

Present: Councillors Bird (Mayor), Dryden (Deputy Mayor) , Abbott, Ashton, Austin, Avery, Baigent, Benstead, Bick, Bird, Blackhurst, Blencowe, Cantrill, Dryden, Gawthroe, Hart, Herbert, Hipkin, Holland, Johnson, McPherson, Meftah, Moghadas, Moore, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Pippas, Pitt, Price, Ratcliffe, Reid, Reiner, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, C. Smart, M. Smart, Todd-Jones, Tucker and Tunnacliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

14/50/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2014

The minutes of the 24 July 2014 meeting were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

14/51/CNL Mayors Announcements

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Julie Smith.

2. OPEN CAMBRIDGE WEEKEND

The Mayor confirmed that the City had collaborated with the University of Cambridge in the Open Cambridge weekend and groups had visited the Guildhall on Friday 12 and Saturday 13 September.

3. MAYOR'S DAY OUT

The Mayor thanked Councillors that had helped with stewarding at the annual outing for senior citizens to Great Yarmouth on 21 August.

4. REMEMBRANCE

The Mayor confirmed that the Remembrance Sunday Civic Service would take place at Great St. Mary's Church at 10.55am.

A wreath would be laid on behalf of the City at the War Memorial and 2 minutes silence would be observed from the main entrance to the Guildhall on Tuesday 11 November at 11am.

5. DISABILITY CAMBRIDGESHIRE

The Mayor confirmed that a fund raising event for Disability Cambridgeshire would take place on 4 December during Disability History Month.

6. MAYOR'S RECEPTION – FRIDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER

The Mayor confirmed that a reception would take place at the Guildhall on Friday 21 November from 7pm to 9pm.

7. CHEVYN SERVICE

The Mayor confirmed that the preaching of the Chevyn Sermon would take place at St. George's Church, Chesterfield Road, on Sunday, 1 February at 10am.

8. HONORARY COUNCILLOR PETER COWELL

The Mayor formally reported that Honorary Councillor Peter Cowell had passed away in September, aged 81 years.

Peter was a Councillor for 30 years and represented King's Hedges Ward. During that period he was elected to the office of Mayor on four occasions.

He served on a number of the Council's Committees and, for many years, chaired the Planning Committee. He was a great supporter of the City's twinning link the City with Heidelberg and played a key role in establishing the link of friendship with Szeged.

When he retired from the Council, he was elected to be an Honorary Councillor and, in 2003, the City granted to him the exceptional honour of becoming an Honorary Freeman of Cambridge. This is the highest honour any Council can bestow and was in recognition of his eminent service to the City over such a long period of years.

A letter had been sent on behalf of the Council to Peter's widow, Annette, and a donation had been made in Peter's memory to Parkinson's UK.

Councillors observed a minutes silence in memory of Peter Cowell.

14/52/CNL Public Questions Time - see at the foot of the agenda for details of the scheme

There were no public questions.

14/53/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for Adoption

14/53a/CNL Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Mid-Year Financial Review (Executive Councillor for Housing)

Resolved (by 27 votes to 0):

To approve:

- Proposals for changes in existing housing capital budgets, as introduced in Sections 6 and 7 and detailed in Appendix E of the document, with the resulting position summarised in Appendix H.
- Inclusion of a new scheme in the Housing Capital Investment Plan, relating to the replacement of air cooling systems at the area housing offices, at a cost of £11,000.

Under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Mayor ruled that the Executive Councillor recommendations regarding the Mid-Year Financial (MFR) October 2014 be considered despite not being made publicly available for this Committee five clear days prior to the meeting.

14/53b/CNL Mid Year Financial Review (MFR) October 2014 (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Catherine Smart seconded the following amendment:

Amend General Fund Revenue recommendation (ii):

After "[pages 15 to 17 refer] insert: "with the exception of the savings items in relation to Safer City Grants, Housing Improvement Grants and Grants to the Voluntary Sector which should not be considered until the budget, generating the revised pressures and savings table attached. This provided an indication of the net savings requirements, by year for the next 5 years, and revised General Fund revenue, funding and reserves projections as shown in the revised Section 5 table (attached) and the revised Section 8 savings requirements table (attached).

Revised table: MFR Section 4, pages 16-17 (agenda pages 219-220)

Description	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Pressures						
Cowley Road ex Park and ride site - Unavoidable loss of income from non-renewal of lease.	60					
Land charges - to increase existing earmarked reserve to the total expected amount of litigation claims brought by personal search companies	30					
Lion Yard - revised rental income projections in light of current occupation levels and prospects		150	150	150	150	150
Guildhall – expected reduction in turnover rent receipts due to increased competition for the occupier	40	40	40	40	40	40
Trade Waste – Increases in gate fees for disposal	40	40	40	40	40	40
Shortfall in budgeted commercial property income. Additional property not purchased as planned due to shortfall in business rates income earmarked for the purchase	46	69	84	84	84	84
Investment estate (excluding Lion Yard) – decrease in rent and service charge projections in light of current occupation levels and prospects		96	96	96	96	96
Statutory adjustment of interest on capital receipts between GF and HRA, required to ensure costs are correctly assigned between the accounts	166	166	166	166	166	166
Total pressures	382	561	576	576	576	576
Deliverable savings						
Review and rebalancing of recharges from GF to HRA, to ensure equitable distribution of costs between the accounts	(81)	(81)	(81)	(81)	(81)	(81)
Corporate Strategy miscellaneous savings identified from 2013/14 underspend	(17)	(17)	(17)	(17)	(17)	(17)
Safer City Grants – Reduction identified from 2013/14 underspend	–	–	–	–	–	–
Home Improvement Grants – savings as a result of underspends in previous years.	–	–	–	–	–	–
Waste savings identified from 2013/14 underspends in trade refuse, recycling and Refuse and Environment operational support	(125)	(55)	(55)	(55)	(55)	(55)
Business rates on moorings not now needed	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)

Description	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Pre application planning advice savings identified from 2013/14 underspends	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
Grants to the voluntary sector – savings following review	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revised provision for supplies and services inflation		(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
HR savings following review of service	-	(56)	(56)	(56)	(56)	(56)
Total deliverable savings	(236)	(322)	(322)	(322)	(322)	(322)
Total pressures less deliverable savings	146	239	254	254	254	254

Applying these budget savings and pressures gives an indication of the net savings requirements by year for the next 5 years.

Description	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Total £000
Current Savings Target (new savings each year)	-	1,315	1,308	798	1,073	1,547	6,041
Impact on savings target - pressures	-	561	15	-	-	-	576
Revised savings target including pressures	-	1,876	1,323	798	1,073	1,547	6,617
Impact on savings target - deliverable savings	-	(322)	-	-	-	-	(322)
Savings still to be found	-	1,554	1,323	798	1,073	1,547	6,295

Revised table: MFR Section 5, page 18 (agenda page 221)

Description	2014/15 £000	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Expenditure						
Net service budgets	19,813	18,488	17,434	16,673	16,719	16,488
Revenue budget proposals	125	239	254	254	254	254
Future years PPF provision	-	100	100	100	100	100
Capital accounting adjustments	(4,656)	(4,656)	(4,656)	(4,656)	(4,656)	(4,656)
Capital expenditure financed from revenue	3,224	3,656	2,457	1,075	1,075	1,075
Contributions to earmarked funds	2,678	2,959	3,263	3,357	2,622	2,369
Revised net savings requirement	-	(1,554)	(1,323)	(798)	(1,073)	(1,547)
Contribution to reserves	-	-	-	258	-	-
Net spending requirement	21,184	19,232	17,529	16,263	15,041	14,083
Funded by:						
Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA)	(8,115)	(6,901)	(6,004)	(5,224)	(4,545)	(3,954)
Locally Retained Business Rates – Growth element	(670)	(800)	(800)	(800)	(800)	(800)
Other grants from central government	(93)	-	-	-	-	-
New Homes Bonus (NHB)	(3,376)	(3,376)	(3,376)	(2,589)	(1,854)	(1,291)
Appropriations from earmarked funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
Council Tax	(6,706)	(7,024)	(7,349)	(7,650)	(7,842)	(8,038)
Contributions from reserves	(2,224)	(1,131)	-	-	-	-
Total funding	(21,184)	(19,232)	(17,529)	(16,263)	(15,041)	(14,083)

Revised table: MFR Section 8, page 25 (agenda page 228)

Description	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000	Total £000
Net savings requirement (BSR 2014)	1,315	1,308	798	1,073	1,547	6,041
Contribution to savings target (Section 4)	239	15	-	-	-	254
Revised (MFR) net savings requirement	1,554	1,323	798	1,073	1,547	6,295

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 13 votes to 27.

Resolved (unanimously):

General Fund Revenue

- i. To agree the budget strategy, process and timetable for the 2015/16 budget cycle as outlined in Section 1 [pages 5 to 6 refer] and Appendix A of the MFR document.

Resolved (by 27 votes to 0):

- ii. To agree incorporation of the budget savings and pressures identified in Section 4 [pages 15 to 17 refer]. This provided an indication of the net savings requirements, by year for the next 5 years, and revised General Fund revenue, funding and reserves projections as shown in Section 5 [page 18 refers] of the MFR document.

Resolved (unanimously):

Capital

To agree:

- iii. inclusion of a new scheme in the Capital Plan relating to the replacement of an air cooling system, at a cost of £166,950 (£70,000 from existing repairs and renewals funding, the remainder from available capital funding), subject to a detailed project appraisal.
- iv. other changes to the Capital Plan, predominantly re-phasing as set out in Section 6 [pages 19 to 22 refer] of the MFR document.

Note the proposal for a focused review of the processes and procedures underlying capital planning and delivery in advance of setting the 2015/16 budget in February 2015, with a view to delivering improved, fit for purpose processes and a sustainable capital plan, as set out in Section 6 [page 22 of MFR document refers]

Reserves

- v. changes to General Fund Reserve levels, with the Prudent Minimum Balance being set at £4.40m and the target level at £5.28m as detailed in Section 7 [pages 23 to 24 of the MFR document refer].

14/53c/CNL Mid-Year Financial Review (MFR) 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Treasury Management half yearly update report (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)

Resolved (unanimously):

- i. To agree amendments to the Counterparty list, which highlighted changes in Capita's (Council's Treasury Adviser) credit criteria, within Appendix B of the officer's report. These are summarised below:-
 - Name 'smaller' building societies with an asset value greater than £5billion; and;
 - Show the limits for 'smaller' building societies meeting these criteria.
- ii. To add equity investment in the Local Capital Finance Company, the legal entity of the UK Municipal Bonds Agency, to non-specified investments within the Council's investment strategy.
- iii. To agree changes to the estimated Prudential & Treasury Indicators for 2014/15 to 2017/18, inclusive, as set out in Appendix G of the officer's report.
- iv. To approve a capital investment of up to £50,000 in the equity share capital of the Local Capital Finance Company; and;
- v. To delegate the final decision on investment to the Head of Finance in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources.
- vi. To include additional capital expenditure of £220,000, funded by borrowing, to the capital plan, for the additional capital cost of the Clay Farm Community Centre.

14/53d/CNL Arrangements to establish The Cultural Trust (The Leader)

Councillor Cantrill proposed and Councillor Reid seconded the following amendment (additions underlined):

Recommends Council

- a) To approve the budget and finance proposals set out in the report.
- b) To instruct the Leader of the Council to seek a commitment from Cambridge Live that they will pay the living wage and seek to become an accredited living wage employer with the Living Wage Foundation.

- c) To instruct the Leader of the Council to write to Cambridge Live stating that the Council's financial commitment to the trust will be limited to that proposed in the report and will not be the lender of last resort.
- d) To approve that the two councillor trustees appointed to the board of Cambridge Live represent the two largest parties on the council and that the Executive Councillor consult Chair and Spokes of Customer and Community Services committee (and having due regard to comments made) before nominating.
- e) To instruct the Leader of the Council to bring to S&R Scrutiny committee the final scrutiny arrangements for Cambridge Live following the trust working group meeting of 5th November.

It was agreed that the amendments would be voted on separately.

On a show of hands the following amendment was carried unanimously:

- b) *To instruct the Leader of the Council to seek a commitment from Cambridge Live that they will pay the living wage and seek to become an accredited living wage employer with the Living Wage Foundation.*

On a show of hands the following amendments were lost by 13 votes to 27:

- c) To instruct the Leader of the Council to write to Cambridge Live stating that the Council's financial commitment to the trust will be limited to that proposed in the report and will not be the lender of last resort.
- d) To approve that the two councillor trustees appointed to the board of Cambridge Live represent the two largest parties on the council and that the Executive Councillor consult Chair and Spokes of Customer and Community Services committee (and having due regard to comments made) before nominating.
- e) To instruct the Leader of the Council to bring to S&R Scrutiny committee the final scrutiny arrangements for Cambridge Live following the trust working group meeting of 5th November.

Resolved (unanimously):

- i. To approve the budget and finance proposals set out in the report.
- ii. To instruct the Leader of the Council to seek a commitment from Cambridge Live that they will pay the living wage and seek to become an accredited living wage employer with the Living Wage Foundation.

14/53d/CNL Establishment of Greater Cambridge Joint Governance Framework (The Leader)

Resolved (unanimously):

- i. To endorse the following:
 - The amended Terms of Reference for the Executive Board;
 - The Leader of the Council be appointed to represent the Council on the Executive Board;
 - Councillor Blencowe be appointed as the Council's substitute representative on the Executive Board;
 - the amended Terms of Reference for the Assembly;
 - The delegation of the executive functions of the City Council referred to in the Terms of Reference for the Executive Board.
- ii To appoint the following three City Council representatives onto the Assembly, on a politically proportionate basis:
 - Councillor Price
 - Councillor Martin Smart
 - Councillor Bick

14/53e/CNL Authority to deputise for the Chief Executive (The Leader)

Resolved (unanimously):

- i. To authorises the Director of Customer and Community Services to deputise for the Chief Executive and to act as Head of Paid Service during the Chief Executive's absence.

14/54/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for Adoption

14/54a/CNL Constitution-changes to comply with legislation on recording officer decisions and recording meetings

Resolved (unanimously):

- i. To adopt the revised 'Part 4B- Access to Information Rules' set out in the appendix of the officer's report.

- ii. To authorise the Monitoring Officer to make consequential changes to other parts of the Constitution that refer to recording meetings and public speaking rights.

14/54B/CNL Ombudsman finding of Maladministration

Resolved (unanimously):

- i. To endorse the actions taken by officers in response to the findings of the Local Government Ombudsman.

14/55/CNL To deal with Oral Questions

1) Councillor Dryden to the Leader

Can the Leader update the Council on events relating to the training of Libyan soldiers at Bassingbourn Barracks and the information available to date on the sexual assaults in Cambridge, both admitted and alleged?

The Leader responded that he was deeply concerned about the recent incidents involving Libyan soldiers. The City had been unprepared for their arrival. The soldiers should not have been permitted to leave Bassingbourn Barracks without supervision, yet transport had been provided for them to come into the City.

Concern was also raised that the barracks had only contacted the City Council on the 30 October after the incidents had been reported in the press.

The City Council was investigating the incidents and had written to the Commanding Officer as well as holding discussions with the Police and Crime Commissioner. Issues regarding lighting and CCTV in the City had been raised and these were also being investigated.

2) Councillor Avery to the Leader

Would the Leader please confirm that the Council's priorities extend to all areas of the City?

The Leader responded that the Labour Group took an interest in, and were active in, all Wards within the City.

3) Councillor Blackhurst to the Executive Councillor for Housing

How many, a) one bedroom, b) two bedroom , c) three bedroom and d) properties with four or more bedrooms, have been sold from the Council's housing stock under the right to buy scheme since 1st April 2012, and how many, if any, of those properties had been specially adapted to meet tenants' disability needs?

The Executive Councillor responded that 27 1-bedroom, 52 2-bedroom, 45 3-bedroom, 0 4-bedroom and 1 bedsit property had been sold from the Council's housing stock under the right to buy scheme since 1st April 2012.

A total of 7 properties had been specially adapted to meet tenants' disability needs.

4) Councillor Tunnacliffe to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

Could the Executive Councillor say why there has been inadequate lighting on Jesus Green recently which may have contributed to the unfortunate assault on a resident who was crossing the Green early in the evening last week?

The Executive Councillor responded that, whilst it was unclear if better lighting would have prevented the incident, high quality lighting was important for the City.

The lighting on Jesus Green was powered by sodium lamps and was therefore low quality. The County Council, who were responsible for street lighting, were however undertaking a 2 year upgrade programme.

Officers had requested that the contractor Balfour Beatty undertake a lighting survey on Jesus Green and this was being progressed. Any lighting failures should be reported to the County Council.

The Executive Councillor also noted that, whilst the paths on Jesus Green had been resurfaced, the County Council were unable to replace the lighting before December. The City Council had however installed temporary lights.

5) Councillor Catherine Smart to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

What criteria did the Executive Councillor use when calculating the new car park charges to be brought in next April? How will they compare with on-street parking charges and for those using the Park and Ride sites?

The Executive Councillor responded that in the current financial climate it was necessary to review car parking charges. Whilst car parking was an income generator for the City Council it was important to balance this against possible economic affects in the City. A consultation was underway and a report would be brought to the Joint Area Committee (JAC) in due course. The County Council were also in the process of reviewing their on-street car parking charges.

The Executive Councillor noted that on-street parking remained the most expensive way to park in the City, with Park and Ride being the cheapest.

6) Councillor Bick to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

Would the Executive Councillor comment on the public impact of the additional lights installed on Parker's Piece at the beginning of this year?

The Executive Councillor responded that whilst support had been expressed for the additional lighting on Parker's Piece at the moment all of the feedback was anecdotal.

The lighting had only been in place since May, during the lighter months of the year, and it was only after a full 12 month period that its impact could be judged.

Whilst police and crime figures could be looked at, on occasion it was the perception of risk and safety that was more important than raw data.

7) Councillor Pippas to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Now that domestic planning applications have been considered by the Central Planning Committee on a number of occasions, can the Executive Councillor comment on whether he believes that the decision by the Labour Group to remove planning from Area Committees was the right one?

The Executive Councillor responded that he still felt that it was the correct decision to remove planning from Area Committees.

The following Oral Questions were also tabled, but owing to the expiry of the period of time permitted, were not covered during the meeting:

8) Councillor Tucker to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Could the Executive Councillor please explain the rationale of retaining the existing car parking charges on a Sunday next year?

9) Councillor Baigent to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Following the release of The Lyons Housing Review, can the Executive Councillor explain the potential benefits of this report for the people of Cambridge?

10) Councillor Moore to the Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

Is the Executive Councillor aware that the drop in support group for breastfeeding mothers meeting at Homerton Children's Centre is at risk of closing? This group supports babies and their mothers from all over the City who have the most difficult feeding problems to get the best nutritional start in life.

11) Councillor Cantrill to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Could the Executive Councillor indicate the current level of R&R funds the Council has available for spending on replacement and renewal of equipment and infrastructure on green open spaces?

12) Councillor Roberts to the Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

Can the Executive Councillor please update Council on preparations for the first Cambridge Community Fair to be held in February 2015?

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

The Executive Councillor has a very important decision to take in relation to allowing a compound to be constructed on Parkers Piece a key open space in the city. What criteria will she use to make her decision and what weighting will she give to the important view of residents who have responded to the consultation?

14/56/CNL To consider the following Notices of Motion, notice of which has been given by:

14/56a/CNL Motion A

Councillor Dryden proposed and Councillor Ashton seconded the following motion:

“This Council believes that:

- i. As a local authority we have a duty to provide the best possible public services.
- ii. Our ability to provide quality local services would be significantly enhanced by Government securing increased revenues by tackling tax dodging, particularly the large sums avoided by multinationals.
- iii. All who benefit from public spending should contribute their fair share.
- iv. The UK must take a lead role in creating a fairer tax system and combating tax dodging, a matter of major concern to a significant number of Cambridge residents.

The Council will therefore write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Shadow Chancellor asking for further action and detail on measures under way to stop tax dodging and work internationally to end opportunities for multinationals to avoid UK tax obligations using tax havens.”

Resolved (unanimously) to agree the motion as set out above.

14/56b/CNL Motion B

Councillor Robertson proposed and Councillor Todd-Jones seconded the following motion:

“The bedroom tax, also called the Spare Room Subsidy, was introduced by the coalition government in April 2012, despite serious concerns being raised by stock holding councils, housing professionals and charities such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. In Cambridge up to 800 Council and Housing Association tenants were affected, with 3/4 of these being Council tenants.

This Council notes that:

- i. The bedroom tax continues to have a severe impact on its tenants with 20% now in arrears and only 5% having been able to downsize in line with national findings.

- ii. 45% of tenants are also being supported through Discretionary Housing Payments, which are a time limited award.
- iii. The Discretionary Housing Payment (DHP) fund is also meant to support top ups to the Local Housing Allowance for private sector tenants and those impacted by other welfare reforms by the coalition government but over 80% of the DHP fund is being used for bedroom tax cases.

This Council also notes that:

- i. Julian Huppert has consistently voted for the bedroom tax in Parliament, voting 12 times in support of it and only now that it has proved to be unpopular has he changed his position to appear to be against it. The Parliamentary Labour Party is committed to repealing the bedroom tax if elected in May 2015 and the Cambridge Labour led City Council is committed to not evicting any tenant in arrears solely due to the bedroom tax.
- ii. The Affordable Homes Bill from Andrew George MP in September 2014 is very unlikely to become law and in any case would not mitigate the impact sufficiently on vulnerable groups and will continue to cause pressure and stress to those affected over a prolonged period of time.

This Council therefore resolves that the Leader of the Council will:

- i. Write to Julian Huppert asking him to recognise the misery the bedroom tax had caused and ask for his support in Parliament to repeal the Bill and to recognise that, in line with localism, social sector landlords are best placed to determine their own local lettings policies and best use of their existing stock.
- ii. Ask for his support to lift or remove the debt cap on the Housing Revenue Account which is the chief barrier to the City Council to build more social housing and tackle overcrowding and waiting lists.”

Councillor Blackhurst proposed and Councillor Catherine Smart seconded the following amendment:

“Delete all after:

The Council also notes that:-

and substitute:-

i) Julian Huppert MP secured a public commitment from the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, Iain Duncan Smith, that ‘no benefit reduction should take place until people have at least been offered somewhere appropriately sized and located’, but that Mr Duncan Smith failed to fulfil his promise

ii) The Affordable Homes Bill currently before Parliament would, if passed, deliver on that commitment, and exempt people with disabilities from the changes. The Council supports this Bill and condemns the actions of Conservative MPs in blocking this essential Bill

iii) In 2008, the then Labour Government brought in a similar removal of spare room subsidy for private rented accommodation on which the new one is modelled.

iv) The Labour Government in reforming the Local Housing Allowance, chose to calculate it on a Broad Market Rental Area, which has made it impossible for anyone reliant on the LHA to find anywhere to live in the city. Shelter found that by May 2010, not a single property in Cambridge was affordable under LHA.

v) That all over the country, including here in Cambridge, people are living in overcrowded rented accommodation.

vi) The lack of social rented houses for those in need is a national disgrace and the loss of 421,000 social rented properties during the time of the Labour Government has contributed to this.

vii) This government has scrapped Labour's tenant tax, also known as negative subsidy, which took £12 million away from council tenants in Cambridge.

The Council therefore resolves that the Leader of the Council will:-

i) Write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Chief Secretary to the Treasury explaining that lifting or removing the debt cap on the Housing Revenue Account and permitting prudent borrowing would enable the City Council to build more social houses and start to tackle the problems of overcrowding and long waiting lists.

ii) Write to Julian Huppert MP, enclosing copies of those letters and asking him to continue to support our efforts to lift or remove the debt cap on the Housing Revenue Account, and to write to Andrew Lansley MP, asking for his support to this end also.

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 12 votes to 27.

Resolved (by 27 votes to 0) that:

The bedroom tax, also called the Spare Room Subsidy, was introduced by the coalition government in April 2012, despite serious concerns being raised by stock holding councils, housing professionals and charities such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. In Cambridge up to 800 Council and Housing Association tenants were affected, with 3/4 of these being Council tenants.

This Council notes that:

- i. The bedroom tax continues to have a severe impact on its tenants with 20% now in arrears and only 5% having been able to downsize in line with national findings.
- ii. 45% of tenants are also being supported through Discretionary Housing Payments, which are a time limited award.
- iii. The Discretionary Housing Payment (DHP) fund is also meant to support top ups to the Local Housing Allowance for private sector tenants and those impacted by other welfare reforms by the coalition government but over 80% of the DHP fund is being used for bedroom tax cases.

This Council also notes that:

- i. Julian Huppert has consistently voted for the bedroom tax in Parliament, voting 12 times in support of it and only now that it has proved to be unpopular has he changed his position to appear to be against it. The Parliamentary Labour Party is committed to repealing the bedroom tax if elected in May 2015 and the Cambridge Labour led City Council is committed to not evicting any tenant in arrears solely due to the bedroom tax.
- ii. The Affordable Homes Bill from Andrew George MP in September 2014 is very unlikely to become law and in any case would not mitigate the impact sufficiently on vulnerable groups and will continue to cause pressure and stress to those affected over a prolonged period of time.

This Council therefore resolves that the Leader of the Council will:

- i. Write to Julian Huppert asking him to recognise the misery the bedroom tax had caused and ask for his support in Parliament to repeal the Bill and to recognise that, in line with localism, social sector landlords are best placed to determine their own local lettings policies and best use of their existing stock.
- ii. Ask for his support to lift or remove the debt cap on the Housing Revenue Account which is the chief barrier to the City Council to build more social housing and tackle overcrowding and waiting lists.

14/56c/CNL Motion C

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Reid seconded the following motion:

“Council notes:

- i. The urgent need to increase the relevance of public decision making to people’s daily lives and to rejuvenate our local democracy.
- ii. The opportunity to tackle this in an appropriate way in England following the Scottish referendum and the commitments made there for increased devolution from Westminster.
- iii. The recent report of the RSA City Growth Commission presenting just the latest evidence that city regions, if empowered to do so, can serve to boost national economic growth.
- iv. The groundswell of support in the local business community for a single council providing coordinated, accountable leadership for the Greater Cambridge area.
- v. The welcome debate opened up at the County Council for alternative approaches to local government in our area, to which the City Council will be asked to participate.

Council believes that:

- i. The survival of the proud tradition of municipal innovation and enterprise, which historically transformed social conditions and enabled strides in prosperity is under threat from the control tendencies of all recent governments.
- ii. There is much to do to in our own area, yet too often our locally elected representatives are circumscribed from taking actions that local people expect of them.
- iii. Both the unwieldy structure of local government covering the City of Cambridge and the centralisation of the vast majority of revenues arising from the area are major sources of frustration with the democratic process.
- iv. Power should reside as close to people as is consistent with making effective decisions that impact them.
- v. Irrespective of demarcations between councils, voluntary collaborations between them are being shown to offer economies of scale and critical mass where needed for cost effective service delivery.
- vi. For purposeful, democratic, local government, we should aspire to a single tier council framed around the logical community of interest within an economic sub region: a shared area of identity within which most people both live and work;

Council calls on the Leader and Chief Executive to:

- i. Participate in discussions with other Cambridgeshire authorities to build a consensus for a new single tier authority for the south of the county with appropriate solutions for the remainder.
- ii. Seek in the interim negotiations with central Government through the structure created for the Greater Cambridge City Deal to seek acceleration of the already committed legislation to enable a Greater Cambridge combined authority.
- iii. Develop and articulate the case for:
 - The retention without strings of a majority of the public revenues arising in this area from business rates and other property based taxation, allowing for the remainder to be redeployed nationally for equalisation.
 - Local accountability to local people for setting business rates and council tax levels.
 - Greater freedom to borrow against business plans for investment in housing.
 - A proportional voting system within a newly empowered local government.
 - A national constitutional convention to provide the stimulus for a new mindset in Westminster and Whitehall and a general framework for progress in all these respects.”

Councillor Herbert proposed and Councillor Roberts seconded the following amendment (additions underlined, deletions ~~struck through~~):

“Council notes:

- i. The urgent need to increase the relevance of public decision making to people’s daily lives and to rejuvenate our local democracy.
- ii. The opportunity to tackle this in an appropriate way in England following the Scottish referendum and the commitments made there for increased devolution from Westminster.
- iii. The recent report of the RSA City Growth Commission presenting just the latest evidence that city regions, if empowered to do so, can serve to boost national economic growth.
- iv. The groundswell of support in the local business community for a single council providing coordinated, accountable leadership for the Greater Cambridge area.
- v. The welcome debate opened up at the County Council for alternative approaches to local government in our area, to which the City Council will be asked to participate.

Council believes that:

- i. The survival of the proud tradition of municipal innovation and enterprise, which historically transformed social conditions and enabled strides in prosperity is under threat from the control tendencies of all recent governments.
- ii. There is much to do to in our own area, yet too often our locally elected representatives are circumscribed from taking actions that local people expect of them.
- iii. Both the unwieldy structure of local government covering the city of Cambridge and the centralisation of the vast majority of revenues arising from the area are major sources of frustration with the democratic process.
- iv. Power should reside as close to people as is consistent with making effective decisions that impact them.
- v. Irrespective of demarcations between councils, voluntary collaborations between them are being shown to offer economies of scale and critical mass where needed for cost effective service delivery.
- vi. For purposeful, democratic, local government, we should aspire to a single tier council framed around the logical community of interest within an economic sub region: a shared area of identity within which most people both live and work;

Council calls on the Leader and Chief Executive to:

- i. Participate in discussions with other Cambridgeshire authorities and Peterborough to ~~build~~ seek a consensus for a ~~new~~ single tier solution of several unitary authorities including one for greater Cambridge, and a local referendum if supported in principle, including full involvement of residents, local community organisations, the business community and Universities. ~~authority for the south of the county with appropriate solutions for the remainder.~~
 - ii. Seek in the interim negotiations with central Government through the ~~structure created for~~ on the Greater Cambridge City Deal to ~~seek~~ acceleration of the already ~~committed~~ proposed legislation to enable a Greater Cambridge combined authority.
 - iii. Develop and articulate the case for:
- The retention without strings of a majority of the public revenues arising in this area from business rates and other property based taxation, allowing for the remainder to be redeployed nationally for equalisation.

- Local accountability to local people for setting business rates and council tax levels.
- clear devolution of powers from Whitehall, working in partnership with Cambridgeshire councils, Peterborough and similar city regions, to remove obstacles to sustainable growth for Greater Cambridge including
 - lifting the Housing Revenue Account cap and transferring related housing powers
 - addressing additional strategic transport infrastructure that is essential but not covered by the City Deal or already agreed
 - increasing capital and revenue funding for schools and skills development
 - removing barriers to enable councils to tackle inequality, and
 - strengthening local planning powers for Greater Cambridge. ~~Greater freedom to borrow against business plans for investment in housing.~~
- A proportional voting system within a newly empowered local government.
- A national constitutional convention to provide the stimulus for a new mindset in Westminster and Whitehall and a general framework for progress in all these respects

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 36 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions.

Resolved (by 37 votes to 0, with 3 abstentions) that:

Council notes:

- i. The urgent need to increase the relevance of public decision making to people's daily lives and to rejuvenate our local democracy.
- ii. The opportunity to tackle this in an appropriate way in England following the Scottish referendum and the commitments made there for increased devolution from Westminster.
- iii. The recent report of the RSA City Growth Commission presenting just the latest evidence that city regions, if empowered to do so, can serve to boost national economic growth.
- iv. The groundswell of support in the local business community for a single council providing coordinated, accountable leadership for the Greater Cambridge area.
- v. The welcome debate opened up at the County Council for alternative approaches to local government in our area, to which the City Council will be asked to participate.

Council believes that:

- i. The survival of the proud tradition of municipal innovation and enterprise, which historically transformed social conditions and enabled strides in prosperity is under threat from the control tendencies of all recent governments.
- ii. There is much to do to in our own area, yet too often our locally elected representatives are circumscribed from taking actions that local people expect of them.
- iii. Both the unwieldy structure of local government covering the city of Cambridge and the centralisation of the vast majority of revenues arising from the area are major sources of frustration with the democratic process.
- iv. Power should reside as close to people as is consistent with making effective decisions that impact them.
- v. Irrespective of demarcations between councils, voluntary collaborations between them are being shown to offer economies of scale and critical mass where needed for cost effective service delivery.

- vi. For purposeful, democratic, local government, we should aspire to a single tier council framed around the logical community of interest within an economic sub region: a shared area of identity within which most people both live and work;

Council calls on the Leader and Chief Executive to:

- i. Participate in discussions with other Cambridgeshire authorities and Peterborough to seek a consensus for a single tier solution of several unitary authorities including one for greater Cambridge, and a local referendum if supported in principle, including full involvement of residents, local community organisations, the business community and Universities.
- ii. Seek in the interim negotiations with central Government on the Greater Cambridge City Deal acceleration of the already proposed legislation to enable a Greater Cambridge combined authority.
- iii. Develop and articulate the case for:
 - The retention without strings of a majority of the public revenues arising in this area from business rates and other property based taxation, allowing for the remainder to be redeployed nationally for equalisation.
 - Local accountability to local people for setting business rates and council tax levels.
 - clear devolution of powers from Whitehall, working in partnership with Cambridgeshire councils, Peterborough and similar city regions, to remove obstacles to sustainable growth for Greater Cambridge including
 - lifting the Housing Revenue Account cap and transferring related housing powers
 - addressing additional strategic transport infrastructure that is essential but not covered by the City Deal or already agreed
 - increasing capital and revenue funding for schools and skills development
 - removing barriers to enable councils to tackle inequality, and

- strengthening local planning powers for Greater Cambridge.

- A proportional voting system within a newly empowered local government.
- A national constitutional convention to provide the stimulus for a new mindset in Westminster and Whitehall and a general framework for progress in all these respects.

14/56d/CNL Motion D

Councillor Owers proposed and Councillor Martin Smart seconded the following motion:

“This Council uses the opportunity of Living Wage Week 2014 (2nd-8th November) to welcome Cambridge City Council’s new status as an accredited Living Wage employer, and to thank all those who worked hard to make that status possible.

This Council resolves to scrupulously ensure that the terms of accreditation are satisfactorily and expeditiously implemented.

This Council resolves to now take the Living Wage campaign in Cambridge further by prioritising the promotion of the Living Wage in the wider Cambridge economy, among both public and private sector organisations, by highlighting not only the moral case, but also the business case for paying a wage that allows all workers to live a full, active and decent life within the community.

This Council notes that independent research has concluded that paying the Living Wage has multiple benefits for businesses, including:

- i. Improving staff productivity and performance.
- ii. Improving staff retention and loyalty.
- iii. Improving companies’ reputation for corporate social responsibility.
- iv. Increased local purchasing power and demand for goods and services.

This Council notes that these benefits are particularly pertinent to Cambridge given the city’s high population churn, high living and housing costs, competitive labour market, and high level of concern about corporate social responsibility.

This Council notes and supports the appointment of the innovative new post of Living Wage Co-ordinator, a position that has received strong public backing from the Living Wage Foundation.

This Council resolves to work with the Living Wage Co-ordinator and Living Wage Foundation to implement a Living Wage external promotion strategy that will include:

- i. Information-gathering and research to identify which organisations do and do not pay the Living Wage.
- ii. Advocating the benefits of paying the Living Wage and assisting firms with the business case for implementing the Living Wage.
- iii. Helping sympathetic organisations apply for Living Wage accreditation.
- iv. Enlisting private and public sector partners who can advocate and outline the benefits of the Living Wage on our behalf.
- v. High level political engagement and advocacy, including through local business and public sector networks such as Cambridge Ahead, the Cambridge BID, and the Cambridge Network, and our partnerships in the City Deal and the LEP, and with other local authorities.
- vi. Partnership with local Trade Unions.
- vii. Working with the Living Wage Foundation to implement the next stage of their national strategy, namely to give consumers more information about which firms and organisations pay the Living Wage so that people can make ethical purchasing decisions, perhaps through a 'kitemark' scheme."

Councillor Cantrill proposed and Councillor Reid seconded the following amendment:

Delete all and replace with

"This Council uses the opportunity of the Living Wage Week 2014 (2nd -8th November) to welcome Cambridge City Council's new status as an accredited Living Wage Employer. The Council acknowledges the steps taken by the Liberal Democrat administration in a) introducing the Living Wage for all council employees and agency staff in 2013 and b) proposing and initiating the process by which the council has become an accredited Living Wage Employer at the beginning of 2014.

This Council resolves to scrupulously ensure that the terms of the accreditation are satisfactorily and expeditiously implemented, particularly in relation to council contracts with third parties and commits to ensure that any activities

that are currently undertaken by the council but will in the future be undertaken on a joint or third party basis commit to paying the Living Wage and to seeking Living Wage Employer accreditation (to the extent that they do not have it).

This Council resolves to take the living wage campaign in Cambridge further by prioritising the promotion of the Living Wage in the wider Cambridge economy, among both public and private sector organisations, by highlighting not only the moral case, but also the business case for paying a wage that allows all workers to live a full, active and decent life within the community.

This Council notes that independent research has concluded that paying the Living Wage has multiple benefits for employers:

1. Improve staff productivity and performance
2. Improve staff retention and loyalty
3. Improving companies' reputation for corporate social responsibility
4. Increased local purchasing power and demand for goods and services

This Council notes that these benefits are particularly pertinent to Cambridge given the city's high population churn, high living and housing costs, competitive labour market and high level of concern about corporate social responsibility.

This Council notes the appointment of the post of Living Wage Coordinator, supported by the Living Wage Foundation.

This Council resolves to work with the Living Wage Co-ordinator and the Living Wage Foundation to implement a Living Wage external promotion strategy that will include:

1. Information gathering and research to identify which organisations do not pay the Living Wage – prioritising
 - a. Those employers that have a relationship with the council; and
 - b. retailers within Cambridge
2. Advocate the benefits of paying the Living Wage and assisting firms with the business case for implementing the living wage
3. Helping sympathetic organisations apply for Living Wage accreditation
4. Enlisting private and public sector partners who can advocate and outline the benefits of the Living Wage on our behalf
5. High level political engagement and advocacy, including through local business and public sector networks such as Cambridge Ahead, the

Cambridge BID, and the Cambridge Network, and our partnerships in the City Deal and the LEP, and other local authorities

6. Partnerships with local Trade Unions and the Chamber of Commerce
7. Working with the Living Wage Foundation to implement the next stage of their national strategy, namely to give consumers more information about which firms and organisations pay the pay the Living Wage so that people can make ethical purchasing decisions, perhaps through the kitemark scheme

Further more this Council resolves:

To set a target of achieving the Living Wage City status within a 24 month period (as defined by 75% of employers within the city paying the living wage) and asks the executive councillor to set out plans as to how this goal will be achieved.”

With the agreement of Council, Councillor Cantrill withdrew this amendment.

Councillor Cantrill proposed and Councillor Owers seconded the following amendment:

Delete all and replace with

“This Council uses the opportunity of the Living Wage Week 2014 (2nd -8th November) to welcome Cambridge City Council’s new status as an accredited Living Wage Employer and to thank all those who made it possible.

This Council resolves to scrupulously ensure that the terms of the accreditation and satisfactorily and expeditiously implemented, particularly in relation to council contracts with third parties and will ensure that any activities that are currently undertaken by the council but will in the future be undertaken on a joint or third party basis that those employers commit to paying the Living Wage.

This Council resolves to take the living wage campaign in Cambridge further by prioritising the promotion of the Living Wage in the wider Cambridge economy, among both public and private sector organisations, by highlighting not only the moral case, but also the business case for paying a wage that allows all workers to live a full, active and decent life within the community.

This Council notes that independent research has concluded that paying the Living Wage has multiple benefits for employers:

1. Improve staff productivity and performance
2. Improve staff retention and loyalty
3. Improving companies' reputation for corporate social responsibility
4. Increased local purchasing power and demand for goods and services

This Council notes that these benefits are particularly pertinent to Cambridge given the city's high population churn, high living and housing costs, competitive labour market and high level of concern about corporate social responsibility.

This Council notes and supports the appointment of the innovative new post of Living Wage Coordinator, supported by the Living Wage Foundation.

This Council resolves to work with the Living Wage Co-ordinator and the Living Wage Foundation to implement a Living Wage external promotion strategy that will include:

1. Information gathering and research to identify which organisations do not pay the Living Wage – prioritising
 - a. Those employers that have a relationship with the council; and
 - b. retailers within Cambridge
2. Advocate the benefits of paying the Living Wage and assisting firms with the business case for implementing the living wage
3. Helping sympathetic organisations apply for Living Wage accreditation
4. Enlisting private and public sector partners who can advocate and outline the benefits of the Living Wage on our behalf
5. High level political engagement and advocacy, including through local business and public sector networks such as Cambridge Ahead, the Cambridge BID, and the Cambridge Network, and our partnerships in the City Deal and the LEP, and other local authorities
6. Partnerships with local Trade Unions and the Chamber of Commerce
7. Working with the Living Wage Foundation to implement the next stage of their national strategy, namely to give consumers more information about which firms and organisations pay the pay the Living Wage so that people can make ethical purchasing decisions, perhaps through the kitemark scheme

Further more this Council resolves:

To set a target of achieving the Living Wage City status in the medium term period (as defined by 75% of employers within the city paying the living wage) and asks the executive councillor in consultation with the living wage coordinator to set out plans as to how this goal will be achieved.”

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

Resolved (unanimously) that:

This Council uses the opportunity of the Living Wage Week 2014 (2nd -8th November) to welcome Cambridge City Council’s new status as an accredited Living Wage Employer and to thank all those who made it possible.

This Council resolves to scrupulously ensure that the terms of the accreditation and satisfactorily and expeditiously implemented, particularly in relation to council contracts with third parties and will ensure that any activities that are currently undertaken by the council but will in the future be undertaken on a joint or third party basis that those employers commit to paying the Living Wage.

This Council resolves to take the living wage campaign in Cambridge further by prioritising the promotion of the Living Wage in the wider Cambridge economy, among both public and private sector organisations, by highlighting not only the moral case, but also the business case for paying a wage that allows all workers to live a full, active and decent life within the community.

This Council notes that independent research has concluded that paying the Living Wage has multiple benefits for employers:

1. Improve staff productivity and performance
2. Improve staff retention and loyalty
3. Improving companies’ reputation for corporate social responsibility
4. Increased local purchasing power and demand for goods and services

This Council notes that these benefits are particularly pertinent to Cambridge given the city’s high population churn, high living and housing costs, competitive labour market and high level of concern about corporate social responsibility.

This Council notes and supports the appointment of the innovative new post of Living Wage Coordinator, supported by the Living Wage Foundation.

This Council resolves to work with the Living Wage Co-ordinator and the Living Wage Foundation to implement a Living Wage external promotion strategy that will include:

1. Information gathering and research to identify which organisations do not pay the Living Wage – prioritising
 - a. Those employers that have a relationship with the council; and
 - b. retailers within Cambridge
2. Advocate the benefits of paying the Living Wage and assisting firms with the business case for implementing the living wage
3. Helping sympathetic organisations apply for Living Wage accreditation
4. Enlisting private and public sector partners who can advocate and outline the benefits of the Living Wage on our behalf
5. High level political engagement and advocacy, including through local business and public sector networks such as Cambridge Ahead, the Cambridge BID, and the Cambridge Network, and our partnerships in the City Deal and the LEP, and other local authorities
6. Partnerships with local Trade Unions and the Chamber of Commerce
7. Working with the Living Wage Foundation to implement the next stage of their national strategy, namely to give consumers more information about which firms and organisations pay the pay the Living Wage so that people can make ethical purchasing decisions, perhaps through the kitemark scheme

Further more this Council resolves:

To set a target of achieving the Living Wage City status in the medium term period (as defined by 75% of employers within the city paying the living wage) and asks the executive councillor in consultation with the living wage coordinator to set out plans as to how this goal will be achieved.

14/56e/CNL Motion E

Councillor Cantrill proposed and Councillor Catherine Smart seconded the following motion:

“Council recognises that

- i. The city's connection to long distance coach networks is important to residents and visitors alike and makes a positive contribution to the city economy
- ii. Current arrangements to provide a terminus on Parkside are inadequate and unsustainable both to surrounding residents and the travelling public as well as inconsistent with the character and amenity of Parker's Piece
- iii. The current temporary facilities at Parkside were put in place in 2007 pending development of a county-led bus management strategy which does not seem to have materialised and the current temporary planning permission expires this year
- iv. In order to obtain proper facilities for travellers, some flexibility and willingness to work with the local authorities should be expected of the bus companies to determine the most suitable permanent location

Council calls on its Planning Officers to work with County Transport Officers to develop alternative locations as a means of providing a suitable permanent home for the coach interchange, noting in particular the expectation that the railway station after its redevelopment would provide a possible solution, as discussed at the start of the current temporary arrangement on Parkside.”

Councillor Blencowe proposed and Councillor Dryden seconded the following amendment (additions underlined, deletions ~~struck through~~):

“Council recognises that

- i. The city's connection to long distance coach networks is important to residents and visitors alike and makes a positive contribution to the city economy.
- ii. Current arrangements to provide a terminus on Parkside are inadequate and unsustainable both to surrounding residents and the travelling public ~~as well as inconsistent with the character and amenity of Parker's Piece~~
- iii. The current temporary facilities at Parkside were put in place in 2007 following the joint county/city meeting in 2006 of the Cambridge Environmental and Traffic Management Area Joint

Committee chaired by Julian Huppert, pending development of a county-led bus management strategy which does not seem to have materialised. and the current temporary planning permission expires this year

- iv. In order to obtain proper facilities for travellers, some flexibility and willingness to work with the local authorities should be expected of the bus companies to determine the most suitable permanent location.

~~Council calls on its Planning Officers to work with County Transport Officers to develop alternative locations as a means of providing a suitable permanent home for the coach interchange, noting in particular the expectation that the railway station after its redevelopment would provide a possible solution, as discussed at the start of the current temporary arrangement on Parkside.~~

Council calls on the County Council, supported by the City Council Planning Service, to undertake a thorough review of long distance coach/bus passenger waiting facilities in Cambridge, and asks the County Council to report back to the Cambridge Joint Area Committee as soon as practical.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried by 24 votes to 11.

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Pitt seconded the following amendment (addition underlined):

“Council recognises that

- i. The city's connection to long distance coach networks is important to residents and visitors alike and makes a positive contribution to the city economy.
- ii. Current arrangements to provide a terminus on Parkside are inadequate and unsustainable both to surrounding residents and the travelling public.
- iii. The current temporary facilities at Parkside were put in place in 2007 following the joint county/city meeting in 2006 of the Cambridge Environmental and Traffic Management Area Joint Committee chaired by Julian Huppert, pending development of a county-led bus management strategy which does not seem to have materialised.

- iv. In order to obtain proper facilities for travellers, some flexibility and willingness to work with the local authorities should be expected of the bus companies to determine the most suitable permanent location.

Council calls on the County Council, supported by the City Council Planning Service, to undertake a thorough review of long distance coach/bus passenger waiting facilities in Cambridge considering alternative locations, and asks the County Council to report back to the Cambridge Joint Area Committee as soon as practical.”

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

Resolved (unanimously) that:

Council recognises that

- i. The city's connection to long distance coach networks is important to residents and visitors alike and makes a positive contribution to the city economy.
- ii. Current arrangements to provide a terminus on Parkside are inadequate and unsustainable both to surrounding residents and the travelling public.
- iii. The current temporary facilities at Parkside were put in place in 2007 following the joint county/city meeting in 2006 of the Cambridge Environmental and Traffic Management Area Joint Committee chaired by Julian Huppert, pending development of a county-led bus management strategy which does not seem to have materialised.
- iv. In order to obtain proper facilities for travellers, some flexibility and willingness to work with the local authorities should be expected of the bus companies to determine the most suitable permanent location.

Council calls on the County Council, supported by the City Council Planning Service, to undertake a thorough review of long distance coach/bus passenger waiting facilities in Cambridge considering alternative locations, and asks the County Council to report back to the Cambridge Joint Area Committee as soon as practical.

14/57/CNL Written Questions

Members noted the written question and answer circulated around the Chamber.

14/58/CNL Special Urgency DecisionsPotential Sale of LBI HF claims

Members noted the Special Urgency decision.

The meeting ended at 11.58 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank