

**COUNCIL**23 July 2015  
6.00 - 10.55 pm

**Present:** Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Austin, Avery, Baigent, Benstead, Bick, Bird, Blencowe, Cantrill, Dryden, Gawthrop, Gehring, Gillespie, Hart, Herbert, Hipkin, Holland, Holt, Johnson, McPherson, Meftah, Moore, O'Reilly, Owers, Pippas, Price, Ratcliffe, Reid, Roberts, Robertson, Sanders, Sarris, Sinnott, C. Smart, M. Smart, Smith, Todd-Jones and Tunnacliffe

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL****15/94/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held on 28 May 2015**

The minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting and Annual Council meeting both held on 28 May 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

**15/95/CNL Mayor's Announcements****1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors, O'Connell, Perry and Pitt. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor McPherson and Councillor Austin.

**2. Mayor's Day Out**

The Mayor confirmed that the annual Mayor's Day Out to Great Yarmouth would take place on Tuesday 11th August 2015.

**3. Commemoration for the Cambridgeshire Regiment Far East Prisoners Of War**

The Mayor confirmed that the Leader of the Council (Councillor Lewis Herbert) would give a talk on his research into the experiences of Cambridgeshire soldiers sent to Singapore in 1942, and as prison labourers working on the Burma Railway. The talk would be given in the Council Chamber on Friday 11th September at 12.30 p.m. as part of the Open Cambridge weekend.

The Mayor confirmed that the Sergeant-at-Mace would also give a talk as part of the Open Cambridge weekend on Friday 11th September and Saturday 12th September both at 11 a.m.

#### **4. Civic Dinner at Anglia Ruskin University**

The Mayor reminded members that the civic dinner at Anglia Ruskin University was scheduled for Thursday 17th September.

#### **5. Harvest Festival Civic Service**

The Mayor confirmed that the Harvest Festival Civic Service would take place on Sunday 4th October at 9.30 a.m. at Great St. Mary's Church.

#### **6. Charity Fundraising Event**

The Mayor confirmed the first charity fund raising event would take place on Wednesday 21st October 2015 and was in aid of the Arthur Rank Hospice Appeal.

#### **7. Festival of Ideas**

The Mayor gave advance notice that the Civic Office was joining with the University of Cambridge for the Festival of Ideas initiative at the Guildhall on 26th and 29th October 2015.

#### **8. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor	Item	Interest
Councillor Roberts	15/101/CNLc	Personal: Employed by the European Parliament. Employer tabled the amendment to TTIP as part of the S&D Group to Parliament.

#### **9. Presentation of Resolution of Thanks To Councillor Gerri Bird**

On behalf of the City Council, the Mayor presented Gerri Bird with a framed copy of the Resolution of Thanks for her service as Mayor during the 2014/15

municipal year, passed at the annual meeting of the Council on the 28 May 2015.

### **15/96/CNL Public Questions Time**

Members of the public made a number of statements, as set out below.

1. Mr Howlett (Chief Executive of CHS Group) raised the following points:
  - i. Referred to motion 7b.
  - ii. Stated that the right to buy would have a detrimental impact on housing supply in the city.
  - iii. There were three issues that would affect CHS as a housing association:
    - Loss of income in future.
    - Loss of independence. The new policy (intervention) by Central Government would adversely affect CHS's business plan and its capacity to provide social housing in future (existing numbers and new homes that could be built).
    - Increase in cost of borrowing.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- i. He shared Mr Howlett's concerns.
- ii. The negative impact of Central Government's policy on building new homes was a common issue across the city despite a growing need.
- iii. Referred to motion 7b and said it would be discussed as the next agenda item.

Mr Howlett made the following supplementary points:

Asked the Council to ensure Cambridge MPs were made aware of the following issues:

- i. Cuts to housing benefits for under 21 year olds should be avoided, vulnerable people needed to be protected.
- ii. Rent cuts on supported housing and residential care needed protection.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded with the following:

- i. Noted the supplementary points raised by Mr Howlett.
- ii. Undertook to advise Cambridge MPs of the City Council's debate and its resolution.
- iii. Reiterated the need to provide housing to vulnerable city residents.

2. Ms Minns raised the following points:

- i. Spoke as a council tenant and Housing Scrutiny Committee representative.
- ii. Referred to the 7 July 2015 Conservative Emergency Budget and took issue with it due to the impact on social housing i.e. it would lead to a loss of social housing.
- iii. The right to buy scheme would lead to a loss of (council) housing stock.
- iv. Families would be forced into private rented housing instead of buying their own homes.
- v. A cut to benefits would lead to social deprivation.

The Executive Councillor for Housing noted Ms Minns comments, specifically the impact of proposals on social deprivation.

Ms Minns made a supplementary point to say that stories of people's experiences were important to show the (negative) impact of Central Government policy.

3. Mr Marais raised the following points:

- i. Council housing had been "residualised" over time.
- ii. Council housing used to be formed from a mixed community of blue and white collar workers.
- iii. The 1980s onwards saw the selling off of council housing stock. This led to less of a mix of blue and white collar residents; and a higher housing waiting list which forced people into the private sector rented market except for the most needy who could not afford it.
- iv. Council housing stock was being sold off to finance the discounted sale of council houses.
- v. Took issue with the sale of council housing stock and asked the Council to oppose it.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- i. Noted comments made.
- ii. Labour and the Conservatives used to compete to build houses when in Government. Now it was Government policy to sell off council housing stock.
- iii. Undertook to lobby Cambridge MPs to oppose housing stock sell off.

### **15/97/CNL Re-Ordering Agenda**

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Mayor used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

**15/98/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for Adoption****4a Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - HRA****Resolved (by 26 votes to 0) to:**

Approve the carry forward requests, totalling £9,272,120 as detailed in Appendix C of the Officer's report.

**4b 2014/15 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances – all General Fund Portfolios****Resolved (27 votes to 0) to:**

- i. Agree the final carry forward requests, totalling £657,030 as detailed in Appendix C of the officers report, subject to the final outturn position.
- ii. Approve to carry forward (net) capital resources to fund re-phased capital spending of £27,044,000 (of which HRA is £13,758,000) as shown in Appendix D – Overview of the officer's report.

**Buchan Street Community Centre - New roof replacement**

- iii. Approve capital funding of £60,000 for the refurbishment of the tiled roof and replacement of thermal insulation project.

**Ross Street Community Centre - New Boiler system**

- iv. Approve capital funding of £36,000 for the replacement boiler system project.

**4c Review of Capital Plan Processes and Procedures****Resolved (by 26 votes to 0) to:**

- i. Approve a Capital Feasibility Fund of £35,600 in 2015/16, funded from a 'top-sliced' 5% of net capital funding available, with delegated authority for allocation of these funds given to the CPB in conjunction with the s151 officer.
- ii. Approve placing all current projects on the General Fund capital plan that do not produce a full business case by 30 November 2015 on to the PUD list, i.e. remove approved funding and require these projects to come forward for funding once a full business case has been approved.

**4d Annual Treasury Management Report 2014/15**

**Resolved (by 26 votes to 0) to:**

- i. Approve the report which included the Council's actual Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2014/15.
- ii. Approve changes (shown in bold) to our Counterparty List as highlighted within Appendix D of the Officer's report.

**4e Replacement Financial Management System****Resolved (by 26 votes to 0) to:**

Approve capital and revenue funding for the replacement financial management system project.

**4f General Fund Investment in Housing****Resolved (unanimously) to:**

Agree a budget provision is made to allow the General fund to lend money to the Housing Company to acquire 24 properties at Aylesborough Close and Water Lane as detailed in the report.

**15/99/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for Adoption****5a Civic Affairs: Changes To The Officer Employment Procedure Rules In Respect Of Disciplinary Action****Resolved (unanimously) to:**

- i. Amend the Officer Employment Procedure Rules in accordance with Appendix 1 to this report.
- ii. Amend the terms of reference of the Employment (Senior Officer) Committee in accordance with Appendix 2 to this report.
- iii. Authorise the Head of Human Resources to convene a panel of "independent persons", as and when required by the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001 and to determine its procedure.

**5b Civic Affairs: Assurance Framework, Draft Annual Governance Statement and Draft Code of Corporate Governance 2014/15****Resolved (unanimously) to:**

Approve the Code of Corporate Governance.

**15/100/CNL To deal with Oral Questions****1) Councillor C. Smart to the Leader**

**Can the Leader tell the Council about the progress of his talks with various parties to improve the conditions for people trying to use the railway station?**

The Leader stated that there was a lack of ticket facilities and a failure to promote adequate parking. A letter had been written to Abellio Greater Anglia and a response had been provided and a meeting was to be held on 7 August 2015. The train station needed to provide a welcome front door for Cambridge, a station where residents and commuters could purchase train tickets easily and properly functioning cycle parks were provided.

**2) Councillor Austin to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

**On 9 July 21 punt touts were counted between St Johns College and Kings College. How are plans progressing to control this activity?**

The Executive Councillor responded that the Police, the Cam Conservators and the City Council had worked together to try to tackle the illegal punt operators which operated from Garrett Hostel Lane. The vast majority of the punt touts operating in the Market Square, Petty Cury and Kings Parade areas were working for these operators. Touting per se was not illegal but there was a byelaw in place to deal with aggressive touting and this would be enforced as appropriate. Enforcement was difficult as it required detailed witness statements which understandably visitors were not always happy or in a position to make.

The City Council had taken legal advice and was acting in accordance with that advice with a view to stopping the illegal punt operations from Garret Hostel Lane. The City Council continued to work with the Cam Conservators and the Police to collect evidence so that action could be taken at the appropriate time and against the appropriate individuals. In June of this year the Conservators successfully prosecuted a number of people involved with providing chauffeur punt tours from Garret Hostel Lane for criminal offences under the Conservators' byelaws. The District Judge in this case stated in his findings:

*“I find that the behaviour of these defendants as a group towards the Conservators to be coercive and bullying. They have attempted to use fraudulent means to obtain the registration of punts on a private basis when they knew full well they would be used to promote a commercial activity.”*

*“The arrogance of the defendants towards the Conservators is evident in that the punts remain on the river, unregistered and it seems still working providing tours. Meanwhile, the Company in 2013/4 declared a turnover of £337,418. Their motivation is clear.”*

The illegal punt operators were challenging this judgement.

The Council had submitted a planning application to install railings along the stone walkway alongside Garret Hostel Lane to improve safety and ensure the slipway was used for legitimate access to the river. The application had been approved and it was hoped that the railings would be in place in the near future after fabrication.

The Council made the La Mimosa punt station available to independent punt operators several years ago and allocated places in a transparent and fair manner. This scheme had operated successfully through the development of a touting “Code of Conduct” which was agreed between both the independent operators and Scudamores who operated nearby. The Council did not intend to establish any new punt stations which would be subject to planning and Conservator approvals. There was already an approved punt station beside Garret Hostel Lane within Trinity College and it was considered unlikely that consent would be granted for another station at Garret Hostel Lane. This would also have interfered with public access to the river.

### **3) Councillor Reid to the Executive Councillor for Communities**

**Does the Executive Councillor agree that political balance and local knowledge are important considerations in making appointments to collaborative external bodies such as Clay Farm Community Centre?**

The Executive Councillor responded that political balance was important and that many outside bodies had cross-party representation. Legal advice had been sought prior to the appointment of the representative for Clay Farm Community Centre and the advice confirmed that it was for the ruling group to make their decision; this had previously been reported back to the Community



Services Scrutiny Committee. The appointment of Cllr Robertson took into consideration his management and financial expertise.

#### **4) Councillor Bick to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste**

**Following his recent failure to recognise the Parker's Piece conservation plan by public consultation before installing new concrete bases and bins, for which his officers have apologised, can the Executive Councillor confirm the undertaking he made at the West-Central Area Committee to consult on any future changes like this to Parker's Piece which are potentially in conflict with the conservation plan?**

The Conservation Plan for Parkers Piece was written in 2011 and was prepared to provide a basis for management to safeguard the elements that a wide range of people considered should be conserved for the future.

The Conservation Management Plan recommended in its policies and guidance section:-

- 5.12 to retain the open character of the central area of Parkers Piece and to avoid introducing tree planting, additional lights, other structures or artefacts.
- 5.3.3 Litter collection services responded to periods of high visitor numbers.

It also stated in Appendix 7 section 5, that the litter bin was possibly rather rural for this formal location.

The replacement bin works related to Capital Plan item PR027, which was approved in February 2012.

Officers had reviewed the existing bin provision, to see if the number of locations could be reduced; however the numbers of bins were increased, adding a new provision for recycling.

The style of the bins was of a high quality and reflected the Conservation Plans requirement 5.3.8 for adequate resources for appropriate high quality materials and design for artefacts. The new bins also contributed to 5.3.3 Litter collection services which responded to periods of high visitor numbers.

There was no local Friends Group with a direct association with Parkers Piece, and Officers did not consult as the works were deemed as operational

activities. The locations of the central path bins on Parkers Piece, also replicated those of the established positions for temporary summer bins.

Capital Item PR027 had installed 'Big Belly Bins' on Midsummer Common, Stourbridge Common and Riverside. The provision of new bins on these sites was also deemed an operational decision therefore no formal consultation was completed.

The new OMOS bins for Parkers Piece, Jesus Green, Christ's Pieces and New Square were ordered in February '15. Officers' that managed the roll out of the additional bins had given a commitment at West/ Central Area Committee to notify Ward Councillors of the intended locations for replacement bins prior to installation.

The new lead Officer had also considered feedback from West/ Central Area Committee with regards to the installation of bins with concrete bases. The footprint required to support the new bins would be reduced to the minimum as a consequence of this feedback.

Officers had also confirmed that the existing bins that were to be replaced were also fixed using a concrete base and these would be removed and reinstated to grass, where a bin location was no longer used.

#### **5) Councillor Cantrill to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources**

**The proposals for a national living wage announced at the budget, appear to be a living wage in name only and does not appear to reflect the aims of the long established living wage campaign. Can the Executive Councillor confirm that the city council will continue with its efforts to pursue the living wage campaign as pursued by the Living Wage Foundation?**

The Executive Councillor responded that the City Council would continue with its living wage campaign. The announcement by George Osbourn attempted to muddy the water for the general public's understanding of what the living wage was. On a local level, the City Council was clear that what George Osbourn had done was not enough and the living wage campaign with the Living Wage Foundation would continue.

#### **Secondary Question**

The following oral question was tabled but owing to the expiry of the period of time permitted, was not covered during the meeting.

### **Councillor Reid to the Leader**

**Does the Leader agree that the council should be transparent in the financial reporting it offers to support decision making and scrutiny?**

**15/101/CNL To consider the following Notices of Motion, notice of which has been given by:**

**7a Councillor Gillespie**

Councillor Gillespie proposed and Councillor Herbert seconded the following motion:

#### Human Rights Act

That Cambridge City Council expresses support for the Human Rights Act and the positive impact it has had on rights protections of individuals in the UK; welcomes the guidance the Human Rights Act provides for public authorities in ensuring policies are developed in line with international human rights standards; and calls on the Government to retain the Human Rights Act, the protections within it, and then UK's international obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights.

**Resolved** (unanimously):

To agree the motion as set out above.

**7b Councillor Price**

Councillors Price proposed and Councillor Todd-Jones seconded the following motion:

#### Emergency Budget Housing Measures

This Council is very concerned at the implications for its tenants and housing stock (City Homes) in the Tory government's Emergency Budget's housing measures.

Namely: a benefit cap of £20,000 a year for couples and £13,400 for single people in the City; Housing Benefit to be withdrawn from 18 - 21 year olds; Housing Benefit and Local Housing Allowance to be frozen for 5 years; Tax Credits and Housing Benefit/Local Housing Allowance only to take into

account the first two children in households for children born after April 2017; market rents to be charged in social housing for all households with incomes of £30,000 with additional rent receipts going to the Treasury not the Council.

The Council considers that the impact of these measures in the City will be to seriously worsen the housing affordability crisis in Cambridge and increase poverty, homelessness and the numbers at risk of being homeless in the City, particularly amongst the young and very low income families.

The Council recognises that for individual tenants who have faced significant above inflation rent increases and falling incomes over the last few years, the Budget proposal to cut social sector rents by 1% for the next four years may well be welcome. However, it also notes that a 1% rent cut will mean a loss of rental income to its Housing Revenue Account of £14,883,000 from 2016 /2017 - 2019/2020 and that loss will have very significant consequences for the Council's plans to build new homes and maintain its services to its current tenants.

The Council therefore resolves to write to the two MPs for Cambridge, Daniel Zeichner MP and Heidi Allen MP, to lay out its concerns and ask them to do all they can to highlight the impact on City tenants of these measures in Westminster.

**Resolved** (unanimously):

To agree the motion as set out above.

**7c** Councillor Gillespie

Councillor Roberts withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision making.

Councillors Gillespie proposed and Councillor Cantrill seconded the following motion:

Transatlantic Trade and Industry Partnership

This Council notes:

1. That the EU and USA launched negotiations in July 2013 on Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).
2. That negotiations are underway to determine which goods and services TTIP will apply to and if new rules can be agreed to protect investors, harmonise standards, reduce tariffs and open new markets throughout the EU and USA.

3. That there had been no impact assessment about the potential impact on local authorities.
4. That there has been no scrutiny of negotiating texts by local government and no consultation with local government representatives.
5. That MPs are also unable to scrutinise the negotiating documents.

This council believes that:

1. TTIP could have a detrimental impact on local services, employment, suppliers and decision-making.
2. A thorough impact assessment of TTIP on local authorities must be undertaken before the negotiations can be concluded.
3. The proposed Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanism has been used by corporations to overturn democratic decisions by all levels of governments at significant public cost. Local decision-making must be protected from ISDS.
4. The EU's food, environmental and labour standards are better than those in the US and TTIP negotiations must raise and not lower these standards across the EU and USA.
5. Sourcing supplies and employment locally is important to strengthening local economies and meeting local needs. TTIP must not impact on local authorities' ability to act in the best interests its communities.

This council resolves:

1. To write to the secretary of state for communities and local government, local MPs, and all Eastern Region MEPs raising our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and the secrecy of the negotiating process.
2. To write to the local government association to raise our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and ask them to raise these with government on our behalf.
3. To call for an impact assessment on the impact of TTIP on local authorities.
4. To publicise the council's concerns about TTIP; join with other local authorities which are opposed to TTIP across Europe and work with local campaigners to raise awareness about the problems of TTIP.
5. To contact the local authorities of municipalities twinned with Cambridge asking them to consider passing a similar motion on TTIP

Councillor Herbert proposed and Councillor Sinnott seconded the following amendment to motion (deleted text ~~struck through~~ and additional text underlined):

This council notes:

1. That the EU and USA launched negotiations in July 2013 on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).
2. That negotiations are underway to determine which goods and services TTIP will apply to and if new rules can be agreed to protect investors, harmonise standards, reduce tariffs and open new markets throughout the EU and USA.
3. That there has been no impact assessment about the potential impact on local authorities.
4. That there has been no scrutiny of the negotiating texts by local government and no consultation with local government representatives
5. That MPs are also unable to scrutinise the negotiating documents.

~~This council believes that:~~

- ~~1. TTIP could have a detrimental impact on local services, employment, suppliers and decision-making.~~
- ~~2. A thorough impact assessment of TTIP on local authorities must be undertaken before the negotiations can be concluded.~~
- ~~3. The proposed Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanism has been used by corporations to overturn democratic decisions by all levels of governments at significant public cost. Local decision-making must be protected from ISDS.~~
- ~~4. The EU's food, environmental and labour standards are better than those in the US and TTIP negotiations must raise and not lower these standards across the EU and USA.~~
- ~~5. Sourcing supplies and employment locally is important to strengthening local economies and meeting local needs. TTIP must not impact on local authorities' ability to act in the best interests its communities.~~

This council resolves:

To hold a Councillor briefing and meeting including an invited speaker from LGIU or equivalent organisation, and better informed by that meeting:

1. To write to the secretary of state for communities and local government, local MPs, and all Eastern Region MEPs raising our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and the secrecy of the negotiating process.
2. To write to the local government association to raise our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and ask them to raise these with government on our behalf.
3. To call for an impact assessment on the impact of TTIP on local authorities.

- ~~4. To publicise the council's concerns about TTIP; join with other local authorities which are opposed to TTIP across Europe and work with local campaigners to raise awareness about the problems of TTIP.~~
- ~~5. To contact the local authorities of municipalities twinned with Cambridge asking them to consider passing a similar motion on TTIP~~

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

Resolved (by 37 votes to 0) that:

This council notes:

1. That the EU and USA launched negotiations in July 2013 on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).
2. That negotiations are underway to determine which goods and services TTIP will apply to and if new rules can be agreed to protect investors, harmonise standards, reduce tariffs and open new markets throughout the EU and USA.
3. That there has been no impact assessment about the potential impact on local authorities.
4. That there has been no scrutiny of the negotiating texts by local government and no consultation with local government representatives
5. That MPs are also unable to scrutinise the negotiating documents.

To hold a Councillor briefing and meeting including an invited speaker from LGIU or equivalent organisation, and better informed by that meeting:

1. To write to the secretary of state for communities and local government, local MPs, and all Eastern Region MEPs raising our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and the secrecy of the negotiating process.
2. To write to the local government association to raise our serious concerns about the impact of TTIP on local authorities and ask them to raise these with government on our behalf.
3. To call for an impact assessment on the impact of TTIP on local authorities.

#### **7d Councillor Bick**

Councillors Bick proposed and Councillor Reid seconded the following motion:

Greater Cambridge Combined Authority

Council calls on the County Council to make a statement, enabling a

public debate about the model of devolutionary package it is considering to negotiate with central government and the consequences of this for the already agreed move to create a Greater Cambridge Combined Authority for the governance of integrated planning and transport strategy in the Cambridge city region.

Whilst welcoming the goal of devolving powers from Whitehall, it calls on the Leader, on behalf of this council, to resist any devolution model which frustrates existing moves towards an emergent simpler and more joined-up local government for Greater Cambridge. It re-confirms the goal outlined in the city council's overwhelmingly supported resolution last November calling for a unitary council for Greater Cambridge. As part of current discussions, Council looks for a 'big agreement' among neighbouring partners, which combines a firm commitment to establish a Greater Cambridge unitary council with consideration of any new regional tier of decision-making.

Councillor Herbert proposed and Councillor Blencowe seconded the following amendment to motion (deleted text ~~struck through~~ and additional text underlined):

Delete all after 'Council', and amend so it reads:

Council supports further devolution to Greater Cambridge and Cambridgeshire from Whitehall, as articulated in this week's letter to Greg Clark from all Cambridgeshire and Peterborough council leaders and public bodies, and is seeking improvements in the Cities and Local Devolution Bill to build on that strong partnership.

Delivering improvements now for our residents is our immediate priority, including by making the case for an improved share of national funding and increased freedoms for service delivery and local decision making.

Our focus as a Council is to build on the strong partnership and increasing achievements of councils within the Greater Cambridge area, working with our Universities and education bodies and local businesses, to improve the lives of Cambridge and Greater Cambridge residents, and help protect the city against future funding cuts from government. This will build on the achievements of the City Deal and our commitment to a Combined Authority for Greater Cambridge, and expand joint delivery and shared services locally.



In addition, we also support working for wider devolution across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough footprint, including all seven councils and the Local Enterprise Partnership area, helped by the recent securing of Cambridgeshire business rates above growth projections from Treasury.

Building on earlier Council decisions, Council states that our devolution objectives are to

- provide future benefit to the city and Greater Cambridge area;
- aid delivery of the Council's priorities for affordable housing, anti-poverty, transport, skills, service transformation and quality of life within communities and neighbourhoods; and
- recognise the importance to government of Greater Cambridge and Cambridgeshire as a 'Southern Powerhouse', delivering significant extra returns to the Treasury for every additional pound they invest in transport and rail infrastructure, education, skills and research.

Council therefore asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

a) to press for Combined Authority provisions in the Bill that are genuinely flexible as promised by the Government spokesperson in the House of Lords on 21st July, and

b) to seek maximum mutually agreed devolution for both Greater Cambridge and for the whole of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and our 'Southern Powerhouse'.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 27 votes to 0.

**Resolved** (unanimously) that:

Council supports further devolution to Greater Cambridge and Cambridgeshire from Whitehall, as articulated in this week's letter to Greg Clark from all Cambridgeshire and Peterborough council leaders and public bodies, and is seeking improvements in the Cities and Local Devolution Bill to build on that strong partnership.

Delivering improvements now for our residents is our immediate priority, including by making the case for an improved share of national funding and increased freedoms for service delivery and local decision making.

Our focus as a Council is to build on the strong partnership and increasing achievements of councils within the Greater Cambridge area, working with our Universities and education bodies and local businesses, to improve the lives of Cambridge and Greater Cambridge residents, and help protect the city against future funding cuts from government. This will build on the achievements of the City Deal and our commitment to a Combined Authority for Greater Cambridge, and expand joint delivery and shared services locally.

In addition, we also support working for wider devolution across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough footprint, including all seven councils and the Local Enterprise Partnership area, helped by the recent securing of Cambridgeshire business rates above growth projections from Treasury. Building on earlier Council decisions, Council states that our devolution objectives are to

- provide future benefit to the city and Greater Cambridge area;
- aid delivery of the Council's priorities for affordable housing, anti-poverty, transport, skills, service transformation and quality of life within communities and neighbourhoods; and
- recognise the importance to government of Greater Cambridge and Cambridgeshire as a 'Southern Powerhouse', delivering significant extra returns to the Treasury for every additional pound they invest in transport and rail infrastructure, education, skills and research.

Council therefore asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

a) to press for Combined Authority provisions in the Bill that are genuinely flexible as promised by the Government spokesperson in the House of Lords on 21st July, and

b) to seek maximum mutually agreed devolution for both Greater Cambridge and for the whole of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and our 'Southern Powerhouse'.

### **15/102/CNL Written Questions**

The Mayor advised that no written questions had been received.

The meeting ended at 10.55 pm

**MAYOR**