

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 20 February 2020 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Anna Bradnam – Chairman
Councillor – Vice-Chairman

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

Officers:	Patrick Adams	Senior Democratic Services Officer
	Kathrin John	Democratic Services Team Leader
	Susan Gardner Craig	Interim Director of Corporate Services
	Peter Maddock	Head of Finance
	Rory McKenna	Deputy Head of Legal Practice
	Liz Watts	Chief Executive

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors Ruth Betson, Grenville Chamberlain, Dr. Douglas de Lacey, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Pippa Heylings, Alex Malyon, Dawn Percival and Nick Sample.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors John Batchelor and Dr. Ian Sollom declared non-pecuniary interests as non-remunerated Directors of Ermine Street Housing.

Councillor Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 20 as a member of Cambourne Town Council.

Councillor Mark Howell declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8(d) Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy and Conditions, as a friend of former District Councillor Kevin Cuffley, who owned a taxi licence.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart declared an interest in item 8(l) as he paid rent on a Council owned garage.

Councillor Heather Williams declared an interest in all budget related items as a Council Taxpayer.

Councillor Brian Milnes declared a pecuniary interest in item 12 Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel, as Vice Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.

3. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

The Chairman requested that Members inform Democratic Services of any changes to their registered interests.

4. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reported that owing to the absence of Councillor Dr. Douglas de Lacey, the Chairman of Council, she had asked Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton to assist with the duties of the Vice Chairman at this meeting.

Volunteer Appreciation Event on Friday 26 June

The Chairman reported that the Council was holding a Volunteer Appreciation Event on Friday 26 June from 7.30pm to 9.00pm, to celebrate those people who make our villages better places to live for our communities. All Members were invited to nominate one volunteer in their community by 6 March, who will attend the event as their guest.

Retirement of Peter Topping

Councillor Bridget Smith, the Leader of Council, paid tribute to Peter Topping, who had stood down as the Member for the Whittlesford ward. He had served the Council as Leader, Cabinet member, Leader of the Opposition group and ward councillor. The Leader welcomed Councillor Heather Smith as the new Opposition Group Leader and Councillor Graham Cone as Deputy Leader and looked forward to working with them both in the future. Councillor Heather Williams thanked the Leader and praised Peter Topping for his tireless work for residents.

Tony Nicholas

Nigel Cathcart reported the sad news that Tony Nicholas, who had been the Member for Cottenham from May 2002 until June 2004, had died. Councillor Cathcart paid tribute to Tony Nicholas as a constructive and sensible district and parish councillor, who would be missed by the community he had served. The Chairman asked that Council's regards for Tony Nicholas be formally minuted.

6. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

6 (a) From Dr Bryan Cameron

In the absence of Dr Bryan Cameron, Daniel Fulton asked the following question:

“Under Article 36 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, the Council is required to register all planning applications and is required to make the register available for public inspection.

However, only 11 applications have been received over the last few weeks, which is 200 fewer than over the same period last year. It had been impossible to access any applications online, although they were accessible again now.

Please can the Council provide details of the IT upgrade that led to the temporary cessation?”

Cllr Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Lead Member for Planning, commented that this was a different question from that submitted by Dr. Cameron. She explained that the Shared Planning Service was in the process of transitioning from two separate planning systems onto a single platform. This was a central plank of the new operating model. During the transition period applications had been registered on the new system. As from 19 February 2020 all applications had now been registered on the new system, which was more efficient and streamlined than the previous system.

The Chairman explained that supplementary questions were only permitted from the questioner, who was not present.

6 (b) From Mr Daniel Fulton

Mr Daniel Fulton asked the following question:

“I was very pleased to learn recently that the Council has asked the Local Government Association’s Planning Advisory Service to conduct an independent review of the shared planning service. Will the Leader of Council agree to the report being made available to the public once it is issued?”

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Lead Member for Planning, explained that the Planning Advisory Service would be reviewing the Planning Committees and not the Planning service. The draft terms of reference of this review would become available shortly and the review would be published once it concluded.

As a supplementary question Mr Daniel Fulton stated that the Planning Committee had passed a resolution to amend the planning delegation scheme within the Constitution, but asserted that according to the Local Government Act 2000, only full Council had this power and so argued that the amendment was ultra vires and the existing Constitution was still in effect. He invited the Lead member for Planning comment to comment on this.

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins announced that if Mr Fulton provided a copy of his supplementary question he would receive a written response.

7. PETITIONS

The Chairman explained that no new petitions had been submitted to the

Council. It was noted that Mr Tariq Ahmed's petition, which had been discussed at the last Council meeting, had been taken into consideration as part of the Council's consultation on the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy and Conditions, which was listed as item 8(d) on the agenda.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL:

8 (a) Medium Term Financial Strategy (Cabinet - 4 December 2019)

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, presented this item on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) to the financial year 2024/25. He explained that the MTFS was reviewed every six months and he expressed the hope that the Government's plans would be clearer by the time of the next review. The following assumptions had been made:

- A retention of 40% of Business Rates, which equated to a loss of £2.3 million from 2021/22.
- New Homes Bonus would be phased out entirely by 2022/23.
- Commercial income had been estimated from Ermine Street Housing Ltd, but not from any other investments.
- These assumptions meant that the Council had a £5.7 million shortfall by the end of 2024/25.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, expressed her thanks to officers who had written such a clear and concise report. She expressed her disappointment that there had been no national agreement amongst local authorities regarding the division of Business Rates.

Councillor Heather Williams explained that the increase in the funding gap from £3 million to £5.7 million and the perceived risk to service provision that this entailed, meant that she could not support the MTFS. Councillor John Williams explained that the administration had assumed a worst case scenario in identifying a £5.7 million shortfall, for example no income had been estimated from any commercial investments, with the exception of Ermine Street Housing Ltd.

In response to concerns expressed by Councillors Mark Howell and Heather Williams, Councillor John Williams assured Council that the administration's MTFS was based on the principle that any Council Tax increases would be within the Government's guidelines of a £5 or 2.99% maximum increase and so there was no intention of triggering a referendum by exceeding those limits.

Councillor John Williams proposed and the Leader seconded the recommendations in the report. A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

In favour (26):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes,

Judith Rippeth, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Against (9):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Abstain (0):

Council

RESOLVED

To

- (a) Acknowledge the projected changes in service spending and the overall resources available to the Council over the medium term;
- (b) Approve the Medium Term Financial Strategy at Appendix A and the updated financial forecast at Appendix B.

8 (b) Annual Pay Policy Statement (Employment & Staffing Committee, 23 January 2020)

Councillor Henry Batchelor, Chairman of the Employment and Staffing Committee, proposed the recommendations in this report to ensure that the Council complied with the Localism Act 2011 and approved the annual Pay Policy Statement which been thoroughly discussed at the meeting of the Employment and Staffing Committee on 23 January 2020. Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, seconded the proposal.

Councillor Graham Cone asked whether support was offered to staff who wished to move from the Council's childcare voucher scheme to the Government's scheme. Councillor John Williams agreed that the administration would take this into account.

Councillor Heather Williams welcomed the fact that the mean gender pay gap was in favour of females, but she asserted that true equality meant asking why this was and considering if there were barriers for men seeking better paid employment. Councillor Henry Batchelor explained that the number of men employed in the waste service was one of the main reasons for the inequality.

Councillor Nick Wright asked for the figures on how much the Council had paid in redundancy payments and gardening leave over the last year. Councillor John Williams agreed to provide a written response to Councillor Wright's question.

Councillor Gavin Clayton welcomed the fact that the ratio between the highest and lowest paid was 1:9 and suggested that there be a target for the authority and that the Council should also consider whether our contractors should also

abide by this. Councillor John Williams agreed that the Council should be proud of its ratio and suggested that the Employment and Staffing Committee consider whether future Pay Policy statements should include a target.

A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

In favour (35):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (0):

Abstain (0):

Council

RESOLVED

To approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2020.

8 (c) Appointment of Monitoring Officer (Employment & Staffing Committee, 23 January 2020)

Councillor Henry Batchelor, Chairman of the Employment and Staffing Committee, proposed and Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, seconded the appointment of Rory McKenna as this authority's Monitoring Officer.

Council by affirmation

RESOLVED

To appoint Rory McKenna as the Council's Monitoring Officer.

8 (d) Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy and Conditions (Licensing Committee - 10 February 2020)

The Chairman explained that this policy had been proposed by the Licensing Committee and would usually be presented by its Chairman, but as she was chairing the meeting she invited Councillor Bill Handley, Lead Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Licensing, to present the report.

Councillor Bill Handley introduced this report, which invited Council to approve a new Taxi Licensing Policy for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire vehicles,

drivers, proprietor (vehicles) and operators following an extensive public consultation process, which included workshops as well as Licensing Committee meetings.

Councillor Handley commented that the significant changes to the previous policy were in two main areas: those intended to protect the environment and public health and those designed to further protect both passenger and driver. A number of the new measures brought the Council's policies into line with those in Cambridge City Council's licensing policy.

Councillor Handley then proceeded to highlight the most significant changes to the policy:-

Age Limit

An upper age limit would be introduced for vehicles of 9 year for the renewal of vehicle licences from December 2021.

Plate Exemption Policy

A "Plate Exemption" policy would continue to apply, on request, for operators of executive/chauffeur-based work but the word "primarily" was replaced by the word "solely" to remove any ambiguity and to provide clarity and consistency.

Internal Vehicle Notice

A compulsory Internal Vehicle Notice was to be displayed by all licensed vehicles at all times. This was for the safety of the public to allow the on-board identification of both driver and vehicle.

Wheelchair accessible

The trade had made the point that there was currently a very limited choice of wheelchair accessible ultra-low and zero emission vehicles on the market. The Licensing Committee had listened to the trade on this but considered that the needs of disabled passengers should not be compromised. Since central government had made it clear that the sale of private petrol and diesel fuelled vehicles was to be phased out, possibly as early as 2035, there would be an incentive for companies to introduce suitable vehicles. This part of the policy would be reviewed from time to time as the situation changed as suitable vehicles become available.

Door signage

The new Policy had not changed from the previous 2018 policy on door signage, although Councillor Handley recognised that changes in the market had brought this matter into more focus. Councillor Handley referred to the petition received at the Council meeting in September 2019 but noted that ultimately the Licensing Committee had rejected the claim that it was difficult or potentially dangerous for drivers to have to change signs at the side of the highway and the door signage enabled a clear mechanism for reporting issues to the operator.

Installation of CCTV Cameras to all Vehicles (including "plate exempt")

Concerns regards privacy had been discussed at the Licensing Committee of 10 February 2020. The operators of executive and chauffeur-style "plate-exempt"

vehicles had asked for an exemption for their vehicles on the grounds of privacy. The Licensing Committee had borne these concerns in mind and had sought to reassure all operators that:

- The images would be held encrypted in secure storage in the vehicle. It would be accessible only to authorised persons in the event of a request be the police or an enforcement officers
- Audio recording would be switched off and signage installed to reassure passengers of this. Audio records could be activated by either the driver or passenger if it was felt it was needed.

Ultra-low and Zero Ultra-low and Zero Emission Vehicles

The policy provided for the introduction of ultra-low & zero emission vehicles for all new vehicle licences from 1st December 2021 and for renewals from 1st December 2028. The renewals date was considered sufficient time for drivers and operators to plan for the change.

Councillor Handley drew attention to a number of proposed amendments to the draft policy as were set out in the supplementary paper which had been circulated to all Members of the Council.

Councillor Heather Williams proposed, and Councillor Anna Bradnam seconded, an amendment to include the following extra paragraph in the Policy (paragraph 3.10 I) Requests for Data):

“iv) There will be a report to Licensing Committee at least once a year showing how many times a request for data has been received, granted access to, and for what purposes.”

Councillor Handley accepted this amendment, which was included in the substantive proposal without debate

The Chairman thanked the Interim Corporate Lead of Licensing and the Resource Team Leader for their efforts in producing the draft policy over the past months.

Councillor Handley proposed, and the Chairman seconded, the amended recommendations. A vote was taken and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (34):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (0):

Abstain (0):

Council

NOTED and gave full consideration to the petition presented to Full Council on 28 November 2019.

RESOLVED

To approve and adopt the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy with effect from 1 April 2020 as detailed in the agenda, subject to:

- a) Inclusion of the following amendments to the Policy, as detailed in the supplement report:
 - Paragraph 3.16 (d) of the policy was amended to:
“New Hackney Carriage vehicles will need to comply with this immediately, and those vehicles currently licensed as a Hackney Carriage will have to comply by 1st December 2021. Failure to do so will result in the vehicle licence being revoked, or not renewed.”
 - Paragraph 3.16 (h) of the policy was amended to:
“All vehicles fitted with a tail lift for wheelchairs must provide a valid Lifting Operations Lifting Equipment Regulations (LOLER) certificate of compliance to prove that the tail lift has been tested and checked to the required standards. It must be retested every six months as per Health and Safety Executive (HSE) requirements.”
 - Replacement of the table at paragraph 3.27 (k) of the policy with the table set out in the supplement report.
- b) The inclusion of an extra paragraph in the Policy under the heading “Requests for Data”:
“iv) There will be a report to Licensing Committee at least once a year showing how many times a request for data has been received, granted access to, and for what purposes.”

8 (e) 2020 - 2025 Business Plan (Cabinet - 5 February 2020)

Councillor Neil Gough, the Deputy Leader (non-statutory), presented the Business Plan, which provided clear and measurable actions that the Council will carry out up until 2025 to achieve the overarching priorities. He highlighted the following points:

- Promotion of Mobile Warden Schemes
- Promotion of Green agenda, including the provision of LED footway lighting
- Trial of electric collection vehicles
- Provision of £100,000 for zero carbon communities

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Neil Gough and seconded by Councillor John Williams.

Councillor Heather Williams suggested that the Business Plan favoured business interests over the interests of residents. Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, explained that local businesses were vital to the wellbeing of the District's residents.

Councillor Nick Wright stated that the core of the Plan was from the previous administration. He praised the commitment to sustainability and paperless meetings. He commented that the replacement of footway lights was well overdue. He stated that more should be done for communities and was concerned that there was no commitment to supporting village pubs. The Leader explained that whilst pubs were not specifically mentioned in the Plan, which took a strategic overview, pubs were included in lower level documents. Councillor John Williams asserted that there had been insufficient funds in the budget under the previous administration to replace the footway lights.

Councillor Peter McDonald explained most of the focus was on Small and Medium Enterprises who employed fewer than 10 people. These businesses needed the Council's support more than larger organisations.

Councillor Sue Ellington stated that the Plan did little to tackle social isolation and that it was pity that the time banking initiative had been lost. She expressed concern that no new villages were coming forward to ask for a Mobile Warden Scheme and so only existing schemes were being supported. Councillor Handley was happy to report that a new Mobile Warden Scheme had been set up in his ward of Over and Willingham.

Councillor Sarah Cheung-Johnson welcomed the provision of community buildings in Northstowe.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart supported the "green to our core" initiative and the need to support local initiatives and schemes. However, he also highlighted the need for conservation and that many historic buildings in the District needed protection.

Councillor Gavin Clayton asked if the target to build 50 council homes was ambitious enough and congratulated the administration in pledging to support refugee families. He welcomed the ambitious plans for Northstowe, but asked that Cambourne not be forgotten.

Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn supported the Plan, but expressed concern that the word culture had been omitted. He stated that including this when supporting the construction of community buildings would help businesses.

Councillor Geoff Harvey thanked officers for their work in producing the Plan and delivering on it. He asserted that by making South Cambs Hall more energy efficient provided an exemplar for other organisations in the District.

Councillor John Williams explained that the Plan had been developed after speaking to residents. He referred to the enthusiasm expressed by parish councils about the Council's green initiatives at the recent Cabinet liaison meeting. 70 parish councils had taken up the Council's three trees offer.

A vote was taken and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (26):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Against (9):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Abstain (0):

Council

RESOLVED to

- (a) Adopt the proposed 2020-25 Business Plan action grid at **Appendix A**.
- (b) Authorise the Chief Executive to make any minor wording changes required to final drafts, in consultation with the Deputy Leader.

8 (f) Localised Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTS): 2020/21 (Cabinet - 5 February 2020)

Following agreement of the Council, signalled by affirmation, to vary the order of business in accordance with Standing Order 13(c), this item was discussed after Agenda Item 8a (Medium Term Financial Strategy).

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member of Finance, proposed the recommendations in the report, which reviewed the Localised Council Tax Support scheme for 2019/20 and sought agreement for the scheme for 2020/21. Councillor Heather Williams seconded the proposal.

Councillor Gavin Clayton expressed his concern at the increase in the use of food banks in Cambourne due to Universal Credit. The Leader invited Councillor Clayton to discuss this matter with her outside the meeting to look at whether the Council could develop a local solution to support residents in Cambourne.

A vote was taken and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (35):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (0):**Abstain (0):**

Council

RESOLVED to

- (a) Approve the adoption of Option 1 in the report, comprising the LCTS Income Bands scheme currently in operation, with an uprating of calculation figures in line with the Consumer Price Index;
- (b) Approve the delegation of future annual inflation adjustments to the LCTS scheme limits to the Head of Finance in liaison with the Lead Cabinet Member for Finance.

8 (g) Review of Reserves and Provisions (Cabinet - 5 February 2020)

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, proposed the recommendations in the report, which advised the Council of the outcome of the Cabinet's review of the Council's Revenue Reserves and Provisions as part of the 2020/21 budget setting process. He explained that the commas in paragraph 8 of the report should have been decimal points. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Deputy Leader.

Councillor Heather Williams asked how the management consultants had been funded. Councillor John Williams explained that a Transformation budget had been set up and any funds that were unspent would be returned to reserves.

In response to a question from Councillor Heather Williams, Councillor John Williams confirmed that the Children and Young People reserve was ring-fenced. The Leader added that the Children and Young People City and South Cambs Area Partnership Committee, which had allocated funds, no longer existed, so the decision had been taken to ensure that the funds that the Council previous paid to the Committee could still be spent on initiatives that benefitted children.

Councillor Sue Ellington explained that Webbs Hole sluice was vital to land drainage in her ward of Swavesey and she asserted that Mare Fen needed to be completed before work commenced on Phase 2 of Northstowe.

Councillor John Williams assured Council that funds were not being moved from the Community Chest reserves and the Council would have greater flexibility to move extra funds for Community Chest applications.

A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

In favour (31):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (1):

Councillor Deborah Roberts.

Abstain (2):

Councillors Nigel Cathcart and Gavin Clayton.

Council

RESOLVED

- (a) That the Reserves as summarised at paragraph 13 of the report be released and transferred to the General Reserve on 31 March 2020.
- (b) That the Reserves proposed for replenishment or combination, and the outstanding balances at 31 March 2020 proposed for release, as detailed in Appendix A to the report, be approved.
- (c) That the proposed new Reserves, as summarised at paragraph 16 of the report, be approved.
- (d) That the movement in Reserves in 2019/2020 as set out in Appendix A, and the estimated balance of Reserves of £41.763 million, be noted.

8 (h) Capital Strategy (Cabinet - 5 February 2020)

John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, proposed the recommendations in the report, which undertook an annual review of the Capital Strategy and invited Council to approve it, as recommended by Cabinet on 5 February 2020. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer.

Councillor Heather Williams supported the Strategy and stated that officers needed the support and resources in order to carry out their job.

Councillor Nick Wright welcomed this report but expressed concern that the Council could replace Section 106 Agreements with the Community Infrastructure Levy, which would mean less funding for local infrastructure. Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Leader Member for Planning, assured Members that there were no plans to do this, but that it was sensible to periodically review the Council's position.

A vote was taken and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (32):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (0):

Abstain (2):

Councillors Nigel Cathcart and Gavin Clayton.

Council

RESOLVED to approve (i) the updated Capital Strategy attached at Appendix A to the report which sets the policy framework for the development, management and monitoring of capital investment, and (ii) Prudential Indicators.

8 (i) Capital Programme 2020/2021 to 2024/2025 (Cabinet - 5 February 2020)

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, proposed the recommendations in the report, which invited Council to approve the Capital Programme for the years 2020/21 to 2024/25. He explained that the Programme proposed £96 million for the investment programme, which included £1.9 million for South Cambs Hall and £1.3 million for LED street lighting. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer.

Councillor Graham Cone asked whether the increase in funding for refuse collection vehicles was due to the planned purchase of electric vehicles. He requested information on mileage and what areas the vehicles would be serving. Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, explained that electric bin lorries were more fuel efficient than current vehicles and so the Council was going to try one out in March. The administration was also looking at hydrogen powered vehicles. Councillor John Williams explained that bin lorries needed to be replaced in any case and it made sense to look at more energy efficient alternatives.

Councillor Mark Howell suggested that the renewable energy proposed for South Cambs Hall could have been better spent on providing charging points for electric vehicles for taxi drivers. Councillor Heather Williams added that the Council's own premises should not be a priority for this authority. Councillor John Williams stated that the renewable energy initiatives being installed at South Cambs Hall would pay for themselves in 16 years and would encourage other businesses to do the same. This would help the Council to become net carbon neutral by 2050.

Councillor Heather Williams explained that she would not support the Investment Strategy, as she was of the view that allocating £300 million without proper scrutiny was too risky. Councillor Nick Wright stated that he continued to support Ermine Street Housing, which brought in funds to the Council. However, Councillor Wright expressed concern regarding the plan to invest in commercial land, which was high risk and could become a liability if there was an economic downturn.

Councillor Sue Ellington stated that this authority was once debt free and she expressed concern at the proposal for the Council to take on debt of £119 million. Councillor John Williams responded to the comments made during earlier speeches.

A vote was taken and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (24):

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

Against (9):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Abstain (2):

Nigel Cathcart, Gavin Clayton

Council

RESOLVED to approve the revised Capital Programme outlined at Appendix A.

8 (j) Treasury Management Strategy (Cabinet - 5 February 2020)

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, proposed and Councillor Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Deputy Leader, seconded this proposal, which invited the Council to approve the Treasury Management Strategy. Councillor Heather Williams explained that the opposition supported Ermine

Street Housing Ltd and were happy to support the Treasury Management Strategy.

A vote was taken and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (33):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (0):

Abstain (2):

Councillors Nigel Cathcart and Gavin Clayton.

Council

RESOLVED To approve the updated Treasury Management Strategy, attached at Appendix A to the report, which sets the policy framework for the Council's treasury management activity, including (i) the Treasury Management Policy Statement, (ii) Minimum Revenue Provision Policy and (iii) Treasury Indicators.

8 (k) Summary General Fund Revenue Budget 2020/21 (Cabinet - 5 February 2020)

Councillor John Williams introduced this report on the General Fund Revenue Budget for 2020/21. He reported that in the table on paragraph 21 of the report, on page 313 of the agenda, the figures in the table should be in pounds, not millions of pounds and the figures in paragraph 33a of the report, on page 316 of the agenda, should be £92.116 million and £38.207 million.

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, made the following points:

- He thanked the Head of Finance for working with other Cambridgeshire authorities to set up a Business Rates pooling scheme which realised an extra £1 million to the Council.
- An extra £5 million had been allocated to reduce the authority's carbon footprint, including improving the efficiency of the Council's housing stock and the purchasing of an electric bin lorry.
- £4.5 million would be generated from investments over the next 12 months.
- Income would continue to be generated from Ermine Street Housing Ltd, from business premises on Cambridge Science Park and Colmworth Trade Park, and from a return on a loan to deliver a new Ice Rink on the

- edge of Cambridge.
- £200,000 would be invested in expanding the Mobile Warden Scheme.
- £200,000 would support local businesses.
- It was proposed to increase Council Tax by £5 for a Band D property.

Councillor John Williams proposed and Councillor Neil Gough seconded the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Heather Williams proposed an amendment to recommendation 1, seconded by Councillor Graham Cone, by the addition of the words shown in italics:

- 1) *Approve the 2020/21 General Fund Revenue Budget based on known commitments at this time and planned levels of service/functions resulting in a Budget requirement of £24.350 million, subject to:*

- a. *The inclusion of the following additional items:*

- I. Support for Olympic Athletes**

£10,000

To establish an "Olympic Hopefuls" grant for residents of the District who are in full time education and are preparing for the next Olympic Games in Tokyo, Japan, this summer and future games. Applications to be processed, assessed and determined in the same way as Community Chest grants.

- II. Youth Engagement**

£5,000

To enable the Council to organise a youth engagement event or events in order to raise awareness and encourage young people to get involved. Parish councils/meetings to be invited to send 2 representatives aged 21 or under to event(s) where local issues could be debated and provide an introduction to the different layers of local government and how to get involved and all members being given the opportunity to get involved on an apolitical level.

- III. Long Service Awards**

£13,500

To extend the long service awards scheme (that currently applies after 20 years' service) so that awards are given to staff at intervals of five years' service starting at five years' employment with South Cambridgeshire District Council.

- a. *The £28,500 required to fund the above items, be met from a reduction to*

the budget within communications for the South Cambridgeshire magazine of £15,000 and a reduction in the maximum number of Special Responsibility Allowance to one, producing a saving of £13,500.

Councillor Heather Williams argued that these were modest amendments that would recognise the service of staff, help kindle community spirit and support the District's best young athletes. Councillor John Williams explained that he would not accept this amendment as the proposed expenditure was not in the agreed Business Plan. He reported that there would be tax implications for the suggested long service award and the current administration supported all staff, not just long-term employees. He did not support the proposed reduction in the Communications budget, at a time when the Council was proposing new initiatives to tackle the climate emergency.

Councillor Nick Wright stated that the long service award was a small gesture that rewarded staff for their loyalty. He explained that village colleges no longer had the finances to support their best athletes and the proposed amendment helped to promote youth engagement.

Councillor Deborah Roberts supported the amendment which she believed was modest in scope and she stated that the impact on reducing the Communications budget would be minimal.

Councillor Peter McDonald explained that the Grants Advisory Committee had given detailed consideration to whether to continue the elite athletes scheme and had been mindful of the increase in national funding for Olympic and Paralympic athletes. The Advisory Committee had concluded that it was more beneficial to spread the Council's grant funding across all community and age groups and that small amounts of funding, such as that proposed in the amendment, would make little difference for elite athletes.

Councillor Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya suggested that if Councillors were serious about supporting the District's youth then they should agree the amendment which proposed a modest budget for supporting young athletes.

Councillor Eileen Wilson suggested that the Council should support its staff all year round, with a good management structure and benefits such as flexi-time. Giving a reward to some staff every five years did not achieve this.

A vote was taken on the amendment and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (9):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams and Nick Wright

Against (26):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Sarah Cheung Johnson, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey,

Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Abstain (0):

The Chairman declared the amendment **LOST**.

Councillor Tom Bygott asked why there had been a reduction in Environment Protection and renewable energy, when being “Green to Our Core” was one of the Council’s objectives.

Councillor Mark Howell asked for clarification on the note on page 330 of the agenda, which stated that funds from the Housing Revenue Account would be used to set up a Community Liaison forum.

Councillor Nick Wright queried why funding for Legal Services was reducing from £331,000 this financial year to £308,000 for 2020/21 at a time when workload appeared to be increasing. He also expressed surprise that £216,000 had not been collected as part of the PPA agreement and asked what had happened to the £500,000 removed from the Transformation Budget. Finally he asked how much of the Planning budget had been spent on consultants, agency staff and the hiring of private companies.

Councillor Graham Cone noted that the Communications budget was to increase from £287,000 to £303,000 and that the Policy and Performance budget was also increasing and asked whether this was at the expense of the Planning Service.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart queried what savings were being referred to on page 315 of the agenda under the heading “Workforce Operating Model.” He also queried why Ageing Well was increasing from £44,000 to £244,000 whilst Children and Young People was reducing from £12,000 to £0. He expressed his support for Health and Wellbeing and expressed concern regarding the risk to future service delivery.

Councillor Heather Williams stated that she could not support the Budget due to the risks involved in borrowing £340 million and she also expressed concern at the apparent desire for the Council to be the first authority to have electric bin lorries, due to the associated risks. She expressed support for the income generated by Ermine Street Housing Ltd and the Ice Rink.

Councillor Neil Gough expressed his confidence in the Business Plans and the work officers had carried out to ensure that a robust and viable budget.

Councillor John Williams explained the reductions in the specific budget for 2020/21 when compared to the 2019/20 figures were, following detailed review of estimates by Heads of Service, largely due to underspends this year. Increases were generally due to overspends. With regard to risk management, he referred to the assurances given by the Chief Finance Officer in paragraph 2 on page 391 of the budget report and that the Council had sufficient reserves to respond to

unforeseen events. He stated that officers would provide a written response to the questions raised by Councillors Howell and Wright.

Votes on the substantive motion were cast as follows:

In favour (24):

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

Against (10):

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

Abstain (1):

Councillor Nigel Cathcart.

Council

RESOLVED to

- (a) Approve the 2020/2021 General Fund Revenue Budget based on known commitments at this time and planned levels of Service/functions resulting in a Budget Requirement of £24.350 million; and
- (b) Approve the District Council Precept on the Collection Fund (Council Tax Requirement) of £9.562 million in 2020/2021 (based on the Government Settlement) and a Band D Council Tax of £150.31.

8 (I) Housing Revenue Account Revenue and Capital Budget 2020/2021 (Cabinet - 5 February 2020)

Councillor Hazel Smith, Lead Cabinet Member for Housing, presented this report on the Housing Revenue Account Revenue and Capital Budget for 2020/21. She made the following points:

- On page 406 of the agenda, it should read 3 Shared Ownership homes at Impington Lane, Impington and the figure should be £150,000.
- It was proposed to add agreement of Service Charges at Appendix D to the recommendations, although some of these had already been agreed at Cabinet.
- The Council had contracted out to build 265 homes, but the aim was to increase this number, as homes in Northstowe had planning permission.
- It was possible that the Council would have to borrow in the short-term.

Councillor Hazel Smith proposed and Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, seconded the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Mark Howell expressed his support for these proposals, which were good for the Housing Revenue Account in the long term. He asked for assurance that capital receipts would not be returned to Government. Councillor Hazel Smith assured Council that Right to Buy receipts would continue to be used to build new Council owned properties.

In response to Councillor Nigel Cathcart, Councillor Hazel Smith confirmed that there would be no exorbitant increases in rent under the current administration and details of the 2.7% increase from 2020/21 were provided in paragraph 32 of the report.

A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

In favour (33):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Gavin Clayton, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (0):

Abstain (0):

Council

RESOLVED to

- (a) Approve the HRA revenue budget for 2020/2021 as shown in the HRA Budget Summary as presented at Appendix A;
- (b) Approve the HRA Medium Term Financial Strategy forecasts as shown in Appendix B;
- (c) Approve the Housing Capital Programme as shown in Appendix C.
- (d) Approve the Service Charges as shown in Appendix D.

9. COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION

Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member of Finance, introduced this item, which invited Council to formally approve the total Council Tax for the residents of South Cambridgeshire District, including the Council Tax requirements of precepting organisations. Councillor John Williams proposed and Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, seconded the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Deborah Roberts explained that she would not be supporting this proposal,

as any increases needed to be paid for by ordinary residents, who would be funding sustainable initiatives, which she did not believe would not make any difference when compared to the energy usage of countries like India, China, the United States and Germany. She added that Council Tax from residents also paid for the Police force, whom she had little confidence in, due to their apparent recent inaction regarding protestors in Cambridge.

Councillor Nick Wright stated that the increase in Council Tax might have been unnecessary if the Council had not employed management consultants and suggested that it was unclear what they had achieved.

Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn explained that whilst it was simple to cut services, it was difficult re-instate them. He supported the modest increase in Council Tax, as it would be used to rebuild public services.

Councillor Heather Williams stated that any increase in Council Tax was a difficult decision, but she recognised that the Council had little choice. She declared an interest as Council Taxpayer.

Councillor John Williams stated that the Council did not know what the results would be of the Government's Fair Funding review and it so would be foolish to not increase Council Tax by the maximum amount permitted. Recent history showed that those local authorities who had not increased Council Tax in the past, had then experienced financial difficulties. He urged Council to support the proposal, as it was in the best interests of the District's residents.

A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

In favour (33):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Gavin Clayton, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams, John Williams, Eileen Wilson and Nick Wright.

Against (1):

Councillor Deborah Roberts.

Abstain (0):

Council RESOLVED TO NOTE

1. That on 26th November 2019 the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2020/2021:
 - (a) for the whole Council area as 63,617.60 [Item T in the formula in Section 31B(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")] and,
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in Appendix B.

2. That the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2020/2021 (excluding Parish precepts) is calculated as £9,562,361.

Council **RESOLVED** to approve the following statutory resolution in respect of the Council Tax for 2020/21:

1. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2020/2021 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
 - (a) £115,260,298 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) £99,815,531 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) £15,444,767 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(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 £9,562,361 and the Parish precepts of £5,882,406).
 - (d) £242.78 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) £5,882,406 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (parish precepts).
 - (f) £150.31 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 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 C**.
 - (h) In accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of the categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands are shown by adding the amounts for each band in **Table 1** and **Appendix C** of the supplement submitted to Council.

2. That it be noted that for the year 2020/2021 Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridgeshire Police & Crime Commissioner, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each category of dwellings in the Council's area indicated in the **Table 1**:

Table 1	Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
County Council	906.12	1,057.14	1,208.16	1,359.18	1,661.22	1,963.26	2,265.30	2,718.36
Police & Crime Commissioner	155.10	180.95	206.80	232.65	284.35	336.05	387.75	465.30
District Council	100.21	116.91	133.61	150.31	183.71	217.11	250.52	300.62
Fire Authority	48.06	56.07	64.08	72.09	88.11	104.13	120.15	144.18
Cambs and Peterborough Combined Authority	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts shown in **Appendix D** of the supplement as the amounts of Council Tax for 2020/2021 for each of the categories of dwellings shown in **Appendix D** of that supplement.
4. Determines that the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2020/2021 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB and 52ZY Local Government Finance Act 1992 and Section 4ZA Local Government Finance Act 1992: Referendums relating to Council Tax Increases.

10. **SWAVESEY BYEWAYS RATE 2020/21**

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Lead Member for Planning, introduced this report which detailed the annual meeting of the Swavesey Byeways Advisory Committee held on 3 February 2020 and sought to set the level of the Swavesey Byeways rate. Councillor Dr. Hawkins proposed and Councillor Sue Ellington seconded the recommendation in the report.

Councillor Nick Wright expressed concern that the Council had not provided the road planings required to repair the pot holes on the byeways in question. Councillor Ellington stated that this was a contentious issue affecting her ward and asked that the Council act to resolve it. Councillor Hawkins explained that she was liaising with the Head of Shared Waste and Environment on this matter.

A vote was taken and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (32):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Dr. Shrobona

Bhattacharya, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Dr. Martin Cahn, Nigel Cathcart, Gavin Clayton, Graham Cone, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Sue Ellington, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Brian Milnes, Judith Rippeth, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, Heather Williams, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Against (2):

Councillors Bunty Waters and Nick Wright

Abstain (0):

Council

RESOLVED To retain the level of the Swavesey Byeways rate at £1.20 per hectare for land within the charge paying area for the period 2020/21 in order to fund the required level of maintenance.

11. 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 2019 and January 2020.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, announced that the Mayor had launched a £100,000 housing scheme and discussions were taking place on the possibility of running a pilot in South Cambridgeshire. A site had been identified but any construction would be subject to planning permission.

The Leader also reported that she had given evidence to the Public Service Reform Commission and commented on the work of the Climate Commission.

Council **NOTED** the report on the recent meetings of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

12. REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, introduced this report, which considered the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel with regard to the Special Responsibility Allowances paid to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee and the Chairman of the Joint Development Control Committee. The Leader proposed and Councillor John Williams, Lead Cabinet Member for Finance, seconded the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Brian Milnes declared a pecuniary interest in this item as the Vice-Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee. He did not participate in the debate and did not vote.

Councillor Heather Williams expressed the view that it would be inappropriate for

councillors to increase their own allowances, having just agreed to increase Council Tax.

Councillor John Williams stated that the Council employed an Independent Remuneration Panel to give their fair and honest opinion. The increases proposed were modest and gave a recognition of the extra work involved by the postholders.

A vote was taken and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (22):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Bill Handley, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Peter McDonald, Judith Rippeth, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Against (8):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Bunty Waters, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Abstain (1):

Councillor Gavin Clayton.

Council

RESOLVED to

- (a) To approve the Independent Remuneration Panel's recommendations on proposed revisions to the Scheme of Members' Allowances 2019/20, as set out in Appendix A to this report.
- (b) To approve the implementation of the amendments to Special Responsibility Allowances from the date of adoption of the revised scheme (ie: 20 February 2020).
- (c) To authorise the Interim Director of Corporate Services to implement and advertise any revisions to the scheme and to make any consequential amendments required to the Scheme of Members' Allowances in Part 6 of the Constitution.

13. 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.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, reported that Councillor Brian Milnes had been appointed as the Council's representative on the A505 Royston to Granta Park Strategic Growth and Transport Study Steering Group, replacing

former Councillor Peter Topping. Councillor Jose Hales had been appointed as substitute.

Council

RESOLVED To note and endorse the changes to membership and substitutes of Committees and Outside Bodies detailed at item 13 of the agenda.

14. **CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2020/21**

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, proposed and Councillor Anna Bradnam, Chairman, seconded the Calendar of Meetings for 2020/21, as detailed in the agenda.

It was noted that a Council meeting had been scheduled for Tuesday 14 July 2020 to avoid clashes with meetings of the County Council.

Councillor Heather Williams suggested that the meeting of the Council on 15 April 2021 shown as a reserve meeting in the draft Calendar of Meetings should be included as a scheduled meeting. Council agreed this by affirmation.

Councillor Dr. Ian Sollom asked if an alternative date for the Council meeting on 18 February 2021 could be considered, as this was in half-term. It was agreed that officers would investigate this.

Councillor Deborah Roberts asked that Planning Committee meet at 10:00am instead of 10:30am. Councillor John Batchelor, Chairman of Planning Committee, explained that the Committee only met at 10:30am if a briefing had been scheduled before the meeting, which was usually not the case. Council agreed to amend the start date of Planning Committee in the Calendar of Meetings to 10am.

Council by affirmation

RESOLVED

To approve the Calendar of meetings 2020/21 as set out at Appendix A, with the following amendments:

- Council to meet on 15 April 2021, upgrading it from a reserve date.
- The time of Planning Committee meetings to be amended to 10am.
- Officers to consider moving the Council meeting scheduled for 18 February 2021, as this is in half-term.

In accordance with Standing Orders, Council agreed by affirmation that the meeting should continue beyond four hours.

15. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**15 (a) From Councillor Dr. Ian Sollom**

With the welcome announcement of a preferred route option for East West Rail that will connect Cambourne and surrounding communities, both existing and planned, to the national rail network, can the administration explain how they will ensure that communities along the route are properly engaged and heard in the next phase of developing a specific route alignment?

Councillor Dr. Aiden Van de Weyer, Deputy Leader, explained that following the announcement of the preferred route option, Council officers would be meeting with representatives from the East West Rail Company to ensure that the Council, local communities, parish councils, residents and all other stakeholders were fully engaged with before and during the public consultation on the detailed route alignment.

Councillor Dr. Ian Sollom expressed his concern that East West Rail had not contacted the parish councils in his ward and the first event in Cambourne was due to take place in the middle of the day, which few residents would be able to attend. Councillor Dr. Sollom asked if East West Rail could be persuaded to improve their consultation process. Councillor Dr. Van de Weyer explained that the Council had received feedback from parish councils on the proposed timing of consultation events and the authority was liaising with East West Rail on the preferred options.

15 (b) From Councillor Sue Ellington

Can the lead member tell us how South Cambridgeshire District Council plans to commemorate the 75th anniversary of VE Day?

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, thanked Councillor Ellington for her question, which helped to promote the Council's plans for this event. To ensure a lasting tribute, a tree with a plaque would be planted outside South Cambs Hall. Grants would be provided by the Council for residents to host their own events. The deadline for applications was Sunday 15 March.

Councillor Sue Ellington asked if there were any plans for VJ Day in August. Councillor Bridget Smith stated that this was being considered and suggested that Councillor Ellington discuss this with her outside the meeting. It was noted that the Chairman and Vice Chairman should be involved in any discussions as they would be expected to perform any ceremonial role.

15 (c) From Councillor Nigel Cathcart

Could the Leader of the Council please give an update regarding the development of Cambourne High Street?

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Lead Cabinet Member for Planning, explained that

proposals for a mix of residential and commercial development had been discussed with the developer's agent and were considered at a Design enabling Panel. The Council was waiting to receive a planning application.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart stated that a High Street had been planned and was an important part of any community. He asked whether the Council had looked at any other fine examples of new High Street developments. Councillor Dr. Hawkins confirmed that this was the case and the Council had engaged a company called Pegasus to help ensure a good standard of design in any new development.

15 (d) From Councillor Gavin Clayton

Please would the Leader undertake to request officers to bring forward a progress report to Cabinet on the action requested in my motion to Council on 18 July 2019, most notably to deliver a Single Equality Scheme and to join the Encompass Network's Safer Spaces Scheme so that there is a visible reassurance for LGBTQ+ residents of South Cambridgeshire District Council?

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, explained that whilst the Council had decided not to join the Safer Spaces Scheme, an annual report would go to Cabinet in May providing details on the work carried out this year, including Diversity and Equality training for staff, promotion of Hate Crime Awareness week and an event to mark Holocaust Memorial Day, which had been led by Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn. An Equality, Diversity and Inclusion forum for South Cambridgeshire would be set up to improve equality and diversity both at the Council and across the District. The Equality Impact Form had been re-designed to make it relevant to a predominantly rural District and when approved, would be put on the website.

Councillor Gavin Clayton expressed his concern about the rise in hate crime and asked whether more could be done to encourage businesses to sign up to a Single Equality Scheme. The Leader of Council announced that she would ask Councillor Peter McDonald to look into this as part of his role as business champion.

15 (e) From Councillor Nick Wright

Scheme of delegation difficulties have resulted in a number of planning decision notices being delayed. Is there anything that members of the Council can do to aid officers come to more timely decisions?

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Leader Member for Planning, announced that meetings to review requests in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman would resume from next week. Depending on the outcome of this process, officers would review the need for any additional Planning Committee meetings.

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins responded to a supplementary question from Councillor Nick Wright regarding the deliverability of the Five Year Land Supply

reminding Members that the Government had changed the way in which sites that could be delivered was calculated and referring to the impact of the recent decision of the Planning Committee to approve a development in Northstowe.

15 (f) From Councillor Heather Williams

Will the administration consider allowing parishes to apply for the Three Free Trees and put them on district council land?

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, confirmed that this would be considered and only be rejected if there were good reasons to do so. Officers were prepared to work with parish councils to identify suitable sites. Councillor Heather Williams welcomed this response and confirmed that many parish councils wished to benefit from this initiative.

15 (g) From Councillor Ruth Betson

Does the leader approve of the GCP's C2C route?

In the absence of Councillor Ruth Betson, it was agreed that a written answer be provided.

15 (h) From Councillor Graham Cone

Is the Leader accepting the removal of 1.7miles of trees for the C2C?

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, stated that this was a decision for the Greater Cambridge Partnership and not for this authority.

Councillor Graham Cone asked for the Leader's personal view on this issue. The Leader reiterated that this was a matter for the Greater Cambridge Partnership, who had decided to remove the issue from their agenda of the Board meeting held on 19 February 2020.

16. NOTICES OF MOTION

16 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Peter Fane

Councillor Peter Fane proposed the following motion, as set out in the agenda:

"This Council recognises the invaluable contribution of EU citizens working in jobs that provide Council services to residents and are crucial to key sectors of the economy in the City and South Cambs, including the health and care sectors, as well as their contribution to our society as a whole.

This Council therefore:

- Pledges to support and protect all EU citizens who live or work in the District, throughout and after the Brexit process
- Confirms that it believes that all EU citizens in the District should retain

- their right to vote in and be candidates in local elections;
- Requests Cabinet to explore ways in which it can help EU citizens in the District apply for permanent residence and citizenship.”

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Peter McDonald.

Councillor Fane explained that this motion was following on from the work of the cross party Brexit Advisory Group and the need to support small businesses due to their contribution to the local economy and the wider community.

Councillor Deborah Roberts expressed her support for the motion, but recommended that the words “and protect” be removed, as this was the responsibility of the Cambridgeshire Constabulary. Councillor Fane agreed and the amendment was accepted without debate.

By affirmation Council

RESOLVED

This Council recognises the invaluable contribution of EU citizens working in jobs that provide Council services to residents and are crucial to key sectors of the economy in the City and South Cambs, including the health and care sectors, as well as their contribution to our society as a whole.

This Council therefore:

- Pledges to support all EU citizens who live or work in the District, throughout and after the Brexit process
- Confirms that it believes that all EU citizens in the District should retain their right to vote in and be candidates in local elections;
- Requests Cabinet to explore ways in which it can help EU citizens in the District apply for permanent residence and citizenship.

16 (b) Standing in the name of Councillor Geoff Harvey

Councillor Geoff Harvey moved the following motion, as set out in the agenda:

“With reference to the Future Homes Standard 2019 Consultation on changes to Part L (conservation of fuel and power) and Part F (ventilation) of the Building Regulations for new dwellings (consultation closed 7th Feb 2020):-

This Council deplores:-

1. That the Government wishes to take away from local government and planning authorities their already very limited powers to require energy efficiency standards higher than national minimum standards embodied in Part L of Building Regulations (now subject to revision).
2. That following revision, the proposed new Future Homes Standard will not be in force until 2025.
3. That regarding transitional arrangements, of the two options consulted upon, this Government is promoting the option with the least focus on

- raising the insulation standards of building fabric.
4. That transitional arrangements will allow these already limited building fabric requirements to be side-stepped by the installation of green energy add-ons such as heat pumps and solar PV, masking a poor standard of insulation.

This Council urges Government to listen to and act upon the concerns raised nationally by professional planners, architects and engineers and by responsible developers alike; concerns being articulated, for example, by the London Energy Transition Initiative (LETI), representing the views of over 1000 built environment professionals.

When the Government scrapped the Zero Carbon Homes policy in 2015 it not only delivered a huge windfall to developers but also set back progress towards a low carbon future by many years. This Government is doubling down on that error by proposing a new standard that will not come into force until 2025. Transitional arrangements will allow developers to largely escape building to higher standard of fabric until that date so that 10 critical years will have been lost. Insulation standards proposed beyond 2025 are inadequate. At the same time, local planning authorities will be prevented from intervening. This policy direction will simply add to our stock of poorly insulated homes needing to be expensively upgraded in future with retrofit insulation.

The 'fabric first' approach to reducing emissions from dwellings is a central plank of the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, adopted by SCDC 8th Jan 2020. Whilst green energy add-ons are to be encouraged, their operational lifetime is perhaps 25 years and they are more readily retrofitted. High quality building fabric would deliver its benefits for 100 years or more but is extremely costly when installed as a retrofit upgrade. The most effective way to reduce carbon emissions is to reduce heat loss at source as the first priority.

It is a national scandal that the Government, having announced a 2050 zero carbon target, is now consulting on plans effectively allowing poorly insulated homes to be built for another five years at least whilst further limiting the ability of local authorities to intervene. If building regulations are to have primacy in setting sustainability standards, these must encourage a 'fabric first' approach and the highest possible standards of insulation.

This Council authorises officers to write to the Ministry for Housing, Local Government and Communities to express these concerns."

The motion was seconded by Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton.

Councillor Graham Cone proposed and Councillor Heather Williams seconded a number of amendments to the motion, to include the text underlined and remove the text struck through, as shown below:

"With reference to the Future Homes Standard 2019 Consultation on changes to Part L (conservation of fuel and power) and Part F (ventilation) of the Building Regulations for new dwellings (consultation closed 7th Feb 2020):-

This Council is concerned ~~deplores:-~~

1. That the Government may ~~wishes~~ to take away from local government and planning authorities their already very limited powers to require energy efficiency standards higher than national minimum standards embodied in Part L of Building Regulations (now subject to revision).
2. That following revision, the proposed new Future Homes Standard will not be in force until 2025, and would like reassurance that the government's motive is to reduce this timescale if possible.
3. ~~That regarding transitional arrangements, of the two options consulted upon, this Government is promoting the option with the least focus on raising the insulation standards of building fabric~~ and would like to impress the importance of selecting the option with the most focus on raising insulation standards of building fabric.
4. That transitional arrangements shall be proposed in a manner that will not allow these already limited building fabric requirements to be side-stepped by the installation of green energy add-ons such as heat pumps and solar PV, which potentially could mask ~~masking~~ a poor standard of insulation.

This Council urges Government to ~~listen to and act upon~~ take into consideration and give due weight to the concerns raised nationally by professional planners, architects and engineers and by responsible developers alike; concerns being articulated, for example, by the London Energy Transition Initiative (LETI), representing the views of over 1000 built environment professionals.

~~When t~~The Government scrapped decided not to proceed with the Zero Carbon Homes policy in 2015. ~~it not only delivered a huge windfall to developers but also set back progress towards a low carbon future by many years. This Government is doubling down on that error by proposing a new standard that will not come into force until 2025. The council is concerned that the proposed transitional arrangements if continued to 2025 would mean that will allow developers to largely escape building to higher standard of fabric until that date so that 10 critical years will have been lost. Insulation standards proposed beyond 2025 are inadequate. At the same time, local planning authorities will be prevented from intervening. This policy could impact the insulation quality of our district homes, this is concerning due to the additional expense of upgrading and retro fitting insulation, we would welcome any measures that the government is proposing to help mitigate this issue. direction will simply add to our stock of poorly insulated homes needing to be expensively upgraded in future with retrofit insulation.~~

The 'fabric first' approach to reducing emissions from dwellings is a central plank of the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, adopted by SCDC 8th Jan 2020. Whilst green energy add-ons are to be encouraged, their operational lifetime is perhaps 25 years and they are more readily retrofitted. High quality building fabric ~~could~~ would deliver its benefits for 100 years or more but is extremely costly when installed as a retrofit upgrade. The One of the most effective ways to reduce carbon emissions is to reduce heat loss at source as the first priority.

~~It is a national scandal that the Government, h~~Having announced a 2050 zero

carbon target, we hope the government will understand our concerns and work with authorities such as ours to achieve a zero-carbon target as soon as possible. ~~is now consulting on plans effectively allowing poorly insulated homes to be built for another five years at least whilst further limiting the ability of local authorities to intervene.~~ If building regulations are to have primacy in setting sustainability standards, these must encourage a 'fabric first' approach and the highest possible standards of insulation.

This Council authorises officers to write to the Ministry for Housing, Local Government and Communities to express these concerns.”

Councillor Graham Cone stated that the Government were more likely to respond to the amended version of the motion above. Councillor Geoff Harvey did not accept these amendments.

Councillor Steve Hunt spoke against the amendment, as he opposed the Government's proposals which he believed would lead to a large amount of unnecessary and expensive retro-fitting.

Councillor Heather Williams explained that the Government's proposals were at the consultation phase and a reasonable cross-party response would be more likely to receive a positive response from the Government, than a motion that used emotive language and could be construed as an attack.

Councillor Deborah Roberts supported the proposed amendments, as she considered that experience showed that the motion in its unamended form was unlikely to receive a response from the Government. She suggested that the Council should approach its MPs on this matter. Councillor Sue Ellington stated that a unanimously agreed motion would be more likely to receive a response than an aggressive letter.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, explained that she was due to have a phone conversation with the MP for South Cambridgeshire on 20 March and bi-monthly phone calls had been arranged for the future. She suggested that, if passed, the letter to the Minister would need to express the concerns stated in the Motion, but not necessarily use the same wording.

Councillor Brian Milnes spoke against the amendment, by stating that the Council should use strong language to condemn proposals that would benefit developers.

Councillor John Williams stated that the proposed amendment reduced the meaning and impact of the original motion. In response to request from legal guidance, the Head of Legal Services stated that in his opinion the amendment did not negate the original motion, which Council could vote on.

Council voted on the amendment and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (8):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Against (20):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Neil Gough, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Brian Milnes, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Abstain (0):

The Chairman declared the amendment **LOST**.

Council then voted on the substantive motion and votes were cast as follows:

In favour: (21):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Brian Milnes, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Against (8):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Abstain (0):

Council

RESOLVED

With reference to the Future Homes Standard 2019 Consultation on changes to Part L (conservation of fuel and power) and Part F (ventilation) of the Building Regulations for new dwellings (consultation closed 7th Feb 2020):-

This Council deplores:-

1. That the Government wishes to take away from local government and planning authorities their already very limited powers to require energy efficiency standards higher than national minimum standards embodied in Part L of Building Regulations (now subject to revision).
2. That following revision, the proposed new Future Homes Standard will not be in force until 2025
3. That regarding transitional arrangements, of the two options consulted upon, this Government is promoting the option with the least focus on raising the insulation standards of building fabric.
4. That transitional arrangements will allow these already limited building fabric requirements to be side-stepped by the installation of green energy add-ons such as heat pumps and solar PV, masking a poor standard of insulation.

This Council urges Government to listen to and act upon the concerns raised nationally by professional planners, architects and engineers and by responsible developers alike; concerns being articulated, for example, by the London Energy Transition Initiative (LETI), representing the views of over 1000 built environment professionals.

When the Government scrapped the Zero Carbon Homes policy in 2015 it not only delivered a huge windfall to developers but also set back progress towards a low carbon future by many years. This Government is doubling down on that error by proposing a new standard that will not come into force until 2025. Transitional arrangements will allow developers to largely escape building to higher standard of fabric until that date so that 10 critical years will have been lost. Insulation standards proposed beyond 2025 are inadequate. At the same time, local planning authorities will be prevented from intervening. This policy direction will simply add to our stock of poorly insulated homes needing to be expensively upgraded in future with retrofit insulation.

The 'fabric first' approach to reducing emissions from dwellings is a central plank of the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, adopted by SCDC 8th Jan 2020. Whilst green energy add-ons are to be encouraged, their operational lifetime is perhaps 25 years and they are more readily retrofitted. High quality building fabric would deliver its benefits for 100 years or more but is extremely costly when installed as a retrofit upgrade. The most effective way to reduce carbon emissions is to reduce heat loss at source as the first priority.

It is a national scandal that the Government, having announced a 2050 zero carbon target, is now consulting on plans effectively allowing poorly insulated homes to be built for another five years at least whilst further limiting the ability of local authorities to intervene. If building regulations are to have primacy in setting sustainability standards, these must encourage a 'fabric first' approach and the highest possible standards of insulation.

This Council authorises officers to write to the Ministry for Housing, Local Government and Communities to express these concerns.

16 (c) Standing in the name of Councillor Dr. Ian Sollom

Councillor Dr. Ian Sollom moved the following motion, as set out in the agenda:

"South Cambridgeshire District Council is proud of its efforts to tackle discrimination in all its forms and we condemn racism and antisemitism of any form. Following the Council's very moving ceremony led by Cllr Cahn on Holocaust Memorial Day, and as part of the Council's ongoing equalities work we resolve to adopt the internationally recognised International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) guidelines on antisemitism, which define antisemitism as:-

'a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred towards Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward

Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.’

The guidelines highlight various manifestations and are accessible at:-

<https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/working-definition-antisemitism>

This Council underlines its condemnation of all forms of racism and religious discrimination in all its manifestations and adopts the IHRA definition of antisemitism as the working model for challenging and confronting incidents of this form of discrimination.”

Councillor Heather Williams seconded this motion.

Councillor Dr. Sollom stated that this was a timely motion as it marked the 75th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz and the fourth year in a row that the number of nationally recorded anti-Semitic hate crimes had increased.

Councillor Heather Williams supported the motion and stated that all hate crimes needed to be tackled. Councillor Nick Wright agreed and praised the “Reflections” event held by a local Iman who pulled Members together in prayers and thoughts.

Councillor Deborah Roberts spoke in favour of the motion. She stated that her home city of York had a dubious anti-Semitic past and warned that anti-Semitism was on the rise across Europe.

Both Councillor Phillip Allen and Councillor Gavin Clayton stated that they had visited Auschwitz and recommended the educational experience to everyone. Councillor Martin Cahn commented that he had lost family members in the holocaust, which had many non-Jewish victims. He asserted that the key was to respect the views of others, even those you disagreed with.

By affirmation, Council

RESOLVED

South Cambridgeshire District Council is proud of its efforts to tackle discrimination in all its forms and we condemn racism and antisemitism of any form. Following the Council’s very moving ceremony led by Cllr Cahn on Holocaust Memorial Day, and as part of the Council’s ongoing equalities work we resolve to adopt the internationally recognised International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) guidelines on antisemitism, which define antisemitism as:-

‘a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred towards Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.’

The guidelines highlight various manifestations and are accessible at:-

<https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/working-definition-antisemitism>

This Council underlines its condemnation of all forms of racism and religious discrimination in all its manifestations and adopts the IHRA definition of antisemitism as the working model for challenging and confronting incidents of this form of discrimination.

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

Councillor Dr. Martin Cahn moved the following motion, as set out in the agenda:

“South Cambridgeshire District Council has no close links to other local authorities in Europe, either through membership of European local authority networks or through twinning arrangements. The Government insists that we are leaving the European Union, but not Europe, and it would seem an appropriate moment to emphasise that in South Cambridgeshire, at least, the desire for close links to Europe remains. The adjoining districts of both Fenland and Cambridge are twinned with European local authorities, as are Bourn, Comberton, the Fen Edge villages, Foxton, the Shelfords/Stapleford and Sawston as well as Huntingdon, St Ives, Ely and Soham Town Councils and Burwell Parish Council in adjoining districts.

Withdrawal from the EU also does not mean that we are necessarily withdrawing from all European programmes. The EU’s Interreg programmes promote interaction with local authorities across borders, including its external borders, and the North Sea, North West Europe and UK-Northern France programmes are currently open to Cambridgeshire. One can anticipate that the UK Government, if it is to keep to its promises, will continue to fund participation in these, but for South Cambridgeshire to do this it is necessary to build links with local authorities in Europe.

The development of such twinning links is generally done through the establishment of a twinning association. The twinning budget of Cambridge, which is twinned with both Heidelberg and Szeged, is £8140 including grants to the two twinning associations. Membership of international networks is generally more expensive than this, but may allow the development of more connections.

This Council notes the lack of international links in South Cambridgeshire and proposes that this Council:

- 1) emphasises our commitment to pan-European activity by European local authorities.
- 2) supports the development of links with European local authorities in order to maintain our links with our counterparts in Europe following withdrawal from the European Union.
- 3) calls upon the Cabinet to:
 - a. examine in more detail potential means of increasing our own links with European local authorities and localities, examining the costs

- and the benefits, and report back.
- b. examine means of supporting and promoting the development of European links by the parish and town councils in the District.”

Councillor Gavin Clayton seconded the motion.

Councillor Dr. Cahn expressed his surprise at the fact that the District Council was not twinned with another authority, when Fenland District Council, Cambridge City Council and many parish councils had twinned with suitable authorities from overseas.

Councillor Nick Wright proposed and Councillor Deborah Roberts seconded that the motion be amended to allow twinings with authorities from any nation and not just those from Europe. Councillor Cahn did not accept this amendment.

Councillor Heather Williams stated that in its current guise the motion could appear to be anti-Brexit and it was time to move on. Councillor Deborah Roberts explained that the world had changed and links should be established with authorities from the Commonwealth.

Councillor Steve Hunt explained that the UK's relationship with the European Union had changed and this motion could help to maintain friendly relations. He stated that it was easier to visit European nations than many of the nations from the Commonwealth.

Councillor Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya spoke in favour of the proposal that twinings should be international.

Councillor Phillip Allen pointed out that amending the motion by substituting the word “European” with “world” would not make grammatical sense in many instances.

A vote was held on the amendment and was cast as follows:

In favour (8):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Against (21):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Brian Milnes, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Abstain (0):

The Chairman declared the amendment **LOST**.

Council then voted on the substantive motion and votes were cast as follows:

In favour (21):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Brian Milnes, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Against (8):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Abstain (0):

Council

RESOLVED

South Cambridgeshire District Council has no close links to other local authorities in Europe, either through membership of European local authority networks or through twinning arrangements. The Government insists that we are leaving the European Union, but not Europe, and it would seem an appropriate moment to emphasise that in South Cambridgeshire, at least, the desire for close links to Europe remains. The adjoining districts of both Fenland and Cambridge are twinned with European local authorities, as are Bourn, Comberton, the Fen Edge villages, Foxton, the Shelfords/Stapleford and Sawston as well as Huntingdon, St Ives, Ely and Soham Town Councils and Burwell Parish Council in adjoining districts.

Withdrawal from the EU also does not mean that we are necessarily withdrawing from all European programmes. The EU's Interreg programmes promote interaction with local authorities across borders, including its external borders, and the North Sea, North West Europe and UK-Northern France programmes are currently open to Cambridgeshire. One can anticipate that the UK Government, if it is to keep to its promises, will continue to fund participation in these, but for South Cambridgeshire to do this it is necessary to build links with local authorities in Europe.

The development of such twinning links is generally done through the establishment of a twinning association. The twinning budget of Cambridge, which is twinned with both Heidelberg and Szeged, is £8140 including grants to the two twinning associations. Membership of international networks is generally more expensive than this, but may allow the development of more connections.

This Council notes the lack of international links in South Cambridgeshire and proposes that this Council:

- 1) emphasises our commitment to pan-European activity by European local authorities.
- 2) supports the development of links with European local authorities in order

to maintain our links with our counterparts in Europe following withdrawal from the European Union.

3) calls upon the Cabinet to:

- a. examine in more detail potential means of increasing our own links with European local authorities and localities, examining the costs and the benefits, and report back.
- b. examine means of supporting and promoting the development of European links by the parish and town councils in the District.

16 (e) Standing in the name of Councillor Heather Williams

Councillor Heather Williams moved the following motion, as set out in the agenda:

“That this Council opposes congestion charging in Cambridge.”

The motion was seconded by Councillor Tom Bygott.

Councillor Heather Williams stated that the infrastructure was not in place to provide alternative forms of transport, which made the District’s residents reliant on their cars to visit Cambridge. She added that having energy efficient cars was expensive and not a practical choice for most people. She warned that tradespeople would be unfairly penalised, as using public transport was not an option.

Councillor Tom Bygott suggested that the solution to congestion was to have viable alternatives and a congestion charge was treating the symptom not the cause of the problem. He recommended that the Council support the installing of more charge points for electric cars. He warned that it had been suggested that City residents be exempt from the charge, which would then fall on the District’s residents.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, recommended that the Council reject this motion, which would commit the authority to opposing the congestion charge before the issue was properly discussed. She supported evidence based decision making.

Councillor Eileen Wilson stated that congestion charging was an option and could be used to fund better public transport, which was needed with the extra development being planned.

Councillor Deborah Roberts stated that cars were a necessity for rural residents and it was unlikely that public transport would ever become a viable alternative for most of the District’s residents.

Councillor Nick Wright stated that according to London Transport the cost of financing a congestion charge made up approximately three quarters of the income, so a Cambridge congestion charge was unlikely to provide significant funds for alternatives to the car.

Councillor Dr. Aiden Van de Weyer assured the Council that at this stage there were no firm plans for a congestion charge and that the Greater Cambridge Partnership was reviewing all available options.

A vote was taken and were cast as follows:

In favour (8):

Councillors Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya, Tom Bygott, Graham Cone, Sue Ellington, Mark Howell, Deborah Roberts, Heather Williams and Nick Wright.

Against (21):

Councillors Philip Allen, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Dr. Martin Cahn, Gavin Clayton, Dr. Claire Daunton, Clare Delderfield, Peter Fane, Neil Gough, Geoff Harvey, Dr. Tumi Hawkins, Steve Hunt, Tony Mason, Brian Milnes, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Dr. Ian Sollom, Dr. Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Eileen Wilson.

Abstain (0):

The Chairman declared this motion to be **LOST**.

17. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

Council noted the Chairman's engagements since the last Council meeting, as set out in the agenda.

18. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chairman moved and Councillor Dr. Claire Daunton seconded:

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that, if present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended).

Council, by affirmation

RESOLVED:

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that, if present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended).

19. MINUTES (EXEMPT)

Council agreed the Minute of the meeting held on 28 November 2019, which contained exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), which had been circulated

to Members of the Council only.

Councillor John Williams reported that the Council had now purchased the property at Cambridge Science Park referred to in the minute.

20. **THIRD PARTY LOAN**

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of Council, introduced this item, which sought approval for a 3rd party loan.

Councillor Dr. Shrobona Bhattacharya proposed an amendment to the recommendation, to include the following paragraph:
“Agree that the Council will not seek to make profit on the community scheme, thus any profit made via interest after costs will be given back to the third party to better youth provision.”

The Leader seconded the amendment, which was accepted without debate.

Councillor Nick Wright and Councillor Mark Howell thanked the Leader for accepting the amendment. Councillor Howell reported that it was often more difficult for community organisations to raise revenue funding.

Councillor Dr. Tumi Hawkins expressed support for the loan, which would also benefit residents surrounding villages.

The Leader proposed and Councillor John Williams seconded the amended recommendations.

Council by affirmation

RESOLVED to

- (a) Approve an investment of up to the sum stated in the exempt report by way of a 3rd party loan on the basis of the terms referred to in that exempt report.
- (b) Approve the requirement for a formal legal agreement between the Council and the third party as laid out in the exempt report.
- (c) Agree that the Council will not seek to make profit on the community scheme, thus any profit made via interest after costs will be given back to the third party to better youth provision.

The Meeting ended at 8.15 p.m.
