

**COUNCIL**18 April 2013  
6.00pm - 10.14 pm

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

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

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

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

Apologies were received from Councillors Hart, McPherson and Reid

**2. REACH FAIR**

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

**3. ELECTIONS**

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

#### **4. TWINNING**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **6. CITY COUNCIL ANNUAL MEETING**

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

## 7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

#### Speaking on Motion 6a

Ms Agate addressed the Council and made the following points:

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

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

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

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

Ms Agate said she may consider revising the petition wording.

### Speaking on Motion 6a

Mr Fryde addressed the Council and made the following points:

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

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

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

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded:

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

Mr Fryde reiterated his concern over changes to benefit payments.

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

#### Speaking on Motion 6a

Mr Woodcock addressed the Council and made the following points:

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

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

Mr Woodcock made the following supplementary points:

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

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

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

### Speaking on Motion 6a

Ms Brightman addressed the Council and made the following points:

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

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

### Speaking on Motion 6b

Mr Mather addressed the Council and made the following points:

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

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

The Leader responded:

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

Mr Mather made the following supplementary points:

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

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

### **13/19CNL Re-Ordering of the Agenda**

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

**13/20CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for Adoption****13/20a/CNL Constitution Amendment : Review of Homelessness Decisions**

**Resolved** (Unanimously) that:

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

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

**Resolved** (Unanimously) that:

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

**13/21CNL To deal with Oral Questions****1. Councillor Brown to the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services**

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

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



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

## **2. Councillor Herbert to the Executive Councillor for Housing**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **8. Councillor Herbert to the Leader**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **11. Councillor Johnson to the Executive Councillor for Housing**

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

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

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

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

### 13/22a/CNL Motion A

Councillor Price proposed and Councillor Birtles seconded the following motion:

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

This Council notes that:

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

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

This Council therefore resolves to:

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

2. Urge the Council's Executive to:

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

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

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

Councillor Smart proposed and Councillor Smith seconded the following amendment:

Delete all and replace with:

“Council acknowledges

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

Council further acknowledges

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

Council further acknowledges

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

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

#### Council further acknowledges

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

#### Council therefore

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



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

Council commits itself to

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

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

**Resolved** (by 20 votes to 0) that:

Council acknowledges

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

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

#### Council further acknowledges

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

#### Council further acknowledges

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

#### Council further acknowledges

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

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

#### Council therefore

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

#### Council commits itself to

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

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

### 13/22b/CNL Motion B

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Ward seconded the following motion:

“Council notes that

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

Council regrets that

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

Council believes that

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

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

Council resolves to

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

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

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

"Deleting all after 'Council' and insert:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Resolved** (by 21 votes to 1) that:

Council notes that

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

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

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

Council regrets that

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

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

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

Council believes that

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

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

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

Council resolves to

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

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

### **13/23CNL Written Questions**

There were no written questions.

The meeting ended at 10.14 pm

**CHAIR**