

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 24 September 2009 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Charles Nightingale – Chairman
Councillor Tony Orgee – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Frances Amrani, David Bard, Richard Barrett, Val Barrett, John Batchelor, Trisha Bear, Nigel Bolitho, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Neil Davies, Douglas de Lacey, Jaime Dipple, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Janice Guest, Steve Harangozo, Sally Hatton, Liz Heazell, James Hockney, Mark Howell, Sebastian Kindersley, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Robin Martlew, Mike Mason, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, David Morgan, Lorraine Morgan, Cicely Murfitt, Alex Riley, Neil Scarr, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Julia Squier, Jim Stewart, Richard Summerfield, Peter Topping, Robert Turner, Susan van de Ven, Bunty Waters, John Williams, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright

Officers:	Alex Colyer	Executive Director, Corporate Services
	Steve Hampson	Executive Director, Operational Services
	Greg Harlock	Chief Executive
	Fiona McMillan	Senior Lawyer
	Richard May	Democratic Services Manager

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Anthony Berent, David Bird, Roger Hall, Peter Johnson and Deborah Roberts.

PRESENTATIONS

Presentation of badges to past Chairman of the Council

The Chairman of Council presented a Past Chairman's Badge to former Councillor Mr. Ken Collett, Chairman of the Council between 1983-1985.

Smoke-free Gold Award

Councillor SM Edwards, Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder, presented the Gold National Clean Air Award to the Chairman of the Council. The award recognised the Council's outstanding commitment in providing a tobacco smoke-free environment to protect the health, safety and well-being of all who entered Council premises. Council was advised that a similar award would be presented at the Waterbeach Depot.

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Dr DR Bard, D de Lacey, SGM Kindersley, DC McCraith and AG Orgee declared personal non-prejudicial interests in Agenda item 9 (North West Cambridge Area Action Plan) as Members of the Cambridge Fringes Joint Development Control Committee. Given that the interests were not prejudicial, and in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors, they remained in the meeting and took part in the discussions and voting. Councillor TJ Wotherspoon declared a similar interest as an alternative (substitute) member of this committee.

The following Councillors also declared personal non-prejudicial interests in Agenda item

9 (North West Cambridge Area Action Plan):

- Councillor Mrs FAR Amrani, whose husband was a member of the Cambridge University.
- Councillor Mrs SA Hatton, whose son was a Researcher at the Cambridge University.
- Councillor Dr D de Lacey, as a member of the Cambridge University
- Councillor TD Bygott, as a member of the Cambridge University.

Given that the interests were not prejudicial, and in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors, they remained in the meeting and took part in the discussions and voting.

Councillor SGM Kindersley declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda item 7(a) (Barrington: Review of Community Governance Arrangements) as an elected Cambridgeshire County Councillor whose division covered Barrington. Given that the interest was not prejudicial, and in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors, he remained in the meeting and took part in the discussions and voting.

41. MINUTES

Council **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 July 2009 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the inclusion of Councillor FWM Burkitt within the list of Councillors whose apologies for absence had been submitted, an amendment to Minute 28(a) to state that, in his absence, the Chairman had put the question standing in Councillor Burkitt's name, and an amendment to Minute 28(f) (Question by Councillor SGM Kindersley to the Housing Portfolio Holder) to refer to an 'elected tenant participation management board', deleting reference to Elected Member representation.

42. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- Thanking Councillors who had attended his Reception.
- Doubling the fine levied on Councillors whose mobile telephones sounded during Council meetings to £10, to be paid as a donation to the Chairman's Charity.
- Advising that a dedicated Chairman's page on the Council's public website had been launched ([link to www.scams.gov.uk](http://www.scams.gov.uk))
- Collection boxes were available to raise funds for the Chairman's charity; the Councillor who returned the heaviest box would receive a bottle of champagne. Lapel badges were also available at £3 each, proceeds from which would be given to the Chairman's charity.

43. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND THE PUBLIC**43 (a) From Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt to the Leader of the Council**

Councillor Mrs CAED Murfitt asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

In the recent IDeA Members' Guide 'Top tips for making savings through better procurement in professional services', Members are told it is their role to ask three

fundamental questions. The questions are as follows:

- What are we spending on temporary agency staff and consultancy?
- Do we have a co-ordinated corporate approach to procuring and managing these contracts?
- Are we collaborating with others, regionally and nationally, to gain efficiencies and implement best practice?

Please can the Leader of the Council advise whether answers are available for these questions and, if not, when Members can expect to receive satisfactory answers?

Councillor RMA Manning, Leader of the Council, advised that he had read the same article. Before providing figures, he requested clarification on the time period over which the information was required, and the level of detail sought. For example, should the definition of temporary agency staff include refuse loaders providing Christmas cover and staff covering maternity leave, and should 'consultancy' include work such as that undertaken by the Environment Agency in respect of Covell's Drain, or that reimbursed partly or wholly by outside organisations such as Cambridgeshire Horizons? It was likely that the detailed scoping of such a report would entail a substantial time commitment. The Leader requested that Councillor Murfitt and other Councillors should focus their attention on providing ongoing challenge to the Council's approach to agency and consultancy costs through their contributions to debates at Cabinet, Portfolio Holders' meetings and Scrutiny and Overview Committee. Councillors' suggestions for alternative courses of action would be welcomed and considered.

In terms of regional collaboration, the Leader advised that the Making Cambridgeshire Count project had commenced, under the terms of which all relevant service providers in the county would examine how the £1.85 billion annual funding was allocated, to enable them to work together to ensure it was spent most efficiently and effectively.

By way of a Supplementary Question, Councillor Mrs. Murfitt requested relevant information relating to the current financial year. The Leader of the Council responded that he was happy to provide this information, and would discuss details with Councillor Murfitt outside of the meeting.

43 (b) From Councillor Mrs FAR Amrani to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Mrs FAR Amrani asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

'With all the discussion of cutbacks we are hearing about in various Council meetings and the local press, everyone is aware that the Council is facing a huge financial crisis. Most householders know, when faced with debts, you can address the problem by reducing spending and increasing income. Can the Leader expand on what sustainable revenue raising measures the Council is planning to adopt to counterbalance the current spending-cut strategy?'

Councillor RMA Manning, Leader of the Council, advised that the option for the Council to increase income and reduce spending was restricted by its requirement to provide services. Its biggest sources of income, for example those from planning fees, had reduced significantly as a result of the current economic downturn, whilst the Council owned no assets such as car parks from which additional income could be generated. In these circumstances, the Council sought to seek efficiencies in the ways it provided services, a process which included ongoing investigation of potential shared services

with other local authorities.

By way of a Supplementary question, Councillor Amrani requested that the Leader and Portfolio Holder establish a task group to explore innovative methods of raising income which might be gained from initiatives such as web advertising or sponsorship. The Leader of the Council thanked Councillor Amrani for her suggestions and advised that she and the Finance Staffing Portfolio Holder had noted her request to establish such a group.

43 (c) From Councillor RE Barrett to the New Communities Portfolio Holder

Councillor RE Barrett asked the New Communities Portfolio Holder the following question:

Please could the Portfolio Holder comment on the progress in obtaining off-site contributions towards recreation and public open space since the Public Open Space Supplementary Planning Document was adopted in January 2009?

Councillor Dr DR Bard, New Communities Portfolio Holder, advised that contributions of £168,649 had been received since the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in January 2009. Developer contributions were sought at a typical level of £3,000 per three-bedroom dwelling, and were available to parish councils to fund specific local projects. The Portfolio Holder stated that he did not consider that parish councils were sufficiently aware of the scheme to have secured maximum benefit from it, before advising that he had undertaken to address this through regular updates to parish councils, the inclusion of a fact sheet within parish planning packs and an information item which he hoped to place on the agenda for the next meeting of the local association of parish councils.

Councillor Barrett thanked the Portfolio Holder for his answer, stating that he welcomed proposals to provide additional information on the scheme.

43 (d) From Councillor Dr SEK van de Ven to the Planning Portfolio Holder and the Chairman of the Planning Committee

Councillor Dr SEK van de Ven asked the Planning Portfolio Holder the following question:

The Planning Portfolio Holder would agree, I am sure, that changes to Chairman's Delegation would affect all parishes and, consequently, all Members. Given that there has been no offer of a member workshop to discuss concerns or any new proposals, please would he and the Chairman of the Planning Committee therefore guarantee that all members' opinions will be heard either in person (or failing that in writing) at the Planning Committee meeting on 7 October 2009?

Councillor van de Ven thanked the Portfolio Holder for allowing a full debate at his meeting on 1 September.

Councillor NIC Wright thanked Councillor van de Ven for her question and positive feedback. He had intended a full debate at the meeting on 1 September, but had been disappointed that more parish than district councillors had attended. Councillor Wright advised that the Chairman's Delegation Meeting was very unpopular with parish councils for a number of reasons. A report, summarising the key arguments, would be submitted to the Planning Committee on 7 October, at which the Committee would take a decision

on the future of such meetings. In essence, the two principal options involved abolition or significant revisions to the format to increase transparency. Councillor Wright understood that opportunities for all Members to contribute to the discussion would be given at the Planning Committee meeting.

43 (e) From Councillor Dr SA Harangozo to the Leader of the Council

Councillor Dr SA Harangozo asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

Does the Leader intend writing to the Minister for Energy and Climate Change to support substantial and binding cuts in international CO2 emissions at the Copenhagen Climate Change summit and, if not, please could he explain why?

Councillor RMA Manning, Leader of the Council, stated that he considered local actions to be the key to combating climate change; however, in the apparent absence of co-ordinated international action, it was important for the Council to lobby government as best it could. The Leader suggested that Councillor Harangozo discuss the issue with the Climate Change, Sustainability and Procurement Portfolio Holder, with a view to drafting a joint letter from all three councillors.

Councillor Dr Harangozo thanked the Leader for his positive response. He reiterated that, without a binding international agreement in respect of cuts in CO2 emissions, the Council would be in a harder position in its attempts to tackle climate change.

Councillor TD Bygott, Climate Change, Sustainability and Procurement Portfolio Holder, stated that he was happy to discuss the issue and sign the letter as suggested by the Leader. He advised that the threat posed by climate change could not be ignored, especially given Cambridgeshire's particular vulnerability to rising sea levels.

43 (f) From Councillor JD Batchelor to the Housing Portfolio Holder

Councillor JD Batchelor asked the Housing Portfolio Holder the following question:

In view of local concerns over the decision to sell-off Council property at Frog End, Shepreth, has consideration been given to including an "up-lift" clause in any sales contract allowing the Council Tax payers of SCDC to benefit from the sale of any subsequent development?

Councillor MP Howell, Housing Portfolio Holder, advised that, having taken advice from legal services and the Council's Valuers, an up-lift clause would only be required in respect of the Frog End property in the event of the land being sold below market value.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Batchelor requested the Portfolio Holder revisit the matter, as his understanding from similar transactions involving the county council was that up-lifts could be applied in situations such as Frog End in which a future developer could achieve huge net profit.

The Portfolio Holder replied the ultimate benefit from such clauses on commercial land was negated through a short-term drop in value; however, he undertook to liaise with colleagues at the county council with a view to clarifying the matter further.

43 (g) From Councillor DH Morgan to the New Communities Portfolio Holder

Councillor DH Morgan asked the New Communities Portfolio Holder the following question:

Why has the recently-adopted Open Space Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) not made any reference to a requirement for a minimum separation distance between play areas and housing despite representations during the consultation on the draft policy that play areas were being built far too close to homes in new communities, in particular Cambourne, leading to numerous complaints received by the Parish Council, Housing Associations and Police from residents about the noise of children screaming and anti-social behaviour?

Councillor Dr DR Bard, New Communities Portfolio Holder, advised that page 23 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document set out a schedule of separation distances. Councillor Bard was aware of the issue in Cambourne, advising that staff were working with the parish council to address local concerns. He advised that, in all developments, a balance needed to be struck between the noise and disturbance caused to neighbouring properties by play areas in close proximity, and the dangers of bullying and other anti-social which were more likely to be undetected in isolated locations; in each case, however, consultation took place with the parish council and residents in order to resolve such issues at the planning stage.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Morgan requested that the Portfolio Holder ensure the Council maintained a robust position in negotiations with developers to ensure that minimum distances were complied with in respect of playgrounds. Referring to the Upper Cambourne site, Councillor Morgan reported that the anti-social behaviour taking place at the playground in question, located 30 metres from nearby houses, might have to be dealt with by measures such as the employment of security staff to lock it each night. Such measures carried substantial cost implications.

The Portfolio Holder reminded Councillor Morgan that the location of the play area referred to had not been imposed on the local area but agreed following consultation, which had included a meeting in Cambourne held on 15 August 2009.

43 (h) From Councillor Mrs LA Morgan to the New Communities Portfolio Holder

Councillor Mrs LA Morgan asked the New Communities Portfolio Holder the following question:

Would the responsible Portfolio Holder please explain why Cambourne was included in the options to be consulted on for the provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site but without a specific location being identified?

Councillor Dr DR Bard, New Communities Portfolio Holder, advised that new communities had to be considered as possible sites to provide Gypsy and Traveller sites; however, the identification of specific locations pre-empted the master-planning process as it could constrain other potential land uses. In normal circumstances, this work would be completed prior to the first development of new sites. The consultation process was causing particular concern in Cambourne as it was an established new community.

43 (i) From Councillor FWM Burkitt to the Leader of the Council

Councillor FWM Burkitt asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

Would the Leader of the Council agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should play as active a role as possible in the current debate about traffic management in and around Cambridge?

Councillor RMA Manning, Leader of the Council, advised that the Council was already taking an active role in the debate of traffic management issue, and would be proactive in contributing to future discussions. The Leader reported that the Council supported the Chesterton Sidings rail initiative, and the provision of major improvements in traffic infrastructure through funding from the Transport Innovation Fund for measures short of a congestion charging scheme. The Leader requested that the Planning Portfolio Holder and Member Champion for Transport consider the establish of a task group with the specific remit of contributing to the county-wide debate on traffic management issues.

43 (j) From Councillor PW Topping to the Housing Portfolio Holder

Councillor PW Topping asked the Housing Portfolio Holder the following question:

Could the Portfolio holder for housing set out his assessment of the pressures faced by the Council's sheltered housing scheme, and its warden service in particular?

Councillor MP Howell, Housing Portfolio Holder, advised that pressures on the sheltered housing service arose from two sources:

1. The need to make savings within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA)
2. The need to respond to changes within the Supporting People regime.

In respect of the the HRA, income from service charges and Supported People was not sufficient to cover the current level of expenditure on the sheltered housing service. A cross subsidy from HRA rental income was required to balance the books, currently running at around £600K per year. The retention by the Council of its council homes required a saving on the HRA of around £500K to be in place by 2011/12. Cuts across all service areas were being considered, but a significant proportion of the £500K savings would have to come from the cross subsidy to sheltered housing services.

With regard to Supporting People, Councillor Howell advised that the budget managed by the County Council would be subject to cuts over the next three years. In addition there was a proposed shift of resources from services to older people to services for others with housing needs. There was also a steer from Supporting People that there would be a shift of resources from residential based services to floating support style services.

The contract to provide housing support services to the elderly was due to be competitively tendered in around 3 years time. In order to prepare the service at the Council to be able to win such a tender, work was underway now to redesign the service as a floating support model. This was intended to ensure that the resources available were targeted at those that most needed support, and were not spent on providing visits to those that did not need them.

The Council had already moved away from providing resident wardens some years ago.

The current set up involved three teams of sheltered housing officers providing a semi floating service to the sheltered housing schemes. The developing proposals would see a shift away from a scheme based service to an individually tailored support service. The role of the sheltered housing staff would therefore change, with some staff providing the support services to individual people whilst others focussed on working with groups of residents to assist with social activities in the common rooms.

Councillor Topping thanked the Portfolio Holder for his answer and stated that he had intended to invite Councillor Howell to visit the Sheltered Housing Scheme in Whittlesford; however, he would delay that invitation given the more immediate urgency of work to develop solutions to the severe challenges facing the sheltered housing service.

The Portfolio Holder stated that he had visited the Sheltered Housing scheme at Gamlingay to hear residents' concerns expressed directly, and advised that he would be happy to do similar at any scheme. He stated that the nature of the sheltered housing service, particularly the distinction between care and support, was complicated, and that he had asked for an explanatory leaflet to be prepared which would help Members explain the key issues to tenants and residents.

Councillor NJ Scarr requested that a full written answer be circulated to all Members as it had been of great assistance in outlining the key issues.

44. PETITIONS

No petitions had been submitted since the last meeting.

45. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION:

45 (a) BARRINGTON: Review of Community Governance Arrangements (Electoral Arrangements Committee, 17 September 2009)

Councillor RJ Turner proposed, Councillor SGM Kindersley seconded and Council **RESOLVED** that, having conducted a community governance review, the number of Parish Councillors on Barrington Parish Council be increased from 7 to 9.

46. CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP ANNUAL REPORT

Council received the annual report of the Climate Change Working Group.

Councillor Dr SA Harangozo, Chairman of the Climate Change Working Group, introduced the report, explaining that it sought to go beyond a mere outline of work over the previous year to set out the Council's evolving approach as a key agent in enabling climate change to be addressed, and its severest effects mitigated against, through effective partnership work with residents and businesses in the district, and with other councils and public bodies to establish and achieve a shared vision for Cambridgeshire. Dr Harangozo drew Council's attention to a forthcoming example of such an initiative, encouraging Councillors to attend a Village Energy Show at Impington Village College on Saturday 24 October, at which practical advice would be given to assist householders in saving money through cutting energy bills.

During the discussion which followed, Members thanked Councillor Harangozo and the

Council's Strategic Sustainability Officer for their work and for producing a clear and comprehensive report. The Sustainability, Procurement and Efficiency Portfolio Holder stated that he would ensure that the Council and Cabinet continued to demonstrate strong local leadership, and that he looked forward to the submission of new ideas from all Members. It was considered that a key area of focus in which the Council could have direct influence involved enforcement of stringent minimum sustainability standards on new developments, so that developers who were reluctant to implement sustainable methods of design and construction so should be obliged to do so. This could be achieved through the adoption of Supplementary Planning Guidance in respect of energy use as part of the Council's Local Development Framework.

47. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (LDF) - NORTH WEST CAMBRIDGE AREA ACTION PLAN (JOINT PLAN WITH CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL)

Council considered a report recommending adoption of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan following receipt of the Inspector's binding report. Councillor Dr DR Bard moved and Councillor RMA Manning seconded the recommendations set out at paragraph 37, stating that the Council had little choice but to adopt the plan once the Inspector's binding conclusions had been received. During debate of this item, Councillors expressed concern and dismay that key elements of the Council's work in developing a plan which maximised protection of the Green Belt and preserved the identity of the village of Girton had been overturned by the Government's Inspector who, in so doing, was acting contrary to the wishes and needs of the local community.

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- (a) **ADOPT** the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan, as contained in Appendix 2, on 22 October 2009, subject to Cambridge City Council adopting the AAP on that day, and proceed in accordance with Regulations 35 and 36.
- (b) **ADOPT** the revisions to the adopted Proposals Map, as contained in Appendix 3; and
- (c) **NOTE** the Sustainability Appraisal Adoption Statement as contained in Appendix 4.

Councillor TD Bygott requested to be recorded as voting against the Motion.

48. APPOINTMENT TO STANDARDS COMMITTEE OF A PARISH COUNCIL MEMBER 2009-2013

Council **NOTED** that, all parish and community councils and meetings in South Cambridgeshire having been invited to submit nominations for a representative to serve on the Standards Committee for the next four years, Stapleford Parish Council had nominated Mr Michael Farrar, who was returned unopposed to serve a four-year term until 7 August 2013.

49. CAMBRIDGE CITY FRINGES (SECTION 29) JOINT COMMITTEE - APPOINTMENT AND CONFIRMATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Council **RESOLVED** that Councillor NIC Wright be appointed to the Cambridge City Fringes (Section 29) Joint Committee as substitute for Councillor Dr DR Bard, and that Councillor SM Edwards be confirmed as substitute for Councillor RMA Manning on this Committee.

50. UPDATES FROM MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Councillor Mrs BZD Smith introduced a report relating to her work as the Council's representative on the Children and Young People's Partnership. In response to a question, Councillor Mrs Smith explained that the 'Big Plan' was a statutory document setting out the county council and its key partners' vision for children and young people. The two priorities of particular relevance to South Cambridgeshire District Council were to help children and young people feel safe and happy within their communities, and to meet their needs in areas experiencing growth and demographic change. The plan contained a 'Participation Ladder', the objective of which was to achieve shared decision-making with children and young people themselves. Councillor Smith advised that the Scrutiny and Overview Committee would be reviewing children and young people's issues as part of its agreed work programme.

51. NOTICES OF MOTION

51 (a) Standing in the names of Councillor Mrs EM Heazell and SGM Kindersley

Councillor Mrs EM Heazell moved and Councillor SGM Kindersley seconded a Motion in the following terms:

'Concern is mounting particularly amongst our sheltered housing residents and their families regarding our services provided for the vulnerable elderly. There is also rising public concern on this issue.

While many Council sheltered residents have found the emergency cover very satisfactory, and realise that service charges are very much lower than in the private sheltered sector, there are many apprehensions being voiced about the prospect of more change, less staff on-site hours together with increased charges / rents.

Council agrees to subject all services for the vulnerable elderly, whether provided by us or partners across the district, to a review. Such a review could be conducted by our own Scrutiny and Overview Committee, or as a pilot study by the county-wide Joint Accountability Committee.'

Councillor Mrs SM Ellington moved and Councillor JA Hockney seconded an amendment in the following terms (alterations marked in ***bold italics***):

'Concern is mounting particularly amongst our sheltered housing residents and their families regarding our services provided for the vulnerable elderly. There is also rising public concern on this issue.

While many Council sheltered residents have found the emergency cover very satisfactory, and realise that service charges are very much lower than in the private sheltered sector, there are many apprehensions being voiced about the prospect of more change, less staff on-site hours together with increased charges / rents.

Council agrees to subject all services for ***sheltered housing residents***, provided by us or by partners across the district, to a review, ***which will be conducted by a Task and Finish Group set up by the Portfolio Holder.***

The mover and seconded of the original Motion agreed, in accordance with Standing Order 14.6(b), to accept the amendment through its incorporation into their Motion. With the consent of the mover of the amendment, the original Motion stood altered

accordingly, the amendment was deemed withdrawn and debate proceeded on the Substantive Motion.

Councillor NN Cathcart moved and Councillor JH Stewart seconded an amendment in the following terms (alterations marked in ***bold italics***):

‘Concern is mounting particularly amongst our sheltered housing residents and their families regarding our services provided for the vulnerable elderly. There is also rising public concern on this issue.

While many Council sheltered residents have found the emergency cover very satisfactory, and realise that service charges are very much lower than in the private sheltered sector, there are many apprehensions being voiced about the prospect of more change, less staff on-site hours together with increased charges / rents.

Council agrees to subject all services for sheltered housing residents, provided by us or by partners across the district, to a review, ***with the objective of achieving the best possible standard of service provision***, which will be conducted by a Task and Finish Group set up by the Portfolio Holder.’

Councillor NS Davies moved, Councillor D de Lacey seconded and Council **RESOLVED**, with 40 votes in favour and 9 against, in accordance with Standing Order 14.11(a)(iii), to adjourn the debate to the next meeting.

52. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

Council noted the Chairman's engagements since the last meeting, being advised that the event on 8 August had been a charity match, not march, and that the event on 7 September at the Cambridge Preservation Society had been intended to mark this organisation's relaunch as Cambridge Past, Present and Future.

The Meeting ended at 4.52 p.m.
