

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 27 February 2014 at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor David Bard – Chairman
Councillor Sue Ellington – Vice-Chairman

Councillors: Richard Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Jonathan Chatfield, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Alison Elcox, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Tumi Hawkins, Roger Hickford, Clayton Hudson, Caroline Hunt, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Susan van de Ven, Bunty Waters, Aidan Van de Weyer, David Whiteman-Downes, John Williams, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright

Officers:	Graham Aisthorpe-Watts	Democratic Services Team Leader
	Alex Colyer	Executive Director, Corporate Services
	Jean Hunter	Chief Executive
	Fiona McMillan	Legal & Democratic Services Manager and Monitoring Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Val Barrett, Trisha Bear, Tom Bygott, Jose Hales, Mark Hersom, James Hockney, Mark Howell, Peter Johnson, Robin Page, Alex Riley and Robert Turner.

81. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Brian Burling declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in minute number 88 as a rate payer and indicated that he would leave the meeting upon consideration of this item.

Councillor Sue Ellington declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute number 88 as she was a member of the Swavesey Byeways Advisory Committee.

Councillor Roger Hickford declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute number 92(b) as a Governor of the University of Cambridge Addenbrooke's Trust.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute number 87(b) with regard to St Denis Church in East Hatley as he owned land in very close proximity to the building.

Councillor Nick Wright declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute number 92(b) as a representative on the Board of Governors at Papworth Hospital.

82. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

The Chairman reminded Members that they needed to update their register of interests whenever their circumstances changed.

83. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

84. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, reported that a Government announcement had been made in relation to Government-funded Council Tax and Business Rate relief for those residents or businesses affected by the recent flooding. The announcement stated that residents and businesses could be entitled to a three month rebate of Council Tax or Business Rates if they had experienced flooding. Residents would also be given an opportunity to apply to the Council for grant funding to assist with any necessary repairs as a result of the floods. Councillor Edwards reported that the Council was in the process of working up a scheme to facilitate applications for this grant funding and details would soon be publicised on the Council's website.

85. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No questions from the public had been received.

86. PETITIONS

No petitions for consideration at this meeting of the Council had been received.

87. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:**87 (a) Corporate Plan Priorities 2014-2019 (Cabinet, 13 February 2014)**

Councillor David Whiteman-Downes proposed that approval be given to the revised Corporate Plan, which set out the authority's vision, objectives and actions for 2014 – 2019. It was noted that the document consisted of three key areas and set out the objectives for each, what would be done to achieve them and what success looked like.

Councillor Whiteman-Downes took this opportunity to thank officers, particularly the Council's Policy and Performance Manager, for their work in producing the latest version of the Council's Corporate Plan.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, seconded the proposal.

The following comments were noted during the debate:

- no key performance indicators had been added to the Corporate Plan, so it was unclear how the objectives and actions would be measured. It was noted that key performance indicators were currently being developed;
- rather than focussing on what success looked like, the Corporate Plan should make it clear what the implications of failure would be;
- a question was raised as to why affordable housing featured in the Corporate Plan as part of the following objective, when the property company was established to enter into the private housing rental market:
 - 'develop the property company pilot scheme into a full business plan to deliver affordable housing and generate income'

Members were informed that the first houses the company would be bidding for were affordable homes and specific details surrounding this issue were discussed as part of an exempt item at the meeting of Cabinet on 13 February 2014;

- in respect of the objective entitled 'move to a commercial approach to service delivery', a suggestion was made to include the word 'more' so it read 'move to a more commercial approach to service delivery', recognising that some of the Council's services had to be delivered outside of a commercial attitude, with the emphasis focussing on the quality of the service;
- a suggestion was made to reflect the importance of safeguarding the most vulnerable people in the district as part of the objective entitled 'ensure the impacts of welfare reform are managed smoothly and effectively';
- the Corporate Plan was easy for people to understand due to it being written in plain English, and it was a SMART document in that it was Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-scaled;
- the Corporate Plan had clear levels of accountability, from Portfolio Holders to lead Directors, who were responsible for the delivery of specific sections;
- it was important to acknowledge that South Cambridgeshire was a rural district with significant challenges ahead, such as improving health and delivering community transport initiatives;
- the Corporate Plan did not make any reference to the Green Deal, which could provide huge opportunities for the Council;
- there was no indication of a commitment in the Corporate Plan to deliver improvements to local infrastructure, which would help South Cambridgeshire continue to be one of the best places to live, work and study in the country. In terms of local infrastructure reference was made to the Greater Cambridgeshire City Deal, elements of which would deliver infrastructural improvements. It was anticipated that specific details around the City Deal would be considered at an extraordinary meeting of Full Council in due course.

Voting on the motion, with 33 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 12 abstentions, Council **APPROVED** the Corporate Plan, setting out the Council's vision, objectives and actions for 2014 – 2019.

87 (b) Medium Term Financial Strategy (General Fund budget 2014/15 including Council Tax setting), Housing Revenue Account (including housing rents), Capital Programme 2014/15-2018/19 and Treasury Management (Revised 2013/14 and 2014/15) (Cabinet, 13 February 2014)

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder, proposed the Medium Term Financial Strategy and associated elements as set out in the agenda. Putting forward the proposal, Councillor Edwards made the following points:

- further reductions in revenue support grant funding had been announced, the net result of which in the district equated to a reduction of £20 per Band D home. Councils were required to hold a referendum if their proposed Council Tax increases were higher than 2%, so it was therefore proposed for Council Tax to increase by 1.99%, equating to a £2.40 increase per Band D home;
- a 1.99% increase in Council Tax meant that the Council had to find £18 per Band D home in additional savings or income on top of the £5 million in efficiency savings that had already been achieved. This meant that the Council had a revised saving or additional income target of £300,000 this year and £1 million in 2015-16;

- an option detailed in the report was to freeze Council Tax and receive a grant equivalent from the Government for 2014-15. Indications were that this grant would be consolidated within the Council's future funding and consequently add to the savings or additional income target;
- the revenue support grant had been modelled within the Medium Term Financial Strategy to reduce to zero by 2019. However, good progress was being made with the housing company and by 2020 a new revenue stream for the Council should be provided, meaning South Cambridgeshire District Council would become self-sufficient. A £7m investment in South Cambs Ltd, the Council's housing company, was reflected in the proposed Capital Programme;
- the Capital Programme also made provision for an expected contribution towards the A14 Improvement Scheme, although the specific details around any such contribution was yet to be confirmed;
- the Housing Revenue Account indicated a proposed investment of £2.75 million to £3.3 million for the new build programme, with some houses having already been built;
- a proposed increase in rents for existing tenants was in line with Government guidance, meaning that 80% of tenants would see a maximum variation of £2 per week towards the phasing-in of rent restructuring, in addition to the 3.7% increase;
- the budget proposals were considered and supported by the Scrutiny and Overview Committee and Cabinet at their respective meetings earlier this month.

Councillor Edwards took this opportunity to thank officers for their excellent work in producing the budget and supportive information for this meeting.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, seconded the proposal.

A number of comments were made during the debate, as follows:

- the proposal to pay £60,000 to the Friends of Friendless Churches for St Denis Church in East Hatley was questionable when considering a proposed increase in Council Tax alongside the loss of key services such as the pest control service and reduced collection services for waste and recycling;
- St Denis Church was in a very poor state of disrepair and the payment of £60,000 would actually result in the Council saving in the region of £200,000 as it would no longer be responsible or liable for maintaining the building;
- the proposed budget was based on the assumption that the Council would not receive any grant funding by 2019, whereas this position could change should a new Government be elected in 2015;
- lessons had to be learnt from the Council's past and its former policy to reduce Council Tax. The authority was still burdened by that policy, which had done its residents no favours in the longer term;

(Councillors Alison Elcox and Neil Davies left the meeting at this stage of proceedings.)

- the Council should be proud of the fact that it had one of the lowest levels of Council Tax in the country;
- the Council should not be expected to put forward any contributions for the A14 following the recent announcement that the improvement scheme did not need to include tolling;
- communication with residents, together with education, was extremely important in respect of the changes to waste and recycling collections;
- it was much easier to undertake long term planning if the Council's financial

future was in its own hands, rather than relying upon Government grant funding that could be taken away at any opportunity. Modelling in this way also meant that the Council could be even more accountable.

Voting on recommendations (a) – (j), as set out on the agenda, with 33 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 10 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED** that:

- (a) the Capital Programme and the associated funding up to the year ending 31 March 2019 be approved as submitted;
- (b) a contribution of £60,000 be paid to the Friends of Friendless Churches in respect of St Denis Church, East Hatley;
- (c) projected Local Plan expenditure be included in the revenue estimates and Medium Term Financial Strategy;
- (d) the revenue estimates for 2014-15 be approved as submitted in the General Fund summary;
- (e) the precautionary items for the General Fund be approved;
- (f) the Medium Term Financial Strategy for the General Fund be approved based on the assumptions set out in the report to Cabinet on 13 February 2014;
- (g) the fees and charges proposed for 2014-15 be approved;
- (h) Executive Management Team be instructed to identify additional income/savings of £300,000 in 2014-15 and further additional income/savings of £790,000 from 2015-16;
- (i) the Council Tax requirement for 2014-15 be £7,155,680;
- (j) the Council sets the amount of Council Tax for each of the relevant categories of dwelling in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 on the basis of a District Council Tax for general expenses on a Band D property of £122.86 plus the relevant amounts required by the precepts of Parish Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council, the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the Cambridgeshire Fire Authority, details of those precepts and their effect as circulated with the formal resolution required at the Council meeting;

In addition to resolution (i) above, Council **AGREED** the following statutory resolution in respect of the Council Tax for 2014/15:

That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2014-15 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

- (i) **£84,933,596** 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)

- (ii) **£73,372,205** 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)
- (iii) **£11,561,391** being the amount by which the aggregate at (i) above exceeds the aggregate at (ii) 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 £7,155,680 and the parish precepts of £4,405,711
- (iv) **£198.50** 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)
- (v) **£4,405,711** being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (parish precepts)
- (vi) **£122.86** being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates (average Council Tax for a Band D property for the District excluding parishes), the amounts being for each of the categories of dwellings shown below in **Table 1**
- (vii) 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 adding the amounts for band D for the District Council in **Table 1** and Appendix A of the report.
- (viii) in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands are shown by adding the amounts for each band in **Table 1** and Appendix A of the report.

That it be noted that for the year 2014-15 Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings as shown in **Table 1**:

Table 1	Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
County Council	747.96	872.62	977.28	1,121.94	1,371.26	1620.58	1,869.90	2,243.88
Police & Crime Commissioner	120.90	141.05	161.20	181.35	221.65	261.95	302.25	362.70
District Council	81.91	95.56	109.21	122.86	150.16	177.46	204.77	245.72
Fire Authority	42.84	49.98	57.12	64.26	78.54	92.82	107.10	128.52

and

- (ix) that the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts set out in Appendix B of the report as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2014-15 for each of the categories of dwellings shown in Appendix B of the report.

Council agreed to hold a recorded vote following correspondence received from the Department for Communities and Local Government ahead of the imminent introduction of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, requiring recorded votes at budget meetings. Votes were therefore cast on resolutions (a) to (j) above, as follows:

For

Councillors David Bard, Richard Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Roger Hickford, Clayton Hudson, Caroline Hunt, Douglas de Lacey, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Neil Scarr, Timothy Scott, Ben Shelton, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillor Deborah Roberts.

Abstention

Councillors Jonathan Chatfield, Tumi Hawkins, Sebastian Kindersley, Janet Lockwood, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Susan van de Ven, Aidan Van De Weyer and John Williams.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION IN RESPECT OF SETTING THE COUNCIL TAX

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

		£ p	%
District Council	General Expenses	122.86	+1.99%
	Special Expenses for Parish Precepts (average)	75.64	+2.85%
County Council		1,121.94	+1.99%
Police & Crime Commissioner		181.35	+1.92%
Fire Authority		64.26	+0%
Total		1,566.05	+1.94%

On these figures the Council Tax would range from £993.61 for Band A to £3,227.76 for Band H before any discounts or benefits.

Appendix C of the report showed the General Fund summary including Parish precepts and the final Formula Grant figure.

Voting on recommendations (k) – (p), as set out on the agenda, with 32 votes in favour and 12 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED** that:

- (k) the Housing Revenue Account estimates and the rent increase for the financial year ending 31 March 2015 be approved, the rent increase being in accordance with rent restructuring guidance from the Department for Communities and Local Government;
- (l) the service and other charges for housing services for the financial year ending 31 March 2015 be approved;
- (m) the Housing Revenue Account business plan summary for the next 30 years to 31 March 2044 be approved;
- (n) the borrowing and investment strategy for the year to 31 March 2015 be approved;
- (o) the prudential indicators required by the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities for the year to 31 March 2015 be approved;
- (p) the Executive Director, Corporate Services, be given delegated authority to issue the final version of the Estimates Book, incorporating any amendments required from Council's decisions.

Council agreed to hold a recorded vote on resolutions (k) to (p) above and votes were therefore cast as follows:

For

Councillors David Bard, Richard Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Brian Burling, Nigel Cathcart, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Roger Hickford, Clayton Hudson, Caroline Hunt, Douglas de Lacey, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Tony Orgee, Timothy Scott, Ben Shelton, Edd Stonham, Peter Topping, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes, Tim Wotherspoon and Nick Wright.

Abstention

Councillors Jonathan Chatfield, Tumi Hawkins, Sebastian Kindersley, Janet Lockwood, Deborah Roberts, Neil Scarr, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Jim Stewart, Susan van de Ven, Aidan Van De Weyer and John Williams.

88. SWAVESEY BYWAYS RATE 2014-15

Having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest, as referred to in minute number 81, Councillor Brian Burling left the meeting for the consideration of this item.

Council considered a report following the annual meeting of the Swavesey Byeways Advisory Committee.

Councillor Sue Ellington, Vice-Chairman, proposed the recommendations of the Swavesey Byeways Advisory Committee as set out in the report. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council.

(Councillor Edd Stonham left the meeting at this stage of proceedings).

Council unanimously **AGREED** to:

- (a) maintain the current level of byeway maintenance for the period 2014/15;
- (b) levy a rate at 90 pence to fund the required maintenance for the period 2014/15.

89. REVIEW OF POLITICAL BALANCE AND THE ALLOCATION OF SEATS TO COMMITTEES

Council considered a report setting out a review of the authority's political balance and the allocation of seats to committees.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, proposed that Council approved:

- (a) the allocation of seats, as set out in Appendix A of the report;
- (b) the nominations of the political groups to seats on committees, as set out in Appendix B of the report, subject to Councillor Alison Elcox being appointed as a substitute on the Planning Committee and the hierarchal substitutes list for the committee being revised as follows:

- 1) Charlie Nightingale
- 2) Richard Barrett
- 3) Raymond Matthews
- 4) Alex Riley
- 5) Alison Elcox

- (c) the addition of a paragraph in the Council's Standing Orders under the section entitled 'appointment of substitute members of committees, sub-committees and outside or joint bodies' to read:

"Vacant positions

Group Leaders can appoint a substitute to fill any vacancy that may arise on a committee, sub-committee, outside body or joint body, where those bodies allow, until a replacement has been appointed at a meeting of Council."

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, seconded the proposal.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey moved an amendment to add the word 'individual' to the opening sentence of the proposed additional paragraph to the Council's Standing Orders, making it clear that individual Group Leaders could appoint substitutes to fill vacancies. The proposer and seconder of the original motion accepted the proposed amendment.

Voting on the substantive motion, Council unanimously **APPROVED**:

- (a) the allocation of seats, as set out in Appendix A of the report;
- (b) the nominations of the political groups to seats on committees, as set out in Appendix B of the report, subject to Councillor Alison Elcox being appointed as a substitute on the Planning Committee and the hierarchal substitutes list for the committee being revised as follows:

- 1) Charlie Nightingale
- 2) Richard Barrett
- 3) Raymond Matthews
- 4) Alex Riley
- 5) Alison Elcox

- (c) the addition of a paragraph in the Council's Standing Orders under the section entitled 'appointment of substitute members of committees, sub-committees and outside or joint bodies' to read:

"Vacant positions

Individual Group Leaders can appoint a substitute to fill any vacancy that may arise on a committee, sub-committee, outside body or joint body, where those bodies allow, until a replacement has been appointed at a meeting of Council."

90. QUESTIONS ON JOINT MEETINGS

No questions on joint meetings were raised.

91. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**91 (a) From Councillor Tumi Hawkins**

Councillor Tumi Hawkins asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“In preparing the Draft Local Development Plan, this authority has maintained that the basis for requiring the large scale developments proposed, including at Bourn Airfield, is that the SHMA identifies a need for 19,000 homes in South Cambridgeshire by 2031. Although this number has been questioned by a large number of residents and Members, the authority maintains that it is correct.

This stance has again been thrown into considerable doubt by the statement made by two Councillors at the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group Meeting of 6 February 2014. A Cambridge City Councillor said “we know that South Cambridgeshire is taking the bulk of the housing growth needs of Cambridge, and we would like to help them do that”. Further during the meeting, a County Councillor re-iterated this statement “as we have heard, South Cambridgeshire is taking the bulk of the housing needs of Cambridge”. There were two Cabinet Members at that meeting, and neither one of them denied this statement or even made any response to those comments.

Can the Leader and/or Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Localism please explain why Members have been seriously misled on this matter and what deal was done with the City to bring about this situation where South Cambridgeshire is taking the bulk of the housing needs of the City?”

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, stated that this was not the case and that no such deals had been made between South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council on the issue of housing need. He emphasised that this issue was dealt with at the recent Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder Meeting and reiterated that there had never been any agreement between the two authorities on this issue. Councillor Manning offered to request a letter from the Chief Executive or Leader of the City Council to confirm this point for Councillor Hawkins.

Calculating a shortfall between the modelling of required homes for the City Council's Local Development Plan against the jobs forecast, Councillor Hawkins asked the following question as a supplementary:

“Where will the extra 5,000 homes come from?”

Councillor Ray Manning reiterated that no deal had been made and stated that he would write to the City Council's Chief Executive on the matter.

91 (b) From Councillor Charles Nightingale

Councillor Charles Nightingale asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Will the Leader have the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, hold an enquiry into why it has taken Anglian Water so long (over two weeks) to solve the maintenance problem at the Great Shelford pumping station which caused the recent flooding. Residents have had tankers on 24 hour standby for the last fortnight and sandbags are still in place. A simple press release would have been nice. Will the Portfolio Holder also find a way around the 0800 number in emergencies?”

Councillor Mick Martin, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, answered this question and made it clear that it related solely to Anglian Water and was in no way a criticism of the Council's activities or processes in response to the recent floods. Councillor Martin had engaged with Anglian Water's Resilience Officer and now had a telephone number for the Duty Operations Manager, which he had lodged with the Council's Emergency Planning team. He added that a review of what happened was currently being undertaken but agreed to write to Anglian Water, expressing his concerns over the incident.

91 (c) From Councillor Susan van de Ven

Councillor Susan van de Ven asked the Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services the following question:

"As a local representative, I have been unable to get an officer response on two pieces of case work in my ward involving damage caused by trees on council properties, in spite of multiple attempts over several months. A key aspect of a councillor's role must surely be to facilitate communication for local residents seeking help or advice from the council. Given the acute pressures on staff and the understandable challenge of responding to high volumes of incoming queries, what systems are in place to ensure a reliable and reasonable response time to councillor queries?"

Councillor David-Whiteman Downes, Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, responded by reporting that the Council did not have a rigid timetable or prescription about responding to such enquiries, but stated that he did expect timely responses from officers. He confirmed that the Council's Executive Management Team would be setting up an officer working group on the issue of customer services and that this question would be fed into that piece of work, with any outcomes being reported back to Members in due course.

92. NOTICES OF MOTION

92 (a) Standing in the name of Councillor Aidan Van De Weyer

Councillor Aidan Van De Weyer proposed the following motion:

"This council:

- a) requests that the Civic Affairs Committee considers and proposes amendments to the Council's Standing Orders so that all votes, except for those taken by affirmation and for appointments, are recorded in the manner described in Standing Order 16.5 (Recorded vote);
- b) will follow, until the Council Standing Orders have been so amended, the procedure described in Standing Order 16.5 (Recorded vote) for all votes, except for those taken by affirmation and for appointments."

Councillor Douglas de Lacey seconded the proposal.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, moved an amendment to delete paragraph (b). The amendment, having been seconded by Councillor Roger Hickford, was accepted by the mover and seconder of the original motion.

Voting on the substantive motion, Council unanimously **AGREED** the following:

“This Council requests that the Civic Affairs Committee considers and proposes amendments to the Council’s Standing Orders so that all votes, except for those taken by affirmation and for appointments, are recorded in the manner described in Standing Order 16.5 (Recorded Vote).”

92 (b) Standing in the name of Councillor Janet Lockwood

Councillor Janet Lockwood proposed the following motion:

“This Council is disturbed by reports suggesting that the Treasury is planning to move Papworth Hospital to Peterborough in an attempt to shore up the finances of Peterborough Hospital, and asks the Treasury and the Department of Health to avoid any further delays to the planned move to Addenbrooke’s.”

Councillor Lockwood sought the Council’s support on this motion as she felt it was so obviously in the interests of all residents in the district who became patients or knew people who were already patients at either Addenbrooke’s or Papworth Hospitals. She believed it was in the best interests of the country, as both hospitals were tertiary referral centres and, due to the research base, was also significant in terms of world medicine. Councillor Lockwood understood the concerns of the residents of Papworth in losing their hospital, but was of the view that this was inevitable and reminded Members that the purpose of a hospital was to treat patients and not support local communities. She closed by stating that the move to Addenbrooke’s was ready to go, with any delay being insensible and costly.

Councillor Aidan Van De Weyer seconded the proposal.

Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, proposed that this issue be referred to the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board and the County Council’s Adults Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee. In noting that both bodies were already considering this issue, with the Adults Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee having sent formal representation on the issue, Councillor Manning withdrew his proposal.

Voting on the motion, with 37 votes in favour, 5 against and 1 abstention, Council **AGREED** the following:

“This Council is disturbed by reports suggesting that the Treasury is planning to move Papworth Hospital to Peterborough in an attempt to shore up the finances of Peterborough Hospital, and asks the Treasury and the Department of Health to avoid any further delays to the planned move to Addenbrooke’s.”

93. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

Council noted those engagements attended by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman since the last Council meeting, as set out on the agenda.

The Meeting ended at 3.40 p.m.
