





Council Information Pack 24 July 2014

Chamber Seating Plan	Page: 1
Budget 2014/15 – further amendment by the Executive	Page: 2
Budget 2014/15 – amendment as proposed by Liberal Democrat Group at the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 14 July 2014	Page: 4 - 29
New convention for Planning Committee relating to decisions contrary to officer advice – Amended Appendix C of officers report	Page: 30 - 31
Civic Affairs Adoption Minutes: - Constitutional Impact - Transfer of Planning Items from Area to Central Planning Committee - City Council Appointment to the Conservators of the River Cam	Page: 32 - 35
Amendment to Motion A: proposed by Councillor Blackhurst	Page: 36
Amendment to Motion C: proposed by Councillor Johnson	Page: 37
Oral Questions	Page: 38 - 39



Council Meeting 24 July 2014

Item 4(a): Budget 2014/15 - Amendment by the Executive

FURTHER AMENDMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE

The following amendments are proposed to papers circulated:

(i) Delete LS6:

It has come to light that, since Strategy and Resources on the 14th July, the original estimate for the cost of altering the mechanism on the minority of toilets that require payment to increase the entry charge by 10p was too low, and the cost will be higher than previously thought. In light of this, and the need for a comprehensive review of toilet provision in Cambridge rather than making piecemeal changes, this item is withdrawn.

Replace with:

(ii) Additional Waste Service £10k saving per annum from 2015/16

Joint waste operational centre with South Cambs DC - further savings are anticipated in addition to those included in the budget (reference SR3303).

(iii) Reduce contribution to “Sharing Prosperity Fund” by £5k in 2014/15

This will reduce the contribution in 2014/15 to £9,760.

(iv) Summary:

Council Amendment (Executive): Revenue (General Fund Reserves) - Appendix A

Reference	Portfolio	Item Description	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
New items for approval July Council - Council Amendment (Executive)							
Delete:							
LS6	Environment, Waste and Public Health	Increase charges at public toilets that require payment	5,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	Bob Carter
<p>Increase charges at public toilets that require payment by 10p (from 20 to 30p) - This is a small increase, still keeping public toilet charges at a modest level to yield increased income for the council. The alterations to the toilets can be funded from existing R & R budgets.</p> <p>It has come to light that, since Strategy and Resources on the 14th July, the original estimate for the cost of altering the mechanism on the minority of toilets that require payment to increase the entry charge by 10p was too low, and the cost will be higher than previously thought. In light of this, and the need for a comprehensive review of toilet provision in Cambridge rather than making piecemeal changes, this item is withdrawn.</p>							
Replace with:							
LSNew2	Environment, Waste and Public Health	Waste Service	0	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	Jas Lally
<p>Joint waste operational centre with South Cambs DC - further savings anticipated in addition to those included in the budget (reference SR3303)</p>							
LB3	Finance and Resources	Contributions from core funding to 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'	(5,000)	0	0	0	Ray Ward
<p>Ongoing contributions from Savings to the 'Sharing Prosperity Fund" - reduces contribution to £9,760 in 2014/15.</p>							
Net Revenue items			0	0	0	0	

(v) Note: Appendix E EQIA and Appendix D Earmarked Funds (for “Saving Prosperity Fund”) will be updated to reflect these changes.

This page is intentionally left blank

NOTICE OF COUNCIL MEETING - 24 JULY 2014

Dear Councillor,

A meeting of Cambridge City Council will be held in the Council Chamber - Guildhall on Thursday, 24 July 2014 at 6.00 pm and I hereby summon you to attend.

Dated 16 July 2014

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'AP Jackson', with a large, stylized initial 'A'.

Chief Executive

Supplementary Agenda**Associated Budget Documents**

Budget 2014/15 – Amendment proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group

Budget amendment tabled for scrutiny at the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 14 July 2014.

This page is intentionally left blank



To: Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources:
George Owers

Report by: Director of Business Transformation

Relevant scrutiny committee: Strategy & Resources 14 July 2014

Wards affected: All Wards

Budget 2014/15 – Amendment proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group

Key Decision

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 This report sets out a budget amendment proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group.
- 1.2 The appendices to this report present the budget proposals in relation to specific budget items for both General Fund (GF) Revenue and Capital as follows:
- (i) to add new budget proposals
 - (ii) to amend or delete specific revenue budgets
 - (iii) to amend changes to the Capital & Revenue projects Plan
 - (iv) to amend contributions to and use of Earmarked Funds.
- 1.3 The item descriptions included in Appendix A have been provided by the Liberal Democrat Group.
- 1.4 The purpose of this amendment, as stated by the Liberal Democrat Group, is:
- (i) to maintain the council's commitment to the easing of congestion in the city, in particular by sustaining the "Keep Cambridge Moving Fund" to strengthen the council's leverage with the county council and the highways agency for traffic mitigation measures arising from the growth associated with the enlargement of the A14;
 - (ii) prior to committing resources to the Anti-Poverty Strategy, to await the clear definition of areas where the city council expenditure is realistically able to provide measurable long term reduction in poverty in the city;
 - (iii) to continue to meet needs for future policy initiatives, whether fixed term or ongoing, through the existing budgeted Priority Policy Fund;
 - (iv) to enable momentum to be maintained in the council's established councillor-led Living Wage policy in conjunction with the council's accreditation with the living wage foundation and the promotion of the living wage week;

- (v) to increase the council's general custodianship of public open spaces by providing additional on-the-spot staff for peak times of the year, including but not unduly focused on enforcement activity.

2. Recommendations

2.1 To recommend to Council budget changes as outlined in the following:

General Fund Revenue Budgets:

2.2 Approve the following revenue budget changes:

- delete or add new items funded from General Fund Reserves, as shown in Appendix A, with item descriptions provided by the Liberal Democrat Group
- delete items funded from External or Earmarked Funds, as shown in Appendix B

Capital & Revenue Projects Plan:

2.3 Approve the capital amendment, as shown in Appendix C.

Earmarked Reserves:

2.4 Approve changes as follows:

- ***Amend the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund'.***

The Budget-Setting Report approved by Council in February 2014 included a contribution to this fund of £1,063.9k and the Executive have reduced this to £263.9k. This amendment proposes to reverse this. The updated Earmarked and Specific Funds are shown in Appendix D.

- ***Delete the earmarked reserve of £500,000 for 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'***
- ***Delete the earmarked reserve of £300,000 for 'Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund'.***

3. Earmarked Reserves

3.1 It is recommended that the revenue and capital contributions to "Keep Cambridge Moving Fund" are re-instated so that the fund balance will be £1.5m, deleting the proposed new earmarked funds.

4. Capital

4.1 The Liberal Democrat Group are proposing to reverse the Executive proposal by reinstating the 'Capital contribution to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' of £111,140, as identified in Appendix C.

5. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

The financial implications are outlined in the proposals. The follow table summarises the revenue position:

	Delete (£)	2014/15	2015/16 onwards
LB2	Bolstering Public Realm enforcement	(51,000)	(102,000)
LS6	Increase charges at Public toilets	5,000	10,000
LS5	Return planning from Area committees to central planning Committee	3,400	3,400
LS1	Increase Roundabout charges	0	5,000
-	Surplus to 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'	(14,760)	0
		(57,360)	(83,600)

	New (£)		
LD1	Support Living Wage week	2,000	2,000
LD2	4 Seasonal part-time Park Rangers	14,720	58,870
		16,720	60,870
	Return to General Fund Reserves	(40,640)	(22,730)

(b) Staffing Implications

Where relevant, these are included in the proposals outlined in the Appendices.

(c) Equal Opportunities Implications

An Equality Impact Assessment is included as Appendix E.

(d) Consultation

Public consultations relating to Council services are undertaken throughout the year, and details can be found on the Council's website - details of the results of the 2013 survey can be found on the internet at: <http://alturl.com/h9jgw>

(e) Community Safety

Where relevant, these are included in the proposals outlined in the Appendices.

(g) Environmental Implications

Where relevant, officers have considered the environmental impact of budget proposals.

6. Background papers

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Mid-Year Financial Review (MFR) 2013
- Budget files: Revised 2013/14 and Original 2014/15.

7. Appendices

In this Report:

Budget 2014/15 – Liberal Democrat Group Amendment:

- Appendix A - Revenue items
- Appendix B - Earmarked items
- Appendix C - Capital items
- Appendix D - Earmarked & Specific Funds
- Appendix E - Equality Impact Assessment

8. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name:	John Harvey
Author's Phone Number:	01223 - 458143
Author's Email:	john.harvey@cambridge.gov.uk

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Revenue (General Fund Reserves) - Appendix A

Reference	Portfolio	Old Portfolio	Item Description	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
Delete								
LNCL1	Finance and Resources	Strategy & Resources - Strategy	Decrease contribution to Keep Cambridge Moving Fund Traffic congestion is one of the factors endangering the continuing prosperity of Cambridge; down-grading the fund to deal with this is unacceptable when the opportunity to implement long held ambitions may arise at short notice or match funding could be demanded by the County to implement schemes. We have a one-off opportunity to get a key part of the city's future success right: we need to be prepared.	688,840	0	0	0	Simon Payne
LNCL2	Finance and Resources	Strategy & Resources - Strategy	Contribution to create 'Sharing Prosperity Fund While fully supporting the expressed concern about the pockets of poverty in the city, in view of the extensive work already done by the council to alleviate it, we need a coherent strategy to bring things together and identify gaps where council action would be appropriate and effective. Until that is done, this fund is premature.	(500,000)	0	0	0	Andrew Limb
LNCL3	Finance and Resources	Strategy & Resources - Strategy	Contribution to create a Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund (FTPPF) There is no need for a separate fund as the previous administration was very careful to allocate money from the NHB to things which would increase the NHB or were of a time-limited nature. Separate funds limit the ability of the Council to be flexible to achieve its aims.	(300,000)	0	0	0	Ray Ward
LS6	Environment, Waste and Public Health	Environment - Environmental & Waste Services	Increase charges at public toilets that require payment This breaks the policy that charges would be minimal so all could afford to use them but would provide a bar to casual vandalism. Changing the locks will cost money and needing two coins will be inconvenient for the public.	5,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	Bob Carter
LS1	City Centre and Public Places	Environment - Public Places	Increase roundabout sponsorship Premature to count on this increased sum as every proposal will need planning permission which residents in conservation areas have opposed vigorously in the past.	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	Alistair Wilson

Reference	Portfolio	Old Portfolio	Item Description	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
LS5	Finance and Resources	Strategy & Resources - Customer Services & Resources	Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee The Liberal Democrat group are committed to devolving decision making to local communities across the city. The determination of planning at area committees is a clear demonstration of this commitment. The removal of planning from area committees and the reduction in their frequency is a clear erosion of local decision making and is something we oppose	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	Gary Clift
LB2	Environment, Waste and Public Health	Environment - Environmental & Waste Services	Bolstering Public Realm Enforcement There is a fundamental difference of approach between the two groups on where the line should be drawn between engagement/education and enforcement. We oppose the more punitive attitude taken by the leading group as we do not think criminalising people quickly is appropriate or in the long-term good of the city.	(51,000)	(102,000)	(102,000)	(102,000)	Adrian Ash
LB3	Finance and Resources	Strategy & Resources - Strategy	Contributions from core funding to 'Sharing Prosperity Fund' See LNCL2	(14,760)	0	0	0	Ray Ward
LD1	Strategy and Transformation	Strategy & Resources - Strategy	Provision of budget to support Living Wage week The city council is committed to the adoption of the living wage within Cambridge. It was introduced by the council in 2013 and it has initiated accreditation of the authority by the living wage foundation. The Liberal Democrat group believe that engagement with other employers should be undertaken at a senior political level and in conjunction with the living wage foundation. The proposed funding will provide a platform during the living wage week for the council to undertake this.	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	Deborah Simson
LD2	Environment, Waste and Public Health	Environment - Environmental & Waste Services	Creation of 4 seasonal part-time Park Rangers New posts to provide broad council guardianship of the most frequented public open spaces at busiest times of the year, stretching from on the spot first aid litter management and maintenance reporting to the issue of fixed penalty notices when appropriate in accordance with the council's policy. Post holders to work a 3 day week, including weekends and public holidays, with post holders assigned to particular open spaces and contactable by users.	14,720	58,870	58,870	58,870	Adrian Ash
Net Revenue items				(151,780)	(22,730)	(22,730)	(22,730)	
Return to General Fund Reserves				40,640	22,730	22,730	22,730	
Net Revenue				(111,140)	0	0	0	

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Revenue (Earmarked Funds) - Appendix B

Reference	Portfolio	Old Portfolio	Item Description	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
Delete								
Sharing Prosperity Fund								
LX1	Housing	Community Services - Housing	Expanded programme of 'Community Clear-Out Days' Living Wage External Campaign Officer	(9,000)	0	0	0	Liz Bisset
LX2	Strategy and Transformation	Strategy & Resources - Strategy	Promotion budget to accompany Living Wage campaign	(9,820)	(19,630)	(9,820)	0	Deborah Simpson
LX3	Strategy and Transformation	Strategy & Resources - Strategy	Water and Energy Costs Anti-Poverty Scheme	(3,500)	(7,000)	(3,500)	0	Deborah Simpson
LX4	Finance and Resources	Strategy & Resources - Strategy	Extra project budget for Private Sector Energy Youth Apprenticeship Programme	(15,000)	(40,000)	(45,000)	0	Jas Lally
LX5	Finance and Resources	Strategy & Resources - Strategy		(2,000)	(2,500)	(2,500)	0	Jas Lally
LX6	Strategy and Transformation	Strategy & Resources - Strategy		(31,500)	(63,000)	(94,500)	(126,000)	Deborah Simpson
Sharing Prosperity Fund Total items				(70,820)	(132,130)	(155,320)	(126,000)	
Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund								
FPPF3	Strategy and Transformation	Environment - Planning & Climate Change	Cambridge Specific promotion of the Cambridgeshire Collective Switching Scheme and Action on Energy	(5,000)	(2,500)	(2,500)	0	Jas Lally
FPPF2	City Centre and Public Places	Environment - Public Places	Chesterford Co-ordinator	(11,250)	(22,500)	(11,250)	0	Emma Thornton
Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund Total				(16,250)	(25,000)	(13,750)	0	

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Capital - Appendix C

Reference	Portfolio	Old Portfolio	Item Description	2014/15 Budget £	2015/16 Budget £	2016/17 Budget £	2017/18 Budget £	Contact
Reinstate								
Capital contribution to the 'Keep Cambridge Movina Fund'								
LC1			Reinstate 'Capital contribution to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' and Capital Plan SC593 [Linked to LNCL1]	111,140	0	0	0	
Requirement for Capital Funding (included above)				111,140	0	0	0	

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Earmarked Funds - Appendix D

Earmarked & Specific Funds (all figures in £'000s)

Sharing Prosperity Fund

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
(Surplus) / Deficit Balance b/f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contributions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contributions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total surplus available	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Expenditure approvals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pending approvals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(Surplus) / Deficit Balance c/f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
(Surplus) / Deficit Balance b/f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contributions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total surplus available	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Expenditure approvals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(Surplus) / Deficit Balance c/f	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Keep Cambridge Moving Fund

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
(Surplus) / Deficit Balance b/f	(436.1)	(1,500.0)	(1,500.0)	(1,500.0)
Contributions	(1,063.9)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total surplus available	(1,500.0)	(1,500.0)	(1,500.0)	(1,500.0)
Expenditure approvals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(Surplus) / Deficit Balance c/f	(1,500.0)	(1,500.0)	(1,500.0)	(1,500.0)

Cambridge City Council Equality Impact Assessment



Completing an Equality Impact Assessment will help you to think about what impact your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service may have on people that live in, work in or visit Cambridge, as well as on City Council staff.

The template is easy to use. You do not need to have specialist equalities knowledge to complete it. It asks you to make judgements based on evidence and experience. There are guidance notes on the intranet to help you. You can also get advice from Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer on 01223 457174 or email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk or from any member of the Joint Equalities Group.

1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service:

Budget 2014/15 – Amendment proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group

2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

The objective of the Liberal Democrat Group amendment is to propose changes to the budget for the General Fund for 2014/15, following the Executive Amendment. The proposed Liberal Democrat Group amendments include: new budget proposals; amendments to, or deletion of, specific existing revenue budgets; amendments to existing items on the Capital and Revenue Projects Plan.

This EQIA provides an assessment of the equality impacts of the amendments proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group, based on the information available about each project – the information is taken directly from the Liberal Democrat Group proposal and referenced below

There is a more detailed EqIA on item LS5 (returning planning from area committees to a central planning committee) which is the subject of a separate report and EqIA to Environment Scrutiny Committee on 8 July.

It is recommended that should any of the Liberal Democrat Group amendments be agreed, a fuller and more comprehensive EqIA should be completed.

The Liberal Democrat Group amendments are listed here and are evaluated later on in the assessment.

LNCL1 Decrease contribution to Keep Cambridge Moving Fund

“Traffic congestion is one of the factors endangering the continuing prosperity of Cambridge: down-grading the fund to deal with this is unacceptable when the opportunity to implement long held ambitions may arise at short notice or match funding could be demanded by the County to implement schemes. We have a one-off opportunity to get a key part of the city's future success right: we need to be prepared.”

LNCL2 Contribution to create 'Sharing Prosperity Fund/ LB3 Contributions from core funding to 'Sharing Prosperity Fund'

“While fully supporting the expressed concern about the pockets of poverty in the city, in view of the extensive work already done by the council to alleviate it, we need a coherent strategy to bring things together and identify gaps where council action would be appropriate and effective. Until that is done, this fund is premature”

LNCL3 Contribution to create a Fixed-Term Priority Project Fund (FTPPF)

“There is no need for a separate fund as the previous administration was very careful to allocate money from the NHB to things which would increase the NHB or were of a time-limited nature. Separate funds limit the ability of the Council to be flexible to achieve its aims”

LS6 Increase charges at public toilets that require payment

“This breaks the policy that charges would be minimal so all could afford to use them but would provide a bar to casual vandalism. Changing the locks will cost money and needing

2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

two coins will be inconvenient for the public”

LS1 Increase roundabout sponsorship

“Premature to count on this increased sum as every proposal will need planning permission which residents in conservation areas have opposed vigorously in the past”

LS5 Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee

“The Liberal Democrat group are committed to devolving decision making to local communities across the city. The determination of planning at area committees is a clear demonstration of this commitment. The removal of planning from area committees and the reduction in their frequency is a clear erosion of local decision making and is something we oppose”

LB2 Bolstering Public Realm Enforcement

“There is a fundamental difference of approach between the two groups on where the line should be drawn between engagement/education and enforcement. We oppose the more punitive attitude taken by the leading group as we do not think criminalising people quickly is appropriate or in the long-term good of the city”

***New Proposal* LD1 Provision of budget to support Living Wage week**

“The City Council is committed to the adoption of the living wage within Cambridge. It was introduced by the council in 2013 and it has initiated accreditation of the authority by the living wage foundation. The Liberal Democrat group believe that engagement with other employers should be undertaken at a senior political level and in conjunction with the living wage foundation. The proposed funding will provide a platform during the living wage week for the council to undertake this”

***New Proposal* LD2 Creation of 4 seasonal part-time Park Rangers**

“New posts to provide broad council guardianship of the most frequented public open spaces at busiest times of the year, stretching from on the spot first aid litter management and maintenance reporting to the issue of fixed penalty notices when appropriate in accordance with the council's policy. Post holders to work a 3 day week, including weekends and public holidays, with post holders assigned to particular open spaces and contactable by users”

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

3. Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service? (Please tick those that apply)

☒ Residents

☒ Visitors

☒ Staff

A specific client group or groups (please state):

This is an assessment of proposed amendments to the Council's budget. The amendments relate to a number of different City Council service areas. Some of the proposals will have a universal impact, while others may have a differential impact on particular client groups. Further information on these impacts is set out in section 7 of this assessment.

4. What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this? (Please tick)

☒ New

☐ Revised

☐ Existing

5. Responsible directorate and service

Directorate: Business Transformation

Service: Accounting Services

6. Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

☐ No

☒ Yes (please give details):

The proposed amendments would require action by a number of City Council services, including City Homes, Corporate Strategy, Human Resources, Planning, Property Services, Refuse and Environment, Streets and Open Spaces, and Tourism and City Centre Management

7. Potential impact

Please list and explain how this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could **positively** or **negatively** affect individuals from the following equalities groups.

When answering this question, please think about:

- The results of relevant consultation that you or others have completed (for example with residents, people that work in or visit Cambridge, service users, staff or partner organisations).
- Complaints information.
- Performance information.
- Information about people using your service (for example whether people from certain equalities groups use the service more or less than others).
- Inspection results.
- Comparisons with other organisations.
- The implementation of your piece of work (don't just assess what you think the impact will be after you have completed your work, but also think about what steps you might have to take to make sure that the implementation of your work does not negatively impact on people from a particular equality group).
- The relevant premises involved.
- Your communications.
- National research (local information is not always available, particularly for some equalities groups, so use national research to provide evidence for your conclusions).

(a) Age (any group of people of a particular age, including younger and older people – in particular, please consider any safeguarding issues for children and vulnerable adults)

LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment - The Executive amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, which could include some older people. The Liberal Democrat Group amendment suggests that keeping some cost at a lower rate which may benefit those older people who frequently use the facilities.

LS5 - Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee – The Liberal Democrat Group proposal suggests keeping planning decisions at area committee meetings held in community venues rather than moving to a central planning committee held in the Guildhall. This could have both positive and negative impacts for different age groups.

There could be benefits for some people who have mobility issues, including some older people who might find it more difficult to travel in from the area in which they live into the centre of the City to attend meetings.

However the Guildhall is located in the centre of Cambridge, arguably the most accessible part of Cambridge by public transport. The Guildhall is also an accessible public building, set up and fully equipped for meetings to take place.

Keeping evening meetings instead of afternoon meetings could have both positive and negative impacts for different age groups. Meetings that take place in the evenings are better for working people, people of school age or anyone normally unavailable during the day would need to arrange time off to attend an afternoon meeting.

However, for afternoon meetings might be better for people who may not wish to be out in the evenings or late at night or who are not normally available in the evening. The availability of public transport is also better during the daytime compared to late evening.

LX2 - Living Wage External Campaign Officer and LX3 - Promotion Budget to accompany Living Wage Campaign – The Liberal Democrat Group amendment would remove the proposal for a dedicated officer to promote the Living Wage. If engagement is undertaken at a senior political level, to promote the uptake of organisations paying a Living Wage to their staff, this may have a positive impact on those residents who are currently not paid the Living Wage.

There may be a disproportionate representation of some of the protected characteristics amongst those who are currently paid less than the Living Wage in the City. For example, recent national research by the Resolution Foundation (Low Pay Britain, 2012) found that people aged 16-20 (76%), 21-30 (27%) and 60+ (23%) are most likely to receive less than the living wage. However, further research would be needed to demonstrate the impact on particular groups within Cambridge, as trends may differ from those observed nationally.

(b) Disability (including people with a physical impairment, sensory impairment, learning disability, mental health problem or other condition which has an impact on their daily life)

LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment

The Executive amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, which could include some people with disabilities. The Liberal Democrat Group amendment suggests that keeping some cost at a lower rate which may benefit those people with disabilities or health conditions who frequently use the facilities.

LS5 - Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee

The Liberal Democrat Group proposal suggests keeping planning decisions at area committee meetings held in community venues rather than moving to a central planning committee held in the Guildhall. This could have both positive and negative impacts for different groups of people who may have disabilities or health needs.

There could be benefits for some people who have mobility issues who might find it more difficult to travel in from the area in which they live to the centre of the City to attend meetings.

However the Guildhall is located in the centre of Cambridge, arguably the most accessible part of Cambridge by public transport. The Guildhall is also an accessible public building, set up and fully equipped for meetings to take place.

However, for afternoon meetings might be better for people who may not wish to be out in the evenings or late at night or who may rely on additional support to attend meetings.

The availability of public transport is also better during the daytime compared to late evening.

(c) Gender

LX2 - Living Wage External Campaign Officer and LX3 - Promotion Budget to accompany Living Wage Campaign - The Liberal Democrat Group amendment would remove the proposal for a dedicated officer to promote the Living Wage. If engagement is undertaken at a senior political level, to promote the uptake of organisations paying a Living Wage to their staff, this may have a positive impact on those residents who are currently not paid the Living Wage. The promotion of the living wage within the City may result in more businesses and other organisations within the City, including the Universities, paying a Living Wage to their staff, could have a positive impact on those residents who are currently not paid the Living Wage.

There may be a disproportionate representation of some of the protected characteristics amongst those who are currently paid less than the Living Wage in the City. For example, recent national research by the Resolution Foundation (Low Pay Britain, 2012) found that a higher proportion of women (25%) receive less than the living wage than men (15%). However, further research would be needed to demonstrate the impact on particular groups within Cambridge, as trends may differ from those observed nationally.

LS5 - Returning planning from area committees to central planning committee - There are no specific gender implications from this proposed change. However, attending meetings in the afternoon may be more difficult if individuals have primary childcare or caring responsibilities, but this may apply equally to the evening.

(d) Pregnancy and maternity

LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment - The Executive amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a small negative impact on those people who need to use toilets more frequently, including those who are pregnant or those with young children. The Liberal Democrat Group amendment suggests that keeping some cost at a lower rate which may benefit those people/ families who frequently use the facilities.

(e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)

LS6 - Increased charges at public toilets that require payment - The Executive amendment to increase charges from 20p to 30p at those public toilets which require payment may have a disproportionate impact on transgender people. The City Council provides toilets in 21 locations, of which 14 are free and 7 are subject to a 20p charge for use. Of the 7 which are subject to charges, 6 are unisex toilets, while a mixture of male, female and unisex toilets are provided at the seventh location (Drummer Street). Transgender residents and visitors may feel more comfortable using unisex toilets rather than designated male or female toilets in the city.

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

(f) Marriage and Civil Partnership

No differential impact on people of particular marital or civil partnership status has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments.

(g) Race or Ethnicity

No differential impact on people of a particular race or ethnicity has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments.

(h) Religion or Belief

No differential impact on people of particular religion or beliefs has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments

(i) Sexual Orientation

No differential impact on people of a particular sexual orientation has been identified through this assessment of the proposed budget amendments

(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – in particular – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty (please state):

LNCL1 - Maintaining the contribution to the Keep Cambridge Moving Fund and LNCL2 - Contribution to Sharing Prosperity Fund. - These amendments propose to reinstate the capital contribution to the 'Keep Cambridge Moving Fund' and Capital Plan SC593 [Linked to LNCL1] and would mean not investing £500,000 in the Executive's proposed 'Sharing Prosperity Fund' to support the delivery of an Anti-Poverty Strategy.

This may mean that the reversal of the funding proposal could have a negative impact on residents on low incomes, by removing an earmarked fund which would support projects that aim to assist those on low incomes, reduce economic inequality and ameliorate deprivation.

The initial projects that would have been supported by the Fund were likely to have had a positive impact on those on low incomes, including the expanded programme of 'Community Clear-Out Days', the Living Wage Campaign Officer, the Water Costs Anti-Poverty Scheme, the extra project budget for private sector energy and the Youth Apprenticeship Programme – referenced below. The remainder of the Fund would have been be used to support projects which meet the objectives of the Anti-Poverty Strategy.

- LX1 - Expanded programme of 'Community Clear Out Days'
- LX2 - Living Wage External Campaign Officer and LX3 - Promotion Budget to accompany Living Wage Campaign -
- LX4 - Water and Energy Costs Anti-Poverty Scheme
- LX5 - Extra project budget for Private Sector Energy Officer
- LX6 - Youth Apprenticeship Programme

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – in particular – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty (please state):

By proposing to retain the “Keep Cambridge Moving Fund” and tackle things like traffic congestion instead, the amendment may have a positive impact on transport and mobility across the City which may have indirect impacts on employees and employers. There may also be some health impacts in terms of air quality and road safety. This would need to be explored in more detail in a revised EqlA as there is limited information available currently.

8. If you have any additional comments please add them here

9. Conclusions and Next Steps

- If you have not identified any negative impacts, please sign off this form.
- If you have identified potential negative actions, you must complete the action plan at the end of this document to set out how you propose to mitigate the impact. If you do not feel that the potential negative impact can be mitigated, you must complete question 8 to explain why that is the case.
- If there is insufficient evidence to say whether or not there is likely to be a negative impact, please complete the action plan setting out what additional information you need to gather to complete the assessment.

All completed Equality Impact Assessments must be emailed to Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer, who will arrange for it to be published on the City Council’s website.

Email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk

10. Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer: David Kidston, Strategy and Partnerships Manager

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted:

Date of completion: 24 June 2014

Date of next review of the assessment:

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

Action Plan

Equality Impact Assessment title:

Date of completion:

Equality Group	Age
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Disability
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Gender
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

Equality Group	Pregnancy and Maternity
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Transgender
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Marriage and Civil Partnership
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

Equality Group	Race or Ethnicity
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Religion or Belief
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Equality Group	Sexual Orientation
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Budget Amendment (LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP) - Appendix E

Other factors that may lead to inequality	
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	
Officer responsible for progressing the action	
Date action to be completed by	

Appendix C: The new convention principles

- The new process will only apply to major planning applications considered by the council's planning committee (using the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) definition of major - >10 dwellings or >1,000m² floorspace), and
- Where there is a majority resolution that is minded to make a decision contrary to officer advice
- The procedure will be initiated as appropriate by the Chair/Vice-Chair in consultation with the Head of Planning Services/ City Development Manager.
- This convention will operate where the item has been presented by officers, public speaking has taken place and members have debated the merits of the proposal. The Chair of the Planning Committee ~~(or Vice Chair when acting in that capacity)~~ will seek a resolution and the specific grounds upon which the members of the committee agree by a majority that they are minded to refuse planning permission (including the member reasons for that refusal based on relevant planning policy, technical and other matters which in the committee's judgement means the application should be refused); or alternatively, minded to approve planning permission in which case planning conditions, reasons and s.106 matters may be involved
- The item will then be ~~deferred~~ adjourned and officers will prepare a further report providing relevant additional advice on the committee resolution. This would normally be brought back to the next available meeting but may be delayed to a later meeting if external legal or technical advice needs to be sought
- To ensure safe decision making, members of the planning committee absent from the previous discussion, should not take part in the resumed debate. ~~the original planning officer's report and the new advice will need to be re-presented and reconsidered by the planning committee. Public speakers will be contacted and given a second opportunity to address the committee, (reconsideration of the items along with further advice and repeated public speaking will address any probity issues arising with a different committee composition)~~
- The committee will determine if their original minded-to resolution (reasons for refusal) are still appropriate, should be amended or whether the original officer recommendation should be followed, likewise the means by which a permission can be granted with planning conditions and s.106 requirements will be outlined. The decision and reasons for it are to be noted in the minutes of the meeting.
- ~~The committee's final decision will be confirmed and the decision and reasons for it noted in the minutes of the meeting~~
- Should the decision result in an appeal, the approach to defending the council's case at the appeal will be managed by officers and reported back to committee if needed

COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM 4D

Revised Appendix C: The new Planning Committee Convention principles Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport Addendum following Environment Scrutiny Committee

- The new process will only apply to major planning applications considered by the council's planning committee (using the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) definition of major - >10 dwellings or >1,000m² floorspace), and
- Where there is a majority resolution that is minded to make a decision contrary to officer advice
- The procedure will be initiated as appropriate by the Chair/Vice-Chair in consultation with the Head of Planning Services/ City Development Manager.
- This convention will operate where the item has been presented by officers, public speaking has taken place and members have debated the merits of the proposal. The Chair of the Planning Committee will seek a resolution and the specific grounds upon which the members of the committee agree by a majority that they are minded to refuse planning permission (including the member reasons for that refusal based on relevant planning policy, technical and other matters which in the committee's judgement means the application should be refused); or alternatively, minded to approve planning permission in which case planning conditions, reasons and s.106 matters may be involved
- The item will then be adjourned and officers will prepare a further report providing relevant additional advice on the committee resolution. This would normally be brought back to the next available meeting but may be delayed to a later meeting if external legal or technical advice needs to be sought
- To ensure safe decision making, members of the planning committee absent from the previous discussion, should not take part in the resumed debate.
- The committee will determine if their original minded-to resolution is still appropriate, should be amended or whether the original officer recommendation should be followed, likewise the means by which a permission can be granted with planning conditions and s.106 requirements will be outlined. The decision and reasons for it are to be noted in the minutes of the meeting.
- Should the decision result in an appeal, the approach to defending the council's case at the appeal will be managed by officers and reported back to committee if needed

CIVIC AFFAIRS

15 July 2014
5pm – 5.30pm

Present: Councillors McPherson (Chair), Benstead (Vice Chair), Cantrill, Pitt, Hart and Robertson

Also present: Councillor Herbert (Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation)

FOR ADOPTION BY THE COUNCIL

14/43/CIV Constitutional Impact - Transfer of Planning Items from Area to Central Planning Committee

The committee received a report regarding the constitutional impact of transferring Planning Items from Area to Central Planning Committee.

Councillor Cantrill proposed an amendment as follows:

‘To agree Area Committee meeting frequency is altered from the current ‘every eight weeks’ to ‘at least six (delete - four) times per year.

Councillor Benstead stated that the recommendation as worded gave each area committee the ability to set its own timetable without being influenced by the planning process.

Councillor Pitt stated that by going down to four meetings per year all meetings would be busy and balancing demands may be difficult. Councillor Cantrill revised his amendment to:

‘To agree Area Committee meeting frequency is altered from the current ‘every eight weeks’ to a recommended six times a year (delete - at least four times per year).

Councillors Cantrill and Pitt asked about the funding of additional Area Committees (if they all met six times). The Leader stated that the budget amendment to be considered at Council was based on each area committee having five meetings per year but that if all area committees met more than that then the savings would need to be found elsewhere.

Members of the committee were reminded that there was provision in the Constitution for the Chief Executive following consultation with the Chair to call additional meetings of an area committee if the business (for that cycle) warranted it.

The amendment was put to the vote and was lost by 2 votes in favour to 4 against.

Resolved (by 4 votes in favour to 2 against) to recommend to Council:

- i. To agree Area Committee meeting frequency is altered from the current 'every eight weeks' to 'at least four times per year' commencing from October 2014, with each Area Committee continuing, as now, to set its own timetable of meetings for the municipal year; and
- ii. To instruct the Head of Legal Services to amend the Constitution to reflect this change.

CIVIC AFFAIRS

15 July 2014
5pm – 5.30pm

Present: Councillors McPherson (Chair), Benstead (Vice Chair), Cantrill, Pitt, Hart and Robertson

FOR ADOPTION BY THE COUNCIL

14/44/CIV City Council Appointment to Conservators of the River Cam

The Chair ruled under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the item be considered despite not being made publicly available five clear days prior to the meeting.

The committee received a late agenda item regarding a vacancy following Councillor Reiner's recent decision to step down as a city councillor appointee on the Conservators of the River Cam.

Resolved (by 3 votes to 0) to recommend to Council:

- i. That Councillor Tunnacliffe take the place of Councillor Reiner on the Conservators of the River Cam.

This page is intentionally left blank

JULY 24th: Motion 7(a)

Amendment proposed by Cllr Blackhurst and seconded by Cllr Pitt

Delete all after “This Council notes” and replace with -

i. In the period 1997-2007 new social rented housing was delivered in England, on average, at just half the rate achieved in the period 1992-1997, which has contributed to the current national housing shortage. That the coalition government has taken decisive steps to increase the supply of affordable housing, with £19.5 billion of public and private investment in the current Spending Review, and has freed those local authorities which retained their housing stock from financial controls which prevented their direct investment in new housing. The introduction of affordable rents, pegged at no more than 80% of local market rents is facilitating the delivery of additional housing capacity.

ii. This Council has successfully argued that to be “affordable” rents should be defined in relation to the availability of housing benefit.

iii. This Council has made full use of the discretionary payments regime, funded by central government, to those seeking appropriately-sized accommodation, since the removal of the spare room subsidy was extended to those in social rented accommodation. However the removal of the subsidy can only be an effective and fair incentive for the release of larger homes if there is an adequate supply of smaller homes, so the subsidy should not be removed from tenants who have not been offered appropriate alternative accommodation.

iv. The Homes and Communities Agency currently indicate that they will only support funding for traditional social rented accommodation in limited circumstances (for example in regeneration schemes where decanting is necessary), though social rented accommodation may still be supported through the application of Council resources (funding or land).

This Council therefore resolves:

i. that the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council write to the two MPs for Cambridge, Julian Huppert MP and Andrew Lansley MP, laying out the case for a continuing role for social rent levels for new, as well as existing, City Homes accommodation, and requesting their support for this and lobbying of the Minister for Communities and Local Government to ensure the Affordable Housing Programme favours a Cambridge Social Rented Programme.

ii. To consider how the City Deal can deliver a programme of new council homes at affordable social rent levels, including working in partnership with other providers and local authorities.

iii. To support the work of the SHOUT campaign and take a lead in affirming the positive value and purpose of social rented housing.

This Council notes:

- I. That the Tour de France event in Cambridge on Monday 7th July was an overwhelming success for the city;

And replace the remainder with:
- II. That the event was only possible through hard work, partnerships and planning over two years, in particular the tremendous work of the staff of the City and County Councils, the police, South Cambridgeshire District Council, volunteers including the 'Tour Makers' and the contributions of others notably ASO the Tour de France organisers;
- III. The much appreciated financial support from TdFHub Ltd and national organisations that enabled the event to be held at no additional financial cost, and through existing Council resources;
- IV. The spectacular success of community events including the Velo Festival that has allowed community groups, local businesses, schools, and others to contribute their passion for cycling through cultural and sporting activities;
- V. The funding received from Arts Council England, which supported a series of cultural activities, including the highly successful Cycle of Songs commission;
- VI. The ongoing partnership with Sport England and now introducing British Cycling in promoting cycling in all its forms, and continuing work with organisations including You Can Bike Too in increasing participation among under-represented groups;
- VII. The progress already underway by the council through its Legacy and Activity Group in bringing together local sports and cycling clubs, community groups, schools, charities and other interested parties to develop ideas for future events that celebrate cycling in Cambridge, and
- VIII. Work being led by the Business and Tourism Legacy Group organised by Visit Cambridge to develop the economic legacy from the event.

The Council will work with the County Council and partners in continuing to create a lasting legacy of the Tour de France and asks officers to bring a report to the Environment and Planning Policy Scrutiny Committee to:

- I. Build on our Council-wide commitment to the promotion of safe and secure cycling, as illustrated by investment in new cycle racks in the city centre and beyond;
- II. Ensure all new schemes take into account best practice as set out in the Cambridge Cycling Campaign, 'Making Space for Cycling' report and related publications, and consider how best to implement its proposals and conclusions through the planning process;
- III. Commit to support and press for the delivery of the Chisholm Trail, and support wider investment and delivery in cycling infrastructure in and around Cambridge, and
- IV. Continue to lobby for additional high quality cycling and pedestrian improvements in the city centre and on major roads, including schemes similar to those recently approved by the County Council on Hills Road and Huntingdon Road.

Oral Questions for Council (in order for Council)

1. Councillor Martin Smart to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Is it true, as the latest Julian Huppert and Andy Blackhurst leaflet claims, that the Council is stopping work where improved wheelchair access is needed by tenants?

2. Councillor Benstead to the Executive Councillor for Housing

What has been the response of Lichfield Road tenants and residents since his decision not to demolish the happy community in Lichfield Road?

3. Councillor Smith to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

What actions has the Executive Councillor taken to tackle issues associated with the unlicensed punt station at Garret Hostel Lane?

4. Councillor Todd-Jones to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Can the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources outline the status of the proposal passed as part of the 2014/15 budget for additional investment in the Council's commercial property portfolio?

5. Councillor Pitt to the Executive Councillor for Environmental, Waste and Public Health

What lessons have been learned from the response to the issues raised by the bin strike?

6. Councillor Ratcliffe to the Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

Can the Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation confirm that the recent grants review will prioritise funding for voluntary and community groups which assist in tackling inequality in the city, and that this will be achieved despite significant cuts to the Council's core budget as voted for by the Lib Dem Cambridge MP, Julian Huppert?

7. Councillor Reid to the Leader

Will this Council take every opportunity it can to achieve multi-party representation in making Councillor Appointments to external bodies?

8. Councillor Bick to the Leader

Does the Leader agree that even though we are waiting for revised legislation to enable a combined authority for Greater Cambridge, the time is nevertheless now ripe for the establishment of an interim governance structure for the Greater Cambridge City Deal so there can be proper public transparency and democratic involvement of this and the other two partner Councils in the preparation for action in all the areas covered by the Deal - transport, housing, land use planning and skills?

9. Councillor Gawthroe to the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health

Can the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health let me know what measures are being put in place to help boost recycling?

10. Councillor Perry to the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health

Can the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health please let me know how the Council's litter and dog bin mapping is coming along?

11. Councillor Bick to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

In deflecting from the one week delay in city rubbish collections the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health talked about the recent local authority workers' strike as a dispute between the coalition Government and workers who aren't paid a fair wage for what they do". Given this view, since taking office, what direction has the new Executive given the Council employers side of the national negotiations where Labour (not the coalition government) are in the lead position, and what upward adjustment does he expect to make to the existing provision for Council pay increases in the Mid-Year Financial review?

12. Councillor Perry to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Can the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources outline what steps he will be taking to help Cambridge residents struggling with their energy and water bills?

13. Councillor Ratcliffe to the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health

Can the Executive Councillor for Environment, Waste and Public Health update us on the current situation regarding distribution of pocket ashtrays?

This page is intentionally left blank