


(185)

187

May Richard

From: PETER TOPPING []
Sent: 05 July 2008 09:44
To: May Richard
Cc: Cllr Edwards Simon
Subject: notice of motion

Richard

I should like to submit the following notice of motion in time for it to be considered and voted on at the next full council meeting :

'Council considers that the current Standing Order 4.1(b) preventing substitution by Executive (Cabinet) members on committees is unduly restrictive and should be removed. The rule was introduced for consistency with the rule preventing Executive Members from sitting as ordinary members of committees. In several cases, application of this rule has prevented full attendance at committees which could otherwise have been achieved through substitution by experienced Councillors who have received the appropriate training. Such a situation is damaging for local democracy and has the potential to detract from the overall quality of decisions, therefore this Council resolves that Standing Order 4.1(b) be deleted.'

Please advise me if there is anything else I need to do

Regards

Peter

Peter Topping

Personal Telephone and Mobile



(186)

(188)

May Richard

From: Sebastian Kindersley [Personal E-mail]
Sent: 07 July 2008 09:02
To: May Richard
Subject: For Next Council

Richard - can you please arrange for these to be added to Council's Agenda:

Motion:

This Council deplores the appointment of a non-Executive Councillor to represent this Council's interests at the East of England Regional Assembly.

Proposed by me, seconded by Cllr Williams.

Question:

During the 2008 election campaign the Conservatives highlighted the importance of saving our Post Offices from closure. Now that the list of Post Offices selected for closure is in the public domain could the Conservative Executive please tell Council exactly what steps are being taken by the Conservatives to save the South Cambridgeshire Post Offices from closure? I would appreciate full timings and costings. In addition, an indication how much officer time the Conservatives intend to focus on this important issue (and election commitment) would be useful.

Thanks - Sebastian

Motion to Council

(187)

(189)

Mrs Roberts (Signature)

Standing in the name of all.

That this Council is greatly concerned on the effect to ~~the~~ its reputation following the disclosures that cabinet members very public pronouncements regarding its policy and procedures on bin collection have proven not to have been true.

8/7/2008

Motion standing in the name of Councillor RE Barrett

This Council notes:

- (1) That blind people experience significant barriers to independent mobility.
- (2) That blind people are often isolated and find it difficult to access basic services without mobility assistance;
- (3) That many blind residents in this authority area find it difficult to access shops, supermarkets, doctors, dentists and community facilities and centres.
- (4) Our blind residents find it difficult to access many Council services ranging from housing to voting without mobility support and face additional costs as a result, such as using taxis or private hire vehicles.

This Council further notes:

- (1) That blind people are not entitled to the higher rate mobility component of disability living allowance
- (2) Loss of usable light causes significant independent mobility problems and incurs significant additional and unmet costs
- (3) That blind people are in many parts of England excluded from social care support because their needs are not considered 'critical' or 'substantial'.

This Council resolves:

- (1) To ask the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, the Rt Hon James Purnell MP, expressing these concerns.
- (2) To ask the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council to write to MPs representing the district requesting that they sign up to Early Day Motion number 1982 (submitted by Sir John Butterfield MP) and write to the Secretary of State expressing these concerns.
- (3) To support the Royal National Institute of Blind People's (RNIB) campaign on securing the higher rate mobility component of DLA for blind people.

(189)

(191)

Motion 116

Adams Patrick

From: nigel cathcart [Personal E-mail]
Sent: 15 September 2008 17:37
To: Cllr Cathcart Nigel
Cc: Adams Patrick
Subject: Re: Motion to Council

The motion should now read:

HOUSING FUTURES

We are concerned that the case presented to our tenants both in writing and at tenants meetings is too skewed in favour of transfer and we feel that the Council is under an obligation to present a balanced case with arguments both for and against transfer.

The Council will therefore ensure that in all future communications with tenants equal weight will be given to the advantages and disadvantages of remaining with SCDC and the disadvantages and advantages of transferring to a housing association. In particular the following points need to be highlighted as they have not been given sufficient weight in previous communications;

- a) A housing association may face difficulties in repaying the loan needed to buy the houses from SCDC and may find this and the payment of the interest on the loan more urgent than financing repairs and the maintenance of the houses
- b) The uncertainty generated for tenants by having a weaker form of tenure
- c) The strong possibility that a housing association may adopt a more ruthless approach in contrast to the "public sector ethos" of the Council
- d) With a housing association there is likely to be a need to dismantle an existing functioning and trusted system of relations between housing staff and tenants and members and replace it with a new one in which the close personal contact is unlikely to be the same.
- e) Housing is very long term and even if a stand alone housing association were formed initially, there is no certainty that this would remain and it may end up being part of a much larger and more remote housing group.
- f) Transfer of the housing stock would be an irrevocable decision

— Original Message —

From: nigel.cathcart
To: patrick.adams@scambs.gov.uk
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2008 5:03 PM
Subject: Motion to Council

The following alterations need to be made to the motion I left at the Council this morning:
 1) point a) to be replaced by the following

a) A housing association may face difficulties in repaying the loan needed to buy the houses from SCDC and may find this and the payment of the interest on the loan more urgent than financing repairs and the maintenance of the houses

2. Point c) to be replaced by the following

c) The strong possibility that a housing association may adopt a more ruthless approach in contrast to the "public sector ethos" of the Council

Adams Patrick

From: Senior Ian on behalf of Democratic Services
Sent: 17 September 2008 10:03
To: Adams Patrick
Subject: FW: Questions for Council meeting

Importance: High

Patrick

Was this received too late? I haven't replied....

Ian

-----Original Message-----

From: Dr D.R. de Lacey [mailto:Personal E-mail] On Behalf Of Dr DR de Lacey
Sent: 16 September 2008 21:37
To: Democratic Services
Subject: Questions for Council meeting

FAO Richard May

Richard

I would like to ask a Question, and propose a Motion, for the next Council meeting.

1. Question:

Does the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services consider that the following is the right way to write a Sustainable Transport Policy:

- a. Introduce a "Travel to Work Plan" to encourage staff to cycle despite the fact that most live too far from Cambourne (which is not well served by cycle facilities) for this to be feasible, or use buses when the bus service is almost non-existent;
- b. Provide lockers for cyclists but neither showers nor adequate changing facilities;
- c. Have one, but only one, "cycle to work day";
- d. Encourage motor-cycling which is not particularly sustainable nor safe;
- e. Having paid lip service to sustainability, significantly increase the size of our car park?

2. Motion

Motion 119

In the Risk Log for Housing Futures presented to the last Portfolio Holder's meeting, Risk no. 07 is stated to be "Inaccurate information is disseminated to tenants", and the stated countermeasure is to "refer to the Advertising Standards Authority *any* material that is false and/or misleading". A leaflet was issued by South Cambs Against Transfers (SCAT) which among other things includes a quotation from Cllr Scarr: "Tenant reps. on housing association boards are a con. By law they must act in the interests of the company, and they are clearly told that they cannot act on behalf of tenants".

The response labelled "FACT NOT FICTION" issued by the Housing Futures Management Team to all our tenants clearly presents the SCAT leaflet as false and/or misleading. In particular it brands Cllr Scarr's contribution as "fiction". Either this council owes Cllr Scarr an apology or some action needs to be taken.

Therefore:

This Council agrees to refer the SCAT leaflet to the Advertising Standards Authority.

Adams Patrick

Motion 11d)

~~193~~

193



From: Senior Ian
Sent: 16 September 2008 08:53
To: Adams Patrick
Subject: FW: Question for full council - REPLACEMENT

Importance: High

FYI

Ian

-----Original Message-----

From: stephen harangozo [mailto:  Personal E-mail]
Sent: 15 September 2008 21:07
To: Senior Ian
Cc: ; Moody Guy; Jennings Maggie
Subject: Question for full council

Dear Ian

Please could you withdraw the question I submitted last week for next week's full council.

We would now like to submit the following MOTION:

Given that the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 received enthusiastic cross-party support in Parliament, we propose that SCDC should opt in to the Act by the date specified in the letter of invitation (expected shortly) given by the Secretary of State, in order to further sustainable living in South Cambridgeshire.

Standing in the name of councillors Dr S Harangozo and A Berent.

Adams Patrick

Moiz (e)

(192) (194)

From: James Hockney [Personal E-mail]
Sent: 16 September 2008 08:53
To: Adams Patrick
Subject: Fw: Motion
Importance: High

Dear Patrick,

As Richard is out of the Office I am sending this to you..

----- Original Message -----

From: James Hockney
To: richard.may@scambs.gov.uk
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2008 8:47 AM
Subject: Fw: Motion

Dear Richard,

I would like to put forward the following motion at Full Council;

"This Council fully supports the principle of erecting a statue at a suitable location in Cambridge City to celebrate the life of Snowy Farr."

I will let you know who is the seconder later.

Best Regards

James Hockney

(193) (195)

Motion 193 (See attached)

Adams Patrick

From: Mike Mason [Personal E-mail]
Sent: 17 September 2008 00:14
To: Adams Patrick
Subject: [Fwd: NOTICE OF QUESTION AND NOTICE OF MOTION]
Attachments: Council Meeting 25th September 2008.doc



Council Meeting
25th September...

Dear Patrick,

Having had an out of office reply from Richard I now re-submit to yourself and would be obliged if you could acknowledge receipt.

Regards Mike Mason

----- Original Message -----
Subject: NOTICE OF QUESTION AND NOTICE OF MOTION
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 23:43:47 +0100
From: Mike Mason <[Personal E-mail]>
To: May Richard <Richard.May@scams.gov.uk>

Dear Richard,

I attach a copy of the notices required for the meeting of Council on 25th September.

Kind regards Mike Mason

Council Meeting 25th September 2008

Notice of Question from Cllr. M. J. Mason

Hearing Loops at Cambourne.

With reference to my statement to Council in July and the coming Customer Service Event, can Portfolio Holder please update council on the current position with the maintenance and repair contract for the infra red hearing loop system installed in the Council chamber, mezzanine gallery, Swansley and Monkfield rooms? What arrangements have been made for testing and when is this likely to be carried out and will the contract include the issue of instruction manuals for staff in the use of the portable induction loops held at reception?

Mason 11/8
Notice of Motion standing in the name of Cllr. M. J. Mason

Council, whilst noting the intention of Cambridgeshire Horizons to hold a lunchtime seminar for members, expresses extreme disquiet concerning the effect of the current economic downturn, on the delivery of the new communities in the Cambridge Sub Region and requests that briefing and discussion on 9th October be primarily directed towards dealing with the current crisis rather than planning for unrealistic and unsustainable growth in the medium to long term.

(96)

196

May Richard

From: roger hall [**Personal E-mail**]
Sent: 13 November 2008 14:48
To: May Richard
Subject: Questions and Motion to the Council on 26 November

Question

Considering that the Electoral Arrangements Committee accepted the recommendation of the Arbury Park Scrutiny Review that a new Parish Council for the development called the Orchard Park Community Council should be put in place as soon as possible, which was confirmed by this Council on 25th September, why have councillors only recently been informed that this is not possible before April next year?

Question

When are Section 215 orders being taken out against developers house builders at Orchard Park who leave building sites incomplete and untidy leaving them prone to acts of theft and vandalism?

Motion

In the village of Dry Drayton, the local pub., the Black Horse, has recently closed and residents are concerned as to the long-term future of its school. This Council, therefore, welcomes proposals to build affordable housing for local people in our villages so that they will continue to be inhabited by people across the age range and village facilities will remain open and viable.

Roger Hall



May Richard

From: Sebastian Kindersley [Personal E-mail]
Sent: 02 January 2009 09:53
To: May Richard
Subject: Motion for next Council
Attachments: about-this-email.txt

Richard - Happy New Year - please would you put this on the Agenda for next Council - proposed by me. Ta!

This Council notes the Government's plans to introduce ID cards. This scheme will impact all South Cambridgeshire resident's lives.

This Council believes:

- 1) That the disadvantages of such a scheme will outweigh any likely benefits to the people of South Cambridgeshire.
- 2) That the scheme will do little, if anything, to prevent terrorism, crime or fraud.
- 3) That the national database that underpins the identity card scheme may facilitate criminal fraud, terrorism and potential state abuses of human rights.
- 4) That the ID card and database proposals are likely to fundamentally alter the relationship between the state and the individual.

According to Government estimates, the cost of such a scheme could reach £7.5 billion, with independent commentators predicting substantially higher costs. As the current plan stands South Cambridgeshire residents will be required to pay £93 for a passport and ID card together.

This Council resolves to:

- 1) affiliate to the 'No2ID' campaign, which already includes MPs and several political parties
- 2) make representations at every possible stage, reiterating this Council's opposition to ID cards
- 3) take no part in any pilot scheme or feasibility work in relation to the introduction of the national identity cards
- 4) make it a policy of the council to ensure that national identity cards would not be required to access council services or benefits unless specifically required to do so by law
- 5) only co-operate with the national identity card scheme where to do otherwise would be unlawful.

Ends

South Cambridgeshire District Council
Meeting of Council 29th January 2009

Notice of Motion standing in the name of

Councillor M.J.Mason

Council takes note of the statements concerning the delivery of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway by the County Council, in its Cabinet Report of 16 December 2008, in its publication entitled Weathering the Storm dated January 2009 and in its Press Release dated 12 January 2009.

Council formally requests that our Joint Planning partners publish a report giving full and complete details of the delays to service commencement and the financial implications for Cambridgeshire Council Tax Payers, as a result of borrowing the money to complete the construction programme.

199

~~197~~

May Richard

From: Tom Bygott [Personal E-mail]
Sent: 16 February 2009 21:25
To: May Richard
Cc: Peter Topping
Subject: Motion for full council

Dear Richard,

I would like to submit the following motion for the next full council meeting on 26th February:

This Council believes that the proposal of a Congestion Charge or workplace parking charge would be against the best interests of the residents of South Cambridgeshire.

Any form of charging would be unfair to those who travel into Cambridge compared to those who live in the city, and could lead to a loss of employment and the closure of shops and other businesses.

We believe that improvements to public transport should be made - and given time to work - before any form of charging is even considered.

Proposer: Cllr Thomas Bygott
Secunder: Cllr Peter Topping

Thanks,

Tom

Thomas Bygott
SCDC Councillor for Girton

Personal Address

~~198~~

200

Motion to the Council April 2009

The Local Government Association has recently identified over 100 words and phrases that councillors and officers should resist using and replace them with plain English. At a time when the chasm between local government and those electing it is widening, such a step should be welcomed. The use of jargon and council-speak serves only to alienate taxpayers and members of the public. This Council urges councillors and officers to take note of this report and strike out jargon and council-speak before documents are released for public view.