



CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

INFORMATION PACK

PACK - INFO PACK FOR COUNCIL

Date: Thursday, 26 February 2015

- 1 SEATING PLAN**
(Pages 5 - 6)
- 2 ASSOCIATED BUDGET DOCUMENTS**
- 2a Budget Setting Report Update Appendix Aa & Ab
(Pages 7 - 10)
- 2b Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee Minutes_ 13.02.15
(Pages 11 - 20)
- 2c Background information on Liberal Democratic Budget Amendment: Trade Union Facilities Funding
(Pages 21 - 26)
- 2d Final Liberal Democrat: Section 25 Report
(Pages 27 - 28)
- 3 ORAL QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM 7)**
(Pages 29 - 32)
- 4 BRIEFING NOTE FOR COUNCIL ON THE VACANT BUILDING CREDIT (AGENDA ITEM 8)**
(Pages 33 - 34)
- 5 AMENDMENT TO MOTION 8A**
(Pages 35 - 36)
- 6 WRITTEN QUESTIONS (AGENDA ITEM 9)**
- Please note there are no written questions.

Lewis Herbert
Martin Smart
Mike Todd-Jones
Peter Sarris
Nigel Gawthroe
Russ McPherson

Kevin Price
Zoe Moghadas
Jeremy Benstead
Margery Abbott

Kevin Blencowe
Dave Baigent
George Owers
Richard Johnson
Dan Ratcliffe
Mark Ashton
Ann Sinnott
Caroline Hart

Richard Robertson

Rod Cantrill

Ysanne Austin
Andrea Reiner

Julie Smith
George Pippas
Philip Tucker
Sian Reid

Catherine Smart
Tim Blck
Andy Jackhurst
Tim Moore
Nick Avery
Mike Pitt

The Chief Executive
Head of Legal Services
The Mayor
Gerri Bird
The Deputy Mayor
Robert Dryden
The Mayor's Chaplain

Viki Sanders
Damien Tunnacliffe
Shapour Meftah
Marie-Louise Holland
John Hipkin

Peter Roberts
Peter Sarris
Charlotte Perry
Carina O'Reilly

This page is intentionally left blank

Section 10

Section 25 Report

The final table in Section 8 shows that the anticipated level of the general fund reserves will remain above the prudent minimum level for the duration of the medium term planning period.

I therefore consider that the estimates for the financial year 2015/16 to be sufficiently robust and the financial reserves up to 31 March 2016 to be adequate.

Caroline Ryba

Head of Finance and S151 Officer

Appendix A(a)

Calculation of Council Tax Base 2015/16

	Council Tax Bands									
	A entitled to disabled relief reduction	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Total
Dwellings										
Dwellings on the valuation list		3,350	9,814	18,425	9,258	5,284	3,392	2,911	456	52,890
Dwellings treated as exempt		(400)	(542)	(928)	(668)	(399)	(249)	(364)	(169)	(3,719)
Adjustments for disabled relief (i.e. reduced by one band)		(1)	(12)	(45)	(27)	(24)	(7)	(12)	(2)	(130)
	1	12	45	27	24	7	12	2	0	130
Total chargeable dwellings	1	2,961	9,305	17,479	8,585	4,870	3,147	2,536	285	49,171
Number of dwellings included in the in the above totals:										
Where there is liability to pay 100% Council Tax	0	1,281	4,286	11,986	6,230	3,690	2,518	2,130	249	32,370
That are assumed to be subject to a discount or premium	1	1,680	5,019	5,493	2,355	1,180	629	408	36	16,801
Dwelling Equivalents										
Number of dwelling equivalents after applying discounts and premiums to calculate taxbase	0.75	2,530.25	8,010.00	16,069.50	7,978.50	4,571.25	2,983.00	2,430.00	272.50	44,845.75
Reduction in taxbase as a result of the Family Annex discount	(0.00)	(1.00)	(0.00)	(1.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(2.00)
Reduction in taxbase as a result of local Council Tax support	(0.75)	(565.42)	(1,874.45)	(1,905.73)	(370.53)	(131.27)	(33.34)	(7.07)	(0.00)	(4,888.56)
Total number of equivalent dwellings after discounts, exemptions , disabled relief and Council Tax support	0	1,963.83	6,135.55	14,162.77	7,607.97	4,439.98	2,949.66	2,422.93	272.5	39,955.19
Ratio to Band D	5/9	6/9	7/9	8/9	1	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9	
Band D equivalents	0	1,309.2	4,772.1	12,589.1	7,608.0	5,426.6	4,260.6	4,038.2	545.0	40,548.8
Band D equivalent contributions for Government properties										1.0
Tax base after allowance for Council Tax Support										40,549.8
	Add		Estimated net growth in tax base							497.0
	Less		Adjustment for student exemptions							(574.5)
	Less		Assumed loss on collection at 1.3%							(526.1)
Total Band D Equivalents – Tax base for Council Tax and Precept Setting Purposes										39,946.2

Appendix A(b)

Council Tax Setting 2015/16

1. The Council calculated its Council Tax Base 2015/16 for the whole Council area as **39,946.2** [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]
2. The Council calculates that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2015/16 is **£7,060,490**
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2014/15 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (a) | £177,391,040 | being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act |
| (b) | £170,330,550 | being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act |
| (c) | £7,060,490 | being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. [Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act] |
| (d) | £176.75 | being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by the amount at 1 above (Item T), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year. |

4. To note that Cambridgeshire County Council, the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each of the categories of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2015/16 for each of the categories of dwellings in the Council's area.

Dwelling Band	Cambridge City Council £	Cambridgeshire County Council £	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner £	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority £	Aggregate Council Tax £
A	117.83	762.84	120.90	42.84	1,044.41
B	137.47	889.98	141.05	49.98	1,218.48
C	157.11	1,017.12	161.20	57.12	1,392.55
D	176.75	1,144.26	181.35	64.26	1,566.62
E	216.03	1,398.54	221.65	78.54	1,914.76
F	255.31	1,652.82	261.95	92.82	2,262.90
G	294.58	1,907.10	302.25	107.10	2,611.03
H	353.50	2,288.52	362.70	128.52	3,133.24

6. The Council determines that, in accordance with Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the basic amount of its Council Tax for 2015/16 is not excessive.

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 13 February 2015
5.00 - 6.45 pm

Present: Councillors Robertson (Chair), Sinnott (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Benstead, Bick, Cantrill, C. Smart and M. Smart

Councillor Smart joined the Committee after the decision on item 15/22/SNRa

Leader of the Council: Councillor Lewis Herbert

Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources: Councillor George Owers

Other Councillors:

Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation: Councillor Richard Johnson

Executive Councillor for Housing: Councillor Kevin Price

Officers:

Chief Executive: Antoinette Jackson

Director of Customer and Community Services: Liz Bisset

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Director of Business Transformation: Ray Ward

Head of Finance: Caroline Ryba

Safer Communities Section Manager: Lynda Kilkelly

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers:

Head of Legal Services: Simon Pugh

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/19/SNR Apologies for absence

No apologies were received.

15/20/SNR Declarations of interest

No declarations of interest were made.

15/21/SNR Public Questions

There were no public questions.

15/22/SNR Amendments to the Budget Setting Report February 2015

15/22/SNRa Executive Amendment

Matter for Decision

The Head of Finance introduced the Executive Amendment.

The Officer's report detailed amendments to the Budget-Setting Report 2015/16 that was recommended to Council by the Executive at its meeting on 22 January 2015.

These amendments include corrections and also reflect new or updated information that has been received since that meeting and the consequent changes required.

Unless otherwise stated, any references in the recommendations to sections, pages and appendices relate to Version 1 of the Budget Setting Report (BSR) 2015/16.

Corrections and new or updated information:

- **Collection Fund Deficit, Appendix B(e):**
Change to item NCL3740 - increasing the City Council's share of the projected year-end deficit from £24k to £60k (revised calculation based on updated information), the additional £36k to be met from general fund reserves in 2015/16.
- **Budget Pressures, Appendix B(a):**
Inclusion of omitted item CF3672 £1m
- **Projects Under Development (PUD) List, Appendix D(a):**
Inclusion of omitted item UD016 Public Conveniences
- **City Deal:**
Change the "**City Deal Infrastructure Investment Fund**" to "**City Deal Investment and Delivery Fund**" - the Council has committed to pooling a proportion of gross NHB receipts with its local authority partners to provide funding to enable delivery of City Deal objectives to support and address the impacts of growth. The change in wording reflects ongoing discussions on the use of this funding [pages 22, 24, 31 and 100 in Appendix E refer].

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

The Executive Councillor approved the amendments:

i. Collection Fund Deficit:

Change to item NCL3740 – increasing the City Council's share of the projected year-end deficit from £24k to £60k, the additional £36k to be met from general fund reserves in 2015/16.

ii. City Deal:

- Change the "City Deal Infrastructure Investment Fund" to "City Deal Investment and Delivery Fund".
- To authorise the Section 151 officer to make necessary changes to the Budget Setting Report 2015/16, to be considered by Council at the meeting on 26 February 2015, to reflect the impact of changes for the above.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions to endorse the recommendations as set out in the Officer's report.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Councillor Smart joined the Committee after the decision was taken.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/22/SNRb Liberal Democrat Amendment

The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group introduced the item.

The following questions (Q) were put by Members on the items in the Liberal Democrat Amendment and answered (A) as listed:

Finance

- i. (Q) Would the amendment lead to higher spending? (A) The purpose of 2015/16 Budget - Bids & Savings – GF (P16 of Officer's report) was to avoid higher net spend 2015 – 2020.
- ii. (Q) There appeared to be a conflict of information. £97,500 spending increase was implied in Appendix [B(e) Non-Cash Limit] (P16), but tables later in the report suggested a decrease. (A) Tables on P38 showed savings targets.
- iii. (Q) The amendment would lead to an unsustainable budget and higher savings requirements in future. (A) Again referred to tables on P38 showed savings targets. Labour and Liberal Democrats both wished to make savings by 2020, each had their own spending priorities. There were £2.471m of undefined savings.
- iv. Queried details of saving expectations in 2015/16 Budget - Bids & Savings – GF (P16 – 17). (A) Reducing the backlog in delivery would make the process more efficient.
- v. (Q) Referred to 2015/16 Budget - Capital Bids – GF (P17), how would separating a small element of highways project funding for City Council use, instead of the Joint Area Committee, lead to efficiencies? (A) The intention was to decentralise some funding to Area Committees so they could decide how to use it. The role of the Joint Area Committee was different from the Area Joint Committee it replaces.
- vi. (Q) Queried reason for abandoning introduction of self-service telephony and electronic enquiry services 2015/16 Budget - Bids & Savings – GF (P16). (A) An automated and complex self-service system did not provide the service people expected from the Council. The Customer Service Centre was brought in to address this.

Housing

- vii. (Q) Queried housing sites expected to come forward. (A) Sites in Council General Fund ownership
 - Mill Road Depot.
 - North West Cambridge.
 - Park Street Car Park.
- viii. (Q) What is the average timescale to execute housing projects and make potential sites available? (A) To be set out in future for scrutiny by relevant committees. The timescales in Liberal Democrat and Labour 2015 – 2016 budgets were similar.

The Director of Environment said the Mill Road Depot site should come free for housing by 2018. Three operational sites needed to be released before the land as a whole could be released. A detailed plan was being worked up regarding the timeframe. This was also dependent on the Local Plan timetable. Three years seemed a realistic timeframe.

Timeframes for making intermediate housing sites available depended on particular site factors such as ensuring access and undertaking consultation. Eighteen months to three years seemed a realistic timeframe.

- ix. (Q) Requested clarity on how £450,000 of income would be generated from housing sites in 2017 – 2018. (A) The income figures were based on briefing details given by Officers. Councillor Bick undertook to share the briefing information with The Executive to show the evidence base for amendment figures.

If sites were brought forward for use quickly, the Council would get the income sooner.

- x. (Q) Sought clarity on how planning process could be speeded up to bring more sites forward for development and build housing. (A) Undertake due planning process faster ie in parallel not in series.
- xi. (Q) Why had the Liberal Democrats not undertaken faster house building when they were in control of the Council? (A) A number of factors had come into place recently such as some sites only now becoming available.

Community, Arts and Recreation

- xii. (Q) Were living wage sums appropriate? (A) The premise of the amendment was to expect employers contracted by the Council to pay a living wage. This would be paid for by contractors making operational efficiencies. The situation would not be cost free, the Council would have to negotiate with contractors.
- xiii. (Q) Why should the Council subsidise contractors to pay the living wage when they should be doing this already? (A) Some contracts were put out to tender prior to the Council implementing its living wage policy, therefore changes to contract terms would have to be negotiated (as a moral expectation), not expected arbitrarily. New contracts would reflect living wage expectations.

- xiv. (Q) Were funding sources appropriate for Nightingale Recreation Ground Pavilion refurbishment (P17)? (A) £400,000 was appropriate funding. The intention was to re-instate the scheme in the Capital Plan.
- xv. (Q) Was Jesus Green Pavilion sufficiently developed to receive funding (P17)? Had appropriate consultation been undertaken on the scheme? Should the scheme should be listed in 'projects under development' rather than the Capital Plan? (A) The project had received funding for two years prior to removal from the Capital Plan. The intention was to re-instate the scheme. Detailed consultation information was not set out in the Capital Plan.
- xvi. (Q) 2015/16 Budget - Bids & Savings – GF (P16) set out tapering living wage costs. Please clarify details. (A) Figures provided a platform/expectation that could be used for future negotiation. Also for Lion Yard toilets and partnership work with the Police.
- xvii. (Q) Had Liberal Democrat budget amendment figures 2015/16 Budget - Bids & Savings – GF (P16) been drawn up in conjunction with advice from the Police in terms of their resource expectations? Labour had liaised with third parties when in opposition. (A) The budget amendment was Liberal Democrats saying that Labour had got its spending priorities wrong. The Police need resources to assist the Council.
- xviii. (Q) Would revealing that the Council was prepared to negotiate on living wage terms and conditions (ie provide subsidies) weaken its bargaining position? (A) No.
- xix. (Q) Sought clarification regarding Deletion of proposed cutback in Maternity Fund funding 2015/16 Budget - Bids & Savings – GF (P16). (A) Accept that saving will be made here if they cannot be found elsewhere, but object to making savings in the Maternity Fund on principle.

15/23/SNR Public Spaces Protection Order

Matter for Decision

The report set out the result of the officers' review of potential areas for public spaces protection orders proposed by the Area Committees and asked the Executive Councillor to approve in principle the proposal to make a public spaces protection order in respect of Mill Road Cemetery, Petersfield Green and the front garden of Ditchburn Place; in the form set out at Appendix A of the Officer's report. Also to authorise officers to publicise the proposed order and to consult.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Approved in principle the proposal to make a public spaces protection order for Mill Road Cemetery, Petersfield Green and the front garden of

Ditchburn Place, Cambridge in the form set out at Appendix A of the Officer's report.

- ii. Authorised officers to publicise the proposed order and to carry out consultation as required by the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Communities Section Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. It was recognised that some areas of the city such as Mill Road Cemetery were affected by anti-social drinking. The Council wished to take steps to address this.
- ii. The PSPO was designed to stop anti-social street drinking, not displace it by moving drinkers from one area to another.

Liberal Democrat Councillors made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Sought clarification regarding the scope of the PSPO, and if it would impact on people having social drinks in public, as well as those who behaved in an anti-social way.
- ii. Asked how 'anti-social drinking' could be quantified in a meaningful way. There were no specifications in the document on how the Police should implement the power. An agreed protocol as discussed in proposals for a Designated Public Places Order in 2006 would address this and ensure the power was used with discretion.

In response to Members' questions the Leader said the following:

- i. The intention of the PSPO was to discourage anti-social drinking in public places. It was not expected to stop people having social drinks at picnics etc.
- ii. The power was not automatically available to the Police, it had to be given by the Council. This would decentralise its use and enable Officers to make on the spot decisions on whether to exercise the power or not. A Police Constable would have discretion by not having a

bureaucratic protocol in place, to be considered alongside any other rules and regulations. The Leader undertook to liaise with the Police regarding the PSPO implementation process. Labour Councillors did not think there was a need for a usage protocol as the PSPO would not stop general drinking, only anti-social street drinking.

- iii. The evidence base of need for a PSPO was set out in P4 – 7 of the Officer's report.
- iv. A PSPO was part of the range of options the Police could use to stop anti-social drinking.

Liberal Democrat Councillors requested a change to the recommendations. Councillor Bick formally proposed to add the following text (shown in bold) to recommendation 1 from the Officer's report:

To approve in principle the proposal to make a public spaces protection order for Mill Road Cemetery, Petersfield Green and the front garden of Ditchburn Place, Cambridge in the form set out at Appendix A **subject to agreement with the Police on a protocol defining situations where the power to enforce would be used, namely in response to incidents of anti-social behaviour;**

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 5 votes to 3.

The Leader and Labour Councillors said the amendment would delay the introduction of the PSPO and a protocol was not needed as the PSPO and 2006 DPPO were two separate entities, and he had arranged a meeting with the police to ask appropriate questions on implementation.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions to endorse the recommendations as set out in the Officer's report.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

15/24/SNR Procedural Item: Change to February 2016 Meeting Date

The Committee agreed they would like the Committee Manager to investigate if it were possible to move future February Committee meetings from Fridays to another eg Mondays or Thursdays.

The meeting ended at 6.45 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

5b Additional background information

Extract from report considered by Joint Staff Employer Forum 13th April 2011

This is included for reference at the request of Councillor Catherine Smart.

Appendix 1

Cambridgeshire: Authority and unions recognised	2008-09	2009-10
Cambridge City Council – GMB and Unison	2.0	2.0
Cambridgeshire County Council – ASCL, ATL, NAHT, NASUWT, NUT, Unison, VOICE	0.25,0.25, 0.25,0.25, 0.25, 2.0, 0.25	0.25,0.25, 0.25,0.25,0.25, 2.0, 0.25
Huntingdonshire – Unison	0.13	0.16
South Cambs – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Fenland – Unison	0.00	0.10
East Cambridgeshire – Unison	0.10	0.10
Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue - FBU	0.17	0.31
Cambridge University Hospitals –Unison, RCN, RCM	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (Mental Health) – BMA, CSP, GMB, RCN, Unison, Unite	1.0	1.0

District Councils and unions recognised	2008-09	2009-10
Adur - Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Allerdale - Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Amber Valley - Unison	0.01	0.02
Arun – Unison	0.16	0.16
Ashfield – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not recorded
Ashford – Unison	0.27	0.27
Aylesbury Vale – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not recorded
Babergh – Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Bassetlaw – Unison (Branch Secretary role)	0.61	0.61
Blaby - Unison	0.03	0.03
Bolsover – Unison and Unite	Not recorded	Not recorded
Boston – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not recorded
Braintree – GMB and Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Breckland – Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Brentwood - Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Broadland – Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Broxbourne	0.00	0.00
Canterbury - Unison	0.5	0.5
Castle Point – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Charnwood – Unison and GMB	0.62	0.62
Chelmsford – Unison (Branch Secretary)	1.00	0.75
Cheltenham – Unison	0.50	0.50
Cherwell – Unison	0.60	0.60
Chesterfield – Unison	1.0	1.0
Chiltern	0.0	0.0
Chorley – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Christchurch – Unison	0.10	0.10
Colchester – Unison	0.50	0.50

District Councils and unions recognised	2008-09	2009-10
Copeland – GMB and Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Cotswold - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Craven – Unison (Branch Secretary)	0.50	0.50
Crawley - Unison	1.0	1.0
Dacorum - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Daventry – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Dover – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
East Devon – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
East Dorset – Unison and Unite	1.24	1.24
East Hampshire – Unison	0.04	0.01
East Hertfordshire – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
East Lindsey – Unison	0.50	0.50
East Northamptonshire	0.0	0.0
Eastbourne – Unison	0.50	0.50
Eastleigh – Unison	0.40	0.40
Eden – Unison	0.09	0.06
Elmbridge – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Epping Forest – Unison	0.02	0.02
Epsom and Ewell – Unison	0.35	0.35
Erewash – Unison (Branch Secretary 2009)	Not recorded	0.60
Fareham – Unison, UCATT, Unite	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Forest Heath – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Forest of Dean – GMB and Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Gedling - Unison	0.20	0.20
Gloucester – Unison	Not recorded	0.12
Gosport - Unison	0.25	0.25
Great Yarmouth - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Guildford – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Harborough	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Harrogate – Unison, MPO/GMB	0.89, 0.10/0.02	0.81, 0.10/0.02
Hastings - Unison	0.41	0.41
Havant - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Hertsmere - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
High Peak – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Hinckley and Bosworth – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Horsham – GMB and Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Hyndburn – unison, GMB and unite	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Ipswich - Unison	1.0	1.0
Kettering – Unison, UCATT and Amicus	Not recorded	Not Recorded
King's Lynn and West Norfolk - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Lewes - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Lichfield - Unison	0.21	0.21
Lincoln – Unison and UCATT	0.50 and 0.40	0.50 and 0.40
Maldon – Unison	0.10	0.10
Malvern Hills – Unison	0.10	0.10
Mansfield – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Mid Suffolk – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded

District Councils and unions recognised	2008-09	2009-10
Mole Valley	0.0	0.0
New Forest – Unison, Unite and GMB	1.0	1.0
Newark and Sherwood – Unison, GMB and UCATT	Not recorded	Not Recorded
North Devon - Unison	0.22	0.35
North Dorset – Unison and Unite	0.06	0.06
North Hertfordshire – Unison	1.35	1.12
North Kesteven – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
North Norfolk – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
North Warwickshire – unison and GMB	0.10	0.10
Northampton – Unison and GMB	1.0	3.0
Norwich - Unison	1.0	1.0
Nuneaton and Bedworth – Unite, Unison and GMB	1.0, 0.50 and 0.00	1.0, 0.50 and 0.00
Oadby and Wigston	Not recorded	Not recorded
Oxford – Unison and Unite	2.6	2.0
Pendle - Unison	0.50	0.50
Purbeck – Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Redditch – Unison and UCATT	0.70	0.70
Rossendale - Unison	Not recorded	0.13
Rother – Unison	0.25	0.18
Rugby – Unison and Unite	Not recorded	Not recorded
Runnymede - Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Rushmoor - Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Ryedale - Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Sedgemoor – Unite, Amicus, GMB and Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
Selby - Unison	0.0	0.0
Sevenoaks – Unison	Not recorded	Not recorded
South Bucks	0.0	0.0
South Holland – Unison and UCATT	Not recorded	Not Recorded
South Kesteven – Unison and Unite	0.85 and 0.10	0.85 and 0.10
South Lakeland – Unison and GMB	0.36 and 0.12	0.36 and 0.12
South Norfolk – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
South Oxfordshire – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
South Somerset – Unison and GMB	0.40 and 0.20	0.40 and 0.20
Spelthorne – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
St Albans – Unison	1.15	1.15
St Edmundsbury – Unison	0.08	0.20
Stevenage – Unison, Unite, GMB and UCATT	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Stratford-on-Avon - Unison	0.36	Not recorded
Stroud – Unison	0.16	0.16
Suffolk Coastal – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Surrey Heath – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Swale – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Tamworth – GMBATU, Unite and Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Tandridge – Unison	0.03	0.03
Taunton Deane – Unison	0.71	0.70
Teignbridge – Unison and GMB	0.02	0.02

District Councils and unions recognised	2008-09	2009-10
Test Valley – Unison, Unite and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Tewkesbury – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Three Rivers – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Tonbridge and Malling – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Tunbridge Wells – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Uttlesford - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Vale of White Horse - Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Warwick – Unison	0.26	0.35
Watford - Unison	0.82	0.82
Waveney – Unison and UCATT	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Waverley – Unison	0.33	0.33
Wealdon – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Wellingborough – Unison	0.50	0.50
Welwyn Hatfield – Unison and GMB	Not recorded	Not Recorded
West Dorset – Unison and Unite	0.92	0.92
West Oxfordshire – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Weymouth and Portland – Unison	0.40	0.40
Wychavon – Unison	0.20	0.20
Wycombe – Unison	Not recorded	Not Recorded
Wyre – Unison, UCATT, GMBTU and AEEU	Not recorded	Not Recorded

East of England Local Government Association Survey (EEGLA) – 2011 district councils – 12 results – FTE funded posts
0.8
0.0
0.0
A part time post
0.0 + support funded by union
1.0 + 0.5 FTE funded by TU
0.0
0.0
0.6
0.0
0.5
1.0 + special funding for one year part TU funded

This page is intentionally left blank

LIB DEM - Section 25 Report [BSR 2015/16, Section 10]

This budget amendment would not require any substantive changes to the existing Section 10 – Section 25 Report.

The amendment shifts the timing of the net savings target over the five-year planning period, reducing the total savings required by £93k. However, the following impacts of the proposals should be noted:-

- The returns from the £4m moved from investment in commercial property to intermediate housing are reduced by £50k p.a.
- Returns of £300k p.a. from 2017/18 are obtained from investing the £8m from the Invest for Income Fund in intermediate housing. The BSR does not include any income from investing this fund, as potential investments have not yet been identified.
- Assuming a minimum return of 5% p.a. on investments, the potential return from the £8m funding is reduced by £100k each year.

The intermediate housing proposal would therefore restrict the level of income earned by the council from £12m of funding and would reduce the overall sustainability of the budget.

It should also be noted that the proposed intermediate housing programme would be a large and complex programme with a number of dependencies. There are, therefore, significant levels of risk around the estimation of potential returns and the timing of their delivery. These risks would be mitigated, to a certain extent, by management review and challenge of the proposals.

I therefore consider, in relation the budget resulting from the application of this amendment, that the estimates for the financial year 2015/16 to be sufficiently robust and the financial reserves up to 31 March 2016 to be adequate.

Caroline Ryba
Head of Finance and S151 Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

Council Meeting: 26th February 2015

Oral Questions in Order for Council

1) Councillor Austin to the Chair of Licensing Committee

Is the chair of licensing concerned that the newly introduced cap on Hackney cabs in the city will make it much more difficult to increase the number of cabs which meet current and enhanced standards for disability access?

2) Councillor Blackhurst to the Executive Councillor for Housing

What feedback has been obtained from former Water Lane residents as to their satisfaction with their new accommodation?

3) Councillor Charlotte Perry to the Executive Cllr for Finance and Resources

Can the Executive Councillor update us on progress to tackle illegal punt touting and operations from Garrett Hostel Lane?

4) Councillor Reid to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

What steps are the administration taking to ensure food retailers in the city pay the living wage?

5) Councillor Sarris for the Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

Does the Executive Councillor agree that the unanimous vote in favour for this year's Community Grant finance package at committee recently was evidence of how successful the new approach taken by the council has been, namely, by prioritising funding to those organisations that tackle inequality in our city?

6) Councillor Pitt to the Leader

Should executive councillors participate in the discussions at committee during pre-decision scrutiny?

7) Councillor Pippas to the Leader

How will the Leader safeguard vulnerable and destitute people from needless criminalisation under his proposed Public Space Protection Orders?

8) Councillor Tim Bick to the Leader

How does the Leader plan to ensure that the Public Place Protection Orders he is proposing are directed at those who are responsible for anti-social behaviour and not those who aren't?

9) Councillor Mike Todd-Jones to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

Can the Executive Councillor give an update on the Chesterton Co-ordinator?

10) Councillor Robertson to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Can the Executive Councillor confirm that:

- there has been no change in the Council's maternity pay policy
- the Council maintains its commitment to fully supporting staff on maternity leave
- following the reduction in the Maternity Fund there will still be full funding of all maternity pay and conditions commitments

11) Councillor Sinnott to the Leader

What explanation did Cllr Herbert obtain from the Army regarding the Libyan cadets and the alleged serious sexual attacks last October?

12) Councillor Mark Ashton to the Leader

Now that planning has been removed from Area Committees does he agree more time as been freed up for the Public to question councillors on the matters that concern them?

13) Councillor Catherine Smart to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Will the Councillor indicate which repairs are classified as emergency, which urgent and which routine? What proportion of each has been dealt with within the time limits during the last six months (or the latest available data)?

14) Councillor Dryden to the Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

Does the Executive Councillor agree that the exciting line-up recently announced for this year's Folk Festival, following on from last year's successful 50th anniversary, is further evidence of how highly regarded the festival is not just here and the UK, but from many other counties around the world?

15) Councillor Catherine Smart for the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

Was a business case made out for the Early Bird concession in the Grand Arcade? If so, how has it worked out? Has there been any increase in custom on the Tuesday mornings it has been operating?

16) Councillor Mark Ashton to Executive Councillor Environment, Waste and Public Health

Following the Labour initiative on Ward Blitzes what has been the feedback so far?

This page is intentionally left blank

Council 26 February 2015

Briefing note on recent changes to National Planning Policy: The Small Sites Exemption and the Vacant Building Credit

The Small Sites Exemption

In a written statement to parliament in November 2014, housing and planning minister Brandon Lewis announced that planning policy would be changed to exempt small developments of 10 homes or fewer from affordable housing provision and from planning obligations requiring "tariff style contributions". The government committed in its 2013 Autumn Statement to consult on the proposed new threshold, in order to address the "disproportionate burden" it said section 106 obligations could place on small scale developers. In a response to the consultation, the DCLG said that developers and development representative bodies had generally expressed their support for the proposals but that local authorities had generally opposed the plans. According to the response, the government had decided to change national planning policy to introduce the exemption, which would apply to both affordable housing contributions and other "tariff style contributions" and include residential annexes and extensions within its ambit.

This change came into immediate effect and in Cambridge this means that the tariff style developer contributions set out in the Planning Obligations SPD and used to secure off-site infrastructure provision including: education, libraries, open space, strategic waste, transport corridor payments and public art can no longer be applied to schemes of under 10 dwellings.

The Vacant Building Credit

On the 28 November 2014, the Government issued new National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) introducing the 'Vacant Building Credit (VBC)'.

The Implications

The VBC allows for an affordable housing 'credit' if any vacant building is brought back into any lawful use OR demolished to be replaced by a new building. In effect, developers will be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of vacant/demolished buildings when the affordable housing contribution is calculated. Affordable housing contributions would be required only for any increase in floorspace. The National Planning Practice Guidance states that the vacant building credit applies to any vacant building where the building has not been abandoned.

What is the vacant building credit?

Where a vacant building is brought back into any lawful use, or is demolished to be replaced by a new building, the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of relevant vacant buildings when the local planning authority calculates any affordable housing contribution which will be sought. Affordable housing contributions would be required for any increase in floorspace.

What is the process for determining the vacant building credit?

Where there is an overall increase in floorspace in the proposed development, the local planning authority should calculate the amount of affordable housing contributions required from the development as set out in their Local Plan. A 'credit' should then be applied which is the equivalent of the gross floorspace of any relevant vacant buildings being brought back into use or demolished as part of the scheme and deducted from the overall affordable housing contribution calculation.

Recent Developer Comment on the VBC

The VBC helps to reiterate the Government's intentions to promote brownfield development and conversions of existing buildings. The likelihood is that the 'Credit' is more likely to tip the balance in marginal value areas, perhaps avoiding the requirement for a viability argument. There are, however, significant benefits for developers in higher value areas such as London and the South East. The policy has been met by staunch opposition from some, a senior official at Westminster City Council claimed this weekend in the Guardian Newspaper that it could cost the Government as much as £1bn in lost housing payments. Given the level of opposition, it is perhaps likely that the rules will be tightened up in the near future. However, the scheme does currently offer some real benefits to developers.

Amendment to Motion on Housing Affordable Supply in Cambridge.

The City Council's Vision for Cambridge as One Cambridge Fair for All is one in which an affordable local home close to jobs and good neighbourhood facilities is available to all regardless of income or tenure. To achieve our aim for a City with mixed and balanced communities where prosperity is shared, it is vital that developers contribute their fair share towards meeting housing needs and the cost of community infrastructure.

The Council notes that recent changes in the national planning framework will seriously impact our ability to deliver affordable housing requirements through the planning process. It will also transfer the cost of meeting vital neighbourhood infrastructure from developers to residents.

In particular this Council condemns

1. The Small Sites Exemption whereby affordable housing and other S106 contributions cannot be sought on small sites of 10 units and under with a maximum combined floor space of less than 1000 sq metres.
2. The Vacant Building Credit whereby affordable housing contributions can only be sought on any increase in floor space where buildings are brought back into use or replaced.

The Council further notes that Cambridge has a strong property and development sector so these are wholly unnecessary developer give-aways.

The Council acknowledges, however, that the latest planning changes have met with almost universal condemnation from councils across the political spectrum and it resolves to work through the Local Government Association and with other councils to seek their reversal by government.

This page is intentionally left blank