




CAMBRIDGE

CITY COUNCIL

Council Information Pack April 2013

Seating Plan	Page: 1
Minutes of the meeting held on 18 April 2013	Page: 2 - 25
Appointment of Committees 2013/14 – UPDATED	Page: 26 - 28
Civic Affairs – Special Meeting Agenda	Page: 29 - 30
Community Services - Special Meeting Agenda	Page: 31 - 33
Environment - Special Meeting Agenda	Page: 34 - 37
Licensing - Special Meeting Agenda	Page: 38 - 39
Strategy and Resources – Special Meeting Agenda	Page: 40 - 43
Oral Questions	Page: 45
Proposed amendment to Motion B	Page: 46
Written Questions	Page: 47 - 49



- The Chief Executive, Antoinette Jackson
- Head of Legal Services, Simon Pugh
- The Mayor Sheila Stuart
- The Deputy Mayor Paul Saunders
- The Mayor's Chaplain

COUNCIL18 April 2013
6.00pm - 10.14 pm

Present: Councillors Stuart (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Abbott, Ashton, Benstead, Bick, Bird, Birtles, Blackhurst, Blencowe, Boyce, Brierley, Brown, Cantrill, Dryden, Gawthrope, Herbert, Hipkin, Johnson, Kerr, Kightley, Marchant-Daisley, Meftah, Moghadas, O'Reilly, Owers, Pippas, Pitt, Price, Reiner, Rosenstiel, Smart, Smith, Swanson, Todd-Jones, Tucker, Tunnacliffe and Ward

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**13/16CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2013**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

13/17CNL Mayors Announcements**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Hart, McPherson and Reid

2. REACH FAIR

The Mayor confirmed that the annual Proclamation of Reach Fair would take place on Bank Holiday Monday, 6 May. It was noted that newly minted pennies were available from the Sargeant-at-Mace.

3. ELECTIONS

The Mayor confirmed that Councillor Adam Pogonowski had resigned from the City Council and that a bi-election would take place on Thursday, 2 May. The Mayor thanked Councillor Pogonowski for his contribution to the work of the Council and offered her best wishes for the future.

4. TWINNING

The Mayor noted that the City had hosted a successful visit by the Mayor of Szeged in March during which the Honorary Freedom of the City of Cambridge was conferred upon the City of Szeged. Thanks were expressed to Councillors who had assisted with hosting the guests.

Under the auspices of the Cambridge-Heidelberg Partnership Association, a group from Cambridge had also visited Heidelberg over the Easter weekend for the annual Cambridge-Heidelberg Easter Festival and some young musicians from Heidelberg had given a concert for the residents of Ditchburn Place.

It was noted that the Deputy Mayor and Councillor Gerri Bird would be representing the City at the Szeged Festival Day in mid-May.

5. EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL AND SUBSEQUENT CHANGES TO SCRUTINY DATES IN JUNE

The Mayor reminded Councillors that an Extraordinary Council Meeting would be held on Thursday 27 June at 6pm. The matter for debate would be approval of the Local Plan prior to statutory public consultation.

It was noted that, as a consequence of the date for the Extraordinary Council meeting and the prior scrutiny of the Local Plan required, a revised June scrutiny committee meeting calendar had been implemented. Councillors were asked to contact Committee Services with any queries.

6. CITY COUNCIL ANNUAL MEETING

The Mayor confirmed that the Council's Annual Meeting would take place on Thursday, 23 May and Councillors were reminded to let the Civic and Twinning Officer know if they required guest tickets.

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor	Item	Interest
Smith	13/22/CNLa	Personal: Private landlord in the City
Stuart	13/22/CNLa	Personal: Private landlord in the City
Tucker	13/22/CNLa	Personal: Private landlord in the City
Ward	13/22/CNLa	Personal: Private landlord in the City

13/18CNL Public Questions Time - see at the foot of the agenda for details of the scheme

Speaking on Motion 6a

Ms Agate addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Proposed to present a petition to the next Council meeting regarding the 'Bedroom Tax'.
- (ii) The petition would ask the Council not to collect the 'Bedroom Tax' or evict people from their homes if they got into rent arrears.
- (iii) Took issue with the 'Bedroom Tax' policy and suggested it would not generate the income Central Government expected. However it would lead to people losing their homes and experiencing financial hardship.
- (iv) The 'Bedroom Tax' had caused people a lot of concern; this had been feedback to her organisation.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- (i) Suggested rewording the petition to avoid references to the 'Bedroom Tax' as this did not exist and was properly called the Social Sector Size Criteria.

- (ii) The intention of Social Sector Size Criteria was that people whose sole income was benefits received less if they had more bedrooms than they needed.
- (iii) The benefit change was to bring public/social housing in line with private sector housing.

Ms Agate said she may consider revising the petition wording.

Speaking on Motion 6a

Mr Fryde addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Expressed concern for himself and others due to benefit system changes.
- (ii) He and his wife had lost benefits due to the 'Bedroom Tax'. There were no children living at home, but their home had been adapted with disabled facilities.
- (iii) It would be a waste of money to move having put in disabled facilities. Other issues would also arise such as suitability of accommodation, no pet rules etc.
- (iv) The Council was paying a temporary discretionary payment.
- (v) Mr Fryde could not increase his income or reduce his costs to cover the loss of benefits.
- (vi) Requested that Council and social landlords work together on a common policy.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- (i) Encouraged people eligible to claim temporary discretionary payments to seek them from the Council.
- (ii) The Council needed to know how many people wanted temporary discretionary payments so an approach could be made to Central Government seeking more funding if required.
- (iii) Agreed with Mr Fryde that it would not be sensible for people to move having made disabled adaptations to their homes.

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded:

- (i) Temporary discretionary payments could not be guaranteed to be paid to people in the next financial year as the budget was limited to the current financial year. However there was an intention to continue this financial support in future where possible.
- (ii) Reiterated that it would not be sensible for people to move having made disabled adaptations to their homes

Mr Fryde reiterated his concern over changes to benefit payments.

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources reiterated that the Council intended to continue financial support for tenants who had lost benefits where possible.

Speaking on Motion 6a

Mr Woodcock addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Suggested that the purpose of the Social Sector Size Criteria was to bring public/social sector housing in-line with private housing policy. This would increase the cost of housing/rent and the Council would pick up the cost.
- (ii) Queried if people currently receiving discretionary funding from the Council would receive it next year.

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources said financial support would be reviewed on an individual basis and subject to budget limitations.

Mr Woodcock made the following supplementary points:

- (i) Eight hundred people in the City would be affected by benefit cuts. Two hundred of these would move if helped. Six hundred people could not or would not move.
- (ii) Queried how many of the six hundred people received discretionary payments from the Council.
- (iii) Queried availability of alternative accommodation for people to move into.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- (i) Estimated it would take two years for the people who indicated a wish to move (as a result of benefit changes) to find alternative accommodation.
- (ii) Anticipated movement in the social housing sector as properties in fringe sites became available.
- (iii) Fifty people received temporary discretionary funding from the Council. Suggested that others should apply if they felt funding was appropriate for them.
- (iv) The Council had proactively contacted tenants to advise them of the implications of changes to the benefits system.

Speaking on Motion 6a

Ms Brightman addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Queried how many councillors:
 - a. Lived in social housing.
 - b. Were affected by the 'Bedroom Tax'.
 - c. Had an empty bedroom in their private house.
- (ii) Took issue with Councillor Smart making a policy decision due to Equality Impact Assessment issues associated with the redevelopment of housing in Water Lane etc raised at Council 25 October 2012.
- (iii) Took issue with Motions being passed on the Chair's casting vote.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded that Ms Brightman's statements were noted, but there were no questions to answer.

Speaking on Motion 6b

Mr Mather addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) He had been involved with the City of Cambridge for over 30 years and understood its business needs.
- (ii) Referred to the text of Motion 6b and took issue with its contents.
- (iii) Suggested the Council had a narrow interpretation of the benefits the City would gain from improvements to the A14, such as increased income from business rates and growth.

- (iv) Queried if the Leader accepted that the Council would benefit from A14 improvements.

The Leader responded:

- (i) He shared Mr Mather's frustration that the accrued benefit to the City Council and city economy were two separate issues. Council revenue was not linked to the health of the City.
- (ii) The City Council would not benefit directly from funding streams that would be enabled by improvements to the A14 as some other Council's would. This is why the narrow definition of benefits had been set out in Motion 6b.
- (iii) Under the new government regime, the Council's share of increases in business rates revenue was only 20%. This was in practice heavily circumscribed as a long term income stream by periodic re-setting of the baseline.
- (iv) There was a misconception regarding the area of land within the City Council's boundaries. Some areas perceived as 'city' were in fact within the boundaries of neighbouring authorities such as South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Mr Mather made the following supplementary points:

- (i) Referred to the 2006 Eddington report on transport and the need for appropriate infrastructure to support growth.
- (ii) Reiterated his view that the city would benefit from improvements to the A14.
- (iii) Reiterated his disagreement with the narrow interpretation of Motion 6b text.

The Leader suggested discussing Mr Mather's points with him after the meeting.

13/19CNL Re-Ordering of the Agenda

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Mayor used her discretion to alter the order of the agenda to take item 6a and 6b next. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the published agenda.

13/20CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for Adoption

13/20a/CNL Constitution Amendment : Review of Homelessness Decisions

Resolved (Unanimously) that:

- i. The Council treats its functions relating to the review of homelessness applications under the Housing Act 1996 as executive functions.
- ii. The Head of Legal Services is authorised to amend the Constitution to reflect this

13/20b/CNL Amendment to Standing Orders of Joint Development Control Committee (Cambridge Fringe Sites) to increase number of alternate members

Resolved (Unanimously) that:

- i. Section 5.1 of the Standing Orders of the Joint Development Control Committee (Cambridge Fringe Sites) be amended to allow two alternate members to be appointed in respect of each political group which represents each of the three councils on the Committee.

13/21CNL To deal with Oral Questions

1. Councillor Brown to the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services

Can the Executive Councillor confirm if new litter bins will be installed in the Mill Road area in the next year?

The Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services confirmed that her intention was to focus on the requirements of part of the Mill Road area as the second phase of the capital funded litter and recycling bin scheme. This would obviously be subject to consultation through the East Area Committee. Following the successful installation of over 200 new litter and recycling bins in the first phase of the project it was important to make sure communities get maximum benefit from this investment and were able to recycle their litter on the go. It was also noted that the Mill Road area was

likely to require up to fifty new bins but final numbers and locations would be subject to consultation and feedback. Work would also be on-going with the Mill Road co-ordinator

2. Councillor Herbert to the Executive Councillor for Housing

What is the current position on the dispute between the Council and its housing stock improvement contractor Apollo over the delivery and pricing of the stock improvement programme, including sorting out the delays to improvements caused by the late contract start?

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded that, as set out in the terms of the contract, the Council had referred its dispute with Apollo for adjudication and the outcome was due in early May. It was confirmed that £7m of work had been delivered as part of the contract in year 1, and £3.5m in year 2.

3. Councillor Rosenstiel to the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

Some of my constituents have raised concerns that the switch from S106 to CIL payments by developers will end the involvement of Area Committees in determining which schemes will be funded by developers' funds in future. Can you provide any reassurance for them?

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded that CIL legislation required a percentage of the developer contribution to be determined in the local area. Officers were working on the detail of this process but it was expected that Area Committees would be a way of delivering this.

4. Councillor Owers to the Executive Councillor for Waste and Environmental Services

Does the Executive Councillor agree with me that, in light of the success of the Ipswich 'Reduce the Strength' campaign, which has helped Ipswich reduce its street-drinking related anti-social behaviour incidents by 49%, the Council should reconsider its decision to reject this approach?

The Executive Councillor for Waste and Environmental Services confirmed that she had been following the Ipswich campaign with interest but noted that it was a police lead initiative rather than the licensing approach proposed in the Labour budget amendment. It was noted that if Cambridgeshire Police requested such action it would be seriously looked at. However it was useful to note what the licensing team were doing within current resources.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that, following a premises licence review of an off licence in Norfolk Street, officers met with the Police to look at what other reviews they plan to undertake and how that could be better co-ordinated. Residents were encouraged to talk to the licensing team about problems or issues they may be experiencing. It was noted that officers could provide advice on a case by case basis and work with premises, and when necessary a joint visit with the Police could take place and be effective. It was confirmed that this was already happening. Work would also be done with the county during the year through the "Alcohol Related Violent Crime Group" to consider the public health impact.

The Executive Councillor felt that the City Council should continue with this approach and not be too heavy handed at present. It would need careful thought to introduce a wider ban as some people liked the freedom to buy extra strength beers and did not abuse that freedom.

5. Councillor Moghadas to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places

Following January's Community Services meeting where representations were heard from the Romsey residents group, Friends of Coldhams Common, can the Executive Councillor provide Councillors with what action has been taken with regards to the four measures agreed for Coldhams Common, in particular; a) The review by officers to be carried out regarding the actions taken to date b) The management plan to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the maintenance and any future enhancement.

The Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places responded that following the Scrutiny Committee meeting he had met with the Chair and representatives of the Friends Group on 25 January 2013 to discuss their concerns. He had agreed to remove sections of the railings to ensure the safety of users and a review of the project had been completed by officers. It was noted that a copy file had been provided to the Friends Group as requested.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that revised proposals for the fencing scheme had been discussed with the Friends Group. The local Wildlife Trust had also been commissioned to undertake botanical surveys between June and early August 2013 of the whole Common to inform a site wide management plan which would be subject to consultation. It was envisaged that it would take 12-18 months to complete the plan.

6. Councillor Johnson to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources

Can the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources update Council on the impact of the new Council Tax Support scheme that came into effect at the beginning of April?

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded that, whilst it may be difficult to identify the full impact, one mechanism would be through complaints and concerns raised via the Customer Service Centre. The Head of Revenues and Benefits was not aware of any significant complaints but some enquiries had come in regarding second home allowance and long term empty home payments.

7. Councillor Todd-Jones to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Are the jobs of Council housing improvement staff transferred to Apollo secure, given clear commitments given to them by the Council and Apollo when they transferred?

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded that Apollo had informed the City Council that they had issued a risk of redundancy notice to some of their staff. Even though Apollo had known the detail of the contract when they had tendered for the work, the size and scope of year 3 work was given as the primary reason of these potential redundancies. Apollo were however looking at other options such as retraining and the use of sub-contractors.

8. Councillor Herbert to the Leader

When will he ensure that the public receive a fully detailed report on why the £2.3m budget error occurred, and what actions is the Council taking to improve its accounting systems and financial scrutiny to prevent a similar problem occurring in the future?

The Leader responded that, at the Civic Affairs Committee held on 17 April 2013, the Chief Executive had committed to providing a publically available summary report. It was noted that open discussions had taken place at The Executive, Civic Affairs Committee, Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee and full Council.

9. Councillor Moghadas to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places

Are there any plans to review the changes made by the Executive Councillor to the Marketing Strategy of the Cambridge Folk Festival, selling tickets prior to any release of artists line up or booking, in light of the slow rate of ticket sales compared to previous years and some key sponsors pulling out last month, can the Councillor give an account of the implications of this to the delivery of the event this year?

The Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places responded that since 2011 Folk Festival tickets had come on sale on the Monday immediately following the Festival. Prior to that year, tickets were placed on sale in the May before the event, once the line-up had been announced. Under this process, about 20% of ticket sales had taken place in the 6 months between July and December but the majority took place once the line-up was announced in the Spring. The rate of ticket sales in 2013 was comparable to the rate of ticket sales in 2012.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that it was unlikely Sky Arts would sponsor this year's event but alternative options were being looked at by the City Council.

10. Councillor Brown to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places

Can the Executive Councillor provide an update on progress redrafting bylaws for the Lime Kiln Hill chalk pit nature reserve, after previous proposals were deferred due to concerns expressed at the recent Community Services Scrutiny Committee?

The Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places responded that discussions were on-going with stakeholders to look at alternative options to the introduction of byelaws.

11. Councillor Johnson to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Could the Executive Councillor for Housing update Council on the Barnwell Road and Latimer Close redevelopments and give information on the number of tenants and leaseholders from those sites who have been successfully relocated within the Abbey ward?

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded that a planning application to redevelop Latimer Close had been approved on 3 April 2013, and building work was likely to start in July. It was noted that all 16 tenants had been moved to suitable alternative accommodation. Four had moved within the Abbey Ward. To date, one property had been obtained by the Council under a Compulsory Purchase Order, with negotiations on-going on a second property.

It was noted that a planning application had been submitted regarding Barnwell Road and, subject to approval, building work would be completed by August 2014. 14 of the 23 tenants had moved out with 7 remaining in Abbey Ward. Negotiations were on-going with a single leaseholder.

13/22CNL To consider the following Notices of Motion, notice of which has been given by:

13/22a/CNL Motion A

Councillor Price proposed and Councillor Birtles seconded the following motion:

“The City Council condemns the decision by the Coalition government to introduce the 'Bedroom Tax,' also called the Social Sector Size Criteria, this month whereby over 800 households in Council and Housing Association homes in Cambridge will lose around £70 or £120 per month from their housing benefit unless they move from their homes, which most have lived in for many years.

This Council notes that:

- Many of those affected are both low income and vulnerable individuals or families, with up to two thirds of those affected likely to have a disability, and many already suffering multiple benefit cuts this year.

- The impact will be greatest in those wards which already have high numbers of children living in poverty causing significant impacts on families, with some being forced to move requiring children to change schools.
- Some will struggle to pay a higher rent on low incomes and they risk either falling into debt including rent arrears, or have to choose between eating, heating or rent.
- Some may need to move from the social rented to the private rented sector which may mean even higher rents and less security of tenure.
- In spite of additional transitional funding to reduce the impact of the tax, the Discretionary Housing Payment Fund will be unable to meet the needs of all those affected in either the short or long term, causing severe hardship for many.

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Urge the City's two MP's to oppose the 'Bedroom Tax' and lobby Iain Duncan Smith, Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, to repeal this part of the legislation; and instruct the Chief Executive to also write directly to the Secretary of State calling on him to do the same.

2. Urge the Council's Executive to:

a) Follow the example of other councils and social landlords and remove the unnecessary bedroom classification from rooms that are really too small to be bedrooms, and avoid unnecessary financial penalties or evictions.

b) Ensure that any decision to evict a tenant solely because of the 'Bedroom Tax' and arrears is the responsibility of the Executive Councillor for Housing; that the Executive Councillor be urged to prevent all such evictions, and that any such proposal shall first be reported to Housing Management Board with their decision then guiding the Executive Councillor; and

c) Take all further appropriate measures necessary to minimise the impact of the 'Bedroom Tax' and protect the most vulnerable in Cambridge affected by it until its repeal."

Councillor Smart proposed and Councillor Smith seconded the following amendment:

Delete all and replace with:

“Council acknowledges

- that it has responsibility to make best use of its own housing stock and assist Housing Associations in the Cambridge area to do the same.
- that about 600 households are on the Cambridge Housing Needs register because they are in over-crowded accommodation.
- that as a result of right to buy the Council is particularly deficient in larger family sized houses
- that successive governments, including the last Labour government, restricted the ability of councils to replace houses lost from council stock through right to buy
- that the new restriction on a spare-room subsidy in social housing brings housing benefit paid to tenants in social housing into line with housing benefit paid to those in the private rented sector which has been in place throughout the last government's term of office.

Council further acknowledges

- that the new restrictions will affect about 800 households in Cambridge
- that for some of the tenants affected, the extra space is not a luxury as they have a genuine need, and it greatly regrets the worry and upset the changes are causing
- that the transition period will involve some households in difficult decisions

Council further acknowledges

- that the Government has allocated an increased sum to use at its discretion to supplement housing benefit for some households

- that allocation of these supplementary housing payments has to be assessed on the merits of each individual case and general policies are not permitted
- that a policy paper on the application of supplementary housing payment was discussed, amended and accepted by the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 8th April 2013
- that Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee agreed that a review of the policy and its financing should be brought back to Committee not later than its October 2013 meeting.

Council further acknowledges

- that up to a third of households affected by the changes may wish to move
- that finding appropriately sized and located places for this number may take up to two years
- that the Cambridge MP, Dr Julian Huppert, asked the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to agree that no benefit reduction should take place until people have at least been offered somewhere appropriately sized and located and that there would be enough in the discretionary housing budget for councils to ensure that that is the case
- that the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions did agree with the question, even though his answer appears to be contrary to his department's 'no general policy' ruling and he did not identify any specific additional funding to deal with this situation

Council therefore

- urges any household affected by the changes in housing benefit who might be eligible for some supplementary housing payment, to apply as soon as possible
- requests that officers keep a record of the number of successful applications for supplementary housing payments where the situation is not temporary

- requests that officers keep a record of those affected by the new policy and actively seeking to move

Council commits itself to

- treating everyone applying for supplementary housing benefit fairly and dealing with their case speedily and with proper consideration
- continue to lobby the Department of Work and Pensions to acknowledge that some households, particularly those including a disabled member, have a permanent need of extra space so should not be required to move or be penalised financially or required to reapply for supplementary housing payment
- work with Dr Huppert MP, to hold the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to his public statement on help for those seeking to move who have not yet found an appropriate place by increasing the financial assistance to Cambridge City Council.
- write to the other Cambridge MP, Mr Lansley, to seek his support for these changes to the policy.”

On a show of hands the amendment was carried 20 votes to 16.

Resolved (by 20 votes to 0) that:

Council acknowledges

- that it has responsibility to make best use of its own housing stock and assist Housing Associations in the Cambridge area to do the same.
- that about 600 households are on the Cambridge Housing Needs register because they are in over-crowded accommodation.
- that as a result of right to buy the Council is particularly deficient in larger family sized houses
- that successive governments, including the last Labour government, restricted the ability of councils to replace houses lost from council stock through right to buy

- that the new restriction on a spare-room subsidy in social housing brings housing benefit paid to tenants in social housing into line with housing benefit paid to those in the private rented sector which has been in place throughout the last government's term of office.

Council further acknowledges

- that the new restrictions will affect about 800 households in Cambridge
- that for some of the tenants affected, the extra space is not a luxury as they have a genuine need, and it greatly regrets the worry and upset the changes are causing
- that the transition period will involve some households in difficult decisions

Council further acknowledges

- that the Government has allocated an increased sum to use at its discretion to supplement housing benefit for some households
- that allocation of these supplementary housing payments has to be assessed on the merits of each individual case and general policies are not permitted
- that a policy paper on the application of supplementary housing payment was discussed, amended and accepted by the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 8th April 2013
- that Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee agreed that a review of the policy and its financing should be brought back to Committee not later than its October 2013 meeting.

Council further acknowledges

- that up to a third of households affected by the changes may wish to move
- that finding appropriately sized and located places for this number may take up to two years

- that the Cambridge MP, Dr Julian Huppert, asked the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to agree that no benefit reduction should take place until people have at least been offered somewhere appropriately sized and located and that there would be enough in the discretionary housing budget for councils to ensure that that is the case
- that the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions did agree with the question, even though his answer appears to be contrary to his department's 'no general policy' ruling and he did not identify any specific additional funding to deal with this situation

Council therefore

- urges any household affected by the changes in housing benefit who might be eligible for some supplementary housing payment, to apply as soon as possible
- requests that officers keep a record of the number of successful applications for supplementary housing payments where the situation is not temporary
- requests that officers keep a record of those affected by the new policy and actively seeking to move

Council commits itself to

- treating everyone applying for supplementary housing benefit fairly and dealing with their case speedily and with proper consideration
- continue to lobby the Department of Work and Pensions to acknowledge that some households, particularly those including a disabled member, have a permanent need of extra space so should not be required to move or be penalised financially or required to reapply for supplementary housing payment
- work with Dr Huppert MP, to hold the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to his public statement on help for those seeking to move who have not yet found an appropriate place by increasing the financial assistance to Cambridge City Council.

write to the other Cambridge MP, Mr Lansley, to seek his support for these changes to the policy.

13/22b/CNL Motion B

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Ward seconded the following motion:

“Council notes that

- (i) After many years of talking about it, the government is set to proceed with improvements to the A14;
- (ii) Unprecedentedly for a key element of national infrastructure, the government has invited local councils to contribute to the funding of the scheme;
- (iii) Our transport authority, the County Council, has approached councils within Cambridgeshire requesting contributions, based on future payback from the financial gain that will accrue to them from unlocked development.

Council regrets that

- (a) The proposed A14 scheme is not based on our own case for faster, targeted safety improvements on the road combined with much more investment in east-west rail;
- (b) The funding proposition is not accompanied by any opportunity to influence the design of the scheme and the project does not at this stage comprise any plans to address congestion within the city;
- (c) The County Council has tried to impose on all councils a funding proposition that is only relevant to some of them.

Council believes that

1. The A14 upgrade is nevertheless likely now to happen and that it will bring some economic benefits to the city region, which it welcomes;
2. Future funds will however not accrue to the City Council arising from the scheme, invalidating the County Council's payback proposition in our case;

3. In addition to the advantages, the broader impact of the scheme is likely to bring additional pressure on traffic congestion within the city itself.

Council resolves to

A. Abstain from making a funding contribution to the A14 upgrade, based on the failure of the payback mechanism in the case of the City Council;

B. Continue contributing what funds it can make available as a non-transport authority, towards providing for public transport and cycling within the city to help mitigate the impact of significantly easier commuting into the city, in particular by starting a "Keep Cambridge Moving Fund" enabling future partnering with the County Council on agreed measures."

Councillor Herbert proposed and Councillor Marchant-Daisley seconded the following amendment:

"Deleting all after 'Council' and insert:

supports the major upgrading of the A14, based around the scheme design proposed under the last Government.

Given that the new outline Coalition A14 proposal appears to be different, particularly on funding, a hastily written motion to Council is a wholly inadequate way for the City Council to develop an effective response on behalf of Cambridge, including as

- the Liberal Democrats have to date avoided any democratic scrutiny, Committee decision making or consultation with residents or businesses on their response to date, and
- only circulated county council information to their party Councillors, excluding all other Councillors as well as Cambridge residents and businesses.

The Council therefore supports the earlier Labour requisition to hold a special meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Committee on the response to the county council on the A14, to be held as soon as practicable, including

- a detailed Committee report from city officers with county council input, also available for the public and local businesses

- committee scrutiny that needs to include contributions from county officers and the opportunity for public input at the beginning,

before decisions by the Executive, after reflecting fully on the Committee's detailed scrutiny and conclusions.”

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 18 votes to 20

Resolved (by 21 votes to 1) that:

Council notes that

(i) After many years of talking about it, the government is set to proceed with improvements to the A14;

(ii) Unprecedentedly for a key element of national infrastructure, the government has invited local councils to contribute to the funding of the scheme;

(iii) Our transport authority, the County Council, has approached councils within Cambridgeshire requesting contributions, based on future payback from the financial gain that will accrue to them from unlocked development.

Council regrets that

(a) The proposed A14 scheme is not based on our own case for faster, targeted safety improvements on the road combined with much more investment in east-west rail;

(b) The funding proposition is not accompanied by any opportunity to influence the design of the scheme and the project does not at this stage comprise any plans to address congestion within the city;

(c) The County Council has tried to impose on all councils a funding proposition that is only relevant to some of them.

Council believes that

1. The A14 upgrade is nevertheless likely now to happen and that it will bring some economic benefits to the city region, which it welcomes;

2. Future funds will however not accrue to the City Council arising from the scheme, invalidating the County Council's payback proposition in our case;

3. In addition to the advantages, the broader impact of the scheme is likely to bring additional pressure on traffic congestion within the city itself.

Council resolves to

A. Abstain from making a funding contribution to the A14 upgrade, based on the failure of the payback mechanism in the case of the City Council;

B. Continue contributing what funds it can make available as a non-transport authority, towards providing for public transport and cycling within the city to help mitigate the impact of significantly easier commuting into the city, in particular by starting a "Keep Cambridge Moving Fund" enabling future partnering with the County Council on agreed measures.

13/23CNL Written Questions

There were no written questions.

The meeting ended at 10.14 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

Appointment of Committees 2013/14 – updated

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	GROUP	CURRENT NUMBERS (1) =Alternate	NOMINATIONS
Community Services	Liberal Democrats	4 (1)	Blackhurst, Kerr, Kightley, Tucker Alt: Brierley
	Labour	4 (1)	Johnson, Moghadas (Community Wellbeing Spokes), Price (Housing Spokes), Roberts Alt: Todd-Jones
Environment	Liberal Democrats	4 (1)	Kightley, Reid, Saunders, Tunnacliffe Alt: Brierley
	Labour	4 (1)	Blencowe (Planning and Climate Change Spokes), Owers (Environmental and Waste Services Spokes), O'Reilly (Public Places Spokes), Marchant-Daisley Alt: Herbert
Strategy & Resources	Liberal Democrats	4 (1)	Boyce, Cantrill, Pitt, Rosenstiel Alt: Stuart
	Labour	4 (1)	Ashton, Benstead (Customer Services and Resources Spokes), Herbert (Strategy Spokes), O'Reilly Alt: Bird

Housing Management Board	Liberal Democrats	4 (1)	Blackhurst, Brierley, Pippas, Rosenstiel Alt: Pitt
	Labour	4 (1)	Bird, Blencowe, Price (Spokes), Johnson Alt: Todd-Jones

REGULATORY COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE/SUB COMMITTEE	NOMINATIONS	CURRENT NUMBERS (1)= Alternate	PROPOSED CHANGES AND NOMINATIONS
PLANNING	Liberal Democrat	4 (1)	Rosenstiel, Saunders, Stuart, Tunnacliffe Alt: Swanson
	Labour	3 (1)	Blencowe, Dryden, Marchant-Daisley Alt: Herbert
	Ind&Con	1	Hipkin
JOINT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE	Liberal Democrat	3 (2)	Reid, Smart, Tucker Alts: Tunnacliffe + 1
	Labour	3 (2)	Blencowe, Dryden, Price, Alts: Herbert and O'Reilly

LICENSING	Liberal Democrat	6 (1)	Brierley, Pippas, Rosenstiel, Saunders, Stuart, Boyce Alt: Brown
	Labour	5 (1)	Benstead, Gawthrope, McPherson, Owers, O'Reilly Alt: Bird
	Ind&Con	1	Meftah
CIVIC AFFAIRS	Liberal Democrat	3 (1)	Cantrill, Pitt, Rosenstiel Alt: Boyce
	Labour	3 (1)	Benstead, Herbert, Johnson Alt: Ashton
EMPLOYMENT APPEALS SUB	Liberal Democrat	5	Brierley, Boyce, Pippas, Smart, Stuart
	Labour	4	Bird, Gawthrope, Price, Birtles
	Ind&Con	1	Hipkin

CIVIC AFFAIRS

To: Committee Members: Rosenstiel, Cantrill, Pitt, Benstead, Herbert and Johnson

Alternates: Councillors Boyce and Ashton

Despatched: Wednesday, 15 May 2013

Date: Thursday, 23 May 2013

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber - Guildhall

Contact: Glenn Burgess

Direct Dial: 01223 457013

AGENDA

1 APPOINTMENT TO WORKING PARTY

To agree the membership of the following.

CHIEF OFFICER PERFORMANCE REVIEW

(6 Members)

Cllrs: Bick, Smart, Stuart, Herbert, O'Reilly and Ashton

Alt: Kightley

COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

To: Scrutiny Committee Members: Kerr, Blackhurst, Kightley, Tucker, Johnson, Moghadas, Price and Roberts

Alternates: Councillors Brierley and Todd-Jones

Executive Councillor for Community Wellbeing: Councillor Brown

Executive Councillor for Housing: Councillor Smart

Despatched: Wednesday, 15 May 2013

Date: Thursday, 23 May 2013

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber - Guildhall

Contact: Glenn Burgess

Direct Dial: 01223 457013

AGENDA

1 APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

The Scrutiny Committee is requested to recommend appointment to the outside bodies listed below.

The Executive Councillor for Community Wellbeing and the Executive Councillor for Housing will be asked to agree the appointments.

Adults Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Committee

(led by County Council) (1 + 1 alternate)

Cllr: Brierley

Alternate: Moghadas

The Junction (3)

Cllrs: Kightley, Cantrill and Birtles

Addenbrookes Board of Governors (1)

Cllr: Swanson

Health and Wellbeing Partnership District Members Group (1)

Cllr: Brown

Opposition Spokes: Moghadas

City and South Cambs Children's and Young People's Area Board (1)

Cllr: Brown

Opposition Spokes: Moghadas

Local Health Partnership (3)

Cllrs: Brown, Moghadas and Smart

Older People Champion (1)

Cllr: Swanson

Young People Champion (1)

Cllr: Kerr

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

To: Scrutiny Committee Members: Kightley, Saunders, Reid, Tunnacliffe, Blencowe, Owers, O'Reilly and Marchant-Daisley

Alternates: Councillors Brierley and Herbert

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Ward

Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services:
Councillor Swanson

Executive Councillor for Public Places: Councillor Reiner

Despatched: Wednesday, 15 May 2013

Date: Thursday, 23 May 2013

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber - Guildhall

Contact: Toni Birkin

Direct Dial: 01223 457013

AGENDA

1 APPOINTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB COMMITTEE

The Scrutiny Committee is requested to agree the membership of the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee:

Cllrs: Reid, Saunders, Brierley, Marchant-Daisley, Price and Blencowe

Alts: Blackhurst and Herbert

To agree the Chair and Vice Chair for the Sub-Committee:

Nominations for Chair: **Cllr Reid or Marchant-Daisley**

Nomination for Vice Chair: Cllr Saunders

2 APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES

To recommend appointments to the outside bodies listed below.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport, Executive Councillor for Public Places and the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services will be asked to agree the appointments.

Local Water Forum (1)

Cllr: Swanson

Cambridge Universities Hospital's Joint Council's Forum (3)

Cllrs: Ward, Pippas and Birtles

Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group (3+2)

Cllrs: Ward, Rosenstiel and Blencowe

Alts: Reid and Price

Transport and Spatial Planning Steering Group (3+2)

Cllrs: Reid, Ward and Blencowe

Alts: Rosenstiel and Price

Recycling in Cambridge and Peterborough (RECAP) (1)

Cllr: Swanson

Opposition Spokes: Owers

Joint Transport and Planning Lead Member Group (1)

Cllr: Ward

PATROL Adjudication and Bus Lane Adjudication Joint Committee (1)

Cllr: Ward

Cycling Champion (1)

Cllr: Cantrill

Design Champion (1)

Cllr: Stuart

Historic Environment Champion (1)

Cllr: Tunnacliffe

Licensing Committee

Committee Members: Councillors Rosenstiel (Chair), Benstead (Vice-Chair), Brierley, Pippas, Saunders, Stuart, Gawthrop, McPherson, Owers, O'Reilly, Meftah and Boyce

Alternates: Councillors Brown and Bird

Published & Despatched: Wednesday, 15 May 2013

Date: Thursday, 23 May 2013
Time: 2.00 pm
Venue: Council Chamber - Guildhall
Contact: Glenn Burgess

AGENDA

1 Appointment of Sub Committees

To agree the membership of 4 Subcommittees of 3 members each to undertake the business of the Licensing Committee.

Sub Committee A: Rosenstiel, O'Reilly, Gawthrop

Sub Committee B: Benstead, Boyce, Brierley

Sub Committee C: Saunders, Owers, Meftah

Sub Committee D: Stuart, McPherson, Pippas

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

To: **Scrutiny Committee Members** – Pitt, Cantrill, Boyce, Rosenstiel, Ashton, Benstead, Herbert and O'Reilly

Alternates: Councillors Stuart and Bird

Leader of the Council: Councillor Bick

Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources:
Councillor Smith

Despatched: Wednesday 15 May 2013

Date: Thursday, 23 May 2013

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber - Guildhall

Contact: Glenn Burgess

Direct Dial: 01223 457013

AGENDA

1 APPOINTMENT OF EQUALITIES PANEL

The Scrutiny Committee is requested to agree the four nominations below:

Cllrs: Brown, Bick, Bird and Johnson

2 APPOINTMENT OF JOINT STAFF EMPLOYER FORUM

The Scrutiny Committee is requested to agree the membership of Joint Staff Employer Forum:

Cllrs: Smart, Boyce, Swanson, Gawthrope, Dryden and Bird

Alt: Kightley

To agree the Chair for the Forum:

Nomination for Chair: Smart

Nomination for Vice-Chair: Boyce

3 APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES

The Scrutiny Committee is requested to recommend appointment to the outside bodies listed below.

The Leader and the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources will be asked to agree the appointments.

City University Forum - ARU (4)

Cllrs: Brown, Saunders, O'Reilly and Marchant-Daisley

LGA Urban Commission (2)

Cllrs: Rosenstiel and O'Reilly

Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (1)

Cllr: Bick

Opposition Spokes: Herbert

Local Government information Unit (1)

Cllr: Rosenstiel

Police and Crime Panel (1)

Cllr: Bick

Alt: Smart

East of England Local Government Association (1)

Cllr: Bick

LGA General Assembly (1)

Cllr: Bick

Horizons Board (1)

Cllr: Bick

City Community Safety Partnership (1)

Cllr: Bick

Opposition Spokes: Herbert

Director Representative on the BID Board (1)

Cllr: Reiner

Member Training Champions (2)

Cllrs: Boyce and O'Reilly

Appointment of Directors: University Site – Joint Venture Company (3)

Cllrs: Cantrill, Reid, Blencowe

Oral Questions for Council (in order for Council)

1. Councillor Johnson to the Executive Councillor for Public Places

Can the Executive Councillor for Public Places reassure Council that the surveillance of Cambridge boat-dwellers, as recently highlighted in local media, did not breach the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act?

2. Councillor Reid to the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services

Would the Executive Councillor explain her reactions to Marshall's announcement on Monday of the increase in flights from Cambridge Airport?

3. Councillor Blackhurst to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Has the Adjudicator ruled on the Council's dispute with Apollo and if so, will the Executive Councillor tell us what effect the ruling will have on the programme of planned maintenance?

4. Councillor Tunnacliffe to the Executive Councillor for Public Places

Could the Executive Councillor provide an update on the proposed lighting along the footpaths on Parkers Piece?

5. Councillor Cantrill to the Chair of the Civic Affairs Committee

At a time when the public engagement in the election process is low, it is important that the City Council does everything possible to make the process of voting easy.

The selection of the University Sports Ground as the location for one of the polling stations in the Newnham ward in the recent County Council elections, did nothing to help this goal.

Could the Executive Councillor for CS&R indicate what actions are being taken to ensure that this venue is not used again.

6. Councillor Pitt to the Executive Councillor for Public Places

What steps have been taken to address the issues around punt touting ahead of this summer?

7. Councillor Price to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources

How many of those affected by the Bedroom Tax/Social Sector Size Criteria were given wrong information about the amount of money they would lose from their housing benefit by housing officers?

2013 Council AGM**Labour Amendment to Liberal Democrat Accountability Motion**

1. The Council is committed to further improving its own democratic accountability and decision making, including major improvements to joint delivery. Internal issues at the county council are the job of the newly elected County Council.
2. The Chief Executive is asked to write to the County Council proposing improvements to joint decision making, including detailed proposals to revamp the new Area Joint Transport Committee, with clear responsibility and accountability for delivering all Cambridge area transport initiatives, working closely with South Cambridgeshire.
3. The Council supports a unitary council for the combined area of the two councils, to radically improve delivery for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire residents and businesses, and deliver better decisions and future planning, improved and more efficient services, and clear accountability and transparency.

The Council recognises that this change needs detailed discussion with South Cambridgeshire and the County Council to seek support and agreement, and then consult with Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire residents and organisations to decide whether and how best to implement it.

4. As a half way house, the Council will also work with South Cambridgeshire and the County Council to establish a 'virtual unitary council' including fully integrating Local Plans and Transport Strategy, expanding joint services and shared delivery, and wider initiatives to achieve integrated, efficient, effective and accountable local government for the city and the Greater Cambridge area.

Council 23 May 2013 Written Questions

1. Councillor Rosenstiel to the Leader of the Council.

What are the objectives of the Construct programme, which has been funded by the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership and run by the City Council's ChYPPS team and was referred to in the Cambridge News of 11th May?

Who participates in the programme and how and why are they invited?

What type of activities are undertaken by participants on the programme?

Over the times that the programme has been run, what outcomes have been assessed?

What is the relationship between this programme and the application of sanctions for wrongdoing through the criminal justice system?

Response:

"What are the objectives of the Construct programme, which has been funded by the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership and run by the City Council's Children and Young Peoples Participation Service (Chypps) team and which was criticised in the paper last week?

- A reduction in Antisocial Behaviour in a particular hotspot area or
- That the offending behaviour of a young person is significantly reduced, stopped or averted altogether.
- Helping young people to engage beyond the project in a positive way
- Helping young people to resist pressure to get involved in ASB

Who participates in the programme and how and why are they invited?

Young people between the ages of 9-12 who have been identified as being at risk of engaging in or are engaging in ASB, for example they may have been causing a nuisance to other residents, entering their gardens without permission, swearing in the street or throwing objects.

They are referred by Police, Safer Communities Team, City Homes, Housing Associations and Fire and Rescue

On the 2012/13 programme 7 were referred by Police, 2 by the Council's Safer Community Team, 1 by Chypps.

What type of activities are undertaken by participants on the programme?

- A family event to introduce them to the programme
- A team building activity or residential to introduce the young people to each other and establish rules
- Weekly meeting after school to take part in positive activities such as cooking, art, music making/playing and Urban Adventure playground activity
- End of project residential

These activities also include some group exercises that are designed to address discriminatory attitudes and to explore the consequences of actions and accepting responsibility.

The various activities are used as learning and development opportunities around attitudes and behaviour. One to one interventions are also used to challenge attitudes and behaviour and to recognise and praise positive outcomes.

The young people are signposted to other activities when the programme ends.

Over the times that the programme has been run, what outcomes have been assessed?

- ASB overall is down 23% in the City
- ASB in Abbey Ward where the last Construct programme was focused is down 30% - 84 incidents from Nov – Feb compared to 120 incidents for the same period last year
- The Cambridge Community Safety Partnership in their plan for 2012/13 had pledged to do preventative work with young people that would contribute to 'having no more than 130 first time entrants to the criminal justice system from Cambridge for 2012/13' and this has been achieved.
- Three of the young people referred to the Construct programme 2012/13 had been the subject of discussion at Problem Solving Group (a multi-agency group working together to take enforcement and/or preventative actions to address ASB) and the cases relating to them have been closed as there has been no further reported problems with the young people.
- Three young people who took part in an earlier Construct programme were known to the Youth Offending Service but none have committed an offence since taking part.

What is the relationship between this programme and the application of sanctions for wrongdoing through the criminal justice system?"

This programme is aimed at very low level ASB or behaviour that indicates a young person may be at risk of engaging in ASB. It is primarily aimed at stopping a young person entering the criminal justice system and steering them away to more positives activities. Criminal justice sanctions are applied in the normal way if individuals offend before, during or after participation in the programmes if this is appropriate. The programme is designed to change behaviour that might escalate to a point where sanctions are appropriate, it is not in lieu of these sanctions.

Quote from Tom Jefford Head of the Youth Offending Service

“There is a clear case for prevention to reduce the higher costs of later interventions should young people enter the criminal justice system. This should also be thought about in regard to the reductions in the number of victims of offences and the general safety of the community at large. The thrust of Government policy is towards effective and targeted early intervention as expressed by the Troubled Families agenda of which the City Council is an active partner in seeking to intervene positively and with a real chance of sustained behavioural change, for families where problems have become entrenched. Taking action before a crime has been committed or a victim has been harmed must be the preference for policy and practice.”

2. Councillor Hipkin to the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

What weight of support was there (judged by numbers of representations) in the recent Local Plan Options and Issues consultation for 14000 homes in the city up to 2031 (the figure going forward in the Draft Local Plan) compared to the three other options offered?

Response attached separately

This page is intentionally left blank