIGB and noted that in a commercial environment it was necessary to move swiftly in order to secure investments.
- In response to a question from Councillor Steve Hunt, the Executive Director outlined the nature of the training being provided to PIGB members.
- Councillor John Williams, the Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, did not support the amendment. He pointed out that criteria against which investments could be measured were set out in the Investment Strategy and again emphasised the importance of swift decision making. He did not believe it was practical to have a sub committee. Councillor John Williams was also disappointed that the opportunity had not been taken to raise the amendment at the Scrutiny and Overview Committee or Cabinet when the budget report had been discussed. He suggested that Scrutiny and Overview Committee could perhaps review how the new process was working in due course.
- Councillor Pippa Heylings cited the renewable energy project as an example of the value of having in place an Investment Strategy with criteria against which the project could be measured. At the time at which the Council had needed to evaluate the project, no criteria had been in place to guide a quick decision. The proposed strategy would be available to guide future decision making and ensure that investments aligned with Council priorities.
- Councillor Peter Topping supported the amendment which he regarded as a

modest proposal that would improve accountability and transparency of the governance associated with decision making.

- Councillor Nick Wright spoke in favour of the amendment and felt that pre-scrutinising decisions would reduce risks. Referring to earlier comments comparing the position with Ermine Street Housing, he pointed out that Ermine Street Housing was a private company and thus the situation was not directly comparable.
- Councillor Bill Handley was against the amendment and emphasised that investment decisions had to be made quickly in order to be successful. Having to take decisions via a sub committee would slow down the decision making process and would be impractical.
- Councillor Grenville Chamberlain, in seconding the motion, spoke in support, arguing that the proposal would bring greater transparency to the decision making process. He noted that the investments could involve spending significant amounts of tax payers' money and that such decisions therefore merited pre-scrutiny.
- Councillor Heather Williams, in summing up, referred to earlier comments about not having raised the proposal at Scrutiny and Overview Committee or Cabinet and emphasised that her motive in bringing the amendment was to promote openness and transparency in the decision making process. She reiterated that Ermine Street Housing was a separate company and therefore did not bear a direct comparison but observed that the loan to Ermine Street had been discussed by Scrutiny and Overview Committee and full Council.

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

In favour (13):

Councillors Ruth Betson, Dr Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Grenville Chamberlain, Gavin Clayton, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Peter Topping, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Against (26):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Dr. Claire Daunton, 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, Dawn Percival, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Abstain (2):

Councillors Dr. Douglas de Lacey and Brian Milnes.

The Chairman accordingly declared that the amendment was lost.

During further discussion on the original motion:-

- Councillor Heather Williams referred to the savings requirement of £3m over the next 5 years and to the indication given in the budget report that considerable levels of risk and uncertainty remained. She questioned whether it would be possible to deliver the further £3m of savings required, citing the reference on page 175 of the report to the difficulty of identifying and delivering further savings and efficiencies. If those savings were not forthcoming, Councillor Heather

Williams argued that the Council's investments would need to generate a high return to produce the income required and the only way to achieve that would be to increase the risk around the investments. She noted that both the Government and CIPFA had raised concerns over local government borrowing for investments in commercial schemes and was concerned at the reliance on borrowing. Councillor Heather Williams further observed that if the savings or additional income required were not achieved, there was a potential for the Council's reserves to fall well below the minimum recommended level of £2.5m which she regarded as irresponsible. She hoped that the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee, which had not met since September, would be given the opportunity to monitor the Council's financial position. In her view, a high risk appetite was needed to approve the submitted budget.

- Councillor Deborah Roberts echoed earlier expressed concerns about using Council land for the purpose of self build schemes and argued that where the Council had spare land, it should be used for the provision of Council housing. She also referred to concerns regarding the planning service and felt that the budget did not focus sufficiently on that service, suggesting that there was a need to review the shared planning service.
- Councillor Sue Ellington had concerns around the additional number of support staff proposed in the budget, referring, in particular, to the proposed role of Cabinet Support Officer. She remarked that the Cabinet had previously managed with the support of existing administrative and professional staff and felt that the expenditure was unnecessary.
- Councillor Pippa Heylings challenged any suggestion that it would not be possible to generate a return of around 2 – 2.5% return on investments, citing the return that would be generated by the green investment project. Once Government funding for local government ceased it would be essential to maintain such income streams and it was disappointing that the Council had not taken advantage of this investment opportunity much earlier.
- Councillor Gavin Clayton commented that in view of earlier expressed concerns around risks associated with investments and the speed of decision making required, there was a need to include an addendum on page 349 to list all unethical investments.

Councillor Peter Topping moved an amendment as follows:

"That recommendation (a) be amended by the addition of the following words shown in italics

- (a) Approve the revenue estimates for 2019-20 as shown in the **GF BSR Section 5 at Appendix 1** to this report, *subject to inclusion of the following additional items and the making of the necessary consequential changes to the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the Capital Programme:*

(i) *Flytipping*

£120k in revenue (vehicle plus two staff) and £100k capital for a new vehicle together with £30k with on costs for an additional investigation officer.

To enable the Council to respond to and clear away fly tipping within two working days and increase its ability to investigate and crack down on fly tipping offenders.

(ii) Drone costs

£50k

To enable the Council to use drone technology accurately to identify reports and verify with complainants. The Council would commit to a new protocol with Cambridgeshire Constabulary to share resources and information to secure prosecutions.

(iii) Street cleaning

£90k revenue (vehicle plus driver) and £120k capital for a new vehicle.

To enable the Council to carry out street sweeping in the major villages every quarter and in all other villages three times a year.

(iv) Community environment initiatives officer

Establishment of a new post of community environment initiatives officer to be established in place of the proposed additional policy officer to support the Climate Change and Environment Advisory Committee.”

In moving the amendment, Councillor Topping commented that the proposal had been discussed at the meeting of Scrutiny and Overview Committee held on 20 February 2019. He noted that the Committee had expressed some reservations regarding the part of the amendment relating to drones and indicated his willingness to withdraw that aspect, if the remainder would find favour with the Council. Councillor Topping expanded on the rationale behind his motion, referring in particular, to the increase in fly tipping in the District. He commented that he had supported the motion at the previous Council meeting to transition to zero carbon by 2050 and hoped that the Council would be able to agree the amendment now presented.

Councillor Nick Wright seconded the amendment.

Speaking on the amendment, Councillor Neil Gough, Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing, acknowledged that fly tipping was a blight on the District but drew attention to a number of initiatives already contained in the new Business Plan to tackle fly tipping. He reported that officers were also reviewing processes and procedures with a view to “working smarter” and changing the approach for dealing with fly tipping. He did not feel that simply providing more equipment was the solution for tackling fly tipping and therefore did not support the amendment.

Councillor Nick Wright, as seconder of the amendment, did not feel that improved processes would result in a faster response to fly tipping. He pointed out that the amendment proposed additional staffing and felt that approving it would enable achievement of a quick win and an improvement in the quality of life of residents in the District.

In summing up, Councillor Peter Topping encouraged Members to vote in support of his amendment which was designed to achieve an improvement in the cleanliness of the villages in South Cambridgeshire.

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

In favour (12):

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

Against (28):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, 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, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Abstain (0):

The Chairman declared that the amendment was lost.

Councillor John Williams, the mover of the original motion, then summed up. He believed that the budget was robust, would enable delivery of the objectives in the Business Plan and would meet the needs of South Cambridgeshire in the 21st Century. He therefore commended the budget to the Council.

Councillor Mark Howell, noted that his questions asked earlier in the meeting had not received a response and requested that he be provided with a written response.

As required by the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 and Council Standing Order 16.6, a recorded vote was taken by means of the Council's electronic voting system. Votes were cast as follows:

In favour (28):

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

Against (11)

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

Abstain (0)

The Council

(1) RESOLVED to:

- (a) Approve the revenue estimates for 2019-20 as shown in the General Fund (GF) Budget Setting Report (BSR) Section 5 at Appendix 1 to the

report.

- (b) Approve the precautionary items for the GF, GF BSR Appendix B, Appendix 1 to the report.
- (c) Approve the GF revenue forecasts as set out in GF BSR Section 6, Appendix 1 to the report.
- (d) Instruct the Executive Management Team to identify additional income / cumulative savings of £3m for the 5 years from 2019-2024.
- (e) Authorise that the use of the earmarked reserve for Business Efficiency initiatives is delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Lead Member for Finance, and that £1m is transferred into this reserve from the General Fund reserve. As at the end of 2017-18 financial year, the General Fund reserve stood at £7,751,000.
- (f) Authorise £500,000 of Planning earmarked reserves, budgeted to support the shortfall in income in the year 2018-19, but not required due to sufficient over budget income levels being achieved, to be budgeted to use towards Business Transformation programmes in Planning in 2019-20.
- (g) Approve the GF capital programme and associated funding up to the year ended 31 March 2024, as set out in GF BSR Section 7, at Appendix 1 to the report.
- (h) Set the Council Tax Requirement for 2019-20 at £9,092,962.
- (i) Set the amount of Council Tax for each of the relevant categories of dwelling in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 on the basis of the District Council Tax for general expenses on a Band D property of £145.31 plus the relevant amounts required by the precepts of the Parish Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council, the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the Cambridgeshire Fire Authority, details of those precepts and their effect are as set out in the statutory resolution at (2) below..
- (j) Approve the HRA savings, increased income, unavoidable revenue pressures, bids and reduced income items, as summarised in Section 4, and detailed in Appendix G (1) of the HRA Budget Setting Report at Appendix 2 to the report.
- (k) Approve the non-cash limit adjustments, as summarised in Section 4, and detailed in Appendix G (1) of the HRA Budget Setting Report at Appendix 2 to the report.
- (l) Approve the resulting HRA revenue budget as shown in the HRA Summary Forecast 2018-19 to 2023-24 in Appendix I of the HRA Budget Setting Report at Appendix 2 to the report.
- (m) Approve the retention of the balance of the 4-year efficiency savings target of £95,000 per annum from 2020-21 included as part of the 2018-19 HRA Medium Term Financial Strategy, and the corresponding Strategic Investment Fund for the same value.

- (n) Approve that council dwelling rents for all social rented properties be reduced by 1% for the final year, in line with legislative requirements introduced as part of the Welfare Reform and Work Act, with effect from 1st April 2019.
- (o) Approve that affordable rents are reviewed in line with rent legislation, to ensure that rents charged are no more than 80% of market rent, with this figure then reduced by 1% as with social housing. Local policy is to cap affordable rents at the lower level of Local Housing Allowance, which will result in rent variations in line with any changes notified to the authority in this level, effective from 1st April 2019.
- (p) Approve inflationary increases of 2.2% in garage rents for 2019-20, in line with the base rate of inflation for the year assumed in the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- (q) Approve the proposed service charges for HRA services and facilities provided to both tenants and leaseholders, as shown in Appendix B of the HRA Budget Setting Report, at Appendix 2 to the report.
- (r) Approve the latest budget, spend profile and funding mix for each of the schemes in the new build programme, as detailed in Section 5 and Appendix E of the HRA Budget Setting Report at Appendix 2 to the report, recognising the most up to date information available as each scheme progresses through the design, planning, build contract and completion process.
- (s) Approve earmarking of the required level of additional funding for new build investment between 2019-20 and 2023-24 to ensure that commitments can be met in respect of the investment of all right to buy receipts currently retained or anticipated to be received by the authority for this period. This expenditure will either take the form of HRA new build, with the 70% top up met by other HRA resources, acquisition of homes on the open market, or could alternatively be a grant made to a registered provider, where the registered provider will provide the 70% top up to build new homes.
- (t) Approve the capital budget proposals, detailed in Appendix G (2) of the HRA Budget Setting Report at Appendix 2 to the report.
- (u) Approve the capital amendments, detailed in Appendix H of the HRA Budget Setting Report, which include the capital proposals in Appendix G (2) of the HRA Budget Setting Report, at Appendix 2 to the report, alongside re-profiling of investment, increase and re-allocation of resource for new build schemes.
- (v) Approve the revised Housing Capital Investment Plan as shown in Appendix J of the HRA Budget Setting Report at Appendix 2 to the report.
- (w) Approve the Capital and Investment Strategies 2019-20 to 2023-24, Appendix 3 and 3A
- (x) Approve the borrowing and lending strategies for the year to March 2020, as included in the Treasury Management Strategy Statement in Appendix 4.

- (y) Approve the prudential indicators required by the Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities for the year to 31 March 2020, included in Appendix 4.
- (z) Approve any unspent New Homes Bonus money allocated to the Greater Cambridge Partnership to be rolled into 2019-20.

(2) Council **RESOLVED** to approve the following statutory resolution in respect of the Council Tax for 2019-20:-

That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2019-20 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

- | | | |
|-----|-------------|---|
| (a) | £96,766,406 | being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) (a) to (f) of the Act (gross expenditure including parish precepts, the Housing Revenue Account and additions to reserves) |
| (b) | £82,055,655 | being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) (a) to (d) of the Act (gross income including the Housing Revenue Account and use of reserves) |
| (c) | £14,710,751 | being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A (4) of the Act, as its council tax requirement for the year (net expenditure to be met from council tax) being the district amount of £9,092,962 and the parish precepts of £5,617,789 |
| (d) | £235.09 | being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year (average council tax for a band D property for the District including parishes) |
| (e) | £5,617,789 | being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (parish precepts) |

- (f) £145.31 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates (average council tax for a Band D property for the District excluding parishes), the amounts being for each of the categories of dwellings shown below in **Table 1**
- (g) In accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, the basic amounts of Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a special item relates are shown by addition of the amounts for Band D for the District Council in **Table 1** and **Appendix A** of the supplement submitted to Council.
- (h) In accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands are shown by adding the amounts for each band in **Table 1** and **Appendix A** of the supplement submitted to Council.

That it be noted that for the year 2019-20 Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings as shown in **Table 1**:

Table 1	Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
County Council	874.74	1,020.53	1,166.32	1,312.11	1,603.69	1,895.27	2,186.85	2,624.22
Police & Crime Commissioner	148.44	173.18	197.92	222.66	272.14	321.62	371.10	445.32
District Council	96.87	113.02	129.16	145.31	177.60	209.89	242.18	290.62
Fire Authority	47.16	55.02	62.88	70.74	86.46	102.18	117.90	141.48
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

- (i) That the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts set out in **Appendix B** of the supplement submitted to Council as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2019-20 for each of the categories of dwellings shown in **Appendix B** of that supplement.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION IN RESPECT OF SETTING THE COUNCIL TAX

Including the precepts from the County Council, the Police and Crime Commissioner, Fire Authority and all of the parishes, the formal Council Resolution would produce a Council Tax for an Band D property of:

		£	Change from previous year
District Council	General Expenses	145.31	+3.56%
	Special Expenses for Parish Precepts (average)	89.78	+2.15%
County Council		1,312.11	+4.98%
Police & Crime Commissioner		222.66	+12.05%
Fire Authority		70.74	+2.88%
Combined Authority		0.00	0.00%
Total		1,840.60	+5.45%

On these figures the council tax would range from £1,167.21 for Band A to £3,774.72 for Band H before any discounts or benefits.

Appendix C of the supplement submitted to Council shows the General Fund summary (£'000's) including Parish precepts and the final Formula Grant figure (£Nil)

10. GREAT ABINGTON FORMER LAND SETTLEMENT ASSOCIATION ESTATE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - MAKING (ADOPTING) THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Chairman of the Council varied the order of business to take this item at this point in the meeting to avoid causing any further delay to a proposed speaker on the item.

The Chairman of the Council indicated that he had agreed to exercise his discretion to allow Mr Bernie Talbot, the Chairman of Great Abington Parish Council, to address the meeting. Mr Talbot referred to the significant work involved in developing the Great Abington Former Land Settlement Association (LSA) Estate Neighbourhood Plan to adoption stage. He commented on the close working relationship developed between District Council officers and the Parish Council and its planning consultant throughout the preparation of the neighbourhood plan. Mr Talbot particularly thanked Jenny Nuttycombe, Senior Planning Policy Officer, and Dave Roberts, Principal Planning Policy Officer, for their help and support throughout the process.

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, moved the recommendations in the report which invited the Council to make the Great Abington Former LSA Estate Neighbourhood Plan. Councillor Dr. Hawkins spoke of the Council's wish to support local communities in developing neighbourhood plans, noting that this was the first such plan to be completed in the District. She thanked both the Parish Council and the officers involved in preparing the plan.

Councillor Henry Batchelor seconded the motion. He noted that this was a landmark day insofar as this was the first neighbourhood plan to be adopted in South Cambridgeshire and he added his congratulations to the Parish Council and the officers.

Councillor Nick Wright also congratulated Great Abington Parish Council on developing the plan and thanked the officers involved in the project.

Councillor John Batchelor welcomed the development of the neighbourhood plan and offered his congratulations to the Parish Council and the officers. He noted that a high

turnout of over 60% had been achieved in the referendum but observed that the process involved in developing a neighbourhood plan was cumbersome, commenting that Linton Parish Council had been working on developing its plan for four years.

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, felt that the development of the neighbourhood plan set a great example for other communities to follow and thanked the Parish Council and officers for their hard work.

Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn indicated that he had personal experience of such settlements which he felt were a very specific feature of the countryside.

Council by affirmation

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the results of the referendum on the Great Abington Former LSA Estate Neighbourhood Plan be noted.
- (2) That the Great Abington Former LSA Estate Neighbourhood Plan be made (adopted) as submitted.

11. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The Chairman of the Council adjourned the meeting for a short break at 6.27pm. The meeting resumed at 6.40pm.

12. SWAVESEY BYEWAYS RATE 2019/20

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, introduced this report, which recommended that the Swavesey Byeways rate be increased from £1.10 to £1.20 per hectare. Councillor Dr. Hawkins explained that this increase had been recommended by the annual meeting of the Swavesey Byeways Advisory Committee, which she had attended with the Director of Housing, Health and Environmental Services.

Councillor Dr. Hawkins proposed and Councillor Brian Milnes seconded this recommendation.

Council by affirmation

RESOLVED:

That the level of the Swavesey Byeways rate be increased from £1.10 to £1.20 per hectare for land within the charge paying area for the period 2019/20 in order to fund the required level of maintenance.

13. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY

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

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

- Councillor Philip Allen reported that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at its

meeting on 25 February 2019, would consider a decision which had been “called in”. Cross party support had been received for the call in of the decision.

- Councillor Peter Topping noted that he had substituted at a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee and commended the committee for the proportionate and apolitical approach it had taken to the scrutiny of matters associated with the budget and business plan; the bus franchise plan and funding of the mayoral ball.
- Councillor Tony Mason reported on his attendance at the meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee on 30 November 2018 at which it had been reported that the Interim Chief Finance Officer had been dismissed. Councillor Mason noted that at a previous meeting of the Scrutiny Committee, the Interim Chief Finance Officer had highlighted his concerns regarding the priorities of the Combined Authority; the budget and the level of employment. A new Interim Chief Finance Officer had subsequently presented the budget to the Scrutiny Committee which had again highlighted the need for prioritisation and for head count reduction. The Audit and Corporate Governance Committee had acknowledged that the Combined Authority was a new entity and was still in the early stage of its development but had asked Ernst and Young to work with the internal auditors to review ways in which audit and corporate governance could be improved going forward. Councillor Mason hoped that at the next meeting of the committee on 29 March 2019 there would be some feedback from Ernst and Young on the terms of reference for such a review.

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

14. **MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Council noted changes in membership made in accordance with the wishes of Group Leaders in respect of places allocated to their Groups on Committees and outside bodies.

Following a request from a Member for a report back from the Council’s representative on the Papworth Hospital Board, Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, agreed that reports should be submitted by all the Council’s representatives on outside bodies.

Council by affirmation:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the following changes in substitute appointments be noted and endorsed:
 - Employment and Staffing Committee – Councillors Peter McDonald and Clare Delderfield (appointed in place of Councillors Bridget Smith and Aidan Van de Weyer).
 - Grants Committee – Councillor Peter Topping (appointed in place of Councillor Grenville Chamberlain)
- (2) That Councillor Pippa Heylings be appointed as the Council’s representative on Natural Cambridgeshire (in place of Councillor Peter Fane).
- (3) That Councillor Pippa Heylings be appointed as the representative of the Liberal Democrat Group on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority’s Overview and Scrutiny Committee (in place of Councillor Philip Allen) to take effect following the next scheduled meeting of that Committee and that Councillor Peter Fane be appointed as substitute.

15. CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2019/20

The Council received a report which invited approval of the draft Calendar of Meetings 2019/20, as set out at Appendix A.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey, the Chairman of the Council proposed that the draft Calendar of Meetings 2019/20 be approved.

Councillor Anna Bradnam, the Vice-Chairman of the Council seconded the motion.

Council by affirmation

RESOLVED:

That the Calendar of Meetings 2019/20, as set out at Appendix A to the submitted report, be approved.

16. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**16 (a) From Councillor Sarah Cheung Johnson**

The previous administration approved the devolution deal which gave us the Combined Authority and the Mayor because we in South Cambs would benefit. Where is our fair share of the £100 million for affordable housing?

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of the Council, responded that this was an ongoing issue which she had inherited on becoming Leader and commented on the efforts of her predecessor, Councillor Peter Topping, to ensure that the Council received its fair share of the £100m fund for affordable housing. The Leader indicated that she was continuing to press for a fair share of the money for South Cambridgeshire but there was on going discussion over what constituted a "fair share". She had called for the allocation to be based on the business case produced whilst Councillor Topping was the Combined Authority's Housing Portfolio holder but the Combined Authority's view was that allocation should operate on a "first come, first served" model. It had also allocated £40m of the £100m to a revolving fund. The Leader noted that she was a member of the Combined Authority's Housing Committee and that she would continue to argue the case for South Cambridgeshire to receive its fair share of the funding. She did note that some projects were going forward, including the proposed scheme for provision of 880 key worker units at Northstowe.

As a supplementary question, Councillor Cheung Johnson asked what impact the withdrawal of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan would have on the funding already committed from the Combined Authority to East Cambridgeshire District Council.

The Leader of the Council indicated that she had written to the Leader of East Cambridgeshire District Council when the announcement had been made about the withdrawal of the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan. He had responded to assure her that there would be no impact. However the Leader felt that this would need further exploration given that funding had been allocated in respect of the East Cambridgeshire Community Land Trust.

16 (b) From Councillor Bunty Waters

Is the Leader of the Council confident that the Council's Planning Department has sufficient capacity to handle the important phase 3 of the Northstowe planning application this summer?

The Chairman noted that Councillor Waters had withdrawn the above question as she had had to leave the meeting.

16 (c) From Councillor Nick Wright

Cotton Farm Windfarm started operating in January 2013. Noise emissions were immediately experienced and recorded in Graveley. By 2016 these complaints exceeded 2000. The operators responded by working the turbines in curtailment and changing parts of the turbines. This resulted in new noise tests by Huntingdonshire District Council to establish whether the windfarm was operating in the terms of its planning condition. The noise complaints continue. Is the windfarm operating within the limits of its noise condition?

Councillor Neil Gough, the Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing, reported that Huntingdonshire District Council, as the planning authority, had concluded that the facility was operating within the limits of the conditions. However, that Authority was currently working to reconfirm its findings in terms of compliance with the condition and was liaising with South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Cotton Farm resident's association in relation to this.

Councillor Nick Wright, as a supplementary question, asked whether a meeting could be arranged between residents, the Parish Council, and officers of this Council and Huntingdonshire District Council to discuss the complaint.

The Chairman noted that the Council could not commit Huntingdonshire District Council to any action.

Councillor Gough, the Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing, expanded on the nature of the work underway to gather and analyse data. He indicated that the Council would encourage all parties to meet together to discuss the complaints. Councillor Gough also noted that officers were engaging with residents to invite them to allow formal monitoring to take place within their homes. To date one resident had come forward but it would be helpful if further residents participated in the monitoring exercise. He noted that if no statutory noise nuisance was identified, there were limited powers at the Council's disposal. However officers were happy to work with residents in relation to their concerns.

16 (d) From Councillor Peter Topping

Is the Leader satisfied that the drainage conditions issued with regard to the Persimmon development at Cottenham are sufficient to protect the residents from flood risk?

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, responded that officers had checked the minutes of the Planning Committee on this item to ensure that the final wording of the drainage condition was as discussed by the Committee. This had been confirmed.

As a supplementary question, Councillor Topping asked whether the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning was aware that the Cottenham Flood Forum considered the

drainage condition to be weak and was considering taking action through the administrative courts to quash the condition.

Councillor Dr. Hawkins, the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, indicated that she had seen a letter to that effect but that the Council had taken advice and was satisfied that the condition was enforceable. The Council was happy to meet with the group and the Parish Council and indeed she understood that a meeting was scheduled for the following week.

16 (e) From Councillor Sue Ellington

I have been made aware that the commercial paper recycling bin is to be removed from Swavesey church car park. This would indicate that there has been a change in policy which would previously have been discussed at a portfolio meeting and circulated as a decision. As this is no longer the practice, can the Leader enlighten us as to all the changes in waste and recycling policy and what efforts have been made to identify the implication?

Councillor Ellington indicated that she was content to receive a written response to her question but did ask whether a large bin could be put back on the site at Swavesey and other villages because it aided recycling.

Councillor Neil Gough, as Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing, indicated that he would provide a written response but on the latter question indicated that there were many better solutions rather than replacing the bins, noting that there had been abuse of the "paper only" bins leading to contamination of the load.

16 (f) From Councillor Ruth Betson

The shared finance service between this Council and the City of Cambridge Council appears to have been terminated, with the majority of the officers being repatriated to the City of Cambridge. What officer resource exists going forward to support this Council in its financial and budgetary obligations?

Councillor Betson indicated that she was content to receive a written response to her question.

16 (g) From Councillor Graham Cone

Following recent changes in the communications department where will responsibility of reprographics and print services be located?

Councillor Graham Cone confirmed that he would be prepared to receive a written response to his question.

16 (h) From Councillor Heather Williams

Where fees and charges are introduced for Council services, will these ever be applied retrospectively to our residents?

Councillor John Williams, the Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, replied that he could not foresee an instance where the Council could apply a retrospective change unless permitted by legislation or unless there was a contract in place to provide the services between the Council and the individual in the first instance.

As a supplementary question, Councillor Heather Williams asked how the charges would be applied for the new additional green bin service.

Councillor Neil Gough, the Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing, responded that during the introductory period from April to September 2019 there would be a £20 charge per additional bin irrespective of when starting the service. From October 2019 the cost would be £35 per additional bin per year.

16 (i) From Councillor Shrobona Bhattacharya

Why is the Council deliberately downplaying the success of the Cambourne Electronics and Robotics Club (CERC) that was supported by SCDC? The club has featured on BBC and ITV news channels and was shortlisted for national awards, and brings together 250 families, yet the previous South Cambs magazine for residents has not found a space to report its success. Can the lead member for communications explain this?

Councillor Dr. Bhattacharya agreed to receive a written response to her question.

17. NOTICES OF MOTION

17 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Peter Topping

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

“The Council notes with growing concern the reduction in the numbers of affordable housing proposed for the new settlement at Waterbeach, set against the increase in the numbers of houses proposed, and calls for the Council to drive forward development of this important new community for the benefit of both current and future residents.”

In moving his motion, Councillor Topping provided background and context to the subject and highlighted what he regarded as a potentially worrying trend in terms of the apparent reduction in the number of affordable houses proposed for the new settlement at Waterbeach. He asked whether, as had happened for Northstowe, a two stage approach would be adopted. For Northstowe, the two stage approach had enabled the target number of affordable homes for stage one to be “caught up” in stage two of the development resulting in 41% of affordable housing overall. Councillor Topping also sought further information on the actual number of houses planned for the new settlement and on the amount of the contribution from the developers for the transport mitigation requirements and asked what action was proposed if it was less than that targeted. He noted that he had carefully constructed the wording of the motion and hoped that it would find favour with all Members.

Councillor Nick Wright seconded the motion.

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, moved an amendment follows:

“The Council notes and welcomes efforts being made to maximise with growing concern ~~the reduction in~~ the numbers of affordable housing proposed for the new settlement at Waterbeach, set against the increase in the numbers of houses proposed and the complexity of the site, and calls for the Council to continue to drive forward development

of this important new community for the benefit of both current and future residents.”

Councillor Dr. Hawkins noted the concerns expressed in the motion around the level of affordable housing and indicated that the amendment was intended to provide reassurance that the Council was working towards maximising the numbers of affordable houses on the site in line with its policies. She acknowledged the extent of infrastructure works that needed to be delivered at the outset and confirmed that a phased approach would be followed to the development. Officers were discussing with developers what could be delivered in the first phase and what could be delivered in subsequent phases. It was necessary to acknowledge that the settlement would be developed over a number of years and to recognise that there would be a need to review delivery at each phase of the development with a view to ensuring that the Council's policy requirements were met and the required number of affordable houses were delivered.

Councillor John Batchelor seconded the amendment.

Councillor Peter Topping indicated that he was not prepared to accept the wording of the amendment as he believed it weakened his motion.

Councillor Nick Wright, as the seconder of the original motion, noted that the affordable housing targets of 30% and 41% had been achieved for the Cambourne and Northstowe settlements respectively and commented on the importance of achieving the required number of affordable houses on the Waterbeach settlement which he regarded would be a measure of the Council's commitment to providing affordable housing.

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

In favour (23):

Councillors Philip Allen, John Batchelor, Dr Martin Cahn, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Jose Hales, Bill Handley, Philippa Hart, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Pippa Heylings, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, John Williams and Eileen Wilson

Against (10):

Councillors Ruth Betson, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam*, Graham Cone, Dr. Douglas de Lacey, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Peter Topping, Heather Williams and Nick Wright

Abstain (0)

* Councillor Anna Bradnam indicated that she had inadvertently voted against the amendment.

The Chairman declared the amendment to be carried.

In summing up on the substantive motion, Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, the Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, indicated that she acknowledged the concerns expressed by Councillor Topping and confirmed the commitment to maximise the number of affordable houses provided and to hold developers to account.

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

In favour (33):

Councillors Philip Allen, John Batchelor, Ruth Betson, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Dr Martin Cahn, 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, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Dawn Percival, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Peter Topping, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (0):

Abstain (0)

Council

RESOLVED:

This Council notes and welcomes efforts being made to maximise the numbers of affordable housing proposed for the new settlement of Waterbeach against the increase in numbers of houses proposed and the complexity of the site and calls for the Council to continue to drive forward development of this important new community for the benefit of both current and future residents.

18. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

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

19. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chairman moved:

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended).

Councillor Brian Milnes seconded the motion.

Council, by affirmation

RESOLVED:

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that, if present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended).

20. MINUTES (EXEMPT)

Minute 19 of the meeting of the Council held on 29 November (which contained exempt

information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)) was approved for signature by the Chairman as a correct record.

The Meeting ended at 7.22 p.m.
