

COUNCIL

25 February 2016

6.00 - 11.25 pm

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

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/1/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October & 30 November 2015

The minutes of the 22 October and 30 November 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

16/2/CNL Mayor's Announcements

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor McPherson and Saunders
Councillor Holland had given apologies for lateness

CHEVYN SERMON

The Mayor thanked those members of the Council who attended the annual Chevyn Sermon at Our Lady and the English Martyrs at the end of January.

CAMBRIDGE-HEIDELBERG EASTER FESTIVAL

The Mayor informed Councillors that this year's civic reception for the Cambridge-Heidelberg Easter Festival had been cancelled due to a conflict with dates between colleagues in Heidelberg. The next reception to be held in Cambridge would take place in 2018, as this was a biennial event.

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING

Councillors were reminded that a special council meeting would take place on Wednesday 23 March to consider the Local Plan.

SUE EDWARDS AWARDED AN HONORARY DEGREE

The Mayor announced that Sue Edwards, former Civic & Twinning Officer, would be awarded an Honorary Degree from the University of Cambridge on 23 April 2016, in recognition of her time and dedication serving the City.

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Avery	16/4/CNLb	Personal: Rents a City Council Garage

16/3/CNL Public Questions Time

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Mr Alistair Boyles raised the following points:
 - i. The 2003 Design and Development Brief for Cambridge stated that the single greatest obstacle to community cohesion and development of the Mitcham's Corner area was the overwhelming effect of traffic and the gyratory traffic system.
 - ii. In the New Local Plan, Policy 21, the City recognises Mitcham's Corner as an Opportunity Area and sets out the objective to reduce the effect of traffic in the area and ultimately to remove the gyratory system in favour of a simpler intersection. This policy has overwhelming support from the residents and traders in the Mitcham's Corner catchment area and City and County Councillors.
 - iii. Asked what measures were the City Council and the City Deal Authority taking to ensure that City Deal proposals for Milton Road would further this objective to reduce the effects of traffic and the gyratory road system that have blighted this part of Cambridge for decades.

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport responded:

- i. The Local Plan Design and Development Brief Process covered Mitcham's Corner and its gyratory system with a view to shape future development.
- ii. A constructive consultation exercise had been held relatively recently.
- iii. Currently the City Council and County Council were working on the Mitcham's Corner Area Master Plan.
- iv. As part of developing a Master Plan for Mitcham's Corner, the City Council did have a policy that sought to "remove or revise" the existing gyratory for Mitcham's Corner.

This was draft Policy 21 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Draft Submission, known as the "Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area", which required the preparation of a Master Plan to guide future change for Mitcham's Corner.

- v. There was a City Deal project affecting the north of Milton Road, this was not dependent on changes made to Mitcham's Corner.
 - vi. If changes to the gyratory at Mitcham's Corner could help deliver better public transport and improve the reliability and speed of journeys by public transport to meet some of the objectives of City Deal, then the City Council hoped that the changes to Mitcham's Corner could be delivered as part of City Deal.
 - vi. Until the City Deal and City Council plans progressed, it could not be confirmed if the City Deal could fund the removal of the Mitcham's Corner gyratory system. This would be expensive to implement, so other sources of funding may be required to assist this.
2. Mr Simon Baugh raised the following points:
- i. The City Council should encourage the City Deal to remove the Mitcham's Corner gyratory system.
 - ii. If the City Deal cannot undertake this work, what other sources of funding could be sought to undertake this work?

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport responded:

- i. Residents of in and around Mitcham's Corner were consulted to set the design brief to develop the area in-line with their wishes.
- ii. Some funding for development work would come from the area through planning obligation requirements. Other sources of funding would also be required such as the City Deal and national funding.
- iii. The developing Mitcham's Corner Master Plan would set out proposals. Infrastructure was integral to developing the area.

The Leader responded:

- i. The whole of Milton Road and Mitcham's Corner public realm was being reviewed.
- ii. Undertook to meet with Mitcham's Corner Residents Association in future.

Mr Baugh raised the following supplementary point:

- i. Developers of 1 Milton Road were keen for their s106 funding to be used specifically in the Mitcham's Corner area, not syphoned into a general fund. Would it be possible for this funding to be ring fenced for Mitcham's Corner?

The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport responded that developments were obliged to pay funding into funds that the City Council deemed appropriate such as transport. Funding would be allocated to the local area or transport corridor where appropriate.

3. Mrs Penny Heath raised the following points:

- i. People understood the economic benefits of tourism but there was a call for addressing the adverse effects of mass tourism and would question if the City was getting the balance right.
- ii. In the Corporate Plan there was a statement: "working with the organisations Cambridge Live, Cambridge Bid and 'Visit Cambridge and Beyond' to develop and deliver a programme of outdoor public events and activities and to maximise economic benefits from visits and tourism". Should this sentence make it clearer that any programme of events should benefit the residents, as well as tourism?
- iii. Queried if there needed to be another line in the Corporate Plan to indicate how the City Council would protect the City from the exploitation of tourism?
- iv. The word 'maximise' was a strong term and there needed to be some counterbalance. This line could be interpreted that this was carte blanche for the City Council or these unaccountable companies to set up kiosks selling hot dogs for visitors in every street corner and run yet uglier tourist buses around our historic streets.
- v. It is hard to see what the governance structure is for these unaccountable companies from the website. Enquired which department they were within Council and if accountable to the elected Council.
- vi. Would like to suggest the following amendment to the Corporate Plan:
"Work with Cambridge Live, Cambridge BID and Visit Cambridge & Beyond to develop and deliver a programme of outdoor public events and activities, that were primarily of benefit to residents and create no adverse effects to the City's valuable green, natural and historic assets and to gain from the economic benefits from visits and tourisms"

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

- i. Cambridge Live was an arm's length management organisation for the City Council to manage tourism.
- ii. Visit Cambridge & Beyond had been newly launched in January 2016.
- iii. The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places portfolio included tourism, the city centre, public parks and open spaces. This helped to support joined up and balanced strategic planning, policy development and service delivery across these inter-related public service areas.
- iv. As portfolio holder for these areas, the Executive Councillor also represented the Council on the Boards of Cambridge BID and recently launched DMO - Visit Cambridge and Beyond, so there was an opportunity to influence these organisations.
- v. The City Council recognised there were benefits and burdens from tourism which could be shared amongst the City Council, Visit Cambridge & Beyond and Cambridge Live.
- vi. The Corporate Plan set out strategic level details, so it would be difficult to incorporate Ms Heath's points as they may be more appropriate in an operational plan.
- vii. Would take the comments back on the website to the relevant individuals.
- viii. Undertook to liaise with Ms Heath outside of the meeting to try and address her points.

Mrs Heath made the following supplementary points:

- i. It was important to measure the positive and negative impacts of tourism.
- ii. Members of the public should be invited on to the board of Visit Cambridge & Beyond.

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places thanked Mrs Heath for her comment.

4. Mr Sergeant raised the following point:

- i. Asked if there was any substance to the article in the West Chesterton Liberal Democrat magazine reporting that rubbish was piling up in the area.

The Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste responded with the following:

- i. He had seen the article concerned but there were two different (West Chesterton) issues which appeared to have been confused:
 - Some rubbish bins were not emptied prior to a change in the collection schedule.
 - Some recycling bins had overflowed.
- ii. 99.9% of bins were emptied according to key performance indicators under Labour administration.
- iii. There had only been four complaints about bins not being emptied last year and eight the year before
- iv. People were being encouraged to report litter in areas so that Officers could quickly remove it.
- v. The Executive Councillor had forwarded the article in the West Chesterton Liberal Democrat magazine to Officers for comment. Officers confirmed there had been no complaints received regarding litter in children's' play areas either in West Chesterton or the City in general.
- vi. Officers regularly checked play areas on average once a day for litter and safety issues, these checks was logged. Area Committee Environmental (data) Reports also monitored litter.
- viii. Labour had implemented a number of measures to improve the public realm such as:
 - Devolved decisions to area committees such as the placement of litter bins to reduce the amount of litter on ground.
 - Fixed penalty notices for littering and dog fouling.

Mr Sergeant made the following supplementary point:

- i. Would the Executive Councillor would seek a formal retraction of the details referenced from the West Chesterton Liberal Democrat magazine.

The Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste responded with the following:

- i. The same picture and residents quotes regarding litter were used in various wards and attributed to problems in each.
- ii. Took issue with accuracy of the Liberal Democrat campaign material.

16/4/CNL To consider the recommendations of the Executive for Adoption

16/4/CNLa Annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement Report 2016/17 to 2018/19 (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)

Resolved unanimously to approve:

- i. The Annual Borrowing Statement at paragraph 4, the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy at paragraph 5 and the Council's Annual Investment Strategy as contained within paragraphs 8 & 9.
- ii. An amendment to the counterparty list to include Enhanced Cash Funds. A limit of £5m is recommended and has been updated within Appendix A as follows:

Name	Recommended Limit (£)
Enhanced Cash Funds (Standard & Poor's: AAA/S1, Fitch: AAA/V1)	5m (in each fund)

- iii. Changes to the estimated Prudential & Treasury Indicators for 2015/16 to 2018/19 inclusive as set out in Appendix C.
- iv. That the following counterparty limits are required to come into effect on 1 April 2016 until further notice:-
 - Reduce HSBC's counterparty limit by £5m to £20m; and
 - Increase Barclays Bank plc counterparty limit by £5m to £25m.

16/4/CNLb 2016/17 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Setting Report (Executive Councillor for Housing)

Resolved (27 Votes to 0) to approve:

Treasury Management

- i. Request that, in 2016/17, officers review the existing approach to treasury management, which required 25% of the value of the housing debt to be set-aside by the point at which the loan portfolio matures, recognising the financial constraints that have been placed upon the HRA as a result of recent change in national housing policy. A separate report will be brought back to Housing Scrutiny Committee in 2016/17 following this review.

Housing Capital

- ii. Approval of capital bids, shown in Appendix D (2) of the HRA Budget Setting Report, to include meeting the capital cost of re-locating staff to a single area housing office, with the cost to be funded from existing repairs and renewals funds for the service.
- iii. Approval of amendment to the Decent Homes Programme investment, recognising the ability to make savings of £810,000 in 2015/16 in respect of boiler replacements, roof structure works, communal areas investment, garage refurbishment, asbestos removal and fire safety works, as detailed in Section 5 and Appendix E (2) of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- iv. Approval of the need to re-profile resource of £570,000 from 2015/16 into 2016/17 in respect of roof covering works and bathroom replacements, and £102,000 from 2015/16 into later years of the programme in respect of remedial works due to sulphate, as detailed in Section 5 and Appendix E (2) of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- v. Approval of the latest budget, spend profile and funding mix for each of the schemes in the new build programme, as detailed in Section 5 and Appendix H of the HRA Budget Setting Report, recognising the most up to date information available as each scheme progresses through the design, planning, build contract and completion process.
- vi. Recognition of the need to incorporate into the Housing Capital Investment Plan, grants awarded by the Homes and Communities Agency in respect of Aylesborough Close, Water Lane, Ditchburn Place and Clay Farm.
- vii. Approval to earmark the required level of additional funding for new build investment between 2016/17 and 2017/18 to ensure that commitments can be met in respect of the investment of all right to buy receipts retained by the authority, up to the end of September 2015.
- viii. Approval to earmark additional resource of £3,110,000 towards the cost of the re-development of Anstey Way, in anticipation of a revised scheme being brought forward for the site, recognising the lower level of HRA resource available than anticipated when the scheme was first considered.
- ix. Approval of allocation of funds for a scheme to re-develop a mixed use HRA site in Akeman Street, subject to the approval of a separate report for the scheme, to be considered in Part 2 of this committee agenda.
- x. Approval of the revised Housing Capital Investment Plan as shown in Appendix K of the HRA Budget Setting Report.
- xi. Approve a provisional addition to the Housing Capital Allowance of £34,303,000 in respect of anticipated qualifying expenditure in 2016/17.

General

- xii. Approval of delegation to the Head of Finance, as Section 151 Officer, to make the necessary detailed budgetary adjustments in the HRA, in respect of savings approved as part of the HRA Mid-Year Financial Review, following the outcome of consultation with both tenants and staff about proposed service changes and resulting final savings.

16/5/CNL To Consider Budget Recommendations of the Executive for Adoption

16/5/CNLa Proposed Revenue and Capital Budgets - 2015/16 (Revised), 2016/17 (Budget & Council Tax) and 2017/18 (Forecast)

The Executive presented its budget recommendations as set out in the Council Agenda, also on the amendment sheet circulated around the Chamber and published on the City Council's website.

16/5/CNLb Liberal Democrat Group Amendment to the Executive Budget Recommendations.

Councillor Bick and Liberal Democrat Group Members presented the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget as set out in the Council Agenda, on the amendment sheet circulated around the Chamber and published on the City Council's website.

Under the Council's budget procedure, the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget was deemed to have been moved and seconded as an amendment.

On a show of hands the Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget amendment was lost by:

13 votes in favour: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Gillespie, Holt, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas, Pitt, Reid, & Tunnacliffe.

to 25 votes against: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthorpe, Hart, Herbert, Hipkin, Holland, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

Abstention: Councillor Meftah.

In accordance with the Council's budget procedure, Councillor Bick moved separately the following proposals, which formed part of the Liberal Democrat Group alternative budget:

Reference	Details
	Earmarked Reserve amendment to the remit of the Invest for Income Fund

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

13 votes in favour: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Gillespie, Holt, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas, Pitt, Reid, & Tunnaclyffe.

to 23 votes against: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthroe, Hart, Herbert, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

Abstentions: Councillors Hipkin, Holland, Meftah.

Reference	Details
B0001	Tree planting

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

13 votes in favour: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Gillespie, Holt, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas, Pitt, Reid, & Tunnaclyffe.

to 23 votes against: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthroe, Hart, Herbert, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

Abstentions: Councillors Hipkin, Holland, Meftah.

Reference	Details
B0004	Refugee support

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

13 votes in favour: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Gillespie, Holt, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas, Pitt & Reid.

to 23 votes against: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthrope, Hart, Herbert, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

Abstentions: Councillors Hipkin, Holland, Meftah.

Reference	Details
B0005 + C0001	Licensing income and Rapid Charging Points

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

13 votes in favour: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Gillespie Holt, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas, Pitt, Reid, & Tunnacliffe.

to 23 votes against: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthrope, Hart, Herbert, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

Abstentions: Councillors Hipkin, Holland, Meftah.

Reference	Details
B0006 + X0001	Affordable Housing Analyst and Planning Enforcement Officer

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Holt, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas, Pitt, Reid, & Tunnacliffe.

to 25 votes against: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthrope, Hart, Herbert, Hipkin, Holland, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

Abstentions: Councillors Gillespie and Meftah.

Reference	Details
NCL0001	LED Street Lighting

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

12 votes in favour: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Holt, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas, Pitt, Reid, & Tunnacliffe.

to 24 votes against: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthroe, Hart, Herbert, Holland, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

Abstentions: Councillors Gillespie, Hipkin, Meftah

Reference	Details
II0001	Car Park Charges

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by:

14 votes in favour: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Gillespie, Holt, Hipkin, Moore, O'Connell, Pippas, Pitt, Reid, & Tunnacliffe.

to 24 votes against: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthroe, Hart, Herbert, Holland, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

Abstention: Councillor Meftah

Unless otherwise stated, all references in the recommendations to sections, pages and appendices relate to Version 1 of the Budget Setting Report (BSR).

This can be found via:

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=159&MId=2874&Ver=4>

Before the vote to the Executive Budget and Amendment was taken Councillor Reid proposed the following technical amendments to the Budget Setting Report, Climate Change, which can be found at the following link:

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MId=2796&Ver=4>

Members resolved (nem com) to accept the climate change, technical amendments.

It was **RESOLVED** to agree the Executive's budget proposals and Executive Amendment by:

25 votes in favour: Councillors Abbott, Ashton, Baigent, Benstead, Bird, Blencowe, Dryden, Gawthrope, Gillespie, Hart, Herbert, Holland, Johnson, O'Reilly, Owers, Perry, Price, Ratcliffe, Roberts, Robertson, Sarris, Sinnott, M Smart, Smith & Todd-Jones.

To 0 votes.

Abstentions: Councillors Austin, Avery, Bick, Cantrill, Gehring, Gillespie, Hipkin, Holt, Meftah, Moore, O'Connell, Pitt, Reid, & Tunnacliffe.

To approve the following:

General Fund Revenue Budgets: [Section 5, page 28 refers]

- i. Revenue Pressures shown in Appendix B(a) and Savings shown in Appendix B(b).
- ii. Bids to be funded from External or Earmarked Funds as shown in Appendix B(c).
- iii. Non Cash Limit items as shown in Appendix B(d).
- iv. Delegate to the Chief Financial Officer (Head of Finance) the calculation and determination of the Council Tax taxbase (including submission of the National Non-Domestic Rates Forecast Form, NNDR1, for each financial year) as set out in Appendix A(a).
- v. Agree the level of Council Tax for 2016/17 as set out in Section 4 [page 25 refers] and as updated to take account of decisions made by precepting authorities.

Appendix A(b)

Council Tax Setting 2016/17

1. The Council calculated its Council Tax Base 2016/17 for the whole Council area as **40,932.1**

[Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the “Act”)]

2. The Council calculates that the Council Tax requirement for the Council’s own purposes for 2016/17 is **£7,439,410**
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) **£186,409,040** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act
 - (b) **£178,969,630** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act
 - (c) **£7,439,410** being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. [Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act]
 - (d) **£181.75** being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by the amount at 1 above (Item T), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.
4. To note that Cambridgeshire County Council, the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each of the categories of dwellings in the Council’s area as indicated in the table below.
5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2016/17 for each of the categories of dwellings in the Council’s area.

<i>Dwelling Band</i>	<i>City Council £</i>	<i>County Council £</i>	<i>Police and Crime Commissioner £</i>	<i>Fire & Rescue Authority £</i>	<i>Aggregate Council Tax £</i>
A	121.17	778.08	122.10	43.68	1,065.03
B	141.36	907.76	142.45	50.96	1,242.53
C	161.56	1,037.44	162.80	58.24	1,420.04
D	181.75	1,167.12	183.15	65.52	1,597.54
E	222.14	1,426.48	223.85	80.08	1,952.55
F	262.53	1,685.84	264.55	94.64	2,307.56
G	302.92	1,945.20	305.25	109.20	2,662.57
H	363.50	2,334.24	366.30	131.04	3,195.08

6. The Council determines that, in accordance with Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the basic amount of its council tax for 2016/17 is not excessive.

Other Revenue:

- vi. Delegate to the Head of Finance authority to finalise changes relating to any corporate and/or departmental restructuring and any reallocation of support service and central costs, in accordance with the CIPFA Service Reporting Code of Practice for Local Authorities (SeRCOP).
- vii. Agree the approval of the new remit for the “Invest for Income Earmarked Reserve” [page 22 refers].
- viii. Approve the new remit for the “Office accommodation strategy fund” [page 25 refers].

Capital: [Section 7, page 33 refers]

Capital Plan:

- ix. Approve the proposals outlined in Appendix D(a) for inclusion in the Capital Plan, or put on the Projects Under Development List, including any additional use of revenue resources required.

- x. Approve the revised Capital Plan for the General Fund as set out in Appendix D(c), the Funding as set out in Section 7, page 37 and note the Projects Under Development list set out in Appendix D(d).

General Fund Reserves:

- xi. Noted the impact of revenue and capital budget approvals and approve the resulting level of reserves to be used to support the budget proposals as set out in the table [Section 8, page 40 refers].

Revised Recommendations:

- xii. Approve to insert into the BSR the Section 25 report [Section 10, page 45 refers].
- xiii. Approve to insert into the BSR updated Council Tax Base 2016/17 and Council Tax Setting 2016/17 [Appendices A(a) and A(b), pages 46 and 47 (Final BSR pages 48 and 49) refer]

The Executive Amendment:

Revenue:

- xiv. Approve to amend for the new budget items [Appendix B, pages 53 to 67 (Final BSR pages 56 to 71) refer]

Capital:

- xv. Agreed that Executive Councillor for Planning Policy & Transport include the Electric Vehicle Charging Point project in the Council's capital process.

16/6/CNL To consider the recommendations of Committees for Adoption

16/6/CNLa 26.01.16 Licensing Committee: Annual Review of Licensing Fees

The Mayor advised Council that this item should not have appeared on the agenda as the Licensing Committee were empowered to set its fees, which it did so at the January meeting.

16/6/CNLb 26.01.16 Licensing Committee: Incorporation of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 into the Council Constitution

Resolved unanimously to:

- i. Approve that sections 19-28 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 be added to the scheme of delegations which are the responsibility of the Licensing Committee as found in Part 3 Section 5.6 of the Council's constitution.
- ii. Approve for recommendation 2.1 ([i] above), that the Director of Customer and Community Services be given delegated powers to exercise the Council's functions under section 19-28 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001.

16/6/CNLc 17.02.16 Civic Affairs: Pay Policy Statement 2016/17

Resolved unanimously to:

- i. Approve the draft Pay Policy Statement 2016/17 attached as Appendix 1 to the Officers report.
- ii. Note that a review of senior officers salaries had been undertaken in 2015 and that no change to pay levels of the Chief Executive, Directors and Heads of Service on JNC1 and JNC2 were recommended as a result of the review.
- iii. Delegate authority to the Head of Human Resources to implement the new Band 10.
- iv. Note the position on the chief officer pay award and received an update at the meeting.
- v. Delegate authority to the Head of Human Resources to update the Pay Policy Statement 2016/17 should a Chief Executive and / or Chief Officer pay award be agreed.

16/6/CNLd 17/02/16 Civic Affairs: Constitutional Changes, For Council Meetings, Procedure Rules, Amending the Constitution

Resolved unanimously to approve:Constitution changes:

- i. The changes to Council Procedure Rules as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer's report.
- ii. That the Committee review the effect of these changes in Spring 2017.

Motion on public engagement in local democracy:

- iii. To agree a member working party with terms of reference, composition and delivery timetable as set out in paragraphs 4.2 to 4.3.

Updating the Constitution:

- iv. The changes to the Constitution as set out in Appendix 2 to allow the Monitoring Officer to keep the Constitution Updated. The Monitoring Officer would also keep Members informed of changes to the Constitution.

16/6/CNLe 17.02.16 Civic Affairs: Localism Act 2011 and Standards of Conduct: Appointment of "Independent Person" and Deputy

Resolved unanimously to approve:

- i. Extending the appointment of Sean Brady and Robert Bennett as the Council's Independent Person and Deputy for a term of two years until the end of February 2018.

16/6/CNLf 17.02.16 Civic Affairs: Localism Act 2011 and Standards of Conduct: Appointment of "Independent Person" and Deputy

Resolved unanimously to approve:

Extending the appointment of Sean Brady and Robert Bennett as the Council's Independent Person and Deputy for a term of two years until the end of February 2018.

16/7/CNL To deal with Oral Questions**1) Councillor Pitt to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste**

What steps was the Council taking to support Addenbrooke's in making improvements following the recent one-star food safety inspection?

The Executive Councillor responded that at summary of the report from Frank Harrison (Refuse & Environment Team Manager) had been sent to Councillor Pitt for information. The report set out the detail of how concerns were being addressed and offered a re-inspection of the kitchen in future. Addenbrooke's had confirmed that the necessary work had been undertaken and requested a further inspection.

2) Councillor Robertson to the Executive Councillor for Communities

Could the Executive Councillor for Communities update the Council on its recent project to expand the number of Credit Union access points across the City?

The Executive Councillor responded that six new access points were in operation across the City. The new locations had become operational from 23 November 2015 in the following locations and were mainly manned by volunteers:

- East Barnwell Community Centre
- Meadows Community Centre
- Brown's Fields Community Centre
- Trumpington Pavilion
- Ross Street Community Centre
- City Homes South

Volunteers continued to be sought to staff the access points, some people had come forward expressing an interest in the project. All benefit recipients across the City had been notified. Advertising of these points would continue.

In terms of impact both Credit Unions had seen at least a 10% increase in membership since publicity started in October in Cambridge. Eastern Savings had confirmed that although existing membership had increased by 4%, membership for Cambridge had increased by 10%. Since October, Eastern Savings had increased membership from 169 to 185 as from the end of January (10% increase/16 new accounts). Since October 2015 there had been an increase of 36 new adult accounts and 73 Junior Savers accounts from Kings Hedges and North Cambridge Academy. The original aim in twelve months was to have 125 new accounts, which although seemed small was fairly substantial in comparison to current totals. Overall there were 52 new accounts in four months across the City and should this continue the Council would potentially exceed the target.

3) Councillor Tunnacliffe to the Leader

What assurances and precise examples could he give to show that the bus service on Milton Road would fully meet the needs and expectations of local residents as a result of investment by the City Deal?

The Leader responded he hoped the City Deal would facilitate a better bus service for everyone who used the service, including local residents. It was clear there was a poor service in terms of where the buses stopped along Milton Road due to the road layout and the location of the bus stops.

The Leader concluded that questions regarding the City Deal should be brought forward to a meeting of the City Deal Board or City Deal Executive. It was hoped that discussions regarding this particular service and other possible services such as a guided bus stop in Mitcham's Corner, could be discussed with Stagecoach at future meetings.

4) Councillor Cantrill to the Leader

As the Chair of the City Deal Board and one of the three politicians who would make the final decision on the nature and form of the city deal proposals that would impact the residents of Cambridge, could the Leader commit to explore and introduce on a trial basis demand management measures on the city's roads before any heavy engineered infrastructure projects were undertaken?

The Leader responded that there was a need for citywide measures to improve access and exit routes in and out of the City for all users while balancing these improvements against the needs of local residents and the environmental impact.

5) Councillor Perry to Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

Could the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste please provide a brief overview of what changes were planned for Environment Reports over the coming year, especially in terms of additional resources and bolstering volunteering and community action across Cambridge?

The Executive Councillor responded environmental reports had been in place for over a year with many successes. In the upcoming year data would be provided on:

- Educational activities and events undertaken and planned by the Waste teams particularly with local schools.
- Community payback activities with details of how small scale projects could be requested and those actioned and planned, as well as progress on longer term projects.

- Volunteer opportunities on how individuals could sign up to clean their local environment, get involved with planned projects, activities and campaigns and what kits and equipment volunteers could borrow from the Streets and Open Spaces Team. This would also include details of Time Credits that volunteers were eligible for.
- Campaigns details of planned / ongoing educational campaigns related to environmental education / crime, such as 'Clean for the Queen' scheme.

The Mayor advised Councillors that he would take questions six and seven together as they were of a similar content.

6) Councillor Todd Jones to the Leader

What was the council's position on the Government's proposed 'Three County Devolution' which the Government launched at a meeting on Monday 15th February and where they want final agreed proposals from 23 councils and other organisations by Friday 4th March?

7) Councillor Bick to the Leader

What were your sticking points in participating in discussions on devolution with other councils and the Government?

The Leader responded the City Council had established a good reputation for working with other councils and believed in a Cambridge based devolution that respected the needs of Greater Cambridge. At a recent workshop with a large number of representatives from various Cambridgeshire Local Authorities the question had been asked 'do you want a three county devolution? The majority of answers had been no.

The Government had since advised that there was only one option available which was a three county devolution plus a Mayor. The deadline to respond to Central Government was March 4 2016. Further discussion and consultation would take place during this time with invites to the opposition Leaders to take part in this process. During this time frame the following points had been expressed to Central Government:

- Councils needed to have a say over issues that affect them.
- The proposal could put the greater Cambridge economy at risk.
- A regional transport board was needed.

- Social rented homes were required in addition to the private rented market in Cambridge. The City Council had put forward a proposal for a total of 1350 new social houses to be built.
- The City Deal needed to be supported.

The following Oral Questions were also tabled, but owing to the expiry of the period of time permitted, were not covered during the meeting. The Mayor encouraged a written response to be sent out those Councillors whose questions were not answered:

8) Councillor O'Connell to the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places

Can the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places tell us how she would like the North Pole compound on Parker's Piece to look in December 2016?

9) Councillor Markus Gehring to the Leader

Does the Leader believe that all consultation with stakeholders in relation to the city deal A428 proposals should be public – particularly given the level of response of over 2000 members of the public took the trouble to respond to the consultation?

10) Councillor Baigent to the Leader

What progress has he made in persuading the current Police and Crime Commissioner to ensure that the PCC's force-wide policing priorities, and the separate policing priorities of the Chief Constable, link up and also integrate with the Cambridge Community Safety priorities and Area Committee policing priorities?

11) Councillor Sinnott to the Executive Councillor for Communities

Can the Executive Councillor for Communities provide an update on the preparations for this year's Cambridge Folk Festival, organised by Cambridge Live, but supported by this authority?

12) Councillor Reid to the Leader

How is the Leader promoting transparency and engagement in City Deal processes?

13) Councillor Bird to the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

What is the Council's view on the 'National Living Wage' of £7.20/hour planned from 1st April and the difference from the 'Living Wage' outside London of £8.25/hour since October 2015?

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

Has the council done a deal to provide delivery access across Jesus Green to the Lock House site?

15) Councillor M. Smart to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

Can the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste provide an update on the total amount of fixed penalty notices issued for dog fouling in the last year and his projection for the year ahead?

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

We are pleased to see that the 20 mile per hour speed limit has been implemented in certain Wards in Cambridge including Coleridge.

When will the 20 mile per hour speed limit be implemented in Queen Edith's ward please?

Secondary Questions

1) Councillor Sinnott to the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste

Does the Executive Councillor for Environment and Waste agree with me that there is no logical reason why women should not consider a career working in our front line waste teams, and does the new shared waste service provide a golden opportunity to look at this matter?

2) Councillor Bird to the Executive Councillor for Communities

It has been claimed in media that Cambridge has one of the lowest public participation rates in swimming activities in the country. Is this true? And what is the council doing to promote swimming?

In addition the Council has also invested in programmes to support all children and families learning to swim, whatever their abilities and background. Cambridge also has a range of other swimming pools at schools and private clubs.

16/8/CNL To consider the following Notices of Motion, notice of which has been given by:

16/8/CNLa Councillor Gillespie: Tourism Levy

Councillor Gillespie proposed and Councillor Holland seconded the following motion:

"This council is working hard to deal with the significant funding reductions being administered as part of the Government's austerity agenda which is giving rise to the current funding crisis in local government and the limits on the council's powers to control council tax and to raise revenue.

Council appreciates the contribution of tourism to our local economy and notes that major city tourism destinations such as Vancouver, New York and Venice, as well as many other cities in the United States and Europe, place a small levy on visitors.

Cambridge notes the potential of a relatively small levy of around £1-2 per night stayed to generate at least £1 - 2 million per annum – and that this scale of levy is unlikely to discourage visitors or drastically affect the hotel trade.

Council agrees in principle that Cambridge should pursue a policy that could introduce a Tourism Levy; and therefore formally agrees that a full report on the approach to introduction of a Tourism Levy should be presented to the Strategy and Resources Committee by July 2016."

On a show of hands the motion was lost by 28 votes to 1 vote.

16/8/CNLb Councillor Gillespie: Fair Tax

Councillors Gillespie proposed and Councillor Holland seconded the following motion:

"This council notes that:

- * Corporate tax evasion and avoidance are having a damaging impact on the world's poorest countries, to such a level that it is costing them far more than they receive in aid
- * This is costing the UK as much as £30bn a year
- * This practice also has a negative effect on small and medium-sized companies who pay more tax proportionately.

This council further notes that the UK Government has taken steps to tackle the issue of tax avoidance and evasion by issuing Procurement Policy Note 03/14 (PPN 03/14). This applies to all central government contracts worth more than £5m.

This council also notes the existence of voluntary schemes promoting tax compliance such as the Fair Tax Mark, which can serve as an independent means of verification. In early 2015 new regulations required public bodies, including councils, to ask procurement qualification questions of all companies for tenders over £173,000 for service contracts and £4m for works contracts.

However, these questions are not as detailed as the PPN 03/14.

This council believes that bidders for council contracts should be asked to account for their past tax records, using the standards in PPN 03/14, rather than the lower standards in the recent regulations. This council therefore calls for procurement procedures to be amended to require all companies bidding for service contracts worth more than £80,000 and for works contracts worth more than £2m to self-certify that they are fully tax-compliant in line with central government practice using the standards in 03/14, applying to contracts of the size specified above."

Councillor Owers proposed and Councillor Pitt seconded the following amendment to motion (deleted text struck through and additional text underlined):

"This council notes that:

* Corporate tax evasion and avoidance are having a damaging impact on the world's poorest countries, to such a level that it is costing them far more than they receive in aid

* This is costing the UK as much as £30bn a year

* This practice also has a negative effect on small and medium-sized companies who pay more tax proportionately.

This council further notes that the UK Government has taken steps to tackle the issue of tax avoidance and evasion by issuing Procurement Policy Note 03/14 (PPN 03/14). This applies to all central government contracts worth more than £5m.

This council also notes the existence of voluntary schemes promoting tax compliance such as the Fair Tax Mark, which can serve as an independent means of verification. In early 2015 new regulations required public bodies, including councils, to ask procurement qualification questions of all companies for tenders over £173,000 for service contracts and £4m for works contracts.

However, these questions are not as detailed as the PPN 03/14.

~~This council believes that bidders for council contracts should be asked to account for their past tax records, using the standards in PPN 03/14, rather than the lower standards in the recent regulations. This council therefore calls for procurement procedures to be amended to require all companies bidding for service contracts worth more than £80,000 and for works contracts worth more than £2m to self-certify that they are fully tax-compliant in line with central government practice using the standards in 03/14, applying to contracts of the size specified above."~~

This council resolves to bring a report to Strategy and Resources committee as soon as practicable to consider whether it is prudent, justified and practical to amend its procurement procedures in such a way as to require bidders for council contracts to account for their past tax records using the standards in PPN 03/14, and if so at what thresholds such a requirement should apply.'

On a show of hands the amendment was carried unanimously.

Resolved unanimously that:

"This council notes that:

- * Corporate tax evasion and avoidance are having a damaging impact on the world's poorest countries, to such a level that it is costing them far more than they receive in aid
- * This is costing the UK as much as £30bn a year
- * This practice also has a negative effect on small and medium-sized companies who pay more tax proportionately.

This council further notes that the UK Government has taken steps to tackle the issue of tax avoidance and evasion by issuing Procurement Policy Note 03/14 (PPN 03/14). This applies to all central government contracts worth more than £5m.

This council also notes the existence of voluntary schemes promoting tax compliance such as the Fair Tax Mark, which can serve as an independent means of verification. In early 2015 new regulations required public bodies, including councils, to ask procurement qualification questions of all companies for tenders over £173,000 for service contracts and £4m for works contracts.

However, these questions are not as detailed as the PPN 03/14.

This council resolves to bring a report to Strategy and Resources committee as soon as practicable to consider whether it is prudent, justified and practical to amend its procurement procedures in such a way as to require bidders for council contracts to account for their past tax records using the standards in PPN 03/14, and if so at what thresholds such a requirement should apply.

16/9/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.

16/10/CNL Urgent Decision

16/10/CNLa Amendment to the Capital Plan

The decision was noted.

The meeting ended at 11.25 pm

MAYOR

This page is intentionally left blank