

**COUNCIL**

25 October 2012

6.00 pm - 0.45 am

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

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**12/50/CNL To Approve as a Correct Record the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 19 July 2012**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

**12/51/CNL Mayors Announcements**

**1. Apologies**

No apologies were received.

**2. Open Cambridge Weekend**

The Mayor confirmed the City collaborated with the University of Cambridge in the Open Cambridge weekend and groups of visitors came to the Guildhall on Friday 7 and Saturday 8 September.

**3. Mayor's Day Out**

The Mayor confirmed the annual outing for senior citizens to Great Yarmouth on 10 September went very well and thanked those councillors who helped with stewarding. The Mayor had the pleasure of welcoming a group of older people from Great Yarmouth when they made a return visit on 27 September.

**4. Remembrance**

The Mayor confirmed the Remembrance Sunday civic service would take place on Sunday 11 November at Great St. Mary's Church; details of which have been circulated. The re-positioned War Memorial on Hills Road will be dedicated by the Lord Bishop of Ely that same morning. The Mayor will lay a wreath at the War Memorial on behalf of the City; and the Deputy Mayor will be leading the civic procession to Great St. Mary's. The Mayor hoped Councillors would be able to support one or other of these services.

A service of remembrance will be held at the American Cemetery on Monday 12 November and again the Mayor will be laying a wreath on behalf of the City.

## **5. National Takeover Day**

The Mayor confirmed the National Takeover Day gives children and young people the chance to work with adults for the day and to be involved in decision-making. This year's event will take place on Friday 23 November when two young people will shadow the Mayor for the day.

## **6. Chevyn Service**

The Mayor confirmed the preaching of the Chevyn Sermon would take place at St. Paul's Church, Hills Road on Sunday 27 January.

## **7. Olympic And Paralympic Games**

The Mayor confirmed that following a tremendously exciting summer of sport for the UK and the city, which included the Olympic Torch Relay celebrations and many community events inspired by the Olympics and Paralympic Games; the Council would take the opportunity to host a civic event for local Games Makers (Olympic volunteers), Torchbearers and local volunteers (Sportmakers) to commemorate their involvement.

This core group of volunteers will be invited to an event in early December 2012.

It was noted that the Council had received a certificate of thanks from the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games for the part it played in the Torch Relay.

## **8. Children In Need**

The Mayor confirmed the Cambridge Grafton has challenged the Mayor and former Mayors to take turns in the stocks, and have wet sponges thrown at them on Friday 16 November over the lunch period to raise funds for Children in Need. So far, the Mayor and six former Mayors have agreed to participate.

## 9. Declarations Of Interest

| Councillor | Item                                     | Interest   |
|------------|--|--|
| Boyce      | 12/52/CNL,<br>12/54/CNLa &<br>12/57/CNLd | Personal: Trustee/Director of Cambridge Sports Hall Trust  |
| Reiner     | 12/52/CNL,<br>12/54/CNLa &<br>12/57/CNLd | Personal: Employed by a business in the BID area           |
| Smith      | 12/52/CNL,<br>12/54/CNLa &<br>12/57/CNLd | Personal: Trustee of Cambridge Arts Theatre                |
| Smith      | 12/54/CNLc                               | Personal: Mal Schofield is a personal friend               |
| Dryden     | 12/57/CNLe                               | Personal: Signed Unison petition calling for a living wage |
| Kerr       | 12/57/CNLe                               | Personal: Acts as Office Manager for Julian Huppert MP     |

## 12/52/CNL Public Questions Time

### Speaking on an item not on the agenda

Dr Eva addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Global climate change is the greatest challenge the world faces today.
- (ii) The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change stated that green house gases were rising faster than expected, and that they needed to be reduced.
- (iii) Cambridge should be proud of its contributions to mitigate climate change; three University Departments in the City were investigating climate change.
- (iv) The Council has produced Climate Change Strategies covering 2008 – 2012 and 2012 – 2016. Targets in the 2008 – 2012 Strategy have not been met.

- (v) Leadership is required to mitigate the affect climate change; organisations could achieve greater change than individuals.
- (vi) Asked that climate change be added as a regular agenda item to all future Council meetings.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- (i) Considerable progress was made mitigating climate change 2008 – 2012 through planning decisions, such as implementing energy efficiency measures. The Executive Councillor acknowledged that more could have been done in other areas.
- (ii) Targets in the 2012 – 2016 Strategy were challenging but achievable.
- (iii) Climate change was mainstreamed through council activities, rather than treated as a separate issue.
- (iv) The Chief Executive would chair a special Officer Environmental Strategy meeting in November 2012 to look at climate change implications and budget bids. The outcome would be reported to Councillors.
- (v) The Executive Councillor undertook to meet with Dr Eva and Officers post Council if requested.
- (vi) The Executive Councillor undertook to supply Dr Eva, via officers, with any of the documentation on the Council's climate change activities of which he didn't already have copies.

#### Speaking on Motion 7a

Mr Bond addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Supported motion 7a, but felt it was 'wishy-washy'.
- (ii) Suggested the Council had more outstanding planning consents than constructions occurring.
- (iii) The Government had sufficient powers to take action against councils not fulfilling their statutory duties.
- (iv) The Council should lobby Central Government concerning the local plan process.
- (v) Suggested the Council should have the power to call-in permitted developments before they occur.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded:

- (i) The Council had a number of channels to lobby Government.
- (ii) Ministers were aware that there were a lot of successful developments in Cambridge.
- (iii) The Council has lobbied Central Government on infrastructure issues at every opportunity, but it wasn't clear what this had achieved.

- (iv) The Executive Councillor would discuss the need to call-in permitted developments with Officers.

### Speaking on Motion 7b

Mr Noble addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Presented an unvalidated petition to Officers on behalf of Lichfield Road and Neville Road residents who did not want to move from their homes to other properties so they could be redeveloped.
- (ii) Stated the third highest cause of stress nationally was caused by moving house.
- (iii) Stated that moving residents would cause them distress.

Mrs Blair addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Presented an unvalidated petition to Officers on behalf of Water Lane and Green End Road residents who did not want to move from their homes to other properties so they could be redeveloped.
- (ii) Stated that vulnerable and elderly people were shocked that their homes would be demolished.
- (iii) Asked the Council to reconsider the decision made 11 October 2012.
- (iv) Raised serious concerns regarding how the Council communicated its redevelopment policy to residents.
- (v) Queried why the Executive Councillor for Housing did not follow the two stage process she agreed to follow at Community Services Committee 24 July 2010.
- (vi) Suggested the wrong type of Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) had been undertaken, so the redevelopment policy was open to legal challenge. Mrs Blair queried if EqIAs would be undertaken as a standard requirement for site development in future.

Mr Marais addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Residents welcomed new homes being built.
- (ii) Residents in areas such as Water Lane and Campkin Road were being moved without consultation so that their homes could be demolished and redeveloped.
- (iii) Residents were concerned that the Council was not undertaking consultation as it stated it would.
- (iv) Requested that the Council takes a more sensitive approach to working with residents in future.

Ms Math addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Residents in Aylesborough Close were being moved without consultation so that their homes could be demolished and redeveloped.
- (ii) Requested alternative options to rehousing be considered.
- (iii) Queried where residents would be moved to once they left Aylesborough Close.

Mr May addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Raised concerns on behalf of Colville Road (Cherry Hinton) residents who did not want to move from their homes to other properties so they could be redeveloped.
- (ii) Queried if the Council would abandon its redevelopment policy, then consult with residents on other ways to improve their properties.

Dr Guskov addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Presented an unvalidated petition to Officers on behalf of Aylesborough Close residents who did not want to move from their homes to other properties so they could be redeveloped.
- (ii) Residents were concerned about the enforced move imposed on them.
- (iii) Suggested the redevelopment would reduce the total number of bedrooms available in housing stock.
- (iv) Suggested the redevelopment was not making the most efficient use of Central Government funding.
- (v) Suggested the redevelopment would disproportionately affect children/families compared to single people, which is indirect discrimination.
- (vi) Suggested the project had not been implemented correctly (eg poor consultation), which undermined public confidence.
- (vii) Felt that compensation payments were insufficient.
- (viii) Asked if the Council could offer comparable/higher value properties at no extra cost to tenants/leaseholders who have to move.

Mr Hinton addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) He had lived at his current address since 1966.
- (ii) Maintenance/building work had been undertaken on properties in the area at the Councils' expense. The properties were now due to be demolished, which was a waste of money.
- (iii) Redevelopment would not contribute to the provision of housing, as less would be available in the area.
- (iv) No meaningful consultation has been undertaken.

- (v) No alternatives to redevelopment appears to have been considered/offered. Refurbishment would have been a better option.

Mr Sales addressed the Council to express concern over inadequate notice of redevelopment, and asked for the policy to be reconsidered.

Honorary Councillor Woodhouse addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Residents affected by the redevelopment policy were elderly and vulnerable.
- (ii) Suggested that the redevelopment policy would lead to the death and isolation of residents.
- (iii) Queried if Councillor Smart had considered the human rights of residents prior to presenting the redevelopment policy to Council.
- (iv) Proposed to seek legal advice on challenging the redevelopment policy if Council approved it.

In response to public questions the Executive Councillor for Housing said:

- (i) Properties were brought up to Decent Homes standards prior to the redevelopment proposal.
- (ii) The redevelopment would replace predominantly one bedroom housing stock with mixed stock of one or more bedrooms.
- (iii) Acknowledged the consultation process had been unsatisfactory and said the Council needed to improve what it did, and how this was communicated.
- (iv) The Council has experience of refurbishing sheltered housing, which led to the rehousing of occupiers. The Executive Councillor empathised that moving caused people distress, but suggested that residents may see the benefits of moving in time.

#### Speaking on Motion 7d

Ms Brightman addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Residents felt they were not considered as stakeholders in the city centre.
- (ii) Businesses in the city centre were generally chain stores, rather than independent retailers. This would affect representations regarding the Business Improvement District (BID).
- (iii) Expressed concern regarding perceived lack of right to veto/object to the BID.

Ms Agate addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Friends of the Earth helped local citizens to engage with the Council to support the planet. Suggested the BID proposal would discourage this.
- (ii) Suggested Councillors had not considered the views of residents before proposing the BID.
- (iii) Expressed concern regarding perceived lack of right to veto/object to the BID.

Mrs Preston addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Suggested that a lack of consultation had undermined residents' and business' trust in the BID process.
- (ii) Questioned if Councillor Boyce should have participated in the Strategy & Resources meeting when he had declared an interest as a Director of a Charity that had a commercial interest in the BID. This led to a perceived conflict of interests.
- (iii) Asked for assurance that residents would be informed of the number of 'no' votes cast for the BID.

Mr Preston addressed the Council and made the following points:

- (i) Cambridge For All had had visited various independent businesses who seemed to be unaware of, or not participating in the BID process - this raised concerns:
  - Not enough independent retailers were involved.
  - It was cheaper to open shops in London than Cambridge.
  - The Council appeared to be unaware of independent traders' needs.
  - Transparency of the BID process.
- (ii) Questioned how the Council could be sure the BID ballot reflected the views of independent traders.
- (iii) Questioned if chain store representatives would out vote independent traders on the BID Board.

Councillor Boyce stated that he had removed himself from decisions being taken by the Cambridge Sports Hall Trust Board regarding the BID once he had suggested that they respond to it.

In response to public questions the Leader said:

- (i) Historically a few businesses and organisations in the city centre had contributed to Christmas lights and other projects that benefited a wider number of businesses than the number who contributed. This was unsustainable. If adopted, the BID enabled voluntary contributions to be replaced by a levy on rates.



- (ii) BIDs in other areas were seen as beneficial.
- (iii) The BID was not a system of government or regulation, nor were powers to be given away by the Council.
- (iv) The right to veto/object to the BID had not been taken away. The decision on whether to adopt the BID or not was still to be taken.
- (v) Independent traders could benefit from the opportunity to undertake joint procurement with other organisations in the BID. This could help mitigate expensive city centre rates.

## **12/53/CNL Re-Ordering Agenda**

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

## **12/54/CNL To Consider the Recommendations of the Executive for Adoption**

### The Medium Term Strategy (The Executive)

**Resolved** (by 21 votes to 20) to:

#### **General Fund Revenue**

- (i) Agree the budget strategy, process and timetable for the 2013/14 budget cycle as outlined in Section 8 [pages 114 to 121 refer] and Appendix A of the MTS document.
- (ii) Agree the revised General Fund revenue, funding and reserves projections as shown in Appendix E, and the associated decisions in Section 8 [pages 114 to 121 refer], of the MTS document.
- (iii) Authorise the Director of Resources to calculate and communicate final cash limits or savings targets based on the decisions taken in relation to this report, based on the method shown in Appendix H of the MTS document.

#### **Capital**

- (iv) Agree the revised Capital & Revenue Projects Plan, the Hold list and the Funding as shown in Appendix G of the MTS document.

- (v) Agree inclusion in the Capital & Revenue Projects Plan of new additional items, listed below, and as set out in Section 8 [pages 121 to 123 refer] of the MTS document.
- Stourbridge Common Riverbanks – initial works to stabilise and improve the areas of riverbank for which the Council has responsibility - £100,000, funded from Reserves in 2013/14.
  - City Centre Cycle Parking - to provide additional cycle parking to meet identified need across the City. Total £500,000 comprising £50,000 funded from Reserves in 2012/13 and £450,000 from New Homes Bonus in 2013/14.
  - Cambridge Future Cities Feasibility Report - £50,000 in 2012/13 to be funded from the Technology Investment Fund pending receipt of £50,000 grant funding, following submission of the feasibility report.

**Additional items approved after Budget Setting (February 2012) that require formal approval by Council [pages 97 and 98 of the MTS document refer].**

- Approved the following decisions taken since the Budget Setting Report was approved:

| Scheme Ref | Title  | Total Value £000 | 2012-13 £000 | 2013-14 £000 | 2014-15 £000 | 2015-16 & future years £000 |
|------------|--|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| SC528      | Changes to office layout for Housing Options/Choice Based Lettings | 17               | 17           | -            | -            | -                           |
| SC547      | Corn Exchange Lift Replacement                                     | 15               | 15           | -            | -            | -                           |
| SC548      | Southern Connections Public Art Commission (\$106)                 | 107              | 4            | 73           | 30           | -                           |
| SC549 *    | City Cycle Park  | 500              | 50           | 450          | -            | -                           |
| SC550 *    | Cambridge Future City – Feasibility Study                          | 50               | 50           | -            | -            | -                           |
| SC551 *    | Stourbridge Common – Riverbank Project                             | 100              | -            | 100          | -            | -                           |
| SC552      | Localisation of Council Tax – Implementation Costs                 | 84               | 84           | -            | -            | -                           |
| SC553      | Corn Exchange House LED Lighting Upgrade                           | 40               | 40           | -            | -            | -                           |

| Scheme Ref | Title                                       | Total Value £000 | 2012-13 £000 | 2013-14 £000 | 2014-15 £000 | 2015-16 & future years £000 |
|------------|---|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| SC554      | Development of Land at Clay Farm            | 5,535            | 2,523        | 1,092        | 786          | 1,134                       |
| SC555      | Siemens Maintenance Contract                | 75               | 75           | -            | -            | -                           |
| SC556      | Arbury Community Centre                     | 80               | 0            | 80           | -            | -                           |
| SC557      | Grand Arcade Annex Car Park Repairs         | 26               | 26           | -            | -            | -                           |
| SC558      | Boiler Replacement at Mill Road Admin block | 30               | 30           | -            | -            | -                           |
|            |   | <b>6,659</b>     | <b>2,914</b> | <b>1,795</b> | <b>816</b>   | <b>1,134</b>                |
| SC283      | City Centre Youth Venue (S106)              | (100)            | (100)        | -            | -            | -                           |
|            | <b>Total General Fund</b>                   | <b>6,559</b>     | <b>2,814</b> | <b>1,795</b> | <b>816</b>   | <b>1,134</b>                |
| PR001      | Housing Capital Investment Programme        | 225              | (3,786)      | 3,956        | (1)          | 56                          |
|            | <b>Total Capital Plan</b>                   | <b>6,784</b>     | <b>(972)</b> | <b>5,751</b> | <b>815</b>   | <b>1,190</b>                |

\* Note that these were included in the original recommendations from the Executive

- (vi) Approve the delegation of authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources, Chair and relevant Spokes of the scrutiny committee to agree the Future Cities bid for submission [Section 4 page 51 of the MTS document refers].

### Treasury Management

- (vii) Approve changes to the Council's Treasury Management Indicators [Section 7, page 105 of the MTS document refers].
- (VIII) Approve changes to the Treasury Management and Investment Strategy to permit the deposit of funds into 95 day and 100 day Notice Accounts offered by financial institutions on the Council's approved counterparty list [Section 7, pages 109 to 110 and Appendix I (a) of the MTS document refer].

Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Mid-Year Business Plan Update (Executive Councillor for Housing)

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

### **Revenue – HRA**

- (i) Agree the HRA budget strategy, process and timetable for the 2013/14 budget cycle as outlined in Section 9 of the HRA Mid Year Business Plan Update [pages 84 to 97 refer].
- (ii) Agree the revised HRA revenue, funding and reserves projections as shown in Appendix E, and the associated decisions in section 9 [pages 84 to 97 refer], of the HRA Mid-Year Business Plan Update document.
- (iii) Approve the mid-year unavoidable expenditure items and savings, as detailed in Section 9, on pages 85 to 88 of the HRA document.
- (iv) Authorise the Director of Customer & Community Services, in consultation with the Director of Resources, to calculate and communicate final cash limits or savings targets based on the decisions taken in this report, as outlined in Section 9 of the HRA document.

### **Treasury Management**

- (v) Approve the approach to determining the most appropriate borrowing route in respect of any additional HRA borrowing requirement, as outlined in Section 8 of the HRA Mid-Year Business Plan Update, delegating responsibility to the Director of Resources for the final decision, in consultation with the Executive Councillor, Chair, Vice Chair and Opposition Spokesperson for HMB.

### **Capital**

- (vi) Agree in-year re-allocation of funding for decent homes and other investment in the housing stock, to allow unavoidable expenditure items to be met and to make best use of the current procurement arrangements, as detailed in Section 9, on pages 96 and 97 of the HRA document.
- (vii) Approve additional investment in 2012/13 in respect of the warden call system at Rawlyn Court, as identified on pages 96 and 97 of the HRA document.
- (viii) Approve re-phasing of £3,800,000 of resource, ear-marked for investment in Ditchburn Place, from 2012/13 into 2013/14, recognising that the feasibility work undertaken in the current year will

not result in a decision that will be implemented until 2013/14 at the earliest.

- (IX) Agree the revised Housing Capital Investment Plan as shown in Appendix F of the HRA Mid-Year Business Plan Update.

Council Appointments to the Conservators of the River Cam (Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change)

Council is recommended to:

- (i) Appoint Councillors Price, Reiner and Ward as Conservators of the River Cam commencing 1 January 2013.
- (ii) Appoint Anthony Brown, James Macnaghten, Malcolm Schofield and Amy-Alys Tillson as Conservators of the River Cam commencing 1 January 2013.

Councillor Owers proposed and Councillor Price seconded the following amendment:

Delete "Councillor Ward" and replace with "Councillor Benstead".

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 19 votes to 21.

**Resolved** (by 21 votes to 0) that:

- (i) Appoint Councillors Price, Reiner and Ward as Conservators of the River Cam commencing 1 January 2013.
- (II) Appoint Anthony Brown, James Macnaghten, Malcolm Schofield and Amy-Alys Tillson as Conservators of the River Cam commencing 1 January 2013.

**12/55/CNL To Consider the Recommendations of Committees for Adoption**

**Licensing Committee - 8 October 2012**

Review of Gambling Principles

**Resolved** (unanimously) to:

Approve the Statement of Gambling Principles shown in Appendix A of the report to Licensing Committee 8 October 2012 and agreed the Gambling Principles be published on 21 December 2012, to come in to effect on 18 January 2013.

### Statement of Licensing Policy

**Resolved** (unanimously) to:

Approve the Statement of Licensing Policy as shown in Appendix B of the report to 8 October 2012 Licensing Committee and to adopt the policy from 25 October 2012.

### **12/56/CNL To Deal with Oral Questions**

#### **1. Councillor Reid to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places**

**Residents have expressed concern that the car park in Lammas Land is being used by commuters, therefore making it difficult for families to park and use the facilities on Lammas Land. Could the Executive Councillor confirm the current barrier closure arrangements that are in place, and what additional measures the Council may put in place to improve the service for residents?**

The Executive Councillor responded that the car park would be closed 6:00 pm to 10:00 am Monday to Friday.

There was a proposal to install an automatic barrier to replace staff currently on the gate.

#### **2. Blackhurst to the Executive Councillor for Arts, Sport and Public Places**

**What consideration has been given to naming the open space in the green corridor at Trumpington?**

The Executive Councillor responded that there were no planning obligations regarding the naming of the green corridor.

There was no general Council policy regarding the naming of open spaces. Historically places names were taken on by the community.

The Council would be responsible for the green corridor on a ninety-nine year lease. The naming issue could be picked up through the lease process if developers had not already named the area.

### **3. Councillor Owers to the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health**

#### **What solid progress has been made on implementing the Labour motion passed recently at Council which resolves to support the development of credit unions in Cambridge?**

The Executive Councillor responded that Councillor Owers would be aware from a response to a similar question at Council in July, and from the Council's Forward Plan, that the Head of Community Development would be bringing a report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee in January 2013. The report would set out ways for the Council to enable more people in Cambridge to access credit unions.

In the meantime, good progress was being made. Officers had held separate and joint meetings with both the Rainbow Savers and Cambridge credit unions to explore how the Council can support them. Some examples of work that has been carried out or is being progressed are:

- (i) The credit unions have agreed to co-operate and work together with the Council to avoid duplication and competition.
- (ii) A joint meeting has been held with officers from the Customer Services Centre where plans are under way to host the credit unions so that visitors can seek advice and make payments. The plan is to start hosting them before Christmas.
- (iii) A double page spread on what the 2 credit unions have to offer and how to use them was featured in the summer edition of the Council's Open Door magazine.
- (iv) An article is due to appear in the winter edition of Cambridge Matters.
- (v) The Head of Community Development is working with the 2 credit unions to plan promotional activities in the New Year to encourage more volunteers to come forward to work with the credit unions so they can expand their activities across the city. At present they don't have enough volunteers to provide extra services in more locations

across the city. Discussions are under way with Cambridge and District Volunteer Centre to see how they can assist with this.

- (vi) The credit unions are producing publicity that will be included in the welcome packs for residents moving into homes in the southern fringe growth sites where there will be 40% affordable housing.

#### **4. Councillor Herbert to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources**

**Given the unacceptable weekend interruption to emergency telephone services resulting from Bank Holiday weekend flooding, and city CCTV being out of action for several days, how will the Council prevent this happening again?**

The Executive Councillor responded that CCTV was out of action for two and a half days; and telephone services were out of action for three hours, but calls were logged and responded to.

The flood was exceptional and a similar scale of flood had a probability of occurring once in every two hundred years, but the Council was already making changes to mitigate another flood happening in future. Floods were exceptional, but may happen more frequently.

The Director of Environment was liaising with County Council and Anglian Water representatives to draw up future mitigation measures, as flooding was not solely a Council issue.

#### **5. Councillor Marchant-Daisley to Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change**

**What arrangements have been put in place to ensure that the Council complies with its duty under the Localism Act to co-operate with neighbouring authorities (the "Duty to Co-Operate"); what detailed working arrangements are in place to ensure that, in the absence of a single joint plan with South Cambridgeshire and the County Council, the Council is able to deliver an integrated, sustainable plan for the future of the City that provides for sustainable development supported by appropriate infrastructure & what are the consequences if the Council is found to have failed in the Duty to Co-operate?**

The Executive Councillor responded that the Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group is the governance body that has been established to have



oversight of the delivery of new local plans and associated transport strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The Group is comprised of members from the City, County and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. At its meeting on 13 September 2012 the group considered a joint report on how the duty to co-operate responsibilities were being dealt with and how joint working on new local plan and transport strategy production is being carried out.

The Localism Act introduced a requirement on local planning authorities (LPAs) to work together under the Duty to Cooperate, which also covers a number of other public bodies such as LEPs, Highways Agency, Environment Agency, Natural England and Primary Care Trusts. The duty requires LPAs to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis on 'strategic matters' regarding sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) says that LPAs should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. It says that LPAs should consider producing joint planning policies on strategic matters, but there is no requirement to do so.

The two district Councils have decided to prepare separate Local Plans for their areas, but are fully aware of the need to work effectively together and that they will need to demonstrate how they have cooperated effectively, both with each other and other key public bodies including the County Council, on the preparation of their respective new local plans. This will be a key consideration for Inspectors as part of the public examination process on the respective Local Plans. The Councils' on-going approach to joint working is therefore now a specific legal requirement and it will be necessary to provide formal evidence of the cooperation as part of the plan making process. The Cambridgeshire Councils have already commissioned the Joint Strategic Planning Unit to prepare a strategic spatial framework for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, which will also help demonstrate to coordinated approach the planning for the long term needs of the wider area.

In addition to the Duty to Cooperate, in this new era of plan making Local Authorities are now responsible for setting the level of housing and employment provision for their areas, rather than working to targets set at a regional level through Regional Spatial Strategies. The level of provision and where development should be located are fundamental to the development strategy for the wider Cambridge area. Whilst Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are preparing separate plans, this does

not prevent a comprehensive approach being developed and sound arrangements have been put in place in order to ensure this.

The Councils have been working together throughout the preparation of the Issues and Options consultations on the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the Cambridge Local Plan, and also the parallel consultation on issues for a new Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The Councils will continue to work jointly as plan preparation continues and the intention is to consult jointly on alternative options for the development strategy for the wider Cambridge area in January 2013. This joint consultation will also include site options on the edge of Cambridge. This second consultation will build on the issues and options that the Councils have already consulted on this summer. The two District Councils are jointly instructing Counsel on this approach and are also tracking all new Local Plan Inspectors reports for emerging trends in how the duty to co-operate responsibilities are being tested nationally through local plan examinations.

A significant body of joint evidence has already been prepared either by or on behalf of the two local planning authorities or more widely prepared or commissioned, including by all Cambridgeshire districts or Cambridgeshire Horizons (operated between 2004 and 2011) or the recently established Joint Strategic Planning Unit.

A revised programme was agreed by the JST&SP and subsequently at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee that shows that the Local Plan timetables are now aligned for Issues and Options 2 (January – February 2013) and Draft Local Plan consultation (June – July 2013) and only a month apart for the Submission stage (Cambridge – October 2013, South Cambridgeshire – November 2013). It also shows that the Transport Strategy will follow the Local Plan timetable, with the final Transport Strategy forming a supporting document for the plans.

Officers believe that everything possible is being done to meet the duty to co-operate requirements.

## **6. Councillor Johnson to the Leader**

**Does the Leader of the Council agree that the ruling group, based on its failure to find where £619,000 of taxpayers' money went from the 2008 Folk Festival, and who recently voted to write it off, should have undertaken at least one effective council led investigation to discover**

**where the money eventually ended up and to recover any money that remained unspent?**

The Leader responded that this was work for specialists - criminal investigators, professional liquidators, insolvency lawyers - all of whom the Council had worked with and through exhaustively over the past 4 years. He added that members, including the Opposition had been involved in this process.

**7. Councillor Herbert to the Leader****Why is he opposed to returning to the committee system for running Council business?**

The Leader responded that he did not favour a return to the committee system at this point because the Executive and scrutiny system adopted by the council when it had been obliged to change by Central Government, as closely reflected the values of the previous committee system as it was possible to do. The result was that the upheaval of further constitutional change now seemed an investment of effort that would be disproportionate to the return at a time when the Council has a lot of other pressing priorities.

**12/57/CNL To Consider the Following Notices of Motion, Notice of Which has Been Given by:****12/57/CNLa Motion A**

Councillor Ward proposed and Councillor Smart seconded the following motion:

“This Council wishes the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to note the following:

Cambridge City Council believes that local people, through their democratically elected local authorities, are the most suitable judges of what development is acceptable in an area and the suitable level of contributions that developers need to make;

The Council opposes:

1. The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to have powers to override agreements between Councils and developers over the number of affordable housing units allocated to planning applications.
2. The Secretary of State's proposals for planning permission – currently required for extensions of more than three or four metres from the rear wall of any home – to only be needed for those reaching beyond 8m for detached homes and 6m for others
3. The Secretary of State's intention to override Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1990 which will allow developers to immediately appeal to the Planning Inspectorate over the allocation of affordable housing units in any scheme they maybe concerned with.
4. The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to take planning powers away from local authorities which he deems to be slow or of making poor quality planning decisions in determining applications.

This Council notes that the current Coalition Government did listen earlier in the year over concerns regarding the National Planning Policy Framework and revised its plans accordingly, so urges the Government to listen to the concerns being expressed by the cross-party LGA;

This Council however welcomes other parts of the stimulus package including:

- a) £300 million to provide 15,000 affordable homes across the country
- b) An extension of the refurbishment programme to bring an extra 5,000 empty homes back into use
- c) £280m for FirstBuy, the shared equity scheme to give a futher 16,500 first time buyers the chance to own their own homes
- d) Up to £10bn of guarantees to housing associations, property management companies and developers which will be able to use the guarantees to secure lower borrowing costs. This will lead to hundreds of thousands of extra rental homes being built.

This Council also notes:

- A. The record of the previous Labour government on providing affordable social housing – and that during their 13 years in power, the social housing stock fell by another 420,000 houses, as Labour continually failed to build more homes than they were selling off. In the meantime, social housing waiting list soared to almost 1.8 million, a rise of 741,000 families.
- B. The record of previous Conservative Governments where 1.1 million social homes were lost from the stock during the 18 years of Tory rule up to 1997, through a combination of Right to Buy sales and a failure to invest in replacements. When the Major government left office more than 1 million families were on social housing waiting lists.

This Council resolves to formally write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, outlining this Council's opposition to the plans."

Councillor Ward proposed and Councillor Smart seconded the following amendment:

Delete from "This Council however welcomes other parts of the stimulus package ..." to "... more than 1 million families were on social housing waiting lists" inclusive."

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

**Resolved** (unanimously) that:

This Council wishes the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to note the following:

Cambridge City Council believes that local people, through their democratically elected local authorities, are the most suitable judges of what development is acceptable in an area and the suitable level of contributions that developers need to make;

The Council opposes:

1. The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to have powers to override agreements between Councils and developers over the number of affordable housing units allocated to planning applications.

2. The Secretary of State's proposals for planning permission – currently required for extensions of more than three or four metres from the rear wall of any home – to only be needed for those reaching beyond 8m for detached homes and 6m for others
3. The Secretary of State's intention to override Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1990 which will allow developers to immediately appeal to the Planning Inspectorate over the allocation of affordable housing units in any scheme they maybe concerned with.
4. The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to take planning powers away from local authorities which he deems to be slow or of making poor quality planning decisions in determining applications.

This Council notes that the current Coalition Government did listen earlier in the year over concerns regarding the National Planning Policy Framework and revised its plans accordingly, so urges the Government to listen to the concerns being expressed by the cross-party LGA.

This Council resolves to formally write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, outlining this Council's opposition to the plans.

### **12/57/CNLb Motion B**

Councillor Price proposed and Councillor Ashton seconded the following motion:

“This Council

1. Supports the continued building of additional Council affordable housing, with the aim of building at least 650 additional homes by 2020.
2. Requests officers to report on all sites in the Council's current programme proposing redevelopment of existing housing to Community Services Scrutiny Committee for a full member review.
3. Requests the Committee to carry out a scrutiny review of present processes and procedures:
  - (a) To recommend radical consultation improvements to ensure that there is proper and meaningful consultation, in line with the Council's

agreed Code of Practice on Consultation with residents, before any further sites are approved for redevelopment;

- (b) To ensure processes take into account the fact that many of the residents at these locations are vulnerable and/or elderly and need support, in consultation with Independent Living, County Council Social Services and the mental health team at the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust; and
- (c) To instigate a fresh land review to identify further deliverable sites for new housing, including land that can potentially be obtained from wider Council or other public or housing association land holdings in Cambridge.

4. As part of this review, to hold a city wide review meeting with wider support organisations, and tenant representatives from each significant review site, and representatives of the County Council and NHS Foundation Trust and undertake and publish a full and effective Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA).”

Councillor Smart proposed and Councillor Blackhurst seconded the following amendment:

Delete all and replace with:

“This Council

Supports the continued building of additional Council affordable housing, with the aim of building at least 650 additional homes by 2020, including 146 by 2015.

Notes that, while the present residents cannot have a veto on the programme, they should be kept fully informed of the plans and reassured that help, both financial and supportive, will be given them should the plans include the redevelopment of existing houses.

Greatly regrets that there has not always been adequate and appropriate communication to some of the residents affected by the present programme.

Notes that there is an annual report on all sites in the Council's current programme, including those which propose redevelopment of existing housing, at the June meeting of the Community Services Scrutiny Committee.

Requests that future reports give a detailed account of the consultation and communication that has taken place with the residents principally affected by the programme,

Requests also that future reports give details of the houses that are being considered for redevelopment including their size, setting, lettability and potential future repair costs.

Requests that a steering group is set up to over-see the development of the programme: the group would consist of the Executive Councillor for Housing, the Chair of the Community Services Scrutiny Committee, the opposition Spokesperson on the Community Services Scrutiny Committee and an elected Tenant or Leaseholder representative.”

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 21 votes to 21 – and on the Mayor’s casting vote.

Councillor Blencowe asked for the minutes to show that Councillor Smart acknowledged that an appropriate Equality Impact Assessment was not undertaken concerning the Council housing redevelopment policy; and was willing to ask the Director of Customer & Community Services to do so in future.

**Resolved** (by 21 votes to 21 – and on the Mayor’s casting vote.) that:

This Council

Supports the continued building of additional Council affordable housing, with the aim of building at least 650 additional homes by 2020, including 146 by 2015.

Notes that, while the present residents cannot have a veto on the programme, they should be kept fully informed of the plans and reassured that help, both financial and supportive, will be given them should the plans include the redevelopment of existing houses.

Greatly regrets that there has not always been adequate and appropriate communication to some of the residents affected by the present programme.

Notes that there is an annual report on all sites in the Council's current programme, including those which propose redevelopment of existing housing,



at the June meeting of the Community Services Scrutiny Committee.

Requests that future reports give a detailed account of the consultation and communication that has taken place with the residents principally affected by the programme,

Requests also that future reports give details of the houses that are being considered for redevelopment including their size, setting, lettable and potential future repair costs.

Requests that a steering group is set up to over-see the development of the programme: the group would consist of the Executive Councillor for Housing, the Chair of the Community Services Scrutiny Committee, the opposition Spokesperson on the Community Services Scrutiny Committee and an elected Tenant or Leaseholder representative.

### **12/57/CNLc Motion C**

Councillor Owers proposed and Councillor Pitt seconded the following motion:

“The Council is deeply concerned at the recent Royal Mail announcement that it is considering the closure of Cambridge mail sorting office on Clifton Road which

- Is likely to reduce service quality for Cambridge residents including reduced late posting times and the loss of the 7.30pm last post
- Threatens 200 skilled blue-collar jobs in the city
- Will add unnecessary increased lorry congestion on the A14 and increased carbon emissions, including local Cambridge post that will have to be transported all the way to Peterborough and back every day
- Could remove the Cambridge post-mark for non pre-franked mail.

The Council is opposed to the proposed closure, opposes the inevitable erosion in service to the public from relocation, at a time also of enforced rises in postage costs, and opposes the negative environmental impact of the proposal.

The Council resolves to write to Royal Mail expressing these views and calls on Royal Mail to retain the sorting office in Cambridge.”

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

### **12/57/CNLd Motion D**

Councillor Benstead proposed and Councillor Herbert seconded the following motion:

“The Council supports the opportunity of city centre businesses to make a clear choice one way or other on a Business Improvement District (BID).

The Council notes that it holds a power, in limited circumstances, to veto the Business Improvement District (BID) proposals, on which businesses within the BID area are being balloted. Depending on the outcome of the ballot, the Council asks officers, immediately after the conclusion of the ballot:

- To prepare a report setting out the circumstances that might justify a veto
- To send the report to the Leader and to the Chair and Spokes of Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee, so their comments may inform the Leader's decision on whether or not to use the veto power.

The Council also requests a report by officers to the next meeting of the Committee on options for working with the County Council to improve city centre policy making and service deliver. This needs to include improved engagement of residents as well as business representatives, the University and wider parties, and recognise that all Cambridge residents have an interest in, and the right to a say, in the effective running of the City Centre.”

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Brown seconded the following amendment:

Delete all after first paragraph and insert:

“It notes the comprehensive officer report to the October 3rd Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on all aspects of the BID process including the veto power, and the agreed recommendations to the Leader that there were no grounds to exercise it, leaving the participants themselves to resolve the issue in the ballot.

For leadership and decision making of public matters within the city centre, the Council welcomes:

- the current process of formulating a new Local Plan through which the city centre has been identified for focused study and consultation with all city residents and stakeholders, including the County Council;
- the recently adopted approach to developer contributions providing a citywide strategic fund for investment in the public realm, for which the city centre would be a potential candidate
- the contribution of the West-Central Area Committee, on behalf of residents of the city centre, to environmental improvements, community safety and planning, in which they are often joined by organisations and traders and residents of other parts of the city
- the oversight and customisation of the Council's general service offering in the city centre through its central committee structure, involving councillors from across the city, which triggers wider consultation where applicable."

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 21 votes to 19.

**Resolved** (by 21 votes to 3) that:

The Council supports the opportunity of city centre businesses to make a clear choice one way or other on a Business Improvement District (BID).

It notes the comprehensive officer report to the October 3rd Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on all aspects of the BID process including the veto power, and the agreed recommendations to the Leader that there were no grounds to exercise it, leaving the participants themselves to resolve the issue in the ballot.

For leadership and decision making of public matters within the city centre, the Council welcomes:

- the current process of formulating a new Local Plan through which the city centre has been identified for focused study and consultation with all city residents and stakeholders, including the County Council;
- the recently adopted approach to developer contributions providing a citywide strategic fund for investment in the public realm, for which the city centre would be a potential candidate
- the contribution of the West-Central Area committee, on behalf of residents of the city centre, to environmental improvements, community

- safety and planning, in which they are often joined by organisations and traders and residents of other parts of the city
- the oversight and customisation of the Council's general service offering in the city centre through its central committee structure, involving councillors from across the city, which triggers wider consultation where applicable.

### **12/57/CNLe Motion E**

Councillor Cantrill proposed and Councillor Reiner seconded the following motion:

“Council notes:

- A living wage was first established in the UK in 2001
- Currently the living wage rate is £7.20p per hour outside London (the “Living Wage”), calculated using incomes and prices data on a system developed and maintained by the Centre for Research and Social Policy at Loughborough University
- According to charity Barnardo's over 58% of children who live in poverty in the UK have at least one parent in paid work
- The Living Wage Foundation estimates over 10,000 families have been helped out of working poverty across the UK as a result of the living wage
- Recent tax changes put in place by the Liberal Democrats as part of the Coalition Government that provided a tax cut of £220 per year for low paid individuals has lifted many of the low paid out of the tax threshold
- That key components of the cost of living (food and utilities) continue to being challenging for residents of the city
- The Living Wage Week during 4<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> November 2012 will actively promote the living wage across the UK

Council believes:

- The national minimum wage was an important development to ensure a basic level of income for the lowest paid
- However, given the cost of living in Cambridge the minimum wage is not enough for an individual or a family to avoid living in poverty with all the ill effects that has
- A living wage is considered the minimum wage needed to provide 'adequate income' to ensure social inclusion for an individual or their family
- As one of the City's biggest employers, the City Council can help promote the living wage in Cambridge by becoming a 'living wage employer'
- That the procurement strategy of the City Council can influence and encourage our partners in service delivery to uphold the same approach as ours

Council requests that the Executive Councillor for Customer Services & Resources:

- Bring forward proposals that:
  - o Ensure all employees receive at least the Living Wage as soon as practicable and by no later than April 2013; and
  - o Explore agency staff receiving the Living Wage as part of the Budget process for 2013/2014; and
  - o Explore changing the Council's procurement processes to encourage contractors to adopt a similar position and as legislation permits insist that contractors meet the living wage obligation
- Writes to the MPs in Cambridge seeking their support and asking them to campaign for the living wage in the City".

Councillor Price proposed and Councillor Herbert seconded the following amendment:

Paragraph 4 after "Council believes" beginning "As one of the City's biggest employers..." delete "can" and insert "will" after "City Council".

After “Bring forward proposals that” (hollow bullet points):

- Paragraph 2 - Delete all and replace with “Ensure all agency and temporary staff receive the Living Wage as part of the Budget process for 2013/2014; and”.
- Paragraph 3 - delete all and replace with “Change the Council’s procurement processes to ensure contractors adopt the same position and, as legislation permits, insist that contractors meet the living wage obligation.”

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 15 votes to 21.

Councillor Price proposed and Councillor Owers seconded the following amendment:

Delete paragraph 5 in its entirety “Recent tax changes put in place by the Liberal Democrats as part of the Coalition Government that provided a tax cut of £220 per year for low paid individuals has lifted many of the low paid out of the tax threshold”.

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 16 votes to 21.

Councillor Blencowe proposed and Councillor Cantrill seconded the following amendment:

Delete paragraph starting “Explore agency staff...” and replace with “Ensure all agency and temporary staff receive the Living Wage as part of the Budget process for 2013/2014; and”.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

**Resolved** (unanimously) that:

Council notes:

- A living wage was first established in the UK in 2001
- Currently the living wage rate is £7.20p per hour outside London (the “Living Wage”), calculated using incomes and prices data on a system developed and maintained by the Centre for Research and Social Policy at Loughborough University

- According to charity Barnardo's over 58% of children who live in poverty in the UK have at least one parent in paid work
- The Living Wage Foundation estimates over 10,000 families have been helped out of working poverty across the UK as a result of the living wage
- Recent tax changes put in place by the Liberal Democrats as part of the Coalition Government that provided a tax cut of £220 per year for low paid individuals has lifted many of the low paid out of the tax threshold
- That key components of the cost of living (food and utilities) continue to being challenging for residents of the city
- The Living Wage Week during 4<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> November 2012 will actively promote the living wage across the UK

Council believes:

- The national minimum wage was an important development to ensure a basic level of income for the lowest paid
- However, given the cost of living in Cambridge the minimum wage is not enough for an individual or a family to avoid living in poverty with all the ill effects that has
- A living wage is considered the minimum wage needed to provide 'adequate income' to ensure social inclusion for an individual or their family
- As one of the City's biggest employers, the City Council can help promote the living wage in Cambridge by becoming a 'living wage employer'
- That the procurement strategy of the City Council can influence and encourage our partners in service delivery to uphold the same approach as ours

Council requests that the Executive Councillor for Customer Services & Resources:

- Bring forward proposals that:
  - Ensure all employees receive at least the Living Wage as soon as practicable and by no later than April 2013; and
  - Ensure all agency and temporary staff receive the Living Wage as part of the Budget process for 2013/2014; and
  - Explore changing the Council's procurement processes to encourage contractors to adopt a similar position and as legislation permits insist that contractors meet the living wage obligation

Writes to the MPs in Cambridge seeking their support and asking them to campaign for the living wage in the City.

### **12/58/CNL Written Questions**

No written questions were received.

The meeting ended at 0.45 am

**CHAIR**