

COUNCIL

17 February 2011

6.00 - 11.30 pm

Present: Councillors Stuart (Chair), Nimmo-Smith (Vice-Chair), Al Bander, Benstead, Bick, Blackhurst, Blair, Boyce, Brierley, Brown, Cantrill, Dixon, Hart, Herbert, Hipkin, Kerr, Kightley, Levy, Marchant-Daisley, McGovern, McPherson, Newbold, Owers, Pitt, Pogonowski, Reid, Rosenstiel, Saunders, Shah, Smart, Smith, Swanson, Taylor, Todd-Jones, Tunnacliffe, Walker, Ward, Wright, Zmura and Znajek

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**11/1/CNL To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held on 21 October and 8 November 2010**

The minutes of the meetings held on 21 October and 8 November 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

11/2/CNL Mayors Announcements

The Mayor respectfully reminded those present that in the event of any interruption of proceedings, a warning would be issued. If the interruption continued, the person or persons would be removed from Public Gallery. In the event of a general disturbance the Public Gallery would be cleared.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Dryden and Sanders.

2. WELCOME TO STUDENT OF IMPINGTON VILLAGE COLLEGE

The Mayor welcomed Maja Amilkiewicz, a student from Impington Village College, to the meeting.

3. PRINCE WILLIAM'S ENGAGEMENT

The Mayor reported that congratulations had been sent, on behalf of the City, to HRH Prince William and Miss Catherine Middleton on their engagement on 16th November 2010.

4. FAR EAST PRISONERS OF WAR

The Mayor reported that she had entertained some Far East Prisoners of War and their near families at the Guildhall. The occasion marked the 65th anniversary of a civic reception held on 17th February, 1946 to welcome the prisoners home from war.

5. CEILIDH IN AID OF WHITWORTH HOUSE

The Mayor reported that the ceilidh held on 21st January 2010 raised over £1,500 for the Whitworth House appeal fund. Councillors were thanked for supporting this event.

6. ABSEIL IN AID OF THE EAST ANGLIA CHILDREN'S HOSPICES

The Mayor reminded Councillors that a charity abseil would take place at the Guildhall on 27th March 2010. Further details were available on the EACH website.

7. PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTION OF THANKS

The Mayor presented to Councillor Russ McPherson and Mrs Carole McPherson a framed copy of the Council's resolution of thanks for their year of Mayoralty.

8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor	Item	Interest
Brown	11/11/CNLd (21.02.11)	Personal: Member of LINK and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Trust
Brown	11/6/CNLb	Personal: Wife an assessor for the Citizens Advice Bureau
Cantrill	11/6/CNLb	Personal: Family member associated with Cambridge United Football Club
Hart	11/6/CNLb	Personal: Husband a shareholder of Cambridge United Football Club
McPherson	11/11/CNLb (21.02.11)	Personal: Employee of Cambridge Regional College

9. LETTER FROM CAMBRIDGE PENSIONER'S ACTION GROUP

The Mayor acknowledged receipt of a letter from the Cambridge Pensioner's Action Group regarding Lion Yard toilets.

11/3/CNL Petition

A petition had been received containing over 500 valid signatures stating the following:

"We call on Cambridge City Council to retain ground floor toilets at Lion Yard and for the Council's Executive Councillor to meet the Cambridge Forum of Disabled People and service users to fully consider our views."

Ms Bird presented and spoke in support of the petition.

The following points were made:

- i. 10,389 people had signed the petition over a 3 week period.
- ii. There was a general lack of toilet facilities in the City Centre.
- iii. It was essential to have toilets in an accessible location close to the central shopping areas.
- iv. The toilets at Lion Yard were the only ground floor, fully accessible toilets in the whole of the City Centre.
- v. A lack of accessible toilets could have a detrimental effect on tourism in Cambridge.
- vi. Profit seemed to be more important than the needs of the old, young and disabled.
- vii. On an average shopping day it would take approximately 8 minutes to travel from the entrance of Lion Yard to the proposed site of the relocated toilets. This was not acceptable.
- viii. Breakdown of the lifts was a concern. One such breakdown was timed at 4.5 hours.
- ix. It was essential that a fire risk assessment be carried out.

The Leader thanked the petitioner and welcomed the opportunity to discuss these issues in more detail. It was noted that the proposed relocation had been discussed over a number of years with decisions being taken through the Planning Committee, the City Centre Development Scrutiny Committee and the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee. At no stage throughout this process had any Councillors voted against the proposals to relocate the toilets. Whilst four Councillors had voted against the proposals at the Planning Committee, these objections were based purely on the closure of the Fisher Square access route and not the relocation of the toilets. It was also noted that some public support had been received for the proposed relocation.

However the differences between the proposals at previous committees and the proposals now presented was that earlier versions planned new ground floor disabled and family facilities (as well as some disabled facilities co-located with the multipurpose toilets on the first floor).

The Leader confirmed that an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) would be carried out, including full consultation with all user groups. Discussions had also taken place with the Aberdeen Asset Managers (acting as the agent on behalf of the Lion Yard Shopping Centre owners), and they were happy to cooperate with the EqIA and look in detail at any issues raised through the consultation. The proposal would not progress any further until this work had been completed.

In response to Member's questions, the petitioner made the following points:

- i. She was unaware of the proposed relocation until the meeting of the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee.
- ii. Consultation and an EqIA should have been done years ago.
- iii. In 20 years of campaigning on disability issues she had never seen such a lack of consultation on an issue.
- iv. The proposed plans indicate that the disabled toilets would be smaller (including door width), and that they would be incorrectly located in corners, as opposed to centrally. The proposed changing areas would also result in the overall space being less than was currently available.
- v. Whilst disabled toilets were available in Marks and Spencer and McDonalds, these were obviously for customers only.
- vi. For people shopping in the City Centre, the Drummer Street toilets were too far away.
- vii. The issues had been raised with the owners of Lion Yard Shopping Centre, but it was felt more appropriate to contact the City Council as the landlord.

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources thanked the petitioners for attending and for raising these issues. It was again noted that discussions had been taking place with Aberdeen Asset Managers over a number of years and the level of public concern was fully recognised. Any proposed relocation would now be deferred until the Council had undertaken a full EqlA.

The Executive Councillor reiterated the City Council's commitment to public toilet provision and highlighted the £350,000 invested annually as evidence of this. It was also noted that in the face of government grant reductions of £1.6m, the proposed saving of £240,00 as a result of the proposed relocation would be welcome.

At approximately 6.40pm, and following warnings by the Mayor that members of the public should refrain from disrupting proceedings, the Mayor suspended the meeting and ordered the Public Gallery to be cleared.

The meeting reconvened at 7.25pm.

11/4/CNL Public Questions Time

1) Ms Pargeter addressed the Council and asked the following question:

"I submit this statement because I fear that today Council will abandon common sense and ratify the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee's plan to close the Lion Yard's Fisher Square entrance and demolish a perfectly good set of public conveniences, putting alternatives upstairs where they will be very inconvenient for everyone. It seems that with a Deed of Variation to the Lion Yard lease, Members put themselves in a position which makes unreasonable rejection of the re-provision of toilets difficult. Members may still decide that it is unreasonable to accept a 26% reduction in facilities, but if a scheme is to go ahead, any other adverse impact of its design must be minimised.

There are problems with a shared space for baby changing and disabled persons' facilities. A reduced space for toilets is proposed, with fewer cubicles and urinals and no dedicated baby changing room. Facilities for babies will only be in the disabled person's toilets. Whilst this might be OK for occasional use, in busy multi-toilet areas it does not work.

Such schemes were found at early Motorway service stations, but I know of no busy place where it still happens. Most of you will know how long it takes to change a baby's mucky nappy. You are less likely to know how long it takes someone like me to go to the toilet. You will get queues, unhappy people, and inevitably one day a disabled adult with bladder problems will either have the indignity of wetting themselves or the stress of toileting next to a stranger changing a nappy. I have seen this happen. Also, don't assume that if there are two rooms, but one free, everyone can manage in either of them. They should be mirror images, and some people can only manage one way round. You will need extra large rooms too. Babies' nappies are bulky, and large bins are needed for them. You must not prevent wheelchair users from using their toilets by obstructing the floor with bins.

I had 3 children post-disability, and would welcome accessible toilets with wheelchair height baby changing places, and better still, adult changing places. It would be a big mistake to put all nappy changing in the disabled persons' toilets, and Part M of the Building Regulations says it should not be done.

So, if Council cannot be swayed from allowing this re-siting of toilets, I suggest a condition is made that there must be a dedicated baby-changing room, or facilities in the female and men's areas, even at the expense of further reduction in the numbers of conventional cubicles.

I would urge you to accept proposals as they stand, with conditions or not at all.

The committee consulted no user group before their January 17th decision to downgrade and relocate the toilets. I have focussed on one, but they have apparently dismissed various access requirements of the Building Regulations. Maybe too, in expecting disabled people to use a lift and be dependent on electricity to use all toilets, there is an issue with the Equality Act.

Officers and Members of Full Council, please think extremely carefully about every ramification of change to the City's main toilet provision. Could the present scheme be rejected without punitive financial consequences? Might its acceptance give rise to other legal challenges? If re-location is sanctioned however, it is your duty to impose conditions that will ensure the best possible provision for all users. I trust that in any case you will give at least as much weight to the needs of those using the centre of Cambridge as to financial considerations."

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources thanked Ms Pargeter for her comments. Whilst it was the owner's responsibility to conform to Part 10 of the building regulations, Council officers would be asked to look into these issues.

Ms Pargeter stated that various aspects of the building regulations seemed not to have been adhered to. She felt that this needed to be addressed.

These comments were noted.

2) Mr Southren addressed the Council and asked the following question:

"The abolition of the Educational Maintenance Allowance (EMA) will have a significant impact on students at Cambridge Regional College (CRC). A total of 1289 CRC students (45% of the total number) currently receive EMA and the loss of this allowance will make it very difficult for some to continue in education. How can this be addressed?"

The Leader thanked Mr Southren for his comments and highlighted the Liberal Democrats support of further education and training. It was regrettable that replacement funding was not in place already as the uncertainty for young people was difficult. Increased funding to enable young people to remain in post-16 education was essential and the Learner Support Fund, which was funded by central government but administered locally, would assist with this.

The Leader confirmed that Councillor Smith currently sat on the Liberal Democrat Federal Policy Committee and that Mr Southren's comments would be forwarded to Simon Hughes (Advocate for Access to Education).

3) Mr Boorman addressed the Council and asked the following question:

"Firstly I would like to thank Councillor Blair for having already responded to COPE's request to reinstate the Public Transport Steering Group meetings. I also note the email from Councillor Rosenstiel and support his wish to continue to subsidise the Cambridge City Centre Bus.

Regarding Motion 9c, whilst I have already raised this with the Executive Councillor, could she tell COPE what responsibilities still lie within the purview of the City Council for public transport?

COPE would like to make it clear that we support Motion 9e. However on behalf of the majority of the COPE members who have expressed an opinion, they wish to support the maintenance of support on those routes giving pensioners in rural areas access to public transport. I wonder if the consequences of the removal of such subsidised services has been fully assessed and the affect on the disabled and frail elderly taken into account. A London Borough failed to do so and I believe were instructed to think again by the courts.

A COPE Executive Member has written to the Cambridge News supporting the petition against moving the toilets from their current location and I note that several COPE members are leading the protests and collecting signatures. I believe that the majority of members would, if asked, support maintaining the current location.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth thanked Mr Boorman for his comments and confirmed that a meeting of the Community and Public Transport Steering Group was in the process of being organised. The Executive Councillor had been asked to attend the Governance Group and had also recently attended the Summit Meeting with County Councillor McGuire.

It was noted that Cambridge City Council had maintained all of its bus and 'Dial A Ride' subsidies for the coming year.

Mr Boorman felt that 'Dial A Ride' should be free for anyone with a regular bus pass and proposed that the recent £1m investment for local transport services be used to fund this.

These comments were noted.

4) Ms Wheeler addressed the Council and asked the following question:

"I would like to address the issue of unaccompanied young asylum seekers in Cambridge. I am particularly concerned about the plight of post 18 year old unaccompanied young people who entered the country as asylum seekers or refugees before they were 18 and whose asylum cases will be, or are already being, reviewed as they reach the age of 18.

Some of these young people reside in Cambridge and national figures suggest that many may be receiving inadequate support, both as looked after young people, and as unaccompanied asylum seekers with traumatic life experiences and complex legal cases. National figures suggest that a disproportionate number of these young people are failing in their asylum claims (far more than any other age bracket of asylum seekers) despite the fact that they are invariably from countries where the threats to civilian life are known to be extremely grave.

I am involved locally in a campaign aimed at increasing awareness of the experiences of unaccompanied young people (the Young People Seeking Safety campaign). We are very concerned about the vulnerability of this group and are seeking information and support from the Council to ensure that these young people in Cambridge are fully and appropriately supported.

The case studies we have collected nationally suggest that some young people are living in terribly distressing circumstances, in fear and uncertainty for their lives and their futures, and that some have become destitute. We are concerned that this is as a result of inadequate oversight in relation to an extremely vulnerable group, whose voices are easily overlooked. We want to ensure that in Cambridge these young people are not overlooked.”

The Executive Councillor for Housing thanked Ms Wheeler for her comments and confirmed that the Office of Children and Young People’s Service 16+ team was primarily responsible for housing 16 and 17 year olds who had become homeless. There were currently four unaccompanied minors housed in Cambridge (2 in hostels, 1 in foster care and 1 in a residential home). In addition to this, there were fourteen 18-21 year olds fitting this category housed at various locations throughout the City.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that no unaccompanied asylum seekers under the age of 18 had been found rough sleeping in Cambridge in the past 5 years, but one failed asylum seeker over the age of 18 was found sleeping rough in 2010. Additional support to these groups was provided by the Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum (CECF).

Ms Wheeler highlighted the need for age assessments to be carried out independently, and the Executive Councillor supported this view.

5) Ms Salkield addressed the Council and asked the following question:

"Like many people I am concerned about the proposed move of the Lion Yard toilets from the ground to the first floor. This will make it more difficult for people with wheelchairs or pushchairs to be able to visit the toilets. If such people had a fear of lifts, or the lifts were broken - it could make it impossible.

It's a while since I made use of the Lion Yard facilities, so the following suggestion may already be in place. However, has thought been given to advertisements in the toilets - entrance, exit, the inside of the cubicle doors etc. Certainly with the inside of the cubicle doors the advertisers have a captive audience, who will almost certainly read the advert. Could enough money be made from advertising space, or loo sponsorship, to make a need to relocate the toilets unnecessary? Motorway service stations do this already, with adverts directed at the person using the facilities - car insurance for women etc.

Also, I have lived in Cambridge all of my life and did not know about the public toilets at the Guildhall"

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources thanked Ms Salkield for her comments and agreed to discuss the suggestion of advertising with the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services and the Property Services Department. The need for extra toilet provision and increased advertising for the Guildhall facilities would also be looked at.

6) Ms Eastland addressed the Council and asked the following question:

"I represent 'Cambridge Against Cuts' and would ask that Cambridge City Council follow the example of Liverpool City Council and reject the notion of a 'Big Society'. As a result of funding cuts charities will lose out, people will lose jobs and I see this as a form of genocide."

The Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health thanked Ms Eastland for her question. He said that as he understood it, "the Big Society" was not a programme, and was therefore not something to which Cambridge City Council had been asked to sign up to or not, and so the question of rejecting it did not arise. Although the Council had not used the term "Big Society" and had no plans to do so, for many years under different administrations it had been committed to community development and a strong civil society, which he acknowledged were close to the notion of "The Big Society". He hoped these would continue.

11/5/CNL To consider the recommendation of the Executive for adoption

Draft Revenue and Capital budgets 2010/11 (Revised), 2011/12 (Budget) and 2012/13 (Forecast)

The Executive presented its budget recommendations as set out in the Council Agenda and on the amendment sheet circulated around the Chamber.

11/6/CNL To consider amendments to the Executive's Budget

Labour Group Amendment - Draft Revenue and Capital budgets 2010/11 (Revised), 2011/12 (Budget) and 2012/13 (Forecast)

Councillor Herbert presented the Labour Group's alternative budget as set out in the Council Agenda.

Green Group Amendment - Draft Revenue and Capital budgets 2010/11 (Revised), 2011/12 (Budget) and 2012/13 (Forecast)

Councillor Wright presented the Green Group's alternative budget as set out in the Council Agenda.

Councillor Hipkin Budget Statement

Councillor Hipkin presented a short budget statement.

Labour Group Alternative Budget Amendment

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

On a show of hands the Labour Group's alternative budget amendment was lost by 9 votes to 29.

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

Reference	Details
LB01	Expand benefit support for disabled people in Cambridge to address benefit cuts and local housing allowance problems
LB02	Increase benefit advice accessibility
LB13	Benefit cuts and changes training for all relevant staff

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 11 votes to 28.

Reference	Details
LB07	Restore Community Development grant cuts [S2651
LB08	Reduce Economic Policy grant cuts [S2648 part]

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 11 votes to 28.

Reference	Details
LB04	Snow & ice clearing on main pavements and main areas where older people live
LB05	Snow & ice clearing on main pavements and main areas where older people live

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 11 votes to 28.

Reference	Details
LC03	Increase contribution to Environmental Improvements Programme
LC04	Increase contribution to Joint Cycleways Capital budget

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 11 votes to 28.

Reference	Details
LB15	Defer income from Lion Yard development

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 11 votes to 28.

Green Group Alternative Budget Amendment

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

On a show of hands the Green Group's alternative budget amendment was lost by 2 votes to 29.

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

Reference	Details
S2670	Remove charging for Conveniences

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 2 votes to 29.

Reference	Details
PPFG10	Remove charging for conveniences

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 2 votes to 29.

Reference	Details
S2671	Retain staff (needed after removing charge from conveniences)

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 2 votes to 29.

Reference	Details
SG6B	Efficiency savings from returning planning to central committee

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

Reference	Details
PPFG8	For work with CFU to see how CCC can assist in club's transition to community trust-run status

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 2 votes to 28.

Reference	Details
CG12	3 year doubling of EIP money for local projects and devolved decision making

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 11 votes to 28.

Reference	Details
CG13	Cambridge's Green Deal

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 2 votes to 28.

Unless otherwise specified, all references in the recommendations to Appendices, pages and sections relate to the updated version of the Budget-Setting Report (Version 4 - Council). This can be found via the Council agenda page:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MId=259&Ver=4>

RESOLVED (by 29 votes to 11) to agree the Executive's budget proposals:

Revenue: [Part B, page 23 refers]

in relation to the General Fund Revenue Budgets 2010/11 :

- a) Approved the 2010/11 revised budget savings and bids as shown in Appendix B [page 110 refers].
- b) Approved the overall revised budget for 2010/11, with net committee spending at £23,569,070, as shown in Section 3 [page 25 refers] and Appendix W [page 299 refers] for General Fund Services.

c) Approved the level of reserves to be used to support the 2010/11 budget, at £4,433,750 as shown above in Appendix W [page 299 refers].

in relation to the General Fund Revenue Budgets 2011/12 :

d) Approved the Revenue Bids and Savings shown in Appendix E [page 126 refers] and which are built into the General Fund Summary, Appendix W [page 299 refers].

e) Approved the Bids to be funded from External or Earmarked Funds, set out in Appendix C [page 125, refers]

f) Agreed the Priority Policy Fund (PPF) Bids, set out in Appendix I [page 171 refers] – based on the position as outlined in Section 10 [page 57 refers]

g) Approved the overall base budget for 2011/12, as shown in Appendix W [page 299 refers] and summarised below:

	2011/12
	£
SPEND:	
Scrutiny Committees / Portfolios	
Community Services – Arts & Recreation	4,965,600
Community Services –	
Community Development & Health	4,288,340
Community Services – Housing	2,612,470
Environment – Climate Change & Growth	3,046,160
Environment – Environmental & Waste Services	7,269,400
Strategy & Resources –	
Customer Services & Resources	(5,151,390)
Strategy & Resources – Strategy (including central adjustments to be allocated)	1,326,350
Committees Total	18,356,930
 Capital Adjustments Account	 839,230
Minimum Revenue Provision	(3,254,400)
Contribution to Capital Spending	3,682,000
Additional Council Tax earmarked for growth (unallocated)	109,250
Efficiency Fund	475,000
Council Tax Compensation Grant	(170,000)

Spending Requirement	20,038,010
-----------------------------	-------------------

FUNDING:

Revenue Support Grant and Business Rates	(9,515,100)
--	-------------

Collection Fund Deficit (net)	41,580
-------------------------------	--------

Raised from Council Tax	
-------------------------	--

(based on recommendation (i), below)	(6,785,900)
--------------------------------------	-------------

Total Funding	(16,259,420)
----------------------	---------------------

Contribution from Reserves	(3,778,590)
-----------------------------------	--------------------

h) Approved the level of reserves to be used to support the 2011/12 budget, at £3,778,590 as shown above and in Appendix W *[page 299 refers]*.

i) Approved the Council Tax Base and set the level of Council Tax for 2011/12, based on a 99% collection rate [Section 8, page 47 refers], Appendix G (a) and (b) and that all necessary steps be taken to collect and recover the Council Tax. In summary:

- The Council Tax base has been calculated at 40,739 – see Appendix G(a) *[page 160 refers]*;

- No increase in the City Council level of Council Tax at band D, staying at £166.57 in 2011/12 (0%) – see Appendix G(b) *[page 161 refers]*

j) Approved:

(i) the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix M(a), Annex 1 (page 191) and noted that the “Authorised Limit” determined for 2011/12 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003 [Section 14, page 85 refers].

(ii) to delegate to the Director of Resources, within the borrowing totals for any financial year within (i) above, to effect movement between the separately agreed figures for ‘borrowing’ and ‘other long term liabilities’.

(iii) the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategy set out in Appendix M(b) *[page 196 refers]*.

(iv) amendments to the Council's Approved Lending List, shown in Appendix M(c) [page 217 refers] and also to include the following addition:

- Nationwide Building Society
(Colour: red, Category: UK Building Society)

k) Delegated to the Director of Resources authority to finalise changes relating to the corporate and departmental restructuring and the reallocation of support service and central costs, in accordance with the CIPFA Best Value Accounting Code of Practice and the Service Reporting Code of Practice for Local Authorities (SeRCOP) which applies from 1 April 2011 i.e. for 2011/12 budgets. [para 6.23, page 43 refers].

Capital: [Part D, page 71 refers]

in relation to the Capital Plan: [section 13, page 77 refers]

l) Agreed the inclusion in the Capital Plan of capital schemes approved by the Leader in out of cycle decisions:

- (i) Lammas Land Play Area
- (ii) Vie Play Area
- (iii) Vie Public Open Space
- (iv) Replacement of Market Sheets
- (v) Chip & Pin Upgrade in Car Parks
- (vi) Route Optimisation Software

[as referred to under para 4.5, table 8, on page 30].

m) Agreed the transfer of £25,000 funding from City Centre Management Capital Programme to the City Centre Management revenue budget approved by the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources as an out of cycle decision.

n) Approved the following project appraisals, that have been referred by Executive Councillors:

From the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources:

- (i) Procurement of Electric Van for Courier Service
- (ii) Northgate e-Benefits, Self-Serve and Mobile Working Module

(iii) Vehicle Replacements 2011/12

(iv) Redevelopment of the Visit Cambridge website and the development of a fully integrated Destination Management System

From the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth:

(i) Tins Path cycleway improvements

(ii) Essential Repairs to Grafton West Multi-Storey Car Park Boundary Wall

From the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation:

(i) Corn Exchange winches

From the Executive Councillor for Community Development & Health:

(i) Replacement of CCTV Communications Equipment

o) Agreed recommendations by the Executive in respect of the bids outlined in Appendix Q [page 259 refers] for approval to include in the Capital Plan, or put on the Hold List, including any additional use of reserves required.

p) From the Executive Councillor for Housing:

(i) Approved the use of £331,000 of Developer's Contributions, identified for investment in affordable housing, towards the cost of the redevelopment of Seymour Court, with the balance of funding to be met through Homes and Communities Agency grant (if available), housing capital balances and an element of prudential borrowing if required (although it is not anticipated that this will be required).

(ii) Approved a Housing Capital Allowance for 2011/12 of £13,930,000.

q) Agreed to a one-year reduction of £220,000 in the revenue funding to support Capital in 2012/13 [para 16.44, page 98 refers].

r) Agreed the Capital Plan, as shown in Appendix N [page 219 refers] for the General Fund (which will be updated to incorporate rephasing, new bids and the above recommendations) and Appendix S [page 288 refers] for the Housing Capital Investment Programme.

s) Noted the impact of revenue, capital and other approvals and approved the level of reserves to be used to:

i) support the 2010/11 budget

ii) support the 2011/12 and future years budgets. [Section 17, page 99 refers].

in relation to the Housing Revenue Account

t) Noted that amendments resulting from the announcement of the final subsidy determination for the HRA is reflected in the updated Budget-Setting Report (Version 4 - Council)

Other

u) From the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth:

- Approved the transfer of the Sustainable City grants budget from 2011/12 onwards from the Environment to the Customer and Community Services department (see report on Environment Scrutiny Committee agenda 11.01.11).
- Approved the transfer of the funding for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Biodiversity Partnership and the Cambridgeshire Travel for Work Partnership from 2011/12 onwards from the Environment department to the Chief Executives department (see report on Environment Scrutiny Committee agenda 11.01.11).

Appendix G (b) – Council Tax Setting 2011/12

Agreed:

(1) That the Council calculated its Council Tax Base to be **40,739** for the year 2011/12 in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 and subsequent amendments, made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as shown in the schedule of properties in this Appendix.

(2) That the following amounts are now calculated by the Council for the year 2011/12 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

(a) £138,294,360 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act **[the Council's gross expenditure]**

(b) £122,034,940 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act **[gross income including a contribution from Reserves for 2011/12]**

(c) £16,259,420 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year **[net expenditure]**

(d) £9,473.520 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates and revenue support grant **[Formula Grant]** and reduced by the amount of the sum which the Council estimates will be transferred from its General Fund to its Collection Fund in accordance with section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 **[Council Tax Deficit]**

(e) £166.57 being the amount at (c) above less the amount at (d) above, all divided by the amount at (1) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.

(f) The resulting City Council element of the Council Tax at Band D is shown in the table below, representing an increase of 0%.

City Council element of Council Tax

Band	City Council 2010/11 £'s	Council Tax 2011/12 £'s	Difference (£'s)
A	111.05	111.05	0.00
B	129.55	129.55	0.00
C	148.06	148.06	0.00
D	166.57	166.57	0.00
E	203.59	203.59	0.00
F	240.60	240.60	0.00
G	277.62	277.62	0.00
H	333.14	333.14	0.00

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at (e) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands **[Council Tax relating to the City Council's expenditure]**.

(3) Agreed amounts in precepts to be issued to the City Council for the year 2011/12, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:

Appendix G(b) - Council Tax Setting 2011/12

Band	County Council £	Police Authority £	Fire Authority £
A	698.52	113.04	38.58
B	814.94	131.88	45.01
C	931.36	150.72	51.44
D	1,047.78	169.56	57.87
E	1,280.62	207.24	70.73
F	1,513.46	244.92	83.59
G	1,746.30	282.60	96.45
H	2,095.56	339.12	115.74

(4) Having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (2)(f) and (3) above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2011/12 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Band	Council Tax £
A	961.19
B	1,121.38
C	1,281.58
D	1,441.78
E	1,762.18
F	2,082.57
G	2,402.97
H	2,883.56

And in addition:

Final Formula Grant Settlement

(a) Replaced Table 36 [Section 16, Page 93 refers] with the amended Table below:

(a) Table 36 [Executive Amendment]: Formula Grant Settlement for 2011/12 and (Revised) Provisional 2012/13

Formula Grant	2011/12 £	2012/13 £
Prior Year Adjusted Base (i.e. after adjustments including Concessionary Fares)	10,961,863	9,472,251
Formula Grant entitlement	9,515,105	8,429,164
%age Reduction (year-on-year)	(13.20%)	(11.41%)
%age Reduction from 2010/11 Adjusted Base		(23.10%)

(b) Replaced Table 40 [Section 16, Page 97 refers] with the amended Table below:

(b) Table 40 [Executive Amendment]: Effect on the Level of General Fund Reserves - 2011/12 to 2015/16

Reserves at Year End	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	2013/14 £	2014/15 £	2015/16 £
September 2010 MTS	2,792,340	4,012,700	4,994,650	5,911,580	5,713,715
February 2011 BSR Ver 1.0	3,356,200	4,191,720	4,998,420	6,115,390	5,811,540
February 2011 (post Final Settlement)	3,420,200	4,179,760	4,986,460	6,103,430	5,799,580
February 2011 (post Revised Final Settlement)	3,420,200	4,249,000	5,055,700	6,172,670	5,868,820

- (c) Authorised the Director of Resources to make all further amendments to text in the Budget Setting Report to reflect the changes contained with recommendations (a) and (b) above.

11/7/CNL To consider recommendations of Committees for adoption

Civic Affairs Committee (2 February 2011)

The Council's Filming Protocol

Resolved (unanimously) to:

Approve the Council's Filming Protocol as amended by the Civic Affairs Committee on 2 February 2011.

11/8/CNL To deal with Oral Questions

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

Why was his report to the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on the closure of the ground floor Lion Yard toilets devoid of alternative options, missing an effective assessment of impacts on disabled people and others, devoid of data including usage, missing the promised appendices and plans when circulated, and mistitled on the agenda to remove the critical word 'toilets'?

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded that the proposal had been subject to internal scrutiny through the asset management process. Consent of the landlord was also required to make the proposed changes, and the responsibility for assessing the impact rested with the owners.

2. Councillor Newbold to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources

Please supply details of the consultations undertaken, particularly with users, prior to the planned closure of the ground floor location of the Lion Yard Toilets.

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded that he was unsure what consultation Aberdeen Asset Managers or their architects may have undertaken in arriving at their proposals. It was confirmed that the Council's Access Officer was consulted by Council officers on the request to give landlord's consent to implement the changes. As previously stated, the Access Officer confirmed he did not think that the proposed relocation breached either the Equalities Act or any part of the Disability Discrimination Act.

3. From Councillor Marchant-Daisley to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources

It is understood that in anticipation of the effect of benefit cuts there will be an increase in the Discretionary Housing Payment. What will be the increase and the total value of the fund as a result?

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded that the Government had increased its contributions to funding Discretionary

Housing Payments by £10m to £30m in 2011/12, and Cambridge had been allocated £32,347. This equated to an increase of £7,023 from last year.

The purpose of the additional funding was to provide more flexibility to help a greater number of new and existing customers who faced a shortfall in rent because of changes to Housing Benefit, which come into effect from April 2011.

The Council had been advised that its Discretionary Housing Payment allocation for 2011/12 would be £32,347, which was less than expected given that the distribution formula was intended, as far as possible, to target resources according to need. This did not seem to be borne out with the additional allocation that Cambridge had received.

The financial arrangements for Discretionary Housing Payments sets an overall limit on expenditure at 2.5 x the Government allocation. Due to the issues that Cambridge faced, there would be a need to seek additional Council funding of up to £48,521 (as the overall limit for 2011/12 was £80,868) to meet some of the expected shortfalls as a result of the Housing Benefit changes.

4. Councillor Hart to the Executive Councillor for Housing

How many social housing units, with 4 or more bedrooms, have been built in the City over the last 5 years and how many families are on the City Council's housing needs register for such accommodation?

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded that from April 2005 a total of 24 social housing units had been built. These comprised of 18 x 4 beds, 5 x 5 beds and 1 x 6 bed – and equated to 3% of the total units built during that period. There was currently 123 families on the housing needs register, with 3 pending.

5. Councillor Pogonowski to the Leader

What is the City Council doing to pursue enforcement of the 20mph zone in Market Ward, or is the Council choosing to pursue the path of unenforcement?

The Leader responded that she had campaigned for many years and welcomed a 20mph zone in Market Ward. Reports had been brought to the West/Central Area Committee and resulted in public discussion on the issue.

Whilst responsibility for enforcement sat with the Highway Authority and the Police, options such as signage, street design and education could have a positive impact.

The City Council would encourage enforcement of this 20mph zone, and support its extension across the City.

6. Councillor Hipkin to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources

What response from the general public has the Executive Councillor received to the closure of the Lion Yard public toilet and to the decision to relocate it to a less accessible position at first floor level?

What account will he take of the widespread opposition to this proposal?

Councillor Hipkin withdrew this question.

7. Councillor Wright to the Executive Councillor for Housing

How many unaccompanied asylum seeker young people are being housed in Cambridge?

What support is being offered in the city to those young people on notice to return to the country from whence they have fled?

The Executive Councillor for Housing responded that the Office of Children and Young People's Service 16+ team was primarily responsible for housing 16 and 17 year olds who had become homeless and there were currently four unaccompanied minors housed in Cambridge (2 in hostels, 1 in foster care and 1 in a residential home). In addition to this, there were fourteen 18-21 year olds fitting this category housed at various locations throughout the City. No unaccompanied asylum seekers under the age of 18 had been found rough sleeping in Cambridge in the past 5 years, but one failed asylum seeker over the age of 18 was found sleeping rough in 2010. Additional support to these groups was provided by the Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum (CECF).

8. Councillor Owers to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources

Why has the Council not undertaken an Equalities Impact Assessment in relation to the removal of the downstairs Lion Yard toilets?

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded that an Equalities Impact Assessment would be undertaken and discussions were ongoing with Aberdeen Asset Managers and local users.

9. Councillor Walker to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources

On an averagely busy shopping day, how long would it take someone in a wheelchair and someone with a child in a pushchair at the Petty Cury entrance to Lion Yard shopping centre to get to:

- i) the downstairs Lion Yard toilets**
- ii) the proposed replacement toilets on the first floor in the Grand Arcade**

and what would be their best route?"

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded that the best route to access the proposed new toilets would be through the Grand Arcade, up in the lifts and along the first floor. Whilst travel times would be impacted on due to the closure of the Fisher Square entrance, no exact timings were available. The Executive Councillor agreed to raise this further when he met with user groups and feed back details to Councillor Walker at a later date.

11/9/CNL Closure of Motion

Under paragraph 28.4 of the Council Procedure Rules, Councillor Rosenstiel proposed that the Council adjourn and reconvene at 6pm on Monday 21 February 2011.

On a show of hands the proposal was carried by 30 votes to 1.

The meeting ended at 11.30 pm

CHAIR