

COUNCIL

22 October 2015

6.00 - 11.20 pm

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/103/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

15/104/CNL Mayor's Announcements

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Tunnacliffe.

2. Mayor's Day Out

The Mayor advised the annual outing for senior citizens to Great Yarmouth on 11th August was once again a huge success and thanked those councillors who helped with stewarding.

3. Remembrance

The Mayor gave advance notice that Remembrance Sunday Civic Service would take place on Sunday, 8th November, at Great St. Mary's Church at 10.55 a.m. A two minute silence would be observed from the main entrance to the Guildhall on Wednesday, 11th November at 11 a.m. and that all Councillors were welcome to join in this act of remembrance.

4. Arthur Rank Hospice Appeal

The Mayor informed Councillors that a profile raising event for The Arthur Rank Hospice Appeal had taken place in the Guildhall the previous night and thanked those who had attended.

5. The Honorary Recorder

The Mayor advised that the title of Honorary Recorder would be passed to his Honour Judge David Farrell following the retirement of his Honour Judge Haskesworth.

6. Chevyn Service

The Mayor gave advance notice that the preaching of the Chevyn Sermon would take place at the Church of Our Lady and the English Martyrs, Hills Road on Sunday, 31st January, 2016 at 10.45 a.m.

7. Declarations of Interest

| Item | Member | Interest |
|-------------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| 15/110/CNLb | Reid | Trustee of Cambridge Live |
| 15/110/CNLb | Gillespie | Works for energy wholesaler |
| 15/110/CNLc | Reid | Chair of Cambridge Retrofit |
| 15/110/CNLe | Price | Member of Unite |

15/105/CNL Public Questions Time

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

- 1) Mr Julius Carrington raised the following points:
 - i. Here to represent the thousands of people from Cambridge and around the world who had signed a petition objecting to the proposal to build a two-way bus road on the West Fields of Cambridge.
 - ii. The petition had reached 3,500 signatures and the intention was to continue collecting them.
 - iii. The petition would be presented to a meeting of the City Deal Executive Board but representation was being made to the City Council so that concerns could be recorded.
 - iv. Had personally spoken with various friends and neighbours, on doorsteps, at village fetes and community events; the support was passionate and broad-based.
 - v. Recognised that this was a high-level consultation process which presented outline ideas only, and not a firm plan.
 - vi. Requested the weight of public opinion against 'Option 1C' be heard.

The Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation responded:

- i. Welcomed the representation.
- ii. Suggested the petition be presented to the City Deal Board as they would be the decision maker on this issue.

- iii. Proposals in the Local Plan favoured a compact city which would take minimal land out of the green belt.
- iv. There was a need to resolve the issues affecting bus services and cycle ways in/out the west of the city.
- v. The Council had a duty to assist people commuting in/out of the city to satellite developments.
- vi. Views on all three of the proposed routes were welcomed.

As a supplementary point Mr Carrington said the impact on the West Fields of Cambridge would be felt by more than just those in the west of the city.

The Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation responded with the following:

- i. Recognised the strength of feeling in response.
- ii. The decision regarding traffic links would be one that seemed most likely to benefit Cambridge as a whole.

2) Mr Antony Carpen raised the following points:

- i. Had recently been commissioned to run a democracy workshop for the Wintercomfort community.
- ii. Had written a blog about the workshop and circulated details to Councillors and invited them to view the blog.
- iii. The Wintercomfort community felt there was a lack of joined up support services. Councillors were invited to attend a future meeting to discuss issues.
- iv. A Council Officer had been present at the workshop to encourage people to register to vote, with some success.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded:

- i. Thanked Mr Carpen for raising the profile of homeless people and rough sleepers in the City.
- ii. Homelessness had risen since 2010. Of the three hundred and fifty six general needs lettings in City Homes last year, one hundred (28%) were to people for whom the Council had accepted a statutory duty to house as homeless. They were supported, where necessary, by Housing Officers, benefit advisers and, if their needs were high, two recently-appointed specialist support workers.
- iii. Councils had no statutory responsibility toward single homeless people who had no vulnerabilities, but provision in Cambridge extended beyond what the Council were required to do by law.

- iv. Not everyone on the street was homeless or vulnerably housed. Most had tenancies or licences in the City's hostels and move-on houses which together provided more than two hundred units of accommodation. This did not mean that there weren't people sleeping rough but it was a situation which constantly changed.
- v. One of the best indicators of those people sleeping on the streets were the weekly figures collected by the Street Outreach Team.
- vi. Mr Carpen had queried on his blog what the Council and others were doing to address their needs with flip charts, which highlighted how complex and diverse the daily lives of the group at Wintercomfort could be. But looked at a different way, this showed the range of local provision, almost all of which was supported by substantial grants from the City Council.
- vii. The City Council support included a grant to Wintercomfort, the providers of all the two hundred bed spaces including Jimmy's Cambridge, the City's assessment centre which provided twenty two direct access hostel beds to all, and it offered tailor-made support packages to move people through to more permanent accommodation within twenty eight days.
- viii. The Council also funded the Street Outreach Team who had a regular presence at Wintercomfort who operated out of the same building as the Newmarket Road Access Surgery, a health centre exclusively for the needs of people in hostels and on the street, which had recently been refurbished by the City Council at a cost of £500,000.
- ix. The single homelessness service, provided by the City Council was dedicated to providing accommodation for single people before they developed the habits associated with long-term rough-sleeping and hostel-living. Town Hall Lettings, a social lettings agency intended to make privately rented accommodation available to low-income households. Between them, since inception, had helped accommodate one hundred and sixty five single Cambridge people who might otherwise be homeless.
- x. The City Council supported a user group of street service users. This group sat on two important decision-making bodies and assisted in shaping services. An annual 'census' of service users was also carried out to enable the City Council to better understand the needs and views of service users.
- xi. Reference had been made on Mr Carpen's blog of people having to "shuttle between services". This was sometimes inevitable but services were provided together in one location whenever possible.
- xii. A "super social worker" had been created in 2011 when the City and County Councils set up the chronically-excluded adults' (CEA) service. This service cut across all the boundaries, coordinating and providing

intensive support for, and advocating on behalf of, people with the most complex support needs. The service had assisted fifty two Cambridge individuals since its inception in 2011.

- xiii. Disagreed with Mr Carpen's comment that the state had a large impact on the lives of street people but "is not delivering". The Council was part of the 'state' which was delivering public services which had a demonstrable effect on the lives of many people.
- xiv. There was only so much skilled staff could do and adult service users also had a part to play by taking up services that were offered and by making a decision to turn their lives around.

Mr Carpen made the following supplementary points:

- i. His blog listed a variety of people's views that were not necessarily his own.
- ii. Students had raised concerns regarding violence against women at the Winter Comfort workshop and said they would like to work with the Council to address these.

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded with the following:

- i. Appreciated that the blog represented the views of other people, not necessarily Mr Carpen's.
- ii. Advised that Councillor Sinnott would be happy to work with students to address concerns regarding violence against women.

3) Mr Taylor made the following points:

- i. A new tree policy for Cambridge had been approved by the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places on the 8th of October 2015. The Policy had set out how decisions would be made on trees the City Council owned or managed from now on.
- ii. Highways trees in the City were managed, albeit informally, by the City Council.
- iii. Queried how the process regarding notification of any proposed tree works to the highways trees on Milton Road would occur.
- iv. Asked if the Executive Councillor would make the decisions on which, if any, trees would be felled.
- v. Had to put forward these questions as the new policy itself did not contain sufficient information to give the answers.

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded:

- i. Trees on Milton Road were highways trees and therefore belonged to Cambridgeshire County Council. This had always been the case and nothing had changed in terms of ownership.

- Therefore ultimate decision-making on them since the approval of the new Tree Strategy belonged to Cambridgeshire County Council.
- ii. The City Council did not decide the ultimate fate of Cambridgeshire County Council owned trees but only managed them, which excluded decisions such as felling.
 - iii. The City Council expected that any consultation undertaken by the City Deal on road widening would include a consultation on tree works. This was not a decision for the City Council but for Cambridgeshire County Council. At present no decision on the scope of consultation had been made, or who would undertake that consultation. However no final decisions would be made by Cambridge City Council as they did not belong to the Council.
 - iv. The City Council provided a service to Cambridgeshire County Council for street trees, under an established financial arrangement; including tree inspection, scheduling works, ordering works and tree advice for which the City Council was paid a fee.
 - v. The City Council would seek to clarify notification procedures for the County's trees through the negotiation of the agency agreement which was referenced in Policy WP4 of the Tree Policy document. As the City Council had developed its own comprehensive tree strategy, it could help and advise Cambridgeshire County Council on developing their own.
 - vi. With regards to the Milton Road trees, Mr Taylor would have to address his concerns to Cambridgeshire County Council, who would ultimately make decisions on them.

Mr Taylor made the following supplementary points:

- i. Enquired if the City Council's tree management power did not extend to felling, why residents were encouraged to contact the City Council through consultation regarding the notification processes.
- ii. This had been raised as an issue at a variety of committees without receiving a clear answer regarding who would make decisions on the Milton Road trees.
- iii. Requested that clearer information be published on the City Council website.

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded with the following:

- i. Acknowledged the Milton Road notification process could be confusing as Cambridgeshire County Council allowed the City Council to undertake the notification process on their behalf. The policy could be amended to make details clearer in future.

- ii. Currently Cambridgeshire County Council were not in a position to outline its own strategy on trees. It was hoped they would be able to do so next year after they have concluded their own review of their highways department.
 - iii. Re-iterated Cambridgeshire County Council had asked the City Council to maintain trees, not fell them.
- 4) Dr Julian Smith raised the following points:
- i. Over 200 people had signed the Fossil Free Cambridgeshire petition and there were an increasing number of events taking place in the City on this subject.
 - ii. If the Council chose to support the principle of fossil fuel divestment it would become the fourth City in England after Oxford, Bristol and Kirklees to do so.
 - iii. It was crucially important that together we frame climate action at an appropriate scale and that we frame it as a positive opportunity for local communities.
 - iv. To avoid the high emissions devastating climate change scenario the City Council and residents needed to look beyond our normal boundaries and influence more widely.
 - v. What plans did the City Council have to build on the current momentum in Cambridge and take its climate leadership forward?
 - vi. How would the City Council ensure these plans were of an appropriate scale to make the most of the opportunities which climate action presented?
 - vii. How would the City Council ensure it wasn't insular in its approach to climate change but was working to influence climate action outside Cambridge, given the importance of this to the future of the people of Cambridge?
 - viii. Climate change was expected, it would impact on people's health. The City Council needed to get its scale of response right.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources responded:

- i. Appreciated the need to avoid being insular, but the City Council needed to get its 'own house' in order prior to trying to influence others.
- ii. A Climate Change Officer was being recruited who would take on a strategic role to engage with partners.
- iii. A Carbon Management Plan would come forward in 2016.
- iv. Referred to details that had been placed on Councillors seats regarding Carbon Management Plan Actions, such as working with Cambridge Retrofit to retrofit properties in Cambridge to reduce their carbon footprint.

- v. European funding was also being bid for to improve the City Council's leadership role.
- vi. The City Council was looking to better engage with the public to raise awareness of issues and implement energy efficiency.
- vii. Anti-water poverty and fuel poverty strategies had been set up that would affect public and private sector housing.
- viii. Better joined up working was desired with Cambridgeshire County Council to address issues. The City Council would only have a limited impact on its own. The Central Government withdrawal of financial support for carbon reduction measures also impacted on City Council effectiveness.

Dr Smith made the following supplementary points:

- i. Recognised that the City Council faced certain issues.
- ii. Engaging different groups would drive the climate change agenda forward.

15/106/CNL Re-Ordering of the Agenda

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

15/107/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for Adoption

15/107/CNL a Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Mid-Year Financial Review (Executive Councillor for Housing)

Resolved (28 votes to 0) to:

- i. Approve proposals for changes in existing housing capital budgets, as introduced in Sections 6 and 7 and detailed in Appendix F(1) of the document, with the resulting position summarised in Appendix I of the Officer's report.
- ii. Approve proposals for changes in housing capital investment resulting from the Fundamental Review of the Housing Service, as introduced in Sections 6 and 7 and detailed in Appendix F(2) of the document, with the resulting position summarised in Appendix I of the Officer's report.

15/107/CNLb General Fund (GF) Mid-Year Financial Review (MFR) (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)

Resolved (28 votes to 0) to:

General Fund Revenue

- i. Agree the budget strategy, process and timetable for the 2016/17 budget cycle as outlined in Section 1 (pages 1 to 2 refer) and Appendix A of the MFR document.
- ii. Agree incorporation of the budget savings and pressures identified in Section 4 (pages 11 to 13 refer). This provides 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 14 refers) of the MFR document.

Capital

- i. Note the changes to the Capital Plan as set out in Section 6 (pages 15 to 19 refer) of the MFR document and agree the new proposals:

| Ref | Description | 2015/16 £000 | 2016/17 £000 | Total £000 |
|--------|---|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| SC605 | Replacement Building Access Control System | 50 | 50 | 100 |
| PR037a | Local Centres Improvement Programme - Cherry Hinton High Street | 15 | 185 | 200 |
| S607 | Fleet Maintenance and Management Service at Waterbeach | 34 | 11 | 45 |
| | Total Proposals | 99 | 246 | 345 |

Reserves

- i. Agree changes to General Fund Reserve levels, with the Prudent Minimum Balance being set at £5.13m and the target level at £6.16m as detailed in Section 7 (pages 20 to 21 refer).

15/107/CNLc Treasury Management Half Yearly Update Report 2015/16 to 2018/19 (Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources)

Resolved (28 votes to 0) to:

- i. Agree the treasury management half yearly update report 2015/16 to 2018/19, which includes the Council's estimated Prudential and Treasury Indicators 2015/16 to 2018/19.

15/107/CNLd Council Appointments to the Conservators of the River Cam (Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places)

Resolved unanimously to:

- i. Approve the nominations of the three Councillor appointments of Councillors O'Reilly, Robertson and Tunnacliffe for the Conservators of the River Cam commencing January 2016 for a three year term.
- ii. Appoint James Macnaghten, Malcolm Scholfield, Amy Alys- Tilson and Lynden Golliday.

15/108/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for Adoption

15/108/CNLa Licensing Committee: Adoption of Gambling Policy

Resolved (unanimously) to:

- i. Endorse the post-consultation draft Statement of Gambling Principles shown in Appendix A and the policy is approved for publication on 21 December 2015 for it to come in to effect on 18 January 2016.

15/107/CNLb Planning Committee: Consultation on review of Cambridge Fringes Joint Development Control Committee terms of reference to determine City Deal Infrastructure Schemes

Resolved (39 Votes to 0)

To accept the Officer recommendation to support the principle of the proposed changes to the JDCC Terms of Reference

15/109/CNL To deal with Oral Questions

1) Councillor Gehring to the Leader

How will the results of the City Deal consultation on the Cambourne to Cambridge Bus Route be evaluated?

The Leader responded that the consultation outcomes would be reported to the City Deal Assembly Board and a full analysis provided. The evaluation would be both quantitative and qualitative.

On the quantitative side, it would be reported numerically on the different levels of support for the options put forward and to cross reference those to other pertinent factors such as location and modes of transport used. On the qualitative side, comments would be reviewed and options assessed. Should new ideas be submitted these would undertake high level analysis and be included in the report to the Board. Generally full release of anonymised data and comments would form part of this process. The consultation itself formed a key part of the overall evaluation of options, particularly feeding into the 'delivery case' around public acceptability of options. A full and transparent process of undertaking and evaluating the consultation was a crucial part of arriving at an acceptable scheme proposal.

The Leader concluded it was the view of the City Deal Board that there was a need to address the traffic congestion issues, provide a more reliable bus service and improve cycle ways in and out of the City.

2) Councillor Abbott to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Can the Executive Councillor provide an update on the Council's current work on digital inclusion, undertaken as part of the anti-poverty strategy?

The Executive Councillor acknowledged that whilst each digitally excluded person had their own individual set of circumstances, digital exclusion affected some of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. The most excluded were:

- Those in social housing, 39.2% of tenants not online in Cambridge City
- Those on lower wages, or unemployed with 44% of people without basic digital skills on lower wages or unemployed.
- Those with disabilities, 33% of people with registered disabilities had never used the internet.
- Older people, over 53% of people who lacked basic digital skills were aged over 65.
- Young people, only 27% of young people who were offline were in fulltime employment.

To help eliminate this gap, £15,000 in funding from the Sharing Prosperity Fund had been allocated for digital inclusion work in 2015/2016. The Council's

Digital Inclusion Fund had been set up to help people get the online skills, as outlined in the City Council's Anti-Poverty Strategy and Budget Setting Report. The fund had been administered by Community Grants and the successful organisations were as follows:

- Camsight awarded £2,000 for purchase of equipment and support for 15 visually impaired Cambridge residents to receive a package of support and training in basic digital skills as outlined by go-on.co.uk
- Cambridge Online awarded £5,920 to set up and run Digital Inclusion "Clubs" in various City locations for a minimum of fifty city residents.
- Cambridge Housing Society (CHS) awarded £3,868 to contribute to costs of two pilot projects; The first would develop specialist IT skills of CHS support staff working in four community support projects in the city to enable their clients to get online and practise their digital skills. The second is to work with volunteers from Lloyds bank to support digitally excluded older people living in CHS housing (30 beneficiaries).
- City Homes awarded £3,000 to deliver comprehensive structured twelve week training courses to twenty City Homes residents. The course included aspects around financial inclusion and obtaining a computer.

As the projects were due to finish in March 2016 the full impact and numbers of beneficiaries were yet to be collated. Nevertheless approximately one hundred and fifteen residents had benefited from the funding to date.

3) Councillor Holt to the Leader

Many residents particularly students in my ward and across the city are very concerned about the county councils proposals to switch off the street lights at night. Will the Leader confirm that this will not happen if the majority of people in the city don't want it to?

The Leader stated that he and Councillor Sinnott had been insistent for Cambridgeshire County Council to undertake a full public consultation on this issue.

The County Council had agreed to a full online public consultation, which would take place from 1 November for six weeks. However the public consultation would only be available as an online survey which did not take into account those people who did not have access to the internet. A wider more inclusive approach would be necessary. The Leader had planned to attend the City Council's Area Committee meetings to inform the public of the County Council's proposals. A meeting had taken place with County Council Officers and external agencies to express the City Council's concerns. Trying

to shift the burden of County Council costs was not the answer and the City Council would not make up the shortfall.

The view of the City Council was that residents would tolerate a certain level of dimming of the lights; that there were areas of the City Centre that should not be dimmed at all and that to switch off street lights between the hours of midnight to 6.00am was not an acceptable proposal.

4) Councillor Sarris (Lead Councillor for Homelessness) to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

In light of the 'Microchipping of Dogs (England) Regulations 2014' requiring all dogs over 8 weeks old to be microchipped by April 2016, can the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste please tell the chamber what specific outreach work will be done by the council's dog warden team to assist dog-owners in the homeless community?

The Executive Councillor confirmed that for every keeper of a dog not currently microchipped the owner had until April 6 2016, to microchip their dog and register with an approved microchip database. After this date puppies had to be microchipped and registered to an approved database by the time they were eight weeks old. Anyone who did not have their dog chipped after the law came into force would have twenty one days to comply, and failure to do so could result in a fine of up to £500.

In 2014, the Council had been given a number of microchips from the Dog's Trust and had been working since that time to provide these free of charge to dog owners within Cambridge. Over 100 dogs had been microchipped by the Dog Warden service at the summer dog roadshows across the City. Between October 2015 and April 2016 the service had been extended and Officers were running 'microchipping Wednesday's', a free service in the convenience of the owner's home. Charities and organisations who dealt with homelessness within Cambridge had extended the offer of having their own free microchipping event for visitors and residents.

Wood Green Animal Shelter had its own Outreach Team that worked with owners of animals within the community to assist with improving the standards of animal care. The dog wardens had worked in partnership with the charity for over six years, often taking and receiving referrals on cases.

Following on from the success of the summer roadshows in 2014 and 2015, the Dog Warden Service would continue to hold free dog microchipping events throughout the summer of 2016 both as pop up events and as part of the

community clean up days. The service would also continue its current work with outreach teams and Wood Green to provide microchipping free of charge to dog owners in Cambridge.

5) Councillor Perry (Lead Councillor for Recycling) to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste
It is important that we do all we can to encourage recycling and limit waste, can the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste please confirm that a campaign to remove unauthorised second black bins will continue for the year ahead?

The Executive Councillor responded that policy was one black bin per household. If a second black bin had been approved on application, the second bin would have a red lid to show that both bins should be emptied by the refuse crew. There had been a number of residents who had acquired a second bin over the years. These households had been written to advising that the second black bin would be removed and an application should be made for an additional bin. Although only midway through the campaign a total of 278 unauthorised black bins had been removed, 82 additional blue bins had been distributed and 97 second black had been authorised.

6) Councillor O'Connell to the Executive Councillor for Communities
Can the Executive Councillor for Communities tell the council what action he is taking to ensure community services are targeted at the most in need areas in the city, as identified in the recently-published indices of multiple deprivation?

The Executive Councillor explained he would advise on the results of the 2015 indices of multiple deprivation, recently published by DCLG, and what the Council was doing to target services for those who most need them.

Of the Seventy Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA) in Cambridge, the ten that were ranked the lowest in the index of multiple deprivation 2015, were within Abbey, Kings Hedges, Arbury and East Chesterton wards. There were pockets of the City where the level of deprivation was comparable to some of the most disadvantaged areas in the country. Two LSOAs in Abbey ward appeared in the top 20% most deprived parts in the country. Previously two LSOAs in Kings Hedges were in the 20% most deprived, but these LSOAs were now ranked slightly higher.

There would be a review into community provision in Cambridge, partly as a result of demographic and population change, which would be looked at

against need in areas of the City. In assessing known need, a variety of approaches would be used. This would include public data, such as that reported via the Indices of Multiple Deprivations, an audit of current community provision, feedback from providers and the public on potential gaps and community needs. It was important to try to anticipate future areas of need that may not have yet been fully evident.

The review did not seek to pre-empt this assessment. However, as the Council already owned and managed a number of centres, it would be sensible to consider their current focus and functionality in order to consider how they were meeting local needs but also that future arrangements aligned to need identified across the City.

The Executive Councillor concluded that the aim would be to ensure the Council's resources complemented other facilities and services to ensure that those residents were targeted who faced the most wherever they lived in the City.

7) Councillor Cantrill to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste.

Could the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste explain the current approach of the city council to street cleaning and litter bin emptying in the historic core?

The Executive Councillor explained that the regime for cleansing and clearing of litter and debris from was currently two teams of three operatives working on a four day on four day off shift pattern. The city centre team started at 6.00am from the pavilion at Christ Pieces. Each team member worked from their task 'tickets' which covered all of the City area. One of the teams were also tasked with opening & cleaning the market area before the traders arrive to set up their stalls.

The City Centre was divided into three areas with each staff member working along dedicated routes. Once the teams had finished they moved to other areas of the city centre. The three operatives were supported by mechanical sweepers working to routed task 'tickets'. A mid-size sweeper swept the footways and a large sweeper swept the carriageways.

Separate litter picking teams worked on outlying areas of the City Centre from 6.00am – 8.00am. After 8.00am the teams moved onto other activities such as ward blitzes and fly tipping.

The regime for emptying bins was currently two teams of two operatives who also worked on a four day on, four day off shift pattern. At 6.00am the teams start from Mill Road depot and work to a dedicated task route, finishing at 7.00pm. All litter/ recycling bins within the City Centre were emptied between 6.00am – 9.00am daily. The vehicle would then visit various locations throughout the city. Once this task had been completed the team re-visit the historic section of the City again and start to empty the bins. This task could be undertaken twice in the afternoon and evening, dependent on the weather conditions and how busy the area could be. The teams used their knowledge and experience to know the areas where the bins were most frequently used.

8) Councillor Bick to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Place

The Executive Councillor may not be aware that her current plan to replace the cast iron lighting columns in the Kite with modern 'heritage style' columns will omit Victoria Street.

The only reason that Victoria Street has no cast iron columns today is that in March last year Balfour Beatty prematurely replaced the 3 columns there with their standard design prior to consultations being completed, for which they subsequently apologised. In view of this, will she undertake discussions with Balfour Beatty to determine whether there is scope to review the placement of columns in Victoria Street within the existing approved budget allocation, £6,000 of which is currently projected to be unused, so that work can be carried out within the same timeframe as the other streets involved?

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places responded that £82,000 had been approved in the capital plan for street lighting, with annual allocations of £42,000 and £40,000 over two years.

Cambridgeshire County Council and Belfour Beatty had agreed a maximum contribution of £65,000 for the City Centre Historic Core which included funding for New Square but excluded any other Kite Area streets. The City had a further Executive Councillor commitment of £11,000 for the ten columns in Kite Area streets, which left up to £6,000 uncommitted. The term 'uncommitted' did not mean 'projected to be unused'. Like any other capital scheme there was a requirement to recover Officer fees and cover potential risks or unseen eventualities.

The Executive Councillor stated she had understood that Councillor Bick and County Councillor Cearns had been lobbying Balfour Beatty to upgrade Victoria Street at their own, or at a discounted cost, arguing that this street was

a special case given its proximity to the city centre, an effort which was welcomed. Tearing out heritage columns across the city had been absolute vandalism and there are several streets in the Executive Councillor's own ward where if the City Council could afford it, would like to see those columns replaced, but it had not been possible.

The City Council could not afford to run its own services and pay for all of Cambridgeshire County Council's mistakes as well. By committing to fund Victoria Street when the Council had yet to see the final costs for the projects that had already been agreed, there was potential for a challenge as to why it was being treated as a special case from other streets, which had similar cast iron columns removed and replaced with standard PFI contract units (for example approximately sixteen units in Blinco Grove).

The following oral questions were also tabled, but owing to the expiry time of the period of time permitted, were not covered during the meeting.

9) Councillor Ratcliffe to Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

Please provide an update on the amount of fixed penalty notices issued for littering in the last year?

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

In light of the planned consultation of the review of the river moorings policy, can your assurance be given to boat owners who have been living on the river in the city for many years that they can continue to live as part of their riverboat community?

11) Councillor Smith to the Executive Councillor of Finance and Resources

Can the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources update us on preparations for Living Wage Week, and on how promotion of the Living Wage is proceeding?

12) Councillor Pitt to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

Can the Executive Councillor give an update on arrangements and expected impact on staff affected by the move of waste services to Waterbeach?

13) Councillor C Smart to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport

Seeing that Stage 2 of the 20 mph roll-out was agreed on 8th July 2014 and the combined Stages 3 and 4 were agreed 17th March 2015, can the Executive Councillor tell us when anything will actually happen?

14) Councillor Todd-Jones to the Executive Councillor for Communities
Can the Executive Councillor for Communities confirm that, contrary to opposition claims, the primary focus of the review into the Council's Community provision is in ensuring its resources are appropriately targeted and go to where it is most needed in the City?

15) Councillor Hart to the Executive Councillor of Finance and Resources
Please could the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources give us an update on the outreach Citizens Advice Bureau project at the East Barnwell Health Centre, funded by the City Council?

16) Councillor Sinnott to the Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation (The Leader)

What is the current County Council position on the proposed switch-off of Cambridge streetlights and how and when will they undertake the public consultation they promised a month ago?

17) Councillor Baigent to the Executive Councillor for Housing

Can the Executive Councillor for Housing explain how the Housing Bill, published on Tuesday 13th October will impact this Council's Housing Revenue Account and it's ability to continue meeting the needs of current tenants and those on the housing needs register in Cambridge?

18) Councillor M Smart to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

Please will the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste explain to councillors recent changes to our waste HGV's and driver training aimed at helping city cyclists?

19) Councillor Pippas to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste.

According to local residents the Council has been taking away any second dustbin with a black top from people's homes without any prior warning. Some residents claim they have "bought" the second bin from the council some years ago. They are distraught that no prior warning was given of the council's intention.

What measures the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste will put in place to ensure that the residents are fully informed prior to confiscating these bins?

20) Councillor Gillespie to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

I recommend the Wealth and Want report by the Cambridge Commons, to the council. (I will send a link by email to it http://www.thecambridgecommons.org/tcc/reports/fairness_review/2015/tcc_fairness_review_201506.pdf before the meeting). You may have read about it in the Cambridge News at the weekend. As well as a survey providing extensive information about gross inequality in the city, it provides a list of urgent recommendations. The Labour group says that tackling inequality is its top priority. The council is doing tremendous work on the living wage; this report recommends a Cambridge Supplement. The need for a review of investment priorities in benefits advice and advocacy is important. Will the Executive Councillor for Finance commit to publish a step by step response to the recommendations, to be published within 2015?

21) Councillor Hipkin to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

Students living in Halls of Residences (e.g. Chestnut House, Histon/Huntingdon Rd, CB4) are exempt from the payment of Council Tax. Does the City Council receive any recompense for this loss of revenue and if not, who is bearing the cost of waste disposal and other council-provided services?

Second Questions

23) Councillor Todd-Jones to the Executive Councillor for Communities
Can the Executive Councillor for Communities update Council on the Plans for next year's Volunteer for Cambridge Community Fair at the Guildhall, building on from the success of the inaugural event in February?

22) Councillor Perry to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Can the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources provide an update on the future of Action on Energy Cambridgeshire in light of Climate Energy Ltd going into administration?

24) Councillor Baigent to the Executive Councillor for Housing
Does the Executive Councillor for Housing consider that ‘starter homes’ as described in the housing bill should be included in the definition of affordable housing on S106 sites?

15/110/CNL To consider the following Notices of Motion, notice of which has been given by:

15/110/CNLa Councillor Gehring

As the mover of the motion Councillor Gehring proposed to withdraw the motion from the agenda requested the consent of the Council without discussion in line with 27.1 of the Council's Constitution.

Resolved unanimously to withdraw the motion.

15/107/CNLb Councillor Hipkin and Councillor Holland

Councillor Hipkin proposed and Councillor Holland seconded the following motion:

Mindful of the need to engage the public as fully as possible in the democratic life of the city and at the same time acknowledging the severe financial pressures we are under, this Council calls for a comprehensive review, undertaken by the Civic Affairs Committee or a sub-group of that committee, of the ways in which the council can most effectively combine its responsibilities to promote local democracy while at the same time ensuring the prudent use of resources.

Councillor Pitt proposed and Councillor Cantrill seconded the following motion (additional text underlined):

Mindful of the need to engage the public as fully as possible in the democratic life of the city and at the same time acknowledging the severe financial pressures we are under, this Council calls for a comprehensive review, undertaken by the Civic Affairs Committee or a sub-group of that committee, of the ways in which the council can most effectively combine its responsibilities to promote local democracy while at the same time ensuring the prudent use of resources.

This council has a strong record of encouraging public involvement in decision making which should be reflected in the review, including consultation processes, devolving power to area committees and extensive public speaking rights.

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 12 votes to 28.

Resolved (28 votes to 0) that:

Mindful of the need to engage the public as fully as possible in the democratic life of the city and at the same time acknowledging the severe financial pressures we are under, this Council calls for a comprehensive review, undertaken by the Civic Affairs Committee or a sub-group of that committee, of the ways in which the council can most effectively combine its responsibilities to promote local democracy while at the same time ensuring the prudent use of resources.

15/107/CNLC Councillor Gillespie

Councillor Gillespie proposed and Councillor Pitt seconded the following motion:

This Council wishes to assist the most vulnerable people hoping to come to Cambridge to seek refuge and sanctuary from war and persecution.

The UN refugee agency has asked EU Member States to immediately take 200,000 additional refugees to lessen the humanitarian crisis. In response, the EU has adopted a quota system which the UK Government has refused to participate in. Rather than the 25,000 that would represent its 'fair share' of migrants (spreading this across the country would mean about 50 refugees being accommodated in a city the size of Cambridge), the Prime Minister has instead announced that his Government would make provision for only 4,000 each year.

We recognise the strong support local communities, voluntary bodies; faith groups and others in Cambridge already give to those seeking refuge and sanctuary. The strength of public feeling was well expressed in the two 'Cambridge Welcomes Refugees' marches on the 5th of September and the 10th of October. Over 500 people in Cambridge have signed a petition saying "We are willing to house Syrian refugees; please rescue more of those fleeing the conflict.

This council pledges to become a City of Sanctuary, and accordingly to call on the Leader and Executive to:

- Work with the City of Sanctuary network, the Regional Strategic Migration Partnership, and also local groups like Refugees Cambridge to develop a plan that would allow refugees to be housed within the City in volunteer's homes, through schemes similar to that used in Oxford ('Host Oxford').

- Consider what support can be given to donation efforts, providing supplies to refugees in Calais.
- Ask Cambridge Live if it would hold a benefit concert, raising more money for supplies, and promoting the benefits that multiculturalism brings to our society.
- Review its own budgets, services and policies to check that these are adequately supporting refugees and present no impediment to the accommodation in private homes of refugees.
- Apply for Government funding under the Syrian Vulnerable Person Relocation (SVPR), the Gateway Protection Programme (GPP) and European Refugee Fund (ERF) schemes to help support its efforts to provide housing for refugees.
- Write to the City's Universities encouraging them to consider extending their funded studentships to include more places specifically for refugees.

Councillor Herbert proposed and Councillor Price seconded the following amendment to the motion:

This Council wishes to assist the most vulnerable people hoping to come to Cambridge to seek refuge and sanctuary from war and persecution.

The UN refugee agency has asked EU Member States to immediately take 200,000 additional refugees to lessen the humanitarian crisis. In response, the EU has adopted a quota system which the UK Government has refused to participate in. Rather than the 25,000 that would represent its 'fair share' of migrants (spreading this across the country would mean about 50 refugees being accommodated in a city the size of Cambridge), the Prime Minister has instead announced that his Government would make provision for only 4,000 each year.

We recognise the strong support local communities, voluntary bodies, faith groups and others in Cambridge already give to those seeking refuge and sanctuary. The strength of public feeling was well expressed in the two 'Cambridge Welcomes Refugees' marches on the 5th of September and the 10th of October. Over 500 people in Cambridge have signed a petition saying "We are willing to house Syrian refugees; please rescue more of those fleeing the conflict.

The Council supports the initiative it has taken in responding to the Government invitation in September to assist refugees including;

The Council's written commitment to provide housing in Cambridge for at least 50 Syrian refugees, despite the detail of the Government plan changing week by week discussions now underway with the Home Office on the early resettlement of several refugee families in Cambridge in our council housing, supported by the county council and voluntary agencies.

This council pledges to become a City of Sanctuary, and accordingly to call on the Leader and Executive to:

~~Work with the City of Sanctuary network, the Regional Strategic Migration Partnership, and also local groups like Refugees Cambridge to develop a plan that would allow refugees to be housed within the City in volunteer's homes, through schemes similar to that used in Oxford('Host Oxford').~~ provide assistance to Syrian refugees arriving in Cambridge, in Cambridge, and other refugees in the future

~~Consider what support~~ Endorse the response by the Mayor who has committed to assist a planned benefit event, including a concert, by the Cambridge Calais group so assistance can be given to donation efforts, providing supplies to refugees in Calais.

~~Ask Cambridge Live if it would hold a benefit concert, raising more money for supplies, and promoting the benefits that multiculturalism brings to our society.~~

Review its own budgets, services and policies to check that these are adequately supporting Syrian refugees under the Government programme and present no impediment to the accommodation in private council homes of refugees.

Apply for Government funding under the Syrian Vulnerable Person Relocation (SVPR), the Gateway Protection Programme (GPP) and European Refugee Fund (ERF) schemes to help support its efforts to provide housing for refugees.

Expand on the existing initiative by Councillor Peter Sarris, Lead Councillor for Homelessness, with the City's Universities encouraging them to consider extending their funded studentships and other support to include more places specifically for refugees.

On a show of hands, the amendment was carried unanimously.

Resolved unanimously that:

This Council wishes to assist the most vulnerable people hoping to come to Cambridge to seek refuge and sanctuary from war and persecution.

The UN refugee agency has asked EU Member States to immediately take 200,000 additional refugees to lessen the humanitarian crisis. In response, the EU has adopted a quota system which the UK Government has refused to participate in. Rather than the 25,000 that would represent its 'fair share' of migrants (spreading this across the country would mean about 50 refugees being accommodated in a city the size of Cambridge), the Prime Minister has instead announced that his Government would make provision for only 4,000 each year.

We recognise the strong support local communities, voluntary bodies, faith groups and others in Cambridge already give to those seeking refuge and sanctuary. The strength of public feeling was well expressed in the two 'Cambridge Welcomes Refugees' marches on the 5th of September and the 10th of October. Over 500 people in Cambridge have signed a petition saying "We are willing to house Syrian refugees; please rescue more of those fleeing the conflict.

The Council supports the initiative it has taken in responding to the Government invitation in September to assist refugees including;

The Council's written commitment to provide housing in Cambridge for at least 50 Syrian refugees, despite the detail of the Government plan changing week by week discussions now underway with the Home Office on the early resettlement of several refugee families in Cambridge in our council housing, supported by the county council and voluntary agencies.

This council pledges to become a City of Sanctuary, and accordingly to call on the Leader and Executive to:

Work with the City of Sanctuary network, the Regional Strategic Migration Partnership, and also local groups like Refugees Cambridge to provide assistance to Syrian refugees arriving in Cambridge, in Cambridge, and other refugees in the future

Endorse the response by the Mayor who has committed to assist a planned benefit event, including a concert, by the Cambridge Calais group so assistance can be given to donation efforts, providing supplies to refugees in Calais.

Review its own budgets, services and policies to check that these are adequately supporting Syrian refugees under the Government programme and present no impediment to the accommodation in council homes of refugees.

Apply for Government funding under the Syrian Vulnerable Person Relocation (SVPR), the Gateway Protection Programme (GPP) and European Refugee Fund (ERF) schemes to help support its efforts to provide housing for refugees.

Expand on the existing initiative by Councillor Peter Sarris, Lead Councillor for Homelessness, with the City's Universities encouraging them to consider extending their funded studentships and other support to include more places specifically for refugees.

15/107/CNLd Councillor Owers and Councillor M Smart

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

Cambridge City Council notes:

- The risk to both the planet and Cambridge from Climate Change, and this council's commitment to tackle the issue, as expressed both by its Climate Change Strategy, which is currently being reviewed, and its role as a signatory to the Nottingham Declaration.
- The need to show leadership in advocating a fossil-fuel free future, both in terms of the council's own policies, including its investments, and external engagement.
- That the Law Commission reviewed the meaning of fiduciary duty as it applies to investments in 2014, concluding that "Where trustees think ethical or environmental, social or governance (ESG) issues are financially material they should take them into account."
- That there is nonetheless a risk for this Council in any non-financial considerations in investment policy, and therefore before any such change, the implications should be studied and considered carefully.
- That the University of Cambridge have this year launched a wide ranging report into its £2.2bn endowments fund.

Cambridge City Council therefore resolves:

- To ask the Head of Finance to author a report to Strategy and Resources committee outlining the options for, as well as the risks associated with, the implementation of an ethical investment policy, in relation to both

direct investments and our Treasury Management strategy, with a particular emphasis on the issues of companies that are associated with investments in fossil fuels, and fossil fuel disinvestment.

- To engage with local businesses and community groups, including Fossil Free Cambridgeshire, Cambridge Carbon Footprint and Transition Cambridge, during the forthcoming Climate Change Strategy consultation in order to explore the potential for supporting the move to a fossil fuel free future.
- To call on Cambridgeshire County Council to consider an ethical investment policy and disinvestment from fossil fuels.
- To call on the Cambridgeshire Pension Fund to consider an ethical investment policy and disinvestment from fossil fuels.
- To call on the national U.K. government to stop carrying out policies that harm the fight against climate change (such as recent changes to Feed-In Tariffs and other subsidies for green energy, changes to planning policy, and cuts to Green Deal Finance), support the principles of fossil fuel divestment and stopping subsidies to the fossil fuel industry, and advocate for all other countries to commit to this during the COP21 global climate change negotiations later this year.
- To direct the Chief Executive to write to the University group asking them to share the conclusions of their review as and when they are available, so that the Head of Finance and the Pension Fund can consider this work in their reviews.

Councillor Gehring proposed and Councillor Reid seconded the following amendment to the motion (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined).

Cambridge City Council notes:

- The risk to both the planet and Cambridge from Climate Change, and this council's commitment to tackle the issue, as expressed both by its Climate Change Strategy, which is currently being reviewed, and its role as a signatory to the Nottingham Declaration.
- The need to show leadership in advocating a fossil-fuel free future, both in terms of the council's own policies, including its investments, and external engagement.
- The growing number of commercial, educational and governmental organisations deciding to support low carbon investment, such as:
 - Bristol Council's decision to alter its investment policy to exclude companies whose core activities cover fossil fuel extraction.

- The Norwegian Government's decision to divest from fossil fuel investment in its pension fund.
- The over 150 companies, including Hewlet-Packard, BT Group & Volvo who have signed up to the "We mean business" coalition's aims.
- That the Law Commission reviewed the meaning of fiduciary duty as it applies to investments in 2014, concluding that "Where trustees think ethical or environmental, social or governance (ESG) issues are financially material they should take them into account."
- That there is nonetheless a risk for this Council in any non-financial considerations in investment policy, and therefore before any such change, the implications should be studied and considered carefully.
- That the University of Cambridge have this year launched a wide ranging report into its £2.2bn endowments fund.

Cambridge City Council therefore resolves:

- To ask the Head of Finance to author a report to Strategy and Resources committee outlining the options for, as well as the risks associated with, the implementation of an ethical investment policy, in relation to both direct investments and our Treasury Management strategy, with a particular emphasis on the issues of companies that are associated with investments in fossil fuels, and fossil fuel divestment.
- To ask the Executive Councillor:
 - a) To ensure that commercial property investments are taken with close regard to Climate Change criteria, in such a way as to preclude investment in carbon intensive buildings and favour investment in properties that are carbon neutral or positive or at least have a high EPC rating (A-C).
 - b) To study the energy and carbon status of existing City Council commercial properties and consider investment in energy efficiency upgrades or, if that is not practical, divestment from under-performing properties.
 - c) To study, jointly with the County Council or independently, positive investment into a local not-for-profit renewable energy provider, similar to Robin Hood Energy in Nottingham, to address fuel poverty and climate change as a joint social justice concern.
- To engage with local businesses and community groups, including Fossil Free Cambridgeshire, Cambridge Carbon Footprint and Transition Cambridge, during the forthcoming Climate Change Strategy

consultation in order to explore the potential for supporting the move to a fossil fuel free future.

- To call on Cambridgeshire County Council to consider an ethical investment policy and divestment from fossil fuels.
- To call on the Cambridgeshire Pension Fund to consider an ethical investment policy and divestment from fossil fuels.
- To call on the national U.K. government to stop carrying out policies that harm the fight against climate change (such as recent changes to Feed-In Tariffs and other subsidies for green energy, changes to planning policy, and cuts to Green Deal Finance), support the principles of fossil fuel divestment and stopping subsidies to the fossil fuel industry, and advocate for all other countries to commit to this during the COP21 global climate change negotiations later this year.
- To direct the Chief Executive to write to the University group asking them to share the conclusions of their review as and when they are available, so that the Head of Finance and the Pension Fund can consider this work in their reviews.
- To urge the Leader and Executive Cllr for Finance and Resources to prepare the City Council's own statement of support for climate action and publish this at the time of COP21.

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

Resolved unanimously that:

Cambridge City Council notes:

- The risk to both the planet and Cambridge from Climate Change, and this council's commitment to tackle the issue, as expressed both by its Climate Change Strategy, which is currently being reviewed, and its role as a signatory to the Nottingham Declaration.
- The need to show leadership in advocating a fossil-fuel free future, both in terms of the council's own policies, including its investments, and external engagement.
- The growing number of commercial, educational and governmental organisations deciding to support low carbon investment, such as:
 - Bristol Council's decision to alter its investment policy to exclude companies whose core activities cover fossil fuel extraction.
 - The Norwegian Government's decision to divest from fossil fuel investment in its pension fund.

- The over 150 companies, including Hewlet-Packard, BT Group & Volvo who have signed up to the “We mean business” coalition’s aims.
- That the Law Commission reviewed the meaning of fiduciary duty as it applies to investments in 2014, concluding that “Where trustees think ethical or environmental, social or governance (ESG) issues are financially material they should take them into account.”
- That there is nonetheless a risk for this Council in any non-financial considerations in investment policy, and therefore before any such change, the implications should be studied and considered carefully.
- That the University of Cambridge have this year launched a wide ranging report into its £2.2bn endowments fund.

Cambridge City Council therefore resolves:

- To ask the Head of Finance to author a report to Strategy and Resources committee outlining the options for, as well as the risks associated with, the implementation of an ethical investment policy, in relation to both direct investments and our Treasury Management strategy, with a particular emphasis on the issues of companies that are associated with investments in fossil fuels, and fossil fuel disinvestment.
- To ask the Executive Councillor:
 - d) To ensure that commercial property investments are taken with close regard to Climate Change criteria, in such a way as to preclude investment in carbon intensive buildings and favour investment in properties that are carbon neutral or positive or at least have a high EPC rating (A-C).
 - e) To study the energy and carbon status of existing City Council commercial properties and consider investment in energy efficiency upgrades or, if that is not practical, divestment from under-performing properties.
 - f) To study, jointly with the County Council or independently, positive investment into a local not-for-profit renewable energy provider, similar to Robin Hood Energy in Nottingham, to address fuel poverty and climate change as a joint social justice concern.
- To engage with local businesses and community groups, including Fossil Free Cambridgeshire, Cambridge Carbon Footprint and Transition Cambridge, during the forthcoming Climate Change Strategy consultation in order to explore the potential for supporting the move to a fossil fuel free future.
- To call on Cambridgeshire County Council to consider an ethical investment policy and disinvestment from fossil fuels.

- To call on the Cambridgeshire Pension Fund to consider an ethical investment policy and disinvestment from fossil fuels.
- To call on the national U.K. government to stop carrying out policies that harm the fight against climate change (such as recent changes to Feed-In Tariffs and other subsidies for green energy, changes to planning policy, and cuts to Green Deal Finance), support the principles of fossil fuel divestment and stopping subsidies to the fossil fuel industry, and advocate for all other countries to commit to this during the COP21 global climate change negotiations later this year.
- To direct the Chief Executive to write to the University group asking them to share the conclusions of their review as and when they are available, so that the Head of Finance and the Pension Fund can consider this work in their reviews.
- To urge the Leader and Executive Cllr for Finance and Resources to prepare the City Council's own statement of support for climate action and publish this at the time of COP21.

15/107/CNLe Councillor Price and Councillor Johnson

Councillor Price proposed and Councillor Johnson seconded the following amendment:

This Council:

Notes with concern the Trade Union Bill which is currently being proposed by the Government and which would affect this Council's relationship with our trade unions and our workforce as a whole.

Rejects this Bill's attack on local democracy and the attack on our right to manage our own affairs.

Is clear that facility time, negotiated and agreed by us and our trade unions to suit our own specific needs, has a valuable role to play in the creation of good quality, responsive local services. Facility time should not be determined or controlled by Government in London.

Is pleased with the arrangements we currently have in place for deducting trade union membership subscriptions through our payroll. We see this as an important part of our positive industrial relations and a cheap and easy to administer system that supports our staff. This system is an administrative matter for the Council and should not be interfered with by the UK Government.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- Support the campaign against the unnecessary, anti-democratic and bureaucratic Trade Union Bill.
- To continue its own locally agreed industrial relations strategy and will take every measure possible to maintain its autonomy with regard to facility time and the continuing use of check-off.

Resolved (unanimously):

To agree the motion as set out above.

15/107/CNlf Councillor Moore

Councillor Moore proposed and Councillor Pippas seconded the following motion:

Open Access Policy

Cambridge as a City which actively seeks to reduce discrimination against those with disability in the Built Environment.

Council notes that those with disabilities are impeded by a variety of obstacles as they move through the built environment in Cambridge, and that many of these are outside the direct control of the City Council (e.g. on public highway, in shops, on public and private land including NHS premises, and the behaviour individuals and business).

Council notes that discrimination worsens inequality by damaging the health, well-being, life chances, life expectancy, productivity and wealth of those affected. This is recognised by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and United Nations. Reducing such inequality plays an important part in the WHO Healthy Cities program and city sustainability.

Council notes that the difficulties in reducing or removing these obstacles are legion and has made a good start at tackling the issue with the Cambridge City Centre Accessibility Review Action Plan.

Council notes that only a small proportion of all those with a disability are easily recognised, and that most of our citizens over 60 will have impairments.

Council notes the breadth of issues which include:

- Obstacles on road and pavement that impede progress, confuse guide dogs, create trip and other hazards, have insufficient contrast to be recognised by some visually disabled
- Route obstacles such as traffic lights with timings too fast for a slower person to cross, lights without a tactile feedback button for deaf-blind, poor and confusing road crossings
- Support issues such as public seats without a variety of heights, available public toilets, disabled drop off and collection points
- Behaviours that create problems including narrowing a cycle path so that those cyclists with balance problems are prevented from using that route, wheelie bins on the pavement, pavement conflicts between disabled pedestrians and cyclists, construction activity which diverts disabled people onto the road or provides barriers with poor visibility causing a trip hazard them.

Council notes that there are solutions (even if partial) for all the City's Open Access issues and that a clear statement of principle, of our intention and direction, will help empower all the City's residents, organisations and businesses to become more aware and active in support of our Open Access Policy.

The Council endorses the principle of Open Access in our Built Environment: our Built Environment should not discriminate against citizens and visitors with disability of any form,

- will actively seek to reduce such discrimination in all publicly accessible areas of the City,
- recognises that, in order to reduce this discrimination, it needs to work with many organisations and agencies, public and private, and with its citizens to develop policies and practices which reduce the existing obstacles for disabled walkers and cyclists, and for those using other forms of transport,
- recognises that a means to prioritise, measure and publicly report progress, policies and the process by which they were agreed, and steer this effort is developed,
- recognises the important part that our residents, students, businesses and visitors can play and welcomes their involvement.

Resolved (unanimously):

To agree the motion as set out above.

15/111/CNL Written Questions

Members were asked to note the written questions and answers that had been placed in the information pack circulated around the Chamber.

The meeting ended at 11.20 pm

MAYOR

This page is intentionally left blank