

COUNCIL

19 July 2012
6.00 - 11.39 pm

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

The Mayor opened the meeting with a minute's silence in memory of the late Margaret Wright, who served as an Abbey Ward Councillor between 2008 and 2012.

Members spoke in tribute to Margaret Wright.

The Leader of the Council confirmed that a members' panel, made up of one member from each party, would be established to agree a fitting memorial. Consultation would be undertaken with all members, key officers and Margaret Wright's family.

12/41/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Extra-Ordinary Meeting and the Annual Meeting held on 24 May 2012

The minutes of the Extra-Ordinary meeting held on 24 May 2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

With minor amendments to minute items 12/21/CNL, 12/22/CNL and 12/31/CNL (see attached at appendix 1) the minutes of the Annual Meeting held on 24 May 2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

12/42/CNL Mayors Announcements

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Bird, Hipkin and Pogonowski.

2. Cambridge/Heidelberg/Montpellier Youth Orchestra

The Mayor confirmed that the 50th anniversary of the Cambridge/Heidelberg/Montpellier Youth Orchestra would be celebrated in Heidelberg over the weekend of 3/5 August 2012.

3. Mayor's Day Out

The Mayor confirmed that the Mayor's Day Out to Great Yarmouth would take place on Monday 10th September 2012. Any Councillor wishing to steward a coach should contact the Arts and Entertainments team as soon as possible.

4. Cambridge Open Weekend

The Mayor confirmed that the City Council had again joined with the University of Cambridge to participate in the Open Cambridge weekend. The Council Chamber and civic suite would be open to the public on Friday 7th and Saturday 8th September 2012 with a timed talk about the civic insignia on both dates.

5. Harvest Festival Civic Service

The Mayor confirmed that the Harvest Festival Civic Service would take place on Sunday 21st October at 9.30 a.m. at Great St. Mary's Church.

6. Fund raising event for the Cambridge Women's Resource Centre.

The Mayor confirmed that she would be hosting a fund raising event for the Cambridge Women's Resource Centre at the Guildhall on Wednesday 17 October 2012.

7. Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Item	Interest
Johnson	12/44c/CNL	Personal: Employed by the University
Smith	12/44c/CNL	Personal: Employed by the University
Blackhurst	12/44c/CNL	Personal: Employed by the University
Todd-Jones	12/44c/CNL	Personal: Employed by the University
Reiner	12/44c/CNL	Personal: Partner employed by the University
Owers	12/44c/CNL	Personal: Student of the University

Reid	12/47a/CNL	Personal: Member of an Advisory Board that looks at sustainable housing
Rosenstiel	12/47d/CNL	Personal: Member of CAMRA
Brown	12/47d/CNL	Personal: Member of CAMRA

12/43/CNL Public Questions Time

No questions were received.

12/44/CNL To consider recommendations of the Executive for Adoption

Annual Treasury Management report 2011/12 (The Leader)

Resolved (by 21 votes to 0) to:

- i. Approve the Annual Treasury Management Report 2011/12, which included reporting of the Council's actual Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2011/12.

2011/12 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - General Fund - Overview - (The Leader)

Resolved (by 21 votes to 0) to:

- i. Agree carry forward requests, totalling £632,970, as detailed in Appendix C of the officer's report, subject to the final outturn position.

Note: Appendix C of the officer's report contained an item for £16,000 - Food and Occupational Safety - which was incorrectly listed in the Environmental & Waste Services portfolio. Therefore this carry forward will be transferred to Community Development & Health budgets for 2012/13.

- II. Carry forward (net) capital resources to fund re-phased capital spending of £8,872,000 as shown in Appendix D of the officer's report - Overview.

North West Cambridge Development - Management Strategy for Open Spaces, Sports and Community Facilities (The Leader)

Resolved (by 21 votes to 0) to:

- I. Approve a budget allocation for the proposed Joint Management Vehicle of up to £100k from 2027 onwards and that this be included in the Council's Medium Term Strategy.

12/45/CNL To consider recommendations of Committees for Adoption

Joint Meeting of Civic Affairs and Standards Committee - 27 June 2012

The Head of Legal Services introduced the item and responded to member's questions.

Notification and Declaration of Members Interests

Resolved (unanimously):

- i. That, pending the appointment of an "Independent Person", the Monitoring Officer is authorised to determine applications for dispensations to speak and or vote from members with declarable pecuniary or other Code of Conduct interests, subject to the Monitoring Officer first consulting the Chair and Opposition spokesperson for Civic Affairs.
- ii. That the Monitoring Officer shall consult the Independent Person, when appointed, before determining applications for dispensations, as well as the Chair and Opposition Spokesperson for Civic Affairs (or appropriate alternative councillor if either is directly affected).
- iii. That the Monitoring Officer is authorised to deal with applications for dispensations at short notice, where it is not practical to consult the Independent Person, Chair or Opposition Spokesperson subject to the decision being reported to members of Civic Affairs Committee thereafter.
- iv. That the Civic Affairs Committee keeps this arrangement under review.

Adoption of a new Code of Conduct for Members

Resolved (by 28 votes to 0) to:

- i. Adopt the Code of Conduct set out in Appendix 1 of the report to Civic Affairs Committee on 27 June 2012.

Appointment of an Independent Person

Resolved (unanimously) to:

- i. Appoint one Independent Person and one deputy, and that the appointment process is advertised in the press, as well as on the Council's website.
- ii. Agree that the Independent Person is paid an annual allowance of £1,000 and that the Deputy is paid an annual allowance of £500.
- iii. Agree that the appointments are made for a three year term but with appointments subject to annual ratification at the Annual Meeting of the Council.
- iv. Agree the selection criteria and role description annexed to the report to Civic Affairs Committee on 27 June 2012.
- v. Agree that a member panel is appointed to recommend appointments to the Council.
- vi. Agree that the Monitoring Officer is authorised to take such reasonable steps as he considers necessary to implement these recommendations.

Considering Complaints and Governance

Councillor Boyce proposed the following amendment to recommendation iv. of the officer's report:

- iv. Agree that the Civic Affairs Committee is invited to appoint Standards Sub-Committees (2 LD + 2Lab) to consider complaints (as outlined in Appendix 2 of the officer's report), ~~with all members of Civic Affairs Committee authorised to be members.~~

On a show of hands this was approved unanimously.

Resolved (unanimously) to:

- i. Agree that a direct replacement for the Standards Committee is not appointed and that the Civic Affairs Committee is made responsible for promoting high standards of conduct by members and officers, for overseeing the procedure for considering complaints against councillors, and for any other aspect of promoting or regulating standards in local government that do not fall within the remit of the Executive or another regulatory committee.
- ii. Agree that the Council amends the terms of reference for the Civic Affairs Committee as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer's report to Civic Affairs Committee on 27 June 2012, and that references to the Standards Committee are deleted.
- iii. Agree that the procedure for considering complaints against councillors set out in Appendix 2 of the officer's report is adopted as amended.
- iv. Agree that the Civic Affairs Committee is invited to appoint Standards Sub-Committees (2 LD + 2Lab) to consider complaints (as outlined in Appendix 2 of the officer's report).
- v. Agree that the arrangements proposed are reviewed by the Civic Affairs Committee in 12 months' time.
- vi. Thank the external members of the Standards Committee for their contribution to the work of the Council in promoting and maintaining ethical standards.

Civic Affairs Committee - 27 June 2012**Code of Corporate Governance 2012****Resolved** (unanimously) to:

- i. Approve the Code of Corporate Governance set out at pages 175 to 195 of the Council agenda

12/46/CNL To deal with Oral Questions**1. Councillor Moghadas to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places**

Having made a big media splash on 13th July, Cambridge Evening News, what assurances can the Executive Councillor provide to the future funding and timescale of the Romsey Beach Resort?

The Executive Councillor responded that the City Council encouraged project ideas from the local community and was committed to helping progress these projects where possible. It was noted that the idea of a Romsey Beach Resort had been put forward by a local resident and was a genuinely inspiring project idea. However issues such as land ownership, health and safety concerns and the location of the wildlife site meant it was a complex issue.

The Executive Councillor stated that, whilst the project was in the early stages of development, he hoped that in the future residents would be enjoying a facility such as this.

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

Does the Executive Councillor join me in welcoming the recent announcement from the Government that they are to simplify the introduction of 20mph limits in urban areas?

The Executive Councillor responded that new government guidance released in July 2012 would assist the Council to regulate 20mph zones in the City. The guidance offered more options to local authorities and greater scope to control costs.

3. Councillor Blackhurst to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places

Could the Executive Councillor provide the Council with an update on developer contribution projects in the southern part of the city?

The Executive Councillor confirmed that it was the strategy of the Council to provide developer contribution projects across all 14 wards within the city. It was noted that projects in the south of the City had included improvements to Nightingale Recreation Ground and Cherry Hinton Hall. Current projects

included improved changing facilities at Cherry Hinton Village Hall at a cost of £65,000, and the Trumpington 'Electronic Play' scheme at a cost of £35,000.

4. Councillor Hart to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Can the Executive Councillor for Housing please state what was the annual budget for fencing repairs in Abbey and citywide last year and this year?

The Executive Councillor responded that the City wide budget for last year was £196,403, of which the value of fencing spent in Abbey Ward was £46,093.23. However, maintenance and investment budgets were not normally prepared on a ward basis.

It was noted that the City wide budget for 2012-13 was £54,000.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that the Housing Asset Management Team were currently examining the possibility of front loading the current year fencing programme by bringing forward future years programmes so as to reflect increased levels of repairs identified by expanding the scope of survey work undertaken prior to cyclical redecoration. It was noted that fencing did not form part of Decent Homes work and was therefore not captured by HHSRS (Decent Homes) surveys.

5. Councillor Herbert to the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

Which Executive Councillor(s) made the decision on the planned apportionment of affordable housing on the University-led NW Cambridge development, and on what date and how was the decision taken and reported to Councillors, and what were the detailed proposed %s to be allocated to people in different categories of housing need ahead of any planning application?

The Executive Councillor confirmed that as part of the pre-application process a number of briefings had taken place. These had included housing specific sessions on both 8 October 2010 and 21 December 2010.

It was noted that, whilst no formal sign-off was required by an Executive Councillor, consultation had been undertaken at the time with the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth and the Executive Councillor for Housing.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that the 50% allocation had been recommended by an independent consultant, and formally agreed through the Environment Scrutiny Committee in 2009.

6. Councillor Benstead to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Does the Executive Councillor agree that it is important to foster community spirit on the estates, which the council has responsibility for?

The Executive Councillor responded that Community Development Officers worked in Council owned estates in liaison with Housing Officers.

Examples of this work included:

- Hanover and Princes Court in Trumpington: work with residents to improve the area and bring people together including planting schemes, jubilee events and discussions about whether a small community facility could be delivered.
- Thorpe Way area in Abbey and Nuns Way area in Kings Hedges: ChYpPS activities for local young people.

7. Councillor Kerr to the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health

What progress have officers made in investigating ways for the Council to enable more people in Cambridge to access credit unions?

The Executive Councillor responded that, alongside Officers, he had met with the two Credit Unions operating in the City - Rainbow Saver Anglia Credit Union (operating primarily in Cherry Hinton as Cambridge Rainbow Savers) and Cambridge Credit Union (operating primarily in the north of the City from City Homes North Office). It was noted that both Credit Unions expressed a desire to raise their profiles and make their services more accessible to Cambridge residents, and both had suggested ways that the Council could assist them. The Credit Unions had also expressed the willingness to work together so that resources could be shared where possible.

It was noted that Officers were currently preparing a proposal for discussion with members of all parties and the Credit Unions. This was likely to include things such as:

- Help with promoting their services
- Promotion of their services to staff and members
- Help to encourage volunteers to come forward
- Help with finding locations for them to operate
- Considering whether the Customer Service Centre and City Homes South are suitable locations

The Executive Councillor confirmed that the Head of Community Development was hoping to bring a detailed report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee in January setting out any formal proposals for approval.

8. Councillor Kightley to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places

Does the Executive Councillor believe that the Olympic Torch Relay was a success for Cambridge?

The Executive Councillor responded that the Olympic Torch Relay event had been a great success for Cambridge. It had been the largest outdoor event ever held in the City with an attendance of over 120,000, with no major incidents or arrests recorded. The event had been voted one of the top 3 relay events in the country by LOCOG and cost less than £1 for every person that had attended. The Executive Councillor confirmed that the cost would be covered equally between the City Council and the County Council.

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

Could you please give us the reasons why the Cherry Hinton members of the City Council were not consulted this year concerning the new arrangements with the Folk Festival when you publicly stated you had strong political backing?

The Executive Councillor confirmed that the City Council were committed to enhancing and promoting the Folk Festival for both local residents and those from outside the area.

It was noted that the Executive Councillor had not issued a public statement regarding this year's event, but had simply responded to a request for a comment from the Cambridge Evening News.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that sponsorship from both the Co-Op and BBC Television had been withdrawn for this year's event, and the only current media provider on offer was Sky Arts.

Whilst it was confirmed that Cherry Hinton Ward Councillors had been consulted on extending the closure of the park, it was acknowledged that further consultation could have been undertaken on some of the wider issues. The Executive Councillor confirmed that he had met with Ward Councillors on this issue and that further discussions would take place.

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

In 2008 the Council used its enforcement powers to end commercial punting from its land on Jesus Green. Will it now use the same powers to prevent commercial punting from the slipway it now owns at Garrett Hostel Bridge?

The Executive Councillor responded that whilst a decision had been taken by the Leader in 2008 to approve enforcement action at Jesus Green, ownership issues around Garret Hostel Lane had caused complications. However in February 2012 the Land Registry had recognised the City Council's property rights by registering its title.

In September 2011 the Cam Conservators had decided only to register commercial punts operating from authorised punt stations, and with the express permission of the riparian owners. Garret Hostel Lane was not an authorised punt station and commercial punts using it were in breach of the Conservators' byelaws. However this had failed to stop the use of Garret Hostel Lane and the punt trade had continued.

The Executive Councillor said that the City Council was taking legal advice with a view to asserting its property rights over the Garret Hostel Lane site and stopping the unauthorised use by punt operators.

The following Oral Questions were also tabled, but owing to the expiry of the period of time permitted, were not replied to during the meeting. The Mayor asked Executive Councillors to supply written responses to these questions:

11. Councillor McPherson to the Leader

I hope the Council will agree with me that road safety is of vital importance as much in our county and City as it is across the rest of the country.

Could I ask the Leader therefore if he will join with me in using his considerable influence at county level to ensure that the post of Casualty Reduction Officer for Cambridgeshire is not reassigned as a 'staff position' (that is 'civilianised') within Cambridgeshire Constabulary, as may well be the case at the next Police Authority meeting. The influence on young divers and riders especially is far greater when advised and instructed by a 'Warranted Police Officer' in this role than is likely from someone in a civilian capacity however competent, dedicated and able that person may be.

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

Can the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources explain why the proposed Cambridge Business Improvement District plan by Love Cambridge failed to properly consult with residents?

The following response was provided outside of the meeting and has been requested for inclusion:

“Love Cambridge secured the funding for the BID proposal but is not itself developing the proposal, which is being led by a BID Development Manager and a taskforce. Some members of Love Cambridge are not part of the BID area, while the task force includes businesses that are outside Love Cambridge.

The taskforce has sought to consult widely with local businesses, as they would be liable for the business levy should the BID ballot lead to the creation of a BID. While some task force members have spoken to residents, they do not generally perceive a need to do so, precisely because as this is a business initiative, as the name implies, and residents will not pay the levy. However, to enhance transparency, I am happy to ask the BID taskforce to find a way of

sharing their plans with the public and getting feedback. In addition, I suggested at the last Strategy and Resources meeting that there should be an extraordinary S&R meeting to discuss the proposals when they are known.”

13. Councillor Reiner to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places

What is the Executive Councillor's view of the decision of the Heritage Lottery Fund not to support the Jesus Green bid?

14. Councillor Boyce to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places

Could the Executive Councillor comment on the possibility of the City hosting the Tour de France?

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

As a third of the £129 000 spent on the Olympic Community Arts Project was Council funds, can the Executive Councillor explain why there was no secure storage provision for the giant puppets in Cambridge, resulting in them being stored in Brighton?

16. Councillor McPherson to the Leader

After the recent publication over last weekend of the fiasco that has befallen G4S in attempting to create a Security structure for the coming Olympic games: Can the Leader seek to reassure us that he will use all means at his disposal to halt the plans by the Chief Constable of Cambridge Constabulary to out-source many support posts and even front line posts such as dog section to G4S and recognise that although savings must be made this may not now be the most effective way of making them.

17. Councillor Herbert to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources

Will the Executive Councillor ensure that the River Cam, Parker's Piece, Christ's Pieces and all publicly owned spaces in the City Centre are deleted from the area of responsibility of the proposed Business Improvement District?

The following response was provided outside of the meeting and has been requested for inclusion:

“Like Councillor Herbert and I, the BID development manager was present at the Strategy and Resources Committee where members made clear their concerns about the area covered, particularly the green open spaces and the River Cam.

For the avoidance of doubt, inclusion of a public space in a BID area would **not** privatise that space nor would it become the ‘responsibility’ of the BID. A BID can spend money to augment existing amenities, but it must not, according to the legislation introduced by the last Labour government, supplant the existing contribution of the local authority; nor would the governance of the public space change.

I did wonder whether in order to benefit from any enhancements the open spaces and river needed to be within the BID area. However, I have been informed that this is not the case and am therefore very happy to write to the BID manager to request that the river and the public open spaces be excluded from the BID. I do not, however, think that all publicly owned spaces should by definition be removed from the BID area, the aim of which, after all, is to improve an area and hence should be welcome.”

12/47/CNL To consider the following Notices of Motion, notice of which has been given by:

12/47a/CNL Motion A

Councillor Ward proposed and Councillor Reid seconded the following motion:

“This council agrees to sign up to the Local Government Association's Climate Local commitment as the successor to the Nottingham Declaration on Climate Change to which the council signed up in 2006:

Our commitment to taking action in a changing climate.

We recognise that our council has an important role to help our residents and businesses to capture the opportunities and benefits of action on climate change. These include saving money on energy bills, generating income from renewable energy, attracting new jobs and investment in 'green' industries,

supporting new sources of energy, managing local flood-risk and water scarcity and protecting our natural environment.

We will progressively address the risks and pursue the opportunities presented by a changing climate, in line with local priorities, through our role as:

- Community leader - helping local people and businesses to be smarter about their energy use and to prepare for climate impacts;
- Service provider - delivering services that are resource efficient, less carbon intensive, resilient and that protect those who are most vulnerable to climate impacts;
- Estate manager - ensuring that our own buildings and operations are resource efficient, use clean energy, and are well prepared for the impacts of a changing climate.

In signing this commitment, we will:

- Set locally-owned and determined commitments and actions to reduce carbon emissions and to manage climate impacts. These will be specific, measurable and challenging;
- Publish our commitments, actions and progress, enabling local communities to hold us to account;
- Share the learning from our experiences and achievements with other councils; and
- Regularly refresh our commitments and actions to ensure they are current and continue to reflect local priorities.”

Resolved (unanimously) that the motion be agreed as set out above.

12/47b/CNL Motion B

Councillor Herbert proposed and Councillor Owers seconded the following motion:

“The Council considers that its decision-making processes need updating, along with wider aspects of its Constitution.

It therefore asks the Chief Executive to establish a Member Review Panel to conduct the review and report to Civic Affairs Committee, so improvements can be implemented then and at the next Council AGM, and that the Panel be asked to:

- identify issues needing review, including the Executive Councillor/Committee split
- investigate potential areas of agreement between the parties on the council
- review how the role and contribution of individual Councillors can be increased, and
- assess further improvements to public involvement including webcasting of key meetings.

On a show of hands the motion was lost by 18 votes to 21.

Duration of the meeting

Resolved at 10.30pm under Council Procedure Rule 10.1 that the meeting not be adjourned.

12/47c/CNL Motion C

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

“The Council urges local residents, organisations and businesses to make full use of the last week of consultation on the Cambridge Local Plan 'Issues and Options report' to 2031. We want all sections of the community to have a voice in the Local Plan review and in shaping future decisions.

The Council recognizes that major challenges will be raised in responses to the city and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan consultations that require an overall plan for major developments in the Cambridge area including:

- to expand jobs and education and skills
- the building of badly needed additional market and affordable housing
- vital transport and wider improvements, and
- protecting the best features of our area and environment,

and that these major issues can only be effectively addressed by the City, South Cambridgeshire and the County Council implementing integrated planning consultation and decision making.

The Council asks the Leader to instigate urgent member and officer meetings with the two other councils to maximise integration and:

a) create one integrated, transparent and robust decision making process on the two Local Plan reviews, learning from other city region joint decision making like the Greater Norwich Development Partnerships

b) Ensure the same consultation timings for both the two reviews and transport strategy consultations

c) add an evidence base on combined Cambridge area projections on employment, housing and transport needs for 2020 and 2030, including to quantify unmet needs, and

d) investigate the potential to develop plans for a 'Cambridge City region' including a potential 'City Deal' bid to Government for extra powers and investment and infrastructure options.

Councillor Ward proposed and Councillor Kightley seconded the following amendment:

Delete from paragraph starting “and that these major issues ...” to end. Then insert at end:

“The Council further recognises that

- South Cambridgeshire District Council have stated that it is neither necessary nor practical to speed up their local plan review process sufficiently to match the City Council’s dates
- To delay the City Council’s local plan review process to match South Cambridgeshire District Council’s dates would run the risk of opening up a policy vacuum which could be exploited by developers to promote inappropriate development in and around Cambridge.

The Council endorses the objective of achieving alongside South Cambridgeshire District Council two complementary local plans which make sense whether taken separately or together, supported by a consistent transport strategy enabled by Cambridgeshire County Council, but it fails to see why this can only be achieved by surrendering local decision-making upwards. It notes the machinery already established through which the City

Council, along with other authorities, will seek to discharge their legal duty to co-operate:

- The County Council is preparing its Transport Strategy on a trajectory to match with the two Districts' plans and is consulting on transport planning alongside the districts' local plan Issues and Options consultations (there was no comparable transport strategy underpinning the 2006 Local Plan).
- The City Council, the County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council have set up a Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group to co-ordinate planning activities in the Cambridge area, and this body has committed to a shared process and consultation on the "broad locations for development" around Cambridge. The current issues and options consultation will be followed by a joint 'fringe sites' consultation before Christmas.
- The County Council along with all the districts and Peterborough City Council have agreed and contributed to the setting up of the Cambridgeshire Joint Planning unit and set up a Strategic Planning & Transport Joint Member Group to co-ordinate evidence preparation and strategic planning across the county.
- Officers of the councils are working closely together to support this joined-up plan making process. Key parts of the evidence base have been jointly commissioned (e.g. the infrastructure study and the Employment Land review) and there is significant day to day working going on.

The Council further notes and endorses the work already under way in conjunction with our partner authorities to investigate the potential for the Cambridge City Region to attract devolved powers from central government to facilitate its contribution to national economic growth in the manner of the recent "city deals" with the 8 core cities.

The Council asks the Executive to

- (a) Ensure that officers and members continue to work closely with partner councils to deliver as joined-up a spatial and transport planning process as is practical.
- (b) Continue work on the City Deal concept and if it appears to add value to our objectives within the area, to bring forward a bid to central government."

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 21 votes to 18.

Resolved (by 21 votes to 0) that:

The Council urges local residents, organisations and businesses to make full use of the last week of consultation on the Cambridge Local Plan 'Issues and Options report' to 2031. We want all sections of the community to have a voice in the Local Plan review and in shaping future decisions.

The Council recognizes that major challenges will be raised in responses to the city and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan consultations that require an overall plan for major developments in the Cambridge area including:

- to expand jobs and education and skills
- the building of badly needed additional market and affordable housing
- vital transport and wider improvements, and
- protecting the best features of our area and environment,

The Council further recognises that

- South Cambridgeshire District Council have stated that it is neither necessary nor practical to speed up their local plan review process sufficiently to match the City Council's dates
- To delay the City Council's local plan review process to match South Cambridgeshire District Council's dates would run the risk of opening up a policy vacuum which could be exploited by developers to promote inappropriate development in and around Cambridge.

The Council endorses the objective of achieving alongside South Cambridgeshire District Council two complementary local plans which make sense whether taken separately or together, supported by a consistent transport strategy enabled by Cambridgeshire County Council, but it fails to see why this can only be achieved by surrendering local decision-making upwards. It notes the machinery already established through which the City Council, along with other authorities, will seek to discharge their legal duty to co-operate:

- The County Council is preparing its Transport Strategy on a trajectory to match with the two Districts' plans and is consulting on transport planning alongside the districts' local plan Issues and Options consultations (there was no comparable transport strategy underpinning the 2006 Local Plan).
- The City Council, the County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council have set up a Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council Strategic Transport

and Spatial Planning Group to co-ordinate planning activities in the Cambridge area, and this body has committed to a shared process and consultation on the "broad locations for development" around Cambridge. The current issues and options consultation will be followed by a joint 'fringe sites' consultation before Christmas.

- The County Council along with all the districts and Peterborough City Council have agreed and contributed to the setting up of the Cambridgeshire Joint Planning unit and set up a Strategic Planning & Transport Joint Member Group to co-ordinate evidence preparation and strategic planning across the county.
- Officers of the councils are working closely together to support this joined-up plan making process. Key parts of the evidence base have been jointly commissioned (e.g. the infrastructure study and the Employment Land review) and there is significant day to day working going on.

The Council further notes and endorses the work already under way in conjunction with our partner authorities to investigate the potential for the Cambridge City Region to attract devolved powers from central government to facilitate its contribution to national economic growth in the manner of the recent "city deals" with the 8 core cities.

The Council asks the Executive to

- (c) Ensure that officers and members continue to work closely with partner councils to deliver as joined-up a spatial and transport planning process as is practical.
- (d) Continue work on the City Deal concept and if it appears to add value to our objectives within the area, to bring forward a bid to central government.

12/47d/CNL Motion D

Councillor Rosenstiel proposed and Councillor Brown seconded the following motion:

"This council recognises the valuable role that pubs play in their communities and is alarmed by the number that have been closed down, used for other purposes or demolished in recent years. Council also notes that communities are most successful when they contain a healthy mix of shops, including those that are independently run.

This council therefore congratulates Julian Huppert MP on proposing a 10 Minute Rule Bill which would defend against change of use or demolition of local pubs or independent shops without planning permission. It further notes that this would complement the powers currently being consulted on by the council for protection of pubs by means of Interim Planning Policy Guidance.

This Council calls on the Leader to write to Andrew Lansley MP, as the city's other representative in Parliament, requesting that he support the Bill on second reading on Friday 26 October and to encourage other MPs to do likewise.”

Resolved (by 21 votes to 0) that the motion be agreed as set out above.

12/48/CNL Written Questions

Members noted that written questions and answers as circulated around the Chamber.

12/49/CNL Special Urgency Decision

Resolved that:

- i. The Special Urgency decision be noted.

The meeting ended at 11.39 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank