

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on
Thursday, 17 November 2016 at 6.30 p.m.

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

Councillors: David Bard, Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Doug Cattermole, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Peter Topping, Ingrid Tregoing, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters, Aidan Van de Weyer, John Williams and Nick Wright

Officers:	Alex Colyer	Interim Chief Executive
	Caroline Hunt	Planning Policy Manager
	Tom Lewis	Monitoring Officer
	Graham Watts	Democratic Services Team Leader

PRESENTATION

Councillor Sue Ellington, Chairman of the Council, reported that the Council's Ecology Consultancy Officer, Rob Mungovan, had recently been presented with the Wild Trout Trust's 'Wild Trout Hero 2016' national award. Councillor Ellington, on behalf of the Council, commended Mr Mungovan for his much deserved achievement. All Members of the Council gave him a congratulatory round of applause.

Councillor Ellington also reported that Graham Watts, Democratic Services Team Leader, would shortly be leaving the authority and that this would be his last meeting of the Council. She thanked him for his service over the last four years and, on behalf of the authority, wished him well with his future endeavours. All Members of the Council gave Mr Watts a round of applause in appreciation of his service to the authority.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brian Burling, Simon Crocker, Mervyn Loynes, Cicley Murfitt, Des O'Brien, Tony Orgee, Deborah Roberts, Edd Stonham, David Whiteman-Downes and Tim Wotherspoon.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Reference was made to the comprehensive interests declared by Members at the meeting of Council held on 13 March 2014 when the Local Development Plan was initially being considered for submission. Members took the interests they declared at that meeting as read in respect of the Local Development Plan's further work and consequential modifications for consideration at this meeting.

In addition to those interests:

- Councillor Tumi Hawkins declared that the house where she resided backed onto

Bourn Airfield;

- Councillor Edwards declared that he was a member of the Royal British Legion;
- Councillor Graham Cone declared that he was an employee of Addenbrooke's Hospital.

3. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

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

4. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 22 September 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Sue Ellington, Chairman of the Council, announced that this meeting would be adjourned to the 21 November 2016 at 7.30pm in respect of the item on Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution. Appendix A1 marked 'to follow' in the report for that item had been circulated on 15 November 2016, however, a technical issue with the Council's email system had prevented some Members of the Council being able to access the document. She therefore felt it necessary to adjourn consideration of this item so that all Members had sufficient time to properly consider Appendix A1.

6. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No questions from the public were considered.

7. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

8. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:

8 (a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution

The Council adjourned its meeting on 17 November 2016 at 8.57pm. and agreed to consider this item at a reconvened meeting of Council on 21 November 2016 at 7.30pm.

The following Members were in attendance on 21 November 2016:

Councillors Sue Ellington (Chairman), David McCraith (Vice-Chairman), David Bard, Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Doug Cattermole, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Simon Crocker, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Cicley Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Des O'Brien, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Deborah Roberts, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Peter Topping, Ingrid Tregoeing, Richard Turner, Bunty Waters, Aidan Van de Weyer, David Whiteman-Downes, John Williams and Nick Wright.

Alex Colyer (Interim Chief Executive), Tom Lewis (Monitoring Officer) and Graham Watts

(Democratic Services Team Leader) were also in attendance.

Apologies for absence for the reconvened meeting were received from Councillors Francis Burkitt, Neil Davies, Caroline Hunt, Peter Johnson, Raymond Matthews, Edd Stonham, Robert Turner and Tim Wotherspoon.

Councillor Sue Ellington, Chairman of Council, proposed that Standing Orders be suspended to facilitate an informal question and answer session on the proposed Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution deal. This was seconded by Councillor David McCraith, Vice-Chairman of Council, and unanimously agreed by Council.

Questions were asked and answers provided as follows during the informal question and answer session:

Councillor Douglas de Lacey, Convenor of the Independent Group, referred to three documents which had been circulated setting out different voting rights for the constituent authorities in relation to Transport Plans, particularly Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council. He asked for some clarity on this issue. Alex Colyer, Interim Chief Executive, confirmed that the Statutory Order set out that the majority of the Combined Authority would need to approve Transport Plans, which had to include Peterborough City Council. He added that the document included provision for Standing Orders to be amended by the Combined Authority.

Councillor Alex Riley reflected on the proposed scrutiny arrangements of the Combined Authority, of which he had some concerns. He was keen for South Cambridgeshire District Council to take a leading role on this aspect of the deal as a project in its own right in order to provide some constructive responses to some of the unresolved issues and questions that had recently arisen. He queried, for example, the role of independent members on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and questioned their purpose given they would not be entitled to voting rights. Councillor Topping reminded Council that this was a collaborative effort but agreed that further work would be undertaken on this issue.

Councillor John Williams asked what would happen if the elected Mayor resigned or was otherwise unable to hold office. Mr Colyer reported that an election would be called and that one of the constituent Members would be appointed by the Combined Authority on an interim basis until a new Mayor was elected.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Opposition, referred to paragraph 26 of the report in relation to the costs incurred in establishing and running the Combined Authority which said that the aim would be to keep costs at an absolute minimum, using existing resource where possible, and look to generate savings and efficiencies through public sector reform. She felt that 'public sector reform' was a significant thing to say and asked what this meant. Councillor Topping made the point that Council was being asked to agree heads of terms and that there would be further work to undertake which he did not dispute. He said that the devolution deal provided the Council with an opportunity to enter into a Combined Authority and receive the benefits offered as part of that deal. He felt that the deal would provide opportunities for activities to be taken forward in different ways and naturally provide efficiencies, citing Transport Plans as an example whereby currently Cambridgeshire and Peterborough had their own respective Plans and separate teams of officers working on them which could potentially evolve to be one team supporting one Plan, thereby delivering efficiency savings.

Councillor John Batchelor asked how the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would work in terms of political proportionality. Mr Colyer reported that constituent authorities would be allocated seats on a political proportionate basis and that Council, via political groups,

would be required to put forward nominations accordingly. He added that this may require political groups across the region to nominate collectively through negotiation but stated that the Order made it clear that there should be at least one Member from each constituent authority on the Committee and that the Committee had to be politically proportionate.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley asked why the leadership had not negotiated specific provision in the deal for affordable housing to be delivered in South Cambridgeshire. Councillor Topping referred to a letter by Sajid Javid MP, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, which stated a commitment for Greater Cambridge to receive a £100 million housing infrastructure fund to help deliver infrastructure for housing and growth, which included at least 2,000 affordable homes. He said that the Council had led that aspect of the deal as part of its negotiations, adding that South Cambridgeshire would receive money to accelerate delivery of affordable housing in the district as part of this commitment. It was noted that, in the same letter, a capital fund of £70 million over five years would be ring-fenced for Cambridge to meet its housing needs.

Councillor Lynda Harford, Portfolio Holder for Housing, reiterated that the Council had led on the inclusion of housing as part of the devolution deal and that the £100 million referred to in the letter from the Secretary of State was designed to support growth. On that basis, any sites being put forward would be required to demonstrate that they supported growth. She said that sites in South Cambridgeshire had already been identified for relatively quick delivery in this respect and was confident that a high proportion of the planned 2,000 affordable homes would be delivered in the district as a result of this deal.

Councillor Anna Bradnam questioned the likelihood of the devolution deal funding, which equated to £20 million per year over 30 years, actually being delivered, citing a potential change in Government following a General Election as an example of something that could significantly change this agreement. Councillor Topping acknowledged that things were subject to change but that any amendment to this agreement would require a Parliamentary decision. He added, however, that the current Government through this deal was prepared to invest in the area due to its economic prosperity and potential for significant economic growth and emphasised that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution deal represented the best deal that had been negotiated across the country.

Councillor Harford reflected that the devolution deal would make constituent authorities think strategically across the region, ensuring that they worked and negotiated collaboratively. She acknowledged that this would be difficult to begin with but saw a directly elected Mayor as an accountable position which would play a pivotal part of facilitating this important aspect of the devolution deal. Councillor Harford said that it was important that people understood the housing element of the devolution deal, reiterating the content of the Secretary of State's letter which she felt clearly outlined the funding that would be allocated to the city of Cambridge, together with funding that would be allocated to Greater Cambridge, which comprised South Cambridgeshire. She repeated the point that South Cambridge District Council was already working on those sites that could be delivered through this funding on the basis of demonstrating that they would support economic growth.

Councillor Tumi Hawkins asked why there was not any specific reference to housing in the Statutory Order document, when reference to other key aspects such as transport were included. She questioned whether this could potentially prevent any funding being received for housing. Councillor Hawkins also sought clarity regarding inflation as to whether the funding over the 30 year term would be indexed linked. Councillor Topping

explained that the Statutory Order provided the basis in legislation to establish a Combined Authority with the deal document itself containing the detail around the specific agreement, including the funding model. Mr Colyer confirmed that the funding would be a cash sum and therefore not index linked to inflation.

Councillor Deborah Roberts was of the opinion that the public were against the concept of a directly elected Mayor and questioned the reliability of the results of the survey which had been carried out, as set out in the report and appendices, stating that at least half of the respondents did not understand what they were being consulted on. Mr Colyer informed Council that those participants who had indicated that they were not aware of the devolution principles had been provided with a briefing in order that they could respond to a further survey from a position of knowledge. The outcomes of this further survey were also set out in the report and appendices.

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer noted that the expected £600 million over the 30 year period of the devolution deal would be considerably less than that amount in real terms due to the fact that it would not be index linked to inflation. He understood that the funding would be split by a ratio of 60:40 in respect of capital and revenue and asked what the revenue funding could be used for, anticipating that it would be used to run the Mayor's office and pay for their elections. Councillor Topping said that the deal offered by the Government provided flexibility and cited the funding available for housing as an example of money that could be used on infrastructure by way of accelerating development if necessary. Mr Colyer reported that capital funding would be used for building infrastructure and physical assets, whereas revenue would be used to pay for the running costs of the Mayor's office. It was noted that revenue could also be used for debt servicing, potentially as a way of funding capital expenditure, which provided an additional element of flexibility.

Councillor Nigel Cathcart was concerned that the views of South Cambridgeshire District Council as one of many constituent authorities in the Combined Authority could become diluted, especially in respect of development in the district, and may even see itself being outvoted on something that could be very damaging to residents. Councillor Topping emphasised the point that the responsibilities of district councils as local planning authorities would not be affected by these proposals. Councillor Harford, in agreeing with Councillor Topping, made it clear that South Cambridgeshire District Council would retain responsibility of its local planning policies and that if anything contravened local policy the Council would have a right to rule them out and ensured the Council still, therefore, maintained that element of control.

Councillor Sue Ellington closed the informal question and answer session and invited Council to formally debate the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution deal.

Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, proposed the recommendations contained within the report in support of the establishment of a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to deliver a devolution deal with Government for the area, details of which were set out in the report and appendices. He also proposed the appointment of Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader of the Council, as the Council's substitute on the Combined Authority.

Councillor Topping referred to the extraordinary meeting of Council held on 28 June 2016 when it had agreed to go out to public consultation on the prospect of a Combined Authority and devolution deal. As part of that consultation process a range of methods had been used to gauge public opinion and he himself had attended numerous meetings of Parish Councils, listening to residents put forward their views where he had heard arguments both in support and against the proposition. He referred to the poll that had

been carried out, as set out in the appendices to the report, where he said that the majority of people supported the principle of a devolution deal, including the establishment of a Combined Authority with a directly elected Mayor. He took that as a mandate from the public to pursue this proposition further, hence putting forward the motion to Council that it supported the devolution deal and a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

Councillor Topping added that there would be no direct cost to residents in setting up these arrangements since this would be funded via Government grant rather than through Council Tax. He also made the point that the Combined Authority would report back to the Council regularly with a high degree of openness and transparency and emphasised the benefits that would be delivered to the people of South Cambridgeshire as a result of entering into this deal with the Government. Councillor Topping closed by reiterating that this was the best deal that had been offered by Government elsewhere in the country and was the only deal open for consideration.

Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, seconded the motion.

Councillor John Williams referred to a similar situation two years ago in relation to the A14 improvement scheme where the Council was told by the Government that if it did not agree to support a proposed toll as part of the scheme then the A14 would not be improved or rebuilt. He said that with this particular issue it became obvious that the Government would not ignore this key part of the country's economic growth and subsequently a revised proposition came forward for the improvement scheme, without a toll. Councillor Williams felt that it was the same with the devolution deal and the proposal for a Combined Authority with a directly elected Mayor. He firmly believed that the Government would not refuse to enter into a revised devolution deal that did not include a directly elected Mayor if the growth of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area was so vital and dependent to the country's economy.

Councillor Williams also disagreed that a directly elected Mayor was needed to facilitate partnership working between the constituent authorities and said that in the past year there had been noticeable co-operation between councils in the wider region. He cited shared services and joint service arrangements as examples of where councils could work together and did not believe that a directly elected Mayor was necessary to help with that.

In respect of the survey, Councillor Williams was of the opinion that the online responses were more telling as they represented the views of people who had taken the time to understand what the proposals meant. He noted that the majority of online responses had indicated that they were in support of a devolution deal, but not a deal that included a directly elected Mayor.

Councillor Deborah Roberts also reflected on the consultation responses and highlighted that the public did not want to see an additional layer of bureaucracy put in place which, in her view, was exactly what was being proposed. She did not agree with one person having so much power, seeing this as corruptible and undemocratic.

Councillor Philippa Hart noted that the main justification put forward in favour of supporting the devolution deal, from this Council's perspective, was that it comprised of new money which would be used to deliver affordable housing to South Cambridgeshire. She was highly dubious, however, that this could be controlled or managed when the devolution deal was region-wide. She referred to Police and Crime Commissioners who had been elected across the country, which she called ineffective and a waste of public

money nationwide, and expected this directly elected Mayor to be the same. Councillor Hart did not think that the salary being offered would attract the right candidate to manage the power and patronage a role such as this comprised of.

Councillor Hart queried whether the Government really believed affordable housing could not be delivered in South Cambridgeshire without a devolution deal, and whether the Government would really walk away from a deal if it was refused solely because of the inclusion of a directly elected Mayor. She was of the opinion that the price of this deal was too high to pay if it meant being forced to have a governance structure which included a directly elected Mayor, something she felt the public were not enthusiastic about.

Councillor John Batchelor agreed with views previously made that this proposal created another layer of government and bureaucracy, with too much power being delegated to one person. He did not feel that this represented true democracy and effectively took power away from wider local government and the wider electorate. He questioned how the funding would be used, claiming that the Mayor's office and the running of its committees could cost approximately £800,000 to £900,000 a year with the election process itself expected to cost in the region of £700,000. Councillor Batchelor reflected on some of the key elements included as part of the devolution deal, including the proposed University at Peterborough, and said that the deal itself together with its proposed governance arrangements amounted to the most inefficient and costly way of managing local government.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley was concerned that the establishment of a Combined Authority in the way proposed would effectively silence the democratic way in which the constituent authorities had conducted themselves for many generations. He was disappointed with the way in which the consultation had been carried out, claiming that many people and bodies such as Parish Councils had been caught out by its timing. Councillor Kindersley did not agree with the concept of a directly elected Mayor and felt that the Government had seen an opportunity to give power to one person so that it had a single point of contact, rather than having to consult or negotiate with a number of local authorities. He therefore strongly opposed the proposal.

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer acknowledged that the directly elected Mayor was highly likely to be a representative of the same political party as the majority of constituent councils in the region, and was therefore concerned that he or she would be answerable to Members of their own political group. He agreed with the sentiments that the proposed Combined Authority created another level of local government, which he did not feel supported democracy or engagement with the electorate.

Councillor Henry Batchelor agreed with a comment previously put that the responses to the online survey were likely to more accurately represent the public's views and was of the opinion that the majority of people were against the establishment of a Combined Authority and a directly elected Mayor.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey, Convener of the Independent Group, queried why the outcomes of the poll that had been undertaken were so different from the views he had gathered from residents of the villages he represented. He claimed that the wording of the survey regarding the section on the directly elected Mayor was extremely misleading and did not properly explain the implications of having such a position imposed.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Opposition, questioned why a directly elected Mayor was necessary and what this role could do which the constituent authorities could not do themselves, stating that she had not seen any evidence to suggest that a Mayor

was needed as part of these proposals. She reflected on the Mayor's salary, the cost of running their office and the cost of holding the elections and was very concerned about the risk that this position could precept Council Tax and directly cost the district's residents more money. Councillor Smith claimed that the salary being offered would not attract a high enough calibre of person to ensure that the position was effective and agreed with points made previously that so much power should not be given to one person. She said that there were no guarantees that the funding for the devolution deal would continue to be delivered and reiterated that it would not be index linked to inflation, meaning that the £600 million would be significantly less in real terms at the end of the 30 year term of the deal. Questioning why the Government was insisting on the inclusion of a Mayor, Councillor Smith surmised that it was so that the Government only had one person to control rather than all of the different councils in the region. She said that a directly elected Mayor was too high a price to pay and therefore called for the Council to reject this proposal.

Councillor Lynda Harford, Portfolio Holder for Housing, reflected on comments made during the debate which hinted that by refusing this devolution deal a better deal could be negotiated with the Government. She fundamentally disagreed with this and said that this offer would come once and once only. Councillor Harford also disagreed that the Combined Authority created an extra layer of local government, since it would be taking over responsibilities from authorities such as Cambridgeshire County Council. Regarding affordable housing, Councillor Harford emphasised how urgently this needed to be accelerated and thought that the proposed devolution deal was an effective way of delivering that. She made the point that South Cambridgeshire District Council had led on the housing element all the way through the negotiations for the devolution deal and had been key to ensuring that it was included as part of the final deal. She reminded Council that this was the first time housing provision had been included in any devolution deal with the Government.

Councillor David Bard questioned the argument that the concept of a directly elected Mayor was undemocratic, making the point that this person would not be appointed by the constituent councils of the Combined Authority but would in fact be directly elected by the electorate. He reiterated Councillor Harford's comments regarding housing and saw the devolution deal as an opportunity to bring forward its delivery. Councillor Bard agreed that it was a unique offer, with the inclusion of housing being a significant achievement.

Councillor Alex Riley did not support the concept of a directly elected Mayor, but believed that the Government was serious when stipulating that a deal could only be agreed if it included a directly elected Mayor. He made the point that all other constituent authorities that had considered the proposed devolution deal, to date, had agreed to it. Councillor Ryley highlighted that South Cambridgeshire was in desperate need of local infrastructure to support delivery of additional affordable housing so was supportive of that aspect of the devolution deal.

Councillor Simon Edwards, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, reflected on the young people living in his electoral ward and made the point that they had no interest in whether the Combined Authority was established with or without a directly elected Mayor. He said the only thing they were concerned about was having somewhere to live, reiterating the significance of affordable housing in the district.

Councillor Roger Hall said that the area was embarking on a technical revolution and that the directly elected Mayor needed to be someone who could represent the region's views and influence Government. He was very confident about the future of the region if the devolution deal was agreed, as proposed.

Councillor Cicely Murfitt did not support the concept of a directly elected Mayor, agreeing that too much power for one person could lead to corruption or bullying. She was supportive of the affordable housing element of the deal, but did not think that this should be at any cost.

Councillor Tumi Hawkins said that this Council had not helped itself regarding delivery of affordable housing, citing the 20% ratio at the Northstowe development as an example of where the authority had failed to negotiate a higher rate, adding that every time consideration was given to a large development the rate of affordable housing was always negotiated down. She saw the deal as a bullying tactic by the Government and questioned how 2,000 affordable houses could realistically be delivered with £100 million which equated to £50,000 per house.

Councillor Christopher Cross was supportive of the devolution deal proposals and said that it provided a real development opportunity for Cambridge to build on its strengths, improve the expertise in the area and generate more momentum and money for the whole region. Councillor Cross reiterated the point that the Mayor would be an elected position and could be a representative of any political party.

Councillor Des O'Brien questioned whether support for the devolution deal should rest solely on the affordable housing offer. He said that the key consideration should be why the devolution deal as a whole was good for the region.

Councillor Ray Manning could understand the concerns around the devolution deal in view of it being a big step for all constituent authorities involved. He highlighted the significant opportunity the deal presented regarding affordable housing, but made the point that this was not the reason why the proposals should be supported. Councillor Manning said that this was the very beginning of the process and that consideration should not be based solely on what was included as part of this devolution deal, but on what could be achieved as a result of subsequent deals with the Government.

Councillor Topping reflected on the passionate discussion that had taken place on this item. He said that South Cambridgeshire District Council did work well with other authorities, but he was also keen for it to work closer with Government and that the Combined Authority proposed as part of the devolution deal was a model which helped achieve this alongside all constituent authorities.

In response to comments on the cost of running the directly elected Mayor's office, Councillor Topping highlighted that this equated to 2% of the grant. He was keen for this and the wider deliverables of the devolution deal to continue to be challenged and committed to ensure that regular update reports were submitted to the Council for consideration.

Councillor Topping supported the views expressed by Councillors Edwards, Harford, Hall and Manning in particular, calling for the Council to look forward and support the devolution deal as proposed.

Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, agreed that this was a unique opportunity for the Council and the wider region. He looked forward to the prospect of further deals, highlighting that Manchester had already successfully negotiated four devolution deals, and emphasised that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution deal was the best deal in the country.

Voting on the motion, with 30 votes in favour and 18 votes against, Council **ENDORSED**

the recommendations to Cabinet that it:

- (i) Consent to the Secretary of State making an Order to establish the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (Appendix A).
- (ii) Consent to the Council being a constituent member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority with effect from the commencement date determined by the final Order.
- (iii) Authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to consent to the final draft Order and associated documents, specifically:
 - to agree minor drafting amendments to the Combined Authority Order to be laid before Parliament;
 - to consent to the Council being included within the draft Parliamentary Order thereby reflecting this Council's decision.
- (iv) Authorise the Combined Authority to have a power to issue a levy to the constituent Councils in respect of any financial year. (This will be subject to the inclusion of a unanimity clause in the Combined Authority constitution on this specific matter).
- (v) Recommend to the Combined Authority that the costs of establishing the Combined Authority, holding the elections in May 2017 and running the Combined Authority (including Mayoral Office) for 2016/17 and 2017/18 are funded from the gain share grant provided by Government (as outlined the financial implications section of the report).
- (vi) Appoint Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, to act as Council's appointee to the Shadow Combined Authority and once established, to the Combined Authority.
- (vii) Appoint Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader of the Council, to act as the substitute to the above.
- (viii) Note the outcome of the public consultation on the establishment of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as outlined in paragraph 5.1 and 5.2 and Appendices 2A - 2D.
- (ix) Note the timetable for the implementation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution Order as summarised in paragraph 16.
- (x) Note the Government's response to the outline business case for Housing capital investment funds secured as part of the devolution deal as set out in Appendix 3.
- (xi) Agree, in principle, for a protocol requiring the Council Leader and the representative on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to report to each meeting of Council setting out the activities and decisions related to their respective roles within the Combined Authority.
- (xii) To request that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Civic Affairs Committee engage their fellow committee members with a view to devising and agreeing the wording of a protocol for inclusion in the Council's constitution.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Brian Burling, Tom Bygott, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Simon Crocker, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Mark Howell, Mervyn Loynes, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Des O'Brien, Tony Orgee, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Bunty Waters, David Whiteman-Downes and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Nigel Cathcart, Doug Cattermole, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Sebastian Kindesley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Cicely Murfitt, Deborah Roberts, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Ingrid Tregoing, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

8 (b) Appointment of External Auditors (Audit and Corporate Governance Committee, 21 October 2016)

Councillor Andrew Fraser, Chairman of the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee, proposed that Council approved the adoption of Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) as the appointing person for the Council for the purposes of external auditing. He reported that the Committee had considered this issue at length, which included looking into a range of options, before agreeing the recommendation to Council.

Councillor Grenville Chamberlain, Vice-Chairman of the Audit and Corporate Governance Committee, seconded the proposal.

Council unanimously **APPROVED** the adoption of Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) as the appointing person for the Council, subject to receiving a satisfactory invitation to opt into the PSAA's appointing person arrangements.

8 (c) Amendments to the Terms of Reference for the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board

Councillor Francis Burkitt, Portfolio Holder for the Greater Cambridge City Deal, presented a report which set out proposed changes to the Standing Orders for the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board. He proposed that the Council endorsed the amendments to Standing Orders, as set out in the report, which sought to improve the way in which public questions were considered and received at meetings of the Assembly and Board. He emphasised that the changes were being proposed in response to an open letter by a range of individuals from organisations who regularly submitted questions to the Assembly and Board and who had become increasingly dissatisfied with the answers they were being provided with. The changes to Standing Orders would mean that more notice would need to be given to the Assembly and Board of the content of the question, rather than the current arrangement of being able to provide only 24 hours notice, in order that officers and Members had sufficient time to provide a more comprehensive response to the issues raised.

Councillor Kevin Cuffley seconded the proposal.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley was concerned that questions were being limited to 300 words as part of the proposed changes. He felt that this was patronising and stifled the public in being able to put forward meaningful questions to the Assembly and Board. He proposed an amendment that this element of the changes be removed.

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Opposition, seconded the amendment.

Councillor Burkitt did not agree with the suggestion that a word limit was patronising or stifling, making the point that this proposal came directly from those individuals who had signed the open letter and who regularly asked questions at the Assembly and Board. They were Cambridge Past, Present and Future, the Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations, Cambridge Cycling Campaign, Smarter Cambridge Transport, Coton Parish Council and Madingley Parish Council. He referred to the pages of documentation often submitted as part of questions where the actual question had been difficult to identify and said that there was a differential between a question and supporting material. A word limit on the question would add clarity around a specific question, with supporting material still able to be submitted.

Councillor Bridget Smith, as a Member of the Joint Assembly, said that she had never experienced any problems in understanding questions from members of the public and questioned where the provision for supporting materials was set out in the proposed changes to Standing Orders. Councillor Anna Bradnam echoed these sentiments and agreed that supplementary documents should be able to be supplied in support of any questions.

Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, made the point that the proposed changes were seeking the facilitation of clarity and succinctness and therefore felt that a word limit seemed like a useful, reasonable, practical and sensible thing to introduce. Councillor Ray Manning supported the inclusion of a word limit.

Anna Bradnam proposed an amendment to retain the existing form of words regarding the word limit, but for Standing Orders to state that supporting information may be submitted without limit in support of questions.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey seconded this amendment.

Councillors Sebastian Kindersley and Bridget Smith, as mover and seconder of the original amendment, accepted this amendment which became the substantive amendment.

Voting on the substantive amendment, with 20 votes in favour, 26 votes against and 1 abstention, the amendment was lost.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Nigel Cathcart, Doug Cattermole, Christopher Cross, Neil Davies, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Ingrid Tregoin, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Against

Councillors David Bard, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright.

Abstention

Councillor Lynda Harford.

Councillor Bridget Smith reflected on paragraph 6 of the report which stated that responses were prepared by officers in order to advise Joint Assembly and Executive Board Members on responding to questions at the meeting. She disagreed that this was the practice for the Joint Assembly and said that questions were always dealt with by officers.

With 30 votes in favour, 12 votes against, 4 abstentions and 1 not voting, Council **ENDORSED** the proposed modified Standing Orders for the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board, as set out in the appendices to the report.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Douglas de Lacey, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Doug Cattermole, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Abstention

Councillors Anna Bradnam, Nigel Cathcart, Janet Lockwood and Ingrid Tregoing.

Not Voting

Councillor Christopher Cross.

8 (d) South Cambridgeshire Local Plan update (Planning Portfolio Holder Meeting, 9 November 2016)

Councillor Robert Turner, Portfolio Holder for Planning, presented a report which he had considered at his Portfolio Holder Meeting held on 9 November 2016 in respect of proposed modifications to the submitted Local Plan. He took this opportunity to thank the Council's Planning Policy Manager and her team for all the work they had done with regard to the Local Plan at this stage of the process.

Councillor Turner highlighted the sections in the report relating to further planning guidance for new settlements and specifically Waterbeach, Bourn Airfield, land south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople policies as the key areas where modifications were proposed, outlining the details of each case.

Councillor Turner proposed that Council:

- (a) Agreed that the Proposed Modifications, set out in Appendix A of the report, including:
 - (i) that the proposal to prepare Area Action Plans for Waterbeach New Town and Bourn Airfield New Village, is replaced by a proposal to produce Supplementary Planning Documents, that the village separation policy wording at sub-section 3 and paragraph 3.37 be refined in the case of Waterbeach, as set out in paragraph 3 of the supplement, and that necessary and consequential modifications are made to the Local Plan policies;
 - (ii) that changes are proposed to the Bourn Airfield new village Major Development Site boundary in respect of parcels 1, 2, 4 and 5 only as shown on the map attached to Appendix A of the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development, that parcel 3 be rejected, with parcel 4 included subject to the additional wording contained in paragraph 5 of the supplement relating to boundary treatment being considered further by the Portfolio Holder;
 - (iii) that land south of Cambridge Biomedical Campus as shown on the map attached to Appendix A of the report is allocated as an extension to the employment site allocated in the submitted Cambridge Local Plan.

and the Sustainability Appraisal Screening, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be submitted to the Inspectors examining the Local Plan.

- (b) Delegated authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to propose Modifications in respect to Travelling Showpeople to the examination consistent with the approach set out in paragraphs 51 to 53 of the report, in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder, and agreed that any material changes to be brought back to Members for consideration.
- (c) Agreed that the documents attached to the report as Appendices C to I are noted and submitted as part of the evidence base for the submitted Local Plan.
- (d) Noted that a report will be brought to the Planning Portfolio Holder Meeting on 13 December 2016 to revise the Local Development Scheme to delete the AAPs and to also consider the most appropriate way to prepare the proposed SPDs.
- (e) Delegated authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to make any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes, in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder.

Caroline Hunt, Planning Policy Manager, highlighted the following points that had arisen since the Portfolio Holder Meeting on 9 November 2016 for consideration by Council:

- further to a request to speak by a member of the public, which the Chairman had refused, the details of an ecology survey undertaken by that member of the public

had previously been forwarded onto the landowner's consultants for their consideration. The report, as at Appendix E, took that information into account and included reference to it. The consultant's report and the survey referred to had also been considered by the Council's Ecology Officer;

- the Council received a letter on 15 November 2016 from the solicitors acting for a landowner in relation to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus regarding access rights. A written agreement had been drawn up in 2014 with third parties regarding access rights in respect of phase 2 of the proposed modification site that did not provide for access to the proposed additional site. Mrs Hunt advised that this issue was being dealt with by Cambridgeshire County Council as the landowner. The Strategic Assets Manager at the County Council had advised that Liberty and Countryside had a Joint Venture and that he had held discussions with the Managing Director of the Joint Venture six months ago. In view of Liberty's support for the proposed allocation and given the fact that access to the site could not be gained without crossing land in others control, he felt able to state with some confidence that it would be in all parties' interests to collaborate in delivering the third phase of the Biomedical Park. Mrs Hunt had also spoken to the Council's Barrister in respect of this issue who had advised that, on the information currently provided to the Council and a lack of information on the nature of the arrangement referred to, he did not consider it to be an impediment to the likely delivery or soundness of the proposed modification. This matter could be considered further, if necessary or appropriate, during the course of the examination. Mrs Hunt said that it was not uncommon for issues like this to occur when multiple landowners were involved and that such matters were usually resolved, but needed to draw this letter to the attention of Council as part of its considerations.

Councillor Douglas de Lacey sought clarity in respect of Appendix A and the section relating to paragraph 7.28 on page 139 of the Plan, as to whether the affordable housing element had purposely been removed. In addition, he asked for confirmation that the amendment to Policy H/19 regarding provision for gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople should reflect 11 plots. It was noted that the removal of the affording housing element was intentional and responded to changes in national planning policy since submission of the Local Plan in 2014. Further investigatory work had been carried out in respect of this issue which found that requiring all affordable homes to be built to the standard could not be supported through evidence, whereas an element of accessible homes was demonstrable. Mrs Hunt informed Council that she was liaising closely with her Housing colleagues to consider the evidence available to secure accessible housing. It was noted that the figure of 11 plots was correct in respect of Policy H/19.

Councillor Ingrid Tregoing referred to paragraph 25 of the report and the approximation ahead of dwelling range of 8,000 to 9,000 in relation to Waterbeach, stating that the term 'approximate' should be defined in the Local Plan which she understood equated to 10%. Mrs Hunt explained that the explanation of the term 'approximately' in this context, as being in the order of 10% as a broad rule of thumb, had been discussed at the Portfolio Holder Meeting. The proposed use of the word 'approximately' was in the context of representations from the promotor who had indicated that the development should increase to 10,000 dwellings. Mrs Hunt was of the opinion that the Council did not have enough evidence to support amending the figure in the Plan, however, she felt that it would be important for there to be scope to identify the appropriate capacity of the site via a supplementary planning document and subsequent planning process through a design-led approach. It was therefore appropriate to provide an element of flexibility around the range included in the policy, which was why the addition of the word 'approximately' was being proposed as a modification.

Councillor Tregoing also highlighted paragraph 26 of the report, noting that if Historic England concluded that the northern boundary of Waterbeach could be revised whilst retaining an appropriate setting to Denny Abbey, the report said it would be consistent with the approach taken in the submitted Local Plan to consider modifications to give effect to such a change. She therefore sought clarity as to whether any further decision by South Cambridgeshire District Council would be necessary on this issue pending the outcome of Historic England's considerations. Mrs Hunt confirmed that discussions were ongoing with Historic England to agree upon a boundary that made the best use of the site whilst ensuring the retention of an appropriate setting of the Abbey and its grounds. As these discussions were still active there was no further update Mrs Hunt was able to provide, but she confirmed that a report would be brought back to Council on this specific issue should the final outcome of these discussions suggest the need for a further modification that would not be consistent with the approach submitted in the Local Plan.

Councillor Anna Bradnam was concerned that a decision regarding the northern boundary of the Waterbeach site would effectively be taken by Historic England, which she called an inappropriate extension to that originally submitted even with Historic England's caveats. Mrs Hunt advised that it would be for the Council to consider whether to put forward a change to the northern boundary and stressed that the report before Council did not propose a change, but solely sought to highlight that these discussions were taking place.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley made the general point that assumptions were being made that the Inspector would agree to the inclusion of the Bourn Airfield and Waterbeach sites in the Local Plan. He said that the Plan was not yet at that stage and emphasised that there was a great deal of antipathy towards these two sites from the public and a number of Members of the Council. He registered his grave concerns regarding Waterbeach and referred to Cambourne as a lesson which he said should have been learnt, explaining that it was originally planned to be a development of 3,000 houses which then very quickly increased to 3,300 houses, followed by an additional 950 houses and which was now seeing several more thousand being added to the village. Councillor Kindersley was also profoundly against any development at Bourn Airfield, citing the capacity of the A428 as a key issue regarding the lack of infrastructure and the fact that this would be a coalescence from Cambridge to St Neots. He said that the prospect of development on this site was unacceptable to a lot of local people, adding that, in his opinion, it would contribute to the destruction of South Cambridgeshire and was something that should not be supported.

Councillor Turner reminded Members that the submitted Local Plan went through the process of consideration by the Council in 2014, with Bourn Airfield included as part of the document that was agreed and put forward to the Inspector.

Councillor Peter Johnson, in respect of Waterbeach, did not agree with changing the boundary. Councillor Turner confirmed that Council was not being asked to change the boundary and that negotiations were still ongoing with Historic England.

Councillor Tumi Hawkins did not support development at Bourn Airfield and disagreed fundamentally with the inclusion of the additional land at parcel 4 as set out in Appendix A of the report, seeking for it to be rejected. She therefore moved an amendment to paragraph (a)(ii) of Councillor Turner's motion so that it read:

'that changes are proposed to the Bourn Airfield new village Major Development Site boundary in respect of parcels 1, 2 and 5 only as shown on the map attached to

Appendix A of the report from the Joint Director for Planning and Economic Development, that parcels 3 and 4 be rejected.'

Councillor Aidan Van de Weyer seconded the amendment.

Councillor Mark Howell agreed that consideration should never have been given to the prospect of development at Bourn Airfield. He reflected on other large developments that had previously been agreed in villages which, as set out in the Local Plan, had since doubled in size. He therefore felt unable to trust developers, but equally made the point that the Council had limited powers in this respect. He supported the amendment to reject parcel 4 and said that the Council needed take the opportunity now to stop this additional part of the site being included in the Plan.

Councillor Van de Weyer was concerned about the precedent that would be set by including this additional parcel of land as part of development on Bourn Airfield, together with the close proximity the development would eventually have to the existing woodland. He reflected on the Council's original decision to approve the Local Plan and strongly emphasised that there was no need, or supporting evidence, to modify the Plan further requiring parcel 4 to be built on.

Councillor Turner explained that new woodland would be put in place in the area.

Voting on the amendment, with 23 votes in favour, 23 votes against and 1 abstention, the vote was tied. Using her casting vote, Councillor Sue Ellington, Chairman of the Council, voted against the amendment and the amendment was lost.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors Val Barrett, Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Tom Bygott, Doug Cattermole, Pippa Corney, Neil Davies, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Ingrid Tregoing, Bunty Waters, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Against

Councillors David Bard, Francis Burkitt, Nigel Cathcart, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Caroline Hunt, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner and Nick Wright.

Abstention

Councillor Tim Scott.

Councillor Pippa Corney highlighted that Councillor Turner's motion in respect of paragraph (a)(ii) included a proviso that this would be considered subject to additional wording relating to boundary treatment. She had sympathy with those supporting the amendment for rejecting plot 4 and highlighted the importance of ensuring that the wording was as tight as possible in relation to that plot. It was agreed that this wording would be considered at his Portfolio Holder Meeting scheduled to be held on 13

December 2016.

Councillor Simon Edwards reflected with regard to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site on the distinction between the grey partridge and the red-legged partridge and the fact that the numbers quoted in the survey may have been exaggerated, particularly in the winter months. He said that having the right evidence to support the Local Plan was key.

Councillor Graham Cone, in relation to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site, said that the location of this site would have huge benefits in terms of jobs and help encourage significant companies and highly skilled professionals to the area.

Councillor Bridget Smith acknowledged that the Inspector had sought modifications to the Local Plan with regard to further sites for housing development, but she highlighted that the Inspector had not identified a requirement to modify the Local Plan for further employment land, such as that proposed in respect of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site. She therefore suggested that there was no reason or evidence to justify releasing that land for development, especially in view of its extremely close proximity to the Nine Wells nature reserve. Councillor Smith made the point that once the greenbelt had been developed on there would be no way of getting it back. She reiterated that this particular area had the Government's highest level of protection and felt very strongly that the Council should be standing by that. Councillor Smith was also alarmed by some of the terminology used in a letter by Mr Meed, who had undertaken an ecological survey on this site, quoting phrases such as 'misleading', 'selective' and 'unfounded ascertains' which had been used throughout the document in response to the evidence used to support the proposed modifications. She therefore called upon the Council to vote against the motion.

Councillor Van de Weyer shared concerns regarding the greenbelt and the impact development on the site in relation to the Biomedical Campus would have on habitats currently living there. He acknowledged that further work had been undertaken, identifying a range of mitigations, but made the point that some things could not be avoided through mitigation should these proposals be agreed. He did not think that the modifications put forward on this site would deliver the benefits of economic growth that had been claimed, adding that there was no evidence to support such a claim. In weighing up the damage that would be caused to the greenbelt against the perceived benefits of allowing development on this site, he was unable to support the proposed modifications.

Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, referred to the national importance of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, not just for local people but for humanity in general. He said that the world-leading research that took place at that Campus should continue to be supported so that it could remain in Cambridgeshire rather than be undertaken elsewhere in the world. Councillor Topping also made reference to grey partridges and red-legged partridges and the concerns about their habitat in relation to the Biomedical Campus site, stating that there was a large expanse of land in the area where they could adapt and settle. He added that taking a small segment out of that land as proposed via the modification, in his view, would not materially impact where these birds settled. Councillor Topping highlighted that a lot of mitigation had been identified and called for the proposed modifications to be supported.

Councillor John Williams supported the view that the Council's decisions should be based on evidence, making the point that there was no evidence to suggest that the site at the Biomedical Campus was needed as an employment site. He questioned how the necessary infrastructure would be put in place and felt that agreeing this modification

was essentially seeking to justify speculative employment development which was contrary to what the Council was currently seeking to do with regard to housing development.

Councillor Lockwood reflected on the balance between the need for development and the harm any development may cause by removing part of the greenbelt. She did not consider that there was any demand for this particular site, especially since this had not been allocated at the request of Addenbrooke's, and could not therefore support the proposed modification.

Councillor Anna Bradnam endorsed this view, as well as comments made earlier in the debate regarding the importance of the Nine Wells nature reserve and the close proximity this proposed modification would have to the nature reserve. She reiterated that there was no designated need to justify this development in the greenbelt.

This point of view was echoed by Councillor Hazel Smith, who also reflected on the significance of the Nine Wells nature reserve and the fact that ecologists had previously sought to allocate it as a country park, including an exclusion zone around its perimeter. She felt that the greenbelt should be protected and reminded Council that once it had been allocated for development, it would be lost forever.

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley felt that the leadership of the Council should be fighting to protect this area of land on behalf of the people of South Cambridgeshire. He proposed that paragraph (a)(iii) of the motion be rejected. Tom Lewis, Monitoring Officer, advised that such an amendment would negate the purpose of the motion presented and therefore suggested that a vote against this aspect of the motion would achieve the same outcome. The proposition was withdrawn.

Councillor Ben Shelton said that he had yet to be convinced regarding the need, impact and potential harm that would be caused by agreeing to the Biomedical Campus modification and could therefore not support it.

Councillor Nick Wright, Deputy Leader of the Council, made the point that this was spare agricultural land which birds would come and go from. He reflected that the independent environmental specialists and the Council's Ecology Officer had identified some issues, but that they had also highlighted appropriate mitigation. Councillor Wright informed Council that the site of the proposed modification was located adjacent to the Nine Wells nature reserve and was not encroaching onto the site of the nature reserve itself. He supported the inclusion of this site, echoing the reasons given by the Leader of the Council regarding the significant research that took place on the Campus and the likelihood that this would need to expand, saying that it needed to be retained for Cambridgeshire rather than relocate elsewhere in the world.

Mrs Hunt clarified that the Inspectors had requested further work to take place on the submitted Local Plan, further to which the Council had identified a need for 500 additional homes. The Inspectors had not requested any further employment development sites, but Mrs Hunt emphasised that the hearings in relation to that aspect of the Local Plan had not yet taken place and were due early in the New Year.

It was noted that work had been carried out by independent consultants on the greenbelt, which broadly agreed with the Council's own findings but had identified two different views in relation to two areas, one of which being land south of the Biomedical Campus where the study had concluded that development could take place without significant harm to Green Belt purposes.

Mrs Hunt reported that evidence suggested that there were sufficient employment development sites already allocated in the Plan, however, the evidence also recognised that there were benefits in developing areas on the edge of Cambridge. The proposed modification at the Biomedical Campus had been supported by the developers of the Campus and the University of Cambridge to enable the Centre of Excellence to continue to thrive. This would equate to a 10% increase of the Biomedical Campus site. Mrs Hunt explained that the ecological evidence, together with the mitigation measures, had been considered alongside all evidence as part of considering and recommending the proposed modification.

Councillor Lynda Harford, Portfolio Holder for Housing, reminded Council that the motion put forward by Councillor Turner related to modifications to the already submitted Local Plan. She welcomed Councillor Turner's agreement to tighten up the wording in relation to the Bourn Airfield site and hoped this would provide some comfort to those against that particular proposal. In respect of the Biomedical Campus site, Councillor Harford thought that the benefits of releasing the land from the greenbelt did outweigh any harm that may be caused.

Voting on paragraph (a)(i), with 35 votes in favour and 12 votes against, that aspect of the motion was **AGREED**.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Caroline Hunt, Peter Johnson, Douglas de Lacey, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Hazel Smith, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Doug Cattermole, Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Sebastian Kindersley, Janet Lockwood, Bridget Smith, Ingrid Tregging, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Voting on paragraph (a)(ii), with 29 votes in favour, 17 votes against and 1 abstention, that aspect of the motion was **AGREED**.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Caroline Hunt, Douglas de Lacey, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Doug Cattermole, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Mark Howell, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Janet Lockwood, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Ingrid Tregoing, Bunty Waters, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Abstention

Councillor Tim Scott.

Voting on paragraph (a)(iii), with 24 votes in favour, 21 votes against and 2 abstention, that aspect of the motion was **AGREED**.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Christopher Cross, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Mark Howell, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Alex Riley, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Anna Bradnam, Doug Cattermole, Neil Davies, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Charles Nightingale, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Ingrid Tregoing, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Abstention

Councillors Kevin Cuffley and Caroline Hunt.

Voting on paragraph (a) in its entirety, including the proposed modifications set out in Appendix A and the Sustainability Appraisal Screening set out in Appendix B, with 31 votes in favour, 12 votes against, 3 abstentions and 1 not voting, Council:

- (a) **AGREED** that the Proposed Modifications, set out in Appendix A of the report, including:
- (i) that the proposal to prepare Area Action Plans for Waterbeach New Town and Bourn Airfield New Village, is replaced by a proposal to produce Supplementary Planning Documents, that the village separation policy wording at sub-section 3 and paragraph 3.37 be refined in the case of Waterbeach, as set out in paragraph 3 of the supplement, and that necessary and consequential modifications are made to the Local Plan policies;
 - (ii) that changes are proposed to the Bourn Airfield new village Major Development Site boundary in respect of parcels 1, 2, 4 and 5 only as shown on the map attached to Appendix A of the report from the Joint

Director for Planning and Economic Development, that parcel 3 be rejected, with parcel 4 included subject to the additional wording contained in paragraph 5 of the supplement relating to boundary treatment being considered further by the Portfolio Holder;

- (iii) that land south of Cambridge Biomedical Campus as shown on the map attached to Appendix A of the report is allocated as an extension to the employment site allocated in the submitted Cambridge Local Plan.

and the Sustainability Appraisal Screening, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be submitted to the Inspectors examining the Local Plan.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Doug Cattermole, Jose Hales, Philippa Hart, Tumi Hawkins, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Abstention

Councillors Anna Bradnam, Douglas de Lacey and Ingrid Tregoeing.

Not voting

Councillor Janet Lockwood.

Voting on paragraph (b) of the motion, with 39 votes in favour and 8 votes against, Council **DELEGATED** authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to propose Modifications in respect to Travelling Showpeople to the examination consistent with the approach set out in paragraphs 51 to 53 of the report, in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder, and agreed that any material changes to be brought back to Members for consideration.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Anna Bradnam, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Doug Cattermole, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Jose Hales, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Peter Johnson, Douglas de Lacey, Janet Lockwood, Ray Manning, Mick Martin,

Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Ingrid Tregoing, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Tumi Hawkins, Sebastian Kindersley, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Voting on paragraph (c) of the motion, with 33 votes in favour, 10 votes against and 3 abstentions, Council **AGREED** that the documents attached to the report as Appendices C to I are noted and submitted as part of the evidence base for the submitted Local Plan.

Enough Members as prescribed by Council's Standing Orders requested a recorded vote. Votes were therefore cast as follows:

In favour

Councillors David Bard, Val Barrett, Francis Burkitt, Tom Bygott, Nigel Cathcart, Grenville Chamberlain, Graham Cone, Pippa Corney, Christopher Cross, Kevin Cuffley, Neil Davies, Simon Edwards, Sue Ellington, Andrew Fraser, Roger Hall, Lynda Harford, Philippa Hart, Mark Howell, Caroline Hunt, Douglas de Lacey, Ray Manning, Mick Martin, Raymond Matthews, David McCraith, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley, Tim Scott, Ben Shelton, Peter Topping, Richard Turner, Robert Turner, Bunty Waters and Nick Wright.

Against

Councillors Henry Batchelor, John Batchelor, Doug Cattermole, Jose Hales, Tumi Hawkins, Peter Johnson, Sebastian Kindersley, Bridget Smith, Aidan Van de Weyer and John Williams.

Abstention

Councillors Anna Bradnam, Janet Lockwood and Hazel Smith.

Voting on paragraph (d) of the motion, Council unanimously **NOTED** that a report will be brought to the Planning Portfolio Holder Meeting on 13 December 2016 to revise the Local Development Scheme to delete the AAPs and to also consider the most appropriate way to prepare the proposed SPDs.

Voting on paragraph (e) of the motion, Council unanimously **DELEGATED** authority to the Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development to make any subsequent minor amendments and editing changes, in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder.

9. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

Questions without notice were asked and answered as follows:

Question by Councillor Bridget Smith

Councillor Bridget Smith, Leader of the Opposition, asked when officers had been appointed in respect of the proposed Combined Authority relating to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution deal and who their employers were.

Councillor Peter Topping, Leader of the Council, reported that the Combined Authority would be created as a result of the Statutory Order that had recently been made available should an agreement be made for a devolution deal. He emphasised that this was not yet a body but made the point that it was necessary and sensible to commence with preparations in advance should a Combined Authority be formally established. Leaders and officers from the partner Councils included as part of the proposed devolution deal had met regularly to take forward this work, further to which it had been deemed as sensible to the Leaders to collectively decide that some officers should take on additional responsibilities. He reflected that those specific officers had put a great deal of effort into supporting the work associated with the proposed devolution deal.

Councillor Smith sought clarity that these officers continued to be employed by their respective Councils. Councillor Topping confirmed that this was correct.

Question by Councillor Douglas de Lacey

Further to his question at the previous meeting of Council in relation to card payments, Councillor de Lacey asked the Portfolio Holder to explain why the Council still used Capita to process card payments when it had to pay for the privilege and the company was essentially practicing extortion on the district's residents.

Councillor Simon Edwards, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, agreed to provide Councillor de Lacey with a written response.

Question by Councillor Aidan van de Weyer

Councillor Aidan van de Weyer, following calls by a local Member of Parliament to extend the deadline for spending for the first phase of the Greater Cambridge City Deal, asked whether the Portfolio Holder could inform the Council what discussions he had held on this with the City Deal Executive Board and the Government.

Councillor Francis Burkitt, Portfolio Holder for the Greater Cambridge City Deal, explained that no discussions had yet taken place. Heidi Allen MP had agreed to facilitate a meeting with the relevant Minister but as of yet Councillor Burkitt had not received an agenda for such a meeting.

Question by Councillor Sebastian Kindersley

Councillor Sebastian Kindersley expressed his concern in what he and some of his colleagues perceived as a move towards the removal of the democratic role of Members when sitting on the authority's Planning Committee. He understood that applications should be judged on material planning grounds, but said that Members also had to consider an element of protecting the district's parishes and that it was down to individual Members to decide the greater or lesser weight in their consideration of applications in this respect. Councillor Kindersley raised this issue in response to the consideration of a recent application where there had been an obvious move towards clear material planning considerations at the cost of the representative role of Members, to the extent where he questioned the point of the Planning Committee as a body.

Councillor Robert Turner, Planning Portfolio Holder, agreed that local Members did represent the views of the residents they represented in their electoral wards, as well as the views of all residents of the district. He understood the point but also highlighted the need for Members of the Committee to consider legal advice, together with advice on national and local policy. Councillor Turner stated that the way in which applications

were determined was entirely a decision of the Planning Committee, but reminded Members that any appeal decisions against the authority then had to be addressed. He said that Members of the Committee were able to represent their residents, but ultimately the Committee's decisions could be challenged.

Councillor Kindersley said that it was alarming that, in his opinion, it was becoming more acceptable for the Committee to make a decision which officers subsequently felt was not the right decision. He asked whether the Portfolio Holder agreed that it was a dangerous precedent for an application to be re-submitted to the Planning Committee for reconsideration.

Councillor Turner acknowledged that Councillor Kindersley was referring to an application at Waterbeach. He said that the Committee would be required to consider that application based on the information presented before Members at that meeting.

10. NOTICES OF MOTION

No Notices of Motion had been received.

11. CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS

Those engagements attended by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman since the last meeting were noted. The Chairman reported that the Vice-Chairman had raised the flag at South Cambridgeshire Hall on 11 November 2016 as she had been otherwise engaged with another remembrance service.

NOTE - This meeting adjourned at 8.57pm and reconvened on 21 November 2016 at 7.30pm. Item 8(a) above incorporates the minute of the reconvened meeting, which closed at 9.13pm